UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

ALŽBĚTA LÖBLOVÁ

Negative intensification in spoken British English

Intenzifikace záporu v mluvené britské angličtině

Praha 2015   Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Markéta Malá, Ph.D.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala

všechny použité prameny a literaturu, a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného

vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 11. srpna 2015   **.…………………………..**

ABSTRACT

The BA thesis examines means of intensification of negation in British spoken English. Since intensification is generally associated with adverbials, more precisely with adverbs of degree, another aim of the study is to prove there are other than lexical means of intensification. For it is focused on the spoken language, which is natural, unplanned, improvised, it includes constructions that are regarded as ungrammatical in Standard English, but occur widely in the material used, namely the demographically sampled sub-corpus of the British National Corpus.

Drawing on Dušková et al. (1988) and Biber et al. (1999) the thesis defines negation and intensification, and their mutual interaction and relation. Based on the findings of Palacios-Martínez (1996), the thesis aims at suggesting a suitable classification of the means of negative intensification provided by the corpus-based study.

keywords: intensification, intensifier, negation, speech, colloquial language

ABSTRAKT

Tato bakalářská práce zkoumá prostředky intenzifikace záporu v britské mluvené angličtině. Jelikož intenzifikace je obecně spojovaná s příslovečným určením, konkrétněji s adverbii míry, je dalším cílem práce prokázat, že existují i jiné než lexikální prostředky intenzifikace. Protože je práce zaměřena na mluvený jazyk, přirozený, neplánovaný, improvizovaný, jsou zahrnuty i konstrukce, které jsou ve standardní angličtině považovány za mluvnicky nesprávné, ale vyskytují se běžně v hovorovém jazyce. Materiál pro analýzu byl proto čerpán z neformálních dialogů obsažených v Britském národním korpusu.

Zápor a intenzifikace a jejich vzájemný vztah či interakce jsou popsány podle poznatků Duškové a kol. (1988) a Bibera a kol. (1999). Práce usiluje o návrh vhodné klasifikace prostředků intenzifikace záporu získané korpusovou studií založené na poznatcích Palacios-Martíneze (1996).

klíčová slova: intenzifikace, intenzifikátor, zápor, mluvený jazyk, hovorový jazyk

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

BNC - British National Corpus

OALD – *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, 2015. Available Online from <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (accessed 2nd August 2015)

* ungrammatical form

→ contrast example

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

1 INTRODUCTION

The study examines various ways of negative intensification in spoken British English. It focuses not only on lexical devices, with which intensification is often associated, but deals with means of intensification on different levels of language. The hypothesis is based on the assumption that the means of intensification of negation will differ to a certain extent from those used in positive context. Due to fast development of the function of intensifiers, the analysis may also provide devices of emphasis that are not described in the theoretical part and vice versa, since some of the used secondary material might be older than the data. All means of intensification of negation provided by the analysis will be, then, assessed according to various criteria, for example type of negation, position in the sentence, collocability, etc.

The theoretical part is concerned with two phenomena, negation and intensification, and their mutual relation and co-occurrence. Since the analysis of the corpus is focused on spoken language which includes even ungrammatical forms, the boundaries between what is regarded as grammatically acceptable and what is not needs to be defined. For that purpose, several grammars are used - *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Quirk et al., 1985), *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (Dušková et al., 1988), *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Biber et al., 1999) and *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002). The grammars appear to grasp the phenomena from different perspectives and thus offer different terminology and classification of negation and intensification. However, Biber et al. (1999) and Dušková et al. (1988) seem to share the view on the phenomena to a considerable extent and thus logically became the basis of the theoretical part. Additional linguistic studies are used to complete and further specify the definition of the phenomena and help to clarify the relation between them or the behaviour of individual means of intensification.

Based on the research of the secondary sources, the data will be assessed and defined in the analytical part. The used material will consist of 100 sentences that include both intensification and negation,[1] which will be drawn from the British National Corpus (BNC). The study is directed only at natural speech and for that reason, the search is narrowed to the demographically sampled spoken section of the corpus. To set up a suitable classification, Dušková et al. (1988) and "Negative Intensification in Modern English" by Palacios-Martínez (1996) were mainly used. Since speech typically includes pauses, repetition, inconsistencies,

---

[1] The number of sentences does not have to correspond with the number of occurrences of intensification of negation, since it is not unusual co-occurrence of several means of intensification in a sentence.

disfluency, etc. it is expected that not all material provided by the query of BNC could be actually used for the analysis and thus, the representation of means of negative intensification need to be chosen carefully.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Generally, spoken English is known to have a higher number of occurrences not only of negation, but of intensification as well (cf. Biber et al., 1999). The high frequency is influenced by several factors. Those that seem the most relevant to this study are the frequent repetition of lexical units, either negative or intensifying words, and the tendency to use shorter sentences in speech. This explains the high occurrence of verbs, and since the negation is usually tied to the verb it accounts for the high frequency of negative forms as well (Biber et al., 1999: 159). The function of negation is to express the speaker's negative attitude towards or denial of what is being communicated (Dušková et al., 1988: 336), therefore the sentence *I have not finished* is the negative counterpart of *I have finished* (Quirk et al., 1985: 776).

Intensification is described as means how to "convey a message more clearly and to strengthen the speaker's position as well as their attitude toward what they are saying." (Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez, 2014: 212) Intensifiers in English received considerable attention over the years mostly from diachronic or sociolinguistic point of view, which provided significant information about their flexibility and grammaticalization processes they have undergone or about their usage across genders, social classes or generations (cf. Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez, 2014). Nonetheless, it seems that the relation between negation and intensification, in other words the ways of emphasizing the speaker's negative attitude towards what is being communicated, has been given relatively little attention.

2.1. Standard forms of negation

In order to be able to describe intensified negation, we need to determine what is considered the standard, non-emphatic negative form. There are several different ways how to express the negative, however, this study focuses only on the grammatical negation. Lexical negation formed by an affix or through words that are negative only in their meaning, but not in form, will be mentioned only briefly. Grammatical negation can be expressed by the particle *not* or a negative quantifier, e.g. *no*, *nothing*, *never*. In both cases, however, negation is usually expressed only once (cf. Dušková et al., 1988). When the verb is negated by the particle *not*, the clause employs *any*-forms (non-assertive forms) (ex. 1) while negation through negative quantifiers requires a positive verb (ex. 2).

(1) *She isn't any different*.

(2) *She is no different*. (Quirk et al., 1985: 778)

2.1.1. *Not*-negation

The particle *not* can negate any clause element, however, the negation of the predicate needs to be dealt with separately. In this case, the particle *not* is inserted inside the verb phrase after the operator (the first auxiliary or modal).

(3) *You can do this but you can't do that*. (Biber et al., 1999: 160)

With the exception of the verbs *be* and *have*, *not* can never stand after a lexical verb.[2] If the positive counterpart of the negative sentence does not employ any auxiliary or modal, the verb requires *do*-insertion (Biber et al., 1999: 160).

(4) *The children are playing. The children are not playing*. (Quirk et al., 1985: 776)

(5) *I studied the label. I didn't study the label*. (Biber et al., 1999: 160)

Since the negative particle *not* is one of the function words, which often have reduced forms, it is worth noting that "there are three possible ways of realizing an operator followed by the negator *not*" (Biber et al., 1999: 165): the full form (ex. 6); *not*-contraction (ex. 7); and operator contraction (ex. 8).

(6) *He is not acting wisely*. (my own example)

(7) *He isn't acting wisely*.

(8) *He's not acting wisely*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 337)

The occurrence of each form varies in terms of register, choice of operator and the word (or noun phrase) preceding it. In spoken English, the reduced forms are expected to be found more frequently than the full forms (Biber et al., 1999: 165).

When negating another clause element, *not* obligatorily stands in pre-position with respect to the negated element (ex. 9).

(9) *Not a single star could be seen*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 339)

---

[2] The rule applies with the exception of the subjunctive, in which case the particle *not* is placed immediately before the lexical verb and requires no operator (Quirk et al., 1988: 777):
They insisted that we not eat meat. (Quirk et al., 1988: 157)

2.1.2 *No*-negation

The grammatical *no*-negation employs negative quantifiers – *no*, *none*, *no one*, *nobody*, *nothing*, *nowhere*, *never*, *neither*, *nor*. *No* can be then used as a response to a yes/no question (ex. 10) or as a determiner (ex. 11).

(10) *Have you been waiting long? – No, I've only just arrived.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 337)

(11) *They had no sympathy for him.* (Biber et al., 1999: 168)

In contexts that require the use of not one, but several quantifiers, a rule of expressing the negative first is established. The negative quantifier is followed by *any*-forms.

(12) *We got nothing for anyone anywhere.*

* *We got anything for anyone nowhere.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 340)

* *We got anything for no one anywhere.* (my own example)

2.1.3. Correspondence of *not*-negation and *no*-negation

The two forms of negation are not fully interchangeable. Furthermore, substitutability of one form by the other is not the same for both forms. While *no*-negation can be expressed by *not*-negation in 80 per cent of occurrences, *not*-negation is replaceable by *no*-negation in 30 per cent of cases only, for the particle *not* needs to co-occur in a sentence with another word which can incorporate the negative element, such as one of the *any*-forms or the indefinite article (Biber et al., 1999: 169).

(13) *She doesn't have a car yet.*

→ *She has no car yet.*

The definite article does not allow the substitution.

(14) *She doesn't have the car yet.* (Biber et al., 1999: 169)

→ * *She has no car yet.*

Even though *no*-negation is statistically more inclined to being replaced by another form of negation, there is at least one case that does not allow the substitution - the case where the negative form stands in pre-verbal position (Biber et al., 1999: 170).[3]

(15) *Nobody was hurt*.

→ * *Anybody wasn't hurt*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 340)

Apart from the restrictions stated above, there are also preferences for one of the forms in terms of the type of clause, the choice of the operator or the lexical verb (Biber et al., 1999: 171) – e.g. *no*-negation is much more frequent in existential constructions than *not*-negation and thus it is not usual to find *not* followed by *any*-forms in such constructions (Poldauf, 1964: 371).

(16) *There's no hope*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 341)

On the other hand, *not*-negation tends to collocate with mental verbs more often than *no*-negation (Biber et al., 1999: 174).

(17) *They don't know you*. (Quirk et al., 1985: 776)

In cases that allow the use of both forms, *no*-negation seems to have different implications than *not*-negation.

(18) *He's not a teacher*.

(19) *He's no teacher*. (Biber et al., 1999: 169)

It appears that *not*-negation (ex. 18) is more neutral, giving a neutral characterization or expressing a judgement, while *no*-negation (ex. 19) is rather evaluative and refers to the person's abilities and assesses his role (Biber et al., 1999: 169). The reason for this might be that "the determiner *no* converts the usually gradable noun into a nongradable noun that characterizes the person." (Quirk et al., 1985: 780)

Overall, the frequency of *not*-negation is much higher than that of *no*-negation in all registers, especially in speech. *No*-negation occurs with frequent verbs, such as *be* or *have*,

---

[3] Only in cases where the negated subject is of a generic reference both forms of negation are possible.

No honest man would lie.

An honest man would not lie. (Quirk et al., 1985: 779)

and some of the combinations with *be* and *have* are very frequent, e.g. *there + be + no chance/evidence/reason*, *have + no choice/desire/effect* (Biber et al., 1999: 170 - 173).

2.1.4. Scope of negation

The negatives differ not only in terms of form, which has been discussed, but also in terms of the scope of negation, i.e. "the stretch of language over which the negative item has a semantic influence" (Quirk et al., 1985: 787). The stretch determines what lies within and outside the effect of negation - what in a clause is perceived as negative or as positive. Nevertheless, the classification is not uniform among scholars.[4] This study follows the distinction of clause and local negation (cf. Biber et al., 1999). In case of clause negation the scope usually extends from the negative word to the end of the clause with the exception of adverbials preceding the negation, while local negation negates only a word or a phrase (Quirk et al., 1985: 787 – 790).

2.1.4.1. Clause negation

Through clause negation, whether expressed by the negative particle *not* or by a negative quantifier, the negative notion is applied to the whole clause and thus "the whole clause is syntactically treated as negative" (Quirk et al., 1985: 775). In case of the *not*-negation, the clause is usually negated through verb-negation (ex. 20), however, the particle *not* can be placed before another clause element and still negate the whole clause (ex. 21), though local negation is more frequent. In that case of clause negation the negative particle *not* receives the same function as the negative quantifier *no* (ex. 22).

(20) *It just wasn't worth our while*. (Biber et al., 1999: 160)

(21) *Not a single star could be seen.*

(22) *No star could be seen.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 339)

Apart from the tendency to place the negative as early as possible (cf. Jespersen, 1917) and co-occurrence with non-assertive forms, which has already been mentioned, clause negation also takes a positive question tag in both, *no*-negation (ex. 23) and *not*-negation (ex. 24) unlike in the case of a positive sentence (ex. 25).

---

[4] Jespersen (1917) distinguishes between nexal and special negation; Quirk et al. (1985) describes clause, local and predication negation. The classifications differ not only in terms of terminology, but also in the delimitation of the individual types of negation.

(23) *No dogs are permitted here, are they?* (Quirk et al., 1985: 779)

(24) *She doesn't work hard, does she?*

(25) *She works hard, doesn't she?* (Quirk et al., 1985: 777)

Furthermore, an initial position of a negative adverbial or another negative element in informal style usually causes subject-operator inversion.

(26) *Not until yesterday did he change his mind.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 779)

A special case of clause negation is that of mental verbs such as *think*, *seem*, *suppose* in complex sentences along with content clauses. The negative element can be found in the main clause (where it usually stands) or can be shifted to the subordinate clause.

(27) *I thought it didn't matter.*

I didn't think it mattered. (Dušková et al., 1988: 348)

2.1.4.2. Local negation

Since in local negation only one constituent, a word or a phrase, is negated, the clause as a whole is understood as positive.

(28) *He was here not a minute ago.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 339)

In that case *not* only modifies, reverses the polarity of the following expression (Quirk et al., 1985: 791). For that reason, the clause usually cannot employ non-assertive forms, but the assertive ones are used.

(29) *I can't do everything myself.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 343)

Also, local negation differs from clause negation when followed by a question tag, which is negative as it is in case of a positive clause.

 (30) *It's in the middle of nowhere, isn't it?* (Biber et al., 1999: 175)

Additionally, there is no subject-operator inversion when a negated adverbial is moved to the initial position (ex. 31). The meaning of such sentence differs significantly from that of clause negation (ex. 32).

(31) *Not even ten years ago you could see such a film.*

'You could see such a film as recently as ten years ago.'

(32) *Not even ten years ago could you see such a film.*

'You couldn't see such a film even ten years ago.' (Quirk et al., 1985: 793)

The boundary between clause and local negation is very thin, but sometimes a test of extending the scope of negation to another subject with *neither* or *nor* can distinguish between the two forms (Dušková et al., 1988: 339).

(33) *She isn't satisfied, and neither (nor) am I.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 339)

2.1.5. Double negation

Even though negation is usually expressed just once, occasionally two or more negative forms co-occur within a clause. However, "[t]he double negation in standard English is very different from the double or multiple negation in nonstandard English" (Quirk et al., 1985: 799). In standard English, negative items in such sentences usually cancel out each other making the sentence semantically positive, but syntactically negative. In nonstandard English the additional negatives replace non-assertive forms that would occur in standard English and do not cancel out each other, but rather strengthen the negative meaning (Quirk et al., 1985: 799).

Dušková et al. describe three types of double negation in standard English. One of them is a combination of grammatical and lexical negation. It regards both clause (ex. 34) and local negation (ex. 35) and also includes the negative construction with *but* (ex. 36).

(34) *What he says is not unreasonable.*

'What he says is (quite) reasonable.' (Dušková et al., 1988: 346)

(35) *She is a not entirely unintelligent woman.*

'She is a fairly intelligent woman.' (Quirk et al., 1985: 791)

(36) *You do nothing but play.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 346)

The other two types of double negation comprise a combination of two grammatical negations which belong either to two separate predications (ex. 37) or, less likely, to the same predication (ex. 38) (Dušková et al., 1988: 346).

(37) *He isn't likely to have no previous engagement*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 346)

(38) *Not all imperatives have no subject, do they?* (Quirk et al., 1985: 799)

In both cases, one negation lies outside the scope of the other one. Nevertheless, these sentences are infrequent in English and speakers often prefer different expressions.

2.2. Intensification

Intensification is a phenomenon pervading all levels of language[5] but is mainly associated with lexical devices − intensifiers. Therefore the terms intensification and intensifiers needs to be carefully distinguished from each other. However, Bolinger (1972) uses the term *intensifier* "for any device that scales a quality, whether up or down or somewhere between the two" (Bolinger, 1972: 17). Since the study examines the intensifiers in great detail, they will be dealt with separately (chapter 2.2.1.) apart from other means of intensification − phonological, morphological, grammatical (chapter 2.2.2.). The use of various devices of intensification differ in terms of register, dialectal variety, gender, age, social status etc. − e.g. teenagers are considered to be true innovators in the use of language of intensification for their tendency to play with language (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 774). The variety of ways how teenagers express emphasis is much wider and entirely distinct from other generations.

2.2.1. Lexical intensifiers

Traditionally, intensifiers are associated with adjectives and adverbs − the function of intensifiers, usually adverbs of degree, is to increase or tone down the strength of an adjective or another adverb in a sentence (Anderson, 2006: 11). These adverbs do not bring a new semantic unit into a structure, but only denote the degree of intensity (Dušková et al., 1988: 465). The reason for not having a distinct independent meaning is the process of delexicalization which intensifiers undergo. During this process they gradually lose their original meaning and evolve into intensifying markers (Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez, 2014: 213). It is also due to this process that the level of collocability of intensifiers varies and thus the more delexicalized an intensifier is, the less meaning it has, the more widely and easily it collocates (Anderson, 2006: 12). Intensifiers divide into two classes − adjectival or verbal. Some of the intensifiers can be found only in one of the classes or are further

---

[5] Aleksandrovič (2013) distinguishes among graphic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic means of intensification.

syntactically (ex. 39), semantically (ex.40), grammatically (ex. 41) or stylistically (ex. 42) restricted (Dušková et al., 1988: 465 - 469).

> (39) *Most will be extremely cautious until new case law defines the extent of the new Act.* (Biber et al., 1999: 554)

> (40) *It's a hopeless position, a ridiculous position, and utterly untenable.* (Bäcklund, 1973: 214)

> (41) *We were greatly amused.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 468)

> (42) *The highly complex process of adjustments to infection is determined by many variables.* (Biber et al., 1999: 565)

The intensifier *extremely* stands only in pre-modifying position, while *utterly* tends to collocate with words with negative implications (Anderson, 2006: 12 - 16). *Greatly* then co-occurs with past participles and *highly* usually collocates with strong adjectives[6] (Dušková et al., 1988: 468-469).

As it was in the case of negation, the terminology referring to lexical devices of intensification is not uniform.[7] For the purposes of this study the distinction into *intensifiers* (or also *amplifiers*), whose function is to increase intensity in the comparison with the norm (ex. 43), and *downtoners* (or also *diminishers*), which have the exact opposite effect (ex. 44) (cf. Biber et al., 1999) is used.

> (43) *It is extremely important.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 466)

> → *It is important.* (my own example)

> (44) *He's a bit of an idiot.* (Bolinger, 1972: 17)

> → *He's an idiot.* (my own example)

Furthermore, more grammars classify only adverbs of degree as intensifiers, but this thesis also includes other lexical devices of intensification – e.g. a prepositional phrase, nominal-turned-adverbial, present participle, simile (comparison), coordination or a swear word.

---

[6] It is a typical intensifier used in academic prose (Biber et al., 1999: 566).

[7] Quirk et al. (1985) divide intensifiers into two groups, *amplifiers* and *downtoners*. Those two types are then divided into several sub-types – *amplifiers* into *maximizers* and *boosters*; *downtoners* into *approximators*, *compromisers*, *diminishers* and *minimizers*.

2.2.1.1. Adverbs of degree

Adverbs of degree are the most frequent intensifiers. As mentioned above they are bound by a number of syntactic, semantic, lexical and stylistic restrictions which influence their potential to collocate with other words. Syntactic limitations mainly refer to their function; adverb intensifiers occur inside a clause element as premodifiers of adjectives whether in their positive (ex. 45), comparative or superlative form, other adverbs (ex. 46), pronouns whether in determination (ex. 47) or pronominal function (ex. 48) or prepositional phrases (ex. 49), but they can also modify a predicate (ex. 50) or stand clause-finally (ex. 51), where they have an intensifying scope over the whole previous sentence (Altenberg, 2011: 128-129).

(45) *The hotel is very good*. (Carrillo-de-Albornoz and Plaza, 2013: 1620)

(46) *I do it quite quickly*. (Macaulay, 2002: 405)

(47) *...who's got absolutely no sense of golfing etiquette.* (Macaulay, 2002: 410)

(48) *I've got absolutely nothing to hide about this*. (Núñez Pertejo and Palacios Martínez, 2014: 222)

(49) *They looked absolutely at ease together, Carter thought...* (Bäcklund, 1973: 225)

(50) *I quite despise him*. (Bolinger, 1972: 224)

(51) *He denied it completely*. (Altenberg, 2011: 129)

It needs to be pointed out that adverb intensifiers tend to modify only units that are gradable and thus some items cannot be intensified (ex. 52) (Quirk et al., 1985: 590).

(52) *Why do you hesitate so?*

* *Why do you wait so?* (Bolinger, 1972: 160)

2.2.1.2. Swear words and expletives

Recent sociolinguistic studies[8] showed that speakers, especially younger people, also use swear and taboo words to intensify their language. Similarly to adverbs as intensifiers, these items do not make any contribution to the propositional meaning of the clause, but rather denote the speaker's emotions, usually negative ones like ill will, irritation, agitation,

---

[8] e.g. Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo (2012)

but also enthusiasm (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 558). These intensifiers seem to be less restricted in usage, since words like *fucking* or *bloody*, for example, can even modify nouns (ex. 53), verbs (ex. 54), proper nouns (ex. 55), or quantifiers (ex. 56) (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 783).

(53) *It cost me ten bucks just to get the bloody picture taken.* (Biber et al., 1999: 1094)

(54) *What are you fucking doing, Selum?* (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 783)

(55) *You know, not just watch fucking Bart Simpson*. (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 783)

(56) *I bought fucking loads of them.* (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 783)

It is necessary to distinguish this usage of swear words from the intensificatory function of expletives. Despite being realized by swear words, they are employed in a sentence rather as exclamations than modifiers. Expletives occur alone or initially within a clause, utterance or turn (ex. 57) (Biber et al., 1999: 1094).

(57) *What the fuck is this?* (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 788)

As was pointed out, intensifiers are of unsettled nature and thus "quickly grow stale and need to be replaced" (Bolinger, 1972: 18). One of the reasons for this tendency is that intensifiers signal in-group membership. And once a particular intensifier starts spreading to other groups, it loses its identifying function and needs to be replaced by another one (Ito and Tagliamonte, 2003: 261).

2.2.2. Other means of intensification

Although intensification is traditionally connected with lexical intensifiers, there are other ways how to intensify language. Although mainly grammatical means of intensification represent the rest of this study, morphological and phonological intensification must be mentioned at least briefly. Phonological intensification often co-occurs with other ways of intensification and is usually achieved by moving, doubling, or even multiplying the focus on other elements than the last lexical item, which receives the focus in natural speech[9] (Biber et

---

[9] Focus is here understood as a point in a clause where nuclear intonation or stress falls, which means that it is the centre of emphasis.

al., 1999: 897). In addition to the change of its position, the stress can be exaggerated in length, pitch range, or intensity (Bolinger, 1972: 281).

Morphological means of intensification involve adding an affix. The most frequent intensifying prefixes are probably *super-* or *mega-* (ex. 58). The prefix does not have to be attached to another word; it can stand as an independent word (cf. Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012).

(58) *Everyone has at least one mega embarrassing moment!* (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012 : 789)

The most frequent morphological means of intensification with the downtoning effect is the suffix *–ish* used primarily in colloquial language (Dušková et al., 1988: 470).

(59) *It was latish.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 470)

Among the grammatical means of intensification, probably the most frequent ones are the rhetorical question (ex. 60), exclamation (ex. 61), demonstrative focusing (ex. 62), clefting (ex. 63), or emphatic *do*-support construction (ex. 64).

(60) *Did they gave him a surprise!* (Bolinger, 1972: 283)

(61) *What a lawyer!* (Bolinger, 1972: 285)

(62) *That's us going for another game.* (Macaulay, 2002: 413)

(63) *It's them that's running it now.* (Macaulay, 2002: 414)

(64) *Kim's the one who did make a donation.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 98)

Other common ways of syntactic intensification include inversion (ex. 65) or placing the element into initial focused position (ex. 66) – in case of an adjective the emphasis is analogous to that of an intensifier (Biber et al., 1999: 898).

(65) *He talked back to her and was she mad!* (Kirchner, 1955: 17)[10]

(66) *Brilliant that was! ~ That was totally brilliant!* (Biber et al., 1999: 898)

Aleksandrovič (2013) in her comparative study discusses the structure *so/such...that* as one of the syntactic, or grammatical, means of intensification, and terms it *clause of degree*.

---

[10] cf. Anderson (2006)

(67) *She looked so appealing and so pretty that I could not refuse her.* (Aleksandrovič, 2013: 69)

In this construction the intensifier and the element it modifies combine with a clause of comparison that further specifies the two elements – the *intensification group*. However, the study points out that the intensification can be expressed only by the intensifier, or that other types of clause can have an emphatic meaning (Aleksandrovič, 2013: 69).

2.2.2.1. Repetition

There is a device of intensification that lies somewhere between the classification of lexical and grammatical intensification – repetition. Thus, it needs to be dealt with separately. Repetition of a particular lexical item, which is a way of lengthening, can be of two types – it is either asyndetic coordination, as it is in case of adjective or adverb intensifiers (ex. 68), or coordination with a conjunction, which can be the case of verbs (ex. 69) (Bolinger, 1972: 289).

(68) *It's quite, quite, quite, quite different*. (Macaulay, 2002: 405)

(69) *He drank and drank.* (Bolinger, 1972: 289)

Repetition is found most frequently in language addressed to children, but it is also common in other registers. A special case of repetition, tautology, is based on combining synonyms – two different words with similar meaning, e.g. *just* and *exactly* (ex. 70) (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 562).

(70) *And just exactly who do you think you are?* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 592)

Also, use of repetition is quite stereotyped – frequently, it occurs in fixed expressions.

(71) *It happened day after day.* (Bolinger, 1972: 289)

However, this intensification construction needs to be distinguished from the type of repetition that arises from hesitant dysfluent speech (repeats),[11] recapitulation or ironic use (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 561).

---

[11] The same piece of speech, words, a word or even a syllable, is repeated in order to gain time for speaker to be able to continue as in the sentence:
Hopefully, he'll, er, he'll see the error of his ways.

2.3. Intensification of negation

Intensification of negation can be defined as strengthening (or weakening) of the polarity of a text or utterance, which allows identifying different degrees of negativity (Carrillo-de-Albornoz, 2013: 1618 - 1619). Jespersen (1917) discusses the necessity for intensification of negation that has emerged in languages due to insufficient expressiveness of the particle *not*, which explains not only the existence of other negative words, but also the fact that additional words are needed to stress the negative meaning and thus avoid misunderstanding or strengthen the speaker's emotive position towards what is being said.

There are various ways of intensifying the negative notion, but since this paper focuses primarily on verbs in their negative forms and negative quantifiers, it examines in depth lexical and grammatical intensification of these two forms.

2.3.1. Negation intensifiers

Lexical intensification of negation is very similar to the one in positive contexts with a slightly different tendency – "[n]egative terms tend to demand stronger intensifiers than positive terms." (Altenberg, 2011: 143) Several categories of intensifiers for both, *not*-negation and *no*-negation, can be distinguished – constructions of negative import (including adverbial intensifiers of verbs), expressions with idiomatic meaning, various types of repetition, multiple negation, and other less frequent types.

2.3.1.1. Constructions of negative import

The class includes formally diverse intensifiers whose occurrence does not appear to be collocationally restricted to specific verbs or other negative expressions. In case of clause negation, the negative element changes the polarity of the whole clause, including the intensifier when it is present. Thus the strengthening force of an intensifier is usually weakened to that of a downtoner (ex. 72), and the force of a downtoner is switched into that of an intensifier (ex. 73) (Bolinger, 1972: 116).[12]

(72) *He didn't ignore my request completely.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 590)

The purpose of repeats is to relieve planning pressure of the speech and thus need to be carefully distinguished from repetition used for intensification purposes (Biber et al., 1999: 1055-1058).

[12] This tendency seems to apply to the majority of lexical means of intensification, but not to all – e.g. *so* can intensify even a negative element when preceding it.

I'm so not ready for this. (Kuha, 2004: 219)

(73) *I was not a bit surprised.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 348)

The fact that the polarity of an intensifier is reversed when standing within the scope of negation explains the use of expressions with negative or weakening connotations for the purpose of strengthening negation – expressions like *a bit* (ex. 73), *at all* (ex. 74), *in the slightest* (ex. 75) *in the least* (ex. 76), *by any means/in any way* (ex. 77), etc.

(74) *It was no trouble at all.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 347)

(75) *They didn't praise him in the slightest.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 600)

(76) *It isn't in the least necessary.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 468)

(77) *It does not in any way cause these sort of problems.* (Biber et al., 1999: 258)

The constructions *not one*, *not a* and *not a single* then represent emphatic alternatives to the negative determiner *no* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786).

(78) *There's not a single whole plate in the house.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 348)

Furthermore, intensification with *whatever* or *whatsoever* is typical of negated copular verbs and *no*-negation as well (Dušková et al., 1988: 348).

(79) *A: Did she have an excuse for being late?*

B: None whatsoever. (Quirk et al., 1985: 392)

Some of the intensifiers, however, cannot occur in negative sentences, and are classified as strictly assertive – e.g. *far* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786).

(80) **The food wasn't far better than I expected.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786)

2.3.1.1.1. Adverbial intensifiers of verbs

Since intensification can be also verbal and one of the options how to achieve a negative sentence is through verb negation, adverbial intensifiers that typically co-occur with a negated verb need to be discussed as well.

A typical verb intensifier occurring in a negative (or non-assertive) sentence is *much* which often corresponds to the intensifier *seldom* used in a positive sentence.

(81) *We don't go out much. We seldom go out.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 470)

Other frequent verb intensifiers found in a sentence along with *not*-negation are *certainly* (ex. 82), *even* (ex. 83) or *really* (ex. 84) (Biber et al., 1999: 173-174).

(82) *They certainly couldn't tell her the truth.* (Biber et al., 1999: 389)[13]

(83) *It happened so fast that I didn't even realise that I had fallen off.* (Biber et al., 1999: 550)

(84) *Um I'm not really sure, but...* (Ito and Tagliamonte, 2003: 264)

For British colloquial language there is usual co-occurrence of a negated verb and the intensifier *half*.

(85) *She doesn't half swear.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 594)

Syntactic, semantic, or other restrictions apply also to verb intensifiers (already discussed in 2.2.1.) and thus some of them cannot be found along with *not*-negation or in a negative sentence in general. On the other hand, there are even intensifiers that appear only in negation (Dušková et al., 1988: 473), e.g. the idiomatic expression *a wink* (ex. 86).

(86) *I didn't sleep a wink.*[14] (Quirk et al., 1988: 786)

Other adverbial intensifiers may conform to the tendencies in terms of collocability or position holding – e.g. the intensifier *possibly* co-occurs in a negative clause only with the operator *can*. (Dušková et al., 1988: 348)

(87) *They can't possibly leave now.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 600)[15]

2.3.1.2. Expressions with idiomatic meaning

This type of intensification refers to fixed expressions where one of the components cannot be understood in its literal meaning (ex. 86, 88). Swear words also appear in such constructions quite often (ex. 89).

---

[13] The adverbial *certainly* precedes the negation, which is not the position of an intensifier, but acts as a disjunct that intensifies the whole clause (Dušková et al., 1988: 478).

[14] In this case *a wink* is not an object but an intensifier, an adverb of degree; for it denotes degree as *a tear* in the sentence *She wept a tear or two*. We ask *How much did she weep?* instead of *What did she weep?* (Dušková et al., 1988: 447). Due to the restrictions in usage of the intensifier, the whole expression *not sleep a wink* would be regarded as an intensifying expression with idiomatic meaning.

[15] Unlike in the previous sentence (ex. 86), the intensifier here is restricted only in choice of operator, but collocates with various types of lexical verbs and thus is classified as an adverbial intensifier of verbs.

(88) *He won't lift a finger to help you.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786)

(89) *Cassie, we don't give a fuck about!* (Palacios Martínez and Núñez Pertejo, 2012: 787)

Nevertheless, swear words can intensify negation on their own, since they are less restricted in terms of usage.

2.3.2. Other means of negative intensification

Other than the lexical means of intensification used in positive and negative sentences differ to even lesser extent than it is in case of intensifiers. As well as in case of positive contexts, the second most frequent type of intensification is a grammatical one.[16] In negative contexts intensification can take the form of the *do*-support construction.

(90) *He never did understand how she felt.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 98)

Another case of grammatical intensification of negation is the contrastive construction with *but*.

(91) *He thinks they are cheating, but they are not.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 98)

Another way of intensifying the negative notion is placing the negative element (usually adverbial) in the initial position, which is usually accompanied by inversion.

(92) *Not a single word did he say in his defence.* (Dušková et al., 1988: 348)

A different, emphatic use of *never* appears in cases where the negative quantifier loses its temporal meaning and functions in the clause as a substitution for *not* (Jespersen, 1917: 17).[17]

(93) *I never stayed there last night.[18]* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786)

A type of intensification of negation that can be classified as grammatical as well as lexical is repetition of a negative quantifier or quantifiers, usually *never* (ex. 94) or the combination of *never ever* (ex. 95).

(94) *I'll never, never go there again.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 786)

---

[16] Phonological intensification of negation is analogous to that in positive sentences (cf. Jespersen, 1917).

[17] The temporal connotations of *never* are usually substituted by an adverbial referring to specific time (Quirk et al., 1985: 601).

[18] This emphatic use of *never* is used particularly in denials (Quirk et al., 1988: 786).

(95) *I'll never ever stay with them again.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 787)

2.3.2.1. Multiple negation

The means of intensification also include employing multiple negation in a sentence. The phenomenon "fits into a more general pattern of double or multiple marking, the mechanism that if you want to stress something, you say it more than once." (Van der Wouden, 1997: 243) Double or multiple negation consists in the co-occurrence of two or more negative forms in the same clause to mark one semantic negation, a single negative meaning. An additional negative element is employed instead of a non-assertive form which would occur in standard English (Biber et al., 1999: 177-178).

(96) *He didn't say nothing*.

He didn't say anything. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 846)

Although multiple negation is considered stigmatized in the English language, the use of multiple negative elements in a sentence cannot be regarded as illogical despite its redundancy or stylistic superfluousness (Jespersen, 1917: 71). Multiple negation is a widespread feature of casual speech or of non-standard dialects, such as Cockney (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 845 - 846).

3. MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY

The analytical part of the thesis relies on 100 negative sentences that include 106 occurrences of intensification of negation[19] drawn from the British National Corpus. Since the thesis examines ways of intensifying negation in natural speech, the search in the corpus was narrowed down to the demographically sampled spoken section of the corpus. The demographically sampled sub-corpus comprises 153 texts – transcripts of everyday conversations (4.3 million words), recorded in the latter half of the 20th century across the United Kingdom.[20] The corpus was accessed via the BNCweb interface, which includes textual mark-up, and the Czech National Corpus KonText interface.[21]

The material consists of 106 examples of intensification of negation that present only a fragment of the findings. Not to omit any instance of either type of negation, the query needed to list all negative forms attested in the corpus. The first query showed, not unexpectedly, that apart from the forms of negation listed in grammars the BNC includes even informal negative items and unusual spelling variants, such as *nowt*, *nah* or *nuffink*. Thus, the final query was:

[lemma="not|never|no|none|nobody|nowhere|nothing|neither|nor|nah|nae|nuffink|nowt|nope"]

The search rendered 145,948 hits of negation. The examples of intensification of negation thus make only a representative sample. The results were shuffled before selecting the initial 100 relevant sentences to collect more diverse data.

The hits were examined to assess whether the utterance includes intensification that would have a strengthening effect on negation or not. The instances of intensification, then, needed to be sorted into classes according to their collocability and level of idiomaticity. Where necessary, additional queries[22] were used that made it possible to delimit the class (see introduction to chapter 4.), especially in terms of collocations. The whole sub-corpus was also resorted to where more information on the syntactic behaviour of the intensifiers was needed. The audio-recordings of the sound-files of the sub-corpus available through the BNCweb

---

[19] The number of occurrences of negative intensification is higher than the number of concordance lines, for few sentences include more than one means of intensification of negation.

[20] http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/ accessed 2nd August 2015

[21] http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/

https://kontext.korpus.cz/

[22] The additional queries are not included in the collected data represented by the 100 examples of intensification of negation, for they serve only to determine the class of a particular intensifier

interface were used as supplementary material when distinguishing between emphatic and non-emphatic repetition.

4. ANALYSIS

The analytical part of the study examines 100 negative sentences with 106 corpus findings of negative intensification. It is focused on the way that the negative notion is emphasized. The intensification with the opposite effect is not included in the analysis. The examples were sorted into several classes of intensification that are found within negative context − the two major classes were delimited on the basis of idiomaticity and collocational restrictions imposed on the combination with the negation, the third class comprises various means of intensification, often combinations of lexical and grammatical means: 1) constructions with negative import, 2) intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning, 3) other means of intensification (repetition, negative concord, etc.).

4.1 Constructions with negative import

The use of expressions with negative import is not collocationally restricted; they can occur along with various verbs in a sentence. They usually also stand in post-position to the negative in both types of negation. The constructions can be realized either by a phrase or only a word, as illustrated in Table 1.

	total number	subclass	intensifiers
constructions with negative import	(57)	phrase	*at all* (10), *a (flat) bit* (2), *no way* (1), *a word* (1), *by any stretch of the imagination* (1)
		pronominal intensifier	*whatsoever* (1), *whatever* (1)
		adverbial intensifier of verbs	*really* (19), *even* (10), *just* (3), *only* (2), *definitely* (2),
		swear word	*bloody* (3), *damn* (1)

Table 1: Constructions with negative import

4.1.1. Phrases

One of the most frequent intensifying constructions with negative import is the prepositional phrase *at all*. Though it appears typically with *not*-negation (ex. 1), the results provide an instance of co-occurrence of the construction with *no*-negation (ex. 2)

(1) *Shakespeare, we don't know what Shakespeare wanted <pause> to do on stage, he doesn't give you any idea <pause> at all.* (KPV, 7531)

(2) *Th there's no logic to it at all but they play it on.* (KC0, 3650)

In all but one instance provided by the analysis, the construction *at all* is found at the very end of the negative clause. The exception is represented by a complex sentence where negation is raised to the main clause while intensification remains in the content clause (ex. 3). *At all*, however, still emphasizes the negative predicate.

(3) *I'm confusing 'em I don't know who I'm I <u>don't</u> think I'm gonna vote <u>at all</u>.* (KDX, 67)

The phrase *a bit* is also included in the class of constructions with negative import with two occurrences in total. It is found either with the verb *have* or *have got* in the excerpt, even though it is known to collocate with various verbs.[23]

In one of the examples *a bit* is even further intensified (ex. 4)

(4) *You <u>haven't</u> got <u>a flat bit</u> there*. (KCA, 2040)

A flat bit is used to denote even higher degree of absence than the one implied by *a bit*.

Other constructions work on a similar basis – consisting of an indefinite article indicating (emphasizing) singularity and a countable noun. In the excerpt such construction is represented by the phrase *a word* (ex. 5), emphasizing the fact someone did not mention the topic at all. A further query focussing on the intensifier *a word* shows that it combines typically with verbs of speaking, hearing and understanding (Figure 1) – but the semantic class is so broad that the intensifier was included among the non-idiomatic expressions.

(5) *No, not a word.* (KE0, 2975)

KB2:2592	*but on Monday I <u>couldn't</u>*	*<u>speak a word</u> Oh you're lucky*
KBE:25	*you been swearing Rose? No I <u>haven't</u>*	*<u>said a word</u>. Oh she's all right then?*
KBE:8509	*I said to his girlfriend Liar. <u>Can't</u>*	*<u>get a word</u> in without [unclear] can he?*
KBF:8796	*He goes over and over yeah. <u>Doesn't</u>*	*<u>listen to a word</u> I say. Like the woman's*
KBG:417	*outrageous every week, you <u>can't</u>*	*<u>believe a word</u> of it! There's no plot*
KBS:273	*If you talk with your mouth full I <u>can't</u>*	*<u>understand a word</u> you say can I?*

Figure 1: *Not a word* collocations

---

[23] The verbs attested in the construction 'n't/not VERB a bit' in the spoken sub-corpus of BNC include, e.g. *mind*, *totter*, *age, eat* or *hear*. Syntactically, the phrase constitutes either the adverbial of degree (*Well they haven't aged a bit ...* (KRM 1724)) or the object of the verb (*yeah, there you are don't eat a bit* (KD6 3291)).

In the excerpt, we also find the construction *no way* (ex. 6) which mostly occurs alone standing for *there is no way...*[24]

(6) <u>*No way,*</u> *I said before you can't do that.* (KD8, 8325)

The intensifier could be moved to the final position.[25]

The last phrase of negative import found by the analysis is the construction *by any stretch of the imagination* (ex. 7). A further analysis of the phrase aimed at assertion of the extent of its collocability showed that it co-occurs with various verbs (Figure 2), often with copular predications.

(7) *Saw one one lad was really really sort of well okay he* <u>*wasn't*</u> *clever* <u>*by any stretch of the imagination*</u> *but he just, was just a you know a sort of no-hoper...* (KB7, 255)

HGD:1481	*Marguerite was not exactly a motherly woman... <u>Not</u>*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u> could she be called beautiful*
JY1:1899	*It could <u>not</u>,*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u>*
FDW:170	*...which could <u>not</u>*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u> relate to the duties of judges...*
CTX:1910	*The program <u>isn't</u> perfect*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u>.*
CBV:923	*The Super Seven is <u>not</u>*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u> a cruising car*
JYB:531	*...although he <u>didn't</u> look it*	*<u>by any stretch of the imagination</u>.*

Figure 2: Occurences of the construction *by any stretch of the imagination*

4.1.2. Pronominal intensifiers

Two of the intensifiers found in the analysis collocate rather with *no*-negation, but it does not mean that the co-occurrence with *not*-negation is purely impossible; it is just far less frequent. Those two intensifiers are *whatever* (ex.8) and *whatsoever* (ex. 9).

(8) *it was solid and it was all sort of, his age, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen year olds and all vowing they're* <u>*never*</u> *gonna sniff* <u>*whatever*</u> *again, you know all making these* (KP1, 3898)

---

[24] In the demographically sampled spoken sub-corpus of BNC the utterance initial occurrences (i.e. those following immediately a clause-final punctuation mark) account for 30 per cent of instances of *no way*.

[25] Cf. *... I mean I don't think I look too bad in the leggings, I mean I would never have done it when I used to go to Weightwatchers when I was thirteen and a half stone, I would never of gone in leggings,* <u>*no way*</u>, *...* (KBH, 6175)

(9) *None whatsoever.* (KBF, 13395)

4.1.3. Swear words

There is a new type of intensifiers on the rise that can also be classified as words with negative import – swear words (see chapter 2). They are extremely universal. They occur with negated verbs as well as with the negative quantifiers usually following the negation, whatever the type. The analysis shows that *bloody* is used most often among British English speakers, co-occurring with both *not*-negation (10) and *no*-negation (11).

(10) *I can't bloody lift that.* (KCN, 3546)

(11) *Well that's no bloody good.* (KCE, 4725)

Apart from the use of *bloody* as an intensifier, one instance of *damn* (ex. 12) was found in the excerpt of the corpus.

(12) *Oh god damn no*. (KCN, 5345)

4.1.4. Adverbial intensifiers of verbs

In the class of construction of negative import verb intensifiers can also be found. Although they occur primarily in *not*-negation sentences, co-occurrence with *no*-negation is by all means acceptable. They differ slightly from the constructions examined earlier by their position in the clause, for they usually stand exclusively between negation and a lexical verb. The analysis shows that the most frequent verb intensifier found in negative context is *really* (ex. 13).

(13) *I don't really take any notice.* (KBH, 634)

The sentence without the intensifier, *I don't take any notice*, would present very little semantic difference to that one with an intensifier, which means that *really* brings no new meaning to the structure but denotes degree and is thus to be classified as an intensifier.

In order to lie within the scope of negation, intensifiers are found in post-position to the negated operator (ex. 13). However, disjuncts standing directly before an operator have also an emphatic effect on the whole clause (ex. 14) despite lying outside the scope.[26]

---

[26] "The position of *really* can change the meaning of the sentence. *I don't really know* means that you are not sure about something; *I really don't know* emphasizes that you do not know." (OALD) Thus, when preceding the

(14) *I don't think anybody should go out with someone on their own in the beginning, I* *really don't.* (KPU, 1421)

Almost unlimited use of intensifying *really* does not apply only to its position in the sentence, but also to its collocability, for it is found along with various lexical verbs and operators (ex. 15), (ex. 16).

(15) *Mademoiselle stared at the enormous thing as if she really could not believe her eyes, she gave a shriek even louder than Mary-Lou had given.* (KCP, 66)

(16) *We shouldn't really have been, you never heard us talking to you.* (KPR, 1112)

The intensifier also appears in sentences with *no*-negation (ex. 17) though less frequently.

(17) *...I would of thought nothing's been really said about what's happening on that yet, not till the end of towards the end of the* (KCU, 8674)

However, the analysis showed that the most frequent context the intensifier *really* occurs in is that of short answer *Not really* (KBL, 2262) which does not indicate higher degree of negativity but rather the lower one and for that reason this use of *really* is not included in the analysis

According to the data collected by the analysis, the second most frequently used construction with negative import used by British English speakers is *even*. It primarily co-occurs with *not*-negation (ex. 18) and stands exclusively in the position following the negation.

(18) *And I wouldn't even go in because I don't think my dad's making me go in except* *<pause> she kept me, <pause> <gap desc="name" reason="anonymization"> and* *<pause> all behind because we didn't do our homework and she said right see me* *tomorrow, <unclear> <-/->* (KE1, 3477)

Out of eleven findings of intensifying *even* in negative context one collocates with the negative quantifier *never* (ex. 19).

---

negation, the adverb *really* (and other similar adverbs) modifies the clause, while when following the negation, *really* acts as an intensifier of the verb (Dušková et al., 1988).

(19) *...the dealer send the maintenance agreement to us, we signed it, send it back, we've <u>never even</u> seen it, then we turn up and find that the main control unit's high up in the attic or in a damp cellar...*(KCY, 430)

Never, however, seems to replace the negative particle *not* here, for the speaker talks about one specific situation, which is incompatible with the time reference of *never*.

The results brought by the analysis showed also occurrences of the adverb *definitely* both preceding the negative and thus modifying the whole clause (ex. 20), and occurrences of the intensifiers *only* (ex. 21) and *just* (ex. 22) which usually follow the negated operator.

(20) *It <u>definitely weren't</u> me that checked it.* (KD2, 1878)

(21) *He <u>didn't only</u> did that cos you lost your temper.* (KCY, 1920)

(22) *...we're <u>not just</u> celebrating the living Christ we're also celebrating the crucified Christ and we're simply meeting our pain and our joys together in communion with him.* (KB0, 1146)

The fact that some intensifiers, e.g. *definitely or only*, were found in the excerpt exclusively in one particular position in a sentence implies that those adverbs are not as universal in their use regarding intensifying negative context as *really*.

4.2. Intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning

Idiomatic constructions with intensifying function differ from the ones with negative import in the collocability, for they co-occur only with a specific verb or group of verbs. Such construction cannot be found outside the fixed phrase. The excerpt from the BNC includes only four instances of expressions with idiomatic meaning (Table 2), which constitutes the smallest class of intensification of negation.

	total number	idiomatic expressions
intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning	(4)[27]	*couldn't care less* (1), *not a clue* (1), *no idea* (1), *not give a shit* (1)

Table 2: Intensifying constructions with idiomatic meaning

---

[27] Although the class of intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning is represented only by few instances of occurrence in the excerpt, another query proved that they are represented frequently in the whole BNC – *no idea* with 228 occurrences, *not a clue* with 102, *not give a shit* with 17 and *couldn't care less* with 10 occurrences in total.

The idiomatic expression *not a clue* co-occurs in the excerpt with the verb *have got* (ex. 23). Further analysis of the expression conducted in the BNC showed that it can occasionally stand alone, but usually the expression collocates with verbs denoting possession – *have*, *have got* (Figure 3)

(23) *not got a clue what he's done* (KD6, 2755)

ED9:2684	*...most of us didn't*	*have a clue about what we would do.*
KCE:6678	*I haven't*	*got a clue what to do.*
KDA:4414	*ain't*	*got a fucking clue.*
CBG:9210	*It just seemed weird to me that we didn't*	*have a clue about the line-up .*
GWG:1820	*The police haven't*	*got a clue who killed MacQuillan.*

Figure 3: Collocations of the expression *not a clue*

The expression *no idea* behaves similarly. The *no*-negation construction[28] co-occurs exclusively with the verb *have* (ex. 24).

(24) *I've no idea.* (KDM, 7769)

An additional query examining contexts of the phrase proved that such construction occur even in *not*-negation in order to enable further and more emphatic modification of the phrase (Figure 4).

CJA:1576	*I hadn't*	*the first idea what she meant.*
JY5:390	*I haven't*	*the faintest idea what you 're talking about.*
CAW:833	*I must confess that I have not*	*the least idea what this phrase could mean in an orthodox Christian context.*
H8B:1859	*Quite frankly, sir, I haven't got*	*the foggiest idea.*
HTT:290	*Geraci clearly didn't have*	*the slightest idea what Zen was talking about*
FM2,1719	*I have not*	*the remotest idea David*

Figure 4: Modification of the phrase *no idea*

The third idiomatic expression found in the excerpt is *not care less*. Its usage is restricted to the collocation *couldn't care less* (ex. 25).

(25) *I couldn't care less whether I go dancing or not me.* (KB2, 2578)

---

[28] Its *not*-negation counterpart *I don't have an/any idea* does not seem to be emphatic.

Similar meaning is expressed by the phrase *not a shit* that is not found outside the fixed expression *not give a shit* (ex. 26)

(26) *So now I just <u>don't give a shit</u>, I do the dishes and <-/-> <unclear> <-/->* (KDN, 5526)

4.3. Other means of intensification of negation

The last class of intensification of negation includes various devices for emphasis that are not entirely only lexical. Such means are brought by the nature of spoken language and phenomena arising from it or non-standard variants of English. For that reason, some of the constructions can be regarded by grammarians as ungrammatical (e.g. negative concord). The complete list of devices classified as other means of intensification of negation is presented by Table 3 with a total number of occurrences in the excerpt per each.

	total number	individual means of intensification
other means of intensification	(45)	negative concord (21), repetition (12), *never* as *not* (10), inversion (2)

Table 3: Representation of other means of intensification

4.3.1. Repetition

Since repetition is one of the most distinctive features of speech, a large number of occurrences of repetition of a negative element were found in our data. It was necessary to distinguish the emphatic repetition from the repetition arising from dysfluency of speech – repeats. To determine the purpose of repetition of a particular example further context was examined, which allowed identifying the emphatic repetition. More problematic contexts were finally classified with the help of the original audio recordings, for phonological intensification co-occurs with other types of intensification (see 2.2.2) and thus supports the emphatic repetition (ex. 27).

(27) *You never never grow up.* (KP6, 2478)

The analysis showed that repetition of *no* is the most frequently represented one in the data. It usually functions as exclamation denoting disagreement or discontent (ex. 28).

(28) *No, no, no, no, no you <-/-> cheat!* (KCU, 4337)

Repetition is based on repeated use of one element, which makes it different from negative concord that combines several different negative words in a clause. An exception is the combination of *never ever* (ex. 29).

(29) *I've <u>never</u> really found it that much of an insult <u>ever</u> anyway, but I just think that it's a bit of a term which doesn't really apply to us.* (KC7, 1215)[29]

The reason for classifying the combination of *never* and *ever* as repetition is the fact that those are the same quantifier; one is just negated and the other not. As an additional query showed, the two words are often adjacent (ex. 30).

(30) *They <u>never ever</u> did pay it.* (KBF 6330)

4.3.2. Negative concord

Multiple negation is regarded as ungrammatical in standard English, but in colloquial English, especially in speech, it is used quite freely. It is based on the use of several negatives that do not cancel out each other, but strengthen the negative notion. It usually consists of a combination of *not*-negation and *no*-negation (ex. 31).

(31) *<-/-> <unclear> <-/-> he comes round, and just say <u>no</u>, I'm <u>not</u> doing <u>nothing</u> for <-/-> you.* (KB7, 8628)

The fact that each negative does not cancel out another and the sentence remains negative is sometimes supported by a positive question tag (ex. 32).

(32) *Cos there <u>won't</u> be <u>no</u> overtime after Christmas <u>will</u> there?* (KBF, 11994)

Negation with transitive verbs and multiple objects is especially interesting. The first negative is found close to the verb – in the excerpt it is either the particle *not* or the quantifier *never*. The last realization of the object is negative as well in order to re-inforce negation (ex. 33).

(33) *I took, never take that, I <u>never</u> take me bracelets, necklace, <u>nothing</u> off.* (KBE, 9513)

From the example above it is clear that a combination of several negative quantifiers can also be found, but possibly less frequently.

---

[29] There is a combination of several means of intensification – repetition or combination of *never ever* and intensifier *really*.

4.3.2.1. Negative concord in content clauses with mental verbs

A special case of negative concord can be found in complex sentences with a content clause and verbs such as *think*, *suppose* etc. (see chapter 2). Negation in such sentences can be found either in the main clause or in the subordinate clause. The analysis, however, revealed two instances of a sentence where both verbs, in the main clause (*suppose*) and in the content clause (*be*), are negated (ex. 34).

(34) *Well it <u>won't</u> be on the national news I <u>don't</u> suppose cos it comes under sports.* (KE2, 9629)

In a non-emphatic way the sentence could be re-phrased as either *I suppose (that) it won't be on the national news...* or *I don't suppose it will be on the national news...* The second negation does not cancel out the first one or change the meaning (in terms of polarity) of the sentence. It strengthens the negation and thus such constructions are classified as a special instance of negative concord.

4.3.3 Use of *never* instead of the particle *not*

The analysis of the BNC excerpt has also shown a different use of the quantifier *never* in a clause. *Never* indicates a specific point in time where action is conducted. This time reference, which denotes usually definite past, does not correspond with the temporal meaning of *never* in its original use, "not at any time; not on any occasion" (OALD).[30] The specific reference may be just implied by the context or expressed literally by expressions of time − e.g. *yesterday*, *in the morning* etc. The function of the negative quantifier in these sentences is the one of the particle *not*, only more emphasized (ex. 35).

(35) <u>*never*</u> *came over today did he?* (KDA, 713)

One of the collocations of such use of *never* became more grammaticalised than others, namely *never mind*. It occurs in imperative utterances and often stands alone as an exclamation (ex. 36).[31]

(36) *Oh, <u>never mind</u>!* (KE0, 522)

---

[30] http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/never_1?q=never

[31] *Never mind* is immediately followed by a full stop or an exclamation mark in 43.6 per cent of occurrences in the demographically sampled spoken sub-corpus of the BNC, e.g. *Ah [pause] never mind.* (KBA, 1125).

The use of *never mind* is not restricted to exclamations. Additional examination of the expression's context in BNC (Figure 5) revealed that, for example, it can take objects realized by a nominal phrase or a clause.

| KC3:310 | ...*never mind* | *what we could, should or might have done then...* |
| KDM:817 | *Never mind* | *my fault.* |

Figure 5: Use of *never mind*

4.3.4. Emphatic inversion

One of the devices used for strengthening negation was not expected to be found by the analysis – emphatic inversion. The reason is that the study examines only non-prepared, improvised speech and inversion in clauses beginning with a negative expression is a feature of rather careful or planned speech or written English.[32] Nonetheless, we came across two occurrences of it as the means of intensifying the negative in the excerpt (ex. 37).

(37) *No way am I going to get an A for English literature.* (KSV, 4719)

The initial position of the negative in the sentence causes the subject-verb inversion which leads to a more emphasized negative notion.

4.4. Piling-up intensification of negation

Due to the nature of spoken language, often emotional, unplanned and full of repetitions, it is also not unusual to encounter various means of intensification in one sentence. By employing more than one of the devices the speakers can further strengthen their attitude towards what is being said.

One of such combinations of two different means of intensification of negation is the co-occurrence of negative concord and repetition (ex. 38). Their co-occurrence is expected due to the similar principle they are based on.

(38) *No no not like that.* (KP3, 678)

The whole sentence combines repetition of *no* with multiple negation consisting of *no* and *not* and thus achieving more emphatic intensification.

---

[32] Other types of inversion do not have to give the same impression of careful speech – e.g. inversion in questions is common in all registers

Repetition, however, can form a combination not only with negative concord, but also with constructions with negative import (39).

(39) *You <u>can't</u> you <u>can't</u> <u>really</u> get, be mad with her cos she's so nice, she never er, never nasty with you, is she?* (KB2, 1019)

The analysis, though, showed that constructions with negative import, and especially the intensifier *really*, combines most easily with other means of intensification of negation – in case of *really* it is most likely due to its universal use and application in a sentence. Most frequently, adverbial intensifiers of verbs in negation are found along with emphatic repetition (ex. 39) or negative concord (ex. 40).

(40) *<u>No, definitely not</u>.* (KCX, 4575)

Due to their restricted collocability, the expressions with idiomatic meaning do not usually co-occur with other means of intensification, and thus we find only one instance of forming an intensification combination – the expression *not give a shit* (ex. 26) and the disjunct *just*.

5. CONCLUCION

The study aimed at identification and classification of various ways of negative intensification in spoken British English. The nature of spoken language, its occasional dysfluency, inconsistency, or lack of clarity, sometimes complicated the process of analysing the data. The initial expectations were to find certain dissimilarity from the means of intensification used in positive sentences as well as the different strength of emphasis of each intensifying device. The results of the analysis confirmed both hypotheses even though some of the devices used to amplify negation are also used for emphasis in positive context. The data, then, were assessed according to the nature of the means, range of collocability, and level of idiomaticity to form three classes of intensification of negation (some of them overlapping) based on Dušková et al. (1988) and Palacios-Martínez (1996). The first of them are constructions with negative import that consist of phrase or pronominal intensifiers as well as swear words and adverbial intensifiers of verbs. The second class of the means of negative intensification are intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning which are represented by only few fixed phrases in the excerpt. The last class, called other means of intensification of negation, consists of various means of intensification that cannot fit into the classification of the former two. All of the means of negative intensification are listed along with the overall representation in Table 4.

means of intensification	total number	percentage
constructions with negative import	(57)	53,78%
intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning	(4)	3,77%
other means of intensification of negation	(45)	42,45%
total		100
combinations of means of intensification	(6)	5,66%

Table 4: Overall representation of the classes of intensification of negation

5.1. Overview

The major part of the excerpt consists of constructions with negative import which present 53,78% of it. It includes a wide range of intensifiers which share the capability to occur in various (and often not only negative) contexts with verbs of different semantic classes. The class is not restricted only in terms of collocability, but also position of an intensifier in a sentence, because some of the constructions of negative import are found not only following negation, but also preceding it. Because of the diverse realization of the

intensifiers in the class, they are divided into four sub-classes depending on the type of realization. The one realized by a phrase is represented by the intensifiers *at all*, *a bit*, *a word*, *no way*, and *by any stretch of the imagination*. Except from *a word*, the intensifiers show very little restrictions in terms of co-occurrence with verbs. Also all but one, *no way*, are found in the post-modifying position (see 4.1.1.). Second sub-class of intensifiers is represented by pronouns *whatever* and *whatsoever* that both show preference for *no*-negation. The third and most substantially represented sub-class of constructions with negative import is formed by adverbial intensifiers that can also have an intensifying function in a positive context (unlike, for example, the phrase *at all*). In the excerpt, they are found either as intensifiers or intensifying disjuncts. The adverbial with the highest number of occurrences in the analysis is *really* followed by *even*, *just*, *only* and *definitely*. The last group of intensifiers belonging to the class of constructions with negative import comprise swear words that proved to become universal intensifiers in the recent development in the language (see 2.2.1.2.). That was proved by the analysis, since they, namely *bloody* and *damn*, co-occur with *not*-negation and *no*-negation in the excerpt and seem not to have any preferences in terms of collocating with verbs. Furthermore, they appear even in positive context where swear words are used to intensify items of various word classes.

Second class of intensification of negation called intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning includes constructions highly restricted in its usage whose meaning often cannot be understood literally. Since they are usually fixed phrases, namely *not have/have got a clue*, *couldn't care less*, *have/have got no idea*, *not give a shit* (see 4.2.), one cannot find them outside this phrase. The additional queries focussing on examination of the context the expressions can occur in served as the evidence supporting the presumption. Due to the collocation restrictions, the occurrence of such expressions is far less frequent in the corpus. In the excerpt intensifying expressions with negative meaning represent only 3,77% of the analysed data.

The last class consists of various means of negative intensification that cannot fall into any of the previous classes, for they are not purely of lexical nature. Thus, they make their own class of other means of intensification of negation. The class of other means of intensification of negation consists of repetition, negative concord, use of *never* as the particle *not*, and emphatic inversion. The data shows that negative concord is the most frequently represented means of intensification of the class forming 19,8% of the whole excerpt. It is a feature of colloquial language, for the use of more than one negative lying

within the same scope that do not cancel out each other is regarded as ungrammatical in standard English (see 2.1.5.). However, the analysis of the data proved that multiple negation is used broadly as the means of emphasis. The second intensifying device used most frequently in the excerpt turns out to be repetition. We presumed a high number of occurrences of repetition as the way of strengthening negation, since the phenomenon is a characteristic trait of speech. Repetition arising from the dysfluency of speech needed to be distinguished from the one used for emphasis and thus it makes 11,32% of the results, which is still a quite high number, but maybe lower than expected. Another colloquial means of negative intensification consists in the use of *never* as the particle *not* which occurs in 9,43% of the examples of negative intensification in the excerpt. *Never* loses its temporal meaning corresponding to *not ever* or *not on any occasion* and is used rather to refer to definite past. Emphatic inversion, represented merely twice in the sample, is a marginal means of intensification. The reason is a fact that the initial position of a negative causing subject-verb inversion is a feature rather of careful, planned speech or writing than casual, improvised speech which the study is interested in.

The data also included instances where various means of negative intensification combine with one another in order to create even greater emphasis on the negative notion. Piling-up of intensifiers, thus, also supports the hypothesis that various means of intensification possess various intensity of emphasis.[33] In the excerpt, we found instances of negative concord with emphatic repetition or adverbial intensifiers, and repetition along with the negation using *never* as the particle *not*. The co-occurrence of various means of intensification of negation comprises a quite significant part of the excerpt – 5,66% of the data. That may also correspond to the conclusions made by Bolinger (1972) that intensifiers are extremely unstable units whose intensifying function is quickly used up and speakers need to look for alternative ways how to put an emphasis on what they want to say.

On the other hand, the data that provided material for the analysis does not include some means of negative intensification observed by other studies which are mentioned in the theoretical part of this study (e.g. the intensifiers *in the slightest*, *in the least*, *in any way*, or *by any means*,[34] or some intensifying expressions with idiomatic meaning, such as *not lift a*

---

[33] The intensity of different devices used for emphasis is examined by Carrillo-de-Albornoz and Plaza (2013).

[34] There are only two instances of the intensifier *in the slightest*, two of *in the least,* seven instances of *in any way* and seven of *by any means* used in negative sentences in the demographically sampled sub-corpus of the BNC. The expression *(not) lift a finger* is represented only once in the sub-corpus.

finger). The fact that some of the means of negative intensification are infrequent in BNC but can be found in other, possibly older studies also supports Bolinger's idea of short function expectancy of an intensifier.

To summarize, the study shows various means of intensification of negation and how they differ from those occurring in the positive context. It also proves that negative intensification is based on grammatical level of language to a considerable extent, which questions the association of intensification primarily and in some sources exclusively with lexical level. Furthermore, the analysis supports Bolinger's conclusion that intensifiers quickly lose their function and purpose and are substituted by different devices.

5.2. Obstacles

As suggested earlier, the nature of speech sometimes presented an obstacle in analysing the excerpt. One of them is the fact that in spoken language one often finds ungrammatical constructions or not yet grammaticalised words. The initial query, thus, proved to be insufficient, since it did not include all the negative contexts that are found in spoken English – namely *nuffink*, *nowt*, *nah*. For that reason, the original query needed to be modified in order to extend the search to even those negatives.

A far more problematic obstacle consists in dysfluency or lack of clarity. These natural features of speech complicated and sometimes even prevented a classification of a sample. The obstacle concerns mainly the class of other means of intensification of negation, namely repetition and negative concord. Since both of the means are based on similar repetition of a negative item, the distinction between emphatic repetition and a repeat might become far from possible. Such occurrences were excluded from the final excerpt.

6 REFERENCES AND SOURCES

References

Aleksandrovič, T. T. (2013) "Lexical-Syntactic Fields of Intensification in English and Belarusian." *Frontiers of Language and Teaching* 4, 67-75. Available online from <http://www.academia.edu/4140162/Lexical-Syntactic_Fields_of_Intensification_in_English_and_Belarusian> (accessed 16th December 2014)

Altenberg, B. (1991) 'Amplifier Collocations in Spoken English' in Johansson, S. et al. (ed.) English Computer Corpora: Selected Papers and Research Guide, 127-147. Berlin, Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

Anderson, W. (2006) "Absolutely, totally, filled to the brim with the Famous Grouse: intensifying adverbs in the Scottish Corpus of Texts and Speech." *English Today* 22.3, 10-16. Available online from <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/4685/> (accessed 28th November 2014)

Bolinger, D. (1972) *Degree Words*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Biber, D. et al. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Bäcklund, U. (1973) *The Collocation of Adverbs of Degree in English*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Carrillo-de-Albornoz, J. and Plaza, L. (2013) "An Emotion-Based Model of Negation, Intensifiers, and Modality for Polarity and Intensity Classification." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64.8, 1618–1633. Available online from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=89024361&lang=cs&site=ehost-live> (accessed 28th November 2014)

Dušková, L. et al. (1988) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*, Praha: Academia.

Greenbaum, S. (1974) "Some Verb-Intensifier Collocations in American and British English." *American Speech* 49.1, 79-89. Available online from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=9749207&lang=cs&site=ehost-live> (accessed 26th November 2014)

Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: University Press.

Ito, R. and Tagliamonte, S. (2003) "*Well* weird, *right* dodgy, *very* strange, *really* cool: Layering and recycling in English intensifiers." *Language in Society* 32, 257-279. Available online from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4169258> (accessed 28th November 2014)

Jespersen, O. (1917) *Negation in English and Other Languages*, Köbenhavn: Höst.

Kuha, M. (2004) "Investigating the Spread of "So" as an Intensifier: Social and Structural Factors." *Texas Linguistic Forum* 48, 217-227.

Macaulay, R. (2002) "Extremely Interesting, Very Interesting, or Only Quite Interesting? Adverbs and Social Class." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6.3, 398-417. Available online from <http://studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/2004/Kuha.pdf> (accessed 28th November 2014)

Núñez Pertejo, P. and Palacios Martínez, I. M. (2014) "That's Absolutely Crap, Totally Rubbish: The Use of the Intensifiers Absolutely and Totally in the Spoken Language of British Adults and Teenagers." *Functions of Language* 21.2, 210-237. Available online from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=97581485&lang=cs&site=ehost-live> (accessed 24th September 2014).

Palacios Martínez, I. M. and Núñez Pertejo, P. (2012) "He's Absolutely Massive. It's a Super Day. Madonna, She Is a Wicked Singer. Youth Language and Intensification: A Corpus-Based Study." *Text&Talk* 32.6, 773-796. Available online from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=83469020&lang=cs&site=ehost-live> (accessed 24th September 2014).

Palacios Martínez, I. M. (1996) "Negative Intensification in Modern English." Some sundry wits gathered together, 183-196. Available online from <http://ruc.udc.es/bitstream/2183/9523/1/CC_26_art_16.pdf> (accessed 24th September 2014)

Poldauf, I. (1964) "Some Points on Negation in Colloquial English," *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*. Ed. J. Vachek. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Van der Wouden, T. (1997) *Negative Contexts: Collocations, Polarity and Multiple Negation*, London: Routledge.

Sources

The British National Corpus, version 3. Available online from <http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/> (accessed 8th April 2015)

Český národní korpus – KonText. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Prague. Available online from <https://kontext.korpus.cz/> (accessed 8th April 2014)

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford University Press, 2015. Available Online from <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (accessed 2nd August 2015)

6 RESUMÉ

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá intenzifikací záporu v současné britské angličtině. Práce si dává za cíl identifikovat různé prostředky, které mluvčí využívá ke zdůraznění záporné polarity věty. Jelikož terminologie a klasifikace není jednotná, čerpá práce z několika obsáhlých gramatik angličtiny. Nejvíce ale vychází z *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Biber et al., 1999) a *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (Dušková et al., 1988). Jak negace, tak intenzifikace svým způsobem vyjadřují postoj mluvčího ke sdělovanému obsahu. Zápor je definován jako vyjádření nesouhlasu (záporného postoje) vůči obsahu; součást intenční modality. Intenzifikace pak nese emocionální zabarvení, jímž mluvčí posiluje a specifikuje svůj postoj k obsahu. Oběma jevům bylo v poslední době věnováno velké množství pozornosti; v případě intenzifikace pak zejména ze sociolingvistického a diachronního hlediska. Nicméně vztah mezi záporem a intenzifikací se prozatím nestal předmětem mnoha studií.

Ze studia sekundární literatury vyplynulo, že negativní postoj v angličtině může být vyjádřen několika způsoby; obecně lze zápor dělit na gramatický a lexikální. Lexikální zápor využívá záporných afixů, jež ale nemají vliv na polaritu věty nebo některé její části a z tohoto důvodu se jimi práce nezabývá. Gramatický zápor ovlivňuje větnou strukturu a může být tvořen dvěma typy prostředků – částicí *not* nebo zápornými kvantifikátory jako například *no*, *never*, *nothing*, atd. Intenzifikace se většinou spojuje s příslovečným určením, konkrétně s adverbii míry. Nicméně podrobná analýza sekundárních zdrojů a později i zkoumaného materiálu ukázala, že domněnka spojovat intenzifikaci výhradně s adverbii míry je mylná. Lexikální prostředky intenzifikace se ukázaly být daleko rozmanitější, zahrnují mimo adverbií i expletiva nebo intenzifikaci pomocí fráze či zájmena. Navíc bylo zjištěno, že prostředky intenzifikace neleží pouze v lexikální jazykové rovině, ale lze ji dosáhnout i gramatickými prostředky – například opakováním. Z analýzy sekundárních zdrojů také vyplynulo, že prostředky pro intenzifikaci záporu jsou do jisté míry odlišné – některé intenzifikátory se v záporné větě nevyskytují, jiné vykazují opačný efekt než ve větě kladné a negaci zmírňují či naopak. Ukázalo se ale, že toto pravidlo se netýká všech intenzifikátorů stejně a proto až analýza odhalila škálu nástrojů, které mluvčí využívá k zesílení záporu.

V praktické části bylo analyzováno 100 vět obsahující 106 příkladů intenzifikace záporu, jež byly excerpovány z neformálních dialogů z mluvené části Britského národního korpusu (BNC). Základní dotaz obsahoval všechny obměny jak záporné částice, tak i záporných kvantifikátorů včetně jejich negramatikalizovaných variant. Z výsledků byly

vybrány ty konkordanční řádky, jež obsahovaly intenzifikaci, která zesilovala vyjádřený zápor. Příklady, které obsahovaly přespříliš nejasností vyplývajících z povahy mluveného jazyka, nebyly do zkoumaného materiálu zařazeny. Prostředky intenzifikace záporu, které byly do vytvořeného sub-korpusu zařazeny, byly následně klasifikovány do tří tříd na základě jazykové roviny, ze které vycházejí, schopnosti kolokace či idiomatičnosti. Každá třída je pak samostatně definována a jsou popsány všechny intenzifikační prostředky, které zahrnuje, včetně jejich kolokability či pozice ve větě. Popis každé třídy pak zahrnuje výčet všech intenzifikačních prostředků a jejich zastoupení v analyzovaném materiálu.

První třídu tvoří *constructions with negative import*, které se vyznačují velkou mírou kolokability, širokou škálou intenzifikátorů, a vysokým celkovým zastoupením v sub-korpusu (57%). Jsou sem zařazeny intenzifikátory tvořené frázemi, zájmeny, expletivy, ale i slovesné (adverbiální) intenzifikátory. Jejich užití není omezeno na konkrétní sloveso, a proto se v našem sub-korpusu (ale i v celém BNC) vyskytují hojně. Mohou se vyskytovat jak v pozici za záporem, kdy intenzifikátor leží v dosahu negace, tak i před ním, kde má funkci emfatického disjunktu mimo dosah záporu a modifikuje větu jako celek. Většina intenzifikátorů, jak se ukázalo, ale upřednostňuje pouze jednu z těchto dvou pozic – výjimku tvoří *really* a *just*. Druhá třída lexikálních prostředků obsahuje *intensifying constructions with idiomatic meaning*, jež zahrnují intenzifikátory fixované na konkrétní frázi – jmenovitě *couldn't care less*, *not give shit*, *not have/have got a clue*, *have/have got no idea*. Tyto prostředky intenzifikace se tedy vyskytují pouze a výhradně v tomto a žádném jiném kontextu. Jejich význam má navíc často idiomatické zabarvení a nelze ho tedy chápat doslovně. Kvůli svému omezení kolokace je jejich výskyt omezen, a proto tvoří jen 4% našeho sub-korpusu. Poslední třída intenzifikačních prostředků vychází z gramatické jazykové roviny nebo ji kombinuje s rovinou lexikální. Nezapadají tedy ani do jedné z předešlých tříd, a proto tvoří svoji vlastní skupinu. Do této skupiny prostředků intenzifikace je zařazeno opakování, záporová shoda, emfatická inverze a užití záporného kvantifikátoru *never* ve funkci záporné částice *not*. Tyto prostředky nesdílejí žádný společný rys týkající se míry kolokability či idiomatičnosti a každý je z tohoto důvodu popsán jednotlivě.

V závěru tedy práce potvrzuje svou počáteční hypotézu o jisté odlišnosti prostředků intenzifikace v kladném a záporném kontextu, ale zároveň i nepopírá jejich podobnosti. Výskyt více než jednoho prostředku intenzifikace záporu také potvrdil, že intenzifikátory disponují různými stupni emfatičnosti. V případě intenzifikátoru *really*, jež se vyskytuje s prostředky jako opakování nebo záporná shoda, tomu nasvědčuje i jeho široká škála

možností použití. Intenzifikátor se vyskytuje jak v pozitivním, tak v negativním kontextu a v různých pozicích ve větě, což signalizuje míru jeho kolokability, díky níž se jako prostředek pro zesílení (nejen) záporu pomalu stává nedostačujícím. Z tohoto důvodu jsou také zřejmě mluvčí v některých situacích nuceni využít dalších prostředků, aby sdělovanému obsahu dodali patřičný důraz, jenž by odpovídal jejich postoji.

7 APPENDIX

Since the material includes co-occurrences of more means of intensification of negation in a concordance line the Appendix table lists together all 100 sentences with 106 examples of intensification of negation. The concordance lines include sometimes textual mark-up.

Any context unnecessary to the negative intensification was excluded from the text and substituted by full stops (...).

Appendix Table 1

	REFERENCE	CONCORDANCE LINES	INTENSIFICATION
1	KBH, 634	I don't really take any notice.	*really* (intensifier)
2	KD2, 1878	It definitely weren't me that checked it.	*definitely* (disjunct)
3	KPV, 2517	I know, my dad's going, oh, can't really believe it, you've got Edmund <gap desc="name" reason="anonymization">, I said.	*really* (intensifier)
4	KB2, 1019	You can't you can't really get, be mad with her cos she's so nice, she never er, never nasty with you, is she?	*really* (intensifier) repetition
5	KCX, 4575	No, definitely not.	*definitely* (disjunct) negative concord
6	KPR, 130	When I go cos when I, it didn't say much, is a, is, he really wasn't going?	*really* (disjunct)
7	KC7, 1215	I've never really found it that much of an insult ever anyway, but I just think that it's a bit of a term which doesn't really apply to us.	*really* (intensifier) repetition *really* (intensifier)
8	KPU, 1421	I don't think anybody should go out with someone on their own in the beginning, I really don't.	*really* (disjunct)
9	KC3, 2286	I and Vicki we don't really like caramels because of chewing them and every one we	*really* (intensifier)
10	KCP, 66	Mademoiselle stared at the enormous thing as if she really could not believe her	*really* (disjunct)

		eyes, she gave a shriek even louder than Mary-Lou had given.	
11	KCT, 8201	But apart from that I <u>hadn't</u> <u>really</u> thought about it really.	*really* (intensifier)
12	KCU, 8674	...I would of thought <u>nothing</u>'s been <u>really</u> said about what's happening on that yet, not till the end of towards the end of the	*really* (intensifier)
13	KPN, 81	I <u>really</u> <u>don't</u> know what I'm gonna do.	*really* (disjunct)
14	KPR, 1112	We <u>shouldn't</u> <u>really</u> have been, you <u>never</u> heard us talking to you.	*really* (intensifier) *never* as the particle *not*
15	KCV, 676	Oh my god, <u>can't</u> you <u>really</u> find.	*really* (intensifier)
16	KB7, 1939	And I mean you <u>don't</u> <u>really</u> need all that space.	*really* (intensifier)
17	KBG, 3065	We <u>haven't</u> <u>really</u> seen anybody have we?	*really* (intensifier)
18	KCX, 1572	I <u>don't</u> <u>even</u> like football!	*even* (intensifier)
19	KDA, 934	You <u>can't</u> <u>even</u> get loads on anybody now.	*even* (intensifier)
20	KE1, 3477	And I <u>wouldn't</u> <u>even</u> go in because I don't think my dad's making me go in except <pause> she kept me, <pause> <gap desc="name" reason="anonymization"> and<pause> all behind because we didn't do our homework and she said right see me tomorrow, <unclear> <-|->	*even* (intensifier)
21	KE3, 2715	No, I can't, it'll, if you don't take the head of it I can't eat it, I <u>couldn't</u> <u>even</u>, I have prawn cocktail <pause> and you have a prawn, they put, they put a prawn on top whole, I couldn't eat that...	*even* (intensifier)
22	KDW, 7785	You <u>don't</u> <u>even</u>	*even* (intensifier)
23	KBR, 80	<u>Not</u> <u>even</u> a fifty P?	*even* (intensifier)

24	KDV, 5177	...I come home, I put it in the cupboard and I've <u>not</u> <u>even</u> looked at it since.	*even* (intensifier)
25	KPH, 843	About Hattie, she wasn't in the concert cos she supposed to be ill but she <u>didn't</u> <u>even</u> come to watch and her parents came to watch her.	*even* (intensifier)
26	KCY, 430	...the dealer send the maintenance agreement to us, we signed it, send it back, we've <u>never</u> <u>even</u> seen it, then we turn up and find that the main control unit's high up in the attic or in a damp cellar...	*even* (intensifier) *never* as the particle *not*
27	KBF, 9699	We didn't have to queue for food we waited five minutes to get into the car, we didn't have to queue for food or coffee, we ke, we <u>didn't</u> <u>even</u> get into very long lines too pay.	*even* (intensifier)
28	KB9, 630	Well it <u>isn't</u> <u>only</u> that I mean er we don't provide the food when they're at home, do we?	*only* (intensifier)
29	KCY, 1920	He <u>didn't</u> <u>only</u> did that cos you lost your temper	*only* (intensifier)
30	KPV, 7531	Shakespeare, we don't know what Shakespeare wanted <pause> to do on stage, he <u>doesn't</u> give you any idea <pause> <u>at all</u>.	*at all*
31	KCW, 3947	Well if you are then we won't ma--, you <u>won't</u> make it to it <u>at all</u> because I don't <-|->	*at all*
32	KBD, 8567	He <u>wasn't</u> a natural <u>at all</u>.	*at all*
33	KDE,4089	Cos they're <u>not</u> doing any harm to anybody <u>at all</u>.	*at all*
34	KB7, 358	Well sorry if she <u>didn't</u> wear any <u>at all</u> eh dear, eh?	*at all*
35	KB2, 4398	It's <u>not</u> free parking <u>at all</u>!	*at all*
36	KC0, 3650	Th there's <u>no</u> logic to it <u>at all</u> but they	*at all*

		play it on.	
37	KDS, 974	Oh, I <u>didn't</u> see him go up <u>at all</u>.	*at all*
38	KCX, 7882	and I bought three and I thought there should be five \<pause\> cos I <u>didn't</u> have a fire \<pause\> on Sunday <u>at all</u> and twice this week I haven't lit it till fi-- you know them four buckets	*at all*
39	KE0, 2975	<u>No</u>, <u>not a word</u>.	*not a word* negative concord
40	KCG, 1735	...I don't mind some of it, I've <u>not</u> had <u>a bit</u> of marzipan for I don't mind these erm almond slices, I quite like them, but I think it must be the texture of the marzipan	*a bit*
41	KC2, 2902	I <u>don't</u> <u>really</u>	*really* (intensifier)
42	KCA, 2040	You <u>haven't</u> got <u>a flat bit</u> there.	*a bit*
43	KBG, 78	they're not all that marvellous, they're <u>not</u> <u>really</u> that much to look up	*really* (intensifier)
44	KD5, 1879	Just a case of taking the tape deck around and if you're not having a conversation yo you can use the radio so I'm <u>not</u> <u>really</u> worried.	*really* (intensifier)
45	KBF, 13395	<u>None</u> <u>whatsoever</u>.	*whatsoever*
46	KBE, 8379	Ah well you <u>no</u> <u>bloody</u> live here do you?	*bloody*
47	KCE, 4725	Well that's <u>no</u> <u>bloody</u> good.	*bloody*
48	KCN, 3546	I <u>can't</u> <u>bloody</u> lift that.	*bloody*
49	KCN, 5345	Oh god <u>damn</u> <u>no</u>.	*damn*
50	KCE, 2201	I said, you do it, you don't, <u>no way are you</u> getting whisky from France!	inversion
51	KD8, 8325	<u>No way</u>, I said before you can't do that	*no way*
52	KB0, 1146	...we're <u>not</u> <u>just</u> celebrating the living Christ we're also celebrating the crucified Christ and we're simply meeting our pain	*just* (intensifier)

		and our joys together in communion with him.	
53	KD1, 4127	...you couldn't just let them rummage through that, so what I done I took a couple of handfuls out and put them in here	*just* (intensifier)
54	KP1, 3898	it was solid and it was all sort of, his age, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen year olds and all vowing they're never gonna sniff whatever again, you know all making these	*whatever*
55	KB7, 255	Saw one one lad was really really sort of well okay he wasn't clever by any stretch of the imagination but he just, was just a you know a sort of no-hoper...	*by any stretch of the imagination*
56	KDX, 67	I'm confusing 'em I don't know who I'm I don't think I'm gonna vote at all.	*at all*
57	KB7, 8628	<-|-> <unclear> <-|-> he comes round, and just say no, I'm not doing nothing for <-|-> you.	negative concord
58	KCT, 5620	<-|-> I mean to say <-|-> you don't want no more like this	negative concord
59	KCA, 312	Yeah and she doesn't do any ironing, nothing.	negative concord
60	KDV, 413	They ain't got none Kyle.	negative concord
61	KCX, 2809	But, he won't say nowt.	negative concord
62	KBE, 9513	I took, never take that, I never take me bracelets, necklace, nothing off.	negative concord
63	KCP, 6676	Well when you all went, as you all left, when the last lot of redundancies were made, I said I'm not paying no more union...	negative concord
64	KPW, 825	No, there ain't nothing else I could do.	negative concord
65	KBE, 2846	I don't know no bloody hymns do I?	negative concord
66	KBE, 6084	I ain't got no inclination to go down the	negative concord

		town	
67	KCJ, 84	and er, anyway he hobbled in, oh he said, me knee, hmm, anyway sat with him and had a cup of tea, she <u>didn't</u> have <u>nothing</u> to drink like and er, anyway we had our tea and he hobbled in to the front room, and er and er, she says well you bugger you are, er batter mixture up for ya	negative concord
68	KCP, 3267	And I come home and I says to him, I'm <u>not</u> having this <u>no</u> more.	negative concord
69	KD8, 277	Ain't your mum said nothing to her?	negative concord
70	KCT, 3292	Well that <u>ain't</u> got <u>nothing</u> to do with his kidney problems.	negative concord
71	KE6, 2348	it's, it's not Anne's way but it's <-|-> <u>not</u> far I <u>don't</u> think <-|->	negative concord
72	KE2, 9629	Well it <u>won't</u> be on the national news I <u>don't</u> suppose cos it comes under sports	negative concord
73	KBN, 73	and I told Susan like, but I told her <u>not</u> to say <u>nothing</u> to <u>nobody</u> and she goes, told Clare <gap desc="name" reason="anonymization"> she never said I said anything and Susan goes to her oh you think you're right again, and I said yes <pause>	negative concord
74	KBF, 11994	Cos there <u>won't</u> be <u>no</u> overtime after Christmas will there?	negative concord
75	KCP, 5306	I <u>ain't</u> got that, <u>nothing</u>	negative concord
76	KPA, 948	Okay okay no <u>don't don't</u> I <u>won't</u> I <u>won't</u>.	repetition
77	KP3, 678	<u>No no not</u> like that.	negative concord
78	KB2, 2578	I <u>couldn't care less</u> whether I go dancing or not me	*couldn't care less*
79	KD6, 2755	<u>not got a clue</u> what he's done	*not have/have got a clue*
80	KDN, 5526	So now I just <u>don't give a shit</u>, I do the	*not give a shit*

		dishes and <-|-> <unclear> <-|->	
81	KDM, 7769	I've no idea.	*have/have got no idea*
82	KDP, 1396	No no no no no <pause>	repetition
83	KC2, 2578	No, no	repetition
84	KCH, 5113	<-|-> No, no, no, no!	repetition
85	KCU, 4337	No, no, no, no, no you <-|-> cheat!	repetition
86	KB7, 6363	Here I goes oh right, one in there oh, one in there, one in there, one in there and one in there yes yeah no no, no.	repetition
87	KSS, 865	But we didn't I mean never Arthur never had any <-|-> broad <unclear> broad <unclear> <-|->	repetition
88	KP6, 2478	You never never grow up.	repetition
89	KC3, 2432	Oh I kept thinking of this fire hazard thought I can't, I can't live with that any longer	repetition
90	KDW, 1183	That never came, that never came to fruition.	*never as the particle not*
91	KB8, 2541	and I'm never going to get it drunk.	*never as the particle not*
92	KDA,713	never came over today did he?	*never as the particle not*
93	KD8, 9368	Well she never looked brown all the time, do you know, I don't think it affected her after a while.	*never as the particle not*
94	KBD, 8622	Yeah, but we never put that on do we?	*never as the particle not*
95	KD2, 1155	You never know what could happen.	*never as the particle not*
96	KE0,522	Oh never mind!	*never as the particle not*
97	KE6, 1433	because you never know whether they're going to turn	*never as the particle not*

98	KSV, 4719	<u>No way</u> am I going to get an A for English literature.	inversion
99	KDH,2244	<u>No, no, no</u>!	repetition
100	KDM,7666	oh, it <u>just</u> <u>wouldn't</u>	*just* (disjunct)