

Summary

The aim of this thesis is to analyse Czech translation counterparts of English demonstrative determiners and determine the degree of correspondence in the use of demonstratives in both languages.

The first half of the theoretical chapter defines the English demonstrative determiners on the morpho-syntactic level. Demonstrative determiners in English carry either situational or textual reference, which can be further divided into anaphora, cataphora and the non-phoric reference. Demonstratives also distinguish between singular forms (*this/that*) and plural forms (*these/those*), as well as between proximal (*this/these*) and distal forms (*that/those*). The choice of either a proximal or a distal form is not always influenced by solely spatial relationships. Less frequent instances of a co-occurrence of a demonstrative and a proper name (Vantage Theory), and of demonstratives with prominent cohesive features (Gradient focus theory), are also discussed. The second half of the theoretical introduction is focused on a morpho-syntactic classification of Czech demonstratives. The inflectional character of Czech, together with the absence of the category of definiteness results in different realisations of certain grammatical structures. The quantitatively larger set of Czech demonstratives is classified according to the type of reference (situational/textual), and the most frequent representatives are listed.

The empirical part is based on 100 examples of demonstrative determiners in translation from English. The examples are at first used to illustrate the connection between various forms and functions of the English demonstrative determiners. Subsequently, their Czech translation counterparts are analysed. Three main translation tendencies, which vary in the degree of correspondence to the English examples, were identified during the analysis.

The final chapter summarises the findings, which confirmed that Czech makes use of a wider variety of linguistic devices in order to relay the same grammatical and semantic content as the English original. The two languages thus differ in the degree of correspondence in the use of demonstrative determiners.