UNIVERZITA KARLOVA - FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLICKÉHO JAZYKA A DIDAKTIKY

A contrastive study of the Czech translation equivalents of the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* in electronic parallel texts

Srovnávací překladová studie českých překladových ekvivalentů pragmatických částic *now* a *well* v elektronických paralelních textech

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **Zpracoval:**

prof. doc. PhDr. Aleš Klégr   Bc. Aleš Houra

anglistika-amerikanistika

Praha, duben 2014

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval 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 26. dubna 2014

Souhlasím se zapůjčením diplomové práce ke studijním účelům.

Abstract

This thesis presents a contrastive analysis of the English pragmatic markers *now* and *well* and their Czech translation equivalents. The overall material is based on 200+12 occurrences that were excerpted from the electronic parallel corpus InterCorp, with all the instances appearing in fictional dialogues. The contrastive study focuses on the role of translation as a means to understand better the nature of the two pragmatic markers. It analyzes specific marker-collocate sequences and the respective Czech translation equivalents. It demonstrates that certain marker-collocate sequences have a tendency to be translated by specific Czech translation equivalents and that the role of other factors, such as position in discourse structure, prosody, and broader context, play in this respect an important role as well. All this and the finding that both *now* and *well* share certain Czech translation equivalents add to the multifunctionality of both *now* and *well* and prove that a combination of other factors is needed to comprehend the use of the two pragmatic markers in English. The comparison of the Czech translation equivalents in this thesis to the Czech translation equivalents in the Czech-English dictionary Lingea attempted to provide an example of how a contrastive analysis can be useful in Lexicography.

Abstrakt

Tato práce se zabývá kontrastivní analýzou anglických pragmatických částic *now* a *well*. Vzorek je založen na 200+12 dokladech v psané próze (dialogy), které byly excerpovány z elektronického paralelního korpusu InterCorp. Kontrastivní studie se zaměřuje na úlohu překladu jako prostředku, jehož prostřednictvím lze snáze pochopit podstatu obou anglických pragmatických částic. Dále zkoumá obě pragmatické částice ve specifických kolokačních spojeních, a následně jsou analyzovány jejich české překladové ekvivalenty. Analýza tak dokazuje, že některá tato kolokační spojení mají tendenci být překládána do češtiny užitím specifických ekvivalentů, avšak důležitou roli zde hrají i jiné faktory, jakými jsou např. pozice v textu, prosodie a širší kontext. Všechny tyto aspekty spolu se zjištěním, že *now* a *well* zároveň sdílí určité české překladové ekvivalenty, tak podtrhují multifunkční charakter obou pragmatických částic a poukazují na to, že k úplnému porozumění jejich užití je zapotřebí vzít v potaz kombinaci různých činitelů. Srovnání českých překladových ekvivalentů v této studii s překladovými ekvivalenty v česko-anglickém slovníku Lingea bylo zároveň pokusem ukázat, jak může být kontrastivní analýza využitelná v Lexikografii.

Table of contents

List of tables

List of Abbreviations

InterCorp	elektronický paralelní korpus v rámci projektu Český národní korpus
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
ENPC	English-Norwegian-Parallel-Corpus
SWAT	Special Weapons And Tactics

1 Introduction

This thesis provides a contrastive analysis of the Czech translation equivalents of the English pragmatic markers *now* and *well*. The aim of the contrastive analysis is not to comment upon the Czech translation equivalents only, but to discover whether a contrastive analysis can be helpful in understanding the pragmatic markers *now* and *well*, or English pragmatic markers generally.

The theoretical part provides an outline of the treatment of English pragmatic markers with a focus on *now* and *well*. It mentions a variety of previous contrastive studies and linguistic approaches to the phenomenon in question. These contrastive studies analyze the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* in depth and attempt to characterize their meanings generally and in many different contexts. This contributes to the overall comprehension of the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* and their Czech translation equivalents. Therefore, the studies are more than relevant with respect to this thesis. The empirical part launched by the methodological chapter providing an introduction to the methodology used in this thesis, as well as clarifying the selection of the source material focuses on the analysis of 200+12 occurrences of the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* specified by the methodology employed and on their Czech translation equivalents. All of the occurrences are gathered from the parallel corpus InterCorp. The empirical part is divided into several subsections, each discussing the individual and more specific occurrences of *now* and *well* and their Czech translation equivalents. Tables and illustrative examples are provided to relate the theoretical background to the analysis proper.

The conclusion part summarizes the main findings and results with respect to the theoretical background and the analysis proper.

2 Theoretical part

The theoretical part is divided into three sections. Section 2.1 focuses on the introduction to the theoretical background of discourse markers generally, section 2.2 concentrates on the discourse markers *now* and *well*, and section 2.3 offers concluding remarks.

2.1 The definition of discourse markers in English: a terminological disunity

As Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2011: 224) point out, there have been published many publications endeavouring to throw light on the nature of expressions variously referred to as *pragmatic markers*, *discourse markers* or *discourse particles*. As can be seen, there are number of different labels attached to the same linguistic phenomenon. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen go further and believe that terminology is crucial because the terms are used for "different perspectives on the functions and status of the markers and on what to include in and exclude from the class." They also claim that there is little agreement on this, the main reason being that many different theoretical views are taken with respect to the analysis of pragmatic markers as such (ibid: 226). However, when the markers seem to have pragmatic rather than a discourse-marking function, there is a preference for the term *pragmatic marker* over the term *discourse marker*. Furthermore, using the term *marker* reflects the fact that "an element functions as a signpost or signal instructing the hearer how the message should be interpreted." The use of the term *marker* seems to be much broader than the term *particle*, which, grammatically speaking, is used when referring to a part of speech (ibid: 227). However, what is most important about pragmatic markers generally is that they can possess many different functions depending on the context, which leads to another problem – whether pragmatic markers can have one meaning or whether they can have a variety of meanings (ibid: 228).

Müller (2005: 3) also mentions that other linguists (e.g. Fraser, Bazzanella, Lamiroy, Unger, Degand) use the term *connective*. She also speaks about the terms we have already mentioned above, primarily focusing on the distinction between *discourse marker* and *pragmatic marker*. Müller (ibid: 3) says that Andersen uses the term *pragmatic marker* because "the label 'pragmatic' is meant to suggest a relatively low degree of lexical specificity and a high degree of context-sensitivity" (Andersen 2001). Müller (ibid: 3) also says that Andersen decides not to use the term 'discourse marker' because it could be confused with Fraser's account. Fraser treats discourse markers as a certain subtype of pragmatic markers that signal "a sequential relationship between the current basic message

and the previous discourse" (Fraser 1990: 383; Fraser 1996). Andersen calls this function a textual function. A similar stance is held by Lenk (1997:2), who makes a distinction between the two terms in a following way:

> "Studies that investigate *pragmatic* markers often focus more on the interactional aspects between the participants […] One of the most prominent functions of discourse markers, however, is to signal the kinds of relations a speaker perceives between different part of the discourse."

Müller (2005: 3) concludes saying that the markers she is going to analyze in her (2005) research will have both textual and interactional functions, therefore using both terms is in fact seen as the most appropriate approach.

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2011: 231) discuss the pragmatic and textual aspects of discourse markers as well, claiming that according to Brinton a distinction between interpersonal and textual has been made allowing to group pragmatic markers into two main classes. Therefore, "discourse markers have a discourse-marking or textual function which relates to the structuring of discourse as text and an interpersonal function which relates to the expression of speaker attitudes" (ibid: 231). It should be mentioned that terminology differs in this subdivision as well: what Lenk calls *interactional* is called by Brinton *interpersonal*, both terms, however, refer to the same notion, i.e. to the very pragmatic aspects of pragmatic markers.

The most appropriate, and for our thesis the most relevant, approach is adopted by Rühlemann. His approach is mentioned by Aijmer et al. (2011: 225), who say that Rühlemann's definition of discourse markers uses a distinction between five features that overlap to a certain extent: (1) they indicate how discourse relates to other discourse; (2) they do meta-lingual work; (3) they are discourse-deictic and indicate how the utterance containing them is a response to preceding discourse; (4) they create discourse coherence and (5) they are oriented to the hearer's needs. The most important from this approach is the fact that the individual features of pragmatic markers are "partly overlapping" (ibid: 225). As was mentioned above, pragmatic markers can have many different meanings. Trying to recognize what meaning a pragmatic marker has seems to create rather a problematic situation, since it can express one or more meanings at the same time.

2.2 The pragmatic markers *now* and *well*

As was discussed in the previous section, there are many different approaches with respect to pragmatic markers generally. The same seems to be true of the pragmatic markers

now and *well*. Both pragmatic markers can have different meanings and thus the respective approaches to them vary, with many linguists using different terminology in their studies. For the sake of appropriateness and relevancy to the subject matter of this thesis, it was decided that this section would provide only the most relevant accounts of classification and terminology, for to do otherwise would go completely beyond the scope of this thesis.

2.2.1 The pragmatic marker *well*

When comparing research in English pragmatic markers with research in pragmatic markers in other languages, Aijmer et al. (2011: 232) point out that detailed studies focus primarily on pragmatic markers in English. They also claim that some English markers have been studied extensively. For example, *well* was examined by Svartvik (1980), Carlson (1984), Schiffrin (1987), Watts (1989), Schourup (1985, 2001), Jucker (1993), Greasley (1994), Norrick (2001), Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2003), Aijmer (2009), amongst others (ibid: 232).

Johansson (2006: 115) claims that the discourse particle *well* is an "enigmatic word which has attracted the attention of a great many scholars." He goes further and asks: What does it actually mean? (ibid: 115)

2.2.1.1 The different positions on the nature of *well*

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 2) claim that there are many studies which have shaped their (i.e. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's) own overall perception of *well*. These treatments, they say, can be grouped into two main approaches: those seeking a unified meaning of the discourse marker (Carlson 1984, Bolinger 1989), and those which are primarily pragmatic or interactional and focus on the functions that *well* performs as a warning-signal in different discourse contexts (Jucker 1993, Smith and Jucker 2000, Smith and Jucker forthcoming).

2.2.1.2 Lauri Carlson: the 'acceptance' meaning of *well*

Carlson's (1984) approach is discussed in Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 3) at some length. Carlson (1984: 27) describes the meaning of *well* in terms of its semantic source, which is the adverb with the meaning 'according to one's wish' (Oxford English Dictionary, further referred to as OED). The OED uses this origin for the description of the discourse marker *well*, which, in Carlson's terms, means that 'the speaker accepts a situation' Carlson treats the 'acceptance meaning' as the core meaning of *well*. The main reason for this

4

is that it is based "on etymological as well as on intuitive grounds" (Carlson 1984: 28). As Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:3) comment further, Carlson then specifies the meaning of 'accepting a situation' and he endeavours to make a description of how the meaning of *well* interacts with different dialogue contexts. This allows him to posit a unitary meaning which "offers a plausible explanation in many contexts" and to come up with "a detailed description of the functions of *well* in different contextual environments." Nevertheless, Carlson's unified meaning forces him to use a number of different subtypes, particularly *well* as a 'frame' and as a 'qualifier'.

2.2.1.3 Dwight Bolinger: the 'some standard' meaning of *well*

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 3) mention Bolinger (1989) in connection with Carlson. Bolinger says that his own approach is similar to Carlson's. Similarly, Bolinger claims that we must see the meaning of the discourse marker *well* as relating to other uses of *well*. As Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (ibid) point out, by investigating these 'other uses', Bolinger uses the notion of 'norm' or 'conformity': by using *well* a speaker invokes "some standard" (Bolinger 1989: 321). Furthermore, the "content of *well* in the locutionary sphere ('relatively good, relatively strong') is transferred to the illocutionary sphere ('matched to a standard or norm') (Bolinger 1989: 332)" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 3). As can be evident, Bolinger's approach can be linked with Carlson's in a way that the notion of 'acceptance' "implies that one finds something 'good', i.e. in conformity with a norm" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 3).

2.2.1.4 Sara Smith and Andreas H. Jucker: the 'facilitator' use of *well*

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 4) mention in their study Smith and Jucker's (2000; and forthcoming) and Jucker's (1993) approaches as well. These two linguist focus on what the pragmatic marker *well* does in conversation rather than on what it in fact means (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 4). Jucker (1993) uses relevance theory when trying to explain how *well* is used. He demonstrates that in many cases *well* is an indication of "a shift in context, in the sense that the speaker signals that the background assumptions need to be renegotiated in order to establish common ground" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003:4). Similarly, both Smith and Jucker (2000: 209) claim that the pragmatic marker w*ell* introduces "repairs to the common ground." Therefore, as Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 4) point out, *well* is used in contexts where speakers have a feeling that "there is a discrepancy between propositional attitudes of the [participants] in conversation."

Accordingly, Smith and Jucker treat the pragmatic marker *well* as a 'facilitator' when a common ground needs to be renegotiated and they discuss *well* in contexts of replies to questions, assessments, invitations, and advice (ibid).

2.2.1.5 Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's assessment and approach

When comparing the main approaches mentioned above, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 4) claim that although the individual approaches use different theoretical models and they each aim at something different, they are "not fundamentally incompatible". They find Carlson's and Bolinger's accounts "appealing", the reason is that they try to seek a unified semantic description of *well* by "establishing a link between the discourse particle and its semantic source, the adverb *well*" (ibid). These accounts are interesting for Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen especially from a contrastive point of view. By adopting these approaches one can compare "different languages with regard to which lexical words they have mobilised to fulfil discourse particle function" (ibid: 4-5). According to Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (ibid: 5), it is not a coincidence if a cognate of *well* is used in many different languages. On the other hand, however, there is Schourup's comment (2001: 1038) that the "relationship between the adverb *well* and the discourse [marker] *well* is 'far more tenuous' than that between locutionary and illocutionary uses of the adverbs such as *frankly, confidentially, seriously*" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen: 2003: 4). This is a comment on Bolinger's and Carlson's analyses (cf. 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3) (ibid). Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) claim that the reason for this is that most of the original meaning of *well* has been on its way from a lexical adverb to a discourse marker.

Additionally, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) state that by adopting Smith's and Juker's accounts in terms of negotiation of common ground they are able to "explain the contextual uses of *well* which are apparent in the translations as signals of the need to negotiate the background assumptions and preceding discourse."

In their contrastive study, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) pose a question what analysis is the most suitable for the contrastive study of the pragmatic marker *well*. They claim that on one hand a pragmatic approach focusing on "what *well* does in conversation" is important if one wants to demonstrate its "multifunctionality and its use as a warning-signal." Furthermore, they continue, Jucker's, and Smith and Jucker's analyses allow one to find a "common denominator in the plurality of contextual uses." On the other hand, Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (ibid) claim that in their own contrastive approach they need to "recognize a core meaning which is compatible with the translations in Swedish and Dutch

and with the meaning of *well* as a fully lexical verb." They also claim that in order to achieve this, it is not possible to look at the nature of *well* as a facilitator only, but there is a need to link w*ell* both to semantics and pragmatics (ibid). Therefore, as a solution they offer to bring together "its core meaning and its conversational function in one linguistic framework" (ibid: 6). They use the notion of Bakhtin's heteroglossia.[1] They argue that this can be helpful when explaining the ability of *well* to assume many different positions towards the addressee and the text (ibid). In their cross-linguistic study, they deal with the translations of the English pragmatic marker *well* into Swedish and Dutch. With respect to the notion of heteroglossia, Johansson (2006: 115) also mentions that Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen treat *well* as a heteroglossic option, "accommodating the utterance to the context, in particular to the hearer's expectations" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 8). In order to study *well* cross-linguistically, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 2) adopted a functional approach to interpersonal meaning (see the term *interpersonal (interactional)* in 2.1). In this approach Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia[2] is integrated within the system of modality and evidentiality, in which Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen also situate *well*[3]. Furthermore, "[t]his view is in the spirit of analyses of discourse particles treating *well* as a marker negotiating common ground (Smith and Jucker 2000)" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 2). Additionally, this framework is useful because it "offers a way in which *well* can be assigned a unified meaning" (ibid). Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 6) claim that their translation data suggest that the unified meanings of 'acceptance' (cf. Carlson 2.2.1.2) and 'matching to a standard or norm' (cf. Bolinger 2.2.1.3) "go a long way towards explaining certain equivalences found in the target languages [i.e. in Dutch and Swedish]." Furthermore, their position is to treat *well* as an interpersonal element "since it is concerned with the speaker's subjective 'intrusion' in the proposition (Halliday: 1970: 335) (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 6). Therefore, as was already mentioned, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid: 8) thus suggest that the pragmatic marker *well* is a "heteroglossic option, accommodating the utterance to the context, in particular the hearer's expectations." In this

---

[1] Let us provide a simple definition of this term. Bakhtin defines heteroglossia as "a blending of world views through language that creates complex unity from a hybrid of utterances"<http://www2.bgsu.edu/departments/english/cconline/wills/hereroglossia.html>.

[2] Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 2) use, I think, a better definition of heteroglossia than the one provided in footnote 1: "positioning speakers and texts within the heterogeneity of world views and social interaction."

[3] There is not enough space to provide an exhausting explantion of or introduction to the term *evidentiality.* Suffice it to say that Ferdinand de Haan (1999: Abstract) from the University of Mexico distinguishes between *evidentiality* and *epistemic modality*, claiming that evidentiality and epistemic modality differ in their semantics: evidentials *assert* the nature of the evidence for the information in the sentence, while epistemic modals *evaluate* the speaker's commitment for the statement.

way it is possible to use the pragmatic marker *well* as a politeness marker, respecting the face of the addressee. This approach is suitable, since it can account both for the textual function of the pragmatic marker *well* (as a boundary marker or a topic introducer) and for its interpersonal value (as a marker of politeness) (ibid).

In reference to the above mentioned, in their analysis, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) go further and claim that the semantic source of the pragmatic marker *well* "suggests that it is a marker of positive attitude", which, however, leads to the question of how it can be related to the notion of heteroglossia. Martin's (2000) model of interpersonal meaning treats the adverb *well* as "a positive option in expressing the speaker's subjective judgement (appraisal) of human behaviour by reference to implicit but tacitly accepted institutionalised norms (ibid)." Therefore, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) come to a conclusion that the positive meaning of *well* is, from an interactional point of view, useful in those cases where "speakers are aware of possibly divergent interpretations, of possibly different expectations, of the need to negotiate common ground." This perspective thus makes a connection between the adverb *well* and the pragmatic marker *well* in "the same framework of appraisal", which allows Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen to put together a semantic and a pragmatic explanation (ibid).

With respect to the multifunctionality, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid: 9) claim that the specific function of *well* is dependent both on the context, especially on the preceding context, and on the relationship between the speaker and the hearer; and as such it will thus vary accordingly. When summarizing, Aijmer and Vandebergen (ibid: 10) argue that the most suitable approach is to treat *well* as a lexical item with a core meaning and a core function but "whose value depends very much on the contextual use that is made of it." They suggest that *well* has the core meaning of positive appraisal and whose core function is to "express the speaker's heteroglossic stance, signaling awareness of heterogeneity, and more specifically counter-expectation." Nevertheless, it is possible to use *well* for a number of different 'rhetorical ends', including those contexts where "no approval or acceptance is involved", but where the speaker evaluates the whole situation as 'problematical' and "the possibility of choosing between divergent positions needs to be negotiated." Therefore, the meaning of *well* is in accord with the meanings of 'acceptance' and 'conformity with a norm', suggested by Carlson (1984) and Bolinger (1989) respectively (ibid).

2.2.1.6 Diane Blakemore's survey of *well* studies

A completely different stance is held by Blakemore. In her book *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*, she says that she is not going to give any comprehensive overview of the expanding literature on *well* (Blakemore 2002: 129).[4] Nevertheless, for the sake of her own analysis, she discusses two main approaches. She says that for some linguists, *well* is a signal that "something has gone wrong with the discourse, or in other words, that things are *not* well." On the other hand, for some of the linguists it signals that all *is* well (ibid). Similarly, when Johansson (2006: 115) tries to capture the meaning of well (cf. 2.2.1., Johansson's rhetorical question and the use of the word 'enigmatic'), he mentions in his study that Blakemore shows that there are many different interpretations that range from 'all is not well' to 'all is well'. Blakemore (ibid) then goes on and talks about what we have covered in the previous subsections of our theoretical part, i.e. the individual approaches discussed. In addition, she mentions one more linguist that was not covered in the overview so far. Deborah Schiffrin, whose contribution to the field is more than important. Blakemore (ibid) thus claims that what is well or not well is clarified in many different ways and she says that although both Schiffrin (1987) and Jucker (1993) sees the pragmatic marker *well* as a signal that something is not well, it is rendered by each in a little different way. Blakemore (ibid) continues saying that for Schiffrin *well* is an indication that "the speaker has diverged from *coherence*", while Jucker treats it as "a signal that the speaker has diverged from *relevance*" (cf. 2.2.1.4 , Jucker and Smith's 'repairs' to the common ground). Similarly, says Blakemore (ibid), while for both Bolinger (1989) and Carlson (1984) *well* is used to imply that the speaker accepts something, Bolinger takes this to be the acceptance of a norm (with the norm's depending on a different situation), while for Carlson *well* is used for "the acceptance of a move in a dialogue game" (cf. 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3). Blakemore (ibid) considers her own attitude to *well* similar to the accounts of both Carlson and Bolinger rather than to Schiffrin's and Jucker's approaches in that her analysis treats *well* as "encod[ing] the information that the utterance it introduces is consistent with the principle of relevance, and hence that things are well" (cf. 2.2.1.3). However, she goes against Carlson's and Bolinger's notion of the semantic identity of the discourse marker *well* and the adverb *well*. Particularly, her main argument is that while the adverb "encodes a constituent of a conceptual representation, the discourse marker encodes a procedure." By this, she partially

---

[4] We, in fact, did right the opposite, but that was thought to be appropriate with respect to our thesis.

agrees with the proposed attitudes, on the other hand she holds her own stance to the phenomenon in question.

2.2.1.7 A contrastive approach to pragmatic markers with a focus on *well*

As was shown in section 2.2.1, extensive literature has been devoted to the study of the nature of *well*. Additionally, *well* has been studied from a contrastive, or cross-linguistic, point of view. In connection with this, the role of translation arises, which is crucial for the present analysis. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2011: 235) mention for example the following contrastive studies: English-Swedish-Dutch, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003); English-Norwegian, Johansson (2006); English-Italian, Bazzanella and Morra (2000); English-Spanish, García Vizcaino and Martinez-Cabeza (2005); English-Spanish-Catalan, Cuenca (2008). In section 2.2.1 we mentioned Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's contrastive study. In this section, we will focus on Johansson's (2006), and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's (2003) contrastive approaches to *well*. Their contrastive studies deal with the role of translation and they help to throw light on the pragmatic marker *well*.

Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2011: 236) say that pragmatic markers have also been a very interesting field for translators. Similarly, Johansson (2006: 115) mentions that Jan-Ola Östman (1979: 177) makes a suggestion that a cross-linguistic perspective may make the description of textual particles (Östman's term – again we can see how terminology varies) much easier in a way that it can a) widen our horizons about the phenomenon itself; and (b) aide both language-specific and contrastive-linguistic description. In his paper, Johansson (ibid: 115) also asks: "To what extent can the meaning of *well* be illuminated by a cross-linguistic study? To what extent can its meaning be conveyed in other languages?" Similarly, Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (2003: 11) say that for the linguistics "in the field" the translations and translation corpora are useful and make a rewarding contribution to the further research of a particular item in the source language (see e.g. the articles in the volume edited by Johansson and Oksefjell 1998 and Hasselgård and Oksekfjell 1999; see also Noël forthcoming, showing how a translation corpus can work well with a monolingual corpus and how both corpora together can be used for evidence of the meaning of the source language items). As Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) continue, there are a number of different advantages of how translations may be useful for analysis of discourse markers. First, translations can be used when focusing on the comparison of discourse markers of two or more languages (cf Carlson 1984, Fleischman and Yaguello 1999). Secondly, if a pragmatic marker in the source language is translated by a number of different items in the target

language, it indicates that the contextual meanings adopted by the source language item should be taken into account and analyzed more in detail. Therefore, the translations may "highlight" the contextual factors that contribute to the "chaotic picture" that words such as *well* present (ibid). As can be seen, the role of parallel corpora, and more specifically the role of translation, may thus help to bring the phenomenon of pragmatic markers into focus more clearly.

Pragmatic markers generally are a typical feature of spoken discourse. Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (2003: 1) claim that *well* is used very frequently in English conversation[5]. However, in our sample, the individual examples discussed and excerpted from the parallel corpus InterCorp come from the written sources, or more specifically from fictional dialogues. Nevertheless, Johansson's study deals with the subject matter similarly. Johansson (2006: 117) believes that it is important to mention a serious though excusable shortcoming of the material. He says that the pragmatic marker *well* is "characteristic of conversational interaction, where the speaker and the addressee are in direct contact and where prosody is crucial for the interpretation, but all [Johansson's] material is written." He goes further and mentions that the closest one can get to real conversation is in fictional dialogue, and this is of course where the majority of the instances can be found. He thinks that his material has the advantage of having been interpreted independently by translators in the process of translation. Therefore, he analyzes "the result of this interpretation (and recreation) process, which simultaneously illuminates the function of *well* and shows how and to what extent it can be conveyed in other languages (ibid)." He mentions that Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's study (2003) is also based on corpora of English fiction texts and their Swedish and Dutch translations (ibid: 115) (cf. 2.2.1.5). Despite the fact that the pragmatic use of *well* is particularly frequent in and characteristic of English conversation discourse, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 13) see fictional dialogues as even better than the real conversation and they claim that one might believe that, especially in the case of pragmatic markers, naturally occurring data are to be perceived as better than fictional texts. They say that despite the fact that undoubtedly the dialogues in fiction are immediate reflections of the authors' decisions regarding discourse representation, and as such they are to be considered as their own individual "literary stylistic preferences", there are many different aspects that "override the problem" in this case. First, they continue, it has been demonstrated that if the natural spoken data are interpreted simultaneously, it causes that the

---

[5] It is among the 100 most frequent words in the conversational part of the London-Lund Corpus, where it occupies rank 14 (Svartvik 1990: 66).

pragmatic markers in the target language are often omitted (Fischer 2000: 200). Therefore, for the purpose of their analysis, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) do not consider natural data as an appropriate source of information (ibid). Second, "fictional texts are translated by professionals, who make a conscious effort to produce a text for a new audience, the target language community" (ibid). In addition, this text is very often subject to revision by editors and publishers, who are "further and further removed from the source language data, so that the final product becomes a target language text with its own history." Finally, one can expect that fiction writers use pragmatic markers very frequently in order to characterise personages and situations. For the same reason, one can also expect that the translators of fictional texts will search for target language equivalents (ibid).

As can be seen, both Johansson, and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen are in agreement and they all treat the written data from the corpus, i.e. the fictional dialogues, as a good source when analyzing pragmatic markers. Moreover, they also do not see the role of a translator as a mediator between the source text and the target text as a problem. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen mention that a translator in fact creates a completely new text for a target community of readers. Johansson claims that the material (i.e. Johansson's material) has been interpreted independently by translators (mentioned above). Similarly, Johansson (2006: 116) points out that "the translations were made by professional translators and have presumably gone through and editing process before publication" (cf. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's note above that the texts are revised by editors and publishers). Although the editing process and the role of a professional translator are important aspects of a good corpus contrastive study, it is more important for this thesis that both Johansson's, and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's studies work with written corpus data that are represented by a variety of different authors and the respective translators. This is crucial for eliminating the effects of a translator's personal style. In the case of Johansson this problem is avoided, since "a wide range of authors and translators are represented" (ibid: 116). Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 12) similarly concede that "not only the source language but also the translator's personal style may leave traces on the translation." The main concern is that translators may prefer and try to look for a particular target language item, which is consequently recurring, despite the fact that another item may be perceived as "contextually more appropriate." In their study "this risk has been minimized", since they studied extracts from target texts that have been produced by many different translators (ibid). Both studies thus eschewed the possible risk of an individual translator's preferred style. Similarly, in this thesis, this problem was avoided not only by choosing corpus data written by different source

language authors (thus the risk of a source language author's personal style was avoided as well), but also by a variety of different translators, and this is crucial for the whole analysis. In short, like Johansson, and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen, I used fictional dialogues from a written corpus as the source material.

2.2.1.8 Johansson's, and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's contrastive studies of *well*

As was made clear above, I will now focus on the two contrastive studies and their results concerning the perception of *well* as a pragmatic marker. The reason for mentioning the two studies is not only to provide a mere summary of their results and to compare them. The two studies are particularly relevant with respect to this thesis in a way that they also deal with the pragmatic marker *well* cross-linguistically[6].

Commenting on how the pragmatic marker *well* should be translated into the target language, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 11-12) say that pragmatic markers present a "challenge" because the main problem for a translator is to find an appropriate translation equivalent that would sound natural in the target language. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen say that Bazzanella and Morra (2000) point out that this is much more complex than in "other areas of the language because the discourse-boundness and multifunctionality of [pragmatic markers] will result in the choice of particular 'equivalents' which are, however, "unlikely to preserve the different shades of meaning and all the different functions" of the source item" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 11-12). Similarly, Johansson (2006: 135) claims that it happens very often that translation causes complications and he goes on to quote his teacher Bertil Malberg from Lund University, who said: "translation is theoretically impossible, but feasible in practice." Johansson thus concludes saying that "it is feasible in spite of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural non-equivalence, because the translator serves as a negotiator across languages and cultures" (cf. the term 'mediator' in 2.2.2). As can be seen, not only due to the fact that translation as such is a mere mediation between or among cultures, an approximation, but largely due to the multifunctional nature of pragmatic markers (and in the case of *well* this is more than evident), translation (although seen as a helpful means to understand the nature of pragmatic markers), on the other hand, presents a problem with respect to the individual translation equivalents in the target language(s).

In their contrastive study, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 17) summarize their results by saying that the Swedish translations highlight different aspects of the meaning

---

[6] *Well* is of course one of totally two pragmatic markers that are in focus in this thesis, the other being *now,* but as the two studies focus on *well,* we will thus treat them in connection to *well* in our thesis. This fact notwithstanding, there is provided a relevant connection to *now* when necessary.

of the pragmatic marker *well*. They find it difficult to describe the outcome of translation in functional terms and have problems identifying the core meaning of the source item. They attempt to relate the translation equivalents and the meaning aspects of *well* as they believe they provide a clue to understanding of the pragmatic marker *well*. Furthermore, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid: 25) come to the conclusion that in Swedish there is no pragmatic marker that would have the same meaning as the English *well*. Still they find many translation correspondences which all reflect some aspect of what *well* may mean in English. In addition, they add that analyzing the data is worsened by the fact that individual translation equivalents overlap in certain cases. Therefore, we speak about many different "contextual equivalents" (ibid: 36). The term 'contextual equivalent' is important, since it highlights the role of context in translation. Moreover, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 40) say that "if an item in the source language is translated by a wide range of target language items this variety will bring the polysemic nature of the item in question into focus more clearly." Referring to other contrastive studies, they also add that their finding that *well* has so many translation equivalents (or contextual equivalents) in both Swedish and Dutch is, however, in line with earlier translation research on both "discourse and modal particles" in other languages[7] and highlights the "polysemic nature and multifunctionality of [these] words" (ibid: 15). Furthermore, they claim that the number of different translation equivalents is "indefinite", due to the new correspondences that are context-specific and will occur in the new contexts. Nevertheless, these contextually restricted translation equivalents will appear in "decreasing frequencies, and become less interesting from a system-descriptive point-of-view" (ibid).

Additionally, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 41) conclude, saying that the fact that there exist so many different translation equivalents proves how *well* is multifunctional and how it can be strategically used in a wide range of contexts. While some translation equivalents reflect the textual function of *well*, others focus primarily on its interpersonal function (cf. the terms 'heteroglossic' and 'interpersonal' in 2.2.1.5). To put it differently, "some target language equivalents have a clear connective function, others a clear emotive one and most have both at the same time." Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (ibid) provide an explanation for these two aspects of the meaning of *well* (the linking function and the interpersonal function) using the already mentioned model of heteroglossia. By doing this they suggest for the pragmatic marker well a "general function". They call this function

---

[7] See for instance Fischer (2000: 206), demonstrating that German *ja* has 13 translation equivalents in English; Abraham (1984) and Heinemann (1985) on many different German translation equivalents of Dutch *wel*; Bazzanella and Morra (2000) on the wide range of translation equivalents of *well* in Italian (Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen's note).

"modal in a broad sense", which means that an utterance is transferred into a "heteroglossic one, signalling the speaker's awareness of the heterogeneity of views, positioning the utterance in the context of preceding and following texts." This allows the speakers to connect their utterance to other utterances and simultaneously to "orient to addressees' expectations" (ibid).

Johansson' study offers similar results. He finds that the interpretations made by the translators offers a "good picture" of the type of meaning the pragmatic marker *well* can have (Johansson 2006: 131). He mentions that there is a wide range of means how to "pick up facets" of the meaning of *well* and that the large number of the correspondences clearly demonstrates that the translation of *well* is "far from straightforward" (ibid: 135). Johansson's results show that the correspondences he found may have different meaning and use, but they undoubtedly reflect the aspects of the meaning of the pragmatic marker *well* used in the original. He asks whether some kind of "unity behind diversity" can be found and agrees with Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's claim of a heteroglossic option which the use of *well* signals and so even the presence of "other, possibly discordant voices" (ibid: 134-5).

As can be seen, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's results show that there are many different translation equivalents to reflect the meaning of the pragmatic marker *well* in Swedish and Dutch. This adds to the multifunctional nature of *well*. What seems to be more important, however, is the fact that also the translation equivalents are overlapping and they combine the different functions of *well* at the same time. Thus, the aspect of multifunctionality arises here not only with respect to the source language, but to the target language as well. In addition, the aspect of *well* as a heteroglossic option is emphasized as well. Johansson takes a similar stance when analyzing his results from his contrastive study. Both studies offer an insight into the phenomenon in question. The existence of different studies exploring the ways how *well* is translated into different languages is very useful for the description of the Czech equivalents of *well*. The advantage of this, of course, is that it helps to connect the individual findings to one another. Also the methodology employed in the two studies may provide guidance for the investigation of how *well* is dealt with in the Czech translations.

2.2.2 The pragmatic marker *now*

When comparing the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* with respect to the number of studies or publications in general, the overall number is no doubt in favour of the pragmatic marker *well*. The possible reason may be that *well* is the more prototypical, while *now* is the more problematic of the two, exhibiting a wider range of different functions.

Although there are fewer publications focusing solely on the rather problematic pragmatic marker *now*, there is, nevertheless, one important book that devotes a whole chapter to it. The chapter is so relevant and the description it offers so extensive as to provide the much appreciated theoretical background for the present thesis. This publication is Karin Aijmer's (2002) *English Discourse Particles*. This section will outline the theoretical background and methodology used in this book.

Although Aijmer's book uses oral and not written material for analyzing *now*, this makes no difference as far as its application to the present study is concerned. It is true that pragmatic markers are generally characteristic of a spoken discourse, and so the fact that the present thesis focuses on the use of pragmatic markers *now* and *well* in a written discourse, i.e. in fictional dialogues, may be something of a disadvantage. On the other hand, the similarities between the treatment of the two pragmatic markers in fictional dialogues and in naturally occurring speech can be expected to be overwhelming. And so while acknowledging Aijmer's (2002: 70) conclusion that *now* is characteristic of speech rather than of writing[8], the frequent occurrence of the pragmatic marker in fictional dialogue justifies the use of fiction data.

2.2.2.1 The fuzzy functions of *now*

In her book, Aijmer introduces her Chapter 2 on *now* with a citation by Bolinger (1989: 291): "*Now* is a discourse marker basically for change of topic." In fact the chapter is called the topic-changer *now*. To begin with, she explains the distinction between the S-use of *now* (temporal or sentence *now*) and the D-use of *now* (discourse *now*). She then continues saying that *now* has a wide range of properties that are characteristic of discourse particles (Aijmer 2000 uses the term *particle*, which has been retained here for the sake of simplicity). First, it is short and placed initially in the utterance. Second, "it does not belong to the propositional content of the utterance and it has a discourse-organizing function" (Aijmer

---

[8] Structures such as *I begin now, let me tell you now*, which have the same discourse function as *now* alone, may occur more frequently in writing and in formal, planned discourse modes (Schiffrin 1987: 263). According to Schiffrin (ibid), such examples show "the fuzziness between adverb and marker in actual use" (Aijmer 2002: 70).

2002: 57). Although Aijmer studies only those instances where *now* functions as a particle, she admits that sometimes in many cases it was difficult to make a distinction between the adverb *well* and the particle *well*, since they can be only

"fuzzily delimited from each other"[9] (Aijmer 2002: 58). She then continues and mentions that "there is a great deal of fuzziness between the particle and the temporal adverb" (ibid: 59). She admits, however, that it is possible to expect this fuzziness in some contexts providing that *now* is polysemous and "has developed its pragmatic functions as the result of grammaticalisation" (ibid: 60). Furthermore, even the immediate linguistic context is not enough to decide whether *now* should be treated more as a pragmatic marker or as a temporal adverb (ibid). This seems to be a different case than with *well*. In the case of *well* it is easier to distinguish between a particle and an adverb, and therefore we have talked only about the difficulty in distinguishing the two different primary meanings or functions it can have, i.e. the two major meanings (functions) being textual (*connective*), or interpersonal, with further subclassification of the individual, more specified meanings being contextually bounded and the two major meanings overlapping. However, in the case of *now*, there seems to be a difficulty in distinguishing between two completely different uses, i.e. between a temporal adverb and a particle. Moreover, there is also the possibility of these two uses overlapping at the same time. Aijmer (ibid) claims that *now* can have temporal meaning (whose function is to introduce a "temporal comparison") or textual function (which introduces a "new step in a series of actions")[10]. However, the interpretations are not mutually exclusive and there is a possibility that the speaker's intention was to use both interpretations at the same time (ibid). Aijmer (ibid) uses Schiffrin's words (1987: 231) saying that "there is a fuzzy zone 'where the discourse structure of temporal comparisons neutralizes the distinction between *now* as a time adverb and *now* as a marker'."

2.2.2.2 The role of grammaticalisation

Another important aspect when dealing with the function of *now* is the role of grammaticalisation. Aijmer (2002: 62) says that the temporal meaning of *now* is closely connected to its function as a pragmatic marker. She thus finds it appropriate to consider

---

[9] Aijmer makes an interesting observation:
> "The fact that the discourse particle *now* is not unequivocally a particle excludes it from the core class of discourse particles according to the criteria used to define discourse particles by Östman (1982: 153). It can be argued that the distinction between core and peripheral members of discourse particles is better captured by taking into account degrees of grammaticalisation" (Aijmer (2002: 58).

[10] In other words, we can treat *now* as an "emphatic (modal) particle strengthening the request" (Aijmer 2002: 60).

whether this might be the result of grammaticalisation. However, Aijmer (ibid) points out that the development of temporal adverbs to pragmatic markers was not studied as extensively as the role of grammaticalisation ("pragmaticalisation"; see also Traugott (2004) using this term) of manner adverbs. She goes further and claims that the primary function of the pragmatic marker *now* is to connect items in the topic structure "when there is a break in coherence, e.g. because there is a topic change or a major boundary between discourse units." According to her, in contrast to other connectives *now* can also function as a "marker of subjective modality." For Aijmer, "the diachronic tendency whereby structures and strategies evolve to express the speaker's perspective or point of view (subjectification)" can help to account for the affective or evaluative function the pragmatic marker *now* has in addition to its textual function (ibid). She then offers an interesting account by Ochs:

> "For many speakers of English, the temporal dimension of the present moment, 'now', may help to constitute a stance of affective intensity (as in the utterance 'Now look at what you have done'). And as well, for many speakers of English, the stance of affectivity/intensity is part of the meaning of 'now' (Ochs 1996: 419)" (Aijmer 2002: 62).

Aijmer also mentions Schiffrin's (1987: 229) approach in which Shiffrin sees *now* in connection to "the speaker's point of view and evaluation:

> [...] deictic center is also subjectively influenced depending upon the point of view, and the frame of reference, being taken by a speaker. One such subjective influence is the speaker's personal evaluation of a state of affairs (Schiffrin 1987: 229)" (Aijmer 2002: 62).

As it is obvious, grammaticalisation seems to play a crucial role in forming the functions of *now*. There is a link between *now* used as a temporal adverb and its being used as a pragmatic marker. Moreover, grammaticalisation also seems to be the reason for *now's* acquiring an affective or evaluative function in addition to its textual function. The aspect of affectivity/intensity and speaker's evaluation or point of view is very similar to how *well* was treated both by Johansson, and by Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen. Let us now once again mention Johansson's stating that the translation equivalents provided demonstrate the type of meaning the pragmatic marker *well* carries. One of the meanings is classified by Johansson as 'emotional' (Johansson 2006: 131, cf. 2.2.1.8). Similarly, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 26) state that the translation equivalents that occurred less frequently were context-specific and imply that *well* is often used with "various emotional meanings." Moreover, Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2002: 3) mention Carlson's distinguishing many subtypes of the pragmatic use of *well*, one of them being a 'qualifier' (cf. 2.2.1.2, cf. here the term 'intensity'). Furthermore, Aijmer (2002: 63) continues saying that an indication that *now* has

undergone the process of grammaticalisation is the fact that the "temporal meaning colours the meaning of the particle. This is compatible with several accounts of grammaticalisation." She also mentions Quirk et al.'s observation that the process under which an adverbial changes into a pragmatic marker occurs when a verb of speaking is implied. To demonstrate this, she offers Quirk et al.'s direct quotation:

> "The succession in time … conveyed by the adverbial is converted into the logical succession of discourse when there is the implication of a verb of speaking (Quirk et al. 1985: 640)" (Aijmer 2002: 63).

Aijmer (ibid) comments on Quirk et al. by saying that the "correspondence can be given the form: Now ['I will say now that', 'one can say now that'] this is a success." She then makes a final comment in which she claims that in the earliest examples given by OED it is difficult to say whether *now* should be classified as an adverb, or as a pragmatic marker, "as it is to be expected if grammaticalisation has not yet taken place[11]."

2.2.2.3 Indicators of *now* functions

According to Aijmer (2002) there are in fact many ways in which the function of *now* can be indicated, e.g. by means of its position in the discourse structure, collocations, prosody, etc. As we will see, this observation is very important for the analysis in this thesis. Aijmer (ibid: 61) gives an illustrative example by Schiffrin (1987: 230) on which she demonstrates that when *now* is next to another *now*, as in *Now. He is issued now a directive to all leaders.*, only one of them can be an adverb, the other one is a pragmatic marker. In Schiffrin's example, the first *now* is a pragmatic marker; "it is placed initially and is unstressed in contrast with the adverb which is stressed" (Aijmer 2002: 61). Aijmer (ibid) further mentions that *now* "together with other particles (*well now, now then, now look*) has also been analyzed as a particle." She then says that she used a "combination of criteria (position, prosody, collocation)" which helped her to classify about a third (34%) of the examples of *now* in the London-Lund Corpus as "particles". She also claims that "a necessary but not sufficient condition for particle status is that *now* is initial in the phrase" and she finally gives an overview of the conditions, or criteria, employed to distinguish between *now* as an adverb and *now* as a pragmatic marker:

---

[11] Aijmer (2002: 63) also gives a footnote on this: "*Well* and *now* form a group of early topic changers. According to Finell (1992: 732), there are examples of *well* and *now* being used as topic introducers already at the end of the 9th century."

(1) "*now* as a separate tone unit (prosodic phrase) has been regarded as the discourse particle

(2) *now* when deaccentuated has been regarded as the discourse particle also when the 'time criterion' is not unambiguous

(3) *now* when stressed without a following tone unit boundary has been analysed as the time adjunct

(4) *now* with a lexical collocate (*well now*, *now then*) has discourse function"
(Aijmer 2002: 62)

There seems to be more to be mentioned when dealing with *now* and its collocations. First, *now* collocating with *then,* signals "a transition to something new resulting in a fresh look on a state of affairs" (ibid: 65). Second, the "connective *now* co-occurs with metacomments, other discourse particles (e.g. *well now, now look, now then*)" (ibid: 74). Furthermore, *now* is very frequently used to signal the transition to a metacomment such as *let me see* (ibid: 87). In Aijmer's analysis, some of the typical metacomments, or asides[12], which signal minor breaks in discourse structure, were *now let me try and think, now let me think, now let me see, now let me pause, now where was I, now what was it, now what else have I been doing* (ibid: 88). The instances in which *now* collocates with *you see* or *I mean* are treated by Aijmer as introducers to an "explanation or justification" (ibid: 86).

Another important aspect is prosody. Prosody (prosodic phrasing, tone and pausing) helps to differentiate the time adverb from the pragmatic marker (cf. Aijmer 2002: 61-2 and the example mentioned above; Aijmer 2002: 64). Aijmer (ibid: 65) says that "[a]ccording to Altenberg (1987: 87), both *now* and *well* showed a tendency to be separated by a tone unit boundary. Furthermore, *well* has also been studied prosodically in greater detail than *now* (cf. Altenberg 1987 and particularly Svartvik 1980)." Aijmer (ibid: 66) uses Altenberg's findings to support her own analysis. She says that Altenberg (1987: 136) places *well* in the category of "closed items which are 'fairly often marked by stress'." Aijmer (2002: 66) says that her results show that there were by far more examples of *well* with stress than of *now* with stress. She therefore comes to the conclusion that the pragmatic marker *now* has the prosodic pattern without stress, while *now* used as adverb is "'non-reduced' by default" (cf. Aijmer 2002: 61-2 and the example mentioned above). Aijmer (2002: 66) also quotes Halliday and Hasan (1976: 268) who treat the reduced variant as having a special function:

> "When *now* carries the tone, certain tendencies can be distinguished. If it is tonic, *now* is deictic and not cohesive…If it is reduced, it means the meaning of a new stage in the communication; this may be a new incident in the story, a new point in the argument, a new role or attitude being taken on by the speaker, and so on."

---

[12] Asides (or self-reflexive comments) are explained as parenthetical comments (Aijmer 2002: 74).

As can be observed, collocations are important when distinguishing between *now* as a pragmatic marker and *now* as a temporal adverb. Moreover, different functions are assigned to *now* when it is found in connection to metacomments or other discourse markers. Furthermore, there are different aspects at work as well, such as prosody and the position of *now* in a text. As it is obvious, the aspects of collocation, prosody and position also seem to be relevant and crucial with respect to *well*. They are all discussed by both Johansson, and Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen. Therefore, for the sake of better organization and understanding, it was thought to be more appropriate to include these aspects not in the separate section dealing solely with *well*, but to mention them with reference to *now* when necessary. With respect to both pragmatic markers, we have here touched upon the issues of prosody, position and collocations. However, the following section (i.e. 2.2.2.4) focuses more on the comparison between *now* and *well*. The main reason is that although this thesis is structured into the respective sub/sections or headings, each focusing on a different aspect, the individual aspects seem to overlap, which is characteristic of linguistics. Sometimes it seems more relevant to look at both pragmatic markers as they operate together rather than to treat them individually, i.e. separately. As Aijmer and Simon-Vandebergen (2011: 234) claim: "from an intra-linguistic point of view pragmatic markers can be compared on the basis of similarities and differences." Not only the comparison of different pragmatic markers can be beneficial from an intra-linguistic point of view, but, as was mentioned above, it can contribute to the overall comprehension of pragmatic markers as their individual meanings and functions are reflected in translation, i.e. cross-linguistically.

2.2.2.4 Comparing *now* and *well*

As our thesis deals with two pragmatic markers, i.e. *now* and *well*, let us now look at the comparison of both pragmatic markers. Aijmer (2002: 71-2) says that *well* and *now* are "close in meaning and there are distributional similarities between them." Therefore, she finds it interesting to compare them. She points out that it is frequent for both pragmatic markers to form a collocation together (*well now*) and that in many situations they have a similar function. Furthermore, they are both used to change the topic (viz. Aijmer's using the label "topic-changer") and to signal "transitions to a subtopic." They are also to be found in "conversational openings", where they have a similar meaning (Aijmer 2002: 71). Aijmer continues and gives an illustrative example of a beginning of a radio conversation (instead of 'conversation' she uses 'transaction'), with *now* used as a 'discussion-opener': *Good evening. Now tonight our guests are...* She says that for Quirk et al. (1985: 634) and Sinclair &

Coulthard (1975: 22) it is possible to use both *now* and *well* at the beginning of a transaction. However, on closer inspection, she continues, we discover that although similar in meaning, the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* are not "freely interchangeable" and we have to take into consideration in what sort of activity they in fact occur (Aijmer 2002: 71). She says that in the example mentioned above it is more appropriate to use *now* because the meaning intended by the speaker is to put emphasis and the context is formal (ibid).

Therefore, in this case *well* "would sound 'informal, improvised, or colloquial as it suggests that the speaker is not really beginning from the beginning but already responding to his audience or to his own implicit deliberations. On informal occasions, particularly after an introduction, such a beginning is quite normal' (Carlson 1984: 52)" (Aijmer 2002: 71). Aijmer (ibid: 71-2) also claims that the "distributional properties and the temporal core meaning of *now*" can be considered as "compatible with a connective particle" that has "propulsive or emphatic function" which is very typical of signalling "changes or switches in the argument or narrative." Furthermore, she says, there is "additional evidence" comparing *now* with *well* in contexts where although it is possible to use both pragmatic markers, each implies something different (ibid: 72). To demonstrate the differences and similarities between the two pragmatic markers, Aijmer (ibid) gives the following example (originally from Quirk et al. 1985:1470):

> (A) That man speaks extremely good English.
> (B) ***Well*** he comes from a village in Mongolia.
> (C) ***Now*** he comes from a village in Mongolia.

Both *now* and *well* respond to the utterance A and signal a "transition between what has been said and what is about to be said. *Well* [is the indication of] acceptance: 'it is an established fact (*Well, of course!*) that Mongolian villages provide excellent bases for learning English' (Quirk et al., ibid)" (Aijmer 2002: 72). While *well* would result in closing the whole conversation, *now* implies "a continuation or elaboration of what has just been said" (ibid).

As can be seen, *now* and *well* are not freely interchangeable. Therefore, if the role of context has been put in question in relation to delimiting the meaning of *well* and with reference to translation, we have here a similar case, i.e. the role of context also plays an important role when deciding whether to use *now* or *well,* despite the fact they show similar tendencies in terms of meanings or functions. Similarly, Aijmer (2003: 27) believes that when textual function is concerned the pragmatic marker *now* is close to *well*. To support this, Aijmer (ibid) also quotes Schiffrin (1987: 230), who point out that *now* indicates "attention to an upcoming idea, orientation, and/or participation framework." Aijmer (ibid) continues and

says that despite the fact that both pragmatic markers are close to each other, they are, however, different in a way that while *well* is both backward- and forward-looking, *now* is "exclusively forward-looking." Here, again, Aijmer (ibid) mentions Schiffrin's (1987: 323-4) account in which she sees both pragmatic markers as having different indexical functions, with *well* indexing an utterance to both the speaker and hearer, and with *now* indexing an utterance to the speaker and to the upcoming text. However, Aijmer (2002: 93-94) treats *now* both as speaker- and hearer-oriented. "Affective" or "intensifying" *now*, as she calls it, implies that the speaker is involved with the hearer (e.g. when in occurrence with imperatives) (ibid). Furthermore, she continues, affective *now* is also used by a speaker that cannot wait to "take control of the conversational floor (*now wait a moment*)." In collocations such as *now look*, *now come on*, *now* implies "affective intensity" (cf. 2.2.2.2, 'affectivity', 'intensity'). Used as an intensifier, *now* may acquire "an overtone of urgency and interest or a 'friendly overtone' " (ibid). Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 27) conclude by saying that intralinguistically speaking, *well* and *now* can be considered as "functional equivalents in some contexts, although they have different implications."

Furthermore, when focusing on the already mentioned aspects of collocation, prosody and position in text with reference to the comparison between *now* and *well*, not only are these aspects relevant for *now*, but also for *well* (as was mentioned above, cf. 2.2.2.3). Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003: 12-13) say that prosodic information are missing in the examples in their contrastive study, since they used written corpus data, which, logically, does not contain this piece of information. Therefore, they continue, it means that when interpreting *well,* they had to do without "important clues." They, however, do not see this as presenting a serious problem, since "authors frequently add information about tone of voice and attitude of the personages, and the context (collocations and higher level contexts) is in most cases disambiguating." As can be seen, although Aijmer (2002) deals with the aspect of prosody on the examples of spoken corpus data, the written corpus data, although being unable to offer prosodic information, are not entirely at a disadvantage when it comes to prosody. Clearly enough, again the role of context(s) and collocations are a clue how to deal with the question of prosody. Similarly, Johansson's methodology is a result of the aspects of prosody and position in text. Johansson (2006: 118) says that all instances of *well* retrieved from the fiction texts of the ENPC (English-Norwegian-Parallel-Corpus) occurred in sentence-initial position (*Well, he had earned it*) and were followed by a comma (e.g. *His eyes were blue, well, maybe more a blue-green).* His methodology has an important reason. In relation to what was mentioned above, in the sentence-initial position, *well* is more likely to

function as a pragmatic marker. Moreover, if it is used in a fictional dialogue and if the immediate context together with the relevant collocations are analyzed in a right way, some prosodic information may be gained as well (cf. Aijmer 2002 above). A similar methodology was used in this thesis as well, though independently and in a slightly different manner (cf. Project and Methodology).

2.2.2.5 The overview of the core meaning and function of *now*

If we have provided the core meaning and function(s) for *well*, *now* should deserve a similar treatment. Aijmer (2002: 70) states that the core meaning 'at the present moment' of *now* is an explanation for its functioning as "a stepping-stone to a new topic, new argument or new stage in a narrative." She uses Quirk et al.'s (1985: 638) describing it as a 'discourse conjunct' whose primary function is "to shift attention to a new topic" (Aijmer 2002: 71) and Bolinger's (1989: 132) account in which *now* is treated as 'a prompter' implying 'Mind you, put other considerations aside, don't give me an argument on this'. In addition, according to Ochs (1996: 421), the core meaning of *now* explains why it can also function as an 'evaluator' or 'intensifier' that can be compared with other markers signalling "emphatic stress, emphatic adverbs, repetition, etc" (Aijmer: 2002: 71). Furthermore, Aijmer (2002: 95) offers an exhaustive conclusion saying that *now* marks a change in a topic in that it draws one's attention to "something new." Another interesting point of Aijmer's is that the temporal meaning of *now* can help us to understand why it also has the textual functions, the affective meaning, and the evaluative meaning. According to her, in order to interpret *now*, we have to take into account how it is indexically related to the preceding and forthcoming text, as well as we have to consider its "close connection with subjectivity." She distinguishes between emphatic, direct and argumentative *now* and says that it prompts new arguments and topics in the discourse and highlights the "speaker's right to control the progression of talk and the development of the topic."

Aijmer (2002: 95) also summarizes the main points about the pragmatic marker *now*: The primary functions of *now* are textual and affective. However, when compared to *well* or when looking at the collocations with *now, now* can have many different textual and affective functions. Generally speaking, *now* is a "boundary signal between discourse units (paragraphs, subtopics) in the turns of the same speaker." It is an indication of a topic-change (thus *now* treated as a 'topic-changer'), or it introduces "a new stage in the conversation (e.g. coming to the main point after some preliminaries)." Therefore, she continues, there are many different meanings of *now*, ranging from those where *now* indicates a "smooth transition from

one topic to another", pointing forwards in the discourse, to those instances where it "marks 'misplacement' (e.g. the resumption of a topic)." Aijmer mentions other meanings of *now*, including elaboration, explanation or justification in those cases where *now* functions as an introductory element to a "subordinate speech act." The primary function of *now,* however, is to indicate "subjective modality because of its link to the speaker." According to her, this serves as an explanation for its behaving as an affective intensifier (a subjective modal particle) that is typically accompanied with metacomments (*let me see now*), prefaces (*my duty this morning is to...*), evaluations (*that's awful)*, and "subjective opinions" (*I think*). Therefore, for Aijmer it is very interesting to analyze the individual uses of the modal particle (pragmatic marker) *now*. Furthermore, as she points out, *now* "represents the end-point of grammaticalisation from a deictic source." Another Aijmer's observation worth mentioning is that when *now* is analyzed as "a modal particle (e.g. before imperatives), it may carry friendly overtones (*now come on*) as its derived meaning as well as impatience (*now wait*) or resistance (*well now*, *now look*)." As we will see, this is very important for the analysis in this thesis as well.

To conclude, as it is obvious, Aijmer provides an appropriate overview that covers almost all of the aspects we have talked about in relation to the characteristics of *now*. Additionally, it mentions the aspects that can also be related to the pragmatic marker *well*.

2.3 Concluding remarks

As can be seen, there are many different views on how to treat the pragmatic markers *now* and *well,* and pragmatic markers generally. There have been published many studies, more on *well* than on *now*, each, however, both coming up with something new and referring to the previous respective studies as well. The overall amalgam of opinions thus enables us to comprehend the nature of pragmatic markers better, although it still remains rather a problematic issue in linguistics.

3 Empirical part

The empirical part includes the methodology of the research, the presentation and analysis of the data and the interpretation of the findings.

3.1 Project and Methodology

The project involves data collection, interpretation and assessment of the data. Its main goal is to show what the Czech translation equivalents of the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* are like, their distribution and adequacy with regard to the functions of these markers in the original texts. The selection and collection of the data is described in the methodology below. On careful consideration, it was decided that rather than collecting the pragmatic markers *now* and *well* on their own the extraction will focus on their most frequent co-occurrences in the corpus. The marker-collocate sequences identified in the corpus are treated as subgroups and the distribution of their equivalents is investigated separately. The strategy follows from the idea that each subgroup may have specific semantic properties and so specific equivalents. It should answer the question whether collocation may have an influence on the choice of the equivalent.

The methodological issues that had to be resolved were the source and amount of data and the procedure to be used when retrieving the data. The source is the parallel corpus InterCorp, which is part of the Czech National Corpus project of the Institute of the Czech National Corpus. The material basis of this thesis consists of 100+6 occurrences of the pragmatic marker *now* and of 100+6 occurrences of the pragmatic marker *well* and their Czech translation equivalents. The reason for the 12 occurrences used as additional material for this thesis is explained in the analytical section. The procedure involves the following features. The interface used for the work with the corpus was NoSketch Engine, which was accessed through the website of the Czech National Corpus, whose link can be found in the list of on-line sources. The queries used to retrieve the results were *Now,* and *Well,*. The reason for the restriction of both particles to instances with the capital letter and followed by a comma was to have a greater chance of the particles' behaving more as pragmatic markers rather than adverbs. However, all the instances had to be sorted manually in order to eliminate the occurrences of the particles as adverbs. Sometimes this was difficult, especially in the case of *now*, when occasionally, as mentioned in the theoretical part, both the temporal and the pragmatic meaning overlap. As pointed out in the theoretical part as well, pragmatic markers are characteristic of spoken discourse, but fictional dialogue may well serve as a good source instead, or, as was discussed already, may even be better for analysis. Therefore, the material

used for this thesis is based on written data, more specifically fictional dialogues. Even here it was necessary to sort the instances, i.e. to check if they all occurred in direct speech (in order to adhere to the criterion of fictional dialogue). The whole of the written material, however, was subject to further selection as well. Since this thesis focuses on Czech translation equivalents of the pragmatic markers *now* and *well*, it was necessary to restrict the corpus to the subcorpus where only those instances of *now* and *well* were retrieved that occurred in the English originals, i.e. English was not the target language, but the source language. This was very important, since the results of the analysis would have been totally different had English not been a source language only. Furthermore, a wide range of originals, and subsequently translations, was used in order to eliminate any specific author's or translator's style. Therefore, the sample is widely representative. To achieve this, the occurrences retrieved had to be randomized. As can be seen, the methodology employed to retrieve the data is in compliance with what was mentioned in the theoretical part when Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's, and Johansson's own methodologies were discussed (the role of fictional dialogues, Johansson's restriction of *well* to the sentence-initial position and followed by a comma, the role of prosody, etc.).

In the selection procedure, we took into account other aspects that were already mentioned in the theoretical part, especially the role of collocates of *now* and *well*. In the distribution span, the collocate's position was 1 RIGHT. Furthermore, out of the total number of all these collocates, only those were selected that were not only among the most frequent ones, but they were symptomatic of both pragmatic markers in a way that they reflected the use of the marker-collocate sequences with regard to the theoretical background discussed. For this reason, we can talk about both corpus-based and corpus-driven approaches being adopted in this thesis. The collocates thus not only serve as a clue to differentiate an adverb from a pragmatic marker (cf. the theoretical part mentioning the criteria for distinguishing between the two uses of *now*, e.g. with a lexical collocate: *now then, well now*) and are not only telling us that it is frequent for them to be further expanded to metacomments such as *now let me see*, but they may be helpful in analyzing both pragmatic markers cross-linguistically and in broader context, which is the main aim of this thesis. It was thus thought to be appropriate to take only those instances of *Now,* and *Well,* that were followed by the first collocate to the right. The reason is that in order to obtain the most reliable results in a contrastive (translation) study, the best way seems to be to have an identical, or parallel, structure. Such a restricted structure is much more useful as a starting point for the analysis of the translation equivalents. To give an example, one of the aspects that will be analyzed is

cases in which both *now* and *well* share the same collocate, e.g. *then*. Therefore, the retrieved items to be analyzed are *Now, then* and *Well, then*. In the empirical part, we will look at both instances and at the Czech translation equivalents. Such a procedure seems to be helpful for another reason. Restricting the occurrences to the combination of a pragmatic marker and a collocate will also result in restricting or narrowing the meaning or interpretation of the pragmatic markers, and therefore can help to provide a better starting point for the analysis of the Czech translation equivalents as well, since the narrower the interpretation of the pragmatic markers, the better it is for the comparison of the individual translation choices. Of course, for even a deeper analysis it was necessary to treat every individual instance on its own. For example, it was necessary to subject the final occurrences to additional semantic sorting. To demonstrate this, let us consider the example with *Now, then*. Only those instances were analyzed in which *then* was used not as a temporal adverb, but as a pragmatic marker. Exceptions to this criterion will be commented upon as they arise.

Next, the overall number of occurrences of both pragmatic markers found in the corpus was different. There were in all 128 occurrences of *Now,* + the selected collocates in the position 1RIGHT, and 730 occurrences of *Well,* + the selected collocates 1RIGHT. Obviously, the results are in favour of *well*, which, as mentioned in the theoretical part, can be regarded as the more prototypical of the two. Although this thesis works with a smaller sample (200+12 items), it was thought to be appropriate to give both the total number of occurrences of the respective collocations in the whole corpus and the actual number of occurrences selected for the analysis at the beginning (Tables 1 and 2). The total number of occurrences shows the frequency and rank of the individual collocates in the whole corpus, while the actual number presents the number of occurrences after the semantic sorting (i.e. counting only the uses as a pragmatic marker and not as an adverb) and after the overall data sorting (i.e. counting only those instances that occurred in a fictional dialogue).

As the overall number of 858 occurrences of *Now,* and *Well,* found in the corpus is too large for the purposes of the thesis it had to be cut down to a manageable size. In principle, there are two strategies that can be applied here: (a) to scale down the representation of marker-collocate subgroups proportionately, and (b) to preserve the range of marker-collocate subgroups. The proportionate scaling down, which would reduce the range of marker-collocate subgroups (due to the disproportion between the occurrences of the markers), was ruled out as the goal of the thesis is to review and compare the translation equivalents of the two markers for which as large a range of marker-collocate subgroups is useful. So the second strategy was chosen – to preserve all the 12 marker-collocate subgroups of *Now,* and 11

subgroups of *Well,*. As the target number for the sample was 200 items, it was still necessary to reduce the 128 occurrences of *Now,* to 100 (actually to 106, including the special case of *Now, now* – viz. Footnote 13). This was done by randomly omitting 22 occurrences from the largest subgroups (especially *Now, I*). Once the number of *Now,* occurrences in the subgroups was reduced to 106, the subgroups of the marker *Well,* were randomly reduced to the same size as those of the *Now,* subgroups, 9 of them with the same collocates (*I, if, you, do, my, then, look, let* and *now*) – 3 *Now*-specific (*listen, wait, tell*) and 2 *Well*-specific (*well, see*). The size of marker-specific subgroups is either equivalent to the number of occurrences in the whole corpus or is randomly reduced. Although this method disregards the actual distribution of the two pragmatic markers in the corpus, it allows comparing the translation equivalents of *Now,* and *Well,* with the same collocates. In spite of possible objections to the way the sample was constructed, the analysis yielded some interesting results and made it possible for conclusions worth mentioning to be drawn.

3.2 Analysis

The application of the above methodology and selection restrictions resulted in the final sample for analysis consisting of 100+6 occurrences of *now* and 100+6 occurrences of *well*. When presenting and discussing the 200+12 occurrences of *Now*, and *Well*, and their respective Czech equivalents we will focus on illustrative examples only, since commenting on every individual occurrence and its translation would go beyond the scope of this thesis. These examples, however, are carefully chosen to illustrate the relevant aspects discussed in the theoretical background. The complete data on which the analysis draws is presented in the Appendix (i.e. all the occurrences and their Czech translations). Whenever necessary, the illustrative examples discussed in the analysis are supplied with a broader context as well.

3.2.1 Collocates *of Now,* and *Well,*

We will now look closer at the overall frequency breakdown of the collocates of *Now,* and *Well,* that are the focus of this thesis. The collocates in blue are those shared by both pragmatic markers. The collocates in red are those that are either *now*-specific, or *well*-specific. The collocates of *Now,* and *Well,* are presented in Tables 1 and 2 respectively:

Table 1: *Now, + the selected collocates 1RIGHT*

Collocate	Rank	Occurrences	Occurrences used for analysis
I	1	37	23
IF	4	24	22
YOU	7	14	11
DO	12	12	12
MY	14	10	9
(NOW)[13]	(18)	(8)	(6)
LISTEN	24	5	5
THEN	27	4	4
TELL	28	4	4
LOOK	31	4	4
WAIT	35	3	3
LET	40	3	3
TOTAL		128	106

Table 2: *Well, + the selected collocates 1RIGHT*

Collocate	Rank	Occurrences	Occurrences used for analysis
I	1	357	23
YOU	2	122	11
IF	6	68	22
THEN	11	40	4
WELL	13	37	9
LET	16	31	3
(NOW)	(17)	(29)	(6)
MY	26	17	9
DO	28	15	12
SEE	45	8	3
LOOK	55	6	4
TOTAL		730	106

We can see that there are quite a large number of the collocates that are typical of both pragmatic markers, and some are characteristic of either *now* (*listen, wait, tell*), or *well* (*well, see*) only. In the following subsections of this thesis the individual collocates are going to be discussed with respect to both pragmatic markers and the Czech translation equivalents.

---

[13] *Now* as a collocate to *Now,* makes the additional 6 occurrences to the 100. Since it is rather a specific case, it was included only additionally and was given the green colour. This similarly applies to *Well, now,* although to a certain extent only. This will be analyzed in detail later in this thesis.

3.2.2 *Now, I* and *Well, I*

The instances of *Now* collocating with the personal pronoun *I* and their Czech translation equivalents are presented in Table 3:

Table 3: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, I*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	11	47.8
a teď	3	13.0
teď	1	4.35
ale	1	4.35
nadto	1	4.35
podívej	1	4.35
a koukej	1	4.35
však	1	4.35
tak	1	4.35
tak tedy	1	4.35
vím	1	4.35
Total	**23**	**100**

They provide good examples of the theoretical issues discussed earlier in this thesis. To begin with, a brief note on why to choose collocations with the personal pronoun *I*. Not only were they chosen because of their highest frequency, but since *now* is believed to behave primarily as a "marker of subjective modality" of the speaker (Aijmer 2002: 62; cf. 2.2.2.2), the personal pronoun *I* appears to highlight the speaker-oriented aspect of *now*, as it explicitly refers to the speaker. So the choice was not only logical, but also inevitable.

As can be seen, in more than 52% of the cases, omission was used as a means of translation. As was pointed out already, the uses of *now* may sometimes overlap. It can be difficult to distinguish between the temporal adverb and the pragmatic marker, and both uses can be present at the same time, as we could see. Furthermore, even when the distinction is made, in the case of *now* as a pragmatic marker, it can have many different functions as well. Therefore, the solution in the form of translation by omission suggests itself as the easiest and safest way out when translating the marker. In this way the translator avoids making a mistake, and at the same time bearing the responsibility for deciphering the most probable meaning of the original and for choosing the most appropriate translation equivalent. The second most frequent translation equivalent was *a teď* with 3 occurrences. The rest of the translation equivalents have each one occurrence only and they thus obviously demonstrate that contextually-restricted translations are less frequent, i.e. we talk about contextual equivalents (cf. 2.2.2.2 and 2.2.1.8 respectively). Given the aspect of context-specificity, it is

therefore much more difficult for a translator to choose a contextual equivalent, but, if chosen correctly, it can convey the meaning closest to the original and it can highlight some of the specific uses of the pragmatic marker. Let us now look at Example 1:

(1) *Now, I* suppose I should tell you a little about this ball.
     Teď *bych vám asi měla něco říct o dnešním plese.*

The example illustrates several theoretical aspects mentioned above. *Now* functions here as a topic-changer, or as a marker of drawing "attention to an upcoming idea" Schiffrin (1987: 230; 2.2.2.4). It indexes the utterance both to the speaker and to the upcoming text. By 'text' we mean any discourse, in this case the utterance of the speaker. Furthermore, it has also interactional meaning, and as such it is also hearer-oriented. By the speaker's saying *I should tell you*, the hearer is explicitly involved in the conversational discourse. Furthermore, the aspect of subjective modality, and therefore the use of *now* as an affective intensifier when in conjunction with subjective opinions such as *I think* (cf. 2.2.2.5), is enhanced here similarly by *I suppose*. The translation equivalent *teď* is an appropriate solution here, since despite its interactional meaning, *now* seems to have predominantly temporal meaning here. Yet, it would not be advisable to classify *now* as an adverb in this case, since it definitely behaves more as a pragmatic marker. What we have here is a good example of the meanings or functions overlapping. And, as was mentioned above, it is up to the translator which meaning they will highlight (cf. 2.2.1.8). Here the temporal meaning was stressed, yet this *now* must be classified as a pragmatic marker. However, it is in line with the view that *now*'s core meaning 'at the present moment' explains its function as a marker for a new topic or a "new stage in a narrative" (cf. 2.2.2.5.). In this case, the new topic is the *ball* about which the speaker is going to tell the heare(s).

A very interesting is the Czech translation equivalent *a koukej*. In this case, we can undoubtedly speak about a contextual equivalent. The example in point is:

(2) "**Now, *I*** want you in bed at your normal time, young lady," Tracy said.
     „A koukej jít včas do postele, princezno," nabádala ji Tracy.

The example clearly shows the interactional, or more specifically the affective (intensifying), meaning of *now*. However, the role of context arises here as an important disambiguator when delimiting the meaning of *now*. In this case, it is the *I want you* which makes the whole utterance understandable in terms of the speaker's subjective modality. *Now* highlights the affective (emotive) aspect and, more specifically, we can talk about *now* having not a 'friendly overtone', but rather indicating the speaker's impatience (cf. 2.2.2.5) with the hearer.

Therefore, *now* is in this case clearly both speaker- and hearer-oriented, but it may be directed more towards the hearer, which is very interesting, since, as was mentioned above, *now* is primarily treated as speaker- or text-oriented rather than hearer-oriented (cf. 2.2.2.4). The Czech translation equivalent *a koukej* is an appropriate solution here, as it reflects the speaker's impatience, or rather irritation.

Turning to *Well, I* collocations, we can see another, yet quite different example of what we have found with *Now,*. First of all, we can justify the choice of collocations with the personal pronoun *I* for the analysis on similar grounds. Also, like *Now* the marker *Well* is treated unambiguously as both speaker- and hearer-oriented. We will see too that the core meaning of *well* was successfully rendered in some of the translations. The results of the analysis are given in Table 4 which shows the overall distribution of the Czech translation equivalents of *Well, I*:

Table 4: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, I*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
no	10	43.5
omission/zero translation	4	17.3
ale	2	8.7
a (já) zas	1	4.35
vlastně	1	4.35
inu	1	4.35
přece	1	4.35
jen tak	1	4.35
dobrá	1	4.35
no dobře	1	4.35
Total	**23**	**100**

Whereas *Now, I* was translated by omission in an overwhelming majority of the cases (nearly 48%), *Well, I* was translated in more than 43% by the Czech particle *no*. Translation by omission is, however, the second most frequent means of translation, with more than 17%. As with *Now*, we have here many different contextual equivalents as well. Consider Example 3:

(3) Speaker A: "Please don't destroy our illusions"
Speaker B: "***Well, I*** was merely pointing out that there's nothing conceptually novel about Rama, though its size is startling. "
Speaker A: Prosím, abyste nám neničil iluze."
*Speaker B: **No dobře**, chtěl jsem jenom zdůraznit, že na Rámovi není nic principiálně nového, ačkoli jeho velikost ohromuje.*

Here we have a clear example of how several features of *well* are at work at the same time. First, although we treat the Czech translation equivalent *no dobře* as a separate equivalent, it is in fact a combination of two equivalents in one, i.e. of *no* and *dobře* (a variant of *dobrá*, which is labelled as another equivalent on its own). It is thus a combination that consists of the most frequent equivalent (*no*) and of the contextual equivalent (*dobře*). If we look at the original and its translation closer, we will see that *well* behaves as a pragmatic marker signalling the "shift in context, in the sense that the speaker signals that the background assumptions need to be renegotiated in order to establish common ground" (see Jucker in Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 4; cf. 2.2.1.4). Therefore, we have here an obvious instance of *well* as a 'facilitator' (cf. 2.2.1.4). Speaker B facilitates the whole conversation, for he may be feeling that there is a "discrepancy between propositional attitudes of the [participants] in conversation" (Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen 2003: 4; cf. 2.2.1.4), speakers A and B in this case. Speaker B reacts to Speaker A's request not to destroy the illusions of the participants in the conversation. Speaker A's utterance obviously contains something that is negative, i.e. *destroying one's illusions*, therefore, in order to re-establish/renegotiate the common ground between the speakers, Speaker B decides to use the pragmatic marker *well*. Interestingly enough, this is further enhanced by the fact that Speaker B uses a mitigator *merely* (the Czech translation equivalent being *jenom*). Moreover, we have here another interesting fact worth mentioning. The Czech translation equivalent *no dobře* shows that the translator decided to highlight the core meaning of *well*, i.e. 'positive appraisal' signalling Speaker B's being aware of counter-expectation (cf. 2.2.1.5). The aspect of counter-expectation is better rendered by choosing *no dobře* than it would have been by choosing *dobře* only, since it would not reflect the subjective modality of Speaker B so aptly. And since in the original this is done by using *well* in combination with *merely*, this had to be translated into Czech somehow. The translator's strategy was to use the Czech particle *no* in combination with *dobře*.

Let us now look at Example 4:

(4) "***Well, I*** tried to swing the wheel -" He broke off, and suddenly I guessed at the truth.
„***Inu***, *pokusil jsem se strhnout volant –"Zarazil se a já jsem najednou uhodl pravdu.*

Here we have an example of the translator's trying to find an appropriate equivalent in Czech that would highlight the pragmatic use of *well* that establishes the common ground between the participants in conversation, and so has interactional meaning. In order to achieve this, the translator decided to use a translation equivalent *inu*, which is one of the particles in Czech that prototypically reflect interactional meaning. Although it may sound archaic to some of

the native speakers of Czech, *inu* as a pragmatic marker is at the same time characteristic of fictional prose, and therefore as a translation solution it serves well to highlight the interactional meaning of *well*.

3.2.3 *Now, if* and *Well, if*

The next marker-collocate subgroups are those with *if*. Table 5 shows the Czech translation equivalents of *Now, if*:

Table 5: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, if*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	7	31.8
a teď	6	27.3
tak	4	18.2
ale	1	4.54
teď	1	4.54
tedy	1	4.54
nu	1	4.54
hm	1	4.54
Total	**22**	**100**

As we can see, with more than 31%, omission was the most frequent means of translation. More interesting, however, from the linguistic point of view, is the translation equivalent *a teď*, with more than 27%. For the analysis to be more accurate, however, it is not sufficient to look at the collocate *if* only. It is necessary to see a broader context, therefore the lexical items immediately following *Now, if* are analyzed as well. Consider the following illustrative examples:

(5) "**Now**, **if** you'll excuse me, I have to get back to work."
   A teď *mě laskavě omluvte, musím se vrátit ke svý práci."*
(6) **Now**, **if** you gentlemen will leave us for a few minutes, I need to talk with Mr. Ladd and his client in private."
   A teď, *pánové, jestli nás na pár minut opustíte, rád bych si promluvil s panem Laddem a jeho klientem soukromě."*
(7) **Now**, **if** you'll excuse me-"
   A teď, *jestli mě omluvíte…"*
(8) **Now**, **if** you don't mind, I'm going to bed. "
   A teď, *jestli vám to nevadí, si půjdu lehnout*

In all cases, the Czech translation equivalent is *a teď*. The translator obviously highlighted the core meaning 'at the present moment' of *now*. However, the pragmatic meaning is included as well, since the equivalent is not *teď*, but *a teď*. It might be argued that the conjunction *a* carries the pragmatic meaning and *teď* implies the temporal meaning, with the whole

35

equivalent *a teď*, however, conveying both meanings at the same time, which is typical of *now* (cf. 2.2.2.1; the "fuzziness" of *now*; the functions overlap). *Now* functions here as an indicator of a transition to a new stage in the conversation (cf. 2.2.2.5), it indexes to both the speaker and to the upcoming text (i.e. conversational discourse), and as such it is forward-looking (cf. 2.2.2.4). All these aspects are further enhanced by the speaker's using the verb *to excuse oneself* in combination with *will,* that functions here as a marker of politeness (and as such it saves the addressee's face; cf. 2.2.1.5), or by the phrase *if you don't mind*, and by the speaker's implying that he will leave the conversational floor himself (*getting back to work, going to bed*), or that he politely asks others to leave him and the other participant(s) (*if you gentlemen will leave us*). In all cases, however, as the speaker is politely expressing that he will leave the conversational floor, he is also interacting with the hearer. Therefore, *now* is here hearer-oriented as well. The translation equivalent *a teď* is therefore justified, since it preserves the shade of the core meaning 'at the present moment', it marks a transition to a new stage in conversation (the forward-lookedness), and is interactional (hearer-oriented). There is another important observation to be made. The phrases that immediately follow *Now, if* (*if you will excuse me, if you will leave us, if you don't mind*) may be classified as the instances of Aijmer's 'metacomments', 'parenthetical comments', or 'asides', marking minor breaks in discourse structure. Therefore, their use proves that *now* is very frequently employed to signal a transition to metacomments (cf. 2.2.2.3).

Table 6 presents the Czech translation equivalents of the sequence *Well, if*:

Table 6: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, if*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	8	36.4
no	6	27.3
dobrá	2	9.09
nu	2	9.09
takže	2	9.09
tedy	1	4.54
dobře	1	4.54
Total	**22**	**100**

As is the case with *Now, if*, translation by omission was most frequent, with more than 36%. The second most frequent means of translation was the particle *no*, occurring in more than 27%. Let us now look at some of the examples:

(9) Now he grumbled, "**Well, if** you wish, but…"
    *Přesto brumlavě ustoupil: "**Dobře**, jak si přeješ, ale…"*

(10) "**Well**, **if** it makes you feel any better,"she continued, "Ellis Cutler is not a hot date.
„Jestli tě to uklidní,"pokračovala, „s Ellisem Cutlerem nic nemám.

(11) "**Well**, **if** that's what you like,"Marion was saying,"maybe I'll surprise you!"
*„**Takže** ten se ti líbí?"ptala se."Možná tě překvapím!"*

(12) "**Well**, **if** you don't mind when we get back, I don't!"said Leo heroically.
*„**No**, jestli vám na tom nesejde, kdy se vrátíme, mně jistě ne,"odpověděl Leo hrdinsky.*

All these are once again instances of metacomment (see the lexical items in red colour). Apparently, it is not only *now* that can mark a transition to metacomments; *well* may fulfil the same function. Furthermore, from the semantic perspective, all the metacomments have positive meaning (*wish, feel better, like*), or they function as markers of politeness (*if you don't mind*), which is positive in nature as well. The translation equivalents are *dobře, takže, no,* translation by *omission*. In the majority of these examples, the translator retained the interactional aspect of *well* by choosing a relevant equivalent in Czech. Besides, in Example 9, the core meaning of *well* ('positive appraisal'), i.e. signaling the speaker's awareness of counter-expectation (cf. 2.2.1.5 and 3.2.2), was highlighted as well, by the translator's use of the equivalent *dobře*. If we have a closer look at the example, we will see that the emotive quality is further enhanced by the metacomment *if you wish* and the aspect of counter-expectation by the adversative conjunction *but*. This was appropriately conveyed by the Czech translation *dobře, **jak** si přeješ, **ale**...*, where, in addition, the *if*-clause was not translated as a conditional clause ***jestli** si přeješ*, but as ***jak** si přeješ*, which makes the aspect of counter-expectation much more prominent.

Example 12 is a rather different case. Here, unlike in Example 9, *if* was translated as *jestli*; the reason for this is that the clause should be interpreted as conditional per se. In addition, Example 12 is interesting if compared to Example 8. Both use the same metacomment (*if you don't mind*), the difference being that whereas Example 8 contains the temporal meaning in translation in addition to the pragmatic meaning (*a teď*), Example 12 expresses only the pragmatic meaning. Accordingly it is translated by the Czech particle *no*, which is due to the difference in the core meanings of *now* and *well*. Furthermore, Example 8 is interesting from another perspective. With reference to Aijmer's quoting Quirk's example indicating the interchangeability of *now* and *well* (cf. 2.2.2.4), we can pose a question whether both *now* and *well* could be used in Example 8. I think that it proves Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's (2003: 27; cf. 2.2.2.4) point when they claim that *now* and *well* are "functional equivalents in some contexts, [but] they have [each] different implications", and therefore they are not "freely interchangeable" (Aijmer 2002: 71; cf. 2.2.2.4). Let us demonstrate this by the following substitution test:

> **Now**, **if** you don't mind, I'm going to bed.
> **?Well**, **if** you don't mind, I'm going to bed.

The use of *well* instead of *now* is rather infelicitous in this case, since the combination of a transition to a new stage in conversation, forward-lookedness, and temporal meaning that *now* imparts can hardly be expressed by *well*; consequently, the translation equivalents such as *dobře, no, takže, tedy* would not be suitable either.

3.2.4 *Now, you* and *Well, you*

While the reason for choosing the sequences *Now, I* and *Well, I* was that the personal pronoun *I* reflects especially the speaker-oriented aspect of both pragmatic markers, with *Now, you* and *Well, you* the focus is on the hearer, which is enhanced by the use of the personal pronoun *you*, directly addressing the hearer. First, Table 7 shows the Czech translation equivalents of *Now, you*:

Table 7: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, you*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	5	45.5
a teď	2	18.1
takže teď	1	9.09
nu	1	9.09
a	1	9.09
hezky	1	9.09
Total	**11**	**100**

With more than 45%, omission is again the most frequent way to deal with translation into Czech. Although Johansson (2006: 127) claims that in his contrastive study it was often impossible to "identify a plausible reason for omission", we will see that even translation by omission can be an appropriate means of translation. Let us now look at the following examples:

(13) **Now**, **you** come along with me.
   *Pojď **hezky** se mnou, ...*
(14) **Now**, **you** get a bit of paper and write down
   Ty si vem kousek papíru, Jerome, a piš, ...
(15) "**Now**, **you** want to tell me what you learned in school today?"
   „Nechceš mi povědět, co jste se dneska učili ve škole?"
(16) **Now**, **you** two – this year, you behave yourselves.
   „A vy dva – chovejte se slušně!

As is obvious, *you* functions here as an emphasizer of the imperative mood (see the respective verbs in red colour), and Example 16 is the most prominent instance of this (*you two…you behave yourselves*). Accordingly, the Czech translation equivalents tried to reflect this. Example 13 with the equivalent *hezky* emphasizes the imperative mood more than aptly. Similarly, as was already mentioned above, Aijmer says that for the modal particle *now* it is typical to occur with imperatives and that it may either have a 'friendly overtone', or imply impatience (cf. 2.2.2.5 and Example 2 in 3.2.2). Example 15 is another interesting case, yet it is very different in meaning. Here, the question mark at the end of the sentence together with the expected intonation signal that the indicative sentence structured by means of the informal use of omission of the auxiliary *do* has the function of a polite inquiry. Using the verb *want* in this way is more likely to express a 'friendly overtone' rather than impatience, but of course this depends on context. The context of Example 15 involves two female speakers – Lauren and Delphine. Delphine is trying to talk to Lauren in as pleasant a way as possible. The example illustrates Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's point (2003: 12-13; cf. 2.2.2), i.e., that "authors frequently add information about tone of voice and attitude of the personages" as well as the importance of the role of "higher level context" (ibid) and the specific function of a pragmatic marker dependent on the relationship between the speaker and hearer (ibid: 9; cf. 2.2.2.). A similar pattern can be seen in Example 2 in 3.2.2 ("**Now ,** *I* want you in bed at your normal time, young lady, " Tracy said./*„A koukej jít včas do postele, princezno," nabádala ji Tracy.*). As far as the translation equivalent is concerned, even though not an explicit Czech equivalent was used, i.e. translation by omission was employed, the translation in the form of **nechceš** seems to be a good choice. The negative question maintains a polite relationship between the speaker and the hearer and as such it carries with it a 'friendly overtone'. Such a solution is possible in Czech where, unlike in English, the positive and negative yes-no questions are almost in free variation, the negative form semantically expressing greater politeness etc. (cf. *Chceš/Nechceš cigaretu?* vs *Do you want a cigarette/Don't you want a cigarette?,* the latter implying surprise or annoyance in English).

The Czech translations of *Well, I* are summed up in Table 8:

Table 8: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, you*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
no	3	27.2
dobře	2	18.2
ale	2	18.2
no nic	1	9.1
jistě	1	9.1
vždyť	1	9.1
omission/zero translation	1	9.1
Total	**11**	**100**

In this case, the translation equivalent *no* is the most frequent translation solution, with more than 27%. The Czech translation equivalents *dobře* and *ale* have each 2 occurrences.

Of the 11 occurrences three examples are particularly interesting:

(17) **Well**, **you** two think on it and come back tomorrow.
No nic, *tak si to oba nechte projít hlavou a zejtra přijďte.*
(18) "**Well**, **you**'ll be wanting more definite information than that, won't you?"
Potřeboval byste ale nějaké přesnější vyjádření."
(19) "**Well**, **you** know, not happy as such, but..."
„No víš, ne tak docela, ale…"

Examples 17 and 18 are similar to the above examples with *now*, i.e. we have here the imperative meaning (request, order) emphasized by the personal pronoun *you*, which is even more prominent in Example 17 (*you two*). On the other hand, although Example 17 is such an instance, the aspect of impatience is more likely not to be present here[14], unlike with *now* and Example 16. Example 18 is similar to Example 15, the only difference being that the verb *want* is used in the future continuous tense, which is, by the way, grammatically and semantically interesting on its own (expressing the speaker's conviction, i.e. modal meaning), since the future continuous form of the verb *want* is not so frequent (cf. *want* in Examples 15 in 3.2.4, and Example 2 in 3.2.2). However, even here it seems to signal a good relationship between the participants of the conversation, enhanced by the use of the question tag *won't you*. From the translation point of view, the Czech equivalent *ale* not only suitably renders the use of *well*, but it also covers the question tag *won't you*, and thus incorporates both meanings into one lexical item.

---

[14] Rather than to talk about *impatience* in all of the examples analyzed so far, we should talk about a speaker's *irritation*.

3.2.5 *Now, do* and *Well, do*

The sequences *Now, do* and *Well, do* include both the positive and the negative form of the auxiliary (*Now, don't,* and *Well, don't*). Apart from frequency, the reason for their inclusion is that these sequences are semantically salient which results in some specific translation equivalents. The equivalents of the *Now, do* sequences are given in Table 9:

Table 9: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, do*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	2	16.7
hlavně	2	16.7
teď	2	16.7
tak a teď	1	8.3
poslyš	1	8.3
nu, teď	1	8.3
ale nic	1	8.3
víte	1	8.3
přece	1	8.3
Total	**12**	**100**

The table shows that the range of equivalents is rather wide (9 different translations) and that there is strictly speaking no most frequent translation equivalent in this case. However, one more statistical fact deserves to be mentioned. In all but two cases, we have instances with *do* being followed by the negative *not* in the contracted form, i.e. *n't*. As *n't* is tagged in a corpus as a separate lexical item, the finding was made when analyzing the broader context. On closer inspection, some interesting features emerged deserving comment. They are illustrated by the following examples:

(20) "**Now, do**n't forget that nice wrist movement we've been practicing"
 *„**Hlavně** nesmíte zapomenout na ten pěkný pohyb zápěstím, který jsme nacvičovali!"*
(21) "**Now, do**n't forget it's Locomotor Mortis,"…
 *„**Hlavně** nezapomeň, že formule zní Locomotor mortis,"...*
(22) **Now, do** you want the gun?"
 ***Tak a teď** znovu: chceš tu pistoli?"*

Examples 20 and 21 are interesting in that they both use the same construction *Now, don't forget* in which *Now* is in each case translated by the word *hlavně.* As far as the translation of the verb phrase is concerned, *don't forget* has two slightly different equivalents in Czech, with the Example 20 translation using a modal in the negative (***nesmíte** zapomenout*), and the translation of Example 21 using a lexical verb (***nezapomeň)**.* The use of the modal *nesmíte* is of course more emphatic and the command is stronger. However, the fact that both

translations use the same word *hlavně* is more prominent than the variation in the verb structure. It may be argued that the reason for using *hlavně* is that *now* functions here as an affective intensifier, and as such, it may develop "an overtone of urgency" (Aijmer (2002: 93-94); cf. 2.2.2.4). Therefore, *hlavně* seems to be a good translation solution, since it works as a sufficient intensifier which combines the intensity of the modal and the urgency of *now*. as well.

Example 22 is interesting for another reason. It is one of the two occurrences in the subgroup which do not use the auxiliary *do* to form the negative, but a question in the present simple tense. Here we can talk about a prototypical example of *now* signalling impatience.[15] The note of impatience is very forcefully rendered in the translation by the equivalent *tak a teď znovu*. Although the translator chose an equivalent which is the combination of both temporal and interactional meaning that we could see in some of the examples above, the reiterative adverb *znovu* seems to add greater urgency to the interactional meaning, with the aspects of affective intensity, urgency, and impatience thus being made much more prominent.

The equivalents of the next marker-collocate subgroup *Well, do* are outlined in Table 10:

Table 10: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, do*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
tak	3	25
omission/zero translation	2	16.7
no	2	16.7
no jo	1	8.3
no dobrá	1	8.3
no prostě	1	8.3
a	1	8.3
dobrá	1	8.3
Total	**12**	**100**

Although the Czech translation equivalent *tak* is the most frequent of all the translation equivalents (3 occurrences, 25%), closely followed by omissions, in actual fact the particle *no* appearing both on its own and as part of three more equivalents (*no jo, no dobrá, no prostě*) with 5 occurrences in all has the same frequency as *tak* and omissions together. Let us have a look at two examples with the equivalents *tak* and one with omission:

---

[15] This example seems to be more prototypically implying the aspect of impatience than the instances analyzed above, where we should rather talk about irritation (see footnote 14).

(23) "**Well**, **do** tell me then, Matsuda.
    Dobrá. Tak mi tedy, Macudo, prozraď...
(24) **Wel**l, **do** hurry.
    Tak honem!
(25) "**Well**, **do**n't I have a right?"
    „Copak na to nemám právo?

In the case of *now*, most of the instances occurred with the negative form *don't*. With *well*, *don't* is frequent as well, but at the same time there is a new aspect that is worth mentioning. While in *Now, you* and *Well, you* it was *you* that served as a means of emphasizing the speaker's will (see the examples in 3.2.4), here in Examples 23 and 24, something similar is expressed by the use of the emphatic *do.* In Example 23 the emphasis is even further enhanced by the use of *then*. The translator's solution was to separate the interactional aspect of the pragmatic marker *well* and the emphasis into two parts, *dobrá* and *tak tedy*, which operate together. This appears to be a reasonable strategy, since it gives prominence to both the pragmatic marker *well* and other means of emphasis (emphatic *do*, *then*). The translation equivalent *dobrá* conveys the meaning of *well* that was already mentioned in 2.2.1.5 and demonstrated by the examples in 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. That is the core meaning of *well* ('positive appraisal') is closely connected to interactional meaning involving the speaker's awareness of possible counter-expectations and of the need to establish common ground. Example 25 once again illustrates the difference between Czech and English negative questions (cf. Example 15 in 3.2.4, and the distinction *chceš-nechceš/do you want/don't you want*). The particle *copak* correctly translates the speaker's annoyance expressed by the negative question, while the pragmatic marker *well* remains untranslated. Nonetheless, the Czech *copak* likewise may be said to have an interactional function and so it translates both the meaning of *well* and that of the negative question *don't*. Hence, when looking at the translation as a whole, the use of the Czech particle *copak* incorporates two meanings into one lexical item only (cf. Example 18 in 3.2.4).

3.2.6 *Now, my* and *Well, my*

Like the other collocates of *now* and *well*, *my* definitely does occur with the two markers by accident. Rather than expressing possession it is a familiarity marker indicating the speaker's attitude towards the addressee which makes it a logical companion to the interactional uses of *now* and *well*. And as with the other marker-collocate subgroups the absence of a fully corresponding Czech equivalent forces the translators to use a range of different, for occasion-specific, solutions. First, Table 11 shows the Czech translation equivalents of the collocation *Now, my*:

Table 11: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, my*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
a teď	2	22.2
omission/zero translation	2	22.2
taky	1	11.1
no tak	1	11.1
ale tak	1	11.1
podívej	1	11.1
teď	1	11.1
Total	**9**	**100**

As expected, *now* in this sequence does not have a predominant Czech translation equivalent, although *a teď* and translation by omission have 2 occurrences each. The following examples were chosen for a discussion:

(26) "**Now**, **my** dear," said she, "I'll tell you what you shall do.
   *„**Teď**, drahý, poslouchejte.*
(27) **Now**, **my** dear, don't be a fool.
   *„**Podívej**, miláčku, přestaň bláznit"*
(28) "**Now**, **my** little fellows, where be you a-going to, puffing like a bellows?
   *„**No tak**, chlapíčci, kampak se to ženete a funíte jako měchy?*
(29) "**Now**, **my** boy, I hope you're good and hungry…
   *„**A teď**, chlapče, doufám, že máš pořádný hlad…*

A look at the examples shows that *my* collocates with a noun (*my dear, my little fellows, my boy*) to form a vocative used in addressing a person. As such, they are undoubtedly interactional, and therefore strengthen the interactional meaning of *now*. However, *now* has temporal meaning as well and so there are instances in Czech where the translator either decided to emphasize the temporal meaning, or the interactional meaning. Examples 26 a 29 demonstrate this with the equivalents *teď* and *a teď*, both highlighting the temporal meaning. On the other hand, the translation equivalents in Examples 27 and 28 (*podívej, no tak*) are typical instances of the translator's opting for the interactional meaning. In addition, the translation equivalent *podívej* in Example 27, skilfully preserves the meaning of the whole original utterance, by taking into consideration the broader context. The speaker wants to address the other participant of the conversation in as politely as possible. The reason is that telling someone *don't be a fool* can be rather offending unless a redressive action is taken. Therefore, we might say that in this case the offensive nature of this phrase is mitigated to a certain extent by the use of *now, my dear*, the whole structure together can be perceived as a form of face-saving. The translator handled this by using *podívej*, which, in the context of the whole utterance, has a softening effect and so is more appropriate than, for example, the

translation equivalent *teď,* which is used in Example 26 with the same form of addressing the hearer, i.e. *my dear.* For a Czech speaker switching the translation equivalents, ***podívejte, drahý, poslouchejte*** and ***teď, miláčku, přestaň bláznit***, would sound rather awkward. The main problem would be that it would not preserve the meaning of *now* in the respective examples. In Example 26, although the meaning of *now* can be interactional, the temporal meaning is more prominent, viz. the translation substitution test. By contrast, Example 27 is more interactional than temporal. As regards the role of *podívej* as a mitigator, on closer inspection, it might be argued that if the mitigating effect were to be made even stronger, a better and more appropriate translation equivalent would be *no tak*, as in Example 28. As we can see, the examples analyzed clearly illustrate how important the role of context and translation are in determining the meaning of a pragmatic marker.

The translation equivalents of the sequence *Well, my* are listed in Table 13:

Table 12: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, my*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
tedy	2	22.2
no	2	22.2
nuže	1	11.1
nu	1	11.1
tak	1	11.1
totiž	1	11.1
omission/zero translation	1	11.1
Total	**9**	**100**

Well, *my* has the same numerical distribution of the Czech translation equivalents as *Now, my*: there are 2 equivalents (*tedy* and *no*) with 2 occurrences each, and 5 other equivalents, each with 1 occurrence only. The difference is in the actual equivalents, i.e. *now* and *well* do not share a single Czech translation equivalent as far as the collocation with *my* is concerned. It indicates that the two marker-collocate sequences are associated with different meanings. Let us now analyze the following typical examples:

    (30) "**Well**, **my** dear," says he.
       *„**Tedy**, drahá,…"*
    (31) "**Well**, **my** fellow delegates, Mercury has done more than this"
       *„**Nuže**, mí kolegové delegáti, Merkur udělal víc než jenom tolik."*
    (32) "**Well**, **my** young pathologist friend, Lucy Grainger expects an answer today.
       *„**Tak**, milý kamaráde!" Lucy Graingnerová očekává odpověď dnes!*

All of the examples contain the same structure *my* + noun, functioning as a vocative. We find here three different translation equivalents, each, however, reflecting the same function of

well. This function is both interactional and textual: it indexes both to the speaker and at the same time it marks a new stage in the conversational discourse, i.e. the aspect of forward-lookedness is present here as well. For this reason, it seems that all of the equivalents are well-chosen to translate the functions of *well* in all of the instances. This finding is in line with Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's (2003:41) claim that the existence of a variety of translation equivalents is evidence of the multifunctional character of *well* in different contexts. While some translators highlight the textual function of *well*, others stress the interpersonal (interactional) function, therefore "some target language equivalents have a clear connective function, others a clear emotive one and most have both at the same time" (cf. 2.2.1.8).

3.2.7 *Now, look* and *Well, look*

Although the sequence *Now, look* (and similarly *Well, look, well*) is represented only by four occurrences (see Table 13), it nevertheless exhibits some interesting features. For one, the verb *look* appears in two distinct roles in the collocation, as a default lexical verb and as a pragmatic marker. We will now focus on the translation equivalents of *Now, look* and on the relevant examples:

Table 13: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, look*

Translation equivalent		Occurrences	Percent
look as a lexical verb	omission/zero translation	1	25
	tak	1	25
look as a pragmatic marker	*a teď*	1	25
	poslyš	1	25
Total		**4**	**100**

As it was found that in some instances, *look* behaves either as a lexical verb, or as a pragmatic marker, it was thought useful to make a distinction between the two uses. The reason for the distinction is that the different function of *look* was marked by different equivalents. All of the occurrences are presented below, the first two involve *look* as a pragmatic marker, in the other two *look* is used as a verb of perception. Let us now analyze the examples:

(33) He groped for her cheek in the darkness and patted it. It was wet. Using his pajama sleeve, he carefully wiped her eyes. "**Now**, **look**," he said tenderly, "you're being a baby."
*„**Poslyš**, řekl něžně, „chováš se jako dítě."*
(34) **Now**, **look** – I'll give him the work tickets, but you ain't gonna say a word.
__A teď__ dej pozor. Já mu dám ty kartičky, a ty nesmíš ani ceknout.

(35) **Now**, **look** there.
   „*Podívej se tamhle.*"
(36) **Now**, **look** me in the eyes and tell me if you're clean."
   Tak *se mi podívejte do očí a řekněte mi, jestli jste čistá.*"

For the analysis, it is relevant to recall the theoretical comments of Ochs and Aijmer, who claim that *now* can imply 'affective intensity'. However, they each see it from a different perspective. Ochs mentions the role of grammaticalisation and makes a correlation between the temporal meaning of *now* and the pragmatic meaning of *now* ('affective intensity'). To substantiate this, he gives the following example: '*Now look at what you have done*' (cf. Ochs's quotation and the example in 2.2.2.2). This example shows not only how the temporal meaning and the pragmatic meaning overlap, but also – with reference to the distinction between *look* as a lexical verb and *look* as a pragmatic marker – that in Ochs's example *look* is used as a lexical verb, similarly as in (33) and (34). On the other hand, some of Aijmer's observations treat *look* as a pragmatic marker. She says that in combination with other pragmatic markers, such as in the collocation *now look*, *now* is analyzed as a pragmatic marker (cf. 2.2.2.3), where it implies 'affective intensity', and as an intensifier, it may have "an overtone of urgency and interest or a 'friendly overtone' " (Aijmer 2002: 93-94: cf. 2.2.2.4; cf. also 2.2.2.2: 'affectivity' and 'intensity'). In *now look*, *now* can also imply resistance (Aijmer 2002: 95; cf. 2.2.2.5). Moreover, Aijmer (2002: 74) claims that "connective *now* co-occurs with […] other discourse particles [such as] *now look*" (cf. 2.2.2.3).

   With these observations in mind, we may now analyze the translation equivalents in detail. As noted above, in Examples 33 and 34, *look* is a pragmatic marker, in Examples 35 and 36, a lexical verb, and the collocations are translated by three different Czech equivalents (*tak, a teď, poslyš*) and once by omission. Example 33 is interesting in that *poslyš* may be either referring to the pragmatic marker *look* only, or to both *now* and *look*, the latter being more probable. Therefore, it was counted as a translation equivalent per se, not as a translation by omission. *Poslyš* in Example 33 seems to emphasize the aspect of affective intensity without the implication of temporal meaning. The affective intensity is in this case the primary meaning of *now*, which is further enhanced by *look* behaving as another pragmatic marker. Looking at the broader context, both the preceding and following text, it is obvious that the speaker is comforting the other participant of the conversation. Therefore, rather than to talk about 'affective intensity' in this case, it would be better to speak of Johansson's (2006: 131) 'emotional' use (cf. 2.2.1.8 and 2.2.2.2) and similarly, of Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen's (2003: 26) 'emotional meaning' (cf. 2.2.2.2). Example 33 thus

clearly demonstrates that the context and collocations (in our case *look* as another pragmatic marker) can help when determine the meaning of *now*, which is in this case to imply positive emotion, or more specifically consolation. The Czech translation equivalent *poslyš* seems to cover all these nuances well. It is also worth noting that it is a verb of a different kind of perception; the literal Czech translation equivalent to the English *look* would be *podívej*. The same applies to the other examples.

While Example 33, *Now, look* is an indivisible unit of pragmatic meaning, which in the given context reflects affective intensity aptly translated by *poslyš*, Example 34 clearly demonstrates how interactional meaning can overlap with temporal meaning, i.e. both meanings can be present at the same time. However, the translation equivalent *a teď*, although rendering both meanings, seems to refer to *now* only. Therefore, unlike in (33), *now* and *look* are analyzed separately, which is logical, since *a teď* alone does not function as *poslyš*, i.e. it cannot reflect *now, look* as an indivisible unit of pragmatic meaning. As a result, the verb *look* has a separate translation equivalent, *dej pozor*. Once again, as in Example 33, the Czech uses a different type of verb.

While (33) and (34) use different verbs than the literal equivalent *podívej*, Examples 35 and 36, by contrast, both use the default equivalent (i.e.e, *podívej* and *podívejte* respectively). Apparently the main reason for this is that whereas in Examples 33 and 34, *look* is a pragmatic marker, in Examples 35 and 36, *look* is a lexical verb, as so literal translation makes sense. This justifies our decision to analyze the pragmatic marker *now* separately, and why it was translated into Czech by omission in (35) and by *tak* in (36).

Let us now look at the collocation *Well, look* and its translations listed in Table 14:

Table 14: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, look*

Translation equivalent		Occurrences	Percent
look as a lexical verb	omission/zero translation	1	25
	no	1	25
	dobrá	1	25
look as a pragmatic marker	*poslouchej tedy*	1	25
Total		**4**	**100**

The overall distribution of the Czech translation equivalents is the same as with *Now, I*, each has occurred only once. The only difference is that in 3 out of the 4 occurrences, the verb *look* in the collocation was used as a lexical verb:

(37) "**Well**, **look** at this," he said.
   *„**No**, to se na to podívejme," prohlásil*
(38) "**Well**, **look** in my cupboard, Tiger dear, and see what you'd like."
   „Podívej se, milý tygře, do spížky, co bys rád."
(39) "**Well**, **look** **to it** then that thou dost not kill the man-cub.
   *„**Dobrá**; jenom hleď, bys lidské mládě nezabil.*
(40) **Well**, look.
   Poslouchej tedy, Lennie.

The verb *look* is used as a lexical verb in Examples 37, 38, and 39. Therefore, they can be analyzed and their translation interpreted in the same manner as the *Now, look* collocations, i.e. *now* and *look* are viewed as two different lexical items, each with a different meaning, and as such, they have different translation equivalents. In Example 39, the translation equivalent of *look* is *hleď*. The reason for this equivalent is in the broader lexical context (see the green colour). *Look* is part of the phrasal verb *look to (it)*, and has to be translated accordingly. Example 40 is the only instance where *look* is used as a pragmatic marker and, again, it is not translated by the literal Czech *podívej*. This equivalent is the same as in the case of *Now, look*, in (33), i.e. the verb *look* is replaced by *poslouchat*, to listen. However, if in Example 33 we analyzed the equivalent *poslyš* as rendering *Now, look* together, here the equivalent *poslouchej* translates only *look*, and *now* has its own translation equivalent *tedy*, with the equivalents in reverse order compared to the original. The translator obviously wanted to capture the interactional function of *Well, look*, emphasized by the two items and therefore assigned each of the pragmatic markers its own Czech translation equivalent. It is interesting that when *look* is understood as a pragmatic marker, both *Now, look* and *Well, look*, are translated by the verb *poslouchat*, the only difference being the different variant of the verb, i.e. *poslyš* and *poslouchej* respectively.

3.2.8 *Now, let* and *Well, let*

The next subgroup featuring the collocation of the marker and *let* is very small. *Let* introduces the periphrastic imperative both singular and plural. We will now look closer at the Czech translation equivalents of *Now, let* and the respective examples:

Table 15: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, let*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
a teď	2	66.6
tak a teď	1	33.3
Total	**3**	**100**

(41) **Now**, **let's** keep quiet for a while and see if you fall asleep."
  A teď už budeme chvíli zticha, abych zjistil, jestli dokážeš usnout."
(42) As soon as they got downstairs, Regina told her, "**Now**, **let** me see how you walk.
  *Jakmile sešly dolů, Regina jí vyzvala: „**A teď** mi předveďte, jak chodíte.*
(43) **Now**, **let's** get the hell outta here!
  ***Tak a teď** odsud vypadneme.*

As can be seen, all three were translated by *a teď* which in one case was expanded to *tak a teď*. The translation highlights the temporal meaning of *now*, which is in keeping with the context: in all of the cases, *now* implies 'at the present moment' and at the same time it anticipates an action in the immediate future, which is enhanced by *let.* All this is adequately expressed by *a teď*. Moreover, all of the examples support what has been said about metacomments (cf. 2.2.2.3.; 4.3). Aijmer (2002: 87) says that *now* is used frequently to mark a transition to a metacomment such as *let me see*. In her analysis, *now let me see* was among the most frequent typical metacomments (cf. 2.2.2.3). Furthermore, Aijmer (ibid: 95) claims that the primary function of *now* is to express "subjective modality because of its link to the speaker." This explains why it behaves as an affective intensifier (a subjective modal particle) which is typically accompanied with metacomments such as *let me see now* (ibid: 95; 2.2.2.5). Example 42 uses exactly the same metacomment *let me see* as Aijmer mentions, and it might be argued that Examples 41 and 43 may not be strictly speaking metacomments as they do not signal the "minor breaks in discourse structure" (ibid: 88, cf. 2.2.2.3). If anything, they can be analyzed as phrases (see the red colour). In all of the cases, however, we can talk about the speaker's subjective modality, therefore *now* behaves as an affective intensifier.

The situation in the *Well, let* sequences described in Table 15 is somewhat different in terms of equivalents:

Table 16: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, let*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	2	66.6
tak (proboha)	1	33.3
Total	**3**	**100**

Well, let has strictly speaking only one Czech translation equivalent (*tak (proboha)*), the other two were not translated (2 occurrences of omission). Let us now consider the following examples:

(44) "**Well**, **let's** forget it, shall we?"
  „Můžeme na to zapomenout, ne?"

(45) "**Well**, **let's** see if I do?"
Přesvědčme se, zda chápu.
(46) "**Well**, **let's** call her," Kim sputtered.
*„**Tak** ji proboha hned zavolejte," vyhrkl Kim.*

All of the examples, similarly as *Now, let*, are instances of anticipation of an immediate future action, only the temporal meaning is absent here, which is of course due to the different core meanings of *now* and *well*. Example 45 uses a variation of the metacomment *let me see*, i.e. *let's see*. *Well* in this case was not translated by an explicit equivalent, but by omission. Example 44 is translated in the same way. The reason in this case could be that since the utterance contains the question tag *shall we*, the translator may have thought an equivalent for *well* to be redundant. Example 46 is an interesting example of how context plays an important role in translation. The Czech translation has the additional interjection *proboha* and the adverb *hned*. Neither is in the original, but the context does imply a large degree of urgency (cf. 2.2.2.4 and an 'overtone of urgency'). This is further strengthened by the choice of the verb, i.e. *Kim **sputtered***. The verb *to sputter* implies speaking in fast, incoherent bursts. The sense of urgency was what the translator aimed at. This, however, could not be done by choosing *tak* only. Therefore, other lexical elements were used in combination with *tak*, i.e. *proboha* and *hned*.

3.2.9 *Now, then* and *Well, then*

Let us now proceed to the analysis of another tiny subgroup, *Now, then* (Table 17):

Table 17: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, then*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
nuže tedy	1	25
tak tedy	1	25
a	1	25
omission/zero translation	1	25
Total	**4**	**100**

Of the four instances of *Now, then*, all but one case had an explicit Czech equivalent. Let us consider the following examples:

(47) "**Now**, **then**, I promised this would be to the benefit of Spacetown's project, so –
Wait, he's coming to."
*„**Nuže tedy**, slíbil jsem, že to bude ve prospěch plánu Vesmírného Města, tak ...
Okamžik, přichází k sobě."*

(48) "Now. **Now, then**. We 'll have our supper in a minute."
   „A za minutku si dáme večeři."
(49) "**Now, then!**"
   Tak tedy!
(50) **Now, then**, let that learn you!"
   Podruhé si dáš lepší pozor!"

Aijmer (2002: 61) mentions that *now* together with other pragmatic markers, such as *now then,* is also analyzed as a pragmatic marker (cf. 2.2.2.3 and 3.2.7). Undoubtedly, this is the case of all examples here. Both *now* and *then* are used as pragmatic markers, therefore the overall pragmatic aspect is strengthened. Example 48 is relevant with reference to Schiffrin's (1987: 230) example showing that when *now* is next to another *now*, as in *Now. He is issued now a directive to all leaders.*, only one of them can be an adverb, i.e. the first one is an adverb and the second one is a pragmatic marker (cf. 2.2.2.3). Similarly, in Example 48, the first *now* is an adverb, and the second one is a pragmatic marker. Examples 47 and 49, when analyzed from another perspective, are interesting in that the Czech translation equivalents reflect the overall pragmatic meaning that is strengthened in the original by using two pragmatic markers, i.e. *now* and *then* together. Therefore, the respective Czech equivalents emphasize this, by using two pragmatic markers as well, i.e. *nuže tedy,* and *tak tedy*.

Also the *Well, then* sequences are represented only by four examples (Table 18):

Table 18: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, then*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
no	2	50
tak tedy	1	25
dobrá	1	25
Total	**4**	**100**

None is translation by omission, the particle *no* was used as a translation solution twice, *dobrá* and *tak tedy* only once (the latter appearing also in the *Now, then*). We have thus three different Czech equivalents in the following four sentences:

(51) **Well, then**, you really can't blame Joe too much, can you?"
   No, potom ale Joea doopravdy tolik odsuzovat nemůžete, viďte?"
(52) "**Well, then**, Becky, we must stay here, where there's water to drink.
   „Tak tedy, Becky, musíme zůstat tady.
(53) "**Well, then**, maybe she won't kill anybody else."
   „No, aspoň už tam nikoho neoddělá."
(54) "**Well, then**, do we have a settlement?"
   „Dobrá," řekl. „Takže jsme se dohodli?"

When compared to *Now, then*, there is only one instance in which the translator attempted to highlight the overall pragmatic meaning, which is signaled in the original by the use of two pragmatic markers, i.e. *well* and *then*. This instance is Example 52, with the Czech translation using two pragmatic markers as well, i.e. *tak* and *tedy*. In the rest of the examples, only one pragmatic marker was used in the translations, i.e. *no* and *dobrá*. Example 51 is, however, interesting with reference to Example 44 in 3.2.8: "**Well**, let's forget it, shall we?"/ *„Můžeme na to zapomenout, ne?"* If we said that in (44) the translator did not want to translate *well* because of the possible redundancy or awkwardness of the whole utterance, (51) seems to be a different case. The translator translated both the pragmatic marker *now* (*no*) and the question tag *can you* (*viďte*). It remains unclear, however, whether the Czech translation equivalent *no* refers to *now*, or to *then*. Still, although both the question tag and one of the pragmatic markers at the beginning was translated (whether *now*, or *then*), the translator clearly decided not to translate both pragmatic markers. As in Example 44 in 3.2.8, he may have thought redundant and/or awkward, all the more that while in Example 44 in 3.2.8 there is a combination of one pragmatic marker and a question tag, here, on the other hand, the possible redundancy and/or awkwardness would be made much more prominent, since we have a combination of a question tag and two pragmatic markers.

3.2.10 *Now, now* and *Well, now*

These two collocations with *now* include one reduplication (*Now, now*) which it is interesting to compare with *Well, well*. First the analysis of the Czech translation equivalents of *Now, now* presented in Table 19:

Table 19: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, now*

Source: Author	Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
Brown	omission	1	16.7
Frost	*tak (jaképak)*	1	16.7
Tolkien	*no tak*	2	33.3
	no tak, no tak	1	16.7
	hele, hele	1	16.7
Total		**6**	**100**

As we can see, the examples were sorted according to the name of the author of the source material in which the collocation *Now, now* occurred. This sorting was used because of the possible effect of author's personal style (cf. 2.2.1.7) which may, in turn, influence the translator's choice of equivalents. A suggestion of this is in the translation of Tolkien. The

translator used the same Czech equivalent *no tak* in three cases out of four to render Tolkien's *Now, now*, with one occurrence being reduplicated (*no tak, no tak*). Although it is typical for *now* to appear together with other pragmatic markers, the reduplicated collocation *now, now* is somewhat special and its repeated use may be indicative of Tolkien's personal preferences. Let us discuss the following three examples selected, with each representing a different author in order to have as representative a sample of examples as possible:

(55) Let it go! And then you can go yourself, and be free." "I 'll do as I choose and go as I please," said Bilbo obstinately. "**Now**, **now**, my dear hobbit!" said Gandalf.
*„**No tak**, **no tak**, milý hobite!" řekl Gandalf.*

(56) Dean remembered shoving Curtis out of his way as he ran for the exit. He had gained a little ground when Curtis shouted over his shoulder for units to be dispatched to the radio station. "SWAT, too! **Now**, **now**, move it!" Dean was n't going to hang around and see that the sergeant's orders were carried out, and apparently Curtis shared his urgency. They burst through the double doors and clambered down the staircase, taking two or three at a time…
*Dean se pamatoval, že odstrčil Curtise z cesty a hnal se k východu. Získal malý náskok, když Curtis hulákal přes rameno, aby poslali k rozhlasové stanici hlídkové vozy.„A taky speciální jednotku! **Pohyb, pohyb**!" Dean se nezdržoval, aby viděl, jestli se rozkazy plní, a Curtis byl zřejmě stejného náhledu. Vyřítili se z lítacích dveří a hnali se po schodech, brali je po dvou, po třech…*

(57) "**Now**, **now** what seems to be the trouble here?" asked Doyle, slipping into his best bedside manner.
*„**Tak jaképak** máte potíže?" vpravil se Doyle do svých nejlepších ošetřovatelských způsobů.*

 When looking at much broader context in the examples above, we can see that in examples 55 and 56, both *now*'s in the collocation *now, now* have the temporal rather than interactional meaning. In addition, the temporal meaning is not the temporal meaning understood as part of the pragmatic meaning as we have talked about. It is more to be analyzed as the temporal meaning of *now* as an adverb. In Example 55, the translator, on the other hand, decided to use a Czech equivalent in the form of a reduplicated pragmatic marker (*no tak, no tak*), therefore he treated the whole collocation *now, now* being used as a pragmatic marker. In Example 56, however, he left *now, now* without an explicit Czech equivalent and decided to translate the phrase *move it* as *pohyb, pohyb*. It remains unclear, however, whether the translation emphasizes in fact the phrase *move it* and thus treats *now, now* as having the temporal meaning of an adverb, or whether *now, now* was analyzed by the translator as having the pragmatic meaning and thus the Czech translation equivalent reflects the pragmatic meaning. Analyzing the Czech translation equivalent as an emphasis of the phrase *move it* would be, however, more logical, since, given the context, the phrase in the original expresses a strong order. Therefore, the Czech equivalent in the form of reduplication (*pohyb, pohyb*) thus seems

to be more appropriate than the form without reduplication (*pohyb*).[16] On the other hand, analyzing the collocation *now, now* as having the pragmatic meaning, which is on its own strengthened by *now*'s being reduplicated, the Czech reduplicated equivalent *pohyb, pohyb* might thus be understood as trying to reflect the emphasized pragmatic meaning, rather than to emphasize the phrase *move it*. However, it might also be argued that if *now, now* really has the pragmatic meaning, this could be rendered in the translation so that both the pragmatic meaning and the emphasized phrase *move it* could be made prominent. Consider the following hypothetical translation solution: ***No tak**, **pohyb, pohyb***! For this reason, I am personally more inclined to treat *now, now* as having the temporal meaning of an adverb, and subsequently, to believe that the translator did the same. Example 57 is interesting with reference to the already discussed and analyzed comment by Schiffrin on treating two *now*'s next to each other, with the former being an adverb and the latter being a pragmatic marker (cf. 2.2.2.3 and 3.2.9). Similarly, in Example 57, the first *now* is an adverb and the second *now* is a pragmatic marker (the Czech equivalent being *tak (jaképak)*.

To summarize, as we can see in *Now, now*, it is rather more complicated to determine its overall function and meaning. For its borderline character, it was included in this thesis as an additional material. Nevertheless, it was thought to be important and relevant to mention this aspect with respect to both the overall theoretical observations and to the analysis proper.

Let us now look at *Well, now*, which is a different case. However, to leave the total material in balance (with both *Now,* and *Well,* having the same number of instances, i.e. 100+6 each), it was decided to include *Well, now* in the additional material as well. Furthermore, in this case, *now* is a collocate that both *Now,* and *Well,* share, although each differently. Let us now look at the Czech translation equivalents of *Well, now*:

Table 20: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, now*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
takže	2	33.3
podívejte se	1	16.7
no (víš)	1	16.7
ale dobře	1	16.7
no dobře	1	16.7
Total	**6**	**100**

---

[16] SWAT team (Special Weapons And Tactics) is a ''squad of policemen who have been trained to deal with violent and dangerous situations'' <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/SWAT+team>. In this context, therefore, the Czech *pohyb, pohyb* would be better than just *pohyb*, which, in the latter case, might not sound as strong an order as it is implied in the original.

From the translation point of view, the Czech equivalents are obviously varied, with 5 different equivalents for 6 occurrences. Let us proceed to the examples below:

(58) "**Well**, **now**, see, I tried."
　　*„**No**, víš, pokoušel jsem se."*
(59) "**Well**, **now**, Dad," Gary said in the low, slow voice…
　　*„**Takže**, tati," řekl Gary hlubokým a pomalým hlasem…*
(60) "**Well**, **now** – Mr. Potter".
　　*„**Takže**, pane Pottere.*

Example 58 is interesting if we focus on the fact that in the original there is a considerable number of pragmatic markers used in a relatively short utterance. There are, in fact three different pragmatic markers (*well, now, see*). Therefore, if we have analyzed cases such as *well, then* (cf. 3.2.9.) as having a strengthened pragmatic (interactional) meaning, then here this aspect is made even more prominent. Subsequently, the Czech translation equivalent *no, víš* tries to capture this, however, using not three, but two pragmatic markers only. The question is whether in Czech it would not be too much to use more than two pragmatic markers. Probably it would, since when looking at the total number of the Czech equivalents so far, there is not a single instance with more than two pragmatic markers used. Examples 59 and 60 are worth mentioning for another reason. In both cases, *Well, now* is followed by a proper name in the vocative, whose function is to address the second participant of the conversation (cf. 3.2.6). Furthermore, in both cases the Czech translation equivalent is the same (*takže*). It seems that while in English the overall emphatic interactional meaning is expressed by the use of two pragmatic markers, in Czech this is expressed by using one pragmatic marker only. The reason may be that one pragmatic marker in combination with the proper noun in the vocative might be enough to imply the interactional meaning, and two may be considered as too many (cf. Example 58 above).

　　As we can see, whereas *Now,* did not seem to favour taking *now* as its collocate, and thus to become reduplicated, for *Well,* to take *now* as its collocate seemed to be perfectly natural.

3.2.11 *Well, well*

　　Let us now look at the reduplicated collocation *Well, well* and its Czech translation equivalents whose distribution is summarized in Table 21:

Table 21: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, well*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
omission/zero translation	1	11.1
no, no	1	11.1
hele, hele	1	11.1
dobrá, dobrá	1	11.1
vida, vida	1	11.1
ano, ano, ano	1	11.1
tak	1	11.1
tak dobrá	1	11.1
to se podívejme	1	11.1
Total	**9**	**100**

Two instances were chosen to illustrate the use of *Well, well* in text and the way it is translated:

(61) Speaker A: "For some elves tease them and laugh at them, and most of all at their beards."
Speaker B: "**Well**, **well**," said a voice.
*„**Vida, vida**!" řekl nějaký hlas.*
(62) Speaker A: "My name is Amanda Travis."
Speaker B: "Yes ?"
Speaker A: "I 'm calling about John Mallins, the man who was …''
Speaker B: "**Well**, **well**, **well**."
Speaker A: "Excuse me?"
Speaker B: "I was wondering when you bozos would get around to calling me."
Speaker A: „Jmenuji se Amanda Travisová."
Speaker B: „Ano ?"
Speaker A: „Volám vám kvůli Johnu Mallinsovi , tomu muži, který..."
*Speaker B: „**Ano, ano, ano**."*
Speaker A: „Prosím?"
Speaker B: „ Zajímalo mě, kdy mi někdo z vás zavolá."

Obviously, *Well, well* has a wide range of different Czech equivalents. The most striking aspect, however, is that most of the Czech equivalents (5 out of 8, not counting omission) use the reduplicated form, and so reflect the emphasis of the interactional meaning in the original. In Example 61, the emphasis is achieved by the Czech reduplicated equivalent *vida, vida*, which is stylistically an adequate translation solution. The fact that there is a large variety of translation equivalents is in line with what has been said above. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenbergen (2003:11-12) believe that pragmatic markers are a 'challenge' for a translator, since for a translator it is difficult to find an appropriate equivalent that would sound natural (cf. 2.2.1.8). Given the multifunctional and polysemic nature of *well*, the potential for an

almost 'indefinite' number of translation equivalents is large, the translation must be context-specific (ibid: 15; cf. 2.2.1.8).

Example 62 includes the combination of no two but three *well*'s in a row, which is reflected in the Czech translation, using three *ano*'s. If we have said previously that the use of more than two pragmatic markers would be too much (cf. 3.2.10), this obviously does not apply to reiteration of markers. Example 62 again has interactional meaning with the function of sharing the common ground and the 'acceptance' or according to one's wish' meaning (cf. 2.2.1.2). On one hand, the Czech equivalent *ano, ano, ano* reflects this in the translation, on the other hand, the use of just *ano, ano* would be sufficient to convey the meaning of the original, as well as being more usual and typical of everyday Czech conversational discourse.

Analogously to *Now, now* and *Well, now*, we could expect *Well, well* and *Now, well*. However, the collocation *Now, well* did not have a single occurrence. The reason for this may be that as *well* is considered as the more prototypical pragmatic marker of the two, it is thus logical that when in combination with *now* it comes initially. The whole combination functions as one unit of pragmatic meaning. On the contrary, the initial use of *now* followed by *well* may be considered semantically inappropriate, or more specifically incoherent, as in this case *now* would behave more as an adverb rather than as a pragmatic marker, and subsequently the whole collocation would not behave as one unit of pragmatic meaning. In addition, when taking into consideration the role of everyday use of conversational English, it would sound rather awkward to use first a temporal adverb and then a pragmatic marker in a conversational turn.

3.2.12 *Well, see*

Although the collocation *Well, see* occurs only three times in the sample, it is interesting in that is another example of the co-occurrence of two pragmatic markers. The expression *see* has a contact-maintaining function, appealing to the hearer's attention, and is obviously compatible with and probably stronger than the pragmatic meaning of *well*. Let us look at the Czech translation equivalents presented in Table 22 and analyze the illustrative examples:

Table 22: Czech translation equivalents of *Well, see*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
no víš	1	33.3
no, víte	1	33.3
víte	1	33.3
Total	**3**	**100**

(63) "**Well**, **see**, I have this theory."
   *„**No víš**, mám takovou teorii."*
(64) "**Well**, **see**, I'm not actually performing yet.
   *„**No, víte**, já jsem vlastně ještě nevystupovala.*
(65) "**Well**, **see**, that's what bothers me, Jack, because I think you know precisely who she is."
   *„**Víte**, právě to mě znepokojuje, Jacku, protože si myslím, že víte přesně, kdo to je."*

Of the two markers, *well* is translated in 2 out of 3 instances by the Czech equivalent *no*, and all of the Czech equivalents translate the second pragmatic marker using 2nd person forms of the verb *vědět, víš* and *víte* (cf. Example 58 in 3.2.10). In these two cases, the translator preserved the original structure of two pragmatic markers emphasizing the interactional meaning (Examples 63 and 64), while in Example 65, only one of the pragmatic markers, *see*, is translated (*víte*). Apparently, the meaning of *well* is dispensable, while that of *see* is not. As regards the translation of *see*, the switch from a verb of perception to that of cognition in Czech somewhat recalls Example 33 in 3.2.7, where *look* is translated as *poslyš*, one mode of perception is replaced by another. Although *look* and *see* are distantly synonymous, their meaning as pragmatic markers is different. The marker *see* is in fact an ellipsis of the phrase *you see*, which behaves as a pragmatic marker as well and which is used by a speaker when he is trying to explain something to another participant of a conversation, which is exactly the case in all of the examples. Similarly, Aijmer (2002: 86) treats the cases in which *now* collocates with *you see* as introducers to an "explanation or justification" (cf. 2.2.2.3). Therefore, the Czech equivalent *víš/víte* is an appropriate translation. On the other hand, it does not mean that *podívej/podívejte* could not, in this case, be used. Both choices would sound natural. The difference, however, would be that *víš/víte* seem to emphasize more aptly the interactional aspect of the speaker's attempt to explain something.

3.2.13 *Now, listen*

The collocation *Now, listen* is to some extant a variant of *Now, look* and *Now, see* in that the verb of perception *listen* may (but need not) be used in its delexicalized form as a kind of pragmatic marker. The sample contains 5 examples of the collocation (Table 23):

Table 23: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, listen*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
teď	2	40
tak	1	20
ale	1	20
omission/zero translation	1	20
Total	**5**	**100**

(66) "**Now**, listen to this, Beeblebrox, and you better listen good!"
   *„**Tak** poslouchej, Bíblbroxi, a koukej poslouchat dobře"*

(67) Speaker A: "Wake , Little Brother; I bring news."
   Speaker B: "Are all well in the jungle?" said Mowgli, hugging him.
   Speaker A: "All except the wolves that were burned with the Red Flower. **Now**, listen. Shere Khan has gone away to hunt far off till his coat grows again, for he is badly singed. When he returns he swears that he will lay thy bones in the Waingunga."
   Speaker A: „Probuď se, bratříčku, nesu ti zprávy"
   Speaker B: „Daří se všem dobře v džungli?" ptal se Mauglí, objímaje jej.
   *Speaker B: Všem, až na vlky popálené Rudým Květem. **Ale** poslyš. Šir Chan odešel lovit někam daleko, dokud mu nenaroste nový kožich, neboť je zle opálen. Až se vrátí, přísahá, že vhodí tvé kosti do Waingungy."*

Actually *listen* was used as a pragmatic marker in only one case (Example 67). In the rest of the examples, it behaved as a lexical verb (Example 66). All of the Czech translations use the literal equivalent *listen-poslouchat*, including the one in Example 67. The reason why – in spite of its pragmatic meaning – is that the Czech *poslouchat* happens to cover both the pragmatic and the lexical meaning. In fact, both *listen* and *now* when used as pragmatic markers can both interactional and default lexical meaning at the same time. In Example 57 both pragmatic markers were translated, the whole collocation *Now, listen* having the Czech translation equivalent *ale poslyš*. What is, however, dubious is the translation of *now* as *ale*, since neither of the meanings of *now*, interactional and temporal, translates well as *ale*. Rather, one would expect the very frequent Czech translation equivalent was *a teď*, in which case the word *poslyš* should also be replaced, by *poslouchej*.

3.2.14 *Now, wait*

The small subgroup headed by the collocation *Now, wait* (Table 24) is another case where the lexical verb seems to have a potential to acquire pragmatic meaning, or at least support the pragmatic meaning of *now*:

Table 24: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, wait*

Translation equivalent	Occurrences	Percent
teď	2	66.6
ne tak zhurta	1	33.3
Total	**3**	**100**

(68) "**Now**, **wait**, Lije.
   „Ne tak zhurta, Lije"
(69) "**Now**, **wait** quietly, Potter.
   ***Teď* v klidu počkejte, Pottere**.
(70) "**Now**, **wait** a bit and be patient!" he said.
   „Teď chvilku počkej a buď trpělivý!"řekl.

In these examples, 2 out of 3 Czech translation equivalents are *teď* (69 and 70). Obviously, the translator decided to emphasize the temporal meaning of *now* rather than its interactional meaning. The temporal meaning is strengthened by the verb *wait*, implying time reference. However, despite the fact that both meanings of *now* are implied in the original, this does not seem to work in the Czech translation. The Czech *teď* feels more like an adverb of time here rather than as a pragmatic marker, and the interactional meaning is missing. It seems that other equivalents, such as *tak a teď* (cf. 3.2.5 and 3.2.8), would be better. Example 68 is very interesting in that it cleverly combines the interactional meaning of *now* with the meaning of the verb *wait*, which is reflected in the Czech translation equivalent *ne tak zhurta*.

3.2.15 *Now, tell*

In the collocation *Now, tell*, the verb *tell* is used either as a pragmatic marker, or as a lexical verb (cf. the same case with *look* in 3.2.7). A look at the Czech equivalents of *Now, tell* (Table 25) and the examples deserves some comment.

Table 25: Czech translation equivalents of *Now, tell*

Translation equivalent	meaning of *tell*	Occurrences	Percent
tak (nám řekněte)	lexical verb	1	25
ještě (mi prozraďte)		1	25
tak (mi řekni)	pragmatic marker	1	25
nu, jen (se mi svěř)		1	25
Total [17]		**4**	**100**

---

[17] When counting both uses (lexical and pragmatic) together, the equivalent *tak* has thus 2 occurrences in total and the percentage distribution 50%.

(71) **Now**, **tell** me, when do you get here?"
   *„**Tak** mi řekni, kdy sem dorazíš?"*
(72) **Now**, **tell** us how you did it."
   ***Tak** nám řekněte, jak jste je způsobili.”*
(73) "**Now**, **tell** me your names," she said…
   *„**Ještě** mi prozraďte, jak se jmenujete," vyzvala je…*
(74) "**Now**, **tell** me, Catherine, just when did you first notice this terrible fear of fucking on suspension bridges?"
   *„**Nu**, **jen** se mi svěř, Catherine, kdys poprvé zaznamenala ten příšerný strach z intimního styku na visutém mostě?"*

Examples 71 and 74 are instances where *tell* is used as a pragmatic marker, while Examples 72 and 73 use *tell* as a lexical verb. It is important to mention that when making this distinction, the syntactical aspect was very helpful. Used in the lexical sense, *tell* is a ditransitive verb, i.e. *to tell someone something*. This is the case in Examples 72 and 73, with the second argument of the verb in Example 72 being sentential (*how you did it*). However, in Examples 71 and 74 *tell* is not used ditransitively, there is only one argument (recipient, indirect object) and the clause is separated by commas. The importance of commas is what Johansson (2006: 117) describes as the role of prosody, i.e. to facilitate the process of interpretation (cf. 2.2.1.7). Hence, in these examples, the ditransitivity of the verb *tell*, helps to distinguish between the lexical verb and the pragmatic marker. Accordingly, Examples 71 and 74 involve two pragmatic markers used next to one another, and the collocation proper is not *Now, tell*, but *Now, tell me.*

In Examples 71 and 74, *now* as a pragmatic marker implies both the interactional meaning and the temporal meaning. This is further boosted by the second pragmatic marker *tell me*, and additionally, in Example 74, by using the proper noun *Catherine* in the vocative (cf. the aspect of addressing someone: 3.2.6; and Examples 59 and 60 in 3.2.10). Therefore, the underlying meaning the speaker imparts to the other participant of the conversation is "*at the present moment I am prompting you to give me an answer for my inquiry*". The implicit meaning is important when analyzing the Czech translation equivalents. A closer look at the examples shows that in all cases *tell me/us* was translated by one of the Czech verbs of speaking (*řekni/řekněte/prozraďte/svěř*). Clearly, the distinction in the English original between *tell me/us* used either as a pragmatic marker a as a lexical verb is not made in the Czech translations. The Czech translations invariably treat *tell me/us* as a lexical verb, and so miss the interactional meaning of *now* that is emphasized by *tell me/us* as a second pragmatic marker;. The only exception is Example 74, using *jen*, which can be considered as a means of emphasis. Hence, the Czech translations do not seem to be successful at covering the overall interactional meaning that is strengthened in the original. However, as Aijmer and Simon-

Vandenbergen (2011: 225) mentioning Hölker (1991) point out, "pragmatic markers do not add anything to the propositional content" and they have therefore only "emotive, expressive function rather than a referential, denotative or cognitive function." The optional character of the pragmatic markers can be demonstrated by the examples analyzed in this section, or more specifically, by taking into account the syntactic aspect. Considering that *tell me/us* can be analyzed either as a pragmatic marker or as including a lexical verb (as indicated by commas), a syntactic test can be used to prove the optional nature of pragmatic markers. Omission of *tell me* in Example 71 yields *Now, when do you get here?,* which is syntactically correct, lacking only the additional pragmatic (emotive, interactional) meaning. On the other hand, omission of *tell me* in Example 72 produces a syntactically incorrect, or incomplete, sentence *Now, your names*. The omission test in principle can be applied to the Czech translations as well. However, the pragmatic particle status of the Czech equivalents is beyond the scope of the thesis.

3.3 An overall review of the results

The overall review of the results shows (a) the distribution of equivalents over the marker-collocate subgroups of *now* and *well*, i.e. which of them are universal (appearing in all subgroups), and which are collocate-specific; (b) the total number and frequency of equivalents, i.e. which are the most and the least frequent, one-off, equivalents. The following discussion addresses the interpretation of the findings on a theoretical level (reasons for the use of specific equivalents, prevailing pragmatic meanings of the particles and the correlation between the pragmatic meaning of the particles and the equivalents, etc.), and examines the practical outcome of the research findings. That is, a comparison will be made of the range of translation equivalents found in the sample and the range of equivalents offered by a large standard English-Czech dictionary (Lingea).

3.3.1 Equivalents of the *Now,* collocations

The results of examining the Czech translation equivalents of the 12 *Now,* subgroups are summarized in Table 26. They show that although the total number of equivalents of *now* as a pragmatic marker is rather high, 33 items, the number of equivalents shared by the marker-collocate subgroups is not so impressive. The most frequent form of translation is omission, which appeared in 9 different subgroups. This may signalize either that Czech has no truly suitable means of conveying the pragmatic meaning(s), or that the expression of such pragmatic meaning is alien to Czech and so the translators prefer to ignore it. There were three equivalents which occurred in 6 subgroups (i.e. half of the subgroups) and so can be regarded as the most common equivalents of the *Now,* collocations in the sample. They are: *a teď, tak, teď*. The rest of the equivalents rapidly fall off in frequency. One equivalent, *ale*, occurred in 3 subgroups, seven equivalents were found in two subgroups: *no tak, podívej, tak tedy, nu, a, tak a teď, poslyš*. The conclusion is that in terms of the marker-collocate subgroups (leaving aside omissions) the 11 most widespread equivalents (occurring in 6 to 2 of these subgroups) are: *a teď, tak, teď, ale, no tak, podívej, tak tedy, nu, a*, *tak a teď, poslyš*. The remaining 21 equivalents occurred in one subgroup only, and so can be considered (at least provisionally) subgroup-specific.

The table also shows that the marker-collocate subgroups differ in the range of different equivalents they have (including omission). One would expect the number of equivalents per subgroup to correlate with the size of the subgroup (the larger the subgroup, the larger the number of equivalents), but this is only partly true. Although the largest subgroup, *Now, I* (23 items) does have the highest number of equivalents (11), there are two

notable exceptions. The subgroup with the second highest number of different equivalents (9) is *Now, do*, which has only about half the total number of items (12) of the subgroups *Now, I* (23) and *Now, if* (22). Also the subgroup *Now, my* with 7 different equivalents is smaller (9 items) than the subgroup *Now, you* (11 items) with only 6 different equivalents. Obviously both *Now, do* and *Now, my* have a greater potential for different equivalents than the other subgroups.

Table 26: Equivalents of the *Now,* collocations

Subgroup Equivalent (Total / %)	*Now, I*	*Now, if*	*Now, you*	*Now, do*	*Now, my*	*Now, look*	*Now, let*	*Now, then*	*Now, now*	*Now, listen*	*Now, wait*	*Now, tell*	Total / %
1 omission	11/ 47.8	7/ 31.8	5/ 45.5	2/ 16.7	2/ 22.2	1/ 25		1/ 25	1/ 16.7	1/ 20			**31 / 29.25**
2 a teď	3/ 13.0	6/ 27.3	2/ 18.1		2/ 22.2	1/ 25	2/ 66.6						**16 / 15.1**
3 tak	1/ 4.35	4/ 18.2				1/ 25			1/ 16.7	1/ 20		2/ 50	**10 / 9.43**
4 teď	1/ 4.35	1/ 4.54		2/ 16.7	1/ 11.1					2/ 40	2/ 66.6		**9 / 8.49**
5 ale	1/ 4.35	1/ 4.54								1/ 20			**3 / 2.83**
6 no tak					1/ 11.1				2/ 33.3				**3 / 2.83**
7 podívej	1/ 4.35				1/ 11.1								**2 / 1.89**
8 tak tedy	1/ 4.35						1/ 25						**2 / 1.89**
9 nu		1/ 4.54	1/ 9.09										**2/ 1.89**
10 a			1/ 9.09					1/ 25					**2 / 1.89**
11 hlavně				2/ 16.7									**2 / 1.89**
12 tak a teď				1/ 8.3			1/ 33.3						**2 / 1.89**
13 poslyš				1/ 8.3	1/ 25								**2 / 1.89**
14 nadto	1/ 4.35												**1 / 0.94**

15	a koukej	1/ 4.35												**1 / 0.94**
16	však	1/ 4.35												**1 / 0.94**
17	vím	1/ 4.35												**1 / 0.94**
18	tedy		1/ 4.54											**1 / 0.94**
19	hm		1/ 4.54											**1 / 0.94**
20	ještě												1/ 25	**1 / 0.94**
21	takže teď			1/ 9.09										**1 / 0.94**
22	nu, jen												1/ 25	**1 / 0.94**
23	ne tak zhurta											1/ 33.3		**1 / 0.94**
24	hezky			1/ 9.09										**1 / 0.94**
25	nu, teď				1/ 8.3									**1 / 0.94**
26	ale nic				1/ 8.3									**1 / 0.94**
27	víte				1/ 8.3									**1 / 0.94**
28	přece				1/ 8.3									**1 / 0.94**
29	taky					1/ 11.1								**1 / 0.94**
30	ale tak					1/ 11.1								**1 / 0.94**
31	nuže tedy								1/ 25					**1 / 0.94**
32	no tak, no tak									1/ 16.7				**1 / 0.94**
33	hele, hele									1/ 16.7				**1 / 0.94**
Total		**23**	**22**	**11**	**12**	**9**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**4**	**106 / 100.0**

3.3.2 Equivalents of the *Well,* collocations

The overall number of the Czech equivalents (37) of the 11 *Well,* subgroups is even higher than that of the *Now,* subgroups (33). Table 27 shows that (unlike with *Now,* subgroups) omission, occurring in 8 *Well,* subgroups, is not the most widespread (or the most numerous) equivalent – the equivalent *no* appears in the same number of subgroups. One equivalent, *dobrá*, occurred in 5 subgroups, one equivalent, *tak,* in four subgroups, one equivalent, *nu*, in three subgroups, and 5 equivalents in 2 subgroups. They are: *ale, takže, tedy, dobře, no dobře*. So there are 9 equivalents (not counting omission) which occurred in more subgroups than just one: *no, dobrá, tak, nu, ale, takže, tedy, dobře, no dobře*. The remaining 27 equivalents occurred in only one subgroup and in this sense can be seen as subgroup-specific.

Table 27 again shows that the marker-collocate subgroups differ in the range of different equivalents they are translated (including omission). When the ratio of number of different equivalents/items is taken into account (counting only subgroups with 6 and more items), the richest in terms of the range of equivalents are not the most numerous subgroups *Well, I* (10:23) and *Well, if* (7:22), but the subgroup *Well, well* (9:9), followed by *Well, now* (5: 6), *Well, my* (7:9), *Well, do* (8:12) and *Well, you* (7:11). Obviously, the greatest potential for different equivalents among the *Well,* subgroups has the *Well, well* sequence.

Table 27: Equivalents of the *Well,* collocations

Subgroup / Equivalent	*Well, I*	*Well, if*	*Well, you*	*Well, do*	*Well, my*	*Well, look*	*Well, let*	*Well, then*	*Well, now*	*Well, well*	*Well, see*	Total / %
1 *no*	10/ 43.5	6/ 27.3	3/ 27.2	2/ 16.7	2/ 22.2	1/ 25		2/ 50	1/ 16.7			**27/ 25.5**
2 *omission*	4/ 17.3	8/ 36.4	1/ 9.1	2/ 16.7	1/ 11.1	1/ 25	2/ 66.6			1/ 11.1		**20/ 18.9**
3 *dobrá*	1/ 4.35	2/ 9.09		1/ 8.3		1/ 25		1/ 25				**6/ 5.66**
4 *tak*				3/ 25	1/ 11.1		1/ 33.3			1/ 11.1		**6 / 5.66**
5 *ale*	2/ 8.7		2/ 18.2									**4 / 3.77**
6 *nu*	1/ 4.35	2/ 9.09			1/11.1							**4 / 3.77**
7 *takže*		2/ 9.09							2/ 33.3			**4 / 3.77**

67

#		col1	col2	col3	col4	col5	col6	col7	col8	col9	col10	Total
8	*tedy*		1/ 4.54			2/ 22.2						**3 / 2.83**
9	*dobře*		1/ 4.54	2/ 18.2								**3 / 2.83**
10	*no dobře*	1/ 4.35								1/ 16.7		**2 / 1.89**
11	*a (já) zas*	1/ 4.35										**1 / 0.94**
12	*vlastně*	1/ 4.35										**1 / 0.94**
13	*přece*	1/ 4.35										**1 / 0.94**
14	*jen tak*	1/ 4.35										**1 / 0.94**
15	*no nic*			1/ 9.1								**1 / 0.94**
16	*jistě*			1/ 9.1								**1 / 0.94**
17	*vždyť*			1/ 9.1								**1 / 0.94**
18	*no jo*				1/ 8.3							**1 / 0.94**
19	*no dobrá*				1/ 8.3							**1 / 0.94**
20	*no prostě*				1/ 8.3							**1 / 0.94**
21	*a*				1/ 8.3							**1 / 0.94**
22	*nuže*					1/ 11.1						**1 / 0.94**
23	*totiž*					1/ 11.1						**1 / 0.94**
24	*poslouchej tedy*						1/ 25					**1 / 0.94**
25	*tak tedy*								1/ 25			**1 / 0.94**
26	*podívejte se*									1/ 16.7		**1 / 0.94**
27	*ale dobře*									1/ 16.7		**1 / 0.94**

#													Total
28	*no, no*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
29	*hele, hele*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
30	*dobrá, dobrá*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
31	*vida, vida*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
32	*ano, ano,ano*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
33	*tak dobrá*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
34	*to se podívejme*										1/ 11.1		**1 / 0.94**
35	*no víš*											1/ 33.3	**1 / 0.94**
36	*no víte*											1/ 33.3	**1 / 0.94**
37	*víte*											1/ 33.3	**1 / 0.94**
Total		**23**	**22**	**11**	**12**	**9**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**6**	**9**	**3**	**106 / 100.0**

The results for the *Now,* and *Well,* subgroups allow one more comparison. When we look at the most widespread equivalents of the *Now,* and *Well,* subgroups, it turns out that three of the equivalents, *tak, nu* and *ale* are shared by them (see Table 28 below):

Table 28: The most widespread equivalents of the *Now,* and *Well,* subgroups

subgroup	equivalents occurring in at least 2 subgroups										
Now,	*a teď*	***tak***	*teď*	***ale***	*no tak*	*podívej*	*tak tedy*	***nu***	*a*	*tak a teď*	*poslyš*
Well,	*no*	*dobrá*	***tak***	***nu***	***ale***	*takže*	*tedy*	*dobře*	*no dobře*		

We may speculate that there are two reasons for this: (a) some of the pragmatic values of the two markers may be close enough to make them almost interchangeable and the use of the same equivalent possible, especially when (presumably) (b) in Czech pragmatic markers are used less frequently and differently, and so the translators find it difficult to cope with the nuances of the English *now* and *well*.

3.3.3 Discussion

The discussion will focus on the main findings. The dominance of omission as a translation strategy in *now* (29.3 % of all equivalents) and less so in *well* (18.9 %) shows that Czech does not have a corresponding pragmatic marker that would easily translate all the nuances associated with *now/well*. As a result the respective semantic nuances of the English marker are either not explicitly translated and instead some form of alternative lexical and structural means is used or the same equivalent is used for both *now* and *well* (see *tak, nu, ale* above) or they are not translated at all.

As the analysis based on translations made by several translators yielded 9 most widespread and at the same time most numerous equivalents for *now* and *well* in the sample, the findings offer the opportunity to compare their equivalents with equivalents provided in a standard English-Czech dictionary (Lingea). Obviously a number of the equivalents which appeared in our sample are context-specific and idiosyncratic, however those equivalents which appear in all or most collocation subgroups are likely candidates for dictionary equivalents of the *now* and *well* entries. The individual print screens from the Lingea dictionary are included in the Appendix.

As the results show, *now* was translated by 32 different Czech equivalents and by omission, which was the most frequent means of translation, with more than 29 %. The Czech equivalent *a teď* was the second most frequent means of translation, with slightly above 15 %. On closer inspection, however, it is obvious that almost the same meaning is rendered by the equivalent *teď*, which with its 8.5 % is the fourth most frequent translation equivalent. Furthermore, when analyzing the results even more in detail, we will discover that there are also many different translation combinations that include *teď* in their structures as well (*tak a teď*, *takže teď*, *nuže teď*). Although these have only 2, 1, and 1 occurrence respectively, they are important in the overall distribution. When counting all the cases where *teď* occurred, there are 29 occurrences in total, which makes 27.36% and which is thus very close to omission (29.3 %). Therefore, although omission was the most frequent means to deal with the translations, the second most frequent choice was to render the temporal meaning of *now* by using an explicit Czech equivalent *teď* in one of the structures mentioned. It is, however, important to mention that although *teď* when used on its own has temporal meaning, *teď* in the respective collocations has not only temporal meaning, but interactional meaning as well, as was proved by the analysis. As it is obvious, although the pragmatic marker *now* has interactional meaning, it at the same time can express temporal meaning as well, which is in line with the fact that the core meaning of *now* is 'at the present moment'.

70

Another very frequent means of translation was the Czech equivalent *tak*, with 10 occurrences making more than 9% of the total distribution. As in the case of *ted'*, *tak* appeared in different collocations, such as *tak tedy*, *no tak*, *ale tak*, or in a reduplicated form (*no tak, no tak)*, or even in combination with *ted'* (*tak a ted'*). Therefore, *tak* on its own or in any of these combinations had 19 occurrences in total, which makes nearly 18% of the total distribution. As such, it was the third most frequent means of translation and it highlights interactional meaning, with the exception of *tak a ted'*, which emphasizes both meanings.

Some of the examples indicated that the translator sometimes decided to highlight the temporal meaning of *now*, in other cases it was interactional meaning that was made more prominent, some translations focused on textual meaning, and finally many translation equivalents aptly reflected one, two, or all the three meanings. Considering the fact that, in addition to omission and the two most frequent Czech equivalents *ted'* and *tak* in their respective collocations, there were many different other Czech equivalents, we have a clear example of what is in line with the previous studies, i.e. that the role of context is an important factor in translation and as such it gives rise to a considerable number of contextual equivalents that reflect the multifunctional nature of the pragmatic marker *now*, and of pragmatic markers generally.

Looking at the translation equivalents of *Well*, there were used 36 different Czech equivalents and omission. Unlike in the case of *Now,* omission was the second most frequent means of translation, with nearly 19%, the first being the Czech equivalent *no*, with more than 25%. The third most frequent equivalents were *dobrá* and *tak*, each having more than 5%. As in the case of *Now,* equivalents, we have also here different combinations in which the primary equivalents appeared. *No* occurred in collocations such as *no dobře*, *no nic*, *no jo*, *no dobrá*, *no prostě*, *no víš*, *no víte*, and in the reduplicated form *no, no*. Counting all occurrences of *no*, we have 34% in total. Regarding *dobrá,* it appeared in collocations as well, but furthermore, it had also the variant *dobře*, which was used on its own and in collocations as well; the collocations thus being *no dobře, no dobrá, ale dobře, tak dobrá,* and the reduplication *dobrá, dobře*. Counting all instances of *dobrá/dobře*, we have the distribution of 14%. With respect to *tak*, this also had a variant (*takže)* and both equivalents were either used on their own, or they collocated further, the collocations being *tak tedy, tak dobrá, jen tak*, which contributed to the overall distribution with 12.25%. To summarize, the most frequent translation equivalents were those in the following order: *no* and its collocations (34%), translation by omission (19%), *dobrá/dobře* and their collocations (14%), *tak/takže* and their collocations (12.25%). Furthermore, as in the case of *Now,* some of the primary equivalents

collocated among each other, especially with the variant *dobrá*, as in *no dobrá*, *tak dobrá*. Similarly, as in the case of *Now,* there were many different translation (contextual) equivalents, 36 in total (when counting the respective translation collocations analyzed above as translation equivalents on their own). This is, again, proof of the multifunctional nature of the pragmatic marker *well*.

Let us now proceed to the question of the specificity of marker-collocate sequences, with regard to their Czech equivalents, and to the comparison of the entries in the Lingea dictionary.

Looking at the lexical entry of *now* in Lingea, its pragmatic use and the Czech equivalents are to be found under sense numbers 5., 6., 7., and under the section *phr* (*phrases*), reflecting the individual meanings or functions. Under 5 there is the collocation *now (then)*, with the description saying that it is a colloquial use with the function of introducing a new topic (*hovor., uvození nového tématu*); the Czech translation equivalents are *tak(že)*, and *a teď*. As is obvious, both equivalents in the Lingea dictionary are also the two most frequent equivalents in our analysis. However, on closer inspection and with respect to the individual marker-collocate sequences we can see that although *now* behaves as a topic-changer, very important aspects to be considered are the individual collocates, or more specifically in our case the marker-collocate sequences, and the role of context. Both *tak* and *a teď* were the most frequent Czech equivalents of the marker-collocate sequence *Now, if* when compared to other marker-collocate sequences. For *Now, if* the percentage distribution of the Czech equivalents was 27.3% for *a teď,* and 18.2.% for *tak*. Therefore, in more than 45% of all of the cases *Now, if* was translated by one of those two Czech equivalents. On the other hand, not a single instance of *Now, then* found its Czech equivalent in either *a teď*, or *tak*. Although it is undoubtedly important to take the overall number of occurrences into account, i.e. when comparing *Now, if* to *Now, then* we have 22 versus 4 occurrences respectively – which is very disproportionate – this does not account for the overall distribution of the Czech equivalents. If we would like to compare *Now, if* to another marker-collocate sequence with a similar number of occurrences, we can look at *Now, I* with 23 occurrences. Here, the Czech equivalents *a teď* and *tak* make only 13% and 4.4 % respectively, therefore in 17% *Now, I* was translated into Czech by one of those two equivalents, which is far less than in the case of *Now, if*. For a more specific comparison, see the relevant sections above and the respective examples analyzed (*Now, I* – 3.2.2; *Now, if* – 3.2.3; *Now, then* – 3.2.9); but to summarize the findings, the roles of collocate- and context-specificity are at work here. To give an example from the sections mentioned above, in most

cases when *Now, if* was expanded to metacomments such as *Now, if you'll excuse me*, or when both expanded to a metacomment and further specified by the immediate context such as in *Now, if you don't mind, I'm going to bed*, it was translated by the Czech equivalent *a teď*, which reflected the meaning of the original, i.e. the combination of both pragmatic and temporal meanings. Therefore, even though Lingea is right when describing the function of the particle *now* as a topic-changer and giving it the Czech translation equivalents *tak(že)*, and *a teď*, it could be argued that in the case of the marker-collocate sequence *Now, then*, this is a rather different case. Not that *Now, then* could not behave as a topic-changer, but not generally in all cases. In our analysis, much broader context was needed to pin down the meaning and the function of *now*, or of the marker-collocate sequence as a whole, and subsequently the appropriateness of translation equivalents was tested. It could thus be advisable to add some more information under the meaning number 5, such as an illustrative sentence, or more sentences, in order to provide as broad a context as possible. This was done in the subsection *phr (phrases)*, although some objections could be made here as well with respect to the overall description. The phrase *Now, now/then* is translated by the Czech equivalent *Ale no tak* and specified further: *přátelské pokárání* (*a friendly way of reprimanding someone*). As *Now, now* was part of our analysis as well, we will come back to this marker-collocate sequence later, but let us now look closer at the already analyzed *Now, then*. The Czech equivalent *no tak* would be fine, as well as it was a good decision to include an illustrative sentence to better understand the overall function of the marker-collocate sequence. However, it could be argued that the illustrative sentence and the subsequent Czech translation equivalent might not reflect fully the overall function of the marker-collocate sequence, for a broader context would seem necessary in this case. The illustrative sentence is *Now then, don't be rude*[18] , with the Czech translation *Ale no tak, nebuď drzý*. The problem can be that although *Now(,) then* can function in this sentence as a friendly way of reprimanding someone, it is, however, conditioned by a broader context. It can, on the contrary, express a rather strict way of reprimanding if told in a relevant context. In that case, the Czech equivalent should be different as well: *no tak* would be more strict than *ale no tak*, for *ale* can be analyzed as a mitigator (hedge), the whole equivalent *ale no tak* thus being relevant in the case of a friendly way of reprimanding, but not in a strict way of reprimanding. Furthermore, it is also important how the whole sentence is uttered, i.e. intonation plays a key role here as well. Regarding the sequence *Now, now*, it is translated by the same Czech

---

[18] The fact that the sequence is *Now then,* and not *Now, then*, i.e. without a comma, is not to be analyzed in detail, as this does not have any far-reaching consequences for the comparison and the overall results.

equivalent *ale no tak*, as in the case of *Now, then*, and its use is described as *chlácholivě (in a consoling/comforting way)*. The first mention of this sequence, however, is left without any additional information or description. The second mention is given the same information as in the case of *Now, then*, i.e. the illustrative sentence, the Czech equivalent and the use. By doing so, Lingea thus treats *Now, now* and *Now then* interchangeably when Czech translation is concerned. This, however, may be rather problematic. As we could observe, the Czech equivalents had a tendency to be typical for certain marker-collocate sequences. When looking at the examples and at the Czech equivalents of the sequence *Now, now* (see section 3.2.10), the most frequent equivalents were *no tak* (2 occurrences), and its reduplication *no tak, no tak* (1 occurrence). Therefore, in 50% of the cases there was used almost the same equivalent as that offered by Lingea *(ale no tak)*. Even though it was discussed earlier in this thesis that it might be indicative of Tolkien's personal style, the Czech equivalents nevertheless reflect the meaning and function of the whole sequence. It could thus be argued that the Czech equivalent(s) *(ale) no tak, (no tak)* should be used with the marker-collocate sequence *Now, now* rather than with *Now, then*. The Czech equivalent *no tak* described under number 7 will not be commented upon, as this is not relevant for this analysis.

Analyzing the meaning/function and the equivalents under number 6, we have *no, nuže, tak tedy*, described as *colloquial (hovor.) hesitation at the beginning of a sentence (při váhavém začátku věty)*. When comparing the equivalents in Lingea to the equivalents in our analysis, on closer inspection we can see that these were more frequent for the pragmatic marker *well* rather than for *now*. In the case of *now,* the equivalent *tak tedy* had 2 occurrences, and *nuže*, a variant of *nu*, had 1 occurrence; and there was not a single occurrence of *no*. On the other hand, in the case of *well*, with 27 occurrences, the equivalent *no* was the most frequent equivalent. In addition, even though with one occurrence only, there was used exactly the same variant *nuže* as in Lingea, and the variant *nu* had 4 occurrences, which in total makes higher percentage distribution than in the case of *now*. Furthermore, the Czech equivalents in Lingea are left without any illustrative sentence(s), not to mention that the question of a broader context was not considered either.

Turning now to *well* in the Lingea dictionary, the Czech equivalents seem to better reflect its pragmatic meaning and the respective functions than in the case of *now*. Moreover, the overall descriptions of the individual meanings or functions are more precise, i.e. they include more illustrative examples, although a broader context would seem to be needed in some of the cases. Under number 11, the equivalents are *tak(že), tedy, nuže*, described as *introductory use (uvození)*, the illustrative sentences being *Well, we can start / (Takže)*

můžeme začít, and *Well, then? / Tak co?*, described as *expecting a reaction (jak to bude)*. All of the three equivalents appeared in our analysis as well. Furthermore, *tak(že)* and *nuže* – and its variant *nu* – were more frequent than other equivalents. *Tak(že)* contributed to the overall distribution with more than 9% and *(nu)že* with nearly 5%. *Tedy*, being not as frequent, but still more frequent than other equivalents, had nearly 3%. The first illustrative sentence and its translation in Czech seem to be well-chosen in order to reflect the use of the pragmatic marker. The latter, however, seems not to be adequately described. The primary reason is that as we could observe on the example of the marker-collocate sequence *Now, then*, this is similar in that without much broader context the illustrative sentence alone may not be enough and the Czech translation equivalent may not be as appropriate as to fully reflect the use of the pragmatic marker here, as the collocate-specificity is again at work (see section 3.2.9). A similar case can be found under number 12, the description being *topic-changer (při změně tématu)*, and one of the illustrative sentences being *Well, I don't know / No, já nevím.* Although the Czech equivalent *no* seems to be appropriate even without much broader context, the description *topic-changer*, however, seems to work just in certain contexts only, as our analysis proved. If the same illustrative sentence were used in quite a different context, it may well have a different function. One of those functions could easily be the description under number 13: *hedge/mitigator (zmírnění kritiky, návrhu ap.)* On the examples analyzed, we could see that *well* did function as a mitigator, but again in certain contexts only. The sentence *Well, I don't know* could function as a mitigator as well if uttered in a relevant context and with a specific intonation. The Czech equivalents under number 14 are interesting to mention with respect to the marker-collocate sequence *Well, see*. The equivalents offered by Lingea are *no* and *víte*. The description is *hesitation, to gain more time to think etc. (při zaváhání, k získání času na rozmyšlenou).* Especially worth discussing is the equivalent *víte*. The marker-collocate sequence *Well, see* was in all three cases translated by almost the same equivalents – *No víš; No, víte; Víte.* As was discussed earlier in this thesis, these equivalents primarily reflect the pragmatic use of the verb of perception *see*. In 2 out of 3 cases, however, the pragmatic use of *well* was reflected as well – in the equivalent *no*. Not that the equivalent *víte* could not be appropriate for *well*, although it did not occur in any other marker-collocate sequences except for *Well, see*, but – as can be observed – it tends to be used primarily for the verb of perception *see* used as a pragmatic marker, whereas the equivalent *no* reflects the pragmatic use of *well*; the equivalents *No víš / No, víte* thus reflect the strengthened pragmatic meaning. This is another example of how marker-collocate specificity can play a role in the selection of an appropriate translation equivalent. For this reason, it is also important to add as

much information as possible, i.e. the already discussed illustrative sentence(s) and/or broader context, none of which was done in the case of the description of the meaning number 14 in Lingea.

Let us now look at number 15. The equivalents *no* and *vlastně* have the description *correction of the utterance* (*při opravě právě vyřčeného*), as well as the illustrative sentence: *He had a shotgun. Well, maybe it wasn't a shotgun. / Měl brokovnici. No, možná to nebyla brokovnice*. As is obvious, there is included not only one illustrative sentence, but two. They operate together and provide a context that is needed to reflect the function of *well* and to subsequently provide justification for the translation equivalents selected. In addition, leaving the equivalent *no* aside – for it was already discussed and it is the most frequent of all the equivalents – the equivalent *vlastně* had also one occurrence in our analysis, with the same function as stated in Lingea (see Example B17 in the Appendix). Number 15 seems to be a good example of how the meaning and function could be described in the best way possible, i.e. to include almost all the necessary information we have discussed so far. The missing information is the marker-collocate specificity, or more specifically it is the sequence *Well, **maybe*** with the collocate *maybe* that is worth analyzing (it was not part of our analysis) and subsequently worth being commented upon under number 15. As in the case of the reduplicated marker-collocate sequence *Now, now*, Lingea provides as well a Czech translation equivalent for *Well, well*, under the subsection *phr (phrases)*. However, the sequence is followed by the exclamation mark, i.e. *Well, well!*. The Czech equivalents are *Podívejme! To jsou věci! / Ale, ale! / Hleďme!* and the description is *with amusement (pobaveně)*. Here, the marker-collocate sequence is described as having the function of an interjection. Although in our analysis there is only one instance of *Well, well* followed by the exclamation mark, there were more of the occurrences of this marker-collocate sequence that can be analyzed as having the pragmatic function of an interjection. A noteworthy observation is that all of the 9 occurrences of *Well, well* in our analysis were translated by 8 different Czech equivalents and once by omission. Furthermore, interesting reduplications were used to reflect the reduplication in the original: *No, no / Hele, hele / Dobrá, dobrá / Vida / Vida*, or even a tripled combination: *Ano, ano, ano*. Similarly, as mentioned above, Lingea gives a variety of Czech equivalents as well. This is undoubtedly an example of the multifunctional character of pragmatic markers and collocate-specificity. As all these aspects are at work, there could, however, be raised a question of providing a broader context to illustrate the use of *Well, well!*, for – given the large variety of Czech translation equivalents – we can talk here about the equivalents as being the already mentioned one-off equivalents or contextual

equivalents. The multifunctional character of *well* and context-specificity as well as context-sensitivity are further enhanced by the use of non-reduplicated *well* as an interjection under the section *interj*, with the following meanings or functions: 1. *surprise/irritation* (*překvapení, rozčilení)*, the equivalents being *No toto! / No tedy!*, and 2. *expecting an answer etc, often with irritation*). It would therefore again deserve more information to fully describe such use of *well* and its Czech translation equivalents.

4 Conclusion

The study whose aim was to collect a sample of pragmatic uses of *now* and *well* (in combination with the collocational sequences selected) and their Czech equivalents brought several interesting findings. As far as equivalents are concerned, if we have said that the Czech equivalent *teď* rendered the core meaning of *now* (temporal), then in the case of *well* its core meaning 'positive appraisal' was reflected in the Czech equivalent *dobrá/dobře*. Both in the case of *Now* and *Well,* omission was a very frequent means of translation, or more specifically in *Now,* it was the most frequent of all the equivalents and in the case of *Well,* it was the second most frequent means of translation. The reason might be the difference between *now* as a pragmatic marker and *well* as a pragmatic marker, with the latter being the more prototypical of the two. Therefore, it might have been easier for the translator to find an overt Czech translation equivalent for *Well,* than for *Now,* and so, in the case of *Now,* translators more often resorted to omission than in the case of *Well,* to stay on the safe side. However, as we have already demonstrated on the examples analyzed, omission was in some of the cases an appropriate means of translation.

It was found that not only there were collocates that both *Now,* and *Well,* shared, and so appeared in the same collocations or marker-collocate sequences, but they also shared some of the Czech equivalents and even collocation equivalents, such as *ale*, *tak, nu, tak tedy*, or the interesting reduplication *hele*, *hele*. This strengthens the overall multifunctional character of both pragmatic markers and it is a clear example of their interchangeability in certain contexts, which can be observed not only in the source language, but obviously in the target language as well, on the level of translation equivalents. But as was already discussed, this interchangeability is context-dependent, which is to a large extent given by the different core meanings of both pragmatic markers.

The analysis of the Czech translation equivalents of the 100+6 occurrences of *Now,* + a collocation 1RIGHT, and of the 100+6 occurrences of *Well,* + a collocation 1RIGHT proved that a contrastive (translation/cross-linguistic) approach to pragmatic markers can contribute to their comprehension in the source language, which is in line with previous contrastive studies. It also proved how important other factors were in determining the meaning of both *now* and *well*, such as position in text, prosody, context, and collocate-specificity, which all shaped the final translator's decision in selecting the respective Czech equivalent. The results likewise showed that fiction can be a useful material in a contrastive approach to pragmatic markers, if an appropriate methodology is used.

This thesis also proved that a contrastive approach to pragmatic markers can also be practically applied in lexicography. On the examples of *now* and *well* it was possible to observe how difficult it was to fully reflect the wide range of their pragmatic meanings/functions. These were often collocate-specific and as such they also had a tendency to be translated into Czech accordingly, i.e. they had also specific Czech equivalents. The comparison of the results in our analysis to the description of these meanings/functions provided by the Lingea dictionary also proved that that there should have been included in the dictionary a broader context, which would specify the meanings/functions of both pragmatic markers and which would as well justify the selection of the individual Czech equivalents. In addition, it was also proved that although in written data, i.e. fictional dialogues, a broader context can include necessary information about prosody, which narrows down the overall pragmatic meaning/function. All of this is in line with the theoretical background mentioned above. Apart from the already mentioned comments, my suggestion for the overall improvement of the lexical entries of both *now* and *well* in the Lingea dictionary is that when used as pragmatic markers, *now* and *well* should definitely be included each in a separate subgroup. That is, as Lingea uses the following classification for *now* and *well* – adverb /conjunction/adjective/phraseological for *now*, and adverb/adjective/interjection/preposition/phraseological for *well* – there should be a separate class for their being used as pragmatic markers as well. Although this is slightly reflected in the case of *well* being used as an interjection, this is only one of a large variety of the meanings/functions this pragmatic marker can have. By the separate class/subgroup I mean not to include *now* and *well* under the category of *particles*, since English does not have the category of *particles* in the sense that Czech does, but I propose to include the pragmatic use of *now* under the class of *adverbs*, but under a special subclass of their being used as particles/pragmatic markers, for, as already discussed, *now* can behave both as an adverb and as a pragmatic marker at the same time, with the two meanings overlapping. In the case of *well* this would be done in a similar way, but as it is much easier to distinguish between *well* as an adverb and *well* as a pragmatic marker, it would be more advisable to include its pragmatic use not under the class of *adverbs*, but under a separate and special class labeled as *pragmatic use*. This would enable us to see both *now* and *well* in a different but significant usage. Based on corpus analysis, this class/subclass would include the list of their frequent meanings/functions, with each being further defined by using the pragmatic markers with frequent and specific collocations in a relevant and broader context, as well as it would include accordingly frequent and specific Czech translation equivalents.

Český souhrn

Tato práce se zabývá zkoumáním českých překladových ekvivalentů anglických pragmatických částic *now* a *well*.

Teoretická část podává přehled o situaci pragmatických částic v angličtině, s důrazem na *now* a *well*. Jedním z nejdůležitějších aspektů, které je třeba připomenout, je fakt, že v angličtině se terminologie různí a mnozí lingvisté, ať již do jisté míry mezi sebou souhlasí, přicházejí každý s terminologickým aparátem sobě vlastním. Nutno však dodat, že i zde má vše své hranice, a na tomto poli lingvistiky se tak ustálilo jen několik termínů, které však i přesto mají své zastánce a odpůrce. Mezi nejčastějšími všeobecně přijímanými termíny jsou *discourse markers*, *pragmatic markers, discourse particles* (srov. české *partikule*). Důvodem jsou různá pojetí toho, co vlastně třída pragmatických částic v angličtině zahrnuje. Užší vymezení takovéto kategorie je totiž pro angličtinu velmi problematické. Samotné určení, zda se jedná o pragmatickou částici, může být v určitých případech jednoduché, v jiných naopak složitější. V případě *well* je situace jednodušší, tedy máme na mysli rozdíl mezi *well* jakožto adverbiem a *well* jakožto pragmatickou částicí. V případě *now* je vše komplikovanější, jelikož v mnohých případech nelze určit, zdali se jedná o adverbium, či o pragmatickou částici. To je dáno zejména primárním významem *now*, který je ve své podstatě temporální, tedy v angličtině *temporal core meaning* 'at the present moment', tedy časové ohraničení *nyní*. Dochází tedy k situaci, kdy *now* může v určitých případech být užito ve významu pragmatickém, avšak zároveň může mít význam temporální; tedy oba významy se prolínají. I anglické *well* má primární význam, a to ve smyslu tzv. 'positive appraisal' (*souhlas*). Toto však nehraje žádnou roli v základním určení mezi užitím *well* jakožto adverbia, či jakožto pragmatické částice. O primárních významech obou pragmatických částic pojednává teoretická část, která navíc dále specifikuje jednotlivé funkce, ve kterých se obě pragmatické částice vyskytují. Pakliže totiž označíme určité slovo jako *pragmatic marker*, je nutno dále přistoupit ke specifičtější analýze, a dále tak určit právě jednotlivé funkce, které daná pragmatická částice zastává. Tento proces bývá komplikovanější, jelikož ne vždy je možné tyto funkce jasně definovat. Navíc, jak již bylo řečeno a jak dokazuje teoretický přehled a následná analýza, v případě *now* velmi často dochází k tomu, že v mnohých případech ani nelze s jistotou provést základní rozlišení mezi adverbiem a pragmatickou částicí, tudíž i následná klasifikace jednotlivých pragmatických funkcí bývá o to složitější.

U *now* jakožto pragmatické částice rozlišujeme dvě základní funkce: textovou či navazující (*textual/connective*), a tzv. interakční (*interactional*). Nutno však dodat, že i zde

80

dochází k terminologickému rozkolu, kdy někteří lingvisté užívají termínu *interpersonal*, *emotive*, či v případě *now* zejména termínu *affective*. Všechny tyto termíny však odrážejí ryzí charakter pragmatického užití obou částic. I zde však, stejně jako v případě prolínajících se významů pragmatického a temporálního, může i v rámci pragmatického významu docházet k prolínání jednotlivých funkcí. Tedy může nastat situace, kdy je *now* užito v pragmatickém významu, který má jak interakční, tak textovou funkci, a současně je přítomen temporální význam. Textovou funkcí rozumějme, že se jedná o prostředek navazování v textu, přičemž označením *text* rozumějme jakýkoliv diskurs, tedy v případě této práce se jedná o diskurs psaného dialogu. Pragmatická částice *now* s textovou (navazující) funkcí pak vyjadřuje především další fázi v komunikaci (*a new stage in the narrative or communication*), z tohoto důvodu se *now* v této funkci označuje jako 'topic-changer'. V případě tzv. *affective* (*interactional*) funkce pak dochází ke specifičtějšímu určení toho, jakou roli *now* v textu (diskursu) plní. Rovněž i tento užší výběr v mnohých případech může být problematický. Avšak velmi důležitou roli hrají i další faktory, které mohou pomoci tyto funkce určit, ba navíc jsou užitečnými indikátory při základním rozlišení mezi adverbiem a pragmatickou částicí. Nejdůležitějšími těmito faktory, které jsou zmiňovány, jsou kontext, prosodie, kolokace. Kontext představuje zřejmě nejdůležitější faktor na úrovni určení specifických funkcí *now*. Prosodie a kolokace jsou pak nejvýznamnějšími indikátory při rozhodování, zdali je *now* užito jakožto adverbia, či jakožto pragmatické částice. Při zkoumání širšího kontextu snadněji dochází k rozpoznání rolí mezi mluvčím a adresátem. Tyto role pak mohou být dále upřesněny prosodií (intonací, tónem řeči, frázováním). V některých případech lze všechny tyto informace získat nejen z běžně mluvené řeči, ale i v případě dialogů v psané próze. Teoretická část podává i stručný přehled podmínek, za kterých se *now* chová spíše jako adverbium, a za kterých by mělo být chápáno spíše jako pragmatická částice. *Now* v užití pragmatickém je nositelem samostatné intonační jednotky (*separate tone unit*/*prosodic phrase*); v případě že *now* není nositelem přízvuku a bylo-li nepochybně určeno, že není přítomen temporální význam, pak se jedná rovněž o užití pragmatické; je-li *now* přízvučné a nenásleduje-li za ním hranice intonační jednotky (*tone unit boundary*), pak se jedná o časové adverbiale. V případě kolokací jako *now then* se chová *now* jakožto pragmatická částice. Pozoruhodný je i případ, kdy v případě dvou výskytů *now* vedle sebe se v jednom případě jedná o adverbium a ve druhém o pragmatickou částici. Jak je tedy zřejmé, tyto faktory jsou mnohdy klíčové pro určení základního rozdílu mezi *now* jakožto adverbiem, a *now* ve významu pragmatickém. Navíc kontext může pomoci k bližšímu určení toho, jakou roli *now* v textu zastává.

V případě *well* je situace jednodušší v tom ohledu, že nedochází k prolínání dvou zcela odlišných významů jako v případě *now*. Primární význam 'positive appraisal' se však v určitých případech promítá do užití *well* ve významu pragmatickém. K základnímu rozlišení mezi adverbiem a pragmatickou částicí však mnohdy stačí pouze hledisko syntaktické či prosodické, které je v podstatě možné aplikovat podobným způsobem jako v případě *now*. Avšak i zde je mezi *now* a *well* rozdíl. Zatímco *now* ve významu pragmatickém není většinou nositelem přízvuku, *well* jakožto pragmatická částice je ve vícero případech přízvučné. V případě pragmatického užití zastává *well*, podobně jako *now*, základní funkce: textovou a interakční. Rovněž i zde dochází k tomu, že *well* může zastávat různé množství specifických funkcí, která mohou být určena při bližším zkoumání kontextu. Tyto jednotlivé funkce se však i v tomto případě mohou překrývat (*fuzziness/overlapping)*.

Z výše uvedených rozdílů mezi *now* a *well* lze tedy tvrdit, že u *now* je situace komplikovanější než u *well*, jelikož *well* může být chápáno jako typičtější zástupce třídy pragmatických částic než *now*. Svou roli může hrát i rozdíl v primárních významech (*core meaning*) a do určité míry vystupuje do popředí i úloha gramatikalizace, která je rozpracována v kapitole 2.2.2.2 v teoretické části práce.

Teoretická část rovněž nabízí přehled publikací, které jsou považovány za klíčové ve vztahu k této práci a které se zabývají jednou z nejdůležitějších otázek, která je rovněž s ohledem na charakter této práce více než relevantní. Jedná se o úlohu kontrastivní studie jakožto prostředku využitého ke zkoumání pragmatických částic ve výchozím jazyce, tedy v našem případě nejde jen o analýzu českých překladových ekvivalentů pragmatických částic *now* a *well*, ale rovněž i o to, zdali bližší zkoumání těchto překladových ekvivalentů může pomoci při pochopení významů a funkcí *now* a *well* v angličtině. V teoretickém přehledu jsou proto zejména uvedeny publikace mající povahu kontrastivních analýz s ohledem na *now* a *well*. Co se celkového počtu publikací týče, je situace příznivější pro *well* než pro *now*. *Well* bylo věnováno daleko více prostoru než *now*, což opět může odrážet skutečnost, že *well* je chápáno jako charakterističtější zástupce třídy pragmatických částic, nežli je tomu v případě *now*. Na základě zkoumaných výsledků v těchto studiích bylo dokázáno, že kontrastivní přístup skutečně může problematiku pragmatických částic v angličtině, či obecně v jakémkoliv jazyce, osvětlit. Aby byla takováto kontrastivní analýza co nejvěrohodnější, musí také pracovat s co nejlepším lingvistickým materiálem. Uváděné kontrastivní analýzy proto jakožto prostředku k získání co nejvěrohodnějšího a nejspolehlivějšího materiálu využívaly korpus, ať již monolingvní, či, jako v případě této práce, korpus paralelní.

Metodologický postup v této práci odpovídá metodologiím, které byly použity i v uváděných kontrastivních studiích. Jedná se však, samozřejmě, nikoliv o identický postup, ale velice podobný, lišící se jen odlišným pojetím a specifičtějším charakterem. Materiál je založen na 100+6 výskytech pro každou z pragmatických částic, tedy jedná se celkem o 200+12 dokladů, které byly vybrány z paralelního korpusu InterCorp prostřednictvím rozhraní NoSketch Engine. Důvodem, proč je celkově 12 dokladů chápáno jako dodatkových, se zabývá analytická část této práce. Přestože se jedná o metodologický postup, je celou problematiku nutno chápat i ve vztahu k výsledkům této práce, rovněž i v tomto případě je celá problematika zmiňována až na konci tohoto shrnutí, které podává přehled o dosažených výsledcích. Přestože jsou pragmatické částice spíše význačné pro mluvenou formu jazyka, stejně jako v případě zmiňovaných kontrastivních studií i tato práce zvolila dialogy v psané próze za hlavní materiál, který se jevil jako nejvhodnější ke zkoumání. Jelikož se jedná o kontrastivní analýzu zkoumající anglické pragmatické částice *now* a *well*, bylo třeba celkový vzorek dále podrobit třídění. Byly zvoleny tedy jen ty výskyty *now* a *well*, které se objevily v angličtině jakožto ve zdrojovém jazyce, tedy nešlo o překlady z jiných jazyků do angličtiny. Pakliže by totiž angličtina byla nikoliv zdrojovým, ale cílovým jazykem, v případě kontrastivní analýzy by pak toto mělo značný vliv na celkový charakter výsledků. Aby byl vzorek co nejreprezentativnější, zahrnuje různé množství autorů a zároveň překladů. Tím se vyloučila možnost vlivu osobního jazykového stylu autora originálu a překladatele. Rovněž byla zvolena možnost dalšího zúžení vzorku, a to tím, že byly zvoleny pouze takové výskyty *now* a *well*, které se objevily na začátku promluvy a za nimiž následovala čárka, tedy *Now,* a *Well,*. Účelem bylo dosáhnout co největší pravděpodobnosti výskytu *now* a *well*, tedy *Now,* a *Well,* jakožto pragmatických částic, a nikoliv jakožto adverbií. Avšak tyto již zúžené výskyty byly podrobeny dalšímu třídění. V rámci frekvenční distribuce byl navolen výběr kolokací na pozici 1VPRAVO. Dále došlo ke třídění těchto kolokací, a byly zvoleny takové kolokace, které se vyskytovaly nejen frekvenčně v hojném množství, ale které byly zároveň charakteristické pro obě pragmatické částice s ohledem na teoretickou část této práce, a které tak dále specifikovaly jejich užití. Kolokáty, které byly zvoleny, byly jednak ty, které jak *now* tak *well* sdílely (kupř. *then*), jednak ty, které byly symptomatické pro každou pragmatickou částici zvlášť. Tedy ve výsledku byly celkové analýze podrobeny až takové výskyty, které odpovídaly tomuto celkovému zúžení, kupř. *Now, then* a *Well, then*. Takovýto postup nabízí jednak identičnost jazykových konstrukcí a jednak paralelismus, tedy obě složky, které je nutné brát při kontrastivní analýze, a z hlediska translatologického zvláště pak, v úvahu.

Analytická část je věnována zkoumání výsledků překladových ekvivalentů pragmatických částic *now* a *well* podle podmínek stanovených metodologickým postupem. Na ilustrativních příkladech je pak ukázáno, jakým způsobem odráží jednotlivé překladové ekvivalenty výše zmiňované významy a funkce *now* a *well* a do jaké míry osvětlují jejich problematiku.

Bylo zjištěno, že *Now,* ve všech analyzovaných kolokacích má 32 různých českých překladových ekvivalentů a překlad ve formě nulového ekvivalentu (*omission*). Nulový ekvivalent tvořil největší část ze všech možných překladatelských řešení, a to s více než 29%. Druhým nejfrekventovanějším způsobem překladu byl ekvivalent *teď,* objevující se samostatně či rovněž v kolokacích (*a teď, tak a teď, takže teď, nuže teď*), a to s více než 27%. Druhým nejužívanějším českým ekvivalentem bylo *tak,* které bylo užito rovněž samostatně či v různých kolokacích (*tak tedy, no tak, ale tak*). Zajímavý byl i překlad ve formě reduplikace (*no tak, no tak*) či v kolokaci s primárním ekvivalentem *teď* (*tak a teď*). Celkový výskyt tohoto ekvivalentu ve všech možných kombinacích pak tvořil bezmála 18%, což jej činil třetím nejfrekventovanějším ze všech českých ekvivalentů. Z výsledků je patrné, že v určitých případech se překladatel rozhodl klást důraz spíše na primární temporální význam *now* (*temporal core meaning*), a to v podobě ekvivalentu *teď,* v jiných zase na interakční význam *(no tak),* či dokonce se mu podařilo v překladu zachytit oba významy současně (*tak a teď*). Různé množství překladových ekvivalentů[19], kterých je celkově 33 i s ekvivalentem nulovým, pak odráží multifunkčnost *now*, která je daná kontextem. Můžeme tedy hovořit v souladu s citovanými studiemi o tzv. kontextových překladových ekvivalentech.

U *Well,* ve všech jeho kolokacích bylo užito na 37 různých překladatelských řešeních, včetně nulového zastoupení. I toto opět vypovídá o multifunkčním charakteru *well* jakožto pragmatické částice. Podobně jako v případě *Now,* i zde bylo hojně zastoupeno řešení v podobě nulového ekvivalentu, a s bezmála 19% se tak jedná o druhé nejfrekventovanější překladatelské řešení celkově. Nejfrekventovanější způsob překladu, s celkově více než 34%, se stal český ekvivalent *no*, ať už jako samostatný ekvivalent či v různých kolokacích (*no dobře, no nic, no jo, no dobrá, no prostě, no víš, no víte*). Třetím nejužívanějším překladatelským řešením byl český ekvivalent *dobrá* a jeho varianta *dobře*, které byly zastoupeny opět buďto samostatně či v kolokaci (*no dobře, no dobrá, ale dobře, tak dobrá*). Zajímavá byla opět i v tomto případě reduplikovaná forma *dobrá, dobrá*). Celkově pak toto řešení představovalo 14%. Dalším velmi častým ekvivalentem bylo české *tak* s variantou

---

[19] Započítán je každý ekvivalent zvlášť, tedy *tak a teď* vystupuje jako samostatné řešení, avšak vzhledem k ekvivalentu *teď* je započítán jako jeden z výskytů *teď.*

takže, které samostatně či v kolokaci (*tak tedy, tak dobrá, jen tak*) představovalo více než 12%. I zde, jako tomu bylo v případě *Now,*, vystupuje do popředí otázka primárního významu (*core meaning*), tedy v případě *well* jde o již zmiňovaný 'positive appraisal', který je zachycen v českém ekvivalentu *dobrá/dobře*. A rovněž i zde dochází k situaci, kdy primární překladové ekvivalenty vytvářejí mezi sebou kolokace. Zejména se pak jedná o kolokace s překladovým ekvivalentem a variantou *dobrá*, jako např. *no dobrá, tak dobrá*.

Celkové výsledky ukazují, že ve vztahu k aspektům identičnosti jazykových struktur a paralelismu *Now,* a *Well,* nesdílejí jen kolokace ve svém zdrojovém jazyce (angličtině), ale rovněž i na úrovni jazyka cílového (češtiny). Obě pragmatické částice tak sdílejí české překladové ekvivalenty jako např. *ale, tak, nu, tak tedy* či zajímavou reduplikovanou formu *hele, hele*. Jejich multifunkční charakter se tak do jisté míry odráží právě i na rovině překladatelské. Citované kontrastivní studie zároveň hovoří o tzv. zaměnitelnosti obou pragmatických částic (*interchangeability*), která je však vázána kontextem. Sdílení překladových ekvivalentů však tento aspekt jen zdůrazňuje, rovněž tak i úlohu kontextu jak v zdrojovém tak v cílovém jazyce. Zároveň se v překladu odrážejí primární významy (*core meanings*) obou pragmatických částic. V případě reduplikovaných forem v originálu, tedy *Now, now* a *Well, well*, bylo zjištěno, že zatímco reduplikovaná forma v případě *well* nepředstavuje problém, tedy reduplikace *well* je vnímána jako běžné užití jazyka, reduplikace *now*, tedy kolokace *Now, now*, je vnímána spíše jako užití osobního či invenčního jazykového stylu autora, v tomto případě J.R.R. Tolkiena, jelikož, jak ukázaly výsledky, ve 4 z 6 případů šlo právě o výskyt této reduplikované kolokace v jedné z Tolkienových knih. Podobně je tomu i v případě, pakliže *now* a *well* vytvářejí kolokace mezi sebou, tedy jedná se o kolokace *Now, well* a *Well, now*. Kolokace *Well, now* je rovněž vnímána jako běžné užití jazyka, a výsledky ukázaly, že se vyskytla u různého množství autorů. Naproti tomu kolokace *Now, well* se nevyskytla vůbec. Pro svůj specifický charakter bylo 6 výskytů kolokace *Now, now* uvedeno v této práci jako dodatkový materiál. Aby byla zachována rovnovážnost výskytů, kolokace *Well, now* byla rovněž zařazena pod dodatkový materiál, tedy celkově tato práce analyzovala zmiňovaných 200+12 výskytů.

Dále bylo provedeno porovnání českých ekvivalentů v rámci této korpusové/ kontrastivní studie s českými ekvivalenty anglicko-českého elektronického slovníku Lingea. Při bližším zkoumání bylo zjištěno, že určité české překladové ekvivalenty byly charakteristické pro každou z pragmatických částic ve spojení s určitými kolokacemi, hovoříme o tzv. *marker-collocate sequences* (např. *Now, then* a *Well, then*). Tyto ekvivalenty byly následně porovnány s ekvivalenty ve slovníku Lingea a bylo zjištěno, že dané

překladové ekvivalenty, které slovník nabízí, nejsou vždy v souladu s ekvivalenty vyskytujícími se v rámci této studie, či přesněji ne vždy vystihují dané funkce anglických pragmatických částic v plném měřítku, a jsou proto ne vždy zcela vhodnými překladovými řešeními, což je primárně dáno jednak právě kolokační specifičností u obou pragmatických částic, jednak tím, že Lingea u jednotlivých významů či funkcí, které dává jako příklady užití *now* a *well* jakožto pragmatických částic, mnohdy ani neudává ilustrativní větu. Tedy do popředí se dostává vliv kontextu. Teoretická i empirická část v rámci této studie prokázaly, že pochopení jednotlivých významů či funkcí obou pragmatických částic je dáno právě vlivem širšího kontextu. Ilustrativní věta by tedy navíc stále byla v mnohých případech nedostatečná, pakliže by mělo být provedeno důkladné zpracování slovníkového hesla. Tato studie proto navrhuje, aby při zpracování slovníkového hesla *now* bylo jeho pragmatické užití uvedeno sice pod kategorií *adv* (*adverb/příslovce*), ale jakožo podkategorie *pragmatic marker*. Důvodem je již zmíněná komplikace v určení mezi *now* jakožto adverbia a *now* jakožto pragmatické částice, v mnohých případech se pak oba významy prolínají. Uvedení pragmatického užití jako podkategorie v rámci kategorie *příslovce* by tak reflektovalo sporný charakter *now*. Naopak v případě *well* by jeho pragmatické užití bylo uvedeno jako zcela samostatná kategorie, neboť v tomto případě nedochází k výrazným komplikacím v rámci užití *well* jakožto adverbia a *well* jakožto pragmatické částice. V rámci této klasifikace by na základě kontrastivní korpusové analýzy byly ve slovníku uvedeny nejfrekventovanější významy či funkce obou pragmatických částic s ohledem na jejich nejběžnější a charakteristická kolokační spojení, stejně tak jako by byl uveden relevantní širší kontext, který by specifikoval daná užití. Následné překladové ekvivalenty by pak byly vybírány s ohledem na výše zmíněné aspekty a byly by rovněž zasazeny do širšího kontextu. Tato klasifikace by tak umožňovala se dívat na pragmatické užití *now* a *well* jako na užití do jisté míry samostatné a velmi specifické. Tato samostatnost je však, nutno dodat, značně omezena právě již zmíněnou skutečností, že angličtina nezná kategorii *particles* (*částice*), jako je tomu kupř. u češtiny, kde vystupuje jako zcela samostatná kategorie.

Výsledky této práce dokazují, že korpusová kontrastivní analýza může skutečně pomoci osvětlit problematiku pragmatických částic v jazyce výchozím. Navíc může mít i praktické využití v lexikografii. V případě této práce se tak jedná o kontrastivní analýzu mezi angličtinou a češtinou; tedy čeština se jako další jazyk může zařadit mezi jazyky, kterými se již zabývaly studie citované v této práci.

References

Abraham, W. (1984). De betekenis en de functie van het Nederlandse wel – een vergelijking met het Duits. In: Van der Auwera, Johan and Willy Vandeweghe (eds) *Studies over Nederlandse partikels. Antwerp Papers in Linguistics* 35, 17-46.

Adams (eds.) *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk*: 167‑177. Longman.

Aijmer, K. (2002). *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a corpus.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenbergen (2011). "Pragmatic Markers". *Discursive Pragmatics*, ed. by Zienkowski, Jan et al. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Altenberg, B. (1987). *Prosodic patterns in spoken English. Studies in the correlation between prosody and grammar for text-to-speech conversion*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic Markers and Sociolinguistic Variation: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Language of Adolescents*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogical imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bazzanella, C. (1990). "Phatic connectives as interactional cues in contemporary spoken Italian". *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 629–647.

Bazzanella, C. & L. Morra (2000). Discourse markers and the indeterminacy of translation. In I. Korzen & C. Marello (eds.) *Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione. On linguistic aspects of translation. Notes pour une linguistique de la traduction*: 149‑157. Edizioni dell'Orso.

Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers.* Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, D. (1989). *Intonation and its uses. Melody in grammar and discourse.* London: Edward Arnold.

Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Brinton, L. (2008). *The comment clause in English. Syntactic origins and pragmatic development.* Cambridge University Press.

Bulcaen (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 1–17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carlson, L. (1984). '*Well' in dialogue games: A discourse analysis of the interjection 'well' in idealized conversation*. Benjamins.

Cuenca, M.-J. (2008). Pragmatic markers in contrast: The case of *well*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(8): 1373‑1391.

Degand, L. (2000). "Causal connectives or causal prepositions? Discursive constraints". *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 687–707.

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

Finell, A. (1992). The repertoire of topic changers in personal, intimate letters: A diachronic study of Osborne and Woolf. In Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Nevalainen, T. and I. Taavitsainen (eds). *History of Englishes: New methods and interpretations in historical linguistic*s. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 720–35.

Fischer, K. (2000). *From cognitive semantics to lexical pragmatics. The functional polysemy of discourse particles.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fleischman, S. and Yaguello, M. (1999). Discourse markers in comparative perspective: A contribution to cross-language pragmatics. Hand-out at the ICLA Conference, Stockholm.

Fraser, B. (1988). "Types of English discourse markers". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 38*, 19-33.

Fraser, B. (1990). "An approach to discourse markers". *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 383–395.

Fraser, B. (1996). "Pragmatic markers". *Pragmatics, 6*, 167–190.

Greasley, P. (1994). An investigation into the use of the particle *well:* commentaries on a game of snooker. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22(5): 477‑494.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1970). Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of language* 6: 322-61.

Halliday, M.A. K. and R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hasselgård, H. and Oksefjell S. (eds). 1998. *Out of corpora. Studies in honour of Stig Johansson.* Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Heinemann, I. (1985). Die Niederländische Partikel *wel* und ihre Deutschen Entsprechungen. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*, XVIII-XIX, 38-58.

Hölker, K. (1991). Franzosisch: Partikelforschung. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* 5(1): 77‑88. Niemeyer.

Johanssson, S. and Oksefjell S. (eds). (1998). *Corpora and cross-linguistic research: Theory, method and case studies.* Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Johansson, S. (2006). "How well can *well* be translated? On the English discourse particle *well* and its correspondences in Norwegian and German". *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*, Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenbergen (eds).

Jucker, A. (1993). The discourse marker *well*. A relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19(5): 435‑53.

Lamiroy, B. (1994). "Pragmatic connectives and L2 acquisition: The case of French and Dutch". *Pragmatics, 4*, 183–201.

Lenk, U. (1997). "Discourse markers". In J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman, J. Blommaert, and C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 1–17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange. APPRAISAL systems in English. In Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (eds) *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse.* Oxford: OUP, 142-75.

Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*, ed. by H. Jucker, A. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Norrick, N. (2001). Discourse markers in oral narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 849‑878.

Ochs, E. 1996. Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In Gumperz, J. J. and S. C. Levinson (eds). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 407–37.

Östman, J.-O. (1979). On the pragmatic meaning of textual particles. In: Kontrastiv lingvistik och sekundärspråksforskning (B. Hammarberg, ed.), pp. 171-191. Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University, Stockholm.

Östman, J.-O. 1982. The symbiotic relationship between pragmatic particles andimpr omptu speech. In Enkvist, N.E. (ed.). *Impromptu speech: A symposium*. Ĺbo: The Research Institute of the Ĺbo Akademi Foundation. 147–77.

Quirk, R. et al. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Rühlemann, C. (2007). *Conversation in context. A corpus-driven approach.* Continuum.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L.C. (1985). *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. Garland.

Schourup, L.C. (2001). Rethinking *well. Journal of Pragmatics* 33(7): 1025‑1060.

Sinclair, J. McH. andR. M. Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, S. and Jucker, A. (2000). "*Actually* and other markers of an apparent discrepancy between propositional attitudes of conversational partners". Andersen, Gisle and Thorstein Fretheim (eds) *Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude.* Pragmatics & Beyond. New Series. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207-37.

Svartvik, J. 1980. *Well* in conversation. In Greenbaum, S., Leech, G.N. andJ. Svartvik (eds).
    Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk. London: Longman. 167–177.

Svartvik, J. (1990). The TESS project. In: Svartvik, Jan (ed). 1990. *The London-Lund Corpus
    of Spoken English: Description and research.* Lund: Lund University Press, 63-86.

Traugott, E.C. (2004). "Constructions in Grammaticalization". *The Handbook of Historical
    Linguistics*. Jospeh, Brian D. and Richard D. Janda (eds). Blackwell Publishing.

Unger, Ch. J. (1996). "The scope of discourse connectives: implication for discourse
    organization". *Journal of Linguistics, 32*, 402–438.

Vizcaino, G. M.J. & M.A. Martinez-Cabeza (2005). The pragmatics of *well* and *bueno* in
    English and Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2(1): 69‑92.

Watts, R. (1989). Taking the pitcher to the well. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18(2): 203‑231.

On-line sources

Aijmer, K. & A.-M. Simon-Vandenbergen (2003). "The Discourse Particle *well* and its
    equivalents in Swedish and Dutch". Cited Feb 24 2014. Originally from *Linguistics*.
    Volume 41, Issue 6, Pages 1123–1161. Accessed through and cited accordingly
    <http://www.google.cz/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDg
    QFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsws.bu.edu%2Fbfraser%2FOther%2520Specific%252
    0DMs%2520or%2520DPs%2520Papers%2FAimer%2520-
    %2520The%2520DP%2520well.doc&ei=ZHYLU47LE8GVtQb69IDwBg&usg=AFQ
    jCNEXA_x8zC5l2-AsXYLvLopd3kFBng&bvm=bv.61725948,d.Yms>.

Haan, F. (1999)."Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries". Cited Feb 24
    2014.
    <http://www.academia.edu/755475/Evidentiality_and_epistemic_modality_Setting_bo
    undaries>.

"Heteroglossia". Cited Feb 24 2014.
    <http://www2.bgsu.edu/departments/english/cconline/wills/hereroglossia.html>.

InterCorp
    Český národní korpus - InterCorp. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha.
    Cit.26.2.2014 , dostupný z WWW: <http://www.korpus.cz>.

Lingea Lexicon Platinum 5: Czech-English/English-Czech electronic dictionary. Lingea s.r.o.
    2008. Version 5.0.0.2.

"Swat team". Cited Feb 24 2014.
    <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/SWAT+team>.

*Now, I (***A1-A23***)*

A1
Kingsley Amis *Sťatsný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
 "**Now, *I*** 've been wanting us to have a little get-together for quite some time, old boy.
„Chtěl jsem si s vámi pohovořit o něčem docela jiném.

A2
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
He said, "**Now, *I*** want you to think, Jessie.
„A teď, Jessie, přemýšlej," řekl.

A3
Dan Brown *Šifra mistra Leonarda (The Da Vince Code)*
"**Now, *I*** imagine you have something for me to sign?"
„Předpokládám, že chcete, abych vám něco podepsal?"

A4
Dan Brown *Šifra mistra Leonarda (The Da Vince Code)*
Now, *I* realize this is an intrusion, but if you could afford me a few more minutes, I have
traveled a great distance to scatter ashes amongst these tombs."
*Uvědomuji si, že vás vyrušujeme, ale kdybyste mi dal ještě několik minut, cestoval jsem dost
daleko, jen abych nasypal popel na tyto hrobky."*

A5
Sandra Brown *Zdravím temnoto (Hello Darkness)*
Now, *I* ask you, is that a productive way to spend an evening?"
To je smysluplný způsob, jak strávit večer, ptám se tě?"

A6
Lewis Caroll *Alenka v kraji (Alice in Wonderland)*
"**Now, *I*** give you fair warning," shouted the Queen, stamping on the ground as she spoke;
*„Předem vás upozorňuji," Královna křikla a přitom dupla nohou, „než řeknu švec, buď
zmizíte vy, nebo vaše hlava*

A7
Robin Cook *Toxin (Toxin)*
"**Now, *I*** want you in bed at your normal time, young lady, " Tracy said .
„ A koukej jít včas do postele, princezno," nabádala ji Tracy.

A8
Robin Cook *Toxin (Toxin)*
"**Now, *I***'m not going to go that far.
„To bych tak jednoznačně netvrdil.

A9
Robin Cook *Toxin (Toxin)*
"**Now**, *I*'m going to step outside and talk to your parents.
"A já si teď půjdu s tvými rodiči na chvilku popovídat ven, ano?"

A10
Cathy Day *Circus v zimě (The Circus in Winter)*
"Now, I want you to listen to me.
„A teď mě poslouchej.

A11
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Diamant velký jako Ritz (The Diamond as Big as the Ritz)*
"**Now, *I***'ve told you, and I shouldn' t have," she said, calming suddenly and drying her dark blue eyes.
Náhle se ovládla a osušila si tmavomodré oči. „Tak už je to venku, neměla jsem ti to říkat." pravila.

A12
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
Now, *I* 've never known an eleven-year-old kid to be held in contempt, but if you were an adult and you refused to answer the judge's questions, then you'd go to jail for contempt."
Neznám však jediné jedenáctileté dítě, které by zadrželi za pohrdání soudem. Kdybys byl dospělý a odmítl vypovídat na soudcovy otázky, pak by ses dostal do vazby za pohrdání soudem."

A13
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
Now, *I* do n't know anything about hiding out, but since you're dodging a subpoena and you're a lawyer and all, and you deal with criminals all the time, I'm sure you could get us to New Orleans and no one would know it.
Já ale nemám představu, jak se skrývat, ale protože děláte, jako byste nikdy nic neslyšela o obsílce, a jste advokátka a celou dobu si to rozdáváte se zločinci, mám dojem, že byste nás mohla zavést do New Orleansu, a nikdo by se to nedověděl.

A14
John Grisham Partner (*The Partner*)
Now, *I* 'm not quite the First Amendment hawk you are, but if this got published it would be very embarrassing for your client.
Já nejsem takový fanda prvního dodatku ústavy jako vy, ale kdyby se tohle zveřejnilo, vyzní to pro vaši mandantku velice trapně.

A15
John Grisham Partner (*The Partner*)
Now, I'm assuming that we 're all familiar with Mr. Aricia 's 1991 claim against his former employer under the False Claims Act.
Předpokládám, že všichni víte o stížnosti pana Aricii z roku 1991 na svého bývalého zaměstnavatele podle zákona o podvodných pohledávkách.

A16

John Grisham *Poslední vůle (The Testament)*

"**Now,** *I* do n't think you'll have trouble with the answers if you'll pay attention to the questions.

„Tak tedy myslím, že vám odpovědi nebudou dělat potíže, budete - li věnovat pozornost otázkám.

A17

Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*

Now, *I* may say I 'm as shocked as everyone else must have been to learn that examination of food handlers here has n't been done for…"

Nadto jsem nucen zároveň prohlásit, že laboratorní vyšetření zaměstnanců přicházejících do styku s potravou se neprováděla již…"

A18

Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*

Now, *I* have seen men thrust a dry branch into that stuff , and presently the Red Flower blossomed at the end of it.

Vídal jsem lidi, jak strkali do tohoto uhlí uschlou větev a pak Rudý Květ vykvetl hned na jejím konci.

A19

Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*

Now, *I* suppose I should tell you a little bit about this ball.

Teď bych vám asi měla něco říct o dnešním plese.

A20

Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*

Now, *I* have n't done much confiding, other than things you could have heard from anyone.

Vím, že mi moc nevěříš. Asi jsi o mně slyšela ledacos, takže ti něco řeknu:

A21

Philip Roth *Lidská skvrna (The Human Stain)*

"**Now,** *I* could tell you that there is no escape, that all your attempts to escape will only lead you back to where you began.

„Podívej, mohla bych ti vysvětlovat, že únik neexistuje, že tvoje pokusy uniknout tě pouze dovedou zpátky, kde jsi začal.

A22

J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*

"**Now,** *I* want a nice fair game, all of you," she said, once they were all gathered around her.

"Očekávám od vás všech naprosto čestnou hru," prohlásila, když se všichni shromáždili kolem ní.

A23
Anne Rivers Siddons *Bezpečné výšiny (Hill Towns)*
Now, *I* have absolutely nothing against it; it's a quirky, wonderful old hotel, but it's right on a main artery from the station into the heart of the city, and it has no air-conditioning and no window glass, only shutters.
Já vím, že vy čtyři,"a při těch slovech kývla na mne, Colina a Marii, „máte bydlet v hotelu Croce di Malta. Nic proti tomu, je to rázovitý, nádherný starý hotel, ale leží na hlavní dopravní tepně od nádraží do středu města.

Now, if (A24-A45)

A24
Douglas Adams *Restaurace na konci vesmíru (The Restaurant at the End of the Universe)*
"**Now,** *if* you would care to order drinks at last," he said, "I will then show you to your table."
"Tak kdybyste si laskavě už konečně objednali ten aperitiv, uvedl bych vás ke stolu," řekl s povzdechem.

A25
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now,** *if* they knew the truth about Daneel to begin with , who told them?
A teď, jestliže věděli od začátku, kdo Daneel je, kdo jim to prozradil?

A26
Lewis Caroll *Alenka v kraji (Alice in Wonderland)*
Now, *if* you only kept on good terms with him, he'd do almost anything you liked with the clock.
Kdo je s ním zadobře, tomu nařídí hodinky, jak je mu libo.

A27
Lewis Caroll *Alenka za zrcadlem (Through the Looking Glass)*
Now, *if* you'll only attend, Kitty, and not talk so much, I'll tell you all my ideas about Looking-glass House.
Tak dávej, Katko, pozor a nemluv tolik, a já ti povím, co všecko si o tom domě za zrcadlem myslím.

A28
Robin Cook (*Toxin*)
"**Now,** *if* you'll excuse me, I have to get back to work."
A teď mě laskavě omluvte. Musím se vrátit ke svý práci."

A29
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Diamant velký jako Ritz (The Diamond as Big as the Ritz)*
"**Now,** *if* you 'll let me have that name again correct-
„Tak, kdybyste mi teď ještě jednou řekl správně to jméno-"

A30
John Grisham *Partner (The Partner)*
Now, *if* you want someone else to represent you, fine.
Jestli chcete, aby vás zastupoval někdo jiný, fajn.

A31
John Grisham *Partner (The Partner)*
Now , *if* you gentlemen will leave us for a few minutes, I need to talk with Mr. Ladd and his client in private."
A teď, pánové, jestli nás na pár minut opustíte, rád bych si promluvil s panem Laddem a jeho klientem soukromě."

A32
Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*
Now, *if* you'll come with me, I'll show you our histology setup."
Pojďte, prosím, se mnou, provedu vás histologickým úsekem."

A33
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
"**Now,** *if* I kill him here, Nagaina will know;
"Hm, jestliže jej zabiji zde, bude o tom Nagaina vědět;

A34
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
"**Now,** *if* I lie in one word, send men to see, and they will find that the elephant-folk have trampled down more room in their dance-room, and they will find ten and ten, and many times ten, tracks leading to that dance-room.
"A teď jestliže lžu jediným slovem, pošlete muže, aby se podívali a uvidí, že sloní stádo vydupalo více místa ve své tančírně a naleznou deset a deset a mnohokráte deset stop vedoucích k tančírně.

A35
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
Now, *if* I had a full meal for every dog I 've kicked across the parade-ground , I should be as fat as Two Tails nearly."
Nu, kdybych měl plné jesle za každého psa, kterého jsem vykopal přes cvičiště, byl bych skoro tak tlustý jako Dvouohonáč."

A36
Jayne Ann Krentz *Zajatci snů (Falling Awake)*
Now , *if* you 'll excuse me-"
A teď, jestli mě omluvíte…"

A37
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
Now, *if* you have a green balloon , they might think you were only part of the tree, and not notice you, and if you have a blue balloon, they might think you were only part of the sky, and not notice you, and the question is:
Když tedy půjdeš se zeleným balónkem, mohou si myslet, že je to kus stromu, a nevšimnou si tě, a když půjdeš s modrým, mohou si myslet, že to je kus oblohy, a taky si tě nevšimnou;

A38

George Orwell 1984 (*1984*)

Now, *if* it so happened that you wanted to buy it, that'd cost you four dollars.

„Kdybyste to náhodou chtěl koupit, stálo by vás to čtyři dolary.

A39

George Orwell 1984 (*1984*)

"**Now,** *if* you happen to be interested in old prints at all — " he began delicately.

„Jestli se náhodou zajímáte o staré tisky…" začal s citem.

A40

J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*

Now, *if* you do n't mind, I'm going to bed."

A teď, jestli vám to nevadí, si půjdu lehnout."

A41

J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*

Now, *if* any of us finds the unicorn, we'll send up green sparks, right ?

Esli někdo z nás jednorožce najde, vohlásí to vostatním zelenejma jiskrama, platí?

A42

J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 1)*

Now, *if* you 'll excuse me, Mr. Merry and Mr. Frodo and all, I'd best be turning for home.

Teď, jestli prominete, pane Smíšku a pane Frodo a všichni, tak se radši vydám domů.

A43

J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*

Now, *if* you'd brought him along, that might have been useful - if these Nazgûl are all they make out.

Toho jsi měl vzít s sebou, ten by se byl hodil - jestli jsou ti nazgûlové opravdu takoví, jak se o nich říká."

A44

Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*

"**Now,** *if* you 've got the hang, go it lively!"

„Tak, a teď, když už to umíš, to budeme dělat doopravdy!"

A45

Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*

Now, *if* we watch every night, we'll be dead sure to see him go out, some time or other, and then we'll snatch that box quicker'n lightning."

Ale když budeme dávat pozor, jistojistě ho dřív nebo později uvidíme odcházet a potom bedničku chňapneme rychlostí namydleného blesku."

***Now, you* (A46-A57)**

A46
Anonym *Anglické pohádky (English Fairy Tales)*
"**Now,** *you* can eat as much as ever you like from any of the dishes on the table; but don't touch the covered dish in the middle till I come back."
„Od všech jídel můžeš sníst, kolik budeš chtít, jen na to jedno zakryté, co je v samém středu, ať nesáhneš, dokud se nevrátím."

A47
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now,** *you* just eat what's put before you and let's not have any comments."
„Tady jez, co dostaneš, a bez všech připomínek."

A48
Dan Brown *Šifra mistra Leonarda (The Da Vinci Code)*
"**Now,** *you* can either grant his dying wish and let us sprinkle his ashes in the sanctuary, or I tell Father Knowles how we've been treated."
„Takže teď se buďto můžete podřídit poslednímu přání umírajícího člověka a nechat nás rozprášit trochu jeho popela v kostele, nebo sdělím otci Knowlesovi, jakým způsobem jste se k nám choval."

A49
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
Now, *you* said the father is of no use."
Říkala jste, že jeho otec není k ničemu."

A50
Jerome K. Jerome *Tři muži ve člunu (Three men in a boat)*
Now, *you* come along with me.
Pojď hezky se mnou,

A51
Jerome K. Jerome *Tři muži ve člunu (Three men in a boat)*
Now, *you* get a bit of paper and write down, J., and you get the grocery catalogue, George, and somebody give me a bit of pencil, and then I'll make out a list."

A52
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
"**Now,** *you* gentlemen were alarmed, I believe, when I trumpeted."
Nu, vy pánové, jste byli, myslím, poplašeni, když jsem troubil?

A53
Alice Munro *Útěk (Runaway)*
Sara would say, "**Now,** *you* must tell me what you're doing in your studies," and Juliet would sum things up, and Sara might ask her how she kept all those Greek names straight.
Ta například řekla: „A teď mi musíš vyprávět, jak pokračuješ ve studiu," a Juliet jí všechno shrnula a pak se jí Sara třeba zeptala, jak si může pamatovat všechna ta řecká jména.

A54
Alice Munro *Útěk (Runaway)*
"**Now,** *you* want to tell me what you learned in school today?"
„Nechceš mi povědět, co jste se dneska učili ve škole?"

A55
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Now,** *you* listen here, boy," he snarled,
"A teď si poslechni mě, chlapče," zavrčel.

A56
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Now,** *you* two -- this year, you behave yourselves.
„A vy dva - chovejte se letos slušně!

***Now, do* (A57-A68)**

A57
Kingsley Amis *Šťastný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
"**Now,** *do* n't be silly, Jim, there's nothing to apologise for.
„Nemluvte hlouposti, Jime, nemáte se zač omlouvat."

A58
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now ,** *do* as I say."
„Teď udělej, co ti říkám!"

A59
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Diamant velký jako Ritz (The Diamond as Big as the Ritz)*
"**Now,** *do* n't think my opinion on these matters is final," he seemed to say," just because I'm stronger and more of a man than you are."
Jako by říkal, „Nemyslete si, že můj názor na tyhle věci je rozhodující jen proto, že jsem silnější a že jsem víc chlap než vy."

A60
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Now,** *do* n't bother if it's any trouble," she told Bea,
„Poslyš, kdyby ti to mělo dělat potíže, vykašli se na to," řekla Bee,

A61
John Grisham *Klient* (*The Client*)
Now, *do* you want the gun?"
Tak a teď znovu: chceš tu pistoli?"

A62
John Grisham *Klient* (*The Client*)
Now, *do* n't worry, we're gonna come get you tomorrow afternoon and drive you down."
Teď si nedělej starosti. Přijdeme si pro tebe zítra odpoledne a odvezeme tě tam."

A63
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
"**Now,** *do* n't be angry after you've been afraid.
„Nu, teď se nezlob, potom, když jsi se dříve bál."

A64
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
Now, *do* n't forget that nice wrist movement we've been practicing!" squeaked Professor Flitwick, perched on top of his pile of books as usual.
„Hlavně nesmíte zapomenout na ten pěkný pohyb zápěstím, který jsme nacvičovali!" zakvákal profesor Kratiknot, který jako obvykle trůnil na hromadě knih.

A65
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Now ,** *do* n't ask me anymore," said Hagrid gruffly .
„Ale nic, už se mě na nic neptej," odmítl Hagrid nevrle.

A66
 J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Now,** *do* n't forget, it's Locomotor Mortis," Hermione muttered as Ron slipped his wand up his sleeve.
„Hlavně nezapomeň, že formule zní Locomotor mortis," zamumlala Hermiona, když si Ron strkal hůlku do rukávu.

A67
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
Finally he said, "**Now,** *do* n't be offended or anything, but neither of you are that good at chess – "
Nakonec Ron prohlásil: „Víte, nerad bych, abyste se třeba urazili, ale žádný z vás nehraje šachy tak dobře – "

A68
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 1)*
"**Now,** *do* n't mistake me!" he cried, as Frodo rose from his seat, and Sam jumped up with a scowl.
„Nechápejte mě přece špatně!" vykřikl, když Frodo vstal ze židle a Sam vyskočil a zamračil se.

***Now, my* (A69-77)**

A69
Anonym *Anlglické pohádky (English Fairy Tales)*
"**Now,** *my* dear," said she, "I'll you what you shall do.
„Teď, drahý, poslouchejte.

A70
Anonym *Anlglické pohádky (English Fairy Tales)*
"**Now,** *my* dear, here you'll be shut in tomorrow with some victuals and some flax, and if you haven't spun five skeins by the night, your head'll go off."
„Nazítří, moje milá, budeš tu jen s kopou lnu a trochou občerstvení zavřena, a jestli do večera pět přaden spředeno mít nebudeš, o hlavu přijdeš."

A71
Arthur C. Clarke *Setkání s Ramou (Rendezvous with Rama)*
"**Now,** *my* idea was that if the Martians could build a good machine, with all their know-how, it would really perform on the Moon - where gravity is only half as strong."
Taky mě napadlo, že kdyby technicky vyspělí Marťané dokázali postavit dobrý stroj, na Měsíci by teprve ukázal, co umí - když je tam gravitace jen poloviční."

A72
Mark Frost *Seznam sedmi (The List of Seven)*
Now, *my* friend, what have you brought for us?"
A teď, příteli, co jsi nám přinesl?"

A73
R.L. Stevenson *Podivuhodný případ Dr. Jekylla a pana Hyda (The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde)*
"**Now,** *my* good man," said the lawyer, "be explicit.
„ Ale tak mi to přec vysvětlete, milý Poole!" řekl advokát.

A74
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 1)*
"**Now,** *my* little fellows, where be you a-going to, puffing like a bellows?
„No tak, chlapíčci, kampak se to ženete a funíte jako měchy?

A75
Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*
Now, *my* boy, tell us everything that occurred - tell it in your own way - do n't skip anything, and do n't be afraid."
Řekněte nám to vlastními slovy - nic nevynechejte a nebojte se."

A76
Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*
"**Now,** *my* boy, I hope you're good and hungry, because breakfast will be ready as soon as the sun's up, and we'll have a piping hot one, too - make yourself easy about that!
„A teď, chlapče, doufám, že máš pořádný hlad, protože snídaně bude hotová, jen co vyjde slunce.

A77
Virginia Woolf *Paní Dallowayová (Mrs Dalloway)*
"**Now,** *my* dear, do n't be a fool.
„Podívej, miláčku, přestaň bláznit.

Now, now (**A78-83**)

A78
Sandra Brown *Zdravím temnoto (Hello Darkness)*
Now, *now*, move it!"
Pohyb, pohyb!"

A79
Mark Frost *Seznam sedmi (The List of Seven)*
"**Now,** *now* what seems to be the trouble here?"asked Doyle, slipping into his best bedside manner.
„Tak jaképak máte potíže?" vpravil se Doyle do svých nejlepších ošetřovatelských způsobů.

A80
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 1)*
"**Now,** *now*, my dear hobbit!" said Gandalf.
„No tak, no tak, milý hobite!" řekl Gandalf.

A81
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 2 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*
"**Now,** *now*!" said Gimly.
„No tak!" řekl Gimly.
A82
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 2 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*
"**Now,** *now*!" said Sam.
„No tak," řekl Sam.

A83
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 2 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*
"**Now,** *now*, "growled Shagrat, "I have my orders.
„Hele ,hele," zavrčel Šagrat, „já mám svůj rozkaz.

***Now, listen* (A84-88)**

A84
Douglas Adams *Stopařův průvodce po Galaxii (The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy)*
*„***Now,*** listen* to this, Beeblebrox, and you better listen good!"
„Tak poslouchej, Bíblbroxi, a koukej poslouchat dobře!"

A85
Kingsley Amis *Sťatsný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
*„***Now,*** listen* to me, Christine.
„Poslyšte, Christino, jdu teď ven objednat taxi.

A86
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
Now, *listen* to me.
Teď poslouchejte.

A87
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
Now, *listen.*
Ale poslyš.

A88
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
Now, *listen* to me, all three of yeh -- yer meddlin' in things that don' concern yeh.
Teď mě poslouchejte, všecky tři - pletete se do věcí, do kterejch vám nic není.

Now, then (A89-92)

A89
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now,** *then*, I promised this would be to the benefit of Spacetown's project, so - Wait, he's coming to."
„Nuže tedy, slíbil jsem, že to bude ve prospěch plánu Vesmírného Města, tak…Okamžik, přichází k sobě."

A90
Thomas Harris *Mlčení jehňátek (The Silence of the Lambs)*
Now, *then*.
A za minutku si dáme večeři."

A91
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
"**Now,** *then*!"
Tak tedy!

A92
Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*
Now, *then*, let that learn you!"
Podruhé se dáš lepší pozor!"

Now, tell (A93-96)

A93
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
Now, *tell* me, when do you get here?"
Tak mi řekni, kdy sem dorazíš?"

A94
John Grisham Partner (*The Partner*)
Now, *tell* us how you did it."
Tak nám řekněte, jak jste je způsobili."

A95
Alice Munro *Útěk (Runaway)*
"**Now,** *tell* me your names," she said, with a grin that she could not suppress and that was not returned.
„Ještě mi prozraďte, jak se jmenujete," vyzvala je s úsměvem, který nemohla potlačit a který neopětovali.

A96
Anne Rivers Siddons *Bezpečné výšiny (Hill Towns)*
He could mimic Corinne perfectly, and I would find myself laughing in spite of my annoyance when he said things like, "**Now,** *tell* me, Catherine, just when did you first notice this terrible fear of fucking on suspension bridges?"
Zjistila jsem, že se směju, namísto abych byla naštvaná, když mi říkal věci jako:„Nu, jen se mi svěř, Catherine, kdys poprvé zaznamenala ten příšerný strach z intimního styku na visutém mostě?"

***Now, look* (A97-100)**

A97
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now,** *look*," he said tenderly, "you're being a baby."
„Poslyš," řekl něžně, „chováš se jako dítě."

A98
John Grisham *Advokát chudých (The Street Lawyer)*
Now, *look* me in the eyes, and tell me if you're clean."
Tak se mi podívejte do očí a řekněle mi, jestli jste čistá."

A99
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
Now, *look* there."
„Podívej se tamhle."

A100
John Steinbeck *O myších a lidech (Of Mice and Men)*
Now, *look* – I'll give him the work tickets, but you ain't gonna say a word.
A teď dej pozor. Já mu dám ty kartičky, a ty nesmíš ani ceknout.

***Now, wait* (A101-103)**

A101
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Now,** *wait* Lije."
„Ne tak zhurta, Lije.

A102
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Now,** *wait* quietly, Potter."
Teď v klidu počkejte, Pottere.

103
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 2 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*
"**Now,** *wait* a bit and be patient!" he said.
„Teď chvilku počkej a buď trpělivý!" řekl.

***Now, let* (A104-106)**

A104
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
Now, *let'*s get the hell outta here!
Tak a teď odsud vypadneme.

A105
Kazuo Ishiguro *Malíř pomíjivého světa (An Artist of the Floating World)*
Now, *let'*s keep quiet for a while and see if you fall asleep."
A teď už budeme chvíli zticha, abych zjistil, jestli dokážeš usnout."

A106
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
As soon as they got downstairs, Regina told her, "**Now,** *let* me see how you walk.
Jakmile sešly dolů, Regina ji vyzvala:„A teď mi předveďte, jak chodíte.

Well, I (B1-B23)

B1
Douglas Adams *Stopařův průvodce po Galaxii (The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy)*
"**Well, I** may have just dropped in briefly, you know, on my way somewhere…"
„Možná jsem tak prostě jenom zaskočil na cestě někam…"

B2
Lewis Caroll *Alenka za zrcadlem (Through the Looking Glass)*
„**Well, I** don't want any to-day, at any rate."

B3
Arthur C. Clarke *Setkání s Ramou (Rendezvous with Rama)*
"**Well, I** was merely pointing out that there's nothing conceptually novel about Rama, though its size is startling.
„No dobře, chtěl jsem jenom zdůraznit, že na Rámovi není nic principiálně nového, ačkoli jeho velikost ohromuje.

B4
Cathy Day *Cirkus v zimě (The Circus in Winter)*
"**Well, I** guess he just did n't want to get it back for me.
„Mně bylo jasné, proč se mu pro něj nechce.

B5 Cathy Day *Cirkus v zimě (The Circus in Winter)*
"**Well, I**'m sure she's a good girl.
„Ale podle mě je to slušná holka.

B6
Arthur Conan Doyle *Poslední poklona (The Last Bow)*
"**Well, I** chose AUGUST for the word, and 1914 for the figures, and here we are."
„Za slovo jsem si vybral SRPEN a za číslice 1914, a ten čas nyní nadešel."

B7
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Diamant velký jako Ritz (The Diamond as Big as the Ritz)*
Well, I have that last and I will make the usual nothing of it.
No, na mě zbude to druhé a nebude mi to jako obvykle k ničemu."

B8
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Velký Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*
"**Well, I**"ll certainly try.
„No, pokusím se, to jistě.

B9
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Velký Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*
"**Well, I** tried to swing the wheel - * He broke off, and suddenly I guessed at the truth.
„Inu, pokusil jsem se strhnout volant – "Zarazil se a já jsem najednou uhodl pravdu.

B10
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well, I** think he should be in law," Enid said.
„Já si myslím, že by měl dělat něco kolem zákonů," prohlásila Enid.

B11
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
"**Well , I** –"
„*No, já…*"

B12
John Grisham *Poslední vůle (The Tetsament)*
"**Well, I**, uh, I'm not-'
„*No, já, ach, já jsem nic…*"

B13
Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*
Well, I'll answer it.
Dobrá, odpovím na ni.

B14
Kazuo Ishiguro *Malíř pomíjivého světa (An Artist of the Floating World)*
Well, I made sure that evening there 'd be no obstacles to her happiness on account of my
career.
Přece právě ten večer jsem se postaral, aby jí má minulost nestála v cestě ke štěstí.

B15
Jerome K. Jerome *Tři muži ve člunu (Three men in a boat)*
"**Well, I** do n't see how YOU can know much about it, one way or the other," George retorted
on Harris.
„*A já zas nechápu, kde ty bereš ty vědomosti o práci," oplatil George Harrisovi," protože ať
mě hrom bací, jestli jsi polovičku času neprospal!*

B16
Jerome K. Jerome *Tři muži ve člunu (Three men in a boat)*
"**Well, I** do n't know, gents," replied the noble fellow," but I suppose SOME train's got to go
to Kingston;
„*No, já teda nevím, páni," odvětil ten šlechetný muž, „ale předpokládám, že něj akej vlak do
Kingstonu jet musí, tak tam teda pojedu já.*

B17
Jayne Ann Krentz *Zajatci snů (Falling Awake)*
"Those are n't mine." She hesitated, frowning a little. "**Well, I** suppose they are now, given
that they were addressed to me.
„*Ty nejsou moje." Zarazila se.*
„*Vlastně teď asi ano, protože na nich je moje adresa.*

B18
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
"**Well, I** assume you are n't used to being on this end of getting robbed.
„*No, myslím, že asi nejsi zvyklá, aby tě někdo chtěl okrást.*

B19
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
"**Well,** *I* thought perhaps you would n't," said Pooh.
„No já jen myslel, že bys je možná nenašel."řekl Pú.

B20
Alice Munro *Útěk (Runaway)*
"**Well,** *I* haven't got time for all that," Gretchen said.
„Na to už ale nemám čas," namítla Gretchen.

B21
George Orwell 1984 (*1984*)
Well, *I* was young in them days, and I was going to 'ave fetched ' im one, only — "
No, byl jsem tenkrát mladej a byl bych mu jednu vrazil, jenže…"

B22 Anne Rivers Siddons *Bezpečné výšiny (Hill Towns)*
"**Well,** *I*'m not afraid anymore," I said.
„No, já už se teď nebojím," vmetla jsem mu do tváře.

B23
Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*
"**Well,** *I* was afeard."
„Jen tak. Já se bál."

***Well, you* (B24-B34)**

B24
Douglas Adams *Restaurace na konci vesmíru (The Restaurant at the End of the Universe)*
"**Well,** *you*'re obviously being totally naive of course," said the girl,"When you've been in marketing as long as I have you'll know that before any new product can be developed it has to be properly researched.
„Vy jste totiž strašně naivní, pane," zahovořila k Fordovi dívka se silným hlasem. „Kdybyste pracoval v průzkumu trhu tak dlouho jako já, věděl byste, že než se začne s vývojem nového výrobku, je nutno důkladně zmapovat trh.

B25
Douglas Adams *Stopařův průvodce po Galaxii (The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy)*
„**Well,** *you* know, not happy as such, but…"
„No víš, ne tak docela, ale…"

B26
Kingsley Amis *Sťatsný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
Well, *you*'ll be wanting more definite information than that, won't you."
Potřeboval byste ale nějaké přesnější vyjádření."

B27
Jeanette Angell *Dvojí život (Callgirl)*
"**Well,** *you*'re a hooker now, aren't you?"
„No, teď jsi přece děvka, ne?"

B28
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Well,** *you* know how I feel about those things, Lije.
„ Jistě, vy víte, co o nich soudím. Lije.

B29
Sandra Brown *Chuť lásky (The Crush)*
"**Well,** *you*'re wrong.
No, tak to jste na omylu.

B30
Truman Capote *Snídaně u Tiffanyho (Breakfast at Tiffany's)*
Well, *you* can't really run off and leave everybody."
Vždyť nemůžeš takhle utéct a všechny nás opustit."

B31
Lewis Caroll *Alenka za zrcadlem (Through the Looking Glass)*
She had had quite a long argument with her sister only the day before - all because Alice had begun with "Let's pretend we're kings and queens; "and her sister, who liked being very exact , had argued that they couldn't, because there were only two of them, and Alice had been reduced at last to say, "**Well,** *you* can be one of them then, and I'll be all the rest."
Zrovna den předtím se dostaly se sestrou do hádky, a to jen proto , že Alenka zas spustila: „ Budeme jako králové a královny," a sestra, která si potrpěla na přesnost, jí dokazovala, to že být nemohou, protože jsou jen dvě, až nakonec Alenka slevila:„Dobře, ty budeš dělat jednu a já ty ostatní."

B32
Arthur C. Clarke *Setkání s Ramou (Rendezvous with Rama)*
"**Well,** *you* were n't lying.
„Dobře, ty bys nelhal.

B33
Robin Cook *Toxin* (*Toxin*)
"**Well,** *you* got more to do.
Ale nebudem ztrácet čas - máš dost co dělat.

B34
Cathy Day *Circus v zimě (The Circus in Winter)*
Well, *you* two think on it and come back tomorrow.
No nic, tak si to nechte oba projít hlavou a zejtra přijďte.

Well, if **(B35-B56)**

B35
Douglas Adams *Stopařův průvodce po Galaxii (The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy)*
"**Well,** *if* everyone has that perhaps it means something!
„Jestli to má každý, tak to třeba přece jen něco znamená!

B36
Kingsley Amis *Sťastný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
Well, *if* I find you playing this sort of trick again, or any sort of bloody clever trick, I'll break your horrible neck for you and get you dismissed from your job as well.
Tedy: jestli mi to ještě jednou provedete, nebo jestli mi vůbec něco takového ještě jednou provedete, zpřerážím vám pazoury a dám vás vyhodit ze školy, rozuměl jste?"

B37
Kingsley Amis *Sťastný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
"**Well,** *if* you drink as much as that you must expect to feel a bit off colour the next day, mustn't you?"
"Co chcete? Nemůžete se divit, že vám je ráno špatně, když takhle pijete."

B38
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Well,** *if* it will not offend you, I will try to explain myself.
„Dobrá. Když se neurazíte, pokusím se to sám vysvětlit.

B39
Sandra Brown *Chuť lásky (The Crush)*
"**Well,** *if* you ask me, all her volunteering won't make up for her past shenanigans,"she said with a righteous sniff.
„Jestli chcete co vědět, tak podle mě žádnou dobrovolnou prací nenapraví všecko, co v minulosti vyvedla," pravila s opovržením počestné ženy.

B40
Arthur Conan Doyle *Posledné poklona (The Last Bow)*
"**Well,** *if* you will be so good, Watson."
„Pokud mi laskavě vyhovíte, Watsone."

B41
Arthur Conan Doyle *Posledné poklona (The Last Bow)*
"**Well,** *if* you wish to see Godfrey, you shall.
„Nu, když na tom trváte, promluvíte si s Godfreyem.

B42
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Velký Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*
Well, *if* that's the idea you can count me out…
Jestli to má být takhle, tak to se mnou nepočítej…

B43
Francis Scott Fitzgerald *Velký Gatsby (The Great Gatsby)*
"**Well,** *if* you're a poor driver you oughtn't to try driving at night.
"No, když jste mizerný řidič, neměl byste zkoušet řídit v noci."

B44
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *if* he's able to follow basic instructions, and he's willing to travel east in January, Curly might try to include him.
„Takže pokud je schopen řídit se základními pokyny a pokud bude ochoten vyrazit si v lednu na východ, Kudrnáč by se ho mohl pokusit zařadit do programu.

B45
Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*
Now he grumbled, "**Well,** *if* you wish, but…"
Přesto brumlavě ustoupil:„Dobře, jak si přeješ, ale…"

B46
John Irving *Rok vdovou* (*A Widow for a Year*)
"**Well,** if that's what you like," Marion was saying, "maybe I'll surprise you*!"*
„Takže ten se ti líbí?"ptala se. „Možná tě překvapím!"

B47
Jayne Ann Krentz *Zajatci snů (Falling Awake)*
"**Well,** *if* it makes you feel any better,"she continued, "Ellis Cutler is not a hot date.
„Jestli tě to uklidní," pokračovala, „s Ellisem Cutlerem nic nemám.

B48
David Herbert Lawrence *Panna a cikán (The Virgin and the Gypsy)*
"**Well,** *if* you don't mind when we get back, I don't!" said Leo heroically.
„No, jestli vám na tom nesejde, kdy se vrátíme, mně jistě ne," odpověděl Leo hrdinsky.

B49
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
"**Well,** *if* you consider the definition of that word, then, yes, I do.
„No, když zvážím, co to všechno to slovo znamená, pak ano, jsi můj přítel.

B50
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
Danny shrugged, conceding, "**Well,** *if* he's that stupid, as I said, it's a good thing then that I came upstairs before he noticed me.
Danny pokrčila rameny a připustila:„Dobrá, jestli je tak hloupý, tak bylo dobře, že jsem odešla dřív, než si mě stačil všimnout.

B51
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
Well , *if* you see Christopher Robin anywhere , you might tell him I want him."
No, uvidíš - li někde Kryšťůfka Robina, řekni mu, že bych s ním chtělo mluvit."

B52
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
"**Well,** *if* they're lost to-morrow, may I find them?"
„Můžu je jít hledat, až zase někdy zabloudí?"

B53
Anne Rivers Siddons *Bezpečné výšiny (Hill Towns)*
"**Well,** *if* it will help, Yolanda has said she'd come with us," Ada said .
„No, jestli by to pomohlo, tak Yolanda by s námi jela také.

B54
John Steinbeck *O myších a lidech (Of Mice and Men)*
"**Well,** *if* that's all you want, I might get a couple rabbits myself."
„Když vám nejde o nic víc, ňákýho toho králíka bych vám už snad sehnala."

B55
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 2 (The Lord of the Rings 2)*
Well, *if* that's over, I'll have a bit of sleep."
Nu, jestli je to odbyto, tak si trochu zdřímnu."

B56
George Herbert Wells *Neviditelný (The Invisible Man)*
 "**Well,** *if* that do n't lick everything!" said Mr. Wadgers, and left the alternative unsaid.
„No jestli tohle není koruna všeho!" prohodil pan Wadgers a nechal druhou možnost nevyslovenou.

***Well, then* (57-60)**

B57
Joy Fielding *Panenka (Puppet)*
"**Well,** *then*, maybe she won't kill anybody else."
„No, aspoň už tam nikoho neoddělá."

B58
John Grisham *Poslední vůle (The Testament)*
"**Well,** *then*," he said, "do we have a settlement?"
„Dobrá," řekl. „Takže jsme se dohodli?"

B59
Anne Rivers Siddons *Bezpečné výšiny (Hill Towns)*
Well, *then*, you really can't blame Joe too much, can you?"
No, potom ale Joea doopravdy tolik odsuzovat nemůžete, viďte?"

B60
Mark Twain *Dobrodružství Toma Sawyera (The Adventures of Tom Sawyer)*
"**Well,** *then*, Becky, we must stay here, where there's water to drink.
„Tak tedy, Becky, musíme zůstat tady.

***Well, well* (61-69)**

B61
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
Well, *well*," said Clousarr, joylessly.
„ No, no!" řekl Clousarr s pošklebkem, „jako aristokrat nebo fízl C třídy.

B62
Sandra Brown *Chuť lásky (The Crush)*
"**Well,** *well*. Look who's back."
„Hele, hele, podívejme, kdo se nám to vrátil."

B63
Arthur Conan Doyle *Posledné poklona (The Last Bow)*
"**Well,** *well*, that's fine."
„Pěkná hračička."

B64
Joy Fielding *Panenka (Puppet)*
"**Well,** *well*, well."
„Ano, ano, ano."

B65
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *well*."
To se podívejme."

B66
Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
"**Well,** *well*.
„Tak dobrá , je to pro mě pocta.

B67
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
Well, *well*, we will overlook thy letting the herd run off, and perhaps I will give thee one of the rupees of the reward when I have taken the skin to Khanhiwara."
Dobrá, dobrá, přehlédneme, žes nechal stádo utéci, a snad ti dám jednu rupii z odměny, až donesu kůži do Khanhiwary."

B68
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
"**Well,** *well*, I shall go and fetch Christopher Robin."
Tak já dojdu pro Kryštůvka Robina."

B69
J.R.R *Hobit (The Hobbit)*
"**Well,** *well*!" said a voice.
„Vida, vida!"řekl nějaký hlas.

***Well, let* (70-72)**

B70
Kingsley Amis *Sťatsný Jim (Lucky Jim)*
"**Well,** *let*'s forget it, shall we?"
„Můžeme na to zapomenout, ne?"

B71
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
Well, *let* me follow up another thought in my mind, Dr. Gerrigel.
Mám na mysli ještě něco jiného, dr. Gerrigeli.

B72 Robin Cook *Toxin (Toxin)*
"**Well,** *let*'s call her," Kim sputtered.
„Tak ji proboha hned zavolejte,"vyhrkl Kim.

Well, now (B73-78)

B73
Isaac Asimov *Ocelové jeskyně (The Caves of Steel)*
"**Well,** *now*,"said Baley, feeling his temper slipping," if you had let yourself be waited on, you"d have been out of here by now.
„Ale dobře," řekl Baley, který ztrácel trpělivost, „kdybyste se dala obsloužit, už byste byla venku.

B74
Sandra Brown *Chuť lásky (The Crush)*
"**Well,** *now*, see, I tried.
„No víš, pokoušel jsem se."

B75
Arthur Conan Doyle *Posledné poklona (The Last Bow)*
"**Well,** *now*, Miss Winter, if you would call here tomorrow evening at five.
„Podívejte se, slečno Winterová, mohla byste sem přijít zítra v pět hodin?

B76
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *now*, Dad," Gary said in the low, slow voice he reserved for situations in which he was very angry and very certain he was right. "You can't do that."
"Takže tati,"řekl Gary hlubokým a pomalým hlasem, který měl vyhrazený na situace, kdy byl velice nahněvaný a zcela přesvědčený, že má pravdu, "to prostě nemůžeš udělat."

B77
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
"**Well,** now, that's a bleedin' shame.
„No, to máš zatracenou smůlu.

B78
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Well,** *now* -- Mr. Potter.
„Takže, pane Pottere.

Well, my (79-87)

B79
Anonym *Anglické pohádky (English Fairy Tales)*
"**Well,** *my* dear," says he.
„Tedy drahá, nevidím, než že i zítřejšího rána všechna přadena spředena budou, a tedy tě o život připravit nebudu musit. I povečeříme dnes spolu."

B80
Dan Brown *Andělé a Démoni (Angels and Demons)*
"**Well,** *my* students enjoy…"
„No, mým studentům se to líbí…"

B81
Arthur C. Clarke *Setkání s Ramou (Rendezvous with Rama)*
"**Well,** *my* fellow delegates, Mercury has done more than this.
Nuže, mí kolegové delegáti, Merkur udělal víc než jenom tolik.

B82
Joy Fielding *Panenka (Puppet)*
Mallins, it's the police. "**Well,** *my* first thought was that John had been arrested, that they'd discovered his real identity, that they'd come to arrest me too.
„Paní Mallinsová, tady je policie. „No, mě nejdřív napadlo, že Johna zatkli, že odhalili jeho skutečnou identitu, a že mě jdou taky zatknout.
B83
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *my* car's right across the street."
„Přes ulici stojí moje auto."

B84
John Grisham *Klient (The Client)*
"**Well,** *my* theory is that the kid was in the, car before Clifford shot himself, and that he was there for some time because of all the prints, and that he and Clifford talked about something.
„Nu, podle mé teorie ten kluk byl ve voze ještě předtím, než se Clifford zastřelil, byl tam nějakou chvíli, protože tam zůstalo plno jeho otisků. A s Cliffordem o něčem mluvili.

B85
Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*
She appeared to consider." **Well,** *my* pulse has been normal;
Lucy chvíli uvažovala.

B86
Arthur Hailey *Konečná diagnóza (The Final Diagnosis)*
"**Well,** *my* young pathologist friend, Lucy Grainger expects an answer today.
„Tak, milý kamaráde! Lucy Graingerová očekává odpověď dnes!

B87
J.K. Rowling *Harry Potter a kámen mudrců (Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone)*
"**Well,** *my* gran brought me up and she's a witch,"said Neville,"but the family thought I was all- Muggle for ages.
„Totiž, mě vychovala babička, a ta je čarodějka," řekl Neville, „ale všichni v rodině si hrozně dlouho mysleli, že jsem úplný mudla.

***Well, do* (B88-99)**

B88
Douglas Adams *Stopařův průvodce po Galaxii (The Hitch Hiker's Guide to the Galaxy)*
"**Well,** *do* you think this is Southend?"
„A ty si myslíš, že je tohle Southend?"

B89
Jeanette Angell *Dvojí život (Callgirl)*
Everyone around here always says, "**Well,** *do* n't be so sure, remember the time we had a snowstorm in April?" which is what New Englanders like to say, even though in point of fact that one snowstorm was an aberration that was years ago and hasn't repeated since.
Všichni tady vždycky říkávají: „No jo, jen se netěšte, pamatujete přece, že jednou tu sněžilo i v dubnu?" Patří to k novoanglickým oblíbeným rčením, i když zmíněné sněžení bylo výjimka stará řadu let a od té doby se neopakovalo.

B90
Dan Brown *Šifra mistra Leonarda (The Da Vinci Code*)
"**Well,** *do*n't hold your breath.
„No dobrá.

B91
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *do*n't lose anymore," Enid said with the skimpy laugh with which she tried to hide large feelings.
„No, prostě už dál nehubni," uzavřela hovor Enid s krátkým zasmáním, jímž se snažila zakrýt rozporné pocity.

B92
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *do* you think it's going to happen with this new equipment?" Gary said.
„Tak co se podle tebe stane s tím novým zařízením?"nedal mu vydechnout Gary.

B93
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *do*n't I have a right?
„Copak na to nemám právo?

B94
William Golding *Pán much (The Lord of the Flies)*
"**Well,** *do*n't do it again.
„Tak tohle už nikdy nedělej.

B95
Kazuo Ishiguro *An Artist of the Floating World (Malíř pomíjivého světa)*
"**Well,** *do* tell me then, Matsuda.
„Dobrá.

B96
Jerome K. Jerome *Tři muži ve člunu (Three men in a boat)*
"**Well,** *do* you know, I THOUGHT I heard something!"
„No já ti teda musím říct, že se mi ZDÁLO, že něco slyším."

B97
Johanna Lindsey *Zamilovaný ničema (A Loving Scoundrel)*
Well, *do* hurry.
Tak honem!

B98
Danielle Steel *Strážný anděl (Johnny Angel)*
"**Well,** *do*n't rush anything," she said with a grin, and he laughed at her.
„Nepospíchej," naléhala na něj.

B99
J.R.R Tolkien *Pán prstenů 1 (The Lord of the Rings 1)*
"**Well,** *do* as you think best!" said Fredegar.
„No, dělejte, jak myslíte!" řekl Cvalimír.

Well, see **(100-102)**

B100
Jeanette Angell *Dvojí život (Callgirl)*
"**Well,** *see*, I have this theory.
„No víš, mám jednu teorii."

B101
Sandra Brown *Chuť lásky (The Crush)*
"**Well,** *see*, I'm not actually performing yet.
„No, víte, já jsem vlastně ještě nevystupovala.

B102
John Grisham Partner (*The Partner*)
"**Well,** *see*, that's what bothers me, Jack, because I think you know precisely who she is."
„Víte, právě to mě znepokojuje, Jacku, protože si myslím, že víte přesně, kdo to je."

Well, look **(103-106)**

B103
Jonathan Franzen *Rozhřešení (The Corrections)*
"**Well,** *look* at this," he said.
„No, to se na to podívejme," prohlásil.

B104
Rudyard Kipling *Kniha džunglí – Mowgli (The Jungle Book – Mowgli)*
"**Well,** *look* to it then that thou dost not kill the man-cub.
„Dobrá; jenom hleď, abys lidské mládě nezabil.

B105
Alan Alexander Milne *Medvídek Pú (Winnie-The-Pooh)*
So they went into Kanga's house, and when Roo had said," Hallo, Pooh," and "Hallo, Piglet"
once, and "Hallo, Tigger" twice, because he had never said it before and it sounded funny,
they told Kanga what they wanted, and Kanga said very kindly, "**Well,** *look* in my cupboard,
Tigger dear, and see what you'd like."
Šli tedy dovnitř ke Klokanici, a když řekl Klokánek jednou „Nazdar, Pú" a „Nazdar,
Prasátko" a dvakrát „Nazdar, Tygře", protože to ještě nikdy neříkal a znělo to tak divně,
řekli Klokanici, co chtějí, a Klokanice řekla vlídně: „Podívej se, milý Tygře, do spížky, co bys
rád."

B106
John Steinbeck *O myších a lidech (Of Mice and Men)*
Well, *look*.
Poslouchej tedy, Lennie.

Lingea printscreen 1: *now*

Lexicon 5 LINGEA

Slovníky ▾ | Doplňky ▾ | Učení | mini

Hesla | Fulltext

now
NOW
now

Významy | Kolokace

- here and now
- nowadays
- now and then
- right now

now [naʊ]

adv
1. **teď, nyní, právě**
   from now on od teď, od této chvíle
   up to now do teď, doposud
   by now touto dobou
   Now you are talking! To je (aspoň) řeč!, Tak se mi líbíš!
2. **hned, okamžitě**
   I must leave now. Musím okamžitě odejít.
   Give me the letter, now! Dej mi ten dopis, dělej!
3. **teď už**
4. **už, již** (hl. v ději v minulém čase)
   vyjadřuje daný okamžik v té době
   It was too late now. Bylo však již pozdě.
5. **now (then)** (hovor.) **tak(že), a teď** (uvození nového tématu)
6. (hovor.) **no, nuže, tak tedy** (při váhavém začátku věty)
7. **no tak** (mírné zdůraznění příkazu)
   Come on now. No tak pojď.

conj
   now that **teď (když), když už**
   Now that you are here … Když už jsi tady …

adj
1. **nynější, současný**
2. **moderní, módní**

phr
   now and then, (every) now and again občas, čas od času, tu a tam, z času na čas
   any day/moment/time now každou chvíli, co nevidět, každým dnem (ve velmi blízké době)
   And now for … A teď k … (jinému tématu - ve zprávách ap.)
   just now právě/zrovna (teď) (před chviličkou)
   just now zrovna, právě teď (v tomto okamžiku)
   I'm busy just now. Teď zrovna mám hodně práce., Teď nemám čas.
   It's now or never. Teď nebo nikdy.
   Now, now. Ale no tak. (chlácholivě)
   Now, now/then ale no tak (přátelské pokárání)
   Now then, don't be rude. Ale no tak, nebuď drzý.

historie | index

Lingea printscreen 2: *well*

Lingea printscreen 3: *well*

Get well soon! Brzy se uzdrav.
3. **dobrý, rozumný, vhodný, moudrý**
It would be well to check it. Bylo by dobré to zkontrolovat.
4. **zámožný, bohatý**

interj
1. **No toto! No tedy!** (překvapení, rozčílení ap.)
2. **Nuže?, No (tak)?** (v očekávání odpovědi ap., často podrážděně)

prep
as well as jakož i, stejně jako
It is in my interest as well as yours. Je to v mém zájmu stejně jako v tvém.

v
sb **would do well** *to do sth* **kdo by udělal dobře, kdyby udělal co, bylo by dobré, aby** *kdo udělal co*
They would do well if they remembered who supported them. Bylo by dobře, kdyby si připomněli, kdo je podporoval.

phr
Well, well! Podívejme!, To jsou věci!, Ale ale!, Hleďme! (pobaveně)
oh well no nevadí, no nic
Oh well, it could be worse. No nevadí, mohlo to být horší.
as well také, stejně tak
His face paled with fear, perhaps with anger as well. Obličej mu zbledl strachy a možná také zlostí.
as well *sb*/**it might/may a jak/bodejť by taky ne, jak se dá/dalo čekat**
She was terrified, as well he might be after what had happened. Byla zděšená, a jak by taky ne po tom, co se stalo.
it is just as well ještě že (tak), (to) je jenom dobře
It was just as well you didn't see it. Bylo jedině dobře, že jsi to neviděl.
it is as well *to do sth* **je záhodno/radno/dobré/třeba (u)dělat co**
sth **might/may as well be** *sth* **co stejně tak by mohlo/může být** *co* (je to stejně možné)
They might as well be robbers. Stejně tak to mohli být lupiči.
sb **might/may as well** *do sth* **kdo může klidně** *udělat co* (i když se mu moc nechce)
You might as well stay. To už můžeš klidně zůstat.
all well and good všechno (je) zdánlivě v pořádku
(all) well and good jedině dobře (jestli je to pravda ap.)
be well out of it mít to šťastně za sebou, být z toho venku
well and truly (BrE) **definitivně, zcela, úplně, naprosto, nadobro** (ukončený ap.)
well and truly solved zcela vyřešený
well enough docela, dost (mít rád ap.)
He liked her well enough. Měl ji dost rád.

well
Hesla Fulltext
well¹
well²
good
good, well
well
well
good
good

Tvary Kolokace
Předpony
well¹
well²
unwell
Odvozená slova
well¹
well²
wellness

historie   index