

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

ÚSTAV ANGLICKÉHO JAZYKA A DIDAKTIKY



BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Simona Zvěřinová

Anglické rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu a jejich české překladové protějšky

English first person plural imperative clauses and their Czech counterparts

Praha, 2014

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Markéta Malá, Ph.D.

Tímto bych chtěla poděkovat PhDr. Markétě Malé, Ph.D. za všechny čas, který věnovala dlouhým diskuzím na téma této bakalářské práce, její cenné rady, připomínky. Zároveň děkuji PhDr. Pavlíně Šaldové, Ph.D. za vstřícnost při spontánní konzultaci ohledně několika problému, se kterými jsem se při psaní práce setkala.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce ke studijním účelům.

V Praze dne 5. 6. 2014

ABSTRACT

The present thesis studies the English 1st person plural imperative clause. Specifically it focuses on outlining the various possible categories of illocutionary force expressed by it. Czech translation counterparts of the clause are used as an ancillary means of determining these categories. In the process of utilising these counterparts during the analysis, the study also identifies specific markers in the Czech language helpful in determining categories of illocutionary force of the English originals.

The thesis is comprised of two main parts. The first, theoretical part focuses on describing the grammatical form of the 1st person plural imperative clause, on forming the framework of discourse function and categories of illocutionary force as utilised by the study, on summarising the distribution of the 1st person plural imperative clause across the fields of discourse and on outlining the various syntactic and/or lexical means through which the Czech language expresses the directive discourse function. The second, empirical part analyses one hundred examples of English 1st person imperative clauses and their Czech counterparts from the parallel translation corpus *InterCorp*.

ABSTRAKT

Tato práce se zabývá anglickými rozkazovacími větami s imperativem první osoby plurálu. Přesněji řečeno se zaměřuje na poskytnutí přehledu různých kategorií ilokuční síly, které tato forma vyjadřuje. České překladové protějšky jsou užity jako prostředek určování těchto kategorií. V průběhu analýzy studie při využívání těchto protějšků zjišťuje specifické indikátory v češtině, které pomáhají určit kategorie ilokuční síly anglických originálů.

Práce je složena ze dvou hlavních oddílů. První je teoretická část, která se zaměřuje na popsání gramatické formy rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu, na popsání studijního rámce diskursní funkce a kategorií ilokuční síly přizpůsobeného této práci, na shrnutí distribuce rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu napříč oblastmi diskursu a na poskytnutí přehledu různých syntaktických a/nebo lexikálních prostředků vyjadřujících direktivní funkci v češtině. Druhá, empirická část, analyzuje sto příkladů z paralelního překladového korpusu *InterCorp* za užití jejich českých protějšků.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of abbreviations.....	i
List of tables.....	ii
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Theoretical background.....	4
2.1 Clause types and illocutionary force in English.....	4
2.2 English first person plural imperative clause (let us, let's).....	4
2.2.1 Grammatical properties.....	5
2.2.2 Discourse function and illocutionary force.....	7
2.2.3 Distribution.....	11
2.3 Czech directives.....	12
3 Material and method.....	17
3.1 Material.....	17
3.2 Method.....	18
4 Analysis.....	19
4.1 Notes concerning the analysis.....	19
4.1.1 Categories in the analysis.....	19
4.1.2 Classification of the Czech counterparts.....	19
4.2 Illocutionary force of 1st person plural directive clauses.....	20
4.2.1 Suggestion.....	20
4.2.2 Invitation.....	25
4.2.3 Expository directive.....	26
4.2.4 Order.....	28
4.2.5 Request.....	32
4.2.6 Recommendation.....	33
4.2.7 Other.....	34
4.2.8 Additional commentary.....	36
5 Conclusion.....	38
References.....	42
Resumé.....	43
Appendix.....	45

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

* = incorrect form

AmE = American English

StE = Standard English

IF = illocutionary force

AT = appendix table

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of imperatives	11
Table 2: The Czech translation counterparts of suggestions	21
Table 3: The Czech translation counterparts of invitations	25
Table 4: The Czech translation counterparts of expository directives	27
Table 5: The Czech translation counterparts of orders	28
Table 6: The Czech translation counterparts of requests	32
Table 7: The Czech translation counterparts of recommendations	34
Table 8: Other translation counterparts.....	35
Table 9: Identified categories of illocutionary force	38
Table 10: The Czech translation counterparts of the 1st person plural imperative clauses	40
Appendix table 1: The one hundred analysed examples from the corpora	45

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of the present thesis is to outline a variety of possible categories of illocutionary force as expressed by the 1st person plural imperative clause in English. The study also identifies various Czech translation counterparts of this clause. It does, however, use Czech only as an ancillary language helpful in the process of determining the categories of illocutionary force.

The theoretical background of the thesis describes the grammatical form of the 1st person imperative clause and defines the concept of discourse function and illocutionary force in the context of this specific study. It also introduces a framework of categories of illocutionary force as defined by sources which have previously dealt with the discourse function of imperative forms. Furthermore, it shows the distribution of the 1st person plural imperative form across the spectrum of fields of discourse. Finally, it also outlines the various syntactic and/or lexical means through which the Czech language expresses the directive discourse function. The theoretical chapter is based on grammar books written by Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1985), Biber et al. (2007), Dušková et al. (2006) and Grepl et al. (1995).

The empirical part of the thesis examines one hundred occurrences of the 1st person plural imperative clause excerpted from the *InterCorp*. Where possible, it uses the Czech translation counterparts to determine the categories of illocutionary force of the English examples which on their own are not specifically marked. The study assumes the approach where it follows the Czech translator's interpretation of the category in cases where the original does not positively disprove this interpretation by way of context or other markers.

The conclusion presents the findings of the analytical part of the thesis in a compact manner, shortly contrasts them with the information gathered in the theoretical part of the study and finally summarises specific markers of illocutionary force which were identified during the analysis.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Clause types and illocutionary force in English

The basic clause types in English are declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative. They are categorised as such based on their grammatical properties and each of them is linked with a specific discourse function which is most characteristic of the type. The basic categories of discourse function associated with each clause type are respectively - statement, question, directive and exclamation, respectively. However, the correlation between clause types as classified by the grammatical form and categories of meaning is not always straightforward (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 854). This fact is relevant to the purpose of this study in that the illocutionary force of the imperative clause is not simply a matter of linking the clause to the general discourse function of a directive but of finding a variety of specific types of illocutionary force with which it can be associated.

A few words as to the nature and the role of the term illocutionary force seem to be necessary, particularly because the study draws on sources which significantly vary in their approach to the semantic and pragmatic meaning of clauses. The term as such is used by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985), whereas Biber et al. (2007) refer to the categories simply as ‘force’. For the purpose of this study, Quirk et al.’s distinction between **discourse function** and **illocutionary force** (1985: 804) seems to be most fitting; the detailed nature of the study requires that it be concerned with more than general discourse functions as stated above, and the term illocutionary force as used for the overarching category of the more refined pragmatic distinctions should serve as a clear and straightforward framework (more on the concept of illocutionary force and discourse function in chapter 2.2.2).

2.2 English first person plural imperative clause (let us, let’s)

“The imperative clause is a grammatically distinct class of clause whose members are characteristically used to issue directions.”(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 853) The imperative clause in English has two distinct forms – **the basic form** and **the periphrastic form**¹. The 1st person plural imperative clause is periphrastic and therefore the following

¹ Sometimes called **let-imperatives** (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 924).

chapters will refrain from commenting on the basic form unless it happens to be required by the context of the study.

2.2.1 Grammatical properties

The common 1st person plural imperative clause consists of the auxiliary *let*, the objective form or the pronoun *we* and a lexical verb in the form of the bare infinitive.

(1) *Let's hope for the best.*

(2) *Let us consider the following case.* (Dušková et al., 2006: 245)

Example (1) shows that the pronoun in the imperative clause can be used in the contracted form 's. This form presents a possibility to distinguish between the **auxiliary** *let* as a marker of the imperative clause and the **lexical** *let*: *Let us go* in the sense of 'Permit us to go' (Quirk et al., 1985: 830) i.e. 2nd person basic imperative. The latter cannot be used with the contracted form of *us* while for the 1st person imperative clause the contracted form is the usual choice of most speakers (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 925). Quirk et al. (1985: 830) regard the abbreviated form as a colloquialism.

There is possible variation of the basic form in English for either emphasis or softening of the illocutionary force (see 2.1) of the imperative.

(3) *Do let's go.* (Dušková et al., 2006: 246)

Imperative clauses with positive polarity can be emphasised by means of the emphatic *do*² which precedes the whole clause (ex. 3).

(4) *Let's have tea in the garden, shall we?*

(5) *Let's not talk about it, shall we?* (Dušková et al., 2006: 246)

² Quirk et al., unlike Huddleston and Pullum or Dušková et al., seem to distinguish between the supportive/additive uses of *do* in imperative and indicative clauses, and apply the term 'emphatic do' only in the case of the indicative. (1985: 833)

Illocutionary force can be softened in the imperative clause with both positive and negative polarity by way of adding the question tag *shall we*. *Shall we not* or *shan't we* are never used in this case - the polarity of the tag is independent of the polarity of the clause. The reason that this specific tag can be attached to the 1st person plural imperatives is that it is a type commonly used in interrogative directives with similar or the same illocutionary force (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 942) – an example corresponding to example (4) would be *Shall we have tea?*

The **negative imperative** of the 1st person plural appears in English in three distinct forms.

(6) *Let's not disturb him.* (Dušková et al., 2006: 245)

(7) *Don't let's wait.* (Dušková et al., 2006: 245)

(8) *Let's don't bother.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 935)

Example (6) illustrates negation of the infinitive while example (7) shows negation of the imperative clause as a whole. Both versions, (6) and (7), are possible but the form with auxiliary *do* is less formal (Dušková et al., 2006: 245).

The form using *Let's don't*, as in example (8), is used especially in AmE and cannot be regarded as acceptable in StE³. It is, however, syntactically of interest because it provides strong evidence that *let's* is sometimes seen as a single word (instead of a verb + object construction) which functions as an marker of the 1st person imperative; it cannot, as compared to the first two examples, be expanded into **Let us don't bother* and therefore 's cannot be replaced by *us* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 935).⁴

These properties, along with the fact that *let* is not omissible in ellipsis (a response to the imperative cannot be **Yes, do*, only *Yes, let's*), indicate that *let* in these constructions is semantically bleached, partly fixed in its syntax and should rather be seen as a marker of illocutionary force (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 935).

Imperatives are likely to co-occur with **dynamic** rather than stative verbs in the position of the **predicate**. *Let's apply for Australian citizenship* is a more natural expression

³ Standard English is in Huddleston and Pullum's grammar (2002: 2) defined as a system of language that is widely accepted in countries where English is the language of government, education, print, entertainment and other public discourse.

⁴ There is another form of the 1st person imperative which seems to support this analysis, based on the very same reasoning that the 's contraction does not substitute *us*: *Let's you and me make it ourselves* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 935).

than *Let's be Australian*. The reason for this is that imperatives are usually directives (see 2.2.2) and compliance with the directive generally requires some form of dynamic action (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 932). If a stative verb is used in the predication, it usually allows a dynamic interpretation (Quirk et al., 1985: 827).

The imperative clause uses chiefly verbs without tense distinction and it does not allow modal auxiliaries (Quirk et al., 1985: 827).

2.2.2 Discourse function and illocutionary force

The four discourse functions as seen by Quirk et al. (1985, 804) are concerned with a clause's semantic function in the general discourse. Illocutionary force is concerned with the intention of the speaker in making the utterance (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 858); an utterance may then be used with the function of a directive as a command, prohibition, instruction etc., depending on the pragmatic meaning intended by the speaker.

Imperatives are, as directives, used with varied illocutionary force."A **directive** expresses a proposition representing a potential situation: realising and actualising that situation constitutes **compliance** with the directive."(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 936) The directive categories are differentiated based on a large group of factors, the most important being the consideration of compliance – it can be viewed on a scale from strong requirement to mere acceptance of it (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 929). The most common categories, for the purpose of this study based on Huddleston and Pullum's classification (2002: 929), are as follows:

- ORDER
 - includes **commands** (ex. 9), where the speaker is generally backed by an institutionalised authority, and **demands**
 - compliance with this kind of directive is required and forcefully demanded and the failure to comply is often met with negative repercussions
 - an order not to do something is a **prohibition** (ex. 10)

(9) *Release all detainees!* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 929)

(10) *Keep off the grass.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 929)

- REQUEST, PLEA

- here the speaker gives the option of not complying – we are asking, not telling somebody to do something
- markers signalling ‘asking’ (as opposed to ‘telling’) are e.g. *please*, *kindly*, interrogative tags

(11) *Open the door, will you?* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

(12) *Give me one more chance, I beg you.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

- RECOMMENDATION, ADVICE, WARNING

- compliance is not presented as willed by the speaker but rather as being in the interest of addressee (the directive can also address the speaker)
- example (14) is a **warning** – compliance with the directive prevents the addressee from potentially getting injured

(13) *Wait until the price is right.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

(14) *Mind the step.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

- SUGGESTION

- in the case of suggestion the speaker presents compliance simply as a possible course of action that should be taken into consideration
- suggestion differs from advice in the degree of accountability – the speaker is not expected (or less so) to justify the benefits of compliance

(15) *Let's have a party.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 832)

(16) *Ask me about it again next month.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 832)

- INSTRUCTION, EXPOSITORY DIRECTIVE

- these are presented similarly to advice but the difference is that compliance is in the addressee's interest because it is necessary for the

achievement of a relevant goal, e.g. compliance with the instruction as a part of cooking recipe is in somebody's interest to successfully cook a meal

- expository directives (ex. 18) are used especially in written expository discourse and engage the active participation of the addressee; the first person plural imperatives also tend to suggest less inequality between speaker and addressee than the basic imperatives but often do not expect verbal response and agreement is taken for granted

(17) *Insert a cassette as illustrated with its labelled side facing you.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

(18) *Compare these figures with those shown in Table 1 above.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 930)

- INVITATION

- invitation is remarkably similar to advice – compliance is optional although beneficial primarily (but not only) to the addressee
- it is not concerned with the addressee's best interest, but rather with what he or she would like to do
- **offers** (ex. 20) are similar but differ in that they tend not to concern whether compliance is beneficial to the speaker or not

(19) *Feel free to call in at any time.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 931)

(20) *Have a cigarette.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 832)

- PERMISSION

- the speaker here exercises the authority to promote compliance by permitting an action desirable from the addressee's side
- the directive function in promoting compliance is rather weak here in the sense that compliance is already presupposed and the speaker only chooses not to prohibit it

(21) *Yes, go ahead.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 931)

(22) *Take as many as you like.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 931)

- ACCEPTANCE

- the weakest kind of directive
- compliance is not something the speaker might necessarily want but has no power to prevent – the directive then merely expresses acceptance with defiance (ex. 23), often as a kind of an act of **resignation**, or indifference (ex. 24)

(23) *OK, buy it if you insist - it's your money, after all.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 931)

(24) *Well, tell her if you want to - it's all the same to me.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 931)

The list above is not by any means exhaustive. Imperatives may appear with other illocutionary force and in other discourse functions.

The 1st person plural imperative clauses are usually used as directives. The speaker's attitude towards compliance may vary. It can range from strong desire for compliance (*Come on, let's get going: the bus leaves in five minutes*) to mere acceptance (*Okay, let's invite Kim as well, if that's what you want*) (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 936).

(25) *Let's go for a walk.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 936)

(26) *Let's consider now the effect of increasing the velocity.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 936)

(27) *Let's have a look.* (Quirk et al., 1985: 830)

(28) *Let's just eat up these carrots.* (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 936)

In example (25), and also in example (15), we see the most common instance of the directive that involves a required joint action by the speaker and the addressee(s); a proposal that invites the hearer's agreement and consequent co-operation with the speaker. These examples would be issued with the illocutionary force of a **suggestion**.

(29) *Wait a minute, did you have a good day at work?* (conv.) (Biber et al., 2007: 221)

(30) *“Hold on!” continued Jennings, quieting the dissenters.* (fict.) (Biber et al., 2007: 221)

In news and academic prose, 1st person plural imperative clauses may in news and academic prose serve a function of planning a text as in example (31) or as an acknowledgement or concession as in example (32).

(31) *Let's take the Irish Cricket Annual first.* (Biber et al., 2007: 222)

(32) *Let's face it, the whole sport has become more professional off the field.* (Biber et al., 2007: 222)

An example of a similar function as in example (31) can also be found in example (26) where the imperative serves as a means of organisation of a description of a process.

According to Biber et al.'s (2007: 221) findings, specification of the addressee(s) and the use of softening devices in imperative clauses are rare – they are present in less than 20% of all imperatives in conversation and in fiction.

2.3 Czech directives

The directive function in Czech, as well as in English, encompasses various categories of illocutionary force. All of them can be expressed in the form of **the imperative + conclusive cadence**. One of the proper imperative forms is used with specific illocutionary force.

(33) *Odpočijme si.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 600)

(34) *Poslechněme si zprávy.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 600)

The 1st person plural imperative form, as seen in example (33) and (34), functions as a **suggestion** for joint action of the speaker and the addressee.

The imperative form is multifunctional as it expresses multiple categories of illocutionary force; speakers therefore tend to distinguish them by means of various syntactic and/or lexical means. (Grepl et al., 1995: 598)

- **lexical elements functioning as particles**

The imperative form can often be supplemented by lexical elements which function as particles. Example (35) shows that speakers do not necessarily use only one such element; a combination of *tak* and *přece* is employed.

(35) *Tak si přece sedněte.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 599)

(36) *Raději si sedněte.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 599)

These elements usually help to express the speaker's intention more clearly to the addressee and to identify the illocutionary force; the word *raději* in combination with the imperative form, as seen in example (36), conveys the illocutionary force of **advice**.

(37) *Tak si zmrzni.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 601)

Imperatives of **non-action verbs** in combination with the particle *tak*, as seen in example (37) of the reflexive dative construction, often function as an act of resignation – the speaker uses the utterance with the illocutionary force of reserved or defiant **acceptance**.

Particles do not necessarily supplement verbs in the form of the imperative (see the infinitive in ex. 39) and sometimes appear in verbless sentences, thus carrying the illocutionary force on their own (ex. 38).

(38) *Co (takhle) kávu.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 607)

(39) *Co si tak dát kávu.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 607)

The particle *co/což* indicates **suggestion** and is often used as an alternative form of the 1st person plural imperative (*Dejme si kávu.*). These forms include both the speaker and the addressee, but the particle *co/což* helps to express the speaker's awareness of the fact that the suggestion might not be accepted by the addressee. This kind of suggestion is also

conveyed through other particles, usually supplemented by the conditional ⁶ as seen in example (40).

(40) *Snad (možná, třeba ...) abychom to zkusili večer.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 607)

Finally, there is the particle *at'*, sometimes substituted by the verb with deontic meaning *nech(a)t'*, which together with the verb in the indicative in the 3rd person expresses an **appeal** mediated through an addressee to another person.

(41) *At' vstoupí.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

(42) *At' nikdo neodchází.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

With the verb in the 1st or 2nd person, *at'* can have the declarative function of a **wish** (ex. 43). Another possible function with a verb in 2nd person is a **warning** (ex. 44).

(43) *At' máte kopu dětí!* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

(44) *At' tam nelobíš!* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

- **analytical forms using semantically weak or empty imperative forms of certain verbs**

The semantically weak (ex. 45) or empty (ex. 46) imperative forms are often followed by another verb in the infinitival form. This can be seen in example (45), which is an alternative to example (44), also expressing **warning**.

(45) *Chraň se tam zlobit.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 599)

(46) *Pojďme si tykat.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 599)

The delexicalised nature of the verbs in these analytical forms is supported by the fact that they cannot be used in the negative - **Nechraň se tam zlobit.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 599)

The analytical form using the verb *pojď' (-te, -me)* is used as a variant to the already mentioned 1st person plural imperative proper form in example (33).

⁶ Conditional as a marker on its own is mentioned later in this chapter.

(47) *Pojďme si odpočinout.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 600)

(48) *Pojď si chvílku odpočinout.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 600)

This form expresses the same illocutionary force of a **suggestion** of joint action of the speaker and the addressee and is in no way substandard to the proper form. It is merely considered colloquial.

- **particularised imperative forms**

Some of the semantically empty verb forms can be used in the directives as particles. It is possible to see all the semantically empty forms as belonging to this category (ex. 46, 47, 48). Some of these particularised forms function differently from *pojď* in that they are not followed by the infinitive, but a separate clause. In combination with other means included in the following clause, they sometimes function as markers of specific categories of illocutionary force.

(49) *Počkej, ty na to doplatíš.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

(50) *Dejme tomu, (řekněme, připusťme, doufejme), že to dobře dopadne.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 602)

In example (49) the particularised imperative form helps express **warning**, while the 1st person plural imperative forms such as in example (50) often indicate reserved **acceptance**.

- **the indicative**

Verbs in the indicative form, usually in the 1st person plural, in some cases deviate from their most common declarative function and are used as **instructions** or **expository directives**.

(51) *Maso čtvrt hodiny dusíme a pak přidáme dvě vejce.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 604)

- **the conditional and/or the modal verb *moci***

The conditional can sometimes function as a marker of illocutionary force on its own, sometimes it is further specified by an additional element (see example 40).

(52) *Bylo by lepší mu to říct.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 607)

(53) *Nechtěl (neměl) byste si prohlédnout naše sbírky?* (Grepl et al., 1995: 606)

The conditional in example (52) conveys the statement with the illocutionary force of **advice** or **recommendation** whereas in example (53) it functions as a marker of an **offer/invitation**.

(54) *Snad byste mohl informovat Pavla.* (Grepl et al., 1995: 605)

(55) *Můžete informovat Pavla?* (Grepl et al., 1995: 605)

(56) *Informoval byste (laskavě) Pavla?* (Grepl et al., 1995: 605)

The forms as seen in examples (54), (55) and (56) are used to express the presupposition of the speaker that the addressee might be able to comply with the directive, taking into account the condition of its successful realisation. In example (54) both the conditional and the modal verb *moci* (along with the epistemic element in the form of *snad*) are used to express a **plea** or a **request** – they both convey that the speaker is not absolutely certain of the addressee's will to comply with the directive. The verb *moci* can sometimes be used without the conditional, as seen in example (55), where the interrogative form expresses the uncertainty instead. It is also possible to use only the conditional without the modal verb in the interrogative form without a change in function; conditional forms are simply perceived as more polite.

3 MATERIAL AND METHOD

3.1 Material

The empirical part of the thesis analyses one hundred examples of the 1st person plural imperative clause from *InterCorp*⁷. For the purpose of the study, a subcorpus focusing solely on the core texts written in English was employed, using also the aligned Czech corpus to generate their translation counterparts. The excerpts were obtained using the search query **[I,L]et (\'s|us)**, thus finding relevant examples of negative and positive polarity, and the search function *shuffle*.

A few problems were encountered precisely because of the application of the *replicable shuffle* function. The specific search should have been replicable by using the same subcorpus and search query, thereby showing the same items each time the search was made. However, the function was not working properly during the excerpting, thereby making the process complicated. The malfunctioning tool has since been reported.

The initial plan of the thesis was to focus only on fifty excerpts of the 1st person imperative clause examples, the second half of the analysed material therefore had to be excerpted at a later time, at which point the *shuffle* function showed a different set of examples. Three examples from the second set then had to be removed because they were already included in the first set. Other examples which had to be excluded from the analysis were seven examples of **basic-form imperatives with lexical *let***:

- (a) Do you suppose he's going to **let us** get near him with acid in our hands?

Snad si nemyslíš, že nás nechá, abychom se k němu přiblížili s kyselinou v ruce?

One example had to be excluded from the analysis because the English original and the Czech translation were not in alignment:

- (b) “[...] but let’s have the truth, or I will prepare something particularly uncomfortable for you!”

„Ne že by vám to moc pomohlo, Thorine Pavézo, na to vím o tvých lidech až dost, ale s pravdou ven, nebo si pro vás vymyslím něco zvlášť nepříjemného!”

⁷ Parallel Czech-English corpus which is accessible through < <https://www.korpus.cz> >

To make up for the removed examples, another eleven examples of 1st person plural imperative clauses were picked. These were chosen from the concordances following immediately after the fifty examples of the second set during the same search, with the exception examples of the **basic-form imperatives with lexical *let***. The final set of examples comprises one hundred English-Czech translation pairs which are listed in the appendix table.⁸

3.2 Method

The study is focused on finding possible categories of illocutionary force of the 1st person plural imperative clauses. The identified categories are each discussed separately in six sections of the empirical part of the thesis, starting with section 4.2.1. Section 4.2.7 focuses on examples which deviate from the functional categorisation of illocutionary force. Each of these sections is provided with a table summarising all translation patterns of each category. Section 4.2.8 then offers additional commentary concerning some more complicated examples from the analysis. All Czech examples are italicised and the parts of them which form the specific counterpart to the English clause as described in each of the tables are bolded so that they can be more easily followed during the analysis.

⁸ The numbers following the examples given in text of chapter 4 refer to the numbers of the translation pairs as listed in the appendix table. Examples which appear as a whole only in the appendix table, but are referenced in the text, are followed by the abbreviation AT and their respective number.

4 ANALYSIS

4.1 Notes concerning the analysis

4.1.1 Categories in the analysis

For the purpose of the study, invitations and offers are analysed as one category, the reason being that the boundary between them proved to be fuzzy and the distinction almost impossible almost impossible to identify in isolated examples. The categories of requests and pleas have been merged, as have the categories of recommendation and advice, for the very same reason. Another important fact is that the category of expository directives does not necessarily correspond fully with the category as defined in section 2.2.2 (see more in section 4.2.3).

4.1.2 Classification of the Czech counterparts

Tables included in the following sections present the varied translation counterparts as observed in all 100 excerpts. The classification of the means of translation is based on distinct forms of the main lexical verbs (mood, person and number) and relevant additional elements.

Additional features are included in the table when they appear repeatedly or when they have an apparently significant role in the comparison of the translation and the original sentence. Certain **particles**, for example, are present repeatedly in the translation counterparts of the excerpts; it should be said, however, that they are rather potential markers as compared to e.g. modal verbs and part of the focus is on discovering whether they are indeed specific markers which have significant impact on the study or whether they have some other function.

Particularised imperatives are to be understood in the tables (specifically in table 7) as commentary of the grammatical features of the main verb of the Czech counterpart. The only exception can be found in table 2 where the particularised imperative serves as an additional verbal element supplementing the main verb of the translation (see section 4.2.7).

The **analytical imperative** and the **particularised imperative** are similar in that the illocutionary force of the sentence is carried by a verbal element approaching the function of a particle while the semantic meaning of the verb in the clause is carried by another lexical

verb. The main difference between the two is that analytical imperatives are always followed by the infinitive („*Pojďme se podívat,*“ *navrhl.* – AT14) and the particularised imperative stands as the only verb in the clause (*Řekněme, že ten vrah by vám, tedy svému právnímu zástupci, prozradil, kam schoval tělo.* – AT33). It also seems that the particularised imperatives are often semantically weaker than the analytical imperatives and this distinction appears to have some significance in the context of the study of the 1st person plural imperative clauses.

It is also important to mention that some of the **plural forms** of the verbs in the imperative can be viewed in the Czech language as formal or polite forms of the singular. Nevertheless, the study uses formal classification of the form as plural only.

4.2 Illocutionary force of 1st person plural directive clauses

While the 1st person imperative clause seems to be according to for example Quirk et al. (1985: 832) in default, without context and intonation, a suggestion, there are various categories of illocutionary force that can be found in the excerpted examples of this study, often more specific than suggested by the description in chapter 2. It is not always possible to clearly choose a single category for one example even with the help of the Czech counterparts. The study set out, however, to always come to a conclusive decision and sort each example to one category while commenting on accompanying difficulties of the process.

4.2.1 Suggestion

The first and the most frequent category of illocutionary force of the first person imperative clause appearing in the study is suggestion. The speaker's intention in making this speech act is to **suggest a possible joint action** to the addressee.

Most of the examples in the Czech translation are congruent, the 1st person plural imperative form of the verb without additional markers seeming to be almost always indicative of suggestion (ex. 1 and 2). The only two exceptions found in the excerpts of the study function as expository directives (e.g. example 24 in section 4.2.3).

(1) “Let's go,” he said.

„*Pojďme,*” *řekl.* (62)

(2) Don't let us take any unnecessary risks!

Jenom neriskujme zbytečně! (91)

Table 2: The Czech translation counterparts of suggestions

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage ⁹
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Conditional	1	pl	modal verb	2	3%
Imperative	1	pl	—	27	44%
Imperative	1	pl	particle	1	2%
Indicative	1	pl	—	18	29%
Indicative	1	pl	modal verb	1	2%
Indicative	1	pl	particle	5	8%
Indicative	1	pl	particularised imperative	1	2%
Non-finite	—	—	analytical imperative	5	8%
Non-finite	—	—	modal verb	2	3%
Total				62	100%

Some of the excerpts show similarities if they contain specific verbs, for example *let's go*, as in examples (3) and (4). These similarities can be made even more prominent using their Czech counterparts.

(3) It isn't far – let's go and investigate!

Není to daleko – pojd'me na průzkum! (73)

(4) Let us go and see what things are like now!

Pojd'me se podívat, jak to tam vypadá dnes! (68)

(5) 'Let's find a place to lie up in,' he said.

„Pojd'me si lehnout,” řekl. (80)

In example (3) both the original *go* and the translation in the form of *pojd'me* are full lexical verbs expressing actual movement. *Pojd'me* in examples (4) and (5), however, appears in the form of the analytical imperative where it is semantically weak and serves rather to enforce

⁹ Proportional percentages in all following tables may not add up exactly to the 100% total due to rounding.

the suggestion to carry out the action realised by the lexical verb in the non-finite form (*se podívat, si lehnout*). The same form in example (3) could be perceived similarly, and in a way it should be, because the translation could easily substitute the prepositional noun phrase for a verb just as in example (4), thereby making it possible for the verb to be labelled as the analytical imperative. Examples (3) and (4) both indicate the lexicalised, maybe even grammaticalised nature of *let's go (and)* – it functions in a similar fashion as its Czech counterpart. Further proof of its semantic weakness is that *go* in examples (3) and (4) can be removed without impacting on the meaning of the sentence (*Let's go and see. – Let's see.*) It can be then said that the sequence *let's go* in combination with another verb, possibly joined by a conjunction, is then a distinctive marker of a suggestion.

A translation pattern that appears in four examples of suggestions is the modal verb *moci* either in the conditional form (*mohli bychom*) or in the indicative (*můžeme*) followed by the infinitive of the lexical verb.

(6) Let's go somewhere for a couple of weeks.

Mohli bychom na pár týdnů někam vypadnout. (1)

(7) "Let's just get comfortable with each other," I suggested, [...]

„Snad *bychom si pro začátek mohli spolu udělat pohodlí,*” odpověděla jsem [...]

(65)

(8) So now let's **get on and make** some plans.

Takže teď se do toho můžeme pustit a vymyslet nějaký plán. (64)

The verb in these examples is a deontic modal verb, presenting a possible course of action. It is precisely the verb that classifies the Czech counterparts as suggestions, allowing the speaker to present to the addressee a possibility of a certain joint action; following this interpretation of the translator, these examples are overall classified as suggestions. The conditional form in examples (6) and (7) seems to serve only as a means of politeness, the same as the particle *snad* in example (7) only serves to soften the illocutionary force. Example (8) is one of the borderline examples in that it could easily be classified as an expository directive. It may also be viewed as a means used to organise discourse (see chapter 4.2.8).

A problematic translation using a modal verb appears among the excerpts which are classified as suggestions.

(9) Then it was: Let's get him home.

*Potom jsem se s ním **měl** odebrat domů.* (100)

One of the options would be to follow the translation and use the modal verb *mít* to classify this example as a recommendation (see chapter 4.1.6) with the clause commenting on the degree of necessity or appropriateness. The translation, however, deviates from the original rather significantly - the original clause is in the form of direct speech as a kind of unspoken discourse while the Czech version chooses to report the directive indirectly, therefore changing the point of reference – the speaker of the English original is a third person in the story while in the Czech translation it is the 1st person narrator. This is why the translation has been taken out of consideration and the example is categorised as the most common suggestion.

There are a few recurring particles in the examples of this category. The first one is the particle *at'*.

(10) Let us go to the mountains. Just let us get there...

*At' už **jsme** v horách, **at'** už tam **dojdeme**.* (8)

(11) Come out, you two, let us get away.

*Pojďte ven, **at' jsme** co nejdřív pryč.* (46)

This particle helps to identify the Czech translation counterparts as wishes. It also, however, indicates a shift in function from the original sentences. The Czech clauses are very much focused on a state of affairs that the speaker wishes to be true; the verbs in both translations are stative (*jsme*) or in the perfective aspect (*dojdeme*). The English clause, on the other hand, seems rather to be focused on suggesting a way of reaching this desirable state (*get* and *go*), leading the study to categorise these two English sentences as suggestions.

Another particle which appears in the excerpts is *tak*.

(12) “Let's shake them.”

*„**Tak je setřese**me.”(4)*

(13) “Then let's be lovers.”

*„**Tak bud'**me milenci.”(61)*

The particle in both examples does not seem to help significantly in identifying a specific category of illocutionary force. It seems to have rather a prompting function, strengthening the illocutionary force. According to Grepl et al. (1995: 363), particle *tak*, when not in combination with other specific means of expression, only function as an intensifying particle. It is to be expected that at least some of the other examples included in the analysis which include this particle might not be dependent on it to determine the category of illocutionary force.

A large group of translation counterparts brings attention to a specific nuance in the category of suggestions as seen in the excerpted examples.

(14) “Don't let's fight,” she says and gives me her cool white hand.

„*Nebudeme se hádat,*” navrhne a podá mi studenou bílou ruku.(2)

(15) “Let's play,” he said.

„*Hrajem dál,*” vybídl mě. (43)

(16) “Let's hear the story.”

„*Poslechneme si tvou historku.*”(97)

Examples (14), (15), (16) and the already mentioned (12) all have in common the translations by the verbs in the 1st person plural indicative form. In these cases the suggestion formally corresponds to a statement. The speaker does not seem to be concerned with the response of the addressee and instead presents the utterance as a declaration of what is going to happen, as a foregone conclusion. In English, this distinction is not easily recognised, if at all. It is then convenient to use the Czech translation to at least point out that the speaker's intention at the time of utterance might be slightly different.

A rather problematic example where the translation uses the same pattern is example (17).

(17) “Good. Let's have a look.”

„*Dobrá, mrkneme se na to.*”(15)

The particle *dobrá* (in another form sometimes *dobře*) has a rather specific function when in combination with the verb in the 1st person plural indicative form. In this case, however, the translation shifts away from the original meaning of the utterance. *Dobrá* is a rather unfortunate choice of translation to the original *good*. *Good* is a commentary on the previous

context and does not have a real bearing on the meaning of the following sentence. This boundary is reinforced by the separation into two sentences, signalled by the full-stop. By connecting the particle to the following clause by a comma in a single sentence, the translation shifts from the original suggestion to invitation (see chapter 4.2.2). The original and the Czech translation could both be understood as singular in meaning (i.e. *let me have a look*), which supports the interpretation as an invitation, as suggested by the Czech particle.

4.2.2 Invitation

Only three examples in the excerpted material can be viewed as invitations rather than simple suggestions. The difference between the category of suggestion and invitation consists in the fact that in the case of the invitation the action that is proposed by the speaker is to the **benefit of the addressee and presumably also desired by the addressee.**

Table 3: The Czech translation counterparts of invitations

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Indicative	1	pl	particle	2	75%
Imperative	2	sg	particle	1	25%
Total				3	100%

Examples (18) and (19) show a translation by the 1st person plural indicative verb form that has already been mentioned in chapter 4.2.1 and classified as a slightly nuanced form of suggestion.

(18) “OK, let's leave that one and try the second exercise. All right?”

„*Dobře, na tohle cvičení se teď vykašleme a zkusíme to druhé.*”(12)

(19) “Okay. Let's get out of here.”

„*Dobře, tak jdeme.*”(6)

The Czech translation can be put in parallel with the problematic example in chapter 4.2.1, example (17), where the same particle is used in the translation counterpart. The particle in combination with the verb in the 1st person plural indicative form signifies its shift from

simple suggestion to invitation. This is because *dobře* indicates either reluctant agreement, thereby giving in to the addressee and committing to his or her preferred course of action (ex. 19), or a conscious decision to do something for the benefit of the addressee (ex. 18). Its function is mirrored in the English counterpart *okay* which expresses agreement, although not necessarily reluctant or mostly for the benefit of the addressee. The additional particle *tak* in example (19) again does not seem to have an effect on the classification of illocutionary force.

Example (20) includes the particle *tak*, but the same applies here as in example (19). While the form of the verb used in the translation, 2nd person singular imperative, would generally suggest an order, the reason why it functions as an invitation in the English original is the context; the compliance with the directive is desirable on the part of the addressee.

- (20) “You wanted to talk, let's talk.”
„*Chtěl jste si povídat, **tak** povídejte.*”(49)

In contexts where the addressee no longer wants to talk, which cannot be safely assumed in this example, the only beneficiary would be the speaker, in which case the directive would function as an order.

4.2.3 Expository directive

For the purpose of the study, the category of expository directives is understood in a very specific sense and the term is used rather tentatively. Because all samples include the 1st person plural imperative clause in English, there is never an instance in which the clause itself would represent a direct order on its own; this is why the excerpts which are included in the category of expository directives are those which do not contextually, in form or by way of additional markers (see ex. 13 in chapter 4.2.4) as observed in the ancillary Czech translation indicate absolute, if only perceived, authority on the side of the speaker. The 1st person plural imperative form in these cases represents more of an **instructive** approach, by way of at least superficial inclusion of the speaker in the directive, than a strictly authoritative order; in that sense the speech act itself could be seen as an instruction for the addressee to follow. The speaker then has in a broad sense an instructive role rather than the role of an authority giving orders or an equal participant as is the case of suggestions (see

chapter 4.2.1). Where the inclusion of the speaker in the required action is realistically impossible, the excerpts are sorted into the category of orders (see chapter 4.2.4).

Table 4: The Czech translation counterparts of expository directives

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Imperative	1	pl	—	2	22%
Imperative	2	pl	particle	3	33%
Imperative	2	sg	—	3	33%
Non-finite	—	—	analytical imperative	1	11%
Total				9	100%

Examples (21) and (22) illustrate the instances where the original 1st person plural imperative is translated by an imperative in the 2nd person.

(21) “Then let's get some.” Coleman was deliberately brisk.

„*Tak nějaké opatřte,*” Coleman byl vědomě bryskní. (93)

(22) “Well, let's try to remember,” Nate said with a smile.

„*Dobrá, ale snažte si vzpomenout,*” řekl Nate s úsměvem. (51)

The contrasting persons are quite helpful in determining the function of the original examples. While *let's* helps to keep the speaker included the directive, the 2nd person in the translations suggest the transfer of a large part of the responsibility for the compliance onto the addressee. This opposition implies the speaker's instructive role in the situation, the directive inducing the addressee to carry out an action (not always physical – ex. 22). In both of these examples, the particles used in the translation are inconsequential in determining the original functions. *Tak* remains an element of intensification while *dobrá* stands in opposition to the following directive (indicated by the contrasting conjunction *ale - but*), not as a marker of its function.

The few examples where the verb *think* acts as the operative word of the clause may all be seen as expository directives.

(23) “No, well, let's just think about it.”

„*Ne, zkus na to přijít sám.*” (41)

(24) Let's think for a moment about the implications of just that.

A teď se tak trochu zamysleme nad důsledky takového počínání. (78)

Example (23) is very clearly a situation where the speaker is trying to induce the addressee to think over an issue. Example (24) functions similarly; in addition it clearly presents a possibility to view some of the expository directives as a means to organise discourse (see chapter 4.2.8).

4.2.4 Order

The 1st person plural imperative clause does not lend itself easily to expressing orders. The inherent effect that *let's* seems to have on the rest of the utterance is that it softens the illocutionary force and implies the inclusion of the speaker (ex. 14, 15 and 16 in chapter 4.2.1). There are, however, certain contexts and situations where these clauses may be best classified as orders; the compliance seems to be authoritatively required or the directive implies definite negative consequences that would follow the failure to comply. The **primary beneficiary is often the speaker**; he or she also does not take into consideration the addressee's input. This is where the Czech translation counterparts seem to be most helpful.

Table 5: The Czech translation counterparts of orders

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Imperative	2	pl	—	3	20%
Imperative	2	pl	particle	1	7%
Imperative	2	sg	—	1	7%
Indicative	1	sg	—	1	7%
Indicative	3	sg	—	1	7%
Non-finite	—	—	modal verb	5	33%
Verbless clause	—	—	—	3	20%
Total				15	100%

A marker appearing among the excerpts which is undoubtedly indicative of an order is the verbless form of a clause.

(25) Let's get away at once!

Honem odsud! (44)

(26) Let's have no more argument.

A ted' už dost hádek! (13)

The verbless clause in Czech often expresses immediate orders (alternatively commands). For example - *Vztyk!*. (Grepl et al., 1995: 604)¹⁰ When used as counterparts of the 1st person plural imperative clauses, these verbless clauses highlight the speaker's adamant attitude; in the case of example (25) there is also a strong implication of negative consequences, should the addressee fail to comply. Both examples, but especially example (25), show that the inclusion of the speaker in the directive is not detrimental to its commanding function; the speaker is carrying out the action alongside the listener, but he or she has decided freely to do so while the listener is authoritatively ordered to comply.

Other distinctive examples may be seen as orders based on the operative word in the original imperative clause.

(27) "Let's have a light!" he said.

„*Dejte sem světlo!*” ozval se hobit. (58)

(28) "Let's have it, then."

„*Tak se do toho pust'te.*”(90)

Examples (27) and (28) may be seen as two of the examples where *let's* does not imply inclusion but is only present to soften the illocutionary force. This is because the verb *have* in these cases suggests no actual participation of the speaker in the act of compliance with the directive in spite of the inclusive *let's*. This is the very reason why the exclusive 2nd person imperative form was chosen in the translation.

Another marker of this category in the Czech counterparts is the modal verb *muset*.

¹⁰ These constructions are classified in this book as ellipsis rather than the verbless clause. The thesis, however, will continue to use its established classification.

(29) Let's keep up with him and get out of this cursed place as quick as we can – if we can!

Musíme se ho držet a dostat se z tohoto prokletého místa co nejrychleji - jestli to půjde! (31)

(30) “All right. Let's hide the tools in the bushes.”

„Dobře, ale teď **musíme** schovat nářadí do křoví.”(72)

This is a modal verb expressing that the speaker sees compliance with the directive as absolute necessity. In example (29) the modal verb is further reinforced by context. While it is not absolutely necessary to follow the translator's interpretation (ex. 30 is very much unmarked in the original), there is no marker in the originals that would go against the decision to do so.

The category of orders presents a few special and problematic examples. One of them is example (31).

(31) Let's get our guys in Documents to write a letter from Ricky to Lake.

Řekněte lidem z Dokumentů, ať napíšou Lakeovi dopis od Rickyho. (87)

The Czech counterpart clearly functions as an order. The particle *ať* is often used in Czech to indicate appeal to a third person through the addressee; the counterpart of the 1st person plural imperative clause then strongly requires compliance, because the third person (*guys in Documents*) otherwise would not be aware of their task. This is the reason why in this context the English original may easily be viewed as an order on its own, despite the fact that in certain other contexts it could just as well work as a suggestion.

Other two examples completely dependent on context when it comes to classification are example (32) and (33).

(32) “Let's go,” Leo said like a field marshal.

„**Jde se!**” zavelel Leo jako polní maršál. (98)

(33) “Let's see.”

„**Ukažte.**” (24)

Example (32) is easily classifiable in its English form because of the comparison of the speaker to a field marshal. Example (33) is rather complicated in that *let's see* appears in several other categories of illocutionary force. It can be used to issue a suggestion for the speaker and the addressee to look at something together (see AT5). It can also appear as an element in the discourse which does not necessarily belong in any specific category of illocutionary force or at the very least not a directive one (ex. 40 in chapter 4.1.7). When looking at the larger context of example (33), searchable in the corpus for confirmation, it is clear that the directive may function as an order; it is meant to make the addressee show an item to the speaker so that he can inspect it. The context is more apparent in the choice of the verb in the translation – *ukážte* (“show”). Example (34) seems to function in a similar way.

(34) Let's have a look at you.

Ukaž se. (79)

Again, the addressee is to do something (show himself or herself) in order to make it possible for the speaker to look at them. The original sentence may be paraphrased – *Let me have a look at you*. This form would either suggest a request or an order. With the help of the counterpart where the verb is in the 2nd person singular imperative form, it is then possible to say with some certainty, that this form may often work as an order. A comparison can be made with example (17) in chapter 4.2.1, where the form functions as a suggestion for joint action.

The only excerpt which shows a translation of the 1st person imperative clause with a verb in the 1st person singular indicative form is example (35).

(35) “It's a complete mystery to me, and let's just leave it that way.”

„*Je to pro mne naprostá záhada, ale už se k tomu nechci vracet.*” (25)

The indicative form and the 1st person singular form presents the speaker's attitude as strongly adamant and the use of the verb *nechci* (“I don't want”) only enforces the speaker's unwillingness to proceed in a particular direction. The original then could be viewed as an order to the addressee to stop speaking about the topic which was being

discussed in the previous context. With a slightly different approach, it may be viewed as a means used to organise discourse (see chapter 4.2.8).

4.2.5 Request

Requests are similar to orders in that the compliance is primarily **beneficial to the speaker**; compliance on the part of the addressee makes it possible for the speaker's wishes to be fulfilled. Compliance is, however, not required or authoritatively demanded, it is simply **asked for**.

Table 6: The Czech translation counterparts of requests

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Number	Person	Additional features		
indicative	3	sg	particle	1	33%
indicative	3	sg	interrogative	1	33%
conditional	1p	pl	modal verb + interrogative	1	33%
Total				3	100%

Example (36) is easily identified as a request in the English original mainly because of the meaning of the verb following the direct speech which the imperative clause is part of.

(36) “Oh, let’s have fun,” she begged him.

„*Ach, **at’ je nějaká legrace,**” prosila. (47)*

The speaker is explicitly pleading with the addressee. The Czech translation also uses the particle *at’* which in this case would express a wish; it is clear, however, that the speaker is not merely expressing her wish, she is asking for it to be made real by the addressee.

Examples (37) and (38) are not specifically marked for a category of illocutionary force and could easily be analysed as common suggestions. Their translation counterparts, however, imply the possibility of a different interpretation.

(37) “Let’s hear the question.”

„*Jak zní otázka?*”(83)

(38) “Let’s make a deal,” he said, looking out his window.

„*Nemohli bychom se spolu nějak dohodnout,*” zeptal se a díval se oknem ven.

(77)

In example (37), the interrogative form of the makes the Czech sentence function as a question. This is a rather significant shift from the original English sentence where the function remains directive. The original directive is seeking the addressee’s compliance so that the speaker can acquire information. The Czech translation would suggest that the original sentence may be paraphrased as *Tell me, I wish to know what you are asking.* To further prove that this classification may be possible, example (37) can be compared with example (16) from chapter 4.2.1. The latter was identified as a suggestion because the interpretation in the translation suggests an inclusive plural addressee. In example (16) the speaker is one of the addressees of the directive, while in example (37) he or she is requesting somebody else to perform an action to make something possible for the speaker. In this sense it works very similarly to *Let’s see* in example (33) in chapter 4.2.4.

Example (38) may be seen as a request again following the Czech translation, where the interrogative form implies asking instead of telling. There is, however, additionally also the modal verb *moci* and verb in the conditional. These are used in Czech to signify requests (see chapter 2.3). The negative polarity of the modal verb is not relevant to the categorisation, but it is a means of softening the illocutionary force, making the directive more polite; this could possibly imply that choosing the 1st person plural imperative form with *let’s* for expressing requests might be done with the intention of being polite (as compared to for example *Make a deal with me.*)

4.2.6 Recommendation

Recommendations are used to express and suggest the **best course of action according to the speaker**. It is very similar to invitations (see chapter 2.2.2); the difference is that recommendation has the addressee’s **best interest** in mind, not necessarily what the addressee himself or herself might want.

The singular example found in the excerpts is example (39).

(39) But let's have it up here.

Ale *měli bychom se najíst tady nahoře.* (3)

The verb *mít* in the conditional expresses the directive function in the form of recommendation (Grepš et al. 1995: 632). The original sentence does not present any evidence against this interpretation and therefore has been categorised as recommendation, adding another possible category of illocutionary force which can be expressed by the 1st person plural imperative clause.

Table 7: The Czech translation counterparts of recommendations

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Conditional	1	pl	modal verb	1	100%
Total				1	100%

4.2.7 Other

Examples included in this section cannot be satisfactorily categorised as directives, despite their imperative form, because they do not seem to involve compliance.

Example (40) is singular in the study and is perhaps most difficult to properly categorise.

- (40) “Okay, let's see. Yeah, all right. I can do it.”
 „Dobře, *počkej*. Jo, jde to. Zvládnou to.”(54)

Let's see, as a combination, appears to have various functions in discourse depending on whether it actually demands or asks for compliance. While the translation would suggest the same categorisation as example (33) in section 4.2.4, this study would like to propose a slightly different interpretation. *Let's see* may often be paraphrased as *let me see*, which would propose a singular reading of the directive as an order or possibly a request. Quirk et al. (1985: 832) view *let me see* as a directive with a self-deliberating function. Example (40) may then lead to seeing this combination, in certain contexts, as simply the speaker's informing the addressee that he or she will take a pause to deliberate, hence the translator's choice to use the Czech equivalent of the verb *wait*. *Let's see* can be found translated in the *InterCorp* as *počkej* a few more times. Taking the search in the *InterCorp* in the opposite direction, it is possible to find another counterpart of the verb *počkej*, indicating a similar function to *let's see*, which

is not in the form of a directive (*Just a minute*). The study would then suggest a possible interpretation which differs from the Czech translation and Quirk et al.'s classification. The form could be seen as lexicalised and as an organisational element of discourse (see section 4.2.8), signalling a planned pause in conversation. It could also, possibly, function as a statement.

Table 8: Other translation counterparts

Translation counterpart				Occurrences	Percentage
Mood	Person	Number	Additional features		
Imperative	1	pl	particularised imperative	3	43%
Imperative	2	sg	—	1	14%
Indicative	1	pl	—	2	29%
Non-finite	—	—	modal verb	1	14%
Total				7	100%

Apart from example (40), the excerpts also offer a very specific group of examples, which can hardly be considered in the framework of categories of illocutionary force at all.

(41) Let's face it: secrets are fun.

Co si budeme nalhávat: tajemství jsou prima. (9)

(42) I had had a succession of boyfriends - and, let's be honest here, girlfriends too - before the rat bastard, and they all claimed that I was the best lover they'd ever had.

Před soužitím s tím podrazáckým darebákem jsem absolvovala celou řadu známostí - a přiznejme si, že obojího pohlaví - a všichni tvrdili, že jsem nejlepší milenka, jakou kdy měli. (35)

(43) Let's say that the killer tells you, his lawyer, where he hid the body.

Řekněme, že ten vrah by vám, tedy svému právnímu zástupci, prozradil, kam schoval tělo. (33)

The study would like to suggest seeing the three directive clauses present in example (41), (42) and (43), and also the rest of the excerpts belonging in this group, as formulaic and rather

as means of metadiscourse¹¹. Specifically they function as stance expressions¹². These clauses seem to express modality rather than a specific discourse function. To further support this theory, the study employs the following examples from the *InterCorp*, using the Czech counterparts to search for English expressions with the same function: the Czech form **přiznejme** (often used to translate *let's face it* and *let's be honest*) can also be translated as *frankly* (*Frankly, it has been refused several times before*); and the counterparts of the Czech form **řekněme** (often used to translate *let's say*) include *perhaps* (*Unlike, perhaps, some of the more resistant Member States*), *maybe* (*maybe even a few thousand kilometres*), and *suppose* (*suppose you kill me*).

Using these expressions as evidence, it is possible to claim that *let's face it* and *let's be honest* are modal expressions of attitude, functioning similarly to style disjuncts. *Let's say*, on the other hand, is an expression of epistemic modality; its use is similar to the use of content disjuncts. All examples where only a particularised imperative is used to translate the original imperative clause belong to this category; the example which belongs in the category of suggestions (ex. 44) uses the particularised imperative as an additional element in the translation – the main verb of the English clause corresponds to a full lexical verb of a clause separate from the particularised imperative.

(44) Now, Ichiro, let's get back to important things.

Pojď, Ičiró, vrátíme se k důležitějším věcem. (34)

4.2.8 Additional commentary

It should be mentioned that another group of examples which appear in the excerpts seems to function in a slightly different manner than the directives in sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.6. All of the examples in this group have been sorted into specific categories of illocutionary force but merit further consideration. Examples (35) and (24), while still understandable as directives within specific categories of illocutionary force, possibly also function as discourse organisers¹³. Other examples from this group of excerpts are examples (44) and (45).

¹¹ Hyland, 2004.

¹² Stance expressions “express attitudes or assessments of certainty that frame some other propositions. [...] provide a frame for the interpretation of the following proposition, conveying two major kinds of meaning: epistemic and attitude/modality.” (Biber, 2006: 139)

¹³“Discourse organizers reflect relationships between prior and coming discourse.”(Biber, 2006: 139)

(45) Let's start with your parents.

Začneme rodiči! (29)

(46) Together in this book we've only scratched the surface, but let's try to see what we've uncovered so far.

*My jsme spolu v této knize jen 'naťukli' povrch, ale **pojd' me se podívat**, co se nám dosud podařilo odhalit. (53)*

In both examples, more evidently in example (45), the directive organises the discourse between the speaker and the addressee, serving as a transition to further communication, signalling what is to follow.

5 CONCLUSION

The main aim of the thesis was to outline a variety of possible categories of illocutionary force as expressed by the 1st person plural imperative clause, making the study fundamentally qualitative. For reference, the overall number of categories that the study was able to identify, to a certain degree, can be found in table 9.

Table 9: Identified categories of illocutionary force

Category of IF	Occurrences
Suggestion	62
Invitation	3
Expository directive	9
Order	15
Request	3
Recommendation	1
Other	7
Total	100

During the initial analysis it became obvious that the categories as defined in chapter 2.2.2 would not be completely suited to the material comprising of the one hundred corpus excerpts. One of the reasons was that the differences between some categories relied on features which were hard to determine in the analysed isolated examples. Another was that the examples seemed to be similar enough to fit in a specific category but showed a difference prominent enough to warrant change in the definition – one of these categories is the expository directive in section 4.2.3; the need to redefine the categories signals the nuanced nature of speakers' intent in using the 1st person plural imperative clause as a directive.

The analysis also confirmed that the most frequent category of illocutionary force expressed by the 1st person plural imperative clause form is suggestion (62% of all examples). In the absence of specific situational context or reliable marked translation counterparts the function best interpreted from the utterances is indeed suggestion. It also confirmed the expected difficulties that come with the resolution to sort each example to one single category. This resolution was nevertheless made because it was more suited to the main aim

of the thesis and more suitable in making the structure and results of the thesis clearly arranged and better organised.

In most of the categories the analysis suggested that the imperative form with *let's* often functions as a means of softening the illocutionary force; in categories of orders and expository directives in particular, because they seem to place the responsibility for compliance mostly or solely on the addressee. In the case of requests, *let's* serves as a marker of politeness.

One of the more interesting outcomes of the study was the emergence of grammaticalised examples of the 1st person imperative clause as analysed in section 4.2.7 (7% of all examples). The function then moves from the area of propositional discourse¹⁴ to metadiscourse. The speaker uses these grammaticalised sequences to inform following discourse, helping the listeners to interpret his or hers following discourse in a certain way, much like style and content disjuncts.

One of the more problematic decisions made in the analysis was one concerning the examples included in section 4.2.8. While it is possible to view them purely as discourse organisers, and therefore parts of metadiscourse, the analysis failed to convincingly prove that they have ceased to function as directives as well, in the very same way as the other examples included in the six categories of illocutionary force.

Because the analysis relied on Czech as ancillary language, the study was also partly quantitative in discovering a range of translation patterns (see table 9). The Czech counterparts of all the excerpts can be tentatively separated into three groups; those that correspond completely to the original constructions in terms of illocutionary force, those which help narrow down the function of the original constructions where it is unclear and those which seem to have shifted in function from the English originals. The shift in function was determined when context or any other feature of the original English example overtly disagreed with the translation.

The study managed to identify specific features of Czech translation of the 1st person plural imperative clauses which help to identify the category of illocutionary force. These makers are specifically the **analytical imperative** *pojď* (*-te, -me*), **particularised imperatives**, the combination of the **modal verb** *moci* and the **interrogative form**, other **modal verbs**, some **particles** and the **verbless clause**.

¹⁴ Hyland, 2004.

Table 10: The Czech translation counterparts of the 1st person plural imperative clauses

Translation counterpart				Occurrences
Mood	Person	Number	Additional	
Imperative	1	pl	—	29
Imperative	1	pl	particle	1
Imperative	1	pl	particularised imperative	3
Imperative	2	pl	particle	2
Imperative	2	pl	—	5
Imperative	2	sg	particle	1
Imperative	2	sg	—	5
Conditional	1	pl	modal verb	3
Conditional	1	pl	modal verb + interrogative	1
Indicative	1	pl	—	20
Indicative	1	pl	modal verb	1
Indicative	1	pl	particle	7
Indicative	1	pl	particularised imperative	1
Indicative	1	sg	—	1
Indicative	3	sg	—	1
Indicative	3	sg	interrogative	1
Indicative	3	sg	particle	1
Non-finite	—	—	modal verb	8
Non-finite	—	—	analytical imperative	6
Verbless clause	—	—	—	3
Total				100

The Czech analytical imperative signals the category of suggestion. Using this marker, the analysis was enabled to suggest that *let's go* in clauses such as *let's go see* (*pojd'me se podívat*) may function similarly to its counterpart as a distinct lexicalised marker of suggestion in English. The form of a verbless clause seems to, at least in the excerpted examples, be a marker of orders. The combination of the modal verb *moci* and the

interrogative form is strongly linked to requests. The modal verb *mít* in combination with the conditional form implies the interpretation of the original clause as a recommendation. The modal verb *muset* helps distinguish the originals as orders.

Not all particles which repeatedly appeared in the excerpted examples proved to be indicative of the category of illocutionary force. Nevertheless, while the particle *tak* remained an unmarked element of intensification, the particle *dobrá* (or *dobře*) in combination with the imperative or indicative plural form of the main verb proved to be helpful in distinguishing invitations from suggestions – it appears to signal that the compliance is primarily in the benefit of the addressee. The particle *at'* served as a marker in the Czech counterparts but was not helpful in the categorisation of the English examples.

Although there is not a one-to-one correspondence between a particular category of illocutionary force of the English imperative and the Czech translation counterpart, the method of using Czech translation correspondences as markers of discourse function proved to be useful to a large extent in supporting the identification of the category of illocutionary force of the English imperative constructions.

REFERENCES

- Biber, D. et al. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London: Longman.
- Biber, D. (2006) *University Language: A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers*, John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dušková, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*, Praha: Academia.
- Grepl, M. et al. (1995) *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*, Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G. K. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2004) *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*, University of Michigan Press.
- Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.

Source

InterCorp: Český národní korpus - InterCorp. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha. Accessible through <<https://www.korpus.cz>> [last accessed 31.5.2014]

RESUMÉ

Tato práce se zabývá anglickými rozkazovacími větami s imperativem první osoby plurálu. Přesněji řečeno se zaměřuje na poskytnutí přehledu různých kategorií ilokuční síly, které tato forma vyjadřuje. České překladové protějšky jsou užity jako prostředek určování těchto kategorií. V průběhu analýzy studie při využívání těchto protějšků zjišťuje specifické indikátory v češtině, které pomáhají určit kategorie ilokuční síly anglických originálů.

Práce je rozdělena do pěti kapitol. První z nich je úvod, který představuje hlavní body a cíle práce. Další částí je část teoretická, která nastiňuje problematiku kategorií ilokuční síly anglických a českých direktiv. Následuje kapitola, která představuje materiál a metodu studie. Práce pak pokračuje částí praktickou, která obsahuje strukturovanou analýzu příkladů z jazykového korpusu *InterCorp*. Práce je zakončena závěrem, který stručně shrnuje výsledky analýzy v podobě tabulek a popisuje potenciální závěry, které je možné z analýzy vyvodit.

Teoretická část nejprve vymezuje gramatickou formu anglické rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu. Dále definuje zvolenou terminologii a pohled na problematiku diskursních funkcí a kategorií ilokuční síly – objasňuje tedy lingvistický rámec, se kterým studie pracuje. Ten je založen na gramatikách od Huddlestona a Pulluma (2002) a Quirka a kol. (1985). Dále také zmiňuje závěry Bibera a kol. (2007) ohledně distribuce anglické rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu napříč diskursními oblastmi a představuje syntaktické a/nebo lexikální prostředky, kterými se direktivní funkce dle Grepla a kol. (1995) vyjadřuje v českém jazyce.

Následně bylo pro práci získáno sto příkladů anglických rozkazovacích vět s imperativem první osoby plurálu a jejich překladových protějšků. Část zabývající se metodou a materiálem popisuje proces extrakce těchto relevantních příkladů analýzy a problémy, na které se během ní objevily. Analýza pak s těmito příklady pracuje a pokouší se nastínit přehled kategorií ilokuční síly, které může anglická rozkazovací věta s imperativem první osoby plurálu vyjadřovat. Rozděluje nálezy do kapitol dle konkrétní kategorie. Tyto kapitoly pak uvádí konkrétní příklady a komentují jejich analýzu, často za pomoci jejich českých překladových protějšků. Hlavním cílem je určit nejpravděpodobnější kategorii ilokuční síly (s výjimkou jednoho příkladu jsou všechny funkčně direktivy).

Splnění tohoto záměru je, jak se dalo předpokládat, vcelku náročné. K uspokojivým závěrům studie dochází prozkoumáním různých faktorů; převážně se analýza musí spoléhat na kontext a český překlad. České překlady slouží jako pomocná vodítka tak, že prozrazují

interpretaci úmyslu, který má mluvčí každého výroku při jeho vyslovení. Tato interpretace je pak stavěna proti gramatickým i lexikálním rysům originálů a proti situačnímu kontextu. V případech, kdy originální anglické věty ničím neodporují interpretaci svých českých překladových protějšků, následuje analýza v kategorizaci právě je.

Poslední částí práce je závěr. V podobě tabulek ukazuje, že analýza našla v jednom stu příkladů šest různých kategorií ilokuční síly. Kategorie návrhů byla v rámci těchto příkladů zastoupena nejvíce, což se dalo předpokládat z předešlého zkoumání již existujících materiálů. Anglická rozkazovací věta s imperativem první osoby v plurálu bez relevantního kontextu a spolehlivého překladu tak opravdu nemůže být s čistým svědomím řazena do jiné kategorie. Jedním ze závěrů práce je například to, že v mnoha kategoriích působí *let's* forma jako prostředek zmírnění ilokuční síly. Nejzajímavější z výsledků práce bylo naopak objevení specifických gramatikalizovaných forem anglické rozkazovací věty s imperativem první osoby plurálu, které jsou analýzou označeny jako součásti metadiskursu s funkcí podobnou stylovým a obsahovým disjunktům.

Závěr také upozorňuje na nejistý náhled na některé příklady zahrnuté do konkrétních kategorií ilokuční síly; přiznává organizační funkci těchto příkladů v oblasti metadiskursu, ale zároveň neupouští od již zmíněné kategorizace. Jako poslední kapitola shrnuje užitečné indikátory kategorií ilokuční síly, které se v práci objevily během analýzy. Jsou jimi analytické imperativy *pojd'* (-te,-me), partikularizované imperativy, neslovesné věty, kombinace modálního slovesa *moci* a interogativní věty, další modální slovesa a některé částice. Sledováním chování analytického imperativu vyšlo najevo, že na *let's go* ve větách jako *let's go see (pojd'me se podívat)* by se dalo nahlížet, jako na zřetelný lexikalizovaný indikátor návrhové funkce v angličtině. Neslovesná věta se během analýzy ukázala jako vcelku spolehlivý indikátor rozkazovací funkce. Kombinace *moci* a interogativní věty je silně spojená s žádostmi, zatímco modální sloveso *mít* v kombinaci s kondicionálem poukazuje na funkci doporučující. Modální sloveso *muset* pak pomáhá identifikovat funkci rozkazovací. Jediná částice, která byla během analýzy nápomocná, byla částice *dobrá* (případně *dobře*), indikující posun funkce z oblasti návrhů do oblasti nabídek.

APPENDIX

The appendix includes one hundred excerpts analysed in the research part of the thesis, numbered one by one as they were generated by the corpus in the “shuffle” mode.

Appendix table 1: The one hundred analysed examples from the corpora

NO.	SOURCE	EN	CZ
1	Grisham, J. - The Street Lawyer	Let's go somewhere for a couple of weeks.	Mohli bychom na pár týdnů někam vypadnout.
2	Palahniuk, Ch. – Choke	“Don't let's fight,” she says and gives me her cool white hand.	„Nebudeme se hádat,“ navrhne a podá mi studenou bílou ruku.
3	Siddons. A. R. - Hill Towns	But let's have it up here.	Ale měli bychom se najíst tady nahoře.
4	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	“Let's shake them.”	„Tak je setřeseme.“
5	Roth, P. - Human Stain	It's a great new day, let's see what the Paper has to say.	Je krásný nový den, podíváme se, co nám píší v novinách.
6	Fielding, J. – Puppet	“Okay. Let's get out of here.”	„Dobře, tak jdeme.“
7	Sevenson, R. L. - Jekyll & Hyde	Let us make a bargain never to refer to this again.	Plácněme si, že o tom už víckrát nebudeme mluvit.
8	Siddons. A. R. - Hill Towns	Let us get to the mountains. Just let us get there...	Ať už jsme v horách, ať už tam dojedeme...
9	Angell, J. - Callgirl	Let's face it: secrets are fun.	Co si budeme nalhávat: tajemství jsou prima.
10	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Hobbit	Let us set on them now from both sides, before they are fully rested!	Pust'me se teď do nich z obou stran, než si pořádně odpočinou!
11	Brown, S. L. - Hello, Darkness	Let's talk about this, Valentino.	Promluvmě si o tom, Valentino.
12	Franzen, J. - The Corrections	“OK, let's leave that one and try the second exercise. All right?”	„Dobře, na tohle cvičení se teď vykašleme a zkusíme to druhé.“
13	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Hobbit	Let's have no more argument.	A teď už dost hádek!
14	Frost, M. - The List of Seven	“Let's have a look,” he said.	„Pojďme se podívat,“ navrhl.
15	Brown, D. - Angels & Demons	“Good. Let's have a look”	„Dobrá, mrkneme se na to.“
16	Brown, S. L. - Hello, Darkness	Curtis said, “Let's wait and see what turns up.”	„Počkejme a uvidíme, co se ukáže,“ řekl Curtis.

17	Grisham, J. - The Client	So let's get him out of it.	Dostaňme jej z toho.
18	Brown, S. L. - Hello, Darkness	"Let's give Miss Janey Kemp a few more hours to sober up and find her way home before we link her to Ms Gibson's caller," Curtis said	„Dopřejme slečně Janey Kempové ještě pár hodin, aby vystřízlivěla a našla cestu domů, než ji začneme spojovat s tím, co volal paní Gibsonové,“ řekl Curtis.
19	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	Let us go!	Pojďme!
20	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	"Let's bust him," Yarber said.	„Osolíme ho,“ navrhl Yarber.
21	Grisham, J. - The Client	Let's find him. He can stop it, can't he?	Musíme ho najít, přece to může zarazit, ne?
22	Grisham, J. - The Street Lawyer	"Let's throw them out!"	„Tak je vyhod'te!“
23	Siddons. A. R. - Hill Towns	Let's get going, Sam. I'll meet you in the Europa lobby in ten minutes.	Pojďme tam, Same. Sejdeme se za deset minut v hale hotelu Europa.
24	Asimov, I. - The Caves of Steel	"Let's see."	„Ukažte.“
25	Franzen, J. - The Corrections	It's a complete mystery to me, and let's just leave it that way.	Je to pro mne naprostá záhada, ale už se k tomu nechci vracet.
26	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	"Let's talk to him."	„Tak si s ním promluvíme.“
27	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Let us go on!	Pojed'me dál!
28	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	I almost feel that I dislike you both, but do not let us be hasty.	Málem se mi oba nelíbíte, ale neukvapujme se.
29	Hailey, A. - The Final Diagnosis	Let's start with your parents.	Začneme rodiči!
30	Grisham, J. - The Client	Let's take things one day at a time.	Musíme řešit jednu věc po druhé.
31	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	Let's keep up with him and get out of this cursed place as quick as we can - if we can!	Musíme se ho držet a dostat se z tohoto prokletého místa co nejrychleji - jestli to půjde!
32	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Let us take this wood that is set ready for the fire as a sign.	Přijměme to dřevo připravené k podpálení jako znamení.

33	Grisham, J. - The Client	Let's say that the killer tells you, his lawyer, where he hid the body.	Řekněme, že ten vrah by vám, tedy svému právnímu zástupci, prozradil, kam schoval tělo.
34	Ishiguro, K. - An Artist of the Floating World	Now, Ichiro, let's get back to important things.	Pojď, Ičiró, vrátíme se k důležitějším věcem.
35	Angell, J. - Callgirl	I had had a succession of boyfriends - and, let's be honest here, girlfriends too - before the rat bastard, and they all claimed that I was the best lover they'd ever had.	Před soužitím s tím podrazáckým darebákem jsem absolvovala celou řadu známostí - a přiznejme si, že obojího pohlaví - a všichni tvrdili, že jsem nejlepší milenka, jakou kdy měli.
36	Angell, J. - Callgirl	"[...] But when a person, and especially a woman, does something - well, let us say wrong, then an acceptable way to..." He broke off, shaking his head in frustration.	„[...]Ale když se člověk, a žena především, dopustí něčeho - dejme tomu špatného, pak přijatelným řešením je..."Odmlčel se a zoufale zavrtěl hlavou.
37	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	And let's have no more nonsense!	A žádný další pitomosti!
38	Ishiguro, K. - 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.
39	Brown, S. - The Crush	She nodding, saying gruffly, "Let's move."	Přikývla a chraplavě dodala: „Jdeme.“
40	Tulku, T. - Mastering successful work	If we feel like creating a drama, let us create a positive drama!	Cítíme - li se jako tvůrci dramatu, napišme pozitivní hru!
41	Franzen, J. - The Corrections	"No, well, let's just think about it."	„Ne, zkus na to přijít sám.“
42	Kipling, R. - The Jungle Book	[...] let's take him in and dry him.	[...] vezmeme jej domů a osušíme jej.
43	Angell, J. - Callgirl	"Let's play," he said.	„Hrajem dál!“vybídl mě.
44	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Let's get away at once!	Honem odtud!
45	Nabokov, V. - Lolita	Let's look closer at it.	Pojď se na ni podívat zblízka!
46	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Come out, you two, and let us get away.	Pojďte ven, ať jsme co nejdřív pryč.
47	Fitzgerald, F. S.	'Oh, let's have fun,' she begged	„ Ach, ať je nějaká

	- The Great Gatsby	him.	legrace,” prosila.
48	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Let us think of what we are to do now!	Mysleme na to, co máme dělat teď.
49	Grisham, J. - The Testament	You wanted to talk, let’s talk.	Chtěl jste si povídat, tak povídejte.
50	Asimov, I. - The Caves of Steel	Let us go on as before.	„Pokračujme jako doposud.
51	Grisham, J. - The Testament	“Well, let’s try to remember,” Nate said with a smile.	“Dobrá, ale snažte si vzpomenout,” řekl Nate s úsměvem.
52	Fielding, J. - Puppet	“All right, look,” Ben intervenes.”Let’s get back on track, shall we?”	„Tak dobrá,” vložil se mezi ně Ben, „vrátíme se k tomu, co musíme vyřešit, ano?”
53	Kilham, B. - Among the Bears	Together in this book we’ve only scratched the surface, but let’s try to see what we’ve uncovered so far.	My jsme spolu v této knize jen 'naťukli' povrch, ale pojďme se podívat, co se nám dosud podařilo odhalit.
54	Grisham, J. - The Street Lawyer	“Okay, let’s see. Yeah, all right. I can do it.”	„Dobře, počkej. Jo, jde to. Zvládnú to.”
55	Brown, D. - Angels & Demons	Let us wait.	Počkejme na něho.
56	Frost, M. - The List of Seven	“Let’s light the coal as Barry suggests, Doyle, and then”--- Sparks bit on a finger as he pondered --”which one of these ooja-ka-pivvies do you suppose we should pull?”	„Zapalme v kotli podle Barryho návrhu, Doyle, a pak - --” Sparks uvažoval a přitom se kousal do prstu, “kterým z těchto madel a táhel byste radil začít?”
57	Nabokov, V. - Lolita	“Let us turn into a secluded lane and I’ll tell you.”	„Zastav někde stranou od cesty a povím ti to.”
58	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Hobbit	“Let’s have a light!” he said.	„Dejte sem světlo!” ozval se hobit.
59	Grisham, J. - The Client	“Let’s take your car. I’ll drive.”	„Vezmeme si váš a já budu řídit.“
60	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Come, let us go!	Pojďme odsud!
61	Steel, D. - Second Chance	“Then let’s be lovers.”	„ Tak buďme milenci.”
62	Grisham, J. - The Client	“Let’s go,” he said.	„ Pojďme,”řekl.

63	Franzen, J. - The Corrections	However, let's face it, who it?	Jenže - o kom se dá něco takového říct?
64	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Hobbit	So now let's get on and make some plans.	Takže teď se do toho můžeme pustit a vymyslet si nějaký plán.
65	Angell, J. - Callgirl	"Let's just get comfortable with each other," I suggested, remembering to put the purr into my throat, "Then we'll see what feels good."	„Snad bychom si pro začátek mohli spolu udělat pohodlí,“ odpověděla jsem a nezapomněla dodat hlasu hrdelní zastřenost. „A pak se uvidí, do čeho budeme mít chuť.“
66	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	'Now let us cry:"a plague on the stiff necks of Elves!"' said Aragorn.	„Tak, a můžeme volat - zatracení tvrdohlaví elfové!“ řekl Aragorn.
67	Franzen, J. - The Corrections	But not today. Let's not get into it today.	Ale ne dnes. Dnes se do toho nepouštěj.
68	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 1	Let us go and see what things are like now!	Pojďme se podívat, jak to tam vypadá dnes!“
69	Carroll, L. - Alice's Adventures in Wonderland	'Let us get to the shore, and then I'll tell you my history, and you'll understand why it is I hate cats and dogs.'	„Pojďme na břeh, povím ti svůj příběh a pak pochopíš, proč nenávidím kočky a psy.“
70	Frost, M. - The List of Seven	"Let's get the hell out of here," said Sparks.	„Vypadněme odsud, ksakru,“ řekl Sparks.
71	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	"Let's cut the deal first."	„Nejdřív si musíme plácnout.“
72	Twain, M. - Adventures of Tom Sawyer	"All right. Let's hide the tools in the bushes."	„Dobře, ale teď musíme schovat nářadí do křoví.“
73	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	It isn't far – let's go and investigate!	Není to daleko - pojďme na průzkum!
74	Grisham, J. - The Street Lawyer	I stood, and very politely said, "Your Honor, let's split the difference."	Vstal jsem a velmi zdvořile jsem řekl: „Vaše ctihodnosti, pojďme to nějak vyřešit.“
75	Grisham, J. - The Testament	Let's have a long lunch and tell stories.	Udělejme si dlouhý oběd a vy nám budete vyprávět.
76	Grisham, J. - The Testament	Let's not talk about the money.	O penězích už nemluvme.
77	Grisham, J. - The Client	"Let's make a deal," he said, looking out his window.	„Nemohli bychom se spolu nějak dohodnout,“ zeptal se a díval se oknem ven.

78	Kilham, B. - Among the Bears	Let's think for a moment about the implications of just that.	A teď se tak trochu zamysleme nad důsledky takového počínání.
79	Milne, A. A. - Winnie the Pooh	Let's have a look at you.	Ukaž se.
80	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	'Let's find a place to lie up in,' he said.	„Pojďme si někam lehnout,“ řekl.
81	Kilham, B. - Among the Bears	So let's leave it at this.	Takže to shrneme.
82	Brown, S. L. - Hello, Darkness	Let's hear it.	Poslechněme si to.
83	Harris, T. - The Silence of the Lambs	“Let's hear the question.”	„Jak zní otázka?“
84	Milne, A. A. - Winnie the Pooh	Let's build him a house.	Postavíme mu domek.
85	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	Or let us bind them and take them to the king.	Nebo je svažme a odvedme ke králi.
86	Grisham, J. - The Street Lawyer	What will you do if you wake up one day and you're, let's say, sixty years old.	Představ si, že se jednoho dne probudíš a uvědomíš si, že je ti, řekněme, šedesát.
87	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	Let's get our guys in Documents to write a letter from Ricky to Lake.	Řekněte lidem z Dokumentů, ať napíšu Lakeovi dopis od Rickyho.
88	Grisham, J. - The Client	Let's hear the story.	Poslechneme si tvou historku.
89	Grisham, J. - The Client	Let's see what happens over the weekend.	Počkáme, co se bude dít o víkendu.
90	Frost, M. - The List of Seven	“Let's have it, then.”	„Tak se do toho pusťte.“
91	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Hobbit	Don't let us take any unnecessary risks!	Jenom neriskujme zbytečně!
92	Nabokov, V. - Lolita	Let us have a strand of silk descend the stairs.	Spusťme jedno hedvábné vlákno po schodech.
93	Hailey, A. - The Final Diagnosis	“Then let's get some.” Coleman was deliberately brisk.	„Tak nějaké opatřte,“ Coleman byl vědomě bryskní.
94	Grisham, J. - The Brethren	“Let's not preach, okay. We're talking about a small cut from money that 's already tainted, both here and there.	„Nebudeme smlouvat, ano? Mluvíme o penězích, které jsou nelegální - tady i tam.

95	Brown, D. - Angels & Demons	Let's watch.	Ještě počkáme.
96	Tolkien, J. R. R. - The Lord of the Rings 2	Let us leave these wild folk to their fancies.	Nechme ty divochy, ať si žijí ve svých výmyslech.
97	Grisham, J. - The Client	"Let's go back to the room and talk," he said.	„Půjdeme zpět do pokoje a promluvíme si o tom,” řekl.
98	Grisham, J. - The Client	"Let's go," Leo said like a field marshal.	„Jde se!” zavelel Leo jako polní maršál.
99	Harris, T. - The Silence of the Lambs	"[...] Come on, let's go to bed." Mr. Gumb liked to go to bed. He did it several times a night.	„[...] Tak pojď už, jdeme rychle do postele.“ Obecně vzato, chodil pan Gumb do postele velice rád. Dělal to několikrát během noci.
100	Asimov, I. - The Caves of Steel	Then it was: Let's get him home.	Potom jsem se měl s ním odebrat domů.