

Negation in Early Child Communication (Remarks on Linguistic Analysis)¹

Lucie Saicová Římalová

ABSTRACT:

This paper analyses broadly defined negation in early child communication. It offers a semantically-based linguistic analysis that studies the interaction between the child and other people (mostly his or her carers). The paper defines negation, discusses the contexts in which it is expressed, and analyses both verbal and nonverbal means of its expression. It observes various facets of negation and the relationship between the different means of expressing it. The analysis is based on a case study of negation in the speech of a Czech-speaking boy during his “one-word” period, that is, from approximately 12 to 18 months of his age. Both verbal and nonverbal means of expression are studied, but attention is focused on verbal means of expression, such as *ne* (‘no’), *ne ne*, and *není* (‘it/there is not’ etc.), that form a specific system. During the studied period, *ne* is used to express protest or rejection, *ne ne* is connected with meanings such as ‘dangerous’ or ‘undesirable’, and *není* refers to changes of state or perception. The analysis is a part of wider longitudinal research in the language production of Czech-speaking children that uses video recordings of the interaction between the child and his or her carers in a natural environment, in some cases combined with a parental diary; the methodology of the video data collection is analogous to that used by a Slovak research group led by D. Slančová.

KEY WORDS / KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA:

child speech / child language, communication, language acquisition, linguistic analysis, meaning, negation

dětská řeč / dětský jazyk, lingvistická analýza, komunikace, negace, osvojování jazyka, význam

1.

Authors analyzing first language acquisition in children have consistently noted that children often begin to express negative emotions, negative attitudes, discomfort, rejection, protest etc. sooner than they express the positive counterparts (cf. Ohnesorg, 1948, p. 43;² Ninio — Snow, 1996, pp. 86–87; Slančová, 2008, p. 86, etc.). Some authors have studied the acquisition of negation in various languages and also observed early usage of various means of expressing negation. Drozd (1995, cit. in Clark, 2009, pp. 214–215), for example, analyses the differing distribution of *no* and *not* (*don't*) in English-speaking children at the age of approximately 24 months, and van der Wal (1996, cit. in Clark,

1 The paper was supported by the programme PRVOUK (Program rozvoje vědních oblastí na Univerzitě Karlově v Praze), section P10 Linguistics, module “The acquisition and development of linguistic competence in the population of the Czech Republic”.

2 Ohnesorg (1948, p. 43) mentions that the child he observed started to produce *ne* (‘no’) two months earlier than *ano* (‘yes’).

2009, pp. 216–217), who focused on Dutch, confirms that children begin to express negation early and that they start with only one or two expressions. Several other general (and probably not so surprising) developmental tendencies have been consistently noted (Clark, 2009, pp. 214–215): e.g. children begin to express negation with gestures and then proceed to words; they learn how to negate a preceding proposition early; when their utterances become longer than two morphemes, they typically use only two or three negative forms (e.g. *can't/don't, not, no* in English) in differing distributions. Some uses of negation (e.g. the formation of negative questions) are used in arguments for or against generativist or constructivist approaches to first language acquisition (see Ambridge — Lieven, 2011, pp. 290–291). Attention has also been paid to syntax and sentence negation (e.g. Bloom, 1991, pp. 143–207) and other topics (for example Genari and MacDonald (2006) studied negation in ambiguous sentences with quantifiers).

Czech linguistics has not yet paid much attention to the phenomenon of early negation, and as far as I know no research has systematically focused on the acquisition of negation in Czech-speaking children. Some authors comment briefly on the theme and usually focus on the basic grammaticalized means of expressing negation — the prefix *ne-/ni-* and the negative particles *ne, nikoli*.³

This reflects the usual approach to the study of negation in Czech⁴ — e.g. Čejka (in MC3, 1987, pp. 260–278) studies the scope of negation, the relation between negation and the topic–focus organization of the utterance, and outlines four functions of negation in Czech: propositional, performative, expressive, and modal. Attention has been paid to negation and how it functions in Czech from a functional-generative (Hajičová, 1975) and generative point of view (e.g. Kosta, 2001). Some authors attempt to analyse the prefix *ne-* in more detail. Němec (1969), for example, outlines four groups of possible meanings of the prefix, ranging from the contradictory type (e.g. *pravidelně–nepravidelně* / ‘regularly’ — ‘irregularly’) to almost synonymous pairs (e.g. *svár–nesvár* / both meaning ‘quarrel’).

The literature on negation in Czech offers a certain level of inspiration, but many (if not most) of the observations and conclusions relate only to “adult” (and often written) speech and cannot satisfactorily be applied to the early child production we are analysing, as the latter differs significantly both in syntax and morphology from the (adult) target. For example, during the research period, the child produces mainly one-word utterances or combinations of two uninflected elements (e.g. a word + a gesture, 2 uninflected words, 2 gestures etc.), and has not yet started to use prefixes (i.e. does not use the prefix *ne-*).

3 Pačesová (1979, p. 139) asserts that initially, *ne* typically appears in postposition (*papat ne* ‘to eat + no’) and claims that this type of negation is usually connected with words that are considered to be “typical child words”. According to Pačesová, words similar to the target (adult) forms are usually produced with the negative prefix *ne-* (e.g. *nevypiju* ‘I will not drink up’). These statements are, however, quite controversial (cf. the disregarding of the relationship to the developmental stage of the child). Some remarks on the acquisition of negation can also be found in contributions on speech therapy, see e.g. Škodová and Jedlička (2003) or Kutálková (2011). Certain types of negative expression are evaluated as a symptom of possible speech disorders (e.g. negation expressed at the end of the utterance can be seen as a possible indication of SLI, see e.g. Kutálková, 2011, p. 159).

4 Cf. MC3 (1987, pp. 261–263), ESC (2002) and the references mentioned there.

In this paper, I propose a wider and more complex view of negation and its linguistically oriented study in early child communication in Czech (see section 2). The analysis shall also demonstrate that the early stages of first language acquisition demand an approach that reflects and respects specific features of the analysed data.

The analysis (and the methodological remarks) is based on a case study of a Czech-speaking monolingual healthy hearing boy.⁵ I analyse his active production of both verbal and nonverbal means of communication during the so-called one-word period. The language and communication of the child was observed and recorded longitudinally as part of wider research into the early stages of first language acquisition in Czech-speaking children. In this research, the children are videotaped once a month during communication with their parent (usually their mother) in familiar surroundings (typically at home). The total length of the recordings is one hour per month and several types of situation were recorded each month,⁶ for example conversation at meal times or at play with the adult.⁷ In the case of the boy in this study, the recordings are combined with a parental diary, written by his mother (cf. Saicová Římalová, 2012). The diary focuses on new words and new gestures, new combinations of means of expression (combinations of words, combinations of verbal and nonverbal means of communication, combinations of gestures), and (in later phases) on first instances of inflection. The video data corpus of the child analyzed in this paper covers the period from his birth to the age of 6;⁸ and the diary covers the ages from 6 months to 3 years, but this paper studies only part of the earliest stages — approximately the first 19 months, with the emphasis on the period from 12 to 18 months.⁹

2.

There are numerous approaches to first language acquisition that differ in theoretical background, analytical method and technique, the main points of interest etc. (see, e.g., Ambridge — Lieven, 2011; Smolík, 2007). The approaches illustrate the many possible ways of studying the fascinating phenomena of child language and child speech.

⁵ In such cases, there are always questions as to the extent to which analysis of one child's production can be generalized. Although there are theoretical approaches that support such a possibility (see Piaget — Inhelderová, 1997; Slančová, 2008a), I think we should be careful to avoid generalizing until a larger sample of subjects has been analysed.

⁶ The methodology of the video data collection is analogous to the methodology used by a research group led by D. Slančová studying language acquisition in Slovak-speaking children. In this research, the children were videotaped from birth to the age of 6, once a month, for an hour, in several standardized contexts of everyday communication in natural surroundings (see Slančová, 2008a; Kapalková et al., 2010; similar methodology should enable possible future comparative studies).

⁷ Some types of situation were not recorded (see section 2.2).

⁸ Data from October 2013.

⁹ For a discussion of natural data studies, longitudinal studies, and parental diaries see Ambridge and Lieven (2011), Šolcová (2012).

This study follows a linguistically oriented approach that sees interaction,¹⁰ communication and meaning as the core notions that can serve as a useful starting point for the analysis. The paper considers child speech / child language to be, at all stages of development, a specific gestalt that requires a specific approach,¹¹ and believes that it is useful (and in the early stages necessary) to analyse the whole repertoire of a child's means of communication (that is, both verbal and nonverbal means of communication, although verbal means are the focus of interest). The analysis should consider the acquisition of language in the broader context of the acquisition of other means of communication and it should see it as dynamic — observing not only the appearance or usage of form, but also, for example, the development of meanings connected to it (which may differ from the target in various ways and may also be, to some extent, specific).

Meaning is defined under the influence of the cognitively oriented approach to language and is seen as broad (covering both “traditional” semantics and pragmatics), holistic, and encyclopaedic (e.g. Vaňková et al., 2005). Some authors (e.g. Owens, 2001) state that it is almost impossible to get to know what the child really wants to say or what “the child's meaning” is. This study does not aim to find what the child “really” has in his or her mind, but rather uses methods typical of the linguistically (stylistically, pragmatically etc.) based interpretation of texts, speaker intentions and so on. It interprets the child's utterances using such cues as the context and the preceding and subsequent utterances of both the child and his interlocutor and takes into account some general human experiences (such as experiences with our bodies and senses, and the general rules of human communication), although we should bear in mind that the child, his experiences, and his mind are different from those of an adult. A similar approach is adopted by other authors. Kesselová (2008), for example, observes how the meaning of a child's utterance is interpreted by the adult interlocutor; Kesselová takes the interpretation to be confirmed when the child accepts it or (at least) does not protest. The interpretative method, which uses context as one of the major cues for interpreting meaning, has a long tradition and can be applied in various ways. Some authors (see Clark, 2009, p. 292; Lust, 2006, p. 132 and 291) call the interpretative method based on context “rich interpretation”.

When analysing negation (and other similar phenomena) in early child speech, the following aspects should be taken into account:

- (a) Delimitation of the analysed meaning — e.g. definition of “negation” (section 2.1);
- (b) delimitation of contexts where negation does or can appear (section 2.2);
- (c) the search for both linguistic and non-linguistic means of expression for the analysed meaning (section 2.3);
- (d) analysis of the use of the various “forms” carrying the analysed meaning — observation of variants of both the form and the meaning and their changes over time (section 2.4).

¹⁰ See Slančová (2008b), Kesselová (2001).

¹¹ It is not, for example, possible to analyse it automatically using apparatus developed for the analysis of adult speech and language, see Lehečková (2008).

2.1

It is useful to see negation as a more complex phenomenon than it is usually considered to be in linguistic analyses. It is possible to distinguish two types of “negation”: (a) “narrow” (“linguistic”) negation connected with (but not limited to) typical linguistic means of expression such as *ne* or *ne-* and usually described in grammars (our attention is focused on this type); (b) “broad negation” that covers all possible types of “negative” meanings that the child could express — from negative emotions, negative communicative intentions, to “linguistic” (“narrow”) negation. “Broad negation” thus represents a wider context for the study of “narrow” negation; this distinction allows us to see the typical verbal expressions of (narrow) negation as connected with other means of communication.

2.2

Broadly defined negation can appear in numerous contexts. The main types are contexts connected with the following communicative intentions¹² of the child: (a) expression of negative psycho-physical states (such as the expression of discomfort, or negative emotions); (b) negative or disagreeing reactions (e.g. disagreement, denial, refusal, protest); (c) assertions about nonexistence or disappearance etc.

The analysed video material offers samples of “natural” communication with various instances of intentions of this type, but — as with any similar data — it cannot be said to be entirely representative of the child’s production. As far as negation is concerned, the data corpus does not include contexts when the interlocutors — and mainly the child — lose control over their negative emotions and their “face” (Brown — Levinson, 1978) is threatened too much (for example, fits of anger accompanied by intense crying typical of a certain age). These situations were not recorded as I considered their recording unethical, although I am aware that this decision leads to certain limitations of the data. However, no principal means of communication should be completely omitted as similar means of expressing negation often appear in other situations as well, but their intensity is usually reduced.

2.3

The studied meaning is expressed by a wide range of means of expression. This analysis attempts to explore both verbal and nonverbal means of communication using linguistically oriented analysis, but attention is focused on linguistic means. What I consider important is that the appearance of a certain form in a child’s production cannot be taken as proof that the child already “knows” the item in the same way as would an adult speaker, as both the form and its meaning (or meanings) can differ from the target; these differences shall be — if possible — noted. This influences (among other things) the way I interpret forms of flective parts of speech, e.g. *není* (‘it/there is not’ etc.). This form may resemble the form of the 3rd person singular indicative, present

12 Or pragmatic functions (see Slančová, 2008c).

tense, but the child may use it to express various other (grammatical) meanings, for example a different person, tense, or mood,¹³ so we shall not automatically label it as the 3rd person singular indicative, present tense, but we shall take into account its meaning in the given context.

In the case of broadly delimited negation, some means of expression are not typical of children alone, but are used by people throughout their lives, sometimes in a modified way. Nonverbal means include, for example, facial expressions indicating negative emotions, the “colour” of the voice, expressing discomfort, anger or impatience etc., crying (a child’s crying can be “coloured” in various ways too, see Dittrichová et al., 2004; Masopustová, 2011), various types of shouting, various sounds that can be described as, say, “protest” or “lamentation”, broadly delimited gestures (see Kapalková, 2008), or the movement of selected parts of the body (such as turning the body or the head away from the interlocutor, kicking one’s legs, pushing the interlocutor’s hand away, conventional shaking of the head etc.). I expect these types of means to be common to all children (and all people), although individual differences in their form and usage undoubtedly appear.

When the child starts to combine nonverbal means of expression with words, it is possible to study whether the nonverbal means of communication (and mainly the gestures) and the words are semantically complementary or supplementary (Kapalková, 2008): complementary gestures (or other nonverbal means of communication) express the same or similar meaning as the word (e.g. the gesture of conventional shaking of the head + the word *ne* ‘no’ or *ne ne* ‘no no’; the analysed child started to use this combination at the age of 16 months); supplementary gestures add new information to the gesture-word combination (e.g. the child turns an empty glass upside down and says *není* ‘it/there is not’ — in this case, the negation is expressed verbally and the gesture indicates the object to which the negation is related).

The observed child also uses some individual nonverbal vocal means of communication (e.g. *ehe*, *e e*) which can be seen as predecessors of verbal expressions of negation. These sounds and sound combinations do not resemble the form of the target (adult) expression of negation, but appear repeatedly in the context of broad negation and express the same or similar communicative intention as would the verbal expression of negation in target (adult) speech. I expect that other children would show similar examples of transient vocal means, but they may use different forms (sounds or sound combinations).

During the analysed period, the child also starts to use verbal means of expression, and the importance of linguistic means gradually increases. The form of the linguistic means of expression may well resemble the target form, but the meaning may still be different from the target (see below). The verbal repertoire for expressing negation of the analysed child during this period covers *ne*, *ne ne*, and *neni/není*, and we could add several words expressing negative features of objects (such as *kx kx* + a gesture corresponding to ‘dangerous’, *ty ty ty* expressing a warning etc., *e e* or *fj/fuj* corresponding to ‘ugly’, ‘dirty’ etc.; see section 2.3). The child has not yet started to use prefixes (such as *ne-/ni-*).

¹³ For example, when the child is not wearing socks, he says *není*, while the context would require the plural form *nejsou* (cf. section 2.4).

All the above mentioned means of expression may (and often do) appear in various combinations that may often more subtly differentiate the negative meaning. Typical combinations cover such vocal and nonverbal-vocal means of communication as facial expressions, voice “colour”, and verbal or nonverbal sounds expressing the given communicative intention.

2.4

The analysis should try to capture various facets of the meaning(s) or function(s)¹⁴ of the studied forms. It is important not to treat various units (such as a word) as monolithic or as immediately acquired as wholes. Detailed observation and analysis of the meaning (meanings) connected with the form is required — the unit can be used only in some of the target meanings, but it can also express meanings that the adult would not use etc.

I will illustrate the possible approach by a sample analysis of the verbal means of communication used by the child to express negation during his “one-word” period: *ne*, *ne ne* and *není* (for a complete repertoire see section 2.3).

During the period from 12 to 18 (19) months of age the words *ne* (and the reduplicated *ne ne* or *ne ne ne*) and *není/neni/něni* became an integral part of the child’s vocabulary: the child used *ne* from the beginning of the observed period (that is, from 12 months of age);¹⁵ the form *není/neni* expressing negation was used a month later (i.e. when the child was 13 months old).

Throughout almost the whole analysed period, the forms *ne* and *není* differ in their meanings, and these meanings also differ from meanings in the target speech/language.

Ne seems to have a specialized use for expressing protest. From the beginning of the analysed period, it seems typically to be connected with the child’s refusal to do something, and this meaning appears repeatedly throughout the period (for example, when the child is 17 months old, his mother asks him to blink and he refuses: *ne*). From the age of 15 months, the child also uses *ne* to protest against something his interlocutor does (such as when the child is trying to ride a toy motorbike and his mother puts her hand on his back and pushes him; the child does not want this and says emphatically: *ne*). Sometimes *ne* (or *ne ne*; see below) may also be interpreted as a repetition or reformulation of someone’s utterance.¹⁶ *Ne* may also combine with other means of expressing (broad) negation, such as when, at the age of 12 months, the child uses the combination of the verbal *ne* and the nonverbal gesture of kicking his legs (the child was lying on his back).

14 Throughout the paper, the term “meaning” is used in a broad sense, which also covers “function”.

15 At the same time, a form *nejí* was recorded on one occasion, but its meaning and possible relation to *není* is doubtful, as the context allows for several interpretations. This is not unusual at this stage of development.

16 For example, when the child is 17 months old, he comments on or interprets the dissatisfied crying of a child in a pram on the street by *ne ne* + shaking of his head.

Ne can be reduplicated (or multiplied) to form *ne ne / ne ne ne*.¹⁷ *Ne ne* (or *ne ne ne*) can express a more emphatic protest or refusal, but the child also repeatedly connects the reduplicated form with specific meanings. The first specialized meaning appeared when the child was 14 months old and could be paraphrased as ‘(it is) dangerous’ or sometimes possibly ‘(it is) dangerous and one should not touch it’, i.e. as if including the reproduction of an adult’s orders.¹⁸ This type usually appears in contexts in which the child comments on various things that are considered to be dangerous and that the child is taught not to touch: e.g. the child says *ne ne ne* while looking at a knife or an electric kettle. It was also used as a reaction to the mother’s utterance *nemůžeme k tomu chodit protože to je pálí pálí* (‘we cannot go near that because it is burning burning’). This case is interesting as it could be interpreted as a reaction to a verbal stimulus (not necessarily the physical object itself) and could be seen as an early attempt to summarize or paraphrase the meaning core of the interlocutor’s utterance. Two months later, a new facet of the meaning can be found: *ne ne* is used to comment on actions that are incorrect, that the child is not allowed to do etc.; this meaning could be paraphrased as ‘this is not good’, ‘(I) should not do this’ etc. (as when the child is turning cups of food upside down and at the same time is saying *ne ne ne*). At the same age, *ne ne ne* also appeared as a comment on something that the child does not like or that is generally undesirable (e.g. his mother talks about a burnt pot, and the child replies *ne ne ne* and adds an appropriate facial expression with a turned-up nose).

Není is more tightly associated with such contexts as the child’s comments on or assertions about his surroundings (at the beginning of the period, mainly his “now and here”). To use *není*, the child has to be able to cognitively understand an object’s permanence, e.g. that objects do exist even when he does not see them (see Piaget — Inhelderová, 1997). At the age of 13 months, the child produced *není* e.g. as a comment or statement that he could not see himself on the monitor of the camera (the meaning could be paraphrased as ‘I cannot see myself’) or when he was watching a dog and could not see it any more (meaning ‘the dog is not visible any more’ etc.). At this stage, *není* refers to the immediate context and to the child’s mostly perceptual experience. The utterances are associated with contexts in which something cannot be perceived or something has just stopped being perceivable. A month later, instances referring to situations in which “something is not somewhere” were recorded. For example, after finishing his meal, the child looks into an empty glass and says *není* (which could be paraphrased as ‘there is no food / it is (already) empty’). At the age of 16 months, the child is able to comment on more complex situations, such as the difference between the usual and the actual state of something (the child points at the lock on a wardrobe and says *není* — the context reveals that he is commenting

17 Another possible interpretation is to classify *ne* and *ne ne / ne ne ne* as two different means/forms.

18 The relation to an adult’s order not to touch something may explain the choice of the reduplicated form *ne ne / ne ne ne* — when the adult wants to make the order clear and urgent, he or she may, and often does, use a form that is short (it may be *ne* only) and may reduplicate, i.e. *ne!*; *to je ne ne!* ‘no!’; ‘this is no no!’.

on the fact that the key that is usually in the lock is missing). Similarly, at the age of 17 months, the child shows that he is not wearing the socks he usually wears by holding his toes and saying *není*. At the same age, a more explicit expression of the differences between two objects or states can be observed: e.g. when the child has only one sock on, he holds one of his toes and says *hee* (*hele*: 'look'), then holds the other one and says *neni*.

The specialization of the analysed forms seems to be settled when the child is 16 to 17 months old, but is observable until the end of the one-word period, e.g. at the age of 19 months, the child says *koli není* ('roll + is not') when something stops rolling, and *hačí ne* ('sit + no') when he does not want to sit any more. But towards the end of the period, some contexts appear in which the distinction between the forms is not so clear, e.g. when the child is 17 months old, he starts to use negation in a new (and cognitively more complex) context of pretending (or of a joke based on pretending). For example, he makes a face or a gesture as if he needs to go to his potty, but after a short while he stops making it and says *ne* or *néni/není*. Similar instances may signal that the system of expressing negation is changing, and that the forms and their (growing and developing) meanings are becoming more interwoven.

I should also mention that even though the distinction between *ne* and *není* seems to be clear when we analyse the recordings and their transcripts, the recorded data reveals that the communicative partner of the child is not aware of it and sometimes, for example, interprets *ne* as a comment on the current situation when actually the child is trying to express a protest.

At the same time as the above-mentioned meanings of *ne*, *ne ne*, and *není*, the child uses, or starts to use, other forms with similar meanings mentioned in section 2.3. In other words, a certain type of synonymy can be observed. Some of the means of expression are different from the expected target, and are, to a certain extent, specific. The meaning 'dangerous', connected with *ne ne*, can be expressed by a combination of vocal *kx kx* and a gesture (the child repeatedly opens and closes his hand on his chest); this combination is in most cases limited to utterances about electricity and electrical appliances. Another meaning of *ne ne* can be almost synonymously expressed by the form *e e* (later, *fj* — *fuj* as well), which refers to objects that are undesirable and that the child should not touch (in most cases the meaning would correspond to 'dirty'). Disagreement with someone's behaviour (typical of *ne*), or certain types of threat, can be expressed by *ty ty ty* ('you you you'), sometimes accompanied by a corresponding gesture (moving the hand with an outstretched index finger). At the age of 15 months, the child also uses *ty ty ty* specifically as a protest about noise (such as a noisy washing machine). Sometimes the child also uses a gesture to stop the interlocutor doing something, e.g. he holds his mother's hand and moves it away from the object she was holding or touching (for example, when the child does not want his mother to read a certain page of a book, he moves the hand she was using to point at pictures away from the book).

Both *ne* and *není* can combine with the typical (conventional) gesture of shaking one's head, and this gesture can also appear independently. The gesture is a stable part of the child's communicative repertoire by the age of 17 months, but first appeared some time earlier.

3.

I have proposed an approach to early child communication that I consider useful for linguistically oriented analysis. The approach concentrates on broadly defined meanings, and attempts to see them in a complex way in terms of both the means of expression and the meanings. The approach respects the communicative function of language and the specificity of the early stages of development, including the situatedness of early child production, the fact that both the child's forms and their meanings can (and do) differ from the target ("adult") usage, and that language acquisition is a process. I focused on linguistic interpretation of the child's production within the context of interaction between the child and the carer. I did not attempt to draw conclusions about the child's comprehension, about what the child really "had in his mind", or what the underlying and more general psychological principles behind the studied data might be. These problems would need to be analysed using other methods and approaches.

I have illustrated the approach by a case study of (widely delimited) negation in one Czech-speaking child during his one-word period (from approximately 12 to 18 or 19 months of age); I focused on the child's active production. The proposed approach allows observation of a wider repertoire of means of expressing negation used by the child. It also enables the grounding of the analysis of the linguistic means of expression in a broader context (i.e. mainly the context of other, nonverbal means of expressing the same meaning, and the context of the corresponding communicative intentions expressed by the child), and it shows that the main linguistic means of expression (*ne, ne ne, není*) exhibited an interesting distribution of meanings and functions quite different from the target, and that they seemed to form a certain system (a gestalt) during the period under analysis. A more detailed analysis of the data may show more clearly some other tendencies: e.g. the shift from nonverbal to verbal means of expressing negation; the shift from less conventional gestures to more conventional ones; and some preferences for expressing certain communicative functions by certain means of expression. After the child starts to produce more complex utterances and starts to inflect words, a more syntactically oriented analysis would be possible.

REFERENCES:

- AMBRIDGE, Ben — LIEVEN, Elena V. M. (2011): *Child Language Acquisition. Contrasting Theoretical Approaches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BLOOM, Lois (1991): *Language Development from Two to Three*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BROWN, Penelope — LEVINSON, Steven (1978): Universals in language usage. Politeness phenomena. In: Esther N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and Politeness Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56–310.
- CLARK, Eve V. (2009): *First Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DITTRICHOVÁ, Jaroslava et al. (2004): *Chování dítěte raného věku a rodičovská péče*. Praha: Grada.

- ESC: KARLÍK, Petr — NEKULA, Marek — PLESKALOVÁ, Jana (eds.) (2002): *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- GENNARI, Silvia P. — MACDONALD, Maryellen C. (2006): Acquisition of negation and quantification: insights from adult production and comprehension [online]. *Language Acquisition*, 13, pp. 125–168. Cit. 29. 10. 2013. Available at WWW: <http://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/22181878/Gennari_MacDonald_2006.pdf>.
- HAJIČOVÁ, Eva (1975): *Negace a presupozice ve významové stavbě věty*. Praha: Academia.
- JANDA, Laura (2004): Kognitivní lingvistika. In: Iva Nebeská (ed.), *Čítanka textů z kognitivní lingvistiky I*. Praha: FF UK v Praze, pp. 9–58.
- KAPALKOVÁ, Svetlana (2008): Gestá v kontexte raného vývinu dětí. In: Daniela Slančová (ed.), *Štúdie o detskej reči*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove, pp. 169–211.
- KAPALKOVÁ, Svetlana et al. (2010): *Hodnotenie komunikačných schopností detí v ranom veku*. Bratislava: Slovenská asociácia logopédov.
- KESSELOVÁ, Jana (2001): *Lingvistické štúdie o komunikácii detí*. Prešov: Nauka.
- KESSELOVÁ, Jana (2008): Sémantické kategórie v ranej ontogenéze reči dieťaťa. In: Daniela Slančová (ed.), *Štúdie o detskej reči*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove, pp. 121–167.
- KOSTA, Peter (2001): Negace a větná struktura v češtině. In: Zdeňka Hladká — Petr Karlík (eds.), *Čeština — univerzália a specifika 3*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, pp. 117–138.
- KUTÁLKOVÁ, Dana (2011): *Budu správně mluvit. Chodíme na logopedii*. Praha: Grada.
- LEHEČKOVÁ, Helena (2008): Imperfect language: how come? and so what? *Slavica Helsingiensia* [online], 35, pp. 123–133. Cit. 29. 10. 2013. Available at WWW: <<http://www.helsinki.fi/slavicahelsingiensia/previw/sh35/pdf/12.pdf>>.
- LUST, Barbara (2007): *Child Language. Acquisition and Growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MASOPUSTOVÁ, Zuzana (2011): *Kojenecký pláč*. Brno: Muni press.
- MC3: DANĚŠ, František — GREPL, Miroslav — HLAVSA, Zdeněk (eds.) (1987): *Mluvnice češtiny 3. Skladba*. Praha: Academia.
- NĚMEC, Igor (1969): O lexikálním záporu v češtině. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 30, pp. 334–346.
- NINIO, Anat — SNOW, Catherine E. (1996): *Pragmatic Development*. Boulder, CO — Oxford: Westview Press.
- OHNESORG, Karel (1948): *O mluvním vývoji dítěte*. Praha: Jednota čs. matematiků a fysiků — Jednota českých filologů.
- OWENS, Robert E., Jr. (2001²): *Language Development. An Introduction*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- PAČESOVÁ, Jaroslava (1979): *Vývoj dětské řeči v raném věku*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně v Brně.
- PIAGET, Jean — INHELDEROVÁ, Bärbel (1997): *Psychologie dítěte*. Praha: Portál.
- SAICOVÁ ŘÍMALOVÁ, Lucie (2012): Intertextualita v procesu osvojování: raná dětská řeč. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 73, pp. 345–365.
- SLANČOVÁ, Daniela (ed.) (2008a): *Štúdie o detskej reči*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove.
- SLANČOVÁ, Daniela (2008b): Úvod — Východiská výskumu detskej reči v slovenčine. In: Daniela Slančová (ed.), *Štúdie o detskej reči*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove, pp. 10–28.
- SLANČOVÁ, Daniela (2008c): Pragmatické funkcie vo vývine rečovej činnosti (v prvých osemnástich mesiacoch života dieťaťa). In: Daniela Slančová (ed.), *Štúdie o detskej reči*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove, pp. 67–120.
- SMOLÍK, Filip (2007): *Teoretické přístupy k osvojování gramatiky*. Hradec Králové: Gaudeamus.
- ŠKODOVÁ, Eva — JEDLIČKA, Ivan et al. (2003): *Klinická logopedie*. Praha: Portál.
- ŠOLCOVÁ, Iva (2012): Metodologické poznámky k longitudinálním studiím. *Československá psychologie*, 56, pp. 374–380.
- VANĚKOVÁ, Irena et al. (2005): *Co na srdci, to na jazyku*. Praha: Karolinum.

ABSTRAKT:

Studie je věnována široce vymezené negaci v rané dětské komunikaci. Nabízí sémanticky založenou lingvistickou analýzu interakce mezi dítětem a lidmi v jeho blízkosti, především rodiči. Příspěvek definuje negaci, zabývá se kontexty, v nichž se negace objevuje, a analyzuje verbální i neverbální prostředky jejího vyjádření. Sleduje rovněž rozmanité významové odstíny negace a vztahy mezi různými prostředky jejich vyjádření.

Analýza je založena na případové studii negace v projevech česky hovořícího chlapce z tzv. jednoslovného období, tj. přibližně od 12 do 18 měsíců jeho věku. Představuje užívané verbální a neverbální prostředky vyjadřující negaci a soustřeďuje se na prostředky verbální, zejm. *ne*, *ne ne*, *není*, které vytvářejí specifický systém: V analyzovaném období je *ne* užíváno k vyjádření protestu nebo odmítnutí, *ne ne* je spojeno s významy jako ‚nebezpečný‘, ‚nežádoucí‘ a *není* se vztahuje ke změnám stavu nebo smyslových vjemů.

Příspěvek je součástí rozsáhlejšího longitudinálního výzkumu jazykových projevů česky hovořících dětí, který využívá videonahrávek interakce mezi dítětem a jemu blízkými osobami v přirozeném prostředí; v některých případech jsou videonahrávky kombinovány s deníkovými záznamy. Metodologie sběru videonahrávek je analogická metodologii užívané slovenskou výzkumnou skupinou vedenou D. Slančovou.

Lucie Saicová Římalová | Institute of Czech Language and Theory of Communication, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
<Lucie.Rimalova@ff.cuni.cz>