








Lexico-Grammatical Paradigm of the Category of Negation in Diachrony

 Nataliya Pasichnyk¹,
 Nataliia Hotsa²,
 Anna Kosenko³,
 Olga Plavutska⁴,
 Ihor Bloschynskyi⁵

^{1,2,4} Department of Theory and Practice of Translation, Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

³ Department of Communicative Linguistics and Translation, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine

⁵ Foreign Languages Department, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine

Corresponding Author: Ihor Bloschynskyi

e-mail: i.blosch@gmail.com

Article citation: Pasichnyk, N. & Hotsa, N. & Kosenko, A. & Plavutska, O. & Bloschynskyi, I. (2021). Lexico-Grammatical Paradigm of the Category of Negation in Diachrony, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 5 (1): 7–18.

Received Date: November 8, 2020

Accepted Date: November 20, 2020

Online Date: January 5, 2021

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2021 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

This article is an investigation of the grammatical category of negation in diachrony. The issues of negation in logic and linguistics, negation as a grammatical category on the morphological and syntactic levels are highlighted. The authors state that in broad semantic terms negation can be expressed in morphologic and syntactic ways in natural language. The means of expressing negation constitute a hierarchically organized system of heterogeneous language units combined with a similar semantic function. Based on the theoretical premises, it is explained that negation as a grammatical category can be realized on both morphological and syntactic levels. On the morphological level negative affixes paradigm and separate parts of speech are taken into consideration, while on the syntactic level the whole negative sentence that includes one or more than one negator is observed. Negation is expressed by means of affixes that have explicative and implicative components in their meaning. Authentic affixes preserve the semantic meaning of the words they etymologically derive from, giving the word they join to, a special shade of negation. The main source of enrichment of the negative affixes paradigm and their new meaning are affixes borrowed from other languages. The study of the category of negation on different levels in diachronic aspect can help to observe the development of particular parts of speech, which can express negation, and serve as a base for further studies of negation in the different discourses and communicative situations. The prospects of further study in this field lie in investigating negation in different discourses and communicative situations, that would be essential for researching communicative strategies in anthropocentric paradigm.

Keywords: negation, diachrony, morphological level, syntactic level.

1. Introduction

The thorough study of any linguistic notion demands its analysis in different aspects. One of the most efficient approaches is a diachronic one, which considers the historical development of language as the object of linguistic analysis, that is, investigates the development and evolution of a language through history. Thus, **the purpose** of the research is to investigate the main aspects of lexico-grammatical paradigm of the category of negation in diachrony. The study of the category of negation on morphological, lexical and syntactic levels in diachronic aspect can help to observe the development of particular parts of speech, which can express negation, and serve as a base for further studies of negation in the author's discourse. Its results can be considered in textbooks on theoretical grammar and lexicology, in manuals on negation, and on developing the skills of English dialogical speech.

In the process of investigation, the following research methods were used: 1) componential analysis that helps to reveal how semantic components of negative meaning lead to delimiting the field of negation, that is what implicit negative markers being positive in form constitute a part of the category of negation; 2) quantitative analysis that gives precise and testable expression to qualitative ideas of the category of negation; 3) synchronic analysis that aims at revealing the relation between the members of the paradigm of the category of negation; 4) discourse analysis that enables us to understand the conditions behind the problem of "The paradigm of the category of negation in author's discourse (on the material of the "Canterbury Tales" by Geoffrey Chaucer)" and makes us realize that the essence of this problem and its resolution lie in its assumptions; besides it provides the description of discourse characteristics of diachronic and synchronic aspects of negation in a particular text.

Theoretical background

Literature Review

The problem of negation has been much discussed from different perspectives. Most of the investigations are concerned with issues that derive from philosophical and logic problems of sentences where negation is involved. And only today the properties of negation in language use have been studied. Much attention is paid to the issue of equality and none-quality between negative and affirmative statements (I. Kant and Aristotle), negation on syntactic level (R. Zanuttini, M. Greco), the place of negation in the structure of grammar (V. Déprez, A. Pierce, J. Zlatev, M. Andrén), the contrastive analysis of negation in the English speech and writing (G. Tottie), negation as a lexicogrammatical category (V. Bondarenko), negation as a communicative marker in diachrony (V. Mykhailenko), the current state of typological research on negation (M. Miestamo, I. Orenes, P. N. Johnson-Laird), modelling of negation in computational linguistics (R. Morante, C. Sporleder), the form and meaning of negative elements in natural language (H. Zeijlstra), representation of negation during different periods (A. Cichosz, J. M. Arista, M. Laing). In spite of various investigations in this field, a complex nature of negation is still a matter of great interest in modern linguistic research.

Negation as a grammatical category can be realized on both morphological and syntactic levels. On the morphological level negative affixes paradigm and separate parts of speech are taken into consideration, while on the syntactic level the whole negative sentence that includes one or more than one negator is observed.

There are some differences connected with negative affixes paradigm in modern linguistics. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum and G. Leech define prefixes *un-*, *dis-*, *in-* (*ir-*, *il-*, *im-*), *non-*, *a-* as negative but they emphasize that besides them, there exist other prefixes that have negative implication [1]:

- reservative-privative: *un-*, *de-*, *dis-*;
- opposition prefixes: *anti-*, *counter-* [2].

Prefixes *mis-*, *mal-*, *pseudo-*, *false-* are considered to be a stylistic device for expression of pejorative. Suffix *-less* is considered to be a negation marker too.

S. Leontjeva [3] lists such negative affixes as *dis-*, *de-*, *mis-*, *anti-*, *non-*, *-less*, *un-*. Such difference in defining negative affixes is connected with polysemy of the English adjective *negative* in comparison with comparative monosemy of the noun *negation*. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary offers 5 main lexical meanings of the adjective *negative*:

1. considering refusal or negation;
2. considering only bad qualities of situation, person; harmful;
3. considering the absence of substance or condition;
4. less than zero;
5. carried by electron – opposite positive.

At least 4 of them are often used in linguistic terminology, for example, negative morpheme, negative connotation (that is widely used in stylistics), negative prefix. Interference terminology of new linguistic branches helped to admit an expanded paradigm of negative affixes. So, in Modern English we can define the following affixes having negative implication: *un-*, *in-*, (*il-*, *ir-*, *im-*) *a-*, *dis-*, *mis-*, *re-*, *de-*, *counter-*, (*contr-*), *anti-*, *pseudo-*, *-false*, *mal-*, *-non*, *-less*.

For example: *unknown*, *injustice*, *illegal*, *irregular*, *impossible*, *amoral*, *disharmony*, *to misspell*, *reject*, *deluded*, *counterpart*, *antisocial*, *pseudogothic*, *maladjusted*, *nonstandard*, *heartless*.

To paradigm of the affixes having negative implication in Old English belonged included: *wan-*, *un-*, *mis-*, *for-*, *wip-*, *gain-*, *-læs*. For example: *wansælig*, *miscwepan*, *fordeman*, *wipsegen*. In Early Middle English to the paradigm of the affixes with negative implication belonged: *un-*, *mis-*, *for-*, *-læs*. For example: *unwit*, *misdeed*, *forwerpen*, *skillæs* [2, p. 277].

Perhaps, there exist different lexical shades of negation expression and they are expressed with the help of negative affixes. That is why it is reasonable to classify negative affixes according to the main lexical component of negation:

- ✓ affixes with semantic component of refusal (etymologically with the meaning of distance in the late French borrowings) *re-*, *de-* (*repulse*, *refuse*, *deny*);
- ✓ affixes with semantic component of absence or lack of quality: *a-*, *un-*, *in-*, *il-*, *im-*, *-less*, *non-* (*unknown*, *imperfect*, *helpless*, *apolitical*);
- ✓ affixes with semantic component of “bad”, “incorrect”, “mistaken”: *mis-*, *mal-*, *pseudo-* (*misspell*, *pseudogothic*, *malcontent*);
- ✓ affixes with semantic component of a reverse action: *un-*, *de-*, *dis-* (*unbind*, *dequalify*);
- ✓ affixes with semantic component of opposition: *counter-*, (*contr-*), *anti-* (*contradict*, *counterpart*).

It is logical, that semantic shades of negation correspond with the main lexical meaning of the negative adjective.

In the table below a classification of affixes with the negative implication of 3 periods of the English language is offered.

Table 1: The negative affixes paradigm in the English language

OE	-	un-wan- -læss	mis- for-	un-	gain- wip-
Early MidE	-	un- -læss	mis- for-	un-	wip-
ModE	re- de-	un- in-(il-, im-, ir-) en- a- non- -less	mal- pseudo-	un- de- dis-	counter- (contr-) anti-

Affixes in general preserve semantics and compatibility of those lexical items they derived from, but some changes can be observed too. That is why it is logical to investigate the etymology of the affixes of the negative implication to differentiate their meanings.

Affixes of the first group derive from words that had the meaning of distance, rejection of something:

Dis – (its other forms are: *des-*, *de-*, *di-*, *dif-*, *s-*) derives from Latin with the meaning *away*; it should not be confused with the prefix *dis-* (its other forms are *dis-*, *bis-*) with the meaning *apart* that derived from Latin *duo* (*two*). Perhaps, the meaning of distance derives from the meaning of separation.

The prefix *re-* with the meaning of negation appeared in the English language in Late Middle English in French borrowings (*renounce* – *to disclaim*) and preserved the similar meaning mainly in synonymic sequence of the word “reject”.

All affixes of the second group with the exception of *-less* derive from the Indo-European *n/ne*. *Un-* was the general negative prefix for all the Germanic languages. The affix *wan-* belongs to this group too. It was very productive during the Old English Period, but during the Middle Ages it lost its productivity and in Modern English it is completely replaced by the inducing affix *un-*.

Wan- derives from the Anglo-Saxon *wan* (black, dark) and it serves as a source of derivation of the verb *to wane* (to decrease, to fail), to want. There are appropriate adjectives in the Celtic, Scandinavian and Germanic languages. *Wan* joined all the notional parts of speech, as the prefix *un-*, that was favourable to its change into *un-*. For example:

wanhalp – *unheal thickness*

wanhliete – *devoided*

wansalig – *unhappy* [2, p. 279].

Some linguists suppose that the prefix *un-* derives from the prefix *wan-*. Suffix *-less* preserves the semantics of the comparative degree in Old English: *læssa* (*little*) and derives from the Indo-European root *les* (*weak*) that served as a source for derivation of the Indo-European root *lais* (*to diminish*, *to lessen*).

Affixes of the third group have the meaning of the negative mark. The prefix *mis-* can be found in all Germanic languages: in the Icelandic language – *mis-*, in the Swedish language – *miss-*, in German – *missa-* with the meaning of wrong. In the Old Saxon language, it was very productive: *miscwepan* – *neglect*, *mislar* – *bad teaching*, *misslibban* – *lead bad life*. The prefix preserves the semantic shade of the Scandinavian verb with the meaning of *to fail to hit*, *to omit*, from which it derives; the Anglo-Saxon *missan* (*rare*) has the same meaning. Some words with this prefix have Scandinavian origin: *mistake*, *misbecome*, *misdeed*, *misdeem*, *misdo*, *misgive*, *misplay*, *misbehave*, *misunderstand* or they are of French or Latin origin. For example: *misapply*, *misappropriate*. But it is important to distinguish the Germanic *mis-* and the French *mes-* that obtained the English variant of spelling under the influence of the inducing prefix *mis-*.

Mes (*mis-*) derived from the Latin *minus* (*less*) and expresses the negative assessment, like in words *misadventure*, *missaliance*, *mischief*.

Pseudo- derives from the Greek noun with the meaning of “wrong”, but into the English language it came from French.

Mal – is borrowed from French and is firstly fixed in the works by Chaucer. The prefix preserves semantics of the Anglo-Saxon adverb *male* (*badly*) from which it derives.

The prefix *for-* is not recorded in the grammar manuals as negative but the analysis of its marked antonymous pairs, contextual analysis, and correlation of the Old English prefix *for-* with the modern prefix *dis-* proves this fact.

In the Anglo-Saxon dictionaries there are many antonymous pairs with *for-*, for example:

feran (*go*) – *forferan* (*perish*)

cup (*well-known, famous*) – *forcup* (*wicked*)

sweþan (*speak of somebody*) – *forcweþan* (*rebuke*)

deman (*judge well, glorify*) – *fordeman* (*condemn*)

don (*build*) – *fordon* (*destroy*)

bugan (*bow down*) – *forbugan* (*avoid*) [2, p. 280].

It should be mentioned that the intensive component in the semantics for that is quite distinct from the preposition *for*, it expresses destruction, loss as in *forbarnan* (*burn up*). But at the beginning of the Middle English period in the text “Ormulum” the *for-* prefix acquires the negative meaning in the group of verbs that express the attitude and correspond with the modern prefix *dis-*, for example:

forwerrpenn – *despise, neglect*

forrlatenn – *disregard*

forrgloppedd – *disturbed*

But in general it preserves the shade of strengthening. Etymologically the *for-* prefix derived from the Germanic root *for* (*far/fur*), that derived from the Indo-European *per* (*par*)/*pro* with the meaning *to put forward*, from the Old English prefix *for* with the meaning of “movement”. It is possible to presume that the *for-* prefix acquired the negative component because of the removal of the action-doer, that began to be taken as the absence or stopping of the action or in consequence of its completion with a negative result.

The reverse meaning of the *un-* prefix in the English verbs developed from the negative one in the forms of the Participle II. For example, *un-bound*, *de-* with the meaning of the action, reversion is borrowed from the French verbs:

- *to degrade*

- *to demobilize*

The Latin prefixes of opposition *contra-* can be found in the words of Latin origin, for instance: *contradiction*, and in the form of *-counter-* in words of English origin: *counterpart*.

The prefixes *anti-*, *ant-* are borrowed into English from Greek through Latin with the meaning “against”, “opposite”. This prefix is productive in the Modern English language.

The prefix *wip* derived from the Old English preposition *wiper* (*hostile*). The prefix lost its productivity at the beginning of the Middle English period, but preserved in words with *stand*, *withsay* [2, p. 282].

So, the category of negation on the lexical level is expressed with the help of affixes that have explicative and implicative components in their meaning. Authentic affixes preserve the semantic meaning of the words they etymologically derive from, giving the word they join a special shade of negation. The main source of enrichment of the negative affixes paradigm and their new meaning are affixes borrowed from other languages.

Results and Discussion

As it was mentioned, the category of negation is a philosophical, logical and linguistic phenomenon which opposed to affirmation in various strata and on different levels of the language structure. On the semantic level there is always an opposition of positive and negative (antonymic relations): long - short, good - bad, etc. On the lexical level when the affix denotes negation:

1) negative prefix + root: natural - unnatural, proper -improper, regular – irregular; 2) root + negative suffix: shame - shameless, cheer -cheerless.

The prefix *un-* is the most frequent to denote negation of the quality expressed by the root. There are about 1500 examples of *un* + root in Webster’s New World Dictionary.

On the morphological level, the most frequent means of expressing negation is the particle *not*, negative pronouns – *no one*, *nobody*, *nothing*: conjunction *-neither nor*, etc. All these means constitute a negative paradigm in Modern English. As it was mentioned, the grammatical paradigm of negation is formed with the help of the following operators: *not* (*n’t*), *neither*, *never*, *no*, *none*, *no one*, *nothing*, *nor* and *nowhere*. They have the similar semantic meanings: the negation of statement. But when they are used in discourse, the negative operators can have different semantic functions, syntactic characteristics and meanings in predicative and comparative constructions. Firstly, we

should distinguish between two negative operators NO and NOT. They have the similar meanings, but as a rule, they perform different functions.

V. Mykhailenko [4, p. 104] states that in language competence there are three models of describing “not” – functional as a negation marker, distributional as a constituent of the phrase and the sentence, and the communicative as a marker of intentions: negation, denial, refusal, prohibition.

Such diversity comes from the Old English correlation of two negative units:

1. the OE negative particle *ne*, which drops its vowel in some combinations before a vowel, or *h* or *w* followed by a vowel, *these* consonants being also dropped, *nwi*-being made into *ny* – .

Thus:

eom “am”	>	neom “am not”
háefþ “has”	>	náefþ “has not”
háefde “had”	>	náefde “had not”
wat “knows”	>	nat “knows not”
wiste “knew”	>	nyste “knew not”
wile “will”	>	nyle “will not”
wolde “would”	>	noalde “would not”.

Some pronouns and adverbs follow the same transformation pattern. In sentences the particle *ne* is prefixed to the verb and all other words in the sentence that admit contracted negative forms. So the negative particle *ne* developed into a negative prefix of the part of speech and late disappeared entirely as a part of speech from Modern English.

2. Gradually the weakening particle *ne* was supported by the stronger *nō* or *naht*. H. Swift mentions that the contracted forms of *nawiht* > *nat/not* started to supplant *ne* before the verb.

In Old English *nauht* was used as an adverb “not at all”, “by no means”, and in Middle English it became less emphatic, especially in the weak forms, which dropped the *h*, becoming *nat*, *not*, and that at last became the equivalent to the older *ne* “not”.

Thus historically *not* can be treated both as a particle and as an adverb. Therefore, as a particle it is a functional word used as a marker of negation of the object/thing expressed by the word, phrase, sentence and it has a fixed position in the sentence. Though as an adverb it is treated as a notional word with a complex meaning and it takes relatively free position in the sentence. In combination with other parts of a sentence it becomes a communicative focus of the sentence. The distributional model of “not” reveals the whole set of patterns.

V. Mykhailenko [4] provides the distributional model of not in the Modern English sentence which helps to define the subjective modality senses generated by the speaker/author:

1. *not* + at all
2. *not* + half
3. *not* + least
4. *not* + to mention
5. nothing if + not
6. *not* + for nothing
7. *not* + ones

The defined combinability and its notional character make the usage of “not” as an emphatic constituent of utterance/discourse possible.

Although other distributional patterns can reveal the meaning of contrast:

1. *not* + only + a thing
2. *not* + just/simply
3. *not* + merely.

The most elaborated description of the *not* valency in the Modern English sentence is given by Susan K. Bland in her Intermediate Grammar [5, p. 26]. The dictionary entry of “not” gives some evidence for a further comparative analysis:

1. Collins Cobuild – 13 positions and functions;
2. New Webster’s – 7 positions and functions;
3. American Heritage – 4 positions and functions;
4. Oxford Advanced – 8 positions and functions [4, p. 106].

The readings registered in the dictionary entries mainly have the following features in common:

1. not-emphatic: emphatic usage of a modal category’
2. particle: adverb category as a morphological category;
3. constituent of a part of a sentence: a part of a sentence as a syntactic category.

They differ in a number of distributions. It is also possible to determine some functional features:

1. negator;

2. clause substitutor;
3. contrastor;
4. intensifier;
5. emphasiser;
6. introductory [6, p. 107].

Thus, the *not*-paradigm can distinguish between semantic and functional subparadigms proving the thesis that a word in Modern English can be a constituent of various paradigms – grammatical, functional, semantic, word-building, etc.

So, the analysis of “not” in language competence and performance reveals the functions of two different parts of speech each characterized with its own specific features. The transposition of *not-nauht*, adverb into *not1*, a particle, occurred due to the disappearance of Old English negative particle “*ne*”, and into *not2*, adverb which retains its adverbial character as a constituent of the modal adverbs paradigm. Besides, the transformational model of description also proves the fact of difference between *not1* and *not2*.

In the Old English language negative pronouns are formed by fusion of a negative particle *ne* with indefinite pronoun *æ nis* and numeral *an* in its pronominal function. They are *nan* and *næniz*, and are declined like the corresponding words without the particle *ne*:

No one opposed him.

No one lived to the north of him [7, p. 35].

Speaking about pronouns *nanig*, *anig* and *nan*, it is important to mention that according to syntactic point of view, they do not differ. A noticeable difference between them is in their dialectical distribution: *anig*, used in the function of indefinite pronoun (*ne v...anig*) found in the West-Saxon and English texts as “*nanig*” and “*ne v...anig*” is the pure English form, that was avoided by all West-Saxon writers, including Alfred and Aelfric. There are only three examples of “*nanig*” in the Chronic, Alfred uses “*nanig*” only once. Aelfric who is famous for his tendency to use a lot of negations in one sentence has no “*nanig*” in his text. It proves the fact that all the West-Saxon authors used only “*nan*”- a contracted form that cannot be used as “*nanig*” in a full form. It is a well-known fact that the negative contraction in prestressed syllables is common not only for pronouns, but also for verbs. Among Germanic Languages Old English has the highest level of contraction. According to P. Levin (“Negative contraction: an Old and Middle English Dialect Criterion” JEGP57, 1958), the West-Saxon dialect was rich in contracted forms, while the English dialect preferred to use full forms.

For example, Aelfric found 4 full forms and 477 contracted forms. According to Wulfstram, who was conducting his research at the same period, 17 contracted forms and 281 full forms were found respectively. So, if the West-Saxon authors do not use the pronoun “*nanig*” (*ne v...anig*) Wulfstram uses 14 times “*nanig*” in 98 sentences.

Pronoun *none* belongs to the Old English pronoun *ne-ân*, and during the Old English period it became an unseparated word *nan*. During the 12th century the sound [â] turned into [ô] and *nan* under the influence of [n] becomes shorter and turned into none [nun]. Then the long [u] becomes a short [u] and in the 17th century it turned into [a]. So, [nun] > [nun] > [nan].

It is important to mention that during the Middle English Period the pronoun *no* was used together with none. It was not influenced by the vowel changes (shortening), because there were no conditions to cause them, and that is why [ô] turned into [ou]; in such a way a new pronoun *no* appeared and it became an element of pronouns *nobody* and *no one* [7, p. 35].

During the Old English Period the pronoun *nân* was often used together with a noun *pi3*, and during the Middle English period these two words merged into a pronoun *nothing*.

So, it is possible to conclude that in the Old English language negative pronouns were formed by fusion of a negative particle *ne* with indefinite pronoun *æ nis* and numeral *an* in its pronominal function.

Negative adverbs deprecate the existence of the notion, marked by the root morpheme of the mentioned adverb. Thus the adverbs *nowhere* and *never* express absence of place and time correspondingly:

(1) *There was no man nowher so virtuous: he was the beste beggere in his hous.*

(2) *A bettre envined man was nevere noon.*

Adverbs that include negation are used in order to distinguish the object from the set of objects related to it. For example, the adverb *never* pertains to the set of moments or interstice of time, while the adverb *nowhere* pertains to the set of places in space.

At the same time adverbs point at the absence of the thing that corresponds to its matter. For example, the negative adverb *never* expresses the idea of time in general, and at the same time points to the absence of the moment of time for any concrete fact [8].

Negative adverbs in Middle English are formed with the help of the negative particles *no* and *ne*.

(1) *So greet a purchasour was nowher noon.*

(2) *This somnour bar to him a stif burdoun; was nevere trompe of half so greet a soun* [9, p. 168].

So, negative adverbs express negation of the presence of the object in general or in its certain qualitative (*by no means*) definiteness.

Mononegation is the linguistic phenomenon or the characteristic ability of the language to include one negator in the sentence that can make the whole sentence a negative one.

The Old English negative sentence is characterized by polinegation while the Modern English negative sentence is characterized by mononegation and employs a preverbal particle combined with an auxiliary/modal have and be verbs:

(1) *I can't understand it.*

This story isn't about Spanish woman

where the preverbal negative particle combines with an auxiliary/modal/have and be makes the whole sentence negative. However, there are many instances of the cumulative negation in the sentence pattern.

(2) *With an unconscious gesture, the doctor pulled down his waistcoat (inclined of late to be uncomfortably tight) and racked his brains, so as not to disappoint the lovely creature who addressed him so confidently [6, p.16].*

This sentence consists of three clauses and in each clause the negator is the prefix morpheme *un-* or the particle *nor* which also does not refer to the whole clause but to the infinitival phrase. Nevertheless there are three negative elements but the clauses are affirmative.

(3) *There was no denoted attachment between them, no terrible grief [6, p. 16].*

There is a negative pronoun used as a pre-word negation but the sentence remains affirmative. The same holds true about the sentence with negative adverbs and pronouns:

(4) *I never said anything about of the kind.*

There was nothing remarkable about either of them [6, p. 17].

Evidently only a pre-verb particle “not” can make a sentence itself. The sentence three serves as an evidence of the hypothesis – the particle *not* is treated as a sentence negation (sentence modality marker).

The cumulative negation is not a sentence feature; it is a feature of the phrase of the word. This negation type can not be referred to Old Germanic because it was the feature of Late Old English which started to be standardized in accordance with the sentence model common to Modern English.

NP/IP + Vaux/mod + NOT + Vinf + ... (negative statement)

Life will not pass them by [6, p. 16].

V aux + NOT + Vinf + ... (negative question)

Don't you know any creepy stories [6, p. 16].

Vauf + NOT + Vinf + ... (negative command or prohibition)

Don't forget your ginger jar, Rendell [6, p. 16].

Although the category of negation in diachrony is not fully investigated yet, however, the Old Germanic negative sentence is characterized with mononegation where there is a particle in the initial preverb position.

In Late Old English as well as in other Old Germanic languages polynegation was caused by the development of generalized negative parts of a sentence. In this case, negative pronouns, adverbs, and words with a negative affix are the elements of the communicative significance, because the speaker/author attracts the listener/reader's attention to the absence of quality or process by using pre-word negation. In the English sentence the emphasis is laid on the subject that is why it is negated. Accordingly, it can be formally affirmative.

In comparison with the grammatical structure of the sentence containing two grammatical centers there can be several communicative intentions. Probably, these communicative centers in the negative sentences became marked with preword negative elements. However, later on the grammatical constraints began to cause the changes in the sentence structure – the sentence negation was attracted by the verb, i.e. all the negative elements were compressed into one in the regular negative sentence. The algebraic negation (negation + negation = affirmation) is a stylistic feature:

(1) *I don't like untrue people → I like true people.*

The Old English paradigm of negation includes the negative particle *ne-* used in the initial position – preverb or presubject. Whereas the New English particle combines with an auxiliary (or be/have) and can be contracted, the Old English particle can be combined with the verbs *habban* “have” and *wyllan* “will”:

(1) *Nafa þu fremde zodas deforan me! (Deutrononium).*

(2) *Nelle þu elnian and elenwondian betwux awyrzyde (Psalter).*

The Old English prohibitive sentence distinguishes between a preverbal negation and preword negation and preword negation.

(1) *Ne do 3e uryhtwisclice (Pastoral Care).*

It can be stated that this is a mononegative type with an additional direct negation. The dominant structure of the Old English two-member prohibitive sentence is NE + Vimp + Sþu + ...:

(1) *Ne ga þu þanon (Exodus).*

and the Old English one-member prohibitives have the structure:

(1) *Ne forlæt us... (Pastoral Care).*

In Old English likewise in New English the preverbal particle (ne-not) can be treated as a sentence modal operator [6].

Prohibitive mononegative sentences with one verbal center are not characteristic for Old English.

To clarify cumulative negation in New English we must refer to Old English where the number of negative elements was not limited when in fact there is always a sentence negation expressed by the particle *ne* and other are preword negative elements which specify the communicative centres in the sentence,

(1) *Nu zirn þu þines neahstan wifes ne his huses ne his landes ne nan þæra þinza (Deutrononium).*

where *ne* is a preverbal (Sentence Modal Operator), n2, n3, n4 can be interpreted interpreted as New English neither...nor, nan – nothing/no one.

The Old English paradigm of negation means marked in prohibitive utterances distinguishes between the most frequently used – ne...nan, ne...na/no and the least nafa/nyle - ...nan/ne. The qualitative and quantitative data obtained from over 100 Old English written records prove to be reliable.

The use of two or more negation elements does not result in the positive sentence meaning. On the contrary, each succeeding negation intensifies the author's communicative intention:

(1) *ne forbinde ze no þæm descendum (Matheus).*

(2) *ne wire þu nan weore þam dæze (Exodus).*

(3) *ne' spræ þu næfre (John).*

In these examples the second negation (*no, nan, næfre*) specifies the communicatively significant constituent of the sentence and strengthens the sentence negation.

So, the development of the means of negation in English and types of negative sentence stabilization outlines two parallel aspects interacting in the sentence structure – grammatical and communicative. Mononegation as a grammatical phenomenon is characterized for the latter periods of the development of the English language, but not for Old English.

Polynegation is the linguistic phenomenon or the characteristic ability of the language to include more than one negator that can make the whole sentence negative, serving as the accumulation of negation in the sentence.

Despite the fact that the problem of polynegation in Old English was discussed many times but it still demands deeper investigation. All the works that are dedicated to the mentioned question can be divided into two main groups:

1) works which deal with ascertaining of the fact of the polynegation in Old English and explanation of the reasons of its disappearance in Modern English;

2) works which deal with the explanation of the Old English polynegation.

The investigation by L. Kedova was made on the basis of the Old English literature (Bede, Cædmon, Widsith (7th century), Gnostic Verses (the beginning of the 8th century, poems by Cynewulf (750-825 A.D.), Beowulf (7-8 century A.D.), Alfred's prose (849-901 A.D.), Aelfric's prose (1008 A.D.), Wulfstan (1023 A.D.) [10, p. 37].

She mentions that poetry is rich in mononegative sentences, while in prose it is possible to find a great number of polynegative sentences. For example, Aelfric uses only polynegative sentences. Alfred uses mononegative sentences, but rarely. So, it is important to mention that there is a preference of mononegative sentences in poetry. All the mentioned poetical works are older than prosaic works and they continue the initial Indo-European type that was mentioned before.

The accumulation of negation in the sentence becomes a norm for prosaic works, but there are interesting exceptions that can explain this phenomenon. As it was stated all the 8 sentences in the Gnostic Verses are mononegative. In three sentences the pronoun *nænig* is used, in two – *sunig* (negation with the predicate, i.e. *ne v...æfre*); in three – *æfre* (*ne v...æfre*); in one – *nowiht*. In poems by Cynewulf it is possible to find 5 sentences with *nænig*, in the 21st – *ænig* (*ne v...ænig*); in 11 – *næfre*, in 7 – *æfre*, in 2 – *nan*. So, all sentences, besides 2 are mononegative and they include the pronoun *nan*. For example,

(1) *...heah fæ dra nan ne witgena (Juliana);*

(2) *nan swylc ne cwom ænig other ofer ealle men (Christ).* But even this last sentence proves the regularity, because there is a form "*ænig*", and not "*nænig*".

In *Beowulf*, there are examples of *nænig* in 8 sentences, *ænig* – in 24 sentences, *næfre* in 8 sentences, *æfre* – in 2 sentences – *nan*. So, in *Beowulf* there are only two examples of the *nan*-usage:

(1) *næfre at hildene swac manna ængum (Beowulf).*

(2) *pone syncathan ænig ofer eorpan irrena cyst, guthbilla nan, gretan nolde (Beowulf).*

But in the first sentence there is "*ængum*" but not "*nængum*" and in the second usage of "*nolde*" but not "*wolde*" is explained by the demands of alliteration, while "*guthbilla*" would not give the needed sense [10, p. 38].

Speaking about the difference between pronouns "*nænig/ænig*" and "*nan*", we can mention that they perform the same syntactical function in the sentence but according to their dialectical distribution, "*ænig*" performs only the function of the indefinite pronoun (i.e. "*ne v...ænig*"). In the works by West-Saxon writers, including Alfred and Aelfric

we can mention that, in works by Aelfric there are only three examples of the “*nænig*” usage. Alfred uses “*nænig*” only once. Aelfric, famous for his disposition to the accumulation of negation in one sentence didn’t use it at all, i.e. all the West-Saxon writers used only “*nan*” – contracted form, that was not used in comparison with “*nænig*” in full form (*nev...an*). It is a well-known fact that negative contraction in the prestressed syllables is peculiar not only to pronouns, but to predicates too. Among Germanic Languages Old English and Old Frisian have the largest level of contraction. According to P. Levin, the West-Saxon dialect preferred the contracted forms while the English dialect was rich in contraction [11].

For example, in Aelfric’s works were found only 4 full forms and 477 contracted forms. But in works by Wulfstan, the contemporary of Aelfric, there are only 17 contracted forms and 281 full forms. And when the West-Saxon writers don’t use the pronoun “*nænig*” (*ne v...ænig*), in Wulfstan’s 98 sentences “*nan*” is used only 14 times. Then, among all 119 sentences (according to D. Betherum “*The Homilies of Wulfstan*”, Oxford, 1957) 23 are polynegative (19%) and among 23 sentences “*nan*” is used in 14 of them. The other are *næfre...ne v*. It seems that such difference is explained by the English nature of Wulfstan’s sermons [10, p. 39].

All the poetical works, mentioned above, are written in the English dialect, and they do not include the pronoun “*nan*”. It cannot be found in the earliest works at all, for example, in poems by Cædmon or in Gnostic Verses. Perhaps, the cases of its usage in the poems “*Christ*”, “*Guliana*”, “*Beowulf*” should be considered as borrowing.

So, it seems that polynegation in Old English is not a general linguistic phenomenon, that is why it is impossible to speak about it as a norm for Old English. But dialectical phenomenon that is peculiar to the West-Saxon dialect then becomes the norm in the national language.

On the syntactic level the category of negation is expressed with the help of the particle *ne*, that is put before the predicate or any other negative pronoun: *nān* – *nobody*, *nāht* – *nothing*. The main difference between Old English and Modern English was the possibility to put two or more negations in the sentence. For instance, *ne con ich nōht sinzan* – *I can sing nothing*.

In the mentioned sentence *ne* and *nōht* are two examples of negation, used in one sentence. The main peculiarity of Old English was the possibility of the *ne*-particle to unite with the following predicate. For example:

ne habban > *habban*

ne hæfde > *næfde*

ne wiste > *nyste*

ne wæs > *næs* [12, p. 168].

In negative sentences a similar situation observed, as far as the introduction of *do*-periphrasis is concerned.

The usual way of negation (of the predicate) in Old English was by placing the negative particle *ne* before the finite verb. It thus closely resembled Old High German, which did the same with the particle *ni* [12, p. 169]. Compare the Old English examples from *Beowulf*:

(1) *ne mæz ic hēr lenz wesān* (lit. “*not can I here longer be/stay*”).

ne wille ic lenz his zeonzra wurpan.

(2) *ne seah ic þus manize menn mōdislicran.*

hie ne wēndon, thætte æfre menn sceolden swæ reččelēasevweorthan.

The negative construction continues to occur in Middle English. See the examples from *The Canterbury Tales*:

(1) *ne mazzþ þe mann bi bræd all āne libbenn.*

(2) *ic ne cunne singe.*

(3) *shō ne cōþe gōn on fōte.*

(4) *hē nee et, ne drōnk, ne sleep.*

For the strengthening of negation (emphatic negation) Old English made either use of pre- or postverbal stressed *nō/nā* (in conjunction with or without the ordinary negative particle *ne*) or, to an increasing extent, of the postverbal “negative negation supporter” *nōwiht/nāwiht*, or contracted *nōht* (later reduced to *noht*), *nāht*, which is very similar to Old High German *niawiht*, later *niht* (the Modern German *nicht*), as far as its concerned [12, p. 170]. Compare the following instances:

(1) *ic zelyfe nō þæt...eorthwelan ēčč ston dath* (with multiple negation) *næs (<ne wæs)þæt nā se Godrič þe thā zúthe forbēah* (*Battle of Maldon*).

(2) *ne can ic noht sinzan* (*I cannot sing (at all)*) (*Battle of Maldon*).

The latter construction, which seems to have been purely emphatic in Old English, greatly increased in frequency in Middle English and is assumed in course of time to have lost more and more of its original emphatic force and to have, thus, gradually become the “norm” in non-emphatic negative sentences. A very similar development seems to have taken place in German [12, p. 170]. Compare the following examples from *The Canterbury Tales*:

(1) *hē ne wile noht forhēlen hise sinness;*

(2) *ne löve a man ne kan I naught, ne may, ayeins mý wyl;*

(3) *þōu ne schalt nozt brēke spōushōd;* (4) *zē no haue it noust deleid;*

- (5) *the mann ne lēueth (lives) naht be brēad āne;*
 (6) *be nāme ne know ŷ nozt what hē was;*
 (7) *þōu ne lōuest mē nozt I ne dide it nozt, brōþer.*

Loss of the emphatic force of the “negative negation supporter” through frequent use did not only result in reduced forms such as *not/nat* as the only negation marker. Thereafter *ne* quickly passed out of the use in English, as *ni* had done earlier in German, where *niht/nicht* alone then took on the same role as *not* in English [12, p. 171]. Compare later Middle English examples from *The Canterbury Tales* such as following:

- (1) *that folk is nouht ferm in þe faith;*
 (2) *I am nat āble for to descrȳve his virtues;*
 (3) *I kan nat lōue a coward;*
 (4) *in maydons daunce ŷ wyl not gā (go);*
 (5) *hē schall nought faile to receive his peine;*
 (6) *for fēre thei dar noght telle.*
I cōude hire noght discrȳven.

thōu kanst it not ōut of thȳn herte drȳve.

and with “simple finite verb phrases” containing lexical verbs other than *have* or *be* in *The Canterbury Tales*:

- (1) *they herden not the vois of theaskere.*
 (2) *yee knau (know) noght mē.*
 (3) *I sei not þat it is impossible.*
 (4) *I saugh yow noght this fōurtenyght.*
 (5) *hē went nat to the hōuse of his friende.*

Up to this stage, the development of negative construction had proceeded along the same lines both in English and in German. Even in sentences without auxiliary negation forms, not very different from German, continued to be used in the Early Modern English period and did not become completely obsolete until the late eighteenth century [12, p. 171]. Compare:

- (1) *honest gentlemen, I know not your breeding (2 Henry IV).*
 (2) *what they made there, I know not (Merry Wives).*
 (3) *I like not that (Othello).*
 (4) *you spoke not with her since (Lear).*
 (5) *I say not that... (Dryden).*

Even in 20th-century liturgical English there still occur forms like

- (1) *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*

However, in the course of the 16th century a new rival pattern had made its appearance in sentences where no auxiliary was available (*be* or *have*): the negative construction *wit* inserted ‘dummy auxiliary’ *do* followed by the negative particle *not*. Earlier *do* in:

- (1) *hūane wē in godes serūise beoth, wē ne doz nought ōure orde brēke.*

seems to be emphatic and, thus, differs from the unstressed semantically empty auxiliary in the Modern English negative constructions [12, p. 171]. For example, in Elizabethan English compare:

(1) *I know you well enough. – No, Sir John; you do not know me (1 Henry IV)* (possibly with greater emphasis on *not*, since otherwise *know* is still mostly negated without *do*)

- (2) *I do not think that...*

faith doth not always signifie a life

I do not like her name (As You Like It).

From the 17th century, the new pattern became increasingly common in negative sentences, although with some verbs (such as *know*, *mistake*, etc.) *do*-less negatives remained “in favour” for some time to come. After *do*-insertion had become obligatory, negative constructions in English all followed the same pattern and had their negative particle always placed immediately after an auxiliary (with the exception of sentences with non-auxiliary *be* and, to some extent, *have*).

The earliest instances of *do*-insertion in negative interrogative clauses go back as far as Late Middle English and appear, thus, at roughly the same time as in positive questions. As in Present-Day English:

e.g. did they not warn you? (rather formal)

didn't they warn you?

They have the negative particle placed either after the subject noun phrase or pronoun or after the finite form of the auxiliary. Compare examples from *The Canterbury Tales*:

- (1) *dō yē nō drēde God that is abōve?*
 (2) *dōþ nozt þei blasphemē þe gōde nāme þat is y-clēped on zōw?*
 (3) *did nozt ser Dary to vs write his pistil with pride?*

Earlier negation patterns in interrogative clauses occur in the following Old English:

(1) *ne dricst þú win?* (OE)

and Middle English examples from *The Canterbury Tales*:

(1) *ne fēlest tú þi flesch al to- luken?*

(2) *hwi ne fēle ich þē in min breostes&.*

or, with the original 'negative negation supporter' made into the only negation marker:

(3) *sèo zē nouzt þat zǿng mon, þat hap schǿn bouzt?*

(4) *drēdist thǿu not God?*

Constructions of the latter type are far from being uncommon in Early Modern English, as can be seen from Shakespeare's usage:

(1) *went you not to her yesterday?* (*Merry Wives*).

(2) *why went you not with Master doctor, maid?* (*Merry Wives*).

But there was a considerable increase in the use of the *do*-construction at the same time [12, p. 172]. Compare:

(1) *doth not the king lack subjects?* (*2 Henry IV*).

(2) *and didst though not desire me to be no more so familiarity with such poor people?* (*Henry IV*).

(3) *does he not hold up his head? Yes, indeed, does he* (*Merry Wives*).

In negative sentences where the verb is in the imperative the early negation patterns (without *do*-insertion) are exclusively used throughout the Old English construction like:

(1) *ne sorza snotor zuma* (*Beowulf*).

ne zelæd þú us on constnunze (with second-person subject)

ne læd þú nā us on constnunze.

Compare with the Middle English counterparts from *The Canterbury Tales*:

(1) *ne blāme thǿu any man*

ne spēke zē with nā mon

(2) *ne lēd us noht in to costnunga*

ne slēpe zē nawt

(2) *ne hāste yǿw nat tō faste*

The construction with the original negative negation supporter *noht* made into the only negation marker is attested from late 14th century. Compare examples from *The Canterbury Tales*:

(1) *consente þǿu not to such folýe.*

(2) *gā þǿu noght o þi hús a stepe.*

(3) *sey nat al þat þǿu kan.*

Negative "commands" of this type survive until far into the Early Modern English period [12, p. 172], as for instance:

(1) *believe not the word of the noble* (*2 Henry IV*).

(2) *fear not your advancements* (*2 Henry IV*)

(3) *persuae me not* (*Merry Wives*).

The modern *do* construction in which semantically empty *do* occurs in sentence-initial position and the main verb is placed after the negative particle, or, after the subject, as in Middle English:

(1) *lǿke yē, dō not lýe!* (*The Canterbury Tales*)

does not really become a 'rival pattern' before the time of Shakespeare and thereafter, when instances such as the following begin to multiply:

(2) *do not betray me, sir!* (*Merry Wives*).

(2) *do not hang a thief!* (*1 Henry IV*).

With the rise of contracted forms of the negative particle, as in:

(1) *don't open the door* (informal standard), or

(2) *don't you/anyone open the door,*

the present usage was fully established [12, p. 172].

Altogether, the stage of free variation between sentences with and without *do* was gradually coming to an end in later part of the Early Modern English period. Regulation of the use of *do* is assumed to have begun in the middle of the 16th century and to have reached a fairly advanced stage by the beginning of the 18th century. Total adjustment to modern usage was achieved before the opening of the 20th century.

Conclusion

The authors of the article concluded the following:

- the main source of the enrichment of the negative affixes paradigm and their new meaning are affixes, borrowed from other languages;
- the *not-paradigm* can distinguish between semantic and functional subparadigms;

- the transposition of *not-nauht* occurred due to the disappearance of the Old English negative particle “ne”;
- negative pronouns in Old English were formed by means of fusion of a negative particle *ne* with indefinite pronoun *æn nis* and numeral *an* in its pronominal function;
- polynegation in Old English is not a general linguistic phenomenon, that is why it is impossible to speak about polynegation as a norm for Old English;
- the stage of free variation between sentences with and without *do* was gradually coming to an end in the latter part of the Early Modern English period;
- the development of the means of negation in English and types of negative sentence stabilization outline two parallel aspects interacting in the sentence structure – grammatical and communicative.

Given the relevance of the present article, the prospects of further study in this field lie, in our view, in investigating negation in different discourses and communicative situations. That would be essential for researching communicative strategies in anthropocentric paradigm.

References

- [1] Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A. (1982). *University Grammar of English*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, 390 p.
- [2] Trutyak I. (2004) Diachrony of the paradigm of negative affixes of the English language. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №188-189, P. 276–283.
- [3] Leontieva S. (1974). Negative affixes in modern English. High School. Moscow: p. 5–24.
- [4] Mykhailenko V.V. (2000). Semantics and paradigmatics of the negation operator. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №72, P. 48–51.
- [5] Bland, Susan Kesnor. (1996). *Intermediate Grammar. From Form to Meaning and Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 531 p.
- [6] Mykhailenko V.V. (1997) Negation as a communicative indicator in diachrony. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №12 (3), P. 15–22.
- [7] Arakin V. (1985). *History of the English language*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 35 p.
- [8] Hiang Thian-Fan. (1975). *A study of adverbs*. Monton: Academic Press, 96 p.
- [9] *The Norton anthology of English literature*. (1990). The major authors / M.H. Abrams, general editor, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, pp. 165–231.
- [10] Kedova L. (1988). On the issue of the polynegation of the Old English language. *Journal of Kharkiv University*, №322, p.p. 37–40.
- [11] Levin P. (1958). Negative Contraction: An old and Middle English Dialect Criterion. *Bloomington: IEGP*, pp. 22–35.
- [12] Berndt Rolf. (1982). *A History of the English language*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie, pp. 168–172.