

CATEGORY OF NEGATION AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN LANGUAGE BY THE VERBS OF NEGATIVE SEMANTICS

Elena A. Kamyshanchenko¹, Natalia V. Grigorenko²,
Larisa V. Tsurikova³, Andrey P. Peresyppkin⁴, Anna A. Merezhko⁵

^{1,2}Candidate of Philology, Assoc. Prof., ³Candidate of Education, Assoc. Prof.,
⁴Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Assoc. Prof., ⁵Postgraduate, Assist. Prof.,
The National Research University, "Belgorod State University"/"BelSU",
308015, Belgorod, Pobeda Street, 85 (RUSSIA)
E-mails: kamyshanchenko@bsu.edu.ru, grigorenko@bsu.edu.ru,
tsurikova@bsu.edu.ru, peresyppkin@bsu.edu.ru, merezhko@bsu.edu.ru

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2014/5-4/3

Received: 05 Apr, 2014
Accepted: Oct, 14 2014

ABSTRACT

The authors consider different approaches to the definition of the category of negation in philosophy, logic, linguistic. This article reviews a number of properties that are characteristic of various operations under the name 'negation', some of the reasons for and against considering some of them to be a correct account of negation, and whether a variety of negations can coexist. This article also considers the main strategies that languages use for solving the problem of expressing negation and analyses the interaction between the category of negation and negative seme of the English verbs.

Key words: category, negation, affirmation, negative seme, double negatives, explicit negation, implicit negation, modality, predication

1. INTRODUCTION

The categories of *negation* and *affirmation*, according to Getmanova A.D., Bakharev A.I. and others, appeared among the first in the course of human thought development and were brought to absolute categories as defined by philosophers through the categories of *existence / non-existence* [1, 2].

Aristotle gave the *negation* the status of a logical category opposed to *affirmation*, using the concepts of *lack, privation* to express process of negation. He understands the *negation* as a logical form which shows that the thing in itself does not have something that it tends to have by its nature. The *affirmation* claims that an object has any characteristic, and the *negation* claims that an object lacks it. They exist in the relation of contradiction. Every affirmation opposes negation, every negation opposes affirmation [3].

Considering the negation as a lack when something does not have something, Aristotle calls one of the contradiction's oppositions as the negation. One of oppositions acts as a lack of another: inequality is a lack of equality, dissimilarity is a lack of similarity, vice is a lack of virtue and so on. [3]. Thus, the negation is understood as opposition and the result of contradiction.

2. METHODS

Methods of the analysis are defined by the objectives of the research, a theoretical and practical concept, type of the analyzed material. In the work various types of the analysis are implied: conceptual (structuring and analysis of the main theories on the content of negation); semantic analysis (studying semantic structure and distinguishing the negative seme in the analyzed lexical units); contextual and syntactical analysis (studying features of the context and syntactical structures where negative seme is actualized).

3. MAIN PART

In formal logic, the *negation* is a logical process in the result of which, statement (proposition) A turns into statement (proposition) not-A, or statement not-A turns into statement A [2].

The negation is used to reject a false statement and oppose it a true one. However, affirmative or negative statements can be both true. Let's consider the examples given by Bakharev A.I.: *The moon is a satellite of the Earth* (affirmative statement), and *It is not true that wood is metal* (negative statement). These two statements are true. Likewise, affirmative and negative statements can be false. Consequently, the falsity and negation are the concepts of different sense [2].

In addition to the negation of a statement as a whole, classical logic considers the negation of a predicate, which is used to express that a subject doesn't have some characteristics.

The concepts of the negation in the philosophical and logical literature agree on one thing: affirmation and negation are treated as opposed in the statement quality. Bondarenko V.N. considers that an object in its quality distinctness can either exist or not exist, can either have some specific features or not have them. The lack of any object's specific feature is a real characteristic which has objective validity and has place in negative judgments. [4].

In linguistics, as there is no consensus concerning the category of negation. This problem was developed in several directions. In the psychological and pragmatic concepts of negation this category is defined either as a pure product of the human psyche, or just as intralingual function - expression of a speaker's view about someone else's thoughts.

The negation is also interpreted as a special form of modality and predication. Including the negation understood as a subjective assessment or unreality of anything into some certain modal meanings according to Bondarenko V.N. is connected with unjustified broad understanding of the category of modality. Predication does not depend on negative or affirmative form of a statement [4].

We also should pay attention to the concept of negation as an expression of the lack of objective connection.

Linguistic Dictionaries define the category of negation as an element of a sentence's meaning which indicates that the connection between the components of a sentence according to a speaker is not real [5, 6, 7].

However according to Bakharev A.I. we can not flatly insist that by negating the connection between parts of a sentence does not really exist. Means of expressing negation not only persist but do not change the ways of syntactic context.

Defining the negation as a category when we can declare such unreal interrelation which actually have an absolute reality (*chicken is not a bird*) and such realities which no one would guess (*iron is not stone*) A.M. Peshkovskiy says not about the connection between parts of a sentence, but the concept connection, the reality/unreality of the connection between concepts and categories [8].

It is the lack of a certain kind of interrelation in the reality but not merely objective interrelations that should be seen as the negation referent. Negation is not just the lack of objective interrelations, but also the objects themselves and/or their characteristics, which include objective interrelations.

Logical negation and linguistic negation with their means of expression are comparable within their sense, but do not always absolutely correspond with each other. Many linguists (E.I. Shendels, O.V. Trunova et al.) note that the essence of the grammatical category of negation is logical negation. Shendels E.I. claims that the logical category of affirmation and negation is the main essence of the language category, but not entirely filled. The language category of affirmation and negation also performs other functions and has relative independence and its own volume of meanings not adequate with the logical category. Using of different means of negation in a sentence may have quite different goals than the expression of a negative statement. In other words not every sentence with negation corresponds to a negative statement. It may correspond to a positive statement and serve as a mean of expression of not judgment, but prohibition, question and so on [9]. Trunova O.V. sees the difference between logical and grammatical negation in the universality of the first one and its ability to be expressed by different linguistic means [10].

Within the framework of cognitive linguistics the negation is considered as a concept, i.e. operational meaningful unit of thinking. The concept *negation*, as N.N. Boldyrev notes is the product of human consciousness as in the real world there is no lack of existence or occurrence and only human being makes it basing on his own experience and understanding of situation, basing on his own system of values, beliefs, assessments. At the heart of the language negation there is a classification concept which has a relative nature and obtains definite content only in relation with other concepts or conceptual framework [11].

In the statements of the people there are negations of different strength, ranging from a simple, barely noticeable disagreement with the views of another person, to categorical, irreversible negation. Therefore in natural language there is quite a variety of means of negation expression, and therefore there are a number of theories based on different principles of analysis and classification criteria for the category of negation. Variety of approaches to studying this phenomenon can be reduced to two positions: the negation is considered either in terms of formal, or in terms of functional parameters. In the first case we have a binary opposition, one member of which is marked by the introduction of the negation index. Classification formed on the functional basis includes a formal classification as its component and distinguishes two negations: implicit and explicit.

The problem of explicit negation is developed fundamentally and deep enough on the material of English [12, 13, 14, 15, 16 etc.]. The question of the implicit negation has no clear answer. However, many researchers pointed out that in English there are special words with internal negation as part of affirmative word form.

The example of it is the verbs with negative semantic \bar{c} in particular the English verbs with the meaning of *unrealized action* (fail, miss, overlook, disregard, ignore) and the verbs with the meaning of *insufficiency* (lack, want, need, require).

The verbs *fail, miss, overlook, disregard, ignore* and *lack* represent lexical units containing negation in their semantic structure and are a shining example of the expression of implicit negation. Sentences with these verbs are affirmative syntactic constructions, but suggest negation of:

- a) action performance: He failed to smile => He didn't manage to smile;
- b) some characteristics availability: His two top-front teeth were missing => He didn't have two top-front teeth; You lack courage => You don't have (enough) courage.

The verbs *want*, *need* and *require* were traditionally considered as verbs of wish. But in their semantic structure there are such semes as *insufficiency* and *lack of characteristics*. Let's consider some examples:

The book wants two pages at the end.

He wants self-confidence.

The car needs headlights.

The house requires cleaning.

Above sentences represent an affirmative syntactic construction, but imply negation of the existence of the subject's certain characteristics like the verb *lack* does: The book wants two pages at the end → The book does not have two pages; → The car needs headlights → The car does not have headlights; The house requires cleaning → The house is not clean.

Formal organization of a sentence with verbs of negative semantics does not correspond to its meaning. In other words the lack of formal markers of grammatical negation does not mean the lack of a negative meaning. The semantics of sentences with an implicit negation expressed by negative verbs lies in affirmation of negative facts.

Explicit negation is expressed by formal markers: lexical and grammatical. Therefore, adherence of any grammatical negation to predicate (often by means of auxiliary verb) and the occurrence of lexical negation on formal markers transfer a sentence into the category of negative statements: Jake **never** missed a beat; In this we **did not** fail.

In these sentences we observe the presence of two negations: explicit (never, did not) and implicit (miss, fail). The presence of grammatical and lexical negation shows that the sentences are formally negative, but the meaning of the whole sentence becomes positive, that corresponds to the logic law on removal of the negation when you double its representation that is two negations are opposed to each other and make positive meaning: I did not fail = I managed.

However, we can not talk about the linguistic concept of double negatives, which represents two linguistic phenomena different on their nature. This is primarily: 1) the presence of a negative particle, negative affix (morpheme) and means of their intensification in the form of negative pronouns and adverbs; 2) the presence of two negatives at the same part of a sentence. In the first case we have the negation and its intensification in negative form, in the second – negation of the negation. That is referring to the double negatives in linguistics we mean that there are two explicitly expressed negations that is possible, for example, in the Russian language and unacceptable by standards of mononegative languages, particularly in English.

Interesting is the nature of relationship between the verb *fail* and the modal verb *can* within the meaning *ability* in sentences with explicit negation. Here is an example: But her response was in such a loud stage whisper that Richard could not fail to hear. The verb *can* in this case refers to the verbal complement to hear and expresses the ability of auditory perception, and lexical meaning of the verb *fail* completely neutralized by the negative particle *not*, and its role in these sentences is to express more confidence of the speaker in his ability to perform an action. Similar process is observed in combination of the verb *miss* and causative verbs and modal verb *can*: He had been sure that he could not miss with the third shot → he could hit the target; We were eager to miss nothing → eager to see everything.

The verb *fail* has one more peculiarity combining with the verb *can* but in affirmative sentences: *A verb can fail to carry out its prototypical verbal functions by expressing not a report of action*. In such sentences the contrast between the semantic significance of the particle and the verb *fail* is neutralized and there complete agreement between the meaning of the verb and the grammatical form of negation is observed.

4. CONCLUSION

There are a number of issues relating to the semantics of negation. The correct analysis of negation is a subject of ongoing debate in different fields of science, not least because it has wider implications than might at first be evident. The important matter of the discussion is a number of properties that are characteristic of various operations under the name *negation*, some of the reasons for and against considering some of them to be a correct account of *negation* and whether a variety of negations can coexist.

Every language in the world is capable of producing sentences that deny or negate some state of affairs (compare *John likes to work* and *John does not like to work* [it is not true that [John likes to work]]). There are some strategies that languages use for solving the problem of expressing negation. The diachronic evolution of negation techniques shows that the pragmatics of communication plays an important role. Negative verbs such as *fail*, *miss*, *lack*, *want* etc. function somewhat differently in that they do not negate the truth value of an affirmative sentence.

5. RESULTS

Lexical units, in particular, such verbs as *fail*, *miss*, *ignore*, *disregard*, *lack* which include negative constituent in their semantic structure and the verbs *want*, *need*, *require* in definite syntactic structures are implicit negation, i.e. without changing the affirmative nature of the sentence structural scheme give it a negative meaning, but do not negate the truth of the whole statement.

REFERENCES

1. Getmanova A.D., 1972. Otritsanie v sistemakh formalnoy logiki. Moskva. (In Russian).

2. Bakharev A.I., 1980. Otritsanie v logike i grammatike. Saratov: Izdatelstvo Saratovskogo universiteta. (In Russian).
3. Aristotle Categories. Date Views 05.07.2014 <https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au> (2014 The University of Adelaide Last Modified 16/02/2014 CRICOS Provider Number 00123M)
4. Bondarenko V.N., 1983. Otristanie kak logiko-grammaticheskaya kategorija. Moskva: Nauka. (In Russian).
5. Linguistic encyclopaedic dictionary. Date Views 05.07.2014 www.tapemark.narod.ru
6. Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition). Date Views 05.07.2014 www.sciencedirect.com
7. Oxford Dictionaries Language Matters. Date Views 05.07.2014 www.oxforddictionaries.com
8. Peshkovsky A.M., 1938. *Russky syntaxis v nauchnom osveshchenii*. Moskva. (In Russian).
9. Shendels E.I., 1995. *Otritsanie kak lingvisticheskoe ponyatie*. *Uchenye zapiski pervogo Moskovskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta inostrannykh yazykov*, 19: 125-142. (In Russian).
10. Trunova O.V., 1978. *O ponyatii otritsania v logike i lingvistike*. *Sintaksis i rechevaya realizatsia ego kategoriy*. XXX Gertsenovskie chtenia, 4:102-107. (In Russian).
11. Boldyrev N.N., 2010. Kategorialny uroven predstavlenia znaniy v yazyke: modusnaya kategoriya otritsania. *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka*. Tipy kategoriy v yazyke, VII: 45-59. (In Russian).
12. Jespersen O., 1954. *Negation in English and other languages*. Copenhagen: Einar Muxsgaard.
13. Amirov A.T., 1981. *Implitsitnoe otritsanie v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke*. Moskva: Nauka. (In Russian).
14. Klima E., 1964. *Negation in English. The structure of language: readings in the philosophy of language*. Ed. By J. Fodor and J. Katz, pp: 246-323.
15. Miestamo M., 2005. Standard Negation. The Negation of the declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective. *Empirical approaches to language typology* 31. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York.
16. Negative concord in English and Romance: syntax-morphology interface conditions on the expression of negation. Date Views 05.07.2014 www.lotpublications.nl