

THE GRAMMATICAL AND SYNTACTICAL PARADIGM OF THE DIACHRONIC NEGATION CATEGORY

Nataliia PASICHNYK

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk

National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

pasichnyknataly1984@gmail.com

Anna KOSENKO

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine

kosenko.ann@gmail.com

Iryna BEZHENAR

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine

ivmasster@gmail.com

Olena BARABASH

Lviv Polytechnic National University, Ukraine

barabash2011@gmail.com

Nataliia ZAKORDONETS

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk

National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

nataliia.zakordonets@gmail.com

Inna OBIKHOD

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk

National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

innaobihod@gmail.com

Halyna KRASA

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk

National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

krasenijatko@ukr.net

<https://doi.org/10.52846/aucssflingv.v47i1-2.201>

1. Introduction

A comprehensive study of any linguistic concept requires an analysis of its various aspects. One of the most effective approaches is the diachronic approach, which sees the historical development of a language as the object of linguistic analysis. Therefore, the aim of this study is to perform a diachronic investigation on the main aspects of the lexico-grammatical paradigm of the category of negation. The diachronic study of the category of negation at the morphological,

lexical and syntactic levels helps to observe the development of specific parts of speech capable of expressing negation and provides a basis for further research on negation in discourse. The results can be taken into account for theoretical grammar and lexicography textbooks, negation handbooks, and for the development of interactive conversational skills in English.

2. Literature review

The issue of negation has been discussed from various angles. The nature of negation in the use of language has only recently begun to be studied, and most existing studies derive from problems of philosophy and logic, such as the equality and inequality between negative and affirmative sentences (I. Kant and Aristotle), negation at the syntactic level (R. Zanuttini, M. Greco), the place of negation in grammatical structures (V. Déprez, A. Pierce, J. Zlatev, M. Andrén), the contrastive analysis of negation in spoken and written English (G. Tottie), negation as a lexico-grammatical category (V. Bondarenko), negation as a diachronic communicative marker (V. Mykhailenko), current typological research on negation (M. Miestamo, I. Orenes, P. N. Johnson-Laird), the modeling of negation in computational linguistics (R. Morante, C. Sporleder), form and meaning of negative items in natural language (H. Zeijlstra), the representation of negation in different tenses (A. Cichosz, J. M. Arista and M. Laing). Despite the variety of work in this area, the complex nature of negation continues to be of great interest in contemporary linguistic research.

3. Methods

The following research methods were employed during the investigation: 1) componential analysis, which clarifies how the semantic components of negative meanings delimit the domain of negation, i.e., how implicit negative markers contribute to the category of negation with their positive forms; 2) quantitative analysis, which provides a precise and verifiable expression to qualitative ideas; 3) synchronic analysis, which aims to reveal the relationships between members of the negation category paradigm; 4) analysis of the negation category paradigm in author discourse (using Geoffrey Chaucer's 'The Canterbury Tales' as research material). This allows us to understand the conditions and nature of the problem, to analyse it within its own context; and to provide a description of the discourse features of the diachronic and synchronic aspects of negation in the text.

4. Results

As a grammatical category, negation can be realized at both morphological and syntactic levels. On the morphological level, negative affix paradigms and individual speech fragments are considered, while, on the syntactic level, all negative sentences containing one or more negations are observed.

Some differences are established in modern linguistics regarding the paradigm of negation affixation. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current*

English lists five main lexical meanings of the adjective ‘negative’ (Oxford Dictionary 2001: 778):

1. Expressing rejection or denial;
2. Focusing on the unfavorable aspects of a situation or person;
3. Indicating the absence of a condition or clause;
4. Less than zero;
5. Carried by electrons.

Examples include negative morphemes, negative connotations (commonly used in stylistics) and negative affixes. The new terminology of interference in the field of linguistics has helped to acknowledge the expansion of the negative affix paradigm. In Modern English, affixes with negative connotations can be identified as *un-*, *in-* (*il-*, *ir-*, *im-*), *a-*, *dis-*, *mis-*, *re-*, *de-*, *counter-*, (*contr-*), *anti-*, *pseudo-*, *false-*, *mal-*, *non-*, *-less*. Examples include: *unknown*, *dishonest*, *illegal*, *irregular*, *impossible*, *immoral*, *disharmonious*, *falsy spoken*, *rejected*, *deceptive*, *antagonistic*, *antisocial*, *pseudogothic*, *non-conformist*, *non-standard*, *heartless*.

The Old English paradigm of affixes with a negative meaning includes *wan-*, *un-*, *mis-*, *for-*, *wip-*, *gain-* and *-læ*. Examples include *wansaelig*, *miscwepan*, *fordeman* and *wipsegen*. In Early Middle English, they belong to the paradigm of affixes expressing negation: *un-*, *mis-*, *for-*, *-laes*, e.g. *unwit*, *misdeed*, *forwerpen*, *skillaes* (Trutyak 2004: 280-282).

Arguably, negative expressions have different lexical shades which are expressed with the help of negative affixes. Therefore, it makes sense to classify negative affixes according to the main lexical components of negation. Linguists identify four groups of affixes according to the mentioned criteria (Klima 1964: 250; Trutyak 2004: 280). They are:

1. Affixes expressing negativity (etymologically, they mean ‘distance’ in late French): *re-*, *de-* (e.g. *reject*, *deny*);
2. Affixes meaning absence or lack: *a-*, *un-*, *in-*, *il-*, *im-*, *-less*, *non-* (e.g. *unknown*, *incomplete*, *impotent*, *non-political*);
3. Suffixes with ‘bad’, ‘wrong’, ‘erroneous’ -meaning components: *mis-*, *mal-*, *pseudo-* (e.g. *misspelling*, *pseudogothic*, *malcontent*);
4. Affixes with the semantic component of the opposite action: *un-*, *de-*, *dis-* (e.g. *unbind*, *disqualify*); affixes with the semantic component of opposition: *contr-*, *anti-*, *couter-* (e.g. *counterpart*, *contradict*).

In general, affixes retain the meaning of the lexemes from which they are derived, but some variations can also be observed. Therefore, it is reasonable to study the etymology of affixes implying negation and to distinguish their meanings.

The first group of affixes is derived from words that mean ‘to distance oneself’, ‘to deny something’. The prefix *dis-* (its other forms *des-*, *de-*, *di-*, *dif-*, *s-*) derives from the Latin word that means ‘away’; but it should not be confused with the prefix *dis-* (its other form *bis-*), which derives from the Latin word ‘duo’ (‘two’) and means ‘apart’ (Poliuzhyn 2004: 102). Presumably, the meaning of distance is derived from the meaning of separation.

The prefix *re-* denoting negation was introduced into Late Middle English with French loanwords (e.g. *renounce*) and has retained this meaning mainly in the set of synonyms for 'reject'.

The affixes of the second group, except *-less*, derive from Indo-European *n/ne*. The prefix *wan-* was a common negative prefix in the Germanic languages (Berndt 1982: 173). It was very productive in Old English, but lost its productivity in the Middle Ages and was entirely replaced in Modern English by the affix *un-*. The prefix *wan-* derives from the Anglo-Saxon 'wan' that means 'black', 'dark'; and it became the root of the verbs 'to wane' (to decrease, to fail) and 'to want'. The suffix *-less* retains the semantics of the Old English comparative degree of the adjective 'laessa' (small) and derives from the Indo-European root 'laes' (weak) (*Middle English Compendium*).

The third group of affixes has the meaning of negative estimation. The prefix *mis-* is found in all Germanic languages, and it means 'wrong' (Berndt 1982: 170). This prefix has the form of *mis-* in Icelandic, *miss-* in Swedish, and *missa-* in German. It was very productive in Old Saxon, for example: *miscwepan* – 'neglect', *mislar* – 'bad teaching', *misslibban* – 'to live a bad life'. This prefix retains the semantic shadow of the Norse verb that means 'to fail to hit', 'to omit', from which the Anglo-Saxon *missan* (rare) is derived from (Mykhailenko 2000: 49). Words with this prefix have Scandinavian origin (e.g. *mistake*, *misunderstand*) and French origin (e.g. *misapply*, *misappropriate*). It is important to distinguish between the Germanic *mis-* and French *mes-*. The affix *mes-* (which later got the English spelling of *mis-*) derives from the Latin 'minus' (less) and expresses a negative evaluation (Huang 1975: 50-51), as in *misadventure*, *mischief*, *misalliance*.

The prefix *pseudo-* derives from the Greek noun meaning 'false' and it appeared in English from French. The prefix *mal-* was also borrowed from French, and first appeared in G. Chaucer's works. This affix retains the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon adverb 'male' (badly) from which it derived (Horn 1989: 203).

Although the prefix *for-* is not recorded as negative in grammar books, the analysis of its antonyms, its contextual analysis, and its correlation with the modern affix *dis-* attest to this fact. Anglo-Saxon dictionaries are full of antonymic pairs with *for-*, for instance: *feran* (to go) – *forferan* (to disappear); *cweþ* (well-known, famous) – *forþe* (bad); *don* (to build) – *fordon* (to destroy); *bugan* (to crawl) – *forbugan* (to avoid); *cweþan* (to say about someone) – *forþe* (to rebuke); *deman* (to judge well) – *fordeman* (to condemn) (*Middle English Compendium*).

It should be noted that the intensive component in the semantics of the prefix *for-* is quite different from that of the preposition *for*, which renders the meaning of destruction or loss, as it can be traced in the word *forbarnan* (to burn). Nevertheless, at the beginning of the Middle English period, in the *Ormulum* text, the prefix *for-* acquired negative meaning in the group of verbs expressing attitude, corresponding to the modern prefix *dis-*, for instance: *forþe* – 'despise', 'ignore'; *forþe* – 'to be confused' (*Middle English Compendium*). However, the affix *for-* usually retains a reinforcing tone in most lexemes. Etymologically, the prefix *for-* derives from the

Germanic root *for* (far/fur), from the Indo-European *Por/Pro* that means ‘put forward’ (Laduslaw 1992: 243), and from the Old English prefix *for-* denoting motion. The prefix *for-* can indicate a negative outcome or completion. This negative result often implies the absence, cessation or termination of an action, specifically due to the absence or cessation of the actor performing it.

Let us consider the fourth group of negative affixes. The reverse meaning of *un-* in English verbs developed from the negation in Participle II forms (Givon 1979: 134), e.g. *un bound*, *de-* with the meaning of reverse action borrowed from French verbs (e.g. *to degrade*, *to demobilize*).

The Latin opposition prefix *contra-* occurs in words of Latin origin (e.g. *contradiction*). Its other form, *counter-*, can be found in lexemes of English origin (e.g. *counterpart*). The prefix *anti-* (along with the allomorph *ant-*) came into English from Greek via Latin and means ‘opposite’ or ‘against’ (Huddleston 1984: 420). This affix is productive in Modern English.

The prefix *Wið-* derives from the Old English preposition *wiðer* that means ‘against’, or the same adjective meaning ‘hostile’. It lost its productivity at the beginning of the Middle English period, but was retained in the words ‘withstand’ and ‘withsay’ (Pasichnyk 2007a: 53).

In other words, on the lexical level, the category of negation is expressed with the help of affixes whose meaning includes an explanatory or suggestive element. Original affixes preserve the etymological meaning of words etymology and assign a special shade of negativity to the words to which the affixes are attached (Labov 1972: 782). The main source of enrichment and development of new meanings in the negative affix paradigm consists of affixes borrowed from other languages.

As already mentioned, negation is a philosophical, logical, and linguistic phenomenon and is opposed to affirmation at different hierarchies and levels of the linguistic structure. On the semantic level, an opposition can always be seen between affirmation and negation (antonymic relations): *long – short*, *good – bad*, etc. On the lexical level, when an affix expresses negation, the following occurs: 1) negation prefix + word root: *natural – unnatural*; *proper – improper*; *regular – irregular*; 2) word root + negation suffix: *shame – shameless*; *lifeless*. The prefix *un-* is the most frequent indicator of the negative quality expressed by word stems; there are about 1500 examples of ‘*un-* + word stem’ in Webster’s New World Dictionary.

On the morphological level, the most frequent means of expressing negation are the particle *not*, negative pronouns (e.g. *nobody*, *no one*, *nothing*), the conjunction *neither...nor*. All these means constitute the negation paradigm in modern English. As mentioned above, the grammatical paradigm of negation is formed with the help of the operators *not* (*n’t*), *neither*, *never*, *no*, *none*, *no one*, *nothing*, *nor*, *nowhere*. These operators have a similar meaning of sentence negation. However, when used in discourse, the negation operator can have different semantic functions, syntactic properties and meanings in predicate and comparison constructions (Bland 1996: 211).

Firstly, only three examples of *nænig* are found in Ælfric's work. Alfred uses *nænig* only once. In other words, all West Saxon writers predominantly used *nan* – the shortened form – rather than the full form *nænig* ['næ:nig]. This preference for the contracted form is a well-known characteristic, not only for pronouns, but also for predicates. Among the Germanic languages, Old English and Old Frisian exhibit a high frequency of contractions. According to P. Levin (Levin 1958: 24), West Saxon dialects favour contractions, while Anglian dialects display an even greater abundance of contractions. For example, Ælfric's work contains only four perfect forms and 477 contractions. In contrast, Ælfric's contemporary Wulfstan only has 17 contractions and 281 perfect forms. The West Saxon authors' pronoun *nænig* (ne ānig), *nān*, is only used 14 times in Wulfstan's 98 sentences.

Secondly, according to D. Bethurum's 'The Homilies of Wulfstan' (Bethurum 1957), out of a total of 119 sentences, 23 are polysemous (19%) and *nān* is used in 14 of those 23 sentences. These differences seem to be explained by the English nature of Wulfstan's sermons (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 1990). It is not found, for example, in the poems of Cædmon or in the Gnostic Verses. They could perhaps be seen as borrowings when they are used in poems such as *Judith*, *Juliana* and *Beowulf*. In other words, since polysemy was not a general linguistic phenomenon in Old English, one cannot speak of Old English as a uniform norm (Horn 1989: 202). However, it is a dialectal phenomenon specific to West Saxon dialects, which is the norm for that regional language.

On the syntactic level, the category of negation is expressed with the help of the particle *ne*, which is placed before predicates and certain negative pronouns. The main difference between Old and Modern English is that two or more negatives could be placed in a single sentence in Old English. For example, '*Ne con ich nōht simon*' translates to '*I cannot say anything*'. In this sentence, two negatives (*ne* and *nōht*) are used. An important feature of Old English is that the particle *ne* could be combined with the following predicate (Kedova 1988: 38-39), for example: '*ne habban*' became '*naþban*'; '*ne hæfde*' became '*næfde*'; '*ne wiste*' became '*nyste*'; and '*ne wæs*' became '*næs*' (*Bosworth Toller's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*).

A similar situation can be found regarding the introduction of the *do*-periphrasis in negative sentences. The usual method of negation in Old English was to place the negation particle *ne* before the finite verb. It was therefore very similar to Old High German, which did the same thing with the particle *ni* (Jespersen 1962: 74). Let us compare some Old English examples in 'Beowulf':

(1) *ne mæg ic her leng wesan* (I cannot remain here any longer) *ne wille ic leng his seonsra wurðan* (I will no longer be worthy of his sights).

(2) *Hie ne wendon þæt æfre men sceolden swa recceleas weorðan* (They did not think that men would ever become so reckless).

This negative construction is also used in Middle English. See examples in 'The Canterbury Tales':

(1) I ne can singe.

(2) He ne eet, ne drōnk, ne sleep.

To intensify negation (stressed negation), Old English used the stressed *nō/nā* (with or without the usual negation particle *ne*) before or after the verb, or the gradual postverbal ‘negation supporter’ *nōwiht/nāwiht* or the contracted *nōht* (later reduced to *not*), *nāht* (Khaimovych 1975: 80). Let us compare the following examples:

(1) *næs (< ne wæs) þæt nā se Godric þe þā sūþe forbēah* (‘The Battle of Maldon’).

(2) *ne can ic nōht singan* (I cannot sing) (‘The Battle of Maldon’).

The latter construction seems to have been purely emphatic in Old English, but its frequency increased considerably in Middle English. It is assumed that, over time, it lost more and more of its original emphatic force and thus gradually became ‘normative’ in unstressed negative sentences. A very similar development seems to have taken place in German (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1998: 112). Let us compare the following examples from ‘The Canterbury Tales’:

(1) *hé ne wile noht forhélen hise sinness;*

(2) *ne Jove a man ne kan naught, ne may, ayeins my wyl;*

(3) *šou ne schalt nowt bréke spōushād;*

(4) *sé ne haue it noust deleid;*

Let us compare the following examples:

(1) *ne dricst šu wind* (OE)

and

(2) *ne félest tū ši ši flesch al to luken?* (3) *hwi ne féle ich šé in min breostes?* (Middle English examples from *The Canterbury Tales*)

and

(4) *sēo sé noust pat sōng mon, pat han schön boust?* (5) *drédist thōu not God?* (the original ‘negative supporter’ as the only negative marker).

The mentioned constructions are not uncommon in Early Modern English, as Shakespeare’s usage shows:

(1) ‘Went you not to her yesterday?’ (‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’).

(2) ‘Why went you not with the master doctor, servant?’ (‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’).

At the same time, however, the use of *do-* constructions increased significantly (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 1990). Let us compare:

(1) ‘Has the king no subjects?’ (‘Henry IV’).

(2) ‘And did he not wish to be more intimate with such poor people?’ (‘Henry IV’).

(3) ‘And does he not raise his head?’ ‘Yes, indeed he does.’ (‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’).

In negative sentences where the verb is in the imperative mood, only the first negative form (without the suffix *-de*) is used throughout Old English syntax, for example: (1) *ne snotor suma* (‘Beowulf’). *Ne læd þu us on costnunge* (second person subject). *Ne læd þu na us on costnunge*.

Let us compare with Middle English in ‘The Canterbury Tales’:

- (1) ne blame thou any man ne speke so with no man;
- (2) ne led us nought into costnunge ne slepe he nawt;
- (3) ne haste yow nat to faste.

Constructions using the negative auxiliary *nought* as the only negative marker have been seen since the late 14th century. Let us compare with examples from 'The Canterbury Tales':

- (1) consente thou not to such folye;
- (2) go thou noght of thi hous a stepe.

Such negative 'injunctions' continued into the Early Modern English period (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 1990: 172), for example:

- (1) 'Believe not the words of the nobility' ('Henry IV').
- (2) 'Fear not your progress' ('Henry VI').
- (3) 'Do not persuade me' ('The Merry Wives of Windsor').

In modern *do*- constructions, the semantically empty *do* is placed at the beginning of the sentence and the main verb is placed after the negative particle or after the subject, as in Middle English:

- (1) 'Joke ye, do not lye!' ('The Canterbury Tales')

After Shakespeare's time, it doesn't actually become a 'competitive model' until examples such as the following start to develop:

- (1) 'Betray me not!' ('The Merry Wives of Windsor').
- (2) 'Hang not the thief!' ('Henry IV').

Contractions of negative particles have emerged, for example:

- (1) Do not open the door (formal standard).
- (2) Don't open the door (informal standard).

The current usage is now fully established (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 1990: 172).

The phase of free variation between sentences with and without *do* gradually ended in late Early Modern English. The regularization of the use of *do* began in the mid-16th century and is estimated to have reached a fairly advanced stage in the early 18th century (Mykhailenko 1997: 16). Full adaptation to modern usage was achieved in the early 20th century.

On a syntactic level, negatives have different functions in a sentence and are expressed in different ways: a) as the subject, b) as the predicate, c) as the object, d) as the adverbial modifier of time (or sometimes place), e) in the entire sentence (with the help of a negative conjunction). Negative declarative sentences are the standard expression of negation. The scope of the negation is determined by the position of the negation operator relatively to the verb and the boundaries of the components of the sentence (Biber et al. 1995: 200-201). In other words, the analysis of the linguistic levels where negation takes place shows that the category of negation has a wide range of tools for conveying the grammatical meaning of negation regarding a particular level of the linguistic hierarchy.

The phenomenon of multiple negation needs to be defined. Firstly, we should mention that 'mono-negation' is a linguistic phenomenon or a distinctive

linguistic skill in which a single negator in a sentence can turn the whole sentence into a negative sentence. Double or more complex negation, where two or more negations are present in a sentence, is called multiple negation. Double negation is an inference rule about non-operators. It states that two negation operators cancel each other out, and the clause to which they are applied remains unchanged. Applying two negation operators to a sentence does not change the meaning of the sentence, it just makes it more complicated (Swart 1971: 380). Double negation and triple negation are considered normative in Ukrainian, but grammatically incorrect in Standard English.

Double negation can be discarded by removing or replacing one of the negatives. Thus, the same meaning can be correctly expressed by any of the following sentences: 'I have said nothing about it', or 'I have not said anything about it'. Similarly, the following sentences render the same meaning: 'He told no one the secret, or 'He did not tell anybody the secret'.

Some expressions in English have a double form, depending on whether they are used alone or in combination with a negative particle. For example, 'there was nothing' and 'there wasn't anything' mean the same thing, but different pronouns (*nothing* and *anything*) must be used. This fact can be illustrated in the Ukrainian translation, where both sentences are identical with '*не було нічого*' (Pasichnyk 2007b: 32). The same pattern applies to *nobody* – *anyone*, *never* – *ever*, *nowhere* – *anywhere*, etc. Double negation is common in some dialects of modern English, but it is considered grammatically incorrect in Standard English.

If a sentence includes a double negation, it can be handled in two ways (Tottie 1991: 252). The first way of looking at it is that a double negative equals a positive. It is a traditional grammatical fact that double negatives combine to form affirmative sentences. Thus, a person who encounters a sentence like 'He cannot do nothing' will interpret it as an affirmative sentence meaning 'He must do something', unless they are asked to view it as dialectal or non-standard speech. Readers will also assign a positive meaning to constructions that add *not* to an adjective or adverb beginning with a negative prefix such as *in-* or *un-*, for example: 'a visitor who is *not infrequent*' or 'a decision that is *not unfair*'. In these expressions, the affirmation expressed by the double negation is weaker than the one implied by the positive adjective or adverb alone (Hidalgo-Downing 2000: 23). Thus, 'not infrequent visitors' seem to visit less frequently than 'frequent visitors'.

The second approach to double negation is the opposite, according to which double negation equals negation. Indeed, the English language has used multiple negations to express negative meanings since the tenth century, and, for most of its history, such double negation has been perfectly acceptable (Linebarger 1987: 330). Thus, G. Chaucer could say of the monks in 'The Canterbury Tales': '*Ther nas no man nowher so vertuous*'.

Therefore, the use of multiple negation in general discourse is limited to very rare cases. Double negation is also frequently avoided to maintain clarity. Modern English negative sentences are characterized by mono-negation and use a preverbal

negative particle or negative subject to make the whole sentence negative (Morokhovska 1993: 47). The same is true for Middle English. The use of multiple negative sentences has become rare, and writers often use single negative sentences, confirming the process of simplification and general development of the language, for example:

(1) And therto hadde he ridden, *no* man ferre, as wel in Cristendom as he herthenesse, and evere honoured for his worthinesse (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 71).

(2) His hors were goode, but he was *nat* gay. She leet *no* morsel from his lippes falle, *ne* wette hir fingers in hir sauce deepe (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 73).

(3) He yaf nought of that text a pulled hen that saith that hunters been *nought* holy men, *ne* that a monk, whan he is recchelees, is likned til a fissh that is waterlees – this is to sayn, a monk out of his cloister (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 74).

(4) Of priking and of hunting fore the hare was al his lust, for *no* cost wolde he spare (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 74).

(5) To have with sike lazars acquaintance: it is *nat* honeste, it may *nought* avaunce, for to delen with no swich poraile, but al with riche, and sellers of vitaile; and over al ther as profit sholde arise, curteis he was, and lowely of servise (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 76).

(6) This worthy man ful wel his wit bisette: ther wiste *no* wight that he was in dette, so statly was he of his governanunce, with his bargaines, and with his chevissaunce (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 78).

(7) Of his array telle I *no* longer tale (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 78).

(8) Hir frendshipe was *nought* newe to beginner (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 80).

(9) He sette *nought* his benefice to hire and leet his sheepe encombred in the mire and ran to London, unto sainte Poules (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 77).

(10) ...ylik a staf, ther was *no* calf yseene (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 84).

(11) Thanne wolde he speke and crye as he were wood; and when that he speke *no* word but Latin: a fewe temes hadde he, two or three, that he hadde lerned out of som decree; no wonder is he hadde it al the day... (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 85).

(12) For by my trouthe, if that I shall *nat* lie, I sawgh *nat* this yeer so merye a compaignye at ones in this herberwe as is now (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 87).

All these sentences are mono-negative sentences and only contain one negation. In each case, the negation belongs to a specific part of speech. The particles *no*, *ne*, and *not/nat* play an important role in many examples. They usually

appear before nouns, adjectives, and verbs, making the whole sentence negative. In addition to particles, a number of negative pronouns are used. These fulfil the functions of object and predicate in a sentence. As mentioned above, multiple negation is the capability of a language to have negative sentences which contain more than one negative, and is represented by the accumulation of negation in a sentence (Fine 2001: 270). In our study, we have analysed 280 negative sentences. The results are as follows: 175 sentences are multiple negative sentences, and 105 sentences are single negative sentences. This result confirms the fact that the poem includes a significant number of single negative sentences. At the same time, a large number of multiple negative sentences is found.

We can observe five negators in this sentence: *nevere, no, ne, no, ne*, that belong to different parts of speech (negative adverb and negative particle). The same can be said about the rest of the sentences – all of them include more than one negator that performs different functions in the sentence (Tottie 1988: 264). Let us consider the following examples:

(1) Wel coude she carye a morsel, and wel keepe that *no* drope *ne* fille upon hir brest (negative particles precede the predicate of the sentence) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 73).

(2) There was *no* man *nowher* so virtuous: he was the beste beggere in his hous (negative particle precedes the subject, negative adverb performs the function of adverbial modifier of place) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 76).

(3) So greet a purchasour was *nowher noon*, al was fee symple to hym in effect, his purchasyng myghte nat been infect (negative adverb performs the function of adverbial modifier of place, negative pronoun performs the syntactic function of object) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 77).

(4) With us ther was a Doctour of Physic: in al this world *ne* was ther *noon* him lik to speken of physic and of surgerie (negative particle precedes the predicate of the sentence, negative pronoun performs the function of subject) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 80).

(5) In al the pariss wif *ne* was ther *noon* that to the offring before hire sholde goon, and if ther dide, certain so wroth was she that she was out of alle charitee (negative particle precedes the predicate of the sentence, negative pronoun performs the function of subject) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 81).

(6) So that the wolf *ne* made it *nought* miscavye: he was shepherde and *nought* a merce narye (negative particles precede the predicate of the sentence and the objects of the sentence) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 82).

(7). A bettre preest I trowe ther *nowher noon* is (negative adverb performs the function of adverbial modifier of place and negative pronoun performs the function of subject of the sentence) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 82).

(8) Ther nas quirksilver, litarge, *ne* brimstoon, boras, ceruce, *ne* oile of tarter *noon*, *ne* oinement that wolde clense and bite, that him mighte helpen of his cheeks

(negative particles precede enumeration of predicates, negative pronoun in the function of object) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 85).

(9) *No beerd hadde he, ne nevere sholde have*; as smoothe it was as it were late yshave: I trowe he were a gelding or a mare (negative particles precede the noun in the function of object and the verb in the function of predicate, negative adverb performs the function of adverbial modifier of time) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 86).

(10) “Cometh neer”, quod he,” my lady Prioress, and ye, sire Clerk, lat be youre shamefastnesse – *ne studieth nothyngt*. Lay hand to, every man!” (negative particle precedes the predicate of the sentence, negative pronoun in the function of object) (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990: 89).

All sentences contain more than one negator, which proves the phenomenon of multiple negation. Remnants of the multiple negation phenomenon in Old English grammar can be found in Middle English texts.

5. Conclusions

Affixes have been the main source of enrichment and new meanings of the negative affix paradigm, borrowed from other languages. The phase of free variation between sentences with and without *do* gradually ended in late Early Modern English.

The use of single negation is more frequent than the use of multiple negation, which can be explained by the general development of the English language and the stylistic features of ‘The Canterbury Tales’. Therefore, using Geoffrey Chaucer’s ‘The Canterbury Tales’ as research material, we analysed the issue of negation in the author’s discourse and clarified the functional features of negations at the morphological and syntactic level. The results are as follows:

- frequent use of particles (*ne, not/nat, no*) in Geoffrey Chaucer’s ‘The Canterbury Tales’, all of them appearing before or after various parts of speech that perform the function of object or adverbial modifier in the sentence;
- the use of negative pronouns and adverbs reflects pure Middle English without any remnants of Old English. The phenomenon of polysemy is traced by our analysis and proves the fact that ‘The Canterbury Tales’ belongs to the literary monuments of the transitional period of language development;
- polysemy is achieved through the combination of the following parts of speech: particle + adverb; particle + particle; particle + pronoun; adverb + pronoun; particle + particle + pronoun.

The more frequent use of single negative sentences than multiple negative sentences can be explained by the fact that Geoffrey Chaucer’s ‘The Canterbury Tales’ belongs to the category of poetic works.

Future research in this area needs to examine negation in different discourses and communicative situations. It will be crucial to study communication strategies in anthropocentric paradigms.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, M. H. (Ed.), *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1990 (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature* 1990)
- Berndt, Rolf, *A History of the English language*, Leipzig, Enzyklopädie, 1982. (Berndt 1982)
- Bethurum, Dorothy, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957. (Bethurum 1957)
- Biber, D., Johanson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London, Longman, 1995. (Biber et al. 1995)
- Bland, Susan Kesnor, *Intermediate Grammar. From Form to Meaning and Use*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996. (Bland 1996)
- Bosworth Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* online, URL: <https://bosworthtoller.com/> (*Bosworth Toller's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*)
- Fine, K., *The Justification of Negation as a Failure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001. (Fine 2001)
- Givon, T., *On Understanding Grammar*, New York, Academic Press, 1979. (Givon 1979)
- Hidalgo-Downing, Laura, *Negation, Text Worlds, and Discourse: the Pragmatics of fiction*, USA, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 2000. (Hidalgo-Downing 2000)
- Horn, L., *A Natural History of Negation*, London & Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1989. (Horn 1989)
- Huang, Shuan-Fan, *A study of adverbs*, Monton, Academic Press, 1975. (Huang 1975)
- Huddleston, Rodney, *Introduction to the Grammar of English*, Cambridge, CUP, 1984. (Huddleston 1984).
- Jespersen, Otto, *Negation in English and other Languages*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1962. (Jespersen 1962)
- Kedova, L., "On the issue of the polynegation of the Old English language", in *Journal of Kharkiv University*, 1988, No 322, pp. 37-40. (Kedova 1988)
- Khaimovych, B. S., *A Short Outline of the History of English*, Kyiv, Vyscha Shkola, 1975. (Khaimovych 1975)
- Klima, E., "Negation in English" in *The Structure of Language*, Engelwood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, pp. 245-323, 1964. (Klima 1964)
- Labov, W., *Negative Attraction and Negative Concord*, Philadelphia, University of Pensilvania Press, 1972. (Labov 1972)
- Laduslaw, W., *Expressing negation*, Ohio State University, Columbus Press, 1992. (Laduslaw 1992)
- Levin, P., *Negative Contraction: An old and Middle English Dialect Criterion*, Bloomington, IEGP, 1958. (Levin 1958)
- Linebarger, M. C., *Negative Polarity and Grammatical Representation*,

- Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1987. (Linebarger 1987)
Middle English Compendium, URL: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/> (*Middle English Compendium*)
- Morokhovska, E. J., *Fundamentals of English Grammar. Theory and Practice*, Kyiv, Vyscha Shkola, 1993. (Morokhovska 1993)
- Mykhailenko, V. V., “Negation as a communicative indicator in diachrony”, in *Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, 1997, No 12 (3), pp. 15-22. (Mykhailenko 1997)
- Mykhailenko, V. V., “Semantics and paradigmatics of the negation operator”, in *Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, 2000, No 72, pp. 48-51. (Mykhailenko 2000)
- Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English* (6-th ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001. (*Oxford Dictionary* 2001)
- Pasichnyk, N. I., “Language levels of expressing negation in English” in *Materials of the International Students’ Scientific Conference “The Scientific European Space” (16-30 April, 2007)*, Dnipropetrovsk, 2007 (Pasichnyk 2007a)
- Pasichnyk, N. I., “Polynegation on the syntactic level” in *Materials of the International Students’ Scientific Conference “The Scientific European Space” (16-30 April, 2007)*, Dnipropetrovsk, 2007 (Pasichnyk 2007b)
- Poliuzhyn, M. M., *Lecture notes on Historiography of Linguistics*, Vinnutsia, Foliant, 2004. (Poliuzhyn 2004)
- Swart, H., *Negation and negative concord in Romance, Linguistics and Philosophy*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1971. (Swart 1971)
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid, *Negation in the History of English*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1998)
- Tottie, G., *Negation in English Speech and Writing*, San Diego, California, Academic Press, Inc., 1991. (Tottie 1991).
- Tottie, G., *No-negation and Not-negation in Spoken and Written English*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1988. (Tottie 1988).
- Trutyak, I., “Diachrony of the paradigm of negative affixes of the English language” in *Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, 2004, No 18, pp. 276-283. (Trutyak 2004)

ABSTRACT

The article provides an overview of the grammatical and syntactical category of negation in diachronic systems. Particular attention is paid to the problem of negation in linguistics, and to negation as a grammatical category and syntactical category on the morphological and syntactic level. The authors argue that, broadly speaking, negation can be expressed in natural languages through morphological and syntactic tools. Negation is expressed by means of a hierarchically organized system of heterogeneous linguistic units connected by similar semantic functions. Based on this theoretical assumption, it is

explained that negation as a grammatical category and as a syntactical category can be realized on both morphological and syntactic levels. On the morphological level, negation suffixes and individual part-of-speech paradigms are taken into account, while, on the syntactic level, the entire negative sentence containing one or more negations is considered. The diachronic study of the category of negation at different levels helps to observe the development of specific parts of speech that can express negation and provides a basis for further research on negation in different discourses and communicative situations.

Key words: negation, morphological level, syntactic level

REZUMAT

Articolul studiază categoria gramaticală și sintactică a negației în sisteme diacronice. Se acordă o atenție deosebită problemei negației în lingvistică, precum și negației în calitate de categorie gramaticală și sintactică la nivel morfologico-sintactic. Autorii afirmă că, în sens larg, negația poate fi exprimată în limbile naturale prin mijloace morfologice și sintactice. Negația se exprimă prin intermediul unui sistem organizat ierarhic, format din unități lingvistice eterogene, conectate prin funcții semantice similare. Pe baza acestei prezumții teoretice, se explică faptul că negația, în calitate de categorie gramaticală și sintactică, se poate realiza atât la nivel morfologic, cât și la nivel sintactic. La nivel morfologic, sunt analizate sufixele de negație și paradigmele părților de vorbire individuale, în timp ce, la nivel sintactic, este analizată structura negativă (care conține una sau mai multe negații) în întregime. Studiul diacronic al categoriei negației la diferite niveluri ajută la observarea evoluției diferitelor părți de vorbire care pot exprima negația și poate sta la baza unor cercetări ulterioare privind negația în diferite situații discursive și de comunicare.

Cuvinte-cheie: negație, nivel morfologic, nivel sintactic