

**THE CATEGORY OF NEGATION:
THE LEXCOGRAPHIC AND BELLES-LETTRE DISCOURSES**

I. Naumenko, students of Sumy State University;

M. Derevianchenko, students of Sumy State University;

T. Anokhina, * PhD, doctorant of Kyiv National Linguistic University
Sumy State University,

2, Rymskoho-Korsakova St, Sumy, 40007, Ukraine;

*Kyiv National Linguistic University,

73, Velyka Vasylkivska St., Kyiv-150, 3680, Ukraine

The Negation category (NC) makes the subject of this investigation. NC is marked by the concept of the mentioned category in lexicography and belles-lettre discourses (the background of material under research). The working method is ontognoseological. The actuality of this paper is verified by its topicality in terms of the modern syncretic study – modi of language, speech and cognition. The aim of the article consists in two objectives: to consider the mechanics of categorization and conceptualization. The terminology embraces denial, negation, lack, absence.

Key words: the category of negation, the English discourse, lexicography, denial, negation, lack, absence.

There is a group of lexical units (lexicon) denoting negation, absence, gap, want in the linguistic picture of the world [1]. By the opinion of Anna Wierzbicka, mental constructions are congruently identified by basic words [3, p. 54]. The notion of *absence* is exteriorized by allonyms in lexicographic sources (dictionaries). **The object** of our study is the category of negation. **The subject** is the lexicographic and textual affinities of this category, its verbalizers in the English language. **The aim** of the work is determined by its relevance to *Nothing* on its philosophicolinguistic background. **The empiric material** is provided by the English-language explanatory dictionaries and modern belles-lettre texts. **The actuality** of paper is objectivized by its topicality, novelty and relevance to the problem *Nothing*. The article refers to the endozone of the scientific picture of the world [1]. **Methods** are congruent to the nature of the referents, in our case – the category of negation. An ontognoseological approach serves two discourses: lexicographical and belles-lettre.

Words serve many a function. They nominate things, make words and conversations go, they verbalize ideas of scientific research [5, p. 139]. The great part of the English lexicon is made by negation units, both nominative and communicative. The verbal units are being analyzed herein in the vicinity of dictionary entries. The discursive analysis works wonders to materialize the idea of the conceptual view of negation, its *Mentalese*. Concept is rendered by A. Prikhodko as ethnosociolinguocultural phenomenon [4, p. 97].

The communicative units (CU) verbalize negation by all parts of speech expressing losses, omission, denial, doubt etc. Lexicon is made by both notional and syntactic units. See tables 1, 2.

We start our investigation with the English belles-lettre discourse. Some nominative units (NU) render the negative meaning. Lexicographic dictionaries (rather entries) interpret allonyms by the congruent meanings. Thus, nouns mark substance, verbs – actions, adjectives – attributes, adverbs – adverbials. Syntactical formants make syntax go [6, p. 24]. Their omission is troublesome for inattentive readers Cf: *I fear lest I should be late; All day round service but now* [7].

Particle *not* is used with the predicative block: *The bed hasn't been slept in; But you can't leave me on my own, you can't* [12, p.8]. Conjunction *lest* implies the negative

meaning by its inner structure (we should not look for another negator). Conjunctions resound the meaning of former notional units they come from. Cf: preposition *between* implies the meaning of two. The particle *only* keeps alive the memory of its relative source. This is motivated by evolution: *one-* + *-like* > *only* (*adj*) > *only* (*adv*) > *only* (*partical*). These examples objectivize the eternal cyclic move of the words.

NOTIONAL UNITS	Table 1
Nouns: <i>failure, discomfort, Eliza stared at Dolly, momentarily forgetting her pain and discomfort</i> [13, p. 3]; <i>And of his failure</i> [12, p. 14].	
Verbs: <i>to deny, to doubt, to fail, to hate, to disappear. Besides I hate rubber</i> [12, p. 19]; <i>With a wave of his hand, Bart disappeared into the darkness</i> [13, p. 10].	
Adjectives: <i>doubtful, wrong, unsure, erratic, unseen, careless, innocent. There was something wrong</i> [12, p. 15]; <i>It made him awkward, stiff, his big frame more unwieldy than ever</i> [12, p. 10].	
Adverbs: <i>unfortunately, never, reluctantly, nowhere. When he had finished Michael swore he would never pray for the dead again</i> [12, p.5]; <i>Impatiently dismissing all other help – and reluctantly relying on the morose Dr Tudge to take care of his practice – George nursed his wife alone</i> [12, p.13]; <i>Out of mind, out of sight.</i>	
Numerals: <i>Two heads are better than one</i>	
Pronouns: <i>none, nothing, nobody, no. Nothing like the few girls Michael had met through friends of his father, embarrassed offspring set up for inspection by the future heir of Aynhams</i> [12, p. 21]; <i>No other doctor wanted to know; certainly none wanted to walk the Salfords street after dark – except George Cochrane</i> [12, p. 22].	

SYNTACTIC FORMATS	Table 2
Conjunctions: <i>until, unless, neither...nor. Unless you want your mouth washed out with soap</i> [13, p.12]; <i>He went to search behind the counter, scrubbing around amongst the ledgers and receipts until he found a piece of card and a pencil</i> [13, p. 13].	
Particles: <i>not, no. Lock it, for God's sake, bolt it, Liza, and don't open it</i> [13, p.7]; <i>No, I'll stay at home</i> [12, p.14].	

There is a special group of words initiated by the prefix “n-” Cf: *nobody, nothing, never, none, nowhere, neither...nor*. The secondary units go back to phrases which mirror the evolution of compounds from simple words [7]. High frequency of secondary units tells on their phonographic image. Cf: *none, nothing*. Paired conjunctions *neither ... nor* attribute two referents, which are used with negatives Cf: *They speak neither French nor German, but a strange mixture of the two* [12, p.35].

The word *nothing* works wonders. It goes back to the phrase *no thing* which engendered the present form. This idea works with the units *o'clock* < *on clock, afire* < *on fire, alive* < *on life*. The word *nothing* is polyfunctional. It serves pronouns, nouns, adverbs. Cf: *nothing* – pron 1) *no thing (leaves nothing to the imagination)*, 2) *no part*, 3) *one of no interest, value, or importance (she's nothing to me)* [10, p. 564], n) not anything: He had nothing to say. *For nothing*, 1) without payment or reward. *I got it for nothing*; 2) without reason. *They quarrelled for nothing*; 3) uselessly. *We had all our troubles for nothing*; adv. Not in any way. *The heat is nothing like yesterday* [11, p. 613].

The syntactic design of the English megasystem is known for five blocks. Syntax reigns grammar. It works with subject, predicate, object, attribute, adverbial complexes. Cf:

1. Subject group: *Next morning, she found that the rats had polished off the bread and cheese and there was nothing left to eat* [13, p. 11]; *'It's my patch, no one else would touch it with a bargepole,' he said repeatedly, and it was true* [12 p.8].

2. Predicate group: *It was all Eliza couldn't retch, but Mrs Tubbs didn't seem to notice anything out of the ordinary* [13, p. 44]; *Haven't you learnt anything in church on Sunday?* [13, p. 13].

3. Object group: *I'll probably end up on the gallows, so I've got nothing to lose* [13, p. 29]; *Eliza stared at Dolly, momentarily forgetting her pain and discomfort* [13, p. 37].

4. Attributive group: *Here tears were flowing now, pouring down her cheeks in an unstoppable stream* [13, p. 9]; *There was the endless tramp of feet on gangplanks, the rumble of cartwheels over cobblestones* [13, p. 3].

5. Adverbial group: *She gave him a sideways glance, unsure whether he was laughing at her* [13, p. 2]; *She, of course, always saw his father's best side and never felt the pounding terror he did* [12, p. 7].

Stylistic devices are not indifferent to negation either. Stylistic charge is marked by hyperbole, contrast and litotes [8, p. 124]. Cf:

Stanza by G. G. Byron

There is a pleasure in the *pathless* woods,
There is a rapture on the *lonely* shore,
There is society where *none* intrudes,
By the deep Sea, and music in its roar:
I love *not* Man the *less*, but Nature more,
From these our interviews, in which I *steal*
From all I may be, or have been before,
To mingle with the Universe, and feel
What I can *ne'er* express, yet *cannot* all conceal.

Mononegation frequents in English. *The pin scraped her flesh but she did not cry out* [13, p. 13]. *He never meant to kill him* [13, p. 22]. Polynegation enhances the stylistic load, illiterate speech, hyperbole and emphasis. Clauses in composite sentences increase the number of negators: 1) *What I can ne'er express, yet cannot all conceal* (Byron). *I would not say no to a plate of pie and mash* [13, p. 21]. *You can not beat me for nothing* [13, p. 32]. *I'm not got nothing but I stand up in* [13, p. 37]; 2) *Bragg says he does not want her back and I can not afford to keep her if she does not pay her way* [13, p. 40]. *Enoch did not approve of educated women and Eliza suspected that he did not like women at all* [13, p. 2].

The category of negation is of explicit and implicit nature. Explicit is recognized by verbal expression. Cf.: *no, nothing, none, nowhere, nobody, no one*. Implicit negation is determined by semantic charge of linguistic units: it does not have its own markers in the surface structure. The peculiarity of implicit negation lies in asymmetry, discrepancy between content and form [7, p. 150]. Implicit negation works with hidden semas. Cf: *futile, ugly, hardly, reluctantly, to hate, barely etc*. For example: *Reluctantly, Eliza came to him* [13, p. 13]; *Easing her chin defiantly, Eliza looked him in an eye* [13, p. 12]; *His boots barely seeming to touch the rungs of the ladder as he climbed up the sail loft* [13, p. 7]. Polynegeation is presented in 10 % belles-lettres texts

The next stage of research deals with negation in the lexicography endozones, in the vicinity of dictionary entries. The dictionaries involved in our investigation are: the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (further D₁), the New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language (D₂) and the Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture (D₃). Calculations are being objectivized by the formula

$$D = 1 - \frac{2 \cdot q}{a + b},$$

in which D means semantic distance, q is common semas of compared words, (a+b) is the sum of allonym senses [2, p. 285].

The lemma-word to start with is *negation*. In D₁ this lemma is presented by the following allonyms 1) *the act of denying*; 2) *the absence of positive quality* [11, p. 837], and in D₂ they are 1) *denial, contradiction*; 2) *the absence of positive quality* [10, p. 669]. The meanings of *denial* and *absence* are presented in both entries of D₁ and D₂. The

semantic distance of the word *negation* in D_1 and D_2 is equal to zero. These allonyms present the fact of convergence:

$$D = 1 - \frac{2 \cdot 2}{4} = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

Denial – lemma is represented in D_1 as: 1) *denying*; 2) *refusal* [11, p. 309], in D_2 synonyms of *denial* are 1) *assertion that something is not true*; 2) *refusal*; 3) *self-denial* [10, p. 256]. The formula states close neighborhood of *denial* in D_1 and D_2 – the divergence is not great:

$$D = 1 - \frac{2 \cdot 2}{5} = 1 - \frac{4}{5} = \frac{1}{5} = 0,2.$$

As to the allonym *absence* its semantic charge in D_1 is : 1) *being away; an occasion or time of being away*; 2) *not having* [11, p. 4]. And in D_2 *absence* works as 1) *being away*; 2) *a failure to be present*; 3) *lack* [10, p. 3]. The meanings of *absence* make five items. One item *being away* is common, the rest are presented as variants. Absence divergence is great between D_1 and D_2 :

$$D = 1 - \frac{2 \cdot 1}{6} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3} = 0,6.$$

Divergence increases in D_1 and D_2 and allonym *lack of ushers* in lacunarity.

The word *lack* presents the colloquial layer [1, p. 8]. The word *lack* is semantically charged alike in D_1 1) *be without*; 2) *be wanting* [11, p. 695] and in D_2 1) *want, need*; 2) *to be wanting in* [10, p. 550]. The q meaning is *be without*. The semantic distance of *lack* in D_1 and D_2 is considered as:

$$D = 1 - \frac{2 \cdot 1}{4} = 1 - \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2} = 0,5.$$

Having analyzed lemma *negation*, allonyms *absence*, *lack* and *denial* we have come to conclusion that the problem of negation is relevant and valid for further discussion.

In D_3 lemma *negation* is represented by allonyms: 1) *to declare untrue, deny* [9, p. 937]. The semantic charge of *absence* is: 1) *the state or period of being away*; 2) *non-existence, lack* [9, p. 4]. The entry *lack* is objectivized by the meanings 1) *to be without; not have*; 2) *the state of not having something* [9, p. 774]. *Denial* means 1) *the act or an example of saying that something is not true*; 2) *refusing to do something* [9, p. 368].

In the D_1 allonym *lack* had not been registered (D_2 was published in 1958). But in the D_2 and in D_3 (published correspondingly in 1993 and 2005) definitions expand and diverge. We witness the emergence of would be notion *lacunarity* – allonym *lack* ushers in the new lemma in linguistic picture of the word.

КАТЕГОРІЯ НЕГАЦІЇ: ЛЕКСИКОГРАФІЧНИЙ ТА ХУДОЖНІЙ ДИСКУРСИ

І. Науменко, студентка;

М. Дерев'яченко, студентка;

*Т. О. Анохіна**, канд. філол. наук, докторант КНЛУ

Сумський державний університет,

вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна;

**Київський національний лінгвістичний університет,*

вул. Велика Васильківська, 73, м. Київ-150, 3680, Україна

*Категорія негачії (КН) виступає об'єктом дослідження. КН трактується як концепт, який представлений в лексикографічних джерелах та в художньому дискурсі англійської мови. Запропонований метод дослідження – онтогносеологічний. Актуальність статті об'єктивується її топікальністю у режимі сучасних синкретичних досліджень, у модусах мови, мовлення та когніції. Мета статті полягає в осмисленні процесів категоризації та концептуалізації. Термінологія КН включає метазнаки *denial, negation, absence, lack*.*

Ключові слова: *негачія, відмова, відсутність, нестача, англійський художній дискурс, лексикографія.*

КАТЕГОРИЯ НЕГАЦИИ: ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ И ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫЙ ДИСКУРСЫ

*И. Науменко, студентка; М. Дервянченко, студентка;
Т. А. Анохина**, канд. филол. наук, докторант КНЛУ
Сумский государственный университет,
ул. Римского-Корсакова, 2, г. Сумы, 40007, Украина;
*Киевский национальный лингвистический университет,
ул. Большая Васильковская, 73, г. Киев-150, 3680, Украина

Категория негации (КН) – объект исследования. КН трактуется как концепт, представленный в лексикографических источниках и в художественном дискурсе английского языка (на материале объекта исследования). Метод исследования – онтогносеологический. Актуальность работы объективизируется topicalностью темы в режиме современных синкретических проблем, коррелирующих в модусах языка, речи и когниции. Цель статьи – исследовать процесс категоризации и концептуализации. Терминология работы включает метазнаки denial, negation, absence, lack.

Ключевые слова: негация, отсутствие, отрицание, недостаточность, англоязычный дискурс, лексикография.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Анохина Т. О. Лакуни питальних речень vs теорія мовленнєвих актів / Т. О. Анохіна // Філологічні трактати. – 2017. – Т.9, № 2. – Суми : Вид-во СумДУ. – С. 7–12.
2. Бережан С. Г. Семантическая эквивалентность лексических единиц. - Кишинев : Штиинца, 1973. – 372 с.
3. Вежицкая А. Сопоставление культур через посредство лексики и прагматики / А. Вежицкая; пер. с англ. А. Д. Шмелева. – М. : ЯСК, 2001. – 272 с.
4. Приходько А. Н. Языковое картирование мира в паттерне “концептосфера – концептополе – концептосистема” / А. Н. Приходько // *Нова філологія*. – 2005. – № 1 (21). – С. 94 – 104.
5. Селіванова О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми.. – Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. – 712 с.
6. Шевченко І. С. Дискурс як мисленнєво-комунікативна діяльність / І. С. Шевченко, О. І. Морозова // *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен*. – Х. : Константа, 2005. – С. 21–28.
7. Швачко С. О. Лексичні засоби вираження категорії негатиї в англomовному художньому дискурсі / С. О. Швачко, Л. Кравець // *Філологічні трактати*. – 2014. – Том 6, № 1. – С. 149–153.
8. Tarp S. Theoretical foundations of the so-called cross-reference structures / Sven Tarp // *Lexicographica* / ed. by F. F. M. Dolezan. – Berlin / NY : Niemeyer, 1999. – № 15. – P. 114–137.
9. Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. - Pearson education Limited, 2005. – 1617 p.
10. New Webster’s Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language. – The United States of America: Lexicon Publications, INC, 1993. – 1149 p.
11. Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English / ed. by A. S. Hornby, E. V. Gatenby, & H. Wakefield. – London : Oxford University Press, 1958. – 1527 p.
12. Connor Alexandra. *Midnight’s Smiling* / Alexandra Connor. – London : Hammersmith, 1998. – 313 p.
13. Dilly Court. *The Best of Sisters*. – London : Arrow Books, 2007. – 534 p.

REFERENCES

1. Anokhina, T. O. (2017). Question lacunae vs theory of speech. *Filologichni Traktaty*, 9(2), 7–12.
2. Berezhan, S. G. (1979). *Semanticheskaya ekvivalentnost leksicheskikh yedinit* [Semantic equivalence of lexical units]. Chisinau, Moldova: Shtiincza Publishers.
3. Wierzbicka, A. (2001). *Sopostavleniye kultur cherez posredstvo liksiki i prgmatiki* [Sopostavleniye kultur cherez posredstvo leksiki i pragmatiki] [Comparison of cultures through vocabulary and pragmatics]. A. D. Shmelev (Transl.). Moscow, Russia: YSC.
4. Prykhodko, A. M. (2005). *Yazykovoye kartinirovaniye mira v paterne “kontseptosfera-kontseptopole-kontseptosistema”* [The Linguistic worldview represented by the pattern “Conceptosphere – Concept field – Concept system”]. *Nova Philologia*, 21, 94–104.
5. Selivanova, O. (2008). *Suchasna lingvistyka: napriamy ta problem* [The Modern Linguistics: Directions and Problems]. Poltava, Ukraine: Dovkilliya-K.
6. Shevchenko, I. S. & Morozova, O. I. (2005). *Discurs yak myslynevo-kommunikatyvna diyalnist* [Discourse as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon] (pp. 21–28). Kharkiv, Ukraine: Konstanta publishers.
7. Shvachko, S. O. & Kravets, L. (2014). Lexical means of expressing the category of negativity in the English-language artistic discourse. *Filologichni Traktaty*, 6(1), 149–153.
8. Tarp, S. (1999). Theoretical foundations of the so-called cross-reference structures. F. F. M. Dolezan (Ed.). *Lexicographica*, 15, 114–137. Berlin / NY: Niemeyer.
9. *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture*. (2005). Barselona : Pearson education Limited.
10. *New Webster’s Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language* (1993) The United States of America: Lexicon Publications, INC.
11. Hornby, A. S., Gatenby, E. V., & Wakefield, H. (Eds.). (1958), *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press.
12. Connor, Alexandra. (1998). *Midnight’s Smiling*. London : Hammersmith.
13. Dilly, Court. (2007). *The Best of Sisters*. London : Arrow Books.

Received: November, 8, 2017