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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.
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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) componental 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 Aristotel), negation on syntactic level (R. Januttini, 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-prevative: 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-, on-, mis-, for-, wip-, gain-, -les. For example: wansælig, miscwewan, forðeman, wipsegen. In Early Middle English to the paradigm of the affixes with negative implication belonged: un-, mis-, for-, -les. For example: unwit, misdeed, forwerpen, skilæs [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, pseudogetic, 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>un-wan-</th>
<th>mis-</th>
<th>un-</th>
<th>gain-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-laess</td>
<td>for-</td>
<td></td>
<td>wip-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EarlyMidE</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>un-</th>
<th>mis-</th>
<th>un-</th>
<th>wip-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-laess</td>
<td>for-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ModE | re- | un- | mal- | un- | counter- |
|      | de- | (i-, im-, ir-) | pseudo- | de- | (contr-) |
|      | en- | a- |       | dis- | anti- |
|      | non- | -less |       |      |      |

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 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-.

War- 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. War joined all the notional parts of speech, as the prefix un-, that was favourable to its change into un-. For example: 

wanhulp – 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 – mís-, in the Swedish language – miss-, in German – missa- with the meaning of wrong. In the Old Saxon language, it was very productive: miscepan – neglect, mislar – bad teaching, mislibban – 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, misgiv, misplay, misbehave, misunderstand or they are of French or Latin origin. For example: misapply, misappropriate. But it is important to distinguish the German 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) – forswæþan (rebuke)
deman (judge well, glorify) – forðeman (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 (bum 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:

forwærpen – despise, neglect
forrælan – disregard
forrögopen – 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, withsaw [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 the 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 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”
hæfb “has”  >  næfb “has not”
hæfđe “had”  >  næfđe “had not”
wa “knows”  >  nat “knows not”
wiste “knew”  >  nyste “knew not”
wile “will”  >  nyle “will not”
wolde “would”  >  nold “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 nó or naht. H. Swift mentions that the contracted forms of nauht> 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;

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 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. emphasiiser;
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 nænis, 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 “nev...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” JEGPS7, 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” (nev...anig) Wulfstram uses 14 times “nanig” in 98 sentences.

Pronoun none belongs to the Old English pronoun ne-dan, and during the Old English period it became an unseparated word nan. During the 12th century the sound [a] turned into [o] 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 now 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 [o] turned into [ou]; in such a way a new pronoun no appeared and it became an element of pronouns somebody and no one [7, p. 35].

During the Old English Period the pronoun nan was often used together with a nounpis, 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 enviied 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 was 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].
Vaux + 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 significative, 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 preverb 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! (Deuteronium).
(2) Nelle þu elhian and elenwondian betwux awyrsye (Psalter).
The Old English prohibitive sentence distinguishes between a preverbal negation and preword negation and preword negation.
(1) Ne dose 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 panon (Exodus).
and the Old English one-member prohibitives have the structure:
(1) Ne forliæt 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 prewrod negative elements which specify the communicative centres in the sentence,

(1) Nu ðæ t þæ nne ne ðæ t nanesse ne ðæ t nanesse ne ðæ t nanesse ne ðæ t nanesse (Deuterononium).
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 use of two or more negation elements does not result in the positive sentence meaning. On the contrary,

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. Kidova was made on the basis of the Old English literature (Bede, Caedmon, Widseth
(Gnomonic Verses (the beginning of the 8th century, poems by Cyanwulf (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

For example, Aelfric uses only mononegative 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 Gnomonic Verses are mononegative. In three sentences the pronoun næg on is used, in two – sunig (negation with the predicate, i.e. ne v...æfere); in three – æfere (ne v...æfere); in one – nowiht. In poems by Cyanwulf it is possible to find 5 sentences with næg on, in the 21st –ænig (ne v...ænig); in 11 – næfere, in 7 – æfere, 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 (Julian);
(2) nan swylc ne cwm ænig other ofer ealle men (Christ). But even this last sentence proves the regularity,

In Beowulf, there are examples of næg on in 8 sentences, æ nig – in 24 sentences, næfere in 8 sentences, æfere – in
2 sentences – nan. So, in Beowulf there are only two examples of the nan-usage:

(1) næfere at hildene swac menna ængum (Beowulf).
(2) pone syncathan ænig ofer eorpan irenae cyst, guthilla nan, gretan nolde (Beowulf).

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

Speaking about the difference between pronouns “næg on/æ nig” and “næt”, we can mention that they perform the same syntactical function in the sentence but according to their dialectical distribution, “æ nig” 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 “næanig” usage. Alfred uses “næanig” 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 “næanig” 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 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 “næanig” (ne v...æanig), 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 polysemantic (19%) and among 23 sentences “nan” is used in 14 of them. The other are naefre...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 Gnomic Verses. Perhaps, the cases of its usage in the poems “Christ”, “Guliana”, “Beowulf” should be considered as borrowing.

So, it seems that polysemantic 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, nōht – 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 sīsan – 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 haeft > naeft
ne wiste > nyiste
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 mæs ic hēr lens wesan (lit. “not can I here longer be/stay”).
ne wille ic lens hīs seornara wēran.

(2) ne seahic þus manse menn mōðiclicran.
hi ne wēndan, þætte æftre menn sceolden swæ reċčēlæaseæwōrthan.

The negative construction continues to occur in Middle English. See the examples from The Canterbury Tales:
(1) ne mæs þæt mann bi breaed all āne liþenn.
(2) ic ne cunne sanse.
(3) shō ne cūpe gān on ƿēte.
(4) hē nee et, ne drōþ, ne sleep.

For the strengthening of negation (emphatic negation) Old English made either use of pre- or postverbal stressed nōht/nō (in conjunction with or without the ordinary negative particle ne) or, to an increasing extent, of the postverbal “negative negation supporter” nōwih/nōwiht, or contracted nōht (later reduced to nōt), 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 selýfe nō þæt...eorthwelān eċcē stondæth (with multiple negation) næs (<ne wæs)þæt nā se Godríċ þe þa xūþe forbēah (Battle of Maldon).

(2) ne can ic noht sīsan (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 forhēlēn hise sinness;
(2) ne lōve a man ne kan l naught, ne may, ayeins mý wyf;
(3) þāu ne schalt noht bēke spūshōd; (4) þē no hau e þau hōl deleid;
(5) the mann ne lēueth (lives) naht be brēð adné;
(6) be nāmē ne knō yē naht what hē wās;
(7) þū ne ēuēst mē naht I ne dīde it naht, brōper.
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 nequickly 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 not fealt in þe faith;
(2) I am not ðable for to descriue his virtues;
(3) I kan not kūe a coward;
(4) in maydons daunce þy wyl not gā (go);
(5) hē schall nought fāle to receive his peine;
(6) for fēre thei dār noght tele.
I cōude hire noght discronym, þau kanst it not dūt of thyne herte dīve.
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 fourtenyght.
(5) hē went nat to the hōuse of his endre.
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, forgyve 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 serūse beoth, wē ne doz nought Õure orde bēke.
seems to be emphatic and, thus, differs from the unstressed semantically empty 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:
* did they not warn you? (rather formal) did they not 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 nó dōrē God that is abōve?
(2) dōp naht bei blasphēme be ēōde nāme þat is y-clēped on ūow?
(3) did naht ser Dāry 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 félest tú þi flêsh al to- luken?*
(2) *hwí ne féle ic þe in mín breostes &.*
or, with the original ‘negative negation supporter’ made into the only negation marker:
(3) *sëo xe noust þat sông mon, þat háp sôn boast?*
(4) *drêdist thôu 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 sorsa snotor suma* (Beowulf).
*ne selead þu us on constnurse* (with second-person subject)
*ne læd þu nà us on constnurse.*
Compare with the Middle English counterparts from The Canterbury Tales:
(1) *ne blâme thôu any man*
*ne spêke sê with nà mon*
(2) *ne lêd us noth in to costnunga*
*ne slêpe sê nawt*
(2) *ne hâste yôw nat tô faste*
The construction with the original negative negation supporter noth made into the only negation marker is attested from late 14th century. Compare examples from The Canterbury Tales:
(1) *consente þôu not to such fo þê.*
(2) *gâ þau noght oþi hûs a stepe.*
(3) *sey nat al þat þau 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) *persue 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) *lôke yê, do not ñfe!* (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 *æ nihs* 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.
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