

PAPER

LEXICAL ANALYSIS OF THE NEGATIVE CATEGORY IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Ochilova N.S.^{1,*}

¹Lecturer of the Department of Specialization, Social-Humanitarian and Exact Sciences, Andijan Faculty of Tashkent State University of Economics Andijan, Uzbekistan

*Ochilova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents a lexical analysis of the categories of negation, and studies the fact that a lexeme is a linguistic unit that is ready, general and obligatory in the minds of members of a particular language community, consisting of a unity of form and meaning, expressing integrated concepts and relationships, and connecting words and grammatical morphemes in speech. Also, the opinions given by experts are analyzed and illustrated on the basis of examples.

Key words: negation, concept of negation, semantic-syntactic classification, syntactic construction.

Introduction

The article is an analysis of existing methods of negation in the English language. The author highlights the most productive historically developed ways of expressing negativity in various languages. Particular attention is paid to the most common means of expressing negation in many Indo-European languages, such as negative affixes and prefixes.

In the course of studying the features of expressing negativity in many Indo-European languages and analyzing many examples, the author comes to the conclusion that in the overwhelming majority of cases, negation is expressed synthetically, that is, by means of negative affixes, and above all prefixes, while affixes have different compatibility with the bases of parts of speech not only in different languages, but also in the same language.

The article considers the features of such a means of grammatical expression of negation as negative particles. Along with negative affixes and prefixes, as well as negative particles, the work examines the means of strengthening negation, as well as implicit negation, the peculiarity of which is the expression of negativity in an implicit way, that is, as part of a separate positive word form or an entire syntactic construction.

Methods

The research used analytical, transformational, grammatical, component structural, and functional semantic analysis methods.

The grammatical significance of negative generalizing members of a sentence varied: in some (subject, non-prepositional complement, predicative member and adverbial modifier “never”), after the disappearance of “ne”, their ability to convey the negation of the verb-predicate always came to the fore; in others (prepositional complement and all types of adverbial modifiers except “never”), this ability was not always evident, which led to the possibility of double negation during the 15th and early 16th centuries in negative sentences with one generalizing member.

Nevertheless, it can be said with certainty that in the 15th and early 16th centuries, mononegative construction with negation at the generalizing member prevailed in negative sentences with one generalizing member [3].

Results and discussion

Negation as a general language category has a multi-aspect character and can be characterized from different sides: as a logical, grammatical, lexical concept. The following units of expression of negation exist: negative affixes: un-, mis-, in- and others, negative particles, implicit negation, that is, negation

expressed implicitly as part of a separate positive word form or an entire syntactic construction, strengthening of negation, which is understood as a linguistic device by means of which the negative meaning of a sentence is emphasized to one degree or another.

In the current practice of analyzing negative sentences, the consideration of general theoretical issues based on the material of particular languages predominates, without attempts to establish systemic relationships, understand cause-and-effect dependencies, or identify features of similarity and difference in the negation systems characteristic of certain languages. Today, one of the most typical means of expressing negation in many Indo-European languages are negative affixes: in Russian: не-, ни-, Без-, Без- and others, in German: un-, los- and others, in English: un-, in-, dis-, mis- and others [2]. It is impossible not to agree with the opinion that negative affixes in the specified function have the ability to lose their negative meaning and are capable of acquiring a meaning that is not negative, but positive.

In linguistic dictionaries, the category of negation is defined as an element of the meaning of a sentence, which, according to the speaker, indicates that the connection between the components of the sentence is not real. However, according to Bakharev, A.I. We cannot categorically state that the connection between the parts of the sentence does not exist in reality by denying it.

The means of expressing negation not only remain, but do not change the course of the syntactic context. Defining negation as a category by which we can declare a relationship that is absolutely true in reality (a chicken is not a bird) and that no one can guess (iron is not a stone) that does not correspond to such a real relationship, A.M. Peshkovsky speaks not about the connection between the parts of the sentence, but about the reality/irreality of the connection between concepts and categories.

The ability of negative affixes to combine with the stems of different parts of speech varies both from language to language and within the same language. For example, in English, the prefix un-, which is Germanic in origin and has a negative meaning, is not chosen by verb stems, since the meaning of non-action in this language is expressed by the particle 'not'. In combinations with verbs, the prefix un-, as well as the similar prefixes dis-, de-, mis-, have not a strictly negative meaning, but a meaning specific to each case, namely the meaning of an action that is the opposite of that expressed by the motivating verb (to tie and to untie). As a residual phenomenon in modern English, we can single out a small number of verbs whose prefixes mis- and dis- have a negative meaning, for example: dislike, disbelieve, mistrust [3]. Word formation using prefixes, that is, the addition of a suffix to the root. Usually in English, prefixes with a negative meaning are added to nouns, adjectives and verbs.

For example, a-, dis-, il-, im-, in-, ir-, non-, un-. According to the information provided by Laurie Bauer and Rodney Huddleston in the book "The Cambridge Grammar of English", there are 5 prefixes that express a negative meaning that are used with adjectives:

a-: social – asocial, theist – atheist, political – apolitical;
dis-: Agree – disagree, comfort – discomfort, mount – dismount, orient – disorient, ability – disability, advantage – disadvantage, affected – disaffected;
non-: non-committal, non-essential, non-existent, non-standard, non-violent;
un-: unclear, uncommon, unedifying, unhelpful, unintelligible, unjust, unwise;
in-: competent – incompetent; correct – incorrect; visible – invisible;
efficient – inefficient; accurate – inaccurate; sane – insane;
secure – insecure

A rather interesting fact, in our opinion, is the peculiarity of the language in Northern Scotland, where the negative forms of the Present and Past Participle are constructed using the negative prefix on- (=un). In this language, such forms as onhad, onhen

(=not, without having); onbeen (=not, without being) and others are typical.

In combination with adjectives and nouns in the language, the most frequently used prefixes are un- (a homonym for the verb un-), non-, in- (im-, il-), illogical 'illogical' dis-, mis-: unknown 'unknown', untruth 'untruth' and the like. The prefixes un-, non-, in- are the closest in meaning, which is confirmed by the doublet words, which differ from each other to a lesser extent in their meanings, compare, for example: unacceptable – 'unacceptable', nonprofessional – 'unprofessional'. As for the suffix -less, it denotes the absence of something and is mainly attached to the bases of nouns and adjectives, for example: powerless 'powerless', useless 'useless', worthless' [2].

Conclusion

In this article, the author examines the features of negation in the English language, providing examples to support his conclusions. An analysis of the semantic types of negation is also conducted.

Taking this concept as a basis, we have found out on the basis of the English language that in this language with different structures there are also semantic varieties of negation: non-generalized and generalized negation, which have their own formal means of expression: the negative particles not, on the one hand, and negative/non-assertive pronouns of a generalizing nature, on the other.

In this article, our task is to consider the structural models of generalized negation in English in contrast to polynegative Uzbek based on the data and conclusions obtained as a result of the analysis of each of the forms, and also to identify a model of negation common to both languages.

References

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Grammar of the English language. – M.: Higher School, 1973. – 116 p.
2. Bulakh N.A. On the question of expressing the grammatical category of negation in Indo-European languages // Science and the World. – Yaroslavl, 1979. – No. 1. – P. 53–60.
3. Leontyeva S.F. Negative affixes in modern English. – M.: Higher School, 1974. – 108 p.
4. Chistogonova L.K. Repetition as a means of expressing negation in modern English dialogic speech // Questions of English Philology. – Stavropol, 1971. – No. 2. – P. 102–110.
5. Klima E., 1964. Negation in English. The structure of language: readings in the philosophy of language. Ed. By J. Fodor and J. Katz, pp: 246–323.
6. Kunin AV Course of phraseology of the modern English language. – 2nd ed., revised. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1996. – 156 p.
7. Kunin AV English-Russian phraseological dictionary. – 3rd ed., – Moscow: SE, 1967. – Vol. 1. – 738 p.; Vol. 2. – 739 – 1264 p. (ARFS)
8. Superanskaya AV General theory of proper names. – 2nd ed. – Moscow: Nauka, 1973. – 368 p.
9. Рахматуллаев Шавкат. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли фразеологик луғати. Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1978.
10. Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании // Филологические науки, 2001. – № 1. – С. 64–72.

11. Мухитдинова Ф. Р. Описание языкознания как разветвленной многоаспектной лингвистики, имеющей связи практически со всеми областями современного знания. «Мировая наука». № 10(91) (октябрь, 2024). 61 с.
12. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. 2-е изд. – М.: Гнозис, 2004. – 390 с. 024). 61 с.