



Negative Words and Their Classifications in English Language Sentence Structure

Muradova Sevara Zoir Kizi
English Teacher, Denau Institute Of
Entrepreneurship And Pedagogy

ABSTRACT

This paper is devoted to the theoretical significance of the work deceptions in the further modification of presently available demonstrations about details and origin of negative words, their use in sentence structure, and a lot of scholars' works about negative word forms are discussed

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 1st April 2023
Revised: 1st May 2023
Accepted: 11th June 2023

KEY WORDS: Negative words, regular meaning, diachronic approach, actual meaning, sentence structure, syntactical analysis, negator

Introduction

English is the only language which is widely spoken all over the world and it is the most commonly studied foreign language in the world. Although it compromises for perceptive and receptive skills such as reading, writing, speaking and listening which are interlinked, the writing skill is still remaining as the most challenging part of the English language for students of our educational institutions. Words are powerful and they independent and central linguistic unit expressed in the form of sound, which express the meaning of actions and any occasion in existence, are formed grammatically and understood differently according to their outlook and attitude toward something. While positive words can boost your self-esteem and self-image, the impact of negative words can have long-lasting destructive effects. Whether you are talking to a child, a sibling, a friend, a colleague, or a stranger, it's important to consider how negative words can affect a person. Keep reading to see the impact that negative words can have and learn how to better choose your words. It should be noted, the volume before you is devoted to the issue of negation. For an average student of philosophy or logic, negation is included in the class of extensional logical connectives and most often will not take up his mind any more. However, if we take a closer look at the genesis of the issue of negation, it will result from consideration of the most basic metaphysical and epistemological issues. If we give information about the origin of negative words most probably, initially thought on negation come from Parmenides who, together with the Eleatic school, analyzed the relationship between being and non-being. Parmenides' negation has an ontological character, and what is most important, it has a crossed out character, because with its use one can reach something that we call non-being or nothingness, and that is not a kind of being or something.

Discussion And Results

In Modern English, however, while we can still diachronically describe this denotation as main it is no longer synchronically central and as an arrangement of gist in the semantic structure of the word revolution has considerably changed and it is central and the most regular meaning is a broad revolution of the recognized government of the regime. It follows that the primary meaning of the word may become synchronically one of its minor meanings and diachronically a secondary meaning may become the central meaning of the word. The actual arrangement of meanings in the semantic structure of any word in any historical period is the result of the semantic development of this word within the system of the given language. According to Plato this view was critical and, mainly in "Sophist", emphasizes analyses leading to the concept of different negation. He was able to defend the view that the negation of being that is, not too much has an ontological character. The ontological negation was some form of 'difference' and consequently it was 'something' rather than 'nothing'. As W. Stróżewski stated many ontological views on negation, including the concept of different negation, can be reduced to the crossing out negation, and it is this which is the most fundamental one negative, "expressing denial" (a sense now rare or obsolete), from Anglo-French negatif (early 14c.), Old French negatif (13c.) and directly from Latin negativus "that which denies," from negat-, past-participle stem of negare "deny, say no" (see deny).

Syntactical analysis of negation in English

Negation may be analyzed from two ways: Diachronically and synchronically This study deals with the genesis of negators. In the first part I discuss the negators that are involved in what Miestamo (2005) implied 'standard negation'. In the second part I discuss three types of non-standard negation. In standard negation, the scope of the negation is the entire clause, the clause is a declarative, its main predicate is a verb, and the negative strategy is a general (productive) one. A negation that lacks any of these properties is 'non-standard'. In practice, the distinction is not that easy to draw, but I can refer the reader to Miestamo (2005) itself and here just illustrate the two types, i.e., standard negation in and non-standard negation in (2).

(1) John does not like Fred.

(2) a. This is impossible.

b. Doncha come no more!

c. Fred is no stranger to us.

d. I like nothing.

e. I can't be bothered.

In (2a) the scope is not clausal, (2b) the clause is not declarative, in (3c) the predicate is not verbal, and (2d) and (3e) do not use the general strategy with do periphrasis. 2. Though standard and non-standard negation will be discussed in separate sections, the two types of negation are by no means unrelated. For one thing, it seems that everything that is relevant for the diachronic standard negation is also relevant for the diachronic of nonstandard negation, even though the latter typically involves additional complications. And for another thing, non-standard negators may turn into standard ones or into other types of nonstandard negators. These links between the standard and non-standard negators will be discussed too. restrict the attention to processes of change internal to a language and not discuss borrowing and calquing nor cases for which one can argue that both internal and external factors are at play. 3. At a very abstract level, a negator, whether a standard one like not or a negative pronoun like nobody, may come about in three ways. First, some element X that is not itself a negator but usually has a related meaning, like 'to lack', develops into a negator. Second, some element that is not itself a negator but that frequently collocates with a negator, undergoes a 'contamination' (or 'contagion', Bréal 1897: 221-226) and thus develops a negative meaning on its own. An older negator NEG1 thus gets joined and possibly even replaced by a new one NEG2. In French pas was a collocate of the negator ne, and pas can now provide the negative meaning all by itself. Third, some element is not itself a negator, but frequently collocates with one, and they become one word ('univerbation'). Here too we get a new negator NEG2, but this NEG2 comprises the NEG1 marker. The English pronoun nobody is a simple example. The three types are schematized in 4. I abstract from word order. a. $X \rightarrow \text{NEG}$ b. $\text{NEG1 } X \rightarrow \text{NEG1 NEG2} \rightarrow \emptyset$ c. $\text{NEG1 } X \rightarrow [\text{NEG1-X}] \text{NEG2}$ In what follows I will provide illustrations and hypotheses for each of three processes. The first process will be central in the section on prohibitive negation (3.1), which is a

subtype of non-standard negation. For standard negation, the process is hardly documented the scarcity of data on the origin of standard negators in Heine and Kuteva (2002) or the skepticism voiced by Dryer (1988: 112-113) on a proposal by Givón (1984: 337-338) to relate the position of negators to that of their verbal sources). Yet what is well documented for standard negation and intensely studied, also from a formal point of view (e.g. van Gelderen 2008), is the second type of process, that of genesis by contamination. It goes under the name of 'Jespersen cycle' and will be the central topic in section 2. The third type, genesis by univerbation, will be central in the discussion of two non-standard types, non-verbal and existential negation in section 3.2, and negative pronouns and negative adverbs in section.

References:

1. Adger, D. and J. Smith (2003). Variation and the Minimalist Program. Paper given at ICLAVE2, Uppsala University, June 2003
2. Allen, C. (1995). Case Marking and Reanalysis: Grammatical Relations from Old to Early Modern English. Oxford: OUP.
3. Chomsky, N. (1995). The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
4. Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In R. Martin,
5. D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (Eds.), Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik, pp. 89-156. MIT Press: Cambridge Mass.
6. Dahl, O. (1979). Typology of Sentence Negation. *Linguistics* 17,79-106
7. Ernst, T. (1992). The Phrase Structure of English Negation. *The Linguistic Review* 9,109-144