CHAPTER II
THE CONCEPT OF NEGATION AND THE TRANSFORMATIONAL GENERATIVE GRAMMAR II

This chapter will discuss the theories applied to do this research. The concept of negation suggested by Payne (1985) is the primary one used to determine and classify the basic unit that will be analyzed, while Chomsky's transformational generative grammar II (1965) is to analyze Arabic negation both in terms of form and meaning.

2.1. THE NEGATION CONCEPT OF PAYNE; ONE THEORY OF NEGATION IN GENERAL LINGUISTICS

2.1.1. Introduction

There are many concepts of negation, which rise dialectically and complete each other (Sudaryono, 1993:22). The appearance of those concepts starts from the difference of both the basis of analysis and the applicational result of the concepts towards languages. Such fact shows not only the big interest of the experts in negation but also the complexity of the discussion dealing with negation.

Further, the concepts of negation can be classified

into two groups. The first concept is formulating negation by using logical terminology, that is the system of opposition to state unreal things. This logical principle, which is proposed by Aristoteles and some other experts, turns out not to be appropriate to be apllied in linguistic research about negation. Indeed, Givon (1978), one expert who has researched negation, suggests that linguistic of negation needs special basic frame which does not have relation with logic. Jaspersen, another linguist, realizes that negation concept should be determined linguistically, that is based on the new meaning caused by the presence of negative constituent in sentence. This second concept is, then, completed by other linguists: Atlas (1977), Kempson (1979) and Lyons (1977) formulate negation from Semantic point of view; Givon, (1979) uses pragmatic as the base to analyze negation; and Klima (1984) and Payne (1985).

Actually, Payne's concept is the broadening of Klima's. Considering the result of the test of Klima's concept in other languages (in Dutch by Kraak and in Iraq-Arabic by Bakir), Payne need to broaden Klima's concept dealing with the types of negative constituents. Payne classifies negative constituents into five types, though not every language possesses all of them. The five

types of negation are: (1) *standard negation,* (2) *negated quanfifier,* (3) *inherently negated quantifier,*(4) *negated adverbial, and* (5) *inherently negated adverbs.*

2.1.2. Standard Negation

Standard negation is type of negation which can be applied in base sentence or minimal sentence, such as a sentence containing one clause or one predicate. In standard negation, negative constituents stand beside verbs or other constituent following. This concept of standard negation is, in Payne's point of view, needed to broaden the concept of Klima that turns out to fail to be applied in such following sentences:

(1) a. John doesn't often pay taxes { does he ? / and neither do I / not even to Malta }

b. John often doesn't pay taxes { does he? / and neither do I / not even to Malta }

Sentence (1) a. paraphrases with:

(1) a1. I say of John that it is not true that he often pays taxes.

Meanwhile, sentence (1)b. paraphrases with:

(1) b1. I say of John that it is true that he often doesn't often pay taxes.

In sentence (1) a1, *not* occurs between *John* (X) and *often pays taxes* (Y), so it can be classified as sentencial negation. On the other hand, in sentence (1) b1, *not* does not occur between *John* (X) and *often pays taxes* (Y). That is why, *not* in sentence (1) b. is not a sentencial negation. *N*ot in both sentences (1) a. and (1) b., however, are standard negation, though they are not parallel.

Dealing with the position of negative constituent, Givon (1984) elaborates that, universally, negative constituent is standing beside verbs. It may precede or follow the verbs, depending on the type of a language. According to him, negative constituent is usually preceding verbs or it becomes *prefixal NEG-markers* in languages begun by verbs (*V-first language) (VSO,VOS)* or in those which verbs are in the middle of sentences *(V-medial languages) (SVO).* Meanwhile, in languages with verbs in the last sentences *(V-last languages) (SOV),* negative constituents follow verbs or become *suffixal NEG-markers.* Notice the following examples:

- Bikol language (Philippine) (VSO):

(2) a. Affirmative: nag-gadan ang-lalake ning-kanding
AGT-kill TOP-man ACC-goat
'The man killed the goat'

b. Negative : da'i nag-gadan ang-lalake ning-kanding
NEG AGT-kill TOP-man ACC-goat
'The man didn't kill the goat'

- Japanese (SOV)

(3) a. Affirmative: otoko-wa bin-o kosawa-dalo
man TOP bottel-ACC break-FUT
'The man will break the bottel'

b. Negative : otoko-wa bin-o kosawa-nai-dalo
man TOP bottle-ACC break-NEG-FUT
'The man will not break the botttle'

- The Hebrew language:

(4) a. Affiramative: Yoav ax'l et ha laxem
Y ate ACC the-bread
'Yoav ate the bread'

(4) b. Negative : Yoav lo-axal et ha-laxem
Y NEG-ate ACC the-bread
'Yoav didnt eat the bread'

(ACC = accusative; AGT = agentive; FUT = future; NEG = negative; TOP = topic).

The concept of standard negation has close connection with the basic function of negation. In this case, Givon states that the function of negation is, generally, to negate verbs or other constituent following it.

2.1.3. Negated Quantifier

Negative quantifier is negative constituents which are particularly used to negate *quantifier*, as in the

exaples below:

(5) a. Not many student passed { did they? / and neither did I / not even with cribs }

(5) b. Scarcely any student passed { did they? / and neither did I / nor even to Malta }

Even though *not many* and *scarcely any* in sentence (5)a and (5)b fullfil the requirement for being sentencial negation since they are suitable for Klima's test, Payne calls them *negated quantifier*. For esxamples:

(5) a1. Not many students didn't pass.

2.*Murphhy didn't fail not many students.

(5) b1. Scarcely any students didn't pass.

2. Murphy didn't fail scarcely any student.

Concerning with the semantic function of *negated quantifier*, Payne (1985:203) says: "It serves not to differenciate the relative scope of the quantifier", as being able to be seen in the following examples:

(6) a. Not many students passed.

b. Not many student didn't pass.

(7) a. Not every student passed.

b. Every student didn't pass.

In sentence (6) a. and (7) a. *many* and *every* are negated by *not*, while in sentence (6) b. and (7) b., *many* and

every shouldn't negated by *not*. Sentence (7) b, especially, can be exegeted as (7) a. or "No students passed".

2.1.4. Inherently Negated Quantifier

In English, *inherently negated quantifier* is stated with *nothing, nobody, no-one,* or *no* in *no friends* (Payne,1985:204). The behaviour of such constituents called *inherently negated quantifier* is almost the same as that of *negated quantifier*. Both of them are able to be used together with standard negation when their position is in subject phrase or in front of subjects as in the examples below:

(8) a. None of the students didn't pass.

b. *I don't see none of the students.

2.1.5. Negated Adverbial

Payne (1985:205) states that there are three adverbs in English denotes the members of *negated adverbial,* they are *often, always,* and *everywhere* as in these sentences:

(9) { Not often / Not always } do I pay taxes { Do I? / and neither does Murphy / not even to Malta }

Negated adverbial always begins sentences and changes the

order subjects and verbs.

2.1.6. Inherently Negated Adverbs

Payne also proposes the existence of *inherently negated adverbs*. In English, there are two categories, those are *never, nowhere,* and *seldom, rarely, hardly, barely,* and *scarcely. Inherently negated adverbs* occure in close association with *negated adverbial,* as *inherently negated quantifier* and *negated quantifier.*

Based on that Payne's definition and classification, research on negation should be directed to (1) standard negation, (2) relationship between negation and quantity, and (3) relationship between negation and adverbs.

2.2. TRANSFORMATIONAL GENERATIVE GRAMMAR II; THE STAGE OF "THE ASPECT OF THE THEORY OF SYNTAX" 1965

In 1965, Avram Noam Chomsky, a linguistic professor in Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pusblished his book "Aspect of the Theory of Syntax". It becomes the starting point of the second stage of TG Grammar or the "aspect" stage. There are three postulates in this book (Parera, 1991:87), i.e.:

(1) The distinction between competence and performance, namely the knowledge of language and the actual use of language.

(2) The distinction between deep structure and surface structure. Such distinction results in that grammar is based on three components: syntactic components containing basic transformational components; phonological components and semantic components.

(3) The creative aspects of language or dinamicity of language, the capacity of language to make infinite use of finite means.

A generative grammar must be a system of rules that can generate on indefinitely large nuumbers of structures. Such system of rules can be analyzed into three major components of a generative grammar: syntactic, phonological and semantic components.

Syntactic component specifies an infinite set of abstract formal objects, each of which incorporates all informations relevant to a single interpretation of a particular sentence. The syntactic component contains two subcomponents: A base subcomponent and transformational subcomponent. A base subcomponent consists of a set of categories (including such things as S. NP, Adv, etc; this

is a "context-free" grammar which generates "phrase marker") and a lexical component (consisting of a lexical entries each of which is a system of features, for example, animate, human, abstract, etc.). These base subcomponents are elementary units of which deep structures are constituted. Meanwhile, a transformational subcomponent is concerned with its surface structure from its basis. In other words, we say that the transformational subcomponents converts the deep structure to a surface structure.

The phonological component determines the phonetic form of a sentence generated by syntactic rules. THat is, it relates a structure generated by the syntactic component to a phonetically represented signal. It contains phonological rule that is assigned to the surface structure of a phonetic representation in a universal phonetic alphabet (using distinctive features).

The semantic component determines the semantic interpretation of a sentence. That is, it relates a structure generated by the syntactic component to a certain semantic representation. It assigns a meaning to deep structures and by implication to their derived surface structure. Both phonological and semantic components are therefore purely interpretative. Each utilizes information

provided by syntactic component concerning formatives, their inherent properties, and their interrelations in a grammar must specify, for each sentence, a "deep structure" that determines its phonetic interpretation. The first of these is interpreted by the semantic component, while the second by phonological component.

3.2. NEGATION AND TRANSFORMATIONAL ANALYSIS

This point is discussing how to realize the transformational analysis in analyzing negation. In order to be able to realize the transformational analysis, it needs three principles of transformational rules (Parera, 1992: 95) : (1) The realization of syntactic strutures as the basis in deep structure. This realization is marked with DS (deep-structure) and the basic patterns of kernel sentences; (2) The statement and the realization of transformational processes is marked with T (transformation) and process rules with such abbreviation as *del.* (deletion), *add.* (addition), *mod.* (modification); and (3) The projection of transformational meaning, such as in the form of passive, imperative, negative, interogative, etc.

Many linguists pay particular attention to negative transformation (Tneg.) They attempt to observe and then

make rules or pattern of negative transformation. Generally, the position of negative constituent in most languages is unstable. That is why, Edward S. Klima, one of the linguist, proposes that the position of negative constituent in DS is at the beginning. This proposal is noted as the realization in analyzing the pattern of negative transformation in a language (Parera, 1991:98).

In English, for example, the pattern of Tneg can be set as follows :

DS : Neg.X + tense + Aux + Y (neg.John can come)
(neg. he has a son)

Tprocess: Tadd ⟶

SS : X + Aux + not + Y (John can not come)
(he does not have a son)