

**How to Cite:**

Pasichnyk, N., Hotsa, N., Kosenko, A., Plavutska, O., & Bloshchynskyi, I. (2021). Category of negation paradigm in diachrony. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1226-1235.  
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1701>

## Category of Negation Paradigm in Diachrony

**Nataliia Pasichnyk**

Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

**Nataliia Hotsa**

Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

**Anna Kosenko**

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine

**Olga Plavutska**

Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine

**Ihor Bloshchynskyi**

Bohdan Khmelnytskyi National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine

**Abstract**---The negation in logic and linguistics, negation as a grammatical category on the morphological and syntactic levels are substantiated in the article. It is concluded that in broad semantic terms negation can be expressed in morphologic and syntactic ways in natural language. 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 using 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 aspects 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.

**Keywords**---category negation, diachrony, expressing negation, lexico-grammatical paradigm, morphological level, syntactic level.

## Introduction

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. Most of the investigations are concerned with issues that derive from philosophical and logic problems of sentences where negation is involved. 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 (Quirk et al., 1982): *reservative-prevative*: *un-*, *de-*, *dis-*; *opposition* prefixes: *anti-*, *counter-* (Trutyak, 2004). 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 (Soloviova et al., 2021), 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.

Results of the research of the correlation between principles of gender assignment and the meaning of coined words, namely investigating the possibility of a connection between genders of suffixes and the semantic peculiarities of Old English derivatives were presented by such scholars as O. Soloviova, I. Bloshchynskyi, L. Tsviak, O. Voitiuk, & O. Mysechko, O. Their finding suggests that certain semantic regularities are part of the gender assignment system in Old English (Hoang, 2019; Gabidullina et al., 2021). The majority of masculine and feminine suffixes are responsible for nouns belonging to 3 – 5 semantic groups; neuter suffixes have from 2 to 4 main semantic meanings. It provides evidence that derivatives of each gender have the following semantic segments: notions of people, administration and social stratification for masculine suffixes; abstractions, feelings and emotions, traits of character and activities for feminine ones, and structures, locations and lifeless objects for neuter suffixes. Semantic peculiarities of the Old English suffixes built the ground for the competition between them and were vital for their further development in the course of the English language (Leontieva, 1974).

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*. It is logical, that semantic shades of negation correspond with the main lexical meaning of the negative adjective. 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.

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. 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 they join 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 purpose of the research is to study the main aspects of lexico-grammatical paradigm of the category of negation in diachrony. The following methods of research were used in the process of investigation: componential analysis that helps to reveal how semantic components of negative meaning lead to delimiting the field of negation; discourse analysis that makes us realize that the essence of this problem and its resolution lie in its assumptions (Karatsareas, 2014; Helmbrecht, 2015).

## 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 (Palasis, 2015; Butt & Lahiri, 2013). On the lexical level when the affix denotes negation: negative prefix + root: natural - unnatural, proper -improper, regular - irregular; 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 means 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. V. Mykhailenko (Mykhailenko, 2000), 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. 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 (Mykhailenko, 2000), provides the distributional model of *not* in the Modern English sentence which helps to define the subjective modality senses

generated by the speaker/author: *not* + at all; *not* + half; *not* + least; *not* + to mention; nothing if + *not*; *not* + for nothing; *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: *not* + only + a thing; *not* + just/simply; *not* + merely. The most elaborate description of the *not* valency in the Modern English sentence is given by Susan K. Bland in her Intermediate Grammar (Bland, 1996). They differ in several distributions. It is also possible to determine some functional features: negator; clause substitutor; contrastor; intensifier; emphasiser; introductory (Mykhailenko, 1997). 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 *not*1, a particle, occurred due to the disappearance of Old English negative particle “*ne*”, and into *not*2, 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 *not*1 and *not*2.

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* (Arakin, 1985). Considering 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 “*ne v...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” JEGP57, 1958), the West-Saxon dialect was rich in contracted forms, while the English dialect preferred to use full forms (Just & Carpenter, 1971; Grodzinsky, 1984).

Regarding pronoun *none*, which belongs to the Old English pronoun *ne-ân*, and during the Old English period it became an unseparated word *nan*. During the 12<sup>th</sup> century the sound [â] turned into [ō] 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 17<sup>th</sup> century it turned into [a]. So, [nun] > [nun] > [nan]. But during the Middle English Period the pronoun *no* 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 [ō] turned into [ou]; in such a way a new pronoun *no* appeared and it became an element of pronouns *nobody* and *no one* (Arakin, 1985). During the Old English Period the pronoun *nān* was often used together with a noun *piz*, and during the Middle English period these two words merged into a pronoun *nothing*.

Adverbs that include negation are used in order to distinguish the object from the set of objects related to it (Paradis & Willners, 2006; Bero, 2021). 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. Negative adverbs in Middle English are formed with the help of the negative particles *no* and *ne*. So *greet a purchasour was nowher noon. This somnour bar to him a stif burdoun; was nevere trompe of half so greet a soun*. 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. 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 significance, 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 preword negative elements (Dickey & Janda, 2015; Ayres, 1996; Widana et al., 2020). 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. 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”: *Nafa þu fremde zodas deforan me! (Deutrononium). Nelle þu elnian and elenwondian betwux awyrzyde (Psalter)*. The Old English prohibitive sentence distinguishes between a preverbal negation and preword negation and preword negation. *Ne do se uryhtwisclice (Pastoral Care)*.

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 preword negative elements which specify the communicative centres in the sentence (*Nu 3im þu þines neahstan wifes ne his huses ne his landes ne nan þæra þin3a (Deutrononium)*). 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 most frequently used – *ne...nan*, *ne...na/no* and the least *nafa/nyle* – *...nan/ne*. The qualitative and quantitative data obtained from over 100 Old English written records prove to be reliable. The use of two or more negation elements does not result in the positive sentence meaning. On the contrary, each succeeding negation intensifies the author's communicative intention: *ne forbinde 3e no þæm descendum (Matheus)*; *ne wire þu nan weore þam dæ3e (Exodus)*; *ne' spræ þu næfre (John)*. In these examples the second negation (*no*, *nan*, *næfre*) specifies the communicatively significant constituent of the sentence and strengthens the sentence negation.

The development of the means of negation in English and types of negative sentence stabilization outlines two parallel aspects interacting in the sentence structure – grammatical and communicative. Mononegation as a grammatical phenomenon is characterized for the latter periods of the development of the English language, but not for Old English. Polynegation is the linguistic phenomenon or the characteristic ability of the language to include more than one negator that can make the whole sentence negative, serving as the accumulation of negation in the sentence. Even though the problem of polynegation in Old English was discussed many times but it still demands deeper investigation. All the works that are dedicated to the mentioned question can be divided into two main groups: 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; works which deal with the explanation of the Old English polynegation.

The study by L. Kedova was made on the basis of the Old English literature (Bede, Cædmon, Widsith (7<sup>th</sup> century), Gnostic Verses (the beginning of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, poems by Cynewulf (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.) (Kedova, 1988). She mentions that poetry is rich in mononegative sentences, while in prose it is possible to find a great number of polynegative sentences. For example, Aelfric uses only polynegative 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 Gnostic Verses are mononegative. In three sentences the pronoun *nænig* is used, in two – *sunig* (negation with the predicate, i.e. *ne v...æfre*); in three – *æfre* (*ne v...æfre*); in one – *nowiht*. In poems by



Cynewulf it is possible to find 5 sentences with *nænig*, in the 21<sup>st</sup> – *ænig* (*ne v...ænig*); in 11 – *næfre*, in 7 – *æfre*, in 2 – *nan*. So, all sentences, besides 2 are mononegative and they include the pronoun *nan*. For example, ...*heah fæ dra nan ne witgena (Juliana)*; *nan swylc ne cwom ænig other ofer ealle men (Christ)*. But even this last sentence proves the regularity, because there is a form “*æ nig*”, and not “*nænig*”.

Regarding the difference between pronouns “*nænig/æ nig*” and “*nan*”, 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 “*nænig*” 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 “*nænig*” 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 to 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 Anglish dialect was rich in contraction (Levin, 1958).

It should be mentioned that all the poetical works, mentioned above, are written in the Anglish 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 Gnomical Verses. Perhaps, the cases of its usage in the poems “Christ”, “Guliana”, “Beowulf” should be considered as borrowing. It seems that polynegation in 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. 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*, *nāht – 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 sinzan – I can sing nothing*. In this 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 (Rolf, 1982).

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* (Rolf, 1982). Compare the Old English examples from *Beowulf*: *ne mæz ic hēr lenz wesān* (lit. “not can I here longer be/stay”). *ne wille ic lenz his zeonsra wurþan*; *ne seah ic þus manize menn mōdislicran*. *hie ne wēndon, thætte æfre menn sceolden swæ recceleāse vweorþan*. The negative construction continues to occur in Middle English. See the examples from *The Canterbury Tales*: *ne mazzþ þe mann bi bræd all āne libbenn*. *ic ne cunne singe, shō ne cōuþe gōn on fōte, hē nee et, ne drōnk, ne sleep*.

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*. 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: *e.g. did they not warn you?* (rather formal), *didn’t they 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*: *dō yē nō drēde God that is abōve? dōþ nost þei blasphemē þe gōde nāme þat is y-clēped on sōw? did nost ser Dary to vs write his pistil with pride?* Earlier negation patterns in interrogative clauses occur in the following Old English: *ne dricst þú win?* (OE) and Middle English examples from *The Canterbury Tales*: *ne fēlest tú þi flesch al to- luken? hwi ne fēle ich þē in min breostes&. or, with the original ‘negative negation supporter’ made into the only negation marker: sèo zē noust þat sōng mon, þat hap schōn boust? drēdist thow not God?*

Constructions of the latter type are far from being uncommon in Early Modern English, as can be seen from Shakespeare’s usage: *went you not to her yesterday?* (*Merry Wives*), *why went you not with Master doctor, maid?* (*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. The construction with the original negative negation supporter *noht* made into the only negation marker is attested from late 14th century. Compare examples from *The Canterbury Tales*: *consente þow not to such folýe, gā þow noght o þi hús a stepe. sey nat al þat þow kan.*

As for 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: *lōke yē, dō not lýe!* (*The Canterbury Tales*) does not really become a ‘rival pattern’ before the time of Shakespeare and thereafter. 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 (Issa et al., 2021; Setiawan, 2017; Netra, 2016).



## Conclusion

The grammatical category of negation in diachrony has been investigated. 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, namely: negative pronouns in Old English were formed using a fusion of a negative particle *ne* with indefinite pronoun *æn nis* and numeral *an* in its pronominal function; the transposition of *not-nauht* occurred due to the disappearance of the Old English negative particle “ne”; 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 main source of the enrichment of the negative affixes paradigm and their new meaning are affixed, borrowed from other languages. The prospective of further research in this field lies in investigating negation in different discourses and communicative situations, which would be essential for researching communicative strategies in an anthropocentric paradigm.

## References

- Arakin, V. D. (1985). *The history of the English Language*, textbook.
- Ayres, R. U. (1996). Limits to the growth paradigm. *Ecological Economics*, 19(2), 117-134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8009\(96\)00064-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8009(96)00064-X)
- Bero, T. (2021). “Perfect” asymmetry: Variation in Judeo-Spanish as a window into the diachrony of perfect auxiliaries. *Lingua*, 258, 103086. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103086>
- Bland, S. K. (1996). *Intermediate grammar: from form to meaning and use.*[Hauptband]. Oxford University Press.
- Butt, M., & Lahiri, A. (2013). Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua*, 135, 7-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.11.006>
- Dickey, S. M., & Janda, L. A. (2015). Slavic aspectual prefixes and numeral classifiers: Two kinds of lexico-grammatical unitizers. *Lingua*, 168, 57-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.09.005>
- Gabidullina, A., Sokolova, A., Kolesnichenko, E., Zharikova, M., & Shlapakov, O. (2021). Metonymy in scientific linguistic discourse. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 71-83. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1556>
- Grodzinsky, Y. (1984). The syntactic characterization of agrammatism. *Cognition*, 16(2), 99-120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(84\)90001-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(84)90001-5)
- Helmbrecht, J. (2015). A typology of non-prototypical uses of personal pronouns: Synchrony and diachrony. *Journal of pragmatics*, 88, 176-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.10.004>
- Hoang, J. (2019). Translation technique term and semantics. *Applied Translation*, 13(1), 16-25. Retrieved from <https://appliedtranslation.nyc/index.php/journal/article/view/145>
- Issa, S. H. M., Bajiri, M. E., Alyamani, K. A. Z., & Abhishek B. P. (2021). Lexical semantic activation in bilinguals: evidence through blocked naming

- task. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 860-866.  
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS1.1470>
- Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1971). Comprehension of negation with quantification. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, 10(3), 244-253.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(71\)80051-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(71)80051-8)
- Karatsareas, P. (2014). On the diachrony of gender in Asia Minor Greek: The development of semantic agreement in Pontic. *Language Sciences*, 43, 77-101.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.10.005>
- Kedova, L. (1988). On the issue of the polynegation of the Old English language. *Journal of Kharkiv University*, №322, p.p. 37-40.
- Leontieva, S. (1974). Negative affixes in modern English. High School. Moscow: p. 5-24.
- Levin, S. R. (1958). Negative contraction: an Old and Middle English dialect criterion. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 57(3), 492-501.
- Mykhailenko, V. V. (1997). Negation as a communicative indicator in diachrony. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №12 (3), P. 15-22.
- Mykhailenko, V. V. (2000). Semantics and paradigmatics of the negation operator. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №72, P. 48-51.
- Netra, I. M. (2016). Lexical representations of prototypes of semantic primitives in balinese tradition and their meaning configuration in english. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 2(2), 38-49. Retrieved from  
<https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/88>
- Palasis, K. (2015). Subject clitics and preverbal negation in European French: Variation, acquisition, diatopy and diachrony. *Lingua*, 161, 125-143.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.11.012>
- Paradis, C., & Willners, C. (2006). Antonymy and negation—The boundedness hypothesis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 38(7), 1051-1080.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.11.009>
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. A. (1982). *University Grammar of English*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, 390 p.
- Rolf, B. (1982). A History of the English Language. *Leipzig: Enzyklopedie*.
- Setiawan, I. (2017). Relation of Sasak and Samawa Language: Diachronic study in the language kinship of an ethnic group in Indonesia. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 3(5), 83-90. Retrieved from  
<https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/226>
- Soloviova, O., Bloshchynskyi, I., Tsviak, L., Voitiuk, O., & Mysechko, O. (2021). Compatibility of Semantics of Suffixes with Gender Assignment in Old English. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 10(3), 224-235.
- Trutyak, I. (2004). Diachrony of the paradigm of negative affixes of the English language. *Economic Scientific Journal of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University*, №188-189, P. 276-283.
- Widana, I.K., Dewi, G.A.O.C., Suryasa, W. (2020). Ergonomics approach to improve student concentration on learning process of professional ethics. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(7), 429-445.