Mykhaylenko V. V.,
Doctor of Philology,
Professor, Dept. of Translation and Philology
Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytsky University of Law

NEGATION OPERATORS IN CREATING THE OPPONENT'S IMAGE

Summary. The paper examines negation operators (Neg. operator) as a means of creating an image of the opponent in the political discourse, namely the Announcement speech of Donald I. Trump. The definitions of the political discourse have one common feature 'the political use' and based on the concepts of power, conflict, control, or domination which in cognitive linguistics provide instruments for the identification and analysis of the audience manipulation. The explicit and implicit Neg. operators are defined as well as their functions in creating an opponent's negative image in the political speech.

Key words: negation, Neg. operator, political discourse, speaker, recipient, opponent, function, distribution, semantics.

Introduction. The very notions of political analysis and political discourse analysis are ambiguous in linguistics and political studies. The most common interpretation the Political Discourse Analysis is that it focuses on the analysis of 'political discourse', although Teun van Dijk [8, p. 12; 7, p. 12–52] says that, first, it is necessary to determine which discourse is political and which is not [see: 1, p. 236–244; 2]. "A political discourse expresses power or domination including the various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of dominance" [7, p. 249–283]. The term is suggestive of at least two possibilities: first, a discourse which is itself political; and second, an analysis of political discourse as an example of any discourse type [see: 2]. P.A. Chilton defines the political discourse as the use of language in ways that humans, being political animals, tend to recognize as political [4, p. 201]. We attempt to link social practice and linguistic practice, as well as micro- and macro-analysis of discourse [see: 9, p. 97]. The proposed definitions have one common feature 'the political use' and based on the concepts of power, conflict, control, or domination [see: 17, p. 111–113]. Concepts in cognitive linguistics provide instruments for the identification and analysis of linguistic and psychological strategies for manipulation in political discourse.

We shall concentrate on negation operators (Neg. operator) as a means of creating an image of the opponent in the political discourse, namely the Announcement speech of Donald I. Trump. The fact is that classification of types of political discourse much depends on the definition of the political sphere itself. We may consider all political activities of pre- and election campaign, electors, pressure groups, media, political parties and other players in the political process and the announcement speech is one of such activities in political context, which can turn any type of discourse into political. We must admit that when the politicians in power seem to hide the negative events within particular formulations that the population may not detect the truth, the politicians to come vehemently try to disclose and atomize them with the help of the Neg. operators.

The objective of this paper is to examine the functions of Neg. operators in his speech. Negation is one of the major controversial issues in philosophy, logic, and linguistics. Among the traditional problems of negation it is in the first place a phenomenon of semantic opposition. As such, negation relates an expression *e* to another expression with a meaning that is in some way opposed to the meaning of *e*. This relation may be realized syntactically and pragmatically in various ways. Moreover, there are different kinds of semantic opposition [see: Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy On-line, 2015).

It has often been observed that the logical symmetry of negative and affirmative propositions in logic belies a fundamental asymmetry in natural language. In symmetric negation affirmative and negative structures show no differences except for the presence of the negative marker(s), whereas in asymmetric negation there are further structural differences, i.e. asymmetries .In comparison to different perspectives on negation, particular attention is paid to the action of the negative operator *not* and to its interaction with various elements [16, p. 552–570]. Based on an authentic corpus of data, we attempt to indicate the discursive contribution of the Neg. operators in political discourse.

Discussion. We deploy on different existing theories in order to further depict and elucidate various aspects that interact with the negative operator. There is a vast philosophical and linguistic literature on negation [see: 13 for a thorough overview].

In Paul Werth's [20] world text model negation is not just a static semantic notion. The contribution of the discursive level of the Neg. operators is highly contextual. We will begin by discussing standard negation, the negation of declarative verbal clauses. Among the features of the Neg. operators in political discourse are the following: the existence of more discursive entities, represented not only by the speaker but also by allusions to political adversaries and opponents, a rich background the speaker assumes to be shared with the audience. It emerges as a dynamic discourse process as it involves a constant reassessment of ongoing discourse [20, p. 198]. B. Sowinsky considers political language (discourse) as a unity of language structures in the political use specific for a definite language community [19, p. 249].

We shall start our investigation with 'standard negation', the term originates from John R. Payne [18, p. 197–242]. It can be characterized as the basic means that languages have for negating declarative verbal main clauses. In English we can identify the construction that adds *not* after the auxiliary verb as the standard negation strategy [see the history of English negation [15].

Investigation. We consider it appropriate not to analyse Neg. operators as single instances revealed many interesting aspects. Many of them are generated on the speaker's background knowledge, i. e. the speaker assumes that his hearer may form a certain thought at some point based on the same type of information [3, p. 11].

There are two points of differentiating functions of negation: (a) unit of linguistics and (b) a unit within a literary text. As for the position of negative markers in the clause Otto Jespersen [14] had already noted that they tend to be placed before the elements they negate. Östen Dahl [6, p. 79–106] notes that negative operators tend

to be placed in relation to the finite element rather than in relation to the whole clause, and they tend to come as close to the finite element as possible.

Now we shall consider the Neg. operators in the sentence of the political speech and their quantity in the speech: n't (77); not (34); no (17); never (9); nothing (7); nobody (6) are registered in 6 formulae:

I. **N't [Vaux+Neg. n't + V n-f]**, e. g.:

1. I (Trump) don't think, it(other candidates' success)'s gonna happen.

2. But I (Trump) said, "[you the US Military] Don't hit Iraq", because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East.

II. **Not [Vaux + Neg. not + V n-f] / [Neg. not + NP]**, e. g.:

3. They (nowadays American politicians) will not bring us (Americans including Trump) – believe me (Trump) – to the promised land. They (politicians) will not.

4. They(Mexican people)'re sending us (Americans including Trump) not the right people (immirants).

The simplest form of negation appearing in the speech is the use of the operator *not* to reject or to signal the speaker's opposition to the activities of his opponents. He uses negation *not* to show mainly his opponents' failure to achieve an intended goal.

III. **No [Neg. no + NP]**, e. g.:

5. Because we (Americans including Trump) have no protection and we (Americans including Trump) have no competence, we (Americans including Trump) don't know what's happening.

6. They (American unemployed) can't get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs.

The operator 'no' is used to negate the objects, subjects or ideas to reveal the state of affairs which from the speaker's point must be changed and he promises to do it [see: 12].

IV. **Never [Neg. never + VP] / [Vaux +Neg. never + V n-f]**, e. g.:

7. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said to me the other day, "Donald, I never saw anything like it (Obamacare).

8. Now they're going militarily. They're building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never do that because we'd have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist wouldn't let our country – we would never build in an ocean.

Never routinely fails to express temporal quantification, it apparently functions as a straightforward sentential negator with emphatic force to attract the audience's attention.

V. **Nothing [NP =Neg. nothing]**, e. g.:

9. Well, you (hearers) need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing (no changes for the better)'s gonna get done.

10. And we (Americans including Trump) have nothing. We (Americans including Trump) can't even go there. We (Americans including Trump) have nothing (no profiting) And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it.

VI. **Neg. nobody [NP = Neg. nobody]**, e. g.:

11. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody (world including Americans) thought they (Chinese authorities) could do it again.

12. But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even 21 percent, and nobody (American people) talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense.

Nobody can be interpreted as an 'indefinite pronoun' which contextually preconditioned. In natural languages there are different means of expressing negation, for instance, the following models are paraphrases of external negation *not/n't*, however they represent the negative operator. The Neg. prefix is rather frequent as a negation verbalizer in the present speech, wherein the Neg. suffix is used in one case:

Prefix + Root (+ Suf) → Stem (=11), e. g.:

im-possible, in-credible, in-expensively, un-salvageable, il-legal, un-believable, un-employment, de-stabilize, dis-like.

Root +Neg. suffix → Stem = e. g.: use-less (1).

The semantic analysis of the following lexemes reveals a Neg. component in their meaning:

Lexeme with a Neg. semantic component, e. g.:

disaster (5), to take over (3), destroy (2), beat (2), kill (2), stupid (2), lose (2), bad (2), loser (2), small potatoes (2), a third world country (2), disastrous (1), bloat-ed (1), bubble (1), no-good(1), traitor (1), hit (1), destructive (1), wrong (1), to take away(1), nonsense (1), to cut (1), crisis (1), corrupt (1). This is a group of implicit negatives (Clark 1976, Fodor, Fodor, and Garrett, 1975) – they express similar negative meaning but lack morpho-syntactic negation, e. g.:

13. But I said, "Don't hit Iraq", because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. [←"Don't hit Iraq", because you're not (aren't) going to totally stabilize the Middle East]. Though we do not fully agree with the given verb classification, but we will not go into its details in this paper.

The speaker uses Neg. operators to deny all the events carried out or suggested by his opponents. The above forms of natural language negation also use Neg. operators to compare or quantify scalar values. Negation is often used for the concept of zero, or non-existence when the speaker says that there are new jobs then there is a starting point for him to create them. Function, however, is concerned with what the utterance is meant to achieve. Harrold Garfinkel [10, p. 167] states that it is never possible to say what one means 'in so many words' [5, p. 30]. Listeners work to interpret what a speaker functionally means or implies. According to H.P. Grice [11, p. 41–58], for an utterance in form to be unambiguous requires that the speaker fulfill four maxims: 1. Relation be relevant. 2. Quality (a) do not say what you believe to be false; (b) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. 3. Quantity a) make your contribution as informative as is required; (b) do not make your contribution more informative than required; (4) manner: (a) avoid obscurity of expression; (b) avoid ambiguity; (c) be brief; (d) be orderly [5, p. 31]. We have differentiated major functions of negation (1) organizing and updating information, (2) blocking flow of information producing a sort of communicative short circuit, (3) literary function to deny a proposition mentioned in previous explicit or implicit discourse; (4) it does not modify the previously existing information but introduces a new item to deny it [16, p. 198]; (5) contributing to the creation of the opponent's negative image. It is crucial to consider the cognitive properties of negative statements to understand the world view that is being projected in a given speech, paraphrasing the response to Emperor Pu Yi's question on importance of words for a gentleman (Bertolucci & Peploe: The Last Emperor) we can say that Neg. operators are important for a gentleman, "for if he cannot say what he means, he will never mean what he says".

We suppose that the results of the functional and qualitative analyses point out that the speaker tries to actualize the concept 'desaster' in the direct manner using various means of negation,

mainly direct to bring his idea of disaster clearly to his recepients, for instance:

14. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don't know what's happening. A succession of negatives in this fragment stressing the state of the society (no) and its objection to that state (n't) is used to emphasize the disaster in the country.

Neg. operators are used in the sentences with the deixis of person: 'I::We' (including the speaker) and the deixis of time: past::present stress that he (Trump, who succeeded in life all over the world) could not or doesn't grasp of the value events undertaken by the present Administration and his opponents.

Conclusions: In our approach to Neg. operators primarily expressed by explicit negatives: not, n't, no, never, nobody, nothing – negative in meaning, morphologically marked as negative, have specific co-occurrence in sentence that makes them also syntactically negative. The words of different parts of speech with the negative prefixes and adjectives with the negative suffix likewise are explicit negatives, though in case of their co-occurrence with an additional Neg. operator they can transform sentence negation into sentence affirmation.

It becomes evident that negation in natural language must be investigated from a broader perspective than suggested by propositional logic and traditional grammar. The contextual or discursive research of Neg. operators is more comprehensive and objective in determining their function, semantics, and pragmatics in use.

We tried to indicate the Neg. operators used by the speaker in order to persuade his audience to believe in his opponents' inability to succeed and to adhere to his opinions. Special attention was paid to the contribution of Neg. operators in creating the speaker's image that of a 'rescuer'.

Modeling the conceptual system of 'disaster' and determining Neg. operators position in the functional semantic domain of its actualizors can give us a true picture of the speaker's discourse pragmatics.

References:

1. Михайленко В. Дискурс-аналіз як віха у літературній критиці / В. Михайленко // Питання літературознавства. – Вип. 74. – Чернівці : Рута, 2007. – С. 236–244.
2. Вступ до літературного дискурсу [Text] = Introduction to literary discourse : [навч. посіб.] / уклад.: В.В. Михайленко, І.М. Микитюк ; М-во освіти і науки України, Чернівец. нац. ун-т ім. Ю. Федьковича. – Чернівці : Рута, 2003. – 119 с.
3. Albu Elena Nicoleta. The Pragmatics of Negative Structures in Political Discourse. A Relevance Theoretic Approach Elena Nicoleta Albu. Doctorate Dissertation. Resumat. – Bucharest : University of Bucharest, 2012. – 25 p.
4. Chilton P.A. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice / P.A. Chilton. – London : Routledge, 2004. – 227 p.
5. Coulthard R.M. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis / R.M. Coulthard. – Harlow : Longman, 1985. – Pp. 69–88.
6. Dahl Östen. Typology of sentence negation / Östen Dahl // Linguistics. – 1979. – Vol. 17. – Issue 1–2. – Pp. 79–106.
7. Dijk van T.A. Principies of Critical Discourse Analysis / T.A. van Dijk // Discourse and Society. – 1993. – Volume 4. – Issue 2. – Pp. 249–283.
8. Dijk van Teun A. What is Political Discourse Analysis? / T.A. van Dijk // Belgian Journal of Linguistics. – 2009. – Vol. 11. – Pp. 12–52.
9. Fairclough N. Language and Power / N. Fairclough. – London : Longman, 1989. – 135 p.
10. Garfinkel Harold. Studies in Ethnomethodology / Harold Garfinke. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
11. Grice H.P. Logic and conversation / H.P. Grice // P. Cole, J. Morgan (eds.). Speech Acts. – New York : Academic Press, 1975. – Pp. 41–58.
12. Hidalgo Downing L. Negation, Text Worlds, and Discourse: The Pragmatics of Fiction / L. Hidalgo Downing. – Stanford, Connecticut : Ablex Publishing Corporation, 2000. – XXI. – 225 p.
13. Horn Laurence R. A Natural History of Negation / Laurence R. Horn. – Leland Stanford Junior University : CSLI Publications, 2001. –227 p.
14. Jespersen Otto. Negation in English and Other Languages / Otto Jespersen. – Kobenhavn : Blanko Lunos Bogtrykkerei, 1917. – 160 p.
15. Mazzon G. A History of English Negation / G. Mazzon. – London : Pearson Longman. 2004. – XVI. – 176 p.
16. Miestamo Matti. Negation – An Overview of Typological Research / Matti Miestamo // Language and Linguistics Compass. – 2007. – Vol. 1. – Issue 5. – Pp. 552–570.
17. Mykhaylenko Valery V. Prolegomena to Russia's "Readings" Dynamics / Valery V. Mykhaylenko // Образ России в зарубежном политическом дискурсе: стереотипы, мифы и метафоры : материалы Международной научной конференции. Екатеринбург, 13–17сентября 2010 / Урал. гос. пед. Ун-т ; гл. ред. А.П. Чудинов. – Екатеринбург, 2010. – С. 111–113.
18. Payne J.R. Negation. Language Typology and Syntactic Description / J.R. Payne // T. Shopen (ed.). Clause Structure. Volume I. – Cambridge : CUP, 1985. –Pp. 197–242.
19. Sowinsky B. Stilistik. Stiltheorein und Stilanalysen / B. Sowinsky. – Weimar : Metzler Verlag, 1999. – 252 S.
20. Werth Paul. Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse / Paul Werth. – London : Longman, 1999. – 390 p.

Михайленко В. В. Оператори заперечення у створенні образу опонента

Анотація. Об'єктом дослідження слугують оператори заперечення як засіб утворення образу опонента в політичній промові Дональда Трампа. Наявні визначення політичного дискурсу мають спільну рису – «політичний регістр», що базується на концептах «влада», «конфлікт», «контроль» і «панування», які слугують інструментами когнітивного дослідження маніпуляції мовцем аудиторією. Оператори заперечення поділено на експліцитні й імпліцитні, завдяки комплексному аналізові виокремлено їхні прагматичні функції.

Ключові слова: заперечення, оператор заперечення, політичний дискурс, мовець, слухач, опонент, функція, дистрибуція, семантика.

Михайленко В. В. Операторы отрицания в создании образа оппонента

Аннотация. Объектом исследования служат операторы отрицания как способ создания образа оппонента в политическом выступлении Дональда Трампа. Существующие определения политического дискурса располагают общим компонентом – «политическим регистром», основу которого составляют концепты «власть», «конфликт», «контроль», «господство», что служат инструментами когнитивного исследования манипуляции говорящего слушателями. Выделены эксплицитные и имплицитные операторы, а также благодаря комплексному анализу их прагматические функции.

Ключевые слова: отрицание, оператор отрицания, политический дискурс, говорящий, слушатель, оппонент, функция, дистрибуция, семантика.