

УДК 811. 161.2'23

Larysa Kardash

ORCID iD: orcid.org/0000-0002-2098-0240

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,

Department of Ukrainian Linguistics and Teaching Methodology

State Institution of Higher Education

«Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhoriy Skovoroda

State Pedagogical University»

30 Sukhomlynskyi Street, Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, 08400

kkardashlarysa@gmail.com

ON THE PROBLEM OF CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CATEGORIES OF NEGATION, OPPOSITION AND OTHER LINGUISTIC CATEGORIES

У статті розглядаються суперечливі підходи до визначення сутності категорій заперечення й протиставлення, зумовлені передусім багатогранністю цього мовного феномена. Аналізуються лінгвістичні концепції даних категорій, взаємодія їх з іншими категоріями – предикативністю, модальністю, просодикою, оцінкою тощо. Без сумніву, заперечення і протиставлення дотичне до зазначених категорій, але для них властиві й специфічні ознаки, що творять його іманентну суть.

Досить часто межі розгляду категорій заперечення й протиставлення виявляються вужчими, і дослідники намагаються розмежувати їх як категорії поняттєві і як категорії мовні. Однак ми вважаємо, що заперечення й протиставлення – складні явища, далеко не периферійні, обмежувальний і модифікуючий вплив яких тією чи іншою мірою актуальний на всіх рівнях мовної структури.

Ключові слова: *категорія, заперечення, протиставлення, модальність, предикативність, логічний наголос, феномен, маркованість, актуальне членування речення.*

В статье рассматриваются противоречивые подходы к определению сущности категорий возражения и противопоставления, обусловленные прежде всего многогранностью этого языкового феномена. Анализируются лингвистические концепции данных категорий, взаимодействие их с другими категориями – предикативностью, модальностью, просодикой, оценкой и тому подобное. Без сомнения, возражение и противопоставление касательное к указанным категориям, но для них свойственны и специфические признаки, которые составляют их имманентную суть.

Достаточно часто пределы рассмотрения категорий возражения и противопоставления оказываются уже, и исследователи пытаются разграничить их как категории понятийные и как категории языковые.

Однако мы считаем, что отрицание и противопоставление - сложные явления, далеко не периферийные, ограничительное и модифицирующее влияние которых в той или иной степени актуально на всех уровнях языковой структуры.

Ключевые слова: категория, отрицание, противопоставление, модальность, предикативность, логическое ударение, феномен, марочность, актуальное членение предложения.

The article considers contrasting approaches to defining the essence of categories of negation and opposition caused primarily by the many-sidedness of this linguistic phenomenon. The article analyzes linguistic concepts of these categories, their interaction with other categories such as predicativity, modality, prosodics, evaluation etc. There is no doubt that negation and opposition have a certain connection with the said categories, but they also have certain specific features that make up their immanent essence.

Quite often, the boundaries of considering the categories of negation and opposition turn out to be narrower, and scientists try to differentiate them as categories of notion and categories of language. However, we believe that negation and opposition are complicated phenomena and in no case are they peripheral, so their delimiting and modifying influence is relevant at all levels of the language structure, to a certain degree.

Key words: *category, negation, opposition, modality, predicativity, logical stress, phenomenon, markedness, relevant division of a sentence.*

Availability of a logical foundation, versatility, deep origins, and markedness (if compared to affirmation) distinguish negation and opposition as special categories. They have the closest connection with general grammar categories such as predicativity, modality, they interact with logical stress and relevant division, participate in building structural schemes, often cause changes in specific grammar forms within a sentence (change of aspect, using the genitive case instead of accusative etc).

For linguistics, the debating points still include such aspects of the negation and opposition problem as their correlation with the cognitive-communicative category of modality, and such modal subcategories as certainty, necessity and possibility (Ye. Shendels, V. Admoni, I. Susov, O. Bondarko, T. Beliaieva), as delimitation of implicit and explicit, dictal and modus negation (Sh. Balli, V. Gak) and others.

Qualification of negation and opposition as thought-based or notional categories expressed in language (which was described by O. Jespersen, I. Meshchaninov) found its manifestation in the project of functional and semantic analysis of language categories developed by O. Bondarko.

Quite often, the boundaries of considering the categories of negation and opposition turn out to be narrower, and scientists try to differentiate them as categories of notion and categories of language. However, we keep to the belief

that negation and opposition are complicated phenomena and in no case are they peripheral, so their delimiting and modifying influence is relevant at all levels of the language structure, to a certain degree.

Negation and opposition include at least two blocks of information: firstly, the one correlated with the objective reality and representing the fact of absence in space and time, incorrespondence of a certain phenomenon, fact, subject or their properties in reality and exists as a proposition, and secondly, the one related to the speaker's communicative intention, their evaluation and attitude. This fact suggests studying the separate categories in language with consideration of their modal peculiarities.

The issue of correlation between the categories of negation, opposition and the category of modality has not been solved univocally in linguistics. There are different opinions on the subject. It is connected with the fact that negation, opposition and modality considered as notional categories have certain fields where the meanings of such categories overlap, and the fields where they are delimited. Defining these correlations is quite difficult as these categories have many points of tangency. This view is shared, in particular, by linguists M. Liapon, I. Andreieva, and partially, by Ye. Shendels and others. According to M. Liapon, «the scope of functional range is a peculiarity inherent not only to negation. The multilevel arrangement of various categories and the tendency to inter-categorical contacts and tangency based on both formal and semantic commonality is a natural property of a language system» [Liapon M., 1990]. T. Golikova points out that there is a connection between the subjective-modal meaning and the position of the negative element in a phrase: if the negation is placed at the absolute beginning of a phrase, the opposition, contrast and contradiction are expressed less often in comparison with the phrase containing and negative element in the middle or final position.

There is also a view that denies existence of any fields where the categories of negation, opposition and modality may ever overlap. The linguists defending this point include V. Panfilov, P. Chesnokov and S. Vasilieva. According to V. Panfilov, affirmation and negation are not opposed to each other in terms of evaluating reality. Both an affirmative and negative utterance can equally be differentiated by subjective modality (cf. *Можливо, він має рацію – Можливо, вінне має рації / He may be right – He may not be right*). There is also no change in the meaning of objective reality when means of negation are used in an utterance, that is, an affirmative or negative utterance still represent equally real facts. S. Vasilieva believes that «recognizing modality and emphatic nature of negation, researchers separate negation from a certain side of reality - disconnectedness, and therefore identify negation as a subjective view».

Some research works contain the idea that differs from both of the above mentioned that the categories of negation and opposition are identified with the category of modality. They are seen among other modal meanings expressing the speaker's attitude to reality and their evaluation of the contents

reality. This concept was proposed by V. Vynogradov [Vynogradov V., 1975]. Partially, this approach can be found in the works by O. Peshkovskiyi, N. Shvedova. V. Admoni, N. Arutiunova, O. Paducheva, among foreign linguists in the works by Ch. Bally and O. Jespersen.

According to O. Peshkovskiyi's opinion, the essence of the category of negation, having a great psychological and mostly logical meaning, can be reduced to the fact that the connection between two ideas expressed with this category is understood in the negative, that is, there is an understanding that the actual connection expressed in certain forms does not exist in reality [Peshkovskiyi A., 2001]. This definition emphasizes the essence of negation as a category of thinking. This idea is also confirmed by the fact that the author rates the category of negation among «subjective-objective» categories expressing not the relation between ideas but the speaker's attitude to relations between words and word combinations that express these ideas in a language. Conforming to O. Peshkovskiyi's concept, the category of negation expresses direct unreality without any relation to ideas of possibility, necessity etc. [Peshkovskiyi A., 2001]. In O. Peshkovskiyi's opinion, negation belongs to the field of subjective-objective modality and, by this theory, belongs to modality by expressing «the attitude to attitude» [Yartseva A., Arutiunova N., 1990], therefore it is identified as modality.

V. Admoni considered negation as a category representing unreality. In his opinion, affirmation and negation are, correspondingly, the expressions of reality and unreality of the relations and phenomena represented in a sentence [Admoni V., 1955]. He also considers main modal meanings represented by affirmative and negative forms.

Modality is a multi-aspect category, and it interacts actively with the system of other functional and semantic categories (notional categories) of the language and is closely connected to categories of pragmatics. From this viewpoint, representation of complex relations between factors of communication: addressee, addresser, contents of the utterance and reality is found both in the category of modality and in the category of negation.

Including the meaning of negation and opposition to the category of modality can also be explained by the fact that modality can express the attitude to reality, as a multi-aspect category. V. Vynogradov understands modality as a category expressing the relation between the utterance and the reality as seen from the speaker's viewpoint [Vynogradov V., 1975].

Two types, objective and subjective, are distinguished within the category of modality. Objective modality expresses the relation of an utterance to reality in terms of real versus unreal. Subjective modality represents the speaker's attitude to an utterance. The semantic scope of modality is wider than the semantic scope of objective modality.

The interaction between the categories of negation, opposition and modality takes place when correlating the semantic scope of subjective modality with negation. O. Jespersen views negation in a subjective-modal

aspect. G. Paul also rated negation as a subjective-modal category and believed that negation expresses «a failed attempt to establish a connection between two ideas». Negation is also viewed within the boundaries of subjective modality. According to this approach, «negative words-sentences are either a negative answer to a question, or express the speaker's disagreement with someone's utterance, or (in case of monologic speech) express the speaker's disagreement with themselves, a negation of their own statement. In addition to negation, they can also express an evaluation of someone's utterance».

Often, negation expresses not only one's negation, but also a subjective meaning – indecisiveness, hesitation, uncertainty, emotional shades of admiration, surprise etc (additional subjective modality), that is, every subjective-evaluative speaker's attitude to an utterance.

However, we believe that there are no sound grounds to include negation and opposition to the category of modality, to say nothing of equating them, as these categories belong to different levels. The most acceptable is the first approach according to which the categories of negation, opposition and modality have certain overlap points and interact between themselves.

Some linguists have rightly noted that the category of negation is based on two types of modality, subjective and objective, as it expresses simultaneously the state of affairs in the surrounding reality and the speaker's objective evaluation [Zolotova G., 2005]. Without recognizing the fact that the interrogative nature and negative nature are the features shaping the main modality of a sentence, G. Zolotova claims that «interrogative intonation and other constructive means of interrogative sentences (as well as means of expressing negation) can be combined with other means to create additional shades of modality» [Zolotova G., 2005]. She also specifies that the particle «un-» in combination with the Russian word «не-» expresses the shades of hesitation, doubt and apprehension [Zolotova G., 2005].

O. Beliaieva writes thoroughly on the interaction between modality and negation. Basing on the ideas by P. Adamets, she notes that «presence of negation in the semantic structure of utterances with modal modifiers of possibility causes changes in the modal meaning of such utterances. It may produce four types of situations: impossibility, negative possibility, double negation of possibility and negation of impossibility» [Bondarko A., 1990].

In Ukrainian linguistics the problem of correlation between the categories of negation, opposition and modality has not received proper attention yet. Most researchers do not emphasize the connections between the two linguistic categories though it can be understood by analyzing corresponding theoretical materials.

For example, «The Ukrainian Grammar» does not give separate sections for the categories of negation, opposition and modality, but the connection between them is justified by the authors pointing out to such modal words as «аніскільки, навпаки, ніскільки, неправильно, невірно» which acts as syntactically undivided sentences and express varied modal meanings, and are also connected to certain types of syntactical relations.

I. Vykhovanets includes the category of predicativity (in the semantic-syntactical meaning) containing the categories of time and modality, as well as affirmation / negation into the categories of subjective semantic-syntactical level. In his opinion, «the category of affirmation / negation is a semantic-syntactical category that qualifies the connection between the subject of speaking and the things expressed about it as a real connection, or this connection is understood as the one that does not exist in reality. The category of affirmation / negation reflects the speaker's understanding of the relations between objects and phenomena of extra-lingual reality» [Vykhovanets I., 1993]. The very fact of classifying both categories as belonging to one level suggests there should be fields of interaction between modality and negation.

Authors of the academic course «Modern literary Ukrainian language» do not point to the connection between modality, negation and opposition but while considering hypothetical modality they note that «the meaning of hypothetical modality in terms of external syntactical relations between the contents being transmitted and the objective reality is inherent to the sentences that shape such meanings with the particles «ніби, наче, либонь, десь, чи не, ледве (чи) не, навряд (чи)» [Bilodid I., 1972]. The suggested examples justify the overlap between the categories of negation and modality: «Понесу я йому пити, чи не буде говорити / I'll bring him something to drink, would he say something then» (Folklore). «Чи не краще вийти назустріч / Wouldn't it be better to meet them halfway» (М. Kotsiubynskyi). «Так ясно, просто і дотепно ледве чи хто потрапив би у нас вивести тому знялятину на чисту воду / It is unlikely that any of us would be able to bring to light that corrupt person so clearly, easily and wittingly» (М. Kotsiubynskyi).

The correlation between the categories of negation, opposition and modality can be followed both with the objective and subjective kinds of modality.

In negative words-sentences, intellectual intonemes fulfil a leading role in expressing the objective-modal meaning which, however, is motivated by the context or the language situation, which causes such objective modality expressive means to be classified as «intonation-syntactical»: «Досконала робота? Розуміється, ні / Perfect work? Of course, not» (Остап Vyshnia).

Meanings of unreal modality are acquired by structures with the compound verbal predicate, their components being a modal modifier of negative meaning like «неприпустимо» (inadmissible) and the infinitive: «Студентам вищої школи неприпустимо розмовляти під час занять / It is inadmissible for college students to talk during the class».

Often the interaction between the categories of negation and modality is possible at the level of lexical semantics when certain groups of words with negative semantics express the meaning of personal, subjective attitude to a message. For example: «Дітям заборонено гратися з сірниками / Children are prohibited to play with matches». It makes such structures closer to the structures bearing subjective-modal meanings.

A typical structure to express unreal modality of possibility is that of a dependent infinitive, with the modal modifiers «не можна, не може / (can't)» acting as agents of subcategorical meaning: «Через страшенну снігову завію на небі не можна розгледіти жодної зірки / Because of a terrible blizzard, a single star can't be seen in the sky».

The meaning of unreal modality of necessity complicated with additional shades of categoricalness, strict order may be expressed by infinitive sentences containing components with the negative meaning: «Не писати на партах! / No writing on the desks! Не ходити по газонах! / No walking on the lawns!»

The interaction between the categories of negation and subjective modality appears also with active participation of all prosodic elements. For example, the sentences being affirmative by their form acquire negation characteristics, and at the same time, subjective-modal meanings of doubt: «Прийде він! / Will he ever come!»; categorical certainty of impossibility of a certain action: «Шукай вітра в полі! / Go and chase the wind in the field».

The meanings of absolute certainty, a categorical affirmation have structures involving double negation (in other terms, the negation of negation): «Шовкун не міг не впізнати Олесю. / Shovkun couldn't fail to recognize Olesia. Богдан не міг не знати відповідь на питання викладача. / Bogdan couldn't be ignorant of the answer to the teacher's question».

Often the means expressing negation take part in expressing such variety of subjective modality as deontic axiological modality: «Тільки те не до ладу, що мусив збрехати директорові... / What is no good is that he had to lie to the Headmaster...»

Although there is a kind of interaction and tangency between the categories of negation, opposition and modality, and sometimes these categories implement themselves at the expense of each other's expressive means.

An important problem is the connection of negation and opposition with the logical stress and relevant division of a sentence. For example, the logical stress falls on the word to which the means of negation belongs. The core of an utterance (rheme) in negative sentences contains the means of expressing a negation: «Та чесно вам сказати, її я не терплю. / Frankly speaking, I can't stand her. То все не тому, що був я до нього прихильний. / It's not because I used to sympathize with him. І дивується Сидір Пилипович: не стрічає його молода дружина. / And so surprised is Sydir Pylypovych: his young wife doesn't meet him».

Analysis of linguistic concepts of the categories of negation and opposition has allowed us to ascertain that the contrasting approaches to defining their essence are caused primarily by the many-sidedness of this linguistic phenomenon and its interaction with other categories such as predicativity, modality, prosodics, evaluation etc. There is no doubt that negation and opposition have a certain connection with the said categories, but they also have certain specific features that make up their immanent essence.

List of reference

1. Admoni V.G. Introduction to syntax of the modern German language / V.G.Admoni. – Moscow. : Nauka, 1955. – 391 p.
2. Vynogradov V.V. On the category of modality and modal words in the Russian language / V.V. Vynogradov // Selected works: Studies of Russian grammar. - Moscow.: Nauka, 1975. – P.177-198.
3. Vykhovanets I.R. The Ukrainian grammar. Syntax / Vykhovanets I.R. – Kyiv: Lybid, 1993. – 368 p.
4. Zolotova G.A. An outline on functional syntax of the Russian language / G.A. Zolotova. – Moscow: Nauka, 2005. – 351 p.
5. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary / Compiled by: V.N. Yartseva, N.D. Arutiunova. – The Institute of Linguistics at the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. – Moscow: The Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. – 685 p.
6. Liapon M. V. Modality / M.V. Liapon // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. – Moscow, 1990. – P. 302-303.
7. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russian syntax in the highlight of science / Peshkovskiy A.M. – Moscow: The Languages of Slavic Culture, 2001. – 516 p.
8. Modern literary Ukrainian language: Syntax / [under the general editorship of I.K. Bilodid]. – Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1972. – 515 p.
9. The theory of functional grammar: Temporality. Modality: [Editorial staff. A.V.Bondarko (executive editor) et al.]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1990. – 262p.

*Статтю рекомендовано до друку
кандидатом педагогічних наук, доцентом
кафедри української лінгвістики і методики навчання
ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний
університет імені Григорія Сковороди»
Кулик Оленою Дмитрівною*

Стаття надійшла до редакції 15 вересня 2018 року

Кардаш Лариса

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри української лінгвістики і методики навчання,
ГВУЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний
університет імені Григорія Сковороди»,
ул. Сухомлинського, 30 08400, г. Переяслав-Хмельницький,
Україна, 08400
kkardashlarysa@gmail.com

К ПРОБЛЕМЕ СВЯЗИ КАТЕГОРИЙ ВОЗРАЖЕНИЯ И ПРОТИВОПОСТАВЛЕНИЯ С ДРУГИМИ ЯЗЫКОВЫМИ КАТЕГОРИЯМИ

Кардаш Лариса

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри української лінгвістики і методики навчання,
ДВНЗ «Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний університет
імені Григорія Сковороди»,
вул. Сухомлинського, 30, 08400, м. Переяслав-Хмельницький,
Україна, 08400
kkardashlarysa@gmail.com

**ДО ПРОБЛЕМИ ЗВ'ЯЗКУ КАТЕГОРІЙ ЗАПЕРЕЧЕННЯ
ТА ПРОТИСТАВЛЕННЯ З ІНШИМИ МОВНИМИ
КАТЕГОРІЯМИ**