CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter is concerned with the conclusions and suggestions of the research. The conclusion is written based on the analysis of data performed in Chapter IV. Additionally, the suggestion is written for the next researchers who are interested in conducting further research in analyzing the negative equivalent construction ‘no’ and ‘not’

5.1 Conclusions

1. As the results of the analysis, ten constructions have negative equivalent, and six constructions have no negative equivalent. (The list of the constructions, see table 5.1 & 5.2 page 76-77).
2. Four syntactic features that may expose the existence of negative equivalent are found. First, the negative construction ‘no’ or ‘not’ consisting of N/NP/Compound Pronoun whether as subject, object, complement or adverb, will have negative equivalent. Thus, the negative construction without N/NP/compound pronoun is impossible to have negative equivalent (see table 5.2 page 77). Second, the negative construction ‘no’ or ‘not’ conducted with to-infinitive will have more negative equivalent rather than the construction that does not consist of to-infinitive. This type of negative construction may belong to three types of negation caused by its different focus of negation. Third, the negative construction consisting of NP that has been modified by

possessive determiner is impossible to have negative equivalent. Finally yet importantly, the negative construction in which the subject is negative indefinite compound pronoun such as ‘nothing’, ‘none’, ‘no body’, will have no negative equivalent.

3. The semantic entailments occurring from both negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ constructions are the opposite (gradable or non-gradable antonym) of the word which is being the focus of negation, or other words that involves in hyponymy relation with the word where focus of negation refers to. However, ‘no’ is used to emphasize the word that it modifies rather than ‘not’, and to refer to the characteristic of the person.
4. In negative equivalent construction, the Case and State Roles that are involved are different depending on the form of the negative construction; (1) in negative construction with verbal negation ‘not’ the EVENT (in the Case Roles) and the Relation between Topic-Comment (in the State Roles) are treated as negative, (2) in the negative construction with non-verbal negation, the Concepts other than the EVENT (in Case Roles) and the Relation between Topic-Comment (in State Roles) are treated as negative. In other words, the concepts that are negative in non-verbal negation are THING, ATTRIBUTE (in Case Roles) and Topic-Comment (in State Roles).

5.2 Suggestions

This research only examines negative equivalent construction ‘no’ and ‘not’ syntactically and semantically by analyzing its syntactic features, scope and focus of negation, entailments, and case and state roles. Thus, there will be another opportunity for the next researchers who want to do further research of this topic by using other theories. For example, negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ can be analyzed to examine the implication of both ‘no’ and ‘not’ in study of pragmatics. For instance, A: “would you come to the concert tonight?” and B: “I have *no money.”*. The implication of the no-construction is that B wants to emphasize that B could not come because B has no money at all (emphasizing). In addition, in study of syntax and semantics, negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ can also be analyzed in form of double negation construction to examine their different intention. For instances, ‘If I had *no eyes*, I *would not* ask for life’, this construction shows deeper intention rather than to say ‘ If I had two eyes, I would ask for life’. Finally, in order to give clear information about negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ in the sentence, the next researchers can analyze the distribution of ‘no’ and ‘not’ in other construction such as in the sentence whether it is simple, compound, or compound complex.