CHAPTER II

THEORITICAL REVIEW

In this chapter, some theories are applied to analyze data in two different studies. This research is focused on analyzing negation and the analyzing approaches syntax and semantics. The negation that this research aim to analyze is more specific to negative markers *not* and *no.*

2.1 Syntactic Structures

The negative markers *not* and *no* can exist in level of phrases, clauses and sentences. The general function of *not* and *no* is to negate a construction. The constructions are like *not to go* and *no reason* in level of phrases, *I do not have any time, if you come tomorrow* and *I have no time, if you come tomorrow* in clause level, in sentence level as in *I do not have any money* and *I have no money*. The existences of *not* and *no* will be discussed in turn below.

2.1.1. *Not* and *No* in Phrase

The negative markers *not* and *no* exist in the phrase level have functions base on their distributions. Following Quirk et. al (1985), *not* as the adverb has the function as *modifier* of other word classes. *Not* distributes as modifier of pronoun as in *Not everyone will come*. *Not* modifies and negates pronoun *everyone*. *Not* functions as modifier of verb as in *They did not come last night*. The verb *came* is being modified by *not* to make negative. *Not* also modifies the adverb as in *Not*

many times, John read the book. The adverb of quantifier *many* is modified and negated by *not*. In other case, *not* can be modifier of adjective as in *You are not good in acting*. *Not* functions as modifier of the adjective word *good*.

Otherwise, *no* has functions both determiner and modifier as well. The existences of *no* in phrase level as determiner will be shown as in *there is no time to wait for him.* The word *time* as noun is limited by *no* as determiner. Determiner has function to limit the nouns that follow it (Celce-Murcia, 1999). *No* has the function as modifier like (example from Quirk 1985), *You may take no more than an hour's break for lunch*. The negative marker *no* modifies adverb of quantifier *more.*

2.1.2. *Not* and *No* in Clause

In the clause level, the two negative markers *not* and *no* exist to negates either the whole clause or only a constituent of the clause. When a negative marker negates the whole clause, it is the *clause negation* remarked negative markers (Quirk, 1985: 775). The existence *not* to make clause negation is shown as in *we do not have any reason to leave because they need a help. Not* negates the clause within the complex sentence. In other case, *no* can be negative marker to make clause negation as well as in, *No one went to Chicago if you came here*. Negative marker *no* negates the clause in complex sentence.

In another cases, *not* and *no* has function to negates only constituent in a clause about what local negation is (Quirk, 1985: 775). *No*t negates only a constituent in a clause suchas *I visit them not very often* (example from Quirk:

1985). *Not* modifies the degree adverb in Adverb Phrase. Also, no construction in local negation such as *I give the money back for no reason*. *No* negates Noun in Prepositional Phrase.

2.2. Semantic Structures

As in the syntactic structures, the negative markers *not* and *no* exist in the semantic structures. Both of *not* and *no* can negate concepts and propositions as semantic units. *Not* negates the concept such as *not surprisingly* and no negates concept such as *no reason.* In addition, *not* and *no* are to negate the propositions such as *John did not come tomorrow*. Also no exist to negate the proposition as in *No one choose the candidates.*Their existences will be discussed in more detail in turn.

2.2.1 Semantic Hierarchy

The structure is the uniting of smaller groupings and larger groupings (Larson, 1984). As Larson stated, the semantic hierarchy consists units that group in semantic structure. The semantic hierarchy can be seen below as Larson captured:

Semantic Structure		***Syntactic Structure***
meaning component	⟶	morpheme (roots and affixes)
concept	⟶	word
concept cluster	⟶	phrase

Semantic Structure		***Syntactic Structure***
proposition	⟶	clause
propositional cluster	⟶	sentence

The semantic structure relates to the syntactic structure in which the smallest units are grouped into larger units. Those semantic and syntactic structures are focused on this research. However, there are *semantic paragraph, episode, episode cluster, semantic part,* and *discourse* in semantic structures. Also in syntactic structures, *there are paragraph, section, division, part, and text.* The smallest unit in the semantic structure is meaning components. Meaning components are grouped together to form concept. Concepts have a classification as THINGS, EVENTS, ATTRIBUTES, and RELATIONS (Larson, 1984: 29). The relationship will be shown as follows:

THINGS	⟶	nouns, pronouns
EVENTS	⟶	verbs
ATTRIBUTES	⟶	adjectives, adverbs
RELATIONS	⟶	conjunctions, preposition,

The grouping of concepts into a unit, which communicates, is a proposition (Larson, 1984:189). Larson also stated that a proposition is a semantic unit consisting concepts THINGS, EVENTS, ATTRIBUTES in which there is central concept related to other concepts in a system of RELATIONS. For example, *Mary knocked the door. Mary* is the concept THING, knocked is the concept EVENT and *the door* is the concept THING as well.

2.2.2 Relations

The uniting of the smallest units into the larger units has a relation such as concept to one another concept related by *case and state role*. Also, the relation between proposition and proposition are related by *communication relation* (Larson, 1984).

2.2.2.1 Relations within Event Proposition

The relation of concepts and other concepts within proposition is classified into twelve characteristics in *case roles relation* (Larson, 1984: 199). The proposition is EVENT-proposition since EVENT as the central concept. The *agent* is doer the action and refers to THING such as ***John*** *walk down the street*. The *causer* refers to THING that causes an action as in ***Mari****a rang the bell*. The *affected* refers to THING that affected by the EVENT as *The boy kicked the* ***ball***. The *beneficiary* has advantage or disadvantage from the EVENT. The beneficiary refers to THING as *The boy give the ball* ***to John***. The *accompaniment* refers to THING that participated in close association with the agent, causer, or affected. The relation commonly is encoded by preposition *with* such as *She goes to France with* ***her father***. *The instrument* is refers to THING used to do something such as *Maradona made the goal with* ***his hand***. *The location* gives specific information about the place related to EVENT such as *She goes to* ***school***. The *goal* refers to THING as utterance of the action as *Valentino keeps his bike* ***on the race line***. The *time* tells when the action is doing and gives the specific information about the time of an action such as *I will see you* ***next month***.The *manner* gives the

information how the action experience or process of the EVENT such as *the man ran **very fast***. The *measure* quantifies the EVENT as *I go there **rarely***.

2.2.2.2 Relations within State Proposition

The concepts and other concepts are related in State Propositions in there is no EVENT concept as the central concept (Larson, 1984:214).in The State Proposition there are two parts related. They are *topic* and *comment*. Larson stated that the comment is what is being said about the topic, and topic is the THING or ATTRIBUTE being talking about. For example, *that girl is so beautiful* and *The light has more than one color*. In The first state proposition, the topic is *that girl* and the commentis *so beautiful*. Thus, the relation between topic and comment is description relation. In the second proposition, the topic is *the light* and the comment is *more than one color*, and the relation between the topic concept and the comment concept is identification relation.

2.2.2.3 Communication Relation

Considering to Larson, the communication relation is the relation about proposition and one another proposition in propositional cluster. In the communication relation, there are seven types such as reason-RESULT, means-RESULT, purpose-MEANS, concession-CONTRAEXPECTATION, grounds-CONCLUSION, grounds-EXHORTATION, condition-CONSEQUENCES.

The examples of the communication relation are captured as follows:

(1) Reason-RESULT is the role of reason answer questioning *Why this result?* For example, *The boy cried because the ball was stolen*

┌RESULT —— *The boy cried*
└ reason ——*because the ball was stolen*

(2) Means-RESULT is the relation that the means answering *How did this result come about?* As in, *By fighting very hard, John won the battle*

┌ means ——*By fighting very hard,*
└RESULT ——*John won the battle*

(3) Purpose-MEANS is the relation that the MEANS proposition answering the question *What was done to achieve this purpose?*For example, *He practiced a lot so that he won the battle*

┌ MEANS —— *He practiced a lot*
└ purpose —— *John won the battle*

(4) Concession-CONTRAEXPECTATION is the relation of *unexpectedness* For example, *The sky is cloudy, however it has not been rain yet*

┌concession —— *The sky is cloudy,*
└CONTRAEXPECTATION —— *however it has not been rain yet*

(5) Grounds-CONCLUSION is the relation that answering the question *What fact the conclusion based on?* As in, *It must be rain because the sky is cloudy*

┌ grounds ——*because the sky is cloudy*
└ CONCLUSION ——*It must be rain*

(6) Grounds-EXHORTATION is the relation that the exhortation proposition is always command: *Do not open it, because it will be explosive.*

grounds —— *because it will be explosive*

EXHORTATION —— (*you*) *do not open it*

(7) Condition-CONSEQUENCE is the relation that is cause-effect propositions. For example, *It will be better if you come tomorrow*

condition —— *if you come tomorrow*

CONSEQUENCE —— *It will be better*

2.2.2.4 Delimitation Relation

The relations, in semantic structure, are not only the relations of concept to other concept and proposition to proposition, but also the larger units related to concepts. The proposition is related to concepts within another proposition by delimitation relation (Larson, 1984: 273). Larson also stated that delimitation relations are identification and description.

Description gives information about the item. For example, *The man who is standing next to the door is my friend*. The first proposition is *The man is my friend* and the second is *The man is standing next to the door*. The larger unit as the second propositions is related to the concept *the man.* In other hand, identification gives specific information in contrasting. For example, *The man who is wearing the blue jacket is my friend.* There are two propositions: 1) *The man is my friend and* 2) *The man is wearing the blue jacket.* The second proposition delimits the concept *the man* by pointing out *wearing the blue jacket*.