

英語用法における部分否定の問題（Ⅱ）

Problems of the Partial Negation and English Usage: Part II Prescriptive and Descriptive Evidence

宮 畑 カレン

All や both を not とともに用いた「すべてが～とは限らない」「両方ともに～であるわけではない」という表現を、日本の英文法では「部分否定」と名付け、一つの公式として扱っていた時期がある。その妥当性を検証するため、第1部（『芸術』22号）においては、明治初期から近年までに日本で出版された英和辞書、英文法書、英語を教える教科書などを調べて、その扱われ方の変遷を調査した。今回その第2部においては、部分否定と呼ばれる形が、英米で出版された（1）辞書、（2）文法書、（3）語法辞典においてどのように扱われているかを精査した。結論としては、日本におけるような定義付けがなされていないのである。

（1）英語最大の辞書で用例がもっとも豊富な多巻本『オックスフォード英語辞典』（略称 *OED*）から1冊本『ウェブスター（第3版）』、さらには大学生用の辞書まで網羅的に調べてみると、否定文の用例がきわめて少ない上、部分否定か全体否定か決めかねる例もかなり見られた。“not all”は例外なく部分否定とされるが、“all...not”は曖昧な構文として避けられており、

また、“both...not”は一例も見られないが、“not...both”には部分否定・全体否定の双方の場合がある。（2）19世紀半ば以降の文法書は、時代とともに新たな理論を援用しながら文法に対応している。要約すれば、“all...not” “not...all” “not...both”の表現はすべて二つの意味の可能性をもつものの、全体否定には別の表現が存在するところから、これらは部分否定の傾向の大きいことが指摘できる。（3）ファウラーの『現代英語法辞典』をはじめとする語法関係の書物においても、程度に応じて論述が見られる。“All...not”は両義的な曖昧表現ゆえ明確な“Not all”か“None”を用いるようにとの指導や、“Both...not”

構文は誤用と断定がなされており、“not...both”と“not...all”構文については詳述がなされていない。（詳細は本論を参照されたい）

なお、英語を母国語とする人々が、all, both などの代名詞と not に代表される否定語とを同一文の中に用いる際に、またそれらの代名詞を否定する場合に、本論の調査結果と一致した表現をもちいるかどうかの検討が、今後の課題として残る。

In Part I Definition and Method of the above title¹ it was stated that the partial negation, deeply rooted in the history of English teaching in Japan, was once rigorously taught as a codified rule of English grammar. This rule, however, that *all* and *both* negated are partial negations, was found to be nonexistent in British and American English and all signs pointed to the possibility that it had been conceived and formulated by a Japanese scholar or scholars, specifically for the instruction of Japanese students. As it was an *a priori* venture the rule from the outset was seriously flawed, the most reliable confirmation of this being that in contemporary Japanese grammars of English it has lost all of its force as a rule but exists merely as a term. Investigating the problematic nature of the rule opened up whole new areas for research in English grammar and usage. A survey was conducted, not only in Britain and America, but also in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, to test the validity of the rule and its result will be published eventually as Part III under the same title. This survey

needed to be supported by the evidence of published writing, more explicitly, by a preliminary inquiry into the instruction given to native speakers of English as to the negation of the universal indefinite pronouns. In other words, how are they taught to negate the words *all* and *both*? What actually does exist in British and American publications concerning this particular aspect of negation?

Part II Prescriptive and Descriptive Evidence attempts to answer these questions, examining the three sources of dictionaries, grammars, and books on usage. Considering the extent, multitude, and diversity of publications on the English language, this was a formidable task, all the more because I had expected to find evidence only in prescriptive sources, an inference that could seemingly be deduced from the very definition of the contrasting terms of prescriptivism and descriptivism: the former is the approach that prescribes rules, telling what is regarded as correct in a language, how language should be; the latter is the approach that proposes the objective and systematic description of a language, confining itself only to describing how it actually is. The emergence of abundant material among descriptive sources promptly led to its inclusion along with the prescriptive. For want of space only the most important and the most representative titles have been selected. In the section Dictionaries, the entire range, from multi-volume to large unabridged, to single-volume desk, to collegiate and concise editions, is represented each by a single title. I take as the starting point the great *Oxford English Dictionary*, that is to say, beginning with traditional dictionaries based on historical principles, and end with contemporary ones compiled from the corpora of current usage. Grammars, covering the period from 1860 to 2002 consist of three types: the purely prescriptive traditional pedagogical textbooks, the scholarly reference grammars of the early twentieth century when we see the beginnings of descriptivism, and the contemporary comprehensive and synchronic grammars which are almost wholly descriptive. The last section is that of books on usage,

now familiarly called usage books, which has grown enormously at the expense of grammars, and for which there is a large commercial market. Usage criticism having proliferated since the turn of the century, I have taken the first major work, *Fowler's Modern English Usage* as the starting point, examining the traditional general usage guides, the currently popular paperback types, and the very specialized category of usage manuals which aim to help students in correcting common grammatical errors.

1. Dictionaries

While dictionaries of the English language have traditionally provided, besides the meaning of words, the origin (etymology), the representation (orthography), and the pronunciation (phonology) of words, the other two important aspects of the form of words (accidence), and the relation of words to each other in the expression of thought (syntax) have been relegated by lexicographers to grammarians. The question to be posed is why then should one look for prescriptive or descriptive evidence in dictionaries? The first and obvious reason is that dictionaries illustrate the meaning or meanings of each given entry with example phrases, sentences, or quotations from written sources, giving insight, however indirectly, on important points of grammar and usage. The tradition is deeply rooted, for as early as 1755, Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary*, which immediately became the authoritative standard, established the tradition of the dictionary on historical principles, that is to say, the meanings of individual words arranged in the historical order of their appearance in the language, with each word accompanied by supporting quotations. The second reason for which I chose not to bypass the dictionary, but to let it head my list of sources is that the development of lexicography, as that of grammar is clearly an evolution from prescriptivism, emphasizing what is correct, to descriptivism, describing actual usage. If traditional dictionaries were based entirely on written

and historical meanings, the newer dictionaries are compiled more from the corpora of current usage, the spoken as well as the written.² This major shift in dictionary policy has brought about such innovations as the appearance of usage notes and usage paragraphs which have proved invaluable to my research.

Once considered almost as important as the meanings of words, etymology was a major preoccupation of 18th century lexicographers. Suffice it to say that the precursor of Johnson's *Dictionary* by thirty years was entitled *Universal Etymological English Dictionary*.³ This preoccupation with the origin of a word stemmed from the belief that there was an inevitable relation between etymology and meaning. The word itself derives from the Greek root *etymos*, meaning "true". It is difficult to say if they did or did not consider that words often move away from their original meanings. There was also the case for a word's pedigree, the assumption that "proper" words had clearly defined origins, namely Latin, Greek, or Germanic, and if they did not, they were frowned upon. Etymology thus served as an important criterion. Under the weight of tradition the format of English dictionaries remained unchanged for many generations: the entry was followed by pronunciation, part of speech, etymology, and lastly, the meaning or meanings. The great *Oxford English Dictionary*, completed in 1928 and since then the pre-eminent authoritative standard, is no exception to this format, but what follows is prodigious. It must be remembered that its original title was *The New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* and like Johnson's *Dictionary* words are given in historical order with supporting quotations, but whereas Johnson's textual citations came without dates, the *OED* gives the date of each quotation, literally recording the evolution and the history of each word. The Philological Society which initiated the project for the *OED* was seemingly not unsusceptible to the prestige of German philology, for it resolved in 1858 to "follow the lead established in Germany by the classicist Franz Passow and the philologists Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm."⁴ As to

the subject matter of my research the most conspicuous and astounding finding was the paucity of examples of negated structures of the universal indefinite pronouns *all* and *both*. Among quotations numbering in the hundreds there were only four examples of *all* negated, and two examples of *both* negated. For the entry *all*, there were three pages of quotations, all affirmative sentences, with the exception of the following: 1366 Maundev. ii.10: "Alle Men knowen not that."; 1534 More, Conf. agst. Trib. III: "I am not all thing afearde in this case." ; 1667 Milton P.L.I.105: "What though the field be lost? All is not lost." ; 1814 Byron Corsair III XV.18: "I am not all deserted on the main."⁵ Although the *not all* constructions appear to be partial negations, it is not certain whether the first is a partial or a total negation. The evidence for *both* constitutes of two examples: 1628 Hobbes Thucyd. 105: "Shew not yourselves both ways inferior to your ancestors." ; 1849 Ruskin Sev. Lamps IV. 26: "So they have a pair of horns, but not at both ends."⁶ The interpretation of these two examples of the *not...both* construction is perplexing because the first leans heavily toward a total negation, whereas the second is a partial negation, but the meaning is not clear. It is significant that the *OED* chose to include these quotations in spite of their ambiguities. This only reinforces Charles Fries' claim that "the *OED* is the outstanding document in 'the scientific view' of language."⁷ By scientific, we must here take this to mean "objective", and in this sense "descriptive." Indeed, the whole approach of the *OED* was scientific, true to the ideals of its founding fathers, who believed that the dictionary was "a factual inventory" of all words and not merely the good words of a language.⁸ This said however, the total absence of any examples of the *Both...not* construction suggests the hypothesis that it is a faulty construction and thus has no historical precedents.

American lexicography having nothing comparable to the *OED*, I examined the largest dictionary currently published in the U.S., the one-volume, 2,662-paged *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*,

published in 1961. Although it follows exactly the same format as the *OED* the *Webster III* differs in that it is not a dictionary on historical principles, and instead gives short example phrases as well as full textual citations to illustrate the meanings of its entries. For the entries *all* and *both* only example phrases are given, and not surprisingly, they are all in the affirmative except for one: under the entry *all*, adverb, having the sense of wholly, altogether, “a statement that was not all true.”⁹ Whether this means that the *Webster III* approves of the *not all* structure while deliberately ignoring the existence of the other forms is a question that cannot be ascertained from the evidence alone, but it is certain proof that the *not all* form is conventionally taken to be a partial negation.

The publication of the *Webster III* inadvertently ignited a controversy over dictionary policy, the consequence of which was that descriptivism, or too much of it, at least, fell into disrepute. Traditionalists charged that it was permissive, from the dictionary meaning here “deficient in firmness or control,” because the *WIII* had replaced the labels “colloquial” and “informal” with the newer, less pejorative labels “nonstandard,” “substandard,” words which most people did not understand. Many were especially outraged that it did not outrightly condemn the word “ain't,” but said instead, “though disapproved by many and more common in less educated speech, used orally in most parts of the U.S. by many cultivated speakers especially in the phrase “ain't I.”¹⁰ Critics viewed this as an abdication of its responsibility to foster good English. In this way, a great accomplishment fell victim to the thwarted expectations of a public that seemingly looked for more authoritativeness in a dictionary. This debate, however, marks an important turning point, as we shall see, because dictionaries henceforth, not only in the U.S. but also in Britain, will become more assertive in matters of linguistic guidance.

More successful has been the *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, which draws upon the *Webster III* and is now in its 10th edition since its beginnings a hundred years ago. This one-volume desk dictionary not only claims to be America's best-selling dictionary, but also features the major innovation of usage notes and usage paragraphs. The former is “supplementary information about such matters as idiom, syntax, semantic relationships, and status.” Usage paragraphs have been placed “at a number of entries for terms that are considered to present problems of confused or disputed usage.”¹¹ As in the *WIII*, the entries *all* and *both* are supported by many example phrases, but there is not one negated example of either. The silence begs interpretation. In spite of the pitfalls inherent in the negation of the absolute terms there is absolutely no discussion on this matter. By contrast, we find a rather long usage paragraph for the entry *neither*, which seems to have many problem areas, such as neither and verb agreement, if *neither* can be followed by “or,” and if *neither* must be limited in reference to two.¹²

Since the watershed date of 1961, the newer dictionaries are fully aware that users expect guidance, and henceforth become more assertive in matters of linguistic correctness. This new turn of dictionary policy is highly significant for my research because if hitherto the appearance of negated forms of *all* and *both* was rare, almost all the new dictionaries give several examples of them. The obstacle is that they give no clear-cut rules on how to interpret the negated senses, as if the context made the interpretation self-evident.

Published in the 1980s, *Longman Dictionary of the English Language* says at the top of its jacket cover, “Entries include notes on usage, with advice where this is disputed...” There are negated phrases with *all* : “can't eat all that,” “not all berries are edible.” For *both* there is “Why not do both?”¹³ There are no usage notes for *all* but there are for *both*, a rather long one, but surprisingly totally silent on the sense of *both* negated. What are, then, the disputed areas posed by *both*?

The *Longman* lists five points: 1) In formal writing, *both* should be avoided where more than two items are involved. 2) redundant to combine *both... and* with expressions such as, *as well as, alike, equally* etc. 3) When *both* is used to emphasize *and*, the two words should correctly link parallel constructions. 4) *the fault of both* rather than *both their fault(s)* 5) The use of *both* for *each* can lead to ambiguity.¹⁴

Judging from this list, of which the omission of the meaning of the negated sense of *both* is conspicuous, it would not be arbitrary to conclude that there is no awareness that negated *both* poses a problem of interpretation.

The above dictionary's sister publication *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English-New Edition* expresses the new aims of dictionary makers in even more careful wording: "...it is also a valuable resource book, giving information on the grammar, collocations, and stylistic and situational appropriateness of words."¹⁵ As for the negated *all* and *both*, there are: "Not all water is suitable for drinking"; "We invited 100 people, but not all of them came"; "I don't know which to buy." "Why not buy both (of them)?" "I can afford one, but not both."¹⁶ The two examples of the *not all* form are consistent with the rule elaborated in Jespersen's schema, but the first *not...both* construction is a total negation while the second is a partial. This amounts to saying that context alone is sufficient in determining the meaning of the negation.

Lastly, the *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*, published in 1995, is striking in that it has totally eliminated etymology. There are no example phrases, but many example sentences, highly effective in getting to the meanings, and mostly from conversational situations. It states clearly, "Grammar information is explained using example sentences."¹⁷ To be sure, its negated examples leave no doubt as to the meaning of the negation: "Not all my friends approved of what I did." ; "I failed my driving test because I did not keep both hands on the wheel."¹⁸

These three dictionaries being representative of others that I examined, it is possible to draw several conclusions. We see a shift away from literary quotations to sentences taken from spoken English. All these dictionaries evade the ambiguous construction *All...not* and acknowledge unanimously for *not all* as a partial negation; *not...both* is tolerated, even if the interpretation can be either partial or total, suggesting that the only guideline is context. *Both...not* appears nowhere, which most likely means that it is an unconventional construction, but whether it is substandard cannot be ascertained.

2. Grammars

Writing the preface to his *English Grammar* in New York in July of 1862, G. P. Quackenbos, with an LL. D. added to his name standing for doctor of law, resolutely begins by saying that he had previously been engaged to revise Weld's *English Grammar*. Although that revision was done accordingly with Weld's system, the author says that that system was not his own. His views are presented in the present work, "contemplated long before the revision was undertaken and here presented as a new and distinct System of Grammar."¹⁹ It is not my purpose here to find out how his system compares with Weld's, but what I wish to point out is that in the 19th and well into the early 20th century, not only were pedagogical textbooks conceived and written by a sole individual, but also that it was not imperative, especially in the case of grammars, for that individual to be a specialist in English. To produce a work of this nature through collaboration with another or with others was unheard of, so that the whole endeavor achieved a kind of star-quality, as attest a few titles from a long list of school textbooks of that period: Mulligan's *Structure of the English Language*, Cornell's *Geography*, Shannon's *Civil Government*, Taylor's *School History of Germany*.²⁰ Being so thoroughly personalized an effort, the author was allowed much latitude, and to borrow a

term from rhetoric, much area for invention.²¹ Ironically, however, in such a period, in Quackenbos' time, grammars were prescriptive and instruction was mechanical, focusing almost entirely on parts of speech and accident with very little on the study of syntax. The study of the parts of speech was supreme, with its main concern of definition and its divisions and subdivisions into classes, followed by accident with its study of inflections and the order of words. In Quackenbos' grammar there is very little indeed on *all* and *both* and of course nothing on their negated senses, a subject which would normally come under syntax. The only instruction on the universal indefinite pronouns is how to distinguish whether they are Adjective Pronouns or Pronominal Adjectives: *All* and *both* come under the class of Adjective Pronouns and within these are subdivided again into the class of Indefinites, the definition of which is that they refer to objects generally without specifying any in particular. They are Adjective Pronouns only when used instead of nouns, but when they are used with nouns they are Pronominal Adjectives.²² Besides this concern with definition there is instruction in number. Lastly, there is a parsing exercise. The student must parse the word *both* in the sentence, "Parsimony and prodigality should both be avoided," to which the student is expected to say, "*Both* is an adjective pronoun, in the third person, plural number, nominative case, in apposition with *parsimony* and *prodigality*."²³ It would not be an exaggeration to say that parsing was the defining feature of pedagogical grammars. For this reason it will be taken up more fully under Nesfield's *Modern English Grammar*, the leading pedagogical grammar of all time and parsing manual *par excellence*.

A contemporary of G. P. Quackenbos was a Scottish professor of logic at the University of Aberdeen, Alexander Bain, LL. D. In 1795, Longman, which was founded in 1724, and for that being the oldest commercial publishing house in Britain, published the American lawyer Lindley Murray's *English Grammar*,

which led the field until superseded by another Longman publication, Alexander Bain's *English Grammar*, 1863. Although I could not find the aforementioned titles, I was fortunate to come across Bain's *A Companion to the Higher English Grammar, Second Edition*. Its organization reflects the same traditional emphasis on parts of speech and accident, for he begins his preface with "Precision in grammar must begin from correctly defining the parts of speech."²⁴ In discussing *all* under Adjectives of Quantity Bain uses the terms "universal denial" and "partial denial": "The negative adverb *not* in the sentence "John is not here" is effective because John is a singular subject. However, the sentence "All the men are not here," is not a universal denial, it merely means that some men are here. In short, it is only a partial denial. "If we mean to negative the presence of all the men, we need some other construction."²⁵ A universal denial would be either, "All the men are absent," or "No men are present," which according to Bain is the most emphatic form of negation to be found in the language. The senses of the terms "universal and partial denial" are exactly the same as the terms "total and partial negation", but Bain does not use them to make any rules. It is interesting that he should interpret the *All...not* construction exclusively as a partial negation when elsewhere he, as a logician, says that the distinction between affirming and denying predications "attains its highest importance in logic or science."²⁶

The most commercially successful pedagogical grammar of all time has been J. C. Nesfield's *Modern English Grammar*. First published in 1912 and revised once in 1924, it continued to sell in its 25th edition until 1961. After taking up each part of speech at length, it devotes only one chapter to syntax, the nature of which seems to be equivalent to parsing because the chapter begins with a Parsing Chart and ends with Exercises in Parsing and Analysis. Because the Nesfield is heavily accentuated on parsing, it would be helpful to have some notion of what parsing is. If the French

have their “*théorie et pratique*,” parsing would correspond to the “*pratique*” of the dichotomy. In short, it was the practice, intended to complement the theory, but in the case of parsing it was, for most students, a purely mechanical and tedious exercise. It was a fairly long tradition that waned with the years, but continued well into the 1950s.

Just as the word *accidence* comes from Latin *accidencia*, the word *parse* comes from Latin *quae pars orationis*. To parse a word, according to Nesfield is (1) to determine its part of speech; (2) to account for its inflections, if it has any; (3) to show in what relation it stands to any other word or words in the same sentence.²⁷ It is a detailed analysis of a word whose only flaw was that it was the teaching method for Latin grammar. Terms and notions such as nominative, genitive, dative and accusative come from Latin and are essential to the syntax of heavily inflected languages such as Greek and Latin, but have no bearing on English. For example, to parse the word *him* in the sentence “I saw him yesterday,” one would say *him* is a personal pronoun, third person, singular number, masculine gender, objective case, object of the verb *saw*.²⁸ In the case of verbs one would state the kind of verb, its conjugation, voice, mood, tense, and form of tense. In this way, students had to master a whole classification system, which gave the study of grammar the reputation of being difficult and boring. A parsing exercise for *all* is found in the chapter Syntax. The student must pick out and parse the adverbs, the adjectives proper, and the adjectives used as nouns: “He gave me all he had; not all men would have done as much; My coat is all ragged; in fact all my clothes are worn out; I half think he will swim all across someday.”²⁹ Accordingly, the only instruction as to the use of the universal indefinite pronouns is definition. Under the heading *The same word used as different parts of speech*, model sentences, all affirmative, illustrate the various uses of *all* as Adjective of Quantity, Indefinite Numeral Adjective, Adjective used as Noun, and Adverb.

Model sentences use *both* as Definite Numeral Adjective and Conjunctive Co-ordinator.³⁰

The great scholarly grammars of the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century served as a bridge between traditional and contemporary grammars. For my study I have examined those of Henry Sweet, Otto Jespersen, Hendrik Poutsma, and George Curme. Being voluminous and for the most part based on historical principles, they were not intended as books for the classroom, but were conceived primarily as reference books. It is also here that we see the beginnings of descriptivism. At a time when grammar dealt with only the written or literary language, Henry Sweet, eminent philologist and phonetician, made two important statements in his ground-breaking work, *A New English Grammar; Logical and Historical*, in 1891: “The first object in studying grammar is to learn to observe linguistic facts as they are, not as they ought to be, or as they were in an earlier stage of the language... The first thing in studying a language is to learn to look at its phenomena from the point of view of the speaker of the language...”³¹ An early advocate for the objective and systematic description of language, his grammar was conceived to supply “the want of a scientific English grammar.” Indeed, Charles Fries calls him “one of the earliest propagators of descriptivism.”³² Although there is no discussion in Sweet's work on the subject of negation, he makes a distinction between the collective pronouns *all* and *both* and the separative pronouns *every*, *each*, *either*, with *either's* negative being *neither*. *No*, and its absolute form *none* are in form negations of *one*, though in meaning they are negatives of *any*.³³ Nowhere does he say that the negative of *both* is *neither*, or that of *all* is *none*. This will be stated explicitly in the work of Sweet's contemporary, the great Danish scholar of English.

Otto Jespersen, Danish philologist and linguist, whose seven-volume *Modern English Grammar*, written between 1909 and 1949 is still considered an authority in the field, was greatly influenced by his teacher and

friend, Henry Sweet. The latter's words "Whatever is in general use in a language is for that reason grammatically correct,"³⁴ is quoted in Jespersen's work. The words of philologist Sayce, "What is grammatically correct is what is accepted by the great body of those who speak a language,"³⁵ are also quoted in his work. Owing to Jespersen's beliefs in usage as the highest authority and that grammar should objectively investigate what is actually said and written by the speakers of the language investigated, we have not only the first serious objective study of the idiomatic construction *All...not*, but also for the first time, a full-length discussion on the subject of negation, and this focusing on the negation of the absolute extremes. Traditional grammars did not discuss, or perhaps deliberately ignored the existence of the *All...not* construction. Yet, this historical structure was conspicuous enough, when considering the ancient nursery rhyme, "All the king's horses, and all the king's men, could not put Humpty Dumpty together again." Other famous literary quotations abound: "All that glitters is not gold" (Shakespeare); "All is not lost" (Milton); "But all men are not born to reign" (Byron). In *The Meaning of Negation* Jespersen explains schematically, by way of tripartitions, that when *not* comes immediately before *all*, as in *not all*, the meaning is *some*, *not A = B*, but if the absolute term is mentioned first, as in *All...not*, the result is the contrary notion, or *C*, which is *none*. Quotations supporting this are, "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand" (Shakespeare) and "All the money in the world won't make you happy then" (Thackeray).³⁶ This assertion conforms to traditional logic, the negation of the extremes *all* and *nothing* being of paramount interest to the logician as well as to the linguist.³⁷ However, Jespersen recognizes that exceptionally, for the sake of emphasis, the subject is placed first and the effect obtained is that of a partial negation. Interestingly, he observes, this phenomenon is manifest not only in English, but also in the literature of other countries.

What Jespersen has established decisively for future generations is the ambiguity of the *All...not* construction. Proof of this, as we shall see, is that later publications, especially books on usage, from Fowler's *Modern English Usage* to contemporary ones, comment profusely on this "unrecommended construction." (The term is Fowler's.) Although all negated is given extensive coverage, it must be noted that Jespersen is silent on the *not...all* construction. Even more glaring is the silence on *both* negated. On the subject of *both*, he says only that "*both* is related to *all* in its unifying power, only its sphere of activity is generally a number of two, only."³⁸ If the silence merits interpretation, what immediately comes to mind is the advice given in *Collins Cobuild English Usage*, succinct yet extremely perceptive, "You do not usually use *both* in negative sentences."³⁹

From the late 19th to the early 20th century there was a number of eminent Dutch scholars of English grammar, one of whom was Hendrik Poutsma, English teacher for many years at the Municipal Gymnasium, or High School, in Amsterdam.⁴⁰ A contemporary of Sweet and Jespersen, he was influenced by both, and especially by the latter, for in his preface Poutsma says that he is obligated to the "great Danish scholar." Poutsma's monumental work, *A Grammar of Late Modern English* in five large volumes was written for the use of continental, especially Dutch students. Its immense value was immediately recognized, becoming popular not only in English-speaking countries, but also, in the author's words, "notably in Japan." The second volume of Jespersen's grammar appeared a few months before Poutsma's Part II (B) went to press, so we can say that the two great works are concurrent. Both are based on historical principles, but Poutsma's contains many more quotations. It could be said in fact, that the hallmark of his work is the great number of quotations, the majority of them collected from various written sources by Poutsma himself. The innovation of his

grammar is that “the time-honored system” of treating accident in detail before approaching syntax is rejected. His grammar begins with Part I- The Sentence, then Part II- The Parts of Speech. He also states that his work is mainly descriptive, its chief purpose being to register actual usages of speech, abstaining from giving rules, instead giving copious examples of usage through quotations. In Part I Poutsma refers to Jespersen on negation, but there is nothing on the negated absolute extremes. In the chapter on adverbial adjuncts he discusses the grammatical status of *all* and *both*, filling three entire pages with quotations containing the above two words, but not one of them negated. Likewise in another chapter dealing with the order of words, his concern is the placement of the indefinite numerals, but in more than fifty quotations containing *all* and *both* to show their placement in a sentence there is not one example of either used in a negative sentence. Where I finally found the negated *all* was in the chapter on Indefinite Pronouns. Out of twenty-five pages of quotations containing the word *all* there were only five negated ones, with no comments as to their negated senses: “All England did not possess his peer” (Thackeray); “Are they not known of all men for their moderation?” (Westminster Gazette); “All men are not born to reign” (Byron); “All men can't be masters” (proverb); “Every couple is not a pair” (proverb).⁴¹ As the first two are total negations and the following three are partial negations judging by context, we are forced to assume that context is the only criterion necessary to arrive at the meaning. Consistently, in Poutsma as well, there was no example of *both* negated.

Representative of the scholarly grammars on the other side of the Atlantic is the work George Curme. Professing indebtedness to the large English grammars of Jespersen, Poutsma, and Kruisinga, he says that he has learned much from “the keen observations of these foreign scholars, who have sharp eyes for the peculiarities of our language,”⁴² and that he has also made extensive use of the quotations gathered

by them. In spite of the proliferation of usage books published in present-day America, there are no substantial systematic grammars to speak of. There was a time however, before World War II, and George Curme's grammar, published in the 1930s, bear witness to this, when the United States was very much a part of the British and the Continental tradition. As Charles Fries points out, “In the United States especially, with its great middle class gaining control of affairs and striving for social acceptability, the speller and the school grammar became the most important instruments of the accepted marks of culture, so that in this country the study of systematic grammar received an additional emphasis.”⁴³

To be sure, Curme's career much resembles that of Henry Sweet. He was born in 1860, fifteen years after Sweet. Both were philologists before they became grammarians, and both did post-graduate studies at German universities, gaining a first-hand experience of the German philological method. Curme even wrote *A Grammar of the German Language*, which differed from previous works by stressing usage, an achievement for which he received an honorary doctorate from the University of Heidelberg in 1926. Although not as voluminous as the grammars of his predecessors, Curme's *A Grammar of the English Language* in three volumes is systematic and detailed, and soon became a major reference for the development of American English syntax. With regard to the negated absolute terms the findings are no different from the grammars of his European counterparts. In Part II Parts of Speech and Accident, we find under determinatives, the same preoccupation with the word-order of *both*, *all*, *half*, *each*: “Both brothers, or both the brothers, are dead.” or “The brothers are both dead.” In the long list of sentences only one is negated: “All boys are not alike.”⁴⁴ In the section Indefinite Adjectives as Pronouns, there is “All is not gold that glitters,” likewise with no comment as to its meaning.⁴⁵ Under Limiting Adjectives Used as Pronouns there are many sentences containing *both*, but only in the

affirmative, two of which are interesting to note: “Which of these modes of expression is correct? Either is (or Both are) correct” ; “I don't know either of these gentlemen (= Both of these gentlemen are unknown to me).”⁴⁶ There is no discussion of negation here as well. With the exception of Otto Jespersen who theorized on negation, the traits common to all the other systematic grammars of the period are: concern with the parts of speech and accident, use of many illustrative quotations, but almost all affirmative ones, no discussion of negation, and lastly, no examples of *both* used in negated sentences.

Contemporary grammars represent a radical break with those grammars hitherto examined. They are comprehensive grammars of a wide scope, requiring the collaboration of two, or even a team of specialists. More descriptive and more influenced by linguistics than the traditional grammars, they are innovative in many aspects. Emphasis is on syntax rather than accident, parsing has completely disappeared, and a new terminology appears, introducing new concepts such as word classes instead of parts of speech, the terms central determiners, predeterminers, and postdeterminers instead of articles, pronouns, numerals, etc. Gone are the literary quotations from written sources, and in its place are example sentences from current spoken as well as written English. With so many innovations, for those uninitiated into the new grammar and accustomed to traditional grammar it can be a bewildering experience. For my study, however, it was a breakthrough, because finally appeared grammars that discussed the subject matter of negation, and the ensuing problematic areas of the negated universal indefinite pronouns.

First published in 1985 by a team of four grammarians, the ground-breaking *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, or CGEL, has since become the pre-eminent authority in the field. In their preface they say that their work was “inspired by recent developments in linguistic theory,” and that although their primary concern is to describe English

grammar, they “occasionally refer to the prescriptive tradition,”⁴⁷ Negation is treated at length, twenty-four pages, in the chapter on the Simple Sentence. In their effort to explain the *All...not* construction we hear for the first time new terms to express new notions, such as scope of the negation, clause negation, and local negation. In an explanation of the scope of negation: (the scope is underlined) “I wasn't listening all the TIME (1) and I wasn't listening all the TIME (2), the difference of scope, which is here marked by intonation reflects an important difference of meaning. (1) means, “For the whole time I wasn't listening,” whereas (2) means, “It is not true that I wasn't listening all the time.”⁴⁸ Likewise, in another example they say that “Intonation may be crucial also in marking whether or not the subject is the focus of negation” : “All the children didn't SLÈEP” (All the children failed to sleep), ALL the children didn't sleep” (Not all the children slept).⁴⁹ They comment, however, that the first construction is unusual, and that more common is the paraphrase with the negative subject “None of the children slept.” Two things are of great significance here. First that Otto Jespersen's rule, the negative placed after the A item resulting in a C, or *All...not* = *none*, is confirmed. Secondly, instead of ignoring or condemning this construction as a false syntax, they deal with it, describe it, objectively, as it is. For the first time there was an example of the *Both...not* construction, but this was only a very exceptional case, in a discussion on subject-verb concord, in the sentence, “Neither of them is (are) welcome” : “Prescriptive grammars have tended to insist on the singular verb, but notional concord invites a plural verb...a plural verb sometimes occurs in informal usage when *either* or (particularly) *neither* is followed by a prepositional phrase with a plural complement, both because of notional concord and because of the proximity rule.” The example sentence is: “Either (Neither) of them are welcome. (Both are (not) welcome.) <Informal>.”⁵⁰ While it stresses that this usage is informal it says that, “Both are not welcome” is equivalent to “Neither of them are welcome.” Finally, there is a clear and explicit Table

in the chapter on Pronouns that states the converse of the universal pronouns: *all (of)*, *each (of)*, *both (of)*, correspond to the respective negative pronouns *none (of)*, *neither (of)*. In another Table there is *all/both*, with its corresponding negative *none/neither*.⁵¹ The significance of this instruction is that while traditional grammars stated that the converse of *either* was *neither*, they did not say that the converse of *both*, as well, was *neither*.

A new comprehensive grammar, published in 2002, and certain to become another authority in the field is *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Having a different theoretical approach and analysis from that of the *CGEL*, it aims “to take account of the progress that has been made by linguists in our understanding of English grammar.”⁵² Owing to this perspective the subject of negation is treated more extensively than in the *CGEL*. There is an entire chapter devoted to negation and much discussion on the negated universal indefinites, which are treated somewhat as problem areas that require clarification. The *All...not* form is taken up under the heading *Existential qualification, universal qualification and negation*, and for the first time the *not...all* structure is elucidated. The clause “All of the meat wasn't fresh” is ambiguous with respect to scope. Either the negative has scope over the quantifier, meaning simply “Not all of the meat was fresh,” or *all* has scope over the negative (All of the meat had the property of not being fresh); this is equivalent to “None of the meat was fresh.”⁵³ The concluding guideline is that statements using the *All...not* construction are relatively infrequent, and that it is much more common to use *Not all...* or *None*. The construction *not...all* likewise has the possibility of two interpretations. “He hadn't eaten all of the pies” can be a partial negation and it can also mean “He had eaten none of the pies,” or “He hadn't eaten any of the pies,” the last two versions with existential qualification being

“strongly preferred” over the one with universal qualification “He hadn't eaten all of the pies.”⁵⁴ The form *not all* is a non-verbal negation, unequivocally a partial negation, but has certain restrictions as to its use. Sentences such as “I agree with not all your arguments,” and “He not often visits his parents,” are marked with an asterisk, meaning ungrammatical. Verbal negation is needed: “I don't agree with all your arguments” ; “He doesn't often visit his parents.”⁵⁵ For the first time also in the *Cambridge Grammar* there is instruction on *both* negated. For the same reasons as in the example with “all of the pies” , the sentence “He hadn't eaten both of the pies,” can have two interpretations although “He had eaten neither of the pies,” and “He hadn't eaten either of the pies,” are “strongly preferred” over “He hadn't eaten both of the pies,” when intended as a total negation.⁵⁶ Another valuable point made clear is the status of the construction *not both*. Under the Universal Determinatives *All* and *Both* we find: “All permits modification: *Almost all*, *Not all*, but *Both* excludes it: **Almost both*, **Not both*, are not grammatical. To illustrate this, in expressing the outcome of two swimmers' attempt to swim the Bering Strait, the possibilities are threefold: “Both of them succeeded,” “Neither of them succeeded,” or “Only one of them succeeded,” but not the “inadmissible” “Not both of them succeeded.”⁵⁷ Owing to the fresh insights gained from the *Cambridge Grammar*, all of the constructions save one, that of *Both...not*, have been clarified. Would this mean that although it is a legitimate sentence it is a false construction and therefore not subject to comment? In summary, the *All...not*, and the *not...all*, as well as the *not...both* are all susceptible to two interpretations, although in most cases they express partial negations, the reason for this being that there are better, unambiguous alternatives to express total negation. The *not all* form is definitely and exclusively a partial negation while *not both* is ungrammatical.

3. Usage Guides

The last category of books examined is that of books on English usage. Just as there are scholarly traditional grammars it can be said that there are scholarly books on English usage. Three of which I investigated and are still in print are those of H. W. Fowler, Eric Partridge, and the Merriam-Webster. Books on usage, now called usage books, or usage guides, for which there is a large commercial market, have always been prescriptive in answer to the general public's primordial need: readers want guidance in uncertain points of English usage. To be sure, the name that first comes to mind and which has long been the leading authority is Fowler's *Modern English Usage*. David Crystal comments, "often referred to in the revered tones which one associates with bibles, it is the apotheosis of the prescriptive approach."⁵⁸ What then does the acknowledged authority have to say on the negated universal indefinites? Fowler devotes many lines to the problem of the negated *all* under the entries *negation* and *not*; he comments on seven different uncertain points concerning *both* yet not one of them on its negation. Under *negation* Fowler lists the construction *All...not* in third place out of six, calling it an "unrecommended construction" albeit one which has many historical precedents. He cites numerous examples from Jespersen and advises to "avoid ambiguity when the subject of a sentence contains the word *all*," that is to say, to use the *not all* construction in place of the ambiguous *All...not*.⁵⁹ Again under the entry *not* which gives thirteen different examples of uncertain usages, *not all/All...not* is listed as number two: "Fowler admitted in 1926 that the proverb 'All is not gold that glitters'... is not strictly logical because the negative properly belongs with *all*, not with *gold*, 'Not all that glitters is gold.' It would be futile to try to change the proverb now, but caution is desirable when in other contexts *not* and *all* are used in close proximity."⁶⁰ As said above, there is nothing on *both* negated but it is interesting that in explaining, Fowler

twice uses the construction *not...both*. In the first, under the entry *both*, in explaining *we both/both of us*, there is an example sentence, "There was not enough for both of them," without any comment as to its meaning.⁶¹ Similarly, under the entry *neither*, it uses the same structure in an explanation: "Complications occur when, owing to a difference in number between the subject of the *neither* member and that of the *nor* member, the same verb-form or pronoun or possessive adjective does not fit both: 'Neither eyes nor nose (does its? do their?) work?'"⁶² It is possible to say from the evidence of the Fowler's that there is no awareness, or should we say recognition, of the problematic nature of *both*, but at the same time, the commentator uses the *not... both* construction to mean a partial negation.

Eric Partridge's *Usage and Abusage* first appeared in 1942, went through many reprints, and was revised in 1994. The author was aware that not enough attention was given to the subject of negation, and therefore it is the longest entry in his book, totaling eight and a half pages, and this almost entirely from Otto Jespersen's *The Meaning of Negation*. That he reveres Jespersen, who was supreme in Partridge's day, is evident when the latter calls it "perhaps the most acute and subtle, yet gloriously practical and serviceable, of all Jespersen's works."⁶³ Partridge stresses two essential points about the *All...not* construction: first that it is idiomatic, and second that from the point of view of traditional logic, it is a total negation. "All that glitters is not gold," is more usual than "Not all that glitters is gold," despite the fact that the latter is clear, the former ambiguous, but idiomatic. "All men aren't fools," should logically mean "All men are sensible"; idiomatically it means, "Some men aren't fools," or "Not all men are fools."⁶⁴ There is nothing on *both* negated, but as occurred in Fowler's, Partridge presents an example sentence containing *not...both*: "He could not have received both her last letters and not answered them."⁶⁵ The pronoun *them* forces the interpretation to mean a total negation, yet interestingly the author comments not on the meaning

of the negated sense, but that “Both of her last two letters” and “her last two letters” are equally correct; the latter the more idiomatic.⁶⁶ Once again, we are left to infer that the key to the meaning of the negation is context.

As for scholarly usage books in the United States there is *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage*, which documents “the use of words that pose special problems and what others have to say about it.”⁶⁷ Much space is given to the *All...not* structure, saying that Fowler says that it is an old style and that two other commentators say that it is a conversational style of sentence. After presenting many example sentences with *All...not*, it says that although these examples may not be ambiguous in conversation, no doubt because of the element of intonation, they can be in print. In writing, the advice is to use the entirely unambiguous *not all* form at the head of the sentence. Potentially ambiguous constructions with *every*, *everyone* and *everything* are also presented. Like in Fowler's *Modern English Usage* and in Partridge's *Usage and Abusage* there is nothing on *both* negated, but the Merriam-Webster falls into the same, and by now it would be possible to say, grammatical pitfall, in a protracted discussion of the word *both*. In explaining the idiomatic construction *the both*, an “expression that seemingly has come under attack by usage experts from the 18th to the 20th century,” the Merriam-Webster says that in 1972, Perrin and Ebbitt noted that *the both* is a fairly common spoken idiom, usually avoided in writing. The example sentence is: “He found it impossible to earn a living and Alice's income could not support the both of them.”⁶⁸ The advice given is that the expression appears to be an Americanism and that there is no reason one should avoid using it if it is one's normal idiom. Ironically, for my research, here again the focus is misplaced, that is to say, it is focused on the peculiarity of the expression *the both*, while the meaning of the negation does not seem to be a problem. Can we say

beyond any doubt that Alice's income was sufficient for only one of them?

Wilson Follet's *Modern American Usage* derives its format and approach from Fowler's. Even his style bears resemblance to the latter's in that his remarks are straightforward, lucid, and witty. He is known for his famous aphorism, “Freedom from confusion is more desirable than freedom from rule,” which was his way of saying that prescriptivism was a lesser evil than descriptivism. Born in 1887, Mr. Follet passed away in 1963, and so his book was edited and completed by the historian Jacques Barzun. Follet was well into his seventies when he made his hilariously sarcastic yet enlightening comment on the change in the field of grammar: “The linguistic theorists (now in the majority), who despise prescriptive grammar, advocate many liberties that strike the prescriptive grammarian as license; but so far they have not carried the love of liberty to the point of decreeing that a plural subject ought to be followed by a singular verb or a single subject by a plural verb...”⁶⁹ He warns against “misdirected denials” under the entry *negatives, trouble with*. Negative statements, more than affirmative ones risk falling into grammatical pitfalls. This is because an affirmation gives no cause for ambiguity but a negation often applies only to a part. Precise expression is essential to avoid ambiguity as to what is being negated. He states: “The misplaced negative at its simplest occurs in connection with the word *all* and its synonyms.” The model sentence “All of these acids are not found in complete form in protein foods,” usually is a partial negation, but the sentence “flirts with the meaning that none are found,”⁷⁰ The advice given is simply to rewrite using the *not all* structure.

An important study of current American usage in speech and writing was conducted by the American grammarian Margaret Bryant between 1950 to 1961. Appointed by the National Council of Teachers of

English, Mrs Bryant founded and headed the Committee on Current English Usage, which

accepted “the belief of modern linguists that the spoken language is basic to the written, and has therefore taken into account any reliable reports of usage in speech.”⁷¹ After compiling a list of controversial points of usage, evidence was gathered in the field in the form of a survey, then conclusions were drawn, as objectively as possible. In other words, it was a thoroughly descriptive method, not prescribing “how we should speak and write; it describes, rather, how Americans on all levels of education actually do speak and write.”⁷² Two important points could be established from this study: the first concerning the status of the *all...not* construction, and the second that the construction *both are not* in informal English is a total negation. Under the entry *not, illogically placed*, it says that the sentence “All men are not alike,” is an idiomatic expression but that it is standard English: “Despite the logical argument for ‘Not all men are alike,’ this idiom has a long and reputable history, dating back to Hamlet’s ‘All is not well’. Writers of formal English prefer to place the modifier *not* logically, whereas most speakers determine its position by context rather than by logic.”⁷³ The second point is made when discussing verbal agreement with the subject under the entry *neither...nor*. After the sentence, “Neither Iraq nor Iran has any adequate electronic warning system,” comes the comment, “In informal English, however, both the educated and the uneducated tend to employ a plural verb in this situation, especially in the negative, where *neither* is has the same meaning as *both are not*, as in ‘Neither Cecil nor Kate were grateful.’”⁷⁴

The following four usage guides are paperbacks, for which there is an ever-growing commercial market, and which, because of their low prices are more accessible to a large public. What do they have to say about the negated absolute terms? *The Columbia Guide to Standard American English* says under the entry *all*: “placement of *not* in written versions of a sentence can

cause ambiguity that speech might avoid with the help of intonation.”⁷⁵ Model sentences with *All...not* and *Not all* illustrate this statement. *The American Heritage Book on English Usage* gives exactly the same advice, warning users to “Be careful with sentences that have an *all...not* form; they can be hazardous to your clarity.”⁷⁶

Two British guides in paperback were consulted. The first gave exactly the same advice on the *All...not* construction as the above two American guides, with likewise nothing on *both* negated.⁷⁷ The second guide was very interesting for my study because it used the *both...not* construction in two instances, one as a total negation and the other as a partial. In the first case, under the entry *either*, it says that in formal prose in the sentence, “It was improbable that either of our parents were giving thought to the matter,” *either* should be followed by a singular verb, but in informal usage it is quite common to use a plural verb, which accords with the notional meaning “both parents were not.”⁷⁸ In the second case, under the entry *neither...nor*, a statement is made in which *both...not*, judging by context, appears to be a partial negation: “Two singular subjects linked by *neither...nor* can be constructed with either a singular or a plural verb. Strictly and logically a singular verb is required since both subjects are not thought of as governing the verb at the same time.”⁷⁹

The most emphatically prescriptive books on usage are those compiled for foreign learners of English, and which have the special purpose of correcting common grammatical errors. Even the wording is different from the general usage guides. While the latter might say “It is better to...,” the former will say, “You do not...,” or “Right...Wrong.” Focusing on typical errors made by speakers, they state very clearly what is permitted and what is not. Leading in this field is the outstanding *Collins Cobuild English Usage*, which features a combination of general reference and correction handbook. Under *all* used as a pronoun

there is a warning: “You do not use a noun group beginning with *all* as the subject of a negative sentence. You do not say, for example, ‘All the children are not noisy.’ Instead you use *none* or *not all*”⁸⁰ Under the entry *both* it says, “You do not usually use *both* in negative sentences, for example, you do not say, “Both his students were not there.” You say, “Neither of his students was there.” Similarly, you do not say, “I didn't see both of them.” You say, “I didn't see either of them.”⁸¹ This amounts to saying that *both* negated is more likely to be interpreted as a total negation. Similar advice was given in a correction handbook of 1950, written for Japanese students of English by two British professors of English. For *both* negated it says: “ambiguous- I don't want both of them; clear-I don't want either of them, I want neither of them; ambiguous- Both of them do not interest me; clear- Neither of them interests me.”⁸²

Michael Swan's popular *Practical English Usage* deals with over 600 points “which regularly cause problems for foreign students of English.” Under the entry *all* he gives the same advice on the *All...not* construction as the previous guides, but he differs from them in that he comments on *both* negated. He says that instead of *Both...not*, we normally use *neither*: “Neither of them is here,” not “Both of them are not here.”⁸³ *The Longman Dictionary of Common Errors* gives the same advice as Swan's, except that it has a stiffer tone because it uses the labels “X” for wrong and “O” for correct: “Wrong - Both of them have not apologized yet, Correct -Neither of them has apologized yet; Wrong - Both the husband and the wife aren't reliable, Correct - Neither the husband nor the wife is reliable.”⁸⁴ What is particularly noteworthy is that neither commentator comments on the *not...all*, and the *not...both* constructions. Only one correction handbook mentioned the *not...both* construction saying: “She didn't buy both of the dresses because they were too expensive,” change to, “She didn't buy either of the dresses because...” “She didn't buy both of the dresses,” means that she bought just one.⁸⁵

In summary, of all the categories, usage guides have

provided the most consistently prescriptive evidence. What is remarkable is that they unanimously recognize the ambiguity of the *All...not* construction and advise the use of the unambiguous alternatives, *Not all* or *None*. Interestingly, they are all silent as to the *not...all* construction. The *Both...not* construction received much comment from the correction handbooks, suggesting that it is a fairly common utterance, which the handbooks interpreted as a false construction for *Neither* is, and duly corrected. The scholarly usage guides, on the other hand, did not comment on *both* negated, but surprisingly, every commentator used the *not...both* construction usually as a partial negation in his explanations. This last construction, just as the *not...all* construction, was not discussed in any of the usage guides.

NOTES

Dictionaries

1. Karen Miyahata, *Problems of the Partial Negation and English Usage Part I: Definition and Method*, Journal of Osaka University of Arts No.22 Geijutsu (Osaka: Osaka University of Arts, 1999), pp.39-47.
2. Geoffrey Hughes, *A History of English Words* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), p.271. Hughes makes the important point that, “The change in compilation has significant effects on the whole process of definition, in that popular usage becomes the core of the definitions, not exclusively written and historical meanings, as has traditionally been the case.”
3. Nathan Bailey compiled the *Universal Etymological English Dictionary*, published in 1721. It was the first attempt at “comprehensiveness” and proved to be successful, going through 28 editions before 1800. It was the standard dictionary of the 18th century. Dr. Johnson was certainly influenced by this work but his dictionary immediately superseded the *UEED*.
4. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, edited by Tom McArthur (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p.736. Franz Passow, known for his Greek lexicon, *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (1819-1824), was the first to use dated textual citations organized chronologically. Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm began the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* in 1838 along the same model. This massive work would eventually culminate with thirty-two large volumes, and only finally in 1961. Another who was influenced by German philology was Henry Liddle, English classical scholar, renowned for the

- Greek-English Lexicon*, 1834, which he co-authored with Robert Scott, and which was based on Passow's lexicon. Liddle's daughter, Alice, was the little girl for whom Lewis Carroll wrote *Alice in Wonderland*.
5. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), Volume I, pp.225-228.
 6. *Ibid.*, pp.1012-1013.
 7. Charles Carpenter Fries, *American English Grammar* (Michigan: Appleton, 1940), p.5. Fries further states, "The principle underlying the production of the *Oxford Dictionary*, the very foundation of its method, was the insistence upon use or practice as the sole criterion of the legitimate meaning of words."
 8. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, ed. Ted McArthur, p.736.
 9. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1961), edition of 1993, p.54.
 10. *Ibid.*, p.45. It must be stated that this comment on usage is valid only pertaining to *ain't* used in place of *am not*, specifically *I ain't*. It does not apply when used to mean *are not*, or *is not*, as in "You ain't going," or "It ain't raining." Furthermore, the Webster III labels as substandard, meaning disapproval, when it is used in place of *have*, *have not*, *has not*, as in "I ain't seen him," or "You ain't told us."
 11. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 10th Edition* (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1995), Explanatory Notes pp.18a,19a. Usage Paragraphs appeared for the first time in the Ninth Edition.
 12. *Ibid.*, pp.777-778.
 13. *Longman Dictionary of the English Language* (Essex: Longman, 1984), p.166.
 14. *Ibid.*, p.166.
 15. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English-New Edition* (Essex: Longman, 1987), Introduction.
 16. *Ibid.*, pp.12, 110.
 17. *Cambridge International Dictionary of English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), Foreward, p.xi.
 18. *Ibid.*, pp.33, 151.
- Grammars
19. G. P. Quackenbos, LL. D., *English Grammar* (New York: Appleton, 1886), Preface. Quackenbos presents his new system of grammar with the following innovations: combining practice with theory, example with precept, on a more liberal scale, definitions are approached by means of preliminary illustrations, words are classified as parts of speech solely and exclusively according to their use in a sentence, the rules of syntax are introduced in connection with etymological parsing, a simple method of analyzing sentences is presented, the neuter gender is eliminated because it is a factitious distinction engrafted on English from Latin.
 20. The list of titles entitled *Educational Works* are those textbooks which were published by D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1886. The titles are listed by the author's last name, from A to Z.
 21. G. P. Quackenbos, *English Grammar*, Preface. For this reason Quackenbos writes, "In offering the present *Grammar* to the public, the author begs leave to refer to the work itself as the best exponent of those peculiarities by which it is to be approved or condemned."
 22. *Ibid.*, pp.70, 76.
 23. *Ibid.*, p.71.
 24. Alexander Bain, *A Companion to the Higher English Grammar* (London: Longman, 1877), Preface.
 25. *Ibid.*, p.106.
 26. *Ibid.*, p.135-136. In a chapter on the adverb, in section IV, Affirmation and Denial, this is the closest Bain comes to discussing negation: "not, the most genuinely adverbial word in the language is made to assume an adjective form in *no*, *nonē* the pretexts being, first to express universal denial, and next to give emphasis." That the *All...not* construction can be interpreted only as a partial negation does not conform with traditional logic. See *Notes* number 37.
 27. J.C.Nesfield, *Modern English Grammar* (London: Macmillan, 1949), p.215.
 28. *Ibid.*, p.35.
 29. *Ibid.*, p.130B.
 30. *Ibid.*, p.118-119.
 31. Henry Sweet, *A New English Grammar; Logical and Historical* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1891;1960), p.207.
 32. Charles Carpenter Fries, *American English Grammar*, p.20.
 33. Henry Sweet, *A New English Grammar*, p.86.
 34. Cited in Otto Jespersen, *Mankind, Nation and Individual* (London: George Allan and Unwin, 1946), p.97.
 35. *Ibid.*, p.98.
 36. Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (New York: Norton,1924), pp.325-328, *The Meaning of Negation*.
 37. In traditional logic, the *All...not* construction has the meaning of a Total negation. See *the Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, edited by Ted Honderich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp.504- 506: "The traditional system relied upon two kinds of negation. The distinction between 'Not everything which glisters is gold' (negating a proposition) and 'Everything which glisters is not gold' (negation a term) is worth fighting for, despite the common practice of using the seconde to mean the first. Propositional- negation will be represented by N (meaning 'It is not that...'); term-nagation by n (meaning 'non-'). Term-negation may preface either or both terms. Thus 'Everything which doesn't glisters is gold' is Anab, Everything which glisters isn't gold' is Aanb, and 'Everything which doesn't glisters isn't gold' is Ananb."
 38. Otto Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1933), p.184. Jespersen gives five

- examples of *both* used in affirmative sentences, including *Both of you = you both*, but there is nothing on *both* negated.
39. Collins Cobuild *English Usage* (London: Harper Collins, 1992), p.104.
 40. Other well-known Dutch scholars of English are C. H. Hertog, T. Terwey, and R. W. Zandvoort, whose *A Handbook of English Grammar* dominated the field of English pedagogical grammar in Holland for over thirty years. The University of Groningen in the north of Holland is especially renowned for its research in English.
 41. Hendrik Poutsma, *A Grammar of Late Modern English* (Groningen: Noordhoff, 1928), pp.1025, 1027, 1084.
 42. George O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language* (Boston: Heath, 1931), *Syntax III*, Preface. For Otto Jespersen's views on Curme's Grammar, see Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar, Part IV*, Preface (London: Allen and Unwin): Ferdinand de Saussure and his followers insist on a sharp line of division between "what they call diachronic and synchronic linguistics," but this view, to Jespersen, is an exaggeration. He believes that the two subjects cannot and should not be rigidly separated, "least of all in a language possessing so strong a literary tradition as English." For this reason he says that George Curme's *Syntax* "...contains many valuable observations while the system and manner of viewing things syntactically are diametrically opposed to mine."
 44. George O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language, Part II - Parts of Speech and Accidence* (Boston: Heath, 1935), p.53(word- order of both), p.58.
 45. *Ibid.*, p.31.
 46. *Ibid.*, p.25.
 47. Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Essex: Longman, 1985), Preface.
 48. *Ibid.*, p.788. The author apologizes that certain signs could not be faithfully reproduced, (for the following number 49 as well).
 49. *Ibid.*, p.790.
 50. *Ibid.*, p.764.
 51. *Ibid.*, pp.380, 377.
 52. Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), Preface.
 53. *Ibid.*, p.358-359.
 54. *Ibid.*, p.360.
 55. *Ibid.*, p.806.
 56. *Ibid.*, p.360
 57. *Ibid.*, pp.374, 807.
- Usage Guides
58. David Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 196.
 59. H. W. Fowler, *The New Fowler's Modern English Usage, Third Edition*, Edited by R. W. Burchfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp.517.
 60. *Ibid.*, p.529.
 61. *Ibid.*, p.114
 62. *Ibid.*, p.518
 63. Eric Partridge, *Usage and Abuse, Revised New Edition* (New York: Norton, 1994), pp.196-204.
 64. *Ibid.*, p.197
 65. *Ibid.*, sentence of Sheila Kaye-Smith, p.50.
 66. *Ibid.*, p.50.
 67. *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage* (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, 1994), Preface.
 68. *Ibid.*, p.196.
 69. Wilson Follet, *Modern American Usage* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1966), pp.230-231.
 70. *Ibid.*, p.224.
 71. *Current American Usage*, edited by Margaret Bryant (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1962), Introduction, p.xx. One of the functions of the National Council of Teachers of English was to disseminate knowledge about actual usage in America. The Committee proposed the method of studying controversial points of usage in American English, dealing principally with usage in syntax. The book *Current American Usage* grew out of this project, attempting "to bring together the most recent information about frequently debated points of usage in English speech and writing." p.ii.
 72. *Ibid.*, Introduction, p.xx. The committee recognizes two levels of English: Standard and Nonstandard. Standard English is the English used by cultivated people to communicate in speech or writing, the type of language used by those in society who command respect and esteem, the language of the influential classes, which is socially advantageous for the individual. Nonstandard English is the contrary of Standard English. It is disapproved of socially and may put their users at a social and vocational disadvantage. There are three varieties of Standard English: formal English, used in serious writing and in speeches for solemn or formal occasions; informal English is used in many books, magazines, and other writings intended for the general public, in which contractions and ellipses are permitted, having a more familiar style; colloquial English is found in dialogue, and in writings that are conversational in nature. It is the usual language within the family circle and among close friends.

73. *Ibid.*, p.148.
74. *Ibid.*, p.11.
75. *The Columbia Guide to Standard American English*, edited by Kenneth G. Wilson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p.298.
76. *The American Heritage Book of English Usage* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996) p.71.
77. Sidney Greenbaum and Janet Whitcut, *Longman Guide to English Usage* (London: Penguin, 1988), p.470. Under the entry *negation*, the first point is (1) too many negatives, and (2) subject with *all* or *every* followed by negative.
78. E. S. C. Weiner and J. M. Hawkins, *The Oxford Guide to the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p.149.
79. *Ibid.*, p.163.
80. *Collins Cobuild English Usage* (London: Harper Collins, 1992), p.42.
81. *Ibid.*, p.104.
82. Lawrence Faucett and Thomas Fawcett, *Complete Pocket Guide to Standard English, A Composition Correction Handbook* (Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin, 1950), pp.504, 146. The authors say that they are indebted to Otto Jespersen, George P. Krapp, Henry Sweet and George Curme. This handbook was compiled in view of the problem areas encountered in Japanese classrooms, because manuals of composition and grammar published in England and America are based upon difficulties commonly experienced by people in those countries. The authors' aim is to "eliminate persistent blunders in English" experienced by Japanese learners of English. There seems to have been a long tradition of manuals of this nature to draw on, such as James Main Dixon, *English Composition*, 1889; W. B. Mason, *Mistakes Commonly Made by Japanese in Speaking and Writing English*, 1897; Frank Muller, *Notes on Habitual Mistakes Made and Common Difficulties Met With in Speaking English*, 1900; F. W. Eastlake, *Common Mistakes in English*, 1905.
83. Michael Swan, *Practical English Usage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), Preface.
84. *Longman Dictionary of Common Errors, New Edition* (Essex: Longman, 1987), p.55.
85. Nigel D. Turton, *ABC of Common Grammatical Errors* (London: Macmillan Language House, 1995), p.118.