A Study on Negation in English

——A new Approach to Negation in School Grammar——

Mineko Tsukiyama

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Henry Sweet, one of the most distinguished linguists who first established a scientific approach to language teaching and made a great contribution to it, mentioned in his book The Practical Study of Languages that "learning a language means overcoming difficulties, and each language has its own peculiar difficulties." He classified the difficulties into two categories. One is external difficulties. "Some of the difficulties may be purely external—due not to anything in the language itself, but to the circumstances under which it is learnt." The other is internal difficulties, "which are, in the strict sense of the word, internal—inherent in each language apart from external circumstances and from its varying relations to other languages." Through my several years of teaching experiences I have been occasionally confronted with the fact that the students have great difficulty in comprehending sentences containing a negative word or words. Their degree of comprehension in both reading and listening usually shows downward curves when they encounter a paragraph which contains negation. Negative expression in English has several knotty expressions such as sen-

tence negation, word negation, double negation, resumptive negation, conditional negation, implied negation, etc., each one in itself a barrier of their quick understanding. It is very simple and clear for a native speaker to use the word 'no' in his reply, when the answer is negative. But it takes time for the students to use 'no' correctly without hesitation, even if they know the sentence is negative. The following sentences do not appear very difficult at first glance, in their construction. But responding to each question quickly is not as easy for the student as one might think. They are not as easy as they look.

"Didn't you see anyone?"   "No, I didn't."

"You are not going to the concert, are you?"

"No, I am not going."

"Do you mind if I smoke?"   "No, not at all." or

                                 "Certainly not."

I held the idea that these trouble spots apparently belonged to the internal difficulties until I encountered the article written by Chuji Tsuboi, Honorary Professor of Tokyo University. The title was "Japanese and English" and the article was his comment on the result of the intensive training course sponsored by the Council on Language Teaching Development (COLTD). Prof. Chuji Tsuboi is one of the directors of the association. His essay covers more than five pages in Japanese, I have tried to summarize it in English, selecting the passages by which I was most impressed.

The intensive training course was a program to improve English ability for practical uses, and has been continuously held for university students and university graduates who are already engaged in

the business field. Both a pre-test and a post-test are given to all the participants at the beginning and the end of the course so that the efficiency of the program may be measured. The result of the tests is as follows.

	pre-test	post-test
1. Percent of correct answers on the whole	61%	69%
2. Percent of correct answers when the questions were read at speed 150W/1 min.	69%	76%
3. Percent of correct answers. Reading speed 200W/1 min.	58%	64%
4. Percent of correct answers. Reading speed 230W/1 min.	50%	63%
5. Percent of correct answers when requested to write true answers	68%	75%
6. Percent of correct answers when requested to write false answers	53%	59%
7. Percent of correct answers to affirmative sentences	63%	67%
8. Percent of correct answers to negative sentences	55%	73%

The period of the program was two weeks and one of the strict rules which the participants had to observe was to stay with one Japanese and six non-Japanese instructors and speak the English language only, from sunrise to lights out. Therefore, the hours during which they had to use English was estimated to be fourteen hours a day at least. Thus the total hours from start to finish covered about two hundred hours. Chuji Tsuboi indicated the

following three points which seemed to be proven by the results of the two tests.

1. As far as reading speed is concerned, the gap between the percentages of items No. 3 and No. 4 is 8% in the pre-test. But the gap in the post-test is reduced to 1%. This means that in listening comprehension their ability to cope with fast speed had progressed remarkably.

2. As to understanding affirmative and negative sentences, the gap is 8% in the pre-test when we compare item No. 5 with No. 6 in the pre-test. On the contrary, that of the post-test is reduced to −6%. This also reveals that their ability to understand both types of sentences had progressed significantly.

3. As to the response to the true or false questions, a similar improvement is not indicated. we do not deny some improvement on the whole, comparing the result of the pre-test with that of the post-test. However, we have to notice that there still exists about the same gap between the two tests.

Pointing out the same kind of tendency revealed as a general feature among the other groups of participants, he insists that this inefficiency is not caused by any difficulty in the language itself but by some peculiar characteristics of the Japanese, which have rooted deep into our own traditional and cultural background. Referring to the other statistical graphs resulted on close investigation he asserts that these types of our character do not fit us to master English and are very hard to wash away from our ideas. One of the characteristics exemplified is that Japanese people are not bold enough to say 'no' or 'it is wrong' even if it is clearly

wrong.

I do not hesitate to appreciate his statistical research and admit that we do have such character traits. But it is the figures of item No. 6 and No. 8 in the pre-test that have much significant meaning to me, as one who has been teaching English as a foreign language for years. That is, the figures were much lower at the very starting point. This raises a question to me whether Japanese students are properly and thoroughly drilled to understand a sentence with a negative element or elements. Negation presents us with a complicated problem in English grammar. Even among the linguists whose native language is English there are different understanding about sentence negation and non-sentence negation and they have not come to any consensus yet. This confusion and conflict motivated me to study the principles of two scholars, Otto Jespersen, in whom our English grammar has been firmly rooted, and Randolph Quirk, who is one of the greatest of linguists and has reached the peak of his field, and is also well aware of the theory of generative transformational grammar.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL CHANGES IN NEGATIVE FORM

The negative word is generally placed at the beginning of a sentence and pronounced with strong stress so that any listener or reader may know whether a statement is positive or negative as soon as possible. When we look back at the history of negation we notice there was a fluctuation in it, that is, a weakening of the

negative element and then a strengthening of it again occured in this process. We also notice that there has always been a tendency attracting the negation to the verb as the central part of the sentence. In Old English the pattern which was most frequently used in a negative sentence is (a) Ic ne secge (I do not say). As well as this structure we had another pattern which had a negative element 'noht' (not) at the end of the sentence to strengthen the preceding 'ne'. Thus in Middle English (b) I ne seye not was a typical form of negative. The word 'ne' was usually pronounced with a little stress. Consequently it disappeared altogether and the word 'not' became the regular negative element in all cases, (c) I say not became the typical negative sentece in the fifteenth century. The construction 'I say not' was normal for a long time, but in the Elizabethan period a main verb 'do' was used as an auxiliary. The construction (d) I do not say was formed and we seem to have reached the ideal construction, with a distinct negative word before the main verb. The contracted forms such as don't, didn't, mayn't, hadn't, couldn't, wouldn't, shouldn't, needn't, mightn't, oughtn't, etc., came into use in speech in about 1600. And in writing they appeared in about 1660. I have listed below some nexal negative types in which the negative is close to the verb.

Note: Most of the examples are extracted from The Gospel According to Mark in the Authorized Version, the New English Bible, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970, the Holy Bible Revised Standard Version, American Bible Society and Good News for Modern Man, The New Testament in Today's English, American Bible Society 1966. AV stands for

The Authorized Version. NE stands for The New English Bible and HB stands for The Holy Bible. GN is Good News for Modern Man.

because of the crowd they could not get him near.	2:4 NE
The child is not dead.	5:39 NE
You do not understand this parable?	4:13 NE
he did not know what to say.	9:6 GN
I asked your disciples to cast it out, and they were not able.	9:18 HB
And he would not have anyone know it;	9:30 HB
he followeth not us;	9:38 AV
so shall it not be among you.	10:43 AV
If in the field, he must not turn back for his coat.	13:16 HB
never again shall I drink from the fruit of the wine.	14:25 NE
He saved others; he cannot save himself.	15:31 HB

CHAPTER III

FORM OF NEGATION

Randolph Quirk begins his grammatical theory with the fundamental principle of negative sentence forms. The negation of a simple sentence is formed by placing the negative element 'not' between the operator and the predication. Operator is either the first auxiliary verb of the verb phrase or 'be' or 'have' as a main verb.

I am not fit to unfasten his shoes.	1:7 NE
He would not let the devils speak.	1:34 NE

the roots had not grown deep enough. 4 : 6 GN

In the case of a simple sentence with no auxiliary, the negation is accomplished by using the substitute auxiliary 'do'.

But it does not sink deep into them. 4 : 17 GN

But their statements did not tally. 14 : 56 NE

As to abbreviated negation two colloquial forms are possible as exemplified below.

Some's not coming.	Someone isn't coming.
We're not ready.	We aren't ready.
They've not caught him.	They haven't caught him.
He mayn't give us any champagne.	No, he may not.
You mustn't bathe there on account of the sharks.	
I oughtn't to do that.	No, you oughtn't.
Must he go?	No, he needn't.

You daren't borrow it without my permission!

As to the forming of negative sentences, Otto Jespersen does not provide us with a special section about negation in A Modern English Grammar Part V. But it is quite clear by reading the history of negation that the following rules aer recognized. The negative word 'not' generally comes after a finite verb and an anomalous finite. There was a time when 'not' was used before the verb when the negative element 'ne' dropped out of the sentence. Since 'do' took the role of an auxiliary verb, it has been treated in the same way as other anomalous finite verbs. Thus the structures 'do not, does not, did not' + verb have been constructed. Therefore, we can assume that what Otto Jespersen indicated by the history of negation reaches the same conclusion as to the

fundamental principle of negative sentence structures as reached by Randolph Quirk. Concerning the contracted form of negation, there is a difference between the two types. For example, 'he isn't a coward' is different from 'he's not a coward' in the meaning. The former is similar to 'he is not a coward' but the latter is equivalent to 'he is no coward'.

CHAPTER IV

NEGATIVE ATTRACTION AND
THE RELATION BETWEEN
NON-ASSERTIVE FORMS AND NEGATIVE FORMS

English has two tendencies in negation; one is to attach the negative to the verb even when it logically belongs to some other words. This tendency makes a negative sentence a nexal negation, and this tendency is stronger in colloquial language. The other tendency is to attach the negative to any word that can easily be made negative. This makes a word negation (special negation) and it is a conspicuous feature in literary English because it has a more elegant sound. See the following pairs in the examples below.

Jesus could not go into a town publicly.	1:45 GN
Jesus could no longer openly enter a town.	AV
There wasn't any room left.	2:2 GN
There was no room to receive them.	AV
Nor does anyone pour new wine into used wineskins.	1:22 GN
No one puts new wine into old wineskins;	NB
Why is it that you don't have faith?	4:40 GN

How is it that ye have no faith ?   AV

This because we don't have any bread.   8 : 16 GN

It is because we have no bread.   AV

Whenever there is a logical possibility of attaching the negative element to either of two words, the tendency is to join it to the first.

No one ever saw him angry.

Never did any one see him angry.

Any one never saw him angry. (incorrect)

Instead of the negative attraction, Randolph Quirk explains the two different forms of negation by means of referring to the relation between non-assertive forms and negative forms. The negative element 'not' or '-n't' is frequently followed (not necessarily directly) by one or more of the non-assertive items. In all cases the combination of 'not' or '-n't' and the assertive word is more colloquial and idiomatic than negative variant. The non-assertive form associated with negation cannot precede 'not' in the sentence. Therefore, there is no alternative construction to the simple negative form when that form occurs in a subject or initial adjunct. But if, 'any, anyone, etc.' is postmodified, it can precede 'not' in the sentence.

No one shall ever eat figs from you again !   11 : 14 GN

Anyone shall not eat figs from you again ! (incorrect)

No one knows how the fire originated.

Anyone does not know how the fire originated. (incorrect)

Anyone who does that isn't honest.

Any of those who fought at Alma must now be dead.

The construction 'have' or 'there is' + negative word 'no' is generally used instead of 'not' or 'not any' but in colloquial English it is preferred to use 'not a' or 'not any' as an emphatic expression.

There is nobody, or on one, in the house.

There is not anybody in the house.　　　　(incorrect)

He has done nothing to be ashamed of.

He has not done anything to be ashamed of.

CHAPTER　V

DOUBLE NEGATION AND REPEATED NEGATION

Two negatives make an affirmative if both are special negatives attached to the same word. This generally occurs in the way that 'not' is inserted before some word of negative import or containing a negative prefix. But the result of a double negative is somewhat different from the simple idea expressed positively. Accordingly, 'not without some doubt' is not exactly the same thing as 'with some doubt'. The former is weaker than the latter and it implies a certain hesitation of a speaker to express it in a positive and direct way. A repeated negative means a negative. In English as well as many other languages the ordinary negative element is slight in phonetic bulk. Therefore, it becomes habitual to attach it not only to the verb but to any other word that can easily take it, so as to prevent it being overlooked. From the nineteenth century a repeated negation mainly appears only in the mouths of ungrammatical speakers. After a negative sentence has been completed, something is added in a negative form in order to emphasize the

negative effect. Most important instances of this class is the combination of 'not…neither…nor', 'not…not even'.

> He commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only ; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse.   6 : 8   AV
>
> No man could bind him, no, not with chains.   5 : 3   AV
>
> But of that day and that hour knowth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.   13 : 32 AV
>
> No one knows however, when that day or hour will come… neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son : only the Father knows.   13 : 32 GN

At the beginning of the chapter on negation Randolph Quirk gives a note in which he discusses negation as a syntactic process within the clause, rather than a process of word-formation. So negative affixes, despite some affinities with the clause negator 'not' are not dealt within this section. As to double negation which appears in the same clause, he says that such a clause turns out to be an entirely positive sentence because each negative has its separate value and cancels out the other. As to the repeated negative, he uses the term multiple negation where more than one negative word is used, but the meaning does not change, but remains negative. And this structure belongs to substandard English. Roughly speaking there is not any theoretical conflict between Otto Jespersen and Randolph Quirk, as far as double and repeated negations are concerned.

> No one has nothing to offer to society. (Everyone has something to offer to society.)
>
> No one never said nothing. (No one ever said anything.)

CHAPTER VI

SENTENCE NEGATION AND SPECIAL NEGATION

Negation in English is classified in two kinds, due to the negative attraction in the language, according to Otto Jespersen. When the negative is attached to the verb and the whole combination of a subject and a predicate is negatived, it is named nexal negation or sentence negation. While when the negative is attracted to any word that is easily made negative, it is named word negation or special negation. These two different kinds of negation are clear enough in principle, but it is not always easy to distinguish between the two kinds, since there are a number of sentences whose grammatical forms appear to be nexal negation but according to the meanings are word negation. Besides, the same phenomena occur in word negation, too. That is, the structure is word negation but semantically it is sentence negation.

Sentence-Negation-type Word Negation

I don't complain of your words, but of the tone in which they were uttered.

(I complain, not of your words, but of the tone.)

I have not come to call the respectable people, but the outcasts.

2:17 GN

(I have come not to call the respectable people, but the outcasts.)

Word-Negation-type Sentence Negation

No such proof will be given this people.   8:12 GN

There is no other commandment greater than these. 12:13 NB

For nothing is hidden unless it is to be disclosed. 4:22 NB

You have no right to your brother's wife. 6:18 NB

He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen. 9:9 AV

Jesus made no further answer. 15:5 NB

Jesus could no longer openly enter a town. 1:45 NB

Word negation is used in the following cases according to Otto Jespersen.

A. In the case of a contrast. Auxiliary 'do' is not used. Sentence negation is also used in this case with auxiliary 'do'.

He taught them as one who had authority and not as the scribes. 1:22 NB

I did not come to invite virtuous people, but sinners. 2:17 NB

B. In the case of rejecting something as the cause of or reason for something real. Sentence negation is also used.

I complained not because I was dissatisfied but for some other reason.

I did not complain because I was dissatisfied.

C. In the case of phrasal combination of 'not a' or 'not one' or 'no+noun'.

No words can describe the scene.

There was no end to our troubles.

I have not the least interest in the matter.

Thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, are not the least among the princes of Juda. Matt. 2:6

I have not the slightest doubt about it.

He is not at all stupid.

Since 'do' became an auxiliary, sentence negation has been more easily calssified in a sentence with a verb connected with an infinitive.

He tried not to look that way.   (word negation)

He did not try to look that way. (sentence negation)

CHAPTER VII

THE MEANING OF NEGATION

For our ideas about the meaning of negation we hitherto owe much to Otto Jespersen. Some of these concepts are presented below. Though the terms positive and negative are used both in mathematics and in grammar, their meaning is not the same. In mathematics -4 means a point as much below O as $+4$ is above O. In language, on the other hand, a negative changes a term into the contradictory term. For example, Christians and non-Christians together comprise everybody. 'He will come' and 'he will not come' exhaust all possibilities, and 'not-happy' means anything but happy. But this general rule requires some very important qualification as follows.

A. not much=little, not many=few, not good=inferior but does not, with excellent, exhaust the possibilities.

B. With numerals not means less than.

He does not read three books in a year.

The hill is not two hundred feet high.

His income is not $2,000 a year.

But be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats   6:9   AV

With the numerals strongly stressed and followed by the exact

number, not may mean more than.

The hill is not two hundred feet high, but three hundred.

His income is not $2,000 but at least $3,000.

You can't do that in two hours.

C. A distinction is made between 'not' and 'no' before a comparative. Not above thirty=either thirty or less than thirty. Not less than thirty=the word 'less' is made negative by 'not'. So the consequence is that it means either thirty or more than thirty. No less than thirty='less than thirty' is made negative by 'no'. Therefore, the meaning is exactly thirty. Not more than thirty=thirty at most. No more than thirty =thirty only.

D. If 'not' is placed before words like 'all, always, everything, everybody' etc., the consequence is 'some, sometimes, something, somebody'.

I am not always at home on Sundays.

(I am sometimes at home on Sundays.)

You will not always have me.   14:7 NB

(You will sometimes have me.)

I did not ask all of them.

(I asked some of the m.)

All knowledge is not good.

(Some of knowledge is good.)

He has not read every book in the library.

(He has read some of the books in the library.)

The one of the controversial and inconclusive areas is that his interpretation of the sentences is mostly attributed to the common situation though it has more frequency. For instance, the sentence

'she is not happy' is interpreted in the following way according to Otto Jespersen. But it is also interpreted like sentence number three, and 'not-happy' does not necessarily means anything but happy.

1. She isn't happy.
2. She's not happy.
3. It is not so that she is happy.

I will take another sentence 'his income is not $2,000 a year' as an example. According to Otto Jespersen, this is interpreted in two ways like sentences number one and two. However, it has another literally interpretation like sentence number three which has no implication in it.

1. His income is less than $2,000 a year.
2. His income is more than $2,000 a year.
3. It is not so that his income is $2,000 a year.

CHAPTER VIII

THREE TYPES OF NEGATION
AND
SCOPE OF NEGATION

Randolph Quirk categorizes negation into three classes, namely clause, phrasal, and local negations. In the case of a negative form governing the whole clause, that is, form the negative word to the end of the clause, or to the beginning of a final adjunct, it is defined as clause negation. It may be compared to sentence negation in the sense of Otto Jespersen's theory. Phrasal negation

is another type of negation which is grammatically restricted to a single phrase, but semantically applies to a whole clause. It may compare with some types of special negation in Otto Jespersen's theory. Local negation may possibly be explained as negation of a clause condensed into a phrase. It is similar to clause negation in grammatical structure but semantically unlike clause negation. Local negation is a sentence with a negative element but it is not a negative sentence. As to this point, Randoloh Quirk is quite different from Otto Jespersen on classification of negation. See the differences indicated below.

A. The following sentences are clause negation but they are word-negation-type sentence negation according to Otto Jespersen.

Nothing agrees with me more than oysters.

(Oysters agree with me as much as — indeed, more than anything else.)

No news is good news.

(Any of the news that I heard is not good.)

No one uses a piece of new cloth to patch up an old coat.

2 : 21 GN

They might wear sandals, but not a second coat.　　6 : 9　NB

They had no chance to eat.　　3 : 20 NB

They saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves.

9 : 8　AV

There is no means of casting out this sort but prayer. 9 : 29 AV

B. Phrasal negation which is equal to word-negation-type sentence negation according to Otto Jespersen.

Not a word was uttered when he heard of her accident.

They had no more than one loaf in the boat.　　8 : 14 NB

I have not the least interest in the matter.

He is not at all stupid.

C. Local negation which is word negation according to Otto Jespersen.

Nothing agrees with me more than oysters.

(Eating nothing agrees with me more than eating oysters.)

No news is good news.

(Having no news is good news.)

Jesus gave them strict orders not to tell anyone.　　　8:14 NB

A not unattractive woman approached me and asked the direction.

(A woman who is not unattractive approached me and asked
 the direction.)

His not very handsome face sometimes comforts my difficulties in a sense.

(His face which is not so handsome sometimes comforts my
 difficulties in a sense.)

　It is necessary to study the scope of negation, i.e., the relation between negative words and the non-assertive words that they govern so that we may understand more precisely Randolph Quirk's principle of the three different kinds of negation. Then the similarity and difference between his classification and that of Otto Jespersen's becomes clearer. The scope of negation normally extends from the negative word itself to the end of the clause, or to the beginning of a final adjunct. The subject, and any adjuncts occuring before the predication, normaly lie outside it.

　He clearly did not explain the meaning.

　(It was clear that he did not explain the meaning.)

He did not explain the meaning clearly.

(It was not clear that he explained the meaning.)

Evidently he was not satisfied.

(It was evident that he was not satisfied.)

He was not evidently satisfied.

(It was not evident that he was satisfied.)

When an adverbial is final, however, it may or may lie outside of the scope.

He did not select material wisely.

(He was wise not selecting material.)

He did not select material wisely.

(He did not make a wise selection of material.)

He did not wish to join us earnestly.

(His wish to join us was not earnest.)

He did not wish to join us earnestly.

(He did not express his earnest wish to join us.)

You will not have me always.   14:7 NE

(You will not have me for the whole time.)

You will not have me always.

(You will have me sometimes.)

If an assertive form is used, it must lie outside the scope.

I was not correcting some of thier compositions.

I was not correcting any of their compositions.

The scope can sometimes extend into a subordinate clause.

I do not understand what you are talking about.   14:68 GN

I will never say I know you, even if I have to die.

The negation of modal auxiliaries is classified into two kinds such as auxiliary negation and main verb negation. The scope of the

negation may or may not include the meaning of the auxiliary itself. 'Can and need and may' (in its permissive sense) are the group which use auxiliary negation. 'Will, shall, must' follow the pattern of main verb negation and 'may' in the sense of possibility, belongs to the latter group.

You may not go out and play baseball today.

(You are not allowed to go out and play baseball today.)

You cannot see him now. He is quite busy.

(You are not allowed to see him now.)

You can swim very well now but you could not swim last year.

(You are able to swim very well but you were not able to swim last year.)

You need not stay here.

(You are not obliged to stay here.)

You need not set out at once.

(It is not necessary for you to set out at once.)

You ought not pay him the money by the weekend.

(You are not obliged to pay him the money by the weekend.)

You ought not to say such a thing to her.

(It is not necessary for you to say such a thing to her.)

The rumor may not be true.

(It is possible that the rumor is not be true.)

'Will not, won't, shall not, shan't' in all senses

He will not pay the money at the end of this month.

Ho won't come if it rains tomorrow.

You shan't go there alone.

I won't let you go there alone.

It is required that both the scope of negation and the information

focus to describe clause negation be understood. Underlined information focus in the sentences illustrated below indicates both that the contrast of meaning implicit in the negation is located in that spot, and that the rest of the clause can be understood by implication in a positive sense.

Màxwell didn't kill the judge with a silver hámmer.

(Someone killed the judge⋯⋯but it wasn't Maxwell.)

Maxwell didn't kìll the judge with a silver hámmer.

(Maxwell did something to the judge ⋯⋯ but he did not kill him.)

Maxwell didn't kill the jùdge with a silver hámmer.

(Maxwell killed someone ⋯⋯ but it was not the judge.)

Maxwell didn't kill the judge with a sìlver hámmer.

(Maxwell killed the judge with some hammer but it was not silver.)

Randolph Quirk insists that the scope and the focus have such a close interrelation that the scope must include the focus.

CHAPTER IX

SIMILARITY AND DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
O. JESPERSEN AND R. QUIRK

We have seen that the classification of negation by Otto Jespersen is based on the negative attraction and its meaning while that of Randolph Quirk follow the scope of negation and its focus. Now, I would like to collect and summarize all the sentences in the examples from page seven to twenty-eight and see what differences

occur in their definitions. The sentences listed in the A group are sentence negation according to Otto Jespersen's theory and clause negation according to that of Randolph Quirk. The sentences in the B group are sentence-negative-type word negation according to Otto Jespersen but they are clause negation according to Randolph Quirk. The C group is word-negative-type sentence negation according to Otto Jespersen but clause negation according to Randolph Quirk. The D group is word negation according to Otto Jespersen but local negation according to Randolph Quirk. The E group is word-negative-type sentence negation but phrasal negation according to Randolph Quirk.

A. Sentence Negation — Clause Negation

1. Because of the crowd they could not get him near.
2. The child is not dead.
3. You do not understand this parable?
4. He did not know what to say.
5. I asked your disciples to cast it out, and they were not able.
6. And he would not have anyone know it;
7. He followeth not us;
8. So shall it not be among you.
9. If in the field, he must not turn back for his coat.
10. Never again shall I drink from the fruit of the wine.
11. He saved others; he cannot save himself.
12. I am not fit to unfasten his shoes.
13. He would not let the devils speak.
14. The roots had not grown deep enough.
15. But it does not sink deep into them.
16. But their statements did not tally.

17. Jesus could not go into a town publicly.
18. There wasn't any room left.
19. Nor does anyone pour new wine into used wineskins.
20. Why is it that you don't have faith?
21. This because we don't have any bread.
22. Never did any one see him angry.
23. Anyone who does that isn't honest.
24. He has not done anything to be ashamed of.
25. I did not complain because I was dissatisfied.
26. He did not try to look that way.
27. He clearly did not explain the meaning.
28. Evidently he was not satisfied.
29. He did not select material wisely.
30. He did not wish to join us earnestly.
31. You will not have me always.
32. I was not correcting some of their compositions.
33. I was not correcting any of their compositions.
34. I do not understand what you are talking about.
35. I will never say I know you, even if I have to die.
36. You may not go out and play baseball today.
37. You cannot see him now.
38. You can swim very well now but you could not swim last year.
39. You need not stay here.
40. You need not set out at once.
41. You ought not to pay him the money by the weekend.
42. You ought not to say such a thing to her.
43. The rumor may not be true.

44. He will not pay the money at the end of this month.

45. He won't come if it rains tomorrow.

46. You shan't go there alone.

B. Sentence-Negative-Type Word Negation — Clause Negation

1. I have not come to call the respectable people, but the outcasts.

2. He did not explain the meaning clearly.

3. He was not evidently satisfied.

4. He did not select material wisely.

5. He did not wish to join us earnestly.

6. You will not have me always.

7. He does not read three books in a year.

8. The hill is not two hundred feet high.

9. His income is not $2,000 a year.

10. But be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats.

11. You can't do that in two hours.

12. I am not always at home on Sundays.

13. You will not always have me.

14. I did not ask all of them.

15. All knowledge is not good.

16. He has not read every book in the library.

C. Word-Nelgative-Type Sentence Negation — Clause Negation

1. Jesus could no longer openly enter a town.

2. There was no room to receive them.

3. No one puts new wine into old wineskins;

4. How is it that ye have no faith?

5. It is because we have no bread.

6. No one ever saw him angry.

7. No one shall ever eat figs from you again!
8. No one knows how the fire originated.
9. There is nobody, or no one, in the house.
10. He has done nothing to be ashamed of.
11. He commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey.
12. No man could bind him, no, not with chains.
13. No one knows, however, when that day or hour will come⋯
14. No such proof will be given this people.
15. There is no other commandment greater than these.
16. For nothing is hidden unless it is to be disclosed.
17. You have no right to your brother's wife.
18. He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen.
19. Jesus made no further answer.
20. No words can describe the scene.
21. There was no end to our troubles.
22. Nothing agrees with me more than oysters.
23. No news is good news.
24. No one uses a piece of new cloth to patch up an old coat.
25. They had no chance to eat.
26. They saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves.
27. There is no means of casting out this sort but prayer.
D. Word Negation — Local Negation
1. I complain not of your words, but of the tone.
2. I have come not to call the respectable people, but the outcasts.

3. I complained not because I was dissatisfied.

4. He tried not to look that way.

5. Nothing agrees with me more than oysters.

6. No news is good news.

7. Jesus gave them strict order not to tell anyone.

8. A not unattractive woman approached me and asked the direction.

9. His not very handsome face sometimes comforts my difficulties in a sense.

E. Word-Negative-Type Sentence Negation — Phrasal Negation

1. Not a word was uttered when he heard of her accident.

2. They had no more than one loaf in the book.

3. I have not the least interest in the matter.

4. Thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, are not the least among the princes of Juda.

5. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

6. He is not at all stupid.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

When we discuss what negation is or what is essential to negation, one of the main points is whether the sentence belongs to the sentence negation class or not. Therefore, I would like to place a limitation on our problem by considering only sentence negation and non-sentence negation and using only 'not' as a negative word. The following examples indicated below are very simple, and

common structures in English. But when we try to define their negation it is not as simple as it would appear considering the simplicity of the form.

1. You will not have me always.
2. You will not always have me.
3. All cats don't like water.
4. Not all cats like water.
5. She is not happy.

If we follow Otto Jespersen's theory, sentences number one and number three are sentence negation and number two and number four are word negation. As to number five, both of the definitions can be applied according to negative attraction. If we say 'she's not happy' it is word negation, and if we say 'she isn't happy' it will be sentence negation. But we should notice that sentences number one, three and five can be interpreted in the followig ways, according to the scope and focus of negation.

6. You will not have me for the whole time.
7. You will have me sometimes.
8. All cats dislike water.
9. Not all cats like water. Some cats like water.
10. She is unhappy.
11. She is not happy but triumphant.
12. It is not so that she is happy.

As mentioned above, a sentence has some meanings due to the polysemy of language, including literally meaning and some implicit ones. It is expressed in a linear shape and the English language has the two tendencies in negation. Accordingly we may not place a negative word freely before any word which we would like to

negate. In any case if we base it on Otto Jespersen's principle only, we will remain ambiguous in our definition of sentence and word negation. But this does not necessarily mean that his principle is improper, for it seems not to be his first aim to draw an exact line between the two different types of negation when he was attempting to describe negation. He seemed to be trying to define it from two sides at the same time : one was the grammatical form and the other was the meaning. In consequence his point of view cannot help being ambiguous.

On the contrary, Randolph Quirk holds to a firm point, i.e., the scope of negation and its focus, in his classification. As we see the sentences illustrated on previous pages, there do not seem to be many conflicts between sentence negation and local negation. He separates negation into two main classes, i.e., sentence negation and local negation. And as a subclass which is included in sentence negation, he has phrasal negation. Besides, he refers to the possibility of adding a tag-question to the end of a sentece to test whether the structure is sentence negation or non-sentence negation. This proves that he has given some consideration to the generative transformational theory in forming his definition. Certain linguists have suggested adding a tag-question at the end of a sentence, as a method of distinguishing sentence negation from non-sentence negation. If the tag-question is positive, it means that the sentence is defined as sentence negation. If not, it is not a negative sentence though it uses a negative word in its construction. However, we must remember that adding a tag-question is only a method to see whether it is sentence negation or not. So a sentence is not defined as sentence negation only because it is possible to add a positive

tag-question to it. Since it is sentence negation, it is possible to add a tag-question. The reverse is not the case. If we follow his theory, word-negation-type sentence negation will be included into sentence negation as a result. And some word negation will be classified as local negation. See the following examples below.

We met nobody.   (sen. neg.)

We are here not to talk nonsense, (aren't we?)   (local neg.)

Randolqh Quirk emphasizes correlation between the scope of negation and its focus. I do not deny the importance of information focus, which signals a difference in the meaning of a sentence the grammatical form of which is the same. It is clear that the sentence 'Maxwell didn't kill the judge with a silver hammer' differs in meaning according to the information focus. But it is more proper to say that the meaning is different, consequently the focus falls on a different word or phrase. This is similar to the relationship between sentence negation and the possibility of adding a tag-question which was pointed out in the previous page. As one of the practicians who confront the real situation of teaching English as a foreign language, we should try to be informed about some of the new knowledge derived from generative-transformational grammar. If we continue to try to settle our problem without comprehending the deep structure involved the meaning of a sentence, we are not able to understand the negative word 'no', which holds a different position in the deep structure though it appears in the same place in the surface structure. Negation in English a moot point, a controversial problem that has remained still unsettled even among the linguists whose native languge is English. It has also been revealed that a sentence with negative word or words often

causes difficulty in comprehension not only to Japanese students but also to foreign students who speak English as their mother tongue. (JACET Bulletin Number Four, 1973, page twenty-one) It goes without saying that language teachers should always keep studying so as to help the students understand correctly and clearly the language which they are learning, and should not hesitae to drill the students with useful exercises in English grammar. As to sentence and non-sentence negation it is advisable to inform the students about the method of adding a positive tag-question, so that they may notice the fact that a sentence with a negative word or words is not always a negative sentence. As to information focus which causes a different meaning, it is recommended to give them as many chances as possible to litsen to a tape on which real English is recorded, even during grammar class. Another important thing for the acquisition of English is whether the textbook used by students is helpful to them or not. After reading some English grammar textbooks for high school students, I found that most of them dealt with negation only by explaining about the forming of negative sentence structures. As far as sentence or non-sentence negation is concerned, total and partial negation terms generally appear in the item on indefinite articles or on kinds of sentences. Very few books deal with the negation problem from the new point of view. It is my sincere belief that we should provide students with a separate study on negation; and as to the terms to be used to describe the different types of negation, sentence negation and non-sentence negation will be easier to understand and more accept-able as names for the two main classes of negation. Thus word negation becomes a subclass included in sentencen negation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ishibashi, Kotaro. Seibido's Dictionary of English Linguistics, Printed in Japan at Seibido Printing Co., Tokyo, 1973.

Iwakura, Kunihiro. A Generative-Transformational Stndy of Negation. printed in Japan at Kenkyusha Printing Co., Tokyo, 1974.

Hornby, A. S. editor. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. London Oxford University Press. Published by Kaitakusha Printing Co., Tokyo, 1974.

Jespersen, Otto. A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. Printed in Great Britain, 1961 and 1965.

Jespersen, Otto. Essentials of English Grammar. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1966.

McMordie, W. and Goffin, R. C. English Idioms. London Oxford University Press, Published by Maruzen Co., Ltd., Tokyo in 1958.

Otsuka, Takanobu, editor. Sanseido's Dictionary of English Grammar. Printed in Japan, Tokyo, 1973.

Quirk, Randolph. editor. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Printed in Great Britain by William Clowes & Sons. Ltd., London, Beccles and Colchester, 1973.

Quirk, Randolph. editor. A University Grammar of English. Printed in Great Britain by william Clowes & Sons, Ltd., London, Beccles and Colchester, 1973.

Sweet, Henry. The Practical Study of Languages. Oxford University Press, London, 1964.

Yasui, Minoru. 英語学の世界 Printed in Japan at Taishukan Printing Co., Tokyo, 1974.

The Gospel According to Mark :

The Authorized Version.

The New English Bible, Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970.

The Holy Bible, revised Standard Version, American Bible Society.

Good News for Modern Man, The New Tastament in Today's English, American Bible Society, 1966.