**Review**

# Yoko Iyeiri (ed.), *Aspects of English Negation*

Amsterdam/Philadelphia/Tokyo:
John Benjamins/Yushodo Press, 2005. xii + 239 pp.

Fumiko Yoshikawa
(Received on May 7, 2008)

## 1. Introduction

Yoko Iyeiri has now edited a collection of papers that should prove invaluable for researchers from various fields of English linguistics, particularly those interested in phenomena related to negation. The editor's starting-point is that negative constructions in English should be addressed from both diachronic and synchronic viewpoints. The two parts of the book reflect this: "Part I: Aspects of Negation in the History of English" (six papers), and "Part II: Aspects of Negation in Present-day English" (five papers). Both sections will be of interest not only to historical linguists but also to theoretical linguists and inspire linguists to develop new structure models for negative constructions. In the following two sections each part will be briefly summarised, with brief critiques added.

## 2. Summaries and Comments on the Contributions from Diachronic Viewpoints

The first article in Part I, written by Jun Terasawa, is 'Negative Constructions in Old English: The Question of Cynewulf's Authorship'. In his contribution, Terasawa explores the authorship of six works which are more or less attributed to Cynewulf: *Elene, Juliana, The Fates of the Apostles, Christ II, Christ I,* and *Christ III*. Some recent previous studies have regarded the first four as his canon, in which his runic signature can be seen, and the remaining two, *Christ I* and *Christ III*, as non-Cynewulfian. Terasawa examines the use of negative constructions in those poems as evidence for their authorship. For this examination, he classifies three types of negative constructions: 'adverb *ne* used alone',

'other negatives used alone', and 'adverb *ne* with other negatives' (18, 19). He then counts the occurrence of these three types of constructions in the six works. The results show some prominent differences between them. The use of negatives other than *ne* alone is seldom seen in *Fates* and *Christ II* compared to *Elene* and *Juliana*, though all four are Cynewulf's signed poems (19). *Christ I* and *Christ III* show a preference for *nænig* to *næfre* as a negative adverb used alone, while *Elene* and *Juliana* show the reversed preference.

Second, Terasawa examines the contraction of negated verbs. Previous studies[1] have suggested that, in early Old English (hereafter OE), such contraction is a function of dialect, and in late OE, the contracted forms are seen more often in verse. Here he finds that both contracted and uncontracted forms can be found in an single text, *Juliana*. He also points out that there are possibilities of both contracted and uncontracted forms in cases where metrical stress falls on finite verbs or auxiliaries in Cynewulf's poems, though Jack (1999: 140-142) attributes them only to the presence or absence of stress. Terasawa shows that contracted forms are not found on stressed verbs in *Fates* and *Christ II*, though they are present in *Elene* and *Juliana* (21).

Third, Terasawa investigates the order of the adverb *ne*, the finite verb or the auxiliary and the subject, both in principal and subordinate clauses. His investigation is based on Mitchell's observation (1985) that in principal clauses both in OE prose and verse, the order of '*ne* V S' is usual and that in prose, the subject comes first only in cases where the subject is a pronoun, as 'S *ne* V', while in verse, even the full noun subject can come at the beginning of these elements. In the order of those three elements in Cynewulf's poems, *Elene* demonstrates different tendencies from the other poems in principal clauses though in subordinate clauses, differences are not seen between the six texts.

This article is a prominent example of how examining syntactic preferences in works illuminates questions of authorship. Terasawa does not insist on another author for *Fates* and *Christ II*, but his results show that there are quite different tendencies when compared to *Elene* and *Juliana*. As he states, in order to assess whether their differences are attributable to authorship or to different stages in the same author's writing, we have to wait for some more research on this matter from other points of view.

The second contribution is 'Variable Features of Negative Elements in Old English

---

1  Terasawa refers to Levin (1958: 494f.), Fulk (1992: §§131–146) and Jack (1999: 140–142).

Psalter Glosses' by Michiko Ogura.  She also pays attention to Levin's assertion, which is referred to in Terasawa's contribution, that negative contraction is a dominant feature in West Saxon.  Ogura surveyed thirteen OE Psalter glosses taking into account Morrell (1965) and Kitson (2002), who examined the relationships between the thirteen manuscripts.  According to previous works on the manuscripts, *A*, *B* and *C* show similar features and all three are called the *A*-type.  On the other hand, *D*, *F*, *G*, *H*, *J* and *K* belong to the *D*-type, while *E* and *L* draw upon features of both, and *I* is quite independent (Kitson (2002: 476, 477)[2].  First, with regard to the adoption of contracted or uncontracted forms in some corresponding parts in the Psalter glosses, the author demonstrates some varieties within the same type.  For example, in many parts, only *E* displays unique readings (28, 29).  In *Ps* 37.15, however, the forms are clearly divided between the *A*-type and the *D*-type (29).  Regarding the contraction with *be*-verbs, *A*, which is Mercian, has adopted many contracted forms, contrary to all expectations derived from Levin's assertion.

Next, Ogura investigates word selections in rendering particular Latin expressions such as *non sancta, inopum, gratis, ignominia, sterilitatem* and *inperfectum*.  With regard to *non sancta*, the *A*-type replaces it with *noht haligre*; the *D*-type with *unhaligre* and most of the later glosses follow the *D*-type (29, 30).  Regarding *inopum* and *gratis*, the word selections in the manuscripts vary (31, 32).  In rendering *gratis*, *B* and *J* do not follow their originals.  With regard to *ignominia* in *Ps* 82.17, their word choices follow their originals, but they do not agree with their originals in *sterilitatem* and *inperfectum* (31, 32).  In the alternative use of *litel* and *medmicel*, neither type shows exact agreement (32, 33).  In her fourth section, Ogura observes a syntactic choice between *þylæs*, *þæt ... ne*, and *ne/na* V in vernacularizing Latin *ne* V.  In this matter neither type shows an exact pattern to translate Latin *ne* V.

In her contribution, Ogura repeatedly demonstrates that there are some varieties within the *A*-type and the *D*-type respectively and provides useful data on these Psalter glosses.  However, as she herself states in her conclusion, in order to comment on the

---

2  *A* stands for *the Vespasian Psalter*, BL Cotton Vespasian A. i; *B the Junius Psalter*, Bodleian Junius 27; *C the Cambridge Psalter*, Cambridge University Library Ff. 1. 23; *D the Regius Psalter*, BL Royal 2. B. v; *E the Canterbury Psalter*, Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 17.1; *F the Stowe Psalter*, BL Stowe 2; *G the Vitellius Psalter*, BL Cotton Vitellius E. xviii; *H the Tiberius Psalter*, BL Cotton Tiberius C. vi; *I the Lambeth Psalter*, Lambeth Palace 427; *J the Arundel Psalter*, BL Arundel 60; *K the Salisbury Psalter*, Salisbury Cathedral 150; *L the Bosworth Psalter*, BL additional 37517. See Ogura (footnote 2) and Kitson (2002: 474, 475).

distinction between Mercian and West Saxon in early OE, we need a more comprehensive study. First of all, we have to remind ourselves that the corpus treated here is interlinear glosses added to Latin sentences. Interlinear glosses are usually literal, and therefore it is difficult to ascertain how far the glosses reflect the glossator's native syntactic patterns. Besides, the manuscripts are, to some extent, following such traditions as *A*-type and *D*-type, which also makes it more difficult to say whether the word choice reflects the glossator's own dialect. However, the importance of the variants or differences she found in these Psalter glosses far overweighs the weakness inherent in manuscript studies.

The third contribution is Masayuki Ohkado's 'On Grammaticalization of Negative Adverbs, with Special Reference to Jespersen's Cycle Recast'. In this article, the author refutes van Kemenade's (2000) assertion that OE constructions introduced by *ne* developed from constructions introduced by *no/na*. Van Kemenade's assertion was derived from Jespersen's (1917) 'negative cycle', which states that preverbal negative *no/na* came to be phonologically weakened, and then it was reinforced by another negative element, and finally the original negative marker disappeared. Van Kemenade (2000) added a syntactic analysis from a view of generative grammar to Jespersen's 'negative cycle' as 'Negative adverbs grammaticalize to negative head status through incorporation resulting from verb movement.' Van Kemenade claimed that the negative adverb *ne* was the weakened form of *no/na* as a critic of the following finite verb, which was first phonologically and later syntactically cliticized. The three stages in the development of OE negative constructions illustrated in Ohkado's distribution are duplicated here:

stage 1

$[_{\text{spec,CP}}$ *no* [ . . . finite verb . . .]]

stage 2

$[_{\text{spec,CP}}$ *ne* [ finite verb . . .]]

      phonological cliticization

stage 3

$[_{\text{spec,CP}}$ [ *ne*+finite verb . . .]]

     syntactic cliticization     (42).

Ohkado finds several facts that do not accord with van Kemenade's assertion. First,

he points out that neither *no/na* nor *ne* causes inversion in the case where they are used as coordinate conjunctions. That is, we have to say that even though *no/na* as a coordinate conjunction was not adjacent to the finite verb, the cliticized *ne* form had developed in such a coordinate clause. Next, he shows examples from *Beowulf* in which the adverb *ne* introduces a main clause without causing inversion (46), and examples in which the adverb should be outside CP (46, 47). Furthermore, Ohkado illustrates that in *Beowulf* *ne* often triggers inversion, but *no/na* never triggers inversion. This means that there is no stage where *no/na* is adjacent to the finite verb and therefore it makes less sense that the construction introduced by *ne* was derived from that introduced by *no/na*. Following this, he shows that the adverb *no/na* behaves in the same way as other adverbs in *Beowulf*, which rarely cause inversion when the subject is a personal pronoun. The point is that the adverb *ne* behaves differently from other OE adverbs, including *no/na*. Lastly, Ohkado eliminates another piece of evidence that supports van Kemenade's assumption. Van Kemenade (2002) believes that the number of occurrences of *no/na* has been reduced in late OE from the fact that we do not see *no/na* in *The Battle of Maldon*. Ohkado did more extensive research on this matter and found out that *no/na* occurs also in late OE, and the reason we do not see it in *The Battle of Maldon* is due to the small size of the text.

This article provides us with an object lesson on how not to build a historical development model very simplistically. Historical linguists are often urged to construct a diachronic relevance between similar constructions, and there seem to be many cases in which hasty conclusions have been drawn. To avoid such a failure, researchers should always commit themselves to detailed study of each element that supports their ideas, as is shown in this contribution.

The fourth article, '"I not say" Once Again: A Study of the Early History of the "*not* + finite verb" Type in English' is written by Yoko Iyeiri, the editor of this volume. Previous studies in "*not* + finite verb" placed the peak of its use in the early Modern English period. Iyeiri objects to this opinion and demonstrates that in fact this form is well attested in Old and Middle English texts and the constructions in early Modern English are actually its relics. She finds three examples of "*not ne* + finite verb" in Ælfric's *Supplementary Homilies*. She points out that in these examples the negative adverb *not* proceeds the finite verb even though the negative is still in the early stage of the development and accompanied by another negative *ne*. Next, based on her previous

work (2001) and also on Laing (2002), she asserts that there are many occurrences of "*not ne* + finite verb" in early Middle English, and that later the adverb *ne* disappears alongside the development from "*ne* + finite verb + *not*" to "finite verb + *not*". Finally, Iyeiri argues that there are two major differences between the usage of "*not* + finite verb" in Old and Middle English and the same usage in early Modern English. One is that the "*not* + auxiliary verb" form scarcely occurs in early Modern English even though it occurred in previous periods. Iyeiri infers that the development of modal auxiliaries and the fixation of the place of adverbs would be the major factors that restricted the use of auxiliaries in this form (73). The other difference between Middle and early Modern English is related to the ordering of words in subordinate clauses. Iyeiri finds that many examples of "*not* + finite verb" in subordinate clauses or clauses introduced by the conjunctions *and*, *ac* "but" or *ne* "nor" in Middle English (hereafter ME), and reminds us that, in OE, elements in these clauses often followed the subordinate ordering, that is, in these clauses the finite verb comes at the end of the clause. She also finds some examples of "*not* + finite verb" in subordinate clauses or in clauses introduced by *and* in early Modern English, though they do not necessarily demonstrate the subordinate ordering. She concludes that even in early Modern English there might be a remnant from the subordinate ordering to some extent.

Iyeiri reasonably concludes as follows (77): the "*not* + finite verb" form, "which is continuous from earlier English, undergoes some adaptations as the nature of English syntax changes in early Modern English." Most would accept this as an accurate evaluation of this form. The differences between the "*not* + finite verb" in ME and the corresponding ones in early Modern English she demonstrates in this article may newly inspire generative grammarians who are interested in all matters related to negative constructions.

The fifth article is "Decline of Multiple Negation Revisited" by Hideo Nishimura. In this contribution, he reinforces Rissanen's (2000) research on multiple negation seen in legal texts ranging from later Middle to early Modern English. He put the development of nonassertive *any* and the decline of multiple negation together, and investigated the following four constructions in instructive texts as well as in legal texts using the Helsinki Corpus: Type A-1 "*not ... no*", Type A-2 "*not ... any*", Type B-1 "*no ... no*", and Type B-2 "*no ... any*". The results of his investigation denote that in legal texts the avoidance of multiple negation is almost established as early as the fifteenth century (87-88), but in instructive texts multiple negation seems to be used in later periods (91), though the

number of the occurrences of negative constructions is few in this genre (90).  From this examination of the Helsinki Corpus, the author has concluded that legal texts would have helped develop the concept of avoiding multiple negation, but instructive texts would not.

Reading his article, my personal interest in this topic was raised as to how medical writing played a part in accelerating the avoidance of multiple negation.  People might expect medical writing to be entirely instructive, but Taavitsainen (2004) divided medical texts into three textual variations (commentaries, compilations, and the question-answer formulae) and illustrates their differences in discourse.  There might be some interesting differences even within the genre of medical writing.  In the same volume, Jones (2004) also observes that dissemination of medical knowledge depends on the density of the "discourse community" that handled a particular manuscript group.  Considering all these together, we cannot deny the possibility that some differences in the avoidance of multiple negation might be seen in smaller sections of one genre or discourse communities.

The final contribution in Part I is Fujio Nakamura's "A History of the Negative Interrogative *do* in Seventeenth- to Nineteenth Century Diaries and Correspondence".  In his introduction (93), he points out that though many studies have been made on negative interrogative *do*, little attention has been given to similar problems in the late Modern English.  According to Nakaura (95), the negative interrogative with *do* becomes manifest around the end of the fourteenth century, is frequently seen during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, and becomes more prevalent than *do*-less simple negative interrogatives.  After briefly summarizing the development of negative interrogative *do*, Nakamura introduces Tieken (1987) as the only previous study which examined *do* in the eighteenth century.  Tieken (1987) asserts, from his investigation of eighteenth-century *do*-less constructions, that differences from the previous period regarding *do*-less interrogatives with a pronominal or a noun phrase subject cannot be seen in informative prose.  However they are seen in letters (95).  She also says that *do*-less negative questions have not disappeared from the spoken language of the eighteenth century but are rare, and that the number of *do*-less negative questions might have decreased in the latter half of the eighteenth century (95, 96).

Nakamura sets out to reinforce Tieken's investigation on *do*-less constructions in the eighteenth century.  His purposes are: "(1) to set forth how late Modern English underwent a systemic simplification resulting in the *do*-NI (negative interrogative with *do*); (2) to show what verbs continued to take the SNI (simple negative interrogative); and (3) to

clarify what linguistic contexts adhered to it" (96). He investigated 97 collections, 129 volumes of primarily private diaries and personal correspondence mainly from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including several texts from the seventeenth and twentieth centuries.

Showing the occurrences of the SNI and the *do*-NI per quarter of a century in a table (Table 7, p. 99), Nakamura states that the table supports Ellegård (1953: 161-162) which infers that the establishment of negative interrogative *do* was speeded up by the development of auxiliary functions of *do*, and that the *do*-NI would have dominated over SNI in late Modern English (99). SNI only occurs twice in his table, one in 1675-1699 and the other in 1725-1749. In Section 4, Nakamura shows that they are both written by clergymen and may therefore be considered as archaisms. His assertion here seems to be very reasonable. Therefore, reviewing his table again, it seems possible to place the establishment of negative interrogative *do* a bit earlier, because his table does not show any occurrence of the contemporary use except for those archaic instances even in the seventeenth century. However, his corpus does not include many texts from the seventeenth century, while Ellegård has found four SNI instances in 1650-1700. It might be useful for scholars to pursue more extensive research on seventeenth-century negative interrogatives according to Nakamura's method and look closely into the SNI instances at the very end of the seventeenth century.

## 3. Summaries and Comments on the Contributions Mainly from Synchronic Viewpoints

The first contribution in Part II is "Negative Concord in British English Dialects" by Lieselotte Anderwald. It is an excellent work which connects the dialectal distribution of multiple negation in Present-day English and the development of multiple negation avoidance to language contact in the course of the history of English. The historiography on multiple negation is summarized in her introduction and the two corpora she used for research are described in her second section: the subsamples of representative present-day spoken British English in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Freiburg English Dialect Corpus (FRED), which is a newly compiled corpus for dialectal studies at Freiburg University. She then arranges the occurrence of multiple negation in each BNC dialectal code and its ratio against the total possible occurrence in a table (Table 1,

p. 118).　The result shows that multiple negation can be seen in all the dialect areas[3] and that the South of England showed a higher ratio than the North and Midlands, though the author notes that the BNC lacks the homogeneity between data in sub-samples according to dialectal codes.　Anderwald also searched the FRED using the same method as in the BNC and showed that, in the FRED also, multiple negation was seen in all dialect areas and the occurrence rate became higher towards the South.

　　After discussing the actual use of multiple negation in non-standard speech, Anderwald moves on to examine the reason multiple negation is used persistently and quotes Jespersen's functional explanation (128, Jespersen (1917: 71)) that logically one negative is not enough to express that the clause is negative, because extensive memory is needed to recall negation, especially in the case of long sentences.　Jespersen's observation reminds us that the actual uses of human languages are constrained by our physical abilities and do not always have the logically most efficient structure.　Anderwald states that only Germanic languages disallow multiple negation and that regarding this point they are in the minority in European languages.　She also refers to Haspelmath (1997: 202) who says that languages which do not permit multiple negation form "a contiguous area from Iceland and the Alps" and attributes the contiguous distribution to Latin influence.　However, in her first section, Anderwald introduces recent research which found that even before the rise of prescriptive grammars, which were often influenced by Latin grammar, the decline of multiple negation had already started.　The attribution to Latin influence cannot explain its decline before the rise of prescriptive grammars nor the disproportion between the North and South.　Anderwald provides definite answers to these difficult questions.　She asserts that the change is due to the influence of Old Norse.　Its precursor Common Scandinavian had preverbal *ne* and multiple negation, but in Old Norse, preverbal *ne* had already become formulaic and only occurred in poetry, weakened and finally became lost, while a postverbal negative marker, which originally appeared as a reinforcement, had developed as the sentence negator (131, 132).　In Scandinavian languages, preverbal *ne* was lost much earlier than in English.　Anderwald concludes that English was influenced by Old Norse before the rise of prescriptive grammars, therefore the decline of multiple negation starts earlier than previous studies'

---

3　There is no occurrence of multiple negation in Humberside, but the author excludes the data of Humberside in the BNC since the informants in Humberside seem to speak standard English (118, 122).

estimations and that the regional disproportion is a remnant from the language contact with Old Norse in the North.

Anderwald's contribution, which is based on her previous work (Anderwald, 2002), should really be placed between Parts I and II. It has ideal structure and content as a modern historical linguistic study. It combines the synchronic geographical distribution of multiple negation in English with diachronic changes in negative constructions and with language contacts, appropriately picking up reliable data from previous studies and explaining why the English negative construction has evolved and why Present-day English shows such a distribution in informal speech.

The second article in Part II is "*No, nay, never*: Negation in Tyneside English" contributed by Joan C. Beal and Karen P. Corrigan. They investigated some characteristics in the Tyneside dialect using the Newcastle Electronic Corpus of Tyneside English (NECTE) whose compilation had not been completed when they prepared this article and on which they themselves were working. The NECTE consists of two sub-corpora: the Tyneside Linguistic Survey (TLS) and the Phonological Variation and Change (PVC). After they introduce the differences between preverbal negative and postverbal negatives, and between contracted and uncontracted negative markers in syntactic attributes (142, 143), the authors searched the NECTE pilot version for some patterns of non-standard usage in Tyneside English.

First, the authors investigate the use of *never* as a punctual negator, which is non-standard, and show two examples of its use from the NECTE. Second, they review Anderwald (2002) and explore the NECTE for multiple negation. In the NECTE only three speakers use multiple negation, all male, working class and with schooling only to the legal school age. From this fact, the authors conclude that these three informants are comparatively not influenced by the prescriptive stigmatization of multiple negation nor inhibited by the interview situation (147). In this section on multiple negation, they question Anderwald's (2002: 113) description on Tyneside English as "a region that has played a particularly innovative role (in linguistic terms) in recent times", in short, they suspect that the region might not be "innovative". Anderwald uses the same expression in her contribution in this volume (125). If she used rather neutral expressions to say that this region is different from neighboring areas, it would not have mattered. Beal and Corrigan concluded that the use of multiple negation depends on social factors rather than regional distribution (147).

Thirdly, the authors investigated the patterns of auxiliary contraction and non-contraction in Tyneside English. In Standard English, the non-contracted forms are used for emphasis, but in Tyneside English they are used without emphatic stress (148). The same three speakers who use multiple negation also use unemphatic *cannot* in their speech (148). In Tyneside English, auxiliary contraction with *be, have, shall, should, will* and *would* is also used. The contracted forms of *will/shall* and *would/should* are ambiguous, but they are regarded as contractions with *will/would*, according to Beal's (1993: 194) assertion that *shall* and *should* are rarely used in Tyneside. The authors summarize opinions in previous studies: Hughes & Trudgill (1996: 15) on the use of negative or auxiliary contraction regard the choices as distinct between these varieties, but Tagliamonte & Smith (2002: 276) and Anderwald (2002: 76-77) do not recognize the difference between northern and southern dialects. Tagliamonte & Smith state that the distribution of the dialectal preference for auxiliary contraction shows a continuity between the North-East and Scotland (149). The authors also introduce from previous studies the observations that contraction with *be* shows different complexions from other auxiliaries and that in tag questions only negative contraction takes place. Then the authors show the contracted patterns with each auxiliary verb in detail (149-152) referring to the examination of previous studies. They summarize that, in the North-East, *will* prefers auxiliary contraction though *would* takes negative contraction, and that *have* and *be* adopt negative contraction in interrogative constructions.

Finally, the authors examine the choice of contracted or uncontracted forms in interrogative constructions including tag questions (152, 153). The use of contracted and uncontracted negatives in tag questions in Tyneside English is summarized as follows: In tag questions added to negative clauses, the **auxiliary + subject + *not*** form follows the main clause for information seeking and **auxiliary + *n't* + subject + *not*** form for confirmation; in tag questions added to positive clauses, the **auxiliary + subject + *not*** form follows the main clause for information seeking and the **auxiliary + *n't* + subject** form for confirmation.

The next contribution is a rather short article written by Naohiro Takizawa, "A Corpus-based Study of the *haven't NP* Pattern in American English". In this contribution, he researches the negative constructions of the lexical verb *have* in American English, using the Bank of English. According to grammar books such as Quirk et al. (1985) and Swan (1995), the lexical verb *have* in British English has two negative forms, *haven't* and

*don't have*, but American English has only one form, *don't have*. Takizawa shows that actually there are two forms even in American English and summarizes previous studies on this topic. He shows that many scholars notice the *haven't* form in American English and that, for example, Fodor & Smith (1978) state that the *haven't NP* pattern in American English takes only an indefinite NP. Kashino (1993) has found conflicting examples with Fodor & Smith (1978) with definite NP and also Biber et al. (1999) has compiled statistics which illustrate that the "*haven't* + definite NP" is used more than the "*haven't* + indefinite NP" pattern in American English (160-162). Takizawa pays attention to comments in Biber et al. (1999) which say that the *haven't NP* pattern occurs in certain collocations, and produces results from the American English subcorpora and the British English subcorpora in the Bank of English.

The results of his research show that, both in American English and British English, the "haven't the faintest, foggiest, slightest, vaguest (idea)" pattern (Pattern 1) is most eminent, subsequently the "haven't a clue" pattern (Pattern 2), the "haven't the N (courage, heart, strength, wit) (to VP)" pattern (Pattern 3), the "haven't any N (choice, comment, idea, intention, plans)" pattern (Pattern 4), and the "haven't (the) time" pattern (Pattern 5). No significant differences can be seen between British English and American English (168). In addition to this search, he carries out a search on the *have no N* pattern and illustrates the frequent nouns in this pattern again both in British English and American English. He testifies that the *have no idea* pattern is most frequent and the *haven't an idea* pattern is not. He does not recognize significant differences between American English and British English in this regard either (169-170).

The penultimate article in this volume is "Negation in African American Vernacular English" by Darin Howe. Just below the title and author's name, quotations with multiple negatives such as from the rap musician Tupac Shakur known as 2Pac and Muhammad Ali, are neatly exhibited. The author starts the introduction of his article mainly on a negative form *ain't* and negative concord, in other words, multiple negation, both of which are characteristically observed in African American Vernacular English (AAVE) as well as in other kinds of non-standard English. After an introduction to AAVE, the author begins to treat the *ain't* negative form. In his third section, first, he discusses the use of *ain't* used for *have* + *not* in the present tense. He illustrates that in earlier African American English (AAE) this alternation was favored more than in present-day AAVE. As contrasted with present tense, *have* + *not* in past tense, in other words, *hadn't* is not replaced

by *ain't* in earlier AAE and in modern AAVE though previous studies[4] report this kind of alternation in ex-slave narratives and in Southern European American English vernacular (SEAV) (179). Next, the author shows that *ain't* alternates with negative *be* in the present tense whether it is auxiliary or copula. This replacement is strongly favored in AAVE (178). In early AAE, this replacement was favored next to that for *have + not*. However, the replacement for *be + not* in the past tense is rarely seen in modern AAVE, though it is seen in African Nova Scotian English, always in the form of "... *ain't* ... *like* ... *VERB (present tense)* ... *now*" (180). In association with this, the author shows that in early AAE *weren't* is leveled to *wasn't*, and quotes Wolfram (2003) that illustrates that whichever type of levelling, *was* levelling or *were* levelling, is favored, is reversed between African Americans and European American and also differentiated by their age levels within each ethnic group (181, 182). The author also mentions that another form for *be + not* in past tense, *won't*, was developed in some AAVE varieties and that these dialects also prefer *weren't* levelling. Following the replacement with *be + not*, the author deals with *do + not* replaced by *ain't*. Here he refers to Weldon (1994), who states that *ain't* can be used for *do + not* in the present tense only in cases followed by *got* in modern AAVE. The author also shows that, in early AAE, *do + not* in the present tense is only rarely replaced by *ain't* (182) and that especially in its variations where *ain't* is strongly connected to another negative form, *ain't* rarely replaces *do + not*. With regard to the past tense *do + not*, that is, *didn't*, its replacement by *ain't* only takes place in AAVE. He shows that it can seldom be seen in early AAE and takes this alternation as a recent development (187).

In his fourth section, Howe discusses negative concord. He divides negative concord into two types: with indefinites and with verbs. He says that negative concord with indefinites is almost categorical in AAVE (189). It is the same in earlier AAE. With regard to negative concord with indefinites, the author refers to Labov's (1972: 806) interpretation that what is inherent in *no* involved in negative concord is not " NEG + *a*" but "NEG + *any*" (190), and shows its counter examples from AAVE, that is, examples regarded as equivalent to "NEG + *a*" (190, 191). Following this, the author shows that negative concord works across clauses in both types. Negative concord across clauses is often seen in neg-raising constructions, but the environment is not necessary. The author also refers to negative postposing as a related issue to negative concord with indefi-

---

4 E.g., Schneider (1989) and Feagin (1978).

nites (193, 194). This also works across clauses. The author cites the verbs often involved in negative postposing and states that negative postposing is seen in all types of earlier AAE (194). In contrast, negative concord with verbs is not obligatory either in earlier or modern AAE. The author deduces that it is not obligatory because it is competing with negative inversion (195). He asserts that the inverted indefinite subject remains in VP-internal position for the reason that negative inversion takes place in relative clauses, in embedded clauses, and in clauses with the expletive subject *there* (196, 197).

In his contribution, he quotes examples mainly from rap and says in his second section to explain AAVE, "In general, the rapper is considered authentic, hence acceptable, only to the extent that he/she is able to narrate personal (often harrowing) experiences of ghetto life in fluent AAVE" though he admits that its 'performative nature' is problematic (175). The quotations from rap are indeed very interesting, but probably we should be circumspect in dealing with them because they are rhythmic lyrics. Rap is heavily rhythmical and rhymes great deal. These characteristics might affect the result of investigation in some topics.

The final article is "Subjective Meaning of *Except*-linkage in Present-day English in Comparison with *Including*" by Mitsumi Uchida. It does not treat negative construction directly; rather, it treats a functionally related item, *except*-linkage and its apparently antonymic *including*. First, the author introduces the differences of the words' etymological backgrounds. The preposition *except* is a loanword from Latin in the Middle English period, and the quasi-preposition *including* developed much later from the participle of the verb *include* (206). Uchida acknowledges some signs on the early stages of grammaticalization in some uses of *except*-linkage, which Traugott (2003: 638-642) gives: reduction of syntactic constraints, extension from referential meaning to subjective meaning, and extension of scope. Uchida also finds, utilizing the four corpora, the Brown, LOB, FROWN and FLOB,[5] that *including* occurs much more frequently in informative texts but the occurrences of *except* does not denote the same tendency.

Before getting behind the differences in their frequencies in informative and imaginative texts, Uchida explains the fundamental structure of *except*-linkage referring to previous studies. Quirk et al. (1985) state that, in the structure of [NP1 except NP2], the NP1

---

5 These are the Brown Corpus, the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English, the Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English, and Freiburg-LOB corpus of British English in the ICAME collection.

must involve "an item of absolute meaning", and Uchida states that the two entities of NP1 and NP2 should actually be propositions. She also points out that the two entities which Quirk et al. (1985) call NP1 and NP2 can be prepositional phrases, adjectival phrases, *that*-clauses, bare infinitival, to-infinitival, gerund-participial, interrogatives, and subjunctive clauses, quoting examples from Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 642-643). She gives examples to show that the complements of *except* are often "matrix-licensed"; the main clause expresses "an overt proposition" and the complement of *except* bears "a covert proposition" which is interpreted by referring to the overt proposition (211, 212).

Following this, the author starts her analyses of actual examples of *except*-linkage to show their pragmatic aspects. She demonstrates that there are non-matrix licensed types of *except*-linkage. Here the second proposition cannot be reconstructed directly from the first proposition (213). In order to reconstruct the second proposition properly, in some cases, we have to reinterpret the first proposition based on "the real-world situation". An example she found is shown as (1):[6]

(1)  The room was empty *except for* a table, four wooden chairs and a big safe. (WBOL ukbooks)

In some cases, we cannot use even "the real-world situation" and the addressee has to take the *except*-linkage as being based on the addresser's belief:

(2)  . . . they were both handsome fellows, except for their eyes, slit vertically like those of a cat, and their long ears, as delicately curled as seashells. (WBOL ukbooks)

Uchida calls this type of *except*-linkage "subjective". In this type, she recognizes some signs of the early stages of grammaticalization, reduction of structural constraint, extension to subjective references to the main proposition, and scope increase (216). The following example, which is one of the independent *except* phrases, is noteworthy:

(3)  All her credit cards scattered on to the platform. *Except* she didn't pick them up. (sunnow)

---

6  Examples (1) to (4) are Uchida's examples (15), (17), (31) and (19) respectively.

She comments that *except* in this example almost serves as *but*, a coordinative, and that *except* might be on the way to another grammaticalization.

All of her analyses of examples of *except*-linkage seem natural and convincing except for a comment on one example of the subjective types exhibiting the addresser's belief, which is regarded as less common:

    (4)  An easy vegetable to grow for summer or winter, except that the summer variety bolts in hot weather . . . . (WBOL ukbooks)

The author says that this sentence "signals that the writer considers bolting of vegetables a considerable difficulty" (213), but another view is that the writer just takes bolting of the vegetable as unwelcome, contrasted with the ease of growing the vegetable generally, and this belief sounds quite common to me, though such a slight difference in the interpretation of this example does not alter the validity of the conclusion of this article.

In the fourth section, Uchida goes back to the differences in the frequencies of *including* and *except* in informative and imaginative texts. She searches Collins Wordbanks Online (WBOL), divides the data into two, more information-oriented and less information-oriented texts, and counts the frequencies of these phrases per million words. The result shows that *including* appears much more frequently in the more information-oriented texts. Next, she separates the *except* examples according to the complements, and counts the frequencies again in less information-oriented texts and in more information-oriented texts respectively. She notices that the occurrences of *except* accompanied by "for", "that-clause" and "bare (that-less) clause" are significantly more frequent in the less information-oriented texts and these complements cannot be accompanied by *including*. Uchida reasonably concludes that these forms which are unique to *except* raised the number of occurrences of *except* in the less-informative genre.

## 4.　Concluding Remarks

This volume shows a variety of aspects related to negation. It is provocative in the sense that it suggests new topics for theoretical studies. One diachronic model of a constructional development was dismissed in Ohkado's contribution, and the vicissitudes of some constructions were modified in some articles, including Iyeiri's. These two articles

in particular provide new topics for theoretical studies. Some of the other articles compiled in this volume tackle challenging areas that have not received sufficient attention to date. We should expect further reports from the authors themselves and from their subsequent generations of scholars.

The real appeal of this volume is in its structure, which combines synchronic and diachronic aspects of negation. Such synchronic aspects as geographical or language-internal distributions of related forms and the existence of various forms to carry out a certain function are interrelated to diachronic aspects in ways that are familiar to historical linguists, but are often, or usually, treated separately. Here we may enjoy the happy intermingling of the two in a most stimulating volume.

# Acknowledgements

## Works Cited

Anderwald, Lieselotte. (2002). *Negation in Non-standard British English*. London & New York: Routledge.

Beal, Joan C. (1993). "The Grammar of Tyneside and Northumbrian English", in James Milroy and Lesley Milroy (eds.), *Real English: The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles*. London: Longman. 187–213.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Ellegård, Alvar. (1953). *The Auxiliary "Do": The Establishment and Regulation of Its Use in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Feagin, Crawford. (1979). *Variation and Change in Alabama English: A Socio-linguistic Study of the White Community*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Press.

Fodor, Janet Dean & Mary R. Smith. (1978). "What Kind of Expression Is *Have Got*?". *Linguistic Inquiry* 9. 45–66.

Haspelmath, Martin. (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, Arthur & Peter Trudgill. (1996). *English Accents and Dialects*. London: Arnold.

Iyeiri, Yoko. (2001). *Negative Constructions in Middle English*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press.

Jack, George. (1999). "Negative Contraction in Old English Verse". *Review of English Studies* 50. 133–154.

Jespersen, Otto. (1917). *Negation in English and Other Languages*. Historisk-Filologiske Meddelelser I.5. Copenhagen: Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.

Jones, Claire. (2004). "Discourse Communities And Medical Texts", in Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.). *Medical And Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kashino, Kenji. (1993). *Imiron kara Mita Goho (English Usage from the Viewpoint of Semantics)*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Kemenade, Ans van. (2000). "Jespersen's Cycle Revisited: Formal Properties of Grammaticalization", in Susan Pinzuk, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner (eds.). *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 51–74.

Kemenade, Ans van. (2002). "Word Order in Old English Prose and Poetry: The Position of Finite Verbs and Adverbs", in Donka Minkova & Robert Stockwell (eds.). *Studies in the History of the English Language: A Millennial Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 355–371.

Kitson, Peter. (2002). "Topography, Dialect, and the Relation of Old English Psalter-Glosses (I)". *English Studies* 83. 474–503.

Kitson, Peter. (2003). "Topography, Dialect, and the Relation of Old English Psalter-Glosses (II)". *English Studies* 84. 9–32.

Labov, William. (1972). "Negative Attraction and Negative Concord in English Grammar". *Language* 48. 773–818.

Laing, Margaret. (2002). "Corpus-provoked Questions about Negation in Early Middle English". *Linguistic Sciences* 24. 297–321.

Mitchell, Bruce. (1985). *Old English Syntax*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morrell, Minnie C. (1965). *A Manual of Old English Biblical Materials*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Rissanen, Matti. (2000). "Standardisation and the Language of Early Statutes", in Laura Wright (ed.). *The Development of Standard English 1300-1800: Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 117–130.

Schneider, Edgar W. (1989). *American Earlier Black English: Morphological and Syntactic Variables*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Swan, Michael. (1995). *Practical English Usage*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taavitsainen, Irma. (2004). "Transferring Classical Discourse Convention into the Vernacular", in Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.). *Medical and Scientific Writing in Late Medieval English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tagliamonte, Sali & Jennifer Smith. (2002). "'Either It Isn't or It's Not' NEG/AUX Contraction in British Dialects". *English World-Wide* 23:2. 251–281.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. (1987). *The Auxiliary "Do" in Eighteenth-century English: A Sociohistorical-linguistic Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. (2003). "Constructions in Grammaticalization", in Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.). *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 624–647.

Weldon, Tracey. (1994). "Variability in Negation in African American Vernacular English". *Language Variation and Change* 6. 359–397.