Problems of the Partial Negation and English Usage

—Part III Survey and Conclusion—

Karen Miyahata

英語用法における部分否定の問題（III）

—調査と結論—

宮　畑　カレン

本論の第３部「調査と結論」は、大正時代の日本において考案され1950年代の終わりまで教えられていた英文法の「部分否定」に関する研究の最終章である。

実地調査としてアメリカ、イギリス、カナダ、オーストラリア、ニュージーランドの英語を母国語とする５カ国で、質問形式の筆記によるアンケートと聞き取り調査を実施した。この調査で、基本的に第１部（『藝術』22号）で論じた日本におけるような部分否定の言葉も法則も、英語圏の国々には存在しないことが立証された。第２部（『藝術』27号）では、英語を母国語とする人々が、実際この否定文をどのように指導されたかを調べるために、英米で出版された辞書、文法書、語法辞典を精査した。その結果、具体的な法則は見付からず、“not all” の形だけが絶対的な部分否定として認められた。

部分否定が日本において公式化された理由の一つとして、シェークスピアの有名な文である “All that glisters is not gold.” の影響が考えられる。この文には二つの意味が含まれていて “Not all that glisters is gold.” の部分否定と “Gold does not glister.” の全体否定であるが、前者が一般的に正しい意味として解釈されている。それゆえ、この法則の大前提は慣用語法の多い “All...not” の形であり、次にその論理的推論として “not...all” の形で “I don't want all of them.” = “I want some of them.” そして “not...both” の形で “I don't want both of them.” = “I want one of them.” と考えられる。しかしながら、この法則は “It didn't rain all day.” の文のように部分否定も全体否定も同等に潜在している問題も抱えている。

この法則の有効性を調べるために、アンケートの質問として “all” を含む否定文と “both” を含む否定文の二種類の例文を幾つか提示した。例えば “All flights were not cancelled.” や “I didn’t understand all of it.” そして “I don’t need both.” のような文であるが、最初の文の意味の解釈として、全体否定の “No flight was cancelled.” か、部分否定の “Not all flights were cancelled.” か、あるいはその「どちらともとれる」のいずれとして受け取れるかを質問した。さらに別の選択として、もしその文が非文法的か、あるいは単に奇妙な印象を受けたと感じるならば “Faulty Construction” をチェックするようにも質問した。その結果、すべての文にはさまざまな解釈の個人的違いが存在した。その理由として、このような解釈は文法的法則によってではなく文脈によって導かれるものだったからである。“both” を含む否定文は “all” を含む否定文より更なる混乱があったので、北イングランドとスコットランドで “Both are not available.” と “I can’t come on both days.” と “I don’t need both.” の三

つの文だけで聞き取り調査を行った。結果は、これらの地方の主に若いグループの間で、この文を圧倒的に全体否定として解釈した。

最終的にすべてのデータによって以下の五つの結論が導き出された。1）調査の結果は、第2部の論文内容と一致した。2）否定文に関する文法教育の放置。3）部分否定の法則の必然的消滅。―この法則は全くの間違いではなく、一部は正しかった。4）規範文法に対して記述文法が優位に立つ。5）言葉の乱れ。―すべての場合において年配者のグループは若者のグループより英語能力が高く、過去における英語教育のほうが良かったと考えられる。

最後に友人から、漢文には明確な完全否定と部分否定の読み方があり、それが日本において部分否定が公式化された大きな理由の一つではないかと指摘されたが、今後の興味を引く課題である。

"Part III Survey and Conclusion" is the final and conclusive segment of what has proven to be a long and painstaking research project undertaken over many years. Painstaking because any investigation of English usage and particularly one based on the data of the spoken language require extensive fieldwork. In my case the pressing need was to find out how native speakers of English do actually negate *all* and *both* in their daily lives and this meant going out and reaching them by the only two means possible: the written and the oral. The planning began in 1997 and was presented two years later as "Part I Definition and Method" in this same journal[1]. The preliminary gathering of published sources was completed and appeared, likewise in this same journal, as "Part II Prescriptive and Descriptive Evidence" in 2004[2]. Simultaneously the first stage of the fieldwork was being conducted in five different English-speaking countries: questionnaires were being distributed and collected from early 2000 into 2003. The second stage of the survey, the oral survey, covered north England and Scotland, two areas not represented by the questionnaires, and required two trips abroad in 2004 and in 2005. Since the outset of this project almost a decade has elapsed with long periods of pause between the three integral parts and for this reason it is necessary to recapitulate what has been said in the preceding parts about the problematic nature of the partial negation.

I. Recapitulation

It was said in Part I that the partial negation was once taught in Japan as an important rule in the instruction of negation in English grammar. The term of partial negation embodied the rule that the universal indefinites *all*, *both*, and other absolute words such as *every*, *always* and the like, when used in a negative sentence, conveyed the meaning of a partial negation. For example, the sentences "All is not lost," means that some things are lost, and "You can't have both," means, "You can have one." Logical enough, but what about the nursery rhyme that all native speakers learn before they even go to school, "All the king's horses and all the king's men could not put Humpty Dumpty together again"; and the expression that was popular in late Victorian England: "not for all the tea in China"; and a common everyday utterance like: "I haven't seen him all week"? As all of the sentences above are total negations the rule was obviously flawed and questions immediately surfaced as to the origin of this rule, the who, where, when, and why. Equally compelling was the question why, despite its logical resonances, it could not be applied systematically to every negated sentence. Two essential preliminaries were presented in "Part I." First, the affirmation that neither the term nor the rule exists in British or American English. This fact was established after having searched through many sources, dictionaries, grammars, and

guides to usage, dating from the late 19th century to the present day. The negative evidence led to the premise that the partial negation was conceived and formulated in Japan.

The second task was to investigate Japanese sources to find out when and by whom the rule was formulated. The term could not be found in Japanese publications of the late Meiji or Taisho Eras. The first mention of the partial negation appeared in the early Showa Era, in 1932, in *Practical English Grammar* of Hidezaburo Saito, a well-known English scholar of the period. He begins with *all* and *both* at the head of the sentence: "All my brothers are not at home" = not all are; "Both my parents are not living" = one is. Following as a logical corollary are: "All the students are here. I do not know all of them." = "I know some of them"; "Both the brothers are here. I do not know both." = "I know only one of them."[3] This instruction of the partial negation, which in hindsight could be called "the old school", prevailed for more than twenty years until the mid 1950s and in some cases well into the 1960s when we notice in the school grammars a definite phasing out of the first construction with a strong reaffirmation of *not...all*, and *not...both*. In the third phase most high school and university grammars have eliminated even the second construction and have kept only the word order *not all*, *not every*, *not always*, as meaning partial negation. These textbooks are apparently well-informed because the highly questionable *not both* has been rightly omitted. The evolution is complete. Within a span of sixty years the partial negation has lost all its force as a rule and exists merely as a convenient term.

The above findings led inevitably to the questions why was there a need to formulate such a rule? and was the progressive phasing out of the tenets of such a rule justifiable? More than the first question the second posed enormous difficulties because to my knowledge grammar had taught only that the converse of *all* was *no*, *none*, or *any*, and that of *both* was *neither*, with no specific rules on the negated universal indefinites. Investigating the problematic nature of the partial negation thus opened up whole new areas for research in English grammar and usage. If no such rule existed what was the received instruction, in other words, what guidelines do native speakers have regarding this aspect of negation? How do native speakers actually use and interpret negated *alls* and *boths* in their daily lives? Assuredly a survey was needed, not only to test the validity of the rule but also to explore its possibilities and it became the subject of "Part III." The received instruction was presented in "Part II Prescriptive and Descriptive Evidence." This entailed an investigation of the principal categories of published writing on the English language, dictionaries, grammars and guides to usage. The sources were both British and American, the earliest being a grammar of 1860, and the latest the most recent comprehensive grammar of 2002. The guiding light in organizing this vast amount of material to be examined was the distinction between prescriptivism and descriptivism, that is to say, between that approach to language which prescribes rules, telling what is regarded as correct in a language and that which describes objectively only how a language actually is. Instruction on the negation of *all* and *both* emerged from both prescriptive and descriptive sources with surprisingly more important insights coming from the latter. Although "Part II" was divided into three parts, dictionaries, grammars, and guides to usage, I will, for ease of reference, regroup and summarize only the essential points of that inquiry that have a direct bearing on the survey.

The first construction, the emphatic *All...not* is the only construction to receive abundant documentation. To be sure it has glorious historical precedents in English literature because of the great names that have penned it: Shakespeare's "All that glisters is not gold"; Thackeray's "All England did not possess his peer"; Byron's "But all men are not born to reign." Traditional sources of the 1930s, notably the *Oxford English Dictionary* and the scholarly reference grammars of

Jespersen, Poutsma, and Curme, all use such literary quotations as example sentences albeit with no remark on the interpretation of their negated senses. Context alone appears to be the key to understanding. Traditional guides to usage as well, from the 1930s and even until the 1960s all quote this construction, but for the first time they comment on this, in Fowler's words, "unrecommended structure", saying that it can be interpreted as a partial or total negation and thus it is better to avoid the ambiguity by using *No* or *None* for total negations. The recent descriptive grammars give the same advice only with a different wording: *All...not* to mean a total negation is "relatively infrequent" and *No* or *None* are "strongly preferred."

The construction *Both...not* on the other hand has no historical precedents and appears nowhere in the written language, past or present. The deep implication of this negative evidence is that it is unconventional. It would perhaps be far-fetched to call it ungrammatical in view of the fact that it is a legitimate sentence and so a better suited term would be that of *faulty construction*. Mention of *Both...not* appeared quite exceptionally in only two instances. In the small category of usage manuals specializing in correcting common grammatical errors, all four advise not to use *Both are not* for *Neither is*. In the second instance, however, two reliable descriptive sources, one American and the other British, said that in the informal, conversational language *Both are not* is taken to mean *Neither is*.[4]

There is very little to say for *not...all* and *not...both* because except for the most recent descriptive grammars there is no instruction at all. These have stated that just as *All...not* can have two interpretations, *not...all* and *not...both* can have two interpretations depending on intonation.[5]

As for the word orders *not all* and *not both*, according to all of the sources, *not all* is the only structure that is unconditionally a partial negation. *Not both* is not mentioned anywhere except for one valuable elucidation in a grammar of 2002: "Although *all* permits modification, *both* excludes it; *almost both*, *not both* are ungrammatical." Therefore the sentence "Not both of them succeeded" would be inadmissible.[6]

II. Survey

A. Written – Questionnaire

The aim of the questionnaire was to obtain statistics from which I could draw conclusions on two aspects. Do the results of the survey conform with such guidelines as were revealed in the prescriptive and descriptive evidence? Based on these findings conclusions could be made as to the validity of the rule from the time that it was formulated through the subsequent changes that it underwent, and finally as to the question "were Japanese scholars justified in abandoning the rule but in keeping the term, which is very much present in textbooks and dictionaries today?"

The questionnaire consisted of two lists of negated sentences, the first composed of *all*-negated and the second *both*-negated. These sentences came from spoken English, in other words, informal usage and not formal, written English. The surveyed were asked to interpret the negated meanings of each sentence and they were to check one of the following: *Partial negation*, *Total negation*, or *Both*, meaning that it could be one or the other, therefore ambiguous. Another option was to check *Faulty Construction* if he or she thought that the sentence was ungrammatical, or merely strange. The instructions were exemplified with sample sentences in the following manner:

Example 1: All flights were not cancelled.

(possible interpretations)

Partial negation: Not all flights were cancelled.

Total negation: No flight was cancelled.

Both: can mean both, therefore ambiguous

Example 2: I don't need both.

(possible interpretations)

Partial negation: I need one.

Total negation: I don't need either.

Both: can mean both, therefore ambiguous

If any of these sentences sound strange to you, check F.C., standing for *Faulty Construction* and do not answer.

When the questionnaires came in and were ready to be tabulated, it came as a surprise to find sentences which were left completely blank. Did this mean that the surveyed could not answer and did not have the confidence to say that it was a faulty construction? This unexpected occurrence could not be ignored because of the statistics involved and so in the tabulations a separate column was made for these sentences, *N.A.*, meaning *No Answer*.

A little should be said on the manner in which the survey was conducted. Initially I intended to survey only Britain and the United States, but with the help of friends and acquaintances the project came to include Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The questionnaires were "farmed out", from the dictionary meaning "to turn over (as a job) for performance by another usually under contract."[7] I did not give instructions as to what kind of people to survey, only to give the participant's age group, and so it was not a controlled survey. Neither was it a random survey because as it happened the individual in charge approached not total strangers but people in his or her social milieu. Consequently the survey reflected certain groups, as far as age and educational background were concerned and this had to be taken into consideration in the conclusion. The composition of the groups was as follows.

A. United States – I alone am responsible for the questionnaires; the surveyed were predominantly between 30 and 70 years old and the majority had been to university; there were a few people in their twenties, but no one under twenty. Total surveyed were 28 people.

B. Britain – An Oxford-educated lawyer surveyed 20 people, all residents of Oxford and most of them were college-educated. The age group was mixed between 25 and 70 years; in this aspect it is very similar to the United States group.

C. Canada – A middle-aged friend who lives in a very small town in Ontario surveyed 7 people. She is a beautician and proprietor of a beauty salon and her husband is a mechanic. The age group was between 40 and 60.

D. Australia – A retired lady in her late 70s living in Perth conducted the survey. This group of 14 people is a predominantly elderly group of people in their 60s and 70s.

E. New Zealand – This group of 25 students is the only group that can be said to be controlled because the survey was conducted by a teacher at the College of Art and Design in Wanganui. The questionnaires were passed out to her students, all of them between the ages of 18 and 20. Here we have a young group having more or less the same educational background.

The results of the questionnaires are as follows. Under each negated sentence there is the country and in parenthesis the total number of people surveyed. There are five columns representing the interpretations of the negated sentences and under the total count the percentages are given in parenthesis at the bottom of each column.

1. All flights were not cancelled.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	15	6	3	2	2
Britain	(20)	12	2	4	0	2
Canada	(7)	5	0	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	11	0	2	1	0
New Zealand	(25)	9	8	3	4	1
Total	(94)	52 (55.3%)	16 (17%)	14 (14.9%)	7 (7.4%)	5 (5.3%)

2. All men cannot be trusted.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	3	21	3	1	0
Britain	(20)	4	13	2	1	0
Canada	(7)	1	6	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	1	11	2	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	3	20	2	0	0
Total	(94)	12 (12.8%)	71 (75.5%)	9 (9.6%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)

3. All his money couldn't save him.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	0	25	3	0	0
Britain	(20)	0	19	1	0	0
Canada	(7)	0	7	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	0	13	0	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	2	18	4	0	1
Total	(94)	2 (2.1%)	82 (87.2%)	8 (8.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.1%)

4. All of us can't go.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	11	10	6	1	0
Britain	(20)	12	3	3	2	0
Canada	(7)	6	1	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	8	2	3	1	0
New Zealand	(25)	10	11	4	0	0
Total	(94)	47 (50%)	27 (28.7%)	16 (17%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0%)

5. We can't all go.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	19	5	2	2	0
Britain	(20)	19	0	1	0	0
Canada	(7)	4	2	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	11	1	2	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	19	5	1	0	0
Total	(94)	72 (76.6%)	13 (13.8%)	7 (7.4%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)

6. They don't like all foreigners.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	11	11	4	2	0
Britain	(20)	12	5	2	1	0
Canada	(7)	2	3	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	3	4	4	3	0
New Zealand	(25)	8	12	5	0	0
Total	(94)	36 (38.3%)	35 (37.2%)	17 (18.1%)	6 (6.4%)	0 (0%)

7. I didn't understand all of it.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	18	3	4	3	0
Britain	(20)	20	0	0	0	0
Canada	(7)	6	0	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	10	2	2	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	14	5	5	1	0
Total	(94)	68 (72.3%)	10 (10.6%)	12 (12.8%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0%)

8. We don't have all of the colors.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	20	2	5	1	0
Britain	(20)	15	3	0	1	1
Canada	(7)	7	0	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	13	1	0	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	10	13	2	0	0
Total	(94)	65 (69.1%)	19 (20.2%)	7 (7.4%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.1%)

9. We all decided not to go.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	0	28	0	0	0
Britain	(20)	0	20	0	0	0
Canada	(7)	0	7	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	0	14	0	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	2	21	2	0	0
Total	(94)	2 (2.1%)	90 (95.7%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

10. Don't put all your eggs in one basket.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	14	13	1	0	0
Britain	(20)	13	6	0	0	1
Canada	(7)	3	4	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	4	6	3	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	6	18	0	0	1
Total	(94)	40 (42.6%)	47 (50%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.2%)

11. It didn't rain all day.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	8	18	2	0	0
Britain	(20)	6	11	3	0	0
Canada	(7)	0	5	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	4	6	4	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	11	9	5	0	0
Total	(94)	29 (30.9%)	49 (52.1%)	16 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

12. It hasn't rained all day.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	5	22	1	0	0
Britain	(20)	0	15	5	0	0
Canada	(7)	4	2	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	3	8	3	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	3	21	1	0	0
Total	(94)	15 (16%)	68 (72.3%)	11 (11.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

13. I couldn't sleep all night.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	4	20	4	0	0
Britain	(20)	2	12	6	0	0
Canada	(7)	0	7	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	1	10	3	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	5	15	5	0	0
Total	(94)	12 (12.8%)	64 (68.1%)	18 (19.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

14. He didn't stay all day.

USA	(28)	20	4	3	1	0
Britain	(20)	13	3	3	1	0
Canada	(7)	5	1	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	9	3	1	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	14	8	3	0	0
Total	(94)	61 (64.9%)	19 (20.2%)	11 (11.7%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.1%)

15. I haven't seen her all morning.

USA	(28)	1	25	1	0	1
Britain	(20)	1	19	0	0	0
Canada	(7)	2	5	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	2	11	1	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	4	19	2	0	0
Total	(94)	10 (10.6%)	79 (84%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)

16. Didn't you want all of them?

USA	(28)	6	21	1	0	0
Britain	(20)	9	9	2	0	0
Canada	(7)	3	2	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	4	4	6	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	8	13	4	0	0
Total	(94)	30 (31.9%)	49 (52.1%)	15 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

BOTH negated: 1. I don't need both.

USA	(28)	17	1	5	1	4
Britain	(20)	14	0	3	0	3
Canada	(7)	5	1	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	11	0	3	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	14	4	4	0	3
Total	(94)	61 (64.9%)	6 (6.4%)	16 (17%)	1 (1.1%)	10 (10.6%)

2. You can't park on both sides of the street.

USA	(28)	11	10	7	0	0
Britain	(20)	11	5	2	2	0
Canada	(7)	1	5	0	1	0
Australia	(14)	5	5	3	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	16	7	2	0	0
Total	(94)	44 (46.8%)	32 (34%)	14 (14.9%)	3 (3.2%)	1 (1.1%)

3. I don't like both of them.

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
USA	(28)	4	16	5	2	1
Britain	(20)	4	12	1	3	0
Canada	(7)	1	5	0	1	0
Australia	(14)	1	10	2	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	7	13	4	1	0
Total	(94)	17 (18.1%)	56 (59.6%)	12 (12.8%)	7 (7.4%)	2 (2.1%)

4. I don't eat both fish and meat.

USA	(28)	4	16	3	5	0
Britain	(20)	5	10	2	2	1
Canada	(7)	1	3	0	3	0
Australia	(14)	5	6	2	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	10	8	3	4	0
Total	(94)	25 (26.6%)	43 (45.7%)	10 (10.6%)	14 (14.9%)	2 (2.1%)

5. You can't have both soup and salad.

USA	(28)	18	6	3	1	0
Britain	(20)	16	4	0	0	0
Canada	(7)	4	1	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	9	1	4	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	15	7	2	1	0
Total	(94)	62 (66%)	19 (20.2%)	11 (11.7%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)

6. Both of us are not invited.

USA	(28)	6	11	9	2	0
Britain	(20)	3	10	5	2	0
Canada	(7)	1	2	2	2	0
Australia	(14)	4	8	1	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	11	9	4	1	0
Total	(94)	25 (26.9%)	40 (42.6%)	21 (22.3%)	7 (7.4%)	1 (1.1%)

7. We're not both invited.

USA	(28)	16	5	4	3	0
Britain	(20)	18	0	1	1	0
Canada	(7)	6	0	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	5	5	3	0	1
New Zealand	(25)	14	4	5	2	0
Total	(94)	59 (62.8%)	14 (14.9%)	14 (14.9%)	6 (6.4%)	1 (1.1%)

8. Both he and his wife are not coming.

USA	(28)	0	28	0	0	0
Britain	(20)	1	18	1	0	0
Canada	(7)	0	5	2	0	0
Australia	(14)	2	12	0	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	4	19	2	0	0
Total	(94)	7 (7.4%)	82 (87.2%)	5 (5.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

		Partial	Total	Both	F.C.	N.A.
9. He and his wife are not both coming.						
USA	(28)	10	7	6	5	0
Britain	(20)	17	1	0	2	0
Canada	(7)	3	0	1	3	0
Australia	(14)	6	2	3	2	1
New Zealand	(25)	16	4	1	4	0
Total	(94)	52 (55.3%)	14 (14.9%)	11 (11.7%)	16 (17%)	1 (1.1%)
10. Both are not coming.						
USA	(28)	2	23	2	1	0
Britain	(20)	2	15	3	0	0
Canada	(7)	1	6	0	0	0
Australia	(14)	2	11	1	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	3	18	3	1	0
Total	(94)	10 (10.6%)	73 (77.7%)	9 (9.6%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)
11. We both decided not to change our plans.						
USA	(28)	3	25	0	0	0
Britain	(20)	1	19	0	0	0
Canada	(7)	1	5	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	0	14	0	0	0
New Zealand	(25)	4	20	0	0	1
Total	(94)	9 (9.6%)	83 (88.3%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)
12. Don't you want both?						
USA	(28)	10	14	3	1	0
Britain	(20)	7	11	1	0	1
Canada	(7)	5	1	1	0	0
Australia	(14)	5	1	6	0	2
New Zealand	(25)	3	18	3	0	1
Total	(94)	30 (31.9%)	45 (47.9%)	14 (14.9%)	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.3%)

The evaluation and analysis of the results as reflected in the statistics were made on two levels. First and foremost is the criterion of agreement, the guiding question being if any sentence received a 100% agreement in its negated sense. Subsequently the sentences were ranked according to their level of agreement and the results were compared with the prescriptive and descriptive evidence. Do they conform with the received instruction on *all* and *both*?

The answer to the guiding question is an emphatic *no*. No sentence received unanimity: the highest was 95.7% for *all*-negated and 88.3% for *both*-negated. I have ranked the sentences by their range of agreement, for *all*-negated in four groups: those between 90%-100%, then 80%-89%, 70%-79%, and 60%-69%. Anything less than 60% could be taken to be divided usage. In the case of *both* where there was notably less agreement the ranges were 80%-90%, 70%-79%, and 60%-69%.

1. *All*-negated 90%-100% range of agreement:

The highest agreement of the entire survey was sentence #9, "We all decided not to go," interpreted by 95.7% of the surveyed as a total negation. The newer descriptive grammars elucidated this point using the linguistic term *scope of negation*. The *not* negates the noun phrase *to go* and not *all*, which is clearly out of the scope of negation. It is of prime significance that consistently the highest agreement for *both* was also the sentence having exactly the same construction, "We both decided not to change our plans."

2. 80%-89% range of agreement

The second sentence having the highest percentage is "All his money couldn't save him," which 87.2% interpreted as a total negation. Here we have a contextual subtlety, the strongly implied and elliptical "not even by," a meaning that can be logically deduced by the given fact that "he was not saved" and which forces the interpretation to be a total negation. Indeed, the rephrasing "None of his money could save him," would sound strange. Native speakers are accustomed to this well-known construction: besides the nursery rhyme Humptey Dumptey, there is Shakespeare's "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand," and Thackeray's "All the money in the world will not make you happy then."

Following closely at 84% was sentence #15, "I haven't seen her all morning," interpreted as a total negation, the correctness of which can be explained grammatically. The present perfect tense means that the morning is in a state of

continuance because if it were past morning the speaker would say, “I didn’t see her this morning.” Thus, the meaning of “I haven’t seen her,” means “I still haven’t seen her,” and not, “I saw her a part of the morning.”

3. 70%-79% range of agreement

There were four sentences in this range. Sentence #5, “We can’t all go,” at 76.6% is the highest rating until now for a partial negation. Perhaps the presence of the word order *not all* in “We cannot all go,” led to this result. Following closely at 75.5% is sentence #2, “All men cannot be trusted,” interpreted as a total negation. The high rating was quite unexpected because unlike *All...not* with the elliptical meaning “not even by” *All...not* used in this context is not frequent.

Sentences #7 and #12 had the same ratings of 72.3%. The first, “I didn’t understand all of it,” was interpreted by most as a partial negation, and this rightly so because grammatical reasoning tells us that a total negation would call for “I didn’t understand any of it.” The sentence constructed with *all* to mean a total negation is conventionally considered bad English. The second sentence “It hasn’t rained all day,” also received a high rating but as a total negation. The rationale here is the same as that for “I haven’t seen her all morning,” because of the verb being in the past perfect tense.

4. 60%-69% range of agreement

There were three sentences in this range, the highest being #8, “We don’t have all of the colors,” at 69.1% for partial negation. The grammatical logic is exactly the same as that for “I didn’t understand all of it,” which had a rating of 72.3%. This is a satisfyingly consistent result because the slight difference represents one of only three people. The next sentence #13, the common utterance “I couldn’t sleep all night,” meaning “I couldn’t sleep at all last night,” received a 68.1% rating as a total negation because a partial negation would call for “I hardly slept last night.” The third sentence in this category was #14, “He didn’t stay all day,” with 64% for partial negation. We again see common sense at work here because the word *stay* forces the interpretation to mean a partial negation. If it were a total negation it would be a strange way to say that he didn’t come at all.

1. *Both*-negated: 80%-90% range of agreement

The highest rate of agreement for *both* was sentence #11, “We both decided not to change our plans,” at 88.3% as a total negation. It has already been discussed with the highest rate for all-negated, “We all decided not to go.”

The second highest, and only by a very close margin of 1.1% was #8, “Both he and his wife are not coming,” at 87.2% as a total negation, in other words having the same meaning as “Neither he nor his wife is coming.” As the status of *Both are not* is faulty construction, the compounded structure *Both A and B are not* would logically be a faulty construction as well, but the surveyed were apparently comfortable with this construction because no one marked it F.C. and neither were there any abstentions.

2. 70%-79% range of agreement

The third highest was sentence #10, “Both are not coming,” at 77.7% for total negation. This construction appears nowhere in the written language and although language purists are vehemently opposed to it, it seems to have crept into the spoken language as a total negation.

3. 60%-69% range of agreement

Sentence #5, “You can’t have both soup and salad,” rated 66% partial negation. A great discrepancy is that sentence #4, “I don’t eat both fish and meat,” which has exactly the same construction, rated only 26.6% as a partial negation. Illogicalities and inconsistencies like these abounded but here we can best see the preponderant role of context at the

expense of grammatical reasoning in determining the sense of negation. In the first sentence the surveyed most likely visualized a scenario in a typical restaurant situation where on the menu the customer usually has a choice of soup or salad with the entree. If the customer ordered both soup and salad, the server might have said, "You can't have both soup and salad," instead of the grammatically correct "you can have either soup or salad, not both." Interestingly, "I don't eat both fish and meat," was interpreted by more people as a total negation (45.7%), probably because they visualized a vegetarian (of which there are many in English-speaking countries) trying to emphasize this fact.

Sentence #1, "I don't need both," had a rating of 64.4% for partial negation. The same reasoning comes into play here, that if one wanted to express a total negation, one would say "I don't need either." However, the same logic did not apply for the sentences "You can't park on both sides of the street," and "I don't like both of them," because the ratings fell to respectively 46.8% and 18.1% as partial negation.

Following closely with 62.8% for partial negation was sentence #7, "We're not both invited." Although the use of *not both* in "You can have either soup or salad, not both," is tolerated, its use in sentence #7 is a faulty construction, just as "Not both of them were invited," would be "inadmissible."

B. The oral survey

The oral survey was conducted by myself on two trips to Great Britain in 2004 and in 2005. The first trip covered the northern part of England, from Berwick-upon-Tweed near the Scottish border, Newcastle, the Lake District, to York. The second survey was done in Scotland, mainly in the three largest cities of Edingburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen. Why was the oral survey necessary? The results of the questionnaires were satisfactory for *all*-negated but revealed disturbing indications for *both*-negated. What traditional sources told us and the actuality of usage were so conflicting that it compelled additional investigation. If the manuals which correct common grammatical errors said, "We do not normally use *both* in a negated sentence," it would not be a surprise if some answered faulty construction for all of the sentences with *both*-negated. Yet, this was not the case. If *Both are not* appears nowhere in the written language, one would expect many to mark it as a faulty construction. This also was not the case. The oral survey, therefore, needed to focus only on *both*-negated. It had several advantages in that I could see as well as hear my interlocutor and not only could I see their reactions but there was also an opportunity for discussion. I could also guess, more or less, his or her age group and educational background. Would younger people answer differently from older people? Would people with a higher education answer differently from those who had not?

The procedure of the survey consisted of three negated sentences containing *both*: 1) I can't come on both days. 2) Both are not available. 3) I don't need both. The interview went something like this: If I said to you "I can't come on both days, " would you take it to mean that I can't come on one day or two days. Or can it be either?" and so on for the other two sentences. A third option of faulty construction was also given. As said above, the advantage of an oral survey is being face-to-face with the person surveyed, and so I will present the results in a different manner, that is to say, taking into consideration educational background and age differences. Admittedly, the weakness of this approach is that as a traveler, a tourist to be more exact, I did not move in the highly educated circles but came in daily contact mostly with people working in the service industries connected with tourism such as hotel staff, servers and bartenders in restaurants and bars, shop clerks, taxi drivers and the like. Making the best of the material gathered, I have made three categories:

1. university-educated persons, total of eight persons, age group 50-70, from two trips combined

2. survey of 2004; northern England, young group 18-29 years old, and older group 30-60 years old
3. survey of 2005; Scotland, young group 15-29 years old, and older group 30-70 years old

Group 1: Total 8 surveyed	Partial	Total	Both	F.C.
I can't come on both days.	3	3	2	0
Both are not available.	0	8	0	0
I don't need both.	6	1	1	0

Group 2: northern England, 2004	Partial	Total	Both	F.C.
18-29 years old (9 surveyed)				
I can't come on both days.	1	8	0	0
Both are not available.	0	9	0	0
I don't need both.	4	5	0	0
30-70 years old (4 surveyed)				
I can't come on both days.	2	1	1	0
Both are not available.	2	1	1	0
I don't need both.	3	0	1	0

Group 3: Scotland, 2005	Partial	Total	Both	F.C.
15-29 years old (6 surveyed)				
I can't come on both days.	1	5	0	0
Both are not available.	1	5	0	0
I don't need both.	1	4	1	0
30-70 years old (5 surveyed)				
I can't come on both days.	3	2	0	0
Both are not available.	0	5	0	0
I don't need both.	3	2	0	0

The results of the oral survey not only buttressed the written survey but also confirmed several points that were provided by the latter. The construction *Both are not* was interpreted overwhelmingly as a total negation because out of the 32 people surveyed, 28 answered total negation. If the logically thought-out answers for sentences 1 and 3 should have been partial negation because of the existence of alternative *either* for a total negation, it can be concluded that as in the written survey the educated group and the older groups did better than the younger groups, of which many, alarmingly, were answering total negation to all three sentences because "both means two things."

III. Conclusion

1. Did the results of the survey conform with the prescriptive and descriptive evidence that was presented in Part II?

When we compare the statistics against what the prescriptive and descriptive evidence had to say about the negation of *all* and *both*, it must be recalled that traditional grammar gave no rules governing this aspect of negation. The only construction that was unconditionally a partial negation was *not all* and for this reason no sentence with the *not all* structure was submitted for survey in the questionnaire. In light of this fact it could be expected that a negated sentence could be ambiguous and that the interpretations would be diverse. The statistics proved this to be disturbingly true for there was very little agreement in the interpretations of the negated meanings. First of all, no sentence got unanimity and only one in the entire survey placed in the 90%-100% range. If we take the broad range of 60%-100% agreement, for *all*-negated, there were only ten sentences out of a total of sixteen sentences, that is 63%; for *both*-negated, there were six sentences out of a total of twelve sentences, representing 50%. If we take the upper range of 80%-100%, for *all*-negated, there were only three sentences, that is 19%, and for *both*-negated only two sentences, representing 17%. Obviously there is a problem of communication, for what purpose does language serve if it is imprecise, if it does not convey an intended meaning? The reason for this lack of agreement can be attributed to the fact that the surveyed were guided not by rules of grammar, but by context.

On the other hand, to redress the balance, all that is not

covered by grammar (rules) falls into the much larger sphere of usage (convention) and this latter did provide some instruction. Descriptive grammar provided the explication of *the scope of negation*, a term coming from linguistics. Descriptive sources also said that *Both are not* in spoken English meant *Neither is*, and the statistics were conform with this. Complying with the abundant documentation on *All...not* which said that it could be partial or total, it seems that the surveyed were well aware of this fact because they adeptly applied context to determine the meaning. It can be concluded therefore, that there was indeed conformity with the sources.

2. The neglect of instruction on negation

The survey has revealed that instruction on negation has been a neglected area in the study of English: there was no awareness, on the part of native speakers, of the concept of total or partial negations. The diversity of interpretations, which denotes imprecise communication, can be attributed to the preponderant role of context in determining the meanings, and this in turn imports a deficiency of the language. Not only have native speakers received no instruction on the negation of the absolute indefinites but in the oral survey, in our discussions, many expressed that they had never heard of the term of negation. None of the surveyed were aware of the problematic nature of negating *alls* and *boths* before it was put forth before them and they seemed to be amused by the revelation.

It was shown in "Part II" that traditional grammar was wholly concerned with defining the parts of speech and the mechanical exercise of parsing, with very little on syntax, the study of sentence structure, where we would expect to find instruction on negation. In fact, grammar recognized only four types of sentences: declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative. Conspicuously there is no category for the negative sentence, as if negating were simply a matter of putting *not* before or after a verb and all the rest were self-evident. We know that the reality is more complex. There are negative adverbs like *hardly*, *scarcely*. There are concepts such as the notional negative in "has few friends," compared with "has a few friends," and the implied negative in "Am I my brother's keeper?", and "Me, tell a lie?"[8] These subtle points on negation were elucidated in the 1920s not by a native English speaker, but by the great Danish scholar of English, Otto Jespersen, who was one of the first to treat the subject of negation in English. Foreign scholars seemingly could more objectively discern the deficiencies and a few undertook to focus on neglected areas in grammar.

This observation brings me to the important question about the origin of the partial negation. Why was the term coined and the rule formulated in Japan? With hindsight I venture to say that just as Jespersen writing in the 1920s, the rule was formulated by a Japanese scholar to fill the void in an area that he thought was essential. At the time of the writing of "Part I," I said that the earliest mention of the partial negation was that of Hidezaburo Saito of 1932, and that until new evidence materialized it would be assumed that he was the originator. By pure chance I came upon that which appears to be a precursor of Saito, *English Grammar*, by Buhachiro Mitsui, of 1923. The term *partial negation* was not yet coined for Mitsui calls it *half-negation*, but the rule is the same: Half-negation: "All these books are not mine." (=Some are and some are not.); "He is not always idle." (=Sometimes he is; sometimes he is not.); "I don't want all of them." (=I want some of them.); "I don't want both of them." (=I want one of them.) The construction *Both...not* appeared nowhere, but I did find, in the section teaching the usage of *both*, *either*, and *neither*, the example sentence, "Both my parents are living."[9] What is remarkable besides this sign of inventiveness is that in that era and in this field of knowledge Japanese scholars did not blindly import everything from the West. For example, nowhere have I seen parsing exercises in any of the grammars of the period. This says that those scholars were

pragmatic and wise because they rightly saw that they were useless. Conceivably, the elimination of parsing was the main feature and meaning of the *Practical* in Saito's *Practical English Grammar*, which hugely successful, was considered highly innovative for the period.

3. The slow demise of the rule of the partial negation

Another theme of my research had been to find out why the rule failed in spite of the strength of its theory. The survey has revealed that the rule of the partial negation was not totally erroneous, but only partly correct. This was proved in the results of the survey that showed that all of the constructions save *not all* could indeed be interpreted not only as a partial but also as a total negation.

Until other material comes forth I must adhere to my assumption that although the rule was formulated by Mitsui or by some other, the person who coined the term was Saito. He must not be reproached however, because interestingly there was a strong influence of Shakespeare which permeated his work and which suggested a link between Saito and Shakespeare. In Japanese textbooks and dictionaries of the period, when teaching the partial negation, the model sentences were invariably Shakespeare's "All is well that ends well," for the declarative, and for the negative, "All that glisters is not gold." Occasionally I found Milton's "All is not lost," or the proverb "Every man cannot be a poet." Scholars of the day seemed to have a fancy for the idiomatic "All...not" and its variants and its use as model sentences was ubiquitous. When we consider the background of the English scholars of the 1920s and 1930s we must acknowledge the fact that Shakespeare was much-revered and much studied by scholars as well as students as an integral and essential part of the study of English. For this reason, I venture to propose that Shakespeare's famous, and all-pervasive line, "All that glisters is not gold," with its strong resonances of partial negation may have been, if not the cause, the stimulus of the formulation of the rule. The *All...not* construction was its main premise. We need only to look at its placement of prime importance in Mitsui's and in Saito's grammars. Although the *Both...not* inference is unexcusable, can we say then that Saito was misled and that he was a victim of his times? An astonishing and most plausibly not coincidental phenomenon is to see the same preoccupation with "All that glisters..." in British and American grammars and usage manuals of the same period. Almost every commentator discusses this construction using this line as a model sentence. Significantly, *All...not* is the only palpable example of awareness that negating an absolute indefinite entailed a problem of interpretation.

In any case, it soon became apparent that the rule could not be applied systematically and, laudable denouement, it was quietly and progressively abandoned. Although the term is still very much present in students' grammars and dictionaries, it exists merely as a convenient term for *not all*, *not every*, *not always*, and this is perfectly in keeping with the results of my survey.

4. The predominance of descriptivism over prescriptivism

The survey confirms the predominance of descriptivism over prescriptivism. If adherents of the latter complained that descriptivism was "gaining ground" in the 1960s and 1970s, there is no doubt that today descriptivism dominates. Signs of this trend are perceptible: we often see the use of the terms "traditional grammar" and "modern grammar" meaning respectively prescriptive grammar and descriptive grammar; most recent grammars are descriptive and from time to time a few still cause controversy; dictionaries are walking a tightrope trying to be authoritative but not authoritarian. However, this is not to say that prescriptivism is dying out. It is still very much alive and the debate continues. What is good English? Is it the English taught in schools or the

English spoken in daily life? Because of linguistic research into actual usage the descriptive approach is associated mainly with modern linguistics, an approach which does not commend or condemn but only objectively describes and explains existing usage without seeking to fix or judge standards.

The statistics from the survey, both written and oral, have shown actual usage to be conform with what the descriptivists say and not with the opinion of the "language purists." To exemplify this let us take the sentence "I didn't understand all of it." Prescriptivists would say definitely this is unconditionally a partial negation and nothing else because a total negation would call for *any* instead of *all*. Descriptive sources have stated that it could be partial or total depending on intonation, although its use to mean a total negation is "unusual," or "infrequent," and instead the use of "*any*," in this case would be "more common," or "strongly preferred." The statistics from the questionnaires seem to confirm this view because "I didn't understand all of it," rated Partial-72.3%, Total-10.6%, Both-12.8%; "We don't have all of the colors," Partial-69%, Total-20.2%, Both-7.4%. In the oral survey the results were even more pronounced because the younger groups overwhelmingly interpreted *not...both* as a total negation. Indeed, for those maintaining that there exists an immutable standard of the language, the results of the survey have revealed a grim reality.

Another distinguishing feature of descriptivism is its attitude with regard to change. David Crystal informs us that, "... the approach also recognizes the fact that the language is always changing, and there will accordingly always be variation in usage."[10] Understandably, the word *change* does not necessarily mean changes for the bad, but there are many examples of incorrect usage becoming so common and generalized that in the end it becomes acceptable and grammar rules change. I would like to cite three examples. In "Neither of them is/are..." formerly only *is* was correct, but now both are acceptable. In the past "as tall as" became "not so tall as" in the negative but now we often see "not as (so) tall as" which means *so* is alright but *as* is more common. Also in the past for "Do you mind my/me interrupting...?" grammar taught to use *my*, but now both are acceptable. These changes were brought about so imperceptibly and without controversy that there was scarcely any consciousness or notion of deterioration. The example of *Both are not* is relevant as an example of change in the language. All of the manuals teaching the do's and don'ts of language proscribe its usage, but in vain. Bearing in mind that Jespersen said, "Whatever is in general use in a language is for that reason grammatically correct,"[11] the day may come when we will see in the written language, "Both Canada and Mexico did not participate," for "Neither Canada nor Mexico participated."

5. Can we speak of deterioration of the language?

The question implies a value judgement and the answer would wholly depend on whether one aligns oneself with prescriptivism or descriptivism. If it is with the former, like myself and like many of us in the field of teaching English in schools, the answer would be an emphatic *yes*. Prescriptivists have traditionally upheld the conviction that deterioration of the language is a corollary of descriptivism and have repeatedly warned against the latter's disregard for standards. Based on the findings I can conclude that there have been indications of deterioration of the language: although no group was outstanding certain groups did better than others. This general statement presumes that there were right and wrong answers to the questionnaires. What then, were the criteria by which the performance of the surveyed was judged?

As *All...not* and its counterpart *Both...not* were not suitable as criteria, the first because it could have two interpretations and the second for reasons already disclosed, the only

constructions that could be used were *not...all* and *not...both* for sentences in which the alternative negatives *any* and *either* could be applied. This is, in effect, applying the rule of the partial negation.

Three general statements can be made from the statistics. Firstly, that in both the written and the oral survey, the more educated and the older groups did significantly better than the younger groups. It is important here to stress the fact that the more educated groups did not do better than the older groups. The results of the two groups being more or less the same, it is possible to conclude that English was taught better in the past. Secondly. in the written survey, the youngest group of students did the worst. Of the 25 surveyed, the results were: "I didn't understand all of it," Partial-14, Total -5, Both-5; "We don't have all of the colors," Partial-10, Total-13, Both-2; "I don't need both," Partial-14, Total-4, Both-4. Thirdly, in the oral survey, the younger groups, unexpectedly and alarmingly, did even worse than the group above. Most of them answered total negation to all three sentences because, as many had said, "both means two things." The results were: Group 2, of 9 surveyed, "I can't come on both days," Partial-1, Total-8; "I don't need both," Partial-4, Total-5; Group 3, of total 6 surveyed, "I can't come on both days," Partial-1, Total-5; "I don't need both," Partial-1, Total-5. Seen in such a light the statistics indicate glaringly a deterioration of the language. The rule of the partial negation used effectively revealed that younger people had less knowledge of grammar, and because the survey was conducted on three continents we can speak of worldwide deterioration.

Notes

1. Karen Miyahata, "Problems of the Partial Negation and English Usage Part I: Definition and Method," *Geijutsu: Journal of Osaka University of Arts* No.22 (Osaka: Osaka University of Arts, 1999), pp.39-47.
2. Karen Miyahata, "Problems of the Partial Negation and English Usage Part II: Prescriptive and Descriptive Evidence," *Geijutsu: Journal of Osaka University of Arts* No.27 (Osaka: Osaka University of Arts, 2004), pp.31-48.
3. Hidezaburo Saito, *Practical English Grammar* (Tokyo: S.E.G.Press, 1932), pp.600, 114, 116.
4. Margaret Bryant, *Current American Usage* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1962), p.11.
   R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Essex: Longman, 1985), p.377.
5. *Ibid.*, pp.788, 790.
   Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English language* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp.358-360.
6. *Ibid.*, Rodney Huddleston, pp.374, 807.
7. *Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition* (Springfield, Merriam-Webster, Inc., 1995), p.422.
8. Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (New York: Norton, 1924), pp.336-337.
9. Buhachiro Mitsui, *English Grammar* (Osaka: Sekizenkan, 1923), pp.56, 170-171.
10. David Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.366.
11. Otto Jespersen, *Mankind, Nation, and Individual* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1946), P.97.