Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.
Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. I, 5.

NEGATION

IN

ENGLISH AND OTHER LANGUAGES

BY

OTTO JESPERSEN

KØBENHAVN
HOVEDKOMMISSIONÆR: ANDR. FRED. HØST & SØN, KGL. HOF-BOGHANDEL
BIANCO LUNOS BOGTRYKKERI
1917

The nucleus of the following disquisition is the material collected during many years for the chapter on Negatives in vol. III or IV of my *Modern English Grammar* (abbreviated MEG), of which the first two volumes appeared in 1909 and 1914 respectively (Winter, Heidelberg). But as the war has prevented me (provisionally, I hope) from printing the continuation of my book, I have thought fit to enlarge the scope of this paper by including remarks on other languages so as to deal with the question of Negation in general as expressed in language. Though I am painfully conscious of the inadequacy of my studies, it is my hope that the following pages may be of some interest to the student of linguistic history, and that even a few of my paragraphs may be of some use to the logician. My work in some respects continues what DELBRÜCK has written on negation in Indo-European languages (Vergl. Syntax 2. 519 ff.), but while he was more interested in tracing things back to the "ursprache", I have taken more interest in recent developments and in questions of general psychology and logic.

With regard to the older stages of Teutonic or Germanic languages I have learned much from B. DELBRÜCK, *Germanische Syntax I. Zu den negativen Sätzen* (Sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. Leipzig 1910), supplemented by G. NECKEL, *Zu den germanischen Negationen* (in Kuhn's Zeitschr. 45, 1912). Of much less value are the treatments of the specially Old English negatives in M. KNÖRK, *Die Negation in der alteng-*

lischen Dichtung (Kiel 1907) and M. RAUERT, *Die Negation in den Werken Alfred's* (Kiel 1910) as well as E. EINENKEL, *Die englische Verbalnegation* (in Anglia 35, 1911, p. 187 ff. and 401 ff.). As in my Grammar, my chief interest is in Modern English; a great many interesting problems can be best treated in connexion with a language that is accessible to us in everyday conversation as well as in an all-comprehensive literature. Besides, much of what follows will be proof positive that the English language has not stagnated in the modern period, as Einenkel would have us believe (p. 234 "Bei Caxton ist der heutige zustand bereits erreicht"). Further literature on the subject will be quoted below; here I shall mention only the suggestive remarks in J. VAN GINNEKEN, *Principes de linguistique psychologique* (Amsterdam et Paris 1907, 199 ff.).

CHAPTER I

General Tendencies.

The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in its turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development as the original word.

Similar renewals of linguistic expressions may be found in other domains as well, but in this instance they are due not only to the general inconstancy of human habits, but to specific causes operating on these particular words. The negative adverb very often is rather weakly stressed, because some other word in the same sentence receives the strong stress of contrast — the chief use of a negative sentence being

to contradict and to point a contrast. The negative notion, which is logically very important, is thus made to be accentually subordinate to some other notion; and as this happens constantly, the negative gradually becomes a mere proclitic syllable (or even less than a syllable) prefixed to some other word. The incongruity between the notional importance and the formal insignificance of the negative (often, perhaps, even the fear of the hearer failing to perceive it) may then cause the speaker to add something to make the sense perfectly clear to the hearer.

On the other hand there is a natural tendency, also for the sake of clearness, to place the negative first, or at any rate as soon as possible, very often immediately before the particular word to be negatived (generally the verb, see below). At the very beginning of the sentence it is found comparatively often in the early stages of some languages, thus *ou* in Homer (see, for instance, in Od. VI 33, 57, 167, 201, 241, 279, VII 22, 32, 67, 73, 159, 205, 239, 293, 309, besides the frequent instances of *ou gár*; *ou* is far less frequent in the middle of sentences). Readers of Icelandic sagas will similarly have noticed the numerous instances of *eigi* and *ekki* at the beginning of sentences, especially in dialogues. In later stages this tendency, which to us seems to indicate a strong spirit of contradiction, is counterbalanced in various ways, thus very effectively by the habit of placing the subject of a sentence first. But it is still strong in the case of prohibitions, where it is important to make the hearer realize as soon as possible that it is not a permission that is imparted; hence in Danish frequently such sentences as *ikke spise det!* with the infinitive (which is chiefly or exclusively due to 'echoism', see my Nutidssprog hos børn og voxne, 1916, 164) or *ikke spis det!* with the imperative; cf. Ibsen Vildanden 79 Hys — hys; ikke sig noget endnu | ib. 105 Men ikke fordærv øjnene! Further the German *nicht hinauslehnen*, etc., corresponding to the first

mentioned Danish form; and we night also include prohibitions in other languages, Lat. *noli putare*, etc.

Now, when the negative begins a sentence, it is on account of that very position more liable than elsewhere to fall out, by the phenomenon for which I venture to coin the term of *prosiopesis* (the opposite of what has been termed of old aposiopesis): the speaker begins to articulate, or thinks he begins to articulate, but produces no audible sound (either for want of expiration, or because he does not put his vocal chords in the proper position) till one or two syllables after the beginning of what he intended to say. The phenomenon is particularly frequent, and may become a regular speech-habit, in the case of certain set phrases, but may spread from these to other parts of the language.

Some examples of prosiopesis outside the domain of negatives may be given here by way of illustration. Forms of salutation like E. *morning* for *Good morning*, Dan. *(God) dag*, G. *(Guten) tag* are frequent in many languages. Further colloquial E. *See?* for *Do you see* | (Do you re)*member that chap?* | (Will) *that do?* | (I'm a)*fraid not* | (The) *fact is* ... | (When you) *come to think of it* | (I shall) *see you again this afternoon* | (Have you) *seen the Murrays lately?* | (Is) *that you, John?* | (God) *bless you.* Colloquial Fr. *turellement* for *naturellement* | (en)*tends-tu?* | (Est-ce) *convenu?* | (Par)*faitement* | (Je ne me) *rappelle plus.* Swedish (Öd)*mjukaste tjenare.*

The interplay of these tendencies — weakening and strengthening, and protraction — will be seen to lead to curiously similar, though in some respects different developments in Latin with its continuation French, in Scandinavian, and in English. A rapid sketch of the history of negatives in these three languages may, therefore, be an appropriate introduction to the more specified investigations of the following chapters.

The starting point in all three languages is the old negative *ne*, which I take to be (together with the variant *me*) a primitive interjection of disgust, accompanied by the facial gesture of contracting the muscles of the nose (Dan. *rynke på*

næsen, G. *die nase rümpfen*, Fr. *froncer les narines*; the E. *to turn*, or *to screw, up one's nose* is not so expressive). This natural origin will account for the fact that negatives beginning with nasals (*n*, *m*) are found in many languages outside the Indo-European family.

In *Latin*, then, we have at first sentences like

(1) *ne dico.*

This persists with a few verbs only, *nescio*, *nequeo*, *nolo*. *Ne* also enters into the well known combinations *neque*, *neuter*, *numquam*, *nemo*, *ne . . quidem*, *quin*, etc., and is also used "as a conjunction" in subjunctival clauses; further as an "interrogative particle" in *scis-ne?* 'you know, don't you?'. But otherwise *ne* is felt to be too weak, and it is strengthened by the addition of *oenum* 'one thing'; the resulting *non* becomes the usual negative adverb and like *ne* is generally placed before the verb:

(2) *non dico.*

In Old French, *non* becomes *nen*, as in *nenil*, *nenni*, properly 'not he, not it', but more usually with further phonetic weakening *ne*, and thus we get:

(3) *jeo ne di.*

This form of negative expression survives in literary French till our own days in a few combinations, *je ne sais*, *je ne saurais le dire*, *je ne peux*, *n'importe*; but in most cases, the second *ne*, like the first, was felt to be too weak, and a strengthening was found to be necessary, though it is effected in a different way, namely by the addition after the verb, thus separated from *ne*, of some such word as *mie* 'a crumb', *point* 'a point', or *pas* 'a step':

(4) *je ne dis pas* (or rather: *je n' dis pas*).

Everyday colloquial French does not stop here: the weak *ne*, *n'* disappears and we have as the provisionally final stage:

(5) *je dis pas.*

If we turn to *Old Norse*, we first find some remnants of the old *ne* before the verb, inherited from Old Arian, = Got. *ni*, OS. OHG. *ni*, OE *ne*; thus

(1) *Haraldr ne veit*; cf. Lokasenna: þú gefa ne skyldir 'thou shouldst not give'.

This was strengthened in various ways, by adding *at* 'one thing' = Got. *ainata*, or *a*, which is generally explained as = Got. *aiw*, Lat. *ævum*, but may according to Kock be merely a weakened form of *at*; both were placed after the verb and eventually became enclitic quasi-suffixes; the result being

(2) *Haraldr ne veit-at*; or, with a different word-order, *ne veit-at Haraldr.*

In the latter combination, however, *ne* was dropped through prosiopesis:

(3) *veit-at Haraldr.*

This form, with *-at* or *-a* as the negative element, is frequent enough in poetry; in prose, however, another way of strengthening the negative was preferred as having "more body", namely by means of *eigi* or *ekki* after the verb; these also at first must have had a *ne* before the verb as the bearer of the negative idea, as they are compounded of *ei*, orig. 'always' like the corresponding OE *ā*, and *eitt* 'one (neutr.)' +*ge*, *gi*, which was at first positive (it corresponds to Got. *hun*, having a voiced consonant in consequence of weak stress; see Delbrück for relation to Sanskr. *caná*) but acquired a negative signification through constant employment in negative sentences. This, then, becomes the usual negative in Scandinavian languages; e. g. Dan. *ej* (now chiefly poetical; colloquial only in a few more or less settled combinations like "nej, jeg vil ej") and *ikke* (with regard to *inte* see below). The use of the original negative *ne* with a verb has in these languages disappeared centuries ago, leaving as the only curious remnant the first sound of *nogen*, which is, however, a positive pronoun 'some, any', from *ne veit* (*ek*) *hverr* 'nescio quis'. Sic transit . . .

The Danish *ikke* shares with French colloquial *pas* the disadvantage of being placed after the verb: *jeg veed ikke* just as *je sais pas*, even after the verb and subject in cases like *det veed jeg ikke*; but in dependent clauses we have protraction of *ikke: at jeg ikke veed* | *fordi jeg ikke veed*, etc.

In *English* the development has been along similar lines, though with some interesting new results, due chiefly to changes that have taken place in the Modern English period. The starting point, as in the other languages, was

(1) *ic ne secge.*

This is the prevalent form throughout the OE period, though the stronger negatives which were used (and required) whenever there was no verb, *na* (from *ne* + *a* = Got. *aiw*, ON *ei*), *nalles* 'not at all', and *noht* (from *nawiht*, *nowiht*, orig. meaning 'nothing'), were by no means rare after the verb to strengthen the preceding *ne*. The last was the word surviving in Standard English, and thus we get the typical ME form

(2) *I ne seye not.*

Here *ne* was pronounced with so little stress that it was apt to disappear altogether, and *not* becomes the regular negative in all cases:

(3) *I say not.*

This point — the practical disappearance of *ne* and the exclusive use of *not* — was reached in the fifteenth century. Thus far the English development presents an exact parallel to what had happened during the same period in German. Here also we find as the earliest stage (1) *ni* before the verb, then (2) *ne*, often weakened into *n-* or *en* (which probably means syllabic *n*) before and *niht* after the verb; *niht* of course is the compound that corresponds to E. *not*; and finally (3) *nicht* alone. The rules given in Paul's Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik (4th ed. 1894) § 310 ff. for the use of *ne* alone and

with *niht* and of the latter alone might be applied to Middle English of about the same date with hardly any change except in the form of the words, so close is the correspondence. But German remains at the stage of development reached towards the end of the middle period, when the weak *ne*, *en* had been given up; and thus the negative continues in the awkward position after the verb. We saw the same thing in colloquial Fr. *pas* and in Dan. *ikke*; but these are never separated from the verb by so many words as is often the case in German, the result being that the hearer or reader is sometimes bewildered at first and thinks that the sentence is to be understood in a positive sense, till suddenly he comes upon the *nicht*, which changes everything; see, for instance "Das leben ist der güter höchstes nicht". I remember feeling the end of the following sentence as something like a shock when reading it in an article by Gabelentz (Zeitschr. f. völkerpsychol. 8.153) "Man unterschätze den deutschen stil der zopfzeit, den der canzleien des vorigen und vorvorigen jahrhunderts nicht". In dependent clauses *nicht*, like other subjuncts, is placed before the verb: *dass er nicht kommt | wenn er nicht kommt.*

In English, on the other hand, we witness a development that obviates this disadvantage. The Elizabethans began to use the auxiliary *do* indiscriminately in all kinds of sentences, but gradually it was restricted to those sentences in which it served either the purpose of emphasis or a grammatical purpose. In those questions in which the subject is not an interrogatory pronoun, which has to stand first, *do* effects a compromise between the interrogatory word-order (verb-subject) and the universal tendency to have the subject before the verb (that is, the verb that means something) as in "Did he come?" (See Progress in Lang. p. 93 for parallels from other languages). And in sentences containing *not* a similar compromise is achieved by the same means, *not* retaining its place

after the verb which indicates tense, number and person, and yet being placed before the really important verb. Thus we get

(4) *I do not say.*

Note that we have a corresponding word-order in numerous sentences like *I will not say* | *I cannot say* | *I have not said*, etc. But in this position, *not* cannot keep up its strongly stressed pronunciation; and through its weakening we arrive at the colloquial

(5) *I don't say.*

In many combinations even the sound [t] is often dropped here, and thus *nowiht*, *nought* has been finally reduced to a simple [n] tagged on to an auxiliary of no particular signification. If we contrast an extremely common pronunciation of the two opposite statements *I can do it* and *I cannot do it*, the negative notion will be found to be expressed by nothing else but a slight change of the vowel [ai kæn du· it | ai ka·n du· it]. Note also the extreme reduction in a familiar pronunciation of *I don't know* and *I don't mind* as [ai dn-nou] or [ai d-nou] and [ai dm-maind] or [ai d-maind], where practically nothing is left of the original negative. It is possible that some new device of strengthening may at some future date be required to remedy such reductions.

It is interesting to observe that through the stages (4) and (5) the English language has acquired a negative construction that is closely similar to that found in Finnish, where we have a negative auxiliary, inflected in the various persons before an unchanged main verb: *en sido* I do not bind, *et sido* thou dost not bind, *ei sido* he does not bind, *emme sido* we ..., *ette sido* you (pl) ..., *eivät sido* they do not bind. There is, however, the important difference that in Finnish the tense is marked not in the auxiliary, but in the form of the main verb: *en sitonut* I did not bind, *emme sitoneet* we did not bind (*sitonut;* pl *sitoneet* is a participle).

A few things must be added here to supplement the brief sketch of the evolution of English negatives. The old *ne* in some frequently occurring combinations lost its vowel and was fused with the following word; thus we have the following pairs of positive and negative words:

(a) verbs (given in late ME. forms):

am — nam
art — nart
is — nis
has — nas
had(de) — nad(de)
was — nas
were(n) — nere(n)
will(e) — nill(e)
wolde — nolde

These had all become extinct before the MnE. period, except *nill*, which is found rarely, e. g. Kyd Sp. I. 4. 7. I nill refuse; twice in pseudo-Shakespearian passages: Pilgr. 188 in scorn or friendship, nill I construe whether | Per. III prol. 55 I nill relate. Shakespeare himself has it only in the combinations *will you, nill you* (Shr. II. 273) and *will he, nill he* (Hml. V. 1. 19); and the latter combination (or *will I, nill I*; *will ye, nill ye*, which all would yield the same phonetic result) survives in mod. *willy-nilly*, rarely spelt as separate words, as in Byron DJ. 6. 118 Will I — Nill I (rimes with *silly*) | Allen W. 64 they would obtrude themselves, will he, nill he, upon him — where both the person (*he*) and the tense shows that the whole has really become one unanalyzed adverb.

(b) other words (given in MnE. forms):

one, an, a (OE ān) — none, no
aught, ought — naught, nought, not
either — neither
or — nor
ever — never.

It should be remembered that *no* represents two etymologically distinct combinations: OE *ne ān* (as in *no man*, also in *nobody*, *nothing*), and OE *ne* + *ā* (as in: are you ill? No; also in *nowhere*); cf. MEG. II 16. 7.

The transition between stages (2) and (3) is seen, for instance, in Mandeville (14th c.), where *ne* by itself is rare: 130 zif the snow ne were, but is more frequent with some other negative word: 45 it *ne* reynethe *not* | 51 yee *ne* schulle *not* suffre | 52 *ne* ben not | 58 there *nys* *nouther* mete for hors *ne* watre | 181 *ne* . . *nevere*. But *ne* is not required, see e. g. 45 they may not enlarge it . . it reyneth not. — A late example of isolated *ne* is Gammer 140 he ne can; the usual negative in that play is *not*.

Before the *do*-construction was fully developed, there was a certain tendency to place *not* before the verb, in all kinds of sentences, thus not only in dependent clauses (the difference in word-order between main sentences and dependent clauses, which we have alluded to in Scandinavian and German, was never carried through in English). The word-order in "And if I *not performe*, God let me neuer thrive" for *performe not* is considered by Puttenham, The Arte of Engl. Poesie 1589, p. 262, as a "pardonable fault" which "many times giues a pretie grace vnto the speech"; it is pretty frequent in Shakespeare, see Al. Schmidt, Lex. p. 779, but is rare after the 17th c. Examples: Sh. H4B. IV. 1. 107 it not appeares to me | Hml. III. 2. 217 For who not needs, shall neuer lacke a frend | Lr. IV. 2. 1 I meruell our mild husband Not met vs on the way (ib. IV. 2. 50 both orders closely together) | Tp. II. 1. 121 I not doubt | Otway 239 if I not revenge Thy sufferings | Cowper Task IV. 39 the cups That cheer but not inebriate | Rup. Brooke Poems 23 Himself not lives, but is a thing that cries.

When *do* became the ordinary accompaniment of *not*, it was not at first extended to all verbs; besides the well-known instances with *can*, *may*, *must*, *will*, *shall*, *am*, *have*, *dare*, *need*,

ought we must here mention *know*, which now takes *do*, but was long used in the form *know not*, thus pretty regularly in the seventeenth and often in the eighteenth and even in the first part of the nineteenth century. In poetry forms without *do* are by no means rare, but they are now felt as archaisms, and as such must also be considered those instances in which prose writers dispense with *do*. In some instances this is probably done in direct imitation of Biblical usage, thus in Bennett C 1. 47 Somehow, in a way that Darius *comprehended not* — cf. A. V. John 1. 5. And the light shineth in darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not. Perhaps also in Hope F. 43 Isn't Haddington breaking up? I don't know. I *understood not* — this combination occurs Luke 2. 50 and elsewhere in the Bible.

There is a curious agreement among different languages in the kind of verbs that tend to keep up an old type of negative construction after it has been abandoned in other verbs; cf. Lat. *nolo*, Engl. *nill*, MHG. *en will* and Lat. *ne scio*, Fr. *je ne sais*, MHG. *i-n weiz*, Eng. *I know not*. These syntactical correspondences must, of course, have developed independently in each language — in consequence of natural human tendencies on a common basis. (But I do not believe in Miklosich's explanation which is accepted by Delbrück, Synt. 2. 523).

CHAPTER II

Strengthening of Negatives.

There are various ways of strengthening negatives. Sometimes it seems as if the essential thing were only to increase the phonetic bulk of the adverb by an addition of no particular meaning, as when in Latin *non* was preferred to *ne*, *non* being according to the explanation generally accepted compounded

of *ne* and *oenum* (= *unum*) 'one' (neutr.). But in most cases the addition serves to make the negative more impressive as being more vivid or picturesque, generally through an exaggeration, as when substantives meaning something very small are used as subjuncts. Some Engl. examples will show how additions of this kind are often used more or less incongruously, no regard being taken to their etymological meaning:

GE A. 173 She didn't know one *bit* how to speak to a gentleman | Trollope D. 1. 189 I don't believe it was Pepperment's fault a bit | Kipling J. 2. 127 he was not a bit impressed | Di D. 649 it's not a bit of use | Scott A. 2. 17 'An accomplice hid among them, I suppose.' 'Not a *jot*.' | Kipling S. 58 Never got a *sniff* of any ticket | Shaw P. 55 Am I not to care at all? — Not a *scrap* | Were you tired? — Not a scrap | Philips L. 93 he doesn't care a *snap of his* strong *fingers* whether he ever sees me again | Doyle M. 29 he doesn't care a *toss* about all that | Kipling L. 112 the real world doesn't care a tinker's — doesn't care a bit [he breaks off; cf. Farmer & Henley, not worth a *tinker's damn*, or *curse*, see also Lawrence Fortn. Review 1917. 328 Who now cares a tinker's curse for Cheops?] | Page J. 491 I don't give a *blank* what you think.

Collections of similar expressions have been made by J. Hein "Über die bildliche verneinung in der mittelenglischen poesie" (Anglia 15. 41 and 396 ff.) and H. Willert "Über bildliche verneinung im neuenglischen" (Herrigs Archiv 105.36 ff.). The term "bildliche verneinung", by the way, does not seem a very happy one for these combinations, as it is not the negation itself that is expressed figuratively; the term would be more suitably applied to some of the instances I have collected below under the heading of "Indirect negatives".

There is a curious use of the word *cat* in this connexion which is paralleled in Danish (der er ikke en kat der veed det, i. e. nobody) in Philips L. 285 there is not a cat he knows

(cf. the old: it shold not auaylle me a cattes tayl, Caxton R. 50).

To the same order belong, of course, the well-known French words already alluded to, *mie* (obsolete), *goutte*, *pas*, *point*. Originally *pas* could only be used with a verb of motion, etc., but the etymological meaning of all these words was soon forgotten, and they came to be used with all kinds of verbs. — Similar supplements to negatives are frequent in all languages; I have noted, for instance, the Italian "non mi batterò *un fico secco*" (Bersezio, Bolla di sapone 71). In Dan. *spor* 'trace' is the most usual addition: "han læser ikke spor", etc., followed by partitive *af* not only before subs., as in "der var *ikke spor af aviser*", but also before adjs. and verbs: "han er *ikke spor af bange*" | A. Skram, Lucie 187 Han skulde ikke fare op, *ikke spor af fare op*. One may even hear "Det forstår jeg mig *ikke spor af* på", where *af* has no object. Another frequent combination is *ikke skygge* 'not a shade'.

We must here also mention the extremely frequent instances in which words meaning 'nothing' come to mean simply 'not'; these, of course, are closely related to *not a bit*, etc., meaning 'not'. Thus Lat. *nihil* (cf. also *non*, above), Greek *oudèn*, which has become the usual Mod.Gr. word for 'not' *dèn* (pronounced ðen), Engl. *not* from *nought*, *nawiht*, Germ. *nicht* (cf. ON *vættki*); further ON *ekki* from *eittki*, Dan. *ikke*, Swed. *icke*; also Dan. and Swed. *inte*, in Dan. now obsolete in educated speech, though very frequent within living memory even in the highest classes; in dialects it survives in many forms, *it*, *et*, *int*, etc. The expanded form *intet* is still in use as the pronoun 'nothing', chiefly however in literary style.

Where the word for 'nothing' becomes usual in the sense 'not', a new word is frequently formed for the pronoun: thus (probably) Lat. *nihil*, when *non* was degraded, Engl. *nothing* (besides *nought*, the fuller form of *not*), Dan. *ingenting*, G. *nichts*. But in its turn, the new word may be used as a sub-

junct meaning 'not', thus *nihil* (above), Engl. *nothing* as in *nothing loth*, etc., see the full treatment in MEG. II. 17. 36 ff.

Another way of strengthening the negative is by using some word meaning 'never' without its temporal signification. This is the case with OE *nā* (*ne* + *ā* = Got. *ni aiws*, Germ. *nie*); this *nā* was very frequent in OE and later as a rival of *not*, and has prevailed in Scotch and the northern dialects, where it is attached to auxiliaries in the same way as *-n't* in the South: *canna*, *dinna*, etc. In Standard Engl. its rôle is more restricted; besides being used as a sentence-word in answers it is found in combinations like *whether or no* | *no better, no more*, see MEG. II. 16. 8; sometimes it may be doubtful whether we have this original adverb or the pronominal adjective *no* from OE *nān*, *ne* + *ān*, see also ib. 16. 7. — The corresponding ON *nei* has given Engl. *nay* (on which see below); another ON compound of the same *ei* is *eigi*, which gradually loses its temporal signification and becomes the ordinary word for 'not', see Delbrück, and Neckel, KZ. 45. 15 ff.

Engl. *never* also in some connexions comes to mean merely 'not': Kipling L. 109 I never knew it was so chilly [= didn't know] | James S. 6 he knew that for a moment Brown never moved. A transitional case is Di. Do. 76 never once looking over his shoulder.

Never in this sense is especially frequent before *the* (OE þȳ) with a comparative (as in *nevertheless*), and in the combination *never a* = 'no', which has become a kind of compound (adjunct) pronoun, used to a great extent in some dialects (see EDD.: *never a*), and very frequent in colloquial English, especially in the phrase *never a word*: Gammer 134 then we be neuer the nearer || Ch. C. 670 it nedeth never a deel | More U. 264 to neuer a penny coste | Gammer 136 he would . . . leaue you neuer a hen on-liue | Eastw. 482 Canst thou tell nere a one | Marlowe F. (1616) 759 thou canst not tell ne're a word on't | Sh. H4 A. II. 1. 21 you [Q: they] will

allow us ne're a jourden [note the difference from: they will never allow us a j.] | Sh. H4 B. II. 2. 62 neuer a mans thought in the world keepes the rode-way better then thine | Buny. P. 232 the man answered never a word | Di F. 445 he bit his lip, and said never a word | GE. A. 62 when you're married, and have got a three-legged stool to sit on, and never a blanket to cover you | Stevenson JHF. 39 he answered never a word | Kipling L. 218 but never a word did Dick say of Maisie | id. J. 2. 53 but never a beast came to the shrine | Wells T. 21 blank slopes, with never a sign of a decent beast.

A Danish parallel is Holberg Ul. 1. 7 Jeg seer aldrig en smuk plet paa denne Helene.

Never is also used in surprised exclamations like Di F. 680 Why, it's never Bella! | Shaw M. 203 Why, it's never No. 406! — In the same way in Danish: det er da vel aldrig Bella!

Dan. *aldrig* also means 'not' in the combination *aldrig så snart* 'no sooner' as in Goldschmidt Hjeml. 1. 105 Men aldrig saa snart var seiren vunden, før den hos den seirende vakte den dybeste anger.

The frequent adverbial strengthenings of negatives as in *not at all*, *pas du tout*, *aldeles ikke*, *slet ikke*, *durchaus nicht*, *gar nicht*, etc., call for no remark here. It should be mentioned, however, that *by no means* and corresponding expressions in other languages are very often used without any reference to what might really be called 'means', in the same way as in the instances just referred to there is no reference to the time-element of 'never'. In colloquial Dan. one may sometimes hear sentences like "Jeg synes, at brevet var *ikke ud af stedet* tørt" for 'not the least'.

On the flux and reflux in Greek *oudeís*, strengthened into *oudè heîs*, soldered into *outh'heîs*, which was weakened into *outheís*, and replaced in its turn by *oudeís*, see the interesting

account in Meillet, Aperçu d'une histoire de la Langue Grecque, 1913 290 f.

On strengthening through repeated negation see chapter VII.

CHAPTER III

Positive becomes Negative.

The best-known examples of a transition from positive to negative meaning are found in French. Through the phenomenon which Bréal aptly terms "contagion" words like *pas*, *point*, *jamais*, *plus*, *aucun*, *personne*, which were extremely frequent in sentences containing *ne* with the verb, acquired a negative colouring, and gradually came to be looked upon as more essential to express the negative notion than the diminutive *ne*. As this came to be used exclusively in immediate juxtaposition with a verb, the other words were in themselves sufficient to express the negative notion when there was no verb, at first perhaps in answers: "Ne viendra-t-il jamais?" "*Jamais.*" | "Ne vois-tu personne?" "*Personne.*" Now we have everywhere quite regularly: *Pas* de ça! | Pourquoi *pas?* | le compartiment des *pas-fumeurs* | Mérimée 2 Hér. 31 Permettez-moi de lui dire un seul mot, *rien qu*'un seul | Daudet Sapho 134 Il frissonnait *rien que* d'y penser | id. Numa 105 une chambre et un cabinet . . . la chambre *guère* plus grande, etc. In a somewhat different way Daudet Tart. Alpes 252 Mais si vous croyez que Tartarin avait peur, *pas plus!* | Maupass. Bécasse 201 et toute la ligne [tous les enfants assis en ligne] mangeait jusqu'à *plus faim* [= jusqu'à ce qu'ils n'eussent plus faim].

The next step is the leaving out of *ne* even where there is a verb. This may have begun through prosiopesis in interrogative and imperative sentences: (ne) viens-tu *pas?* | (ne) dis *pas* ça!

Cf. also (Il ne) faut *pas* dire ça! It may have been a concomitant circumstance in favour of the omission that it is in many sentences impossible or difficult to hear *ne* distinctly in rapid pronunciation: *on n'a pas* | *on n'est pas* | *on n'arrive jamais* | *la bonne n'a rien* | *je ne nie pas*, etc. Sentences without *ne*, which may be heard any day in France, also among the educated, begin to creep into literature, as in Halévy Notes 91 c'est *pas* ces gredins-là | ib. 92 J'ai *pas* fini, qu'elle disait (ib. 93, 240, 239) | Daudet Sapho 207 Vaut-il *pas* mieux accepter ce qui est? | Gonc. Germ. L. 200 As *pas* peur! | Maupass. Vie 132 une famille où l'argent comptait pour *rien* | id Fort 68 tu seras *pas* mal dans quelque temps (ib. 69) | Rolland JChr. 7. 96 Voudrais-tu *pas* que je reprisse la vieille devise de haine? (Similarly *ne* is now often omitted in those cases in which "correct grammar" requires its use without any *pas*, for instance *de peur qu'il vienne*). In the soldiers' conversations in René Benjamin's Gaspard there is scarcely a single *ne* left. In the case of *plus* this new development might lead to frequent ambiguity, if this had not been obviated in the popular pronunciation, in which [j ān a ply] means 'there is no more of it' and [j ān a plys] 'there is more of it' (= literary *il n'y en a plus* and *il y en a plus*). In *plus de bruit* we have a negative, but in *Plus de bruit que de mal* a positive expression, though here the pronunciation is always the same. Note the difference between *Jean n'avait plus confiance* and *Jean n'avait pas plus confiance* [*que Pierre*]; cf. also *Jean n'avait pas confiance, non plus* 'nor had . . .'. — There is a curious consequence of this negative use of *plus*, namely that *moins* may occasionally appear as a kind of comparative of its etymological antithesis: Mérimée 2 Hér. 50 Plus d'écoles, plus d'asiles, plus de bienfaisance, encore moins de théologie.

One final remark before we leave French. From a psychological point of view it is exactly the same process that leads to the omission of *ne* in two sentences like *il (ne) voit*

nul danger and *il (ne) voit aucun danger*; but etymologically they are opposites: in one an originally negative word keeps its value, in the other an originally positive word is finally changed into a negative word.

In Spanish we have some curious instances of positive words turned into negative ones: *nada* from Lat. *nata (res nata)* means 'nothing', and *nadie*, older *nadien* with the ending of *quien* instead of *nado* from *natus*, means 'nobody'. In both I imagine that the initial sound of *n-* as in *no* has favoured the change. Through the omission of *no* some temporal phrases come to mean 'never' as in Calderon, Alc. de Zal. 2. 12 *En todo el dia* Se ve apartar de la puerta | Galdós Doña Perf. 68 A pesar de tan buen ejemplo, *en mi vida* me hubiera sometido á ejercer una profecion ... Thus also *absolutamente* 'durchaus nicht', see Hanssen, Span. Gramm. § 60, 5.

In ON several words and forms are changed from positive to negative, as already indicated above: the ending *-gi (-ge)* in *eigi*, *einngi (engi)*, *eittgi (etki, ekki)*, *hvárrgi*, *manngi*, *vættki*, *aldrigi*, *ævagi*, further the enclitic *-a* and *-at*.

In German must be mentioned *kein* from OHG. *dihhein*, orig. 'irgend einer' (*dih* of unknown origin), though the really negative form *nihhein* has of course also contributed to the negative use of *kein*; further *weder* from OHG. *ni-wedar* (*wedar* = E. *whether*).

In Engl. we have *but* from *ne ... but*, cf. northern dial. *nobbut* (see below ch. XII), and a rare *more* = 'no more', a clear instance of prosiopesis, which, however, seems to be confined to the South-Western part of England, see Phillpotts M. 29 Not much of a scholar. More am I | ib. 144 You're no longer a child, and more am I | ib. 12 Couldn't suffer it — more

could he | ib. 322 you meant that I couldn't expect that man to like me. More I do. (Cf. with neg. v. ib. 309 he's a man that won't be choked off a thing — and more won't I). — Similarly *me either* = 'nor me either': Quiller-Couch M. 111 it so happens that I have no small change about me. — 'Me either', said Mrs. T. idiomatically (also ib. 181).

Similarly the order to the helmsman when he is too near the wind *Near!* is said to be shortened through prosiopesis (which is here also a kind of haplology) from "No near!" (*near* the old comparative meaning what is now called *nearer*), see NED. *near* adv. 1 c.

CHAPTER IV

Indirect and Incomplete Negation.

In this chapter we shall discuss a great many different ways of expressing negative ideas through indirect or roundabout means, and finally words that without being real negatives express approximately the same thing as the ordinary negative adverb.

A. Indirect Negation.

(1) Questions may be used implying a negative statement: (1) nexal question, e. g. "Am I the guardian of my brother?" = 'I am not . . .'; inversely a negative question means a positive assertion: "Isn't he stupid" = 'he is (very) stupid; — and (2) special question, e. g. "Who knows?" = 'I do not know', or even 'No one knows'; "And what should they know of England who only England know?" (Kipl.) = 'they know nothing'; "where shall I go?" = 'I have nowhere to go'.

Examples of the first:

Shaw 2. 16 Would you know him again if you saw him? — Shall I ever forget him! | Mrs. Browning A. 326 Could I

see his face, I wept so [= I wept so much that I could not see] | Caine C. 34 Well, didn't I just get a wigging from the sister now! | Kipling S. 72 Did you hit Rabbits-Eggs. — Did I jolly well not?

Must I not? = 'I must', e. g. Byron 627 must I not die? | Hawthorne Sn. 53 It has been a wilderness from the Creation. Must it not be a wilderness for ever? | Hardy R. 292 Must I not have a voice in the matter, now I am your wife?

Won't I? = 'I will': Byron 573 And wilt thou? — Will I not? | Di. N. 95 Oh my eye, won't I give it to the boys! | Brontë P. 24 There's Waddy making up to her; won't I cut him out? | Mered R. 27 I say, if you went to school, wouldn't you get into rows | ib. 27 I never drank much claret before. Won't I now, though! Claret is my wine.

The reply in Doyle S. 5. 75 was there ever a more mild-mannered young man? 'It is true' — clearly shows that the other person rightly understood the first speaker's seeming question as a negative statement: 'there never was . . .'

In the same way naturally in other languages as well. In Dan. this form has the curious effect that after *så sandelig* the same meaning may be expressed with and without *ikke*, the word-order being the same, only in the latter case we have the slight rising of the tone indicating a question: Nansen Guds fr. 62 Ja, saa sandelig er det ikke ham! Og han kommer her til mig! [= sandelig er det ham]. In the same way in Norwegian and Swedish: Ibsen Vildand 61 Jo så sandelig glemte jeg det ikke | Lagerlöf Gösta B. 1. 153 Nå sannerligen ser han ej något svart och stort komma. (In none of these quotations, however, there is any question mark.)

A variant of these nexal questions is the elliptical use of a subject and a ('loose') infinitive [see Progr. in Language § 164 f.] with a rising intonation, implying that it is quite impossible to combine the two ideas: Sh. Merch III. 1. 37 My

owne flesh and blood to rebell! | Sh. H4 B. II. 4. 45 You make fat rascalls, Mistris Dol. — I make them? Gluttonie and Diseases make them, I make them not | Farquhar B. 341 Oh la! a footman have the spleen | Goldsmith 660 you amaze me. Such a girl as you want jewels! | Thack. P. 2. 130 Why! they don't come down here to dine you know, they only make believe to dine. *They* dine here, Law bless you! They go to some of the swell clubs | id. V. 180 My son and heir marry a beggar's girl out of the gutter. D— him, if he does | id. N. 163 'Gracious God!' he cried out; 'my boy insult a gentleman at my table!' | Kipling J. 2. 72 Me to sing to naked men! | Galsworthy MP. 8 A man not know what he had on! No, no!

Examples of negative statements expressed by questions containing an interrogative pronoun: Sh. Tit. V. 3. 18 What bootes it thee to call thy selfe a sunne? | Gent II. 1. 158 [she hath not writ to me.] What need she, When shee hath made you write to your selfe? | Who cares? [= 'no one cares', or 'I don't care'].

In this way *what not*, especially after a long enumeration, comes to mean 'everything' (double negation), as in Sh. Shr. V. 2. 110 Marrie, peace it boads, and loue, and quiet life, An awfull rule, and right supremicie: And to be short, what not, that's sweete and happie | Buny. P. 121 silver, gold, pearls, precious stones, and *what not* | Scott OM. 68 Robin, who was butler, footman, gardener, and what not | Seeley E. 111 As now we put our money into railways or what not? so then the keen man of business took shares in the new ship | Hardy F. 314 Whether Newfoundland, mastiff, bloodhound, or what not, it was impossible to say | id. L. 179 Talking of Exhibitions, World's Fairs, and what not | Galsworthy P. 2. 30 if I want five shillings for a charity or what not | NP. 1912 whether he be Hindu or Mohammedan or what-not in religion | Shaw 1. 18 he wont consent unless they send letters and

invitations and congratulations and the dence knows what not || Di D. 544 (vg) they would give me what-not for to eat and drink.

Hence *a what-not* as a sb, 'piece of furniture with shelves for nick-nacks': Caine C 399 on a whatnot at the door-side of the room another photograph stood.

What not is used as a vb and adj in By DJ. 8. 110 Had been neglected, ill-used, and what not | Morris N 46 the government, or the consul, or the commission, or what not other body of fools.

Pronominal questions implying a negative are, of course, frequent in all languages: Dan. *hvem veed?* Fr. *qui sait?* Sp. *quién sabe?* = 'no one knows', etc.

Here belong also questions with *why*: *Why should he?* = ['there is no reason why he should'] 'he should not'; *Why shouldn't he?* = 'he should'. — Note the continuation in Locke S. 197 Why should she, *any more* than I?

In the following two quotations the continuation *and not* shows clearly that the negative questions are to be taken = positive statements:

Defoe G. 28 Why should he not be accepted for what he is, and not for what he is not | Benson A. 40 Doesn't one develop through one's passions, and not through one's renunciations?

In colloquial Dan. one hears pretty frequently questions containing *næsten*, which is only justified logically if the sentence is transposed into the corresponding negative: "Kan du næsten se dærhenne?" (= du kan visst næsten ikke se) | hvordan kan her næsten blive plads til os allesammen? | Knudsen Lærer Ur 104 Hvad skulde saadan een næsten forslaa tiden med — andet end med det unaturlige! | Pontoppidan Landsbybill. 162 Tror jeg næsten ikke, det er første gang, solen skinner for mig paa denne egn.

A similar phenomenon is the use of *heller*, which is not common except with a negative, in Jensen Bræen 230 Hvorledes skulde de heller forstaa kæmper med lyst haar?

(2) Another popular way of denying something is by putting it in a conditional clause with "I am a villain" or something similar in the main clause: Devil E. 534 If I understand thee, I am a villain | Sh. H4. A. II. 4. 169 I am a rogue if I drunke to day | ib. 205 if I fought not with fiftie of them, I am a bunch of radish | Sh. Merch. II. 2. 120 I am a Iew if I serue the Iew anie longer | B. Jo. 3. 195 Don't you know it? No, I am a rook if I do.

A variant is "the devil take me" or "I will be damned" etc. in the main clause, often with prosiopesis "Be damned" or "damned"; any substitute for *damn* may of course be used: Swift J. 428 You may converse with them if you please, but the — take me if ever I do | Kipling L. 229 'We'll go into the parks if you like'. 'Be damned if I do' | Mered R. 394 'Will you leave it to me?' 'Be damned before I do!' | Norris P. 90 Darned if I know | Kipling L. 121 I'm dashed if I know [also Shaw D. 283] | Di F. 343 Dashed if I know! [Also Mered H. 346] | GE. S. 158 ding me if I remember | Read K. 17 Dinged ef I oughtenter be plowin' | Hardy R. 56 be dazed if he who do marry the maid won't hae an uncommon picture . . . . . Be jown'd if I don't learn ten new songs | Smedley F. 1. 268 hang me if I can tell | Kipling L. 83 'Give me credit for a little gumption'. 'Be hanged if I do!' 'Be hanged then' | Shaw 2. 120 Blame me if it did not come into my head once or twyst that he must be horff 'is chump | Trollope D. 1. 50 I'll be shot if I am | Locke A. 95 I'm shot if you do | Di M. 280 It does you honour. I'm blest if it don't | Hughes T. 1. 220 blest if you ain't the best old fellow ever was.

With these last sentences containing *blessed* may be compared the following indirect negatives: Swift P. 92 God bless you, if you ha'n't taken snuff | Di D. 132 why, Lord love my heart alive, if it ain't a treat to look at him!

We have *but* = 'if not' in Sh. Merch. II. 6. 52 Beshrew me but I loue her heartily [= 'damn me if I do not' = 'I do']. Thus often

in Sh.; *but* here might be taken = Lat. *sed*, as *Beshrew me* is used as a single asseveration before a main sentence, e. g. Tw. II. 3. 85 Beshrew me, the knights in admirable fooling.

A curious variant is found in Swift P. 110 if that ben't fair, hang fair.

In Dan. we have corresponding expressions, such as: "Du må kalde mig Mads, om jeg gør det", cf. Holb. Arab. p. 1 Jeg er aldrig ærlig, om det ikke er min gamle cammerat Andreas | Faber Stegek. 33 Jeg vil aldrig døe som en honnet kone, naar jeg de to sidste maaneder har hørt tale om andet end om politik. — In a slightly different way Holb. Jeppe 1. 6 En skielm, der nu har flere penger (= jeg har ikke flere p.).

By a further development the main clause may be left out entirely, and an isolated *if I ever heard* comes to mean 'I never heard', and *if it isn't a pity* comes to mean 'it is a pity'. There is a parallel in French *argot*, where *tu parles s'il est venu* is an emphatic way of saying 'il n'est pas venu'. English examples: Eastw. 444 as I am a lady, if he did not make me blush so that mine eyes stood a water [= he made me b.] | Richardson G. 50 Mercy! if ever I heard the like from a lady | Di N. 127 I declare if it isn't a pity | GE. A. 65 If there isn't Captain Donnithorne a-coming into the yard! | Hardy T. 13 Why, Tess, if there isn't thy father riding hwome in a carriage | Gissing G. 196 'Now if this isn't too bad!' he exclaimed in a thick voice. 'If this isn't monstrously unkind!' | Ridge L. 252 'Pon me word, if this ain't what comes of trusting a woman | Shaw J. 102 Well, I'm sure! if this is English manners! | MacLaren A. 110 If Dr. D. isna comin' up the near road! (also 47, 107, 169) | Doyle NP. 1895 'Well, if this don't lick cock-fighting!' | London M. 276 My goodness! — if I ain't all tired a'ready! || Jerrold C. 56 Well, if I've hardly patience to lie in the same bed!

In Dan. and Norwegian with *om* very often preceded by some adverb of asseveration: Næ, om jeg gjorde det! | Ibsen

P. Gynt 195 De lovte før At spede lidt til. — Nej, om jeg gør! | id. Når vi døde v. 145 Kan du ikke mindes det nu længer? — Nej, så sandelig om jeg kan | Kielland Fort. 40 men nei saagu' om jeg ved, hvad jeg har gjort | Hørup 2. 267 men ved gud! om jeg vilde undvære oppositionen, ingen af os vilde undvære den | Niels Møller Kogl. 297 Og ja, så min sæl, om jeg ikke også ser William sidde derovre | Bang Haabl. sl. 357 Om det just er sundt at ligge og døse i saadan en hundekulde.

In the same way in German: Ob ich das verstehen kann! and in Dutch: Fr. v. Eeden Kl. Joh. 115 Of ik niet besta! Drommels goed. Cf. Fr. (with an oath) Droz Mons. 3 Du diable si je me souviens de son nom (see below on *the devil*).

As if is often used in the same way: B. Jo. 3. 154 "What college?" As if you knew not (= of couse you know). In the same way in other languages: Somom du ikke vidste det! | Als ob du es nicht wüsstest! | Comme si tu ne savais pas!

---

(3) In Roister 38 Hence both twaine. And let me see you play me such a part againe — *let me see you play* means the same as 'don't play'; a threatening "and I shall punish you" is left out after *let me see*, etc.

More often we have the imperative *see* (or *you see*) with an *if*-clause: *see if I don't* = 'I shall':

Sh. H4. B. II. 2. 77 see if the fat villain haue not transform'd him ape | Brontë P. 27 I see such a fine girl sitting in the corner . . . see if I don't get her for a partner in a jiffy! | Thack N. 529 Make your fortune, see if you won't | Trollope O. 137 now I'll get the day fixed; you see if I don't | Gissing G. 64 I shall rise to the occasion, see if I don't | Wells L. 94.

Exactly the same phrase is usual in Dan., see, e. g., DgF. nr. 390 Stat op, her Ioen, och gach her-ud!" "See, om ieg giør!" sagde Ioen — whence Baggesen: "Kom ud, ridder Rap,

til den øvrige flok!" "Ja see, om jeg giør!" sagde Rap || Holb. Pol. kand. 5. 1 Du skal nok see, at bormester staaer paa pinde for dig | id. Masc. 1. 1 Du skal nok see, at det er saa lyst klokken fire i januarii maaned.

---

(4) A somewhat similar phrase is *catch me doing it* = ['you won't catch me doing it' =] 'I shan't do it'; also with *at it*, *at that*; in the last quotation this is combined with the conditional way of expressing a negative: Swift P. 74 Catch him at that, and hang him | Di Do. 108 Catch you forgetting anything! | Di D. 104 Peggotty go away from you? I should like to catch her at it | Hughes T. 2. 127 Old Copas won't say a word — catch him | Shaw 1. 34 Catch him going down to collect his own rents! Not likely! || Fielding 5. 526 but if ever you catch me there again: for I was never so frightened in all my life.

With this may be compared the Dan. phrase with *lur*: Goldschm. Hjeml. 2. 767 Talen er det eneste, der adskiller os fra dyret; saa mangen fugl synger poesi; men luur den, om den kan holde en tale, men det kan jeg! | Hørup 2. 105 bladet anmodede i fredags Hørup om at tænke resten. Men lur ham, om han gør.

---

(5) *Excuse my* (*me*) *doing* is sometimes used in the positive sense 'forgive me for doing', but not unfrequently in the negative sense 'forgive me for not doing'. Examples of the latter (cf. NED. *excuse* 8, only one example (1726) of *-ing*): Hazlitt A. 108 she said she hoped I should excuse Sarah's coming up | Scott O. 76 you will excuse my saying any thing that will criminate myself | Di F. 28 You must excuse my telling you [= I won't] | Kingsley Y. 64 Excuse my rising, gentlemen, but I am very weak | Philips L. 64 you must excuse my saying anything more on the subject at the present moment.

---

(6) Ironical phrases implying incredulity (= 'I don't believe what you are just saying') are frequent in colloquial and jocular speech, thus: Go and tell the marines! | Ridge G. 291 That's my father. 'Go along!' said cook incredulously | Norris P. 84 Oh, get out, protested the broker | ib. 86 Oh, come now | ib. 98 Ah, go to bed, protested H. — Similarly in Dan. Gå væk! | Den må du længere ud på landet med!

Fiddlesticks is used either by itself (= 'nonsense') or after a partial repetition of some words that one wants scornfully to reject: Jerrold C. 53 . . . twenty pounds. — Twenty fiddlesticks | Caine C. 351 'Good men have gone to the mission-field'. 'Mission fiddlesticks!'

Similar exclamations in other languages are Fr. *Des navets!* and G. *blech!* In Dan. *en god støvle* is said either by itself or after a verb: H. C. Andersen O. T. 1. 88 Vilhelm forsikkrede, at man maatte opfriskes lidt efter den megen læsning. "Ja, De læser nok en god støvle!" | Jacobsen N. Lyhne 299 han ligner Themistokles . . . Pyt, Themistokles, en god støvle! | Hørup 2. 228 Det viser dog "en ærlig og redelig vilje". Det viser en god støvle, gør det.

Among other rebuffs implying a negative may be mentioned Dan. *på det lag!* | *snak om en ting!* | Fr. *Plus souvent!* (Halévy Notes 247, frequent).

Swift in the same sense uses a word which is now considered very low: J. 57 they promise me letters to the two archbishops here; but mine a— for it all | ib. 61. Thus also formerly in Dan., see Ranch Skuesp. 322 Min fromme Knep, kand du mig kiende? — O, kysz mig i min bagende!

---

(7) A frequent ironical way of expressing a negative is by placing a word like *much* in the beginning of a sentence: *Much I care* (Stevenson T. 27, Di F. 659, Wells H. 122) = 'I don't care (much)' | Di D. 8 Mr. Copperfield was teaching

me — (Much he knew of it himself!) | Hardy W. 224 you yawned — much my company is to you | Galsworthy P. 3. 96 Much good that would have done | Shaw J. 114 Much good your pity will do it [England] | Id. P. 5 much good you are to wait up | Hope R. 37 Much you can do to stop 'em, old fellow | Kipling, J. 1. 230 A lot I should have cared whose fault it was | id. B. 58 Plucky lot she cared for idols when I kissed her where she stud! | Shaw J. 14 His brogue! A fat lot you know about brogues! | Hewlett Q. 117 She tossed her head, 'Fine he knows the heart of a lass'.

Similarly in Dan., for instance Fibiger Liv 236 han trak spottende paa skuldren og sagde: Naa, det skal vel *stort* hjælpe | Ibsen Inger 98 Det skulde *stort* hjælpe, om jeg . . . | Niels Møller Kogl. 235 Det skulde hjælpe *fedt* | Matthiesen Stjerner 30 men *ligemeget* hjalp det.

There is a curious use of *fejl* as a negative, only with *bryde sig om*: Pal.-Müller Ad. H. 1. 142 Du bryder dig jo feil om eiermanden.

Among ironical expressions must also be mentioned Eng. *love* = 'nothing'. This, I take it, originated in the phrase "to marry for love, not for money", whence the common antithesis "for love or money". Then it was used extensively in the world of games, where it is now the usual word in counting the score, in tennis, for instance, "love fifteen", meaning that one party has nothing to the other's 15, in football "winning by two goals to love", etc. In this sense the Engl. word has become international in the terminology of some games.

---

(8) *The devil* (also without the article) is frequently used as an indirect negative; cf. from other languages J. Grimm, Personenwechsel in der Rede p. 23 f. In English we have *the devil* joined either to a verb, or to a substantive (*the devil a*

word = 'not a word'; *the devil a bit* = 'nothing'). There is a well-known little verse:

When the devil was ill, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil got well, *the devil a monk* was he.
(Sometimes quoted with *a saint* instead of *a monk*).

The following may serve as an illustration of the natural way in which the devil has come to play this part of a disguised negative: Black F. 184 Lady Rosamund is going to take a sketch of the luncheon party'. — 'Let her take a sketch of the devil!' said this very angry and inconsiderate papa.

Examples of *devil*, etc. with a verb:

Fielding T. 4. 174 the devil she won't [= she will] | Sheridan 11 Captain Absolute and Ensign Beverley are one and the same person. — The devil they are | ib. 242 she's in the room now. — The devil she is | ib. 256 | Trollope D. 2. 52 I was at that place at Richmond yesterday. 'The devil you were!' | id. O. 204 I am going back. — The devil you are | Hope M. 102 'I can't give you the money'. 'The devil you can't!' [= you can].

Examples of *devil* + subst. (in Sc. also with pronouns): Marlowe F. 766 My parents are al dead, and the diuel a peny they haue left me, but a bare pention | Sh. Tw. II. 3. 159 The diu'll a Puritane that hee is | Fielding 4. 290 and the devil a bird have I seen | Goldsmith 613 But now-a-days the devil a thing of their own .... about them, except their faces | Di N. 76 Has nothing been heard? 'Devil a bit'. | Quiller-Couch M. 210 If she did not tell you .... Tell me? Devil a bit of it | Scott A. 1. 21 it [the law-suit]'s been four times in afore the fifteen, and deil ony thing the wisest o' them could make o't | ib. 30 the deil a drap punch ye'se get here the day | ib. 31 the de'il ane wad hae stirred | ib. 341 de'il ony o' them daur hurt a hair o' auld Edie's head.

The following quotations exemplify more unusual employments (Irish?) of *devil* as a negative: Birmingham W. 6 Devil

the other idea there is in your head this minute [= there is no other i.] | ib. 34 and devil the word I'll speak to Mr. Eccles on your behalf | ib. 185 They're good anchors. Devil the better you'd see.

In Scotch there is an idiomatic use of *deil* (or *fient*) *hae't* [= 'have it'] in the sense of a negative: Burns 1. 16 For thae frank, rantin, ramblin, billies, Fient haet o' them's [not one of them is] ill-hearted fellows | ib. 17 Tho' deil-haet ails them [nothing] | Scott A. 2. 348 What do you expect? .... De'il hae't do I expect. This leads to a curious use of *hae't* = 'a bit, anything': She has-na a haed left; see NED. hate sb 2.

Instead of the word *devil*, (*the*) *deuce* is very often used in the same way; the word probably is identical with *deuce* from Fr. *deux*, OF. *deus*, to indicate the lowest, and therefore most unlucky, throw at dice, but is now felt as a milder synonym of *devil*.

Examples with the verb negatived:

Housman J. 149 'I heard what you said'. 'The deuce you did!' | Mered R. 287 'Deuce he has' | Hope Z. 174 he lies in his room upstains. — The deuce he does.

Examples with a substantive (or pronoun) negatived: Swift J. 130 I thought to have been very wise; but the deuce a bit, the company stayed | Sterne 98 the deuce of any other rule have I to govern myself by | Hazlitt A. 38 she did beguile me of my tears, but the deuce a one did she shed | ib. 40 The deuce a bit more is there of it | Hardy R. 209 'Sit down, my good people'. But the deuce a bit would they sit down | Mered H. 468 | Shaw J. 38 Jeuce a word I ever heard of it | Hope Z. 37 if you stay here, the deuce a man [= nobody] will doubt of it.

Occasionally other words may be used as substitutes for *the devil* with negative purport: Di Do. 447 'You may give him up, mother. He'll not come here'. 'Death give him up. He *will* come here.' | Worth S. 238 But we're not mixed up

in the party fight. — The hell you're not! [= you are] | Scott A. 1. 145 but ne'er-be-licket could they find that was to their purpose.

In Irish *sorrow* (pronounced "sorra", [sɔrə]) is used as a synonym of the devil (see Joyce Ir. 70), also as a negative, cf. the following quotations: Buchanan F. 110 when he had to cross the mountains on an empty stomach to say Mass, and sorra a bite of bread or ship of water to stay his stomach | ib. 111 Anthony was all for books and book-learning; and sorra a colleen ever troubled the heart of him | ib. 114 Is there any more news? Sorra news, except that he's lying in the gaol | ib. 163 Do you think the intention was to hit the car?' 'Sorra doubt' | ib. 172 Did one of them think . . . . Sorra one | Birmingham W. 308 Sorra the man in the town we'd rather be listening to than yourself | Quiller-Couch T. 181 [Irish lady:] Sam tells me sorra a sowl goes nigh ut | Ward D. 2. 113 He gets rid of one wife and saddles himself with another — sorrow a bit will he stop at home for either of them | ib. 3. 30 But sorrow a bit o' pity will you get out o' me, my boy — sorrow a bit.

The corresponding use of Da. *fanden* is extremely frequent in Holberg and later, see e. g. Holb. Er. Mont. 4. 2 jeg vil bevise af den sunde logica, at I er en tyr. — I skal bevise fanden ¦ Ulyss. 2. 7 Havde jeg ikke været en politicus, saa havde jeg skiøttet fanden derom | Blicher 1. 43 Kan vi ikke sejle fra ham? . . . Fanden kan vi, svarte han | H. C. Andersen O. T. 1. 67 Jeg vidste fanden hvad det var | Pal.-Müller Ad. H. 1. 140 Jeg bryder fanden mig om eiermanden | Drachm. Forskr. 1. 195 De er virkelig født kommentator! — Jeg er fanden, er jeg | Bjørnson Guds v. 71 han brydde sig fanden om sang og solskin. Similarly with the synonym *djævelen*: Holb. Er. Mont. 4. 2 Jeg siger, at I er en hane, og skal bevise det . . . I skal bevise dievelen. This is not usual nowadays.

Fanden often stands for 'not I': Holb. Ulyss. Gid nu fanden staae her længer [= I won't], vi maa ogsaa have noget af byttet | Drachmann Kitzw. 85 Fanden forstaa sig paa kvindfolk! | Bang Ludvb. 38 Fanden véd, om det holder. — Thus also *satan*: Nexø Pelle 2. 129 Satan forstaa sig paa havet.

Fanden (*Satan*) *heller* is also used in a negative sense ('I would rather have the devil'), thus Blicher 3. 547, Goldschmidt Kol. 92.

Sometimes *fanden* is used simply to intensify an expressed negative: Wessel 204 "Gaae du til fanden!" Den anden Gik *fanden ei* til fanden | Juel-Hansen Ung. 186 og saa véd jeg *fanden ikke*, hvordan det gik til.

Two modern G. examples of *den teufel* = 'nicht' may suffice: Sudermann Fritzchen: Die fremden weiber gingen mich den teufel was an | "Im theaterstück sagt ein mann zu seiner stets keifenden, zanksüchtigen frau: "Ich weiss ja doch, dass ich einen sanften engel zur frau habe" — worauf sie mit artigem widerspruch schreit: "Den teufel hast du", wobei sie zunächst nur an widerspruch denkt, als ob sie sagen wollte "nein, gar nichts hast du" (Bruchmann, Psychol. studien zur sprachgesch. 172). For older examples, see Grimm, quoted above.

As *pox* (originally the name of a disease) was popularly used as a kind of substitute for the devil in imprecations, it can also be used in indirect negation, as in Swift J. 22 The Dean friendly! the Dean be poxed [= he is not].

In the same way Dan. *pokker* is used, as in Wessel 4 I kiørte pokker, I! og ikke til majoren | Topsøe Skitseb. 107 Han tror vistnok, at han gør mig en hel glæde . . . Han gør pokker, gør han | Hørup 2. 173 Han har pokker, har han! — Also with *heller*, as above: Kielland Jac. 67 Det retter sig med aarene. Det gjør pokker heller.

God [or *Heaven*] *knows* is in all languages a usual way of saying 'I don't know'; the underlying want of logic is brought out in Marlowe F. 200 wheres thy maister? — God in heauen knowes. — Why, dost not thou know? — Yes I know, but that followes not.

But inversely *Heaven knows* also serves as a strong asseveration, as in Di D. 786 "We were happy then, I think". "Heaven knows we were!" said I.

Elsewhere (Festskrift til Feilberg 1911 36) I have mentioned that in Dan. *gud veed* is used to express uncertainty, and *det veed gud*, certainty; cf. *Gud må vide om han er dum* (uncertainty), but *gud skal vide, han er dum* (certainty).

---

(9) Hypothetical clauses, like *if I were rich* (nowadays also in the indicative: *if I was rich*) or *if I had been rich* are often termed "clauses of rejected condition", but as it is not the condition that is rejected but that which is (or would be) dependent on the condition, (for instance, *I should travel*, or *I should have travelled*) a better name would be "clauses of rejecting condition". At any rate they express by the tense (and mood) that something is irreal, implying 'I am not rich'. — The negative idea may be strengthened in the same way as a pure negative, cf. Hope D. 202 What your poor wife would do if she cared *a button* for you, I don't know — implying: she does not care a button for you.

---

(10) There are other more or less indirect ways of expressing a negative, e.g. Scott A. 1. 65 recollections which were *any thing rather than* agreeable | Trollope W. 85 leaving her lover in *anything but* a happy state of mind | Di F. 275 it is *the reverse of* important to my position | Gissing B. 339 the constitution of his mind made it *the opposite* of natural for him to credit himself with . . . | I am *at a loss* to understand it.

Cf. Dan. Drachm. Forskr. 2. 190 Der havde været tidsafsnit, hvor han laa *alt andet end* paa den lade side. — Below we shall see a further development of *andet end.*

On the whole it may be said that words like *other* (*otherwise, else, different*) in all languages are used as negative terms; cf. also "I had to decide upon the desirability or otherwise [= or the undesirability] of leaving him there".

Negation is also implied in expressions with *too* (she is too poor to give us anything = she cannot . . .) and in all second members of a comparison after a comparative (she is richer than you think = you do not think that she is so rich as she really is); hence we understand the use of Fr. *ne* (elle est plus riche que vous ne croyez) and the development of negatives to signify 'than', as in Swift J. 499 you are more used to it *nor* I, as Mr. Raymond says | GE Mill 1. 6 and often *nor* as dialectal | Shaw C. 69 (vg) I'd sooner be a dog *nor* a trainer. See Holthausen IF. 32. 339 and for Slavonic Vondrák Vgl. gr. 2. 336.

The indirect way of expressing the negative notion is responsible for a pretty frequent continuation with *much less* (which is practically synonymous with "not to speak of" and corresponds very nearly in many instances to Dan. *endsige*, G. *geschweige denn* to introduce a stronger expression), as in Browning 1. 395 How very long since I have thought Concerning — much less wished for — aught Beside the good of Italy [= I have not long thought . . .] | Harrison R. 73 it would need long years, not a few crowded months, to master the history of Venice, much less that of Italy, for the whole Middle Ages [= it is impossible in the course of a few months] | id. [on Mark Pattison] Why did he ever write, much less publish, his memoirs? [= he should not have . . .] | Hardy L. 46 Why were you so weak as to admit such an enemy to

your house — one so obviously your evil genius — much less accept him as a husband? | ib. 201 a place of Dantesque gloom at this hour, which would have afforded secure hiding for a battery of artillery, much less a man and a child [= where you could not see .... much less] | Zangwill in Cosmopolis '97. 619 the child thought it a marvellous feat to read it, much less know precisely how to chant it [= it was not easy ....] | NP. 1907 Is it right to entrust the mental development of a single child, much less a class of children, to a man who is ignorant of mental science?

Thus also in Dan., e. g. Gravlund Da. studier 1909. 86 hvem skulde ta sig det nær, langt mindre blive hidsig | NP. '15 Det er vistnok første gang, at han overhovedet har været i Rømersgade — langt mindre talt der.

In a similar way we have *impossible* followed by *much less* = 'much less possible': London M. 314 It was impossible that this should be, much less in the labour ghetto south of Market | NP. 1914 it is impossible for a Prime Minister to follow, far less to supervise, the work of individual Ministers | Dobson F. 105 to make any extracts from it — still less to make any extracts which should do justice to it, is almost impracticable.

By a similar confusion Carlyle uses *much more*, because he is thinking of something like: "it is impossible for ... to foster the growth of anything": S 73 How can an inanimate Gerund-grinder ... foster the growth of anything; much more of Mind, which grows ... by mysterious contact of Spirit?

Much more would have been more apposite than *much less* in London M 181 I loved you hard enough to melt the heart of a stone, much less the heart of the living, breathing woman you are.

B. Incomplete Negation.

Among *approximate negatives* we must first mention *hardly*, which from signifying 'with hardness, i. e. with difficulty' comes to mean 'almost not'; the negative import is shown by

the possibility of strengthening *hardly* by adding *at all* (which is only found with negative expressions). In this sense *hardly* follows the general tendency to place negatives before the notion negatived (see above, p. 5): *I hardly know*. Cf. Sweet, New E. Gr. § 1847 on the difference between *I hardly think we want a fire* and *to think hardly of a person*.

Corresponding words in other languages, like Dan. *vanskeligt*, G. *schwerlich*, Fr. *à peine*, also have approximately the value of a negative, though perhaps not quite so much as *hardly*.

Scarcely (obsolete adv. *scarce*) also is what the NED. terms "a restricted negative" (= 'not quite'); in the same way Dan. *knap*, *næppe*, *knebent*, G. *kaum*. — Note the use after words meaning *before* in (NED. quot. 1795) Recollection returned before I had scarcely written a line | Rolland J.-Chr. 1. 168 Avant de savoir à peine écrire ses lettres, il s'évertua à griffonner | Henrichsen Mænd fra forfatn.-kamp. 108 Og før han knap selv vidste deraf, gik Berg med en politiker i maven.

In English *scarcely any*, *scarcely ever* is generally preferred to the combinations *almost no*, *almost never*.

But *almost* with *no*, *nothing*, *never* is not quite so rare as most grammarious would have us think; it is perhaps more Scotch (and American) than British, hence Boswell (I 32*) in later editions changed "I suppose there is almost no language" to "we scarcely know of a language". In the following quotations I have separated British, Scotch, and American examples by means of || : Gammer 104 here is almost no fier | Bacon, see Bøgholm p. 74 | Cowper L. 1. 188 I shall remember almost nothing of the matter | Austen M. 352 she has found almost nothing | Ward D. 2. 51 almost nothing definite (see also Storm E. Ph. 942) || Scott A. 2. 66 rights which are now rarely practised in Protestant countries, and almost never in Scotland | Carlyle H. 75 open to all, seen by almost none | id. F. 3. 62 Nothing, or almost nothing, is certain to me, except the Divine Infernal character of this universe | Buchanan, Father Anthony 97 On first entering I could see almost nothing || James A. 1. 265 He himself was almost never bored | G. R. Carpenter The Teaching of English 44 the academies paid almost no attention whatever to English instruction.

Little and *few* are also incomplete negatives; note the frequent collocation with *no*: there is *little or no* danger |

there have been *few or no* attempts at denial; note also the use of *yet* in Shelley Pr. 295 I have yet seen little of Florence. Other examples (the last with *little* before a pl.): Sh. John IV. 3. 3. There's few or none do know me | Wordsworth P. 3. 626 with few wise longings and but little love | Hope F. 38 the situation showed little signs of speedy development.

The negative force of *little* is seen very clearly when (like other negatives, see p. 5) it is placed before the verb. "This use is confined to the vbs. *know*, *think*, *care*, and synonyms of these" (NED. with examples so far back as 1200): Cowper L. 1. 352 I little thought, when I mounted him [John Gilpin] upon my Pegasus, that he would become so famous | Byron D. J. 5. 1 They little think what mischief is in hand | Scott A. 1. 21 I little thought to have seen your honour here | Kingsley H. 236 Little they thought how I was plotting for their amusement | Hope R. 205 He little knew the cause of what he saw. It may be mentioned for the curiosity of the thing that *little* and *much* (see above p. 30) mean exactly the same in *Little* (*much*) *she cares what I say.*

This negative *little* is frequent with verbs and adjectives, but rarer with substantives; in the following quotations we have it with verbal substantives, and *or* in the second shows clearly the negative value of *little*: Austen M. 55 reading in their minds their little approbation of a plan . . . | Carlyle R. 1. 294 as he or I had little interest in that.

While *little* and *few* are approximate negative, *a little* and *a few* are positive expressions: *he has little money* and *he has few friends* express the opposite of *much money* and *many friends* and therefore mean about the same thing as *no money* and *no friends*; but *he has a little money* and *he has a few friends*, generally with the verb stressed rather strongly, mean the opposite of *no money*, and *no friends*, thus nearly the same thing as *some money* and *some friends*. *Little* means 'less than you would expect', *a little* 'more than you would expect':

Unfortunately, little is left of the former splendour | Fortunately, a little is still left of the former splendour | Unfortunately, there are few who think clearly | Fortunately there are a few who think clearly (note here the stress on *are*). Cf. below on *not a little, not a few.*

Sh. uses *a few* in some cases, where now *few* would be used without the article e. g. All. I. 1. 73 Loue all, trust a few, Do wrong to none (see Al. Schmidt); the difference between *a little* and *little* is well brought out in Sh. Merch. I. 2. 95 when he is best, he is a little worse than a man, and when he is worst, he is little better than a beast. — On the other hand *little* is positive in "love me *little* and love me long" (mentioned as a proverb as early as 1548, NED.).

Note the different idioms with the two synonyms *but* and *only*: there is *but little* difference = there is *only a little* difference | there are *but few* traces left = there are *only a few* traces left. — See e. g. Sh. Ado. I. 1. 7 How many gentlemen have you lost in this action? But few of any sort, and none of name | NP. 1917 The fog has lifted only a little; only a few big landmarks are yet visible | Bunyan P. 156 For but few of them that begin to come hither, do shew their face on these mountains | Merriman S. 124 a passion such as a few only are capable of attaining.

In America *a little* is to such an extent felt as a positive term that it can be strengthened by *quite*: *quite a little* means nearly the same thing as 'a good deal', and *quite a few* as 'a good many'. This is rare in England, see Wells Br. 264 In quite a little time Mrs. Britling's mind had adapted itself.

Practically the same distinction as between *little* and *a little* is made between Fr. *peu* and *un peu*, It. and Sp. *poco* and *un poco*, G. (MHG.) *wenig* and *ein wenig*. Has this developed independently in each language? In Dan. the corresponding differentiation has been effected in another way: *lidet*

(literary) or generally *kun lidt* = 'little', *lidt* or very often *en smule* = 'a little'.

Small has not exactly the same negative force as its synonym *little*, cf. however Caine C. 36 Small thanks you get for it either — where *either* is due to the negative notion. Cf. also *slight* in Gissing B. 366 she had slight hope that any other caller would appear.

The comparative of *little* has a negative meaning, especially in the old combination OE *þy læs þe*, which has become *lest* and is the equivalent of 'that not'. (With a following *not* it means the positive 'in order that' as in Sh. Merch III. 2. 7 But least you should not vnderstand me well, I would detaine you here some month or two). With this should be compared the Lat. *minus* in *quo minus* and *si minus*.

CHAPTER V

Special and Nexal Negation.

The negative notion may belong logically either to one definite idea or to the combination of two ideas (what is here called the nexus).

The first, or special, negation may be expressed either by some modification of the word, generally a prefix, as in

*n*ever (etc., see p. 12)
*un*happy
*im*possible, *in*human, *in*competent
*dis*order
non-belligerent

(See on these prefixes ch. XIII) —

or else by the addition of *not* (*not happy*) or *no* (*no longer*). Besides there seem to be some words with inherent negative meaning though positive in form: compare pairs like

absent	*present*
fail	*succeed*
lack	*have*
forget	*remember*
exclude	*include.*

But though we naturally look upon the former in each of these pairs as the negative (*fail* = *not succeed*), nothing hinders us from logically inverting the order (*succeed* = *not fail*). These words, therefore, cannot properly be classed with such formally negative words as *unhappy*, etc.

A simple example of negatived nexus is *he doesn't come*: it is the combination of the two positive ideas *he* and *coming* which is negatived. If we say *he doesn't come today*, we negative the combination of the two ideas *he* and *coming today*; compare, on the other hand, *he comes, but not today*, where it is only the temporal idea *today* that is negatived.

Though the distinction between special and nexal negation is clear enough in principle, it is not always easy in practice to distinguish the two kinds, which accounts for some phenomena to be discussed in detail below. In the sentence "he doesn't smoke cigars" it seems natural to speak of a negative nexus, but if we add "only cigarettes", we see that it is possible to understand it as "he smokes, but not cigars, only cigarettes".

Similarly, it seems to be of no importance whether we look upon one notion only or the whole nexus as being negatived in *she is not happy* = 'she is (positive) not-happy' or 'she is not (negative nexus) happy'; thus also *it is not possible to see it*, etc. In these cases there is a tendency to attract *not* to the verb: *she isn't happy, it isn't possible to see it*, but there is scarcely any difference between these expressions and *she is unhappy, it is impossible to see it*, though the latter are somewhat stronger. If, however, we add a subjunct like *very*,

we see a great difference between *she isn't very happy* and *she is very unhappy.*

The nexus is negatived in *Many of us didn't want the war*, but many others did (NP. '17) — which rejects the combination of the two ideas *many of us* and *want the war* and thus predicates something (though something negative) about *many of us.* But in *Not many of us wanted the war* we have a special negative belonging to *many of us* and making that into *few of us*; and about these it is predicated that they wanted the war. Cf. below ch. VIII on *not all, all . . . not.*

Note also the difference between *the disorder was perfect* (*order* negatived) and *the order was not perfect* (nexus negatived, which amounts to the same thing as: *perfect* negatived).

In a sentence like *he won't kill me* it is the nexus (between the subject *he* and the predicate *will kill me*) that is negatived, even though it is possible by laying extra emphasis on one of the words seemingly to negative the corresponding notion; for "*he* won't kill me" is not = 'not-he will kill me', nor is "he won't *kill* me" = 'he will do the reverse of killing me', etc.

Cf. also the following passage from Stanley Jevons, Elem. Lessons in Logic, p. 175: — "It is curious to observe how many and various may be the meanings attributable to be same sentence according as emphasis is thrown upon one word or another. Thus the sentence 'The study of Logic is not supposed to communicate a knowledge of many useful facts,' may be made to imply that the study of Logic *does* communicate such a knowledge although it is not supposed to; or that it communicates a knowledge of a *few* useful facts; or that it communicates a knowledge af many *useless* facts".

There is a general tendency to use nexal negation wherever it is possible (though we shall later on see another tendency that in many cases counteracts this one); and as the (finite) verb is the linguistic bearer of a nexus, at any rate in all complete sentences, we therefore always find a strong tendency to attract the negative to the verb. We see this in the prefixed *ne* in Fr. as well as in OE, and also in the suffixed *-n't* in Mod. E., which will be dealt with in chapter XI, and

in the suffixed *ikke* in modern Norwegian, as in "Er ikke (erke) det fint?" and "Vil-ikke De komme?", where Dan. has the older word-order "Er det ikke fint?" and "Vil De ikke komme?". — In Mod. E. the use or non-use of the auxiliary *do* serves in many, but not of course in all, cases to distinguish between nexal and special negation; thus we have special negation in Shaw 1. 160 He seems *not certain* of his way.

In French we have a distinction which is somewhat analogous to that between nexal and special negation, namely that between *pas de* and *pas du*: je ne bois pas de vin | ceci n'est pas du vin, c'est du vinaigre, see the full treatment in Storm, Større fransk syntax, 1911 p. 87 ff. Good examples are found in Rolland JChr. 9. 192 ce n'était *plus de la* poésie, ce n'était *pas de la* prose, c'était de la poésie, mise en prose; but ib. 197 Il n'y a *pas d'*amour, *pas de* haine, *pas d'*amis, *pas d'*ennemis, *pas de* foi, *pas de* passion, *pas de* bien, *pas de* mal. — With the partitive force of *pas* with *de* should be compared the well-known use of the genitive for the object in Russian negative sentences and with *nět* 'there is not', etc., also the use of the partitive case for the subject of a negative sentence in Finnish.

In the case of a contrast we have a special negation; hence the separation of *is* (with comparatively strong stress) and *not* in Macaulay E. 1. 41 the remedy is, not to remand him into his dungeon, but to accustom him to the rays of the sun. — *Do* is not used in such sentences as AV. Matt. 10. 34 I came not to send peace, but a sword | Wilde P. 135 my ruin came not from too great individualism of life, but from too little | Dickinson S. 14 We meet not in drawing-rooms, but in the hunting-field.

Even in such contrasted statements, however, the negative is very often attracted to the verb, which then takes *do*: we do not meet in the drawing-room, but in the hunting-field — the latter part being then equivalent to: but we meet in the hunting-field | I do not complain of your words, but of the tone in which they were uttered | I do not admire her face, but (I do admire) her voice | He didn't say that it was a shame, but that it was a pity | Tennyson 464 I did not come to curse thee, Guinevere (contrast not expressed).

In such cases the OE verb naturally had no *ne* before it, see e. g. Beow. 338 wen ic þæt ge for wlenco, nalles for wræcsiðum ac for higeþrymmum, Hroðgar *sohton* | Bede IV. 3 ðæt he nalæs to idelnesse, swa sume oðre, ac to gewinne, in ðæt mynster *eode* | Apoll. 25 ðe ic lufode na for galnesse ac for wisdome. The exception in Matt. 10. 34 *ne com* ic sybbe to sendanne, ac swurd — may be accounted for by the Latin word-order (non veni pacem mittere, sed gladium). But in Ælfric Hom. 1. 234 we have: Ne getimode þam apostole Thome unforsceawodlice, þæt he ungeleafful wæs . . ., ac hit getimode þurh Godes forsceawunge — where the meaning is: 'it happened not-unprovidentially', as shown by the indicative *wæs* and by the necessity of the repetition *hit getimode*. Cf. also the ME. version ed. by Paues 56 For Christ ne sende noȝt me for to baptyze, bote for-to preche þe gospel (= AV. 1. Cor. 1. 17 For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel).

Other examples of constructions in which *not* is referred to the verb instead of some other word ('I stepped . . . not without', 'pay, not only'): Wordsworth P. 4. 16 I did not step into the well-known boat Without a cordial greeting | Hope Q. 132 Don't pay only the arrears, pay all you can | Galsw. F. 332 it doesn't only concern myself.

Note also: We aren't here to talk nonsense, but to act — where the sentence "we aren't here" in itself is a contradiction in terms. (Differently in "We are here, not to retire till compelled to do so" where *not* belongs more closely to what follows).

When the negation is attracted to the verb (in the form *n't*), it occasions a cleaving of *never*, *ever* thus standing by itself. In writing the verbal form is sometimes separated in an unnatural way: "*Can she not ever* write herself?" (Hallam in Tennyson L. 1. 258), representing the spoken "*Can't she ever . . .*"; and thus we get seemingly *not ever* = 'never' (different from

the old *not ever* as in More U. 244, which meant 'not always'). Wells H. 422 You shan't touch those hostels ever again. Ever | Hope D. 40 I suppose you don't ever write to him? | Ward M. 242 I can't ever see that man again | Locke S. 269 Don't you ever go down beneath the surface of things? | Caine P. 219 so don't you ever be troubled about that || Sh. Hml. III. 2. 411 let not euer The soule of Nero enter this firme bosome | Shelley 83 A light around my steps which would not ever fade | Trollope D. 2. 40 Do you not ever go? | Shaw 1. 40 you shall not — not ever.

A special case of frequent occurrence is the rejection of something as the cause of or reason for something real, expressed in a negative form: "he is happy, not on account of his riches, but on account of his good health" expressed in this form "he is not (isn't) happy on account of his riches, but on account of his good health". It will easily be seen that "I didn't go because I was afraid" is ambiguous (I went and was not afraid, or, I did not go, and was afraid), and sentences like this are generally avoided by good stylists. In Di F. 348 Don't patronize *me*, Ma, because I can take care of myself — the clause gives the reason for the speaker not wanting to be patronized. Similarly Locke Ord 151 I have not drunk deep of life because I have been unathirst.

In the spoken language a distinction will usually be made between the two kinds of sentences by the tone, which rises on *call* in "I didn't call because I wanted to see her" (but for some other reason), while it falls on *call* in "I didn't call because I wanted to avoid her" (the reason for not calling).

In Mason R. 95 "You mustn't come whining back to me, because I won't have you" the clause indicates the reason for the prohibition. Thus frequently.

In other languages we have corresponding phenomena. Brandes's sentence (Tilskueren 1915. 52) "Napoleon handlede

ikke saadan, fordi han trængte til sine generaler" is ambiguous; and when Ernst Møller writes (Inderstyre 249, in speaking of "Christian Science"): "Men retningens magt opløses, som alt fremhævet, ikke fordi dens argumenter og læresætninger eftergås og optrævles; dens magt vil blive stående" — I suppose that most readers will misunderstand it as if *opløses* were to be taken in a positive sense; it would have been made clearer by a transposition: Men som alt fremhævet opløses retningens magt ikke . . .

Not unfrequently *not* is attracted to the verb in such a way that an adverb, which belongs to the whole proposition, is more or less awkwardly placed between words which should not properly be separated, as in Trollope D. 1. 76 you *are not probably* aware . . . (= probably you are not aware, or: you are probably not aware) | Ward M. 228 were he at that moment Home Secretary, he *would not probably* be reading it | ead. E. 2 Edward M., however, *was not apparently* consoled by her remarks | NP. '17 This is a strong expression. Yet it *is not perhaps* exaggerated. — The tendency to draw the auxiliary and *not* together has, on the other hand, been resisted in the following passages: Shaw 1. 27 You *will of course not* meet him until he has spoken to me | id. D. 21 he *is clearly not* a prosperous man | Black Ph. 280 they *had clearly not* been unfavourable to him | Ward M. 133 a music-master, whose blood *was certainly not* Christian | Galsw. P. 55 It's *simply not* fair to other people (= is simply unfair) | Wells H. 120 the smashing up of the Burnet family was *disagreeably not in the picture* of these suppositions. — In most of these, *not* evidently is a special negative, belonging to the following word.

It has sometimes been said that the combination *he cannot possibly come* is illogical; *not* is here taken to the verb *can*, while in Danish and German the negative is referred to *pos-*

sibly: "han kan umuligt komme", "er kann unmöglich kommen". There is nothing illogical in either expression, but only redundance: the notion of possibility is expressed twice, in the verb and in the adverb, and it is immaterial to which of these the negative notion is attached.

When *not* is taken with some special word, it becomes possible to use the adverb *still*, which is only found in positive sentences. *The officers were still not friendly* (NP. '17) is different from *the officers were not yet friendly* (*not yet* nexal negative) in so far as the latter presupposes a change having occurred after that time, which the former does not. Cf. also Letter '99 Although I wrote to him a fortnight ago, I have still not heard from him | Swift J. 503 my head is still in no good order (= 'is still bad', slightly different from *is not yet well*).

Yet not is rare: Johnson R. 112 P. was yet not satisfied.

Not a or *not one* before a substantive (very often *word*) is a kind of stronger *no*; at any rate the two words may be treated as belonging closely together, i. e. as an instance of special negative, the verb consequently taking no auxiliary *do*; cf. MEG. II. 16. 73, where many examples are given; see further:

Austen M. 395 say not a word of it | Hawthorne Sn. 46 the face seemed to smile, but answered not a word | Hardy R. 356 he mentioned not a word | Bennett B. 66 she said not a word about that interview | Doyle S. 5. 230 he lost not an hour in breaking with the murderer.

In a similar way *not* is attracted to *the least*, *the slightest*, and in recent usage *at all*, as shown by the absence of the auxiliary *do*: Swift 3. 200 his Majesty took not the least notice of us | Trollope W. 243 my resignation of the wardenship need offer not the slightest bar to its occupation by another person | Phillpotts M. 350 he rested but two hours and slept

not at all | Wells L. 65 an urgency that helped him not at all | Quiller-Couch M. 59 this explanation enlightened the Commandant not at all | Galsw F. 209 they talked not at all for a long time. — Cf. ib. 415 he cared not the snap of one of his thin, yellow fingers.

Where we have a verb connected with an infinitive, it is often of great importance whether the negation refers to the nexus (main verb) or to the infinitive. In the earlier stages of the language this was not always clear: *he tried not to look that way* was ambiguous; now the introduction of *do* as the auxiliary of a negative nexus has rendered a differentiation possible: *he did not try to look that way* | *he tried not to look that way*; and the (not yet recognized) placing of *not* after *to* serves to make the latter sentence even more unambiguous: *he tried to not look that way.* The distinction is clear in Bennett W. 2. 187 She *did not wish* to reflect; she strongly *wished not to* reflect.

Other examples with *not* belonging to an infinitive: Di D. 112 *Try not to do* it again | ib. 432 *Try not to associate* bodily defects with mental | id. X 20 the more he *endeavoured not to think*, the more he thought | Macaulay E. 1. 41 the fool who *resolved not to go* into the water till he had learnt to swim | Hope In. 38 Tommy *deserved not to be* hated | Black Ph. 61 if one were to live always among those bright colours, one would *get not to see* them | Galsworthy P. 6. 91 I soon *got not to care* | Swinburne L. 158 I may *come not to feel* such unbearable shame as I do now | Ward D. 3. 132 I knew he'd *come not to care* about the book-selling || Thack V. 200 I beseech you before you go, not perhaps to return, once more to let me press the hand | Mac Carthy 2. 521 the Prime-minister was too much absorbed in the zeal of his cause not sometimes to run counter to the feelings of men || Mrs. Carlyle F. 3. 24 I

wished to not treat you to more tears || Hope D. 94 I might not have gone. I might easily not have gone (cf. above p. 48 and ch. VIII below).

When *do* cannot be used, it is not always easy to see whether *not* belongs to the main verb or the infinitive, as in Sh. Merch III 2. 230 My purpose was not to haue seen you heere — where, however, the next line shows that what is meant is 'it was not my purpose to have seen you here', and not 'it was my purpose not to have . . .' This paraphrase further serves to show that in some cases word-order may remove any doubt as to the belonging of the negative, thus very often with a predicative; cf. also such frequent cases as Locke S. 232 He was beginning not to despise the day of small things. And in the spoken language the use of *wasn't* [wɔznt] in one case, and unstressed *was* [wəz] followed by a strongly stressed *not* in the other, will at once make the meaning clear of such sentences as the one first quoted here.

Don't let us is the idiomatic expression, where logically it would be preferable to say *let us* with *not* to the infinitive (an injunction not to . . .): Thack P. 2. 213 Do not let us, however, be too prodigal of our pity.

In the old construction without *do* we see the same attraction of *not* to *let* (though the last two quotations show *not* placed with the infinitive): AV. John 19. 24 let not vs rent it | B. Jo. 3. 183 let not my behaviour seem rude | Congreve 255 let not the prospect of worldly lucre carry us beyond your judgment | Di N. 443 And let not those whose eyes have been accustomed to . . . . suppose that . . . | Mered H. 219 let not another dare suspect it || Goldsmith 636 let us not add guilt to our misfortunes | Johnson R. 101 let us not imagine evil which we do not feel.

While now *not* is always in natural language placed before the infinitive it belongs to, there is a poetic or archaic way of placing it after the infinitive, as in Wordsworth 131 one object which you might pass by, Might see and *notice not* | By 396 a continuance of

enduring thought, Which then I can *resist not* | Caine C. 59 God bless you, my son, ... and when He smiles on you, may the frown of a man *affect you not.*

In other languages difficulties like those mentioned in English are obviated in different ways. Thus in Greek *mē* is used to negative an infinitive, while *ou* is used with a finite verb. In Dan. a certain number of combinations like *jeg beklager ikke at kunne hjælpe Dem* may be ambiguous, though less so in the spoken than in the printed form; but in some instances the colloquial use of a preposition shows where *ikke* belongs; instead of the literary *prøv ikke at se derhen* it is usual to say either *prøv ikke på at se derhen* or *prøv på ikke at se derhen.* There is another colloquial way out of the difficulty, by means of the verbal phrase *lade være* or rather *la vær*: *prøv at (å) la vær at (å) se derhen.* Thus also *du skal la vær å se derhen*, different from *du skal ikke se derhen.*

In Latin the place of *non* before the main verb or before the infinitive will generally suffice to make the meaning clear. Similarly in French: *il ne tâche pas de regarder* | *il tâche de ne pas regarder* | *il ne peut pas entendre* | *il peut ne pas entendre* — whence the possibility of saying *non potest non amare* | *il ne peut pas ne pas aimer* = Dan. *han kan ikke lade være at elske*, Eng. *he cannot but love, cannot help loving* (*cannot choose but love*). Cf. below ch. VIII.

In this connexion I must mention an interesting phenomenon frequent in Russian; I take my examples from Holger Pedersen's Russisk Læsebog (København 1916) p. 12: *a pět' už ne stal* 'but sing now he not began' which is explained as standing for the logical 'not-to-sing he began', i. e. 'he ceased to sing' | *ne véléno étogo dělat'* 'order is not given to do this instead of the logical 'order is given not to do this', i. e. 'it is prohibited to do this'. Similarly with *dolžen.* But how comes it that the negative *ne* is in such expressions attached to the wrong word? There is another way of viewing these

sentences, if we take the negative to mean not the contradictory, but the contrary term: *ne stal* 'did the opposite of beginning', i. e. 'ceased'; *ne veľno* 'the opposite of order, i. e. prohibition, is given'. And in Vondrák's Vergleichende slavische Grammatik (Göttingen 1908) 2. 400, I find: "mitunter wird der begriff des verbs nicht durch *ne* aufgehoben, sondern in sein gegenteil verwandelt: aksl. *nenaviděti* 'hassen' (b. *náviděti* 'lieben'), s. *nèstati* 'verschwinden'.

This closely resembles a Greek idiom, see Krüger, Griech. sprachlehre 5th ed. § 67 1. a. 2.: "Einzelne begriffe werden besonders durch *ou* aufgehoben, ja zuweilen ins gegenteil verwandelt, wie *oú phēmi* nego, verneine . . . *ouk axiô* verlange dass nicht, *ouk eô* veto, verwehre, widerrate (auch erlaube nicht)." — Kühner, Ausf. gr. d. griech. spr. v. Gerth II. 2. 180: "litotes liegt vor, wenn *phēmí* die negation an sich zieht, die logisch richtiger beim abhängigen infinitive stehen würde: *oú phēmi toûto kalôs ékhein* nego hoc bene se habere". Ib. p. 182 this is explained as change into the contrary: *ouk eô* prohibeo . . . *ou stérgō* odi . . . *ou sumbouleúō* dissuadeo.

As as "accusative with an infinitive" may be considered as a kind of dependent clause, the mention of Lat. *nego Gaium venisse* = 'I say that Gaius has not come' naturally leads us to the strong tendency found in many languages to attract to the main verb a negative which should logically belong to the dependent nexus. In many cases *I don't think he has come* and similar sentences really mean 'I think he has not come'; though *I hope (expect) he won't come* is more usual than the less logical *I do not hope (expect) he will come*, which is usual in Danish and German, and also, according to Joyce (Ir. 20) among the Irish, who will say, e g. *It is not my wish that you should go to America at all*, by which is meant the positive assertion: 'It is my wish that you should not go', — as well as *I didn't pretend to understand what he said* for 'I pretended not to understand'.

A few Scandinavian examples may be given of this tendency to insert the negative in the main sentence: Hostrup Genb. III. 6 saa vil jeg *aldrig* ønske, at du maa blive gift | Schandorff NP. '97 Jeg tror *ikke*, at mange har læst Brand og at færre har forstaaet den (note here the continuation, which shows that what is meant is: tror at ikke mange . . .) | Bjørnson Guds v. 21 Men det lot 'o [= hun] *ikke*, som 'o hørte | Strindb. Giftas 2. 134 Han trodde *icke* presterna voro annat än examinerade studenter och att deras besvärjelseord bara var mytologi (note also here the positive continuation).

Cf. from French Tobler's Verm. beitr. 1. 164 *il ne faut pas que tu meures.*

In English we must note the distinction between *I don't suppose* (*I am not afraid*), where the main nexus is negatived, and *I suppose not* (*I am afraid not*) where the nexus is positive, but the object (a whole sentence understood) is negative; how old is this use of *not* for a whole sentence? Examples: Congreve 121 I'm afraid not | Di D. 93 Whether it ever came to my knowledge? I believe not directly'. — 'Well, you know not' | Di N. 311 'I am afraid you can't learn it'. — 'I am afraid not' | ib. 590 can you bear the thought of that? No, I should imagine not, indeed! | Trollope D. 2. 81 'I should not mind'. 'I dare say not, because you have nothing particular to say'. 'But I have something particular to say'. 'I hope not'. 'Why should you hope not?' | Kipling L. 217 I'll tell the boys. — Please not, old man | Conway C. 1 I believe I asked him to hold his tongue. — He says not.

Inversely we have a negative adverb standing for a whole main sentence, *not that* meaning "I do not say that" or "the reason is not that" as in Sh. Cæs. III. 2. 22 Not that I lou'd Cæsar lesse, but that I lou'd Rome more | Bunyan P. 113 Not that the heart can be good without knowledge | ib. 213 | Wilde In. 212 Not that I agree with everything I have

said in this essay | Locke W. 309 Not that he had forgotten them. — We shall see in ch. XII the use of *not but* (*that*) and *not but what* in the same sense.

In other languages correspondingly: Ikke at han havde (or: skulde ha) glemt dem | nicht dass er sie vergessen hätte | Rolland J. Chr. 5. 306 Non pas qu'il parlât à personne

When we say ("He'll come back") *Not he!* it is not really *he* that is negatived, but the nexus, although the predicative part of it is unexpressed; the exclamation is a complete equivalent of *He won't!* (with stress on *won't*). Examples (after || with the accusative used as a modern (vulgar or half-vulgar) 'disjointed' nominative):

Sh. H4. A. I. 2. 153 Who, I rob? I a theefe? Not I | Tp. III. 3. 42 | Err. V. 420 | Bunyan P. 142 Let us go see. Not I, said Christian | Carlyle S. 169 Were I a Steam-engine, wouldst thou take the trouble to tell lies of me? Not thou! | Di X. 30 Meg don't know what he likes. Not she! | Galsw F. 255 They wouldn't touch us . . . Not they | GE M. 44 'It'll perhaps rain cats and dogs to-morrow'. 'Not *it*' | Bennett W. 1. 263 Do you think it will last long? — Not it! | id. Cd. 244 | Wells T. 49 || id. V. 338 We shan't hang upon any misunderstanding. Not us | Austen S. 269 you were all in the same room together, were not you? 'No indeed! not us'.

In OE we have the corresponding *nic* in Wright-Wülcker, Voc. 1. 94 Wilt þu fon sumne hwæl? Nic | John, ed. Skeat 1. 21 spelt *nîc* and *nyc*, 18. 17 spelt *nicc* and *nich*. This (with the positive counterpart *I*, which is probably the origin of *ay* = 'yes', and *ye we* in Caxton R. 58 wille ye doo this . . . ye we, lorde) closely resembles the French *naje* 'not I' (in the third person *nenil*) and the positive *oje* 'hoc ego' (in the third person *oïl*, *oui*), see Tobler K. Z. 23. 423, Verm. Beitr. 1. 1, G. Paris, Romania 7. 465.

CHAPTER VI

Negative Attraction.

While the preceding chapter has shown the universal tendency to attract the negative to the verb even where it logically belongs to some other word, there is another tendency to attract the negative notion to any word that can easily be made negative. In colloquial language the former is the stronger tendency, but in literary English the latter often predominates because it yields a more elegant expression. Thus to the colloquial "we didn't meet anybody" corresponds a more literary "we met nobody". Cf. also "union won't be an easy matter" and "union will be no easy matter".

In the following sentences the negative really belongs to the nexus and should therefore be placed with the verb; note especially the tag question in the last sentence (*have we?* as after a negative *we haven't got*): Scott Iv. 89 those of thy tribe give nothing for nothing [= don't give anything for nothing] | Hay B. 68 She was aware of having done nothing wrong | Hewlett Q. 50 she found that she could count certainly upon nobody | Hope R. 230 we ask him to do nothing against his cousin. We ask only his silence | Gilbert 90 she loves you so well that she has the heart to thwart you in nothing | GE M. 2. 114 we've got a glass of nothing in the house, have we? — In Defoe R. 2. 299 'tis none of my business, or any part of my design — the continuation with *or any* shows that the beginning is felt to be = 'it isn't any . . .' — Cf. also the examples MEG. II. 16. 74.

This is particularly frequent with *need*: Swift T. 25 of ladders I need say nothing | Goldsmith 24 you need be under no uneasiness | Scott A. 1. 63 ye need say nothing about that foolish story. — Cf. with a comparative: Swift J. 461 I need tell you no more | Di N. 125 We need detain you no longer.

A curious example is Darwin E. 93 the whole subject is

so obscure, that I have succeeded in throwing hardly any light on it — where *hardly any* is used as a mitigated *no*; the logical expression would be: I have hardly succeeded in throwing any light.

Note also Galsworthy D. 101 to be able to do nothing [= unable to do anything] without hurting someone | Benson D. 50 you and I will go to the smoking-room, and talk about nothing at all subtle [= something that is not subtle] | Norris P. 183 I'm no Bear any longer [= am a Bear no longer].

Storm E. Ph. 694 has a few curious quotations like this from Marryat: O'Brien stated that we were officers, and *had no right* to be treated like common soldiers [= and had a right not to be treated].

This tendency leads to the use of combinations like *he was no ordinary boy* in preference to the unidiomatic *he was a not ordinary boy*; for examples see MEG. II. 16. 751.

Similarly in Spanish, Galdós, Doña Perfecta 39 Era un santo varón piadosa y de *no común* saber.

The attraction of the negative element is the reason why a pronoun like *ingen*, *ingenting*, *intet* is very often in Danish placed in a position which would be impossible in the case of a positive pronoun, but is the one required for the adverb *ikke*: *det fører ingenting til* [= det fører ikke til noget] | *det er ingen skade til* | *når man ingenting har*, or, more popularly, *når ingenting man har*, etc. Cf. also the following quotations, the last two or three of which are, perhaps, not quite natural, though the attraction in them is easy to understand: N. M. Petersen Afhdl. 4. 123 Ti man må ingen gøre uret | ib. 126 Det franske sprog har ingen fordærvet, men den franske gouvernante har gjort det | Goldschmidt Hjeml. 2. 841 lad pøblen intet mærke | J. P. Jacobsen 2. 406 Tage mærkede imidlertid ingen kølighed til | G. Bang Tilsk. 1902. 386 Den samme jordlod, som for 20 aar siden intet eller lidet udbytte gav,

fordi der intet eller lidet arbejde var nedlagt i dens drift | Johs. Jørgensen NP. '15 Jeg veed ogsaa, at jeg intet af alt dette har gjort selv | Ibsen Bygm. Soln. 204 for at jeg ingenting andet skulde ha' at hæfte mig ved. — Bjørnson Det flager 48 *de bærer over med ingen* would in natural Danish be rather *bærer ingen over med.*

Whenever there is logically a possibility of attracting the negative element to either of two words, there seems to be a universal tendency to join it to the first. We may say "*no one ever* saw him angry" or "*never* did *any one* see him angry", but not "*any one never* saw him angry" nor "*ever* did *no one* see him angry". In the same way in Dan. "*ingen* har *nogensinde* set ham vred" or "*aldrig* har *nogen* set ham vred", but not otherwise. Instead of "*no* woman would *ever* think of that" it is impossible to say "*any* woman would *never* think of that", though it is possible to say "*a* woman would *never* think of that", because *no* is not (now) felt to be a combination of the negative element and the indefinite article.

The negative is also attracted to the first word in the well-known Latin combinations *nec quisquam* (not *et nemo*), *neque ullus*, *nec unquam*; thus also *ne quis*, *ne quid*, etc., in clauses of purpose. The same tendency is found also in combinations like *without any danger* | *uden nogen fare* | *sine ullo periculo*, where, however, English has sometimes *with no danger* (to any one); cf. Ruskin Sel. 1. 9 it is a spot which has all the solemnity, with none of the savageness, of the Alps | Williamson S. 231 she went out, with not another word or look.

It strikes one as contrary to this universal tendency to find in OE poetry combinations in which *æfre* or *ænig* precedes a verb with prefixed *ne*, as in Andreas 15 þær *ænig* þa git Ellþeodigra eðles *ne* mihte Blædes brucan | 360 *Æfre* ic *ne* hyrde | 377 *ænig ne* wende, þæt he lifgende land begete | 499, 553 etc. Ib. 493 both combined: swa ic *æfre ne* geseah *ænigne* mann.

When the negative is attracted to the subject, the sentence is often continued in such a way that the positive counterpart of the first subject must be understood. In ordinary life such sentences will cause no misunderstanding, and it is only the critical, or even hyper-critical, grammarian that sees anything wrong in them. Examples: Marlowe T. 1560 Not one should scape, but perish by our swords [= but all perish] | Sh. R. 3. I. 3. 213 I pray him That none of you may liue his naturall age, But by some vnlook'd accident cut off | Bunyan G. 147 none of them are hurtful, but loving and holy [= but they are . . .] | Merriman V. 265 no man may judge another by looking down upon him, but must needs descend into the crowd | Jacobs L. 51 Neither spoke, but lay silently listening [= both lay] | Benson D. 2. 130 Don't let any of us go to bed to-night, but see the morning come | Galsworthy P. 2. 51 Nobody'll get anything till eight, and then [they'll get] only cold shoulder | Miss Paton, Radcliffe Coll. Monographs 15. 23 None of these versions throw any further light upon the original form, and are therefore not important for our analysis [= These versions throw no . . .].

We find the same phenomenon with *few*, as that, too, has a negative purport:

Johnson R. 40 few of the princes had any wish to enlarge their bounds, but passed their lives in full conviction that they had all | Mulock H. 2. 152 Few thought of Jessop — only of themselves [= they thought only of . .].

Similarly in the following quotations: *forget* = 'do not remember' (Cf. also Sh. John I. 1. 188); *unfrequented* = frequented by (of) no one: Di N. 607 I forget, without looking back to some old letters, whether it was my great grandfather | Carlyle R. 2. 317 I quite forget the details, only that I had a good deal of talk with him | Wilkins P. 67 the house vnfrequented, onely of their owne householde | Dickinson After the War 22 it is idle to consider how much territory may

come up for settlement, nor how it may be disposed of [*idle* = 'no use'].

Danish examples of sentences begun negatively and continued as if begun positively: Rask Prisskrift 97 Intet af de finniske sprog adskiller kjøn, hvori de ligne grønlandsken, men have ellers en vidtløftig deklinering | Poul Møller (in Vilh. Andersen 181) Ingen piil bliver længe hængende derved [ved hjertet], men flyver tvert igjennem | Goldschmidt 5. 186 ingen begivenhed havde interesse uden som del af hans indre historie eller fik kun ved den sin rette farve | id. 7. 507 Bare ingen vil skoptisere over mig, men lade mig have ro! | H. C. Andersen To baron. 2. 66 Intet betragtede han som tilfældigt, men som et led i den store kjæde | Molbech brev t. Brøchner 155 jeg havde den tilfredsstillelse, at ikke en eneste af mine 10 tilhørere forlod mig, men holdt alle ud til den sidste time | Høffding St. humor 104 Intet menneskeligt forhold kan have værdi i sig selv, men har kun værdi, naar det bevidst underordnes . . . uendelighedssynspunktet | Feilberg Dania 5. 117 Når korn blev kørt hjem, drak ingen af sin egen flaske, men fik brændevin af manden | L. C. Nielsen Tilsk. '98. 694 jeg saa, at ingen elskede hende, men forførte hende og handlede ilde med hende | W. Johannsen Salmonsen 9. 184 Ingen af dem [teorierne] kan siges at være fyldestgørende og forbigaas derfor her | Ax. Sørensen Ariadnetråd 52 Ikke ên af hundrede læsere gør sig rede hvorfor, og vil også have nogen vanskelighed ved at indse grunden.

The following quotations are somewhat different: Holberg Er. Mont. IV. 2 Jeg kand skaffe attester fra hele byen, at jeg er ingen hane eller at nogen af mine forældre har været andet end christne mennesker | Aage Friis Politiken 6. 2. 06 Langtfra alle vil samstemme med prof. Steenstrup . . . men vil hellere slutte sig til Bricka's beskedne tvivl [= mange vil ikke . . .].

Thus also with Dan. *de færreste* [= de fleste . . . ikke]: NP. '92 de færreste af disse tropper er imidlertid bevæbnede

med nye gode rifler, men nøjes med gamle flintebøsser | Arnskov Tilsk. '14. 29 De færreste forstod meningen eller vilde ikke forstaa den.

And with a negative infinitive means the same thing as *without -ing*. This is felt to be perfectly natural in positive sentences (a), but there is a growing awkwardness about the construction in the following groups: negative sentences (b), interrogative sentences, generally equivalent to negative statements (c), and negative interrogative sentences (d); the sentence in (e) is, strictly speaking, quite unanalyzable. In "I couldn't see you, and not love you" (b) *couldn't* refers at the same time to *see you*, and to *not love you*, the latter in a way that would be quite unidiomatic if used by itself: "I couldn't not love you" (cf. Latin *non possum non amare*); we see that the expression is unimpeachable if we substitute: "Impossible (to see you and) not to love you". But it is difficult to apply the same test to all our quotations.

(a) Sh. Alls II. 5. 91 Strangers and foes do sunder, and not kisse | Sh. Lr. I. 1. 228 that glib and oylie art, To speak and purpose not.

(b) Di D. 570 I couldn't see you, and not love you | Di Do. 473 But he could not look at her, and not be afraid of her | Tenn. 342 I cannot love my lord and not his name | Stevenson M. 179 I could not live in a house where such a thing was conceivable, and not probe the matter home | Merriman S. 13 what are we to do? Can't bury the poor chap and say nothing about it | Henley B. 20 I could not live and not be true with him | Hardy W. 265 I must not stay here and do nothing || Stevenson A. 84 no one can read it and not be moved | Harraden F. 54 No one could have had such a splendid old father as I have, and not believe in the people.

(c) Buny P. 68 how can I go back from this, and not be hanged as a traitor? | Richardson G. 28 Who can touch pitch

and not be defiled? | Shelley 457 how Shall I descend, and perish not? | Ward E. 244 But oh! — what we can bear and not die!

(d) Otway 224 May not a man then trifle out an hour With a kind woman and not wrong his calling? | Hardy W. 270 why can't you marry me, and live here with us, and not be a Methodist preacher any more?

(e) NP. 1911 I'm doing just as little as I can and not be punished [= without being punished].

Conditional conjunctions also have a strong attraction for the negative notion in many languages (cf. Lat. *nisi*, Dan. colloquial *hvis ikke* (*at*) *han kommer* instead of *hvis han ikke kommer*). Thus we have in English the negative conjunction *unless* (formerly *onles*, *onles that*) = 'if . . . not'; *lest* (OE *þy læs þe*) = 'that . . . not'; *for fear* often is equivalent to '(in order) that . . . not'; cf. also *but* (*but that*, *but what*), ch. XII; Dan. *medmindre*; Fr. *à moins que*, Sp. *á menos que*.

CHAPTER VII

Double Negation.

When logicians insist that "two negatives make an affirmative" their rule is not corroborated by actual usage in most languages. But it would be wrong to divide languages into some that follow this rule and others that do not, for on closer inspection we find that in spite of great differences between languages in this respect there are certain underlying principles that hold good for all languages. We shall deal first with those instances in which the rule of the logi-

cians is observed; and afterwards with those in which the final result of two negatives is in itself negative.

First, it seems to be a universal rule in all languages that *two negatives make an affirmative*, if both are special negatives attached to the same word; this generally happens in this way that *not* is placed before some word of negative import or containing a negative prefix. But it should be noted that the double negative always modifies the idea, for the result of the whole expression is somewhat different from the simple idea expressed positively. Thus *not without some doubt* is not exactly the same thing as *with some doubt*; *not uncommon* is weaker than *common*, and *not unhandsome* (Kipl. L. 246) than *handsome*, the psychological reason being that the *detour* through the two mutually destroying negatives weakens the mental energy of the hearer and implies on the part of the speaker a certain hesitation absent from the blunt, outspoken *common* or *handsome*. "Tis not vnknowne to you, Anthonio" (Sh. Merch. I. 1. 122) = 'you are to some extent aware'. — Assertion by negative of opposite is a common feature of English as spoken in Ireland (see Joyce, p. 16): "this little rasher will do you no harm" meaning it will do you good, "Paddy Walsh is no chicken now" meaning he is very old, etc. This is really on a par with "not untragical", "not unentitled to speak", "not unpromptly", etc. which abound in Carlyle (E. St. 6. 388); with him *not without* has become quite a mannerism for which he is taken to task by Sterling: not without ferocity, not without result, not without meditation, etc. etc.

A special instance of this detour is Lat. *non-nunquam*, *non-nulli*, on the meaning of which see ch. VIII.

Next, the result is positive if we have a nexal negative in a sentence containing an implied negative, as in *I do not deny*;

this, of course, closely, resembles the first case. Here belong such frequent Fr. phrases as *il n'était pas sans être frappé par la différence*; the meaning of the round-about expression is 'you will readily understand that he was struck . . .'

In this place should, perhaps, be mentioned the Fr. *il n'y a pas que ça*, which means the opposite of *il n'y a que ça*, thus 'there is more than this'.

The negation of words like *nobody* resulting in the meaning of 'everybody' (*nemo non videt*) will be treated in ch. VIII.

Yet another way of affirming through a double negative is seen in Sh. Oth. II. 1. 120 For I am nothing, if not criticall | Henderson Burns 3. 297 The old Scots poets were nothing if not plain-spoken [= were pl.-sp. to a high degree]. — But this hardly belongs in this chapter.

If now we proceed to those cases in which *a repeated negative means, not an affirmative, but a negative*, we shall do well to separate different classes in which the psychological explanation is not exactly the same.

(1) In the first place we have instances of *double attraction*. Above we have seen the two tendencies, one to place the negative with the verb as nexal negative, and the other to amalgamate a negative element with some word capable of receiving a negative prefix. We have seen how now one, now the other of these tendencies prevails; but here we have to deal with those instances in which both are satisfied at once in popular speech, the result being sentences with double, or even treble or quadruple, negation.

This was the regular idiom in OE, so regular indeed that in the whole of Apollonius there is only one sentence containing *ne* with the verb in which we have another word that *might* take *n-* and does not (22 *ne* ondræt þu ðe *æniges* þinges), while there are 9 instances of *ne* + various forms of *nan*, 3 of *ne* + *naht* ('nothing' or 'not') and 15 of *ne* + some negative adverb begin-

ning with *n-* (*nahwar*, *næfre*, *na*, *naðer*). There are 40 instances of *ne* or *n-* with the verb without any other word that might take *n-*, and 4 of *na* as special negative without any verb. In this text there are no instances of treble or quadruple negation, but these are by no means rare in OE prose, as in *n*an man *n*yste *n*an þing | Boet. 102. 7 *n*e *n*an neat *n*yste *n*ænne andan *n*e *n*ænne ege to oðrum. In the same way in ME., e. g. Ch. A. 70 He *n*euere yet *n*o vileynye *n*e seyde In al his lyf unto *n*o maner wight | Recluse 200 *n*e takeþ *n*oþing to holde of *n*oman *n*e of *n*o womman, *n*e *n*oither of the seruauntz *n*e bere *n*on vncouþ tales.

Early MnE. examples of double negation:

Caxton B. 48 the harneis was hole, and *n*ought dammaged of *n*othyng | id. R. 38 whan he coude *n*owher *n*one see | ib. 84 *n*e *n*euer shal *n*one be born fairer than she | More U. 238 they *n*euer make *n*one with anye nacion [none i. e. leagues].

In Elizabethan English this kind of repeated negation is comparatively rare; from Sh. I have only two instances (but I may, of course, have overlooked others): Ro. III. 1. 58 I will *not* budge for *no* mans pleasure, I | Tw. II. 1. 171 I haue one heart, one bosome, and one truth, And that no woman has, *n*or *n*euer *n*one Shall mistris be of it, saue I alone. — Bøgholm has one from Bacon: he was *n*ever *n*o violent man. — I cannot explain how it is that this particular redundancy seems to disappear for two centuries; it can hardly be accidental that I have no examples from the beginning of the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century, when Pegge mentions this kind of "luxuriance" among the cockneys (I *don't* know *nothing* about it) and says that he has heard in Yorkshire, "No, I shall *not* do *no* such thing" and that a citizen is said to have enquired at a tavern, "if *nobody* had seen *nothing* of *never-a* hat *nowhere's*?"

Recent examples, put in the mouths of vulgar speakers (sometimes, no doubt, with some exaggeration of a tendency

ridiculed at school, however natural in itself): Di D. 19 *Nobody never* went and hinted *no* such a thing, said Peggotty | Di Do. 279 all he [the butler] hopes is, he may *never* hear of *no* foreigner *never* boning *nothing* out of *no* travelling chariot | Thack P. 3. 85 We *never* thought of *nothing* wrong | GE M. 1. 327 There was *niver nobody* else gen (gave) me *nothin'* | Hardy W. 23 I *can't* do *nothing* without my staff | Shaw C. 24 you *wont* like to spar with *nobody* without youre well paid for it | Zangwill G. 209 *No* compensation *nowhere* for being cut off | Herrick M. 87 you *won't* lose *nothing* by it | ib. 89 there *won't* be *no* hung jury.

Cumulative negation exactly resembling that of OE was very frequent in MHG., e. g. diz *en*-mac nu *nieman* bewarn | nu *en*-kan ich *niemanne* gesagen | ir ougen diu *en*-wurden *nie* naz (Delbrück 6). This was continued in later centuries, though as in English it was counteracted by schoolmasters. Luther has "Wir sind *niemand nichts* schuldig" and Goethe "Man sieht, dass er an *nichts keinen* anteil nimmt", Schiller "alles ist partei und *nirgend kein* richter", etc. (Andresen, Sprachgebrauch u. sprachrichtigkeit 1912 209). This is particularly frequent in vulgar language. In O. Weise's Unsere muttersprache 1897 78 I find the following: "Die verneinung wird nachdrücklich wiederholt, damit sie recht ins gewicht fällt. In Angelys Fest der handwerker wird einem gesellen auf die frage: 'Hat keener schwamm?' nicht geantwortet; als er aber dann der frage die form giebt: 'Hat denn *keener keenen* schwamm *nich?*' findet er gehör. Doch kann einer der anwesenden seinen unwillen darüber nicht zurückhalten, dass er nicht gleich ordentlich deutsch geredet habe".

In Dan. similar expressions are extremely rare. El. Christine writes, Jammersm. 132 saa hand kiøbte *aldrig intet* for mig.

In Fr. *nul* with *ne* to the verb (*nul ne* vient | on *ne* le voit

nulle part) is a case in point, though now it is hardly felt to be different from the corresponding usage with *aucun*, which was originally positive, but has now acquired negative force, as we have seen above.

In Spanish repeated negation is not at all rare; I may quote Calderon Alcalde de Z. 1. 545 Estarémos, *sin* que *nadie*, *Ni* aun el mismo sol, *no* sepa De nosotros | Galdós D. Perf. 23 Aquí *no* vienen *nunca* soldados.

Thus also in Slavonic languages; Delbrück, Synt. 2. 526 gives among the other instances Serbian *i nikto mu ne mogaše odgovoriti riječi* 'and nobody him not-could answer word'. In the first few pages of Boyer et Speranski, Manuel de la langue russe, I find: *i nikomú zla ne dělaem* | *ničegó ne berët* | *ne daváĭ že mužikú ničegó* | *Filipók ničegó ne skazál* | *na kryl'cé nikogó nět*, etc.

In Greek, repeated negation is very frequent, see any grammar. Madvig, Græsk ordføjningslære § 209, quotes for instance from Platon: Áneu toútou *oudeìs* eis *oudèn oudenòs* àn humôn *oudépote* génoito áxios.

In Hungarian (Magyar) we have corresponding phenomena, see J. Szinnyei, Ungarische sprachlehre 1912 § 119: Negative pronouns like *sënki* 'nobody', *sëmmi* 'nothing' and pronominal adverbs like *sëhol* 'nowhere', *sëhogy* 'in no wise' are generally used in connexion with a negative particle or verbal form, e. g. *sënki sëm* volt ott (or: *nëm* volt ott *sënki*) 'there was nobody there' | *sëmmit sëm* hallottam (or: *nëm* hallottam *sëmmit*) 'I have heard nothing'. Sometimes there are three negative words in the same sentence: *nëm* felejtëk el *sëmmit sëm* 'I forget nothing'. Negative words begin with *s-* or *n-*.

Repeated negation is found in many other languages. I shall mention only a few examples from Bantu languages. In H. G. Guinness's "Mosaic History in the Congo Language" (London, Hodder and Stoughton, n. d.) I find, for example, *ka bena mambu mambiko* 'not there are words evil not' | *yetu*

katulendi kuba monako 'we cannot them see not' | *kavangidi kwandi wawubiko, kamonanga kwandi nganziko, kaba yelanga kwa-u ko* 'not did he evil not, not feeling he no pain, not they sick they not, etc. In D. Jones and S. T. Plaatje, A Sechuana Reader (London 1916) p. 15 a sentence translated 'not will-not you-be-destroyed by-nothing'; other examples occur p. 33, 41.

Various explanations have been given of this phenomenon, but they mostly fail through not recognizing that this kind of repeated negation is really different from that found, for instance, when in Lat. *non* is followed by *ne . . . quidem*; this will form our second class, but the explanation from "supplementary negation" (ergänzungsnegation), which is there all right, does not hold in the cases here considered. Van Ginneken is right when he criticizes (Principes de linguistique psychol. 200) the view of Romance scholars, who speak of a "half-negation" (demi-négation) — an expression which may be more true of Fr. *ne* than of other negatives, but even there is not quite to the point. Van Ginneken's own explanation is that "negation in natural language is not logical negation, but the expression of a feeling of resistance". He goes on to say: "L'adhésion négative logique ou mathématique (dont deux se compensent) est leur signification figurée, née seulement dans quelques centres de civilisation isolés; jamais et nulle part elle n'a pénétré dans le domaine populaire". It is true that if we look upon *not*, etc., as expressing nothing but resistance, it is easy to see why such an element should be repeated over and over again in a sentence as the most effective way of resisting; but I very much doubt the primitivity of such an idea, and the theory looks suspiciously as having been invented, not from any knowledge of the natural mind of people in general, but from a desire to explain the grammatical phenomenon in question. I cannot imagine that when

one of our primitive ancestors said "he does not sleep", he understood this as meaning "let us resist the idea of sleep in connexion with him" — or how is otherwise the idea of resistance to come in here? I rather imagine he understood it exactly as we do nowadays.

But I quite agree with v. Ginneken, when he emphasizes the emotional character of repeated negation; already H. Ziemer, Junggrammatische streifzüge, 1883, p. 142 says in this connexion: "Der sondernde, unterscheidende verstand blieb bei ihrer bildung ganz aus dem spiel, während das erregte gefühl und der auf den eindruck gerichtete trieb frei schaltete" (though Mourek is probably right when he says that the strengthening is a result, rather than the motive, of the repetition). I may also, like v. Ginneken, quote with approval Cauer's clever remark: "das negative vorzeichen ist, allerdings höchst unmathematisch, zugleich vor und in der klammer gesetzt, indem sich die negative stimmung über den ganzen gedanken verbreitet".

There is one theory that has enjoyed a certain vogue of late years (though it is not mentioned by v. Ginneken) and which I must deal with a little more in detail. It was started by Gebauer with regard to Old Bohemian, but was made better known through Mourek's work on negation in MHG. (Königl. böhm. gesellschaft der wissenschaften 1902) and has been faithfully repeated in the above-named works on Old English by Knörk, Rauert and Einenkel. These writers go back to Kant's table of categories, where the three categories of "position (or realität), negation, limitation" are ranged under the heading of "qualität", while under the heading of "quantität" we find the three "einheit, vielheit, allheit". This leads to the distinction between qualitative and quantitative negation; in the former the verb and by that means the whole sentence (die ganze aussage) is negatived, while in the latter only one part of the sentence is negatived. As

examples of qualitative negation are given "the man is not truly happy" and "my guests have not arrived"; of quantitative negation "no man is truly happy, the man is never truly happy, the man is nowhere truly happy" (I translate *der mensch* as *the man*, though perhaps the generic *man* is meant) and "none of my guests have arrived, I see nowhere any of my guests". Now the supposition is that language started by having qualitative and quantitative negation separately, and that later the combination of both was arrived at in some languages, such as MHG. and OE, and this is looked upon as representing a higher and more logical stage. "Diese art der negation beruht auf der rein logischen forderung, dass, wenn ein satzteil quantitativ verneint auftritt, der ganze inhalt des satzes qualitativ verneint wird. Dies sei an einem beispiel verdeutlicht: *ne mæg nan man twam hlafordum hieran.* In diesem satz wird ausgesagt, dass kein mensch zwei herren zugleich dienen kann. Wenn sich nun kein mensch findet, der 2 herren zugleich dienen kann, so kann eben nicht mehr von einem "können", sondern logischerweise nur von einem "nicht können" die rede sein, daher in dem angeführten satz ganz richtig bei *mæg* "ne" steht". (Rauert 76). — To this line of reasoning several observations naturally offer themselves. Kant's table of categories is not unobjectionable, and in ch. VIII I shall venture to propose an improvement on the tripartition of *einheit, vielheit, allheit.* Kant does not look upon negation as sometimes qualitative and sometimes quantitative, but thinks it always qualitative. It would seem to be more logical to consider it as always quantitative; for even in such a simple sentence as "he does not sleep" we indicate the amount of sleep he obtains, though it is true that the amount is = 0. The true distinction between the two kinds of sentences cited does not, then, depend on two kinds of negation, as this is everywhere the same, but on two kinds of ideas negatived. In the so-called "qualitative"

negation the idea negatived is in itself non-quantitative, while in the other it is in itself quantitative, for *none*, *never* and *nowhere* negative *one* (or *any*), *ever*, and *anywhere* respectively, and these are all quantitative terms. But however this may be, it is curious here to find that language ranged highest that explicitly indicates the negativity of the sentence containing a quantitative negation (a negatived quantity); for if it is logically self-evident that such sentences are in themselves negative, why should it need to be expressed? And if some nations are praised because they have reached this high stage of logical development that they have understood the distinction between qualitative and quantitative negation and have been able to combine both, it seems rather sad that they should later on have lost that faculty, as the Germans and the English have (at any rate the educated classes), for they say "kein mensch kann zwei herren dienen" and "no man can serve two masters". Cf. also Delbrück's criticism of the same theory from partly different points of view, which I need not repeat here (Neg. sätze 36 ff.). — We note incidentally the curious fact that the "logically highest" standpoint in this theory is exactly the reverse of what it was in v. Ginneken's.

My own pet theory is that neither is right; logically one negative suffices, but two or three in the same sentence cannot be termed illogical; they are simply a redundancy, that may be superfluous from a stylistic point of view, just as any repetition in a positive sentence (every and any, always and on all occasions, etc.), but is otherwise unobjectionable. Double negation arises because under the influence of a strong feeling the two tendencies specified above, one to attract the negative to the verb as nexal negative, and the other to prefix it to some other word capable of receiving this element, may both be gratified in the same sentence. But repeated negation seems to become a habitual phenomenon only in those languages in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively

small in regard to phonetic bulk, as *ne* and *n-* in OE and Russian, *en* and *n-* in MHG., *ou* (sounded *u*) in Greek, *s-* or *n-* in Magyar. The insignificance of these elements makes it desirable to multiply them so as to prevent their being overlooked. Hence also the comparative infrequency of this repetition in English and German, after the fuller negatives *not* and *nicht* have been thoroughly established — though, as already stated, the logic of the schools and the influence of Latin has had some share in restricting the tendency to this particular kind of redundancy. It might, however, finally be said that it requires greater mental energy to content oneself with one negative, which has to be remembered during the whole length of the utterance both by the speaker and by the hearer, than to repeat the negative idea (and have it repeated) whenever an occasion offers itself.

(2) A second class comprises what may be termed *resumptive negation*, the characteristic of which is that after a negative sentence has been completed, something is added in a negative form with the obvious result that the negative effect is heightened. This is covered by Delbrück's expression "ergänzungsnegation". In its pure form the supplementary negative is added outside the frame of the first sentence, generally as an afterthought, as in "I shall never do it, not under any circumstances, not on any condition, neither at home nor abroad", etc. A Danish example from Kierkegaard (2 eth-rel. smaaafh. 41) is: "saa afskyeligt har aldrig, aldrig nogensinde (,) ikke den værste tyran handlet". But as no limits of sentences can be drawn with absolute certainty, the supplementary negative may be felt as belonging within the sentence, which accordingly comes to contain two negatives. This is the case in a popular Swedish idiom, in which the sentence begins and ends with *inte*, as in Strindberg Röda r. 283 Inte ha vi några åsigter inte! | Wägner Nortullsl. 108 Inte märkte han mig inte. Similarly in a Greek instance like Od. 3. 27, where the

second *ou* might be placed between two commas: "ou gàr oíō Oú se theôn aékēti genésthai te traphémen te". On account of the difficulty of telling whether we have two sentences or a sentence with a tag it may sometimes be doubtful whether we have to do with this or the preceding class, as in Sh. As. II. 4. 8 "I cannot goe no further", which might be divided: "I cannot go, no further".

The most important instances of this class are those in which *not* is followed by a disjunctive combination with *neither . . . nor* or a restrictive addition with *not even*: "he cannot sleep, neither at night nor in the daytime | he cannot sleep, not even after taking an opiate" | Bunyan P. 80 he had not the discretion neither to stop his ears, nor to know . . ., etc. Cf. also Locke S. 174 You'll do no such thing, not till you've told me about the flat.

In the same way in other languages, e. g. Lat. *non . . . neque . . . neque, non . . . ne . . . quidem*, Gr. *ou . . . oudé . . . oudé* etc. Examples are needless. (In Dan. also with insertion of *ikke* in the main sentence, Christiansen Fædrel. 135 Jeg troer ikke, at hverken De eller jeg skal tage nogen bestemmelse).

It is perhaps in consequence of the scholastic disinclination to repeated negation that some modern writers use *even* instead of *not even*, as in Shaw 1. 182 I *cannot* give my Vivie up, *even* for your sake. — A few similar examples are given by Bøgholm, Anglia n. f. 26. 511.

I am inclined to reckon among the cases of resumption (with the last negative originally outside the sentence) also the repetition *it' ikke* or *itik*, which in various phonetic forms is very frequent in Danish dialects (Seeland, Fyn, some of the southern islands, some parts of Jutland); Feilberg also in his dictionary quotes from various places in Jutland the combination *ik hæjer it* and from Fjolde *oller ek* (aldrig ikke; for the exact phonetic form I refer to the dictionary). — In colloquial Dan. we have also an emphatic negative [gu gør

jeg] *ikke nikke nej*, where *nikke*, which is otherwise unknown, is a contanimation of *ikke* and *nej*. In literature I have found this only in Nexø Pelle Er. 3. 19 Pipmanden havde delirium. Gu' ha'de jeg ikke nikke nej!

An English case of special interest is with *hardly* (on the negative value of this see p. 38) in combination with a preceding negative word, which is felt to be too absolute and is therefore softened down by the addition; the two negatives thus in this case neither neutralize nor strengthen one another: Examples (none in Shakespeare): Defoe R. 50 it gave us not time hardly to say, O God! | Swift J. 372 and nobody hardly took notice of him | Cowper L. 1. 154 nothing hardly is welcome but childish fiction | GE A. 197 I've never hardly known him to miss church before | id. M. 2. 209 | Darwin L. 2. 39 that no one has hardly a right to examine the question of species who has not minutely described many | ib. 2. 165 | Hardy R. 192 Who was there? Nobody hardly | Hope Q. 119 nobody hardly understands criticism as badly as you do | Shaw D. 194 you cant hardly tell who anyone is | id. 1. 29, 34 | Kipling S. 192 He wasn't changed at all hardly | Wells H. 112 they don't seem hardly able to help it | Bennett T. 354 I don't hardly care to stay | id. HL. 17.

Examples of *scarce(ly)* after a negative:

Swinburne T. 137 me not worthy scarce to touch thy kind strong hand | Ward E. 411 There is not a yard of it, scarcely, that hasn't been made by human hands | Morris N. 129 but no one scarcely could throw himself down.

Hardly and *scarcely* are also used after *without* and other indirect negatives: Byron D. J. 5. 66 The black, however, without hardly deigning A glance at that | Thack V. 476 without scarcely hearing a word | Norris P. 52 refusing to acknowledge hardly any fiction that was not classic | Read Toothpick Tales 17 I'll be dinged if I hardly know.

Cf. also Drachmann Forskr. 1. 425 Edith og Gerhard trykkede hinanden i haanden — uden at de knap vidste deraf.

Some instances of double negation with words like *nor* and *neither*, which are not exactly analogues of those given here, will be found in the chapter on Negative connectives (X).

---

(3) Closely connected with resumptive negation is what might perhaps be termed *paratactic negation*: a negative is placed in a clause dependent on a verb of negative import like 'deny, forbid, hinder, doubt'. The clause here is in some way treated as an independent sentence, and the negative is expressed as if there had been no main sentence of that particular kind. It is well known how this develops in some languages to a fixed rule, especially if the negative employed has no longer its full negative force: I need only very briefly refer, for instance, to the Latin use of *ne*, *quin*, *quominus*, and to the Fr. insertion of *ne* (which, by the way, is now disappearing like the other *ne*'s). But even in languages which do not as a rule admit a negative in such clauses, it is by no means rare even in good writers, though generally looked upon as an error by grammarians, see for Engl. e. g. Sh. R. 3. I. 3. 90 Yoy may deny that you were not the meane Of my Lord Hastings late imprisonment | Bacon A. 43. 34 we have forbidden . . . that they doe not shew any naturall worke | Lamb E. 2. 185 What hinders in your own instance that you do not return to those habits | Darwin L. 3. 69 it never occurred to me to doubt that your work . . . . would not advance our common object in the highest degree.

Parallel instances from German may be found, for instance, in Andresen, Sprachgebr. u. sprachricht. 209 ff.

Danish examples: El. Christ. Jammersm. 62 forbøden, att ingen skulle lade mig faa naale | ib. 85 forhindre, att hun icke satte løgn sammen om mig | ib. 107 efftersom quinden saa

høyt haffde forsoeren icke att sige ded | ib. 120 hand nægtede ded altiid, att ded icke war ham | ib. 201, 213 forhindre . . . icke | Holb. Ulyss. II. 7 for at hindre at misundelsens sæd ikke skal saaes iblandt os (also Ped. P. I. 2, I. 4, etc.) | H. C. Andersen Impr. 2. 136 mine venner burde forhindre at ingen af mine digte, der kun vare poetiske misfostre, kom for lyset | Sibbern Gab. 1. 130 alt skulde anvendes for at forebygge, at min lille pige ikke skulde blive koparret | Kierkegaard Øjebl. 7 at jeg af al magt skal stræbe . . . at bidrage til at afværge, at dette ikke skeer | Bang Fædra 161 vogtede hun sig for ikke at tale for meget om Carl. (Note here the difference between the usual Dan. idiom "man må vogte sig for at overdrive" and the corresponding Engl. "one must take care *not* to exaggerate"; cf. also "jeg advarede ham mod at gøre det" and G. "ich warnte ihn, das zu tun", but E. "I warned him *not* to do it").

In this connexion I must mention a Dan. expression which is extremely frequent in colloquial speech, but which is invariably condemned as illogical and put down as one of the worst mistakes possible: "man kan ikke *nægte andet end at* hun er sød". This, of course is illogical if analyzed with *andet* as the sole object of *nægte*: 'one can deny nothing else except that she is sweet'; but to the actual speech-instinct *andet end at hun* . . . goes together as one indivisible whole constituting the object of *nægte*; this is often marked by a pause before *andet*, and *andet-end-at* thus makes one negative conjunction comparable with Lat. *quin* or *quominus*. — In the same way one hears, e. g. Der er ikke to meninger om, andet end (at) han er en dygtig mand | der er ikke noget i vejen for, andet end at han skal nok gøre det | jeg kan ikke komme bort fra, andet end at han har ret. From Norwegian I have noted Garborg Bondest. 33 og det var ikke fritt, annat dei [draumar] tok hugen burt fraa boki med.

The following quotations may serve to illustrate the transi-

tion of *andet* (*end*) to a negative conjunction or adverb: Chr. Pedersen 4. 493 det er ellerss wmweligt *andet end at* han ey skall fare vild | Goldschm. Ravn. 65 Det er sgu da ikke *andet end* til at lee ad | Pontopp. Landsbyb. 155 han bestilte ikke det, man kan tænke sig *andet, end* at drikke portvin | Bjørns. Flag. 432 men det var umuligt *annet æn* i hennes omgang at komme til at gå for langt | Grundtv. Folkeæv. 65 Stodderen laa stille som en mus, *andet end at* hun kunde høre ham trække vejret tungt || Jón Þorkelsson, Ark. f. nord. filol. 6. 163 það var ekki að sjá á honum *annað en* hann væri ungur maður || Blicher Bindst. 51 De war ett got *anned* | E. Brandes Lyk. bl. 3 Maaske højesteretssagføreren kender mig? — Bevares, det vilde være mærkeligt *andet* | Giellerup Rom. 98 begge dele har deres betydning, det kan man ikke sige *andet* | id. Minna 311 Det er jeg vis paa — det er umuligt *andet*.

The related use of E. *but* (*but that, but what*) will be treated in ch. XII.

---

(4) There is a curious use of a seemingly superfluous negative in Dan., which cannot be explained exactly in the same way as any of the phenomena hitherto dealt with, namely *langtfra ikke*, which used to be the regular idiom in phrases like "hun er langtfra ikke så køn som søsteren" from the time of Holberg till the middle of the 19th century, when it was superseded by *langtfra* without *ikke*: "hun er langtfra så køn som søsteren"; Engl. here has the positive form, but inserts the verbal substantive in *-ing*: "she is far from being as pretty as her sister". *Langtfra ikke* would be explicable as an instance of blending (contamination) if it could be proved that *langtfra* was used as in recent times before the rise of *langtfra ikke*, but I have no material to decide this question. (Cf. J. Levin, "Dagbladet" som det danske sprogs ridder, Københ. 1861).

---

(5) I collect here several partly heterogeneous instances of confusion in negative sentences, which I have found some difficulty in placing, either in this or in any other chapter. Such confusion will occur frequently, especially if two or more negative or half-negative words are combined, but more frequently, of course, in everyday speech than in printed literature. Shakespeare, in accordance with the popular character of Elizabethan plays, destined to be heard much more than to be read, pretty frequently indulges in such carelessness (see Al. Schmidt, Sh.-lex. p. 1420), e. g. Wint III. 2. 57 wanted lesse impudence [had less i. or wanted i. more] | Cymb. I. 4. 23 a begger without less quality [with less q.] | Cor. I. 4. 14 nor a man that feares you lesse then he [fears you more]. A doubtful instance is Lr. II. 4. 141 you lesse know how to value her desert, Then she to scant her dutie — for, as Koppel remarks, Verbesserungsvorschläge 70, everything is correct, if we understand 'you are *still* less capable of valuing her than she is capable of scanting her duty'. But Lr. V. 3. 94 Ile proue [folio: make] it on thy heart, Ere I taste bread, thou art in nothing lesse Then I haue heere proclaim'd thee [i. e. a traitor] — evidently is a confusion of two ideas: thou art nothing less than . . . and: thou art in nothing [= in no respect] more than . . .

Cæs. II. 1. 114 if not the face of men, The sufferance of our soules, the times abuse; If these be motiues weake, breake off betimes. Here some editors change *if not* into *if that*, but this is not at all necessary: the sentence is meant to be continued: if not these suffice, or: are strong enough, but is then continued in a different way, as is very often the case in everyday speech.

Modern instances of a similar character: Austen P. 133 he can have nothing to say to me that anybody need not hear [= that anybody may not hear; that it is necessary that nobody hears] | NP. '99 there was none too poor or too remote

not to feel an interest | Huxley L. 1. 118 a married man cannot live at all in the position which I ought to occupy *under less than* six hundred a year | Matthews Father's Son 243 you know what a weak softy he is. If there was *hardly any* mischief to be had he'd be in the thick of it [if there was any, even the slightest, m.; or, there was hardly any m., but . . .].

German instances of confusion have been collected by F. Polle, Wie denkt das volk über die sprache, 1889, 14, e. g. Lessing: "wie wild er schon war, als er nur hörte, dass der prinz dich jüngst *nicht ohne missfallen* gesehen!" (= 'nicht ohne wohlgefallen') | Man *versäume nicht*, die günstige gelegenheit *unbenutzt* vorübergehen zu lassen. — I remember seeing in a notice in the Tirol: "*Nicht unweit* von hier, in dem walde . . .", the meaning evidently being *nicht weit* = *unweit.*

Siesbye, in Opuscula ad Madvigium 241, and Mikkelsen, Ordføjningsl. 328, collect some examples like Hor.: Invidus, iracundus, iners, vinosus, amator, Nemo adeo ferus est, ut non mitescere possit | Goethe: Musik, rollen und schuhe, wäsche und italiänische blumen . . ., keines verschmähte die nachbarschaft des andern | G. Sand: Pistolets, sabres recourbés et coutelas, rien ne manquait pour lui donner l'apparence du plus expéditif tueur d'hommes | sangene, indskrifterne, jordbærrene, intet blev glemt. But Mikkelsen's description is not quite correct, and the real explanation evidently is that the writer begins his sentence with the intention of continuing it in a positive form (the envious, angry . . . all can be mollified, etc.) and then suddenly changes the form of his expression. Nor is it necessary, as Mikkelsen says, to have a whole series of words, as seen in Wells V. 258 People, nobody, can do as they like in this world. — Cf. Dan. NP. '15 Mændene og endnu mindre kvinderne kender begrebet linned [i Japan].

The confusion is somewhat similar to the one found when an enumeration of things that are wanting ends with *no nothing*

(no paper, no pen, no ink, no nothing), which is meant as a negative of *everything*; the origin of the phrase is, of course, to be explained from a desire to go on with *no* + some other noun, but as the speaker can hit upon no more things to enumerate, he breaks off after *no* and finishes with *nothing*; *no* thus is only seemingly an adjunct to *nothing*: Carlyle F. 4. 223 no milk in the house! no nothing!

NED. *help* 11 c says "Often erron. with negative omitted (*can* instead of *cannot*), e. g. I did not trouble myself more than I could help | your name shall occur again as little as I can help". But it would certainly be unidiomatic to say, as Whately demands, *more than I can not help*; the idiom is caused by the fact that every comparison with *than* really implies a negative idea (*he has more than necessary* implies 'it is not necessary to have more', etc.) and it is on a par with the logic that is shown, for instance, in the French use of *ne* (*plus qu'il ne faut*) and in the dialectal *nor* for 'than'. — But there is some difficulty in explaining this meaning of *help*; note that where in England it is usual to say "I could not help admiring her", Americans will often prefer the negative expression with *but*: "I could not help but admire her".

Seldom or never and *seldom if ever* are blended into *seldom or ever*, which is said to be frequent where the influence of the school is not strong; Ellis in Trans. of Philol. Soc. 73 4. 12 Seldom or ever could I detect any approach to a labial.

CHAPTER VIII

The Meaning of Negation.

A linguistic negative generally changes a term into what logicians call the contradictory term (A and not-A comprising everything in existence) and is thus very different from a

negative in the mathematical sense, where — 4 means a point as much below 0 as 4 (or + 4) is above 0. We have, however, seen instances in which a negative changes a term into the "contrary term", as when *he begins-not to sing* (for *he begins not-to-sing*) comes to mean 'he ceases singing' (p. 52).

If we say, according to the general rule, that "not four" means "different from four", this should be taken with a certain qualification, for in practice it generally means, not whatever is above or below 4 in the scale, but only what is below 4, thus less than 4, something between 4 and 0, just as "not everything" means something between everything and nothing (and as "not good" means 'inferior', but does not comprise 'excellent'). Thus in "He does not read three books in a year" | "the hill is not two hundred feet high" | "his income is not £ 200 a year" | "he does not see her once a week".

This explains how 'not one' comes to be the natural expression in many languages for 'none, no', and 'not one thing' for 'nothing', as in OE *nan* = *ne-an*, whence *none* and *no*, OE *nanþing*, whence *nothing*, ON *eingi*, whence Dan. *ingen*, G. *k-ein*, etc. Cf. also Tennyson 261 That *not one* life shall be destroy'd . . . That *not a* worm is cloven in vain; see also p. 49. In French similarly: *Pas un bruit n'*interrompit le silence, etc.

When *not* + a numeral is exceptionally to be taken as 'more than', the numeral has to be strongly stressed, and generally to be followed by a more exact indication: "the hill is not 'two hundred feet high, but 'three hundred" | "his income is not 200, but at least 300 a year" | Locke S. 321 Not one invention, but fifty — from a corkscrew to a machine-gun | Defoe R. 342 not once, but two or three times | Gissing R. 149 books that well merit to be pored over, not once but many a time | Benson A. 220 he would bend to kiss her, not once, not once only.

But *not once or twice* always means 'several times', as in

Tennyson 220 Not once or twice in our rough island-story The path of duty was the way to glory.

In Russian, on the other hand, *ne raz* 'not (a) time', thus really without a numeral, means 'several times, sometimes' and in the same way *ne odin* 'not one' means 'more than one'; corresponding phenomena are found in other languages as well, see a valuable little article by Schuchardt, An Aug. Leskien zum 4. juli 1894 (privately printed). He rightly connects this with the use in Russian of the stronger negative *ni* with a numeral to signify 'less than': *ni odin* 'not even one'.

What the exact import is of a negative quantitative indication may in some instances depend on what is expected, or what is the direction of thought in each case. While the two sentences "he spends £ 200 a year" and "he lives on £ 200 a year" are practically synonymous, everything is changed if we add *not*: "he doesn't spend £ 200 a year" means 'less than'; "he doesn't live on £ 200 a year" means 'more than'; because in the former case we expect an indication of a maximum, and in the latter of a minimum.

Or, perhaps, the explanation is rather this, that in the former sentence it does not matter whether we negative the nexus or the numeral (he does-not-spend £ 200 | he spends not-£200), but in the latter it changes the whole meaning, for "he does-not-live on 200" states the impossibility of living on so little, and "he lives on not-200 a year" (which is rendered more idiomatic if we add an adverb: on not quite 200 a year) states the possibility of living on less than 200. In the former sentence the numeral thus is not negatived at all. Compare also: *he is not content with 200 a year* and *he is content with not 200 a year*. — In the proverb "Rome was not built in a day" (where *a* is the old numeral and equals *one*) the meaning also, of course, is that it took more than one day to build Rome. Thus also in Rolland JChr. 8. 98 on ne bâtit pas un art musical en un jour.

Where a numeral is not used as a point in an ascending scale, its negative is really contradictory; "the train doesn't start at seven" says nothing about the actual time of starting, which may be either before or after seven. But "he won't be here at seven" implies "we can't expect him till after seven", because an arrival before 7 o'clock would naturally imply his being here also at that hour.

As *half* is a numeral, *not half* generally means 'less than half': *the bottle is not half full.* In slang, *not half bad* means, however, 'not at all bad, quite good'. In the following quotation, *not half-alive* (with strong stress on *half*) means 'more than half alive', as shown also by the continuation: Bennett C. 1. 285 At any rate she was not half alive; she was alive in every particle of herself. In the same way, in rustic speech, "she didn't half cry" means that she made a tremendous noise (Wright, Rustic Speech 117).

Not quite the average generally means 'below the average'; sometimes, however, *average* is taken as a depreciating epithet, and then the negative may be appreciatory: Dewey, School and Soc. 61 Here is another piece of work which is not quite average; it is better than the average.

Not above 30 means either 30 or less than 30. But *less than 30* may in English be negatived in two ways: *not less than 30* means either 30 or more than thirty, and *no less than 30* means exactly 30, implying surprise or wonder at the high number. "He has not less than ten children" — I am not certain of the exact number, but it is at least ten. "He has no less than ten children" — he has ten, and isn't that a large family? In the same way with *more.* Cf. on this distinction between *not* and *no* with comparatives MEG. II. 16. 83 ff. and Stoffel, Studies in English 87 ff.

In Latin both *non magis quam* and *non minus quam* are favourite expressions for equality, though of course used in

different connexions: *Cæsar non minus operibus pacis florebat quam rebus in bello gestis | Pericles non magis op. pacis fl. quam r. i. b. g.* (Cauer, Grammatica militans 52).

There is really no perfect negative corresponding to *as rich as*, comprising both 'richer' and 'poorer', for *not so rich as* (note the change of the first conjunction) excludes 'richer' and means 'less rich'.

We have already seen (p. 40) that *a little* and *little* differ, the former being a positive and the latter almost a negative term. We may arrange these terms (with *a few* and *few*) into a scale like this:

1. much:	much money	many (people)	very careless
2. a little:	a little money	a few (people)	a little careless
3. little:	little money	few (people)	little careless

only that *little careless* is not quite idiomatic, as *little* is not often used with depreciatory adjectives; cf. on the other hand *little intelligent.*

Now if we try the negatives of these we discover that negativing 1 turns it into 3: *not much* (*money*) = *little* (*money*); *not many* (*people*) = *few* (*people*); *not very intelligent* = *little intelligent.* But a negative 2 becomes nearly synonymous with 1 (or stands between 1 and 2): *not a little* (*money*) = *much* (*money*); *not a few* (*people*) = *many* (*people*); *not a little intelligent* = *very intelligent.*

Examples of *a few* and *a little* negatived:

Sh. H. 8. I. 2. 18 I am solicited not by a few, And those of true condition [= by not a few] | Sh. Lr. I. 1. 286 Sister, it is not a little I haue to say, Of what most neerely appertaines to vs both [Q not a little, F not little] | Bunyan P. 147 At which they were not a little sorry (ib. 124) | Allen in First 46 it gained me at once the friendship of not a few whose friendship was

worth having | Ruskin Sel. 1. 410 a phenomenon which puzzles me not a little.

While it seems to be usual in all languages to express *contradictory* terms by means either of derivatives like those mentioned p. 42 or of an adverb corresponding to *not*, languages very often resort to separate roots to express the most necessary *contrary* terms. Hence such pairs as *young — old*, *good — bad*, *big — small*, etc. Now, it is characteristic of such pairs that intermediate stages are found, which may be expressed negatively by *neither young nor old*, etc.; the simple negation of one of the terms (for instance *not young*) comprising both the intermediate and the other extreme. Sometimes a language creates a special expression for the intermediate stage, thus *indifferent* in the comparatively recent sense of 'neither good nor bad, what is between good and bad', *medium-sized* between big and small. There may even be a whole long string of words with shades of meaning running into one another and partially overlapping, as in *hot* (*sweltering*) — *warm — tepid — lukewarm — mild — fresh — cool — chilly — cold — frosty — icy*. If one of these is negatived, the result is generally analogous to the negativing of a numeral: *not lukewarm*, for instance, in most cases means less than lukewarm, i. e. cold or something between cold and lukewarm.

If we lengthen the series given above (*much — a little — little*) in both directions, we get on the one hand *all* (*everything*), on the other hand *nothing*. These are contrary terms, even in a higher degree than *good* and *bad* are, as both are absolute. Whatever comes in between them (thus all the three quantities mentioned above) is comprised in the term *something*, and we may now arrange these terms in this way, denoting by A and C the two absolutes, and by B the intermediate relative:

A	B	C
all (n.) everything	something	nothing

and correspondingly

all (pl.) everybody	some somebody	none nobody
all girls	some girls (a girl)	no girl(s)
all the money	some money	no money.

In exactly the same way we have the adverbs:

always	sometimes	never
everywhere	somewhere	nowhere.

Let us now consider what the result is if we negative these terms. A negative *A* means *B*:

not all, not everything = something,
not all, not everybody = some,
not all girls = some girls,
not all the money = some (of the) money,
not always = sometimes,
not everywhere = somewhere.

This amounts to saying that in negativing an *A* it is the *absolute* element of *A* that is negatived. Thus always when the negative precedes the absolute word of the *A*-class: Tennyson 222 We are not cotton-spinners all, But some love England and her honour yet | they are not all of them fools | I do not look on every politician as a humbug | NP. '17 this change is not all gain | Wells Br. 325 Not all Hugh's letters were concerned with these technicalities | Mason R. 179 it seemed that not all the pallor was due to the lamp | he is not always so sad | non omnis moriar.

When a negatived *all* in this sense is the subject, we may have the word-order *not all* before the verb as in the sentences just quoted from Wells and Mason, or in the Dan. and G.

proverb "Ikke alt hvad der glimrer er guld" | "Nicht alles, was glänzt, ist gold"; or the subject may in some way be transposed so as to allow the negative to go with the verb, as in the more usual form of the Dan. proverb "Det er ikke guld alt som glimrer", in G. "Es ist nicht alles gold, was glänzt"; Tobler quotes MHG. "ez en-ist nicht allez gold daz da glizzit" and Rutebeuf "n'est pas tout or quanqu'il reluit". Cf. also Schiller's "Es sind nicht alle frei, die ihrer ketten spotten", and the proverb "Es sind nicht alle jäger, die das horn gut blasen".

But very often *all* is placed first for the sake of emphasis, and the negative is attracted to the verb in accordance with the general tendency mentioned above (p. 44). This is often looked upon as illogical, but Tobler, in an instructive article on Fr. "Tout ce qui reluit n'est pas or" (Vermischte beitr. z. franz. gramm. 1. 159 ff.) rightly calls attention to the difference between sentences like "nicht mitglieder können eingeführt werden" (non-members may be introduced), where only one member of a positive sentence is negative (what I call special negative) and the Fr. proverb, where the negation is connected with the verb, "dem kern der aussage", and the expression consequently is "ein im höchsten grade angemessener, indem er besagt: von dem subjekte "alles glänzende" darf "gold sein" nicht prädiziert werden".

English examples of this arrangement are very frequent: Ch. B. 2708 but *every man may nat* have the perfeccioun that ye seken | Sh. Merch. II. 7. 65 *All that glisters is not* gold | Lr. II. 4. 199 *All's not* offence that indiscretion findes, And dotage termes so | AV. 1. Cor. 6. 12 All things are lawfull vnto mee, but *all things are not* expedient | Walton A. 106 *every one cannot* make musick | Richardson G. 72 thank Heaven, *all scholars are not* like this | Johnson R. 152 *every one is not* able to stem the temptation of public life | Goldsmith 20 As *every person may not* be acquainted with this

pastime | Milt PL. 1. 106 and Shelley 119 *all is not* lost | Byron 436 But *all men are not* born to reign | Lamb. E. 1. 103 *All Valentines are not* foolish | Browning 2. 170 *All women are not* mothers of a boy, Though they live twice the length of my whole life | Ward M. 16 any fool can get up a Blue Book; only, *all the fools don't* | Harraden S. 62 every one is lonely, *but every one does not* know it | Wilde Read. Gaol 3 For each man kills the thing he loves, Yet *each man does not* die | Wells Br. 281 *All our men aren't* angels.

French examples from old and modern times have been collected by Tobler; I add from my own reading Mérimée Deux Hér. 88 *Tout le monde n'a pas* l'esprit de comprendre les chefs d'œuvre | Rolland JChr. 5. 162 *Tout le monde n'est pas* fait pour l'art | ib. 5. 295 *Tout le monde ne peut pas* tirer le gros lot.

In Dan. the same order is not at all rare: *Alt er ikke* tabt, etc. Note the positive continuation, which shows that 'some' (or 'many') is meant, in Kierkegaard Stad. 138 Men *alle ere ikke* saa vise som Socrates, og indlade sig ofte ganske alvorligt med een, der gjør et dumt spørgsmaal.

In German Tobler mentions the possibility of the same: *alle druckfehler können* hier *nicht* aufgezählt werden, etc.

With regard to Greek Krüger in his Griech. sprachl. § 67 insists on the distinction *ou pánta orthôs epoíēsen* nicht alles — wohl aber manches; *pánta ouk orthôs epoíēsen* alles nicht richtig — sondern falsch; *orthôs pánta ouk epoíēsen* mit recht hat er alles nicht gethan — sondern unterlassen; but he admits exceptions for the sake of emphasis, especially with contrasts with *mén* and *dé*; he quotes from Xenophon *Pántes mèn ouk êlthon, Ariaíos dè kaì Artáoxos.* —

On the other hand, when a word of the *A*-class (*all*, etc.) is placed in a sentence containing a special negative (or an implied negative), the result is the same as if we had the

corresponding *C*-word and a positive word; thus the assertion is absolute:

all this is unnecessary = nothing is necessary,
everybody was unkind = nobody was kind,
he was always unkind = he was never kind,
everybody fails = nobody succeeds,
he forgets everything = he remembers nothing.

The same effect is rare when we have a nexal negative with one of the *A*-words; cf. Rolland JChr. 8. 141 Tous ces gens-là ne sont pas humains [i. e. none of them is]. Tobler also has a few examples from Fr., thus La Bruyère: maxime usée et triviale que tout le monde sait, et que *tout le monde ne pratique pas* | id. *Toute jalousie n'est point* exempte de quelque sorte d'envie . . .; l'envie au contraire est quelquefois séparée de la jalousie. I know no English examples of this.

The difference between the two possible results of the negation of a word like *all* is idiomatically expressed by the contrast between two adverbs, as seen in

he is *not altogether* happy (Sh. Wiv. I. 1. 175 I am not altogether an asse) | *pas tout-à-fait* | *ikke helt* | *nicht ganz* — result B;

he is *not at all* happy (he is *not* happy *at all*) | *pas du tout* | *slet ikke* | *gar nicht* (*ganz und gar nicht*) — result C.

It may perhaps be doubtful whether we have B or C as a result in the common phrase Dan. "Det gjorde jeg *ikke for alt i verden*" = G. "Das täte ich *um alles in der welt nicht*" (E. "I shouldn't like to do it for anything in the world" more often than ". . . . for all the world"). It is, however, more natural to take it to be an equivalent of 'nothing', and in the corresponding Fr. idiom *rien* is used, see e. g. Rolland JChr. 5. 83 (des mondains, qui) . . . *pour rien au monde n'eussent* renoncé à l'honneur.

There is a third possibility, when *not* is for the sake of emphasis put before *all* in the sense of 'not even', though it should properly

go with the verb as a nexal negative; *all* here means the sum of... (Cf. the distinction made in MEG II. 5. 4 between "all the boys of this form are stronger that their teacher" (if working together) and "all the boys of this form are able to run faster than their teacher", (i. e. each separately). Thus Sh R 2 III. 2. 54 *Not all* the water in the rough rude sea Can wash the balme from an anoynted king | Locke S 341 *Not all* the trying of Zora and all the Ladies Bountiful of Christendom could give her her heart's desire. Cf. with nexal negative Sh R 3 I. 2. 250 On me, whose *all not equals* Edwards moytie | Rolland JChr 7. 193 *toutes* les idées *ne comptent guère*, quand on aime.

If now we examine what results when a word belonging to the *C*-class is negatived, we shall see corresponding effects, only that immediate combinations are not frequent except in Latin, where *non-nemo*, *non-nulli* means 'some', *non-nihil* 'something', *non-nunquam* 'sometimes'. Here thus the result clearly belongs to class B.

The same is the case in the frequent idiom *not for nothing* = 'not in vain' or even 'to good purpose' as in Sh. Merch. II. 5. 25 it was not for nothing that my nose fell a bleeding on blacke monday last | Kipl. J. 2. 66 Not for nothing have I led the pack | Hope Ch. 190 she would not have done so for nothing | Raleigh Sh. 42 he was not the eldest son of his father for nothing. — In the same way in other languages: Dan. han er *ikke for intet* (*ikke for ingenting*) sin faers søn | Fr. Rolland JChr. 4. 314 Ce *n'*était *pas pour rien* qu'elle avait ces yeux hardis.

It is more usual to place the two negatives in two sentences as in "one cannot say that nothing is finer" (= something is finer) or at any rate in an infinitival combination as in Locke S. 285 "It's not good for a man to have no gods" (= it is good to have some gods). Here too the result belongs to class B.

Inversely if we begin with the word belonging to class C and place the negative adverb after it. Thus again in Latin *nemo non videt* 'everybody sees' | *nihil non videt* 'he sees everything' | *Quum id ipsum dicere nunquam non sit ineptum* (Cic.) 'as it is always foolish'; the result thus belongs to class A.

The same result is obtained when one of these words is followed by a word with a negative prefix or with implied negative meaning:

nothing is unnecessary = everything is necessary,
nobody was unkind = everybody was kind,
he was never unkind = he was always kind,
nobody fails = everybody succeeds,
he forgets nothing = he remembers everything.

When the negative is a separate word, the result is the same; but in English as in Danish such sentences are generally avoided because they are not always clear or readily understood; it is rare to find combinations like Thack. N. 55 not a clerk in that house did not tremble before her (= all the clerks trembled) | Locke S. 228 no other man but you would not have despised the woman (= every other man would have despised). There is, however, no difficulty if the two negatives are placed in separate sentences, as in "There was no one present that did not weep" (= everybody wept); here *that not* is often replaced by *but*, *but that*, *but what*, see ch. XII. In Dan. "der var ingen tilstede, som ikke græd" or, with a curious negative force of *jo*: ". . . som jo græd". Similar constructions are frequent in other languages as well; cf. Dr. Johnson's epitaph on Goldsmith: *Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*

'Everything' is also the result in such combinations as Rolland JChr. 5. 133 L'art est toujours pur; *il n'y a rien que* de chaste en lui.

The ordinary treatment of both A- and C-words when negatived may be brought under one general rule: when the absolute notion (A or C) is mentioned first, the absolute element prevails, and the result is the contrary notion (A . . . not = C; C . . . not = A). If on the other hand, *not* comes first, it nega-

tives the absolute element, and the result is the intermediate relative (not A = B; not C = B).

It seems to me that the tripartition here established, —

A. all
B. some
C. none,

is logically preferable to the tripartition in Kant's famous table of categories, —

A. allheit
B. vielheit
C. einheit,

as *many* (vielheit) and *one* (einheit) are both of them comprised under "some"; Kant does not take "none" here, but unintelligibly places negation under the heading "quality", though it is clearly a quantitative category. (See on the confusion caused by these Kantian categories in some philologists' treatment of negation, p. 69 ff.).

The following remarks may also be of some interest to the student of logic. We may establish another tripartition between

A. necessity
B. possibility
C. impossibility,

and if closely inspected, these three categories are found to be nothing else but special instances of our three categories above, for necessity really means that *all* possibilities are comprised. Note now: *not necessary* = possible; *not impossible* = possible; *it is impossible not to see* = necessary.

The verbal expression for these three categories is:

A. must (or, need)
B. can (or, may)
C. cannot,

and we see their interrelation in instances like these:

he *must* run = he *cannot* but run (cannot help running),
no one *can* deny = every one *must* admit,
nobody *need* be present = everybody *may* be absent,
he *cannot* succeed = he *must* fail,
he *cannot* forget = he *must* remember.

In the same way we have the Lat. expression for necessity *non potest non amare*, and the corresponding Fr. as in Rolland JChr. 5. 54 car il *ne pouvait pas ne pas* voir qu'ils se moquaient de lui | Meillet Caract. des langues germaniques 50 une variation qui *ne peut pas n'être pas* ancienne. Even with *ne plus*, JChr. 9. 12 il l'entendait partout, il *ne* pouvait *plus ne plus* l'entendre. With indirect negation we have the same, ib. 9. 49 Et le moyen de ne pas faire la comparaison! [= you must] — different from "Pas moyen de faire la comparaison" [= impossible].

If to the three categories just mentioned we add an element of will with regard to another being, the result is:

A. command
B. permission
C. prohibition.

But these three categories are not neatly separated in actual language, at any rate not in the forms of the verb, for the imperative is usually the only form available for A and B. Thus *take that!* may have one of two distinct meanings, (A) a command: 'you must take that', (B) a permission: 'you may take that', with some intermediate shades of meaning (request, entreaty, prayer). Now a prohibition (C) means at the same time (1) a positive command to not (take that), and (2) the negative of a permission: 'you are not allowed to (take that)'; hence the possibility of using a negative imperative as a prohibitive: *Don't take that!* | *Don't you stir!* But hence also the disinclination in many languages to use

a negative imperative, because that may be taken in a different and milder sense, as a polite request, or advice, not to, etc. And on the other hand formulas expressive at first of such mild requests may acquire the stronger signification of a prohibition. In Latin the negative imperative is only found poetically (*Tu ne cede malis*, Virgil), otherwise we have a paraphrase with *noli* (*Noli me tangere*) or a subjunctive (*ne nos inducas in tentationem*); in Spanish the latter has become the rule (*no vengas* 'don't come').

In Danish, where *Tag det ikke!* is generally employed = 'I ask you, or advise you, not to take it', a prohibition is expressed by *La vær å ta det* (lad være at tage det), which has also the advantage of presenting the negative element first, or colloquially often by *Ikke ta(ge) det!* (*not* + infin.), which like the corresponding German formula (*Nicht hinauslehnen*) has developed through children's echo of the fuller sentence: *Du må ikke tage det!* (*Du darfst nicht hinauslehnen!*).

In other languages separate verb-forms ('jussive') have developed for prohibitions, or else negative adverbs distinct from the usual ones (cf. Greek *mē*), see Misteli, Charakteristik der typen des sprachbaues p. 22.

This will serve to explain some peculiarities in the use of E. *must* and *may*. As we have seen, a prohibition means (1) a positive command to not . . .; thus: *you must* (positive) *not-take that* (negative); and (2) the negative of a permission: *you may-not* (negative) *take* (positive) *that*. But in (1) we have the usual tendency to attract the negation to the auxiliary (see p. 44), and thus we get: *you mustn't take that*, which never has the sense of 'it is not necessary for you to take that' (negative *must*), but has become the ordinary prohibitive auxiliary. On the other hand, in (2) we have the competition with the usual combination of (positive) *may* + negative infinitive, as in "He may not be rich, but he is

a gentleman"; this makes people shrink from *may-not* in a prohibition, the more so as *may* is felt to be weaker and more polite than the more brutal *must*. The result is that to the positive "we may walk on the grass" corresponds a negative "we mustn't walk on the grass".

See on such semantic changes as a result of negatives Wellander in Språkvetenskapl. sällskapets förhandlingar 1913—15 p. 38.

The old *may not* in prohibitions, which was extremely common in Sh., is now comparatively rare, except in questions implying a positive answer (*mayn't I* = 'I suppose I may') and in close connexion with a positive *may*, thus especially in answers. In our last quotation it is probably put in for the sake of variation: Sh. Lr. IV. 5. 16 'I must needs after him' ... 'Stay with vs' ... 'I may not' | Sh. Err. III. 2. 92 such a one, as a man may not speake of, without he say sir reverence | Marlowe E. 939 You may not in, my lord. May we not? | Congreve 249 Mayn't my cousin stay with me? | Di. X. 17 how it is that I appear before you I may not tell | Hope D. 59 Mayn't I see the dodges? | ib. 90 May not I accompany you? | Hardy R. 73 Perhaps I may kiss your hand? — No, you may not | Benson J. 164 May I tell you? 'No, you may not' | Wells U. 303 they may study maps beforehand ... but they may not carry such helps. They must not go by beaten ways | Merriman V. 175 the Polish Jew must not leave the country, may not even quit his native town, unless it suits a paternal Government that he should go elsewhere.

Positive *may* and negative *must not* are frequently found together: Ruskin T. 102 Your labour only may be sold; your soul must not | Stevenson A. 26 Prose may be rhythmical, and it may be as much so as you will; but it must not be metrical. It may be anything, but it must not be verse | Hope R. 86 I mustn't kiss your face, but your hands I may

kiss | Shaw 2. 251 You may call me Dolly if you like; but you musnt call me child.

May is thus used even in tag questions after *must not*: Austen S. 62 I must not tell, may I, Elinor? | Di. D. 16 You mustn't marry more than one person at a time, may you?' 'Certainly not.' 'But if you marry a person, and the person dies, why then you may marry another person, mayn't you?' 'You MAY, if you choose'.

On the other hand, *must* begins to be used in tag questions, though it is not possible to ask *Must I?* instead of *May I?* Thus: GE M. 2. 50 I must not go any further, must I? | Caine P. 136 I suppose I must not romp too much now, must I?

I may add here a few examples of *may* denoting possibility with a negative infinitive (*you may not know* = 'it is possible that you do not know'); in the first two quotations *not* is attracted to the verb: Hughes T. 2. 222 you mayn't know it, but.... | Locke W. 269 What may be permissible to a scrubby little artist in Paris mayn't be permitted to one who ought to know better | Shaw 1. 16 newcomers whom they may not think quite good enough for them | Hope D. 91 I may not be an earl, but I have a perfect right to be useful.

With *may* we see another semantic change brought about by a negative: to the positive *may, might* corresponds a negative *cannot, could not* (not *may not, might not*): NP. 17 this *cannot* do harm and *may* do good | Cowper L. 2.8 I *might* prudently, perhaps, but I *could not* honestly, admit that charge [of careless writing] | Kingsley H. 357 his dialectic, though it *might* silence her, *could not* convince her | Birmingham W. 94 He *might* be a Turk. — No, he *couldn't*.

CHAPTER IX

Weakened Negatives.

Negative words or formulas may in some combinations be used in such a way that the negative force is almost vanishing. There is scarcely any difference between questions like "Will you have a glass of beer?" and "Won't you have a glass of beer?", because the real question is "Will you, or will you not, have...."; therefore in offering one a glass both formulas may be employed indifferently, though a marked tone of surprise can make the two sentences into distinct contrasts: "Will you have a glass of beer?" then coming to mean 'I am surprised at your wanting it', and "Won't you have a glass of beer?" the reverse. (In this case *really* is often added.)

In the same way in Dan. "Vil De ha et glas øl?" and "Vil De ikke ha et glas øl?" A Dutch lady once told me how surprised she was at first in Denmark at having questions like "Vil De ikke række mig saltet?" asked her at table in a boarding-house; she took the *ikke* literally and did not pass the salt. *Ikke* is also used in indirect (reported) questions, as in Faber Stegek. 28 saa har madammen bedt Giovanni, om han ikke vil passe lidt paa barnet.

A polite request is often expressed by saying "Would (or, Do) you mind taking....", and, as *mind* means 'object to', the logical answer is *no* = 'I don't mind'; but very frequently *yes* or some other positive reply (*By all means*! etc.) is used, which corresponds to the implied positive request: Pinero S. 21 D.: When you two fellows go home, do you mind leaving me behind here? M.: Not at all. J.: By all means. | Ward E. 128 Do you mind my asking you a question? — By all means! What can I do?

Not at all is frequent as an idiomatic reply to phrases of politeness, which do not always contain words to which *not at all* can be logically attached: Di Do 32 "I'm sorry to give

you so much trouble". "Not at all". [does not negative the other's feeling sorry, but the giving trouble; also ib 363] | Di D. 355 "Thank you very much for that!" "Not at all, I said loftily, there is no reason why you should thank me" | Shaw J. 205 I beg your pardon. — Not at all | id 1.48 Excuse me. [Trench is heard replying 'Not at all', Cokane 'Dont mention it, my dear sir.']

In exclamations a *not* is often used though no negative notion is really implied; this has developed from the use of a negative *question* = a positive statement: "How often have we not seen him ?" = 'we have often seen him' | "What have we not suffered ?" = 'we have suffered everything' (or, very much). As an exclamation of this form is a weakened question (as shown also by the tone), we see that in these sentences the import of the negation is also weakened, so that it really matters very little whether a *not* is added or not, as illustrated clearly by the varied sentences in our first quotation: Stanley Dark Cont. 2.482 What a long, long and true friendship was here sundered! Through what strange vicissitudes of life had they not followed me! What wild and varied scenes had we not seen together! What a noble fidelity these untutored souls had exhibited! | Spect 166 What good to his country might not a trader have done with such useful qualifications ? | Doyle NP. 1895 Ah, my friend, what did I not fear at that moment! | Galsworthy M. 34 How often have I not watched him.... How often have I not seen them coming back, tired as cats.

Somewhat differently in Harraden S. 71 I don't know how long I should not have gone on grumbling | Bennett B. 121 no one could say how soon he might not come to himself | Gosse Mod. E. Lit. 23 What Chaucer might not have produced had he lived ten years longer no one can endure to conjecture.

In Dan. exlamations *ikke* is extremely frequent: "Hvor

var han dog ikke rar!" | Pal-Müller 6.380 Hvor har ei da du liidt! | K. Larsen Sidste krig 124 Hvilken større glæde kunde jeg ikke faa her paa jorden.

In German *nicht* was frequent in exclamations in the 18th c.: "wie ungesucht war nicht der gang seines glücks"; now the positive form is preferred (Paul, Wörterb. 383).

In concessive clauses and phrases, *never (so)* is often used concurrently vith *ever*, which seems to be gaining ground. (Cf. Abbott § 52, Storm E. Ph. 702, Alford Q. 62, Bøgholm B. 88).

Never so after *though* and *if*: Ch. B. 355 For though his wyf be cristned never so whyte, She shal have nede to wasshe awey the rede | More U. 299 he shall sterue for honger, though the commen wealthe floryshe neuer so muche (ib. 54,55,241). AV. Job. 9.30 If I make my handes neuer so cleane, yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch | Milton A. 32 any deceased author, though never so famous in his life time | Bunyan G. 11 had I but seen a priest (though never so sordid and debauched in his life) || More U. 38 yf it were neuer so muche | Sh. Mids. III. 2.334 if thou dost intend Neuer so little shew of loue to her, Thou shalt abide it.

It is very frequent in clauses with inverted word-order and no conjunction: Ch. Duch 873 were she never so glad, Hir loking was not foly sprad (ib. 913, 1107) | Roister 48 a wower be he neuer so poore Must play and sing before his bestbeloues doore | More U. 286 they thinke it not lawfull to touch him, be he neuer so vityous | Sh. John III. 3.31 and creepe time nere so slow, Yet it shall come, for me to doe thee good | Milton S. 212 wisest men Have err'd.... And shall again, pretend they ne're so wise | Fielding T. 4.301 forgive her all her sins, be they never so many | Ruskin F. 95 go they never so glibly | Merriman S. 179 there was a sullen silence which Paul could not charm away, charm he never so wisely || Cf.

also Roister 81 lette neuer so little a gappe be open, And.... the worst shall be spoken | Goldsmith 658 curb her never so little, she kicks up, and you're flung in a ditch.

Other examples of *never so*: Sh. R. 2 V. 1.64 thou wilt know againe, Being ne're so little vrg'd another way | Carlyle H. 39 there will not again be any man, never so great, whom his fellowmen will take for a god | id R. 2.258 the pain ceased, except when the wounded limb was meddled with never so little | id F. 2.209 I have heard a hundred anecdotes about William Hazlitt; yet cannot by never so much cross-questioning even form to myself the smallest notion of how it really stood with him | Emerson 308 Private men keep their promises, never so trivial.

Some examples of *ever so* may serve to show that the signification is exactly the same as of the negative phrase: Swift 3.271 every man desired to put off death, let it approach ever so late | id J. 492 There is something of farce in all these mournings, let them be ever so serious | ib. 545 Pray write me a good-humoured letter immediately, let it be ever so short | Burns 3. 272 The honest man, tho' e'er sae poor, Is king o' men for a' that | Kinglake E. [p ?] how easily my reason, if ever so slightly provoked, would drag me back to life | Ruskin C. 68 a chance of being useful, in ever so humble a way | Gissing R. 8 no one will be vexed, linger I ever so late.

In Dan. concessive clauses with *om* we may similarly use either *aldrig* or *nok*: "jeg gør det ikke, om han så ber mig aldrig så meget om det" or "om han så ber mig nok så meget om det". The negative purport of *aldrig* is here so little felt that one may even sometimes find *ikke* after it, Am. Skram Lucie 193 Det er så, om hun så aldrig så meget ikke ved om det = 'however ignorant she may be of it'.

In Russian *ni* after a relative (interrogative) pronoun has the same generalizing effect as Eng. *-ever*: *kto by ni sprocil*

'whoever asks', *kak ni dumal* 'however much he thought' (H. Pedersen, Læsebog 132).

In the Scandinavian languages there is a curious way of using *ikke for aldrig det* in the signification 'not for the whole world': Kierkeg. Stad. 234 Ak! jeg tør ikke spørge et menneske om noget, ikke for aldrig det | Goldschm. Hjeml. 1.48 Man vilde ikke have gjort det samme, ikke for aldrig det | Blicher Bindst. 48 a vel ikke træk kjowlen aa ham faar aalle de | Lie Naar sol g. n. 5 hun vilde ikke truffet toldinspektøren i nattrøje for aldrig det | Strindb. Utop. 52 Han vilde icke sälja den för aldrig det. — Rarely without *ikke*: Larsen Spring. punkt 138 han vilde have givet aldrig det for at kunne have bekæmpet sin uro.

Among weakened negatives should also be mentioned *nay* (ON *nei*): when one has used a weak expression and finds that a stronger might be properly applied, the addition is partly a contradiction, partly a confirmation, as going further in the same direction. Hence, both *nay* and *yea* may be used in the same sense (note that both were in ME. and early MnE. less strong than *no* and *yes*, respectively). Thus Sh. Gent II. 4.179 we are betroathd: nay more, our mariage howre Determin'd on | Mids III. 2.313 threatned me To strike me, spurne me, nay to kill me too | Buny P. 189 I should be as bad, nay worse, then I was before | Seeley E. 89 the Mediterranean Sea.... the chief, nay, almost the one sea of history.

Cf. *yea*: Sh. Merch IV. 1.210 here I tender it for him in the Court, Yea, twice the summe, if that will not suffice.

[*Nay* is preserved with the old negative meaning in connexion with *say*, probably for the sake of the rime, as in Ridge S. 54 no one had the right to say him nay | Parker R. 77 with no one to say him nay].

In Dan. both *ja* and *nej* may be used in correcting

or pointing a statement: "han er millionær, nej mangemillionær" or "...., ja mangemillionær".

A weakened negative is also found in the colloquial exaggeration *no time* (or humorously *less than no time*) = 'a very short time': Wells T. 17 Gip got it in no time | Hope R. 203 The news will filter through the town in no time | Sterne 83 and all this in five minutes less than no time at all.

A different case is found with *no end*, which is used colloquially for 'an infinite quantity', i. e. 'very much' or 'very many'; in recent times this is even found where no quantity is thought of: *no end of a fine fellow* = 'a very fine fellow', *no end of a man* = 'a real man' or 'a great man': Di X. 101 the Alderman had sealed it with a very large coat of arms and no end of wax | Thack S. 128 everybody must make no end of melancholy reflections | Tenn L. 2.285 I have sometimes no end of trouble to get rid of the alliteration | Mac Carthy 2.402 Parliament had passed no end of laws against it | Kipling S. 119 We'll take an interest in the house. We'll take no end of interest in the house | Gissing G. 96 I'm doing a lot of work. No end of work — more than I've ever done | Hankin 2.16 Mrs. H. has had no end of a good time (also ib. 2.167, 3.107) | Swinburne L. 188 she followed, in no end of a maze one would think || Ward M. 17 they'll make me out no end of a fine fellow | Pinero M. 38 I feel no end of a man | id. B. 12 This beastly scrape of Theophila's has been no end of a shocker for me | Kipling S. 171 we're no end of moral reformers | ib 272 About noon there was no end of a snowstorm | ib. 284 I sent him no end of an official stinger | Swinburne L. 43 you ought to make no end of a good hitter in time.... a rod with no end of buds on.

CHAPTER X

Negative Connectives.

It is, of course, possible to put two negative sentences together without any connective ("he is not rich; his sister is not pretty") or loosely joined by means of *and* ("he is not rich, and his sister is not pretty"); but when the two ideas have at least one element in common, it is usual to join them more closely by means of some negative connective: he is neither rich nor pretty | neither he nor his sister is rich | he neither eats nor drinks. Negative connexions may be of various orders, which are here arranged according to a purely logical scheme: it would be impossible to arrange them historically, and nothing hinders the various types from coexisting in the same language. If we represent the two ideas to be connected as A and B, and understand by c a positive, and by nc a negative connective (while n is the ordinary negative without any connective force), we get the following seven types:

(1) nc A nc B;
(2) nc^1 A nc^2 B (c^1 and c^2 being different forms);
(3) nc A c B;
(4) A nc B;
(5) n A nc B;
(6) n A nc^1 B nc^2;
(7) n A n B nc;

Not unfrequently an ordinary negative is found besides the negative connective. — What is here said about two ideas also applies to three or more, though we shall find in some cases simplifications like nc A, B, C, nc D instead of nc A nc B nc C nc D.

In the first three types the speaker from the very first makes the hearer expect a B after the A; in (4), (5), and (6)

the connexion is indicated after A, but before B; and finally in (7) it is not till B has been spoken that the speaker thinks of showing that B is connected with A.

The connectives are often termed disjunctive, like (*either*..) *or*, but are really different and juxtapose rather than indicate an alternative; this is shown in the formation of Lat. *neque* ....*neque*, which are negative forms of *que*....*que* 'both.... and', and it very often influences the number of the verb (neither he nor I *were*), see MEG. II. 6.62. *Neither*.... *nor* thus is essentially different from *either not*.... *or not*, which gives the choice between two negative alternatives, as in Spencer A. 1.380 [Carlyle] either could not or would not think coherently.

(1) nc A nc B.

The best-known examples of this type — the same connective before A and B — are Latin *neque*.... *neque* with Fr. Sp. *ni*....*ni*, It. *né*....*né*, Rum. *nicĭ*....*nicĭ*, and Gr. *oúte* ....*oúte*, *mḗte*....*mḗte*. In the old Germanic languages we had correspondingly Got. *nih*....*nih*, and (with a different word) OHG. (Tatian) *noh*....*noh*; but in *ne*....*ne* as found in ON, OS. and OE the written form at any rate does not show us whether we have this type (*ne* corresponding to Got. *nih*) or the unconnected use of two simple negatives, corresponding to Got. *ni*....*ni*; see on the latter Neckel KZ. 45,11 ff. There can be little doubt that the close similarity of the two words, one corresponding to *ni* (Lat. *ne*) and the other to *nih* (*neque*), contributed to the disappearance of this type in these languages.

A late Eng. example is (NED. 1581): they *ne* could *ne* would help the afflicted.

There is another and fuller form of this type in Eng., namely *nother*....*nother* (from *ne* + *ōhwæðer*), which was in use from the 13th c. to the beginning of the ModE. period,

e. g. More U. 211 whether they belyue well or no, nother the tyme dothe suffer us to discusse, nother it ys nowe necessarye. In the shortened form *nor. . . . nor* it was formerly extremely frequent, as in Sh. Meas. III. 1.32 Thou hast nor youth nor age. This is found as an archaism even in the 19th c., e. g. Shelley PU. 1. 740 Nor seeks nor finds he mortal blisses.

(2) the type nc^1 A nc^2 B,

that is, with two different connectives, both of them negative, has prevailed over (1) in later stages of the Germanic languages. Thus we have ON *hvártki* (*hvárki*). . . . *né*; *hvártki* corresponds to Goth. *ni-hwaþar-hun* with dropping of the original negative *ne*, the negative sense being attached to *-gi* (*ki*). In G. we have *weder. . . . noch*, in which similarly initial *ne* has been dropped; *weder* has quite lost the original pronominal value ('which of two') which *whether* kept much longer in E.

In Engl., on the other hand, the *n*-element has never been lost, but is found both in the old formula *nother* (*nahwæðer*, *nohwæðer*, *nawðer*, *nowðer*). . . . *ne* and in the later (from the ME. period) *neither* (*naiðer*, *nayther*). . . . *ne* as well as in the corresponding forms with *nor* instead of *ne*.

In the second member, the old *ne* as in Caxton R. 88 "I shal neyther hate hym ne haue enuye at him", was used archaically by Spencer and sometimes by his imitators (Shenstone, School-Mistress; Byron, Childe Harold, I and II, etc.)

Apart from this, the normal formula in the ModE. time is *neither. . . . nor*: neither he nor his sister has come | he has neither wit nor money | Swift 3.336 I could neither run with speed, nor climb trees | he neither loves nor hates her.

Where there are more than two alternatives, it is not at all rare to omit the connective with the middle ones or one of them: Sh. Meas. III. 1.37 thou hast neither heate, affection, limbe, nor beautie | id. Cæs. III. 2.226 I haue neyther writ nor

words, nor worth, Action nor Vtterance, nor the power of speech.

The conjunction may even be omitted poetically before all except the first alternative: Sh. Lr. III. 2.15 Nor raine, winde, thunder, fire are my daughters | Wiv. IV. 2.62 neyther presse, coffer, chest, trunke, well, vault | Byron DJ. 10.53 as Nor brother, father, sister, daughter love | ib 10.57 connected In neither clime, time, blood, with her defender. This type, which is found only with more than two alternatives, has been placed here for convenience, but might have been given as an independent type: nc A B C D....

(3). Next we come to the type: nc A c B.

This is different from the preceding one in that the second connective is a positive one, the same as is used in alternatives like *either....or*, *aut....aut*, *ou....ou*, *entweder....oder*. Here the negative force of nc is strong enough to work through A so as to infect B. This is the type in regular use in modern Scandinavian, as in Dan. *hverken....eller*, Swed. *varken.... eller*. Examples: han er hverken rig eller smuk | hverken han eller hans søster er rig | han hverken spiser eller drikker, etc.

In English *neither....or* is by no means uncommon, though now it has been generally discarded from literary writings through the influence of schoolmasters: Sh. Meas. IV. 2.108 That you swerue not from the smallest article of it, Neither in time, matter, or other circumstance (acc. to A. Schmidt only 3 or 4 times in Sh.) | Swift 3.199 they neither can speak, or attend to the discourses of others | id. 3.336 I had neither the strength or agility of a common Yahoo | id. P. 6 replies which are neither witty, humorous, polite, or authentic | Defoe. R. 26 I neither saw, or desir'd to see any people | ib. 17, 101, 106 etc. | ib. 58 having neither sail, oar, or rudder | ib. 81 | Scott Iv. 167 a cloak, neither fit to defend the wearer from cold or from rain | id. A. 2.36 | Carlyle R.

1. 73 thrifty men, who neither fell into laggard relaxation of diligence, or were stung by any madness of ambition | Tenn. 309 he neither wore on helm or shield The golden symbol of his kinglihood | Trollope D. 2. 140 I am suffering neither from one or from the other.

Defoe, who very often has *neither. . . . or*, has the following sentences, which are interesting as showing the effect of distance: where *neither* is near, *or* suffices, where it is some distance back, the negative force has to be renewed: R. 138 I neither knew how to grind or to make meal of my corn, or indeed how to clean it and part it; nor if made into meal, how to make bread of it | ib. 291 having neither weapons or cloaths, nor any food.

In the following sentence *brother or sister* forms so to speak one idea (Ido epicene *frato*), hence *nor* is not used between them: Austen S. 253 neither she nor your brother or sister suspected a word of the matter.

"He knew neither how to walk or speak" (NP. '05) also shows that *or* is preferred when two words are closely linked together; if we substitute *nor*, we should be obliged to continue: *nor how to speak*. A closely similar sentence is found in Bunyan P. 107 they neither know how to do for, or speak to him. — Ib. 204 thou neither seest thy original, or actual infirmities; here if we substitute *nor*, it will be necessary to repeat *thy* before *actual*; but if we change the word-order, it will be possible to say "thou seest neither thy original nor actual infirmities". (In other places Bunyan uses *neither. . . . nor*, thus ib. 106, 108).

The use of *or* after *neither* cannot be separated from the use of *or* after another negative, as in the following instances; it will be seen that *or* is more natural in those marked (a) because the negative word can easily cover everything following, than in (b) or (c): (a) Marlowe F. 718 Faustus vowes neuer to looke to heauen, Neuer to name God, or to pray to him | ib. 729,

ed. 1616, but ed. 1604 nor | Di. Do. 156 he lived alone, and never saw her, or inquired after her | Austen P. 310 she knew not what to think, or how to account for it | Tenn. L. 3. 105 I haven't seen Palgrave yet or Woolner.... I have not written to Browning yet or seen him | Wells Br. 179 Nobody was singing or shouting.

(b) Defoe R. 359 a pleasant country, and no snow, no wolves, or any thing like them | Wells T. 70 there were no looking-glasses or any bedroom signs about it | Parker R. 240 there were no clinging hands, or stolen looks, or any vow or promise.

(c) Di. D. 114 and not a hair of her head, or a fold of her dress, was stirred | ib. 125 not a word was said, or a step taken | Caine C. 95 because your religion is not my religion or your God my God.

Note also the change in "No one supposes that the work is accomplished now or could be accomplished in one day" and ".....is accomplished now, nor could it be accomplished in one day". — The continuation with *hardly* is interesting in Lamb. E. 1. 155 because he never trifled or talked gallantry with them, or paid them, indeed, hardly common attentions.

(4) A nc B,

that is, a negative conjunction "looking before and after" and rendering both A and B negative, is comparatively frequent in ON and OE with *ne*; from Wimmer's Læsebog I quote: kyks né dauðs nautkak karls sonar | hǫnd of þvær né hǫfuð kembir; from OE Beow. 858 suð ne norð | 1100 wordum ne worcum. (The passages mentioned in Grein's Sprachschatz 2d ed. p. 493, are not parallel: in Beow. 1604 "wiston ond ne wendon" must be understood 'they wished, but did not think'; in Andr. 303 and Gu. 671 the great number of preceding *ne*'s account for the omission in one place, cf. above 105 f.).

See Delbrück, p. 55 f., where also instances of OHG. *noh* may be found: *laba noh gizami* 'weder labung noch rettung' | *kind noh quena*, etc. Paul, Wörterb. has a few modern instances, Wieland: in wasser noch in luft | Goethe: da ich mich wegen eines termins der herausgabe noch sonst auf irgend eine weise binden kann. — The examples show that Delbrück's restriction to "einem zweigliedrigen nominalen ausdruck" is too narrow; nor can I admit the correctness of his explanation that "*ni* erspart wurde, weil eine doppelte negation in dem kurzen satzstück als störend empfunde wurde". Neckel says, more convincingly: "In solchen ausdrücken steht *ni(h)* apò koinoû. Die unmittelbare nachbarschaft mit beiden gliedern erlaubt, es auf beide zu beziehen". And then prosiopesis comes into play, too.

In later Engl., though not often in quite recent times, we find *nor* used in the same way without a preceding negative: Caxton R. 89 my fader nor I dyde hym neuer good | Townl. 33 for Jak nor for gill will I turne my face | Marlowe E. 1633 The king of England, nor the court of Fraunce, shall haue me from my gratious mothers side | Eastw. 439 so closely convaide that his new ladie nor any of her friendes know it | Sh. Mcb. II. 3. 69 Tongue nor heart cannot conceiue, nor name thee | Bunyan P. 127 they threatned that the cage nor irons should serve their turn | Austen S. 227 they were both strongly prepossessed that she nor her daughters were such kind of women | Carlyle R. 2. 257 She struggled against this for an instant or two (maid nor nobody assisting) | Hawthorne T. 126 My father, nor his father before him, ever saw it otherwise.

It will be seen that all these are examples of principal words (substantives or pronouns); it is very rare with verbs, as in the following quotation, where *no longer* shows that the negative notion is to be applied to both auxiliaries: Swift J. 117 but I can nor will stay no longer now | cf. also Shelley

88 he moved nor spoke, Nor changed his hue, nor raised his locks.

On a different use of the same form (A nc B), where A is to be understood in a positive sense, see below p. 114.

(5) n A nc B.

In this type the negativity of A is indicated, though not by means of a connective. The negative connective (nc) before B is the counterpart of *also* or *too*; and some languages, such as G., have no special connective for this purpose, but use the same adverb as in positive sentences (*auch nicht*); in Fr. the negative comparative *non plus* is used either with or without the negative connective *ni*. Dan. has a special adverb used with some negative word, *heller ikke*, *heller ingen*, etc.; *heller* (ON *heldr*) is an old comparative as in the Fr. expression and signifies 'rather, sooner'. In Engl. the same negative connectives are used as in the previous types, but in rather a different way; but *no more* may also be used.

Examples of type 5: Sh. As. V. 2. 61 I speake not this, that you should beare a good opinion of my knowledge.... *neither* do I labor for a greater esteeme | Merch I. 1. 43 My ventures are not in one bottome trusted....*nor* is my whole estate Vpon the fortune of this present yeere | Bunyan P. 17 as yet he had not got rid thereof, *nor* could he by any means get it off without help | Ruskin P. 1. 120 never attaching herself much to us, *neither* us to her | id. F. 42 the royal Dane does not haunt his own murderer, — *neither* does Arthur, King John; *neither* Norfolk, King Richard II.; *nor* Tybalt, Romeo | Bradley S. 29 Nothing makes us think.... *Nor*, I believe, are the facts ever so presented.... *Neither*, lastly, do we receive the impression.... | Locke S. 186 She said nothing, *neither* did he.

But neither is used in the same way: Brontë J. 118 She had no great talents....; but neither had she any deficiency

or vice | MacCarthy 2. 52 He did not for a moment underestimate the danger; but neither did he exaggerate its importance | Gissing B. 63 they were not studious youths, but neither did they belong to the class that G. despised. — *And nor* in the same sense is rarer: Cambridge Trifles 194 Thackeray, for instance, didn't take a degree, *and nor* did — oh, lots of others.

Very often the sentence introduced by *neither* or *nor* is added by a different speaker, as in AV. John 8. 11 Hath no man condemned thee ?.. No man.. *Neither* doe I condemne thee; in the 20th c. translation: Did no one condemn you ? No one.... *Nor* do I condemn you.

A repetition of the negation is very frequent in these sentences: Sh. Merch. III. 4. 11 I neuer did repent for doing good, Nor shall not now | id. Ven. 409 I know not loue (quoth he) nor will not know it | Bacon (q Bøgholm 86 with other examples) nor they will not utter the other | Congreve 231 I don't quarrel at that, nor I don't think but your conversation was innocent | ib. 251 | Swift J. 61 nor you shall not know till I see you again | ib. 115 Steele.... came not, nor never did twice, since I knew him | Wordsworth P. 8. 451 nor shall we not be tending towards that point | Hazlitt A. 15 I have never told any one; nor I should not have mentioned it now, but....| ib. 23 I cannot live without you — nor I will not | ib. 97 I never saw anything like her, nor I never shall again | Swinburne S. b. S. 42 For the life of them vanishes and is no more seen, Nor no more known [probably in imitation of El.E.].

Bacon, according to Bøgholm B. 85, nearly always carries through the distinction *neither* + vb.+ subj. (neither do I say) without *not*, and *nor* + subj. + vb. with *not* or other negative (nor they will not utter); it will be seen from my examples that the latter construction is the more frequent one with other writers as well.

Instead of *neither* or *nor* we have also the combination

no more (cf. French above), as in Jerrold C. 60 I don't like W. *No more* do I much (this *much* shows that *no more* is used without any consciousness of its original meaning) | Hughes T. 2. 133 Brown says you don't believe that. *No more* I do. — The same with repeated negation BJons. 3. 182 I would swear to speak ne'er a word to her. By this light, *no more* I will *not*. — Cf. also Di. D. 132 (vg.) *nor more* you wouldn't!

(6) n A nc^1 B nc^2.

This differs from (5) in having a supplementary connective placed after B.

Nor with subsequent (*nother* or) *neither*: More U. 197 nor so nother | Sh. Cæs. II. 1. 327 It is not for your health.... Nor for yours neither | Sh. As. I. 2. 31 loue no man in good earnest, nor no further in sport neyther | Milton A. 34 it stops but one breach of licence, nor that neither | Congreve 267 nor I do not know her if I see her; nor you neither | Swift J. 364 I can know nothing, nor themselves neither || ib. 130 I could not keep the toad from drinking himself, nor he would not let me go neither, nor Masham, who was with us.

(7) n A n B nc.

Here the connexion between the two negative ideas is not thought of till both have been fully expressed, and *neither* comes as an afterthought at the very last. Examples: Sh. LL. IV. 3. 191 it makes nothing sir. If it marre nothing neither, The treason and you goe in peace away together | Defoe G. 66 I'll not spend beyond it. I'll ne're run in debt neither | id R. 2. 47 they would not eat themselves, and would not let others eat neither | id. R. 312 | Fielding T. 4. 302 To which the other making no answer.... Allworthy made no answer to this neither | Scott Iv. 481 blush not.... and do not laugh neither | Austen M. 25 I hope things are not so very bad with you neither | Ruskin P. 1. 53 I had no companions to quarrel

with, neither | ib. 2. 130 Fifteen feet thick, of not flowing, but flying water; not water, neither, — melted glacier rather (frequent in Ru., e. g. P. 2. 288, Sel. 1. 206, C. 201) | Shaw C. 147 I did not come to recommend myself.... and Miss C. might not think it any great recommendation neither.

Instead of the afterthought-*neither* which we have now seen so frequently in this chapter most people now prefer *either*, which seems to have come into use in the 19th c., probably through the war waged at schools against double negatives. Examples after negative expressions: Scott (NED) Thy sex cannot help that either | Browning 1. 524 [I] am unmoved by men's blame or their praise either | Doyle M. 130 poor chap, he had little enough to be cheery over either | Benson D. 10 Maud, tell the boy he need not wait. You needn't either, unless you like.

After a positive expression *either* is used as an afterthought adverb to emphasize the existence of alternatives; the NED has an example from ab. 1400; Shakespeare has it once only: Tw. II. 5. 206 "Wilt thou set thy foote o' my necke?" "Or o' mine either?" Cf. also Di (q) A beautiful figure for a nutcracker, or for a firebox, either | Kingsley H. 274 Ah, if all my priests were but like them; or my people either!

As this use after a positive expression is much older than that after a negative, Storm (E. Ph. 698) cannot be right in believing that the former is "übertragen" from the latter.

It should be noted that we have very frequently sentences connected with previous *positive* sentences in the same ways as we have seen in types (5, 6, 7) with negative ones. This generally serves to point out a contrast, but sometimes the logical connexion between the two sentences is very weak, and the final *neither* then merely "clinches the argument" by making the negative very emphatic. In Sh. Hml. III. 2. 4 ff. we have two illustrations corresponding to types (5) and (7): Speake the speech as I pronounc'd it.... But if you mouth it, as many of your players do, I had as liue the town-cryer had spoke my lines: *Nor* do not saw the ayre with your hand thus.... Be not too tame *neyther*.

Other examples: Sh. Cæs. I. 2. 238 I sawe Marke Antony offer him a crowne, yet 'twas not a crowne neyther, 'twas

one of these coronets | Swift J. 66 the best thing is Dr. Swift's on Vanbrugh; which I do not reckon so very good neither | ib. 121 there, I say, get you gone; no, I will not push you neither, but hand you on one side | Defoe R. 5 I resolv'd to run quite away from him. However, I did not act so hastily neither as my first heat of resolution prompted | Wordsworth 109 I travelled among unknown men, In lands beyond the sea; Nor, England! did I know till then What love I bore to thee. — Cf. also the frequent literary formulas of transition "Nor is this all" and "Nor do we stop here".

While this use of *nor* is perfectly natural, there is another way of using it which is never found in prose though it is a favourite formula with some poets. *Nor* here connects not two complete sentences, but only two verbs, of which the first is to be taken in a positive sense (cf. Dyboski, Tennysons sprache u. stil 2). Thus Tennyson 208 Ida stood nor spoke (= 'she stood and did not speak, she stood without speaking') | id. 219 He that gain'd a hundred fights, Nor ever [= and never] lost an English gun | Browning 1. 518 it concerns you that your knaves Pick up a manner nor discredit you [= and (do) not] | ib. 522 things we have passed Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see | ib. 582 wait death nor be afraid!

These instances may be compared with the ON quotations given by Neckel p. 10: sat hann, né hann svaf, ávalt | gumnum hollr, né gulli, etc.

The negative connectives *neither* and *nor*, which we have treated in this chapter, are characteristic elements of idiomatic English; thus *nor do I see any reason* is always preferred to *and I see also no reason* (cf. the cause of this, above p. 58). In some few cases, however, we find *also* in a negative sentence, but there is generally some special reason for its use, as in Defoe Pl. 44 But I must *also not* forget that.... (*not forget* = 'remem-

ber') | Wells Br. 117 but then too was there *not also* a national virtue ? (= wasn't there a n. v. besides) | ib. 194 Everything may recover. But *also nothing* may recover (*also* = there is another possibility) | Dickinson C. 6 No one is tied, but *also no one* is rooted (= but on the other hand, no one; the contrast is expressed more elegantly than in: but neither is any one rooted).

In rare instances a negative is put only with one of two (or three) verbs though it belongs to both (or all): Ch. A. 507 He sette nat his benefice to hyre, And leet his sheep encombred in the myre, And ran to London.... But dwelte at hoom [Skeat: we should now say — 'nor left'] | Devil Edm. 524 Didst thou not write thy name in thine own blood and drewst the formall deed | Cowper 323 The winds play no longer and sing in the leaves [= no longer p. and s.].

A frequent way of making one *not* serve to negative two verbs is seen in "The winds *do not play and sing* in the leaves" (.. *are not playing and singing*....).

In Dan. *ikke* sometimes is put only with the last of two verbs connected by means of *og*, but only when their signification is closely related as in Goldschm. 8. 60 "jeg hykler og lyver ikke"; otherwise *ikke* has to be repeated: "han spillede ikke klaver og sang ikke (heller)". But if the first verb indicates only a more or less insignificant state or circumstance of the main action denoted by the second verb, *ikke* is put with the first verb: "sid ikke dær og sov" | "jeg går ikke hen og glemmer det". The explanation is that *og* in this case is a disguised *at*, originally followed by the infinitive, see Dania 3. 167 ff., 249 ff.

Where a positive and a negative sentence are combined, English uses the adversative conjunction *but* (like Dan. *men*, G. *aber*), whereas French prefers *et*: I eat, but I don't drink | the guard dies, but does not surrender: je mange, et je ne bois pas | la garde meurt et ne se rend pas. Negation thus is

more vividly present in an English consciousness than in a French mind, since the combination of positive and negative is always felt as a contrast.

CHAPTER XI[1]

English Verbal Forms in -n't.

Not was attracted to the verb, even before it was reduced to *n't* as an integral part of a coalesced verbal form; thus instead of *will I not* we find *wol not I* as early as Ch. (A.3131); both positions in Ch. E. 250 Wol nat oure lord yet leve his vanytee ? Wol he nat wedde ?

From MnE. times may be noted:

Caxton R. 84 art not thou pryamus sone.... art not thou one of the possessours | Roister 52 Will not ye, then will they | ib. 56 Did not you make me a letter | ib. 79 do not ye.... | ib. 79 be not ye.... | Sh. R. 3. I. 2. 117 Is not the causer.... | ib. I. 4. 286 So do not I | ib. III. 2. 6 Cannot thy master sleep | ib. III. 4. 29 Had not you come | Sh. LLL. IV. 1. 51 Are not you | Sh. Tw. III. 4. 202 Now will not I deliuer his letter | Sh. As. IV. 1. 89 Am not I your Rosalind | AV. Psalm. 139. 21 Doe not I hate them.... and am not I grieued | Fielding 3. 431 did not I execute the scheme, did not I run the whole risque ? Should not I have suffered the whole punishment if I had been taken, and is not the labourer worthy of his hire ? | ib. 448 were not these men of honour ? | Franklin 159 Had not you better sell them ? | Austen P. 40 They are wanted in the farm, Mr. Bennet, are not they ? (thus continually in conversations ib.: is not he.... will not you.... could not he .. &c) | Beaconsfield L. 7.... had not he instinctively felt....

[1] This and the following two chapters deal exclusively with English grammar.

There is some vacillation between the two word-orders; in Sh. Ro. 1786 we have "Doth not she thinke me an old murtherer", but Q. 1 has "Doth she not. . . . " Swift in his "Journal to Stella" generally has "did not I", "should not I", etc., but sometimes as p. 17 "Did I not say"; and the latter word-order is even nowadays affected by many writers, though "Didn't I say" has now for generations been the only natural form in everyday speech.

The contracted forms seem to have come into use in speech, though not yet in writing, about the year 1600. In a few instances (extremely few) they may be inferred from the metre in Sh., though the full form is written, thus Oth. IV. 2. 82. *Are not* you a strumpet? No, as I am a Christian | ib. IV. 2. 161 But neuer taynt my loue. I *cannot* say Whore (but *Cant* in Alls I. 3. 171 F. stands for *can it* [be]). — Van Dam's examples (Sh.'s Prosody and Text p. 155) are most of them questionable, and some unquestionably wrong. König (Der vers in Sh's dramen 39) has only the following instances Oth. IV. 2. 161 (as above), H6A. II. 2. 47 (may not), H5. IV. 5. 6 (but the folio arranges the line: O meschante Fortune, do not runne away — with *do not* as two syllables), Err. II. 1. 68 (know not; line metrically doubtful).

In writing the forms in *n't* make their appearance about 1660 and are already frequent in Dryden's, Congreve's, and Farquhar's comedies. Addison in the *Spectator* nr. 135 speaks of *mayn't*, *can't*, *sha'n't*, *won't*, and the like as having "very much untuned our language, and clogged it with consonants". Swift also (in the Tatler nr. 230) brands as examples of "the continual corruption of our English tongue" such forms as *cou'dn't*, *ha'n't*, *can't*, *shan't*; but nevertheless he uses some of them very often in his *Journal to Stella.*

Among the forms there are some that are so simple that they call for no remark, thus

mayn't [meint]
hadn't [hædnt]
didn't [didnt]
couldn't [kudnt]
wouldn't [wudnt]
shouldn't [ʃudnt]
mightn't [maitnt]
daren't [dɛ·ənt]
mustn't [mʌsnt] with natural dropping of [t]
MEG. I. 7. 73.

Thus also

hasn't [hæznt]
isn't [iznt]
doesn't [dʌznt]
haven't [hævnt]
aren't [a·nt]

are simple enough, but it should be noted that these are recent restitutions after *has*, *is*, etc., which have succeeded, partially at least, in ousting other forms developed formerly through phonetic shortening, see below.

Cannot [kæn(n)ɔt] becomes *can't* with a different vowel, long [a·]; Otway 288 writes *cannot*, but pronounces it in one syllable. Congreve 268 has *can't*. In the same way, with additional dropping of [l], *shall not* becomes [ʃa·nt]. The spelling was not, and is not yet, settled; NED. records *sha'nt* from 1664, *shan't* from 1675, *shann't* from 1682 (besides Dryden's *shan'not* 1668); now both *shan't* and *sha'n't* are in use. For the long [a·] in these see MEG. I. 10. 552.

In a similar way I take it that *am not* has become [a·nt] with lengthening of the vowel and dropping of [m]. This may have been the actual pronunciation meant by the spelling *an't* (cf. *can't*, *shan't*) in earlier times, see e. g. Swift P. 90 I a'n't well (also ib. 97) | id. J. 75 I an't vexed | 83 I an't

sleepy | 152 an't I | Defoe. G. 98 I an't to be a tradesman; I am to be a gentleman: I an't to go to school | Congreve 250 I an't deaf | id. 251 I an't calf enough | Sheridan 208 (Sir Oliver) | id. 211 (Sir Peter) | Austen S. 280 I an't the least astonished at it | Dickens X. 59 (vg.) I an't so fond of his company | Bennett W. 1. 152 An't I good enough? | James A. 1. 37 You are what my wife calls intellectual. I an't, a bit. Cf. below on *ain't*.

Elphinstone 1765 (1. 134) mentions *an't* for *am not* with 'sinking' of *m* and *o*, but does not specify the vowel sound.

Nowadays [a·nt] is frequently heard, especially in tag-questions: I'm a bad boy [a·nt ai ?]; but when authors want to write it, they are naturally induced to write *aren't*, as *r* has become mute in such combinations, and the form then looks as if it originated in a mistaken use of the plural instead of the singular (which is in itself absurd, as no one would think of using [a·nt it] or [a·nt hi·]). I find the spelling *aren't I* or *arn't I* pretty frequently in George Eliot (M. 1. 34, 43, 63, 2. 164; A. 441, 451, S. 84, 226), but only to represent vulgar or dialectal speech. In the younger generation of writers, however, it is also found as belonging to educated speakers: Wilde Im 10 I am always smart. Aren't I? | Benson D. 126 Aren't I a wise woman? | id. D. 2. 192 I am a very wonderful woman, aren't I | ib. 297 | Benson N. 319 [aristocrat:] I'm a first-class ass, aren't I | Hope C. 100 you are precious lucky. — Yes, aren't I? | Pinero Q. 203 Well, aren't I, my lord? | Wells N. 513 [an M. P.:] Aren't I in a net? | id. H. 41 | id. V. 245 (Ann. Ver. herself) | Hankin 3. 55 I *am* pretty, aren't I? | Galsworthy P. 2. 57 Aren't I going to get you to do your frock? | ib. 73 | Bennett T. 53 I'm always right, aren't I? | id. C. 1. 113 | Oppenheim M. 180 aren't I lucky?

This form is mixed up with other forms in Quiller Couch

T. 113 That's a wall, ain't et ? An' I'm a preacher, arn't I ? An' you be worms, bain't 'ee ?

The form [a·nt ai] is found convenient and corresponds to the other *n't*-forms; it obviates the clumsy *am I not* and the unpronounceable *amn't I*, which I find written in Ol. Schreiner's Peter Halket 202. — But as [a·nt] may be taken as developed from *aren't*, it may sometimes in children's speech lead to the substitution of *are* for *am* in positive sentences, as when one of Darwin's little boys remarked: 'I are an extraordinary grass-finder' (Darwin L. 1. 116).

Are not becomes [arnt], which regularly becomes [a·nt]; we find spellings like Swift P. 90 ar'n't you sorry | 94 ar'n't you asham'd ?

Thus frequently in 19th c.

But there is also another frequent form, which *may* have developed phonetically from the older alternate form with long ME. |a·|, see MEG. I. 4. 432, and dropping of *r* (ib. 7. 79); this gives the result [eint]; cf. the spellings in Swift J. 81 an't you an impudent slut | ib. 93, 131 | Defoe G. 129 An't you rich | Fielding T. 4. 99 (Mrs. Honour) a'n't (3d person pl.) | ib. 1. 86 you an't | ib. 4. 256 you ant | Austen S. 234 [lady:] they are very pretty, an't they | ib. 237 you an't well | an't in Trollope B. also in the speech of educated people, e. g. 411, 483 || Austen S. 196 [old lady:] Mind me, now, if they ain't married by Midsummer | Shaw C. 116 youre joking, aint you ? | Norris P. 245 Ain't you glad you aren't short of wheat.

Ain't in the first person sg. probably has arisen through morphological analogy, as nowhere else the persons were distinguished in the *-nt*-forms. Examples: Tenn. L. 2. 21 Ain't I a beast for not answering you before ? | Mered H. 346 (young lord:) I ain't a diplomatist. It is probable that some at least of the 19th c. quotations above for *an't I* are meant as [eint ai].

Have not became [heint]; note the older pronunciation of *have* as [heiv], also [hei], written so often *ha'* (Sh. Wint. I. 2. 267 Ha' not (2. syll.) you seene Camillo); the spelling *han't* or *ha'n't* is frequent, e. g. Congreve 230 han't you four thousand pounds | Swift P. 32, 92 you ha'n't, 155 I han't | Swift J. 22 Han't I, ib. 40, 43, 63 etc. | Defoe R. 2. 164 I han't | id. G. 129, 132 | Fielding 1. 377 han't you heard | Sheridan 290 I ha'n't a moment to lose | Hardy R. 34 I han't been | id. L. 201 Ha'n't I mussed her ?

Instead of *han't* the spelling *ain't* also occurs as a vulgarism (*h* dropped).

Do not becomes *don't* [dount], which is found, e. g., in Swift J. 17, etc., Defoe G. 12, 45, 137, and innumerable times since then.

For *will not* we have *won't* [wount], developed (through *wonnot*, found in Dryden and other writers of that time) from the ME. form *wol*. It is written *wont* in Defoe R. 2. 166, but generally *won't*, thus Rehearsal 41, Congreve 237, Farquhar B. 335, Defoe G. 48, 66, Fielding T. 1. 237, etc., etc.

The [s] was frequently dropped in *isn't*, *wasn't*, *doesn't*, (thus expressly Elphinstone 1765 I. 134) and this gives rise to various forms of interest. For *isn't* we find *'ent* (facilitatis causa, Cooper 1685) and in the 18th c. the form *i'n't*, which Fitzedward Hall (M. 236) quotes from Foote, Richardson, and Miss Burney. But the vowel is unstable; Swift P. 32 writes *e'n't*; and if we imagine a lowering and lengthening of the vowel (corresponding pretty exactly to what happened in *don't*, *won't*, and really also in *can't*, etc.), this would result in a pronunciation [eint]; now this must be written *an't* or *ain't*, and would fall together with the form mentioned above as possibly developed from *aren't*. *An't* is found in the third person as early as Swift J. 105 Presto is plaguy silly to-night, an't he ? | ib. 147 An't that right now ? | 179 it an't my fault | 273 In the 19th c. *an't* and *ain't* are frequent for *is not* in

representations of vulgar speech; see quotations in Storm EPh. 709 and Farmer & Henley, also e. g. Austen S. 125 I don't pretend to say that there ain't | ib. 270 What an ill-natured woman his mother is, an't she ? | ib. 287 if Lucy an't there.

But now it is not felt as so vulgar as formerly; Dean Alford (Q. 71) says: "It ain't certain. I ain't going.... very frequently used, even by highly educated persons". And in Anthony Hope (F. 40, 45, C. 57) people of the best society are represented as saying *it ain't* and *ain't it.* Dr. Furnivall, to mention only one man, was particularly fond of using this form.

The form *wa'nt* or *wa'n't* for *was not* is pretty frequent in Defoe, e. g. G. 51 you was.... wa'nt you ? | id. R. 8 I warrant you were frighted, wa'n't you.

I find the same form frequently in American writers: Howells S. 10 we wa'n't ragged | ib. 15 I wa'n't (often, in all persons) | London V. 329 he wa'n't | Page J. 350 (vg.) I wa'n't after no money.... 'T wa'n't me.

A variant is written *warn't*, where *r* of course is mute, the sound represented being [wɔ·nt]; it is frequent vulgarly in Dickens, e. g. Do. 77 If I warn't a man a on small annuity | ib. 223 (vg) it warn't him | id. F. 24 see if he warn't | Galsworthy P. 86.

Don't for *does not* is generally explained from a substitution of some other person for the third person; but as this is not a habitual process, — as *do* in the third person sg. is found only in some few dialects, but not in standard English, and as the tendency is rather in the reverse direction of using the verb form in *s* with subjects of the other persons (*says I, they talks*, etc.), the inference is natural that we have rather a phonetic process, *s* being absorbed before *nt* as in i*sn't*, etc., above. The vowel in [dount] must have developed in the same way as in *do not*, if we admit that the mutescence of *s*

took place before the vowel in *does* was changed into [ʌ]. *Don't* in the third person is found in Farquhar B. 321, in Defoe G. 47 (my brother don't kno'), Sheridan D. 277 and very frequently in the 19th c. Byron uses it repeatedly in the colloquial verse of *Don Juan*, (3. 10, 9. 44, 10. 51, 13. 35, 14. 29), where *doesn't* is probably never found, though *does not* and *doth not* are found. Dickens has it constantly in his dialogues, chiefly, but not exclusively, in representing the speech of vulgar people (see e. g. Do. 13, 16, 22, 31; D. 84, 188, 191, 376, 476, 590; X. 45 educated young man); and he sometimes even uses it in his own name (as Do. 500 How Susan does it, she don't know | ib. 541 he don't appear to break his heart). The form is used constantly in the conversations in such books as Hughes's *Tom Brown*. Kingsley H. 76 makes a well-bred man say "She don't care" (cf. ib. 146), similarly Meredith H. 489 an M.P., Philips L. 226 a perfect gentleman, Egerton K. 101 a lady. That this use of *don't* could not by any means be called a vulgarism nowadays, however much schoolmasters may object to it, will also appear from the following quotations (the two last American): Shelley L. 727 I have just heard from Peacock, saying, that he don't think that my tragedy will do, and that he don't much like it | Austen S. 193 it don't signify talking | Ward F. 184 [a lord:] Well, it don't matter | id. M. 86 [a celebrated traveller:] that don't matter | id. E. 64 [a young diplomatist:] It don't sound much | ib. 65 he don't take Manisty at his own valuation | ib. 254 [an ambassador:] That don't count | ib. 258 [a lady:] He don't care | Shaw D. 93 Sir Patrick: Why dont he live for it ? (cf. id. 1. 4, 174, 178, 179, 203, 204, etc.) | Wells L. 19 it don't matter a bit (said Mr. Lewisham) | Norris O. 231 it stands to reason, don't it ? | Herrick M. 187 it don't make any difference.

Here, as with *aın't*, the distinction of person and number has been obliterated in the negative forms.

Daren't stands for both *dare not* (*dares not*) and *dared not*, the latter through a natural phonetic development (MEG. I. 7. 72; cf. also ESt. 23. 461). The use in the present needs no exemplification (Shaw 1. 198 I darent talk about such things); in the preterite we have, e. g. Thack P. 3. 83 Her restlessness wakened her bedfellows more than once. She daren't read more of Walter Lorraine: Father was at home, and would suffer no light | Ward D. 1. 99 Her spirit failed her a little. She daren't climb after him in the dark | Kipl. L. 126 the ship's charts were in pieces and our ships daren't run south | Shaw. 2. 195 you know you darent have given the order if you hadnt seen us | id. C. 114 otherwise I darent have brought you here | Bennett T. 326 We were halted before I could see. And I daren't look round.

Dare not is often written as a preterite, even by authors who do not use *dare* (without *not*) as a preterite; this of course represents a spoken [dɛ·ənt]. (Tennyson, Doyle, Kipling, Shaw, Hall Caine, Parker).

There is a negative form of the (obsolescent) preterite *durst*, in which the first *t* is often omitted; it is sometimes used as a present (thus a Norfolk speaker, Di. D. 407; Captain Cuttle id. Do. 75). Recent examples, to which are added after || some dialectal forms: Kipl. SS. 166 they dursn't do it | Shaw. 2. 91 They dussent ave nothink to do with me || Masefield E. 39 I durn't | Barrie MO. 100 daurnd | Twain H. 1. 17 I dasn't scratch it.

The sound [t] is also left out in the colloquial form [ju·snt] for *used not*; an American lady told me that this was childish: "no grown-up person in America would say so", but in England it is very often heard, and also often written, see Pinero S. 189 my face is covered with little shadows that usen't to be there | Wilde W. 37 I usen't to be one of her admirers, but I am now | Shaw C. 11 Usent it to be a lark ? | ib. 193 I'm blest if I usent to have to put him up | id. J. 255, M. 192, 202 | Hankin 2. 47

Usen't we to be taught that it was our duty to love our enemies ? | Benson D. 2. 288 Usen't the monks to keep peas in their boots?

Ben't seems now extinct except in dialects (*bain't*); it was heard in educated society in Swift's time, see P. 105 if you ben't hang'd | ib. 110 if that ben't fair, hang fair.

Dialectal *n't*-forms for the second person sg. occur, for instance in Fielding T. (Squire Western): *shatunt* '(thou) shalt not', *wout unt* = 'wouldst not', *at'n't* or *at unt* 'art not', and others.

For *needn't* I find an abbreviated American form several times in Opie Read's Toothpick Tales, e. g. 108 yer neenter fly off'n the handle.

There is a curious American form *whyn't* = 'why didn't' or 'why don't' (Payne, Alab. Wordl.); in Page J. 57 a negro asks: Whyn't you stay ?

In children's speech there is a negative form corresponding to *you better do that* (from *you'd better*), namely *Bettern't you* = 'had you not better'; Sully St. of Childh. 177.

The *n't* forms are colloquial, but may be heard in university lectures, etc. They are not, however, used much in *reading*, and it sounds hyper-colloquial, in some cases even with a comical tinge, when too many *don't*, *isn't* are substituted for *do not*, *is not*, etc. in reading serious prose aloud. In poetry the contracted forms are justified only where other colloquial forms are allowed, e. g. Byron D. J. 5. 6 They vow to amend their lives, and yet they don't; Because if drown'd, they can't — if spared, they won't.

Naturally the full forms admit of greater emphasis on the negative element than the contracted forms; [kænɔt] is hardly ever heard in colloquial speech unless exceptionally stressed, and then the second syllable may have even stronger

stress than the first (cf. the italics in Di. D. 241 I cannot say — I really can*not* say). In Byron's DJ. a distinction seems to be carried through between *cannot* when the stress is on *can*, and *can not* when it is on *not*. *Will not* is more emphatic than *won't* in Ridge G. 219 "I won't have it! I will not have it!" But this does not apply to the two forms in Pinero Q. 213 It's not true! it isn't true! — The difference between the full and the contracted form is sometimes that between a special and a nexal negative (see ch. V.); cf. Sweet, NEG. § 366: "In fact such sentences [as *he is not a fool*] have in the spoken language two forms (hij iznt ə fuwl) and (hijz not ə fuwl). In the former the negation being attached specially to an unmeaning form-word must necessarily logically modify the whole sentence, just as in *I do not think so* (ai dount þiŋk sou), so that the sentence is equivalent to 'I deny that he is a fool'. In the other form of the sentence the *not* is detached from the verb, and is thus at liberty to modify the following noun, so that the sentence is felt to be equivalent to *he is no fool*, where there can be no doubt that the negative adjective-pronoun *no* modifies the noun, so that (hijz not ə fuwl) is almost equivalent to 'I assert that he is the opposite of a fool'."

On the distinction between *may not* and *mayn't*, *must not* and *mustn't* in some cases see p. 94 ff.

The contracted forms are very often used in tag questions (He is old, isn't he ? | you know her, don't you ? etc.), and in such questions as are hardly questions at all, but another form of putting a positive assertion: Isn't he old ? = 'he is very old' (you cannot disagree with me on that point) | Don't you know ? = 'you surely must know'. In a real question, therefore, it is preferable to say and write, for instance: "Did I meet the lady when I was with you ? If not, *did you not* know her at that time ?" because ".... didn't you know her ?" would seem to admit of only one reply.

With regard to the standing of the contracted forms and the way in which they are regarded by the phonetician as opposed to many laymen, there is a characteristic passage in H. C. Wyld's *Hist. Study of the Mother Tongue*, p. 379: "We occasionally hear peculiarly flagrant breaches of polite usage, such as (iz nɔt it) for (iznt it) or (æm nɔt ai), for the now rather old-fashioned, but still commendable, (ɛint ai) or the more usual and familiar (a·nt ai), or, in Ireland, (æmnt ai). These forms, which can only be based upon an uneasy and nervous stumbling after 'correctness', are perfectly indefensible, for no one ever uttered them naturally and spontaneously. They are struck out by the individual, in a painful gasp of false refinement".

In Northern English and Sc. we have an enclitic *-na* (<OE *nā*); thus frequently in GE.A. *donna*, *mustna*, *wasna*, *wonna*, *thee artna*, *ye arena*; in Burns *dinna*, *winna*, *wadna*, *wasna*, etc. — *Canna* is used by Goldsmith 560 as vg., not as specifically Sc.

CHAPTER XII

But.

The word *but*, in many of its applications, has a negative force. At first it is a preposition, OE *be-utan*, formed like *without*, and acquiring the same negative signification as that word. But gradually it came to be used in a variety of ways not shared by *without*. It is only with the negative applications that we are here concerned.

But is a kind of negative relative pronoun, meaning 'that (who or which)....not', but only used after a negative expression.

Examples: Sh. Err. IV. 3. 1 There's not a man I meete but doth salute me | Merch III. 2. 81 There is no vice so

simple, but assumes Some marke of vertue on his outward parts | Lr. II. 4. 71 there's not a nose among twenty, but can smell him that's stinking | Milton A. 56 seeing no man who hath tasted learning, but will confesse the many waies of profiting | Walton A. 15 there are none that deserve commendation but may be justified | Ruskin Sel. 1. 370 there is no existing highest-order art but is decorative | Stevenson B. 110 there was not one but had been guilty of some act of oppression | Dickinson S. 117 I see around me none but are shipwrecked too.

In most cases the relative pronoun represented by *but* is the subject of the clause; but it may also be the object of a verb; rarely, however, the object of a preposition placed at the end of the clause: Sh. Mcb. 1. 6. 9 no iutty, frieze, Buttrice, nor coigne of vantage, but this bird Hath made his pendent bed || Ruskin Sel. 1. 261 there is not a touch of Vandyck's pencil but he seems to have revelled on.

This relative *but* is extremely frequent after an incomplete sentence (without a verb), as in Sh. Alls. II. 3. 68 Not one of those, but had a noble father | Lamb. R. 39 Not a tree, not a bush, scarce a wildflower in their path, but revived in Rosamund some recollection | Quincey 418 and probably not one of the whole brigade but excelled myself in personal advantages | Carlyle H. 132 no one of us, I suppose, but would find it a very rough thing | Thack N. 205 Not one of the Gandishites but was after a while well inclined to the young fellow | Ruskin S. 46 nothing so great but it [a mob] will forget in an hour | Stevenson IHF. 8 no gentleman but wishes to avoid a scene.

The negative idea that conditions this use of *but* may be expressed indirectly, or it may be what has been termed above an incomplete negative. It is sometimes wrongly asserted that Shakespeare did not use this *but* after an interrogative sentence with negative import. Examples: Sh. Ven. 565 What waxe

so frozen but dissolues with tempring ? | Lucr. 414 What could he see but mightily he noted ? What did he note, but strongly he desired ? | Milton SA. 834 what murderer.... but may plead it | Pope RL. 1. 95 What tender maid but must a victim fall To one man's treat, but for another's ball ? || Thack N. 674 Scarce a man but felt Barnes was laughing at him | ib. 235 There is scarce any parent however friendly with his children, but must feel sometimes that they have thoughts which are not his or hers | Spencer Ed. 22 Scarcely a locality but has its history of fortunes thrown away over some impossible project | Galsworthy F. 277 Scarcely a word of the evening's conversation but gave him....the feeling.... || Lamb. E. 2. 219 Few young ladies but in this sense keep a dog | Wells T. 111 And few of the men who were there but judged me a happy man | Bennett C. 1. 102 Few of these men but at some time of their lives had worn the clog.

In some cases *but* is followed by a personal pronoun in such a way that both together make up a relative pronoun (*but they* = 'who.... not', etc.); the phenomenon may be compared with the popular use of *that* or *which* followed by *he* or *him*, etc. *But*, in this case, is not a real relative pronoun, but rather a "relative connective". Examples: Malory 732 there were but few knyghtes in all the courte, but they demed the quene was in the wronge | Sh. Mcb. III. 4. 131 There's not a one of them but in his house I keepe a seruant feed | Stevenson MP. 161 You can propound nothing but he has a theory about it ready-made | id. B. 115 Not a man but he is some deal heartened up | Ruskin Sel. 1. 172 not one great man of them, but he will puzzle you, if you look close, to know what he means | Wilde S. 81 Women are a decorative sex. They never have anything to say but they say it charmingly [with intentional ambiguity].

In the same sense as the relative pronoun *but* we have also, from the beginning of the 18th c., the combination

but what. As applied to persons (= who..not) this is now vulgar, but does not seem to have always been felt as such: Swift J. 489 there is not one of the Ministry but what will employ me | Defoe R. 2. 4 I had no agreeable diversion but what had some thing or other of this in it | Goldsmith 6 scarce a farmer's daughter within ten miles round but what had found him successful | Austen E. 29 not that I think Mr. M. would ever marry any body but what had had some education | id. P. 306 there is not one of his tenants but what will give him a good name | Quincey 220 political economy.... is eminently an organic science (no part, but what acts on the whole, as the whole again reacts on and through each part) | G. E. A. 98 There's nobody round that hearth but what's glad to see you | Benson D. 2. 129 there is nothing else about me but what is intolerable | Bennett A. 20 there is no village lane within a league but what offers a travesty of rural charms.

But as a conjunction = 'that not' is frequent in an object clause after a negative expression, e. g. Sh. Ro. V. 3. 132 my master knowes not but I am gone hence | Ado I. 3. 32 it must not be denied but I am a plaine dealing villaine | Mids. II. 1. 237 do not beleeue But I shall doe thee mischiefe in the wood | Walton A. 11 then doubt not but the art will prove like a vertue | Bunyan P. 75 I know not but some other enemy may be at hand | ib. 233 | Congreve 130 I don't know but she may come this way | Spect. 5 it is not impossible, but I may make discoveries | Swift J. 284 I doubt not but it will take | Defoe R. 25 I make no doubt but he reacht it with ease | Fielding 3. 420 I make no question, but I shall be able to introduce you | Goldsmith 16 Nor can I deny but I have an interest in being first | Wordsworth P. 5. 81 Much I rejoiced, not doubting but a guide was present | GE. A. 247 there was no knowing but she might have been childish enough |

Stevenson B. 113 Doubt not but he will lend a favourable ear.

But evidently in all these cases means the same thing to the popular speech instinct; it stands as the natural conjunction where the notion is negative. But it is easy to see that it really stands for two strictly opposite ideas, according as the main sentence is simply negative or doubly negative, i. e. positive. In the former case *but* gives a negative force to the dependent clause, in the latter case it does not. Thus, the first quotation from Sh. means 'my master knows not otherwise than that I am gone hence', he believes that I am gone, he does not know that I am not gone; but in the second quotation, if for "it must not be denied" we substitute the equivalent "it is certain", we must say "that I am a plain-dealing villain" without any *not*. The use of *but* in such cases, therefore, is on a par with the redundant use of negatives in popular speech (above, p. 75) and, like that, has now been generally discarded in educated speech and in writing, so that the usual expression now is "it must not be denied that I am...." ("Here, *that* is now considered more logical" NED).

In the same sense *but that* is also used: Sh. Alls. V. 3. 167 I neither can nor will denie, But that I know them | Milton A. 5 deny not but that it is of greatest concernment | ib 28 | Walton A. 11 'tis not to be questioned, but that it is an art | Defoe R. 91 not doubting but that there was more | Fielding T. 3. 81 I made no doubt but that his designs were strictly honourable | Johnson R. 102 I cannot be persuaded but that marriage is one of the means of happiness | Sheridan 273 I have no doubt but that bolts and bars will be entirely useless | Cowper L. 1. 210 it is hardly possible but that some of the family must have been bitten | Franklin 181 not knowing but that he might be in the right | Scott Iv. 288 I fear not but that my father will do his best | Di. Do. 151 they can hardly

persuade themselves but that there is something unbecoming in the conduct | id. N. 582 I didn't know but that perhaps somebody might be passing up the stairs | Tennyson 464 Let no man dream but that I love thee still | Trollope W. 115 It is not to be supposed but that much pain will spring out of this question | Ruskin T. 212 I do not doubt but that I shall set many a reader's teeth on edge (ib. 148) | id. C. 102, 115 | id. F. 35 I have no fear but that you will one day understand all my poor words | Ward M. 234 he could not doubt but that she would face it.

And finally *but what* may be used; this however, is recent and generally considered more or less vulgar: Di. N. 131 wouldn't it be much nicer....? I don't know but what it would (ib. 608) | GE. A. 28 There's no knowing but what you may see things different after a while (frequent in GE.) | Trollope D. 3. 153 I am not going to say but what I am gratified (ib. 230) | Mered H. 5 I shouldn't wonder but what that young chap'll want to be a gentleman | Bennett A. 209 We'd no thought but what we should bring you thirty pounds in cash | Housman J. 333 I shouldn't be surprised but what it could be recognized | Wells V. 196 I shall never hear it but what this evening will come pouring back over me | Norris O. 546 I am not so sure but what yesterday's terrible affair might have been avoided.

The use of *but what* cannot be easily accounted for; the NED attempts no explanation, but simply brands the use as "erroneous" in all cases (*but* 12c, 30). Perhaps *but what* first began in the relative employment (see p. 129f.), where *what* has sometimes approximately its usual force (as in the quotation l. c. from Defoe); and as *but what* was thus felt to be the equivalent of *but that*, it was substituted for that combination in other cases as well.

The negative idea in the main sentence may of course be expressed indirectly or by such a word as *little*: Milton A. 12

who denies but that it was justly burnt | Bunyan G. 32 how can you tell but that the Turks had as good scriptures.... as we have | Scott Iv. 482 who knows but the devil may fly off with the supper | Browning 1. 407 Who knows but the world may end to-night ? | Hewlett Q. 150 there is little doubt but he soon tired.

By the side of the elliptical expression *Not that....* mentioned above (p. **54**) we find *not but*, *not but that*, and *not but what*, e. g. Behn 307 not but he confessed Charlot had beauty | Defoe R. 149 not but that the difficulty of launching my boat came into my head | Goldsmith 2 Thus we lived several years in a state of much happiness, not but that we sometimes had little rubs | Cowper L. 1. 328 Not but that I should be very sorry | GE. A. 297 Not but what I'm glad to hear o' anybody respectable coming into the parish | Hankin 2. 10 As long as Wilkins was here things were better. Not but what we had our quarrels even then.

An infinitive is also found after *doubt not but* (obsolete) as in Sh. R. 2. V. 115 I doubt not but to ride as fast as Yorke | Bunyan G. 23 not doubting but to find it presently | Walton A. 17 I doubt not but to relate to you many things | Fielding 3. 548 he doubted not but to subvert any villainous design.

After verbs like *hinder*, *prevent*, *forbid*, etc., the use of *but* (*that*) = '*that not*' is now obsolete; ex.:

Sh. Oth. II. 1. 195 The heauens forbid But that our loues and comforts should encrease.

But (*but that*, *but what*) is also used in the negative sense of 'that....not' after a comparison with *not so*:

More U. 239 the bandes can neuer be so stronge, but they wyll fynde some hole open to crepe owte at | Sh. Merch. III. 2. 163 she is not yet so old But she may learne.... Shee is not bred so dull but she can learne | Milton A. 8 they were not therein so cautious but they were as dissolute in their

promiscuous conversing | Stevenson V. 25 there is nothing so monstrous but we can believe it of ourselves | id. MB. 301 Pepys was not such an ass, but he must have perceived it || Caxton R. 38 I was not so moche a fool but that I fonde the hole | Sh. Mids. III. 2. 298 I am not yet so low, But that my nailes can reach vnto thine eyes | Di. X. 3 he was not so dreadfully cut up by the sad event, but that he was an excellent man of business on the very day of the funeral | Stevenson T. 221 I was not so thoughtless but that I slacked my pace | Hope R. 128 you'll bury the king? 'Not so deep but that we can take him out again' | Harraden S. 11 you are not too ill but that they may be a happiness to you || GE. S. 100 not so long ago but what there were people living who remembered it | Trollope B. 399 she did not however go so fast but what she heard the signora's voice | ib. 452.

Similarly after a comparative: Bunyan G. 24 that I should have no more wit, but to trifle away my time | Caine M. 138 What more natural but there's something for yourself.

But was formerly very frequent after *no sooner*, where now *than* is always used; thus also more rarely *but that*. The last quotations show *but* in the same way after similar expressions: Marlowe F. 1191 I was no sooner in the middle of the pond, but my horse vanisht away (thus also Dekker S. 12, 25, Bunyan G. 12, 30 etc. Otway 221, Swift J. 484) | Defoe R. 102 he was no sooner landed, but he moved forward towards me | id. R. 2.40 | Spect. 92 he no sooner got rid of his enemy, but he marched up to the wood | Franklin 125 || Sh. H. 5. I. 1. 24 The breath no sooner left his fathers body, But that his wildnesse.... Seem'd to dye too || Goldsmith 628 he's scarce gotten out of one scrape, but he's running his head into another (scarce.... but, also Dekker S. 25) | Bunyan P. 3 he had not run far from his own door, but his wife perceiving it, began to cry after him.

But serves to introduce the necessary result 'so that.... not'. The NED says: "Now generally expressed by *without* and gerund: 'you cannot look but you will see it', i. e. without seeing it. Formerly sometimes *but that.*" This expression "formerly" perhaps is too severe: I give below an example of *but that* from a very recent (Amr.) novel; also one of *but what.*

It never rains but it pours | Roister 18 ye passe not by, but they laugh | Byron D. J. 3. 108 nothing dies but something mourns | GE. A. 102 I'll not consent but Seth shall have a hand in it too || Williamson L. 87 you can't look up or down the river, but that on every hill you see a château || Stevenson JHF. 178 the child would never pass one of the unfettered but what he spat at him.

But, or more frequently *but that*, serves to introduce a clause of condition, = 'if .... not'; an old combination, which has long been obsolente, was *but if.* Examples of all three: Caxton R. 64 how shold ony man handle hony, but yf he lycked his fyngres || Roister 85 this man is angry but he haue his [gains] by and by | Sh. Oth. I. 3. 194 I here do giue thee that with all my heart, Which but thou hast [? for: hadst] already with all my heart I would keepe from thee || Sh. Err. IV. 1. 3 And since I haue not much importun'd you; Nor now I had not, but that I am bound To Persia | Bunyan P. 51 I had been here sooner, but that I slept | ib. 55 I could have staid.... but that I knew I had further to go | Franklin 40 I should have taken Collins with me but that he was not sober | MacCarthy 2. 151 they would not be mentioned here, but that they serve to explain some misconceptions | Ward M. 78 I would offer myself for the post but that I feel sure that you would never follow anybody's advice | Locke B. V. 64 But that I considered it to be beneath my dignity as a man, I should have wept too.

The same *but* = 'if not' is also found in the following idiom:

Sh. Merch. III. 1. 75 it shall goe hard but I will better the instruction | Scott Iv. 89 it will go hard with me but I will requite it.

The same idea is very often expressed in betting terms as in the following quotations. But it should be noted that though "ten to one but he comes" means originally 'you may bet ten to one if he does not come', the negative idea has now disappeared, and it means 'the chances are that he does come'; to the old phrase *it is odds but he comes* therefore corresponds the modern *the odds are that he comes*. Besides *but* we find in the 18th c. also *but that*.

Swift J. 26 it is odds but this Mr. Dyot will be hanged | Di N 66 the odds are a hundred to one, but Swillenhausen castle would have been.... || B. Jo. 3. 198 'tis twenty to one but we have them | Bunyan P. 143 a hundred to one but he dies there | Defoe R. 2. 189 it would be a thousand to one but he would repent | Spect. 28 it is ten to one but you learn something of her gown | Fielding T. 1. 11 it is two to one but it lives | Austen M. 4 give a girl an education, and introduce her properly into the world, and ten to one but she has the means of settling well || Goldsmith 261 Whenever the people flock to see a miracle, it is a hundred to one but that they see a miracle | Sterne 12 'tis ten to one but that many of them would be worse mounted.

With *but* in the sense 'if....not' should also be placed the common elliptical idiom *but for*: But for him we should have succeeded, i. e. 'if it had not been for him, if he had not hindered it'.

By a curious transition *but* has come to mean the same thing as 'only'; at first it required a preceding negative: *I will not say but one word*, i. e. 'not except (save) one word'.

compare the form used in nothern dialects *nobbut*. But then the negative was dropped out, and *I will say but one word* came to be used in exactly the same signification. The curious thing is that exactly the same thing has happened in German, where *nur* at first required a negative word before it (it originated in *ne wäre*); cf. also vg. Fr. "je dis qu' ça". In English the old negative idiom may still be used to some extent with *can*, as in Byron D. J. 1. 208 I can't but say [= I can but say] | Read K. 64 I can't come to but one conclusion.

Similarly in the following sentence the words *for no purpose* might be omitted without changing the meaning of the whole: Macaulay E. 4. 79 lying newspapers were set up for no purpose but to abuse him.

Old examples of *but* in this way after a negative are easily found in the dictionaries; I shall therefore give only one: Ælfric 1. 114 *nan* man *ne* bið gehealden *buton* þurh gife Hælendes Cristes (thus before another preposition). The expression is strengthened by *only* in Sh. Merch. III. 5. 51 discourse [will] grow commendable in *none onely but* parrats.

The same redundancy is found when the negative is not expressed: Mi A. 6 I finde *but only* two sorts of writing which the Magistrate car'd to take notice of | Ruskin Sel. 1. 261 caring *only but* to catch the public eye.

As *but* and *only* are thus synonyms, by a natural reaction *only* acquires some of the properties at first belonging exclusively to *but*.

Only that comes to mean 'except that' (or something very similar to that) and eventually even 'if....not', exactly like *but that*. Examples: [Malory 736 I wille not graunte the thy lyf, only that thou frely relece the quene] | Swift J. 86 I will not answer a word of it, only that I never was giddy since my first fit | Ridge S. 41 he would have been more antagonistic at this stage, only that the doorkeeper's wife was a

good soul | Hope D. 227 She'd have done it sooner only that in her heart she credits me with a tragedy | Doyle S. 4. 116 We should not have troubled you only that our friend has been forced to return to the East.

Only when = 'except when': GE. A. 110 Do you come every week to see Mrs. P.? Yes, sir, every Thursday, only when she's got to go out with Miss D. | ib. 141 I'll never fight any man again, only when he behaves like a scoundrel.

Only also by itself, without *that*, may stand for 'if.... not' or at any rate come near to that signification: Thack H. 20 they would have had an answer, only the old lady began rattling on a hundred stories | Doyle B. 169 I should not have noticed this one [letter] only it happened to come alone | London M. 42 I'd introduce you to her, only you'd win her.

Only for is sometimes used like the more usual *but for* = 'if it had not been for' (cf. above p. 136): GE. A. 374 I should have thought she was a beggar-woman, only for her good clothes | Caine E. 112 Only for his exile I shouldn't have been here at all [very frequent in Caine] | Shaw. 1. 143 we should have been here quarter of an hour ago only for his nonsense | Birmingham W. 308 only for me there'd never have been the pier built | Stacpoole C. 168 he would have sworn that this man was Müller, only for the fact that he knew that Müller was dead | London V. 515 he wouldn't have had any community property only for you.

In American slang I find *only* with a preceding negative: Ade A. 84 I could *n't* turn up *only* sixty cents. This shows another reaction on the use of *only* from *but*.

Let me also mention the possibility of a negative answer after *only* because it is = *none but*. "If we were to ask the question 'Had you only the children with you?' a person south of the Tweed would answer '*no*', and a person north of the Tweed '*yes*', both meaning the same thing — viz, that only the children were there. I think I should myself, though a

Southron, answer *yes*". (Quoted from an English correspondent, Storm 703, who also gives literary quotations for *no* in answers to questions with *only*, from Miss Burney, George Eliot, Trollope, Sweet).

CHAPTER XIII

Negative Prefixes.

Un-, in-.

The most important negative prefixes are *un-* and *in-*, both etymologically going back to the same Arian form, *n-* (syllabic), reduced from the negative word *ne* (which gave also the Greek *a* "privativum", see below. *Un-* is the native English form, while *in-* is the Latin form, known to the English through numerous French and Latin words, and to some extent also productive in English itself. A good deal of hesitation has prevailed between the two prefixes, though now in most cases one or the other has been definitely preferred. We shall speak first of the form, next of the choice between the two prefixes, and finally of their meaning.

In-, according to the rules of Latin phonology, has the alternate forms *ig-* as in *ignoble*, *il-* as in *illiterate*, *im-* as in *impossible*, *ir-* as in *irreligious*.

In a few words, the sound of a word is changed, when this prefix is added:

pious [paiəs]	*impious* [impiəs]
finite [fainait]	*infinite* [infinit]
famous [feiməs]	*infamous* [infəməs]

In the last word, the signification too is changed (see p.145).

Pretty often *un-* is preferred before the shorter word, and *in-* before the longer word derived from it, which is generally also of a more learned nature; thus we have

unable	inability
unjust	injustice
unequal	inequality

Austen P. 239 some excuse for incivility if I *was* uncivil.

Un- is preferred where the word has a distinctly native ending, as in

ungrateful	ingratitude.

Hence also the following examples of participles in *-d* with ***un-***, while the adjectives in *-able* have *in-*: Byron Cain I. 1 all the *unnumber'd* and *innumerable* multitudes | Page J. 175 Their faces, *undistinguished* and *indistinguishable* in the crowd | Swinburne Sh. 212 the fragments we possess of Shakespeare's *uncompleted* work are *incomplete* simply because the labour.... was cut short by his timeless death | Gissing G. 90 *unmitigated* and *immitigable* | NP.'17 after an *unexplained*, but not *inexplicable* delay.

It should also be noted that while most of the *in-* words are settled once for all, and have to be learned by children as wholes, there is always a possibility of forming new words on the spur of the moment with the prefix *un-*, see, for instance the contrast in Whiteing No. 5. 267 the *irresponsible* and *unresponsive* powers.

Hence also the difference between *unavoidable* from the existing verb *avoid*, and *inevitable*: there is no Engl. verb *evite*.

In other instances we find *un-* alternating with some other prefix in related words:

unfortunate	misfortune
unsatisfactory	dissatisfaction
uncomfortable	discomfort

In a great many cases, the prefix *un-* was formerly used, either alone or concurrently with *in-*, where now the latter is exclusively used. Examples are:

unactive Sh., Mi.
uncapable Sh., Defoe, Swift, Spect.
unconstant Sh., Lyly.
uncredible More.
uncurable More, Sh.
undecent Lyly.
undocile Defoe.
unhonest More.
unmeasurable Sh.
unnoble Lyly, Sh., Fletcher.
unnumerable More.
unperfect Sh. AV.
unplausible Mi.
unpossible Lyly, Sh., AV., Goldsm. (vg. 650).
unproper Sh.
unsatiable More.
unsatiate Sh.
unsufferable Defoe.
unsufficient More.
untractable Defoe.

Many of these, and similar *un-* words, are still in use in dialects, see EDD. and Wright Rustic Speech p. 31.

Words, in which *in-* was formerly used, while *un-* is now recognized:

incertain Sh.
incharitable Sh.
inchaste Peele.
infortunate Kyd, Sh.
ingrateful Sh., Mi.
insubstantial Sh.

(It is not, of course, pretended that these words occur only in the authors named; in most cases it would be very easy to find examples in other writers as well.)

Both *unfrequent* and *infrequent* are in use, the latter, for instance in Zangw. G. 199 not infrequent. *Unelegant* and *unfirm* are rarer than *inelegant* and *infirm*.

The distinction now made between *human* and *humane* is recent; *inhuman* has the meaning corresponding to *humane*, while the negative of *human* is generally expressed by *non-human*, rarely as in Stevenson MB. 166 he was so unaffectedly *unhuman* that he did not recognise the human intention of that teaching.

Corresponding to *apt* we have the Latin and French *inept* with change of vowel and of meaning ('foolish') and the English formation *unapt*; the corresponding sbs. are *ineptitude* and *unaptness*, rarely as in Shaw Ibsen 10 women....their *inaptitude* for reasoning — evidently with a sly innuendo of the other word.

Inutterable was in use in the 17th c. (Mi., etc.), but has been superseded by *unutterable*; it has been revived, however, in one instance by Tennyson, no doubt to avoid two successive words beginning with *un-*: p. 383 killed with inutterable unkindliness.

Words beginning with *in-* or *im-* do not admit of the prefix *in-*; hence *un-* even in long and learned words like *unimportant*, *unintelligible*, *unintentional*, *uninterrupted*, etc. *Unimmortal* (Mi. PL. 10.611) is rare. Note also *disingenuous* (e. g. Shelley L. 729).

It is sometimes felt as an inconvenience that the negative prefix is identical in form with the (Lat.) preposition *in*. The verb *inhabit* contains the latter; but *inhabitable* is sometimes used with negative import, thus in Mandv. 161 and Sh. R2. I. 1. 65 Euen to the frozen ridges of the Alpes, Or any other ground inhabitable. The ambiguity of this form leads to the use of two forms with *un-*, a rarer one as in Defoe R. 156 the *unhabitable* part of the world, (but the form *inhabited*

is used ib. 188 in the positive sence), and the more usual *uninhabitable*, which is found in Sh. Temp. II. 1. 37 and has now completely prevailed. The corresponding positive adjective ('what can be *inhabited*') is *habitable*. Ambiguities are also found in other similar adjectives, as seen by definitions in dictionaries: *investigable* (1) that may be investigated, (2) incapable of being investigated; *infusible* (1) that may be infused or poured in, (2) incapable of being fused or melted; *invertible* (1) capable of being inverted, (2) incapable of being changed. *Importable*, which is now used only as derived from *import* (capable of being imported) had formerly also the meaning 'unbearable', and *improvable* similarly had the meaning of 'incapable of being proved', though it only retains that of 'capable of being improved'. *Inexistence* means (1) the condition of existing *in* something, and (2), rarely, the condition of not existing. Cf. Growth § 140 for a few more examples.

With regard to the employment and meaning of these two prefixes it is, first, important to note that their proper sphere is with adjectives and adverbs. They are found frequently with sbs., but exclusively with such as are derived from adjectives, e. g. *unkindness*, *injustice*, *unimportance*, *incomprehensibility*. Similarly *unemployment*, which does not mean the same as *non-employment*, but refers to the number of *unemployed*. Cf. also the rare *unproportion*, from *proportionate*, in Kinglake E. 178 the wide unproportion between this slender company, and the boundless plain of sand. *Unfriend* (frequent in Sc.) also smacks of *unfriendly*; it is found in Kipling K. 202 they were unfriends of mine | Hewlett Q. 30 not distinguishing friend from unfriend. Carlyle's "Thinkers and *unthinkers*" (FR. 107) is a nonce-word.

The negative prefixes *un-* and *in-* are not used with verbs, though *un-* is very frequent with participles, because these are adjectival: *undying*, *unfinished*. (*In-* with Latin parti-

ciples, which in Engl. are simply adjectives: *inefficient*, *imperfect*). On the privative *un-* with verbs see below p. 147.

Not all adjectives admit of having the negative prefix *un-* or *in-*, and it is not always easy to assign a reason why one adjective can take the prefix and another cannot. Still, the same general rule obtains in English as in other languages, that most adjectives with *un-* or *in-* have a depreciatory sense: we have *unworthy*, *undue*, *imperfect*, etc., but it is not possible to form similar adjectives from *wicked*, *foolish*, or *terrible*. Van Ginneken (Linguistique psychologique 208) counted the words in *un-* in a German dictionary and found that 98 pct. of the substantives and 85 pct. of the adjectives had "une signification défavorable"; Noreen (Vårt språk 5. 567) found similar relations obtaining in Swedish.

The modification in sense brought about by the addition of the prefix is generally that of a simple negative: *unworthy* = 'not worthy', etc. The two terms are thus contradictory terms. But very often the prefix produces a "contrary" term or at any rate what approaches one: *unjust* (and *injustice*) generally imply the opposite of *just (justice); unwise* means more than *not wise* and approaches *foolish*, *unhappy* is not far from *miserable*, etc. Still, in most cases we have only approximation, and *unbeautiful* (which is not very common, but is used, for instance, by Carlyle R. 1. 118, Swinburne L. 187, Zangwill, and others) is not so strong as *ugly* or *hideous*. Sometimes the use of the negative is restricted: *unwell* refers only to health, and we could not speak of a book as *unwell printed* (for *badly*). *Unfair* is only used in the moral sense, not of outward looks.

While *immoral* means the opposite of *moral*, i. e. what is contrary to (the received ideas of) morality, the necessity is sometimes felt of a term implying 'having nothing to do with morality, standing outside the sphere of morality'; this is some-

times expressed by *amoral* (thus frequently by the late ethnologist A.H. Keane), sometimes by *unmoral*; Stevenson (NED) There is a vast deal in life and letters both, which is not immoral, but simply a-moral | N. P. 1909 children are naturally neither moral nor immoral, but merely unmoral. They are little savages, living in a civilized society that has not yet civilized them | London V. 255 the universe was unmoral and without concern for men. — Cf. from French Rolland J. Chr. 5. 130 Moralité, *immoralité*, *amoralité* — tous ces mots ne veulent rien dire.

As *irreligious* is very often used as the opposite of *religious*, Carlyle in one passage avoids this word, in speaking of University College, London, "it will be *unreligious*, secretly *antireligious* all the same, said Irving to me" (R. 1. 293).

Infamous has been separated from *famous* as in sound (cf. p. 139), so in sense; the negative of *famous* is now rather *unfamed.*

Other examples, in which the word with the negative prefix has been separated in sense from the simplex, are

different	indifferent
pertinent	impertinent.

Invaluable means 'priceless', 'very valuable' while the negative of *valuable* is *worthless.*

Un- (rarely *in-*) may be prefixed to participial groups: *unheard-of*, *uncalled-for*, *uncared-for* | Defoe R. 341 the 872 moidores, which was *indisposed of.*

To the same category may be referred Bennett W. 2. 235 that the time was out of joint and life *unworth living* | Whitney Or. Studies 1. 286 were a generation of infants to grow up *untaught to speak* || B. Jo. 1. 25 you have very rare, and *un-in-one-breath-utterable* skill.

There is an interesting Sc. way of using the negative prefix *on-* (= *un-*) before participles, as in Alexander, Johnny

Gibb 235 I'm nae responsible to gae afore Sir Simon on-hed my papers upo' me [= without having]. — This is sometimes mistakenly written *ohn*, as if from G. *ohne: ohn been ashamed* (EDD.).

Instead of prefixing *un-* to adjectives in *-ful* it is usual to substitute *-less* for *-ful*, thus *careless* corresponding to *careful, thoughtless, hopeless, useless;* but *unfaithful, unmerciful* are used by the side of *faithless, merciless; unlawful* does not mean the same as *lawless; uneventful* and *unsuccessful* are preferred to *eventless* and *successless; unbeautiful* is used, but there is no *beautiless.*

Dis-.

The prefix *dis-* (from Lat.) besides various other meanings also has that of a pure negative, as in *dissimilar, dishonest, dispassionate, disagree* (*-able*), *disuse, dislike, disbelieve* generally implying contrary rather than contradictory opposition, as is seen very distinctly in *dissuade, disadvise* (Trollope W. 231 he disadvised you from it), *disreputable*, etc. Sometimes the prefix has the same privative meaning as *un-* before verbs (see p. 148), as in *disburden, disembarrass*; Carlyle FR. 268 *diswhipped* Taskmaster (nonce-word); *discover* has been specialized and differentiated from *uncover.*

A difference is made between *dis-* and *un-* in Amr. NP. '16 The entrance of a fresh and powerful neutral [U. S.], honestly *disinterested* but not *uninterested* — the former referring to egoism, the latter to more ideal motives. (In Ido the two would be *sen-interesta ma ne sen-interesa*).

As with *in-* we have sometimes here a linguistic drawback arising from the ambiguity of the prefix. *Dissociable* may be either the negative of *sociable* (unsociable) or derived from the verb *dissociate* (separable); in the former case the NED will pronounce a double [s], while Mr. Daniel Jones has single [s] in both, but pronounces the ending in the former [-ʃəbl], in the latter [ʃiəbl] or [ʃjəbl].

Disannul means practically the same thing as *annul* and thus contains a redundant negative (cf. Span. *desnudar*).

Non-.

A great many words (sbs., not so often adjs.) are formed with the Latin *non-*, especially in those cases where no formations with *un-* or *in-* are available. Juridical terms are probably responsible for the extent to which this prefix has been made use of. Sh. has *nonage*, *non-payment*, *non-performance*, *non-regardance*, and *non-suit*. It will be seen that *non-* is chiefly used with action-nouns; but it is also frequent with agent-nouns, such as *non-combatant*, *non-belligerent*, *non-communicant*, *non-conductor*, cf. also *non-conducting*, *non-member*. See also Di. N. 50 the *non-arrival* of her own carriage | Wells A. 303 in a *non-natural* way | London V. 199 this tangled, *nonunderstandable* conflict | Macdonald F. 245 their *non-importation* resolutions | ib. 309 the United States was born *non-viable* | a *non-stopping* train.

An-, a-.

The Greek prefix *an-* before a vowel, *a-* before a consonant, etymologically identical with *un-* and *in-* (see p. 139), is chiefly found in Greek words like *anarchy*, *amorphous*, *achromatic*, but is also in rare instances used in English to form new words (from Latin roots), such as *amoral* (above p. 145), *asexual* in Gissing B. 267 the truly emancipated woman is almost asexual.

No-.

No (the pronoun) is sometimes used as a kind of prefix; this is illustrated in MEG. II. 16. 79 by examples like *no-education*, *no-thoroughfare*, *no-ball*, etc. Cf. also Carlyle FR. 57 with such *no-faculty* as he has | ib. 199 The Constitution which will suit that ? Alas, too clearly, a *No-Constitution*, an Anarchy | Times Lit. Suppl. 6 Jy '17 there can be no settlement which is not a world-settlement. Even the *no-settlement* which a stalemate would involve would be an *unsettlement* of the whole world. (The latter to the following prefix).

The privative *un-*.

OE had the prefix *ond-*, *and-*, which was liable to lose its *d* before a consonant; it corresponds etymologically to Gr. *anti-* and G. *ent-*. In *answer* it is no longer felt as a prefix; and in *dread* the only thing left of the prefix is *d*: OE *ondrædan*, cf. G. *entraten*, was felt as containing the prep. *on*, and when that was subtracted, *drædan* remained (Pogatscher, Anglia Beibl. 14. 182).

In other instances the prefix remained living, but the vowel was changed into *u*, probably through influence from the negative prefix, (cf. *unless*, ME. *on lesse* (*that*), where also the negative notion caused confusion with *un-*). Thus the old *onbindan*, *ontiegan* became *unbindan*, *untigan* in Ælfric, mod. *unbind*, *untie*. The two prefixes are now different through stress, the negative words having even and the privative end stress. The privative *un-* serves to make verbs, such as *uncover* 'deprive of cover', *untie* 'loose', *undress* 'take off dress', *undo* 'reverse what has been done, annul, untie', *unmask*, etc., also for instance *unman* 'deprive of the qualities of a man', *unking* 'dethrone' (Sh.), *unlord*.

The following quotations may serve to illustrate the freedom with which new verbs are formed with this prefix: Sh. VA. 908 she treads the path that she *vntreads* againe | John III. 1. 245 *Vnsweare* faith sworne | H. 5 IV. 3. 76 thou hast *vnwisht* fiue thousand men | Milton PL. 5. 895 Then who created thee lamenting learne, When who can *uncreate* thee thou shalt know | Dryden 5. 193 [he] wishes, he could *unbeget* these rebel sons | ib. 392 to say or to *unsay*, whate'er you please | Defoe P. 25 they were, as it were, alarmed, and *unalarmed* again | Coleridge, Letter 1800 (Campb. LVIII.) before the end of the year I shall have my wings *un-birdlimed* | Byron 582 do not poison all My peace left, by *unwishing* that thou wert A father | Mrs. Browning A. 170 death quite *unfellows* us | Carlyle S. 82 it makes and *unmakes* whole worlds | Twain M. 190 [she] *unhandkerchiefs* one eye.

While infinitives and other pure verb-forms beginning with *un-* can only be privatives, participles with the same beginning may be either negatives or privatives, the written and printed forms being identical in the two cases. Thus *uncovered* may be [ˈʌnˈkʌvəd] 'not covered' and [ʌnˈkʌvəd] 'deprived of cover'; *unlocked* [ˈʌnˈlɔkt] 'not locked' and [ʌnˈlɔkt] 'opened'; similarly *untied*, *undressed*, *unstrapped*, *unbuttoned*, *unharnessed*, *unbridled*, *unloaded*, *unpacked*, etc.

In some cases it may be doubtful whether we have one or the other prefix, e. g. (I reckon here also Swinburne's *unlove* and *unknow*, though according to the ordinary rules these should be only privatives): Wells V. 124 those *unsexed* intellectuals | Di. D. 117 all sorts of clothing, made and *unmade* | Darwin L. 1. 333 [an anonymous book] has been by some attributed to me — at which I ought to be much flattered and *unflattered* | Swinburne S.b. S. 83 Love or *unlove* me, *Unknow* me or know, I am that which unloves me and loves.

The two prefixes are brought together neatly in Locke S. 246 If charity covers a multitude of sins, *uncharitableness* has the advantage of *uncovering* them.

Sh. and AV. have the illogical verb *unloose* with confusion of *untie* and *loose(n)*.

From the privative verb *to undress* is formed the sb. *undress* (stress on the first syllable, MEG. I. 5. 72) meaning 'plain clothes' (not uniform), e. g. Scott A. 1. 298 in military undress.

NB. The rules here given for stress of the two kinds of formations are probably too absolute; as a matter of fact there is a good deal of vacillation. Mr. Daniel Jones, in his *Pronouncing English Dictionay* 1917, does not seem to recognize any distinction between the two prefixes. Most of the unphonetic pronouncing dictionaries give end-stress in all cases.

ADDENDA

P. 10 (Place of G. *nicht*). Collitz, Das schwache präteritum 67 Denn der Rigveda kennt die lautgruppe *skh-*, die ganz den eindruck einer aus dem prakrit stammenden lautverbindung macht, überhaupt nicht | Deutschbein, Syst. d. neuengl. synt. 27 Das frühneuengl. hat die neigung, das object möglichst an das verbum anzuschliessen, noch nicht.

P. 16 (Transition from 'nothing' to 'not'). Cf. on adverbial *none* MEG. II. 16. 69.

P. 39. Carlyle FR. 405 what could he look for there? Exasperated Tickets of Entry answer: Much, all. But cold Reason answers: *Little, almost nothing.*

P. 44 or in some other place combinations like "He regretted that *more* Englishmen did *not* come here" (NP '17) should have been mentioned.

P. 47. With *not ever* compare the rare *not any* as in Quincey 275 "Had any gentleman heard of a dauphin killed by small-pox?" "No, *not any* gentleman had heard of such a case".

P. 47 f. Times Lit. Suppl. 3 Aug. '17 We have not gagged our Press because we disliked our freedom, but because to this extent the Prussian has triumphed | Madvig Program 1857. 90. Jeg elsker ikke mit sprog, fordi det er eller har været herligt og skjønt ... jeg elsker det, fordi det er mine fædres og mit folks sprog.

P. 51. Mason R 104 Sylvia was determined *not to be* disappointed.

P. 60 (Negative continued as if positive). A reference has here unfortunately fallen out to Siesbye, Nord. tidsskr. f. filol. 3. r. 8 p. 8 ff. and Dania 10 p. 44.

P. 77. English does not always require *being* after *far from:* she is far from pretty, etc.

P. 81 (*Not* with numerals). Brontë J 4 he punished me; not two or three times in the week, nor once or twice in the day, but continually.

P. 89 (Negative with word of *A*-class, result *C*). Here should be mentioned words for 'never' like G. *nimmer* and *nie*, OE. *nā*, but then the constituent *ie*, *ā* does not exclusively belong to class *A*, but also to some extent to class *B*. — The effect of stress and tone in these cases is sometimes analogous to what we have seen with numerals; cf. Dan "han var ikke syg på hele rejsen", which with strong stress and high tone on *hele* may mean 'he was only sick during part of the voyage', but otherwise means 'not at all'. — A negative may, of course, be annulled by an indirect negative, as in Rolland JChr. 8. 142 Comment, vous me connaissez? — *Comme si tout le monde ne se connaissait pas* à Paris (= Tout le monde se connaît).

P. 123. A characteristic illustration of the way in which educated people look upon *don't* in the third person singular is found in the conversation in Jack London's Martin Eden, p. 64 f.

Abbreviations of names of authors and books quoted are the same as in my Modern English Grammar vol. II, to which I may here refer (Ch. = Chaucer, Sh. = Shakespeare, AV. = Authorized Version of the Bible, Mi. = Milton, Buny. = Bunyan, By. = Byron, Di. = Dickens, GE. = George Eliot, Tenn. = Tennyson, Thack. = Thackeray, Ru. = Ruskin, NP. = newspaper). A few titles of books which are not found in the list there will be given in the third volume of my Grammar, if that is ever to appear.

CONTENTS

Forelagt paa Møderne d. 13. og 27. April 1917.
Færdig fra Trykkeriet d. 3. December 1917.