

Negation in Benjamin Franklin's Writings: A Stylistic Analysis of his Autobiography and Letters

Yoko Iyeiri
Kyoto University

Abstract

The present paper discusses Benjamin Franklin's (1706–1790) use of negation from stylistic and historical sociolinguistic perspectives. By using the Benjamin Franklin Corpus, which I have compiled for my research purposes, I will investigate the frequency of negation itself, the frequency of *not* (instead of other negative forms like *never* and *no*), and the use of the auxiliary *do*, in Benjamin Franklin's letters and autobiography. The analysis shows that the less formal the language is, the more frequent negation itself tends to be. Likewise, informal styles of writing tend to employ the negative adverb *not* commonly. The establishment of the auxiliary use of *do* also seems to be more typical of informal styles than of formal styles. However, the use of *do* has already been fairly well-established in Benjamin Franklin's writings in general, making the stylistic difference very slight. Finally, I will also refer to *no doubt*, *neither ... nor*, *or not*, and multiple negation, mentioning the availability of *no doubt* in the adverbial use, of *neither ... or* (instead of *neither ... nor*), and *or no* (rather than *or not*), and the absence of multiple negation, in the corpus.

Keywords: *not*, *do*, style, sociolinguistics, historical linguistics

1. Introduction

The present paper explores Benjamin Franklin's (1706–1790) English with a focus on negation from stylistic and historical sociolinguistic perspectives. As one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, Benjamin Franklin has left a wealth of documents, including an autobiography and letters addressed to various people. They are excellent linguistic resources, which reveal the state of affairs of eighteenth-century American English and its relation to possible stylistic and sociolinguistic factors.

2. Data

The analysis of this study is based on the Benjamin Franklin Corpus (BF Corpus), a corpus of Benjamin Franklin's writings, which I have compiled for my research purposes by using material in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin (Papers)*. The BF Corpus consists of the sub-corpora of his letters and autobiography, with a total of around 600,000 words, as summarized in the following table:

	Approximate Number of Words
Letters	
Letters to Deborah Franklin	36,700 words
Other Letters	493,100 words
Autobiography	65,400 words

Table 1: BF Corpus

While the corpus of the autobiography includes the entirety of the text, the sub-corpus of letters is selective for the obvious reason of their abundance. From the *Papers*, I have extracted all the letters from 1706 to 1775 that are signed by Benjamin Franklin (1,322 letters), and divided them into those addressed to Deborah (c. 1708–1774), his wife (126 letters), and to other people as the above table shows.¹ The assumption is that the style of his English differs depending

¹ The letters which may have been written by Benjamin but which are devoid of his signature are not included in this corpus. Also removed are those written by other people and addressed to Benjamin Franklin, although they are also edited in the *Papers*. In counting the number of words, I have made every effort to

on the addressee. As Deborah is the only family member that received a notable number of letters from Benjamin Franklin, it is worthwhile to conduct a separate analysis of his letters to her. 1775 will be a good cut-off point, considering the fact that Deborah died at the end of 1774. All the letters written by Benjamin to Deborah and stored in the *Papers* are included in the BF Corpus.

3. Results

By using this corpus, I have investigated various forms of negation in Benjamin Franklin's English. The present section discusses some of the important findings from stylistic and historical sociolinguistic perspectives. 3.1 deals with the frequency of negation itself, 3.2 negative clauses with *not*, 3.3 the use of the auxiliary *do* in negation, and 3.4 *no doubt*, *neither ... nor*, *or not*, and multiple negation in this order.

3.1 Frequencies of Negation and Style

While the occurrence of negation may seem to be highly conditioned by the content matter of the text, there is a broad relationship between the frequency of negation and the style or text types of language. Biber et al. (1999:159) demonstrate that the occurrence of negation is the most frequent in conversation, followed by fiction, news, and academic texts in this order. Likewise, Tottie (1981:271) writes that negation is "twice as frequent in spoken English as in written English." Although the BF Corpus does not include any of the genres investigated by Biber et al., or show the contrast between spoken and written English, this finding in previous studies is still relevant to the present study. The general assumption is that the more informal or colloquial the style of the text is, the more frequent negation tends to be in it.

As for the BF Corpus, the letters will be more informal than the autobiography, since the readers of the former are specific people, while the audience of the latter are the public.² Among the letters, those addressed to Deborah will

eliminate irrelevant words such as editorial comments from the text.

² Biber (2001:105–106) notes the "expository, descriptive, or argumentative" nature of eighteenth-century letters, but he also remarks that letters increasingly assumed "characteristics of

be more informal and perhaps more colloquial than the rest for obvious reasons. And this inference is confirmed by the analysis of the frequency of negation in the BF Corpus. See the table below, which tabulates the frequencies of negative words in the three text types:³

Negative words (per 10,000 words)	
Letters to Deborah Franklin	457 (124.5)
Other Letters	5968 (121.0)
Autobiography	721 (110.2)

Table 2: Frequencies of negative words

There is a clear correspondence between the frequency of negation and the text type, though the difference is rather slight. The letters addressed to Deborah, the most informal of the three text types, show the largest number of negative words when normalized. By contrast, the frequency of negation is the lowest in the autobiography, whose readers are the public.

One of the factors which Biber et al. (1999:159) consider to be relevant to the frequent attestation of negation in conversation is that it tends to use verbs such as *forget*, *know*, *mind*, *remember*, *think*, *want*, and *worry* that often occur in negation. Of the seven verbs in this list, *know* and *think* are perhaps relevant to the BF Corpus as well, since they are observed numerously, although it is not a corpus of conversation. The verb *know* is found most frequently in the letters to Deborah (25.6 per 10,000 words), followed by the other letters (15.5 per 10,000 words) and autobiography (14.2 per 10,000 words). Also, it is indeed a verb that occurs often in negation (26.3% of the examples of *know* are encountered with negative words on the average).⁴ Hence the frequent occurrence of this verb has, at least to some extent, contributed to the increase of negation in informal texts in the BF Corpus as well. This is not necessarily the case with *think*, by contrast, which is very commonly attested in the other letters (27.3 per 10,000 words) and autobiography (23.5 per 10,000 words), but only at the rate of 19.9 per 10,000 words in the letters to Deborah. Furthermore, the ratio of negation with this verb is not necessarily so high as with *know*. *Think* occurs with negative words at the rate of 5.5% in the letters to Deborah, whereas the corresponding rates in the other letters and autobiography are 6.5% and 11.7% respectively.

3.2 Frequencies of Clausal Negation with *not*

The second feature of some relevance to the style of English is the frequency of the negative adverb *not*. The contrast between so-called *not*-negation (i.e. negative clauses with *not*, as in: *And I do not remember any of my political Manoeuvres*, Autobiography) and *no*-negation (i.e.

negative clauses with other negative words than *not*, such as *no*, *never*, and *nothing*, as in: *Dear Sir, I had no Line from you per last Packet*, Letter to Joseph Galloway) has long been noted in the literature. Tottie (1988:262) relates the issue to the language style and text types, by saying: "Colloquial, spoken English favours *not*-negation, while more 'literary' or formal written English favours *no*-negation."

Although Tottie's definition of *not*-negation is stricter than the simple availability of *not* – she counts only those examples that present the negative adverb *not* together with indefinites like *any*, *ever*, and *either*, under the category of *not*-negation (Tottie, 1988:246) –, I have argued elsewhere that the simple proportion of negative clauses with *not* (irrespective of the indefinites) to the total of negative clauses provides a comparable framework within which to assess the formality of English (Iyeiri et al., 2015). Overall, the less formal the language is, the more frequent negative clauses with *not* are. This is a simpler and more manageable criterion, which can also be used for the analysis of negation in the BF Corpus.

The table below shows the frequencies of negative clauses with *not* together with the overall frequencies of negative clauses in general in the three sub-corpora of the BF Corpus. The figures include the contracted form *-n't* as well:⁵

	Neg. clauses with <i>not</i> (%)	All neg. clauses
Letters to Deborah	248 (69.1%)	359
Other Letters	3,146 (66.4%)	4,735
Autobiography	314 (61.3%)	512

Table 3: Frequencies of negative clauses with *not* and their proportions to the total of negative clauses

The difference among the three text types is rather slight, which suggests the overall stability of Benjamin Franklin's writing style. Still, the above table reveals that his use of *not* in negative clauses is the most frequent in his letters to Deborah, and the least frequent in his autobiography. In other words, the data presented here is in accordance with the generally accepted view that negation with *not* tends to increase in informal or colloquial styles.

As a matter of fact, the trend as hitherto described can be envisaged from diachronic perspectives. Supposing that continual colloquialization or informalization is underway in the history of English, as often suggested in existing studies (e.g. Haselow 2015), negative clauses with *not* (rather than *no*, *never*, etc.) become more and more frequent as time passes. Additional research is called for to prove this, but it is relevant to mention that a very high proportion of *not* has been observed in some formal spoken

speech" in the history of English. Thus the direction of the historical change is clear. The question is to what extent this shift is observable in the language of the BF Corpus.

³ The negative words in this study are restricted to so-called *n*-words, namely words beginning with *n*, such as *not*, *never*, *no*, and *nothing*. Words of negative colouring, such as *little*, *hardly*, and *barely*, are not counted in this table.

⁴ In fact, the relationship between the frequency of negation and *know* is complex, since the rate of negation of *know* itself is lower in the letters to Deborah (20.2%) than in the other letters (27.1%) and autobiography (25.8%). This is in accordance with the

statement by Iyeiri, Yaguchi, and Baba (2015) that *know* tends to occur in negation especially in formal settings. The gist of the argument here is that the letters to Debora include a particularly large number of examples of *know*, which is a verb that is often attested in negation in general.

⁵ This study does not deal with the contrast between *not* and *-n't* in the BF Corpus. The number of contracted forms in the entire data is so small that it is difficult to tell whether the use of contraction counts as a style marker. It may have been a simple writing practice without consistency.

data in late twentieth-century American English. Iyeiri et al. (2015) investigate the Corpus of Spoken Professional English,⁶ which contains data from White House press conferences and various academic meetings, and find that the proportion of *not* to the total of all negative items (excluding the response marker *no*) reaches 85% to 95%.⁷ Even taking into account the spokenness of the data, the dominance of *not* is so marked as to hint at the possibility that the use of *not* (rather than other negative items) is increasingly common in recent years. In other words, the stylistic differences as observed in the BF Corpus may be comparable to the framework of “apparent time” – namely, the stylistic differences reveal different stages of the development of English –, although this well-known concept is usually employed in the discussion of language shift through generations, particularly in relation to phonology and morphology (see Labov, 1994:83–84).

3.3 Negative Clauses with and without *Do*

The third feature of negation is the development of the auxiliary use of *do* in the BF Corpus. The major expansion of the auxiliary *do* in the history of English is known to have taken place in the Early Modern English period (see Ellegård, 1953; Nurmi, 1999; among others). On the other hand, a number of scholars have pointed out that negation of lexical verbs without *do* (e.g. *I know not* as opposed to *I do not know*) is still observable in the eighteenth century, though previous studies in this area tend to focus on British English rather than American English (see Tieken, 1987; Nakamura 1997; Iyeiri 2004; among others).

Benjamin Franklin’s English indeed displays a fluctuation between the two types of negative constructions, as in: *I know not whether he will have time to write to his Betsey* (Letter to Deborah); and *I do not know whether it was worth any expectation* (Autobiography). The table below demonstrates the distribution of “verb + *not*” and “*do not* + verb” (including the contracted forms *dont* and *don’t*)⁸ in the three text types of the BF Corpus:

	Verb + <i>not</i> (%)	<i>Do not</i> + verb (%)	Totals
Letters to Deborah	13 (16.5%)	66 (83.5%)	79
Other Letters	141 (18.5%)	622 (81.5%)	763
Autobiography	13 (14.4%)	77 (85.6%)	90

Table 4: Frequencies of “verb + *not*” and “*do not* + verb” in the BF Corpus (lexical verbs only)

The statistics in this table include lexical verbs only, with the exclusion of central modal auxiliaries and verbs that have auxiliary functions (i.e. *be*, *have*, *ought*, *need*, and *dare*). Quite expectedly, the data here exhibits a fairly well-established use of the auxiliary *do* (more than 80% of the

relevant examples), but still yields some examples without *do*.

While the above table does not seem to show any clear correlation between the use of the auxiliary *do* and the text types or style of Benjamin Franklin’s writings, a clearer picture emerges when the verbs *know* and *doubt* are excluded, both favouring the construction without *do* and occurring so frequently as to affect the overall statistics. Table 5 exhibits the renewed statistics that exclude *know* and *doubt* as well as the verbs excluded in Table 4:⁹

	Verb + <i>not</i> (%)	<i>Do not</i> + verb (%)	Totals
Letters to Deborah	2 (3.2%)	60 (96.8%)	62
Other Letters	18 (3.0%)	581 (97.0%)	599
Autobiography	8 (10.1%)	71 (89.9%)	79

Table 5: Frequencies of “verb + *not*” and “*do not* + verb” in the BF Corpus (lexical verbs with the exclusion of *know* and *doubt*)

Table 5 hints at the possibility that the establishment of the auxiliary use of *do* is more advanced in the letters (of all types) than in the autobiography, which is in accordance with the view that the expansion of *do* is a change that took place, spreading from informal to formal styles.¹⁰ On the whole, however, it will also be a reasonable inference that the establishment of the auxiliary *do* has more or less reached its final stage by this time. The inventory of the verbs illustrating the “verb + *not*” construction is restricted to a small number of verbs in the BF Corpus (i.e. *come*, *distract*, *do*, *drink*, *eat*, *expect*, *forget*, *go*, *let*, *make*, *mean*, *mistake*, *sale*, *speak*, *teach*, as well as *know* and *doubt*). The syntactic environments where the “verb + *not*” construction occurs are also often restricted. Some examples are found in the imperative, as in: *Speak not but what may benefit others or yourself* (Autobiography); And *distrust not Providence* (Autobiography). The verb *mistake* occurs in the fixed form *if I mistake not* three times, whereas the same verb occurs with *do* otherwise (i.e. *I find he did not mistake me*, Letter to Samuel Cooper). Hence, the BF Corpus demonstrates how fixed forms can stay longer in the process of language change.

3.4 Some Additional Features of Negation

Apart from the major issues hitherto discussed, the BF Corpus yields some additional features of negation, which are minor but still interesting and worth investigating.

3.4.1 No Doubt

The phrase *no doubt* occurs both in the letters and the autobiography, often together with the verb *make*, as in: *But I make no doubt he improves very fast* (Letter to Jonathan

of such exceptional verbs, for example, includes *know*, *boot*, *throw*, *care*, *doubt*, *mistake*, *fear*, *skill*, and *list*, while Strang’s (1970:151) list is more selective, including *know*, *mistake*, and *matter*. I will eliminate the data of *know* and *doubt* only, as they clearly have a tendency to stay with the construction without *do* until late and they are so frequent as to affect the entire data, as mentioned in the main body of discussion. See also Nakamura (1997:114), who points to the conservative nature of these two verbs across the board in different genres.

¹⁰ See Tieken (1990) for the possible colloquial nature of “*do not* + verb” at an early stage of its development.

⁶ 2000 © Michael Barlow.

⁷ Due to the fragmentary nature of spoken data, the statistics in Iyeiri, Yaguchi, and Baba (2015) are based on an even simpler framework, namely the relative frequency of *not* itself (instead of the frequency of negative clauses with *not*) to the total of negative items.

⁸ These are the only contracted forms of *do* found in the BF Corpus. For the slower development of *doesn’t* and *didn’t* in the history of English, see Nakayama (2007:52–55).

⁹ A number of scholars have noted that some verbs are slower than others in adopting the *do* construction. Ellegård’s (1953:199) list

Williams); *I make no doubt but great Numbers would sell in America* (Letter to Richard Jackson). Examples of this type are particularly numerous in the sub-corpus of letters, although this may to some extent be due to its larger corpus size. Another use of *no doubt* characteristic of the letters only is the parenthetical use as illustrated in the following, where *no doubt* functions almost like a sentential adverb: *Mr. Hall, no doubt, writes you more fully concerning him* (Letter to William Strahan). The existence of this usage in the letters only may again be due to the larger size of the sub-corpus, though.

At the same time, considering the fact that this parenthetical use of *no doubt* is a development a step forward from the use of *no doubt* as a noun phrase in the history of the English language (cf. Iyeiri, 2010a:152–156), its attestation in the letters only may indicate the progressive nature of the text type, at least in comparison to the autobiography. Unfortunately, the shortage of examples of *doubt* in the autobiography hinders further interpretation.¹¹

3.4.2 Neither ... nor

The negative connectives attested in the BF Corpus are *neither* and *nor*, occurring either alone or together in the form *neither ... nor*. Examples include: *nor was Youth always without it* (Autobiography); *so I shall neither lose nor gain that way* (Letter to James Logan). One interesting variant form attested in Benjamin Franklin's writings is *neither ... or*, as shown in: *Monday was so dark with a thick Fog all day, that we could [sic] neither look out for a Place to build, or see where Materials were to be had* (Letter to an unknown addressee); *However, as I neither ask or expect any particular Consideration for any Service I may have done* (Letter to John Foxcroft).

Examples of *neither ... or* are not at all abundant, but their use is unlikely to be accidental. I have shown in one of my earlier publications that *neither ... or* is more widespread in the Modern English period than expected and that *neither ... or* is in fact dominant in some works, of which *Robinson Crusoe* is one (Iyeiri 2010b).¹² See also Nevalainen (2014), who shows that *neither ... or* is encountered at the rate of around 20% in the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence Extension*, which covers the period from 1680 to 1800. Although present-day usage guides tend to regard this structure as incorrect (e.g. Whitcut, 1994:200) or informal at least (*The American Heritage Book of English Usage*, p. 21), it has a long history in the English language. For some examples in Middle English, see Iyeiri (2001:146). Peters (2004:370) even points to the possible increase of this construction in contemporary English, though his comment is based on British English. All in all, it is not a matter of surprise that *neither ... or* is encountered in the BF Corpus, when viewed from these historical perspectives. Whether its existence only in the letters of the corpus is relevant to the style of the text type is an open question. A tinge of

informal feeling may have been existent with *neither ... or* already in the eighteenth century, and if so, the style may be relevant. As so far discussed, the letters are less formal than the autobiography in terms of the style in the BF Corpus. At the same time, the existence of the construction at issue in the letters may simply have arisen from the sheer size of the sub-corpus. Due to its larger size, it has more room for variation.

3.4.3 Or not

The simple expression *or not*, as illustrated by the following example, also needs some comments: *Whether they will do it or not, I cannot yet say* (Letter to Joseph Galloway); *whether they will give any thing [sic] or not* (Autobiography). There is also a single example illustrating *or no*, a variant form of *or not*, in the BF Corpus: *If it was not quite unreasonable I should desire you to write to me every Post, whether you hear from me or no* (Letter to Catharine Ray).

Again this is probably not a pen slip, since *or no* is a well-established historical form in the English language. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (s.v. *whether*) comments that *whether ... or no* is more usual than *whether ... or not*, and cites a number of its examples from writings in the past, though it is true that *or not* is in fact more usual in today's English (cf. Burchfield 1992:146–148). I have also discussed the historical development of *or not* in my earlier publications, showing that *or no* and *or not* were in a fair competition in different versions of the English Bible until the eighteenth-century (Iyeiri, 1997; 1999; 2001:123–125).¹³ Arai (1998) also shows that the same variation is visible in the quotation base of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. It is really from the middle of the eighteenth century that the dominance of *or not* manifests itself, and in this sense the availability of both *or no* and *or not* in the BF Corpus is not a matter of surprise.

3.4.4 Multiple Negation

Before concluding this paper, I would like to make a short comment on multiple negation, namely the use of two or more negative words in a single clause without the cancellation of the negative concept. It is one of the central issues of debate in eighteenth-century grammars (Tieken 1982), but the BF Corpus does not present the phenomenon.

In view of the stigma often attached to multiple negation, its absence in the BF Corpus may be interpreted as illustrative of Benjamin Franklin's linguistic awareness, namely the awareness to avoid stigmatized forms. It is, however, more likely that multiple negation was no longer a usual phenomenon by the time of Benjamin Franklin's English. Recent studies on negation claim that the decline of multiple negation (including double negation, i.e. negation with two negative words) takes place before the time of normative grammars in the eighteenth century.

¹¹ The parenthetical use of *no doubt* itself goes back to earlier periods in the history of English. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (s.v. *doubt*) gives examples from the fourteenth century onwards. See also Iyeiri (2010a:154–155) and Iyeiri (2017:56–57) for additional examples of this use from earlier days than Benjamin Franklin.

¹² *Robinson Crusoe* provides a total of 27 relevant examples, of which 25 (92.6%) illustrate the sequence *neither ... or*. See Iyeiri (2010b:3) for further details.

¹³ The competition between *or no* and *or not* was preceded by the stage where *or noon* (or *none*) was also involved. For further discussion on the development of *or not*, see Iyeiri (1999, 2001), who, unlike in the present paper, discusses British English in the main.

Tieken (2002:460) refers to Robert Lowth's grammar and argues:¹⁴

It is [...] unlikely that his pronouncements on double negation, which first appeared in the second edition of the grammar (1763), had any impact on usage. At the time, multiple negation barely occurred any longer in the more formal registers of the language.

Nevalainen (2006:264) is another to present the same view. She says:

It is noteworthy that negative concord [= multiple negation] had largely disappeared among the higher ranks, male and female, before the era of prescriptive grammar.

In fact, the process of the decline of multiple negation takes place even from the Middle English period. In my earlier work, I note that "the culmination of the phenomenon [= multiple negation] is identifiable somewhere between the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries" (Iyeiri, 2001:130). I also state that "much of the declining process of multiple negation, in fact, takes place during the ME [= Middle English] period" (2001:155).¹⁵

4. Conclusion

The above discussion has shown some variabilities in Benjamin Franklin's use of negation, which have stylistic and/or historical implications. The frequency of negation itself differs depending on the text type: it is the most frequent in Benjamin Franklin's letters to Deborah, followed by the other letters and the autobiography. This is most likely purely stylistic.

The frequency of negative clauses with *not*, by contrast, may have some chronological implications, since it is probable that negative clauses with *not* increased along with the colloquialization or informalization of the English language. In the BF Corpus, the variation is observable in the form of stylistic differences though: the letters to Deborah yield the largest number of clauses with *not*, when the figure is normalized, and this is followed by the other letters and the autobiography in this order. A chronological interpretation will be that the letters to Deborah reveal the

most colloquialized stage, at least when compared with the other two text types.

The establishment of the auxiliary *do* has not yet been finalized in the BF Corpus. The predominance of "*do not* + verb" as against "verb + *not*" is transparent in Benjamin Franklin's writings in general, and this trend is even clearer when *know* and *doubt*, two verbs favouring "verb + *not*" and occurring so commonly as to affect the overall picture, are removed from the statistics. There seems to be a slight correlation between the stylistic and chronological factors in the statistics, as the proportion of *do* forms is larger in the letters in general than in the autobiography when *know* and *doubt* are excluded. On the whole, however, it is perhaps fairer to state that the development of *do* has more or less reached its final stage by the time of Benjamin Franklin's English. Lexical-verb negation without *do* is restricted to a certain small number of verbs and often to some particular constructions, and this is the case with the letters and autobiography. Apart from *know* and *doubt*, examples without *do* are clearly marginal.

Finally, the above discussion has touched upon some minor features of negation in the BF Corpus and considered their historical implications: *no doubt*, *neither ... nor*, *or not*, and multiple negation.

5. Bibliographical References

- The American Heritage Book of English Usage*. (1996). Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Arai, Y. (1998). Denshi jisho no eigogaku kenkyu eno ôyô (Applied use of electronic dictionaries for English language studies). In T. Saito, J. Nakamura, & I. Akano (Eds.), *Eigo Corpus Gengogaku: Kiso to Jissen* (English Corpus Linguistics). Tokyo: Kenkyusha, pp. 211–232.
- Biber, D. (2001). Dimensions of variation among 18th-century speech-based and written registers. In H.-J. Diller & M. Görlach (Eds.), *Towards a History of English as a History of Genres*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, pp. 89–109.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Blake, N.F. (1996). *A History of the English Language*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

¹⁴ While stating this, Tieken refers to her own earlier work (Tieken 1982).

¹⁵ I need to add a short comment to this citation. Kallel (2011:53–54) cites only the beginning part of this passage and gives the impression that I place emphasis on the Latin influence on the decline of multiple negation, by saying:

she [=Iyeiri] says, "I do not entirely deny the Latin influence upon the decline of multiple negation" (Iyeiri 2001:155). The same idea is also found in Blake (1996): "Double negatives were roundly condemned as illogical because it was said, on the model of Latin, that two negatives made a positive" (1996:264–5[sic, 264 only, instead of 264–5]).

However, this line of mine is followed by additional arguments to the effect that much of the decline of multiple negation occurred

without the influence of Latin, in the Middle English period. The following is the full citation of this passage:

I do not entirely deny the Latin influence upon the decline of multiple negation, but judging from the fact that multiple negation is often more frequent in formal writings than in informal ones in ME, the Latin influence is perhaps more relevant to the MnE [= Modern English] period than to the ME period. And, much of the declining process of multiple negation, in fact, takes place during the ME period. (Iyeiri 2001:155)

Indeed, I do not necessarily deny the influence of Latin on the decline of multiple negation, but clearly, it has been slight in the history of English.

- Burchfield, R.W. 1992. *Points of View: Aspects of Present-Day English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellegård, A. (1953). *The Auxiliary Do: The Establishment and Regulation of its Use in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Haselow, A. (2015). Speech-like syntax in written texts: Changing syntactic conventions in news discourse. In B. Börs & L. Kornexl (Eds.), *Changing Genre Conventions in Historical English News Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 191–221.
- Iyeiri, Y. (1997). Tsūjiteki corpus shiyō ni yoru *or not* no kenkyū (Historical development of *or not*: A study of diachronic corpora). In H. Nishimura (Ed.), *Computer Corpus wo Riyōshita Eigo Hattatsushi Kenkyū* (Corpus-based Research into the Historical Development of English). Annual Report of the Research Supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. 08207106), pp. 21–23.
- Iyeiri, Y. (1999). *Is the Lorde amonge us or not?*: Some observations on *or noon*, *or no*, and *or not* in English Bibles and their historical development. *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 11(1): 89–102.
- Iyeiri, Y. (2001). *Negative Constructions in Middle English*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press.
- Iyeiri, Y. (2004). The use of the auxiliary *do* in negation in *Tom Jones* and some other literary works of the contemporary period, in I. Moskowich-Spiegel Fandiño & B. Crespo Garcia (Eds.), *New Trends in English Historical Linguistics: An Atlantic View*. Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, pp. 223–240.
- Iyeiri, Y. (2010a). *Verbs of Implicit Negation and their Complements in the History of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iyeiri, Y. (2010b). Eigo no hitei kōbun ni okeru *neither A nor B* to *neither A or B*. (*Neither A nor B* vs. *neither A or B* in English negative constructions.) In *Studies in the History of the English Language, 2006–2009*. The Japanese Association for Studies in the History of the English Language. Suita: Osaka Books, pp. 1–5.
- Iyeiri, Y. (2017). The spelling and syntax of *doubt* in Early Modern English: Variation and Latin influence. In M. Uchida, Y. Iyeiri, & L. Schourup (Eds.), *Language Contact and Variation in the History of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, pp. 43–60.
- Iyeiri, Y., Yaguchi, M., and Baba, Y. (2015). Negation and speech style in professional American English. *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University*, 54:181–204. <https://repository.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2433/197457/1/lit54_181-204.pdf>
- Kallel, A. (2011). *The Loss of Negative Concord in Standard English: A Case of Lexical Reanalysis*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of Linguistic Change, Volume 1: Internal Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nakamura, F. (1997). Regulation of negative declarative sentence with auxiliary *do*: Historical facts applicable as subsidiary evidence. *Mulberry*, 46:109–133.
- Nakayama, M. (2007). 19 seiki no hiteikobun (Negative constructions in the 19th century). *The Kyushu Review*, 11:37–57.
- Nevalainen, T. (2006). Negative concord as an English “Vernacular Universal”: Social history and linguistic typology. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 34(3):257–278.
- Nevalainen, T. (2014). Variation in negative correlative conjunctions in 18th-century English. In Ken Nakagawa, et al. (Eds.), *Studies in Modern English: The Thirteenth Anniversary Publication of the Modern English Association*. Tokyo: Eihosha, pp. 21–36.
- Nurmi, A. (1999). *A Social History of Periphrastic Do*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. <<http://www.oed.com/>>
- Peters, P. (2004). *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strang, B.M.H. (1970). *A History of English*. London: Methuen.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1982). Double negation and eighteenth-century English grammars. *Neophilologus*, 66:278–285.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1987). *The Auxiliary Do in Eighteenth-century English: A Sociohistorical-linguistic Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1990). The origin and development of periphrastic auxiliary *do*: A case of destigmatisation. *NOWELE*, 16:3–52.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (2002). Robert Lowth and the strong verb system. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Special Issue of Language Sciences*, 24: 459–469.
- Tottie, G. (1981). Negation and discourse strategy in spoken and written English. In D. Sankoff & H. Cedergren (Eds.), *Variation Omnibus*. Carbondale: Linguistic Research, pp. 271–284.
- Tottie, G. (1988). *No*-negation and *not*-negation in spoken and written English. In M. Kytö, O. Ihalainen, & M. Rissanen (Eds.), *Corpus Linguistics, Hard and Soft: Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 245–265.
- Whitcut, J. (Ed.) (1994). *Eric Partridge, Usage and Abuse: A Guide to Good English*. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company.

6. Language Resource Reference

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Sponsored by The American Philosophical Society and Yale University Digital Edition by The Packard Humanities Institute. <<http://franklinpapers.org/franklin/>>