タイトル
Contractions in Newsweeklies

著者
Sonoda, Kenji

引文

発行日
2004-07-15

URL
http://hdl.handle.net/10069/18044
Contractions in Newsweeklies

Kenji SONODA

Abstract There are two kinds of contractions: verb contraction and negative or not contraction. Forms like he's not, they'll not are called verb contraction because the verbs or auxiliary verbs are contracted, whereas forms like isn't, won't are called negative or not contraction because not is contracted. The objective of this article is to find out the extent to which these two kinds of contractions occur in American newsweeklies and which of these two forms is more frequently used in them. Uncontracted forms like he is not, they will not, are also included for comparison. The material examined here is Newsweek and TIME.
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1 Introduction

Should one say, "he is not studying," or "he isn't studying," or "he's not studying"? Or which should one select from among the following three: "she will not do it," or "she won't do it," or "she'll not do it"? Which would be the most appropriate form? This type of question or perplexity is exactly what prompted me to write this article.

This article is mainly concerned with contractions. He's, she'll, isn't and won't are called contractions. Contractions like he's or she'll are called verb contraction because the verbs or auxiliary verbs are contracted. Contractions like isn't or won't are called negative contraction or not contraction because not is contracted. Verb contraction includes besides he's or she'll the contractions like the following among others: I'm, you're, we've, it's, we'd, there's. Negative contraction or not contraction includes besides isn't or won't the contractions like the following among others: aren't, can't, couldn't, don't, doesn't, haven't, hasn't, hadn't, mustn't, needn't, oughtn't, shouldn't, wasn't, weren't.

Of the two types of verb or negative contraction you're not (he's not), and you aren't (he isn't), which type would be preferred now? There seem to be three different views concerning it. The first is of the opinion that the two forms are commonly used. Collins COBUILD English Usage (1992:158) says:

(1) ...in the case of "be," both types of contraction are equally common." For example, "you're not" and "he's not" are used as commonly as "you aren't" and "he isn't."

Swan (1995:133) is of the same opinion:

(2) The two negative forms of be (e.g. she isn't and she's not) are both common.

In contrast, Quirk et al. (1985:123) say that it is the form with negative contraction (like you aren't, he isn't) that is more common:

(3) Generally speaking, the variant with contracted negation is more common than the variant with contracted verb and full negation.

Leech and Svartvik (1994:307) think the same way: they say, "In general the n't form is more likely."

However, Leech changes his mind later: Leech et al. (2001:103) say that the type she isn't hungry is "less common" than the type she's not hungry. Biber et al. (2002:242), based on their own corpus, agree with this view:

(4) When be contraction is possible, it is strongly favored over not contraction: e.g. you're not, it's not is preferred to you aren't, it's isn't.

With regard to the contracted negative forms used with have, will and would, there seems to be no difference of opinions among grammarians. That is, the types with not contraction are much preferred. For example, Biber et al. (2002:242) say as follows:

(5) ...with the verbs have, will, and would, there is a strong preference for negative contraction: e.g. I haven't, she won't, they wouldn't are much preferred to I've not, she'll not, they'd not.

Apart from I've not, she'll not and they'd not, which do not seem to be so favored now, how about he isn't (you aren't), and he's not (you're not)? Which type is really preferred now? The unabridged form of he isn't
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and he's not is he is not. Then, of these three forms, he is not, he isn't, he's not, which would be the type most favored now? Moreover, expressions like he is not have three negative forms including itself, but there are cases in which only two negative forms are possible: forms that are not contracted like cannot and contracted forms like can't. In this case, of these two forms, which would be the one preferred now? This article tries to explore these questions.

In this article the following are also dealt with: how the negative forms are actually used in the articles in Newsweek and TIME, in what newspapers contractions are not allowed to use, and generally, how contractions should be used.

With respect to the negative forms or types that were taken up for comparison in this article, the following two or three forms in each group were compared based on frequency: he is not, he isn't, he's not; I am not, I'm not; this is not, this isn't; the picture (Iraq) is not, the picture (Iraq) isn't; was not, wasn't, were not, weren't; do not, don't, doesn't, did not, didn't; cannot, can't, couldn't, will not, won't, would not, wouldn't; have not, haven't, has not, hasn't, had not, hadn't.


2 Contractions in Newsweeklies

2.1 He is not, he isn't, he's not; I am not, I'm not; this is not, this isn't; the picture (Iraq) is not, the picture (Iraq) isn't

2.1.1 He is not, he isn't, he's not

The negative forms that are included here are as follows: he (she) is not, he (she) isn't, he's (she's) not; you (we, they) are not, you (we, they) aren't, you're (we're, they're) not, it (that) is not, it (that) isn't, it's (that's) not; who is not, who isn't, who's not; there is not, there isn't, there's not.

Each of these groups has three ways of negative expression. In this category, taken altogether, the type that is most favored is the type of verb contraction: he's not. In the two weeklies, it occurred in 51 instances (68%). It was followed by the type without contractions: he is not. In the two weeklies, it occurred in 15 instances (20%). The type with the fewest number of instances is the type of not contraction: he isn't. It occurred in nine instances (12%).

Interestingly, each of these three types is used almost at the same rate in the two weeklies: the type he's not occurred in Newsweek 26 times and in TIME 25 times, the type he is not occurred six times in Newsweek and in TIME nine times, and the type he isn't occurred four times in Newsweek, and in TIME five times.

When the subject is a pronoun, or the existential there is used, the number of occurrences of each negative form in this category was as follows. He's not and he is not were used six times each, but he isn't was not used at all. She's not and she is not occurred twice each, whereas she isn't did not occur. You're not occurred five times, you are not once, and you aren't did not occur at all. We're not appeared five times, while we aren't and we are not did not appear at all. They're not and they aren't appeared four times each and they are not twice. It's not was used 20 times, it is not three times, and it isn't once. That's not occurred five times, while that isn't and that is not occurred once each. There's not and there isn't were used once each, but there is not was not used.

He's not, he isn't, and he is not need further comments. In Newsweek and TIME he's not occurred three times each. He is not was used six times in TIME, but in Newsweek it was not used at all. He isn't did not appear at all in the two weeklies.

The numbers of occurrences described above suggest that, overall, with the types he's not and he isn't, there is a strong preference for the type he's not. It also suggests that, although instances are confined to the two American newsmagazines, simply put, Collins COBUILD English Usage (1992:158), Swan (1995:133), Quirk et al. (1985:123), and Leech and Svartvik (1994:307) are all wrong, and that Leech et al. (2001:103) and Biber et al. (2002:242) are right.

2.1.2 I am not, I'm not

In this case we have a choice between I am not and I'm not. (I ain't was not found in the newsmagazines.) I'm not occurred five times, and I am not four times in the two weeklies. Consequently, it seems that with these two forms, I'm not seems to be used almost as often as I am not, but it cannot be said so definitely because the instances are relatively few.

2.1.3 This is not, this isn't

Of the two forms this is not and this isn't, this is not is used in almost all cases: it occurred 11 times in both weeklies, and this isn't only once.

2.1.4 The picture (Iraq) is not, the picture (Iraq) isn't

The types included here are: the picture (Iraq) is
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not, the picture (Iraq) isn't; his staff are not, his staff aren't.

When the subject is a common noun or a proper noun, there are cases where be is contracted: my son's not, Bush's not or Mary's not. However, no such instances were found in the two weeklies, and only two types of negative expression were seen: the picture (Iraq) is not (his staff are not), and the picture (Iraq) isn't (his staff aren't). In this case, the situations seem a little different from those referred to in the previous sections. All in all, in the two weeklies the types the picture (Iraq) is not and his staff are not are used almost as frequently as the types the picture isn't (Iraq isn't) and his staff aren't: the types the picture (Iraq) is not and his staff are not were seen in 40 instances (51%), and the types the picture (Iraq) isn't and his staff aren't in 38 instances (49%).

To look at each weekly separately, in Newsweek there were 24 instances of the types the picture (Iraq) is not and his staff are not, and in TIME 16 instances of them; in Newsweek there were 18 instances of the types the picture (Iraq) isn't and his staff aren't and in TIME 20 instances of them.

2.2 Was not, wasn't; were not, weren't

When the subject is a pronoun or noun, the types wasn't and weren't are preferred to the types was not and were not: in the two weeklies the types wasn't and weren't were seen in 38 instances (60%), and the types was not and were not in 25 instances (40%). If we look at the instances in each weekly, in Newsweek there were 12 instances of wasn't and weren't, and in TIME 26 instances of them; in Newsweek there were seven instances of was not and were not and in TIME 18 instances of them.

2.3 Do not, don't, does not, doesn't; did not, didn't

In the types do (does) not and don't (doesn't), don't and doesn't are used far more frequently than do not and does not: there were 139 instances (85%) of don't and doesn't, and 25 instances (15%) of do not and does not in the two weeklies. To look at this more minutely, don't and doesn't occurred 65 times in Newsweek and in TIME 73 times; in Newsweek do not and does not occurred 10 times and in TIME 15 times.

With respect to did not and didn't, didn't is used about twice as often as did not: there were 56 instances (64%) of didn't and 31 instances (36%) of did not.

2.4 Cannot, can't; could not, couldn't

With cannot and can't, can't is used more than twice as often as cannot. There were altogether 39 instances (71%) of can't, and 16 instances (29%) of cannot in both weeklies. To look at each weekly separately, in Newsweek can't appeared 15 times and in TIME 20 times; in Newsweek cannot appeared 10 times and in TIME six times.

Couldn't is used almost twice as often as could not in the two newsmagazines: there were 21 instances (68%) of couldn't and 10 instances (32%) of could not.

2.5 Will not, won't; would not, wouldn't

In the types will not and won't, won't is used almost three times as often as will not: won't was used 33 times (77%) in both of the weeklies and will not 10 times (23%). More precisely, won't occurred 14 times in Newsweek and in TIME 19 times; will not occurred five times in each of these weeklies.

With the types would not and wouldn't, would not is used relatively often: it occurred 11 times in the two weeklies as against 17 times of wouldn't.

(In this study, there were no such instances of verb contraction as he'll not, you'll not, they'll not, or he'd not, you'd not, they'd not.)

2.6 Have not, haven't, has not, hasn't; had not, hadn't

In the types have not, haven't, has not, hasn't, all of which are used with a past participle in the present perfect, haven't and hasn't occur more than twice as frequently as have not and has not in both of the newsweeklies: there were 29 instances (72.5%) of haven't and hasn't, and 11 instances (27.5%) of have not and has not.

With haven't and hasn't, they appeared 16 times in Newsweek and in TIME 13 times. In Newsweek have not and has not occurred almost as often as in TIME: in Newsweek and TIME they occurred five times each.

Hadn't, which is used with a past participle in the past perfect, occurred more often than had not in the two newsmagazines: hadn't was used 11 times and had not twice.

(In this study no instances of haven't, hasn't, hadn't, which are used in the past perfect, were found.)

3 Contractions in Newsweeklies and Newspapers, and Contractions in General

3.1 Contractions in newsweeklies and newspapers

According to Biber et al. (1999:1129), the register in which the largest number of the examples of verb or negative contraction is found is conversation, followed by fiction, news, and academic writing. It means that news has the third largest number of verb or not contraction. And as can be clearly seen from what we
have discussed so far, generally in news—this time the two American newsmagazines—a variety of contracted forms are used far more often than the forms that are not contracted. But naturally, it does not mean that, in the weeklies, only the contracted negative expressions are used. Normally, contracted expressions are used along with those without contractions in articles. For example, the author of an article in *TIME* uses five contracted negative expressions in his one-page article with a few lines or dozens of lines separating them—*didn't, won't, isn't, don't, shouldn't*, and among them he puts four full negative forms—*are not, he is not, they are not, does not*. As a result, these contracted forms and those that are not contracted occurred in one page in this order: *didn't, are not, he is not, they are not, does not, won't, isn't, don't, shouldn't*. The following are the excerpts of sentences from his article that have negative forms:

(6) A rock star of politics, *he didn't* disappoint. But the expectations *are not* simply a function of the fact that he is *not* Chretien. 
...*to do something they are not* always comfortable doing
...*that does not* mean that the Bush Administration will get. ...

Many of the *security first* policies *won't* fly in Canada. But Canada *isn't* a frigid version of the U.S. 
*You don't have to come up here and help us out,* says Martin.
...*there's no reason the President shouldn't* take a trip to Ottawa. 

Michael Elliott, "Wake Up, Canada, Your Leader's Calling"  (*TIME, Nov. 24, 2003*)

In this fashion, in most cases, contracted forms and those without contractions commingle in an article. However, there are some who have a predilection for forms that are not contracted and purposefully use only these forms, and seldom use contracted ones. For example, the author of an article in *Newsweek* has a strong liking for negative forms without contractions: he uses eight negative forms without contractions in his one-page article, and would not use contractions. These negative expressions he uses are: *they are not, does not, it is not, is not, are not, will not, who are not, would not*. Here are the excerpts of sentences from his article that have negative forms:

(7) "*They are not* ready," administration officials explained. ...

This *does not* bode well for a democratic Iraq; it is *not even likely to solve* ...

...the resistance in Iraq is *not* the work of a small band of dead-enders. 
...the locals *are not* actively informing on them. ...

A purely military response *will not* address this problem. These are the people *who are not* helping the Army hunt down the guerrillas. 

One certainly *would not* want a Shiite problem in Iraq. 

Fareed Zakaria, "Job One: Solve the Sunni Problem"  (*Newsweek, Nov. 24, 2003*)

It goes without saying that by using only the forms without contractions, the author is trying to make his article all the more formal. Thus far I have confined my discussion only to such American weeklies as *Newsweek* and *TIME*. But what about the other weeklies or newspapers? Is the trend same? It seems that it is not necessarily so. For one thing, one can hardly find contracted forms in *The Economist*, the British weekly. It seems to be the policy of this weekly not to use contractions. With respect to newspapers, for example, one can seldom find contractions in *The New York Times*. But it is no wonder. This newspaper makes it a company policy not to use contractions except "in quotations, texts and transcripts." The following are quoted from *The New York Times Manual of Style and Usage*:

(8) In straightforward news copy, spell out expressions like *is not, has not, have not, do not, are not, will not, etc. Contractions are acceptable in quotations, in text and transcripts, in light or humorous copy and in headlines and subheadings of all kinds.

*(Siegal and Connolly, 1999:83)*

Furthermore, one can rarely find contractions in *The Washington Post* either. This newspaper also restricts the use of contractions. Here are the quotes from *The Washington Post Deskbook on Style*:

(9) Contractions convey an informal tone more appropriate for feature stories and commentary than for straight news. In any type of story, however, contractions are used in quotations when the speaker actually used them. 

*(Lippman, 1989:92)*

### 3.2 Contractions in general

Although there are newsweeklies or newspapers that are against using them, today contractions seem to have penetrated deep into the area where formality
was the norm. Randall (1988:88) says that with the disappearance of the distinction between speech and writing, more and more contracted expressions have come to appear in print nowadays:

(10) True, writers of textbooks and scholarly works have traditionally avoided contractions, and many novelists and short-story writers have preferred not to use them in narrative passages. Yet, with the fading of the once-sharp distinction between speech and writing, more and more shortened forms of words and phrases appear in print nowadays. And not only in newspaper and magazines articles, but also in works of fiction and nonfiction wherever writers choose to address their readers in a relaxed, somewhat informal way.

But, of course, using too many contractions is not praiseworthy. Flesch (1949:97, repr.1967) warns against using contractions "at every single opportunity":

(11) Don't start using...contractions...at every single opportunity from here on. It's not as simple as that. Contractions have to be used with care. Sometimes they fit, sometimes they don't. It depends on whether you would use the contraction in speaking that particular sentence (e.g. in this sentence I would say you would and not you'd). It also depends on whether the contraction would help or hinder the rhythm that would suit your sentence for proper emphasis. So don't try to be consistent about this; it doesn't work. You have to go by feel, not by rule.¹

Trimble (1975:78) advises us to occasionally use contractions. He also says that a person who would not use contractions is "a prude":

(12) Use occasional contractions. They'll keep you from taking yourself too seriously, tell your reader that you're not a prude, and help you achieve a more natural, conversational rhythm in your style.²

Kuhn (1985:160) tells us that, if used judiciously, contractions can give "a relaxed and mildly informal tone":

(13) Judicious use of the contracted forms can give a relaxed and mildly informal tone in all but the most ceremonious contexts.

Garner (1998:165) says that by using contractions we will gain "a relaxed sincerity":

(14) The common fear is that using contractions can make the writing seem breezy. For most of us, though, that risk is nil. What you gain should be a relaxed sincerity—not breeziness.

I have seen so far to what extent contractions are used today. I am afraid we Japanese have a predilection for not using contractions even when we have to write informal letters. We tend to write informal letters as if they were formal letters. Most of us do not even know where we should use contractions or how often we should use contractions. Many of us have not been taught how to write English sentences using contractions; many of us have not taught our students how to write English sentences using contractions. In order to gain "a relaxed sincerity," or in order not to be called "a prude," isn't it high time we taught our students how to write English sentences using contractions?

4 Conclusion

In this article, the following were discussed: first, which is the most favored form of the two or three negative expressions in the two American newsweeklies; second, how negative expressions are actually used in one-page articles in the two weeklies and what newspapers are against using contractions; third, how we should use contractions and what effects contractions have upon our style.

In this article, it has become clear that although there are a few exceptions, in the two American newsmagazines there is a strong preference for contracted expressions. To be specific, in the types he is not, he isn't, he's not, the type he's not is used most often. In each of the following pairs of negative forms, the first is preferred to the second: this is not, this isn't; wasn't (weren't), was (were) not; don't (doesn't), do (does) not; didn't, did not; can't, cannot; won't, will not; wouldn't, would not; haven't (hasn't), have (has) not; hadn't, had not. The type the picture (Iraq) isn't seems to be used almost as often as the type the picture (Iraq) is not. With respect to I've not, she'll not, they'd not, there were no instances of them, and it may mean that they are coming to be used less frequently.

Contractions are informal expressions, which means that informality is prevalent at least in the two American newsmagazines. Which expression one chooses in preference to the other would in itself be a matter of personal preference, but it seems that this choice is largely dependent upon which type is easier to pronounce, which form has a more natural rhythm, which expression everyone else is using, and what not.
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