

COMBINED MEETING HELD

by Fred Steckert

A combined meeting of the news paper staff and the Belle Lettre Society was held on Feb. 21, 1958 in the Botany Lab. The meeting was conducted by Tom Maxwell, Editor in Chief of the Highacres Collegian. The meeting was not well attended, but the newspaper did acquire three new members. (Ted Minor, John Zisek, & Donald Zanoline).

At the meeting, Mr. Maxwell mentioned that if the newspaper or Belle Lettre Society received any worthy fiction, non-fiction, drama, or poetic writing it will be sent to Bantam Books for their newest edition of New Campus Writing. Mr. Maxwell also mentioned that the newspaper is acquiring a new typewriter. Now all that we need is another typist.

A committee comprised of Ted Minor, Stan Zdep, John Bodnor, and Olga Markus was appointed by Mr. Maxwell to try to improve the character of the articles printed by the paper.

Mr. Kafka, faculty advisor of the Collegian and Mr. Schneider, assistant administrative head, were in attendance at the meeting and gave several helpful suggestions to the newspaper staff on improving the biweekly issue.

\*\*\*\*\*

There ain't nothing wrong with ain't

by

Wilfred Funk (The American Weekly)

I have a friend who came out of college and landed a job as a minor boss in a trucking company. When his gang was loading a van he would say, "Get those crates on the truck." His men sulked themselves into a slowdown and finally refused to work for him at all. Then he took to saying, "Get them crates on the truck," and suddenly he was a respected foreman and a pal.

If you ask me for a match and I say, "I ain't got none," I will have double-negatived you into a complete understanding of my deplorable deficiency, but five will get you 10 that I won't be invited to your next cocktail party, and that you

will look the other way when we pass on the street.

Grammar, you see, is really what your hearers expect. "I saw him" might get you the jaundiced eye from those truckers I mentioned, and "I seen him" might spell the end of your social aspirations elsewhere. Yet both are "correct." It all depends on the orbit in which you happen to be moving.

I don't recommend speech with the stigma of outlawry on it. Certainly you won't get the best job with it. But don't try to tell me it's incorrect. It is merely unacceptable on some levels.

Now who are the special villains who wished all this grammatical nonsense on us? The double negative, for instance?

Well, back in 18th century England, Latin was the language of the court and the intelligentsia. The bigwigs of that time decided to push for a "universal world grammar" suitable for all times and all languages - based, of course, on classical Latin.

The fact that its structure was radically different from English didn't feaze the eager reformers in the least. So, in 1762, Robert Lowth, a pompous British divine, got out a book called Short Introduction to English Grammar, intended to "lay down the rules" and, in addition, to "judge every form and construction."

This boy was his own authority. He needed no help from nobody. He said that two negatives destroy each other and make a positive. He just said it, right out of his own head and, ever since, we've been stuck with it. This means that when your son says, "I don't want no spinach," his tongue should really be hanging out for it.

But Bishop Lowth wasn't even a good Latin scholar. Latin, Greek too, are full of double negatives, used for emphasis. The modern Frenchman still  
(cont on next page)