Negation in the Wycliffite Bible

Negation in the Wycliffite Bible*

Shuichi Aita

INTRODUCTION

The Wycliffite Bible is generally considered as a word-for-word translation of the Latin Vulgate. This is, however, true of the Earlier Version of the Bible alone. In the first complete translation of the Bible, Wycliffe and his collaborators adopted the verbatim Anglicization willingly or unwillingly in the immature circumstances of biblical translation, and this Anglicization entails much awkwardness on the syntactic and lexical domain of language. The awkardness in the Earlier Version is certainly improved in the Later Version. But when we think how much the translators struggled to render the original at once accurately and effectively, the textual differences also ought to be examined from a stylistic point of view, because the accurate and effective translation of divine words shows the writer's stylistic character; in other words, his attitude towords God through the vernacular language.

In order to evaluate the language of each Version, we must, first of all, get a comparative study of the texts by a descriptive way. In this paper, we shall restrict ourselves to the problem of negation and give historical explanations of each phenomenon if possible. References will be made to the original Vulgate when necessary or desirable. The chief reason why we choose negation as a topic is: the negation is not only a grammatical problem, but it shows conspicuously the writer's stylistic character in the days of Wycliffe when, as is commonly found in Chaucer, the cumulative negation is frequently used.

We shall examine the negation from the following aspects: negative morphemes in Chapter 1; negative combination in Chapter 2; word order in a negative sentence in Chapter 3; syntactic differences between the two Versions in Chapter 4.

The corpus examined here is the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. When the examples are seldom or never found within our corpus, some examples are quoted from *MED* or *OED* or other sources.

I NEGATIVE MORPHEMES

1.1 Adverbs
1.1.1 *Not / nat* and its variant *noȝt*

The standard negative adverb in WB is *not,* which was derived from the combination of OE *na, no* and *wiht:* the former was used for sentence negation and the latter for reinforcement with the meaning of 'something, thing.' *Nat* occurs for the most part in EV of Matthew, and *noȝt* in only three cases, Matt 2 : 18 (LV), John 9 : 29 (EV), John 12 : 49 (EV). Examples are :

  Matt 5 : 21[1]
    (EV) Thou shal *nat* slea
    (LV) Thou schalt *not* slee

(V) *non* occides

John 12 : 49

(EV) I haue *noȝt* spokun of my silf

(LV) Y haue *not* spokun of my silf

(V) *non* sum locutus

1.1.2 *Neuer* and its variant *nere*

Neuer, a negative temporal adverb, appears as an emphatic negative from EME on.

Matt 21 : 16

(EV) wher ȝe han nat rad

(LV) whether ȝe han *neuer* redde

(V) *numquam*

Neuer in this example has the sense of negative temporality, while in the following it is used as an emphatic negative.

Luke 15 : 29

(EV) I brak *neuere* thi comaundement

(LV) Y *neuer* brak thi comaundement

(V) *numquam*

John 9 : 21

(EV) how he seeth now, we witen not, or who openyde his yȝen, we witen not

(LV) hou he seeth now, we witen *neuer,*[2] or who openyde hise iȝen, we witen nere

(V) *nescimus···nescimus*

Latin *numquam* is replaced by *neuer;* and the contracted form *nescio* by *witen neuer.* *Nere* is used in John 12 : 35, where *woot nere* occurs.

1.1.3 *Neither*

Although *neither* is mainly used as a conjunction in correlation with *ne, nor,* etc.' as in 'Joon cam *nether* etynge *ne* driynkynge (Matt 11 : 18),' *nether* in the examples below appears alone as an adverb:

Matt 6 : 29

(EV) *neither* Salamon in al his glorie was keuerid as oon of thes[3]

(LV) Salomon in al his glorie was not keuered as oon of these

(V) *nec*

John 4 : 11

(EV) *nether* thou hast in what thing thou schalt drawe

(LV) thou hast not where ynne to drawe

(V) *neque*

Nether in EV occurs due to the literal translation of the Latin *nec/neque,* but it is replaced by *not,* an ordinary adverb, in LV.

1.1.4 *Ne*

The appearance of the adverb, whether singly or with other negative(s) (*e.g.ne...not),* is extremely rare in WB, which conforms to the general observation that *ne* by itself is rare in the fourteenth century and "the practical disappearance of *ne* and exclusive use of *not* was reached in the fifteenth century."[4] Chaucer, accoding to Jack, uses the older forms *ne* alone and *ne...not* more often in Boece, which is a translation of Latin.[5] From

this, it seems natural that these two forms should rarely be used in WB, because the writer of WB, not a literary work, needed no formal, dignified and old-fashioned style there as in Chaucer's works.
The rare examples are :
  Luke 1 : 3
    (EV) *Ne* drede thou
    (LV) *Ne* drede thou *not*
    (V) *Ne* timeas
Other examples are : Matt 5 : 47 (LV) and Matt 24 : 2 (LV).

1.1.5 *Nothing*

  Nothing, from OE *nan ping,* is often used as an emphatic negative all through ME.
  Matt 27 : 24[6]
    (EV) Pilat seynge that he profitide *no thing*
    (LV) Pilat seynge that he profitide *no thing*
    (V) *nihil* proficeret
  Galatians 4 : 1
    (EV) how moche tyme the eyr is litil, he dyuersith *no thing* fro a seruaunt[7]
    (LV) as long tyme as the eir is a litil child, he dyuersith *no thing* fro a seruaunt
    (V) *nihil* differt
Other examples are : John 6 : 64 and Galatian 5 : 2. *Nihil* is a main correspondent to *nothing*; in John 6 : 64 the Latin is *non...quicquam.*

1.1.6 *Nay*

  According to *OED,*[8] it is "a word used to express negation, dissent, denial, or refusal, in answer to some statement, question, command, etc." Etymologically it is derived from Old Norse *nei.*
  Luke 13 : 9
    (EV) if it schal make fruyt, ellis in tyme to comynge thou schalt kitte it down
    (LV) if it schal make fruyt, if *nay*, in tyme comynge thou schalt kitte it doun
    (V) *sin*
MED (s.v.*nai* adv. (b)) has another example of *nay* as an adverb besides Luke 13 : 9 (LV):
  Genesis 24 : 21
    (LV) he ...wolde wite whether the Lord hadde sped his wei, ethir *nay*

1.1.7 *None*

  The adverbial accusative of the neuter pronoun *none* has developed the force of a negative with much the same meaning as an emphatic *not.*[9] From a viewpoint of use, it seems to be a general rule in WB that *none* is used, unlike *not,* as an adverb with comparative or *other* or in another kind of construction.[10]
  Matt 11 : 11
    (EV) ther roose *noon more* than Joon Baptist amonge children of women
    (LV) ther roos *noon more* than Joon Baptist among the children of wymmen
    (V) *non* surrexit inter nato mulierum *maior* Iohanne Baptista
  John 6 : 22
    (EV) there was *non othir* boot there no but oon

(LV) ther was *noon other* boot there but oon

    (V) vidit...navicula *alia non* erat ibi nisi una

Luke 10 : 6

    (EV) if a sone of pees schal be there, ȝoure pees schal reste on him; if *non,* it schal turne aȝen to ȝou

    (LV) if a sone of pees be there, ȝoure pees schal reste on hym ; but if *noon,* it schal turne aȝen to ȝou

      (V) *sin*

A little more discussion about the first two examples, where *none* is used in an idiomatic phrase, will be made in 2.3 with other kinds of combination. *Non* in the last example in the meaning of 'not' is uncommon in ME and WB. *MED* (s. v. *non* adv.(1) (c)), however, gives another construction *or/other non* as an idiom:

Genesis 24 : 21

    (EV) He ...wilnyng to wite whether the Lord maad his weye welsom, *or noon*

    (V) *an non*

So far we have roughly examined all kinds of negative adverbs which appear in WB. The uses of these adverbs are the same as those in other contemporary works. One noteworthy fact is that in negative (and interrogative) sentences we can find no periphrastic *don,* which is already used, though not often, in negations and questions in Wycliffe's time.

1.2 Adjectives

1.2.1 *No* and *non*

The attributive adjective *no* occurs before a consonant, as in *no ston* ; *non* before a vowel, as in *non aventure.* Later, about 1600, *no* begins to be used before both a consonant and vowel.[12] The examples below are those where *no* and *non* are used as attributive adjectives, conforming with the phonological rule of that time:

Matt 17 : 9

    (EV) Saie ȝe to *no* man the visioun

    (LV) Seie ȝe to *no* man the visioun

    (V) *nemini* dixeritis visionem

Mark 4 : 6

    (EV) it hadde not roote

    (LV) it hadde *no* roote[13]

    (V) *non* haberet radicem

John 19 : 9

    (EV) Jhesu ȝaf not answere to him

    (LV) Jhesus ȝaf *noon* answere to him

    (V) responsum *non* dedit

The combination *no man* is often found, in terms of Kerkhof, "forming semi-compounds referring to persons."[14]

The following is a phonetically interesting example:

Matt 20 : 13

    (EV) I do thee *no* wronge

    (LV) Y do thee *noon* wrong

    (V) *non* facio tibi iniuriam

Although the word after the negative does not begin with a vowel (phonetically, [w] is a semi-vowel), the attributive negative *noon* occurs in LV of Matt 20 : 13. It seems quite difficult to regard this *noon* as an adverb, that is to say, modifying the verb *do,* not the noun *wrong,* because *noon* as an adverb is generally used with comparatives or *other* in WB, and *OED* (s.v. Wrong sb² 2c) regards *wrong* as a noun in the idiom 'to do wrong.'

As in the example below, the use of *noon* before *h* may analogically be justified by Jespersen's statement that "Chaucer and Caxton have *an* not only before a vowel, but also before *h* (similarly *mine*)."[15]

John 4 : 17
    (EV) I haue not an hosebonde
    (LV) Y haue *noon* hosebonde
     (V) *non* habeo virum

1.3   Pronouns
1.3.1 *Noon*

Noon in the below example is used as a pronoun in the sense of 'no person(s)':[16]
John 10:28
    (EV) ony man schal not rauysch hem (=my scheep) of myn hond
    (LV) *noon* schal rauysche hem fro myn hoond
     (V) *non* rapiet eas *quisquam*
The following is the example which occurs in the *of*-phrase:[17]
Luke 14:24
    (EV) *noone of* tho men that ben clepid, schal taaste my souper
    (LV) *noon of* tho men that ben clepid, schal taaste my soper
     (V) *nemo*
Other examples are: Mark 11 : 2 (EV) and John 17 : 12 (LV). In the *noon of*-phrase construction, the original Latin is *nemo (=ne + homo),* which is rendered into *noon of men/noon of* + pronoun. The following example shows that Latin *nemo* is rendered into *no man*:
Lake 1 : 61
    (EV) *no man* is in thi kyn, that is clepid bi this name
    (LV) *no man* is in thi kynrede, that is clepid this name
     (V) *nemo*

1.3.2 *Nouȝt*
While *OED* does not give any use as a pronoun to *nouȝt /naught, MED* treats it as a pronoun, explaining that it is used with the copula *ben* in the sense of 'nothing, naught.'[18]
The example is:
John 8 : 54
    (EV) If I glorifie my silf, my glorie is *noȝt*
    (LV) If Y glorifie my silf, my glorie is *nouȝt*
     (V) gloria mea *nihil* est
Another example from *MED* is :
Galatians 6 : 3
    (EV) if ony man gessith him silf for to be ouȝt, whanne he is *noȝt,* he disceyueth him
      silf

(LV) who that trowith that he be ou3t, whanne he is *nou3t,* he bigilith him silf

(V) cum sit *nihil*

1.4 Prepositions

Here will be examined prepositions such as *but, without,* having a "privative sense."[19]

1.4.1 *But*

The local sense 'outside' in OE *butan* does not survive in ME any longer. *But* is common in the privative sense 'without, except' in ME. Although Mustanoja says that in LME *but* begins to give way to *without* and *except,*[20] it is current in the sense of 'except' in WB.

Matt 17 : 8

(EV) thei...sawen no man, *no but* Jhesus aloon

(LV) thei...saien no man, *but* Jhesu aloone

(V) *nisi* solus Iesum

Mark 2 : 7

(EV) who may for3eue synnes, *no but* God alone ?

(LV) who may for3yue synnes, *but* God aloone ?

(V) *nisi* solus Deus

What we should notice in the above examples is that the privative *but* almost always occurs in a negative sentence or a rhetorical question, and that it is very often accompanied by adverbs like *alone* and *only. Nisi* is replaced in EV by *no but,* which in turn is replaced in LV by *but.* It is probably reasonable to assume that *no but* in EV should be under the influence of a word-for-word translation of Latin *nisi* (=*ne* + *si*). A little more detailed comment on its origin will be given in 1.5.1.

1.4.2 *Without*

"The earliest meaning of *without(en)* (late OE *wiþutan,* from *wiþ* +*utan*) is 'outside of,' as opposite to *within,* both expressing position and direction."[21] The following is the example having that meaning:

Luke 4 : 29

(EV) thei risen vp, and castiden out him *wtih oute* the citee

(LV) thei risen vp, and drouen hym out *with out* the citee

(V) *extra* civitatem

On the other hand, "in a privative sense, as an opposite of *with,* the preposition is common."[22] In WB *without* in this sense occurs much more frequently than that in the local sense. Examples are :

Matt 15 : 9

(EV) thei worshipen me *with outen* cause

(LV) thei worschipen me *with outen* cause

(V) *sine*

Luke 22 : 35

(EV) Whanne I sente 3ou *with oute* sachel, and scrip, and schoone, wher ony thing failide to 3ou ?

(LV) Whanne Y sente 3ou *with outen* sachel, and scrippe, and schone, whether ony thing failide to 3ou ?

(V) *sine*

Other examples are: Matt 13 : 22 and Matt 15 : 16

Without in the sense of 'outside of' corresponds to Latin *extra*; that in the sense of 'with absence of'[23], or in a privative sense, to *sine*

1.4.3 *Out of*

Out of has expressed both a concrete and abstract sense. Some examples are found though its frequency is lower than that of *without*:

Luke 1 : 17

(EV) he schal turne the hertis of fadris in to sones, and men *out of* bileue to the
    prudence of iuste men

(LV) he schal turne the hertis of the fadris in to the sone, and men *out of* bileue to
    the prudence of iust men

(V) *incredibiles*

Mark 5 : 10

(EV) he preide hym myche, that he shulde nat put hym *out of* the cuntreie

(LV) he preiede Jhesu myche, that he schulde not putte hym *out of* the cuntrei

(V) *extra*

Out of of the former example has an abstract meaning, or 'without'; that of the latter has a concrete meaning, or 'outside'.

1.4.4 *Outtaken*

"The preposition *out-taken,* originally a translation-loan modelled on the Latin and French absolute participles *excepto* and *excepté,* is used before or after the governing noun."[24] In WB the influence of the translation-loan from Latin causes some examples.

Matt 5 : 32

(EV) euery man that shal leeue his wyf, *outaken* cause of fornicacioun, he makith hire
    do lecherie.

(LV) euery man that leeueth his wijf, *outtakun* cause of fornycaioun, makith hir to
    do letcherie

(V) *excepta* fornicationis causa

Another example is Mark 11 : 13, where *praeter* is replaced by *out taken*.

1.5 Conjunctions

Here conjunctions (*no) but (ȝif), save that* and *lest* will be illustrated: the first two are
parallel to '*if...not*'; the third to '(in order) that ...not.'

1.5.1 (*no) but*

When the Latin conjunction is *nisi, no but* is generally used in EV and *but* in LV, with
variants such as *no but ȝif* and *but if* as in:

Matt 5 : 20

(EV) *no but ȝif* ȝoure riȝtwisnesse shal be more plenteuouse than of scribis and
    Pharisees, ȝee shulen not entre in to kyngdam of heuenes

(LV) *but* ȝour riȝtfulnesse be more plenteuouse than of scribis and of Farisees, ȝe
    schulen not entre into kyngdom of heuenes

(V) *nisi...* abundaverit

Matt 24 : 22

　　　(EV) *no but* tho dayes hadden be breggid, al fleisch, that is, mankynde, schulde not
　　　　be maad saaf

　　　(LV) *but* tho daies hadden be abreggide, ech flesch schulde not be maad saaf

　　　　(V) *nisi* breviaiti fuissent dies ille

　John 6 : 44

　　　(EV) No man may come to me, *no but* the fadir that sente me, schal drawe him

　　　(LV) No man may come to me, *but if* the fadir that sente me, drawe hym

　　　(V) *nisi...* traxerit

When the original uses *si...non, ȝif/if...not* is used in both EV and LV as in:

　Matt 18 : 17

　　　(EV) *ȝif* he shal *nat* heere hem, seie thou to the chirche. Forsothe *ȝif* he shal *not*
　　　　heere the chirche, be hee to thee as an hethen and a puplicane

　　　(LV) *if* he herith *not* hem, seie thou to the chirche. But *if* he herith *not* the chirche,
　　　　be he as an hethen and a pupplican to thee

　　　(V) *si...non* audierit

　　　　si...non audierit

Let us give some consideration to the appearance of *no but* in the sense of 'unless,except
that'. *MED* (s.v. *no-but* (c)) assumes that it comes from the misundertanding of Latin *nisi*
—though literally *ni,* a variant of *ne,* is to *no* and *si* is to *if* — and the dictionary gives
several examples of *no but,* all except one quoted from WB. Visser also discusses some
examples of the conjunction *but* under the heading of "No but; no but that. In Wyclif."[25]
We may say from this that *no but* is derived from the Latin word *nisi* and it is one of
the chararacteristics of WB, especially of EV. The fact that *no but* is rarely used as a
conjunction in LV (though it occurs in other corpora and manuscripts) indicates that it
was considered as unidiomatic even in that time..

1.5.2　*Save that*

　Save that is rarely found in WB. It was not until the fifteenth century that there
appeared other synoymous conjunctions *except* and *unless*[26]. An example is:

　Mark 6 : 5

　　　(EV) he myȝte not make there ony vertu, no but heelide a fewe sike men,the hondis
　　　　put to

　　　(LV) he myȝte not do there ony vertu, *save that* he helide a fewe sijk men, leiynge on
　　　　hem hise hoondis

　　　(V) *nisi* ...curavit

1.5.3　*lest*

　It is a general rule that the negative conjunction *lest* is used when in the original the
negative conjunction *ne* introduces a subordinate clause; that *that... not* is used when *ut
non* appears there. Examples are:

　Matt 4 : 6

　　　(EV) thei shulden take thee in hoondis, *lest* perauenture thou hurte thi fote at a stoon

　　　(LV) thei schulen take thee in hondis, *lest* perauenture thou hirte thi foot at a stoon

　　　(V) *ne...* offendas

　John 12 : 40

(EV) He hath blyndid her y3en, and he hath endurid, or maad hard, the herte of hem, *that* thei se *not* with y3en, and vndirstonde with herte

(LV) He hath blyndid her i3en, and he hath maad hard the herte of hem, *that* thei se *not* with i3en, and vndurstonde with herte

(V) *ut non* videant[27]

Other negative conjunctions *ne* and *neither* will be discussed in 2.4.

1.6 Affixes

According to Jespersen, "English has three important negative prefixes, *un-, in-* with its variants according to the following sound *il-, im-,* and *ir-,* and *an-* or *a-*."[28] We are here to examine the first two, *un-* and *in-* with its variants, because the last *an-* or *a-* seems to be no longer felt as a negative prefix; moreover, as *MED* (s.v.*a-* pref (1)) says that "the force of *a-* is very vague even in early ME." The prefix *un-* has two senses —negative and privative. First, let us consider the negative *un-*.

1.6.1 Negative prefix *un-*

This prefix "has in all periods been attached to innumerable words."[29]

We shall examine three types: *un* + noun, *un* + adjective (including past participle adjective), and *un* + adverb. Since the *un* + verb type means privativity, it will be dealt with in the next section.

Type: *un* + noun

Matt 17 : 19

　　(EV) *vnbyleue*　(LV) *vnbileue*　(V) *incredulitatem*

Matt 23 : 25

　　(EV) *vnclennesse*　(LV) *vnclennesse*　(V) *inmunditia*

Mark 9 : 23

　　(EV) *vnbileuefulnesse*　(LV) *vnbileue*　(V) *incredulitatem*

Mark 7 : 22

　　(EV) *vnchastite*　(LV) *vnchastite*　(V) *inpudicitia*

Luke 6 : 11

　　(EV) *vnwysdom*　(LV) *vnwisdom*　(V) *insipientia*

John 7 : 18

　　(EV) *vnri3tfulnesse*　(LV) *vnri3twisnesse*　(V) *iniustitia*

Type: *un* + adjective

Matt 3 : 12

　　(EV) *unquenchable,* or that neuer shal be quenched

　　(LV) that mai not be quenchid

　　(V) *inextinguibili*

Matt 17 : 16

　　(EV) *vnbyleeful,* or out of the feith

　　(LV) *vnbileueful*

　　(V) *incredula*

Matt 23 : 4

　　(EV) *vnportable,* or that mown nat be born

(LV) that moun not be borun

(V) *inportabilia*

Mark 7 : 18

(EV) *unprudent,* or *vnwyse*

(LV) *vnwise*

(V) *inprudentes*

All the above examples have the prefix *un-*, not *in-*, despite the fact that the original Latin words are all those of the *in-* type. It is in fact difficult to find in WB words with the prefix *in-* except *impossible; incomprehesible* (Romans 11 : 33), *incurable* and *invisible* (II Maccabees 9 : 5), both from *MED.* The translators of WB generally use *un-*, a native English word, as a negative prefix with both native and foreign words while *in-* from Latin is exclusively attached to Latin —Romamtic words.[30] Latin *in-* began to take priority of *un-* in some English words around the fifteenth century.[31] As an example of this kind, the negative form of *possible* need special mention. The usual negative forms of *possible* in WB are *impossible /inpossible* (Matt 17 : 19 (EV), Matt 19 : 26 (EV)(LV), Mark 10 : 27 (EV)(LV), Luke 1 : 37 (EV)(LV),Luke 17 : 1 (EV)(LV),Luke 18 : 27 (LV)); and *vnpossible* is rare (Matt 17 : 19 (LV), Luke 18 : 27(EV)). The predominance of *impossible/ inpossible* over *vnpossible* is significant since, as the above examples in the two types show, the prefix *un-* is generally much preferred to *in-* in WB. This will invite us to think that the adjective *impossible,* introduced into English from the first in the compound form, was at that time already taken as a single word, not as a compound *im + possible.* This view is supported by the fact that Chaucer, who seems to have attaced *un-* to words of foreign origin as well as native ones, always used *impossible* instead of *unpossible.*[32]

Type: *un* + adverb

Vuworthili (Mark 10 : 14 (EV)) is the only example within our material.

1.6.2 Privative prefix *un-*

Jespersen explains privative *un-* as follows: "Privative *un-* is prefixed to vbs and derivatives form vbs, giving the derivative a contrary sense to the single word. *Un-* vbs are generally, though not always, used transitively."[33] Examples are :

Mark 11 : 4

(EV) thei *vnbounden* him

(LV) thei *vntieden* him

(V) *solvunt*

Mark 11 : 4

(EV) thei maden the roof nakid, wher he was

(LV) thei *vnhileden* the roof where he was

(V) *nudaverunt*

Mark 1 : 7

(EV) A strengere than I schal come aftir me, of whom I knelinge am not worthi for to *vndo,* or *vnbynde,* the thwong of his schoon

(LV) A stronger than Y schal come aftir me, and Yam not worthi to knele doun, and *vnlace* his schoone

(V) *solvore*

1.6.3 Privative suffix -*less*

In comparison with the frequency of *un-*/*in-*, that of -*less* seems to be pretty low in ME, especially in WB. This may be party because Latin has no counterpart of English native -*less*. The following are some of the few:

Matt 25 : 35
    (EV) I was *herberlesse*
    (LV) Y was *herbereles*
    (V) *hospes* eram
Mark 27 : 24
    (EV) I am innocent, or *giltlesse*
    (LV) Y am *giltles*
    (V) *innocens* ego
Numbers 5 : 28[34]
    (EV) she shal be *harmles*
    (LV) sche schal be *harmeles*
    (V) *innoxia*
Proverbs 12 : 8[35]
    (EV) who forsothe is veyn and *herteles*
    (LV) he that is veyn and *hertles*
    (V) *excors*

In Chaucer also, the use of the prefix *un-* is even more common than that of the suffix -*less*.[36]

1.7 Negative contractions

When the negative adverb *ne* is followed by very common types of verbs, the adverb often combines with those verbs so as to make such negative contracted forms as *nis, nas, nil, noot* and so on. Negative contracted forms are "typical of the South and the W Midlands, while uncotracted forms (*ne will* etc.) are typical of the North and predominate in the E Midlands."[37] Even the occurrence of the latter in WB, however, is very rare because by the fourteenth century "substitutes for *ne* as the sentence negative were being more widely employed."[38] Let us show an example out of some:

Matt 1 : 20
    (EV) *nyl* thou drede to take Marie, thi wyf
    (LV) *nyle* thou drede to take Marie, thi wijf
    (V) *noli*

Other are Luke 2 : 10 and John 8 : 11. *Nyle* as in these examples is used to translate the Latin imperative *noli*/ *nolite*,[39] which expresses "an emphatic prohibition."[40] *Nyle* in the below, which expresses a refusal of a desire or wish, is used in a declarative sentence.

Matt 21 : 29
    (EV) Sum man hadde two sonys; and he cummynge niȝ to the first seide, Sone, go for
        to worche this day in to myn vyneȝerd. Sothely he answerynge seith, I *nyle*
    (LV) ...Y *nyle*
    (V) *nolo*
Luke 19 : 27
    (EV) brynge ȝe hidir tho myne enemyes, that *nolde* me to regne on hem, and sle ȝe
        bifore me.

(LV) ..., that wolden not that Y regnede on hem

(V) *noluerunt*

We can find the same kind of examples in Luke 19 : 14 (EV) and Luke 13 : 34 (EV). What we should note in the above examples is that, while in imperatives *nyle* is used in both EV and LV, in declaratives it is generally used in EV alone and the uncontracted form *wilen not* is mostly used in LV.

The *ne* + *witen* contruction is extremely rarely found in WB.

Luke 22 : 60

(EV) I wot not what thou seist

(LV) Y *noot* what thou seist

(V) *nescio*

II Corinthian 12 : 3[41]

(EV) wher in body, or out of body, I *noot,* God woot

(LV) whether in bodi, or out of bodi, Y *noot* God woot

(V) *nescio*

It is affirmed that the contraction *noot* was already rare in Wycliffe's time by the following example:

Luke 20 : 7

(EV) thei answeriden, that thei *witen not,* of whennis it was

(LV) thei answeriden, that thei *knewen not,* of whennus it was

(V) responderunt se *nescire* unde esset

In spite of the use of the contracted form *nescire* in the original, EV, a word-for-word translation, does not employ *noot*. This, together with the fact that *noot* is rare throughout WB, indicates that the word was nearly an obsolete one in that time.

Our present examination finds no example where *ne* is proclitically attached to *haven*. *Nys* 'is not' rarely, if, ever, appears in WB; it can just be found in another manuscript of our text.[42]

1.8 Double negation

If we say, "I don't think Ben isn't handsome," then the cognitive meaning of the statment amounts to "I think Ben is handsome." This is due to the general rule in Modern English (or almost all languages) that "two negatives make an affirmative."[43] In early English, however, the rule was not the case. "Two negatives make a negative" as follows:

Mark 12 : 35

(EV) no man durste axe him

(LV) *no* man durste axe hym *no more ony* thing

(V) *nemo iam* audebat eum interrogare

Luke 1 : 30

(EV) Ne drede thou

(LV) *Ne* drede thou *not*

(V) *Ne* timeas

Other examples are: Luke 18 : 13 (EV), Matt 5 : 15 (LV), Matt 5 : 47 (LV) and Luke 6 : 39 (LV). Although it is generally said that in OE and ME and even in the fifteenth century, the double or cumlative negative is common,[44] it cannot possibly be said that such negation is common in WB, becaue the ratio of its occurrence is under one per cent of all negative expressions.

1.9 Summary

The above examinations reveal the following facts:

(1) *Not* is for the most part used as a simple sentence negative adverb in WB except EV of Matthew, where *nat* is common. There rarely occur its early form *noʒt* and other adverbs *neuer, nether, ne, nothing* and *nay.*

(2) *No* or *noon* is used as an attributive adjective.

(3) Pronoun *noon* 'no person(s)' and *nouʒt* 'nothing, trifle' are found.

(4) As a privative preposition, *no but* and *but* occur frequently in EV and LV respectively.

(5) The conjunction *no but* is one of characteristics of WB, especially of EV. In LV *but (if)* is common.

(6) The prefix *un-* is by far more frequently used than *in-*. The suffix *-less* is much less common than the prefix.

(7) As negative contractions there occur *nyle,* which is often used in an imperative sentence to express an emphatic prohibition, and *noot* though much less often than *nyle.* The contracted forms of '*ne +ben*' and '*ne + haven*' seldom or never occur.

(8) The frequency of the double negation in WB is much lower than that in other contemporary works.

II NEGATIVE COMBINATION

In the previous chapter, we have examined every kind of negative morpheme which appears in WB. Hereafter our concern will be with idiomatic and /or compound negatives.

2.1 *Not* + quantifier + noun

WB has some examples where a negative *not* precedes a noun phrase made up of a quantifier and a noun. The following is one of them:

Matt 7 : 21

   (EV) *Nat eche man* that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shal entre in to the kyngdam of heuenes

   (LV) *Not ech mam* that seith to me, Lord, Lord, schal entre in to the kyngdom of heuenes

   (V) *Non omnis*

Others are Matt 19 : 11 and John 2 : 12 : the former has *not alle men*; the latter, *not many daies.*

2.2 *Neuer* + noun

Some cases in which a negative adverb *neuer*[45] appears just before a noun, especially *man,*[46] are as following:

John 7 : 46

   (EV) *Neuere man* spak so, as this spekith

   (LV) *Neuere man* spak so, as this man spekith

   (V) *numquam* ex te fructus nascatur

and *neuer man* in Luke 19 : 30 (LV) and *neuer fruyt* in Matt 21 : 19 (LV).

Negative + *any* + noun will be treated in 2.3.3.

2.3 Idiomatic uses

WB has a number of the comparative constructions with a negative and phrases in which a negative collocates with words such as *any, ever.* We shall examine them by means of syntactic and semantic classifications in this section.

2.3.1 Comparative constructions

The following is a typical comparative construction in a negative sentence:

Matt 11 : 11

   (EV) ther roose *noon more than* Joon Baptist amonge children of wommen

   (LV) ther roos *noon more than* Joon Baptist among the children of wymen

   (V) *non* surrexit inter natos mulierum *maior* Iohann*e* Baptist*a*

As to *more* in the case below, Mark 9 : 7, it seems to be proper to regard *no more* as a unit or a single adverb, as *MED* (s.v. *no-more* adv.) says.

Mark 9 : 7

   (EV) thei biholding aboute, sy3e *no more any* man, *no but* Jhesus *oonli* with hem

   (LV) thei bihelden aboute, and sayn *no more ony* man, *but* Jhesu *oonli* with hem[47]

The sense of *no more any... (no) but...oonli* here is similar to that of *noon other... outakun/ (no) but* in the examples below:

Mark 12 : 32

   (EV) for o God is, and ther is *non, out taken* him

   (LV) for o God is, and ther is *noon other, outakun* hym

   (V) *non* est *alius praeter* eum

John 6 : 22

   (EV) there was *non othir* boot there *no but* oon

   (LV) ther was *noon other* boot there *but* oon

   (V) navicula *alia non* erat ibi *nisi* una

Mustanoja remarks about the comparative constructions with a negative that "it is in accordance with the adversative character of the comparative that *but* is used in negative comparisons (e.g.,*I se namoore but that I am fordo,* Ch. CT F Fkl.1562.) The usage can be traced back to OE," and about such a construction as in John 6 : 22, that "after *other* and *else, (elses), but* has been used since OE."[48]

2.3.2 *No more* and its variants

The compound *no more*[49] is less common than *not* or *no(on)*; it sometimes coincides with *any* as shown in the following:

Luke 12 : 4

   (EV) be 3e not a feerd of hem that slen the body, and aftir thes thingis han *no more* what thei schulen don

   (LV) be 3e not a ferd of hem that sleen the bodie, and aftir these thingis han *no more* what thei schulen do

   (V) post haec *non* habent *amplius* quod faciant

Luke 20 : 40

   (EV) thei durste *no more* axe him *ony* thing

   (LV) thei dursten *no more* axe hym *ony* thing

(V) *amplius non* audebant eum *quicquam* interrogare

As variants, we obtain *not more* (Mark 9 : 24 (EV)), *neuer...ony...more* (Mark 11 : 14 (LV)), *nyle...more* (John 8 : 11 (LV)). In all these examples, the Latin constructions have *amplius* as the correspondent to *more* though John 8 : 11 (EV) does not have *more*.

2.3.3 Negative +*any/euer*

The combination negative +*any/euer* is extremely common all through the history of the English language. The frequent combinations in WB are as following:

Mark 6 : 8

(EV) thei schulde *not* take *ony* thing in the weye

(LV) thei schulde *not* take *ony* thing in the weye

(V) *ne quid* tollerent

John 12 : 8

(EV) ȝe schulen *not euere* haue me

(LV) ȝe schulen *not euermore* haue me

(V) me autem *non semper* habetis

Jespersen states that "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. "[50] This statement of his seems to be also the case with the usage of Wycliffe's in view of the fact that there can be found in WB only two examples where *any* precedes *not*:

John 10 : 28

(EV) *ony* man schal *not* rauysche hem of myn hond

(LV) *noon* schal rauysche hem fro myn hoond

(V) *non* rapiet eas *quisquam* de manu mea

John 15 : 6

(EV) If *ony* man schal *not* dwelle in me, he...

(LV) If *ony* man dwellith *not* in me, he...

(V) si *quis* in me *non* manserit

2.4 Copulative conjunction[51]

Poutsma has divided copulative co-ordination into four varieties in terms of the difference in meaning: simple copulative co-ordination; relieving copulative co-ordination; arranging copulative co-ordination; analysing copulative co-ordination. In this section, we shall discuss the first two: 'simple copulative co-ordination,' "in which the members are simply mentioned in succession without any one being thrown into particular relief": and 'relieving copulative co-ordination,' "in which one member, representing something more or less uncommon or unexpected, is thrown into some relief."[52]

2.4.1 Simple copulative co-ordination

The conjunctions which belonged to this category are: *and, nor/neither*; the correlatives are: *both...and, neither...nor* and so on. *Neither...nor*[53] and its variants, *not...neither, ne...neither* and the like are often found in WB. We give some typical examples below:

Matt 11 : 18

(EV) Joon cam *neither* etyinge *ne* drynkynge

(LV) Joon cam *nether* etynge *ne* drynkynge

(V) venit enim Iohannes *neque* manucans *neque* bibens

Luke 6 : 44

    (EV) *neither* men gederyn fygis of thornes, *neither* men gederyn a grape of a boysch of breris

    (LV) men gaderen *not* figus of thornes, *nethir* men garden a grape of a buysche of breris

    (V) *Neque* enim de spinis colligunt ficus, *neque* de rubo

Matt 7 : 6

    (EV) *Nyl* ȝe ȝeue holy thing to houndis, *nether* sende ȝe ȝour margaritis, or preciouse stoonys, before swyne

    (LV) *Nile* ȝe ȝyue hooli thing to houndis, *nethir* caste ȝe ȝoure margaritis bifore swyne

    (V) *Nolite* dare sanctum canibus *neque* mittatis margaritas vestras ante porcos

The Latin *neque...neque* basically corresponds to the English *nethir/ne/not...nethir/ne*. In spite of the occurrence of the negative in the preceding clause, a few examples have a non-correlative construction by the negative as in:

    Luke 18 : 4

    (EV) I drede *not* God, *and* schame *not* of man

    (LV) Y drede *not* God, *and* schame *not* of man

    (V) Deum *non* timeo *nec* hominem revereor

Luke 12 : 29

    (EV) *nyle* ȝe seke, what ȝe schulen ete, *ethir* what ȝe schulen drynke; *and nyle* ȝe be reysid in to an hiȝ

    (LV) *nyle* ȝe seke, what ȝe schulen ete, *or* what ȝe schulen drynke; *and nyle* ȝe be reisid an hiȝ

    (V) vos *nolite* quaerere quid manducetis *aut* quid bibatis *et nolite* in sublime tolli

In Luke 12 : 29, one interesting linguistic phenomenon is found : in the first clause, though within the scope of the negative *nyle, ethir/or* occurs instead of *nethir/ne*.

Such a deviation from the general negative correlative rule may be because the writer regards *what ȝe schulen eat* and *what ȝe schulen drynke* as a single group with 'related meanings'[54] *Or* of this kind is "simply synonymous with *ne*."[55] From a historical point of view, "within negative clauses *or* has come to be used mainly as a simple equivalent of *ne,* a marked chage from early ME usage."[56]

    In the following examples, a number of clauses are paratactically combined, without correlative conjunctions.

    Mark 10 : 19

    (EV) do thou *non* auoutrie, sle *not,* stele *not,* seie *not* fals witnessinge,do *no* faraud

    (LV) do thou *noon* auowtrie, sle *not,* stele *not,* seie *not* fals witnessyng, do *no* fraude

    (V) *ne* adulters *ne* occidas *ne* fureris *ne* falsum testimonium dixeris *ne* fraudem feceris

Here each statement of prohibition is made as if independently, so that each statement, calling for equal amount of attention, is quite emphasized.

2.4.2 Relieving copulative co-ordination

    Not onli...but also is the typical correlative construction which belongs to this category.

John 17 : 20

    (EV) I preie *not oonli* for hem, *but and* for hem that ben to bileuynge in to me bi the word of hem

    (LV) Y preye *not oneli* for hem, *but also* for hem that schulden bileue in to me bi the word of hem

    (V) *non* pro his autem rogo *tantum sed et* pro eis qui credituri sunt per verbum eorum in me

Its variants are: *not...aloon, bot...* (Matt 4 : 4 (EV)), *not oonli...,but...* (Matt 4 : 4 (LV)). What is felt awkward in this construction is the appearance of *and* in *not oonli...but and* as in John 17 : 20 (EV) and John 5 : 18 (EV). This appearance of *and* is on account of the literal translation of Latin *et* in *set et.*

It is a rule for the construction *not onli..but (also)* to connect two units with the same syntactic structure as in John 17 : 20, for example; nevertheless in the case below it conncects the two units which are different in structure, namely a phrase and a clause, though these units, both explaining 'for what Jesus died,' have semantically the same function:

John 11 : 52

    (EV) Jheus was to deyinge for the folk, and *not oonly* for folk, *but* that he schulde gedere in to oon the sones of God that were scaterid

    (LV) Jhesu was to die for the folc, and *not oneli* for the folc, *but* that he schulde gadere in to oon the sones of God that weren scaterid

    (V) Iesus moriturus erat pro gente et *non tantum* pro gente *sed et* ut filios Dei qui erant dispersi congregaret in unum

2.4.3 *Not...but*

Besides the previous two types, the *not...but* construction is also in common use.

Matt 5 : 17

    (EV) I came *not* to vndo the lawe, *but* to fulfille

    (LV) Y cam *not* to vndo the lawe, *but* to fulfille

    (V) *non* veni solvere *sed* adimplere

John 20 : 27

    (EV) *nyle* thou be vnbileueful, *but* feithful

    (LV) *nyle* thou be inbipeuefel, *but* feithful

    (V) *noli* esse incredulus *sed* fidelis

2.5 Summmary

The examinations made above show the following facts:

(1) *Not*+quantifier *(ech/alle/many)*+noun constructions occasionally occur in both Versions.

(2) There are some cases where *neuer* is used to modify a noun.

(3) WB has a number of idiomatic constructions *(e.g.,*the comparative, *no more,* negative +*any/euer),* where very few unnatural expressions are found.

(4) There occur some variants in the negative simple copulative co-ordination: Negative *...ne/nether...*; *ne...nether...*; *nether...ne...*; *nether...nether...*; *ne...ne...*, while negative/ *neque...neque* is the only corresponding Latin construction.

(5) In *not oonli... but also,* instead of *also, and* which makes the construction

unidiomatic appears in a few examples of EV.

III WORD ORDER

3.1 Position of *not*

The typical ME negative form is: I *ne* seye *not*; but *ne* was generally pronounced so inarticulately that it eventually began to disappear in the fourteenth century.

The result is that *not* alone became the regular negative marker: I say *not*. Our examination so far has shown that the standard negative sentence in WB is the latter type. In this section, we shall restrict ourselves to the sentences with *not* as the negative marker, and try to make clear where the negative abverb *not* is placed in sentences with various kinds of constructinons.

3.1.1 Declarative sentences

(1) S-V-*not*[57]

Matt 21 : 30[58]

he wente *not*

John 18 : 17

He seide, Y am *not*

(2) S-V-*not*-Adv/Adv P

Matt 7 : 25

it felde *not* doun

Matt 13 : 34

he spac *not* to hem with parablis

(3) S-V (ben) -*not*-C

Matt 3 : 11

he...is strongere than Y, whos schoon Y am *not* worhi to bere

Mark 2 : 24

what thi disciplis doon in sabotis, that is *not* leeueful

(4) S-Aux-*not*-V

Matt 11 : 17

ʒe han *not* daunsid

Matt 17 : 15

thei myʒten *not* heele hym

(5) S-Aux-*not*-Aux-V

Matt 12 : 31

the spirit of balsfemye shal *not* be forʒouun

Matt 23 : 30

we schulden *not* haue be her felowis in the blood of prophetis

(6) S-V-O (noun)

Matt 26 : 72

I knewe *not* the man

Mark 9 : 31

thei knewe *not* the word

These examples indicate that in these six types of sentences, the position of the negative abverb *not* in WB, both in EV and LV, is the same as generally observed in early English:

not occurs immediately after the predicate verb in a sentence without an auxiliary; and in a senetence which has one or two auxiliaries, it comes after the first auxiliary. This rule can be applied to both dependent and independent clauses.

In the S-V-O construction with a pronoun as the object, the postion of *not* in LV is significantly different from that in EV. Let us observe the following:

Mark 5 : 7
>   (EV) thou tourmente *not* me
>   (LV) thou turmente me *not*
>   (V) *ne* me torqueas

John 17 : 25
>   (EV) the word knew *not* thee
>   (LV) the world knew thee *not*
>   (V) mundus te *non* congnovit

John 5 : 43
>   (EV) ʒe token *not* me
>   (LV) ʒe token *not* me
>   (V) *non* accipitis me

It is clearly seen in these examples that in EV *not* generally occurs immediately after the verb, while in LV after the verb-pronoun cluster. The frequencies of V-*not*-Pron/V-Pron-*not* constructions in the two Versions are as follows:

	V-*not*-Pron (type A)	V-Pron-*not* (type B)
EV	28	6[59]
LV	13	24

The higher frequency of type A than B in EV is presumably a result of the mechanical translation of V: the Latin negative construction *non*-V/*ne*-V is mechanically replaced by V-*not* even when the object is a pronoun. The practice of LV agrees with the general rule already established in early English: *Not* is placed after an object pronoun. In this point also, the language of LV may be regarded as more natural and idiomatic: V-Pron-*not* will sound more natural than V-*not*-Pron[60].

One may say against this that examples of type A are rather frequent even in LV. In most of them, however, we can find good reasons why such a construction is chosen. The use of the relieving copulative co-oriination *not ...aloone, but*...naturally brings forth this construction, as in:

Mark 9 : 36
>   who euer resseyueth me, he resseyueth *not* me *aloone, but* him that sente me

The addition of some comments also puts *not* before the pronoun object in the following:

John 15 : 21
>   thei knowen *not hym that sente me*

Luke 9 : 49
>   he sueth *not thee with vs*

John 14 : 19
>   the world seeth *not now me*

If a clause, the last word of which is pronoun, continues to another clause, the pronoun does not need a rather strong stress. This is, we should think, why there occur some V-*not*-Pron constructions even in LV with little resistance. We can find four examples like this.

Matt 18 : 17

    if he herith *not hem*, seie thou to the chirche

Mark 9 : 37

    ...which sueth *not vs,* and we han forbodun hym

Mark 14 : 49

    ȝe helden *not me*; but that the scripturis be fulfillid

Luke 9 : 53

    thei resseyueden *not hym,* for the face was of hym goynge in to Jerusalem

It seems to be proper that the four examples below should be regarded as simply nonstandard constructions:

Luke 8 : 28

    Y biseche thee, that thou turmente *not me.*

Luke 24 : 24

    thei founden *not hym.*

John 1 : 5

    derknessis comprehediden *not it.*

John 5 : 43

    ȝe token *not me*[61].

The last example in this type is:

Mark 7 : 12

    ȝe suffren *not hym* do ony thing to fadir or modir

On the other hand, we have another parallel to this:

Mark 1 : 34

    he suffriden *hem not* to speke

The presentation of these two may indicate that the scope of the negative *not* exercises some influence on the syntactic construction.[62]

3.1.2 Interrogative sentences

(1) Interrogative sentences introduced by *whether*

  Matt 10 : 29

    Whether twei sparewis ben *not* seeld for an halpany ?

  Luke 15 : 4

    whether he leeueth *not* nynti and nyne in desert,... ?

  Luke 18 : 7

    whether God schal *not* do veniaunce of hise chosun,... ?

  John 8 : 48

    whether we seien *not* wel, that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a deuel ?

It is apparent from the above that the interrogative sentences introduced by *whether* have the same word order as the declarative ones. The following LV is, however, an example which has the standard interrogative word order like *wh*-interrogatives and non-*wh*-interrogatives in (2) below in spite of the placement of *whether*:

  Matt 13 : 27

    (EV) wher thou hast *nat* sowen good seed in thi feeld ?

    (LV) whether hast thou *not* sowun seed in thi feeld ?

(2) *Wh*-interrogatives and non-*wh*-interrogatives

  Matt 16 : 11

whi vndurstonden ȝe *not,* ... ?

Luke 12 : 56

hou preuen ȝe *not* this tyme.[63]

John 8 : 46

whi bileuen ȝe *not* to me ?

John 13 : 37

Whi may Y *not* sue thee now ?

Mark 27 : 13

Herist thou *not,* hou many witnessyngis thei seies aȝens thee ?

Mark 14 : 37

miȝtist thou *not* wake with me oon our?

We may formulate from these examples the word order of the interrogative negative sentence as follows:

(*wh*-interrog-) V-S- *not*... ?

(*wh*-interrog-) Aux-S-*not*-V... ?

We can find some examples with word orders different from the standard one.

Matt 17 : 18

Whi myȝten *not* we caste hym out?

Matt 19 : 4

(EV)   Han *nat* ȝee rad,... ?

(LV)   Han ȝe *not* red,... ?

Mark 4 : 13

(EV)   Witen *not* ȝee this parable ?

(LV)   Knowe *not* ȝe this parable ?

John 14 : 10

(EV)   Bileuest *not* thou, for I am in the fadir,... ?

(LV)   Bileuest thou *not,* that Y am in the fadir,... ?

John 12 : 5

(EV)   Whi this oygnement is *not* seeld for thre hundred pens,... ?

(LV)   Whi is *not* this oynement seeld for thre hundred pens,... ?

In comparison with the word order of John 13 : 37, in (2) given above, that of Matt 17 : 18[64] seems to be the result of the consideration of rhythm:

Matt 17 : 18

whi myȝten not we caste hym out ?

The verbs *witen/knowen* and *ben* may tend to be followed immediately by *not,* though no statistical observations can be made in the prenent stdy to prove this.

3.2   Position of *neuer*

When a sentence is made up of an auxiliary and a verb, *neuer,* like *not,* occurs between the two; when made up of two auxiliaries and a verb, it occurs after the first auxiliary, as a rule.

Matt 21 : 16

(EV)   wher ȝe han nat rad,... ?

(LV)   whether ȝe han *neuer* redde,... ?

John 13 : 8

(EV) Thou schalt not wische to me the feeet

(LV) Thou schal *neuere* waische my feet

Matt 12 : 7

ȝe schulden *neuer* haue condempned innocentis

Matt 26 : 33

Y schal *neuer* be sclaundrid.

In an S-V cluster, however, there are fluctuations in the positions of the occurrence of *neuer* as shown below:

Mark 2 : 12

we seien *neuer* so

John 8 : 33

we serueden *neuere* to man

Luke 15 : 29

(EV) I brak *neuere* thi comaundement

(LV) Y *neuer* brak thi comaundement

Luke 15 : 29

(EV) thou hast *neuere* ȝouun a kyde to me

(LV) thou *neuer* ȝaf to me a kidde

Although the frequency of *neuer* in a construction of this kind is too low to make an established rule in WB, such a position as in Luke 15 : 29 (LV) and Luke 15 : 29 (LV) —*neuer* is placed before a verb—seems to be a rule, except in the cases where the verb is *witen/knowen*[65]. Examples are:

Matt 7 : 23

Y knewe ȝou *neuere*;

Mark 11:33

we witen *neuer*.

John 9 : 21

(EV) how he seeth now, we witen not, or who openyde his yȝen, me witen not;

(LV) hou he seeth now, we witen *neuer*, or who openyde his iȝen, we witen *nere*;

John 9 : 25

(EV) If he is a synner, I woot not;

(LV) If he is a synnere, Y woot *neuer*;

As the last probiem in this section, let us consider the following examples where *neuer* is, against the rule, placed before the first auxiliary:

Matt 3 : 12

(EV) chaffis he shal brenne with fyr unquenchable, or that *neuer* shal be quenchid

(LV) the chaffe he shal brenne with fier that mai not be quenchid

(V) igni *inextinguibili*

Mark 9 : 42

it is betere to thee to entre feble in to lijf, than haue two hondis, and go in to helle, in to fier that *neuer* schal be quenchid

(V) ignis *inextinguibilis*

Mark 9 : 44

it is betere to thee to entre crokid in to euerlastynge lijf, than haue twei feet, and be sent in to helle of fier, that *neuer* schal be quenchid

(V) ignem *inextinguibilem*

The front position of *neuer* here may be partly for the sake of more pleasing rhythm. The examples have exactly the same wording and construction. The rhythm woud be:

 ...thãt ñeuèr shál bè quénchĩd

Another reason seems to be concerned with semantic emphasis: according to Jespersen, "exceptional front-position of the tertiary (*never* etc.) may be occasioned in an emotionally coloured saying," and "the small vb (=auxiliary verb) is also stressed,"[66] with the result that, in this construction, great emphasis is laid on the sense of *shal*, which expresses 'the prophetic future' or 'the prophetic-oracular future.'[67]

3.3 Inversion

The inverted word order V-S in the declarative negative sentences will be examined here. To use Kellner's concise explanation, "a verb in the negative has, as a rule, more weight than the subject; this accounts for tendency to use negative predicates in the inverted position."[68] The following is the only typical inversion with *neuer*:

 Mark 11 : 14

 (EV) Jhesus answeride and seide to it, Now *neuer ete ony man* fruyt of thee more

Another example is one where *nether*, used as an adverb here, causes inversion:

 Mark 5 : 3

 Which man hadde an hous in biriels, and *nether* with cheynes now *myȝte*
 ony man bynde hym

The last of the three in all is the example in which *not oonli* introduces the inverted order:

 Matt 4 : 4

 (LV) *Not oonli in breed luyeth man,* but in ech word that cometh of Goddis
 mouth

3.4 Summary

The standard negative schemes the above examinations give us are as follows:

(1) S-V-*not*-O/C/Adv.

(1)′ S-V-O (Pron) -*not*.

(2) S-Aux-*not/neuer*- (Aux) -V.

(2)′ S-*neuer*-V.* *V except *witen/knowen*

(3) (*Wh*-interrog-) V-S-*not*.

(4) (*Wh*-interrog-) Aux-S-*not*-V.

(5) Few inverted constructions can be found in WB.

IV SYNTACTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EV AND LV

4.1 *Not*...noun vs. *no*+noun

There are a number of examples where *not*...noun or other parallel constructions in EV are replaced in LV by *no*+noun.

 Mark 4 : 6

 (EV) it hadde *not roote*

 (LV) it hadde *no roote*

 Matt 5 : 27

 (EV) Thou shalt *nat* do *lecherye*

   (LV) Thou schalt do *no letcherie*

John 4 : 17

   (EV) I haue *not an hosebonde*

   (LV) Y haue *noon hosebonde*

Mark 5 : 37

   (EV) he resceyuede *not ony man* to sue him

   (LV) he took *no man* to sue hym

Mark 14 : 60

   (EV) Answerist thou *not ony thing* to tho thisgis that ben put to thee of these?

   (LV) Answerist thou *no thing*[69] to tho thingis that ben aȝens thee of there?

Luke 11 : 36

   (EV) if al thi body schal be liȝtful, *not* hauyge *ony part* of derknnessis, it schal be al liȝtful

   (LV) If al thi bodi be briȝt, and haue *no part* of derknessis, it schal be al briȝt

Our examination shows that about 40 per cent of the *not...* noun constructions in EV are replaced in LV by the *no* +noun construction. This amounts to saying that more than half of EV's sentence negative adverb *not* survives in LV without being replaced by the synymous *no* +noun construction. What we should notice here is that as in Mark 5 : 37, Mark 14 : 60, Luke 11 : 36, the *not...ony* construction in EV is not always replaced by the *no* construction in LV. Examples are :

John 9 : 33

   (EV) he myȝte *not* do *ony* thing

   (LV) he myȝt *not* do *ony* thing

John 18 : 9

   (EV) I loste *not ony* of hem

   (LV) Y loste *not ony* of hem

Mark 8 : 30

   (EV) thei schulden *nat* seie to *ony* man of him

   (LV) thei schulden *not* seie of hym to *ony* man

Luke 8 : 56

   (EV) thei schulden *not* seye to *ony* man the thing that was don

   (LV) thei schulden *not* seie to *ony* that thing that was don

John 16 : 23

   (EV) ȝe schulen *not* axe me *ony* thing

   (LV) ȝe schulen *not* axe me *ony* thing

When *not* and *ony* are split particularly by more than one word, as shown in the last three examples, we may say that the construction in EV tends to remain intact in LV. And this tendency which has been revealed by our exmination is also supported by Jack's research on LME prose: "In later ME *no(n)* continues to be the preferred form, but instances of *any* become rather more common"[70]

 On the other hand, we obtain the reverse replacement — *no* +noun in EV is replaced in LV by *not* +noun — like the following:

Luke 20 : 31

   (EV) alle seuene...leften *no seed,* but ben deede

   (LV) alle seuene...leften *not seed* but ben deed

And we can recognize more Englishness in LV than in EV with regard to the uses of the

negatives in the cases below:

Mark 11 : 13

 (EV) it was *no tyme* of fygis

 (LV) it was *not tyme* of figis

John 16 : 30

 (EV) it is *no nede* to thee, that ony man axe thee

 (LV) it is *not nede* to thee, that ony nan axe thee

Although the following, Matt 22 : 16 and Mark 9 : 29, are among the examples where the *no* +noun construction in EV is replaced by a sentence negative *not,* the sentences in EV are here quite drastically changed in LV.

Matt 22 : 16

 (EV) there is *no cure,* or *charge,* to thee of eny man

 (LV) thou *chargist not* of ony man

Mark 9 : 29

 (EV) he wold *no man* wite

 (LV) thei wolden *not,* that *ony man* wiste

4.2 Some other differences

In Matt 15 : 20 a negatve prefix *vn-* in EV is replaced in LV by a negative adverb *not*, and in Mark 7 : 2 vice versa.

Matt 15 : 20

 (EV) for to ete with hondis *vnwashen,* defouleth not a man

 (LV) to ete with hondis *not waischun,* defoulith not a man

Mark 7 : 2

 (EV) whanne thei hadden seyn summe of hise disciplis ete breed with comune hondis, that is, *not waischun,* thei blamyden

 (LV) whanne thei hadden seen summe of hise disciplis ete breed with *vnwaisschen* hoondis, thei blameden

The participle in EV is resolved into a prepositional phrase in LV as in the example below:[71]

Matt 22 : 12

 (EV) hou entridist thou hidir, *nat hauynge* brijd clothe ?

 (LV) hou entridist thou hidir *with out* bride clothis ?

4.3 Summary

Our examinations made in the above reveal the following facts:

(1) EV's typical constrution S-V-*not*-Noun can be regarded as no less idiomatic than LV's frequent S-V-*no*-Noun.

(2) Both *not...any* +noun and *no* +noun may be said to be the common negative constructions in WB.

(3) EV, though a literal translation, does not produce extremely unidiomatic constructions in respect of negation.

CONCLUSION

Our results through a descriptive analysis will make us notice that the uses of the negation in WB—various negative words and their patterns of collocation and the

positions of the typical negatives, *not* and *neuer*, and so on—conform, for the most part, to those found in other contemporary writings.

As far as this subject is concened, we can rarely find traces of the literal rendering of V, which is said to have marred EV's English, especially concerning "the combination 'particle + verb,' the absolute participle, the appositive participle, and the '*ben + to comyng(e)*' construction."[72] This is due to the fact that Latin *non, neque, nisi* basically correspond to English *not, nether/ne, (no) but* respectively, and that, unlike the verb usage, the Latin negative sentences can fairly easily be rendered into natural English.

We have already seen some examples where the language in EV is thought to be less idiomatic because of the position of *not* in the construction S-V-*not*-Pron. We can reasonably presume that lack of consideration of sound also gives rise to such an unrhythmic structure. (See section 3.1.1.) Purvey, the translator of LV, takes into consideration not only syntactic but also phonological appropriateness.

The translator of EV avoided using the double negation, though in a usable state in his time, in order to give priority to clarity. In other words, when the writer was allowed some latitude in his choice, he preferred the single negation for fear of an ambiguous meaning which might possibly be made by the reader because of the double negation. His preference of the single negation may be a stylistic one. The translator of LV, on the other hand, used the double negation in a few cases. This seems to reflect the contemporary linguistic feature, though slightly, (See section 1.8.) The translators of WB used inversion by negation very rarely, and it is probable that they avoided such inversion intentinaly for the sake of clear English. (See sectinon 3.3.)

NOTES

* This paper is based on my M.A. thesis.
1. The English text used here is: Forshall and Madden (1850). The Latin text used here is: Weber (1969).
2. *MED* (s.v.*never* 2 (a)) says that it is used "as an emphatic negative esp. with *witen.*"
3. Quoted in *MED* s.v. *neither* adv.
4. Jespersen 1949:V,427.
5. Jack 1978:59.
6. Ichikawa 1940:58.
7. Quoted in *MED* s.v. *no-thing* adv. 1. (a).
8. *OED* s.v. *Nay* adv.
9. Curme 1931 : 533.
10. Mustanoja 1960 : 209; *MED* s. v. *non* adv . ; *OED* s. v. *None* C. adv.
11. The example of LV is given in 1.1.6.
12. Curme 1931:533.
13. The syntactic difference between the two Versions of this kind—a replacement of *not* with *no* —will be treated in Chapter IV.
14. Kerkhof 1966 : 193.
15. Jespersen 1949:VII,407.
16. *MED* s.v.*nōn* pron. 1 (a) .
17. *MED* s.v.*nōn* pron. 2.
18. *MED* s. v. *nought* pron. 1a (a) . It seems possible to regard *nough* here as an adjective meaning 'worthless'. See also *OED* s.v.*nought* B adj. and *naught* B. adj.
19. Mustanoja 1960 : 370&422.
20. Mustanoja 1960 : 371.

21. Mustanoja 1960 : 421.
22. Mustanoja 1960 : 422.
23. *OED* s.v. *without* B. 7. a., where Luke 22 : 35 is quoted.
24. Mustnoja 1960 : 404.
25. Visser 1966 : 898.
26. The first *MED* quotation of *except* as a conjunction is dated c. 1400 ; that of *onleesse that,* a variant of *unless, is* dated 1440.
27. As regards the matter of modality in clauses of this kind, much discussion is made in Yonekura (1985 : 302-9) from a viewpoint of comparison between EV, LV and V.
28. Jespersen 1949 : VI, 464.
29. Jespersen 1949 : VI, 464.
30. Franz 1958 : 149.
31. Shimogasa 1976 : 63.
32. Shimogasa 1976 : 63.
33. Jespersen 1949 : VI, 476-77.
34. This example is from *MED.*
35. This example is from *MED.*
36. Burnley 1983:72.
37. Mustanoja 1960 : 339. See also Levin's Table on 1958 : 449.
38. Levin 1958 : 500. It is also "to meet the exigencies of the metre" (Forsström 1968 : 228) that such contracted forms are often used in Chaucer, whose period and dialect are the same as Wycliffe's.
39. Yonekura 1985 : 373.
40. Curme 1931 : 432.
41. Quoted in the Glossary of the text.
42. MS F (Forshall and Madden I, 136) : Genesis 28 : 17 (EV) Here is nother but the hows of God, and the ȝaat of heuene (LV)Here is ﹇MS F *nys*﹈ noon other thing no but the hows of God, and the ȝate of heuene (V)*non* est hic
43. Jespersen 1949 : V, 449.
44. Nakao 1972 : 249; Araki and Ukaji 1984 : 511.
45. *MED* s. v. *never* adv 2. (d).
46. Mätzner 1879 : III, 192; Jacobsson 1951 : 42.
47. (*No) but* in this example, according to Poutsma (1929 : II, 746), "appears to have been in frequent use after a comparative in Early Modern English, "and "*no more but* in the meaning of *only* appears to be still in common use."
48. Mustanoja 1960 : 284. See also Jespersen 1949: VII, 386.
49. Kerkhof (1966 : 194)   points out that its variant, *namore,* is commonly used in Chaucer.
50. Jespersen 1917 : 58. See also Jesprsen 1949 : V, 447.
51. Although Sweet (1892 : 145) distinguishes the affirmative or copulative conjunction from the negative one, we here treat the term 'copulative conujunction' as including both of them.
52. Poutsma 1929:II, 556.
53. The typical correlative *neither...nor,* which has begun to be common since EModE, is not to be found in this limited material. Smith (1907 : 490) comments that "steht *neither* öfters für das moderne *nor"* in WB.
54. Kent 1890 : 139.
55. Jack 1978 : 70.
56. Jack 1978 : 70.
57. The classification of sentence patterns is roghly based on Macleish (1969).
58. In this chapter the examples of LV alone are given when there are no specific differences between the two Versions, and refereneces are made to V only when necessary or desirable.
59. Three out of six have the construction *knowen* –Pron–*not* (Matt 17:12, Luke 9:45 and John 1:10). The verb *knowen* may have had some different property from other verbs in this way.

60. Traugott (1972:161) says that "certain rules still operate to prevent pronouns from occurring in final position in some structures. For example, an object pronoun regularly precedes *not* whereas a noun follows, as in *I know him not,* but *I know not your causin.*"
61. In all the examples above, contextual effects seem to make no difference to their syntactic alternatives.
62. The present writer is not still convinced of the verb composition.
63. A question mark is put in EV.
64. Mark 9: 27 has the same construction as Matt 17: 18.
65. See the example in *MED* s.v. *never* 2 (a) and also n. 2 in this paper.
66. Jespersen 1949: VII, 102.
67. Visser 1969: 1590.
68. Kellner 1956: 286.
69. *Thing* in *no thing* should not be regarded as a noun but *no thing* as a pronoun. See *MED* s.v. *no-thing.*
70. Jack 1978: 70.
71. Yonekura 1985: 434.
72. Yonekura 1985: 487.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Araki, Kazuo and Masatmo Ukaji. 1984. *Eigoshi IIIA* (History of English IIIA). (Outline of English Linguistics, 10), Tokyo: Taishukan.

Burnley, David. 1983. *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*. London: Macmillan.

Carr, Joseph William. 1902. "Über das Verhältnis der Wiclifitischen und der Purvey'schen Bibelübersetzung zur Vulgata und zu einader." Leipzig Diss.

Curme, George Oliver.1931. *Syntax*. Boston: Heath. Reprinted, Tokyo: Maruzen, 1978.

Forshall, Rev. Josiah and Sir Frederic Madden (eds.) 1850. *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apochriphal Books, in the Earlier English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wcliffe and his Followers*. 4 Vols. London: Oxford Univ. Press. Reprinted, New York: AMS Press. 1982.

Forsström, Gösta. 1948. *The verb 'to be' in Middle English: a Survey of the Forms*. Lund Studies in English 15. Lund: Cleerup.

Franz, Wilhelm. 1958. *Shakespeare no Eigo*. Transleted, Saito, Yamaguchi and Ota. Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin.

Hollack, Erick. 1903. "Vergleichende Studien zu der Hereford–Wiclif'schen und Purvey'schen Bibelübersetzung und der lateinischen Vulgata (Ein Beiträg zur altenglischen Syntax)." Leipzig Diss.

Ichikawa, Sanki.1940. *Seisho no Eigo*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Jack, George B. 1978. "Negation in Later Middle English Prose." *Archivum Linguisticum,* 9, 58–72.

Jacobsson. Bengt. 1951. *Inversion in English, with Special Reference to the Early Modern English Period*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. "Negation in English and other languages." *Selected Writings of Otto Jespersen,* 3–151. London: George Allen and Unwin. Reprinted, Tokyo: Senjo.

Jepersen, Otto. 1949. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Vols. V, VI, VII. London: George Allen and Unwin. Reprinted,Tokyo: Meicho Fukyu Kai, 1983.

Kellner, Leon. 1956. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Kent, Charles W. 1890, "Of the Use of the Negative by Chaucer, with Particular to the Particle *ne.*" *PMLA,* V, 109–47.

Kerkhof, Jelle. 1966. *Studies in the Lanquage of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Leiden; E. J. Brill/Leiden Univ. Press.

Levin, Samuel R. 1958. "Negative Construction: an Old and Middle English Dialect Criterion." *JEGP,* 57, 492–501.

Lewis, Charlton and Charles Short (eds.) 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary. London: Oxford Univ. Press. Impression of 1975.

Macleish, Andrew. 1969. *The Middle English Subject-Verb Cluster*. Series Practica 26. The Hague: Mouton.

Mätzner, Eduard. 1874. *An English Grammar: Methodical, Analytical, and Historical*.Vol III. Translated, C. J. Grece. London: Murray; Boston: Roberts. Reprinted, Tokyo: Senjo, 1962.

Middle English Dictionary, edited by H. Kurath and S. Kuhn. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press. 1954-

Mossé, Fernand, 1952. *A Handbook of Middle English*. Translated, J. A. Walker. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. Seventh Printing, 1979.

Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax*. Part I. Parts of Speech. Helsinki: Sociéte Néophiologique. Reprinted, Tokyo: Meicho Fukyu Kai, 1985.

Nakao Toshio. 1972. *Eiglshi II* (History of English II). (Outline of English Linguistics, 9), Tokyo: Taishukan.

Ortmann, Franz Joseph. 1902. "Formen und Syntax des Verbs bei Wycliffe und Purvey. "Berlin Diss.

The Oxford English Dictionary, edited by J. A. H. Murray, H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie and C. T. Onions. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1933. Reprinted, 1970.

Poutsma, Hendrik. 1929. *A Grammar of Late Modern English.* Vol.II. Groningen: Noordhoff. Reprinted, Tokyo: Senjo.

Severs, J. Burke.1970. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500.* Vol.II. New Haven: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Shimogasa, Tokuji. 1976. "A Study of 'un'-Words in Chaucer." (in Japanese) *Bulletin of Yamaguchi Women's Univ.,*1, 59-71.

Smith, Herbert. 1907. "Syntax der Wycliffe-Purveyschen Übersetzung und der 'Authorised Version' der Vier Evanglien."*Anglia,* 30, 413-500.

Sweet, Henry. 1892. *A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical.* Part I. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprinted, Tokyo: Meicho Fukyu Kai, 1983.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1972. *A History of English Syntax: A Transformational Approach to the History of English Sentence Structure.* (Transatlantic Series in Linguistics.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Visser, Frederikus Theodorus. 1966. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language.* Vol.II. Leiden: Brill.

Warner, Anthony. 1982. *Complementation in Middle English and the Methodology of Historical Syntax.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State Universty Press.

Weber, Robertus (ed.) 1969. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem.* Adiuvanitibus Bonifation Fischer OSB, Iohanne Gribomont OSB, H. F. D. Sparks, S. Thiele. Recensuit et brevi apparatu instruxit Bobertus Weber OSB, 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Wurttem-bergische Bibelanstalt.

Yonekura, Hiroshi. 1985. *The Language of the Wycliffite Bible: The Syntactic Differences between the Two Versions.* Tokyo: Aratake Shuppan.

ABBREVIATIONS

Adv	Adverb(ial)
Aux	Auxiliary
C	Complement
EME	Early Middle English
EModE	Early Modern English
EV	The Earlier of the Wycliffte Bible
Interrog	Interrogative
LME	Late Middle English
LV	The Later Version of the Wyclffite Bible
ME	Middle English
MED	*Middle English Dictionary*
MS	Manuscript
O	Object
OE	Old English
OED	*The Oxford English Dictionary*
P	Phrase
Pron	Pronoun
S	Subject
V	The Latin Vulgate
V	Verb
WB	The Wycliffite Bible