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1. Introduction


There are found diverse varieties of variations among the Hengwrt MS [HG], Ellesmere MS [EL], Blake (1980) [BL] and Benson (1987) [BN]. Example (1) is the very beginning of the Canterbury Tales. This is from our database, Jimura, et al 2002b and Nakao, et al 2008. Comments (abbreviated C) are made upon the correspondence between the four texts.

Notes:

Abbreviations: HG=the Hengwrt MS, EL=the Ellesmere MS,  
BL=Blake (1980) [faithfully based on HG]  
BN=Benson (1987) [mainly based on EL]  
The hashtag # stands for the “zero” correspondence between the texts.  
Blanks indicate the exact correspondence between the texts.

(1)
HG:2r GP 0000 {H}ere bygynneth the Book7 of the tales of Caunt  bury
EL:GP 0000 <missing>
BL:GP 0000 Here bygynneth the book of the tales of Caunterbury.
BN:GP 0000 Here bygynneth the Book of the Tales of Caunterbury.

*This paper is based on the presentation we made on the 18th Congress of the New Chaucer Society in Portland, Oregon (Session 3G Working Group: Reading, Editing, and Researching the Text of Chaucer in the Digital Age) on 23 July, 2012 (Portland State University).
Choice and Psychology of Negation in Chaucer's Language: Syntactic, Lexical, Semantic Negative Choice
with Evidence from the Hengwrt and Ellesmere MSs and the Two Editions of the Canterbury Tales

HG:2r GP 0001  {6W}han that AueryH w^t his shoures soote
EL:1r GP 0001  {6W}Han ApriH with hise
BL:GP 0001     Whan Aueryll with
BN:GP 0001     Whan Aprill with

C:EL transforms the French form AueryH to the Latin form ApriH. EL adds a plural indicating final –e to the HG his. Benson chooses HG although usually based on EL.

HG:2r GP 0002  The droghte of MarcH / hath pced to the roote #
EL:1r GP 0002                 Marc✓ perced
BL:GP 0002                    March #      perced
BN:GP 0002                    March #      perced              ,

C:EL expands the HG’s abbreviated pced to the full perced.

HG:2r GP 0003  And bathed euery veyne # in swich lycour
EL:1r GP 0003 /          licour
BL:GP 0003
BN:GP 0003                every                  licour

C:EL adds a virgule before a phrase in swich lycour.

HG:2r GP 0004  Of which v^t tu # engendred is the flour #
EL:1r GP 0004 /
BL:GP 0004                vertu
BN:GP 0004                vertu ;

HG:2r GP 0005  Whan zephirus eek# w^t his sweete breeth
EL:1r GP 0005 Zephirus eek / breethH
BL:GP 0005             Zephirus eek with
BN:GP 0005             Zephirus eek with

C:HG uses the lower case “z” in zephirus, but EL does the upper case. HG and EL both use abbreviations about vertu and with. EL inserts a virgule before w^t, but HG not.
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HG:2r GP 0006  Inspired hath # in every holt7 and heeth
EL:1r GP 0006 / heeth
BL:GP 0006 holt
BN:GP 0006 every holt
C: EL inserts a virgule before in, but HG not.

HG:2r GP 0007  The tendre croppes / and the yonge sonne
EL:1r GP 0007 ,
BL:GP 0007 ,
BN:GP 0007 ,

HG:2r GP 0008  Hath in the Ram / his half cours yronne #
EL:1r GP 0008 ,
BL:GP 0008 half-cours ,
BN:GP 0008 # ,

These variations are too many to quote. In this paper we will concentrate on the negative form alterations as shown in (2) to (5).

(2)
HG:2v GP 0070  Ne neuere yet7 # no vileynye he sayde
EL:1v GP 0070 He yet / ne
BL:GP 0070 yet
BN:GP 0070 He nevere yet ne
C: EL exchanges the negative Ne and the third person pronoun he, deviating from HG.

(3)
HG:3r GP 0074  Hise hors weree goode / but he ne was nat gay #
EL:1v GP 0074 His weren #
BL:GP 0074 ,
BN:GP 0074 His were , #
C: EL deletes ne changing a double negation to a single, and it seems that deletion would affect the meter.
1.2. The purpose of this paper
There has been plenty of scholarship on Chaucer’s textual studies including Hg and El, such as Ruggiers (1979), Burnley (1983), Hanna III (1989), Smith (1988), Parkes (1993), Robinson (1996), Stubbs (2000), Mooney (2006) and Horobin (2003, 2007).

Regarding the negative variations in HG and EL and their based texts, however, there have been few studies. Burnley (1983) and Horobin (2003) are seminal works. Burnley classified the negative expressions into three types: syntactic, lexical, and semantic. In terms of the HG-EL textual variations he touched upon the single and double negation alterations together with the negative scope alterations. However, a systematic discussion of negations regarding HG and EL and their based editions was not produced. Horobin examined the linguistic differences among all the manuscripts of the Prologue of the Wife of Bath from a sociolinguistic perspective and attributed their features mainly to Samuel’s Type III. He found that the negative features are in the same vein. However, his concern with negation is primarily morphological, with little attention to its syntax and meaning.

Despite the discoveries by Burnley and Horobin, choice and psychology as regards which negative form to take and which not are worth revisiting.
We shall examine the editors’ as well as the scribes’ choice and the psychology of negative forms taking evidence from the two manuscripts, HG and EL, of the *Canterbury Tales* and their editions, Blake (1980) and Benson (1987).

1.3. Method
We have used the following digitalized data of HG and EL:

- Stubbs (2000)
  *A Collation Concordance to the Verse Texts of the Hg and El MSs of the Canterbury Tales* [Abbreviated as Verse Texts of the MSs]
  *A Comprehensive Collation of the Hg and El MSs and the Editions Blake (1980) and Benson (1987) from GP to SumT* [GP to SumT]

Regarding the digitalized data of the editions, we have used:


The application softwear for linguistic analysis is as follows:

- Stubbs (2000)
  TERESA [developed by Masatsugu Matsuo, Hiroshima University, Japan]

2. Choice and psychology of negative forms
2.1. The Frequencies of the negative forms *noght* and *nat*
The data of negative forms are from [Verse Texts of the MSs]. The two forms are classified according to Samuels (1963): *noght*: Type II of the London dialect; *nat*: Type III of the London dialect. About *noght*, HG is more frequent than
EL, while about *nat*, EL is more frequent than HG, as shown in Table 1 and Figure 1.

Table 1  The Frequencies of *nat* and *noght* of HG and EL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hg</th>
<th>El</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nat</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noght</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 shows, the frequencies of *nat* and *noght* vary according to the order of the Fragments of the *Canterbury Tales* (adjusted to the Fragments order of HG). (The division of the Tales by “Fragments” is based on Benson(1987)).

Table 2  The frequencies of *nat* and *noght*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hg=El</th>
<th>Hg=nat</th>
<th>El=nat</th>
<th>Hg=noght</th>
<th>El=noght</th>
<th>Hg=ne</th>
<th>El=ne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Kn</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Re</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>WBP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the earlier Fragments of HG, particularly Fragment I, both forms are competently used: GP 14-20; KnT 50-30; Mi 15-18; Re 5-14, with *noght* more numerous than *nat* with Re, but in its later Fragments *nat* is definitely preferred: Fragment III WBP 38-19; WP2 20-1; Fr 27-2; Sum 35-5. (The first number shows “nat”, and the second “noght”.) Fragment II, which is located in
the middle of the CT in the HG’s tales order, is seen to be fluctuating between the two forms: ML 16-17. EL is stable in the use of nat throughout the fragments. The ne negative form (including conjunction “nor”) shows very little difference in frequency between HG and EL. Incidentally, the negative forms of Hoccleve’s (Chaucer’s faithful disciple) Dialogue, his holograph parts ll. 253-826 (Durham MS) are entirely limited to nat (50 occurrences).

Figure 2 is the AntConc-Plot “noght” in Blake (1980). It visually shows that noght is most frequent in the early Fragments. In the Figure, the more frequent, the blacker.

Figure 2 AntConc-Plot of noght in Blake (1980)

Figure 3 is the AntConc-Plot “nat” in Blake (1980). It shows that nat is more frequent in later Fragments.

Figure 3 Antcon-plot of nat in Blake (1980)

In Blake (1980), interestingly enough, we find that nat, more weakened form, tends to occur more frequently with modals than noght does.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq(L)</th>
<th>Freq(R)</th>
<th>L [IL]=Left to nat, R[IR]=Right to nat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>nat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>wol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>shal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>myghte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us see the AntConc-KWIC of *may nat*, top frequency collocation, in Blake (1980).

Table 4  AntConc *noght*-collocates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq(L)</th>
<th>Freq(R)</th>
<th>Collocate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>noght</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Noght</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>wol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us see the AntConc-KWIC of *may nat*, top frequency collocation, in Blake (1980).

![AntConc-KWIC of may nat in Blake (1980)](image)

**Figure 4**  AntConc-Kwic of *may nat* in Blake (1980)
2.2. Four types of correspondences between *noght* and *nat* of HG and EL
We have focused on the four major correspondence patterns between *nat* and *noght*. Those patterns appear as shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HG-EL Type</th>
<th>Type I=nat-nat</th>
<th>Type II=noght-nat</th>
<th>Type III=nat-noght</th>
<th>Type IV=noght-noght</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5**  Four Types of Negative Correspondence (I-II-III-IV)

Type I is most frequent, and Type III is least frequent. Types II and IV are of more or less the same frequency. In Type III, why does the El scribe choose *noght* the older form from the exemplar, and change the Hg *nat* into *noght*? All of them are in non-rhyme positions. Look at example (6), Type III: *nat* → *noght*.

(6)

HG:032v KT 1591  Men may the olde at renne / and *nat* at rede #
EL:026v KT 1591  noght at rede
BL:KnT 2451       atrenne #
BN:Kt 2449        atrenne # noght .

The EL scribe perhaps takes the contrastive context into full account and feels the need to choose the older perhaps more emphatic form. Look at similar examples.
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(7)
HG:060r WBP 0158 I haue the power / duryng al my lyf
EL:064v WBP 0158 durynge lyf
BL:WBP 0158#
BN:WBP 0158 have # durynge

HG:060r WBP 0159 Vp on his propre body / and nat he #
EL:064v WBP 0159 noght
BL:WBP 0159 Vpon propre #
BN:WBP 0159 Upon propre , noght.

HG:111r MA 0212 But as I seyde / I nam nat textuel
EL:205v MA 0212 am noght textueel

EL reduces the HG's nam to am, and changes the HG's nat to a more emphatic noght.

The type IV noght-noght pattern is not necessarily demanded by rhyme, with only 15 examples out of the total 106 (14%) in rhymed position. Let us give one each.

(8)
HG:5v GP 0306 Noght oo word # spak he / moore than was neede #
EL:4r GP 0306 Noght o / spak #
BL:GP 0306 spak #
BN:GP 0304 o spak #

HG:8v GP 0516 He was a Sheepherde / and noght a Mercenarie #
EL:6r GP 0516 Shepherde # Mercenarie
BL:GP 0516 sheepherde # mercenarye.
BN:GP 0514 sheepherde # mercenarye.

HG:083r SU 0313 That oon of hem cam hoom / that oother noght #
EL:084v SU 0313 hoom noght
BL:SumT 1995 , noght.
BN:SU 2021 hoom, noght.
Type II \((\text{noght} \rightarrow \text{nat})\) clusters together in Fragment I (GP 14, Kn 19, Mi 15, Re 9) while Type III \((\text{nat} \rightarrow \text{noght})\) occurs only four times there. This shows that HG has competition between \text{nat} and \text{noght} in the beginning of the Tales, but not in the later Fragments (WBP 7, WP2 1). Table 6 shows the four types of negative correspondence between HG and EL according to the Fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>HG-EL</th>
<th>I: nat-nat</th>
<th>II: noght-nat</th>
<th>III: nat-noght</th>
<th>IV: noght-noght</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Kn</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Re</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag I</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>WBP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag III</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>L29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>L30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>Np</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IX</td>
<td>L36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IX</td>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag II</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag II</td>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>Sq</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IV</td>
<td>L20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IV</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag V</td>
<td>L17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag V</td>
<td>Fk</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IV</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IV</td>
<td>L13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag IV</td>
<td>L14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VI</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VI</td>
<td>L21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VI</td>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag VII</td>
<td>L24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Four Types of Negative Correspondence between HG and EL
2.3. Minor examples of *naught* [Verse Texts of the MSs]
Let us see minor examples of *naught* (retaining northern forms).

(9)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{HG:011v GP 0756} \quad \text{And of manhode / hym lakked right} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{EL:008v GP 0756} \quad \text{manhod} \quad \text{right} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{HG:028r KT 1210} \quad \text{And freten hym / for b} \quad \text{they knewe hym} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{EL:022v KT 1210} \quad \text{freeten} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{HG:035r KT 1791} \quad \text{His hardy herte / myghte hym helpe} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{EL:028v KT 1791} \\
\text{HG:099r L30 0016} \quad \text{Naught helpeth it} \quad \text{to tellen his sentence} \\
\text{EL:178v L30 0016} \quad \text{Noght} \\
\text{HG:111v MA 0234} \quad \text{In muchel speche / synne wanteth} \quad \text{nauth} \\
\text{EL:205v MA 0234} \\
\text{HG:117v ML 0302} \quad \text{Naught trowe I / the triumphe of Iulius} \\
\text{EL:053v ML 0302} \quad \text{Noght} \\
\text{HG:117v ML 0303} \quad \text{Of which} \quad \text{b} \quad \text{Lucan / maketh swich a boost} \\
\text{EL:053v ML 0303} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{#} \\
\text{HG:117v ML 0304} \quad \text{Was roiallour / ne moore curyus} \\
\text{EL:053v ML 0304} \quad \text{roialler} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{curius}
\end{array}
\]
The HG northern dialect *naught* is replaced by the EL central dialect *noght*. The northern *naught* in a rhyming position remains unaltered.

2.4. Negative forms of *Troilus and Criseyde*, Corpus Christi College MS 61
For comparison we will show the frequency of negative forms in *Troilus and Criseyde*, CCC (Corpus Chiristic College) MS 61

Table 7  The frequency of negative forms in *Troilus and Criseyde*, CCC MS 61 according to the Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nat</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noght</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naught</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nought</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6  The Frequency of Negative Forms in *Troilus and Criseyde*, CCC MS 61 according to the Books (→ Nakao et al (2009d)).
Besides the most frequent \textit{nat} in the manuscript, it is noticeable that \textit{naught} appears more frequently than in HG and EL, that \textit{nought} appears in stead of noght, and that the negative form \textit{not}, Type IV according to Samuels, appears three times. The \textit{not} form does not appear in HG and EL. These examples in the CCC MS 61 are shown in (10).

(10)

\begin{itemize}
  \item CP:78v III 897 Woot be \textit{not} wel that noble and heigh corage
  \item WN:
  \begin{itemize}
    \item CP:101v IV 593 Ris vp for by myn hed \textit{the} \textit{shal not} goon
    \item WN:IV 593 she shal
  \end{itemize}
  \item CP:113v IV 1310 So as I \textit{shal not }\textit{so} ben hid in muwe
  \item WN:IV 1310 shal so
\end{itemize}

Abbreviations* CP=Corpus Christi College Manuscript 61, WN=Windeatt’ edition of \textit{Troilus and Criseyde} (1990)

3. Choice and psychology of three negative patterns: syntactic, lexical and semantic [Verse Texts of the MSs, GP to SumT]

Negations in Chaucer's language are, according to Burnley (1983: 71–72), divided into three patterns: syntactic, lexical and semantic. Syntactic negation includes single, double or multiple negations, contractions, word or clausal negations, lexical negation includes \textit{un}-prefixed words, \textit{-less} suffixed words, etc., and semantic negation includes a synonymy of for instance ‘not ... trewe’, ‘untrewe’, and ‘false’. The three negative patterns are exemplified in (11).

(11)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textless\textit{Syntactic negation}\textgreater
  \begin{itemize}
    \item HG:004r GP 0178 That seith / $^t$ hunterys been \textit{none} holy men
    \item EL:002v GP 0178 that hunters beth \textit{nat} hooly
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
b. <Lexical negation>
HG:127r ML 0975 That Alla / giltlees # was of hir wo
EL:062r ML 0975 # /

HG:142v ME 0365 That impossible / it weree to replye
EL:106v ME 0365 impossible were replye

c. <Semantic negation>
HG:213r PR 0235 Preye eek # for vs / we synful folk vnstable
EL:151r PR 0235 /

HG:197r PD 0101 But though my self? # be guilty in that synne
EL:137v PD 0101 self /

HG:016v KT 0296 And thow art fals / I telle thee outrely
EL:013r KT 0296 thou

When comparing the four texts, we addressed the following features: syntactic negations—contracted/uncontracted negations, single/double negations, and clausal/word scope negations; lexical negations—those words with differing negative affixes; semantic negations—category-crossover variations from syntactic to lexical to semantic negations such as nat hooly to unholy to synful. To negate something, and then which negative pattern to choose is likely to be psychologically driven, perhaps more so than simply ‘say yes’ (cf. Watt 1960). Negation is thus considered to be a powerful linguistic device to reveal one’s inner self. This psychological characteristic ascribable to negation encourages editors as well as scribes of Chaucerian manuscripts to be positively involved in editing the negative expressions. Those variations seem to reveal subtle differences in meaning and implication between HG and EL. Benson is occasionally found fluctuating between HG and EL.

3.1. Syntactic negation: bidirectional variations
Scribal variations are almost exclusively seen in syntactic negations. The syntactic variations between HG and EL are mostly bidirectional. Since we
have no extant exemplar/s of HG and EL, for the sake of convenience we have taken HG as a reference point to see EL’s variation. (Cf. Horobin 2003: 45–6.) Our discussion will be limited to the following three things. The EL scribe amplifies the HG negative, while he reduces it; the EL scribe contracts the HG negative, while he un-contracts it; the EL scribe changes the HG word scope of negation to the clausal, while he changes the HG clausal scope of negation to the word. As is clarified by Mooney (2006), both manuscripts are written by one scribe, Adam Pinkhurst. Therefore we are more inclined to ask why these alterations happen? We will show some examples of each type. Are these alternations due to the changing London dialect? or affected by the (not extant) exemplar? or based on the scribe’s attitude or psychology?

a. EL’s amplification of the HG negative

(12)  
2 → 3 [double negation → triple negation]:

HG:5r GP 0251  Ther was no man / nowheer / so vuitive  #
EL:3v GP 0251  nas nowher  #
BL:GP 0251  #  # vertuous  .
BN:GP 0251  nas  # nowher  # vertuous  .

1 → 2: [single negation → double negation]:

HG:021r KT 0661  No thyng  # knew he / it was Arcite  #
EL:017r KT 0661  No thyng ne that
BL:KnT 1521  Nothyng  #  # that  ;
BN:Kt 1519  ne  # that  ;

0 → 1: [zero negation → single negation except “but”]

HG:125r ML 0840  Wel may men seen / it was but goddes gace
EL:060r ML 0840  nas grace

EL chooses here more emphatic negative patterns than HG by doubling/multiplying negations.
(13) is from the portraits of the pilgrims in GP. EL changes a single negative to a double by using a contracted negative.

(13): The portraits of the pilgrims in GP.

HG:4v GP 0205  He was nat paale / as is a forpyned goost? #
EL:3r GP 0205  nas pale # goost /
BL:GP 0205     # goost ,
BN:GP 0205     pale # # goost .

HG:5r GP 0251  Ther was no man / nowheer / so vätuous #
EL:3v GP 0251  nas nowher #
BL:GP 0251     # vertuous .
BN:GP 0251     nas # nowher # vertuous .

HG:5r GP 0252  He was the beste beggere / of his hous #
EL:3v GP 0252  / begger? # in
BL:GP 0252     # ,
BN:GP 0252     # in ;

HG:5v GP 0290  And he was noght right fat? # I vndertake #
EL:3v GP 0290  nas nat right fat
BL:GP 0290     fat
BN:GP 0288     nas nat fat , undertake ,

Quantitatively the contracted-uncontracted correspondence is as follows: was (HG)→nas (EL): 6 times; nas→was: 3; nas→nas: 39; nas→ne was: 1; nys→nas:1.

b. EL’s reduction of the HG negative

(14)
3 → 2:

HG:044r MI 0164  That of no wyf / ne took he noon offrynge #
EL:036r MI 0164  #
BL:Mi1T 3344     # .
BN:MI 3350       # # ;
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$2 \rightarrow 1$: 
HG:3r GP 0074  Hise hors weere goode / but he ne was nat gay #  
EL:1v GP 0074  His were #  
BL:GP 0074  ,  
BN:GP 0074  His were , #  

HG:085r SU 0473  And yet7 ne greueth me / no thyng so soore #  
EL:086r SU 0473  yet #  
BL:SumT 2155  yet # nothyng  
BN:SU 2181  yet greveth # nothyng ,  

Other examples from the manuscripts:  
HG:140v ME 0202  If he ne may nat lyue / chast his lyf #  
EL:104v ME 0202  Siththe / # lyuen # chaast /  

HG:112v L7 0051  And if he ne haue nat seyd hem / leeue brother  
EL:049v L7 0051  # noght # leue  

HG:3r GP 0074  Hise hors weere goode / but he ne was nat gay #  
EL:1v GP 0074  His were #  
BL:GP 0074  ,  
BN:GP 0074  His were , #  

HG:069v WB2 0942  And sith / she dorste nat # telle it to no man  
EL:073r WB2 0942  # # /  

HG:083v SU 0344  Awaityng on a lord / he noot nat where  
EL:084v SU 0344  and #  

HG:116r ML 0209  Thow knyttest thee / ther thow nart nat receyued  
EL:052v ML 0209  Thou thou art
1 → 0 [except “but”]:

HG:060r WBP 0192  For myn entente / nys but for to playe #
EL:065r WBP 0192    is
BL:WBP 0192  #
BN:WBP 0192  #

(c. Contracting of the HG negative
(15)
HG:059r WBP 0098  Of myn estat’ ne wol I # # make no boost’ #
EL:064r WBP 0098  estaat’ # # nyl nat
BL:WBP 0098  estat boost
BN:WBP 0098  estaat # # nyl nat boost ,

(d. Cancelling of the HG negative contraction
(16)
HG:060r WBP 0180  # Who so # nyle # / be war’ # by othere men #
EL:065r WBP 0180  / wol nat # war /
BL:WBP 0180  Whoso that # war ,
BN:WBP 0180  " Whoso that nyl # war ,

BN adopts HG although deleting a final —e of nyle.

e. Changing of the HG word scope of negation to the clausal scope
(17)
HG:4r GP 0177  He yaf noght of that text’ a pulled hen #
EL:2v GP 0177  nat text
BL:GP 0177  text
BN:GP 0177  nat text ,

HG:4r GP 0178  That seith / hunterys been none holy men #
EL:2v GP 0178  that hunters beth nat hooly
BL:GP 0178  # that
BN:GP 0178  # that hunters ben nat hooly ,
This change does not affect the meter of the line nor the rhyme. In the history of English both negations are possible. It has nothing to do with the changing status of the London dialect. The change seems to be purely psychological. The word negation “none holy men” reveals that text’s strong negation or even criticism, while the clausal negation “nat hooly men” moderates it in between “holy men” and the opposite “unholy men”.

(18)
HG:058v WBP 0067  But conseillyng? nys no comandement? #
EL:063v WBP 0067  is nat
BL:WBP 0067  conseillyng comandement .
BN:WBP 0067  conseillyng is comandement .

BN adopts the HG word negation, not the EL clausal nat, but reduces the HG nys to the EL is. As a result, BN proposes a third view of negative variation.

f. Changing the HG clausal scope of negation to word negation
(19)
HG:031r KT 1464  And if so be / thow wolt noght do me # grace #
EL:025r KT 1464  thou # no
BL:KnT 2324  #
BN:Knt 2322  # thou nat ,

EL changes the HG’s clausal scope of negation to a word negation. BN adopts HG, but changes noght to nat.

HG:035v KT 1799  # I wol be trewe Iuge / and nat partye #
EL:029r KT 1799  ¶ no partie
BL:KnT 2659  iuge #
BN:Kt 2657  juge , no partie .
g. Combining the word and the clausal scope negations

(20)

HG:059r WBP 0098  Of myn estat7 ne wol I # # make no boost7 #
EL:064r WBP 0098  estaat7 # # nyl nat
BL:WBP 0098  estat # # boost .
BN:WBP 0098  estaat # # nyl nat boost ,

Nyl in EL is stressed while ne in HG is not. Nat is added in EL with a rise of a triple negation. EL does observe the meter.

HG:059v WBP 0142  I nyl # envie / no virgynyte #
EL:064v WBP 0142  nat enuye virginitee
BL:WBP 0142 # .
BN:WBP 0142  enuye # virginitee .

EL adds nat to the HG nyl with a rise of triple negation.

In (21) EL combines both the clausal and word scope negation while HG does not.

(21)

HG:059v WBP 0138  Thanne # sholde men # take / of Chastitee no cure #
EL:064v WBP 0138  # They shul # nat # chastitee
BL:WBP 0138 # chastitee .
BN:WBP 0138 # chastitee .

HG:016r KT 0271  # It were to thee # # quod he / # # # # no greet honour
EL:012v KT 0271  # nere # # # # to thee /
BL:KnT 1131  # ‘ ‘ ‘ ‘
BN:Kt 1129  # “ nere # # “ “ to thee

HG:039v KT 2136  Ther nedeth # / noon auctoritee to allegge #
EL:032v KT 2136  noght7 # Auctoritee allegge
BL:KnT 2996 #
BN:Kt 3000  noght # t’allegge ,
3.2. Syntactic negation: unidirectional patterns
We have unidirectional variation but very rarely.

(22) HG=Ne → EL=He; HG=he → EL ne
HG:2v GP 0068  And thogh b^t he were worthy / he was wys #
EL:1v GP 0068  though were #
BL:GP 0068  that ,
BN:GP 0068  though that were , ,

HG:2v GP 0069  And of his poort^7. as meke / as is a mayde #
EL:1v GP 0069  port^7 meeke #
BL:GP 0069  poort # .
BN:GP 0069  port meeke # .

HG:2v GP 0070  Ne neuere yet^7 # no vileynye he sayde
EL:1v GP 0070  He yet / ne
BL:GP 0070  yet
BN:GP 0070  He nevere yet ne

HG:2v GP 0071  In al his lyf^7 # vn to no manere wight #
EL:1v GP 0071  lyf / maner wight^7
BL:GP 0071  lyf vnto .
BN:GP 0071  lyf unto maner .

HG:2v GP 0072  He was a verray # pfit^7 # gentil knyght^7 #
EL:1v GP 0072  parfit knyght
BL:GP 0072  , parfit , knyght .
BN:GP 0072  , parfit knyght .

EL exchanges the HG’s line-initial negative Ne with the line-internal pronoun he. EL as a result strengthens the cohesion with the knight. HG seems to be more emphatic than EL as to how to show that the knight has no use of dirty words because Ne is line-initially highlighted and directly collocated with neuere. The collocation between ne and neuere in Blake (1980) occurs fifty times while that of he and neuere occurs only four times.
(23) The Reeve’s Tale: naan → neen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HG:054v RE 0265</th>
<th>And syn I sal / haue naan amendement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL:045r RE 0265</td>
<td># neen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL:RvT 4177</td>
<td># amendement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN:RE 4185</td>
<td># have neen amendement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HG:054v RE 0266</th>
<th>Agayn my los / I wil haue esement? #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL:045r RE 0266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL:RvT 4178</td>
<td>, esement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN:RE 4186</td>
<td>, will have esement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HG’s *naan* is a northern form, which is changed into *neen* by EL. This *neen* is, according to Horobin (2003), a hypercorrection after a model of *heem*, an Old Norse word meaning ‘home.’ This *heem* is used in the earlier context by HG, as shown in (24).

(24)

HG:052v RE 0112 To grynde oure corn / and carie it *heem* agayn #
EL:043v RE 0112 #
BL:RvT 4024 #
BN:RE 4032 #

We still wonder if the exemplar of EL might have had *noon*, the double *o* of which might have been misinterpreted as *ee* for the paleographical similarity.

In (25) HG’s northern negative form *na* is changed to *ne* in EL.

(25) *na* → *ne*

HG:054v RE 0263 Oure corn is stoln / soothly # it is *na* nay #
EL:045r RE 0263 shortly # *ne*
BL:RvT 4175 ,
BN:RE 4183 , sothly ,

EL not only adopts the standard form *ne* but changes the word scope negation to the causal.

4. **Lexical negation variations [Verse Texts of the MSs]**

There are very few occurrences of lexical negation variations. If the scribe understands the line as a whole as usual when copying the exemplar, or phrase by phrase, or word by word where necessary, we expect that he might be
likely to replace a word with a synonymous word. We imagine for instance *untrewe* to be replaced with *unkynde* or *unstable* or *unsad*. But we have found no examples of this lexical variation except for the three (masked examples) in (26) which are only varied by prefixes.

(26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Pair</th>
<th>HG:142v ME 0365</th>
<th>EL:106v ME 0365</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impossible/inpossible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG:142v ME 0365</td>
<td>That impossible / it were to replye</td>
<td>EL:106v ME 0365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG uses the etymological prefix while EL does not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Pair</th>
<th>HG:095v MO 0516</th>
<th>EL:175r MO 0516</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inportable/importable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG:095v MO 0516</td>
<td>That hise peynes / weren inportable</td>
<td>EL:175r MO 0516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG:095v MO 0516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vnstable/instable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG:148r ME 0813</td>
<td>sodeyn hap / o. thou Fortune vnstable</td>
<td>EL:111r ME 0813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG:148r ME 0813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above two examples, EL uses the etymological prefix while HG does not.

(27) is a list of the words with negative affixes.

a. vn-words

vndooth, vnthank, vnecouple, vnwrappeth, vnbokoel, vnshette, vnheele, vnknowe, vnset, vnborn, vntressed, vnhorsed, vnholden, vnwist, vnbokeled, vntold, vnharmed, vnauysed, vnwemmed, vnarmed, vnburyed, vnfeyned, vntressed, vnconstreyned, vnbrente, vntrewes, vnkouth, vnneth, vnneth, vnteelde, vnweyl, vnhardy, vnsely, vndiscreet, vnclene, vnwar, vnlik, vnkynde, vnhappy, vnwar, vnmesurable, vnsofte, vnlikly, vncurtesyly, vnresonable, vnwityng, vnworthy, vnfestlich, vnworthye, vnsofte, vnstable/instable, vnstable/instable, vnsely, vndigne, vndiscreet, vnsad, vnkynedly, vnwityngly, vnright, vnrest, vntrouthe, vnyndenesse, vntrust
b. *dis*-words

disfigure, disfigured, disguised, dished, disparaged, dislaundred, disposed, disfigured, discomfort, dishonor, dissimulacioun, disconforten, disjoint, disparage, displease, distemper, disporten, disdeyne, disobeye, dispoylen, discomfort, disffame, disclandre, disese, disputisoun, dissimuler, distresse, discord, dispensacioun, dissemblenc, displesances, discontentuyinge, dissimilour, discomfiture, dishoneste

c. *in*-words

iniquitee, infortue, inconstance, indigence, infinite, impossible/impossible, insufficient, incurable, importable/importable, infortunat, imprudent, inmut, instable/vnstable (see a.)

d. *lees*-words

recchelees, waterlees, dettelees, giltlees, doutelees, hertelees, titlelees, armlees, sterelees, routhelees, endelees, wiflees, dredelees, causelees, wemmelees, nedelees, smoklees, pridelees, restelees, goldlees

We wonder why there are no substantial lexical disagreements between HG and EL. Most probably the scribe assumes that lexical changes involving the stems would seriously affect the meaning of the text.

5. **Semantic negation variations**

There are very few occurrences of semantic negation variations. If the scribe understands the whole line when copying the exemplar, and understands the plot of the discourse, we might expect for instance such variations among *nat ... kynde, vnkynde/vntrewe* and *false*. But there are no examples of such. (28) is the only near equivalent. EL changes HG’s *dreed nat to dredelees*.

(28)

HG:138v ME 0067 ¶ A wyf*# is goddes yifte verraily
EL:103v ME 0067 wyf /

HG:138v ME 0068 Alle othere manere yiftes hardly
EL:103v ME 0068 otherere
In HG the narrator addresses the audience with an imperative: dread not that a wife will last and endure in your house more than you desire. EL, however, understands the expression perhaps with more stress on its epistemic implication: no dread/doubt. HG has a more performative force than EL while EL has a more modal force than HG. Benson chooses HG although usually based on EL. But he puts the final −e after the HG’s dred to keep the iambic rhythm.

7. Conclusion
This paper is part of our project on computer-assisted textual and linguistic studies of the manuscripts and the editions of Chaucer’s works. As we have
symptomatically shown here, a full text collation concordance and other indexes are of great value and help to investigate linguistic differences between HG and EL and the two editions.

Moreover, these provide us with rich and promising research materials, though they raise interesting questions and puzzles to explore rather than answers. In this paper, though tentatively, we have demonstrated that:

1) HG has competition between nat and noght in Fragment I, and in later Fragments gradually tends towards nat. EL is stable in the use of nat throughout the Fragments.
2) There are four types of negative correspondences between nat and noght. Type III in which EL changes the HG nat to noght an older form is least in frequency. Here EL seems to take into full account a positive-negative polarity contrast.
3) The negative expressions are classified into three patterns: syntactic, lexical and semantic. The manuscript variations are almost exclusively seen in syntactic domains. There are very few variations in lexical and semantic domains.
4) Most of the syntactic variations are bidirectional. On the one hand, EL amplifies the HG negative, while he reduces it. In amplifying the HG negative, he increases double or multiple negations and/or contracted negations. Here EL is more emphatic than HG. On the other, when EL reduces the HG negative, the opposite may be true where EL moderates it. Benson occasionally fluctuates between HG and EL, which leads to a third view of variants, or a composite variant.
5) EL changes the HG's word scope of negation to the clausal. And vice versa. In the former, HG shows a strong negative evaluation while EL shows a neutral. However, in the latter, the opposite may be also true.
6) There are unidirectional variations although very rare. EL puts the HG line initial Ne and the line medial he the other way round. HG seems to be more emphatic than EL as to how to show that the knight has no use of dirty words. EL changes the HG's naan to neen, which is a hypercorrection according to Horobin (2003). There seems to be some possibility that the exemplar of EL has noon, not a northern form.
Horobin (2003) states that the differences between HG and EL are due to several possibilities: that is, the historical change of the London dialect, the growth/attitude of the scribe, the editorial difference/the function of the manuscript, and the difference of a copy text (exemplar) he is based on. With regard to the negative expression, which is the most relevant? We may safely conclude that the variations are partly due to the changing status of the London dialect (negative forms), but mostly due to the scribe’s attitude and psychology towards the manuscript (scope of negation). Chaucer seems to lie in between the variants, which seems to be reflective of the range and tolerance of his language.

In the near future we would like to complete the collation concordance between HG and EL and the two editions to make a more systematic description of their language.
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