1. Introduction

Negation in Finnish and Swedish is expressed by typologically very dissimilar means. Finnish employs a negative verb e- with person and number marking, as well as a distinct negative imperative verb älä, ál-, and marks voice, tense, aspect and mood on a non-finite form of the lexical verb, which is invariably preceded by the negative verb. Swedish, in contrast, employs negative particles like inte, as well as negative pronouns and adverbs like aldrig ‘never’, ingenting ‘nothing’, etc., which are often placed before those phrases under the scope of negation. The large differences between the two systems notwithstanding, negation is one part of grammar in which Swedish influence on Finnish has been documented both in dialects and the written language.

Finnish, and, more broadly, Finnic negation is a system in transition. Whereas the written Finnish language still sports a complete person-number conjugation of the negative verb, earlier tense marking on the negative verb has all but disappeared from Finnic, some vestiges remaining in South Estonian and Livonian (Laanest 1982: 243). Person and number marking on the negative verb has disappeared in standard Estonian, leaving an invariant ei (the original 3rd pers. sing. form). In Finnish, person/number marking is showing attrition of different degree in different dialects: the distinction between the 3rd pers. singular and plural forms seems to be the most widely lost (Savijärvi 1977: 62, 93, 106-107, 120-123, 127-132), including the literary language right until the 19th century (Savijärvi 1977: 44, Häkkinen 1994: 344-345). Though loss of number marking with 3rd pers. verb forms occurs with main verbs as well in spoken Finnish, loss of number marking with main verbs is relatively infrequent in the dialects of Ostrobothnia as well as the Southwestern and Southeastern dialects, whereas loss of number marking in negative clauses seems to be the norm in all Finnish dialects (Savijärvi 1977: 180, Karlsson 1966: 21). Total loss of number marking, with the singular paradigm (en, et, ei) being generalized to the plural as well, seems to occur in a somewhat more restricted fashion in mainly the Southwestern and Ingrian dialects (Savijärvi 1977: 181), whereas total loss of person and number distinction seems to occur in the Southwestern dialects, as well as rarely in some eastern dialects (Savijärvi 1977: 182). In this, Finnish seems to travel a well-worn diachronic pathway, which related languages like Estonian have already travelled (Miestamo 2000: 273-274). Also, loss of marking on the negative verb is well known in genetically unrelated but typologically similar languages like Tunguz (Payne 1985: 214). Nonetheless the westernly and southwesternly location of Finnish dialects apparently most prone to loss of person/number marking, as well as the fact that the one Finnish dialect in which the negative verb appears exclusively unmarked for person and number is the extinct dialect of Värmland in central Sweden (Savijärvi 1977: 188), has led Ilkka Savijärvi (1977: 189-190) to assume that Swedish may have exerted, to some extent, an influence on Finnish loss of marking, in collusion with other factors. Though Savijärvi (1977: 130-131) finds only extremely sporadic
occurrences of loss of 1st and 2nd person and number marking in the northernmost dialects of Finnish, Virtaranta (1982: 305) reports that loss of marking does occur in the dialect of Kurravaara, near Jukkasjärvi, in the Norrbotten province of Sweden. In research of the older written Finnish language, attention has been payed mainly to the frequency of irregular negated forms in which all person and number markers are placed on the lexical verb in the 16th-century religious texts of Agricola, a phenomenon virtually unknown in spoken Finnish, which has been regarded as a result of interference from Swedish and as a possible indication that Agricola spoke Swedish as his mother tongue. (Ojansuu 1909: 167, Savijärvi 1977: 196-197, 222). Aside from this, the same loss of person/number marking known in Finnish dialects appears in Agricola’s texts as well, as well as with other writers, though progressively and particularly after the appearance of the 1642 Bible translation more rarely (Savijärvi 1977: 237, 255). Finally, Swedish may have exerted its influence on the word order of negative sentences as well as on Finnish word order in general, namely on tendencies towards verb-fronting in Finnish (according to Lindén (1963: 217), verb-fronting in negative sentences, eg. placement of the negative verb at the beginning of the sentence, has been wrongly regarded as a result of Swedish interference by 19th and early 20th century prescriptivism).

In this paper, I will examine negation in three Old Finnish translations of King Christopher’s land-law of 1443, as well as one Modern Finnish translation of the same. The three old Finnish translations under examination are Herra Martti’s translation, which was probably written in the early 1580s, in Setälä’s and Nyholm’s 1905 edition, Ljungo Thomae’s translation of 1601, in Martti Ulkuniemi’s 1975 edition, and Abraham Kollanius’ translation of 1648, which appeared in an edition by Martti Rapola in 1926. In some cases, I will refer to Airila and Harmas (1930) who compiled an index of those instances in which the manuscript on which Setälä and Nyholm’s edition of Martti’s translation is based (the Stockholm Codex) differs from other extant manuscripts of the same. Neither of the three old translations were ever printed in their own time, though manuscripts of Martti’s translation – seven of which survive until the present day - were spread and available to Ljungo and most likely also Kollanius (Pajula 1960: 41, 61, 63). It is unknown which manuscripts of Christopher’s Law Martti or Ljungo used – Kollanius could avail himself of a printed version which appeared shortly before he undertook his translation (Pajula 1955: 80). As a Modern Finnish control-case, I have made use of Martti Ulkuniemi’s own translation which appeared in 1978. For the Old Swedish source text, I have used an electronic version of Schlyter’s edition of Christopher’s Law. Henceforth M (Martti), L (Ljungo) and K (Kollanius) will designate the three subsequent Old Finnish translations, U will designate Ulkuniemi’s Modern Finnish translation, and KrL the Old Swedish source text. In examples, Roman numbers (I-XIV) designate the chapters, Arab numbers the paragraphs according to Martti’s translation (note, that in a number of places his division into paragraphs differs slightly from the later translations). I attempted to locate every negative sentence or phrase which appeared in at least two Old Finnish translations (as a negative clause) as well as the Swedish source text: thus my database consists of 847 phrases from M, 833 from L, 833 from K and 829 from U. Though it is of course likely that I have overlooked some negative clauses, I believe that the database should be representative of the corpus as a whole.

My aim here is to research the differences in which the four translators handled the task of translating Old Swedish negativity into Old (and Modern) Finnish negativity. Thus the subject matter of this paper relates to interference as well, but mainly it is it interference in parole, in Weinreich’s (1974: 11) metaphor, the interference that is
“sand carried by a stream” rather than the “sedimented sand deposited in the bottom of a lake” which is interference in langue, although I will touch upon the latter as well, where appropriate. The second chapter below will deal with a general presentation of negation in Finnish as well as with variation between fused and unfused forms of the Finnish conjunction and the negative verb. The third chapter will treat person and number marking of the negative verb in the three Old Finnish translations, and the fourth will deal with the negated imperative and various prohibitive constructions in the translations under examination. In the fifth chapter, I will examine some issues concerning word order. I will present some concluding remarks in the sixth chapter.

2. General remarks

2.1. The negative verb in Modern Finnish

In Modern Finnish, the negative verb e- as well as the negative imperative äl- are inflected for person and number:

Table 1. Indicative forms of the negative verb in Modern Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>emme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>ette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>eivät</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Imperative forms of the negative verb in Modern Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>Plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>älkääämme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>älä</td>
<td>älkää</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>älköön</td>
<td>älkööt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, tense/aspect, mood and voice are marked on a lexical verb preceded by the negative verb, or on the auxiliary olla in periphrastic tenses:

Table 3. Tense/aspect, mood, voice marking on the lexical verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tappaa ‘to kill’</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indicative praes.</td>
<td>(en, et...) tapa</td>
<td>(ei) tapeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>(en, et...) tappanut</td>
<td>(ei) tapettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>(en, et...) olle tappanut</td>
<td>(ei) ole tapettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plusquamperf.</td>
<td>(en, et...) ollut tappanut</td>
<td>(ei) ollut tapettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional praes.</td>
<td>(en, et...) tappasi</td>
<td>(ei) tapettaisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>(en, et...) olisi tappanut</td>
<td>(ei) olisi tapettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative praes.</td>
<td>(älä) tapa, (älkää) tappako</td>
<td>(älköön) tapettako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>(älä) ole tappanut</td>
<td>(älköön) olko tapettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential praes.</td>
<td>(en, et...) tappane</td>
<td>(ei) tapettane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>(en, et...) liene tappanut</td>
<td>(ei) liene tapettu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1. Orthography and translation equivalents of negative adverbs and pronouns

Of the orthographic variants of the common 3rd pers. singular form of the negative verb ei, ei occurs with all four translators, whereas ej is used by M, L and particularly by K. Another variant, ej, is used more rarely, and mostly by L (namely, 31 times, whereas M has 21 occurrences of ej and K only 2). Of the 21 times M uses ej, 18 occur in Chapter VII and VIII. L uses the variant ey very frequently and throughout the whole document (I counted 179 occurrences of ey) – the variant happens to be homographic with the Old Swedish negative particle ey, and it is interesting to wonder whether this led L to use that particular orthography – as it is, however, ey for /ei/ seems to occur more widely in L, for example neytzyen (‘maiden’-GEN, IV:16). With K, ey occurs only once, whereas M has ey once and ey eleven times – all but one occur in Chapters VII and VIII.

As mentioned above, Swedish employs negative pronouns and adverbs as well as a negative particle (ey in KrL) – most commonly in KrL, engen and engte ‘no-one, none’, usually in the nominative case, to some extent case-marked as well, aldre ‘never’, hwargen ‘neither’. The equivalents of negative pronouns and adverbs in Finnish is an interrogative pronoun marked with the enclitic -kAAn, whereas the negative verb must always occur in Finnish with these pronouns (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1988: 269). Enclitic –kAAn and –kin (both meaning ‘too, also’, but obligatory in certain context like the negative pronouns mentioned above) have a complementary distribution in the standard language – the former occurring in negative, the latter in positive clauses – but in dialects the situation is less clear. Particularly in the eastern dialects, -kin occurs in negative clauses as well, according to Savijärvi (1994: 118-119) possibly due to the homophony of the weak-grade variants³ of both enclitic particles. The equivalent of engen is, in Modern Finnish, ei kukaan, and in that fashion it consistently occurs with U wherever engen, engte is translated with a negated pronoun, U has ei kukaan or case-marked variants in 70 cases, ei mitään ‘nothing’ in 22 cases, usually as an equivalent of neuter engte, and only twice ei yksikään lit. ‘not one’). Variation between ei kukaan and ei yksikään occurs with M, L and K, which is to say, ei kukaan is a marginal equivalent of enge, engte (4 occurrences in M, 4 in K, and somewhat more, namely 8 in L), which is most commonly translated with ei yksikään (83 occurrences in M, 79 in L, 87 in K). The Old Swedish negative adverb aldre ‘never’ is consistently (wherever a neg. adverb is used) translated with ei ikänänsä in M, L, and K, whereas U has ei koskaan in two cases and the slightly more emphatic ei milloinkään in 21 cases. Hwargen, hwatzske ‘neither... nor’ is translated most usually with ei...eikä or ei...eli with all four translators (see paragraph 2.3 below). Finally, sentences and phrases beginning with the Old Swedish preposition and conjunction wtan ‘without, except when, if not’ have been translated with to some extent with negative sentences – usually with iold eikä, iollei ’if not' by M, L and K, ellei ’if not' by U.

2.2. Negated conjunctions

In Modern Finnish, the negative verb has a tendency to fuse with a preceding conjunction or interrogative pronoun – in case the conjunction is ja ‘and’, it is

³ An originally regular but in current Finnish fossilized consonantal alternation would have lead to the weakening of *k to *γ when preceded by a non-stressed syllable, and subsequent further weakening.
replaced by a suffix –kä attached to the negative verb in the Modern written language as well as in dialectal Finnish (Ikola, Palomäki and Koitto 1989: 64-65), for example ja en --> enkä, ja ei --> eikä, etc.. With other conjunctions, apocope of the final vowel occurs and the negative verb is fused to the stem of the conjunction, i.e. että ei --> ettei. The process underlying the latter – apocope of a final –ä/-a before a following vowel (as well as the ensuing fusion between the conjunction and the negative verb) - is well-known in most Finnish dialects (Rapola 1966: 490-491). Current normative grammar only allows ja initializing a negative sentence when it is not immediately followed by the negative verb, otherwise the use of the fused form is obligatory (Häkkinen 1994: 379, Saarimaa 1971: 257). The older literary language, however, varied in this respect: both fused forms (eikä, ettei ) and unfused forms occur in Agricola’s writings (Häkkinen 1994: 378-379). Negative sentences initiated by a conjunction are extremely common in the translations of KrL. There are some cases in M in which a fused conjunctive or unfused conjunctive (immediately followed by a negative verb) co-occurs with a negative verb elsewhere in the sentence. In one case L has a similar contamination in the same sentence – though in a different place:

III:12
M: quittingin ioldei cansalapsett ei ole tiedholle tulluet, ia ios Isä eli äiti ei ole eläillä,
however IF-NEG sibling-PL NEG are knowledge-ALL come-PARTIC joka ei tappanut eli murhannut
L: jos ey täysillä sisarita ole taidholla tullet, jos ei isä eli äiti ei ole elehällä ioca ei tappanut eli murhannut
if NEG father or mother NEG is alive
KrL: æn ey æru samsytzkan til weetz komen, oc æn ey ær fadher eller modher lifuandis til som ey draapo eller myrtdho
‘If no siblings are yet able, and if they have no living father or mother, who has not committed murder’

V:31
M: nytt ios se quin maan eli kihlacunna ycteitzellë asupi köyhty nijn ettei hän maan eli kihlacunnan
or district-GEN oikeut ei woi vlgos tehdä right-PART NEG can uphold
KrL: Nu æn then som a almenningiom landz eller heredz boor, kan fatikdom hend, swa ath han formaey landz skyld vppehalda
‘if he who lives on the common lands of the land or parish is so impoverished, that he cannot comply with the rights of the land or the district’

The following abbreviations are used in glosses:
ACC accusative 1 first person
ADESS adessive 2 second person
ALL allative 3 third person
CONJ conjunction
DAT dative/genitive IMPER imperative
ELAT elative NEG negative verb
ESS esseive PART participle
GEN genitive PASS passive
ILL illative
INESS inessive
INSTR instructive
PART partitive
PL plural
SG singular
TRANSL translative
IX:11
M: ioidei ei enâmbs lôytiä nijin
   IF-NEG NEG more find-PASS
KrL: vindz ey mera ath
   ‘if nothing more is found’

In the latter two cases, however, M’s redundant negative verb is absent in five other manuscripts (Airila, Harmas 1930: 165, 274), while in the first it is absent in four (Airila, Harmas 1930: 72). Also, in one case both M and L have translated a sentence which, it seems, was meant to be positive, with a negative, fused conjunction:

VII:43
M: maxakan 3 mrka colmie iakohon, iollei hän sanans sînä cohta oienna ia iâllens eli takaperin ota
   IF-NEG he word-HIS immediately rectifies and withdraws
L: maxakan 3 marca col: kerd: iollei hän sanans sînä cohta ojenda, eli tacaperin otta
   if he immediately word-HIS rectifies or withdraws
KrL: böte III mark til treskïptis om han sin ordh genast rætter eller j geen kallar
   ‘let him pay three marks in three parts, if he immediately rectifies and withdraws his words’

Two similar cases occur in L, where he uses a negative mutoin iollei where the other translators use a positive conditional clause with jos:

VII:25
M: mwtoin ios hän laissa wanno walallansa, nýn ettej hän lakia tiedhâ sînä asiasa
   except if he law-INESS swears oath-ADESS
L: mutoin iollei hän käräïää wanno idze walallans etei hän lakia sînä asias tiedhâ
   except IF-NEG he court-INESS swears himself oath-ADESS
KrL: wtan han for thinge swær meth een edhe sinom ath han ey lagh om thet maal weeth
   ‘except if he swears by an oath in court, that he does not know the law on this issue’

X:6
M: nijn tule hänen saadha cwkaudhen pâiüät mennä kuningan tîgö, ia 14 ôtä mennä kuningan tîköä pois, ia ei enâmö, mwtoin ios hän nautitze kuningan armoia
   except if he receives king-GEN mercy-PART
L: nin hânellä on Cwkauden pâiât Kuningann ethen tulla, ia 14 ôtä Kuningan tîköä mennä ia ey enâmätä, mutoin iollei hän Kuningan armoia nautitze
   except IF-NEG he king-GEN mercy-PART receives
KrL: tha ægher han maanada dagh haua fore konung koma, oc XIII naetter fraan konunge fara, oc ey lenger, wtan konungs nad nyute meth fridzbreff hans
   ‘he shall have a month to travel to the king, and fourteen days to travel back, and no more, except if he has received mercy from the king.’

In the latter two cases, we are dealing with the Old Swedish conjunction wtan ‘if not, except when’, which asserts the factuality of the following conditional clause when preceded by a negative clause, and the non-factuality of the following clause when a positive clause precedes it. Thus it’s translation equivalents in the Finnish texts are various negated conditional conjunctions – jollei, muutoin jossei – or positive – muutoin jos, paitsi jos, etc.

It is thinkable that this variation partially led L to use an, at least in the second example, unintentional negative conjunction. It seems tempting to hypothesize that M and L did not always take the fused, negative conjunction conjunction as including a negative verb, but the material is too sparse to offer any conclusions on this. Also, negativity in the latter two clauses is expressed both by the negative verb (fused with the conjunction) and the stem of the lexical verb. Since the version of KrL available to
them remains unknown (K being the first who was able to avail himself of the printed version of KrL), we cannot draw any conclusions here. Below follow a few tables detailing the distribution of various fused and unfused forms in the four translations examined (leaving out elliptical negative sentences):

Table 3. Fused and unfused negative conjunctions with *jos* ‘if’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jos ei</em></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jolid ei, joll ei</em></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>joldei, jollei, jossei</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ellei</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Fused and unfused negative conjunctions with *ja* ‘and’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ja ei</em></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>eikä</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Fused and unfused negative conjunctions with *että* ‘that’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>että ei</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ettei</em></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Fused and unfused negative conjunctions with *ehkä, vaikka* ‘even though, even if’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ehkä ei</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ehkei</em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vaikka ei</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vaikkei</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas M, L and K show variation in their use of fused and unfused forms (with the exception of *ettei* which appears fused except for a single occurrence in M), U does not, employing – in line with Modern Finnish – virtually only fused forms. The differences in distribution of fused and unfused forms with the four conjunctions examined (*jos, ja, että* and *ehkä* which, in Modern Finnish, has been replaced by *vaikka* in meaning ‘even though’), seems first and foremost a result of the relative transparency of the fused form vs. the unfused one – whereas *ettei* and *ehkei* are hardly more than apocope forms of *että ei* and *ehkä ei*, the issue with *jos* is more complex. The conjunction *jos* has been formed by addition of a lative suffix *-* to a stem *-* (SSA). The fused conjunctions appearing with M, L and K are: *jossei* - the most widespread variant in Finnish dialects (Ikola, Palomäki and Koitto 1989: 99) - to some extent in L, *jollei* occurring in M, L and K whereas M and K also use *joldei, joldeikä* (known to some extent in southwestern dialects, see Ikola 1966: 11). M also often uses apocope forms followed by a seperate negative verb, *jold ei, joll ei* which are found sporadically in K as well but not in L. These fused conjunctions may be
based on apocope forms of the conjunctions jossa, jolla, jolta (compare the conjunction jonsa 'if' and respective negative forms like jonsei which are extant in Finnish dialects (SSA)) whereas ellei – which appears a single time in M, but is used without exception in U, is based on a dialectal conjunction ellä (Ikola 1966: 12, Hakulinen 1979: 74). Another explanation for the form jossei may be that the negative verb is fused with a conjunction jos rather than jossa, and that the final sibilant of the conjunction would have lengthened in a process of gemination\(^5\).

An unfused jossa ey appears once in L:

III:22
L: jossa ey löytä taurata, nin
   if NEG find-PASS ware-PART
KrL: vindz ey gotz till
   'if no wares are found'

It seems that M, L and K chose to base fused negative equivalents of jos on synonymous bisyllabic conjunctions, where apocope similar to that of ettei, ehkei was possible. The form josei has been attested in both the older written language and Finnish dialects (VKS cf. jos, Ikola 1966: 12), but does not seem to occur in the translations examined – doubtlessly it is based on an apocope form of a dialectal josa.

\(2.3.\) eikä

The formation\(^6\) of eikä from ja ei – which is quite a different process altogether - is even less transparent: here not only the conjunction is substituted by a suffix, but also the order of the conjunction and the negative verb is reversed. The picture that the table above offers of the relative rarity of eikä in L and K, however, is a bit skewed: eikä does occur with these writers as well, though not very frequently. In the corpus, there are 25 instances where M and L use eikä. M uses eikä exclusively following other negated sentences – thus rather often in elliptical clauses, whereas L employs eikä mainly after other negative clauses. K, on the other hand, uses eikä freely after positive clauses as well. It seems thus that by M, and to a large extent by L as well, eikä was used to denote resumptive negation (see Jespersen 1917: 72-75), as an equivalent of English neither...nor or Old Swedish hwarte/hwatske...eller (VKS cf. ei 3, OSSGL). This usage seems to be common in the older written language, and possible source patterns would include Latin neque... neque as well (Forsman Svensson 1994: 379 The Swedish source pattern for M and L's use of eikä is usually a pair of Swedish clauses negated both by pronominal or verbal negation (engen, ey etc.) combined with oc (17 times in M, 16 in L) and to a lesser extent Swedish hwatszke/hwarte...eller or hwarte...oc ey (4 times in M, 5 in L). Often, negated clauses or phrases follow after eikä as well, usually by another eikä or eli.

There are some indications that M and L interpreted eikä as a marker of resumptive negation to be used with both clauses as well as noun phrases, rather than a negative conjunction. The coördinative function of the conjunction is not totally lost – since it is often followed by eli or another eikä. First of all, eikä is used as a negative

---

\(^5\) Jussi Ylikoski (p.c.) informed me that such a process of gemination is in fact found in the Southwestern dialects in case of the interrogative pronoun kui (<kuin), which shows a fused form kuinnei if followed by a negative verb.

\(^6\) Not meant in a diachronic sense.
particle to negate noun phrases preceded immediately by the main verb, i.e. not in subordinate complete or elliptical clauses. Examples follow below.

Negation of an adverbal phrase:

I: 29
M: ia se quin omas sýsãns waickene, sitã ei wastat eikã lailla he-PART NEG answer-PASS CONJ-NEG law-ADESS

eikã rahalla CONJ-NEG money-ADESS
L: ia se quin candaian oikeutta ano ia keriã, sitã ei tule kenengãn wastata eikã lailla eikã peningillã
K: ja joca syynejojan oikeutta keriã, hãndã ei wastata eikã Lailla, eli rahalla
KrL: oc them som malsegande Raeth tigger, swaris hwatzske meth laghom eller penningom
‘and he who begs the rights of the plaintiff, he will not be answered either with the law or with money.’

Negation of the subject phrase:

IV: 27
K: nyt eij ole Miehellã eickã maata eli Maan päälistã now NEG is man-ADESS CONJ-NEG land-PART or movable estate-PART
KrL: Nu ægher bonden hwarte iordh eller lösöra ‘now, the man does not own either land or movable estate’

V: 18
M: tammen kuormisen ia metzãn polteen edhest ei pidhã seisoman eikã luuan eli paikan NEG shall stand CONJ-NEG permission-GEN
or compensation-GEN
KrL: Fore barklöpo eller scoga brenno stande hwarte loff eller legha ‘there will be neither permission nor compensation for barking or burning of forest’

V: 35
M: nütt istu mies ÿxinäns kylãs, ia ei ole hänelle itzã eikã huonetta eikã maata and NEG is him-ADESS self CONJ-NEG house-PART
CONJ-NEG land
KrL: Nw siter han ensamen j by, oc æghir sieluir hwatzske hws eller jord ‘now, a man lives alone in the village, and he does not own himself either a house or land’

The examples above are all those found in the corpus of this particular use of eikã – three in M, one in L and two in K. Use of the negative verb as a particle to negate specific adverbal phrases or noun phrases within a main clause is alien to (Modern) Finnish, which uses verbal negation only (i.e. a negative verb co-occurring with a lexical verb, the latter though, is often left out in elliptical clauses), possibly in combination with special negative forms of pronouns or adverbial pronouns, i.e., there is, in as far as the morphosyntax of negation itself is concerned, usually no surface difference between sentential negation and constituent negation in Finnish (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1988: 267-268) though tendencies to use the 3rd pers. sing. form of the negative verb as a particle in a manner similar to the examples above are not unknown in Finnish literature (Savijärvi 1977: 24-25), and of course, the scope of negation may be restricted to single constituents or phrases. The use of eikã as a marker of resumptive negation, which thus always follows a lexical verb already negated by the regular negative verb possibly facilitated the analysis of eikã as a negative particle rather than a conjunction. As is clear from the examples above,

7 The subject here is atypical in all three sentences: possessee in IV:27 and V:35, and a genetive-marked subject of a necessitive existential phrase in V:18
eikä seems to be used in this fashion only as a translation equivalent of the Old Swedish resumptive negative marker hwarte/hwatszke and it is probably through analogy with this model pattern that the use of eikä was extended to negation of noun and adverbial phrases in addition to its regular use as a resumptive negative conjunction. As a negative particle used for resumptive negation of noun or adverbial phrases, eikä is redundant, since it is preceded by a negative verb. Another indication of the use of eikä as a resumptive negative particle rather than a conjunction is the combination of eikä with a preceding conjunction, or not in connection with any preceding clause at all, which is not found in M at all, but is found to some extent in L and K8:

XII:2
L: ja iotca nämät eroittauat etei he hauoi sialla ollet, **eli eikä** sijnä mielin eli syin että hän
cause-INSTR that he
wahinon sai
damage-ACC incurred
KrL: **oc them hon wndan taker, ath ey a wigualle waaro, eller oc ther waaro oc ey thes wiliandhe eller wallande ath han scada fik**
‘and if they decide that he was not present on the scene of the fighting, or that he was not so with the intention to hurt someone’

XII:18
L: *sen maxon quin lapsi andaman pitä sen* **åttakan** Jutun isändä **ia eikä** Kuningas eli kihlacunda
this-ACC take-IMPER plaintiff and CONJ-NEG king
or district
KrL: *j them botom som ouirmagi scal bötä fore, thaki thet maalsegenden, oc hwarte konunger eller herede*
‘and the fine that a child should pay should be taken by the plaintiff and neither by the King or the distruct’

III:3
K: **nyt eijkä** ole Isä eli Äiti taicka xipahnaisia lapsia, **elicka nijdhen lapsia elämäsä**
now CONJ-NEG is father or mother or full siblings-PL.PART or their children-PL.PART alive
KrL: **nu æru ey fadher eller modher, samsytzkane eller thera barn til**
‘Now, if neither father, mother, full siblings or children of those are alive’

III:17
K: **elickä maxacaan, colme marca, sijtä eikä** saa Kihlacunda eli Kuningas, sillä
that-ELAT CONJ-NEG gets district or king
se on Andomiehen oma asia
KrL: **eller böte III marker; oc ther ægher i huarte karl eller konunger, thet æer giptomanz eensak**
‘and pay three marks, and from that neither the parish or the King shall have a part, the fine belongs to the bride’s father.’

XII:15
K: **sijtä eijkä tule Kihlacunnan eli Cuningan**
that-ELAT CONJ-NEG comes parish-DAT or King-DAT
KrL: **oc ther æghir j hwarte karl eller konunger**
‘and neither the parish nor the King shall have a part of this’

8 Apart from the examples listed, in V:11, VIII: 34, X: 35 (L), V:35 (K)
L uses a not-conjunctive eikä without a preceding negative clause twice, and K in all instances. In both cases where L's eikä is preceded by a positive clause and functions as the first component of a resumptive negative construction – the second component being marked by eli ‘or’. Here, the Swedish source pattern shows a resumptive negative marker hwarte/hwatszke...eller, and doubtlessly it is by following the example of the source text that L irregularly uses eikä after the conjunction ja here. In three other cases, where the Old Swedish source patterns use different constructions than hwarte/hwatszke...eller, L's eikä is nevertheless resumptive, following a negated clause. K uses eikä as the first component of resumptive negation. Here, eikä has lost its function as a conjunction since it is unconnected to any preceding clause. In three of the four cases found with K, hwarte/hwatszke...eller appears as the source pattern of the construction.

In short, it seems that, in M, eikä is used exclusively as the second component of resumptive negation, i.e. following negative clauses and thus serving as the translation equivalent of oc ey, eller etc. However, guided by it’s use as the translation equivalent of the Old Swedish resumptive negative hwarte...eller, eikä was reanalyzed by M (and later also L and K) as a negative particle rather than a negative verb fused with a conjunction, and thus began to be used with resumptive negation of noun and adverbial phrases as well. Since it continued to be invariably preceded by regular verbal negation, its use here is in fact redundant. In L, eikä begins to be used as the first rather than the second component of resumptive negation – as the translation equivalent of hwarte instead of eller. In this, L seems to have been guided by using Old Swedish hwarte...eller as a model pattern. As such, the preceding sentence of course no longer needs to be negative. L’s use of eikä as a particle rather than a conjunction is apparent from the co-occurrence of eikä with the conjunction ja ‘and’ on several occasions. Finally, K seems not to be burdened by the use of eikä in only resumptive negative constructions – eikä is used far more widely by him, and regains its status as a negative conjunction rather than a negative particle. However, the use of eikä as a negative particle used in resumptive negation of noun and adverbial phrases continues with K, as well as the use of eikä as a translation equivalent of hwarte. Thus we are in a way dealing with a split: K’s eikä may signify both a negative, fused conjunction, and a negative resumptive particle, the latter function being borrowed from Old Swedish.

Let’s return to the general variation between fused and unfused conjunctions depicted in the table above. Though, of course, Old Swedish negative particles, pronouns etc. do not fuse with the preceding conjunction, the distribution of the competing unfused (jos ei, ja ei) vs. fused (jollei, eikä) forms in the three Old Finnish translations shows no correlation with the occurrence of a negative particle or pronoun after a conjunction in Old Swedish – with the exception of eikä in M and L. First of all, negative pronouns and particles directly following conjunctions are much rarer in Krl than they are in the Old Finnish translations – a quick count showed up only 52 instances of this sequence in Old Swedish model sentences for (non-elliptic) Old Finnish negative sentences. Hence the variation found between analytic constructions – the unfused conjunctives – and synthetic – the fused conjunctives – seems to be governed mainly by language-internal constraints (see, in this regard, also Lindén 1963: 217, who remarks that the tendency in Finnish to front the negative verb cannot be explained by Swedish influence), an exception being the use of eikä particularly in M and L, and to an extent in K, which seems to be governed by Old Swedish resumptive negation.
3. Person/number marking

The four legal translations offer little material to determine anything about the person and number marking that its translators employed with the negative verb, since the frequency of 3rd person forms is overwhelming, and 1st and 2nd person forms occur only extremely sporadically: in fact, they occur in a prayer (I:35), three direct quotes (II:13, III:10, IV:30) and an oath (VII:1). In all the three Old Finnish translations, the 3rd pers. sing. form of the negative verb is left unmarked for number throughout the text, whereas in U it is consistently marked, for example:

IX:14
M: ei mahda ne maan päälle elä
   NEG may they earth upon live
K: eij mahdha ne maan päällä elä
U: ne eivät saa elää maan päällä
KrL: ey mogho the a iordene lifua
   ‘they may not leave on the face of the earth’

This is expected – the plural-marked form eivät was marginal until the 19th century (Häkkinen 1994: 345) and lack of plural marking on the 3rd pers. form of the negative verb is common in many spoken dialects of Finnish. The few 1st and 2nd pers. forms that can be found show all logical possibilities: both person and number marking, only person marking and no person or number marking at all. The only 2nd person form of the negative verb in the Old Finnish translations is marked for both person and number:

III:10
M: sentehdän edh mahda sä miestäs periä
   because of that NEG-2SG may you husband-PART.YOUR inherit
L: sentehden ett mahda sinä miestäs periä
K: sentähden edh mahda sinä miestäs periä
U: ja sen vuoksi sinä et saa hänä periä
KrL: oc thy maa thu han ey erfua
   ‘because of that you may not inherit from your husband’

Likewise, the present 1st pers. singular forms are marked for person and number, with the exception of elliptical clauses in which the lexical verb, mentioned in a previous clause, is not repeated. Lack of number marking but retention of person marking – which, as Savijärvi (1977: 60) remarks, may, in case of verb-initial clauses, large be due to haplology (the marked 1st and 2nd plural forms would be emme me, ette te), is found in one of L’s 1st pers. plural forms:

I:35
L: me rucoilemma Jumalata meitää nin auttamaan, ia ne pyhydet joinnenga pällä me pidhemmä, eten me tahdo yhtän sitä syylliseksi tehdä, ioca syytön on
   THAT-NEG-1PL we want no-one-PART that-PART guilty-TRANSL make
   ‘and we pray God to help us, and the Sacraments which we hold dear, that we do not proclaim anyone guilty, who is innocent.’

The equivalent clauses in M shows lack of person and number marking, whereas K’s negative verb is marked for both person and number:

I:35
Notably though, all the forms in which person marking is found lacking, except the one cited above, are elliptical. Irregular forms with tense, person or number marking on the lexical verb, like Agricola's *enge woin eijke toijuon* (quoted by Ojansuu 1909: 167), are used to a very limited extent by other writers of Agricola's time as well (Savijärvi 1977: 222). In the three Old Finnish translations examined, only two very dubious cases turned up:

**V:9**

M: nämet sakott, quin sanotut on, *ei mahdat cokemmat, ehkä quinga karía olis palio*

NEG may-t higher-PL

‘the mentioned fines may not be higher, regardless of how much cattle there is’

The –*t* at the end of the lexical verb here could be interpreted as a plural marker. However, this is not the only way in which this clause is irregular: the infinitive complement of the verb *mahtaa*, which is *olla* in the other translations, is lacking as well. It is just as likely that we are dealing here with a slip of the pen. In fact, the form *mahdat* seems to occur in the Stockholm codex only, whereas five other surviving manuscripts have the expected *mahda*, and three of them also add an infinitive complement *olla* (Arila, Harmas 1930: 128).

**XI:2**

K: *jos ei* Cuningan nimindämiehelle ja Syynsanojalle nijn oni sanottu: Nijn seisocaan

if NEG King-GEN constable-ALL and plaintiff-ALL thus is-i said-PASS.PARTIC.

‘if thus is not said to the King’s constable and to the plaintiff’

Here, we are dealing with what looks like an imperfect marker –*i* on the lexical verb. The verb phrase would then have to be interpreted as a passive indicative plusquamperfect form, the regular form of which would be *ei ollut sanottu*. However, the equivalent phrases in the other two Old Finnish translations as well as in U are passive perfect forms (*ei ole sanottu*) and it seems more likely to me that here as well we are dealing with a slip of the pen rather than an instance of irregular negation like the forms in Agricola.

4. The negated imperative

The most striking difference in frequency between U on the one hand and the three Old Finnish translations on the other hand is that of the negated imperative. Whereas in the Old Finnish translations they are rather infrequent (all in all 22 occurrences in M, 31 in L, 49 in K), and are, to a large extent, elliptical forms in which the lexical verb, mentioned previously, is dropped and the negated verb is *e*- rather than the imperative *äl*- , negated imperatives make up a rather big portion of negated verbs in U (201 occurrences all in all).

Table 7. Frequency of the negated imperative. The number between brackets indicates the number of elliptical clauses.
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It should be noted, first of all, that the infrequency of imperative forms in the Old Finnish translations seems specific to negated forms. A quick trawl through a very small portion of M (namely, the eight chapter, Walasyyihen Kaari), turned up 43 imperative verbs in positive sentences, all of which had Old Swedish conjunctive verb forms as source patterns in KrL - wherever a source pattern was available. As mentioned, a fair share of the negated imperative forms in M, L and K are elliptical, and here the normal negative verb 
\( \text{ei} \) is used rather than the imperative 
\( \text{äl-} \), for example:

\[ \text{II:19} \]
\[ \text{M: wahettacan sijtekin parannoxexi ia ei pahennoxexi} \]
\[ \text{change-IMPER then also better-TRANSL and NEG worse-TRANSL} \]
\[ \text{‘then, too, change it for the better and not for the worse’} \]

In those phrases where the lexical verb is mentioned, L and K sometimes use hybrid forms, combining the usual negative verb 
\( \text{ei} \) with a lexical verb which shows the regular imperative marker –\( k\O \), for example:

\[ \text{VIII:16} \]
\[ \text{L: maxakan 40 marca col: kerd: ia ei olgo rickonut Kuningan wala sackoa} \]
\[ \text{PART be-imper broken-PARTIC King-GEN oath of peace-PART} \]
\[ \text{‘pay 40 marks in three parts, and the King’s oath of peace shall not be broken’} \]

Compare here the equivalent clause in K:

\[ \text{VIII:16} \]
\[ \text{K: ja älköön olco walasyytä rickonut} \]
\[ \text{and NEG-imper be-imper oath of peace-PART broken-PARTIC} \]

All in all, two forms of this type appear in L (V:27, VIII:16), and two in K (III:15, V:14). In all instances, they follow a regular, positive or negative, imperative form in the preceding clause. Thus the use of \( ei \) instead of the imperative negative verb 
\( \text{äl-} \) may be explained by a tendency for \( ei \) to be used generally in elliptical clauses. One interesting irregular imperative marker on the lexical verb can be found in L:

\[ \text{IV:5} \]
\[ \text{L: ia älkän enämbä hänen maatans myuö quin colmannexen ia} \]
\[ \text{PART more-PART her land-PART-HER sell-imper} \]
\[ \text{caxi åsa åmastans} \]
\[ \text{and NEG-imper more-PART her land-PART-HER sell-imper} \]
\[ \text{‘and may he not sell more of her land than a third, and two parts of his own’} \]
The imperative marker –kO seems here to have an exceptional weak grade *-vO. Such markers are, in fact, found to some extent in Agricola’s writings and Finnish dialects as well (Hakulinen 1979: 244-245) – though rarely, and mostly in the eastern dialects (Rapola 1966: 124-125). Another feature of the imperative in the Old Finnish translations I should mention here is that M, as opposed to L and K, uses the 3rd person sing. throughout even with overt plural objects: this is not a feature specific to the negated imperative and cannot thus be compared to the lack of number marking with the 3rd pers. negative verb in general. It seems that M, L and K seem to use mainly indicative constructions where U uses a negated imperative. In those cases where a negated imperative is used by them, the source pattern is always a Swedish conjunctive. Now, the high frequency of negated imperative verbs in U is expectable, since the source text, as law texts in general, consists overwhelmingly of descriptions of certain situations, and directives on how to act in a given situation (Wendt 1997: 58). In the latter parts, KrL uses indicative forms, but, more usually, auxiliary verb constructions and conjunctive forms (Wendt 1997: 86).

The negated imperative in U mainly has the following source patterns: 1) auxiliary constructions formed with the verbs maa/mogha (Mod. Sw. må) or scal/sculu (Mod. Sw. skola), 2) conjunctive forms, in particularly the phrase hawi ey wald (att göra), 3) to a somewhat lesser extent, indicative constructions using the verb aeghir (Mod. Sw. ega).

4.1. Source patterns with maa/mogha

Table 8. Old Swedish ey maa/mogha and the Finnish equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KrL</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ey maa/mogha</td>
<td>ei mahda: 66</td>
<td>ei mahda: 63</td>
<td>ei mahda: 70</td>
<td>imperative: 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei pidä: 6</td>
<td>ei pidä: 7</td>
<td>ei pidä: 3</td>
<td>ei saa: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei tule: 1</td>
<td>ei tule: 1</td>
<td>ei tule: 1</td>
<td>ei voi: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei ole + PART: 2</td>
<td>ei saa: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, the auxiliary verb maa/mogha accounts for 61 of U’s negated imperatives. The Modern Swedish auxiliary må, Old Swedish mogha, has cognates throughout the Germanic languages, as well as Slavic and Greek (SEO). Schlyter (OSSGL) mentions that the Old Swedish auxiliary has five basic meanings: 1) to be able to, 2) could, 3) be allowed to, have the right to do something, 4) must, 5) would, in expressing a hope or a wish. It is the third meaning which is of most relevance here, and in which it is used regularly in KrL in directive statements – Wessén (1970: 145-146) mentions that there is little difference in meaning between the auxiliaries ma and skal and the exhortative conjunction which is also used widely in directives, and that the use of both may be caused by, among other factors, the diverging dialectal origin of the parts of which KrL is made up (Wessén 1970: 146, Wendt 1997: 88-89). As we see, the most frequent equivalent of maa/mogha in M, L and K seems to be a negative construction employing the verb mahtaa, for example:

II:7
M: ei mahda ylkä enämmbä lahioia wiedhä morsiamellens, waan yhden orhin.
   NEG may groom more-PART gifts-PART.PLUR bring bride-ALL.HIS
Satulan, Suitzet, capun ia hatun

L: ei mahda ylkä enämä lahioia morsiamellans tuodha, quin yhden orihin, Satulan, Suidzet, hiha capun ia hatun
K: ei mahda ylkä enämä lahioia morsiamellensa widhā, cuin yhdhen hewoisen, satulan, suihdhet, hihallisen capun ia nätyn
U: älköön sulhanen antako morsiamelleen enempää kihlalahjoja kuin yhden ratsuhevosen, satulan, suitset, hihallisen päällystakin ja päähineen
KrL: ey maa brudgumme flere förminga föra brud sinne åen een gaangara, sadel, beetzl, ærmakapo oc hetto
‘the groom may not bring more gifts to his bride, than one horse, a saddle, a bridle, an overcoat and a hat’

IX.2
M: sillä ettei mahda yxikän toistans periexens tappa
   so THAT-NEG may no-one another-PART in order to inherit kill
L: sillä ei mahda yxikän ketän periäxens tappa
K: sillä ettei mahdha yxikän toista perjäxens tappa
U: sillä älköön kukaan tappako toista saadakseen perinnön
KrL: thy ath engen maa annan til arfts drepa
‘for no one may kill another in order to inherit’

The negated maa also, at some points, designated an inability to so something rather than a directive or prohibition. Here U has used an indicative form of the verb voida ‘can’ rather than an imperative, whereas M, L and K usually use mahtaa, for example:

VIII:36
M: ei mahda waimo wala sacko rickoa
   NEG may woman oath of peace-PART break
L: ei mahda waimon puoli wala sackoa rickoa
K: ej mahdha waimo Wala syytä ricko
U: nainen ei voi rikkoo rauhavalaa
KrL: Nuu maa ey kona edzöre bryta
‘a woman cannot break the oath of peace’

The Finnish verb mahtaa has cognates throughout the Finnic as well as the Volgaic languages (SKES) and is possibly a Germanic loanword – the donor word would then be a precursor of the same Swedish må (LÄGLO), the etymology is however not uncontroversial (Van Linde 1997: 163-164). The word generally means ‘to be able to do something’ – according to NS, particularly in negative utterances. It also designates a hypothetical possibility or may, in archaic language, be used to express a wish or advice. Lönnrot (SRS) mentions the meanings ‘to be fitting for’ (höfvas, anstā), ‘to be possible’ (läta sig göra), ‘may, be able to’ (må, förmå. kunna) and ‘to be mighty’ or ‘reckless’ (vara mäktig, öfvermodig, väldig). The meaning closest to it’s use by M, L and K in negative utterances - ‘to be allowed to’, is in fact mentioned by NS but designated archaic – Elsayed (2000: 112) mentions that in older Legal Finnish, mahtaa was used very commonly to express deontic permission as well as prohibition, whereas it occurs widely in the older Old Finnish as an auxiliary bearing conditional or future meaning (Rapola 1969: 81-82, Häkkinen 1994: 369-370), as well as in dialectal Finnish and Kalevalan folk poetry (KS). The question which confronts us here is: was the meaning ‘to be allowed to’ already well-established in the Old Finnish that M, L and K spoke, or did their use of mahtaa in prohibitive statements signify a subtle extension of the original meaning of the verb, as proposed by
Elsayed (2000:112)? If the latter is the case, the phonological similarity between *maa/mogho* and *mahtaa* may have led them to identify the two, and to use the latter in contexts and meanings natural to the former. In any event, the phonological similarity between the two words may have at least caused *mahtaa* to be used with overwhelming frequency. The Modern Finnish equivalent of the phrase *ey maa*, namely *ei saa*, has been employed by U as a translation equivalent seven times, but not at all by M, L and K.

Trivially, the use of an auxiliary construction in the Old Swedish text, in addition to the conjunctive constructions, largely explains the differences in frequency between U and the three Old Finnish translations: M, L and K chose to translate the Swedish auxiliary phrase with an auxiliary-like construction in their own language, rather than with the negated imperative.

### 4.2. Source patterns with *scal/sculu*

Table 9. Old Swedish *ey scal/sculu* and its equivalents in Old Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ey scal/sculu</em></td>
<td>ei pidä: 10</td>
<td>ei pidä: 11</td>
<td>ei pidä: 11</td>
<td>imperative: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei mahda: 2</td>
<td>ei mahda: 1</td>
<td>ei mahda: 1</td>
<td>act. indic.: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ei tahdo: 1</td>
<td>ei tahdo: 1</td>
<td>ei tahdo: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Old Swedish auxiliary *scal/sculu*, much rarer in negative sentences than *maa/mogho*, is usually translated by M, L and K by a necessitive construction employing the verb *pitää* ‘must’ and a non-finite lexical verb with instructive case-marking, the 3rd infinitive instructive, e.g. *hänen pitää tekemän* ‘he must do.’. This construction is known, but rather rare, in Southwestern Finnish dialects (Hakulinen 1979: 256, Ikola, Palomäki and Koitto 1989: 356). It’s use as a translation equivalent for the Swedish auxiliary *scal* is extremely common in the older written Finnish language, which, to a large extent, was based on the Southwestern dialects, and in addition to a necessitive meaning, the *pitää tekemän*-construction has been known to show a tendency towards grammaticalization as a future-tense construction under the influence of the Swedish auxiliary construction *scal* (Ikola 1949: 204, Elsayed 2000: 110). Like the *ey maa*-construction mentioned above, here as well the three translators sought to preserve the Swedish auxiliary construction in Finnish well by using an isomorphic translation equivalent.

### 4.3. Source patterns with *hawi ey wald*

Table 10. Old Swedish *hawi ey wald* and its equivalents in Old Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hawi ey wald</em></td>
<td>ei mahda: 20</td>
<td>ei mahda: 5</td>
<td>ei mahda: 1</td>
<td>älköön olko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 “Vanhan lakisuomen tyyppillinen piirre on *mahtaa*-modaaliiverbin yleinen käyttö deonttisen luvan tai kiellon ilmasemiseen, mikä lienee ruotsin *må*-verbin deonttisen painotuksen vaikutusta” (“A typical feature of old Legal Finnish is the general use of the modal verb *mahtaa* to express deontic permission or prohibition, which may be a result of influence from the deontic pressure of the Swedish verb *må*”) (Elsayed 2000: 112)
The Old Swedish vald (Modern Swedish våld, vall) has cognates in other Germanic languages, Finnish having borrowed valta from an early Germanic language (SEO). Schlyter mentions three basic meanings for Old Swedish vald: 1) power, domination, 2) force, 3) right (to do something (OSSGL). This polysemy is present in the borrowed Finnish valta as well: Lönnrot mentions an example sentence siihen on hänellä valtaa ‘he has the right to do so’; the meaning ‘right, permit’ is mentioned by NS and SKES mentions a cognate from Olonets Karelian valdu meaning ‘right, permit’ as well as ‘power, force’. Hence the use of valta in translation equivalents of hawi ei wald may well have been stimulated by the phonological similarity betweenwald and valta but does not entail an extension of the meaning of the Finnish word: the meaning ‘right’ and hence the possibility of a phrase like hänellä ei ole valta ‘he has no right’ was well-established in Finnish.

The translation equivalents show an interesting variety of forms. U has consistently translated the Swedish conjunctive phrase hawi ey wald (which could be translated with ‘let him have no right to...’) by a negated imperative älköön hänellä olko oikeutta – the lexical verb designates negated possession of oikeus ‘right’ and the translation equivalent is thus semantically very close to the Old Swedish original. M has favoured the ei mahda construction here as well, but mahtaa is used considerably less here by L and K, who most commonly use an indicative possessive construction (hänellä) ei ole valta ‘he has no right’. Aside from this, M and L also use (hänellä) ei ole voima to some extent. The noun voima, a derivative of the verb voida ‘can, be able to’, means ‘power, force’ – but a meaning ‘permit, right’ is not mentioned by NS or Lönnrot. Closely related meanings, however, ‘power, ability’ in Finnish dialects as well as regarding the Estonian cognate võim are mentioned in SKES, which also adds the adjective voimallinen meaning ‘possible’ in texts by Agricola. Similar meanings are mentioned to occur in Kalevalan poetry by Turunen (KS).

The use of translation equivalents employing some possessive construction with valta either retain the strong deontic load of the Swedish conjunctive (M, L, K ei pidä valta olemant ‘(he) must not have the right to’, L älköön olko valta in one instance, a negated imperative, ‘let him have no right to’), or seem to discard it (M, L, K ei ole valta ‘(he) has no right to’). Thus the possessive construction hänellä ei ole valta, usual with L and even more so with K, while retaining equivalents of the Old Swedish hawa ‘to have’ and wald ‘right’, does not express the modality of the Swedish source pattern. The difference in distribution between the two constructions – ei pidä valta olemant and ei ole valta – cannot be explained by the Swedish source patterns. In both cases, the subject is usually a negative pronoun engen, i.e. the construction is something like hawi engen wald.

Why did M and L choose a construction which could not express the modality of the Swedish source pattern? Perhaps the typological distance between the Swedish construction and the semantically closest Finnish equivalent – either U’s älköön olko oikeutta or L’s älköön olko valta was simply to great: requiring a Swedish possessive verb to be translated with a Finnish locative possessive construction, a Swedish particle-based negation with a Finnish negative-verb construction, and a Swedish
conjunctive with a Finnish negated imperative. Thus possibly L and K chose to go for a superficially more isomorphic construction at the expense of some of the exactness of the translation. Their choice may have been stimulated by the phonological (and orthographic similarity) between the Old Swedish negative particle ey and the Finnish 3rd pers. negative verb ei – leading the construction hänellä ei ole valta to be closer to the Swedish source pattern than constructions employing a Finnish negated imperative.

4.4. Source patterns with ey aehgr

The Old Swedish aegha (Mod. Swedish ega), is very polysemous, meaning, roughly, ‘to own, to possess’, ‘to have a right to’, and ‘must’ (OSSGL). This polysemy reflects of course upon its translation equivalents in the Finnish translations – in M, ey aeghir has been translated 15 times with some kind of (negated) permissive construction, mostly (9 times) with a construction (hänne) ei tule (tehdä) ‘(he) should not (do), he is not allowed to’. The other 10 occurrences of ey aeghir have been translated with some kind of possessive construction. L and K as well have usually translated the negated directive ey aeghir with ei tule and this construction is used (three times) by K as well, who most often (eight times in all) uses a negated imperative.

4.5. Conclusions about the negated imperative

There are two factors which may have contributed to the tendency of M,L and K to use auxiliary verbs where, at least in Modern Finnish, a negated imperative seems to be more appropriate. First of all, the superficial phonological similarity between maa/mogho and mahtaa may have induced M, L and K to use it as a translation equivalent, and the construction ey maa alone makes up quite a large portion of negated directive statements in KrL.

Accidental phonological similarity has been pinpointed as a factor in the case of loan translations by Haugen (1950: 220), and similarly contact-induced syntactic change stimulated by chance phonological similarity has been analyzed in some detail by Lyle Campbell (1987: 263) in his research on Spanish influence on Pipil syntax, who terms the phenomenon shifts due to phonetic similarity, whereas Aikhenvald (2003:2) labels the phenomenon grammatical accomodation, i.e. “(...) reinterpretation of a native morpheme on the model of the syntactic function of a phonetically similar morpheme in the diffusing language.”. 

Phonological similarity also probably played a role in the choice of valta as a translation equivalent of wald in translating the highly frequent construction hawi ey wald – however, this translation seems perfectly fine (whereas I feel it is doubtful whether mahtaa occurred in the sense of ‘be allowed to’ in M’s and L’s days), although the use of a possessive construction probably restricted the options available to M, L and K. Interestingly it is the first translator, M, who has chosen a pattern rather different from the Swedish original, namely, using mahtaa here as well, and the later translators, L and especially K, chose for a translation equivalent rather isomorphic to the Swedish original. This brings me to the second factor: particularly L and K chose translation equivalents as isomorphic as possible, choosing an auxiliary where the Swedish text uses auxiliaries, and so on. It is therefore particularly fascinating to see that M and K chose to leave the exhortative modality of the construction hawi ey wald untranslated. The type of interference we are dealing with here is what Chaudenson et al. (1993: 68) name convergence, or covert interference (King 2000: 89): the, extremely common, tendency for structures which have a strongly isomorphic
equivalent in a dominant language to be favoured, and the tendency for synonymous structures which do not have a isomorphic equivalent in a dominant language to become marginal and even fall out of use. Probably covert interference in Old Finnish has been stimulated a great deal by the tendency to translate particularly religious texts as faithfully as possible (Häkkinen 1994: 472-473) – M and L were both clergymen. Covert interference crucially involves no transfer of language material, and no change in the rules of the grammar of the ‘recipient’ language – the negated imperative still exists with all the three Old Finnish translators, but has been marginalized in particularly M and L, in favour of various constructions isomorphic with Old Swedish model constructions – although covert interference and the concomitant marginalization of non-isomorphic structures may stimulate structural change (Birnbaum 1984: 41, Campbell 1987: 271-272). As Thomason (2001a: 9-10) stresses, covert interference is a potential change – it may be regarded as grammatical borrowing, but on a discourse level rather than a morphosyntactic level. Perhaps an incipient tendency for covert interference to lead to structural change may be seen with M, where ei mahda has a tendency to become generalized as a prohibitive auxiliary construction regardless of the patterns found in the Swedish source text.

5. The position of the negative verb

The susceptibility of word order patterns to foreign influence is controversial – though McMahon (1994: 209) regards syntax of all linguistic subsystems the least susceptible to foreign influence, Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 54-55, Thomason 2001b: 69) claim that word order patterns are transferred relatively easy in contact situations, similarly Birnbaum (1894: 34) states that: “It should be noted at the outset that the most commonly held view is that syntax is indeed highly permeable as compared to, at any rate, phonology and morphology.”. On the other hand, King (2000: 46-47) is sceptical towards interlingual explanations of word order change, as towards syntactic borrowing in general, believing it to be mainly a secondary effect of lexical borrowing. The case we are dealing with here is the possibility of interference in the relatively free word order patterns of Finnish by a language which has much more fixed word order patterns. In cases like these, one might expect covert interference in the reinforcing of already existing but marginal word order patterns in the recipient language which happen to be isomorphic with source-language word order patterns. Cases like this seem well-documented in the literature (Thomason 2001b: 89).

As for research on Old Finnish, Häkkinen (1994: 472-473) remarks that word order patterns of a given text seem to often closely follow those of the Latin, German or Swedish original, and as far as M is concerned, Pajula (1955: 277) claims that the word order of the first Finnish legal translation seems to be almost totally isomorphic to that of KrL. When dealing more specifically with negative sentences, particularly the frequency of verb-initial (i.e. negative verb-initial, henceforth NEG-initial) clauses has received attention. While on the one hand, the tendency to place the negative verb immediately at the front of the clause, which seems to have been particularly strong with Agricola in whose writings NEG-initial negative clauses make up the vast majority of negative clauses (Savijärvi 1988: 72), has been connected with similar tendencies in spoken Finnish (Lindén 1963: 221-224, Savijärvi 1988: 73), on the other hand, it has been connected as well with a general tendency in literary Finnish to use inverted verb-subject word order as a result of foreign, particularly Swedish interference (treated critically by Häkkinen 1994: 336-339, see also Savijärvi 1988: 73-74).
The latter analysis is controversial, however – as Häkkinen (1994: 339) remarks, even a strong correlation between word order patterns in Finnish translations and Swedish source texts does not imply causation of a given word order pattern by foreign interference, and Lindén (1963: 217-218) points out, among other things, the fact that inverted word order seems to be just as common in Finnish subordinate clauses as in main clauses, while impossible in Swedish subordinate clauses. Aside from that, a tendency towards placing the negative particle or verb at the beginning of a clause seems to occur widely in languages (Jespersen 1917: 5). Vilkuna (1989: 118-119) remarks that NEG-initial word order, being extremely common in spoken Finnish dialogue, serves a pragmatic purpose: in NEG-initial sentences, the content of that which is negated is already known to the participants in communication, whereas with non-NEG-initial sentences, it is totally new.

It should thus be stressed here that source patterns are but one factor in regulating frequencies of various word order types in legal translations. For example, a fair share of the clauses examined are conditional clauses – either subordinate clauses starting with *jos* (and various fused conjunctions) or main clauses starting with *nyt*:

III: 3
M: *nytt ei elä lapset taicka lastein lapset, nijn*
‘Now, neither children nor grandchildren are alive, in that case...’

VIII: 10
L: *nytt ei taidha Kuningas idze läsnä olla, samoilla edzicko ia maan käräjillä, nijn*
‘Now, the King may not be able to be present himself on the research hearing or the country court, in that case...’

VII: 22
L: *nytt tule se käräiän ioca walan tahto käydä ia ei tahdo Jutun isändä tulla*
‘Now, someone comes to court who wants to swear the oath, but the plaintiff does not want to come...’

In clauses like these, the position of the negative verb may be guided by general tendencies within Finnish to using an inverted word-order after adverbs, rather than through direct copying of model patterns.

### 5.1. NEG-initial clauses and their Swedish source patterns

Table 11. Frequency of NEG-initial clauses as opposed to other word order patterns. Clauses starting with a conjunction immediately followed by a negative verb are counted as NEG-initial, elliptical clauses are not taken into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG-initial</td>
<td>626 (90,72%)</td>
<td>613 (90,15%)</td>
<td>601 (91,2%)</td>
<td>545 (80,98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ-initial</td>
<td>47 (6,81%)</td>
<td>52 (7,64%)</td>
<td>42 (6,38%)</td>
<td>95 (14,13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ-initial</td>
<td>17 (2,46%)</td>
<td>14 (2,06%)</td>
<td>16 (2,43%)</td>
<td>33 (4,9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that NEG-initial sentences – sentences either with the negative verb at the front, or preceded by an adverbal or a conjunction, make up the lion’s share of negative sentences in the four translations examined. With M, 90,72% of the negative sentences are NEG-initial, with L, 90,15%, with K, 91,19% and with U, 80,98%. Ilkka Savijärvi’s (1988: 72) research shows 78% of Agricola’s negative sentences are NEG-initial, whereas frequencies of 80% (or slightly higher) of NEG-
initial negative sentences among negative sentences in general seem to be not uncommon in Finnish dialects (Savijärvi 1977: 43). It is unclear whether Savijärvi also took sentences beginning with an adverbial immediately preceding the negative verb to be NEG-initial. Even in the Modern Finnish translation of KrL NEG-initial sentences make up four fifths of the whole. However, there seem to be, at first sight, two factors conductive to a high frequency of NEG-initial sentences in U: first of all, the high frequency of negated imperative verbs in U (rare in M, L and K), which precede the subject - if the subject is mentioned at all - in Modern Finnish as well as in older literary Finnish, second, the high frequency of sentences starting with a conjunction. Thus it seems that NEG-initial word order is the unmarked word order in negative sentences in at least older literary Finnish, that this word order is unmarked in Finnish dialects as well, and that thus a causal link between NEG-initial or verb-initial word order in Swedish and NEG-initial word order in older literary Finnish is very unlikely. Also, though NEG-initial sentences do occur in KrL., they are far less frequent than they are in the Finnish translations – a quick count turned up 133 NEG-initial clauses in KrL from a total of about 870 negative clauses. This notwithstanding, there is some correlation between NEG-initial clauses in KrL and those in M, L and K – NEG-initial source patterns have been translated almost always with NEG-initial clauses, with three exceptions in M, two in L, whereas I found none in K. Thus the relative frequency of NEG-initial clauses with NEG-initial source patterns is higher than the frequency of NEG-initial clauses in general, whereas, interestingly, it is lower in U, who translated NEG-initial source patterns with NEG-initial clauses in 78 instances (70.9%) and with non-NEG-initial clauses in 32 instances (29.1%). However, this correlation does not imply that NEG-initial sentences in KrL have exerted an influence on the frequency of NEG-initial sentences in the Finnish translations. While in Finnish, the negative verb must precede the lexical verb, in Old Swedish the particle used to signify verbal negation, does not occupy a fixed position in the sentence, but often precedes the phrase under the scope of negation (cf. Lindén 1963: 217), for example:

III:23
M: ia e tiedh ä yxikän hän perillisens
    and NEG knows no-one his heir-ACC.HIS
KrL: nu æn man weet ey hans arfua
    now if one knows not his heir
‘(and/if) no-one knows his heir’

VII:22
M: ei on sijnä, ia e tahdo Stauata vala
     or is there and NEG wants to pronounce oath-PART
KrL: eller ær ther oc wil ey edh stafua
     or is there and wants not oath to pronounce
‘or he is there, but does not want to pronounce the oath’

VII:25
M: mwtin ios hän laissa wanno walallansa, nynn ettej hän lakia tiedh syänä asiasa
    so THAT-NEG he law-PART know that-ESS case-
INESS
KrL: wtan han for thinge swær meth een edhe sinom ath han ey
    that he not law about that case knows
     lagh om thet maal weeth
‘except if he swears an oath in court, that he does not know the law in this case’

Also, Swedish may employ negative pronouns and adverbs which have syntactic functions (subject, object, adverbial, etc.) quite distinct from that of the negative verb in Finnish. Therefore, despite the phonological similarity between the Old Swedish
negative particle *ey* and the Finnish negative verb, the much smaller frequency of NEG-initial sentences in the Swedish source text as well as the great typological differences between Finnish and Swedish negation seems to preclude any role played by the Swedish negative particle in the causation of NEG-initialness in the Finnish translations.

Though the Finnish negative verb has no semantic content of its own, it does carry person and number marking, and it is therefore possible to consider the possibility that the frequency of NEG-initial sentences in the Finnish translations may have been guided by the position of the main verb in the Swedish source texts rather than by the position of the negative particle. Lindén (1963: 217) criticizes this idea, noting that the Finnish negative verb lacks some fundamental characteristics of verbality – notably, it cannot get verbal modifiers – and that, semantically, the negative verb is a much closer equivalent to the Swedish negative particle than the verb. Nevertheless, verb-initial clauses are much more frequent in the Swedish source text than NEG-initial clauses – they number slightly over 400, almost half of the sentences examined. Here as well, the frequency of NEG-initial clauses in the Finnish translations is higher than the average (albeit not quite as high as the frequency of NEG-initial clauses with NEG-initial source patterns) – M translated Swedish verb-initial clauses with NEG-initial clauses in 391 cases or 97.5% of the whole, whereas he has subject- or object-initial clauses in 10 cases, L has 388 NEG-initial clauses (98.7%) against 5 subject- or object-initial clauses, K 395 NEG-initial clauses (98.5%) against 3 subject- or object-initial clauses, whereas U has 372 NEG-initial clauses (92.3%) against 31 subject- or object-initial clauses. The relationship between NEG-initial, V-initial and other word order patterns in the source text and the patterns of the Old Finnish translations can be depicted as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{KrL:} & \text{M,L,K:} & \\
\text{V-initial clauses} & \text{NEG-initial clauses} & \\
\text{NEG-initial clauses} & \text{NEG-initial clauses} & \\
\text{Non-V-initial clauses} & \text{NEG-initial clauses} & \\
\text{Non-NEG-initial clauses} & \text{Non-NEG-initial clauses} & \\
\end{array}
\]

The fact that verb-initial clauses have been almost always translated, in the Old Finnish translations, with NEG-initial clauses makes it conceivable that Swedish verb-initiatility contributed to reinforcing the use, and heightening the frequency, of NEG-initial clauses – the use of which itself seems to be rooted in Finnish dialectal usage rather than interference.

5.2. Non-NEG-initial clauses and their Swedish source patterns.

If NEG-initiality is the unmarked word order in the Finnish of M, L and K, then where do the non-NEG-initial sentences come from? With M, subject-initial clauses have subject-initial source patterns in 36 cases, object-initial source patterns in one case, NEG-initial source patterns in two cases and verb-initial source patterns in six cases, whereas object-initial clauses have object-initial source patterns in four cases, subject-initial source patterns in five, NEG-initial source patterns in one case and verb-initial source patterns in four cases. L’s subject-initial clauses have 39 subject-
initial, three object-initia l, two NEG-initial and three verb-initial source patterns, whereas his object-initial clauses have five object-initial, four subject-initial and two verb-initial source patterns. With K, on the other hand, subject-initial clauses have subject-initial source patterns in 35 cases, object-initial source patterns in one case and verb-initial source patterns in one case, whereas object-initial clauses correspond to object-initial clauses in eight cases, subject-initial clauses in two cases and verb-initial clauses in two cases. U has roughly twice as much non-NEG-initial clauses as the three earlier translators.

There are a few word order patterns which contribute particularly to the higher frequency of subject-initial and object-initial clauses in U. The order S-NEG-V occurs 16 times in M, 18 times in L and 15 times in K – but 24 times in U. In nine instances, the phrase in U is nämä sakot eivät ole suuremmat, nämä sakot eivät tule suuremmaksi, se sakko ei tule suuremmaksi or variants, which have a NEG-initial source pattern – ey wardir the booth mere, ey aer the booth mera etc., and which has been translated by a NEG-initial clause in M,L and K, for example:

V:16
M: ei mahda olla se sacko enämbi
   NEG may be the fine higher
L: ei tule se sacko suremmaksi
K: ei ole ne sacot suremmat
U: nämä sakot eivät ole suuremmat
   these fine-PL NEG-3PL be greater
KrL: ey wardir the bot mera
    not will be these fines more
   ‘These fines will not be higher’

The word order patterns Conjunction-O-NEG-V and Conjunction-O-NEG-V-Participle – all passive clauses – occur five times in M, never in L or K, but 12 times in U. Here, too, a large number (eight out of twelve) consists of translations of one particular type of phrase, this time U’s mutta häntä ei ole tavattu itse teosta, mutta häntä ei ole selvästi tavattu teosta, and the like – in KrL, aer ey bar oc atakin, oc aer ey fangen widher, oc aer ey vuppenbarlica taken wider, etc. Here as well the equivalent phrases in M,L and K are NEG-initial, while their Swedish source patterns are NEG-initial or verb-initial. Finally, word order patterns Conjunction-S-NEG-V, Conjunction-S-NEG-V-Infinitive, Conjunction-S-NEG-V-O and Conjunction-S-NEG-V-Infinitive-O, occur, all in all, 35 times in U, but only 11 times in M, 7 times in L and 5 times in K. The source patterns in KrL here are NEG-initial in 5 instances, verb-initial in 13 instances and subject-initial in 17 instances. Their equivalents in the older three translations are presented in the table below:

Table 12. Equivalents of U’s Conjunction-S-NEG-V(-X) order in KrL and the three Old Finnish translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KrL</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ-initial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-initial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG-initial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This demonstrates, if anything, that the strong preference for NEG-initial sentences in M, L and K seems quite independent from NEG-initiality in KrL, even if NEG-initial sentences are almost always translated by NEG-initial sentences. In the case of U's patterns Conjunction-S-NEG-V(-X), neither the three Old Finnish texts nor U's translation seems to be particularly bent on reproducing the word order patterns found in the source text, with M, L and K clearly preferring NEG-initial patterns against U's subject-initial word order patterns, with the Swedish source text showing 18 verb initial and NEG-initial sentences against 17 subject-initial sentences.

5.3. Conclusions on word order

Concluding, the overwhelming frequency of NEG-initial word order patterns in M, L and K (over 90%), seems, like the somewhat slighter but still impressive frequency of NEG-initial patterns in U (over 80%) not to be caused by a tendency to translate NEG-initial or verb-initial source patterns with isomorphic source patterns. Rather, the relative amount of NEG-initial clauses in M, L and K seems to correspond well with the frequency of this pattern in Finnish dialects (as well as with the frequency of NEG-initial patterns in Agricola) as reported by Savijärvi (1977: 43, 1988: 72), and is thus probably reflects the grammar of the Finnish dialects spoken by the three translators. The slightly higher frequency of NEG-initial clauses in M, L and K as compared to the percentages mentioned by Savijärvi for Agricola and certain Finnish dialects may be caused by my regarding sentences in which the negative verb/particle is only preceded by an adverb as NEG-initial sentences as well. This does not mean that the source patterns in KrL have not exerted influence upon the choices M, L and K made when translating it – NEG-initial source patterns are almost consistently translated with NEG-initial clauses, verb-initial source patterns are translated with NEG-initial clauses with overwhelming frequency. In the latter case, we need not necessarily posit an identification made by M, L and K between the negative verb and the Swedish main verb – in fact, a tendency to place the lexical verb in the same position in the clause as the main verb in the source text could lead likewise to a greater frequency of NEG-initial clauses, since the lexical verb in Finnish must be preceded by the negative verb, if nothing else.

As it is, the proportional frequency of verb-initial source patterns among NEG-V(-X) and Conjunction-NEG-V-(X) patterns in M seems to be slightly higher than the proportional frequency of V-initial source patterns for NEG-initial clauses in M in general: of 626 NEG-initial clauses, 391 have, as mentioned above, verb-initial source patterns, or 62.5% of the whole. Taking the 385 clauses with NEG-V(-X) and Conjunction-NEG-V-(X) patterns in M, we find that 265 or 68.8% of them have verb-initial source patterns. The difference is small, and does not really change if we exclude source patterns translated with identical patterns (NEG-initial clauses with NEG-initial source patterns from NEG-initial clauses as a whole, and NEG-V-initial clauses with NEG-V-initial source patterns, excluding those where a negative pronoun like engen functions as subject, from NEG-V sentences as a whole) – the percentages would be 79.8% and 84.1% respectively. Though interesting, the corpus of sentences examined may be too small to draw firm conclusions on whether a tendency to front the lexical verb according to the source text really contributed to the frequency of NEG-initial sentences in the three Old Finnish translations. Thus, we do have some indications for Swedish interference being a factor in regulating NEG-initiality in the Old Finnish translations – however, NEG-initiality in M, L and K remains generally within the norms of spoken Finnish.
6. Evaluation

The negative sentence of the three Old Finnish texts examined seems to have been influenced in various ways by the source patterns of the Old Swedish text, however, this influence seems to have been confined to covert interference, i.e. changes in language use rather than language structure, with the possible exception of the use of *eikä* as a resumptive negative pronoun. Influence from the Swedish source text manifests itself in a tendency to use, where possible, constructions isomorphic with the Swedish model patterns within the boundaries set by Finnish grammar, and, occasionally, exceeding those boundaries. Interesting in this regard is the occasional preference by the three translators to use equivalents which bear a phonological similarity to the Old Swedish original, which may have been stimulated by the accidental homophony between the Old Swedish negative particle *ey* and the 3rd pers. sing. form of the Finnish negative verb, i.e. possible instances of grammatical accommodation.

Hence, the three Old Finnish texts, particularly M and L, to a lesser extent, K, seem to strongly prefer periphrastic prohibitive constructions formed on the basis of a Swedish model like *ei mahda, ei ole valta* than the negated imperative, however, none of the constructions they use seems to have grammaticalized as a prohibitive construction totally substituting the negated imperative – which is used, albeit marginally, by all three authors. Perhaps, an incipient tendency to have *ei mahda* crystallize as a general prohibitive construction can be discerned in M, who prefers the use of it also when the source text has *hawi ey vald*, which the other two translators choose to translate more or less literally. In this case, possibly, superficial phonological similarity between the Old Swedish original form and the Finnish equivalent has possibly led the three authors to prefer it over other alternatives. In case of the translation of *hawi ey vald* with *ei ole valta*, this preference has led to the loss of the deontic load present in the Swedish source pattern, though the translators seem to have attempted to make up for this by occasionally choosing a necessitive or negated imperative construction.

Similarly occupying the borderlands between lexical borrowing/calqueing and contact-induced morphosyntactic change is the use of *eikä* as a resumptive negative particle rather than a negated conjunction. The use of *eikä* as a resumptive negative particle, which seems to be exclusive in M and L, whereas K employs it both as a negative particle and as a conjunction, seems to be based on a semantic loan from Old Swedish – *eikä* is used overwhelmingly as a translation equivalent of Old Swedish *hwarte* in the three Old Finnish translations. Here, though, the semantic loan has great consequences for Finnish morphosyntax, by introducing a negative particle in a system of negation alien to it.

In case of word order, the Old Swedish model pattern does seem to play a role in regulating the distribution of NEG-initiality vs. non-NEG-initiality, but it is only one of many factors. NEG-initiality is most likely the unmarked word order pattern in the Finnish dialects that the translators spoke, as it still is, in many dialects. This notwithstanding there is a strong preference by the three translators to translate Old Swedish NEG-initial and verb-initial sentences with NEG-initial sentences.

The fact that, when dealing with the results of language contact, subsystems of language tend to be porous, and innovations in one subsystem trickle down to the other ones, is one of the main reason morphosyntactic borrowing is still quite a controversial notion, and study of processes like these may advance our understanding of it.
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