Chapter 15

Negation in Afrikaans

Daniel Van Olmen[a], Adri Breed[b] & Ernst Kotzé[c]
[a]Lancaster University [b]North-West University Potchefstroom [c]Nelson Mandela University Port Elizabeth

This chapter is a description of negation in Afrikaans. We cover its standard negation construction (nie_1 … nie_2 'not'), which is used for subordinate clause negation and interrogative negation among other things too, as well as its dedicated strategies for imperative negation ($moenie_1$ … nie_2 'don't!') and certain types of negative stative predication ($geen$ … nie_2 'no'). Attention is also paid to phenomena such as negative indefinites (e.g. $nooit$ … nie_2 'never'), negative polarity items (e.g. *veel* 'much'), response particles (e.g. the use of *nee* 'no' to deny the questioner's presumed concerns), negative derivation (e.g. *-loos* '-less'), the reinforcement of negation (e.g. *glad* nie_1 … nie_2 'not at all) and expletive negation (e.g. in clauses headed by *tensy* 'unless').

Keywords: **Afrikaans, two-part negation, negative imperative, negative stative predication, negative indefinite, expletive negation.**

1 The language

Afrikaans (ISO: afr, Glottocode: afri1274) is primarily spoken in South Africa and Namibia. It is also the language of small minorities in many other Southern African countries, including Botswana and Zambia, and of immigrant communities in, for instance, Australia, Canada and even Argentina (see Du Toit 1995). In South Africa, where it is one of the eleven official languages, it is spoken as a first language by approximately 6,740,000 people, making up 12% of the population (Statistics South Africa 2016), and as a second language by an estimated further ten million (Webb 2002: 78). Afrikaans has a strong literary tradition as well as its own news and media outlets, is widely used in education (although it

has been losing ground to English, particularly in the tertiary sector) and has arguably witnessed something of a revival in movies and music in recent times. In Namibia, where it is recognized as one of eight national languages alongside the official language of English, it is the mother tongue of circa 180,000 individuals or 8% of the entire population (United Nations 2014). It also often serves as the only lingua franca between speakers of other languages.

In genealogical terms, Afrikaans may be described as a sister of Present-day Dutch or, in other words, as Indo-European and (West) Germanic. It is this genus's "contact language par excellence" (McWhorter 2007: 72), though. Arriving in the Cape in 1652, Early Modern Dutch began interacting with the indigenous Khoisan languages (e.g. *dagga* 'cannabis') and with languages like Malay and Creole Portuguese (e.g. *baie* 'a lot, very' and *mielie* 'corn'), spoken by the Asian and African slaves brought to the region (as well as with the languages of other early European migrants, such as French and German). It came into contact with the Bantu languages in the rest of Southern Africa later on (e.g. *babelas* 'hangover') and has been in a relationship of mutual influence with English since the advent of the British in 1795 (e.g. *worrie* 'worry').

The role that these interactions, especially the initial ones, played in the development of Afrikaans (grammar) has been and remains a topic of much debate (see van der Auwera & Van Olmen 2017: 249, 257–258), mainly as to whether the language is a creole or not. A plausible compromise is that Afrikaans, whose standardization and codification started some sixty years before it became an official language of South Africa in 1925, is the product of two opposing forces. The Dutch spoken and passed on by the people of European descent and serving as the Cape's superstrate formed a more conservative force. A more progressive one, involving morphological simplification and substrate influence, was the Dutch that the Khoi and the slaves learned "imperfectly" and most of them eventually switched to. Actually, the varying impact of Settler Dutch, Khoisan and Malay still manifests itself in the three dialects that are typically distinguished for Present-day Afrikaans – i.e., respectively, Eastern Border Afrikaans, Gariep Afrikaans (also known as Orange River Afrikaans) and Cape Afrikaans (for a detailed history of the language, see Van Rensburg 2012). The focus here will be on General Afrikaans (see Van Huyssteen 2020) and the way that it is used both formally and informally.[1]

The rest of the present chapter will take the basic facts of Afrikaans grammar for granted (see Donaldson 1993 and Landsbergen et al.'s 2014 *Taalportaal* web-

---

[1]There is evidence of dialectal variation in negation. Roberge (2000: 165), for instance, observes that the second element of the normal two-part negation of the general language "is facultative in Orange River Afrikaans" (see also Stell 2009).

site for a comprehensive description). One of these is that the language is V2 in main clauses (and complementizer-less subordinate clauses). This fact means that: first, the finite verb occupies second position, like *het* 'has/have' in (1a) or (1b); second, the subject usually precedes it, as in (1a), or immediately follows it if another constituent is in initial place, as in (1b); third, any non-finite verb (or any separable verb particle) appears in clause-final position, like *gesien* 'seen' in (1a) or (1b); and, fourth, the object normally occurs between the finite and non-finite slots, like *die kar* 'the car' in (1a) or (1b). In subordinate clauses, Afrikaans is SOV, as (1c) shows.

(1)   a.   *Sy   het   die kar gesien.*
          3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS DEF car see.PST.PTCP
          'She saw the car.'

      b.   *Gister   het   sy   die kar gesien.*
          yesterday have.PRS 3SG.F.SBJ DEF car see.PST.PTCP
          'Yesterday, she saw the car.'

      c.   *... dat   sy   die kar gesien   het.*
          COMP 3SG.F.SBJ DEF car see.PST.PTCP have.PRS
          '... that she saw the car.'

Another essential fact concerns the general lack of inflection. The language does not indicate case or gender on nouns and, in its pronominal system, such distinctions are restricted to the singular (e.g. *hy/hom* 'he/him' and *sy/haar* 'she/her' versus *hulle* 'they, them'). There is differential object marking, though, with the preposition *vir* 'for', which seems preferred with proper nouns, optional with human or animate nouns and with pronouns and unacceptable with inanimate nouns. Compare (1a) and (2).

(2)   *Sy   het   vir Henk gesien.*
      3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS for Henk see.PST.PTCP
      'She saw Henk.'

Verb inflection is limited too. They show no agreement and tend to have just a base form and a past participle form (e.g. *gaan* 'go', *gegaan* 'gone'). Only the modal auxiliaries and 'know', 'be' and 'have' (still) have a preterite (e.g. *is* 'am/are/is', *was* 'was/were'). The final two verbs are also the sole ones in the language with a distinctive infinitive form (e.g. *wees* 'be', *hê* 'have').

Note that all examples in this chapter are based on earlier research, internet queries (for which we used the Google search engine and relied on factors such

as context, authors' names and dates of publication to assess the relevance of the results) and on actual corpus attestations (from the numerous corpora available and searchable on the Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans's 2019 corpus portal – with recent data from blogs, books, newspapers and plays, among other things). For reasons of space and presentation, they have, however, typically been shortened and/or slightly altered (though native speakers have always been consulted to check their grammaticality). So most examples are constructed to at least some extent and no reference can/will be provided for them. For examples taken from secondary sources or reproduced verbatim from other sources, we will obviously give precise references. The description of negation in Afrikaans in this chapter is based on the questionnaire provided by the editors (Miestamo 2025 [this volume]) and the structure of the chapter follows the model given in the questionnaire.

2 Clausal negation

2.1 Standard negation

Negating a declarative verbal main clause is typically achieved through two identical particles, as in (3). The first *nie*, glossed as NEG$_1$, is clause-medial and comes after the subject, the finite verb slot and, if present, sentential adverbs like *waarskynlik* 'probably' in (3a). In focus-neutral circumstances, it precedes the object, as in (3b), unless this object is a pronoun without *vir*, as in (3c). The second *nie* or NEG$_2$ is clause-final and normally even follows subordinate clauses, like in (3d), and extraposed constituents after the non-finite verb slot.

(3) a. *Die bestuurder-s verkoop waarskynlik nie   kaart-jie-s   nie.*
DEF driver-PL   sell   probably   NEG$_1$ card-DIM-PL NEG$_2$
'The drivers probably do not sell tickets.'

b. *Jy   het   nie   die kar gesien   nie.*
2SG.SBJ have.PRS NEG$_1$ DEF car see.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
'You did not see the car.'

c. *Jy   het   hom   nie gesien   nie.*
2SG.SBJ have.PRS 3SG.M.NSBJ NEG$_1$ see.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
'You did not see him.'

d. *Ek   het   nie gesê   (*nie) dat   die kar stukkend*
1SG.SBJ have.PRS NEG$_1$ say.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$ COMP DEF car broken

was   nie.
be.PST NEG_2

'I did not say that the car was broken.'

The two particles differ from each other in several respects (see Biberauer & Cyrino 2009: 3–4). Only *nie_1* can be modified, for instance, as in (4a). It is also *nie_1* through which negation is primarily expressed: (4a) without *nie_2*, though ill-formed, will still be interpreted as a negative clause. In the same vein, it is *nie_1* that is replaced when a more emphatic negator is required or a negative indefinite is included. *Nie_2* stays put in either case, as (4b) shows.[2] What the markers have in common is the ability to cliticize onto the preceding word in very colloquial language. Example (4c), coming from the hip hop group *Die Antwoord*'s lyrics, is a case in point.

(4)   a. *Sy   wil   (glad)   nie eet (*glad)   nie.*
3SG.F.SBJ want.PRS altogether NEG_1 eat altogether NEG_2

'She does not(/NOT) want to eat at all.'

   b. *Hy   wil   niks/geensins   eet nie.*
3SG.M.SBJ want.PRS nothing/in.no.way eat NEG_2

'He does not want to eat anything/at all.'

   c. *Ek   weet=ie   waar ek   iss=ie.*
1SG.SBJ know=NEG_1 where 1SG.SBJ be.PRS=NEG_2

'I do not know where I am.'[3]

As to (a)symmetry à la Miestamo (2005), this discontinuous two-part negation can be described as fully symmetric. Deleting *nie_1* and *nie_2* from the sentences in (3), for example, produces the positive ones in (5).

(5)   a. *Die bestuurder-s verkoop waarskynlik kaart-jie-s.*
DEF driver-PL   sell   probably   card-DIM-PL

'The drivers probably sell tickets.'

   b. *Jy   het   haar   gesien.*
2SG.SBJ have.PRS 3SG.F.NSJB see.PST.PTCP

'You saw her.'

---

[2]Because of these differences, Afrikaans linguistics tends to analyze *nie_1* as a negative adverb, i.e. the true negator, and *nie_2* as a negative particle (e.g. the Taalportaal grammar). A similar distinction can be found in much generative work on the phenomenon (e.g. Oosthuizen 1998).

[3]https://l-hit.com/en/433108, accessed 2021-11-02.

    c. *Jy   het   die   kar gesien.*
        2SG.SBJ have.PRS DEF car see.PST.PTCP
        'You saw the car.'

    d. *Ek   het   gesê   dat   die   kar stukkend was.*
        1SG.SBJ have.PRS say.PST.PTCP COMP DEF car broken   be.PST
        'I said that the car was broken.'

Afrikaans standard negation thus exhibits constructional symmetry. There also exist no differences between positive and negative declarative verbal main clauses in, inter alia, finiteness or tense-aspect-mood marking, making *nie*$_1$ … *nie*$_2$ paradigmatically symmetric as well.

The above account of the two particles' distribution needs to be qualified in a number of ways. First, *nie*$_2$ is ungrammatical when all slots after *nie*$_1$ are empty and *nie*$_1$ is in final position (see Biberauer 2007: 31 on a syntactic haplology mechanism in Afrikaans). This situation arises in clauses consisting only of a subject and a finite verb, as in (6a) (which would be interpreted as 'they don't not sing' with *nie nie*). It also occurs in clauses with an additional pronominal object preceding *nie*$_1$, as in (6b), where the modifier *glad* 'altogether' indicates that the single negator is indeed *nie*$_1$ rather than *nie*$_2$. This aversion to consecutive cases of *nie* extends to clauses that might have been expected to end in *nie*$_2$ *nie*$_2$. In (6c), for example, one could have envisaged the occurrence of a first *nie*$_2$ for the main clause negation and a second *nie*$_2$ for the subordinate clause negation but only one *nie*$_2$ appears. If *nie*$_1$ in structures like (6a) and (6b) is substituted by a negative indefinite, as in (6d), *nie*$_2$ is optional (just like when negative indefinites are used as short replies to questions).

(6)   a. *Hulle sing nie   (*nie).*
         3PL   sing NEG$_1$ NEG$_2$
         'They do not sing.'

      b. *Die kind-ers verstaan   my   glad   nie   (*nie).*
         DEF child-PL understand 1SG.NSBJ altogether NEG$_1$ NEG$_2$
         'The children do not understand me at all.'

      c. *Hulle het   nie gesê   dat   jy   nie   werk nie*
         3PL   have.PRS NEG $_1$say.PST.PTCP COMP 2SG.SBJ NEG$_1$ work NEG$_2$
         (*nie).
         NEG$_2$
         'They did not say that you do not work.'

d. *Hy   eet niks   (nie).*
   3SG.M.SBJ eat nothing NEG$_2$
   'He does not eat anything.'

Second, *nie$_2$* can be omitted in certain genres. These include poetry, signs and newspaper headlines (see Deumert 2017: 105). The headline from the national news publication *Beeld* in (7) can serve as an example.

(7) *AfriForum mag   nie appelleer oor   ou vlag.*
    AfriForum may.PRS NEG$_1$ appeal   about old flag
    'AfriForum may not appeal about old flag.'[4]

Third, as (8a) shows, *nie$_1$* can be left out too, with a very specific effect. According to Biberauer (2007: 5), the difference from the two-particle equivalent (8b) is that, in the former, the object "is necessarily interpreted as old information" while, in the latter, it is "part of the information focus, either independently as new/focused information or as part of an all-rhematic structure".

(8) a. *Ek   ken   hier-die boek nie.*
       1SG.SBJ know here-DEF book NEG$_2$
       'I do not know this book.'

    b. *Ek   ken   nie   hier-die boek nie.*
       1SG.SBJ know NEG$_1$ here-DEF book NEG$_2$
       'I do not know this book.'

Fourth, and finally, in informal language, *nie$_2$* sometimes appears ahead of extraposed constituents, especially when they are quite heavy (probably for reasons of processing; see Molnárfi 2001: 117). In such cases, there would not normally be a second *nie$_2$* at the end. Compare (9) to (3d).

(9) *Sy   het   nooit gesê   nie dat mens   net so gelukkig*
    3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS never say.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$ COMP human just so happy
    is   soos jou   ongelukkig-ste kind.
    be.PRS as   2SG.NSBJ unhappy-SUPL child
    'She never said that one is only as happy as one's unhappiest child.'

---

[4] https://www.netwerk24.com/netwerk24/nuus/hof/afriforum-mag-nie-appelleer-oor-ou-vlag-20190920, accessed 2021-11-02

2.2 Negation in non-declaratives

The negation of interrogatives, which are formed by inverting the subject and the finite verb, is governed by the same principles as standard negation. Consider the respective counterparts of (3b), (3d), (4b) and (6a) in (10) and notice, inter alia, the two-part negation in (10a), the truly clause-final position of nie_2 in (10b), the replacement of nie_1 by a negative indefinite in (10c) and the ungrammaticality of *nie nie* in (10d).

(10) a. *Het   jy   hom   nie gesien   nie?*
          have.PRS 2SG.SBJ 3SG.M.NSBJ NEG₁ see.PST.PTCP NEG₂
          'Did you not see him?'

   b. *Het   jy   nie gesê   dat die kar stukkend was*
       have.PRS 2SG.SBJ NEG₁ say.PST.PTCP COMP DEF car broken   be.PST
       nie?
       NEG₂
       'Did you not say that the car was broken?'

   c. *Hoekom wil   hy   niks   eet nie?*
       why   want.PRS 3SG.M.SBJ nothing eat NEG₂
       'Why does he not want to eat anything?'

   d. *Sing hulle nie   (*nie)?*
       sing 3PL   NEG₁ NEG₂
       'Do they not sing?'

It should therefore not come as a surprise that interrogative negation is also entirely symmetric. Deleting the two negators in (10a), for instance, results in a sentence with the meaning 'did you see him?'. As to the type of answer expected, the negative polar questions in (10a), (10b) and (10d) may function in a neutral manner but they are often biased toward a positive answer (see Holmberg 2015: 40).

Imperative negation is more complex. As (11a) and (11b) make clear, the imperative cannot be negated in the standard way. The construction in (11c) is employed instead. It features *moenie* 'don't!' rather than nie_1 and has the main verb in the non-finite rather than the finite slot (thus belonging to van der Auwera & Lejeune's 2013 [−imperative verb] [−standard negation] type). This loss of finiteness manifests itself here in the behavior of the separable verb particle *weg* 'away'. In the imperative in (11a), the stem *gaan* 'go' is in the finite slot and, hence, *weg* occupies the non-finite slot, just like in declarative main clauses such as (11d).

In the negative imperative in (11c), by contrast, *weg* is attached to *gaan*, which the declarative main clause in (11e) indicates is characteristic of verbs in the non-finite slot.

(11) a. *Gaan weg!*
  go away
  'Go away!'

  b. **Gaan nie weg nie!*
  go NEG₁ away NEG₂
  'Do not go away!'

  c. *Moenie   weg-gaan nie!*
  must.not.PRS away-go NEG₂
  'Do not go away!'

  d. *Ons gaan 'n bietjie weg.*
  1PL go INDF little.bit away
  'We are going away for a little bit.'

  e. *Ons wil   nie weg-gaan nie.*
  1PL want.PRS NEG₁ away-go NEG₂
  'We do not want to go away.'

The constructional asymmetry in finiteness (see Miestamo 2005: 73–96) between (11a) and (11c) can be attributed to the auxiliary origin of *moenie*. This marker is a combination of *moet* 'must' and *nie₁*. In fact, the two components can be separated, for example, by a pronoun without *vir* taking up its ordinary place between the finite slot and *nie₁*, as in (12a). *Moet* can occur on its own as well, when a negative indefinite or an emphatic negator substitutes for *nie₁*, as in (12b). Still, object pronouns without *vir*, which are ordinarily found before the first negator in other clause types (cf. (3b)), actually tend to follow rather than precede it in the negative imperative, facilitating the fusion of *moet* and *nie* in (12c). This fact is suggestive of some degree of univerbation and grammaticalization (for more details, see Van Olmen 2010: 500–501).[5]

(12) a. *Moet   jou   nie ontstel nie!*
  must.PRS 2SG.NSUBJ NEG₁ trouble NEG₂
  'Do not trouble yourself!'

---

[5]The fused form is not actually limited to negative imperatives. It can also be used for non-performative expressions of negative obligation such as *Piet moenie worrie nie* 'Pete should not worry'.

b. *Moet   niks   eet nie!*
must.PRS nothing eat NEG$_2$
'Do not eat anything!'

c. *Moenie   hom   dood-maak nie!*
must.not.PRS 3SG.M.NSBJ dead-make NEG$_2$
'Do not kill him!'

Moenie can also have a more specific negative imperative sense: when it directly introduces a complementizer clause as in (13a), it expresses the meaning 'don't let'. A function that it does not fulfill is the negation of non-addressee-oriented or "non-canonical" (Aikhenvald 2010: 47) imperatives. They require the auxiliary *laat* 'let' and adhere to the standard way of negating, as (13b) illustrates.

(13)   a. *Moenie   dat hulle jou   bang-maak nie!*
must.not.PRS COMP 3PL   2SG.NSBJ scared-make NEG$_2$
'Do not let them scare you!'

b. *Laat ons (nie) vergeet (nie)!*
let   1PL NEG$_1$ forget NIE$_2$
'Let's (not) forget!'

2.3 Negation in stative predications

Some types of stative predication (see Veselinova 2014: 1386–1389) can only be negated in the standard, symmetric manner. These are equation, attribution and locative predication, as in (14a) to (14c) respectively.

(14)   a. *Hy   is   (nie) my   pa (nie).*
3SG.M.SBJ be.PRS NEG$_1$ 1SG.NSBJ dad NEG$_2$
'He is (not) my dad.'

b. *Hulle is   (nie) braaf (nie).*
3PL   be.PRS NEG$_1$ brave NEG$_2$
'They are (not) brave.'

c. *Die kar is   (nie) in die motorhuis (nie).*
DEF car be.PRS NEG$_1$ in DEF garage   NEG$_2$
'The car is (not) in the garage.'

The negation of the other types may be similar, as possessive predication in (15a) shows, but it is also possible to use the negative determiner *geen* 'no' (or

its informal variant *g'n*) instead of *nie₁*. If it precedes an indefinite singular noun phrase, as in (15b), the article *'n* 'a(n)' from the corresponding positive clause is lost. *Nie₂* is optional here.

(15) a. *Ek   het   (nie) 'n   foon   (nie).*
         1SG.SBJ have.PRS NEG₁ INDF phone NEG₂
         'I (do not) have a phone.'

    b. *Ek   het   geen foon   (nie).*
         1SG.SBJ have.PRS no   phone NEG₂
         'I have no phone.'

This variation is found with proper inclusion too, as in (16), and with locative-existential and purely existential predication, as in (17) and (18) respectively, both of which employ the construction *daar is* 'there is/are'. Existential predication can also be expressed by *bestaan* 'exist', however, and this verb is negated in the standard way, as in (18c).

(16) a. *Henk is   (nie) 'n   onderwyser (nie).*
         Henk be.PRS NEG₁ INDF teacher   NEG₂
         'Henk is (not) a teacher.'

    b. *Henk is   geen onderwyser nie.*
         Henk be.PRS no   teacher   NEG₂
         'Henk is no teacher.'

(17) a. *Daar is   (nie) tran-e in die hemel (nie).*
         there be.PRS NEG₁ tear-PL in DEF heaven NEG₂
         'There are (no) tears in heaven.'

    b. *Daar is   geen tran-e in die hemel   nie.*
         there be.PRS no   tear-PL in DEF heaven NEG₂
         'There are no tears in heaven.'

(18) a. *Daar is   (nie) spok-e (nie).*
         there be.PRS NEG₁ ghost-PL NEG₂
         'There are (no) ghosts.'

    b. *Daar is   geen spok-e   nie.*
         there be.PRS no   ghost-PL NEG₂
         'There are no ghosts.'

c. *Spok-e   bestaan (nie).*
 ghost-PL exist   NEG$_1$
 'Ghosts (do not) exist.'

According to Donaldson (1993: 413), the two variants are interchangeable but it is likely that, as in other Germanic languages, which exhibit considerable variation in this area, the choice of one over the other is determined by a variety of factors. They include but are not limited to the type of stative predication, the complexity of the verb phrase, the scope of negation, the old versus new information status of the proposition and the conventionalized character of phrases (e.g. Peters 2008, Bordal 2017, Burnett et al. 2018, Wallage 2020). An in-depth study of their potential impact falls outside the scope of the present chapter, though. Let it suffice to say that the variant with *nie$_1$* seems to occur much more often than that with *geen* in Present-day Afrikaans.[6] This fact is interesting from the perspective of Dutch, where only *geen* is grammatical in possessive predication, proper inclusion and (locative-)existential predication.[7] The suggestion therefore is that Afrikaans has extended the standard negation pattern to all types of stative predication. Note, finally, that (14) to (18) also demonstrate that no grammatical differences exist between generic and specific predicates or between temporary and permanent property assignment.

2.4 Negation in non-main clauses

Negating subordinate clauses happens in much the same way as standard negation and the negation of stative predication. There are, in other words, no special negators or negative non-finite forms. The subordinate finite equivalents of the standard negation in (3a) and the negated stative predicates in (18a) and (18b) are given in (19). They show that negation is, essentially, completely symmetric here too.

(19)   a. *Jy   beweer dat   hulle (nie) kaart-jie-s   verkoop (nie).*
     2SG.SBJ claim   COMP 3PL   NEG$_1$ card-DIM-PL sell   NEG$_2$
     'You claim that they (do not) sell tickets.'

---

[6]This claim is based on Google searches and an exploratory examination of the Taalkommissiekorpus (Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans 2019), a large reference corpus of present-day written language.

[7]As one reviewer rightly points out, Dutch *niet* 'not' may still appear with these predication types in contrastive contexts. Taking (16b) as a starting point, if one wanted to communicate 'Henk is not a teacher but a professor', one could say *Henk is niet onderwijzer maar professor*. See also §4.1.

b. *Hulle sê dat daar (nie) spok-e is (nie).*
   3PL say COMP there NEG$_1$ ghost-PL be.PRS NEG$_2$
   'They say that there are (no) ghosts.'

c. *Hulle sê dat daar (geen) spok-e is (nie).*
   3PL say COMP there no ghost-PL be.PRS NEG$_2$
   'They say that there are (no) ghosts.'

The word order in finite subordinate clauses is normally SOV, with *nie*$_1$ (or some negative indefinite or emphatic negator) appearing before the verb and *nie*$_2$ after the verb. This syntax has as a result that consecutive occurrences of *nie* are impossible. Main clauses with only *nie*$_1$ thus acquire a second negator when they are turned into subordinate clauses. The comparison of (6b) to (20a) can serve as an example. The complementizer *dat* 'that' is often omitted, though (see Van Rooy & Kruger 2016), in which case the subordinate clause has V2 word order and *nie*$_2$ is again blocked, as in (20b).

(20) a. *Ek dink dat die kind-ers my glad nie verstaan*
        1SG.SBJ think COMP DEF child-PL 1SG.NSBJ altogether NEG$_1$ understand
        nie.
        NEG$_2$
        'I think that the children do not understand me at all.'

   b. *Ek dink die kind-ers verstaan my glad nie (*nie).*
      1SG.SBJ think DEF child-PL understand 1SG.NSBJ altogether NEG$_1$ NEG$_2$

      'I think that the children do not understand me at all.'

The general requirement for two negators extends to cases where, in the main clause, only *nie*$_2$ is found because the object is old information, as in (8a), repeated here as (21a). Its subordinate counterpart in (21b) has *nie*$_1$ coming after the object. When the object is part of the information focus, as in (21c), *nie*$_1$ precedes it (see Biberauer 2008: 106–107).

(21) a. *Ek ken hier-die boek nie.*
        1SG.SBJ know here-DEF book NEG$_2$
        'I do not know this book.'

   b. *... dat ek hier-die boek nie ken nie.*
      COMP 1SG.SBJ here-DEF book NEG$_1$ know NEG$_2$
      '... that I do not know this book.'

c. ... *dat ek   nie hier-die boek ken   nie.*
    COMP 1SG.SBJ NEG$_1$ here-DEF book know NEG$_2$
    '... that I do not know this book.'

The negation of non-finite subordinate clauses, like that of finite ones, tends to behave in fairly straightforward ways, as (22) makes clear. Of note in (22a) is that *nie$_2$* is placed not at the end of the entire sentence but directly after the preposed purpose clause. In (22b), it is the position of *nie$_1$* after *om* 'for' that makes the subordinate clause negative. If it precedes *om*, it negates the main verb, as in (22c).

(22) a. *Ten einde sak-e   (nie) te kompliseer (nie), volg   ons die advies.*
         in   order thing-PL NEG$_1$ to complicate NEG$_2$ follow 1PL DEF advice
         'In order (not) to complicate things, we are following the advice.'

     b. *Sy   vra julle om (nie) te sing (nie).*
        3SG.F.SBJ ask 2PL for NEG$_1$ to sing NEG$_2$
        'She is asking you (not) to sing.'

     c. *Sy   vra julle nie   om te sing nie.*
        3SG.F.SBJ ask 2PL NEG$_1$ for to sing NEG$_2$
        'She is not asking you to sing.'

For non-finite complement clauses with bare infinitives, it seems necessary to make a distinction between verbs of perception like *sien* 'see' and *hoor* 'hear' and verbs like *help* 'help' and *leer* 'teach'. The former can be negated in just one structural way, as in (23a), and it is normally understood as applying to the main verb. To get the (admittedly awkward) interpretation where only the subordinate clause is negated, the negation has to be stressed, as in (23b).[8] With the latter verbs, as in (23c), the simple addition of *nie$_1$* and *nie$_2$* produces the same meaning as in (23a), namely the negation of the main verb.[9] To solely negate the complement clause, the bare infinitive needs to be turned into an *om te* 'for to' infinitive, as in (23d).

---

[8]The generative literature (e.g. Biberauer & Cyrino 2009: 4) indicates that only *nie$_1$* is stressable. The native speakers consulted for the present chapter disagree and maintain that, in particular contexts, like (23b), *nie$_2$* is able/needs to be emphasized as well.

[9]In line with the description in §2.1, *nie$_1$* follows the pronoun (without *vir*) in (23a) and (23c). *Nie$_1$* before *haar* and *jou* would be a marked order. In keeping with the earlier discussion too, *nie$_1$* would precede a lexical replacement of these pronouns in (23a) and (23c) and the reversed order would be marked.

(23)   a.   *Ek   sien haar   (nie) kom (nie).*
            1SG.SBJ see 3SG.F.NSBJ NEG1 come NEG2
            'I (do not) see her come.'

       b.   *Ek   sien haar   NIE kom NIE.*
            1SG.SBJ see 3SG.F.NSBJ NEG1 come NEG2
            'I see her not come.'

       c.   *Dit   leer jou   nie kop-hou   nie.*
            3SG.N teach 2SG.NSBJ NEG1 head-hold NEG2
            'This does not teach you to stay calm.'

       d.   *Dit   leer jou   om nie kwaad te word   nie.*
            3SG.N teach 2SG.NSBJ for NEG1 angry to become NEG2
            'This teaches you not to get angry.'

See also §3.3 about (non-)finite subordinate clauses introduced by *sonder* 'without' and §4.1 about the scope of negation in complex clauses.

2.5 Negative lexicalizations

There are no negative lexicalizations in Afrikaans, with the possible exception of *moenie* 'must not', which is discussed in §2.2 (see footnote 5 too). A potential test for the presence of inherently negative verbs such as 'not exist', 'not want' and 'not know' (see Veselinova 2013) would be the compulsory use of nie_2 in clauses in which they occur. To our knowledge, no verb exhibits this behavior.[10]

---

[10]Oosthuizen (1998: 79) and Biberauer (2008: 116) do mention the ability of verbs with a contradictory meaning such as *weier* 'refuse', as well as of intrinsically negative adverbs such as *nouliks* 'barely', to be followed by nie_2 in colloquial language. Examples like (i) and (ii) are, however, almost consistently judged to be unacceptable by native speakers, as Potgieter's (2018: 58–60) experimental data shows.

(i)   *Ek   weier om saam   te kom nie.*
      1SG.SBJ refuse for together to come NEG2
      'I refuse to come along.' (Biberauer 2008: 116)

(ii) *Ek   kan   my   nouliks in-hou nie.*
      SG.SBJ can.PRS 1SG.NSBJ barely in-hold NEG2
      'I can barely contain myself.' (Biberauer 2008: 116)

3 Non-clausal negation

3.1 Negative replies

To disagree with the polarity of a positive polar question like (24), Afrikaans uses the particle *nee* 'no'. To agree with its polarity, the particle *ja* 'yes' is employed. The replies to a negative polar question like (25) are more complex. *Nee* can serve to express agreement with the interrogative's negative polarity on its own. By contrast, *ja* in isolation will, as Holmberg's (2015: 143) informant for Afrikaans points out, "almost certainly result in confusion if it isn't accompanied by some form of disambiguating intonation or other paratactic device which the hearer can draw on to expand 'yes' in the required way". *Ja* as a reply to the negative polar question in (25) could, in other words, be interpreted as either 'the dog is indeed not barking' or 'but the dog *is* barking'.[11] Adding *hy blaf (nie)* 'he is (not) barking' after *ja* can help to make the reply clearer, though.[12]

(24) Q: *Blaf die hond?*
           bark DEF dog
           'Is the dog barking?'

    A1: *Nee.*
           no
           'No(, the dog isn't barking).'

    A2: *Ja.*
           yes
           'Yes(, the dog is barking).'

(25) Q: *Blaf die hond nie?*
           bark DEF dog   NEG$_1$
           'Isn't the dog barking?'

    A1: *Nee.*
           no
           'No(, the dog isn't barking).'

---

[11]To express the latter meaning, Dutch has a dedicated particle *jawel* 'but yes'. There exists no equivalent of this particle in Afrikaans.

[12]Following a reviewer's suggestion, we also want to mention *(h)aikona* 'no way!' here. It is a relatively common borrowing from the Nguni languages in colloquial Afrikaans (and South African English) and serves, among other things, to convey shock or disbelief and to express emphatic disagreement.

A2:   *?Ja.*
      yes
      'Yes(, the dog is(n't) barking).'

Interestingly, *nee* does occasionally occur in replies expressing agreement with the polarity of positive polar interrogatives, as in (26). In such cases, it fulfills not its regular function but the intersubjective one of denying the concerns that the addressee is presumed to have. It can even be used in this way in replies to content questions, as (27) shows.

(26)   Q: *Is   jy   okay?*
            be.PRS 2SG.SBJ okay
            'Are you okay?'

       A: *Nee, ek   is   reg.*
            no   1SG.SBJ be.PRS alright
            'No, (do not worry,) I am alright.' (Biberauer et al. 2017: 79)

(27)   Q: *Hoe gaan dit?*
            how go   3SG.N
            'How are you doing?'

       A: *Nee, goed.*
            no   good
            'No, (do not worry,) well.' (Biberauer et al. 2017: 79)

Another peculiarity of *nee* is its frequent combination with *ja*, as in (28). *Ja-nee* has essentially the same meaning as *ja* in (24) but the sense of agreement is always qualified in some manner (e.g. reluctance, enthusiasm, resignation; see Biberauer et al. 2017: 76–77). It seems to be used more for confirming statements than for replying to questions, though.

(28)   Q: *Dink jy   hier-die boek is   belangrik?*
            think 2SG.SBJ here-DEF book be.PRS important
            'Do you think that this book is important?'

       A: *Ja-nee, ek   dink so.*
            yes-no 1SG.SBJ think so
            'Yeah, well, I think so.'

3.2 Negative indefinites

The list of negative indefinites in the language includes *niemand* 'nobody', *niks* 'nothing', *nooit* 'never', *nêrens* 'nowhere' and *geen/g'n* 'no' (see Huddlestone 2010). As discussed in §2.1, they usually take the place of nie_1, as in (29a), although they can appear before the finite verb as well. When they do, as in (29b), the clause does not feature nie_1 but still calls for the presence of nie_2 (see Van Olmen & Breed 2015: 237).[13] This requirement is relaxed only when the negative indefinite occupies the clause-final position or serves as a short reply to a question. In these circumstances, nie_2 is optional, as in (29c). Note also that, in informal language, negative indefinites can actually co-occur with nie_1. Sentences (29d) and (29e) are cases in point (see also Biberauer 2009: 102–103).

(29) a. *Hy   wil   niks   eet nie.*
          3SG.M.SBJ want.PRS nothing eat NEG_2
          'He does not want to eat anything.'

      b. *Niemand het   haar   gesien   nie.*
          nobody have.PRS 3SG.F.NSBJ see.PST.PTCP NEG_2
          'Nobody saw her.'

      c. *Hy   eet niks   (nie).*
          3SG.M.SBJ eat nothing NEG_2
          'He does not eat anything.'

      d. *Ons sal   hulle nooit nie   vergeet nie.*
          1PL shall 3PL   never NEG_1 forget NEG_2
          'We will never forget them.'

      e. *Ons sal   niemand nie   vergeet nie.*
          1PL shall nobody NEG_1 forget NEG_2
          'We will forget nobody.'

When a negative clause contains multiple indefinites, the first one is normally negative and the subsequent ones non-negative, like *nooit* and *êrens* 'somewhere' or *iemand* 'someone' in (30a) and (30b). Two negative indefinites in the same sentence cancel each other out, in formal language and according to prescriptive

---

[13]Note, for the sake of completeness, that the slot before the finite verb is not limited to subjects in a V2 language like Afrikaans (see §1). In *ons sal hulle nooit vergeet nie* 'we will never forget them' (cf. (29d)), *nooit* 'never' appears in its "normal" position and the clause conforms to the pattern in (29a). With *nooit* in initial position, as in *nooit sal ons hulle vergeet nie* 'never will we forget them', the clause has the same pattern as (29b).

tradition. Example (30c) thus receives the interpretation of 'she hurt someone at some point'. Yet, in informal language, it is not uncommon for negation to spread to all indefinites in the clause, without resulting in any mutual cancelation of negative meanings or implying a more emphatic negation. So, colloquially, (30c) signifies the same as (30b). In fact, experimental research by Huddlestone & de Swart (2014) indicates that clauses such as (30c) are almost always understood as plainly negative by native speakers.

(30) a. *Hulle gaan nooit êrens   kom nie.*
         3PL go   never somewhere come NEG$_2$
         'They are never going to get anywhere.'

      b. *Sy   het   nooit iemand seer-gemaak   nie.*
         3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS never someone pain-make.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
         'She never hurt anyone.'

      c. *Sy   het   nooit niemand seer-gemaak   nie.*
         3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS never nobody pain-make.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
         'She hurt someone at some point.' or 'She never hurt anyone.'

The pattern in (30b) occurs much more often than that in (30c), though, at least in writing (see Huddlestone 2010: 139). The only exception to this trend is when *g'n* precedes another indefinite. Combinations of *g'n* and a negative indefinite, as in (31a), are more frequent than those of *g'n* and a non-negative indefinite, as in (31b) (see Huddlestone 2010: 137).[14] Now consider (31c) and (31d).

(31) a. *Ons het   g'n niemand op-getel   nie.*
         1PL have.PRS no nobody   up-count.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
         'We did not give anyone a lift.'

      b. *Ons het   g'n iemand op-getel   nie.*
         1PL have.PRS no someone up-count.PST.PTCP NEG$_2$
         'We did not give anyone a lift.'

      c. *Hulle het   geen/g'n kind-ers nie.*
         3PL   have.PRS no   child-PL NEG$_2$
         'They do not have any children.'

---

[14]As pointed out in §4.4, *g'n* may also serve as a colloquial equivalent of *nie$_1$*. With emphasis on *niemand* (31a) can therefore be interpreted as 'we didn't NOT give anybody a lift' as well. Similarly, in the right context, (31b) can function as a strong denial too, meaning 'we certainly did not give anyone a lift'.

d. *Ons het   geen niemand op-getel   nie.*
   1PL have.PRS no nobody up-count.PST.PTCP NEG₂
   'We did not give anyone a lift.'

As simple negative determiners, like in (31c), *geen* and *g'n* are interchangeable, with the former being the more formal or written variant. In combinations with negative indefinites, as in (31d), however, *geen* is generally considered much less acceptable than *g'n* (see Huddlestone 2010: 167, as well as §4.4).

The negative indefinites' non-negative counterparts – i.e. *iemand*, *iets* 'something', *ooit* 'ever' and *êrens* 'somewhere' – can clearly occur in negative clauses when a negative indefinite is present. On their own, they are essentially restricted to what Haspelmath (1997: 31–52), for his semantic map of indefinites, calls specific-known, specific-unknown, irrealis-non-specific, conditional, question and indirect negation contexts, which are illustrated in (32a) to (32f) respectively.

(32) a. *Ek   het   iemand ontmoet; sy   is   'n   navorser.*
         1SG.SBJ have.PRS someone meet   3SG.F.SBJ be.PRS INDF researcher
         'I met someone; she is a researcher.'

      b. *Hy   het   iemand ontmoet maar ek   weet nie wie*
         3SG.M.SBJ have.PRS someone meet   but 1SG.SBJ know NEG₁ who
         nie.
         NEG₂
         'He met someone but I do not know who.'

      c. *Gaan iets   lekker-s doen!*
         go   something nice-GEN do
         'Go and do something nice!'

      d. *As jy   ooit Potch toe kom, …*
         if 2SG.SBJ ever Potch to come
         'If you ever come to Potch, …'

      e. *Gaan julle êrens   heen?*
         go   2PL somewhere from.here
         'Are you going somewhere?'

      f. *Ek   dink nie dat hulle iets   gesien   het   nie.*
         1SG.SBJ think NEG₁ COMP 3PL something see.PST.PTCP have.PRS NEG₂
         'I do not think that they saw anything.'

For Haspelmath's (1997) comparative and free-choice uses, the non-negative indefinites need to combine with *enige* 'any', as in (33a) and (33b) respectively (see §4.2 for more about the negative polarity item *enige*).[15]

(33) a. *Die seun hardloop vinnig-er   as enige iemand   anders.*
          DEF boy   run   fast-CMPR as any   someone else
          'The boy runs faster than anyone else.'

     b. *Hier-die   probleem kan deur enige iemand   opgelos   word.*
          here-DEF problem can by   any   someone solve.PST.PTCP become
          'This problem can be solved by anyone.'

3.3 Negative derivation and case marking

It will come as no surprise that Afrikaans, as a language that makes case distinctions in singular personal pronouns only, does not have any "negative case marking". Abessive meaning at the phrasal level is expressed by the preposition *sonder* 'without', as in (34a).[16] This marker can also introduce a finite subordinate clause, when followed by *dat*, or a non-finite one, as in (34b) and (34c) respectively.

(34) a. *Ons was   sonder kos en   water.*
          1PL be.PRS without food and water
          'We were without food and water.'

     b. *Julle het   dit   gedoen   sonder dat julle ons*
          2PL   have.PRS 3SG.N do.PST.PTCP without COMP 2PL 1PL
          geraadpleeg   het.
          consult.PST.PTCP have.PRS
          'You did it without consulting us.'

     c. *Julle het   dit   gedoen   sonder om ons te raadpleeg.*
          2PL   have.PRS 3SG.N do.PST.PTCP without for 1PL to consult
          'You did it without consulting us.'

Negative derivation is somewhat under-researched in Afrikaans and an exhaustive study of the phenomenon goes beyond the scope of the present chapter in any case. Let the following comments therefore suffice (but see also Van

---

[15]For the contexts in (33), Afrikaans can actually also use the more grammaticalized combinations *enigiets* 'anything at all' and *enigiemand* 'anybody at all'.

[16]In non-native Afrikaans, *nie$_2$* is sometimes added to sentences like (34a).

Huyssteen 2019 and the Afrikaans dictionaries available via the Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans 2019).

The language seems to have a range of negative prefixes at its disposal but few negative suffixes. The affix *-loos* '-less', which turns nouns such as *bodem* 'bottom' into adjectives such as *bodemloos* 'bottomless', may be the only one – although *vry* 'free', which can combine with a noun like *vet* 'fat' to make an adjective like *vetvry* 'fat-free', could potentially be considered here too. The list of prefixes includes *on-* 'un-' and *nie-* 'not-', which can attach to both nouns and adjectives without changing their word classes. The former signifies lack of the quality conveyed by the stem. *(On)trou* '(un)faithfulness' and *(on)gesond* '(un)healthy' are cases in point. The latter expresses exclusion from what the stem refers to, like in *(nie-)roker* '(non-)smoker' and *(nie-)christelik* '(non-)Christian'. Another prefix, for which it is hard to provide a single translation, is *wan-*. It signifies that what the stem conveys is inadequate or wrong, as in *(wan)besteding* '(inappropriate) spending' and *(wan)smaak* '(bad) taste'.

There also exist a number of prefixes that come from other languages. *In-* 'un-', for instance, is found with adjectives (and nouns derived from them), like *(in)formeel* '(in)formal', and frequently varies with *on-*, as *(in)stabiel* '(in)stable' and *(on)stabiel* '(un)stable' show. *Non-* 'non-' is attested occasionally too, as an alternative to *nie-*, as in *(non)figuratief* '(non-)figurative'. Other examples are *kontra-* 'contra-' and *anti-* 'anti-', in nouns like *(Kontra)reformasie* '(Counter-)-Reformation' and adjectives like *(anti)fascisties* '(anti-)fascist', where they have the meaning of 'opposed to'. This last marker can express the sense of 'reverse of' as well, as in *(anti)klimaks* '(anti-)climax'. Two more mainly nominal or adjectival prefixes that are borrowed are *eks-* 'ex-' and *a-* 'a-'. The first one, as in *(eks-)burgemeester* '(ex-)mayor', means 'former' whereas the second one, as in *(a)moreel* '(a)moral', signifies unrelatedness to what the stem conveys.

Affixes that seem to operate primarily – though not exclusively – in the verbal domain, finally, are *dis-* 'dis-' and *ont-* 'un-'. The former turns the meaning of a verb into its opposite, as in *(dis)kwalifiseer* '(dis)qualify', but is not very productive. The latter has a variety of functions (which will not all be discussed here). It can, for instance, combine with verbs to convey the reverse of their original semantics, as in *(ont)laai* '(un)load' and *(ont)koppel* '(dis)connect'. The prefix may also be attached to a noun, with the resulting verb expressing the act of removing what the stem denotes, as in *ontkurk* 'uncork' and *onthoof* 'decapitate'. It can be employed to derive verbs from adjectives as well. The meaning produced this way is that of undoing the quality conveyed by the stem. *Ontrond* 'unround' (e.g. when pronouncing a sound) is a case in point and so is *ontgroen* 'haze' (e.g.

during an initiation ceremony), i.e. making someone not or less green in the metaphorical sense.

4 Other aspects of negation

4.1 The scope of negation

If negation has scope over only one constituent, for instance, for contrastive purposes, *nie*$_1$ and *nie*$_2$ can just surround the constituent in question, as in (35a). To express such a contrast in a coordination construction, *nie*$_1$ can move from its ordinary place in (35b) and directly precede the constituent in focus, as in (35c) (see Robbers 1992: 231–232). This change in position has a similar effect in (35d) and (35e).

(35) a. *Adri, nie Daniel nie, is   verantwoordelik.*
          Adri NEG$_1$ Daniel NEG$_2$ be.PRS responsible
          'Adri, not Daniel, is responsible.'

      b. *Daniel is   nie verantwoordelik nie, maar Adri.*
          Daniel be.PRS NEG$_1$ responsible   NEG$_2$ but Adri
          'Daniel is not responsible but Adri.'

      c. *Nie Daniel is   verantwoordelik nie, maar Adri.*
          NEG$_1$ Daniel be.PRS responsible   NEG$_2$ but Adri
          'Not Daniel is responsible but Adri.'

      d. *Daniel mag   dit   nie sê nie.*
          Daniel may.PRS 3SG.N NEG$_1$ say NEG$_2$
          'Daniel is not allowed to say that.'

      e. *Daniel mag   nie dit   sê nie.*
          Daniel may.PRS NEG$_1$ 3SG.N say NEG$_2$
          'Daniel is not allowed to say *that*.'

Another area of interest for issues of scope is adverbs (see Biberauer 2008: 122–124). If negation ranges over them, *nie*$_1$ comes before them, as in (36a). If an adverb has scope over negation, however, *nie*$_1$ follows it, for which (36b) can serve as a (somewhat marked) example. Not surprisingly therefore, sentential adverbs like *waarskynlik* normally always precede *nie*$_1$, as in (36c) (*nie waarskynlik* 'not probably' would be acceptable, though, when contrasted to *maar beslis* 'but definitely').

(36) a. *Hy   lag   nie altyd vir my   grap-pie-s   nie.*
    3SG.M.SBJ laugh NEG₁ always for 1SG.NSBJ joke-DIM-PL NEG₂
    'He does not always laugh at my jokes.'

  b. *Hy   lag   altyd nie vir my   grap-pie-s   nie.*
    3SG.M.SBJ laugh always NEG₁ for 1SG.NSBJ joke-DIM-PL NEG₂
    'He always does not laugh at my jokes.'

  c. *Hulle kom waarskynlik nie   Potch toe nie.*
    3PL   come probably   NEG₁ Potch to NEG₂
    'They are probably not coming to Potch.'

A final phenomenon relevant to the scope of negation is the position of *nie₂* in complex clauses. As mentioned in §2.1, it is usually found at the end of the entire sentence, including any subordinate clause that the negation ranges over – such as the complement clause in (3c), repeated here as (37a), and the relative clause in (37b).

(37) a. *Ek   het   nie gesê   dat die kar stukkend was*
    1SG.SBJ have.PRS NEG₁ say.PST.PTCP COMP DEF car broken   be.PST
    nie.
    NEG₂
    'I did not say that the car was broken.'

  b. *Dit   is   nie die plek waar sy   begrawe   is*
    3SG.N be.PRS NEG₁ DEF place where 3SG.F.SBJ bury.PST.PTCP be.PRS
    nie.
    NEG₂
    'This is not the place where she is buried.'

Still, when a subordinate clause falls outside the scope of negation, *nie₂* appears at the end of the main clause and not at the end of the whole sentence. In (38a), for instance, the subordinate clause provides a "positive" reason for the "negative" state of affairs in the main clause and *nie₂* occurs before the conjunction *aangesien* 'because'.[17] Conversely, when the negation applies only to the

---

[17]The issue of scope with conjunctions meaning 'because' is interesting. *Want* 'because' is a coordinator and the clause that it introduces therefore always falls outside the scope of a preceding clause's negation. Only the pattern in (38a) – and (38c) – is possible. By contrast, like *aangesien*, *omdat* 'because' is a subordinator and the clause headed by it may be inside the scope of a foregoing clause's negation in particular contexts. For instance, if one wanted to say 'he does not want to eat because he is ill but because …', the reason would fall within the scope of the main clause negation. In that case, *nie₂* would follow the first subordinate clause: *hy wil nie eet omdat hy siek is nie maar omdat …*

subordinate clause, *nie₂* is placed at the end of that clause and not at the end of the complete sentence. In (38b), for example, the main clause makes a "positive" claim, about people who are defined "negatively" in the relative clause, and *nie₂* occurs after *drink* 'drink' rather than *vreemd* 'weird'. Similarly, when a negative clause is followed by a coordinated positive clause, as in (38c), *nie₂* is found at the end of the first clause and not at that of the complex clause.

(38)   a.   *Hy   wil   nie eet nie   aangesien hy   siek is.*
          3SG.M.SBJ want.PRS NEG₁ eat NEG₂ because   3SG.M.SBJ ill   be.PRS
          'He does not want to eat, because he is ill.'

        b.   *Mens-e   wat   nie   drink nie,   is   vreemd.*
          human-PL what NEG1 drink NEG₂ be.PRS weird
          'People who do not drink are weird.'

        c.   *Sy   lees nie boek-e nie en hy   is   'n   skrywer.*
          3SG.F.SBJ read NEG₁ book-PL NEG₂ and 3SG.M.SBJ be.PRS INDF writer
          'She does not read books and he is a writer.'

See also §2.4 about issues of scope in non-finite subordinate clauses.

4.2 Negative polarity

The inventory of negative polarity items includes the modal auxiliaries *hoef* 'need' and *durf* 'dare'. The former expresses absence of necessity in negative clauses, as in (39a), but can be employed in other negative polarity contexts too, such as polar questions and clauses with the restrictive adverb *net* 'only', as (39b) and (39c) respectively show. Its use in a plainly positive clause like (39d) is not grammatical, however.

(39)   a.   *Ons hoef nie   die wet-te te gehoorsaam nie.*
          1PL   need NEG₁ DEF law-PL to obey   NEG₂
          'We do not need to obey the laws.'

        b.   *Hoef ons die   wet-te   te gehoorsaam?*
          need 1PL DEF law-PL to obey
          'Do we need to obey the laws?'

        c.   *Ons hoef net   die wet-te   te gehoorsaam.*
          1PL   need only DEF law-PL to obey
          'We only need to obey the laws.'

    d. *?Ons hoef die wet-te te gehoorsaam.*
       1PL   need DEF law-PL to obey
       'We need to obey the laws.'

Durf exhibits the same behavior, as (40) aims to suggest: (40a) would be unacceptable without the negators and the conditional in (40b) is yet another type of negative polarity context.

(40)   a. *Ek   durf dit   nie sê nie.*
        1SG.SBJ dare 3SG.N NEG$_1$ say NEG$_2$
        'I dare not say it.'

      b. *As jy   durf lag, moer ek   jou.*
        if   2SG.SBJ dare laugh hit   1SG.SBJ 2SG.NSBJ
        'If you dare laugh, I will hit you.'

Another negative polarity item is *veel* 'much' (see also Kotzé & Breed 2019). It can appear in the negative clause in (41a) but has to be replaced by *baie* 'much' (a borrowing from Malay) in its positive equivalent in (41b) (see Kotzé & Breed 2018). *Veel* serves as a(n often rather marked) negative polar alternative to *baie*, which is always possible too, in a variety of contexts – such as with count and mass nouns like (41a), with eventive verbs like (41c) and in comparatives like (41d) (see Berghoff 2016: 23–24, the inspiration for the examples). With gradable adjectives, as in (41e), *veel* is simply not acceptable, though.

(41)   a. *Daar is   nie veel/baie skade nie.*
        There be.PRS NEG$_1$ much   damage NEG$_2$
        'There is not much damage.'

      b. *Daar is   baie/*veel skade.*
        there be.PRS much   damage
        'There is much damage.'

      c. *Sy   reis nie veel/baie nie.*
        3SG.F.SBJ travel NEG$_1$ much   NEG$_2$
        'She does not travel a lot.'

      d. *Gys is   (nie) veel/baie slim-mer as Piet (nie).*
        Gys be.PRS NEG$_1$ much   smart-CMPR as Piet NEG$_2$
        'Gys is (not) much smarter than Piet.'

      e. *Jan is   (nie) baie/*veel snaaks (nie).*
        Jan be.PRS NEG$_1$ much   funny NEG$_2$
        'Jan is (not) very funny.'

Importantly, in (41d), *veel* can even occur without negation. Other positive contexts in which it can be found are the excessive and equative constructions in (42a), where *baie* would be very marked, and questions like (42b) as *hoeveel* 'how much', where *baie* is impossible. The likely reason why *veel* is found in these positive environments is that phrases like *te veel* 'too much' and *ewe veel* 'as much as', which are occasionally joined up in writing, conventionalized as units before it became a negative polarity item (*veel* is not negatively polar in Dutch).

(42)   a. *Louise het   te(/ewe) veel/?baie geld   (as Henk).*
           Louise have.PRS too/as   much   money as Henk
           'Louise has too(/as) much money (as Henk).'

       b. *Hoe-veel/*-baie geld   het   jy?*
           how-much   money have.PRS 2SG.SBJ
           'How much money do you have?'

The last item to be considered here is *enige* 'any' (see Donaldson 1993: 159–160 too). As mentioned in §3.2, it can appear in Haspelmath's (1997) comparative and free-choice uses, of which (43a) is another example. It can also occur in conditional, interrogative and indirect negation contexts, as in (43b) to (43d) respectively, but not in specific-known, specific-unknown and irrealis-non-specific ones. Sentence (43e) is a case in point.

(43)   a. *Enige student kan   hier-die klas-se by-woon.*
           any   student can.PRS here-DEF class-PL at-reside
           'Any student can attend these classes.'

       b. *As jy   enige vra-e   het,   is   nou jou   kans.*
           if   2SG.SBJ any   question-PL have.PRS be.PRS now 2SG.NSBJ chance
           'If you have any questions, now is your chance.'

       c. *Lees jy   op die oomblik enige boek?*
           read 2SG.SBJ on DEF moment any   book
           'Are you reading any book at the moment?'

       d. *Ek   dink nie dat julle enige moeite   hier-mee sal hê*
           1SG.SBJ think NEG$_1$ COMP 2PL any   difficulty here-with shall have.INF
           nie.
           NEG$_2$
           'I do not think that you will have any difficulty with this.'

    e. **Ek   het   enige boek-e.*
        1SG.SBJ have.PRS any   book-PL
        'I have some books.'

   Enige can be attested under direct negation as well. In this context, it acquires the meaning of 'any … at all', though, as (44) shows.

(44) *Ek   het   nie enige foon   nie.*
      1SG.SBJ have.PRS NEG$_1$ any   phone NEG$_2$
      'I do not have any phone at all.'

4.3 Marking of noun phrases in the scope of negation

To our knowledge, there are no changes in, for instance, case or focus marking for noun phrases within the scope of negation in Afrikaans. The only exception seems to be when *geen* heads a singular indefinite noun phrase and the article *'n* disappears (see §2.3, as well as Ponelis 1979: 124).

4.4 Reinforcing negation

Afrikaans has various ways of reinforcing negation (see also §4.2 about *enige* under direct negation). One can, for instance, insert adverbs such as *glad* 'altogether', *geheel* 'wholly' and *hoegenaamd* 'whatsoever' before *nie$_1$*, as in (45a) (see Ponelis 1968: 26). Another strategy is the use of *geensins* 'in no way' instead of *nie$_1$*, as in (45b), or that of *niks* and *nooit*, with their literal meanings still somewhat present, when *nie$_1$* would technically have sufficed, as in (45c) and (45d) respectively (see Biberauer 2008: 109–110).

(45) a. *Hy   wil   glad/geheel/hoegenaamd   nie eet nie.*
         3SG.M.SBJ want.PRS altogether/wholly/whatsoever NEG$_1$ eat NEG$_2$
         'He does not want to eat at all.'

      b. *Sy   wil   geensins eet nie.*
         3SG.F.SBJ want.PRS in.no.way eat NEG$_2$
         'She does not want to eat at all.'

      c. *Hulle het   niks   verander nie.*
         3PL   have.PRS nothing change   NEG$_2$
         'They have not changed a thing.' (i.e. 'They have not changed at all.')

d. *Hulle is   vegetaries; hulle eet nooit vleis nie.*
3PL be.PRS vegetarian 3PL   eat never meat NEG$_2$
'They are vegetarian; they never eat meat.' (i.e. 'They do not eat meat at all.')

In informal language, it is also possible to use *niks (nie)* to reinforce negation in circumstances where the meaning of 'nothing' is entirely bleached, as in (46). Another option in this register is *g'n (nie)* – though not *geen (nie)* – but only to strongly deny "an activated, salient, discourse-old proposition" (Huddlestone 2010: 3). The dialogue in (47) can serve as an illustration. One more informal strategy involves the collocation *g'n niks (nie)*,[18] as in (48).[19]

(46) *Sy   is   niks   (nie) tevrede nie.*
3SG.F.SBJ be.PRS nothing NEG$_1$ satisfied NEG$_2$
'She is not remotely satisfied.' (Biberauer & Cyrino 2009: 11)

(47) A: *Jy   is   my   vriend.*
2SG.SBJ be.PRS 1SG.NSBJ friend
'You are my friend.'

B: *Ek   is   g'n jou   vriend nie.*
1SG.SBJ be.PRS no 2SG.NSBJ friend NEG$_2$
'I am NOT your friend.' (Biberauer & Cyrino 2009: 9)

(48) *Dit   is   g'n niks   (nie) so moeilik nie.*
3SG.N be.PRS no nothing NEG$_1$ so difficult NEG$_2$
'It is NOT so difficult.' (Biberauer & Cyrino 2009: 12)

4.5 Negation, coordination and complex clauses

The way that negation behaves in complex clauses, both coordinate and subordinate ones, has been discussed at some length (see §2.4 and 4.1). Important things

---

[18]Note, for the sake of completeness, that this combination can be employed for other purposes than strong standard negation. As Huddlestone (2010: 265, 269) points out, *g'n* can also function as a reinforcer of *niks* as a genuine negative indefinite, resulting in the meaning 'nothing at all', and as a negator canceling out the negation of indefinite *niks*, producing the meaning 'not nothing'.

[19]As one of the reviewers points out, negation may also be mitigated, of course. One way in which Afrikaans can do this is by putting an adverb like *eintlik* 'actually' or *rêrig* 'really' after *nie*$_1$. The mitigated equivalent of (45a) would thus be: *hy wil nie eintlik/rêrig eet nie* 'he does not really want to eat'.

to add here are that Afrikaans does not have any special negative subordinators such as 'lest' and that the language possesses no dedicated constructions for contrastive negation (see Silvennoinen 2019), to our knowledge. Examples of this last type of negation have been given in (35a) to (35c). Two more comments are in order. First, the special negative coordinator in Afrikaans is *nóg* 'nor'. As (49a) shows, it does not allow *nie$_2$* and, as (49b) makes clear, it can also link phrases and occur only before the second conjunct.

(49) a. *Nóg sy   het   ons gehelp,   nóg haar   ma*
        nor 3SG.F.SBJ have.PRS 1PL help.PST.PTCP nor 3SG.F.NSBJ mum
        het   iets   gedoen.
        have.PRS something do.PST.PTCP
        'Neither did she help us nor did her mum do anything.'

    b. *(Nóg) jy,   nóg ek   moet   gaan.*
        nor   2SG.SBJ nor 1SG.SBJ must.PRS go
        '(Neither) you nor I should go.'

Second, the language has an intriguing construction where a negative clause is coordinated by *of* 'or' with a positive clause and, semantically, the former serves as a restrictive positive subordinate clause for the latter. The literal translation of (50) is 'you cannot move or they gossip' but its meaning is 'as soon as you move, they gossip' (see also Ponelis 1968: 29, for further discussion).

(50) *Jy   kan   nie jou   roer nie   of hulle skinder.*
      2SG.SBJ can.PRS NEG$_1$ 2SG.NSBJ stir NEG$_2$ or 3PL gossip
      'As soon as you move, they gossip.' (Ponelis 1968: 29)

4.6 Miscellaneous aspects of negation

4.6.1 Negative transport

The phenomenon also known as negative raising is attested in the language, though it does not appear to have been studied in any detail yet. Compare the "non-raised" case in (51a) featuring the negation in the finite complement clause, with its "raised" counterpart in (51b), where the main verb is negated instead but the meaning is more or less the same. Examples with a non-finite subordinate clause are given in (51c) and (51d).

(51) a. *Ek   dink dat ons nie 'n   keuse het   nie.*
        1SG.SBJ think COMP 1PL NEG$_1$ INDF choice have.PRS NEG$_2$
        'I think that we do not have a choice.'

 b. *Ek dink nie dat ons 'n keuse het nie.*
   1SG.SBJ think NEG$_1$ COMP 1PL INDF choice have.PRS NEG$_2$
   'I do not think that we have a choice.'

 c. *Ek beplan om nie lank hier te wees nie.*
   1SG.SBJ plan for NEG$_1$ long here to be.INF NEG$_2$
   'I plan not to be here long.'

 d. *Ek beplan nie om lank hier te wees nie.*
   1SG.SBJ plan NEG$_1$ for long here to be.INF NEG$_2$
   'I do not plan to be here long.'

An exploration based on Horn's (1989: 323) and Popp's (2016: 51) lists of predicates suggests that negative raising can occur with at least: the attitude predicates *die indruk kry* 'feel, get the impression', *dink* 'think', *glo* 'believe' and *hoop* 'hope'; the perception predicates *klink asof* 'sound like' and *lyk asof* 'look like'; the volition predicates *beplan* 'plan' and *wil* 'want'; and the judgment predicates *aanraai* 'advise', *dit is gewens* 'it is desirable' and *voorstel* 'suggest'. More in-depth (corpus) research is needed, though, to get the full picture.

4.6.2 Expletive negation

The literature discusses a number of situations in which negation is overtly expressed but does not actually contribute to the meaning. Verbs with contradictory semantics like *weier* 'refuse' and inherently negative adverbs like *nouliks* 'barely' have been mentioned in this context. The expletive use of *nie$_2$* with such items is, however, almost consistently seen as unacceptable by native speakers (see footnote 10). Expletive negation in conditional clauses with *tensy* 'unless' and *voordat* 'before' receives a more – though still not generally – positive reception (see Potgieter 2018: 60–63). In informal language, the subordinate clauses in (52) can (but need not) be negated in spite of the fact that their meaning remains positive.[20]

(52) a. *Jy kan nie gaan voordat jou werk nie klaar is*
   2SG.SBJ can.PRS NEG$_1$ go before 2SG.NSBJ work NEG$_1$ ready be.PRS
   nie.
   NEG$_2$
   'You cannot go before your work is done.' (Donaldson 1993: 405)

---

[20]Biberauer (2009: 102) adds that *nie$_1$* may not be compulsory in the types of expletive negation discussed so far but that it is yet unclear what the difference is between the cases with *nie$_1$* and *nie$_2$* and those with just *nie$_2$*.

b. *Tensy jou   werk nie klaar is   nie, kan   jy   nie*
unless 2SG.NSBJ work NEG₁ ready be.PRS NEG₂ can.PRS 2SG.SBJ NEG₁
gaan nie.
go   NEG₂
'Unless your work is done, you cannot go.'(Donaldson 1993: 405)

Exclamatives are another context where the input of negation, whose occurrence there is widely accepted (see Potgieter 2018: 63–64), is not entirely clear: the cases in (53) are essentially both expressions of, for instance, surprise at or emotion toward a positive state of affairs.

(53)   a. *Hoe vinnig gaan die lewe (nie) verby (nie)!*
how fast   go   DEF life NEG₁ past NEG₂
'How fast life passes us by!' (Biberauer & Potgieter 2017: 3)

        b. *Is   dit   nie alte fraai   nie!*
be.PRS 3SG.N NEG₁ all.too beautiful NEG₂
'Isn't that beautiful!' (Biberauer & Potgieter 2017: 3)

In fact, in so-called wh-exclamatives, like (53a), the negation can quite easily be dropped with little change in meaning. The difference has to do with the discourse status of the information. A positive wh-exclamative conveys new information whereas a negative one expresses a reaction to known information. In what are termed polar exclamatives, like (53b), by contrast, the negation is not optional. Deleting it would result in something that looks like an interrogative with an interpretation of 'is it all too beautiful?'.

In a request such as (54), finally, the addition of negation also has little impact on the act performed with the sentence. It functions as a call on the addressee to close the door with or without *nie₁ … nie₂*. The information's discourse status is again different, however. With the negation, the information is presented as known, which may make the request more insistent – implying, for instance, that the door should have been closed already. Still, in other situations, it may also have a mitigating effect.

(54) *Kan   jy   (nie) asseblief die deur toemaak (nie)?*
can.PRS 2SG.SBJ NEG₁ please   DEF door close   NEG₂
'Could(n't) you close the door please?'

4.6.3 Diachronic notes and observations

The origin of the two-part negation is a matter of much debate in Afrikaans linguistics, to which the present section cannot really do justice. It will therefore

only provide a brief description of this and other diachronic issues and point to some relevant literature. As to the two-part negation (see §2.1), some scholars have argued that it comes directly from particular Dutch dialects with a similar phenomenon while others maintain that it is an innovation of Afrikaans (e.g. nie_2 as deriving from a clause-final resumptive negator). Among the latter, there is disagreement about whether its development was autonomous or whether contact with, for example, the indigenous Khoisan languages in the Cape played a role. The evidence for any single one of these positions seems to be quite scarce, however. A fairly comprehensive overview of the entire debate is given in Roberge (2000). Other important references are Den Besten (1986), Bell (2001), Deumert (2017), Van Rensburg (2018).[21]

There is also some discussion on the origin of *moenie* in negative imperatives (see §2.2). It has, for instance, been argued to be a calque of some eighteenth-century Portuguese Pidgin or Creole construction. It could also be the product of an independent process of grammaticalization for which the politeness strategy of deontic declaratives (i.e. *jy moet nie …* 'you should not …') was the source. Relevant research includes Den Besten (2004) and Van Olmen (2010).

As regards the negation of stative predication (see §2.3), the comparison with Dutch and German, where the negative determiner construction is the only acceptable option for certain types of stative predicate, suggests that the grammaticality in Afrikaans of nie_1 … nie_2 in all types results from an extension of the standard negation construction.

Finally, contrasting the language with Dutch also indirectly supports Donaldson's (1988: 232) and Hoeksema's (2010: 843) claim that the use of *enige* in comparative and free-choice contexts (see §3.2 and §4.2) is due to English influence. Unlike *any* and Afrikaans *enige*, Dutch *enig* cannot be used in this way.

5 Summary

Table 1 gives an overview of the most prominent negative constructions in Afrikaans, together with their functions. For details, we refer to the relevant sections in this chapter.

---

[21]An issue that, to our knowledge, has not been taken into account fully in the debate about the two-part negation's origin is the syntactic position of nie_1. As one of the reviewers rightly points out, its unmarked position in a clause meaning 'I have not seen the house' is before the lexical object *die huis* 'the house': *ek het nie₁ die huis gesien nie₂*. In (Present-day) Dutch, *niet* 'not' comes after *het huis* 'the house': *ik heb het huis niet gezien*. This difference (possibly of a diachronic nature) needs to be explained in any scenario linking Afrikaans negation to Dutch negation.

Table 1: Negation in Afrikaans

Construction	Functions	Notes
nie₁ ... nie₂ 'not ... not'	standard negation interrogative negation non-canonical imperative negation negation of stative predication subordinate clause negation contrastive negation	*nie₁* is clause-medial *nie₂* clause-final *nie₂* can be omitted in certain, very specific contexts the negation is entirely symmetrical
moenie₁ ... nie₂ 'must.not ... not'	canonical imperative negation	the negation exhibits constructional asymmetry in finiteness
moenie₁ dat ... nie₂ 'must.not that ... not'	'don't let (someone do something)!'	
geen/ g'n ... (nie₂) 'no ... not'	negation of possessive predication negation of proper inclusion (locative-)existential negation	standard negation is more common in these types of stative predication *g'n* is the informal variant
nee 'no'	disagreement with positive polar questions agreement with negative polar questions denying a questioner's presumed concerns	
ja 'yes'	agreement with positive polar questions	as a reply to negative polar questions, it is vague vis-à-vis (dis)agreement
ja-nee 'yes-no'	subjectively qualified agreement	
niemand ... nie₂ 'nobody ... not' *niks ... nie₂* 'nothing ... not' *nooit ... nie₂* 'never ... not' *nêrens ... nie₂* 'nowhere ... not'	negative indefinites	*nie₂* is optional in certain, very specific contexts *nie₁* can be added in colloquial language with more than one indefinite, only the first one is normally negative in informal language, multiple negative indefinites are possible without negations canceling each other out *niks* and *nooit* may be used simply to reinforce a standard negation in particular contexts

Construction	Functions	Notes
iemand 'someone' *iets* 'something' *ooit* 'ever' *êrens* 'somewhere'	Indefinites	they require *enige* 'any' in comparative and free-choice contexts
sonder 'without'	abessive meaning	it can be followed by a noun phrase and a finite or non-finite subordinate clause
-loos '-less'	forming adjectives from nouns, with abessive meaning	
on- / *in-* 'un-'	lack of quality denoted by stem	*on-* is more frequent
nie- / *non-* 'not- / non-'	exclusion from what stem denotes	*nie-* is more frequent
anti- 'anti-'	'opposed to', 'reverse of'	
kontra- 'contra-'	'opposed to'	
eks- 'ex-'	'former'	
a- 'a-'	unrelatedness to what stem denotes	
ont- 'un-'	reverse of action denoted by verbal stem removal of referent of nominal stem undoing of quality denoted by adjectival stem	
hoef 'need' *durf* 'dare' Construction	modal verbs Functions	they can only occur in negative polarity contexts Notes
veel 'much'	negatively polar alternative to *baie* 'much'	it can also be found in interrogative, excessive and equative constructions
enige 'any'	negative polarity item	it can occur in comparative, free-choice, conditional, interrogative and (in)direct negation contexts

Construction	Functions	Notes
hoegenaamd / glad /geheel / nie₁ … nie₂ 'whatsoever / altogether / wholly not … not'	reinforcing negation	
geensins … nie₂ 'in.no.way … not'	reinforcing negation	
(nóg) … nóg … 'neither … nor …'	negative coordination	
tensy 'unless' *voordat* 'before'	conjunctions with a (potentially) conditional meaning	the subordinate clauses that they introduce may feature expletive negation in informal language

Abbreviations

1	first person	M	masculine
2	second person	N	neuter
3	third person	NEG	negation
CMPR	comparative	NSBJ	non-subject
COMP	complementizer	PL	plural
DEF	definite	PRS	present
DIM	diminutive	PST	past
F	feminine	PTCP	participle
GEN	genitive	SBJ	subject
INDF	indefinite	SG	singular
INF	infinitive	SUPL	superlative

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, Arthur. 2001. Origins of negative concord in Afrikaans. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 18. 154–183.

Berghoff, Robyn. 2016. *Cross-categorial degree modification in Afrikaans: An analysis of the high-degree modifier baie*. Utrecht: Utrecht University. (MA dissertation).

Biberauer, Theresa. 2007. A closer look at Negative Concord in Afrikaans. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 35. 1–51. DOI: 10.5842/35-0-36.

Biberauer, Theresa. 2008. Doubling vs. omission: Insights from Afrikaans negation. In Sjef Barbiers, Olaf Koenemann, Marika Lekakou & Margreet van der Ham (eds.), *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*, 103–140. Bingley: Emerald. DOI: 10.1163/9781848550216_005.

Biberauer, Theresa. 2009. Jespersen off course? The case of contemporary Afrikaans negation. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change*, 91–130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.146.07bib.

Biberauer, Theresa & Sonia Cyrino. 2009. *Negative developments in Afrikaans and Brazilian Portuguese*. (Paper presented at the 19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Vitoria).

Biberauer, Theresa & Jean-Marie Potgieter. 2017. Negative exclamatives in Afrikaans: Some initial thoughts. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 48. 17–33. DOI: 10.5774/48-0-278.

Biberauer, Theresa, Marie-Louise van Heukelum & Lalia Duke. 2017. 'Ja-nee. No, I'm fine': A note on YES and NO in South Africa. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 48. 67–86. DOI: 10.5774/48-0-281.

Bordal, Heidi V. 2017. *Negation of existential predications in Swedish: A corpus study*. Stockholm: Stockholm University. (MA dissertation).

Burnett, Heather, Hilda Koopman & Sali A. Tagliamonte. 2018. Structural explanations in syntactic variation: The evolution of English negative and polarity indefinites. *Language Variation and Change* 30(1). 83–107. DOI: 10.1017/S0954394517000266.

Den Besten, Hans. 1986. Double negation and the genesis of Afrikaans. In Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrate versus universals in creole genesis: Papers from the Amsterdam Creole workshop, April 1985* (Creole Language Library), 185–230. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cll.1.10bes.

Den Besten, Hans. 2004. Where the historian and the creolist meet: The linguistic analysis of "quotations" and other data in the Cape archives and in old travelogues. In Siegfried Huigen & Jean Kommers (eds.), *Interpretations of colonial representations: Reflections on alterity, social history and intercultural contact*, 81–111. Saarbrücken: Verlag für Entwicklungspolitik Saarbrücken.

Deumert, Ana. 2017. Creole as necessity? Creole as choice? Evidence from Afrikaans historical sociolinguistics. In Cecelia Cutler, Zvjezdana Vrzić & Philipp Angermeyer (eds.), *Language contact in Africa and the African diaspora in the Americas*, 101–122. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cll.53.05due.

Donaldson, Bruce C. 1988. *The influence of English on Afrikaans: A case study of linguistic change in a language contact situation*. Pretoria: Serva.

Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993. *A grammar of Afrikaans.* Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110863154.

Du Toit, Brian M. 1995. *Colonia Boer, an Afrikaner settlement in Chubut, Argentina.* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10 . 1093 / oso / 9780198235606.001.0001.

Hoeksema, Jack. 2010. Dutch *enig*: From nonveridicality to downward entailment. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28(4). 837–859. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-010-9110-4.

Holmberg, Anders. 2015. *The syntax of yes and no.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huddlestone, Kate. 2010. *Negative indefinites in Afrikaans.* Utrecht: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.

Huddlestone, Kate & Henriëtte de Swart. 2014. A bidirectional optimality theoretic analysis of multiple negative indefinites in Afrikaans. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 43. 137–164. DOI: 10.5774/43-0-167.

Kotzé, Ernst & Adri Breed. 2018. *Different ways of not saying what you mean: How polarity can interfere with negative expressions in Afrikaans.* (Paper presented at the 6th Colloquium on Afrikaans, Ghent.)

Kotzé, Ernst & Adri Breed. 2019. *Modification of comparative adjectives.* Taalportaal. http : / / www . taalportaal . org / taalportaal / topic / pid / topic - 13998813333100100) (11 August, 2020).

Landsbergen, Frank, Carole Tiberius & Roderik Dernison. 2014. Taalportaal: An online grammar of Dutch and Frisian: Proceedings of the international conference on language resources and evaluation. 8. 2206–2210. http : / / www . taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/) (11 August, 2020).

McWhorter, John. 2007. *Language interrupted: Signs of non-native acquisition in standard language grammars.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197631.

Miestamo, Matti. 2025. Questionnaire for describing the negation system of a language. In Matti Miestamo & Ljuba Veselinova (eds.), *Negation in the world's languages I: Africa*, 21–36. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17788121.

Molnárfi, László. 2001. On the interpretation of multiple negation in spoken and written Afrikaans. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 44. 102–121.

Oosthuizen, Johan. 1998. The final *nie* in Afrikaans negative sentences. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 31. 61–94. DOI: 10.5774/31-0-57.

Peters, Pam. 2008. Patterns of negation: The relationship between NO and NOT in regional varieties of English. In Terttu Nevalainen, Irma Taavitsainen, Päivi Pahta & Minno Korhonen (eds.), *The dynamics of linguistic variation: Corpus evidence on English past and present*, 147–162. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/silv.2.13pet.

Ponelis, Fritz A. 1968. *Grondtrekke van die Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. DOI: 10.1080/04966740.1968.10587907.

Ponelis, Fritz A. 1979. *Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Popp, Marie-Luise. 2016. *NEG-raising in crosslinguistic perspective*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig. (MA dissertation).

Potgieter, Jean-Marie. 2018. *'n minimalistiese analise van ekspletiewe negativering in Afrikaans*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University. (MA dissertation).

Robbers, Karin. 1992. Properties of negation in Afrikaans and Italian. In Reineke Bok-Benema & Roeland van Hout (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 223–234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/avt.9.21rob.

Roberge, Paul T. 2000. Etymological opacity, hybridization, and the Afrikaans brace negation. *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 12(1). 101–176. DOI: 10.1017/S1040820700002821.

Silvennoinen, Olli O. 2019. *Contrastive negation: Constructional variation within and across languages*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. (PhD dissertation).

Statistics South Africa. 2016. *Community survey 2016*. Pretoria: Government of South Africa. http://cs2016.statssa.gov.za/ (11 August, 2020).

Stell, Gerald. 2009. Is there a Namibian Afrikaans? Recent trends in grammatical variation in Afrikaans varieties within and across Namibia's borders. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 39. 85–105. DOI: 10.5842/39-0-76.

United Nations. 2014. *Demographic statistics database: Namibia*. http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=POP&f=tableCode%3a27%3bcountryCode%3a516&c=2,3,6,8,10,12,14,15,16&s=_countryEnglishNameOrderBy:asc,refYear:desc,areaCode:asc&v=1 (29 March, 2022).

van der Auwera, Johan & Ludo Lejeune. 2013. The prohibitive. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *WALS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. https://wals.info/chapter/71.

van der Auwera, Johan & Daniël Van Olmen. 2017. The Germanic languages and areal linguistics. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of areal linguistics*, 239–269. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Huyssteen, Gerhard B. 2019. *Word formation*. Taalportaal. http://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-20170303103410382) (11 August, 2020).

Van Huyssteen, Gerhard B. 2020. *Which Afrikaans is described on Taalportaal?* Taalportaal. https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-6768884 (5 November, 2021).

Van Olmen, Daniël. 2010. Typology meets usage: The case of the prohibitive infinitive in Dutch. *Folia Linguistica* 44(2). 471–508. DOI: 10.1515/flin.2010.017.

Van Olmen, Daniël & Adri Breed. 2015. Afrikaans as Standaard Gemiddelde Europees: Wanneer 'n lid uit sy taalarea beweeg [Afrikaans as Standard Average European: When a member leaves its language area]. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 33(2). 227–245. DOI: 10.2989/16073614.2015.1063804.

Van Rensburg, Christo. 2012. *So kry ons Afrikaans*. Pretoria: Lapa.

Van Rensburg, Christo. 2018. *Finding Afrikaans*. Pretoria: Lapa.

Van Rooy, Bertus & Haidee Kruger. 2016. Factors that determine the omission of the Afrikaans complementizer *dat* 'that'. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 56(1). 102–116.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013. *Lexicalization of negative senses: A cross-linguistic study*. Paper presented at the 10th Bi-Annual Conference of the Association for Linguistics Typology (ALT 10), Leipzig, Germany, August 15–18, 2013. Leipzig. https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:683656/FULLTEXT01.pdf.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2014. The negative existential cycle revisited. *Linguistics* 52(6). 1327–1389. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2014-0021.

Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans. 2019. *Korpusportaal: omvattend 1.5*. http://viva-afrikaans.org (11 August, 2020).

Wallage, Phillip. 2020. Quantitative studies of the use of negative (dependent) expressions. In Viviane Déprez & M. Teresa Espinal (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of negation*, 499–514. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198830528.013.27.

Webb, Victor. 2002. *Language in South Africa: The role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/impact.14.