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Abstract

Traditionally, typological classifications have been done in a macro-typological perspective; that is, they have been based on balanced world-wide samples of languages, which often avoid including closely related languages, since these are supposed to act alike with respect to their typological features and structures. However, attention has recently been drawn to the idea that even closely related languages, as well as dialects within languages, may differ on their typological features. The intention of this thesis is to give an overview of and study how the Germanic languages differ from each other in regards to their negative word orders and negation strategies. The syntactical position of their negative adverbs (English equivalent not) is analyzed in subject-initial main and subordinate clauses as well as (negative) imperative structures. Whether their negative indefinite quantifiers co-occur or not with the negative adverbs is also studied. The focus lies on the standard language varieties, but some of their non-standard varieties are included, in order to be able to give a more detailed description of the micro-variation within the family. The hypothesis that the rather homogeneous described area of the Germanic languages will turn out to be more complex, with respect to negation aspects, if all the standard language varieties and even non-standard language varieties are included in a typological study is confirmed. The results show that the standard language varieties behave differently from the non-standard ones, which are in addition less “rare” cross-linguistically in that they exhibit multiple negation. In addition, the non-standard North-Germanic language varieties show that multiple negation occurs in the North-Germanic branch, which is traditionally claimed to not occur.
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Sammanfattning

Typologiska klassifikationer har traditionellt gjorts från ett makrotypologiskt perspektiv; vilket innebär att de har baserats på utvalda språksampel där närbesläktade språk ofta exkluderas, eftersom dessa antas uppvisa liknande typologiska särdrag och strukturer. Nyligen har dock påpekats att närbesläktade språk, och även dess dialekter, kan uppvisa signifikant variation med avseende på deras typologiska särdrag. Syftet med den här studien är att ge en översikt över och studera hur de germanska språken skiljer sig åt vad avser deras ordföljd i negativa satser samt deras negationsstrategier. Den syntaktiska positionen av deras negativa adverb ( motsvarande svenskt inte) analyseras i subjektinitiala huvud- och bisatser samt i (negativa) imperativa konstruktioner. Huruvida dess negativa indefinityta pronomen samförekommer med negativa adverb studeras också. Fokus ligger på standardspråkvariateterna, men några icke-standardvariatetser till dessa inkluderas, för att kunna ge en mer detaljerad beskrivning över mikro-variationen inom språkfamiljen. Hypotesen att det traditionellt homogen beskrivna germanska området är mer komplext vad gäller negationsaspekter om alla standardspråkvariateterna och även icke-standardspråkvariateterna inkluderas i en typologisk studie bekräftar. Resultaten visar att de standardspråkvariateterna uppvisa olika mönster jämfört med de icke-standardspråkvariateterna, som är dessutom mindre ”ovanliga” i världens språk i det att de uppvisar dubbelnegation. Dessutom visar de nordgermanska icke-standard språkvariateterna att dubbelnegation förekommer i den nordgermanska språkgrenen också, vilket traditionellt har antagits inte förekomma alls.
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1. Introduction

This research thesis concentrates on the micro-typological variation in the Germanic languages, focusing on their negation strategies and the syntactical position of negative adverbs; with respect to the subject, verb, and object, in main and subordinate clauses as well as in (negative) imperative / prohibitive constructions. A negative adverb is an adverb that negates a verbal clause. In Spanish, for example, no is added to the position preceding the finite verb form. All the language varieties included in this study use a negative adverb to express standard negation; for instance inte (Swedish), nicht (German), or not (English). Another way of expressing negation is by means of (negative) indefinite pronouns, which refer to persons and things, e.g. the equivalents of English nobody, nothing, or no.

Comparing a linguistic phenomenon among a group of closely related languages and their dialects is expected to yield insights about their micro-variation more than macro-typology gives account for, i.e. it is expected to display a more heterogeneous area than is accounted for in macro-typology. Here, the focus will lie on the standard Germanic language varieties but also, to a lesser extent, on their non-standard varieties. The central issues to be described are the syntactic positions the negative adverbs occupy in main clauses, subordinate clauses, and prohibitive constructions; as well as their negation strategies (in terms of whether several negative elements are used in order to negate a clause or whether only one is used), which, secondarily, will be referred to in the diachronic development known as the Jespersen’s Cycle. All of this in order to account for the micro-variation regarding negation in the Germanic language family.

Traditionally, typological classifications have been done in a macro-typological perspective; that is, they have been based on balanced world-wide samples of languages, which often avoid including closely related languages, since these are assumed to exhibit the same or similar typological features and structures. However, attention has recently been drawn to the idea that even closely related languages, as well as dialects within languages, may differ on their typological features.

The standard language varieties which will be investigated are Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, Faroese, Frisian, Dutch, German, Afrikaans, English, and Yiddish. The non-standard varieties, Brabantic (Dutch); Swiss German, Thuringian, and Bavarian (German); Hiberino-English and African American English; the Finland Swedish Sibbo dialect; and Elfdalian. One clarification must be given for Elfdalian – it is usually classified as a dialect of Swedish, which is the reason why there does not seem to be a ‘standard variety’ of Elfdalian. Linguistically, it can be classified as a language of its own, since it differs starkly from Swedish. Henceforth, I shall treat Elfdalian as a ‘language’ of its own and not as a ‘dialect’ of Swedish.

The reason why I have chosen to study the negation strategies in the Germanic language family is, apart from the reasons mentioned above, that negation is somehow a special feature in the sense that it is present in all languages and has basically the same straightforward meaning, at the same time that its grammatical and syntactical properties tend to look very different cross-linguistically. It seems hard to come across a literature which describes the different positions of the negative adverbs in this language family and provides a presentation in one and the same paper. For instance, the Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft (HSK) volume on Nordic Languages does not treat...
negation in any of its 1057 pages (Bandle et al. 2002). This thesis aims to give an overview of the negative word orders and negation strategies in the North- and West-Germanic language family.

The hypothesis is that these language varieties will exhibit a more heterogeneous geographical area, in regards to the syntactical position of the negative marker(s) and the negation strategies, than is accounted by world-wide typological studies.

2. Background

2.1 Macro- and micro-typology

As mentioned in 1. Introduction, it has traditionally been assumed that closely related languages or languages in the same geographical area exhibit similar, or the same, typological features. For this reason, and to desist from the effects that possible differences among them might have on the universal generalizations, typological classifications have been based on balanced world-wide samples of languages, without including closely related languages. However, it has recently been discussed that even closely related languages may differ typologically, and that the macro-typological perspective could be complemented by the micro-typological one. Nevalainen et al. (2006) point out that recent cross-linguistic studies are often build upon large computerized databases, but that significant advances in the field of linguistic typology can be attained by lowering the level of abstraction, in order to bring linguistic variation that is seldom included in grammars of standard written languages or other linguistic studies, by focusing on alternative realizations of a given language (which often only exist in spoken medium). Bisang (2004) argues that if data from dialects and the consequences of language contact were included in typological studies, new perspectives for linguistic variation might arise. Moreover, Bisang suggests that apparently homogeneous areas with regard to the distribution of a certain feature may turn out to be much more complex if more languages from the area were included in typological studies. An example of a micro-typological study is Dahl’s (in Kortmann (eds.) 2004), where the two ways of marking definiteness (by a suffix added to the head noun and by a definite article preceding the head noun) in Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish are studied, concluding in that they are not used identically among the languages and that they represent two separate grammaticalization processes represented in overlapping geographical areas. Another example of a paper dealing with how a certain property is diffused across areas, which macro-typological studies also might investigate, is Trudgill’s (1974), on the use of uvular /r/ from northern France to southern Norway. Regarding dialectological studies, they often cover dialects of one specific language, for instance the Survey of English Dialects by Dieth and Orton (1962-1978), but they do not always compare language varieties in a certain language family / geographical area.

2.2 Negation

Before describing individual negation patterns in the Germanic language varieties, I shall introduce some basic concepts that are relevant for their analyses and descriptions.

According to Miestamo’s (2007a) overview of the current typological research on negation; in negation, there is the domain of standard negation on the one hand and of non-standard negation on
the other hand. The term *standard negation* refers to the negation of declarative verbal main clauses. *Non-standard negation* refers to different structures which do not express standard negation, and thus which have different functions depending on the structure in question. Usually, negative strategies differing from standard negation are found in imperatives, existentials, and non-verbal clauses.

Furthermore, negation can be divided according to its function: into *sentential* and *constituent negation*. In *sentential negation*, the scope of negation is the whole sentence [English (1), (2)]; whereas in *constituent negation*, the scope is a part of the sentence only, i.e. a constituent (Miestamo 2005) [English (3), (4)]. Note that *sentential negation* and *standard negation* are not the same concepts. *Standard negation* refers to the negation of declarative verbal main clauses. *Sentential negation* can be found in other structures than declarative main clauses, e.g. in subordinate clauses.

(1) *I am not reading a book* (constructed example)
(2) *We don’t want to eat pears* (constructed example)
(3) *I live not near you (= I live far from you)* (constructed example)
(4) *We want to eat not pears, but apples* (constructed example)

Dahl (1979) distinguishes mainly between morphological and syntactical negation. The negative markers in morphological negation may be prefixal, suffixal, circumfixal, or reduplicative. In syntactical negation, the negative marker may be uninflected [French (5)], an inflected auxiliary verb [Finnish (6)], or an inflected ‘dummy’ auxiliary verb [Korean (7)]. In the latter case, an auxiliary is added to the clause and the verb of the affirmative is modified morphologically, whereas in [Finnish (6)], the negator itself is an auxiliary (Miestamo 2007a). These cases vary with respect to whether the lexical verb is modified morphologically (as in French) or not (as in Finnish or English). Miestamo (2007a) gives the following examples:

(5) French
   a. *Je chant-e*
      
      I sing.pres1sg
      
      “I sing”
   b. *Je ne chant-e pas*
      
      I neg sing.pres1sg neg
      
      “I do not sing”

(6) Finnish
   a. *Koira-t haukku-vat*
      
      Dog.pl bark.3pl.
      
      “Dogs bark”
   b. *Koira-t ei-vät hauku*
      
      dog.pl neg.pl bark.cng
      
      “Dogs do not bark”
(7) Korean

a.  *Kan-da*  
   Go.decl
   “I go”

b.  *ka-2i ani han-da*  
   go.cvb neg neg aux.decl.
   “I do not go”

(Ramstedt 1997 [1939]: 104, 184; quoted in Miestamo 2007)

The most common syntactical position of negation in WALS is preceding the lexical verb, i.e. *pre-verbal negation* (Dryer 2011a, b). *Post-verbal negation* refers to the position of negation following (immediately or not immediately) the lexical verb. As Miestamo (2007a) mentions, it is important to note that in some languages several negative morphemes co-occur without logically cancelling each other, expressing an overall negative proposition [French (5 b)], which he calls *discontinuous / double negative markers*. There are two distinct strategies related to *multiple / discontinuous negation*: obligatory and optional multiple negation respectively. Languages using multiple negative markers are said to have, *discontinuous negation, negative co-occurrence or negative concord*. Among the languages included in WALS, 115 of 1326 (8.7%) employ obligatory multiple negation, while 80 of 1326 (6%) employ optional multiple negation (Dryer 2011a).

Moreover, in chapter 115 on WALS, Haspelmath (1997) distinguishes between three different types of constructions regarding negative indefinite pronouns. The following examples from chapter 115 (Haspelmath 1997) on WALS show how the negator (of predicate negation) obligatorily co-occurs with indefinite pronouns in some languages [Russian (8)], whereas in other languages they never co-occur [German (9)]; and in others, in so-called ‘mixed behaviour’ or ‘non-strict’ languages, they sometimes co-occur and sometimes not [Spanish (10 a, b)], depending on factors such as word order. In the latter case, in Spanish for instance, the predicate negator must co-occur with the indefinite pronoun when it (the indefinite pronoun) follows the verb, but not when it precedes it [Spanish (10 a, b)].

(8) Russian

*Nikto ne prišel*  
Nobody neg came  
“Nobody came”

(9) German

*Niemand kam*  
Nobody came.past3sg  
“Nobody came”
(10) Spanish

a. Nadie v-in-o
   Nobody come.past.ind.3sg.
   “Nobody came”

b. No v-in-o nadie
   Neg come.past.ind.3sg nobody
   “Nobody came”

(constructed)

Thus, in this thesis, the negative adverbs equivalent to English not will be described in order to account for the variation on their syntactical position. The negative indefinite pronouns such as English nobody will also be described, in order to examine whether the language varieties exhibit (strict or non-strict) double negation or not. Zeijlstra (2004: 8.1.2) claims that in the ‘mixed behaviour’ or non-strict double negation languages like [Spanish (10)], no more than one negative element may precede the verb; whereas languages which strictly include several negative elements [Russian (8)] may or may not have several negative elements preceding the verb. However, this does not seem to be a universal principle. For instance, Catalan, which has the so-called ‘mixed behaviour’ [Catalan (11 a, b)], allows for several negative elements to optionally precede the finite verb [Catalan (11 b, c)].

(11) Catalan

a. Ningú va vin-dre aahir
   Nobody auxp3sg come.inf yesterday
   “Nobody came yesterday”

(constructed)

b. (Ningú) no va vin-dre (ningú) aahir
   (nobody) neg auxp3sg come.inf (nobody) yesterday
   “Nobody came yesterday”

(constructed)

c. Ningú no di-u mai res
   Nobody neg say.pres.ind3sg never nothing
   “Nobody ever says anything”

(Espinal et al. 2010, 1a)
Dahl (1979: 88) describes the term Jespersen’s *Cycle* in recognition of Jespersen’s (1917) work in identifying the pattern where a pre-verbal negative adverb starts to be strengthened by an additional particle / element, which may eventually become the sole negative adverb, causing the original one to disappear. A typical example of this cycle recast is the development of negation in French. We see that the original negative pre-verbal particle *ne* [French (12 a)] was reinforced by post-verbal *pas* [French (12 b)], which nowadays (at least in spoken French) has caused *ne* to disappear [French (12 c)].

(12) French (Jespersen 1917:7)

a. *Je ne di*

   I neg say.presind1sg

   “I don’t say”

b. *Je ne di-s pas*

   I neg say.presind1sg neg

   “I don’t say”

c. *Je di-s pas*

   I say.presind1sg neg

   ”I don’t say”

### 2.3 Introduction to the Germanic Languages

The Germanic languages constitute a sub-family of the Indo-European language family and are, in terms of native speakers, one of the largest sub-families in Europe, alongside the Romance languages. In Europe, they are spoken in the north; stretching from Schweiz, Austria, and Germany, to the United Kingdom and Ireland, to the Scandinavian Peninsula and Iceland. Afrikaans is the only Germanic language which is spoken somewhere else than in Europe, namely in South Africa. English is also spoken in many former colonies of the British Empire such as Australia, India, the U.S.A., or Canada and has established its position as the global *lingua franca* of the modern era (Mauranen *et al.* 2009).

According to Askedal, the most widely spoken Germanic languages are German and English; German with approximately 95 million native speakers and English with about 420 million native speakers world-wide, of which 63 million in Europe. Minor languages in regards to the number of native speakers are Dutch, with 22 million native speakers; Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, and Faroese (the so-called Scandinavian languages) with almost 20 million in total, and Frisian with approximately 600,000 native speakers (Askedal n.d.). Elf’dalian is another variety of the Scandinavian languages, which may be considered as an endangered language in that it has at least 2,000 but no more than 4,000 speakers (Garbacz 2008). It is spoken in Ålvdalen (Dalarna, Sweden) and represents quite an unmapped terrain in typological linguistics. There are no published reference grammars on Elf’dalian (ibid) and it is absent on both WALS and Ethnologue. Usually, as already mentioned in 1. Introduction, it is classified as a Swedish dialect. However, linguistically, it may be considered as a language of its own, not only because of the unintelligibility from the Swedish side (Elf’dalian native
speakers are bilingual in Swedish); but also due to the numerous phonological, grammatical, and lexical features typical of Old Norse which have not been preserved in the other Scandinavian languages (Garbacz 2008). Afrikaans has almost 5 million native speakers, followed by Yiddish with almost 2 million (Eastern Yiddish with 1.7 million and Western Yiddish with 5,000) (Ethnologue).

### 2.3.1 Genealogical classification

According to Nettle, a language family is a group of related languages which descend from the same ancestor language, and thus which can be placed in a phylogeny. This model of classifying languages is the family-tree model, which is useful in many aspects, but has some drawbacks as well. Although it takes into consideration structural, phonological, and lexical similarities; it is first and foremost based on historical patterns. Therefore, a language may be placed in a certain tree-branch even though it looks structurally more alike another language in another tree-branch (Nettle 1999). For example, Dahl (2007: 58-59) points out that the family-tree model has often little to say about the similarities and differences induced by language contact, and gives the example that the degree of spoken mutual intelligibility is higher between Norwegian and Swedish than between Norwegian and Icelandic, which are genetically more closely related; or than between Swedish and Danish, which are also more closely related. One of the examples Dahl gives is that the Norwegian orthographic system was highly influenced by the Danish one and is therefore more similar to the Danish one than to the Icelandic one. However, since I am looking at how similar and different the Germanic languages are with respect to aspects in negation, I shall use the traditional (genealogical) classification of the Germanic languages and be neutral with respect to language-contact based classifications. The traditional classification of the Germanic languages is as follows (the star symbol indicates that a language is a smaller phylogenetic unit, a descendant, of a common ancestor, which appears underlined).

**West-Germanic:** (Ethnologue - Lewis, Simons and Fennig eds. 2013)

- English
- Frisian
- High German
  * German
  * Yiddish
  * Dutch
  * Afrikaans

**North-Germanic,** so-called Scandinavian: (adapted from Dahl, 2007:58)

- West-Nordic:
  * Icelandic
  * Faroese
  * Norwegian

- East-Nordic:
2.3.2 Some similarities and differences

Concerning the tense and mood system, the ancient Germanic mood distinction between subjunctive and indicative is less morphologically differentiated than the Indo-European and Latin one and has only survived other than in remnant structures in German and Icelandic. The innovation of periphrastic tenses (Harbert 2007) (grammaticalizing the English equivalent verbs “be” and “have”) is also common to the Romance languages, but the Germanic languages have maintained less synthetic verb morphology than them (Askedal 2009). Also from a syntactical view, another innovation which has
taken place both in the Germanic and in other European languages is the development of articles. Furthermore, whereas Old Germanic language varieties had four or five morphological cases and (without counting now any main-subordinate clause distinction) both pre- and post-verbal objects; nowadays only Icelandic, Faroese, and German have four morphological cases in pronominal and non-pronominal NPs, the rest of the languages distinguish at least between subject and oblique in personal pronouns, and have post-verbal objects (disregarding for the moment verb-final embedded clause structures) (Askedal 2009).

When comparing two things, the superlative form is used instead of the comparative in, for instance, Dutch, *hij is de grootste van de twee broeders*, or Danish, *han er den ældste af de to brødre*, (lit. he is the oldest of the two brothers) (ibid).

The verbs “be” and “have” in the periphrastic tenses are not used identically. English *he has begun to work*, with the verb “have”, is equivalent to Dutch *hij is begonnen te werken* and Danish *han er begyndt at arbejde* with the verb “be”, or to German *er hat angefangen zu arbeiten* with the verb “have” (ibid).

Askedal (2009) distinguishes between five main areas of Germania which differ in how conservative or progressive they are regarding a general trend towards analyticity: namely England, Iceland, Germany, Nederland, and Scandinavia, and points out that Latin and Greek had a large influence throughout the whole Germania except Iceland during the age of humanism (15th-16th cent.). English, in the central part of Germania, has gone the farthest from the Germanic original stage, much influenced by language contact with Latin and Greek as well as with Danish during the Viking Age (years 800-1050). On the other extreme, Iceland, in the peripheral part, has preserved much of the inflectional morphology from the oldest Germanic features both grammatically and lexically; followed by German, which is often more conservative than, for instance, Dutch or Swedish.

2.3.3 Verb-second position and the position of the finite verb

Concerning non-finite verb forms, the Germanic languages have different inventories. Non-finite verb forms are found in auxiliary constructions and as complements of full lexical verbs. Moreover, there is a distinction between ‘participle’, which are inflected like adjectives, and ‘supine’ forms, which are part of verb chains (Askedal 2009).

What is more relevant noting, and which is one of the most typical characteristics in Germanic syntax, is the so-called verb-second position (V2) phenomenon. In all Germanic languages, the finite verb, i.e. the inflected verb form, occupies the second position in declarative main clauses [Swedish (11)]. In English, however, topicalization does not force the subject into the position after the finite element, resulting in verb-third position constructions [English (12)]. Moreover, in Icelandic, and marginally Faroese, verb-first main clauses, the so-called “narrative inversion”, are also possible. German, Dutch, and Frisian have verb-final structures in embedded clauses lacking in the other languages. Regarding questions, WH-questions have V2 word order as well, whereas yes-no questions have V1 word order (Askedal 2009). In many cases such as in page 25 in chapter 3.2, the V2 phenomenon will be relevant for describing the syntactical positions of negation and verb forms.
Note that there are exceptions to the V2 principle in declarative main clauses. For example, in Swedish, the adverb *kanske* “maybe” can be placed in the second position, preceding the finite verb [Swedish (13 b)], whereas the finite verb occupies the typical second position with other adverbs than *kanske* [Swedish (13 a)]. However, such constructions, as well as constructions which are not subject-initial (except in prohibitives) as [Swedish (13 c)], fall beyond the scope of this study, mainly due to the limited time.

(13) Swedish:

a. Vi *komm-er inte alltid gå dit*  
We comeaux.pres neg always goinf there  
“We will not always go there”  
(constructed)

b. Vi *kanske inte komm-er gå dit*  
We maybe neg comeaux.pres goinf there  
“We will maybe not go there”  
(constructed)

c. *Inte vet jag!*  
Not knowpres I  
“I don’t know!”  
(constructed)

2.4 Method

For accounting for the negation strategies that the language varieties use, i.e. whether they have discontinuous negation or not, sentences involving at least a negative indefinite pronoun will be
looked at, in order to see whether a negative adverb is used in addition to the negative indefinite pronoun, obligatorily as in [Russian (8)], optionally as in [Spanish (10)], or not, as in [German (9)]. For accounting for the variation regarding the syntactical position of the negative adverbs, negative constructions involving a negative adverb will be examined; in main and subordinate clauses as well as in prohibitive constructions. Secondly, in order to motivate how the negative patterns in the languages have developed over time, the stage of the Jespersen’s Cycle in which they are will be described.

Dryer’s (Dryer 2011 a, b) way of classifying languages according to the position of the negative marker with respect to the subject, the lexical verb, and the object, into VNeg or NegV, is followed in this thesis. In addition, the position of the negative adverbs is also described relative to the finite verb forms, which sometimes are auxiliary verb forms and not lexical verbs. Note that doing this in a macro-typological study would often be inconvenient, since languages in which the concept definiteness is irrelevant/ inexistent might be included. On the contrary, in a micro-typological study like this, where it is clear in the Germanic language family that there is a distinction between ‘finite’ and ‘non-finite’, and that the verb-second position of the finite element (see 2.2.3) is an important phenomenon, it seems a good idea to describe the position of the negative relative to the finite form, too.

Although this thesis is not only on word order, word order plays an important role, as many of the descriptions will be on the position of negative adverbs relative to verb forms, objects, and subjects. There is well-documented literature regarding word order, but it seldom includes how negation affects the basic (affirmative) word order, or what positions negative adverbs take in clauses, in a micro-typological perspective. Dahl’s macro-typological work (1979), based on a sample of 240 languages, is important with respect to negation and word order. Dryer’s maps in chapters 143 and 144 on WALS (Dryer 2011 a, b) are also very useful because they show the distribution of the word order of negative morphemes with respect to subject, object, and verb in the world’s languages. Faroese, Elfdalian, Yiddish, Afrikaans, and Frisian are, however, not included in them.

The focus lies on the standard language varieties, but some of their non-standard varieties are included, in order to be able to give a more detailed micro-variation. The comparisons and analyses will hopefully be of some help in future studies regarding negation, especially in those treating negation in this language family. Every standard Germanic language variety was selected; non-standard varieties were included in order to provide more micro-typological variation. Negation in main clauses was chosen because it is the standard negation. Negation in subordinate clauses and prohibitive clauses was selected in order to include non-standard negation structures and to be able to give a more detailed description of the variation in regards to negation. What falls beyond the scope of the study is, however, structures which are not subject-initial (except in imperative structures) and structures which contain ‘exceptional’ adverbs such as kanske in [Swedish (13 b)]. Structures which are not subject-initial are excluded partly to eliminate the difficulty of investigating whether the languages in the study can use (emphatic) constructions like [Swedish (13 c)], partly due to the limited time, and partly due to the unavailability of macro-typological work to compare them with.

Finally, there is a case in which I have looked at how many results Google gives for the so-called ‘narrative embedded clause’ (SAG:4:467, Allan et al. 1995) in Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish; in which the finite verb occupies the second position and precedes the negative adverb, and compared those results with the results given for its “normative” structure, where the finite verb occupies the third position and follows the negative adverb (i.e. main clause word order). Although there are disadvantages (discussed in 3.2), Internet easily shows how people informally write, which often
reflects how they speak. Furthermore, I searched the same sentences in the Swedish corpus *Språkbankens Korp*, limiting the searches to a blog archive consisting of 18 blogs, in order to see whether there might be any interesting results compared the variation that *Google* showed.

Having analyzed the data, questions such as how they vary with respect to the syntactical positions of their negative adverbs, or how much their negation strategy has developed over time are discussed.

### 2.5 Data

One of the problems has been that; whereas some of the languages (mainly Dutch, German, and English) are well-covered in the literature, both synchronically and diachronically; in others there is less literature and grammar books, as in Elfdalian. Although I found the necessary information for Elfdalian, it was not as much information in detail as for the other languages. Especially, I could not find the historical development of Elfdalian negative markers, which would have been interesting for the discussions, since they look atypical among the North-Germanic languages. I have tried to describe the languages to approximately the same extent, which means that I have given simpler descriptions of each language than if I were describing one language only, or fewer languages. On the other hand, I account for all the standard Germanic varieties and for some non-standard ones as well.

Table 1: Inventory of the sources used for language data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Elfdalian</th>
<th>Faroese</th>
<th>Frisian</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Icelandic</th>
<th>Norwegian</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Yiddish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As seen in Table 1, mainly descriptive grammars and typological studies have been used to extract the language examples. There are as well cases in which I have constructed examples, in the languages which I have enough knowledge of (English, Swedish, Catalan, and Spanish) or some knowledge of (German), often in order to be able to illustrate something for which I have not found any examples in the literature. To reinforce the German examples, they were reviewed by a native speaker (Tabea Hammar, 22, student at Stockholm University). Hereafter, when not given any reference, the examples are constructed. Finally, for aesthetical reasons, a language example of every language for every issue/structure is not included, provided that the languages in question follow the same pattern.
3. Data and analysis – Negation in the Germanic languages

I will structure this section in sub-chapters for each function and construction: that is, into main clauses, subordinate clauses, and prohibitive clauses.

3.1 Main Clauses

3.1.1 Standard varieties – Standard negation

First of all, the languages which have SVO word order as their basic word order are: English, Yiddish, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, Elfdalian, and Faroese. Dutch, Frisian, and German have SVO in main clauses containing only one finite verb form. Otherwise, in auxiliary-verb combinations as well as in subordinate clauses, they have SOV as their default word order. As already named in 2.3.3, all of the languages place the finite verb in the second position (V2 word order) in SVO word orders (except English in topicalized structures, which are not part of this study).

Henceforth, with the term lexical verb, I refer to those verb forms which are semantically strongest, in the sense that they express a predicate meaning (an action, state, etc). With auxiliary verb, it is referred to the verb form expressing a grammatical function, for instance ‘tense’. Usually, when no auxiliary verb forms are present, lexical verbs are finite [English (14 a)]; when there are auxiliary verb forms present, lexical verbs are non-finite and auxiliaries finite [English (14 b)].

(14) English

a. He \textit{works} every weekend

\begin{verbatim}
work.pres3sg
\end{verbatim}

b. He \textit{has worked} every weekend

\begin{verbatim}
haveaux.pastperf3sg. work.part
\end{verbatim}

In Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic, the negative adverb, equivalent to English not, follows the finite element [Norwegian (15 cf. a & b)].

(15) Norwegian

a. Jeg \textit{drinker} ikke kaffe

\begin{verbatim}
I drink.pres neg coffee
\end{verbatim}

“I don’t drink coffee”
b. Jeg ha-r ikke dr-ukkit kaffe

"I haven’t drunk coffee"

Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic make an exception in their usual word order SVnegO when the object is a personal pronoun and place the pronoun object before the negative adverb, SVOneg. As will be noted in the next chapter, this phenomenon occurs only in main clauses with no auxiliary verb forms [Swedish (17 c)]. Icelandic and Faroese may sometimes place the negator after a noun object as well [Icelandic (16 a)] (Thráinsson 1996: 76) (which is prohibited in Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish [Swedish (17 a)]). Most comparative studies (e.g. Askedal 2009; Thráinsson et al. 1996: 76) consider that the pronoun object shift is obligatory in Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish. Nevertheless, the usual word order, with the negative adverb preceding the pronoun object is not uncommon.

# indicates that the structure is possible even though it is traditionally not accounted for

(16) Icelandic

a. Jón key-pto ekki bók-inna / Jón key-pto bók-inna ekki
   Jón buy.past3sg neg book.the / Jón buy.past3sg book.the neg
   “Jón didn’t buy the book”
   (Thráinsson et al. 1996: 78)

b. Hann l-as ekki þær* / Hann l-as þær ekki
   He read.past3sg neg them* / He read.past3sg them neg
   “He didn’t read them”
   (Thráinsson et al. 1996 : 76)

(17) Swedish

   John buy.past neg book.the / *John buy.past book.the neg
   “John didn’t buy the book”

b. #Jag läs-er inte dem / Jag läs-er dem inte
   I read.pres neg them / I read.pres them neg
   “I

b. #I haveaux.pres neg read.part them / #I haveaux.pres. read.part them neg
   “I haven’t read them”
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Dutch, German, and Frisian have, as mentioned, different word orders in main clauses, depending on whether there is an auxiliary verb form or not. When no auxiliary verb form is present, the negative adverb follows the object [German (18), Frisian (19)]; when there is an auxiliary verb form, the negative adverb is placed between the object (which follows the auxiliary verb form) and the lexical verb [German (20)].

(18) German

Ich treff-e mein-e Freund-e nicht

I meet.pres1sg my.pl friend.pl neg

“I don’t meet my friends”

(19) Frisian

Ik sjoch it fiskje net

I see.pres1sg. the fish not

“I don’t see the fish”

(Tiersma 1985: 113)

(20) German

Ich hab-e das Buch nicht ge-lesen

I haveaux.pres1sg the book neg part.read

“I haven’t read the book”

Katz (1987) has published one reference grammar on Yiddish, but no chapter on negation and its syntax is included, and the sentence examples appear in the Hebrew alphabet and translated directed to English without any glosses. In Jacobs (2005), however, a paragraph on negation with transcribed sentence examples is included. Those examples show that Yiddish is an SVO-language and that the negative adverb ni(ish)t is usually placed after the finite verb, as in [Norwegian (15)].

(21) Yiddish

a. Keiner efn-t nit mayn tir

None open.pres3sg. neg my door

“Nobody opens my door”

(Jäger 2008: 166)

b. Er iz nit majner a xaver

He bepres.3sg neg mine a friend

“He isn’t a friend of mine”

(ibid)
English has a different basic negation strategy compared to the rest of the Germanic language varieties in the sense that it involves a “dummy” auxiliary [English (22 a)]. The negative adverb *not* appears between a modal verb (finite) (e.g. *have, need, dare*) and an object [English (22 b, c)]; otherwise it is placed between the dummy auxiliary (finite) and the lexical (non-finite) verb. It is worth noting that even though it is possible to place the negative adverb after a modal verb [English (22 c)], it is usual nowadays to use the dummy auxiliary structure even with modal verbs present [English (22 d)]. In addition, while some modal verbs allow for *not* to cliticize to them [English (22 c)], others do not [English (22 e)]. The copula verb *to be* can be regarded as an exception to the dummy auxiliary rule, where it is not allowed [English (22 f)] and where the word order is as in [Norwegian (14 a)]. Note that *not* often cliticizes to the dummy auxiliary as well as to auxiliary verb forms, which makes it look similar to the Finnish auxiliary negation verb [Finnish (6 b)].

(22) English

a. *She likes apples*                      *She does not / doesn’t like apples*
b. *She has slept today*                  *She has not / hasn’t slept today*
c. *We need to say it*                    *We need not / needn’t say it*
d. *We don’t need to say it*              *We need to say*
e. *We dare speak*                       *We dare not to / daren’t* speak
f. *He is so old*                         *He is not so old / He doesn’t be so old*

Standard Afrikaans is also atypical among these standard language varieties in that its basic negation strategy involves discontinuous negation, often exhibiting two instances of the negative adverb *nie*. Word order is mainly as in Dutch, German, and Frisian [German (18), Frisian (19)], but with an additional instance of the negative adverb. In main clauses with only one verb form (the lexical) and an object, there is one *nie* preceding and one *nie* following the object and the word order is SVO [Afrikaans (23 a)]. In auxiliary-verb combinations, the first *nie* is placed between the auxiliary and the object, and the second *nie* after the lexical verb, at the end of the sentence, i.e. SOV word order [Afrikaans (23 b)]. One basic preliminary rule for Afrikaans seems to be that there must be a second negative adverb at the end of the sentence, regardless of the type of clause and of the verb forms present or absent. There are, however, structures where one only *nie* is attributed to the lexical verb, namely in structures containing several lexical verbs [Afrikaans (23 c)], or sentences consisting of only a finite verb without an object [Afrikaans (23 d)].

(23) Afrikaans

a. *Jan eet nie vis nie*                   *Jan eat pres neg fish neg*

“Jan doesn’t eat fish”

(Bernini & Ramat 1996: 56)
b. Ons het nie die fliek gister aand ge-sien nie
We haveauxpres neg the film yesterday night part.see neg
“We didn’t see the movie yesterday night”
(Haddlestone 2010: 2.20a)

c. Jan praat nie en beweeg nie
Jan talkpres neg and movepres neg
“Jan doesn’t talk or move”
(Bernini & Ramat 1996: 60)

d. Ek weet nie
I knowpres neg
“I don’t know”
(Donaldson 1993: 401)

3.1.2 Standard varieties – Negative indefinite pronouns
In the North-Germanic languages, the position remains the same for the negative indefinite pronouns negating a noun object [Swedish (24)]. It is worth noting that these languages may either combine a negative adverb with an affirmative indefinite pronoun [Danish (25 a)] in clauses without any auxiliary verb forms (i.e. a negative indefinite pronoun may not follow a non-finite verb form [Danish (24 d)]), use a negative indefinite only [Swedish (24), Danish (25 b)], or combine a negative adverb with an affirmative indefinite pronoun [Danish (24 c)]. When the negative indefinite pronoun is the object itself, SOV structures are usual in Icelandic and Faroese [Icelandic (26), Faroese (27)]; but nowadays archaic in Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish (Engels 2011: 90), which continue to use the usual SVO word order. In any case, these examples show that none of the standard North-Germanic languages combines negative indefinite pronouns with negative adverbs, i.e. they do not exhibit discontinuous / double negation.

(24) Swedish

Jag ha-r ingen bil
I have.pres no car
“I have no car”
a. *Per læs-te måske ikke nogen bøger
   Per read.past perhaps neg some books
   “Maybe, Per didn’t read any books” (translation by me)
   (Engels 2011: 83)

b. Per læs-te måske ingen bøger
   Per read.past perhaps no books
   “Maybe, Per read no books” (translation by me)
   (ibid)

c. Per haveaux.pastperf perhaps neg read.part some books
   “Maybe, Per hasn’t read any books” (translation by me)
   (ibid)

d. *Per haveaux.pastperf perhaps read.part no books
   Intended “Maybe, Per hasn’t read any books”
   (ibid)

(26) Icelandic

Ég hef engan sé-ð
I haveaux.pres.1sg nobody see.part
“I have seen nobody”
(Engels 2011: 86)

(27) Faroese

Petur hev-ur einki sag-t
Petur haveaux.pastperf3sg nothing say.part
“Petur has said nothing”
(ibid)
Regarding the negative indefinite pronoun in Dutch, German, and Frisian, it is placed immediately before the object [Dutch (28), Frisian (29)] and it does not appear with the negative adverb. Thus, like the North-Germanic standard varieties, they do not either exhibit double negation.

(28) Dutch

\[ Ik \text{ he-b \quad geen \quad tijd} \]

I haveaux.pres1sg no time

“I have no time”

(29) Frisian

\[ Hy \text{ ha-t \quad gjin \quad fyts} \]

He has.pres3sg no bicycle

“He has no bicycle”

(Tiersma 1985: 113)

In Yiddish, however, the negative adverb ni\((sh)\)t sometimes appears with the negative indefinite pronoun keiner [Yiddish (21)]. Moreover, it is unclear whether kejn behaves like the equivalent English indefinite pronoun no or whether it behaves like the equivalent English polarity item any. In any case, ni\((sh)\)t and kejn must sometimes co-occur [Yiddish (29 a)], but kejn cannot occur as an indefinite NP unless it is a part of a larger NP-NP construction [Yiddish (30 b)].

(30) Yiddish

a. \[ Er \text{ iz \quad nit \quad kejn \quad xaver} \]

He bepres3sg neg neg/any friend

“He isn’t any friend” “He is no friend”

(Jacobs 2005:244)

b. \[ Er \text{ iz \quad nit \quad majner \quad a \quad *kejn \quad xaver} \]

He bepres3sg neg mine a *neg/any friend

Intended “He isn’t any friend of mine” “He is no friend of mine”

(ibid)

Negative indefinite pronoun objects in English are placed after the finite verb form when there are no auxiliary verb forms [English (31 a)] and after the lexical verb when an auxiliary is present [English (31 b)], as any non-negative object [English (31 c)]. Negative indefinite pronouns negating noun objects are placed preceding the object [English (31 d)]. Again, the English negative adverb not is not combined with negative indefinite pronouns in standard English.

(31) English

a. I find nothing here

b. I have found nothing here
c. I have found the book here

d. I have no beds at home

Finally, when the negative indefinite pronoun geen is present in Afrikaans, preceding the object, only one nie (the sentence-final one) is used, instead of two instances of nie [Afrikaans (32 a)]. When a negative indefinite pronoun is the object of the sentence and at the end, the use of the negative adverb is optional [Afrikaans (32 b)]. Therefore, Afrikaans exhibits non-strict discontinuous negation: when no negative indefinite pronouns are present, most structures exhibit two instances of the negative adverb nie [Afrikaans (23 a, b, c, d)]; negative indefinite pronouns which are objects can optionally be followed by one nie [Afrikaans (32 b)], and negative indefinite pronouns which negate a noun object are followed by one nie [Afrikaans (32 a)].

(32) Afrikaans

a. Ons het geen motors ge-sien nie
We haveauxpres no cars part.see neg
“We saw no cars”
(Huddlestone 2010)

b. Ek weet niks (nie)
I knowpres nothing (neg)
“I know nothing”
(Donaldson 1993: 408)

3.1.3 Non-standard varieties – Discontinuous negation

Scandinavian non-standard varieties do not differ from the standard-varieties significantly regarding negation. However, Elfdalian, which I have treated as a “language” and not as a “dialect” of any other language variety, exhibits non-strict discontinuous negation. Garbacz (2010) classifies Elfdalian as a non-strict double negation language: double negation occurs in particular syntactic configurations, when the sentential negative adverb is accompanied by a negative indefinite pronoun (33 a, b). Note that the double negation pattern in Elfdalian does not consist of double instances of the negative adverb forms (Garbacz 2010) as occurs in standard Afrikaans [Afrikaans (23 a, b)]. The negative adverb itjä is placed sentence-initially and/or sentence-finally, whereas it / int are sentence-medial (Garbacz 2008). Furthermore, according to Garbacz (2008), Elfdalian was until approximately 1900 an SOV language (and still exhibits some SOV structures nowadays) but adapted then SVO as its basic word order. Note that Elfdalian disallows object shift of pronominal objects [Elfdalian (33 c)] (Garbacz 2010), contrary to what its sister languages Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, and Faroese exhibit in standard negation [Icelandic (16), Swedish (17)]. Furthermore, Garbacz (2010) claims preliminarily (as the texts analyzed were short ones) that double negation seems to be an Elfdalian innovation rather than a heritage from Old East Scandinavian, since no examples of double negation were found in Old Elfdalian texts.
(33) Elfdalian

a. An wet int war indjín páik ir
   He knowpres3sg neg where no boy is
   “He does not know where the boy is”
   (Garbacz 2010)

b. Ig a-r it si’-tt inggan / nån
   I haveaux.pastperf neg see.part nobody / somebody
   “I haven’t seen anybody”
   (ibid)

c. An såg int mig / * An såg mig int
   He see past neg me / * he Seepast me neg
   “He didn’t see me”
   (ibid)

Finland Swedish Sibbo exhibits also atypical negation strategies compared to Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, and Faroese. Namely, it exhibits non-strict discontinuous negation (Engels 2011), with the negative adverb int(e) co-occurring with negative indefinite pronouns [F.S.Sibbo (34)]. Thus, Sibbo strategies remind of Elfdalian’s non-strict double negation (cf. [Sibbo (34 b)] & [Elfdalian 33 b]).

(34) Finland Swedish Sibbo

a. Jag ha-r inte ha-ft ingenting att skaffa med den sak-en
   I haveaux.pres1sg neg have.part nothing to getinf with the thing.the
   “~ I have not had anything to do with that” (translation by me)
   (Engels 2011)

b. Han vill inte se ingenting
   He wantpres3sg neg see nothing
   “He doesn’t want to see anything”
   (ibid)

Brabantic (Dutch), Thuringian (German), Bavarian (German), and Swiss German also exhibit discontinuous negation strategies similar to Elfdalian and Sibbo. In Brabantic, it is possible to combine a negative indefinite pronoun with the “usual” standard negative adverb niet [Brabantic (35 a)], with the negative adverb en (preceding the finite verb form) [Brabantic (35 b)], or with both niet and en [Brabantic (35 c)]. Thuringian, Bavarian, and Swiss German may also combine a negative indefinite
pronoun with the negative adverb nit [Bavarian (36 a, b)], and even two negative indefinite pronouns [Swiss German (37), Thungirian (38)].

(35) Brabantic (van der Auwera and Neuckermans 2004)

a. Ik he-b niemand niet ge-zien
   I haveaux.pres.1sg nobody neg part.see
   “I haven’t seen anybody”

b. Ik en he-b niemand ge-zien
   I neg haveaux.pres1sg nobody part.see
   “I haven’t seen anybody”

c. Ik en he-b niemand niet ge-zien
   I neg haveaux.pres1sg nobody neg part.see
   “I haven’t seen anybody”

(36) Bavarian

Dass da Hons koa Buach (nit) g-lesn ho-t
That the Hons no book (neg) part.read haveaux.pres3sg
“That Hons has read no book”
(from Brugger and Poletto 1995 – quoted in Poletto (n.d.))

b. Dass da Hons nia nit g-sunga ha-t
That the Hons never neg part.sing haveaux.pres3sg
“That Hons has never sung”
(ibid)

(37) Swiss German

Es cha niemer niüüt de.für
It canpres nobody nothing there.for
“It’s nobody’s fault”
(Jäger 2008: 180)
According to Tiersma (1985: 114), double negatives also occur in Frisian but are less common than structures with one negative element only. Whether he refers to standard or non-standard varieties of Frisian is unspecified, but it is implied in the book that these structures are non-standard. In any case, in double negatives, Frisian seems to behave like the German non-standard varieties described above. Note, however, that the following example contains the adverbial *noait* “never” instead of a negative indefinite pronoun, but I have included it here since it was the only example of a double negative structure in Tiersma’s (1985) book.

(39) Frisian

```
Ik ha hjir noait net ien sjo-en
```

“I have aux-pres 1sg here never neg someone seen.part”

(Tiersma 1985: 114)

Similarly to the non-standard language varieties described thus far, non-standard varieties of English often combine multiple negative elements which do not cancel each other, and give an overall negative idea [English (40 a, b)]. Like Sibbo, German, and Frisian varieties, English does not exhibit two instances of *not*, but combines *not* with negative indefinite pronouns. Most English non-standard varieties exhibit basically the same word order as standard English, disregarding the additional instance of a second negative element, but African American English exhibits the so-called *negative inversion* (Labov 1972), where both the negative adverb (counting the dummy auxiliary plus *not*) and any possible negative indefinite quantifiers are placed sentence-initially [English (40 c, d)].

Furthermore, Labov (1972) assumed that indefinite *any*-subjects, which are polarity items in Standard English, do not occur as subjects in negative clauses in any English variety. However, in Muntaña’s (2008) paper there are examples of Irish English / Hiberno-English where *any*-forms function as negative indefinite subjects [English (40 e, f)]. She argues that this is due to Gaelic Irish influence on English, as Gaelic Irish has no negative indefinite quantifiers of the kind of *nobody* or *nothing* [Irish (41)]. The evidence for *any*-subjects being negative indefinite subjects in Hiberno-English is that their structure differs from their counterpart universal indefinite subjects [English (40 g)].

(40) English

a. *But they, nobody didn’t know your life till after you’re dead.* (FRED, CON_004: CAVA_TC, quoted in Muntaña 2008)

b. *Nobody said nothing to him* (Non-Strict Negative Concord) (FRED, CON_004: CAVA_TC. ibid)

c. *Didn’t nobody see it, didn’t nobody hear it!* (Labov 1972a: 187-188) (African American English)

d. *Won’t nobody catch us* (ibid) (African American English)

e. *Anybody won’t know where we went* (Filppula 1999: 180, quoted in Muntaña 2008) (Hiberno-English)
Equivalates to standard English “Nobody will know where we went”

f.  *Now, anything is no sin* (ibid) (Hiberno-English)

Equivalates to standard English “Now, nothing is sin”

g.  *Everybody don’t benefit by tourist at all* (Filppula 1999: 180, quoted in Muntañá 2008)

“Not everybody benefits…”

(41) Irish

\[ \text{Ni raibh aon duine sa bhaile} \]

Neg bepast any person in the home

“Nobody was at home”

(Harris 1984: 305, quoted in Muntañá 2008)

To sum up, what is common to all of the Germanic languages in main clauses is that the negative adverb follows the finite element. In the North-Germanic languages and English the negative adverb is placed immediately after the finite verb form, although the former can shift the object to the position between the finite verb and the negative adverb in certain constructions. In Dutch, German, and Frisian, on the other hand, the object occupies the position between the finite verb form and the negative adverb. Afrikaans places one of the negative adverbs immediately following the finite verb form and the other sentence-finally, either immediately after the non-finite verb form when there is one or immediately after the object when the lexical verb is the finite element. The North-Germanic languages and Dutch, German, and Frisian exhibit post-verbal negation, i.e. the negative adverb follows the lexical verb, when the lexical verb is the finite element; otherwise, when the finite element is an auxiliary verb form, the negative adverb follows it and thus they exhibit pre-verbal negation. Afrikaans and Yiddish are the only standard language varieties which exhibit, to a lesser or greater extent, discontinuous negation, although it is unclear whether Yiddish *kejn* should count as a polarity item or as a negative indefinite pronoun. Note that Afrikaans often uses two instances of the negative adverb, whereas Yiddish uses the negative adverb plus a negative indefinite pronoun in certain contexts. Elfdalian, which in this study is counted as a “language” and not as a variety of another language, also exhibits discontinuous negation as Yiddish, using both a negative adverb and a negative indefinite pronoun. English exhibits mainly pre-verbal negation, since its basic negation strategy involves the dummy auxiliary, but with the copula verb “be” and sometimes with modal verb it exhibits post-verbal negation.

Thus, in Figure 1: Frisian, Afrikaans, Dutch, German, Norwegian, Icelandic, Elfdalian, Faroese, Danish, and Swedish are in the same isogloss, for both post- and pre-verbal negation. The curved lines indicate that the North-Germanic languages (except Elfdalian) can shift objects to the position between the finite verb form and the negation, but whereas the East North Germanic can shift pronoun objects only, the West North Germanic can shift noun objects. Elfdalian and Afrikaans are, in addition, the only languages which exhibit discontinuous negation. Yiddish has been placed between two isoglosses since it is not clear whether *kejn* behaves like a negative adverb, in which the case Yiddish would exhibit discontinuous negation, or whether it is a negative indefinite pronoun (Jäger 2008). English is an isle in that it is the only language which has pre-verbal negation as its basic negation strategy, involving the dummy auxiliary “do”.
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Most of the non-standard language varieties (Elfdalian has been described above, with the standard varieties) follow the opposite negation strategy than their standard counterparts, in terms of whether only one negative element is used in order to express a negative idea or whether multiple negative elements are used. While in standard German, Frisian, and English several negative elements would cancel each other, giving an overall affirmative idea; their non-standard varieties exhibit multiple negation patterns, combining a negative adverb and a negative indefinite pronoun to give an overall negated proposition. Dutch can, in addition, combine two negative adverbs, *en* and *niet*, with a negative indefinite pronoun. Regarding the North-Germanic languages (except Elfdalian), at least one non-standard variety of Swedish exhibits discontinuous negation combining the negative adverb with a negative indefinite pronoun.

### 3.2 Subordinate clauses

As already mentioned; while English, Yiddish, and the North-Germanic maintain SVO word order in subordinate clauses; Dutch, German, Frisian, and Afrikaans change to SOV.

One difference between Dutch, German and Frisian is that the two latter place the negative adverb and negative indefinite pronouns in different positions, whereas both of them occupy the position preceding the object in Dutch [Dutch (42 a, b)]. In German and Frisian, the negative indefinite pronoun is also placed before the object [German (43 c), Frisian (44 c)], but the negative adverb precedes the verb [German (43 b, d), Frisian (44 b)]. When there is an auxiliary verb form, it follows the lexical one and occupies the sentence-final position in Frisian and German (Tiersma 1985: 122-
i.e. the finite form is placed sentence-finally [German (43), Frisian (44)]. On the other hand, in Dutch, the negative adverb occupies the position preceding the object. Moreover, the auxiliary verb form and the lexical one can swap positions in Dutch, resulting in the orders NegOVAux and NegOAuxV [Dutch (41 a)]. Another distinction is that Dutch and Frisian shift personal pronoun objects to the position preceding the negative adverb [Dutch (42 d), Frisian (44 d)].

Note, however, that these languages allow for V2 word order in subordinate clauses under some predicates and constructions [German (43 e)] (the clearest contexts are with verbs of saying, with evidential verbs such as “hear”, and with verbs of thinking such as “believe”), as well as there are some predicates which disallow V2 (verbs of consideration such as “ignore”, inherently negative verbs such as “neglect” or “suppress”, and emotive verbs such as “regret” or “deplore”) (Meinunger 2005). Nevertheless, an important observation is that this occurs almost exclusively in affirmative assertions, i.e. the presence of a negative element in a subordinate clause blocks the V2 word order principle (Meinunger 2005) and thus negated subordinate clauses do not exhibit the V2 principle.

(42) Dutch

a. dat ik niet het schilderij ge-zien he-b / he-b ge-zien
   that I neg the painting part.see haveaux.pastperf1sg / have.aux.pastperf1sg part.see
   “that I haven’t seen the painting”

b. dat ik geen tijd he-b
   that I no time have.pres1sg
   “that I have no time”

c. Het he-eft de hele dag ge-regend zo-dat we niet uit konden gaa-n
   It haveaux.pastf3sg the whole day part.rain so.that we neg out canpast go.inf
   “It has rained the whole day, so we could not go out”
   (Donaldson, 1997: 231)

d. dat ik hem niet zie
   that I him NEG seepres1sg
   “that I don’t see him”

(43) German

a. weil er es schon verstanden haben wird.
   because he it already understand haveauxperf willauxfut
   “because he’ll have already understood it”
   (Askedal 2011, in van der Auwera 2011)
b. weil Berta das Buch nicht l-as
   because Berta the book neg read.past
   “because Berta didn’t read the book”
   (Jäger 2008: 49)

c. weil ich keine lokalen Zeitungen l-as
   because I no local newspaper read.past
   “Because I read no local newspaper”

d. weil ich dich nicht lieb-e
   because I youacc neg love.pres1sg
   “because I don’t love you”

e. Ich glaub-e, er ha-t recht
   I believe.pres1sg, he has.pres3sg right
   “I think he’s right”
   (Reis 1997- quoted in Meinunger 2005)

(44) Frisian

a. om’t ik moarn alles meand hawwe sil
   Because I tomorrow everything mown haveauxperf shallauxfut
   “because tomorrow I will have mown all of it”
   (Askedal, in van der Auwera 2011)

b. Hy fertel-de, om’t er der net foarwei koe, de wierheid
   He tell.past because he there not getoutinf canpast the truth
   “He told the truth, as he couldn’t get out from under it”
   (Tiersma 1985: 113)
The descriptions on Frisian should be regarded as preliminary, or less sure than the descriptions of Dutch and German, as I only found one subordinate clause sentence involving a *net* [Frisian (44 b)], which suggested that Frisian subordinates have the same structure that German ones, i.e. the negative adverb preceding the lexical verb and the auxiliary verb. Example [Frisian (44 d)] should also be regarded as preliminary: in Tiersma’s book (1985), it is not specified whether Frisian has a different word order, in which a personal pronoun object precedes the negative adverb, or not. However, I found the sentence [Frisian (44 d)] in his book (1985: 148), in the translated traditional Frisian tale *It Boekje fan de Dea* (”The Book of the Death”) (collected by Ype Poortinga), where the pronoun object *him* seems to have shifted to the position before the negative adverb. At least this sentence example suggests that in negative structures where the object is a pronoun form, it shifts to the position preceding the verb, as we have seen occurs in Dutch [Dutch (42 d)] but not in German [German (43 d)].

Yiddish and English are exceptions among the West-Germanic language varieties in the sense that they follow the same structure both in main clauses and subordinate clauses. In English, negation precedes the lexical verb [English (45 a)] and follows the auxiliary verb form when there is one [English (45 b, c)]. In Yiddish, negation is post-verbal [Yiddish (46)].

(45) English
a. *You need not say the same thing twice* ➔ *because you need not say the same thing twice*
b. *She hadn’t called them yet* ➔ *that she hadn’t called them yet*
c. *I don’t like apples* ➔ *though I don’t like apples*
Afrikaans resembles Dutch, German, and Frisian in the way it changes from SVO in main clauses without any auxiliary verb form to SOV word order in main clauses with auxiliary verb forms as well as in subordinate clauses. However, it has a more complex system than the rest of the languages in this thesis in that it has different structures depending on whether the main clause of the subordinate clause is affirmative or negative. Verb movement to second position, i.e. embedded V2 word order, is not as usual but it can occur (Donaldson 1997), even in negated clauses. As described already, Afrikaans negation strategies usually consist of multiple negative elements, although there are instances where only one negative adverb is used for a verb form. The main word orders in Afrikaans subordinates are SONegV, SONegVNeg, and SVNegONeg.

I shall divide Afrikaans subordinate clauses into four types: 1) negated main clause + affirmative subordinate clause [Afrikaans (47 a)], 2) negated main clause + negated subordinate clause [Afrikaans 47 b]), 3) affirmative clause + negated subordinate clause [Afrikaans 47 c]), and 4) subordinate clauses following the verb-second principle [Afrikaans (47 d)].

We have seen that in auxiliary-verb main clauses, the order is SAuxNegOVNeg. However, when the object is an affirmative subordinate clause, the lexical verb precedes the object, and the two negators are still placed around the verb and object, i.e. SAuxNegVONeg. Note that the sentence-final nie belongs to the matrix clause and not the subordinate clause [Afrikaans (47 a)].

If both the main and the subordinate clauses are negated; the lexical verb in the subordinate is preceded by one nie only. The main clause places the first nie before the lexical verb and the second nie sentence-finally as usually. The fact that sentence-final nie belongs to the main clause can be seen in example 1), where the subordinate clause is affirmative and there is still a nie following it [Afrikaans (47 b)].

When the main clause is affirmative and the subordinate clause negative, the latter has the two negative adverbs surrounding the verb(s), i.e. SNeg(Aux)VNeg [Afrikaans (47 c)].

Finally, unlike German and Dutch, Afrikaans can exhibit V2 negated subordinate clauses. In that case, the word order is SVNegONeg, and both instances of nie belong to the lexical verb and not the object [Afrikaans (47 d)].

(47) Afrikaans

a. Ek het nie ge-weet [dat hy kom] nie

I haveauxpast neg part.know that he comepres neg

“I didn’t know [that he is coming].”

(Huddlestone 2010, 2.22)
b. *Ek het nie ge-weet [dat hy nie kom] nie*
   I haveuxpast neg part.know that he neg come pres. neg
   “I didn’t know that he isn’t coming”
   (Huddlestone 2010, 2.25)

c. *Ek weet dat [sy nie sal skryf nie]*
   I know pres that she neg shallauxfut writeinf neg
   “I know that she won’t write”
   (Bernini & Ramat 1996)

d. *Ek weet [dat die kind skop nie die bal nie]*
   I know pres that the child kickpres neg the ball neg
   “I know the child isn’t kicking the ball”

Icelandic, Faroese, and Elfdalian use mainly the same basic word order for both main and subordinate clauses: the negative adverb occupies the position after the finite verb form, which occupies the second position (disregarding the subordinate nexuses *af því að* and *tí at* “because”) [Icelandic (48 a)]. On the other hand, according to Svenska Akademiens Grammatik (SAG:4, 1999), the common view of Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish subordinate clauses is that the negative adverb (as other clausal adverbs) precedes the finite verb form, which thus occupies the third position (disregarding the nexuses *att* and *at* “that”) [Swedish (51)]. To this word order I will refer to as “adverb-finite” word order, following SAG’s terms *fa-word order* (finite + adverb) and *af-word order* (adverb + finite).

Faroese used to exhibit only the V2 word order, but can nowadays also exhibit af-word order [Faroese (49 a)], which is likely to be a result of centuries of intense language-contact with Danish (Petersen 2011). As Petersen (2011) states, the majority of Faroese native speakers are high-proficiency bilingual in Danish, resulting in many loanwords, convergence, and replication in the Faroese language, which often allows for both V2 and af-word order structures. Danish, on the contrary, has not been influenced from Faroese, as very few Danes speak the language. Similarly to Faroese, Elfdalian also used V2 word order exclusively, but nowadays allows for af-word orders [Elfdalian (50)], no doubt as a result of the intense language-contact with Swedish. Icelandic has traditionally been said to prohibit af-word orders, but some authors (Angantýsson 2001 – quoted in Hrafnbjargarson 2007) have recently stated that this subordinate word has become possible in Icelandic [Icelandic (48 b)].
b. Ég veit af hverju Hedda kaup-ir oft skó
   I knowpres1sg why Hedda buy.pres3sg often shoes

# Ég veit af hverju Hedda oft kaup-ir skó
   I knowpres1sg why Hedda often buy.pres3sg shoes

“I know why Hedda often buys shoes”
(Angantýsson 2001 – quoted in Hrafnbjargarson 2007)

(49) Faroese

Tí at hann skal ikki koma í dag
   Because he shall.aux.fut neg come.inf to day

“Because he shall not come today”
(ibid)

(50) Elfdalian

Hon ir ie kelingg so ig will older râk-a
   She bepres a woman that I wantpres never meet.inf

Hon ir ie kelingg so ig older Will râk-a
   She bepres a woman that I never wantpres. meet.inf

“She is a woman that I never want to meet”
(Garbacz 2008)
Example [Swedish (51)] illustrates the “normal” subordinate clause structure (SAG 4:536) in Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish. However, V2 word order is also possible in subordinate clauses in the three languages, which Icelandic, Elfdalian, and Faroese have traditionally exhibited. V2 word order is nevertheless not always taken up in reference grammar books. SAG (4: 536) calls subordinate clauses with V2 word order “narrative subordinates”. It is explained that subordinate clauses can often, optionally, exhibit V2 word order, identical to main clause word order. According to SAG, the predicates that make it easier for V2 word order to occur are verbs such as the English equivalents of “believe”, “understand”, “know”, or “say”. However, when the narrative subordinate clause is supposed to be a fact (e.g. with weather verbs) the natural choice is af-word order (SAG: 4:538). In the Danish reference grammar by Allan et al. (1995: 519-520), similarly to Svenska Akademiens Grammatik, it is claimed that this word order may occur in spoken language, and they explain that at in Danish works as a quotation mark. An example of such “narrative” subordinates is as follows [Swedish (52)].

(52) Swedish

Du trodde att hon kunde inte komm-a idag

“You thought she couldn’t come today”

I will briefly show some results from searching on Google with quotation marks and from Språkbanken Korp, a Swedish language corpus where I limited my searches to blog texts. Since this thesis is not specifically on North-Germanic subordinate word order, and due to the limited time, I have not tried to investigate exactly how usual the V2 subordinate word order is. In any case, the results from the searches are interesting because they show that this word order is not any kind of performance error, or an infrequent one, but they rather prove that the variation between the two word orders exists and that both are frequent. Google has both its advantages and disadvantages. It contains an enormous material that long exceeds the material of chosen corpuses, but, for instance, some of the results are not always the expected. If I searched for *att det var inte* (lit. “that it was not”) to see how frequent the non-standard subordinate word order compared to the standard *att det inte var* (lit. “that it not was”); there were some results from sentences such as “att det var inte katter, utan hundar”, where an emphatic *inte* is negating a constituent (“that it was not cats but dogs”). Another example is that when I searched for sentences with the conjunction *om* “if”, Google showed some results where *om* was the preposition “about”, e.g. when I searched for *om det var inte* (lit. “if it was not”), a result was “…inget att snacka om. Det var inte” (“…nothing to talk about. It was not…”). Thus, one must look at the results preliminarily. It did not become clear from the results from Google compared to Korp which word order is more usual. On Google, the V2 word order with the conjunctions *att* at “that”, *hvis leftersom* “as”, *fordi, för att* / *for at* “because”, and *för / for* “for, because”, was almost always (except in one case) more frequent than with the af-word order. On the other hand, on Språkbanken Korp, the V2 word order was always between 0% and 6% frequent only. It was expected that the V2
construction would be frequent, but it was not expected that it would turn to be more frequent (at least on Google) than the standard construction. Some of the hits show constituent negation, but it seems that most of them are standard negation.

The following results show at least that the V2 subordinate word order occurs very often in Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish and that there exists variation regarding the position of the negative adverb in subordinate structures. I have marked in red the V2 word orders that gave more results than the adverb-finite ones, and in blue the adverb-finite ones which gave more results than the V2 word order.

The verb forms *kan* “can” and *var* “was” were chosen because they are one of the most frequent verbs in Swedish (*vara* “be” is the most frequent and *kunna* “can” comes in third place) (according to a corpus study by Tranefeldt 2010) and because they are not included in those predicates which facilitate for V2 word order listed in SAG, i.e. they were chosen to see whether V2 subordinate word order was also frequent in other structures than so-called narrative subordinate clauses.

### Table 2: Results from Google and Korp on the adverb-finite vs. V2 subordinate word order in Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish Google</th>
<th>Norwegian / Danish Google</th>
<th>Swedish Språkbanken: Korp : blogmix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Att han kan inte 23.900.000</td>
<td>At han kan ikke 18.200.000</td>
<td>Att han kan inte 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att han inte kan 39.100.000</td>
<td>At han ikke kan 29.700.000</td>
<td>Att han inte kan 2.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”that he can not / not can”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>att det var inte 115.000.000</td>
<td>at det var ikke 105.000.000</td>
<td>att det var inte 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>att det inte var 92.600.000</td>
<td>at det ikke var 67.200.000</td>
<td>att det inte var 4735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”that it was not / not was”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eftersom du kan inte 24.100.000</td>
<td>fordi du kan ikke 12.400.000</td>
<td>eftersom du kan inte 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eftersom du inte kan 7.100.000</td>
<td>fordi du ikke kan 10.500.000</td>
<td>eftersom du inte kan 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”because you can not / not can”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eftersom det var inte 45.200.000</td>
<td>fordi det var ikke 40.300.000</td>
<td>Eftersom det var inte 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eftersom det inte var 28.500.000</td>
<td>fordi det ikke var 17.800.000</td>
<td>eftersom det inte var 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”because it was not / not was”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, we have seen that the Germanic languages are similar to each other in that they have more patterns in common than they do in main clauses. *Figure 2* shows that whilst the West-Germanic languages (except Yiddish, which has SVO and Afrikaans, which exhibits discontinuous negation) exhibit pre-verbal negation (represented by the bigger triangle) in subordinate clauses. English exhibits post-verbal negation as well, with the copula verb “be” and sometimes with modal verbs, but
has pre-verbal as its basic negation strategy. The North-Germanic languages exhibit both pre- (af-word order) and post (V2 word order)-verbal negation (represented by the smaller triangle). Yiddish is an isle in that it exhibits post-verbal negation only, and Afrikaans and Elfdalian in that they exhibit multiple negation (and exhibit both pre- and post-verbal negation, too). Figure 3 is an isogloss regarding the position of the negative adverb relative to the finite element. English and Yiddish constitute an isle in that the negative adverb always follows the finite element. On the other hand; in Dutch, German, and Frisian the negative adverb precedes the finite element. Recall that a negative element blocks V2 subordinate word order in these languages. The North-Germanic languages and may place it both before and after the finite element. Furthermore, Dutch and Frisian are the only languages which change the position of the negative adverb when the object is a personal pronoun (not indicated in the isogloss).

Figure 2: Isogloss of the position of the negative adverb relative to the lexical verb in subordinate clauses

Figure 3: Isogloss of the position of the negative adverb relative to the finite element in subordinate clauses
3.3 Prohibitives

Van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005) and Van der Auwera (2006) (quoted in Miestamo & Van der Auwera 2007) state that in most languages (183/495) in Van der Auwera and Lejeune’s study, the negative imperative uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative plus a sentential negative strategy not found in indicative. The second most common construction in prohibitives is found in 144/495 languages, in which the negative imperative uses a verbal construction other than the second singular positive imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in declaratives. In the third most frequent type, 113/495, the negative imperative uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative plus a sentential negative strategy found in declaratives.

German [(53)], Dutch [(54)], Yiddish [(56)], and Frisian [(55)] follow the same pattern: a second singular imperative verb form preceding the negative adverb used in declaratives; i.e. V(O)Neg.

(53) German

\[Vergiss \text{ } das \text{ } nicht!\]

Forgetimp. it neg

“Don’t forget that!”

(54) Dutch

\[Vertrek \text{ } niet!\]

Leaveimp. neg

“Don’t leave”

(55) Frisian

\[Ferwachtsje \text{ } net \text{ } tefolle\]

Expectimp neg too much

“Don’t expect too much!”

(56) Yiddish

\[Kuk \text{ } nisht!\]

Lookimp neg

“Don’t look”

English, again, maintains the same structure for negative imperative constructions that is used in main and subordinate clauses, placing the dummy auxiliary do and the negative adverb pre-verbally [English (57 a)].

(57) English

\[Don’t \text{ } go \text{ } so \text{ } fast!\]
Danish and Swedish follow the same pattern that German, Dutch, Yiddish, and Frisian [Danish (58)], with the exception that they can place one adverb, vänligen (Swedish) / vennligst (Danish, Norwegian) “please”, before the verb [Danish (58 c)]. Note that other adverbs cannot be placed pre-verbally [Danish (58 b)].

(58) Danish

a. Gå ikke hjem!

Go imp neg home

“Don’t go home!”

b. *Aldrig spis det! / Spis aldrig det!

Never eat imp it / Eatimp never it

“Don’t ever eat it!”

c. Vennligst spis ikke det!

Please eat imp neg it

“Please, don’t eat it”

In Norwegian, Icelandic, and Faroese, the negative adverb can be placed both after and before the imperative verb form. One difference between these three languages, the West-Scandinavian, is that in Faroese and Icelandic the verb form appears in infinitive when the negative adverb precedes it and in imperative when it follows it [Faroese (59)]. In Norwegian, the verb form always appears in imperative morphology [Norwegian (60)]. When it comes to other adverbs than ikke, only the adverb vennligst (“please”) may precede the verb form in these languages, as in Swedish and Danish [Danish (58 c)].

(59) Faroese

Far ikke í panikk! / Ikki fara í panikk!

Go imp neg in panic / neg goinf in panic

“Don’t panic!”

(60) Norwegian

Ikke spis så mye! / Spis ikke så mye!

neg eat imp so much / Eatimp neg so much

“Don’t eat so much!”

Afrikaans is the only language in this thesis that has no imperative morphology. Instead, the modal moet (“must”, “should”) and the two instances of nie are used. According to Donaldson (1993: 234), in the most frequent structure in prohibitives, the first nie cliticizes to the modal verb [Afrikaans (62 a)]; otherwise the object is placed between the modal verb form and the first nie [Afrikaans (62 b)].
is important to note that Dutch also has an imperative structure with *moet*, but *niet* cannot clitisize and the subject is always overtly included [Dutch (63)].

(62) Afrikaans

a. *Moe-nie dit vir hom gee nie*

Must.neg it for him giveinf neg

“Don’t give it to him”

(Donaldson 1993: 234)

b. *Moet dit nie vir hom gee nie*

Must it neg for him giveinf neg

“Don’t give it to him”

(ibid)

(63) Dutch

*Moet je mij niet voor bedank-en*

Must you me neg for thank.inf

“Don’t thank me”

(Pinter 1984: 17 – quoted in Van Olmen 2009: 29)

The isogloss in Figure 4 shows that in prohibitive structures, only English exhibits pre-verbal negation. The West-Scandinavian languages exhibit both post- and pre-verbal negation. The East-Scandinavian languages and the West-Germanic languages use post-verbal negation only. Furthermore, Afrikaans is the only one of the languages included which does not have imperative morphology and which uses the auxiliary verb equivalent to English *must* instead.

![Pre- and post-verbal negation](image)

**Figure 4: Isogloss of the position of the negative adverb in prohibitive constructions.**
4. Summary of the analysis

In this section, I will summarize the results of the analysis of the data in the previous chapters. The following tables show the different word orders with negative adverbs that were analyzed. The symbol “+” indicates that the structure is possible in the language in question, the symbol “-” that the structure does not occur.

A = Auxiliary, V = Verb, O = Object, N = negative, I = negative indefinite pronoun, / = archaic, # = non-standard but frequent / “new” word order

Table 1: Position of the negative adverb in main clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Da</th>
<th>Ic</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>El</th>
<th>Yi</th>
<th>En</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>Du</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VNO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VON</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Position of the negative adverb in subordinate clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subo. clauses</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Da</th>
<th>Ic</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>El</th>
<th>Yi</th>
<th>En</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>Du</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOVA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNNNO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Position of the negative adverb in prohibitive structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohib.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>Da</th>
<th>lc</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>El</th>
<th>Yi</th>
<th>En</th>
<th>Ge</th>
<th>Du</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Af</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VON</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNO</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONVN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANVO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that on chapters 143 and 144 on WALS, the order of negative morphemes is examined relative to the main verb rather than the finite verb. The choice is motivated as follows: “SAuxOV in German is usually considered SOV, based on the position of the main verb, rather than SVO, based on the position of the auxiliary verb, despite that the second-verb order in German means that both SVO and SAuxOV are placing the object after the finite verb. […] Furthermore, if we were to classify languages according to the position of the negative relative to the auxiliary verb, we would have to ignore the main verb altogether or describe the position of negation relative to both the main and the auxiliary verb. (Dryer 2011 a). The latter option is the one I adopted in this paper, i.e. I have described both the position of the negative adverbs relative to the lexical verb and to the finite element. In a macro-typological study, it might not be a good idea to do this, since it is unclear whether finiteness is a universal feature. However, for a micro-typological study like this, this seemed a convenient decision, because it captures the word order variation in this specific family more accurately, where it is clear what the finite and non-finite elements are and that the V2 principle is such a strong phenomenon. If I had not done this, I would not have captured differences such as the following:

- Here, I have marked the object (OBJ), the negative adverb (NEG), the finite verb form (FIN), and the non-finite verb form (NON-FIN) in parenthesis. Note that none of these four languages combine these elements in the same order, even though all of them follow the pattern of NegV:

  Dutch:

  \[
  \text{Dat ik hem (OBJ) niet (NEG) he-b (FIN) vertel-d... (NON-FIN)}
  \]

  That I him neg haveaux.pres1sg. tell.part

  “That I haven’t told him” (NegV)

  German:

  \[
  \text{Dass ich ihm (OBJ) nicht (NEG) ge-sagt (NON-FIN) hab-e... (FIN)}
  \]

  That I him neg part.say haveaux.pastperf1sg

  “That I haven’t told him” (NegV)
Swedish:

```
Att jag inte (NEG) ha-r (FIN) berätta-t (NON-FIN) för honom (OBJ)
```

That I neg haveaux.pastperf. tell.part for him

“That I haven’t told him” (NegV)

English:

```
That I have (FIN)n’t (NEG) told (NON-FIN) him (OBJ) (NegV)
```

- In the following Brabantic examples, both *en* and *niet* precede the lexical verb, but *en* must precede the finite verb form immediately, whereas *niet* also follows the finite verb form but not immediately.

Brabantic:

```
Ik en he-b niemand ge-zien
```

I neg haveaux.pastperf1sg. nobody part.see

“I haven’t seen anybody” (NegV)

```
Ik en he-b niemand niet ge-zien
```

I neg haveaux.pastperf. nobody neg part.see

“I haven’t seen anybody” (NegV)

Afrikaans, Elfdalian, and Yiddish exhibit, to a lesser or a greater extent, discontinuous negation. Afrikaans differs from the two latter in that it often exhibits multiple negative adverbs, whereas Elfdalian and Yiddish combine a negative adverb with negative indefinite pronouns. The rest of the standard language varieties do not exhibit discontinuous negation strategies.

Furthermore, in main clauses, most languages exhibit both post- and pre-verbal negation; post-verbal when the lexical verb is finite and pre-verbal when there is a (finite) auxiliary verb form (and the lexical verb is non-finite), i.e. negation usually appears after the finite element, which occupies the second position of the clause. However, English differs from them in that its negation involves the dummy auxiliary and thus often exhibits pre-verbal negation.

Regarding object shifts, Elfdalian is the only North-Germanic language variety which does not shift objects. Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian can shift pronoun objects to the position preceding the negative adverb, and Icelandic and Faroese can optionally do the same but with noun objects instead.

In subordinate clauses, the North-Germanic languages exhibit both pre- and post-verbal negation. The common description of the subordinate word order in Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian is that the negative adverb precedes the finite verb form, but the so-called narrative subordinate word order, i.e. V2 word order as in main clauses, is also possible. Elfdalian, Icelandic, and Faroese traditionally exhibit V2 word order even in subordinate clauses, but can nowadays use the af-word order as well. Elfdalian and Faroese are assumed to have started to exhibit af-word order due to intense language contact with Swedish and Danish. The fact that Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish often use V2 word
order does not seem strange, since the V2 principle is so typical in the Germanic languages, but that
Icelandic can nowadays exhibit af-word order is more surprising. English continues to use the same
word orders and the dummy auxiliary negation strategy as in main clauses, and Yiddish continues to
use post-verbal negation. German, Dutch, and Frisian change to SOV word order and can exhibit V2
word order but only in affirmative sentences. Afrikaans exhibits discontinuous negation and also
changes to SOV word order, but unlike Dutch, German, and Frisian, it can use V2 word order even in
negative clauses. Thus, Dutch, German, and Frisian are the only languages which do not exhibit V2
word order in negated subordinate clauses. Moreover, Dutch has been the only language in this study
which can shift pronoun objects in subordinate clauses.

In negative imperative constructions, negation is usually post-verbal; in Icelandic, Faroese, Swedish,
Danish, Afrikaans, Yiddish, German, Dutch, and Frisian, which all have imperative morphology
except Afrikaans, which uses the modal moet instead. English is, again, atypical in that negation is
always pre-verbal. Icelandic, Faroese, and Norwegian can optionally use pre-verbal negation; but
whereas in Icelandic and Faroese the verb appears in infinitive form, in Norwegian it always appears
in imperative morphology. In this sense, Norwegian occupies a middle position between Swedish and
Danish on the one hand and Icelandic and Faroese on the other hand.

If we look at the non-standard language varieties, the variation becomes only larger, and some
questions arise. First of all, most non-standard varieties in West-Germanic follow the opposite
negation strategy than their standard counterparts – while standard English, German, and Dutch do not
use multiple negation; Thuringian, Swiss German, Bavarian, Brabantic, and non-standard English
combine their negative adverb with a negative indefinite pronoun. Frisian does not usually exhibit
multiple negation, according to Tiersma (1985), but it can nevertheless occur. Standard Afrikaans
multiple negation is, however, different to multiple negation in the non-standard varieties of the other
languages: for example, Afrikaans usually uses two instances of the form nie, whereas for instance
Belgian Dutch often uses en plus niet, but not two instances of niet. Similarly, in German dialects,
negation often consists of kein plus nicht, but not two instances of nicht. In the North-Germanic
branch, multiple negation does not occur in the standard languages, but Elfdalian and Finland Swedish
Sibbo exhibit non-strict multiple negation, which suggests that there might be other non-standard
varieties in the North-Germanic branch which behave similarly.

5. Discussion in a diachronic perspective

It is interesting to see how negation has developed with respect to the Jespersen’s Cycle. While
German and Dutch, which exhibit post-verbal and pre-verbal negation, have undergone three stages
[Dutch and German (65)], English has moved the post-verbal not to pre-verbal position (fourth stage)
as its basic negation strategy, involving the dummy auxiliary, in simple tenses [English (66)]. The
North-Germanic languages have undergone four stages but are still in the post-verbal negation stage
(unless the finite element is an auxiliary verb form) [North-Germanic (67)]. Yiddish seems to be in
between the second stage, where double negation occurs (as the pre-verbal negator is strengthened by
a post-verbal element), and the third stage. That is, Yiddish does not exhibit the pre-verbal “old”
negator *en* plus post-verbal *nisht*, but it sometimes combines *nisht* with *kejn*, which may be translated both as English equivalents *any* and *no*. Therefore, it is unclear whether Yiddish exhibits double negation or not. Afrikaans could be argued to be in the second stage, as it shows multiple negators: one before and one after the lexical verb, but it seems to have undergone another development than its sisters Dutch and German, since two instances of *nie* are used, instead of combining, for example, *en* with *nie*.

(65) Dutch and German (Hoeksema 1997: 140)

(1) **Preverbal clitic / Preverbal Negation**

   *Ic*  
   \[ \text{en-was } \neg \text{be past sick} \]

   “I was not sick” (Old Dutch)

   *Ih*  
   \[ \text{en sprehe} \]

   “I do not speak” (Old German)

(2) **Preverbal clitic + postverbal NOT**

   *Ic*  
   \[ \text{en-was niet siec} \]

   “I was not sick” (Middle Dutch)

   *Ih*  
   \[ \text{en sprehe nicht} \]

   “I do not speak” (Middle High German)

(3) **Postverbal NOT**

   *Ik*  
   \[ \text{was niet ziek} \]

   “I was not sick” (Modern Dutch)

   *Ich*  
   \[ \text{spreche nicht} \]

   “I do not speak” (Modern German)
(66) English (Jespersen 1917: 9-11)

(1) Preverbal Negation

Ic ne sege

Preverbal Negation + Postverbal NOT

I ne seye not

(2) Postverbal NOT

I say not

I have not said anything

(3) Obligatory “dummy” auxiliary + Preverbal NOT / Preverbal Clitic NOT (in simple tense)

I do not say / I don’t say

She does not say / She doesn’t say

(67) North-Germanic (Jespersen 1917: 8)

(1) Preverbal Negation

Ne veit Haraldr

Neg knowpres Haraldr

“Haraldr does not know”

(2) Affix –AT-

Ne veit-at Haraldr

Neg knowpres.neg Haraldr

“Haraldr does not know”

(3) Affix –AT- (+ NOT)

Veit-at Haraldr ekki/eigi

Knowpres.neg Haraldr neg

“Haraldr does not know”

(4) Postverbal NOT

Harald vet ekki

Harald knowpres neg

“Harald does not know”
If we look at [Dutch and German (65)], it is clear that Dutch non-standard varieties have not developed as much as German ones, with respect to the Jespersen’s Cycle – German dialects have stopped using *en*, whereas Dutch dialects seem to be undergoing a change from stage two to stage three still, where either the negative preceding the finite element or the negative following the lexical verb are optional and the “old” negator *en* is still used, although no longer as a clitic. Regarding Yiddish, it resembles Middle High German [Middle High German (68)] in that it is unclear whether *kejn* is used as a negative indefinite pronoun or as a polarity item, like English *any*. Jäger (2008: 263) explains that *dehein* in Middle High German developed from the English equivalent polarity item *any* to the English equivalent negative indefinite pronoun *no*, and glosses in her examples *dehein* in Middle High German as “no / any” and present-day *kein* as “no”.

(68) Middle High German

*Da mach-t sie so grossen jammer das nye keyn man...*

“There make.pres3sg she so big mourning that never any/no man...”

(Jäger 2009: 295)

In addition, it was mentioned that *any*-forms in Hiberno-English, which function as negative elements, were very likely to be due to Irish influence. It is important to note, however, that similar structures sometimes occurred in Old English as well, which also remind of the *dehein / keyn* structures in Middle High German and Yiddish.

(69) Old English

*þe ænig mon ne maeg mon.num arecca-n?*

“That any man neg may man.pl explain.inf

“That nobody can explain to men?”

(Mazzon 1999: 38- quoted in Muntañá 2008)

Regarding negation in Afrikaans, according to Hagège (1982: 86) (quoted in Bernini & Ramat, 1996: 44), only 17% of languages display such kind of multiple negation, most of which are SVO-languages. In this sense, Afrikaans may be regarded as special, since its basic word order is SOV. There are several theories regarding its negation origin: that it comes from Dutch dialect (Scholtz 1980; Raidt 1991- quoted in Huddlestone 2010), due to interference with Khoisan languages and from the influence of creolized Portuguese (Bernini & Ramat 1996) [Brazilian Portuguese (70)], or from a re-analysis of Dutch emphatic tag negation in *nee(n)* (“no”) in sentence-final position [Dutch (70)]. Thus, standard Afrikaans behaves similar to non-standard Dutch varieties or Dutch in the second stage of Jespersen’s Cycle in the sense that it uses multiple negation. The difference is that it uses the same negative form twice, whereas Dutch dialects mark multiple negation with one *niet* plus a negative indefinite quantifier or with one *en* and one *niet*.
(70) Dutch

Het kan niet waar zijn, nee!

“No, it can’t be true!”

(Roberge 2000: 147 – quoted in Huddlestone 2010)

(71) Brazilian Portuguese

Ele não fal-a português não

“She doesn’t speak Portuguese”

(Bernini & Ramat 1996)

Afrikaans negation seems in fact to resemble the Dutch construction more than the Portuguese in that in non-standard Portuguese, the first não precedes the finite element, whereas in standard Afrikaans nie occurs after it, as in Dutch.

Among the North-Germanic languages, it is often claimed that there is little variation regarding negation strategies. For example, Haugen (1986: 157) claims that there is no multiple negation, either in standard or in the non-standard varieties. Bernini & Ramat (1996: 187) claim that there is a relationship between a language being Germanic with post-verbal negators and not permitting multiple negation; i.e. the development of a post-verbal negator through Jespersen’s Cycle does not allow multiple negation. In this thesis, we have seen that there is variation concerning word order and negation in the Scandinavian languages, especially in subordinate clauses and prohibitive structures, and that Elfdalian and Finland Swedish Sibbo do exhibit multiple negation when there are negative indefinite pronouns present even though they usually use post-verbal negators.

To sum up, Dutch, German, and Frisian behave very similarly, with the same word orders, even if they are not always used in the same ways. Both Dutch and German non-standard versions exhibit discontinuous negation, but the Dutch varieties seem to be in an earlier stage of Jespersen’s Cycle than the German ones, in the sense that they still can use the older negator en plus the modern niet. Afrikaans and Yiddish differ significantly from the other standard languages in that they exhibit multiple negation. English is atypical among all the Germanic languages in that it uses the dummy auxiliary negation strategy obligatorily in simple tenses.

The North-Germanic languages behave much more alike each other than the West-Germanic ones do, but there are as well differences between them, such as whether they can shift objects in negative constructions or not. Elfdalian and the Swedish non-standard variety of Sibbo are the atypical language varieties among them in that they exhibit (non-strict) multiple negation, when there are negative indefinite pronouns present. The traditional claim has been that neither the standard nor the non-standard language variants exhibit multiple negation. Anderwald (2005) claims that “Without exception, none of the Scandinavian languages today permit negative concord” and quotes Haugen (1986: 157) point out that “There is no cumulative or multiple negation, either in standard speech or in the dialects, of the type that distresses teachers of standard English”. However, the Finland Swedish dialect Sibbo and Elfdalian display non-strict multiple negation.

In addition, it seems logical that Faroese and Elfdalian have started to use the af-word order (pre-verbal negation) in subordinate clauses due to Danish and Swedish influence. However, the reason
why Icelandic has started to use it is more unclear, and interesting in the sense that the typical
Icelandic subordinate word order involves the V2 principle, which is so strong in the Germanic
languages.

Another interesting question is why no standard West-Germanic language except possibly Yiddish
exhibits discontinuous negation, despite the fact that most of their non-standard language varieties do it.

In Bernini & Ramat’s study (1996), while most of the languages included allowed for multiple
negation, 7/31 languages did not, and they were Germanic (standard) languages. Therefore, the
Germanic languages, from Iceland to the Alps, can be described as cross-linguistically rare with
respect to their negation strategy. However, if we look closer, those languages are very different from
each other, in the sense that for instance Danish and Icelandic never allow multiple negation, whereas
Swedish Sibbo, Elfdalian, and most (if not all) English, German, Dutch, (and Frisian) non-standard
varieties exhibit multiple negation as the rule. In this sense, Germanic non-standard varieties are more
typical and “natural” typologically than standard varieties. Bernini & Ramat (1996: 187) give an
implicational correlation between Germanic languages usually placing the negative adverb post-
verbally, and prohibiting multiple negation. Therefore, “modern” post-verbal negators from the
Jespersen’s Cycle are often claimed to be responsible for the prohibition of multiple negation. This is
true regarding the Germanic standard versions, but not regarding the non-standard varieties.

6. Conclusions

The motivation for investigating the micro-variation in a language family was that it might
complement the macro-typological picture and help us better understand current patterns. Typological
studies have traditionally been based on chosen balanced world-wide language samples which avoid
including closely related languages. The hypothesis in this paper was that an apparently homogeneous
area would turn out to be much more complex and heterogeneous if all the languages, and even their
non-standard versions, in that area were taken into account.

The focus in this study lay on the standard language varieties Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Elfdalian,
Faroese, and Icelandic (the North-Germanic languages) on the one hand and on German, Yiddish,
Frisian, Dutch, Afrikaans, and English (the West-Germanic languages) on the other. To a lesser extent,
the non-standard language versions Brabantic (of Dutch); Swiss German, Thuringian, and Bavarian (of
German); Hiberno-English and British dialects (of English), and Finland Swedish Sibbo (of Swedish)
were examined, too. Due to the large number of language varieties and to the limited time, I have not
been able to delve very deeply into each language, but the hypothesis that there is a large micro-
variation in a traditionally described rather homogeneous language family has nevertheless been
confirmed.

An overview of the different syntactic positions of the negative adverb has been given by describing
negative subject-initial main and subordinate clauses as well as negative imperative clauses, both
relative to the lexical verb form and to the finite verb form (when the lexical verb was non-finite).
Moreover, structures involving at least one negative indefinite pronoun were looked at in order to
compare which of the languages exhibited discontinuous negation strategies. This thesis has shown
that by looking closer, in a micro-typological perspective, at all the languages and at least some dialects of a language family or linguistic area, an apparently homogeneous area turned to be more complex. For example, discontinuous negation, which is traditionally claimed not to occur in the North-Germanic language family, is found in Finland Swedish Sibbo and in Elfdalian, suggesting that it might also occur in other non-standard North-Germanic language varieties. Elfdalian, Yiddish, and Afrikaans should be further investigated and included in chapters 143 and 144 on WALS and other macro-typological projects in the future, as they turned out to behave more atypically in the Germanic language family. Finally, for a more detailed picture of the variation concerning negation aspects in this language family, future micro-typological studies should also include other structures, which were excluded in this paper, such as non-subject-initial structures as well as more non-standard language varieties.
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