

- (3) a. *Niemand* het *niks* vir Hans gegee *nie* Afrikaans A
 N-body has nothing for Hans given NEG
 DN: ‘No-one gave nothing to Hans’, i.e. Everyone gave something to him
- b. Hy het *niemand niks* gegee *nie*
 He has n-body n-thing given NEG
 DN: ‘He gave no-one nothing’, i.e. he gave everyone something

That NMs are semantically non-negative, in turn, emerges from the fact that (i) their occurrence is not determined by the position of the NI (cf. (3a,b), and (ii) omission of the prescriptively imposed clause-final NM in (3a,b)-type and fragment-answer contexts does not lead to a loss of negative meaning:

- (4) A: Wie kom? B: *Niemand (nie)*
 Who comes N-one NEG
 ‘Who’s coming?’ ‘No-one’

The only case where the NM is required in Afrikaans A is in negative sentences lacking a NI:

- (5) Ek verstaan **(nie)* sy redenasie *(nie)* Afrikaans A
 I understand NEG his reasoning NEG
 ‘I don’t understand his reasoning’

Here, the NM signals the abstract negative operator, like *ne* in Czech. Evidently, then, Afrikaans A exhibits the properties of a Strict NC language in the NM domain, but the properties of a DN language in the domain of NIs, thus filling Zeijlstra’s typological gap. The fact that this gap is filled suggests further support for the assumption that internal variation with respect to the different types of NC resides in the lexicon (cf. also Déprez 2000 and following).

Introducing Afrikaans Variety B: The variety of Afrikaans spoken in particular by younger speakers and also that spoken by the Cape Coloured community (Kaaps), differs from Afrikaans A in two respects. The first of these is that co-occurring NIs yield an NC reading (cf. Molfnárfi 2002, 2004, van Gass 2007, Biberauer 2008a,b):

- (6) a. *Niemand* het *niks* gesê *(nie)* b. *Niemand* help *nooit nêrens (nie)*
 N-body has n-thing said NEG N-body helps n-ver n-where NEG
 NC: ‘No-one said anything’ NC: ‘No-one ever helps anywhere’

DN readings are also available in this variety, but only in the presence of “hat-contour” intonation (cf. Krifka 1998) and in the special context of metalinguistic negation/denials (cf. Horn 1989). Secondly, these varieties (which we will group together here as *Afrikaans B*) make considerably greater use of the NM, permitting stacking as in (7) (cf. Biberauer 2008b):

- (7) a. Ek het vir *niemand nie* ‘n boek gekoop *nie*
 I have for n-body NEG a book bought NEG
 NC: ‘I didn’t buy a book for ANYBODY’
- b. Hy is *nooit nie* tevrede *nie*
 He is never NEG satisfied NEG
 NC: ‘He is (absolutely) NEVER satisfied’

As (7) shows, the addition of an “extra” *nie* does not contribute a further semantic negation; the only effect of including additional NMs is to signal emphasis. As in Afrikaans A, the omission of the standardly required NM (clause-final *nie*) also does not result in loss of negative meaning. Together, these data then indicate that Afrikaans B is a variety in which both NMs and NIs are semantically negative, i.e. Afrikaans B is a Strict NC variety of the Czech type.

Microvariation in Afrikaans negation: Afrikaans B is younger than Afrikaans A, which is itself a reflection of the normatively imposed 1925 system that built on the various strands of Cape Dutch in use at the end of the 19th century (cf. Roberge 2000, Deumert 2004). Strikingly, this sequence of changes entails a diachronic pathway defined by increasing semantic non-negativity when viewed in terms of Zeijlstra’s typology: an initially DN system (Dutch; all negative elements semantically negative) became a particular type of Strict NC system, one featuring “clause-level” NC (NMs semantically non-negative: NIs semantically negative) which may be thought of as *partial Strict NC*, whereafter it became the familiar Czech-style *full Strict NC* system (all negative elements semantically non-negative).