

Strategies of double negation in Spanish and Portuguese

JOHN M. LIPSKI
The Pennsylvania State University

© 2001 John M. Lipski—DO NOT CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION

Introduction

Negation in Spanish exhibits relatively little variation over the Spanish-speaking world, and the same is true of the remaining Ibero-Romance languages. Etymologically, Spanish *no* is a continuation of Latin *non* and its syntax differs little from its Latin progenitor. Linguistic studies of Ibero-Romance negation revolve around issues of negative scope and the combination of negative elements such as *nada*, *nunca*, *nadie*, and so forth. Regionally, some dialects of Spanish (e.g. in the Caribbean, the Canary Islands, and Galicia) exhibit combinations such as *más nunca* and *más nada*, which, behave, however, the same as their non-inverted counterparts in other Spanish dialects. One exception to the generally unremarkable behavior of negative structures in Spanish and Portuguese is 'double negation,' typically represented by the combination of preposed and postposed *no/não*, but occasionally involving variants of this configuration. In the extreme case, only the postposed negator remains. Significantly, Ibero-Romance double negation always occurs in regions characterized by language contact and the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as a second language, either at the present time or in centuries past. In the majority of instances, contact with African languages is implicated, while in a smaller number of cases, indigenous languages may have provided the impetus for an innovative form of double negation. Among the areas where Spanish and Portuguese double negation is closely correlated with the presence of large numbers of Africans who acquired European languages under harsh conditions (slavery and indentured servitude) are:

- The Colombian Chocó in the northwestern portion of the country; very occasionally single postposed negation can be observed (Schwegler 1991a, Granda 1977):

(1)

No me gustó eso allá no (Schwegler 1991a:95)

Yo no aguanté el calor de allá no (Schwegler 1991a:97)

Mi papá sí fue a la escuela no (Schwegler 1991a:109)

No duró no. No duró nada (Schwegler 1991a:111)

De esas cosas de sembrado, yo no sé no (Ruíz García 2000)

El no ha vuelto no (Ruíz García 2000)

No me había ocurrido esas cosas más no (Ruíz García 2000)

Ellos no le hacen caso a él no (Ruíz García 2000)

Pero atracan no. Aquí en Tadó no atracan (Ruíz García 2000)

Por no verme acostada ahí, ellos llegan aquí no (Ruíz García 2000)

Postposed negation (using *nu*) is found in the Afro-Colombian creole language Palenquero, spoken in the village of Palenque de San Basilio to the south of Cartagena, and in contact with Spanish at least since the early 1700's (examples from Schwegler 1991b):

(2)

e kelé fruta nu 'He doesn't want any fruit'

I kumo suto ten kampo nu majaná a se pelé 'And since we have no land, the boys are lost here'

nu se murí nu kumo ta yobé `one doesn't die when it rains'
nu ten kumina nu ayá casa mi `there is no food in my house'
I bai ayá nu `

In Palenquero the Bantu sources (particularly KiKongo and KiMbundu) are well established. Significantly, in partially decreolized Palenquero, double negation is quite common, and solely preposed negation as in Spanish can be heard even in discourse purportedly containing only Palenquero elements. In the Chocó, an African basis for double negation is quite plausible, particularly given the proximity of the Palenque de San Basilio and the earlier existence of other escaped slave communities, in which creolized language similar to Palenquero appears to have developed. Slaves who escaped from Cartagena or the mining camps in Antioquia often followed the course of rivers and ended up in the Chocó, and given the strong Bantu influence in Palenquero, it is reasonable to suppose that at least some Afro-Colombians acquired double negation due to a Bantu substrate.

- The contemporary Dominican Republic, among the more marginalized sociolects (Benavides 1985; Jiménez Sabater 1975: 170; Megenney 1990: 121-8; Schwegler 1996a):

(3)
Bueno eso no sé decirle no
Yo no estoy llegando tarde no
Por aquí casi nunca lo usa así no
Aquí no hay no
No creo no que eso es factible
Yo no sé nada que se llama así no

Double negation with *no ... no* occasionally appears in Dominican literature:

(4)
no son poquito, *no* (Moscoso Puello 1975)

- 19th century Afro-Cuban language, spoken non-natively by African-born *bozales*, and perhaps momentarily coalescing into a creole in a few isolated areas, or carrying over in the ethnolinguistically marked speech of Afro-Cubans born in Cuba and acquiring Spanish natively:

(5)
yo no so pobre, no (Benítez del Cristo 1930)
Yo no so planeta, no (Benítez del Cristo 1930).
No moja no (Cabrera 1976: 25)
No é mío, no (Cabrera 1976: 44)
no señó, yo no soy cuchara, no. (Cabrera 1983: 443)
El amo no quiere matar Eugenio, no. (Malpica la Barca 1890)
Yo no bebe guariente, no. (Fernández 1987: 96).
... yo pensá que mama suyo que lo parí nelle no lo va a cuñusé, no. (Cruz 1974: 231)
alma mio no va a juntar no, con cuerpo de otra gente ... (Laviña 1989: 89 [1797])

In contemporary Cuban literature, double negation with *no ... no* is almost never attested, reflecting the extreme scarcity in spoken Cuban Spanish:

(6)
Los chivatos no llevan un cartelito en la cara ... No lo llevan, no (Soler Puig 1975:198).
Quieto Rolo, tranquilo. No fumes, no. (Díaz 1966:23)

Examples of double negation have also been recorded among elderly Haitians living in rural eastern Cuba, by Ortiz López (1998a, 1998b, 1999); similar constructions may be heard among Haitians living in the Dominican Republic:

(7)

Cuando yo iba venil pa cá mi familia *no* quiere venil pa cá *no*

La hija mía no entiende nada lo que yo hablo con él. *No* entiende *no*

The Cuban/Haitian data, when combined with the frequent use of double negation in rural regions of the Dominican Republic, suggest that a Haitian influence may be at least partially responsible. Within the Dominican Republic, double negation is particularly frequent in the Samaná Peninsula, and also in western regions where the Haitian presence is especially prevalent. Haitian Creole is noted for use of a sort of double negation, combining the usual preverbal *pa* with cliticized phrase-final *-non* (ending affirmative sentences with cliticized *-wi* is an even more common strategy). Some of the Cuban/Haitian *tumba francesa* songs exemplify this (Alén Rodríguez 1986:57; 1991):

(8)

yo di mué contan

`they say I am happy'

mué pa capa contan no ...

`I can't be happy'

mué pa capa ri no

`I can't laugh'

Given that Spanish *no* is cognate with Haitian *non*, while Spanish *no* occupies the same syntactic position as Haitian *pa* and is easily acquired by speakers of the latter language, the pathway to the formation of double negation in Haitian-Spanish contact situations is straightforward. Speakers of Haitian Creole were certainly in the right places at the right time to have influenced the formation of double negatives in Afro-Cuban *bozal* Spanish, although there is no direct evidence of a Haitian contribution. This hypothesis does not invalidate claims of an African influence in Cuban and even Dominican double negation, but it does reduce the necessity of such a postulate, by suggesting another contributing source (Lipski 1993, 1994, 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 1999). Among the extensive documentation of Afro-Hispanic *bozal* speech in 19th century Peru, Argentina, and Uruguay, there is not a single attestation of double or postposed negation, despite the fact that the Bantu substrate was particularly strong in the Rio Plata area (Lipski 1994b, forthcoming; Fontanella de Weinberg 1987).

- Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese, in which a heavy African component was once present; occasional single postposed *não* also occurs, typically in stereotyped expressions (cf. Schwegler 1985-7):

(9)

não falo italiano não

sei não

tenho não

- Vernacular Angolan Portuguese, spoken as a L₂ in the working-class neighborhoods or *musseques* of Luanda and other Angolan cities exhibits frequent double negation (Lipski 1994c, 1995). Occasionally, sole postposed *não* occurs:

(10)

não se vê, não! {Marcelo Veiga, "O batuque"}

Mas agora não pode, não. {Eduardo Teófilo, "Uma poça de água"; César 1969b:466}

Tem home não volta mais não... não volta não ... Branca tem olho azul não fica tempo

sem home não ... no guerra tá morto, não levanta não ... [eu] não sabe não ... terra

não come tudo não, fica podre mesmo ... Cheiro tá na terra, não sai mais não ...

não precisa falar mais não. Tu vai pôr igual a mim, eu sei. Só que Serafim não

deixa não ... Serafim não vai ficar branco não ... Olhe aqui, branco, botar filho

dentro não custa não ... Homem não sabe isso não ... não tá lá não ... [eu] sabe não

... Sior administrador falou ninguém falta não ... tempo não chega não ... custa não. Só a gente não lembra ... comer não, padrim ... não passa nada não ... Matumbo não vê nada não ... Loja da Companhia não é brincadeira não ... não tá contente não ... Isso de almirante eu não sei qu'ê não ... Boniteza como não vi não ... Tá sofrendo lá, não sai não, só morto ... Mais eu não vi não ... Não é isso não ... Seu Cardoso não fala nada não, só grita ... Não sai não ... não vi ela não ... família não zanga não ... Não saiu mais não ... Mentira não tem cubata na minha boca não ... Mulato não pode ficar branco não ... Branco não gosta mulato não ... Igual é qu'ê ... sei não ... Severino, tu não tem vergonha na tua cara não ... Não quero não ... Não chama ele não ... Juro, juro não queria não ... não chora não ... não faz não ... não olha assim não ... {Castro Soromenho, *A chaga*}

Não vamos ainda, não ... {Luandino Vieira, *Velhas estórias*}

num pode, não ... Num é mais negra de sanzala, não ... Num tá piruca, não! {Cochat Osório, "Aiué"}

Eu não é miúdo, não ... Não vai fazer mal, não ... {Eduardo Teófilo, "O contrato"}

Não deve tanto, não ... Não agradece, não, porque cubata é casa que preto gosta ... Minha terra é pobe, não é Luanda, não ... Tem de dar oitocentos angolares pra papéis ao secretário que padrinhos não paga não ... {Mariza Ryder, Bixila Kiambote (contos angolanos) "As duas mulheres do servente Zau"}

Não compra, não {"A noiva de palmito!"}

Não é como os outros, não {José Luandino Vieira, *A vida verdadeira de Domingos Xavier*}

Estava a olhar as cinzas a nos olhos veio água, muita água de chorar, que não era chuva, não {Antônio Jacinto, 'Vôvô Bartolomeu' (Santilli 1985:57)}

Não é magia, não! {Vieira, *Luuanda*}

Tropa prende, àsvez mata. Não é terrorista não (Correia 1980:13)

Meu anjinho, meu anjinho! Esta vida não é para ti, não (Leonel Cosme, 'O grito' [Imbondeiro 1961:15])

Patrão, mata mesmo "Cappitia", mas "Capitia" não tem culpa. Não tem culpa, não, senhor (Azeredo 1956:31)

- Vernacular Mozambican Portuguese, also spoken as a L₂ in urban areas of

Mozambique:

(11)

Carvno é preto mas nno é pra preto nno (Mendes 1981: 14)

Nno vai hoje, nno (Mendes 1981: 111)

GUILHERME DE MELLO, 'O MOLEQUE DO VIOLÃO' (NEVES 1963:193):

Mas o mainato não lho podia entregar, não.

ANTÔNIO DE ALMEIDA SANTOS, 'HISTÓRIA DE SABÃO' (NEVES 1963:205):

Não é que êle quisesse ser branco, não.

Você não é preto, não, Sabão.

LUIS BERNARDO HONWANA, 'O CÃO TINHOSO' (ANDRADE 1958:290-1):

O meu pai é capaz de me bater quando souber ... eu não quero, não

- Vernacular Portuguese as spoken in São Tomé and Príncipe, where the native language is a Portuguese-derived creole with strong Bantu and Kwa roots (particularly kiKongo and Bini, respectively):

(12)

FERNANDO REIS, “MAIÁ” (CÉSAR 1969A:305-327)

Mar p'ra ele não costa, não

Não sabe que é medo, não!

Sô Silvino com ele não brinca, não!

Eu não tem medo, não!

Não pensa não

Senhor não deixa bater ele, porque se gente bate uma vez Joãozinho não vem mais no
serviço, não!

Não tem rapaz, não!

Senhor não ofendeu, não.

Quando febre passa, já não lembra, não!

Se mãe não quer, não amiga, não.

Esse branco é muito rico, roça dele é muito grande, mas eu não gosta dele, não.

Mãe já falou a mim mas eu não gosta desse velho, não.

Não quer, não!

Esse menino não levava Maiá, não!

Você agora não levanta mais, não.

Não tá mais zangado, não?

LUÍS CAJÃO, “O OUTRO MENINO JESÚS” (CÉSAR 1969A:334-6)

Não morre nada.

Não há novidade, não.

• The Güiria Peninsula of Venezuela, where Spanish is in contact with the French creole of Trinidad, which also employs double negation (Llorente 1994, 1995). This construction is not found elsewhere in Venezuela, even in areas of heavy African cultural and linguistic traditions. :

(13)

yo no estoy yendo no

Outside of the Afro-Hispanic domain, non-emphatic double negation has been observed in the following Spanish dialects:

• The Spanish of Quechua-dominant bilinguals in northwestern Argentina (Postigo de Bedía 1994: 360-61):

(14)

No es orgullosa como yo no.

No ha estudiado la historia no.

Usted no sabe no.

The same construction is also documented in traditional Carnival songs from La Rioja province in northwestern Argentina, where the Quechua influence was also prevalent (Cáceres Freyre 1966: 413):

(15)

No llorís, negra

No llorís no

Porque si lloras

Me muero yo

• A form of double negation, involving two preposed negators, is found in colloquial Paraguayan Spanish (Granda 1988:264-5; Krivoshein de Canese and Corvalán 1987:43; Choi 1998):

(16)
nadie no te dije
nunca no vas a llegar
jamás no te prometí eso

In addition to double negation with *no ... no*, another form of double negation appears frequently in vernacular Caribbean Spanish of several countries, although rarely attested in literature and never commented on by observers of language. The construction is based on *no ... na(da)*; despite the fact that *nada* is ostensibly a pronominal, this construction can occur with intransitive verbs (unaccusative and unergative) as well as with expressed predicate nominals and adjectives. Some overheard examples include:

(17)
No es difícil ná {Puerto Rico}
No llegó nada {Venezuela}

Double negation with *no ... na(da)* appears occasionally in Dominican literature:

(18)
Dicen que Solito es malo;
Solito no es malo ná (Caamaño de Fernández 1976: 29; Henríquez Ureña 1966: 299)
{ 19th century popular song }
Timoteo dizque era muerto; Timoteo no es muerto na' (Prestol Castillo 1986: 47)

In Cuban literature, occasional instances of double negation with *no ... nada* are found:

(19)
... era un hecho inaudito y el sujeto aquel no debia ser tan bueno nada (Herrera 1964: 45)
Un poco de polvo ... no me baño nada (Soler Puig 1975:77)
Espérese. No espero nada, este tipo es peligroso. (Díaz 1966:25)
A usted no le intereso ná (Iznaga 1970:21)
No llueve, Ermidio; no me llueve na' (Iznaga 1970:51)

In Venezuela, a song was transcribed in the village of Caraballeda (Sojo 1986: 106):

(20)
Dicen que mi Changó es mono
Ma Changó *no* es mono *ná*
Ma Changó lo que tiene
que no lo saben bailá.

This song may contain an example of double negation, although if the reference to *Changó* is taken to suggest a Yoruba origin for the verses, double negation would not be an expected result. A similar use of *na(da)* as double negator is found in a song transcribed in Chichiriviche (Sojo 1986: 258):

(21)
Yo soy el Pájaro Negro
cuando la gana me dá;
cuando no me da la gana
no soy pájaro ná!

This construction has also been documented in vernacular L₂ Portuguese in Africa, for example from São Tomé:

(22) LUÍS CAJÃO, "O OUTRO MENINO JESÚS" (CÉSAR 1969A:334-6)
Não morre nada.

It is also attested in Mozambican Portuguese:

(23) *Não vai embora nada!* (Mendes 1981: 110)

Found in Angolan Portuguese are examples like:

(24) SCHUCHARDT (1888: 252 [1979: 70-1])

tens dinheiro? não tem nada

MARIA ARCHER, 'A CARTA' (CÉSAR 1969B:704)

E verdade que eu robei! Mas carta viu nada

Nor are such examples necessarily of recent origin. A very suggestive sentence from the Gold Coast, apparently used in 1621 by a woman as a reason for decapitating a slave (Jones 1995:106) is:

(25) *Siempre Comeer y non trabalhar, nada nada.*

The sentence contains possibly Spanish elements (*siempre, non*), and the sentence-final *nada* may be an emphatic afterthought, but the correspondence with later Angolan and Mozambican Portuguese and vernacular Caribbean Spanish is striking.

Double negation with *no ... nada* is difficult to study given its transient nature, and the fact that it passes unnoticed even by speakers who use this construction. Informal questioning by the author in several Caribbean Spanish speech communities has revealed an almost total unawareness of this construction; when presented explicitly with examples actually produced by other speakers, most individuals consulted did acknowledge that such constructions were possible, although few admitted to ever using them.

At first glance the panoply of examples of double negation seem unrelated, except that language contact appears to have induced constructions not found in patrimonial Spanish. It will be the purpose of the following remarks to demonstrate several strands that connect the Afro-Iberian examples, and to draw the Spanish-Quechua examples into the discussion of the effects of language contact on syntactic change. The ensuing discussion will enter the discussion on the possible African syntactic influences on Latin American Spanish and Portuguese, on theories of Spanish- and Portuguese-derived creole formation, and on the genealogy of several Afro-Iberian pidgins, creoles, and dialects of Spanish and Portuguese.

Double negation in Andean Spanish

The double negation attested for Spanish dialects at the fringes of the Quechua-speaking domain may be a calque from Quechua syntactic patterns, although the reasons why such double negation is unattested for mainstream Andean varieties remain unclear. All varieties of Quechua have some form of double negation, involving variants of the particle *mana*, typically placed at the beginning of the clause, and the enclitic *-chu*, placed at the end of the verbal complex. Unlike the above Spanish examples, *-chu* is not separated from the verb complex by intervening objects, adjuncts, or clauses. Since Quechua is an OV language, a sentence like *no ha estudiado la historia* would end in *-chu*, but attached to the verb, following the SOV order:

(26)

ñuka wawki mana jatun wasi-ta chari-n-chu

'my brother does not have a big house' (Cole 1985:83)

When VO order is present, *-chu* is not phrase-final, but rather occurs immediately after the verb:

(27)

Pedru-ka mana miku-rka-n-chu almuerso-ta

'Pedro didn't eat lunch' (Coombs et al. 1976:185)

Thus it is not immediately clear that the Argentine S.. *no*..V..O..*no* examples represent direct calques of Quechua, particularly since similar cases of double negation are quite rare in the remainder of the Andean region where Quechua continues to provide a strong substratum influence. However, the existence of double negation in Quechua combined with the possibility of contemplative or appositive phrase-final negation in Spanish may have provided a model for an innovative Spanish double negation. The fact that these examples occur in peripheral dialects of Spanish far-removed from the metropolitan standards either of Argentina or of mainstream Andean dialects, together with the relatively diminished standardizing influence found in these isolated rural regions, may have tipped the balance in favor of double negation structures which never coalesced in other Andean Spanish dialects.

Double negation in Paraguayan Spanish/Brazilian Portuguese

There have been some suggestions that double negation in Brazilian Portuguese, which is most frequently attributed to sub-Saharan African influences, reflects the influence of the Tupi-Guaraní-based *Língua Geral*, spoken extensively during the early colonial period. In Tupi-Guaraní, indicative verbs are negated by a combination of negative prefix and negative suffix, while in the imperative and subjunctive a negative suffix alone is present; this has been the case at least since the early grammar of Anchieta, written in 1595 (Anchieta 1990: 169, 220-1). In old colonial Tupi, negation was effected through the combination of the preverbal particle *nda* (with allomorphs *nd* before vowels and *na* before *nd*) and the postverbal atonic particle *-i* (*-î* after a vowel); the suffix typically occurs after all objects (Barbosa 1956:88):

(28)

nd'a-s-endub-î

`I didn't hear it'

However, with predicate nominatives, the postverbal particle is *ruã*, which, however, goes between the verb and the predicate:

(29)

nda itá ruã ixé

`I'm not a stone'

In contemporary Tupi, negation is more frequently realized with a sole postverbal particle – *nheên* (Fernandes 1960:210), which was a rare alternative in earlier times (Barbosa 1956:354). In modern Guaraní, a very similar language, negation continues to be effected by *nda* ... *-i* and its variants (Guasch 1956:155; Muniagurria 1967:50-1).

In Brazil, the existence of such structures in a major indigenous substrate language could further spur on an innovation originally brought by Africans. Indeed Holm (1987:410) acknowledges the possible convergence of *Língua Geral* and African traits in the formation of vernacular Brazilian Portuguese: 'It would seem probable, therefore, that the *Língua Geral* variety of Tupi left as strong a mark on the PBP [popular Brazilian Portuguese] of rural peasants ... although the process involved was simply language shift with no need for a stage of creolization ... the attribution of PBP features to the influence of both Tupi and West African languages leaves no real dilemma: such totally unrelated languages may well coincidentally share structural similarities ...' However, the lack of comparable double negation in Paraguayan and other varieties of Spanish in centuries-long contact with Guaraní and differences in syntax (completely phrase-final postposed negator in Afro-Iberian dialects, sometimes phrase-medial in Tupi and Guaraní) suggest that an early *Língua Geral* contribution to vernacular Brazilian Portuguese double negation was at best a minor contributing factor.

Double negation in other Romance languages

Double and postposed negation in the Romance languages is not particularly uncommon, although the only major Romance language to make use of such constructions is French. A number of Rhaeto-Romance and northern Italian languages also employ double negation or solely postposed negation (Zanuttini 1997), but in ways which differ qualitatively from the Afro-Iberian data studied here. In particular, with very few exceptions, other double and postposed negators in Romance occur in immediate postverbal position, and do not allow intervening object or adjunct phrases to intervene between the verb and the postposed negator. In even fewer cases is the postposed negator derived from Latin *non*. Some representative double/postposed negation structures in Romance are given below, in each case followed by the equivalent phrase in Afro-Hispanic dialects exhibiting double negation:

(30)

Maria a mangia *pa/nen* la carn {Piedmontese}

María *no* come carne *no*

`Maria doesn't eat meat'

A l'ha *pa gia* ciamà {Piedmontese}

No ha llamado *no*

`He hasn't already called'

Mi a *ni vag nu* {Cairo Montenotte, Liguria}

No voy allá *no*

`I'm not going there'

Maréia l'a *pa mèndzà* la tsear {Cognen, Valdôtain}

María *no* ha comido la carne *no*

`Maria hasn't eaten meat'

El l'ha scrivuu *no* {Milanese}

El *no* lo ha escrito *no*

`He hasn't written'

Cerchem de spurcàs *no* {Milanese}

No nos ensuciamos *no*

`Let's try not to get ourselves dirty'

La Maria l'a *no* mangià la carne {Pavese}

María *no* ha comido la carne *no*

`Maria hasn't eaten meat'

Within the extended INFL model (Pollock 1989), Spanish *no*/Portuguese *não* are assumed to occupy the head position of NegP (Haegeman 1995:195-231), with AgrP (agreement) occupying a higher node and TP (tense) intervening between the negator and VP. Spanish and Portuguese are verb-raising languages, so the verb will raise to Agr to acquire its agreement features. The negative element *no/não* also raises to Agr⁰ where it merges with the verb, thus ensuring the canonical preverbal position for negation even after verb-raising has occurred. In these

languages, Spec-NegP contains no overt element (Haegeman 1995 suggests that this position is occupied by a negative operator). French double negation, involving *ne ... pas*, reflects the position of *ne* in Neg^o, with *pas* occupying Spec-NegP. When both the verb and *ne* raise, *pas* remains behind, accounting for the surface *ne V pas* configuration. Only clitics can intervene between *ne* and the verb, while *pas* and the other French negative words occur in immediate postverbal position. In the case of Spanish and Portuguese double negation of the sort described above, it is not feasible to locate the *no/nada/não* which superficially appears postverbally in Spec-NegP, since the second negative element typically appears phrase- or clause-finally, with intervening object NPs, AdvPs, and sometimes even subordinate clauses. In fact, the second negator behaves more like a sentential adverb, adjoined to CP. This is consistent with the theory that double negation originally involved an appositive afterthought or right dislocation in the case of *no/não* and possibly an elipsis of *para/de nada* in the case of *no ... nada* double negation. Zanuttini (1997:97-9) gives examples of several Italian dialects which exhibit double negation of the sort found in Afro-Iberian languages, with the second negative element occurring phrase-finally after the entire VP:

- (31)
 No kredo ke pödia parlar kon elo no {Cembre}
 'I don't think that I could talk to him'
 No lagarlo davert no {Lisignago}
 Don't leave it open'
 No gaj neanka pü en par de kalse no {Lisignago}
 'I don't even have a pair of socks anymore'

Milanese of the 17th century once had a similar structure:

- (32)
 no faró da corú nò
 'I won't do like him'

Zanuttini does not analyze such constructions, described only as occupying 'a position to the right of the VP-complements, but her analysis of most cases as involving emphasis or focus suggests some type of sentential adverb.

In those Romance cases which depart from the Afro-Iberian double/postposed negation patterns, the second negative element is base generated in some functional projection to the left of VP; parameterized movement operations result in the varying placement of the negative items in relation to main and auxiliary verbs and preverbal adverbs. However, in the Afro-Iberian cases, a totally non-Romance pattern emerges, in which right-adjunction to the entire clause has occurred, a position typically occupied by sentential adverbs and other adjuncts. Double negation with ... *nada* may well stem from the pan-Hispanic use of emphatic non-argument *nada*, nudged into a more consistent double negation pattern through contact with a variety of African languages which employ some sort of postverbal negator. Nonemphatic double negation in *no ... no* as found in Afro-Iberian languages is unique among Romance negation strategies; this fact, together with the occurrence of such constructions only in regions characterized by former or present contact with African languages known to employ double negation patterns (or in contact with creole languages exhibiting double negation—possibly also influenced by prior African elements) suggests that language contact in centuries past was a motivating force. The sporadic nature of double negation outside of the Chocó (even in the Dominican Republic this construction appears to be gaining ground only in recent years) undermines the possibility that

double negation was once part of a larger pan-Caribbean or Latin American Afro-Hispanic pidgin or creole.

Overview of negation structures in African languages

By far the most promising approach to Spanish and Portuguese double negation is the possible African connection, given the strong correlation between the occurrence of double negation and the presence—currently or in the past—of significant sub-Saharan African populations who maintained their native languages for at least one generation past arrival. Given the vast array of negation patterns found among the major African language families it is not feasible to postulate common denominators found in all or even most African languages as the source or inspiration for Afro-Iberian double negation. Rather, known demographic distribution of Africans in specific speech communities must be paired with the facts of negation in the corresponding languages.

Patterns of negation among African languages are quite diverse, and members of the same family may express negation in different fashions. In some languages, negation is expressed through purely autosegmental phonological changes, e.g. vowel lengthening or tone shift, although the majority of African languages contain some sort of negative particle corresponding to Spanish *no*/Portuguese *não*. In only a few instances is it likely that African negation patterns had any effect on *bozal* languages. Beginning with the Mande family of northwestern Africa (stretching from Ghana through Sierra Leone and the Senegambia), the principal languages of this group are Mende, Kpelle, Susu, and Vai (spoken in Sierra Leone) and the Mandinkan languages (including Mandinka and Bambara. This language family was well represented during the first century of Portuguese slave traffic in West Africa, and returned to importance in later centuries, particularly when the French used Senegal as a major slave exporting station. The frequent references to Mandinga in early Afro-Hispanic and Afro-Lusitanian literature attests to the prominence of Africans from this language family. In Mende, negation is frequently expressed by simply lengthening the final vowel of the subject clitic. There are also intensifying words which are used to reinforce some negative constructions (cf. Migeod 1908: 92-5). Migeod (1908: 92) cautions that 'the addition of a single word the equivalent of *not* to a positive statement, for the purpose of rendering it negative, does not occur.' Mandinka usually employs a special preverbal negative auxiliary (Rowlands 1959: 87f.). Vai places a negative morpheme between the subject clitic and the verb (Welmers 1976: 84f.). Another major language family well represented in Afro-Iberian language contacts is the Atlantic group. This includes Wolof (the major coastal Lingua Franca of Senegal), Serer (also spoken in Senegal), Fula (a major inland language family covering a wide area in northwestern Africa), Diola (a cluster of languages straddling the border between Senegal and Guinea-Bissau, and Temne (spoken in Sierra Leone). The Atlantic languages were the first to come into direct contact with Portuguese, and made a lasting impact on Atlantic creoles, as well as being mentioned by name in many early *bozal* texts. Atlantic languages, typified by Diola-Fogny, Temne and Wolof (Church 1981: 238f.), suffix morphemes to the verb to indicate negation (cf. Migeod 1911, vol 1: 109-10; Sauvageot 1965: 115f.). Fula combines vowel lengthening with negative items.

Indisputably the most important language families implicated in Afro-Iberian contact languages are the Kwa and Congo-Benue languages. Using the current designation, Kwa languages comprise only a subset ('Western Kwa') of the formerly much broader designation. These languages are spoken along the former Gold and Slave coasts, including Togo, Benin, Ghana, and western Nigeria. Major languages include the Akan group (Twi, Fante, Asante, Bran/Brong),

Gã, the Ewe/Fon group (also known as Gbe languages). The Congo-Benue group contains the former 'eastern Kwa' languages, Bantoid languages, and the entire Bantu group. Among the most important non-Bantu members of the Congo-Benue group are Yoruba, Igbo, Efik, the Edo cluster, the Idoma group. Together with the (new) Kwa group, this was the most important non-Bantu family of African languages to interact with Spanish and Portuguese. Among Kwa languages, and non-Bantu languages of the Benue-Congo group, negation is usually expressed by a single morpheme. In the Akan family, a clitic is prefixed to the verb. Yoruba employs the negative particle *kò* between the subject clitic and the verb. In rapid speech the /k/ disappears and the vowel may merge with the preceding vowel, with the result that negation is frequently realized as a low-tone extension of the preceding vowel. In such languages as Nupe and Igbo, negation is expressed by a sentence-final particle. Ewe combines a sentence-final particle *o* with a particle *me* placed between the subject clitic and the verb (Fiagã 1976: 52-3; Warburton et al. 1968: 32f.). Ijo places a negative particle between the verb and the following aspect marker. Gã combines a prefix and a suffix on the verb stem (Zimmermann 1858: 105-6).

The Bantu languages are a vast family of languages stretching across most of the southern half of Africa and well into the northeastern quadrant. Although some non-Bantu languages are spoken in South Africa, the majority of African languages spoken below the equator belong to the Bantu family. In terms of the impact on Portuguese and, by extension, Spanish, the Kongo branch of the Bantu family is by far the most important. This includes KiKongo and its related dialects (e.g. Fiote, Tchiluba), Cabinda (spoken in the Angolan enclave of the same name), KiMbundu (spoken in and around Luanda, Angola and becoming a lingua franca in much of Angola), UmBundu (spoken in and around the southern Angolan port of Benguela, which was an important slave exporting point). Angolan slave traders also brought speakers of inland Bantu languages such as Ngombe, and eventually from as far away as Mozambique, speaking languages such as Chinyanja, Ronga, Sena, Shona, etc. However, for the purposes of reconstructing early *bozal* language, the Congo Basin Bantu languages are by far the most important. It is also possible that some Africans who arrived in the American colonies spoke regional Bantu lingua francas as Lingala (which currently prevails in Kinshasa, Zaire) or creolized Bantu languages such as Kituba (derived from KiKongo). More so than any other large African language division, the Bantu languages share remarkable resemblances in formal structure (and among neighboring languages, often a relatively high rate of mutual intelligibility). This contrasts, e.g. with neighboring members of Atlantic, Mande, or Kwa languages, in which typological similarities noticed only by linguists are far overshadowed by significant differences and virtually no mutual intelligibility. The comparative homogeneity of Bantu languages is a factor to be reckoned with in tracing the Atlantic slave trade across time, since during the time periods and in colonial regions where slaves were taken from the Bantu-speaking parts of Africa, it is possible to postulate a higher degree of coherence in the substratum, and to open the search for possible areal features creeping into *bozal* language.

Perhaps the most interesting type of negation is found in some Bantu languages, especially KiKongo, which was well established in Brazil, the Colombian Chocó, Cuba, and the other Afro-Hispanic dialects, as well as having an impact on the formation of vernacular Angolan and São Tomé Portuguese. KiKongo, together with some minor Bantu languages, shows 'double negation,' similar to French *ne ... pas* constructions. KiKongo typically uses *ke ... ko* (cf. Bentley 1887: 607):

(33)

ke be- sumba ko

NEG Cl. buy NEG = 'They do not buy.'

Like the above-mentioned Afro-Iberian language varieties, and unlike Quechua, the second negator in kiKongo (*ko*) occurs phrase-finally, allowing for intervening objects and adjuncts:

- (34)
 ke be kuenda malembe ko
 'They don't walk slowly' (A.M.D.G. 1895:24)
 ke tukwendanga lumbu yawaonso ko
 'We do not go every day' (Bentley 1887:607)
 kisumbanga kwame maki ko
 'I [myself] am not buying eggs' (Bentley 1887:608)

This is a more promising candidate for substratal influence on Spanish and Portuguese, given that the placement of *ko* sentence-finally correlates with the position of the second negator in Afro-Iberian double negation constructions. Given that the final particle *ko* may be optionally absent in kiKongo (in which case the sentence carries an element of surprise, A.M.D.G. 1895:23), convergence with Spanish and Portuguese could be further facilitated.

Some related Congo languages, including those implicated in the formation of Afro-Iberian dialects, employ different strategies, typically combining a different set of subject clitics with changes to the verb endings (e.g. Cambier 1891: 69f.). Others use postposed *ko* in conjunction with a preverbal negative particle such as *si*, inserted between the subject clitic and the verb (e.g. Ussel 1888: 48f.). One of the main Bantu languages implicated in Afro-Brazilian Portuguese, as well as in 19th century Afro-Hispanic language of Buenos Aires and Montevideo (Lipski forthcoming; Fontanella de Weinberg 1987) is kiMbundu, the language of Luanda, Angola and the surrounding region. This language has contributed several widely used lexical items to the Southern Cone, including *bunda* 'backside' and *mucama* 'female servant.' More controversial are the possible imprints of KiMbundu on Spanish and Portuguese grammar. In KiMbundu, there is a difference between the speech of Luanda and the speech of the *sertão* or hinterlands (cf. Chatelain 1888-9: 51f.; Dias 1891: 38; cf. also Johnson 1930: 36 whose book describes the 'Mbundu' language but is actually a grammar of KiMbundu). In the latter dialects, negation is accomplished by simply prefixing *ki-* to the affirmative verb. Through vowel fusion with subject clitics and class markers, the variants *ka-* and *ku-* also occur. In the Luanda dialect, however, preverbal *ki-* is optional, while following the verb a disjunctive pronoun, the same used in possessive constructions, occurs:

- (35)
 (eme) ki ngi mutu ami
 (I) NEG Cl. person I = 'I am not a person'
 ki ngi banga ami
 NEG Cl. make I = 'I do not make'

This construction has been in existence for a long time; it is registered, for example, in the early grammar of Dias (1697: 21-3). In Umbundu, another important Angolan language spoken in Benguela (a Portuguese slave-exporting port) to the south of Luanda, negation is done entirely by means of prefixes, usually *ka-* or *ha-*, immediately before the subject clitic, together with some changes in the subject clitic (cf. Lecomte 1963: 37-8; Schadeberg 1990: 40-3). Bubi, spoken on Fernando Poo and an important substratum language in the Spanish of Equatorial Guinea, typically inserts a single particle (*chi*, *ta*, etc.) between the subject clitic and the verb (Abad 1928: 67; Juanola 1890: 56; Bolekia Boleká 1991: 132-4). A similar process is used in Combe/Ndowé, another important language of Equatorial Guinea, spoken along the coast of Río Muni (Fernández 1951: 37f.). Bujeba, another coastal language of Río Muni, employs a form of

double negation, inserting the particle *àà* between the subject clitic and the verb, and affixing *-le* to the end of the verb (González Echegaray 1916: 142f.). Fang, the most widely spoken language of Equatorial Guinea, combines a particle *à* inserted after the subject clitic and a particle *ke* or *ki* (sometimes omitted) following the verb (Ndongo Esono 1956: 60f.; Nze Abuy 1975: 69f.). Despite the prominence of Fang in Equatorial Guinea, being the language of the ruling class and widely spoken as a second language by most of the population, there is no evidence of double or postposed negation in the Spanish of Equatorial Guinea, regardless of the level of fluency or the presence of other interference from native languages.

Negative prefixes are also typical of Bantu languages spoken in Mozambique. For example, Chinyanja prefixes the negative particle *si* (which sometimes appears as *sa-* or *s-*) to the verb (cf. Henry 1891: 132-3; Missionários da Companhia de Jesús 1964: 95f.). In Sena, there are a separate set of subject clitics for negative forms (cf. Anderson 1897: 27). Xilenge preposes a monosyllable, usually *a-*, to the subject clitic (Smith and Matthews 1902: 23f.). Ronga also typically preposes *a-* (or *nga*) to the subject clitic, as well as changing the final vowel of the verb (Junod 1896: 138f.; Quintão 1951: 109f.). Other Bantu languages use only suffixes. For example, Lingala postposes *t'* to the end of the entire predicate (cf. Guthrie 1951: 65). Swahili uses a variety of suffixes, all placed after the verb (cf. Contini-Morava 1989).

Negative structures among African languages exhibit so much diversity that there is little hope for the discovery of a unified 'African' negation pattern in *bozal* Spanish and Portuguese. Most non-Bantu African languages contain a single negative particle, whose placement in the sentence varies somewhat, but which is functionally homologous to Spanish *no*/Portuguese *não*. A speaker of an African language accustomed to inserting a single--usually monosyllabic--element into a sentence to render it negative would experience little difficulty in detecting similar items in Spanish or Portuguese. Even speakers of languages in which negation is effected through autosegmental phonological modifications such as vowel lengthening or tonal shift would soon learn that in the language they were learning a transparently analytical particle, which moreover was very prominent e.g. in response to questions, served to negate words and clauses. Among Bantu languages, strategies of negation are quite diverse, as compared with relatively uniform verbal and pronominal structures. Still, most Bantu languages which interacted with Spanish and Portuguese have at least one invariant particle which acts as a common denominator in nearly all negative sentences, although this is not usually the same item as used in a free-standing negative response to a question. The only circumstances that might allow for an African-influenced negation pattern in *bozal* language would be an unusually homogeneous African linguistic community learning Spanish or Portuguese in the same setting. In the history of Afro-Iberian contacts, this scenario has usually been reserved for African colonial languages (e.g. Angolan and Mozambican Portuguese), or for isolated creoles which originally contained a highly homogeneous slave population, such as Colombian Palenquero. Vernacular Brazilian Portuguese, notorious for double and postposed negation, might also fit this category, given that the vast majority of African slaves came via the Portuguese slaving ports in Angola, with KiMbundu and Umbundu figuring prominently in Afro-Brazilian communities.

In the balance, KiKongo and Ewe, both well-documented for the Spanish Caribbean and Brazil, and both the languages of powerful transplanted religious and cultural communities in Latin America, are the most promising candidates for an African contribution to Afro-Iberian double negation. Schwegler (1996a:284) also implicates Yoruba, through the optional use of postverbal *rará* 'no, nothing,' but this occurs only in highly emphatic sentences. Yoruba may conceivably have influenced double negation in *no ... nada*, but the presence of this construction

in Angolan Portuguese renders a Yoruba influence less likely. Under any circumstances, the African substratum provided only a nudge towards double negation, which has never progressed beyond an optional or emphatic variant in Afro-Iberian dialects, as opposed to the syntactically obligatory status of double negation among African languages that exhibit this combination.

Evolution of double/postposed negation in Romance

There is a recurring pattern throughout the history of Latin and the Romance languages that alternates between pre- and postposed negation, passing through a stage of double negation. For example, Latin had only preverbal negation (NEG1); Old French had preverbal negator + verb + emphatic negative element (NEG2); modern standard French also has NEG2, while contemporary colloquial French has only the postverbal negator *pas* (NEG3). In this scenario, NEG2 is not seen as a necessarily transitional stage, since the double negation construction has survived for centuries in standard French as well as in dialects of Catalan and Franco-Provençal. Schwegler (1986: 161) suggests that '... a negation cycle predictably causes the synthesis of two or more previously independent items. As a given item comes to be frequently used as a verbal emphasizer and thereby loses its original meaning or function, the growing semantic relevance between the negative and emphatic elements causes the construction to undergo the kinds of morphosyntactic changes previously observed in the Lat. *non ... passum ...*' He further proposes (p. 162) that 'a switch in negative pattern always involves four basic steps:

(36)

[a] NEG + VERB -->

[b] NEG + VERB + EMPH --->

[c] NEG + VERB + NEG -->

[d] VERB + NEG.

He gives several examples of repeated pre- and postverbal negators, in Brazilian and Peninsular Portuguese, Palenquero, Chocó Spanish, and some French and Romansch dialects. He concludes (p. 173): '... psycholinguistic factors, namely the constant need for negative emphasizers and their semantic weakening during a frequency increase are responsible for the cyclical renewal of predicate negation. Because a negation cycle always leads to the semantic (and, in some instances also morphosyntactic and/or phonological) *rapprochement* of independent speech units, innovations in the domain of predicate negation inherently trigger a number of changes in the analytic/synthetic spectrum ... in all the vernaculars shown to have undergone a negation cycle, *semantic* synthesis not only preceded but also paved the way for all other types of synthesis. New negators, whether derived from a nominal element ... or copied from an existing negator ... invariably acquired a new emphatic function ... *before* morphological and/or phonological synthesis were allowed to take place. Once the semantic association between negator and emphasizer was firmly established, each language then predictably moved to tighten the morphological and/or phonological relation between these elements so that they eventually developed into units of an entirely different sort.' Schwegler suggests (p. 174) that movement is always in the direction of preverbal to postverbal negation, even in Palenquero: 'Neither preverbal BP *não* nor Pal *nu* is presently being substituted by new forms, yet the ongoing shift to strictly postverbal negation, i.e. the elimination of the preverbal negative particle, is clearly moving BP and Pal back to a more analytic way of expressing negation.'

Schwegler's proposal is an elaboration of ideas first proposed by Jespersen (1917, 1924), regarding the cyclic evolution of negation structures. Jespersen noted that many languages with single negative structures evolve a second negator, a noun or adverb in complement position.

Progressive lack of phonetic stress on the first element causes it to reduce to a clitic and ultimately to disappear, leaving the second element—often originally a non-negative item meaning ‘thing,’ ‘step,’ etc.—as the sole exponent of negation. German and colloquial French are relatively recent examples of this trend. Certainly all Romance languages which currently have only postverbal negators (mostly northern Italian and Franco-Provençal dialects) once had double negators, and originally had only a single preverbal negator, stemming from Latin *non*. Vennemann (1974), on the other hand, argues that if one assumes negation to be essentially adverbial, then in verb-final languages negation should precede the verb, and in verb-medial languages negation should be postverbal. Ibero-Romance and Italian are clear counterexamples to this assertion, as noted by Ashby (1981) among others (cf. also Ramat et al. 1986).

Schwegler (1983; also 1988) postulates that languages with VX word order (e.g. SVO as in Spanish) may not preserve a preverbal negation pattern, while if a VX language develops postverbal negation (modern French, some Romansch dialects), this pattern will always be preserved: ‘Unless a word-order shift of the type VX to XV occurs, no change in negative word-order will take place (French, Occitan, and Sursilvan have now arrived at a ‘dead end’)' (p. 324). These predictions are not borne out in the case of Palenquero Spanish/decreolized Palenquero, where exclusively postverbal negation (NEG3) in this canonical SVO language is shifting to double negation (NEG2) and in the most decreolized variants, to standard Spanish preverbal negation (NEG1).

Pragmatic sources of double negation

There is a significant prosodic distinction between double negation with *no ... no* and double negation with *no ... nada*. In the former case the final *no* is pronounced with no pause and with falling intonation, reflecting enclitic status (in Palenquero the postposed negator *nu* receives no stress accent but is pronounced with a high tone; I owe this observation to Yves Moniño). However, all attested examples of negation with *no ... nada* are emphatic, typically strong negative statements rejection a notion categorically. In such utterances *nada* typically receives a strong stress accent, often the main phrasal accent, and the first syllable carries a high tone. Even though this double negation pattern can be combined with intransitive verbs or with predicate nominatives, *nada* carries the same performative force as adverbial expressions such as *en absoluto*, *para nada*, etc.:

(37)

¡Le dije que no se metiera para nada con ese recluta! (Díaz 1966:65)

There may also be pragmatic differences between *no ... no* and *no ... nada* constructions. Schwegler (1996a) provides evidence that double negation with *no* (in the Dominican Republic and the Chocó) occurs most frequently in response to the presupposition that the affirmative answer is expected (although Ruíz García 2000 finds less evidence of this in Chocó Spanish). Thus in answer to the question *Juan vino hoy, ¿no?* one might receive the answer *no vino no*, whereas a less affirmative gambit, such as *acaso Juan vino hoy* would probably elicit a single preposed negator, as in standard Spanish. Constructions based on *no ... nada* appear most frequently in spontaneous declarations, rather than as a response to a question, which makes elicitation of double negatives in *no ... nada* (as done, e.g. by Schwegler 1996a with *no ... no* in the Dominican Republic) nearly impossible. Often contradictory premises are explicitly stated, as in (20)-(21). Thus it may be that the source of *no ... nada* constructions in Spanish does not stem from an originally double negative in African languages, but rather from some sort of emphatic particle (such as Tagalog *nga*) used in explicit contradictions. Even more so than with

no ... no double negation, emphatic negation with *no ... nada* is so spontaneous in the areas in which it occurs as to be an unconscious discourse marker, not subject to native speaker judgements or intuitions.

The status of double negation with *no ... nada* reopens the issue of whether other forms of double negation, including *no ... no*, are likely to have derived from language-internal sources. At first blush this possibility seems implausible, since the history of Spanish (and Portuguese) gives no indication of any double negation strategy. Simple postposed negation, as in Palenquero and occasionally in vernacular Brazilian Portuguese (e.g. *sei não* 'I don't know') is even further removed from patrimonial Ibero-Romance patterns. The strongest single factor in support of the Afro/creole origin of double negation in Spanish, Palenquero, and Brazilian Portuguese is the fact that these combinations occur exclusively in areas characterized by a heavy African presence during colonial times, and in which an African ethnolinguistic presence is still noteworthy. However, the conspicuous absence of double negation in attested Afro-Hispanic language from Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, and Mexico—all of which colonies also received contingents of Africans speaking languages which could provide a template for double negation—provides a challenge to language-contact theories. Upon further examination, several possibilities suggest themselves as alternatives to an Afro/creole origin for at least some cases of double negation in vernacular Caribbean Spanish dialects. The case of *no ... nada* is perhaps the strongest contender for a non-substratist analysis. In virtually all cases where this construction occurs, it can be paraphrased by *no ... para nada* (or occasionally *... de nada*), thereby suggesting ellipsis as the original source of this construction. The emphatic status of *no ... nada* adds substance to the notion that this construction does not contain two instantiations of NEG (not to mention not having two separate syntactic sites for a spell-out of NEG), but rather a single NEG followed by a sentential adverbial, having the effect of negating the entire proposition. When combined with predicate adjectives, *no ... nada* corresponds to the standard Spanish construction in which *nada* precedes the predicate adjective: *no es nada inteligente*; this analysis does not carry over to predicate nominatives (to wit *no es nada mono*), nor to intransitive verbs (**él [no] nada llegó*). An alternative possibility is that *nada* is simply right-adjoined to the clause as a sort of response to a rhetorical question. In colloquial discourse *nada* is often used in response to questions which do not call for extraction of the subject or direct object (with intransitive verbs, or with questions requiring a yes-no answer):

(38)

¿Pudiste llegar a tiempo? Nada.

¿Supiste algo de Rogelio? Nada.

In the colloquial speech of Spain in particular, *nada* is used to punctuate discourse, meaning roughly 'well, that's it':

(39)

... y yo le dije a Mario que iba a la playa, y nada, me contestó que sí, pues que a él también le gustaría ir, pero ...

Se tomó los calomantes que había en la casa, y na'..., entonces le di un cachaparrazo de raíz de guizado de caballo con mastuerzo ... (Iznaga 1970:135)

From this use of *nada* it is but a small step to postclausal *nada* used to reinforce a preverbal negative element.

Spanish has a number of postverbal negative expressions that contain no negative element, the most common of which is *en absoluto* (*del todo* is another). These postclausal combinations are so closely aligned with verbal negation that even used in isolation (e.g. in

response to a question) they carry negative force. They provide a basis whereby one or more postverbal elements not related directly to verbal arguments (as, e.g., subject/object *nada*, *nadie*, *ninguno*) or as sentential adverbials such as *nunca* and *jamás*. All speakers of Spanish can produce double negation in moments of reflection; the final *no* is set off with an inflectional break and/or pause, and is functionally related to preverbal double negation: *no*, *no voy*, etc. Grammaticalization of postverbal *nada* in which this word does not represent a verbal argument is a feasible outcome. Caribbean Spanish is relatively unique among Latin American dialects in the use of the combinations *más nada*, *más nunca* and *más nadie*, instead of the more usual *nada más*, *nunca más* and *nadie más*. This usage most probably reflects a Canary Island heritage, which in turn bears a Galician-Portuguese imprint. Being inherently a negative expression, *más nada* combines with preverbal *no*: *no quiero más nada* 'I don't want anything else.' This provides yet another template upon which *no ... nada* double negation can be built.

Possible African roots of Spanish/Portuguese double negation

In the case of Angolan *musseque* Portuguese and by extension vernacular Brazilian Portuguese, the KiMbundu connection is undeniable, but the precise mechanism of transfer is not clear, since rural KiMbundu has no double negation, but only a preposed negative particle, while KiMbundu from the Luanda area combines an invariant preverbal particle with the postposition of a possessive pronoun. If simple interference from the latter dialect were at stake, one would expect constructions like *[eu] *não tenho meu*, rather than the actually occurring *não tenho não*. Indeed, KiKongo would seem to be a much better candidate as a source for Angolan Portuguese double negation (Schwegler 1996b believes that the KiKongo contribution to Colombian Palenquero significantly exceeds the KiMbundu element). It is possible that an Afro-Portuguese pidgin formed during the original Portuguese presence in the Kongo Kingdom, and preserved through the later more tenuous Portuguese presence in the old Congo area, formed the nucleus for an expanded vernacular Portuguese in the growing urban area of Luanda. This would explain why the current Portuguese spoken in Luanda does not categorically use double negation. If double negation was a characteristic of Africanized Portuguese spoken along the coast of Angola in previous centuries, then the Brazilian preference for double negatives would also fall into place. The matter awaits further study; although KiKongo, KiMbundu, and other Bantu languages spoken in the Congo Basin are often grouped together as 'Angola/Congo' languages in studying their impact on Spanish and Portuguese, there are some significant internal differences among these languages which necessitates a more accurate picture of precisely which Congo/Angolan languages were spoken at each time and place, in reconstructing the evolution of *bozal* language.

The presence of double negation in Mozambican Portuguese is particularly significant to the study of Afro-Iberian double negation, since the principal indigenous languages of Mozambique do not make use of true double negation, except for Ronga, in which a negative clitic prefixed to the verb is combined with a change in the final vowel of the verbal complex. Nor is it possible—as in the case of Angolan *musseque* Portuguese—to posit an indirect influence of kiKongo-speaking Portuguese learners. There is no evidence that speakers of kiKongo were ever present during the Portuguese colonization of Mozambique; however a kiKongo-influenced L₂ Portuguese, originally formed in the Portuguese Congo, may well have spread to Mozambique, rather than allowing for the spontaneous formation of regional Portuguese interlanguages in Mozambique. This is rendered more plausible by considering the extensive port-to-port contacts conducted among the Portuguese African and Asian colonies,

from the end of the 15th century until the end of the 19th, and the seminal role which the Portuguese Congo and Angola played in supplying African slaves not only to the New World, but to the Portuguese Asian colonies as well. Finally, the presence of double negation in vernacular São Tomé Portuguese is in all probability directly tied to the obligatory double negation in Sãotomense and Angolar creoles, although in São Tomé Portuguese double negation occurs only occasionally. A formerly kiKongo-influenced Portuguese pidgin may thus have arrived in São Tomé well after the creoles developed, perhaps as late as the 19th century, when São Tomé again became the center of a flourishing quasi-forced labor cacao production industry, as well as supplying nominally free laborers to other African territories.

Granda (1976 [1978: 515-18]) was the first researcher to explicitly link Afro-Colombian double negation with an African substrate and/or the Gulf of Guinea Afro-Portuguese creoles:

(40)

En efecto, en San Basilio de Palenque, que mantiene todavía un habla "criolla" relativamente poco distante del basilecto originario, existe, como norma, negación final en oraciones de este tipo, coexistiendo, como en el occidente colombiano, con negación inicial. Y aún es más concluyente la coincidencia del paradigma negativo en las zonas negras de las costas pacíficas colombianas con el que se da en el "criollo"-portugués del Golfo de Guinea. En Annobom y São Tomé (con menos vitalidad, también en Príncipe) las marcas de negación ... son siempre dobles ... con lo que la homología es absoluta entre el "criollo"-portugués de estas áreas, el "criollo" Palenquero y el rasgo morfosintáctico detectado en Colombia occidental. Bien es verdad que en estas dos últimas zonas las marcas de negación, que en el basilecto correspondiente debieron haber coincidido con las del diasistema de base, coinciden hoy día formalmente con la negación castellana (*no*, *nu*), pero esta divergencia es perfectamente explicable por el intenso proceso de relexificación que ha tenido lugar en el palenquero, y que ha sido prácticamente completo en los territorios del Pacífico colombiano. Pero, aunque no se ha conservado la forma *na-fa* de la doble negación del "criollo"-portugués de Africa, sí ha persistido, y ello es mucho más significativo, el esquema morfosintáctico de la misma ...(Granda 1978: 516-7).

Megenney (1990: 125f.) attributes Dominican double negation to a combination of emphatic construction 'de parte de los traficantes portugueses' and the direct influence of kiKongo, kiMbundu, and Umbundu, all of which exhibit some sort of syntactic double negation:

(41)

si creemos que el español basilectico de la República Dominicana se formó originalmente con la ayuda de un lenguaje africanoide de base portuguesa ... no nos debe parecer inadmisible la sugerencia de que, en efect, el fenómeno de la repetición de *no* en la República Dominicana tenga su origen en estas construcciones dobles de negación kimbundu, umbundu, y kikongo, sobre todo desde que dos de los paralelismos (además de la existencia misma de la construcción entre estas lenguas bantús y el español quisqueyano son sorprendentemente exactos: 1) la primera partícula negativa precede al verbo, y 2) la segunda partícula negativa se coloca al final del grupo fónico. El otro paralelismo ... en el portugués brasileño y en el palenquero pero no en Santo Domingo es la posible omisión de la primera partícula' (Megenney 1990: 127-8).

Megenney does acknowledge that the great variety of negation structures among sub-Saharan African languages could be used as an argument against the kiKongo-kiMbundu-Umbundu influence. Anecdotal evidence gleaned by talking to many older Dominicans suggests that double negation is a relatively recent phenomenon (perhaps limited to the 20th century), and that its use appears to be spreading. If this suggestion is true, it would undermine the early Afro-Hispanic origin of double negation, and would more closely coincide with the massive arrival of Haitian sugar cane-cutters in the Dominican Republic and their gradual and partial acquisition of Spanish, all the while speaking Haitian creole, with its stylistic variant of double negation. In contemporary Cuba, double negation has only been detected among Haitians; thus the direction NEG1 > NEG2 can be postulated. In Palenquero Spanish, on the other hand, the trajectory is almost certainly NEG3 > NEG2 (> NEG1 in the most decreolized lects). In Chocó Spanish there is less available evidence upon which to postulate the directionality of double negation; if Chocó Spanish stems from the convergence of L₁ Spanish and a creole like Palenquero having postposed negation, then either NEG1 > NEG2 or NEG3 > NEG2 are possible scenarios. Possibly both patterns converged to produce the nearly canonical double negation pattern in Chocó Spanish, the Spanish dialect in which double negation is the least marked.

Schwegler (1996a, 1996b), Granda (1978), Megenney (1990), and others explicitly relate postposed negation in Afro-Colombian Palenquero (and peripherally, double negation in Chocó and vernacular Dominican Spanish) to the Portuguese-derived creoles found in the Gulf of Guinea, in West Africa: the two creoles of São Tomé (Sãotomense and Angolar), and of Príncipe and Annobón. These creoles bear historical and structural similarities with Palenquero (e.g. plural subject pronouns, postposed possessives, and many lexical items), and given the documented presence of early São Tomé Portuguese creole in nearby Cartagena, observed as early as 1627 by the priest Alonso de Sandoval (1956), Schwegler and Granda, among others, have postulated that Palenquero derives from an earlier pidgin or creole that was either identical to or at least very similar to Sãotomense. Double negation is found in all of the Gulf of Guinea creoles except for Príncipe: In Sãotomense, the particles *na ... fa* circumscribe the verb. In the creole of Annobón, the particles are *na* (or *ã*) ... *-f* (Ferraz 1979; 1984: 130). In Angolar the respective particles are *na ... wa* (Maurer 1995; Lorenzino 1998). Principense uses only postposed *fa*. A convincing etymology for postposed *-fa* (and the clearly related *-wa* found in Angolar) has yet to be proposed, but an African rather than Romance origin seems almost certain. A comparison of the various Gulf of Guinea creoles suggests that *-fa* spread from language to language rather than having an independent origin in each of the closely related creoles. Preposed *na* is apparently derived from Portuguese *não* through a well-documented process of phonological reduction, particularly prevalent among African and Asian varieties of Portuguese.

Returning to the matter of double negation, now from the perspective of Afrogenesis, Schwegler (1996a) offers new hypotheses on the evolution of Afro-Iberian double negatives. When analyzing the possible origins of double (pre- and postposed) negation in vernacular Dominican Spanish, Schwegler speculates that double negation could stem from an initial postposed (NEG3) negative element: `... no es sino lógico pensar que la estructura NEG₃—conservada aún ... en Brasil, El Palenque de San Basilio, y, sólo de manera esporádica, en pequeñas comarcas chocoanas (aisladas geográficamente)—se extendía antaño a gran parte del diastema neogranadino español. Bajo esta perspectiva, el antiguo paradigma negativo afroespañol del Caribe se habría asemejado estructuralmente al del palenquero moderno ...' (p. 272). Schwegler speculates that the intersection of structural and sociolinguistic factors caused

the abandonment of postposed (NEG3) negation in Dominican Spanish (completely unattested) in favor of the double (NEG2) negation: `... el patrón NEG₃ habría resaltado desde muy temprano como una anomalía morfosintáctica, constituyendo así un rasgo identificador muy notable del habla *bozal*. Es natural que haya debido de haberse sujetado tempranamente a las progresivas presiones de la modalidad estándar ... las consecuencias de tales presiones prolongadas no son difíciles de imaginar: se abandona la "anomalía" NEG₃, pero no sin conservar una marca de negación (*no* + VERBO + *no*) cuya forma y morfosintaxis coincide, por lo menos parcialmente, con la negación estándar *no* + VERBO' (p. 273). Schwegler then notes that Dominican double negation, for which he suggests African substratum contributions, may stem from languages which have both double and postverbal negation: `Esta constatación de una doble posibilidad evolutiva nos obliga naturalmente a ampliar cualquier hipótesis de trabajo y nos invita a extender la búsqueda de influencias sustratísticas a lenguas que posean uno de estos esquemas estructurales o ambos' (p. 275).

Schwegler's proposals, although well-grounded in comparative data and historical information, encounter some empirical obstacles. First, solely postposed negation (NEG3) is completely unattested for any (Afro-) Spanish dialect except for the bilingual Spanish-Palenquero continuum of Palenque de San Basilio (and very isolated cases in the Chocó which themselves may be the descendents of a form Palenquero-speaking diaspora to the more isolated northwestern region of Colombia). It is risky to assume that, for example, Afro-Cuban *bozal* Spanish, which is amply attested and whose last stages are remembered by the oldest surviving Afro-Cubans even to this day (Ortiz López 1998a), ever possessed a uniquely postverbal negator. In the case of Afro-Cuban and Afro-Dominican Spanish, it is equally feasible to postulate the influence of Haitian creole and possibly other Afro-Caribbean creoles containing double negation (cf. the presence of double negation in the Spanish of the Güiría Peninsula of Venezuela, influenced by nearby Trinidad French creole, which contains double negation, as well as the use of double negation among contemporary Haitian L₂ speakers of Spanish in Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Postposed negation in vernacular Brazilian Portuguese is usually limited to a few formulaic expressions such as *sei não*, and is quite rare in comparison to the commonplace double negation. The lack of solely postposed negation in vernacular Angolan Portuguese, arguably popular Brazilian Portuguese's closest cousin, casts considerable doubt on the possibility that Brazilian double negation results from an originally postverbal negator.

Schwegler discusses the possible kiKongo or kiMbundu influence on Palenquero and Chocó postposed/double negation (and by extension negation in vernacular Brazilian Portuguese), but the two languages actually use quite different negation systems, and the details of negation in the above-mentioned Afro-Hispanic dialects also differ. KiKongo negation is accomplished by two similar particles which bracket the verb. Rural kiMbundu dialects use only a preposed negative, while in the contemporary dialect of Luanda the preverbal particle is not always present, while postverbally a redundant possessive pronoun signals negation. It is not clear at what historical moment this option arose, but if Afro-Iberian double negation were assumed to be a calque of kiMbundu, the most expected outcome would be a pronoun, not a repetition of the preverbal negator. The possibility of an optional sole postverbal negator in urban KiMbundu may account for the occasional postposed *não* in Angolan Portuguese. Schwegler (1996a: 284) suggests in fact that (Luanda) kiMbundu 'double' negation underlies Angolan *musseque* Portuguese double negation as well as popular BP double negation (and possibly Palenquero and Chocó negation), but in most cases of syntactic calquing of multi-word expressions, especially particles, there is some attempt to replicate the structure of the source

language in the receptor language. A kiKongo source for Spanish/Portuguese double negation is more plausible, since the two kiKongo particles *ki* and *ko* are phonologically close enough to be calqued by a repetition of a single negator (*no/não*) in Afro-Iberian language. This hypothesis assumes a mechanism by which kiKongo—a language native to an area considerably removed from Luanda's kiMbundu-speaking hinterland—could affect a broader cross-section of Afro-Portuguese dialects.

Additional hypotheses and a proposed typology

Attempting to relate Palenquero solely postposed *nu* with kiKongo, vernacular BP, Angolan *musseque* Portuguese, and the Portuguese-derived creoles of the Gulf of Guinea, encounters several typological problems. First, in Palenquero (and the surrounding Palenquero-influenced Spanish varieties), double negation appears to be an intermediate stage between postposed negation and preposed negation. In popular BP on the other hand, there is every indication that postposed negation is a fairly recent innovation, stemming from double negation in which the first instance of *não* became articulated so weakly as to achieve (phonological) clitic status and eventually disappear. In Angolan Portuguese, there are very few attestations of solely postposed negation, casting doubt on the possibility that double negation in that dialect could derive from an originally postverbal negator.

There is another possible explanation for Afro-Hispanic double negation, at least where no direct transfer from a French-based creole is involved, namely an intermediate stage in the reanalysis of the (Afro-Hispanic) negative particle from postverbal to preverbal position. Postverbal negation, either as some form of clitic or elongated vowel, or as a separate negative word, is common in many African language families known to have interacted with Spanish, as shown above. Palenquero, in its most basilectal form, has only postverbal negation; in fact the negative element appears at the end of the entire VP (Schwegler 1991b). In its more decreolized form, Palenquero permits double negation and sometimes even preverbal negation as in Spanish. In Chocó Spanish, on the other hand, the (very) occasional single postverbal *no* is also to be found. This sole postverbal negator is significantly more common in vernacular Brazilian Portuguese (e.g. *sei não* 'I don't know'). There is cross-linguistic evidence in favor of the hypothesis that double negation represents an intermediate stage between (original) postposed negation and later preposed negation, in non-contact varieties of Spanish. For example, speakers of basilectal Andean Spanish interlanguage, which is strongly influenced by the SOV structure of Quechua and Aymara, often repeat object clitics in both preverbal and postverbal position, en route to the monolingual Spanish configurations:

(42)

BOLIVIA:

No *la* he podido conser*la* (Stratford 1989: 120)

'I have not been able to meet her'

Te voy a preguntarte (Stratford 1989: 120)

'I'm going to ask you'

Lastimosamente, no *la* he podido conser*la* ... (Stratford 1989: 120) 'Unfortunately I have not been able to meet her ...'

PERU:

me está castigándome (Luján 1987: 117)

'he is punishing me'

... como no *me* quería aumentarme ... (Klee 1989: 406) 'since he didn't want to give me a raise'

In Korlai, India, speakers of Korlai Portuguese creole (KP), whose nominal word order is SVO, are gradually switching to SOV order (Clements 2000) under the influence of the substrate, Marathi. Speakers of transitional lects of KP often produce sentences with doubled verbs or doubled direct objects, in effect 'splitting the difference' between SVO and SOV:

(43)

haro	ta	kume	haro
rice [(s)he]	ASP	eat	rice = he/she eats rice
el	tada	sikwet	tada
(s)he	ASP-give	fifty	ASP-give = he/she gives fifty [rupees]

In some Basque dialects, originally postnominal determiners are shifting to prenominal status, under the influence of Spanish; hybrid forms combining postnominal and prenominal determiners are heard in these dialects (José Ignacio Hualde, p.c.) Thus in Vizcaíno Basque, the normally postposed demonstrative (e.g. *liburu hori* 'that book') is replaced by a preposed demonstrative (*hori liburua*). The latter construction alternates with a construction in which preposed and postposed demonstratives are combined, in a construction which appears to come chronically between the (original) postposed demonstrative and the innovative (possibly Spanish-like) preposed demonstrative in Vizcaíno:

(44) *hori liburu hori*

Colombian Palenquero is unique among Afro-Hispanic languages in occasionally exhibiting uniquely postposed negation, a trait found elsewhere only in vernacular Brazilian and Angolan Portuguese in limited circumstances. Under the hypothesis that basilectal Afro-Colombian Chocó Spanish has undergone at least partial decreolization from an earlier restructured variety of Spanish, double negation in the Chocó is not to be derived from a direct Afro-Hispanic linguistic interface, involving a language such as KiKongo which employs double negation. Rather, double negation would be a language-internal development, stemming from an earlier stage in which postverbal negation predominated. Extending the parallel, if basilectal Chocó Spanish is ontogenetically related to Palenquero, then the sources of double negation are to be sought in an originally single negation pattern, in postverbal position. From this perspective, a KiKongo source for Palenquero negation is demoted from a leading candidate to a less likely option, since KiKongo employs double negation, as do its less disputed congenors, such as Angolan *musseque* Portuguese and possibly basilectal Brazilian Portuguese. Schwegler (1996b) has convincingly demonstrated a considerable KiKongo imprint in Palenquero, but postposed negation is not the only feature of Palenquero that suggests other origins. As noted above, urban KiMbundu employs a sort of postposed negation, in which the disjoint possessive or subject pronoun is placed preverbally, in combination with a stressless preverbal clitic which might not survive in a short-lived contact environment such as that which gave rise to Palenquero. There are other Bantu languages which may have contributed to Palenquero postposed negation, including Lingala, a major lingua franca in the Congo Basin, and spoken in areas which were well represented in the slave markets of Cartagena de Indias. It may also be that the earliest manifestations of Palenquero also contained a preverbal negative clitic in addition to the postverbal element, which eventually disappeared in favor of the prosodically more prominent postverbal negator *nu*. The latter element, while not receiving a strong stress accent, is usually pronounced with a high tone, thus enjoying a high measure of prosodic prominence.

The Palenquero and Chocó data can be fitted in against the patterns of negation found in the Portuguese-derived creoles of the Gulf of Guinea, which bear historical and synchronic similarities with Palenquero, and which employ double negation—except for Príncipe creole. This suggests a reduction of an originally double negation system. However, this more conservative creole may actually embody an earlier stage of development in the Gulf of Guinea creoles, which subsequently evolved to a double negation configuration in the remaining languages. Thus it could be that the postverbal *-fa* which stands alone in Principese was once the unique negator in the remaining Gulf of Guinea creoles, but that continued contact with Portuguese resulted in the hybrid dual negation system, combining (reduced) Portuguese preverbal *não* with postverbal *-fa*. If true, this scenario would place Palenquero, Chocó Spanish, and the Gulf of Guinea creoles in a different genealogical relationship than has heretofore been assumed. All three languages would originally have presented postverbal negation, with extended contact with the lexifier languages Spanish and Portuguese yielding a hybrid pre- and postverbal negation system. The general outlines of this proposed typology of double negation are sketched in Tables 1-2.

According to the proposed typology, double negation strategies in Spanish and Portuguese dialects are related, in that all arose from some sort of language-contact environment, but not all are related through direct genealogical links. Chocó Spanish is in all probability related to Palenquero, perhaps even directly evolved from Palenquero or one of its congeners in northwestern Colombia. Palenquero negation in turn bears similarities with the Gulf of Guinea creoles, but the fact that Palenquero appears to have always had NEG3 whereas the Gulf of Guinea creoles have only NEG2 (except for Principese, whose current preference for NEG3 derives from the earlier NEG2 characteristic of the other GG creoles. There is nothing to suggest that Dominican double negation is genealogically related to Chocó Spanish; the direct influence of Haitian creole is the more probable source, as it is in 19th century Afro-Cuban *bozal* Spanish, and vestigially among elderly Haitians living in Cuba.

Double negation based on *no ... nada* draws most heavily on Spanish sources, involving emphatic and pleonastic negation. An African component, if present, exercised only a slight nudge on a combination that remains relatively infrequent even today. Double negation with *no/não* more clearly implicates an origin in language-contact environments, although drawing fundamentally on emphatic right-dislocation possibilities intrinsic to Spanish and Portuguese. The fact that double negation is not categorical in any variety of Spanish or Portuguese reflects its origins in variable emphatic dislocations. Solely postposed negation is found only in the completely restructured creole language Palenquero, where it appears that it did NOT evolve from an originally double negation, but rather represents a transplanted extra-Hispanic negation system. Variable double negation in partially decreolized Palenquero, in Palenquero Spanish, and in nearby Chocó Spanish, represents a transitional stage between postposed and preposed negation, in which both positions are simultaneously instantiated. These data potentially constitute counterexamples to claims that the evolution of negation in SVO languages is invariably from preposed to postposed. In short, the complex patterns of double negation in Spanish and Portuguese stem from equally complex sources, in which language contact played a catalytic role, set against the backdrop of language-internal processes that have shaped the Romance languages over their entire history. The present remarks, embryonic rather than complete, suggestive rather than definitive, constitute a call to depart from the STRICT LANGUAGE-INTERNAL/LANGUAGE CONTACT dichotomy in analyzing diachronic developments,

and place greater emphasis on symbiotic and multidimensional systems such as the ones illustrated today.

References

- A.M.D.G. 1895. *Elements de la langue congolaise*. Brussels: Desclée, de Brouwer et C^{ie}.
- Abad, Isidoro. 1928. *Elementos de la gramática bubi*. Madrid: Editorial del Corazón de María.
- Alén Rodríguez, Olavo. 1986. *La música de las sociedades de tumba francesa en Cuba*. La Habana: Ministerio de Cultura.
- . 1991. *The tumba francesa societies and their music*. *Essays on Cuban music: North American and Cuban perspectives*, ed. Peter Manuel, 77-85. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Anchieta, José de. 1990. *Arte de gramática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Anderson, W. G. 1897. *An introductory grammar of the Sena language spoken on the lower Zambesi*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Andrade, G. de. 1961. *Contos d'Africa, antologia de contos angolanos*. Sá da Bandeira: Publicações Imbondeiro.
- Andrade, Mario de. 1958. *Literatura africana de expressão portuguesa: prosa*. Algiers: n.p.
- Ashby, William. 1981. The loss of the negative particle *ne* in French. *Language* 57.674-687.
- Azeredo, Guilhermina de. 1956. *Branças e negras*. Lisbon: Agência Geral do Ultramar.
- Barbosa, A. Lemos. 1956. *Curso de Tupi antigo*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria São José.
- Benavides, Celso. 1985. El dialecto español de Samaná. *Anuario de la Academia de Ciencias de la República Dominicana* 9.297-342.
- Benítez del Cristo, Ignacio. 1930. Los novios catedráticos. *Archivos del Folklore Cubano* 5(2).119-46.
- Bentley, W. Holman. 1887. *Dictionary and grammar of the Kongo language*. London: Tröbner & Co.
- Bolekia Boleká, Justo. 1991. *Curso de lengua bubi*. Malabo: Centro Cultural Hispano-Guineano.
- Caamaño de Fernández, Vicenta. 1976. *La lengua campesina en la narrativa costumbrista dominicana*. Santo Domingo: Centurión.
- Bentley, W. Holman. 1887. *Dictionary and grammar of the Kongo language, as spoken at San Salvador, the ancient capital of the old Kongo Empire, West Africa*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Cabrera, Lydia. 1976. *Francisco y Francisca: chascarrillos de negros viejos*. Miami: Editorial C. R.
- . 1979. *Reglas de congo*. Miami: Editorial C. R.
- . 1983. *El monte*. 3rd ed. Miami: Editorial C. R.
- Cáceres Freyre, Julián. 1966. La celebración del carnaval en la provincia de La Rioja (República Argentina). XXXVI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, España, 1964, *Actas y Memorias*, vol. 2, 389-415. Sevilla: Editorial Católica Española.
- Cambier, Père. 1891. *Essai sur la langue congolaise*. Brussels: Imprimerie Polleunis et Ceuterick.
- César, Amândio. 1969a. *Contos portugueses do ultramar*, vol. I. Porto: Portucalense.
- César, Amândio. 1969a. *Contos portugueses do ultramar*, vol. II. Porto: Portucalense.
- Chatelain, Héli. 1888-9. *Grammática elementar do Kimbundu o língua de Angola*. Geneva: Typ. de Charles Schuchardt.
- Choi, Jinny. 1998. Orígenes de la doble negación en el español paraguayo. *Hispanic Linguistics* 10.236-250.

- Church, Eric. 1981. *Le système verbal du wolof*. Dakar: Université de Dakar.
- Clements, J. Clancy. 2000. Word order shift and natural L₂ acquisition in a Portuguese creole language. Presented at the 30th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), University of Florida, Gainesville, February 2000.
- Cole, Peter. 1985. *Imbabura Quechua*. London: Croom Helm.
- Contini-Morava, Ellen. 1989. Discourse pragmatics and semantic categorization: the case of negation and tense-aspect with special reference to Swahili. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coombs, David, Heidi Coombs, Robert Weber. 1976. *Gramática quechua*. San Martín. Lima: Ministerio de Educación, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Correia, Octaviano. 1980. *Fizeste fogo à viuvinha*. Luanda: União dos Escritores Angolanos.
- Cruz, Mary. 1974. *Creto Gangá*. La Habana: Instituto Cubano del Libro 'Contemporáneos.'
- Dias, Pedro. 1697. *Arte da lingua de Angola*. Lisbon: Officina de Miguel Deslandes.
- Díaz, Jesús. 1966. *Los años duros*. Havana: Casa de la Américas.
- Fernandes, Adaucto. 1960. *Gramática Tupi*. Rio de Janeiro: A. Coelho Branco F.º
- Fernández, Francisco. 1987. El negro cheche. In Montes Huidobro (1987).
- Fernández, P. L. 1951. *Diccionario español-kômbe*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos.
- Ferraz, Luis Ivens. 1979. *The creole of São Tomé*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- _____. 1984. The substrate of Annobonese. *African Studies* 43.119-136.
- Fiagã, Kwasi. 1976. *Grammaire Eve*. Lomé: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Fontanella de Weinberg, María Beatriz. 1987. 1987b. Variedades lingüísticas usadas por la población negra rioplatense. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica (Valladolid)* 3.55-66.
- González Echegaray, Carlos. 1960. *Morfología y sintaxis de la lengua bujeba*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos.
- Granda, Germán de. 1976. Algunos rasgos morfosintácticos de posible origen criollo en el habla de áreas hispanoamericanas de población negra. *Anuario de Letras* 14.5-22.
- _____. 1977. Estudios sobre un área dialectal hispanoamericana de población negra: las tierras bajas occidentales de Colombia. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- _____. 1978. Estudios lingüísticos hispánicos, afrohispanicos y criollos. Madrid: Gredos.
- _____. 1988. *Sociedad, historia y lengua en el Paraguay*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.
- Guasch, Antonio. 1956. *El idioma guaraní*. Asunción: Casa América – Moreno Hermanos.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1951. *Grammaire et dictionnaire de lingala*. Leopoldville: Librarie Evangélique.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henríquez Ureña, Max. 1966. *Panorama histórico de la literatura dominicana*. Santo Domingo: Editorial Librería Dominicana.
- Henry, George. 1891. *Grammar of Chinyanja*. Aberdeen: G. & W. Fraser.
- Herrera, Mariano. 1964. *Despues de la zeta*. Havana: Ediciones R.
- Holm, John. 1987. Creole influence on popular Brazilian Portuguese. *Pidgin and creole languages: essays in memory of John E. Reinecke*, ed. by Glenn Gilbert, 406-429. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Imbondeiro. 1961. *Contos d'Africa: antologia de contos angolanos*. Sá da Bandeira: Publicações Imbondeiro.
- Iznaga, Alcides. 1970. *Las cercas caminaban*. Havana: Unión de Escritores y Artistas de Cuba.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Copenhagen: A. F. Host.
- _____. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. New York: Norton.

- Jiménez Sabater, Max. 1975. Más datos sobre el español en la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo: Ediciones Intec.
- Johnson, Amandus. 1930. Mbundu English-Portuguese dictionary with grammar and syntax. Philadelphia: International Printing Company.
- Jones, Adam. 1995. Female slave-owners on the Gold Coast: just a matter of money. Slave cultures and the cultures of slavery, ed. Stephan Palmie, 100-112. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Juanola, Joaquín. 1890. Primer paso a la lengua bubi. Madrid: A. Pérez Dubrull.
- Junod, Henri. 1896. Grammaire ronga. Lausanne: Imprimerie Georges Bridel & Cie.
- Klee, Carol. 1989. The acquisition of clitic pronouns in the Spanish interlanguage of Peruvian Quechua speakers. *Hispania* 72.402-408.
- Kouwenberg, Sylvia. 1994. Berbice Dutch. Typological studies in negation, ed. Peter Kahrel and René van den Berg, 237-266. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Krivoshein de Canses, Natalia and Graziella Corvalán. 1987. El español del Paraguay. Asunción: Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos.
- Laviña, Javier (ed.). 1989. Doctrina para negros: explicación de la doctrina cristiana acomodada a la capacidad de los negros bozales, de Nicolás Duque de Estrada. Barcelona: Sendai.
- Lecompte, Ernesto. 1963. Método práctico da língua mbundu falada no distrito de Benguela. Coimbra: Gráfica de Coimbra.
- Lipski, John. 1993. On the non-creole basis for Afro-Caribbean Spanish. Research Paper No. 24, Latin American Institute, University of New Mexico.
- _____. 1994a. A new perspective on Afro-Dominican Spanish: the Haitian contribution. Research Paper #26, University of New Mexico Latin American Institute.
- _____. 1994b. El español afroperuano: eslabón entre Africa y América. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* 10.179-216
- _____. 1994c. Afro-Portuguese pidgin: separating innovation from imitation. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP), Philadelphia, August 1994.
- _____. 1995. Portuguese language in Angola: luso-creoles' missing link? Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP), San Diego, California, August 1995.
- _____. 1996. Contacto de criollos en el Caribe hispánico: contribuciones al español *bozal*. *América Negra* 11.31-60.
- _____. 1998a. Latin American Spanish: creolization and the African connection. *PALARA* (Publications of The Afro-Latin American Research Association) 2.54-78.
- _____. 1998b. El español *bozal*. *América negra: panorámica actual de los estudios lingüísticos sobre variedades criollas y afrohispanas*, ed. Matthias Perl and Armin Schwegler, 293-327. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- _____. 1999. Creole-to-creole contacts in the Spanish Caribbean: the genesis of Afro Hispanic language. *Publications of the Afro-Latin American Research Association (PALARA)* 3.5-46.
- _____. forthcoming. Panorama del lenguaje afrorioplatense: vías de evolución fonética. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica*, forthcoming.
- Llorente, María Luisa. 1994. Materiales para el estudio del patois de Güiría. Licenciatura thesis, Universidad Católica Andrés Bello, Caracas.

- _____. 1995. El patois de Güiría: una lengua criolla del estado Sucre. Montalbán 28.7-19.
- Lorenzino, Gerardo. 1998. The Angolar creole Portuguese of São Tomé. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Luján, Marta. 1987. Clitic-doubling in Andean Spanish and the theory of case absorption. Language and language use: studies in Spanish, ed. by Terrell Morgan, James Lee, Bill VanPatten, 109-121. Washington: University Press of America.
- Malpica La Barca, Domingo. 1890. En el cafetal. Havana: Tipografía de "Los niños huérfanos."
- Mattos e Silva, Joao de. 1904. Contribuição para o estudo da região de Cabinda. Lisbon: Typographia Universal.
- McLaren, J. 1906. A grammar of the Kaffir language. London: Longmans, Green and Col.
- Maurer, Philippe. 1995. L'angolar: un créole afro-portugais parlé à São Tomé. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Megenney, William. 1990. Africa en Santo Domingo: la herencia lingüística. Santo Domingo: Museo del Hombre Dominicano.
- Mendes, Orlando. 1981. Portagem. Maputo: Edições 70.
- Migeod, Frederick. 1908. The Mende language. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.
- _____. 1911. The languages of West Africa, 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.
- Missionários da Companhia de Jesús. 1964. Elementos de gramática cinyanja. Lisbon: Imprensa Portuguesa.
- Montes Huidobro, Matías. 1987. Teoría y práctica del catedratisimo en Los negros catedráticos de Francisco Fernández. Miami: Editorial Persona.
- Moscoso Puello, Francisco. 1975. Cañas y bueyes. Santo Domingo: Asociación Serie 23.
- Muniagurria, Saturnino. 1967. El guaraní. Buenos Aires: Librería Hachette.
- Muralha, Pedro. 1925. Terras de Africa: t. 1: S. Tomé e Angola. Lisbon: Publicitas.
- Ndongo Esono, Salvador. 1956. Gramática pamué. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos.
- Neves, João Alves das. 1963. Poetas e contistas africanos de expressão portuguesa. São Paulo: Editôra Brasiliense.
- Nze Abuy, Rafael María. 1975. La lengua fañ o Nkobo fañ. Barcelona: Editorial Claret.
- Ortiz López, Luis. 1998a. Huellas etno-sociolingüísticas bozales y afrocubanas. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- _____. 1998b. El sistema verbal del español haitiano en Cuba: implicaciones para las lenguas en contacto en el Caribe. Presented at the 16th annual conference Spanish in the United States/Spanish and Portuguese in Contact with Other Languages, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, February, 1998.
- _____. 1999. El español haitiano en Cuba y su relación con el habla bozal. Lenguas criollos de base lexical española y portuguesa, ed. Klaus Zimmermann, 177-203. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- Pereira, Joaquim António. 1947. Angola, terra portuguesa: acções de guerra, vida no sertão. Lisbon: Expansão Gráfica Livreira, Lda.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, UG and the structure of IP. Linguistic Inquiry 20.365-424.
- Prestol Castillo, Freddy. 1986. Pablo Mamá. Santo Domingo: Taller.

- Postigo de de Bedía, Ana María. 1994. La enunciación negativa en bilingües de Quechua y español. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* 10.355-365.
- Quintão, José Luís. 1951. Gramática de xironga (landim). Lisbon: Agência Geral das Colónias.
- Ramat, P., G. Bernini and P. Molinelli. 1986. La sintassi della negazione germanica e romanza. Parallela II: spetti della sintassi dell'italiano contemporaneo, ed. by K. Lichem, E. Mara, S. Knaller, 237-270. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Rowlands, E. C. 1959. A grammar of Gambian Mandinka. London: University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Ruíz García, Marta. 2000. El español popular del Chocó: evidencia de una reestructuración parcial. Ph. D. dissertation, University of New Mexico.
- Samarin, William. 1967. A grammar of Sango. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sandoval, Alonso de. 1956. De instauranda aethiopum salute; el mundo de la esclavitud negra en América. Bogotá: Impresa Nacional de Publicaciones, facsimile edition.
- Santilli, Maria Aparecida. 1985. Estórias africanas. São Paulo: Editora Atica.7
- Sauvageot, Serge. 1965. Description synchronique d'un dialecte wolof: le parler du Dyolof. Dakar: IFAN.
- Schadeberg, Thilo. 1990. A sketch of Umbundu. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1888. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch I: Allgemeineres über das Negerportugiesische. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 12.242-254.
- Schwegler, Armin. 1983. Predicate negation and word-order change: a problem of multiple causation. *Lingua* 61.297-334.
- _____. 1985-7. Predicate negation in contemporary Brazilian Portuguese: a change in progress. *Orbis* 34 [1991], 187-214.
- _____. 1986. Analyticity and syntheticity: a diachronic perspective with special reference to Romance languages. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- _____. 1988. Word-order changes in predicate negation strategies in Romance languages. *Diachronica* 5.21-58.
- _____. 1991a. El español del Chocó. *América Negra* 2.85-119.
- _____. 1991b. Negation in Palenquero: synchrony. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 6.165-214.
- _____. 1996a. La doble negación dominicana y la génesis del español caribeño. *Hispanic Linguistics* 8.247-315.
- _____. 1996b. "Chi ma ^ŋkongo": lengua y rito ancestrales en El Palenque de San Basilio (Colombia). Frankfurt: Vervuert. 2 vols.
- Smith, Bishop and John Matthews. 1902. A vocabulary with a short grammar of Xilenge. London: Society for Christian Knowledge.
- Sojo, Juan Pablo. 1986. Estudios del folklore venezolano. Los Teques: Biblioteca de Autores y Temas Mirandinos, Instituto Autónomo Biblioteca Nacional y de Servicios de Biblioteca.
- Soler Puig, José. 1975. Bertillón 166. Havana: Editorial de Arte y Literatura.
- Stratford, Billie Dale. 1989. Structure and use of Altiplano Spanish. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Florida.
- Uppendahl, Klaus. 1979. A negação em português. Porto Alegre: Editora da Universidad Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.
- Ussel, Père. 1888. Petite grammaire de la langue fiote, dialecte du Loango. Loango: Imprimerie de la Mission.

- Vennemann, Theo. 1974. Topics, subjects and word order: from SXV to SVX via TVX. Historical linguistics: proceedings of the First International Conference, Edinburgh 1973, ed. by J. Anderson and C. Jones, 339-376. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Warburton, Irene, Prosper Kpotufe, Roland Glover. 1968. Ewe basic course. Bloomington: Indiana University, African Studies Program
- Welmers, William. 1976. A grammar of Vai. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. Negation and clausal structure: a comparative study of Romance languages. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zimmermann, J. 1858. A grammatical sketch of the Akra- or Ga-language. Stuttgart: Basel Missionary Society.

Table 1: Proposed typology of (Afro-) Iberian double negation with *no/não*

LANGUAGE/ DIALECT	Prevailing NEG pattern	Probable source	Proposed trajectory
(Afro-) Cuban/ Dominican Spanish	NEG2/NEG1	Haitian creole	NEG1 > NEG2
Güiria Spanish (Venezuela)	NEG2/NEG1	Trinidad French creole	NEG1 > NEG2
Chocó Spanish	NEG2/NEG1	Palenquero-like proto-creole (?)	NEG3 > NEG2 or NEG1 > NEG2 (or both)
Palenquero	NEG3 (NEG2; NEG1)	Bantu postposed NEG; maybe KiKongo/ kiMbundu double NEG	NEG3 (> NEG2)
(Afro-) Braz- ilian Portuguese	NEG2/NEG3 (NEG1)	kiMbundu/kiKongo double NEG (?)	NEG1 > NEG2 (> NEG3)
Angolan Portuguese	NEG2/NEG1	kiMbundu/kiKongo double NEG	NEG1 > NEG2
Mozambican Portuguese	NEG2/NEG1	local Bantu double NEG; kiKongo (?)	NEG1 > NEG2
S no Tomé Portuguese	NEG2/NEG1	S no tomense, kiKongo- influenced pidgin (?)	NEG1>NEG2 (or NEG2 > NEG1?)
S no Tomé, Annobón creoles	NEG2	kiKongo (?) double NEG	NEG1 > NEG2
Príncipe	NEG3	kiKongo (?) double NEG	NEG1 > NEG2 > NEG3 or NEG3 (> NEG2?)

Table 2: Proposed genealogical relations among double NEG dialects

Spanish ... <i>nada</i>	÷ Caribbean Spanish <i>no ... nada</i>
	÷ Angola/Mozambique Portuguese
kiKongo/kiMbundu	÷ S <i>no</i> Tomé, Príncipe, Annobón creoles
	÷ S <i>no</i> Tomé Portuguese
	÷ Brazil Portuguese
Tupi/Guaraní	÷ Paraguay Spanish double negation
other NEG3 Bantu	÷ Palenquero ÷ Chocó Spanish(?)
Haitian creole	÷ (Afro-) Dominican Spanish
	÷ Afro-Cuban <i>bozal</i> Spanish
Trinidad French creole	÷ Güiria (Venezuela) Spanish
Quechua	÷ peripheral Andean Spanish