

Dat ek so onnosel kon wees!

An insubordination typology for Afrikaans

Peter Dirix (KU Leuven, Centre for Computational Linguistics, Leuven, Belgium)
peter.dirix@kuleuven.be

Abstract

Evans (2007) defines *insubordination* as the conventionalised main clause use of what appear to be formally subordinate clauses. D’Hertefelt (2018) constructed an insubordination typology for six Germanic languages for both complement insubordinate constructions starting with *that* (and its equivalents in the other languages) as well as conditional insubordinate constructions starting with *if*. In this paper, we aim to extend both typologies to include Afrikaans using a corpus investigation and show that Afrikaans is very similar to Dutch with respect to the types of insubordinate constructions that occur, and that together with Dutch, it has the largest number of different types for the investigated constructions. We also investigate the use of insubordination of other subordinators in Afrikaans, both for complement constructions and for some causal and temporal constructions.

Keywords: Germanic languages, insubordination, typology, syntax

Opsomming

Dat ik so onnosel kon wees! Is daar ’n insubordinasietipologie vir Afrikaans?

Evans (2007) definieer *insubordinasie* as die gekonvensionaliseerde gebruik van ’n hoofsin wat met die eerste oogopslag soos ’n bysin lyk. D’Hertefelt het ’n insubordinasietipologie gekonstrueer vir ses Germaanse tale vir insubordinate komplementsinne wat begin met *that* (en ekwivalente in die ander tale) en insubordinate voorwaardelike sinne wat begin met *if* (en ekwivalente in die ander tale). In hierdie artikel gaan ons aan die hand van ’n korpusondersoek vasstel watter insubordinate komplementsinne voorkom in Afrikaans en hoe ons D’Hertefelt se Germaanse insubordinasietipologie kan uitbrei met Afrikaans. Ons sal aantoon dat Afrikaans baie vergelykbaar is met Nederlands op die gebied van die tipes insubordinate konstruksies wat voorkom en dat Afrikaans saam met Nederlands die grootste verskeidenheid besit vir die ondersoekte konstruksies. Ons ondersoek ook die gebruik van insubordinasie vir ander onderskikkings in Afrikaans, sowel vir komplementsinne as vir enige kousale en temporele konstruksies.

Sleutelwoorde: Germaanse tale, insubordinasie, tipologie, sintaksis

How to cite this article:

Dirix, Peter. 2023. “Dat ek so onnosel kon wees! An insubordination typology for Afrikaans”. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Afrikaans Grammar Workshop*, edited by Adri Breed. Potchefstroom: North-West University. pp. 145-170. DOI:10.25388/nwu.25052768

Copyright:



© 2023 Dirix.
Licensed via [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1 Introduction

Evans (2007:367) defines *insubordination* as the conventionalised main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses. It is a widely attested phenomenon, not just limited to Indo-European languages like English, French, Dutch, or Swedish, but that also occurs in languages like Indonesian. In Germanic languages, insubordinate structures are introduced by a subordinating conjunction, and if the language has a specific subordinate word order, it also retains that order, but there is no main clause structure. This can be used to express irritation, as in the following English example (1):

1 *eng* “He’ll go with us to the hospital. Okay?” **As if I had a choice.**

D’Hertefelt (2018) investigated in her Ph.D. thesis two types of insubordination that are rather productive in Germanic languages, i.e. insubordinate complement clauses as in the German example (2) and insubordinate conditional clauses as in the Dutch example (3):

2 *deu* *Dass ihm nur nicht schlecht dabei wird!*
 COMP him only NEG sick with-that become.PRS
 ‘[I hope] that doesn’t make him feel sick!’

3 *nld* *Als je nu niet heel snel oplazert...*
 COND you PRT NEG very fast piss-off.PRS
 ‘If you don’t piss off very quickly...’

She studied these constructions for six languages: English (*eng*), German (*deu*), Dutch (*nld*), Swedish (*swe*), Danish (*dan*), and Icelandic (*isl*).¹ All the examples for these languages and their translations into English in sections 2-3 have been taken from D’Hertefelt (2018).

Next to a description of the phenomenon in these languages, she also investigated the semantics of the two aforementioned types of insubordinate clauses and constructed a typology for them. Unfortunately, Afrikaans was not included in the comparison, as there was no large readily accessible corpus available at the time of her research. This also means there has not been done any extensive research for insubordination in Afrikaans. However, we can easily find examples of this phenomenon, as in (4)-(7):

4 *afr* *Indien jy dalk vergeet het...*
 COND you PRT forget.PPART have.PRS
 ‘If you’d have forgotten...’

5 *afr* *Hoe hy na jou gekyk het.*
 How he to you look.PPART have.PRS
 ‘How he looked at you.’

6 *afr* *Dat ek so onnosel kon wees!*
 COMP I so stupid can.PST be.INF
 ‘That I could have been so stupid!’

¹ For Icelandic, she used examples from literature, for the other languages a corpus investigations, which was combined with a native speaker informer for the Scandinavian languages.

7 *afr* *Dat dit juis nou moet gebeur.*
 COMP it just now must.PRS happen.INF
 'That this should happen just now.'

In this article, we will first introduce D'Hertefelt's typology for complement insubordination (section 2) and conditional subordination (section 3). In section 4 we introduce our corpus study. Then, we investigate by means of a corpus study which types of insubordination occur in Afrikaans and how we can extend the complement insubordination typology (section 5) and the conditional insubordination typology (section 6) to include Afrikaans. In section 7 we study some other cases of insubordination for Afrikaans. We continue with a discussion of the limits of insubordination (section 8) before we draw some final conclusions in section 9.

2 D'Hertefelt's typology for insubordinate complement clauses

In Germanic languages, complement clauses are marked in several ways. The most typical way of introducing a complement clause is using the complementiser *that* in English, *dat* in Dutch (and Afrikaans), *dass* in German, *att* in Swedish, *at* in Danish and *að* in Icelandic. Most of these languages (apart from Dutch and Icelandic) allow for dropping the complementiser at least in some contexts. Furthermore, all the languages also use an alternative complementiser for indirect yes/no questions, i.e. *if* in English, *of* in Dutch (and Afrikaans), *ob* in German, *om* in Danish and Swedish and *hvort* in Icelandic. D'Hertefelt focuses on the *that* type.

2.1 Deontic constructions

The first type of insubordinate complement clauses discussed by D'Hertefelt are *deontic constructions*, i.e. a construction in which a potential state of affairs is evaluated in terms of desirability. She distinguishes *controlled* and *uncontrolled* deontic constructions. The latter refer to a desirable state of affairs, but the potential realisation of this state is suggested to be out of the control of the addressee. These constructions are also called *optatives* or *wishes*. In controlled deontic constructions on the other hand, the addressee is assumed to control the potential realisation. These constructions are also called *imperatives*, *orders*, or *prohibitions*.

2.1.1 Uncontrolled deontic constructions

8 *nld* *Dat dat maar rap gedaan is. ;-)*
 COMP that PRT soon do.PPART be.PRS
 '[I hope] that that may be over soon. [smiley]'

9 *deu* *Daß du dich nur nicht erkältest!*
 COMP you REFL PRT NEG catch-cold.PRS.IND
 '[I hope] that you don't catch a cold.'

10 *eng* *"Blessed indeed," says the Spirit, "that they may rest from their labors, for their deeds follow them!"*

11 *nld* *Dat je nog maar veel mag draaien de komende jaren!!*
 COMP you PRT PRT much may.PRS turn.INF the coming years
 '[I hope] that you may play many more [records] the years to come!!'

- 12 eng Oh, that I only had room in my backyard.
- 13 deu Dass ich mir auch mal so etwas leisten könnte.
 COMP I REFL also once like something afford.INF can.PST.SBJV
 '[I wish] that I could only afford something like that as well.'
- 14 eng Oh, that I told them both a year ago!
- 15 deu Ach, dass ihre Schiffe unsere Ufer doch nur nie erreicht hätten!
 INTJ COMP their ships our shores PRT PRT NEG rech.PPART have.PST.SBJV
 'Oh, if only their ships hadn't reached our shores.'

D'Hertefelt distinguishes four subtypes of uncontrolled deontic constructions. The complement clauses in (8) and (9) are examples of *potential short-term wishes*. In (8), the speaker wishes for the situation to be finished soon and in (9) for the addressee not to get a cold. These refer to a potential state of affairs which the speaker hopes that shall be realised in the near future. This construction only occurs in Dutch and German, uses always an indicative present and always expects a particle like *maar* in Dutch and *bloss* or *nur* in German.

The clauses in (10)-(11) are examples of *potential long-term wishes*. The speaker wishes for the state of affairs to continue for an indefinite period in the future. This subtype does not seem to be possible in the Scandinavian languages. Similarly to the potential short-term wishes, the speaker has the expectation that the wish could be realised. This construction also uses an indicative present and expects a modal auxiliary like *may* in English and *mogen* or *kunnen* in Dutch.

A third subtype, the *irrealis wishes* can be found in examples (12-13). In (12), the speaker expresses that he would have liked to have room for an antenna in his backyard, but this is not the case. In (13), the speaker wishes that he could also afford such a thing. In English and German, the construction is considered old-fashioned. Occurrences have been found in 19th-century Swedish and Danish, but not in modern Scandinavian languages. This construction requires the verb to be in the past tense and often also a modal auxiliary. In German, the past subjunctive is used. When the modal auxiliary is present, it typically expresses a possibility, like *können* in German, *få* in Swedish, and *må* in Danish.

In (14)-(15) we find examples of *counterfactual wishes*. The difference with irrealis wishes lies in the fact that, in the latter case, while it is not very likely according to the expectation of the speaker, these wishes could still be realised technically, while counterfactual wishes cannot be realised anymore. These constructions only occur in English and German and require a pluperfect in combination with a modal auxiliary like *can* in English or a subjunctive in German. A particle like *doch* or *nur* in German and *only* in English often occurs, but is not obligatory.

2.1.2 Controlled deontic constructions

D'Hertefelt distinguishes strong and weak controlled deontic constructions. *Strong controlled deontic constructions* indicate that the speaker issues an order, like in (16) or a prohibition as in (17).

- 16 *nld* *Da ge maar ziet da da snel gespoten is!!!*
 COMP you PRT see.PRS COMP that quickly paint.PPART be.PRS
 'Just make sure it gets painted soon!!!'
- 17 *nld* *[...] en dat ik u niet meer hoor.*
 and COMP I you NEG anymore hear.PRS
 '[...] and don't let me hear you again.'
- 18 *deu* *Dass er mal eben bei mir vorbeikommt.*
 COMP he PRT just by me come-by.PRS.IND
 '[tell him] that he comes to see me.'

These constructions, which only occur in Dutch and German, require a verb in the present tense. They often have the subject in the second person, but also do occur with a third-person subject like in (18).

In *weak controlled deontic constructions* the speaker evaluates a particular state of affairs as desirable and under the control of the addressee. The speaker does not really feel involved in the realisation of the state of affairs though. These constructions only occur in Dutch and express permission ((19)), advice ((20)), or a challenge ((21)).

- 19 *nld* *Ah ja dat hij dat maar doet*
 INTJ COMP he that PRT do.PRS
 'Oh yes, he can do that'
- 20 *nld* *Jan heeft zijn portefeuille verloren. Dat hij misschien eens in zijn achterzak kijkt.*
 Jan have.PRS his wallet lose.PPART COMP he maybe PRT in his back-pocket
 look.PRS
 'Jan has lost his wallet. He could try and check his back pocket.'
- 21 *nld* *dat hij dat maar eens bewijst met cijfers :-)*
 COMP he that PRT PRT prove.PRS with numbers
 'he should prove it with actual data [smiley]'

These constructions are always affirmative and use a present tense in the third person. A permission is typically constructed with the particle *maar*, while an advice often contains (*misschien*) *eens* and a challenge *maar eens*.

2.2 Evaluative constructions

This type of construction evaluates an actual state of affairs in terms of expectedness. Again, D'Hertefelt distinguishes two subtypes: unexpected and expected evaluatives.

2.2.1 Unexpected evaluatives

This construction occurs in all six investigated languages and evaluates the state of affairs as unexpected. The semantics can be marked with explicit markers like *so* in English, *zoiets* 'such a thing' or *überhaupt* 'at all' in Dutch, *überhaupt* 'at all' in German, or *overhovedet* 'at all' or *så meget som* 'so much as' in Danish. In Swedish (*tänk*) (see example (23)) and Danish (*tænk*), one can use a marker that is morphologically similar to the imperative of think, but is interpreted as a particle.

- 22 *nld* *Ja amai, dat zoiets nog kan in 2006...*
 ye s PRT COMP such-a-thing PRT can.PRS in 2006
 'Yeah wow, [I'm amazed] that something like that is still possible in 2006...'
- 23 *swe* *Tänk att något såäckligt nästan kan bli trevligt!*
 think.IMP COMP something so unsavoury almost can.PRS become.INF pleasant
 '[Think] that something so unsavoury can almost become pleasant!'

2.2.2 Expected evaluatives

These constructions evaluate the state of affairs as expected, but also annoying.

- 24 *nld* *Dat u weer zoiets moet overkomen!*
 COMP you again such-a-thing must.PRS happen.INF
 'That something like that should happen to you again!'
- 25 *dan* *Tænk, at hun altid skulle blive forkølet, ...*
 think COMP she always should become.INF cold
 '[How annoying] that she always had to catch a cold, ...'

This type of construction has not been found in English. Danish expected evaluatives are obligatorily preceded by the particle *tænk* 'think', as in (25).

2.3 Assertive constructions

Assertive constructions are used to assert or emphatically confirm that something is the case.

- 26 *swe* *Du är förtjust i Lisbet. — Att jag det är!*
 You be.PRS fond in Lisbet COMP I that be.PRS
 'You are fond of Lisbeth. — I sure am!'
- 27 *nld* *En dat we goed afgesloten hebben...*
 and COMP we good finish.PPART have.PRS
 'We sure finished in style.'

In the data, D'Hertefelt only found examples with *that* constructions in Dutch and Swedish, but constructions with the indirect yes/no complementiser are known in Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and Icelandic.

2.4 Typology for complement insubordination

We can now summarize the findings in Table 1. Dutch and German seem to allow the most types of insubordination, the Scandinavian languages the least.

Table 1: D’Hertefelt’s typology for complement insubordination

			nld	deu	en g	sw e	da n	isl
Deontic	Uncontrolled	Potential short-term wishes	x	x				
		Potential long-term wishes	x	x	x			
		Irrealis wishes		x	x	†	†	
		Counterfactual wishes		x	x			
	Controlled	Strong	x	x				
		Weak	x					
Evaluative	Unexpected		x	x	x	x	x	x
	Expected		x	x		x	x	x
Assertive			x			x		

3 D’Hertefelt’s typology for insubordinate conditional clauses

In Germanic languages, a conditional clause is introduced with the complementiser *if* in English, *als* or *indien* in Dutch, *wenn* in German, *om* in Swedish, *hvis* in Danish, and *ef* in Icelandic.

3.1 Deontic constructions

The first type of insubordinate conditional clauses discussed by D’Hertefelt are *deontic constructions*, i.e. a construction in which a potential state of affairs is evaluated in terms of desirability. Again, she distinguishes *controlled* and *uncontrolled* deontic constructions. The latter refer to a desirable state of affairs, but the potential realisation of this state is suggested to be out of the control of the addressee. These constructions are also called *optatives* or *wishes*. In controlled deontic constructions, the addressee is assumed to control the potential realisation.

3.1.1 Uncontrolled deontic constructions

28	isl	<i>Ef þú bara dettur ekki!</i> COND you PRT fall.PRS.IND NEG 'If only you don't fall!'
29	eng	<i>If only it isn't snowing.</i>
30	nld	<i>Als dat maar goed gegaan is zonder bril!</i> COND it PRT well go.PPART be.PRS without glasses 'If only that went well without glasses!'
31	nld	<i>Als het maar niet zo koud was.</i> COND it PRT NEG so cold be.PST 'If only it wasn't so cold.'
32	deu	<i>Wenn doch Italien nur ein Stückchen etwas von der deutschen Effizienz hätte!</i> COND PRT Italy PRT a piece .DIM something of the German efficiency have.PST.SBJV 'If only Italy had the smallest bit of German efficiency!'

- 33 *deu* *Wenn er doch nur gewusst hätte, was sie dachte.*
 COND he PRT PRT know.PPART have.PST.SBJV what she think.PST
 'If only he had known what she thought.'
- 34 *nld* *Als ik dat toch geweten had...*
 COND I it PRT know.PPART have.PST
 'If only I had known...'

A first subtype are *potential wishes*, i.e. constructions where the speaker evaluates a particular state of affairs as desirable, and indicates that they have no reservations concerning the potential realization. They obligatorily use a present tense and indicative mood and typically express the speaker's wish that something will happen in the future (example (28)), or also that something is happening in the present (e.g. (29)), and even that something might have gone well before the moment of speaking (e.g. (30)). The verification whether the speaker's wish is realised or not, is always in the future though. In addition to the use of present tense forms, potential wishes always use optative particles like *only* in English, *maar* or *toch* in Dutch, *doch*, *bloss* or *nur* in German, *bara* and *ändå* in Swedish, and *bara* in Icelandic. No examples of this subtype were found in Danish.

A second subtype are *irrealis wishes*, in which the speaker evaluates the state of affairs as desirable and not yet true at the moment of speaking, but its potential realisation as improbable (examples (31) and (32)). The verb is in the past tense (a subjunctive for German and Icelandic), and in addition they always have optative particles like *only* in English, *maar* or *toch* in Dutch, *doch* or *nur* in German, *bara* or *ändå* in Swedish, *bare* in Danish and *aðeins* in Icelandic.

Finally, the third subtype are *counterfactual wishes* again, in which the speaker wishes that something had happened in the past, but indicates that they know this can no longer be realised (examples (33) and (34)). The verb is in the pluperfect (a subjunctive for German and Icelandic), and in addition they always have optative particles like *only* in English, *maar* or *toch* in Dutch, *doch*, *bloss* or *nur* in German, *bara* or *ändå* in Swedish, *bare* in Danish and *aðeins* in Icelandic.

3.1.2 Controlled deontic constructions

- 35 *dan* *Hvis du kort kan give læserne en intro till dig selv?*
 COND you briefly can.PRS give.INF readers.DEF a intro to you REFL
 'If you can briefly introduce yourself to our readers?'
- 36 *nld* *Nou, als ik misschien even mijn vriendin mag bellen?*
 PRT COND I maybe briefly my friend may.PRS call.INF
 'If I could perhaps just call my friend?'
- 37 *deu* *Wenn du es wagst sie nur anzurühren!!*
 COND you it dare.PRS.IND her PRT touch.INF
 'If you dare to even touch her!!'

D’Hertefelt distinguishes speaker-centred and addressee-centred constructions. Within the first category, we can distinguish *requests* and *threats*. Both subtypes occur in all six investigated languages.

Requests (examples (35)-(36)) can be subdivided in requests for action and requests for permission. They often use modal verbs like *can*, *could* and *may* in English, *kunnen*, *willen* or *kunnen* in Dutch, *wollen* or *dürfen* in German, *kan* or *må* in Danish, *få* in Swedish, and *mætti* in Icelandic, but also contain markers that indicate tentativeness like *maybe* or *perhaps* in English, *misschien* in Dutch, *vielleicht* in German, and *kanski* in Icelandic, brevity like *just* or *for a moment* in English or *even* in Dutch or politeness like *graag* or *alsjeblieft* in Dutch and *please* in English.

Threats, like in (37), refer to a potential state of affairs which is controlled by the addressee and evaluated as undesirable by the speaker. These can be expressed by using an action-initiating verb like *dare* in English, *wagen* or *durven* in Dutch, and *wagen* in German, or using scalar expressions like *zelfs maar* ‘even’ in Dutch, *nur* ‘only’ in German or *så mycket som* ‘as much as’ in Swedish. They usually have some elliptical intonation, suggesting that a consequent clause will follow.

Addressee-centred constructions refer to an action which the speaker evaluates as desirable for the addressee. We can distinguish *offers* and *suggestions*.

38	nld	maar als ge hulp kunt gebruiken of	
		but COND you help can.PRS use.INF or	
		‘but if you can use some help or...’	
39	nld	Als we vanavond nu eens een kampvuur maken.	
		COND we tonight PRT PRT a campfire make.PRS	
		‘What if we build a campfire tonight?’	

Just like threats, offers (example (38)) usually have an elliptical intonation, suggesting that a consequent clause will follow. They occur in the data in English, Dutch, German, and Swedish, and often use modal verbs like *can* in English, *kunnen* in Dutch, and *kunna* in Swedish.

Suggestions (e.g. (39)) only seem to occur in Dutch. The speaker proposes an action which they think might be desirable for the addressee, but also leaves the decision to the addressee. This construction uses the particle *eens* or the particule sequence *nu eens* obligatorily.

3.2 Evaluative constructions

The second type of in subordinate conditional clauses are again *evaluative constructions*, i.e. a construction in which a potential state of affairs is evaluated in terms of expectedness. D’Hertefelt distinguishes *remarkable*, *lower-limit* and *absurd evaluatives*.

3.2.1 Remarkable evaluatives

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as remarkable, either in a positive or a negative way.

- 40 *nld* *Allee jong, als ge hier mee kunt leren rijden...*
 INTJ boy COND you here with can.PRS learn.INF drive.INF
 'Come on, if you can learn how to drive in this car...'
- 41 *nld* *Als we vanavond nu eens een kampvuur maken.*
 COND we tonight PRT PRT a campfire make.PRS
 'What if we build a campfire tonight?'

There are no formal grounds to predict whether a particular construction entails a positive or negative evaluation and the expectation will depend on contextual clues. This type occurs in English, Dutch, and German.

3.2.2 Lower-limit evaluatives

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as negative and is implicitly compared to even worse alternatives.

- 42 *deu* *Wenn ich den schon sehe*
 COND I that PRT see.PRS.IND
 'Just seeing him [makes me sick]'
- 43 *nld* *Als ik daar nu alleen al aan denk!*
 COND I there now only PRT about think.PRS
 'Even thinking about it [is awful]'

These constructions are only found in Dutch and German and use contrastive particles like *alleen al* 'only' (Dutch) and *schon* 'just' (German).

3.2.3 Absurd evaluatives

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as absurd, and signal that the speaker thinks that the opposite is the case.

- 44 *deu* *Wenn das nicht schön ist!*
 COND it NEG beautiful be.PRS.IND
 'If that isn't beautiful!'
- 45 *nld* *Als dat al niet meer kan!*
 COND that PRT NEG anymore can.PRS
 'If even that is not allowed anymore!'

This construction occurs in English, Dutch, German, and Swedish. In the latter two languages, it is limited to a more or less fixed form *if this isn't X*.

3.3 Assertive constructions

Just like for complement clauses, assertive constructions are used to assert that something is the case. For conditional in subordinate constructions, D'Hertefelt distinguishes three subtypes, i.e. assertion of the occurrence of an event, of identification and of qualification.

3.3.1 Assertion of the occurrence of an event

46 eng *The wretch! If he has not smashed the window!*

47 nld *Als ik het niet dacht!*
COND I it NEG think.PST
'If I didn't think so!'

These constructions occur in English and Dutch, but in Dutch the only example seems to be the fixed phrase (47). English constructions are deemed to be archaic, and seem to require a perfect or a past tense. They refer to a negative state of affairs, but are used to communicate the opposite.

3.3.2 Assertion of identification

48 nld *Ierse als dat de Yonii niet is :)*
look COND that the Yonii NEG be.PRS
'Look here, if that isn't Yonii'

49 eng *Well well, if it isn't the first lady of the American Theatre.*

These assertions again have negative polarity but are used to indicate the opposite. They occur in English, Dutch, Swedish, and Icelandic.

3.3.3 Assertion of qualification

50 nld *als er nu één iemand verstand van maximaal abblaffen heeft...*
COND there PRT one someone understanding of maximally bark.INF have.PRS
'If there's one person who knows about barking...'

51 eng *Well if ever there was a loss we can afford...*

These constructions occur in English and Dutch. They invoke an implied consequent which refers to an entity that is a prototypical instance of this qualification. They seem to use some typical formal markers like *ever* in English and *nu* 'now' in Dutch.

3.4 Argumentative constructions

Argumentative constructions are in subordinate conditional clauses that serve to justify something which was said in the previous discourse.

3.4.1 Direct arguments

52 nld *Ik zie mezelf niet over twee jaar een vriend van zeventien hebben. [...] Maar ja als ze verliefd is.*
I see.PRS myself NEG over two year a friend of seventeen have.INF But yes
COND she in-love be.PST
'I don't see myself having a seventeen-year-old boyfriend in two years time. [...] But well, if she is in love.'

53 dan *"Okay, hvis du siger det."*
okay COND you say.PRS it
'Okay, if you say so.'

Direct arguments are constructions which justify an element of the preceding discourse by referring to given or known information. They do not use specific formal markers, but they are often preceded by a contrastive conjunction like *maar* 'but' in Dutch or *aber* 'but' in German. These constructions occur in all considered languages. However, Danish and Icelandic only allow formulaic constructions like the Danish example in (53).

3.4.2 Indirect arguments

- 54 nld *ja die CLB's die dan zeiden van uhm ja stuurt ze toch maar naar 't eerste ... studiejaar [...] uh als dat nu nog zo uh een grote flinke zou zijn*
 yes those CLBs REL then say.PST of uhm yes send.IMP her anyway to the first
 grade uh COND that PRT still PRT uh a big strong would be.INF
 'Yes, the centres for pupil support said, do send her to the first grade. [...] If at least she were big and strong.'
- 55 eng *Thanks guys for all the kind words. I knew you'd understand. **If at least it had been an interesting model or on that I wanted.** The seller offered me a discount for it but I refused since I don't really like the G-7700 – hate the shiny bezel ring.*

These constructions occur in English, Dutch, and Swedish. They always use past tense forms, which signals that speaker either knows or thinks that the state of affairs in the conditional is not true. A particle like *nu* 'now' in Dutch or *alltid* 'always' in Swedish frequently occurs. They are also often followed by clauses specifying the contrasting knowledge.

3.5 Reasoning constructions

The final category of insubordinate conditional clauses contains construction that form the starting point for an invited line of reasoning.

- 56 nld *En als hij wel komt?*
 and COND he PRT come.PRS.IND
 'And if he does come?'
- 57 eng ***If Rickie Oppenheimer hadn't picked up the wrong valise...** But Rickie shouldn't have been carrying a brief-case that morning.*

This type occurs in all considered languages but Danish. The speaker introduces a potential scenario and invites the addressee to comment on the consequences. When reasoning construction are directed to the addressee, they often have a question intonation.

3.6 Typology for conditional insubordination

We can now summarize the findings in Table 2. Dutch seems to allow the most types of conditional insubordination, Danish the least.

Table 2: D’Hertefelt’s typology for complement insubordination

			nld	deu	eng	swe	dan	isl
Deontic	Uncontrolled	Potential wishes	x	x	x		x	x
		Irrealis wishes	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Counterfactual wishes	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Controlled	Requests	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Threats	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Offers	x	x	x	x		
	Suggestions	x						
Evaluative	Remarkable	x	x	x				
	Lower-limit	x		x				
	Absurd	x	x	x	x			
Assertive	Occurrence of event	x		x				
	Identification	x		x	x			x
	Qualification	x		x				
Argumentative	Direct argument	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Indirect argument	x		x	x			
Reasoning		x	x	x	x			x

4 Corpus study for Afrikaans

In order to investigate insubordination for Afrikaans, we should repeat D’Hertefelt’s work for similar constructions in an Afrikaans corpus and classify the results according to her typology, in order to compare Afrikaans with the other Germanic languages. It would have been great to have access to a treebank, but the only one available for Afrikaans, AfriBooms (Augustinus et al., 2016) with only 45,000 words, is far too small and does not contain the right genre of texts to study this phenomenon.

Despite the fact that it does not contain syntactic annotations, the VivA corpus portal (VivA, 2020) gives access to the largest corpus of Afrikaans and is currently the best choice for this task. This database contains more than 200 million words of all types of genres of mainly written Afrikaans (manuals, novels, laws, Bible texts, Wikipedia, etc.) and is automatically lemmatised (with an accuracy of about 90%) and tagged for part-of-speech (with an accuracy of about 75%). The portal gives the possibility to search the corpus on the basis of lemma, word form, part of speech and combinations thereof. Because of the lack of syntactic annotation and many errors in the part-of-speech tags, we have to go through the hits of the queries manually to filter out the false positives.

5 Results for insubordinate complement constructions in Afrikaans

For this purpose, we started with searching for sentences starting with the complementiser *dat*, the Afrikaans equivalent of *that* as discussed in section 2, followed by two to seven words before the end of the clause, in order to limit the number of false hits. We got 2,194 hits, of

which still a substantial number were invalid. After manually curing a subset of 500 random hits, we found about 100 real occurrences of insubordination.

5.1 Deontic constructions

5.1.1 Uncontrolled deontic constructions

D’Hertefelt identified four subtypes of uncontrolled deontic constructions.

58	<i>afr</i>	<p><i>Wel, wat Boesman-Stories vir die teenswoordige betref, word hul deur die</i> <small>PRT, what Bushman-stories for the present concern.PRS become.PRS they by the</small> <i>gros van ons lesers bejeën as bloot vermaak vir kinders. Dat dit so mag</i> <small>bulk of our readers treat.PPART as bare amusement for children. COMP it so may.PRS</small> wees! <small>be.INF</small> ‘Well, what concerns Bushman stories for the present, they are considered the bulk of our readers as pure amusement for children. [I hope] that it may be like that!’</p>
59	<i>afr</i>	<p><i>Dat ons lewe mag verander.</i> <small>COMP our life may.PRS change</small> ‘[I hope] that our lives may change.’</p>

In Afrikaans we found, just like in Dutch, examples of both forms of potential wishes. Utterance (58), the only example in the corpus of a potential short-term wish, is expressing a wish for the present. Example (59) is a potential long-term wish, as the speaker hopes that their lives might change forever, so indefinitely. We found a few of those. We have not found any examples of irrealis and counterfactual wishes. Just like in the other Germanic languages, this construction uses the present tense and for long-term wishes, and the modal auxiliary *mag* can be used.

5.1.2 Controlled deontic constructions

There are a few examples of strong controlled deontic constructions in the corpus, e.g. (60).

60	<i>afr</i>	<p><i>Dat hy die walk of shame doen.</i> <small>COND he the walk-of-shame do.PRS</small> ‘He should do the walk of shame.’</p>
61	<i>afr</i>	<p><i>Dat ’n mens moet voel om te leer.</i> <small>COND a human must.PRS feel PRT to learn</small> ‘A human should feel in order to learn.’</p>

We did not find any weak controlled deontic constructions through the corpus portal, but a native speaker of Afrikaans at the Zurich Workshop on Afrikaans Linguistics (2021) suggested (61) as an example of an advice that could be seen as such a construction.

5.2 Evaluative constructions

5.2.1 Unexpected evaluatives

These constructions evaluate the actual state of affairs as unexpected.

- 62 *afr* *Dat dit juis nou moet gebeur.*
COND it just now must.PRS happen
'That this should happen just now.'
- 63 *afr* *Dat ek so onnosel kon wees!*
COND I so stupid can.PST be.INF
'That I could be so stupid!'
- 64 *afr* *Dat sy dit wragtig nou eers beseft.*
COND she it really now first realize.PRS
'That she only just realizes this now.'

This type is the most common and the easiest to identify amongst the occurrences of insubordination in Afrikaans. We observe the presence of partikels like *juis*, *so*, *eers* and *wragtig/wraggies*.

5.2.2 Expected evaluatives

These constructions evaluate the actual state of affairs as expected and annoying.

- 65 *afr* *Dat jy weer eens jou hele toekoms wil weggooi en dit ter wille van...*
COND you again once your complete future want.PRS throw-away.INF and it because-of
'[How annoying] that you want to throw away your future once again and this because of...'

In this example, the speaker expects that the addressee will throw away their future because this is not the first time this happens. There were only a few examples of this type.

5.3 Assertive constructions

Assertive constructions are used to assert or emphatically confirm that something is the case.

- 66 *afr* *Dat sy hom waaragtig so kan oorstuur!*
COND she him really PRT can.PRS send-around.INF
'That she is really able to send him around!'
- 67 *afr* *Dat 'n laatlammetjie nou so kan rys!*
COND a late-born PRT PRT can.PRS rise.INF
'That a late-born child is able to raise oneself so much!'

The distinction between unexpected evaluatives and assertive constructions is not always easy to make. This type is the second most common in the corpus data.

5.4 Afrikaans in D'Hertefelt's typology

We can now extend D'Hertefelt's typological table for insubordinate complement clauses to Afrikaans. On the basis of the corpus study we can determine that Afrikaans covers the same types and subtypes as Dutch.

Table 3: D’Hertefelt’s typology for complement insubordination including Afrikaans

			nld	deu	eng	swe	dan	isl	afr
Deontic	Uncontrolled	Potential short-term wishes	x	x					x
		Potential long-term wishes	x	x	x				x
		Irrealis wishes		x	x	†	†		
		Counterfactual wishes		x	x				
	Controlled	Strong	x	x					x
		Weak	x						x
Evaluative	Unexpected		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Expected		x	x		x	x	x	x
Assertive			x			x			x

6 Results for insubordinate conditional constructions in Afrikaans

For this purpose, we started with searching for sentences starting with the complementisers *as* and *indien*, the Afrikaans equivalent of *if* as discussed in section 3, again followed by two to seven words in order to limit the number of false hits. For *indien* we found about 1,300 hits, but after curing this only about 30 real cases of insubordination remained. For *as* we found about 7,800 hits. We reviewed 500 random hits and got about 100 real cases of insubordination. Extrapolating this, we see that it is almost three times as frequent as complement insubordination.

6.1 Deontic constructions

6.1.1 Uncontrolled deontic constructions

D’Hertefelt identified three subtypes of uncontrolled deontic constructions.

68	<i>afr</i>	<i>As iemand tog net wil inkom.</i> COND someone PRT just want.PRS come in 'If someone would just come in.'
69	<i>afr</i>	<i>As sy pa net wil ophou drink.</i> COND his father PRT want.PRS stop.INF drink.INF 'If his father just would stop drinking.'
70	<i>afr</i>	<i>As ek maar só kon ontroer!</i> COND I PRT so can.PST move.INF 'If I could only move people like that!'
71	<i>afr</i>	<i>As dit maar so was!</i> COND this PRT so be.PST 'If this were only true!'
72	<i>afr</i>	<i>As hulle maar net geweet het hoe sadisties hy is...</i> COND they PRT PRT know.PPART have.PRS how sadistic he be.PRS 'If they had only known how sadistic he is.'

In Afrikaans we found examples of potential wishes, like (68) and (69). Typical particles are *tog*, *net*, and *maar*. This construction uses the present tense, and often uses the modal verb *wil*. We also found irrealis constructions like (70) and (71), which use the same typical particles, but a past tense. (72) is an example of a counterfactual wish, but as Afrikaans has no pluperfect, a past tense is being used here as well, together with the typical particles *tog*, *net*, and *maar*. This is the most common type of conditional insubordination in Afrikaans.

6.1.2. Controlled deontic constructions

73	<i>afr</i>	<i>As jy my sal verskoon.</i> COND you me shall.PRS excuse 'If you would excuse me.'
74	<i>afr</i>	<i>As jy nou nie ophou raas nie...</i> COND you PRT NEG stop rage NEG 'If you don't stop raging...'
75	<i>afr</i>	<i>Dis 'n vergadering. As jy wil praat.</i> This is a meeting COND you want.PRS talk. 'This is a meeting. If you'd want to talk...'
76	<i>afr</i>	<i>As jy nou hier kan wegkom...</i> COND you PRT here can.PRS get away 'If you could get away from here...'

D'Hertefelt distinguishes speaker-centred and addressee-centred constructions. We found a few examples of requests ((73), offers ((75)) and suggestions ((76)) in the data. However, we did not encounter any examples of threats in the corpus portal, but attendees at the 7th Ghent Colloquium on Afrikaans (2022) could imagine examples like (74). Requests and offers use modals like *sal* or *wil*, while threats and suggestions use particles like *nou*.

6.2 Evaluative constructions

6.2.1 Remarkable evaluatives

77	<i>afr</i>	<i>As oom Niek Malan dit moet weet!</i> COND uncle Niek Malan this must.PRS know.INF 'If uncle Niek Malan would know this!'
----	------------	---

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as remarkable, either in a positive or a negative way. We found a few examples in Afrikaans, like (77).

6.2.2 Lower-limit evaluatives

78	<i>afr</i>	<i>Indien dit so voortgaan...</i> COND this so continue.PRS 'If it continues like this ...'
79	<i>afr</i>	<i>As dit darem waar is...</i> COND this really true be.PRS 'If this is really true...'

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as negative and is implicitly compared to even worse alternatives. We found a few examples like (78) and (79), but unlike in Dutch or German, such instances do not seem to use particular particles.

6.2.3 Absurd evaluatives

80	<i>afr</i>	<i>As dit nie alles tekens is nie!</i>
		COND this NEG all signs be.PRS NEG
		'If these aren't all signs!'
81	<i>afr</i>	<i>Indien ons nie nou "wow"!</i>
		COND we NEG PRT wow
		'If we don't say wow now!'

This type of construction is used to evaluate a particular state of affairs as absurd, and that the speaker thinks that the opposite is the case. We found a few examples like (80) and (81).

6.3 Assertive constructions

6.3.1 Assertion of the occurrence of an event

82	<i>afr</i>	<i>as ek dit nie gedink het terwyl ek kook nie lol</i>
		COND I this NEG thought.PPART have.PRS while I cook.PRS NEG lol
		'If I hadn't thought so while I was cooking'

It looks only fixed constructions like (82) occur in Afrikaans. They didn't occur in our data, but we found an example in an online blog.

6.3.2 Assertion of identification

83	<i>afr</i>	<i>As dit meneer Roux nie is</i>
		COND this mister Roux NEG be.PRS
		'If this isn't mister Roux'

Again we didn't find any examples in the data, but attendees at the 7th Ghent colloquium on Afrikaans (2022) could imagine examples like (83).

6.3.3 Assertion of qualification

84	<i>afr</i>	<i>As daar nou 'n gesig is wat ik heeltmal sal opvreet.</i>
		COND there PRT a face be.PRS I completely shall.PRS eat
		'If there's one face I would love to eat completely'

These constructions invoke an implied consequent which refers to an entity that is a prototypical instance of this qualification. In Afrikaans the marker *nou* is used, as in (84).

6.4 Argumentative constructions

Argumentative constructions are insubordinate conditional clauses that serve to justify something which was said in the previous discourse.

6.4.1 Direct arguments

85 *afr* *Kyk, inflasie maak 'n mens so die jodie in soos Eskom se beurtkrag (as daar nou al ooit 'n versagting was...)*
 Look.INF i nflation make.PRS a human so the devil in like Eskom 's shedding COND there
 PRT PRT ever a excuse be.PST
 'Look, inflation makes a person really angry, just like Eskom's load shedding (if there ever was an excuse...)'

Direct arguments are constructions which justify an element of the preceding discourse by referring to given or known information. We did not find any examples in the corpus data, but encountered (85) in a *Maroela* news article.

6.4.2 Indirect arguments

86 *afr* *Sy gaan in ekstase wees, net reg om te begin brei. Indien sy nou 'n breier was.*
 she go.PRS in ecstasy be.PRS just right PRT to begin.INF train COND she PRT a trainer
 be.PST
 'She is going to be in raptures, just right in order to start training. If she were only a trainer.'

(86) is an example of an indirect argument. It is indeed using the past tense, and contains the particle *nou*.

6.5 Reasoning constructions

87 *afr* *Maar wat as dit andersom is?*
 but what COND it the other way around be.PRS
 'But what if it is the other way around?'

88 *afr* *As die sekuriteitsmagte nie nó?*
 COND the security-forces NEG know
 'But what if the security forces don't know?'

The final category of insubordinate conditional clauses contains construction that form the starting point for an invited line of reasoning. We encountered several examples, like (87) and (88).

6.6 Afrikaans in D'Hertefelt's typology

We can now extend D'Hertefelt's typological table for insubordinate conditional clauses to Afrikaans. On the basis of the corpus study we can determine that Afrikaans again covers the same types and subtypes as Dutch.

Table 4: D’Hertefelt’s typology for conditional insubordination including Afrikaans

			nld	deu	eng	swe	dan	isl	afr
Deontic	Uncontrolled	Potential wishes	x	x	x		x	x	x
		Irrealis wishes	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Counterfactual wishes	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Controlled	Requests	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Threats	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
		Offers	x	x	x	x			x
		Suggestions	x					x	
Evaluative	Remarkable		x	x	x				x
	Lower-limit		x		x				x
	Absurd		x	x	x	x			x
Assertive	Occurrence of event		x		x				x
	Identification		x		x	x			x
	Qualification		x		x				x
Argumentative	Direct argument		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Indirect argument		x		x	x			x
Reasoning			x	x	x	x			x

7 More results for Afrikaans

We decided to go beyond what D’Hertefelt investigated for the six languages and have a look at other subordinators in Afrikaans. For this purpose we also selected sentences with the interrogative subordinators *hoe* ‘how’, *hoekom* ‘why’, *wie* ‘who(m)’, *wat* ‘what’, and *of* ‘if, whether’ as well as the comparative subordinator *soos* ‘as, like’, the temporal subordinators *toe en wanneer* ‘when’, and the causal subordinator *omdat* ‘because’. We applied the same heuristics as for sections 5 and 6 by looking at sentences with two to seven words following the subordinator. Again, a large part of data (between 500 and 2200 hits depending on the subordinator) did not really exemplify insubordination and had to be discarded. A majority of the hits occurred in religious texts.

7.1 Subordination in interrogative complements

Not much work on these seems to have been done before. Rosemayer and Sansiñena (2019) discuss the discourse functions for insubordination of *wh*-interrogatives in Spanish. A large comparative study for Germanic languages has not been done yet.

7.1.1 Indirect questions

89 afr **Hoe ons die maande deurgelewe het?** Neef, vra my niet!
 How we the months pass.PPAST have.PRS cousin ask.IMP me NEG
 ‘How we lived through the months? Cousin, don’t ask!’

- 90 *afr* *Probeer Du Toit se resep vir pronto-pronto piesangbrood met sjokolade-stukkies.*
 Try.IMP Du Toit 's recipe for pronto-pronto banana bread with chocolate pieces
Hoekom ek dit pronto-pronto noem?
 Why I this pronto-pronto call
 'Try Du Toit's recipe for pronto-pronto banana bread with little pieces of chocolate.
 Why do I call this pronto-pronto?'
- 91 *afr* *Die Chinese winkeltjie, die toko, is 'n baie belangrike onderdeel van die ekonomie...*
 The Chinese shop the toko is a very important part of the economy
Of hulle in vrede saamleef? Amper té arbeidsaam.
 Whether they in peace live-together.PRS almost too actively
 'The Chinese little shop, called took, is a very important part of the economy. Whether they live together in peace? Almost too industriously.'
- 92 *afr* *Wat ek deesdae lees?*
 What I nowadays read.PRS
 'What am I reading nowadays?'
- 93 *afr* *Hoe lank het Ruben dan na haar gesit en kyk voordat hy die foto geneem het? Hoekom hy niks gesê het nie?*
 How long have.PRS Ruben then to her sit.PPART and watch.INF before he the photo
 take.PPART have.PRS why he nothing say.PPART have.PRS NEG
 'For how long did Ruben sit and watch before he took the picture? Why didn't he say anything?'

A majority of the examples for all of these subordinators seem to be indirect questions without a main clause, which could be hypothesised as *Jy vra...* 'You're asking...'. Basically, the speaker is asking the question before the addressee can ask it, or at least assumes the addressee is wondering about this. The addressee can also be the speaker reflecting about themselves, like in (93). These can be called *anticipatory questions*. Only for *wie* we did not encounter any examples like this.

Another type of questions are questions asking for an explanation or a repetition of the previous discourse.

- 94 *afr* *"Ek ook nie, maar jy weet hoe dit is."* **"Hoe wat is?"**
 I also NEG but you know.PRES how it be.PRS how what be.PRS
 "'Neither do I, but you know how it is.'" "How what is?"
- 95 *afr* *"Jy weet hoekom dit is."* **"Hoekom wat is?"**
 you know.PRES why it be.PRS why what be.PRS
 "'You know why it is.'" "Why what is?"

In this case, the second speaker does not know (or pretends to not know) exactly what the first speaker means, and asks for an elaboration. These are called *explanatory questions*. We only found examples with *hoe* in the data but in principle this should also be possible for *hoekom* insubordination, as in this hypothetical example (95).

This type has also been used as a title of an article, a book and a song, vid. Nadia Vorster's song *Hoe jy lyk* 'How you look like' or Tim du Plessis's article *Hoe ons klink en lyk in 2021* 'How we sound and look like in 2021' in *Rapport*.

7.1.2 Assertions

- 96 *afr* *Hoe ek sweet ná 'n halfuur!*
 how I sweat after a half-hour
 'How do I sweat after half an hour!'
- 97 *afr* *Oukei, hoekom ek van die plek hou!*
 okay why I of the place love.PRS
 'Okay, how I love this place!'
- 98 *afr* *Wat hy nie alles sou wil nie!*
 what he NEG everything should want NEG
 'What kinds of everything he wouldn't like to have!'

This construction is again used to assert or empathically state that something is true. The polarity might be negative, but still mean the opposite, as shown in (98).

7.1.3 Generalisations and acquiescent constructions

- 99 *afr* *Wat dit is, weet hy nie, maar dis njam! Wat dit ook al beteken.*
 what it be.PRS know.PRS he NEG but this-be.PRS yummy what it PRT PRT mean.PRS
 'What this is, he doesn't know, but it is yummy!. Whatever this means.'
- 100 *afr* *Wie dit ook al gedoen het, waag baie. Wie dit ookal mag wees.*
 who it PRT PRT do.PPART have.PRS risk.PRS much who it PRT may.PRES be.INF
 'Whoever did it, has risked a lot. Whoever this may be.'

This type of construction is used to generalize or express acquiescence with something mentioned previously in the discourse. It usually contains the particles *ook al*. We encounter this with the wh-interrogatives *wie* and *wat*.

A particular construction can be found with *of*: it always contains two parts, the former starting with *of*, the latter part always *of nie*.

- 101 *afr* *Of dit nou die waarheid is of nie*
 whether it PRT the truth be.PRS or NEG
 '[...] Whether this is the truth or not.'

7.2 Comparative adverbial insubordination

A large comparative study for adverbial insubordination for Germanic languages has not been done yet. Royo Viñuales and Van linden (2022) discuss their frequency in French and Spanish. Afrikaans uses the subordinators *soos* 'as, like'.

- 102 *afr* *Jy weet mos vrouwmense [...] praat nie oor sulke goed nie. Soos dit hoort!*
 you know.PRS PRT women talk.PRS NEG about such stuff NEG COMP it
hoort!
 behave.PRS
 'You know surely that women don't talk about that kind of stuff. As it should be!'

103 afr "Kners op jou tande!" "Soos u sê, mynheer."
 grate.PRS on your teeth COMP you say.PRS sir
 "Gnash your teeth!" "As you say, Sir."

It seems this construction is used to assert or state emphatically something that was mentioned earlier in the discourse, either by the speaker as in (102) or by the other party as in (103).

7.3 Temporal adjuncts

A large comparative study of insubordination of temporal adjuncts for Germanic languages has not been done yet. Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2023) claim that insubordination for temporal clauses does not exist in American English, since they claim that in order for a clause to be considered as real insubordination, three conditions have to be fulfilled:

- the clause forms a free-standing, prosodic unit on its own;
- the clause implements a discrete social action in its sequential context;
- the clause is interpretable and actionable in the absence of a main clause.

The last condition is actually never true for temporal clauses, as they restrict the temporal validity of something, but what event or situation is being restricted is not clear unless the host is taken into consideration. The second condition means that the action is distinct from the action implemented by the clause that it temporally frames, and this might or might not be fulfilled in the case of temporal adjuncts.

Afrikaans uses the subordinators *toe* en *wanneer* 'when'.

104 afr "Wanneer?" "Toe ons baklei het."
 when when we fight.PPAST have.PRS
 "When?" "When we had a fight.'

105 afr "Wanneer bring jy haar 'n bietjie diékant toe vir 'n drankie?" "Wanneer jy
 when bring.PRS you her a bit this-way for a drink when you
 ordentlike wyn kry. [...]
 decent wine get.PRS
 "When are you going to bring her over here for a drink?" "When you procure decent
 wine. [...]"

The examples we encountered were basically all answers to *when*-questions. Note that *toe* can only refer to events in the past, while *wanneer* can refer to events in both the past and the future. If one looks at (105), it is clear we cannot interpret the answer to the question this without the absence of the main clause, which is actually embedded in the question. The action however, procuring decent wine, is independent from bringing the person over for a drink.

7.4 Causal adjuncts

A large comparative study of insubordination of causal adjuncts for Germanic languages has not been done yet. Higashiizumi (2012) discussed the historical development of causal insubordinates in Modern English. Afrikaans uses the subordinator *omdat* 'because'.

106 afr *“Maar hoekom?” “Omdat sy haar man wou straf.”*
 but why because she her husband want.PST punish.INF
 “But why?” “Because she wanted to punish her husband.”

The examples we encountered were basically all answers to *why*-questions. Again, one could argue that the same holds as for temporal insubordinate structures and that this is not really insubordination, because at least the third condition, the interpretability and actionability, would never be fulfilled.

8 Boundaries of insubordination

About 80% of the hits we got from the corpus portal that looked at first sight as insubordination, cannot actually be classified as such.

107 afr *Hou jy hiervan? Dat ek aan jou vat?*
 love.PRS you of-this COND I on you touch.PRS
 ‘Do you like this? That I touch you?’

108 afr *Ook die kwessie dat Annie klaarblyklik nie dood is nadat sy haar dogter Armandine in die Kaap afgelaai het. Dat sy weer getrou het.*
 Also the question COND Annie apparently NEG dead be.PRS after she her daughter
 Armandine in the Cape drop.PPAST have.PRS COND she again marry.PPAST have.PRS
 “Also the question that Annie apparently didn’t die after she dropped her daughter Armandine at the Cape. That she married again.’

109 afr *Ek sou gegaan het. As dit ek was.*
 I would go.PPART have.PRS COND it I be.PST
 ‘I would have gone. If it were me.’

The bold sentences look like they are independently used subclauses, but they could be connected to a previous sentence that is a main clause. This phenomenon is typical for direct speech and dialogues in novels. About 20% of this type of hits is interrogative. We think this is mainly a matter of the author’s choice where to put the punctuation and is not really representing the independent use of a subclause construction. This problem seems to general for all languages, and D’Hertefelt actually spends a chapter on this.

In general, insubordination seems to occur mainly in spoken language, literature (and then in particular as direct speech), and in religious texts (in particular written out sermons). Therefore, we encountered just a low number of real in subordinations in the corpus, as it contains mostly written texts and does not seem to be part of scientific or formal language use. In the end there might be a few thousand cases in the whole corpus of more than 200 million words, but for some categories there will still be just a few examples, or even none.

There is also the point made by Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2023) that in order for a clause to be considered as real insubordination, three conditions have to be fulfilled:

- the clause forms a free-standing, prosodic unit on its own;
- the clause implements a discrete social action in its sequential context;
- the clause is interpretable and actionable in the absence of a main clause.

These are rather new conditions and we still need to investigate whether all mentioned examples in sections 2-3 and 5-6 would fulfil both the second and third condition. However, one could also see this as a matter of definition of insubordination.

Another problem which is typically Afrikaans, is how to classify sentences with *lat* or *laat*. The form *lat* is in some varieties of Afrikaans a pronunciation or alternative variant of *dat* (Paardekooper, 1990), but we have not found any occurrences of *lat* in the corpus, probably because it is not considered standard language. In this case, it might also be homophonous with the verb *laat*.

110 *afr* *Laat hy dit maar doen.*
let.PRS he it PRT do.INF
'Let him just do this.'

If we look at a construction like (110), this would have the same meaning as the Dutch example in (19), but we can still interpret *laat* as an imperative. Nevertheless, another interpretation could be that *laat* is a particle like *tænk/tank* have become in Scandinavian languages.

9 Conclusions and future work

In this article we compared insubordination in Afrikaans to other major Germanic languages. More in specific, we looked into D'Hertefelt's typology for complement and conditional insubordinate clauses and we found that Afrikaans is very similar to Dutch and has the same types of clauses. As Dutch has the most different categories, we can say that Afrikaans is as rich with respect to insubordination as Dutch. According to the corpus, conditional insubordination is the most frequent and also has the richest palette of usage.

In the future, we can still look at other types of constructions and try to fit them into a typology, and if possible also repeat this for other Germanic languages. At the 4th Afrikaans Grammar Workshop, it was suggested that insubordination could also exist for clauses without a conjunction, e.g. in Dutch²:

111 *nld* *Kwam hij maar!*
come.PST he PRT
'If he would just come.'

112 *nld* *Kwam hij maar!*
come.PST he PRT
'If he would just come.'

It would also be very interesting to do a quantitative study on the occurrences of the different types of insubordinate constructions. This is however greatly impeded by the fact that the majority of the corpus hits are elaborative constructions and even a treebank would not

² Personal communication with Daniel van Olmen, 28 November 2023.

resolve this issue, as their syntactic structure is the same. As this phenomenon mostly occurs in spoken language, it would be good to have access to a larger corpus of transcribed and syntactically annotated spoken Afrikaans.

10 Acknowledgements

We want to thank the audience of the Zurich Workshop on Afrikaans Linguistics (2021), the 7th Ghent Colloquium on Afrikaans (2022) and the 4th International Afrikaans Grammar Workshop in Muldersdrift (2023) for their feedback and examples given in the discussion, as well as the anonymous reviewers for their feedback and remarks.

Neither ChatGPT nor other LLMs were employed during the research or writing of this article.

11 References

- Augustinus, Liesbeth, Peter Dirix, Daniel van Niekerk, Ineke Schuurman, Vincent Vandeghinste, Frank Van Eynde, and Gerhard van Huyssteen. 2016. "AfriBooms: An Online Treebank for Afrikaans." Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016), 677-682, Portorož.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth and Sandra A. Thompson. 2023. "Can temporal clauses be in subordinate?". *Interactional Linguists*: 2:2, 165-189.
- D'Hertefelt, Sarah. 2018. "Insubordination in Germanic: A Typology of Complement and Conditional Constructions." Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. "Insubordination and its uses." In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, edited by Irina Nikolaeva, 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Higashiizumi, Yuko. 2012. "The development of causal clauses and insubordination: The case of *because*-clauses in Modern English". Presentation at the 17th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Zurich.
- Paardekooper, Piet. 1990. "Een voegwoordraadsel: Lat 'dat'.". *South African Journal of Linguistics*: 8, 174-177.
- Rosemayer, Malte and María Sol Sansiñena, 2019. "The discourse functions of insubordination in Spanish *wh*-interrogatives". *Papers of the Linguistic Society of Belgium*: 13.
- Royo Viñuales, Victor and An Van linden, 2022. "Adverbial Insubordination in Interaction: a pilot study on hypothetical-comparative constructions in French and Spanish." *Papers of the Linguistic Society of Belgium*: 16.
- (VivA), Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans. 2020. "Korpusportaal." Accessed several times between April 2021 and August 2023. <http://korpus.viva-afrikaans.org>.