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1. Introduction

Our empirical focus:
- An understudied variety of Afrikaans, referred to i.a. as Cape (Vernacular) Afrikaans, and Kaaps (Hendricks 1978:13-26; Le Cordeur 2011:763-766)
- More recently, by the endonym Afrikaaps (Valley 2010; Williams 2016)

Afrikaaps is…
- a heavily contact-influenced matrilectal variety of Afrikaans, spoken on the Cape Peninsula
- simultaneously a variety with a long history (den Besten 1989; Hendricks & Dyers 2016) and one of the most innovative varieties currently spoken in South Africa
- very different from standard spoken Afrikaans, which has been the focus of most work on ‘Afrikaans’ to date
- a mixed contact variety, which has long been influenced by English, Arabic and other local languages
- typically described as a heavily English-influenced variety (Ponelis 2009, Blignaut 2014, Hendricks 2016), and widely thought to have undergone fundamental changes under English influence, despite having never been the subject of detailed formal investigation

Widespread perception, unchallenged by systematic linguistic investigation, that “anything goes” in Afrikaaps:

Quote from literary reviewer Crito, in their review Heeltemal Anders of Valda Jansen’s review of Jeremy Vearey’s (2018) biography, Jeremy vannie Elsies:

---
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(1) Sy verwys na ’n taal wat loskom van voorskriftelikheid, met voorbeelde, en dan maak sy ’n verdere wending wat my laat ophou om haar opmerkings te beaam, en vasskop. Die boek is vol taalfoute, en die redigering en proefleeswerk laat veel te wense oor. Wat?! Hoe weet mens dit? Is alles dan nou nie los van die voorskrifte nie, en in Afrikaaps praat mense soos hulle wil, dan nie?

Translation:
She [Valda Jansen – TB&EP&FB] writes of a language which frees itself from prescriptivism, with examples, and then she takes a turn which causes me to become suspicious and start resisting her comments: ‘The book is full of language errors, and the editing and proofreading leaves much to be desired’ What?! How could one know that? Isn’t it all free from prescriptivism? And in Afrikaaps, don’t people speak the way they want to?

Our purpose here:
- To introduce a new research project which aims to produce the first systematic documentation of the morphosyntax of Afrikaaps (Section 2).
- To present some initial findings regarding core properties that have been misrepresented where they have previously been mentioned (mostly in passing) in the literature (e.g. the SVO claim).
- To challenge the idea that Afrikaaps / Afrikaans grammar can be best understood as a “daughter of Dutch” (and through the lens of what we know about West Germanic more generally) (Section 3).
- To challenge the idea that Afrikaaps grammar can be understood as “just a combination” of the grammars of other languages with which it has been in contact, e.g. (more) standard Afrikaans (SA), (South African) English (Section 3).
- To highlight the importance of recognising Afrikaaps grammar as an essentially hybrid system.

Key for us:
- Afrikaaps is a more than system.
- NB: both components of Humboldt’s (1836) characterization of human language as a system which:
  (i) which makes ‘infinite use of finite means’ (p.70), and
  (ii) whose ‘synthesis creates something that is not present per se in any of the associated constituents’ (p.67) [see Biberauer 2017a]
- Languages (grammars) are more than the sum of their parts; the way those parts combine - their ecology 5 - is crucial in a way that is typically only partly (if at all) recognised in (generative) syntactic work on contact languages.6

---
5 The underlying formal make-up of a language, where grammatical properties of a system are integrated and form clusters that determine the pre-existing conditions of a (potentially mixed) grammatical system. We do not thus expect the components of any (mixed) system to combine randomly or retain properties they originally possessed. Changes in one part of the system could trigger a range ‘cascading effects’ in seemingly unrelated parts of the grammar (Biberauer & Roberts 2008 et seq.) Adger (2017) calls this a syntactic ecology.
2. Our Data

Planned data sets for the project:

1. **Stories, poems & columns of Nathan Trantraal**, whose Afrikaaps-written short story collection, *Wit issie ’n colour nie*, provides an account of his lived experiences in a coloured community among other things. He is also the author of the graphic novel *Stormkaap: Drome kom altyd andersom uit*, *Chokers en Survivors* and *Alles het niet kom wôd* (poetry anthology).

2. **Die Son**, a weekly national tabloid in which many pieces are written in Afrikaaps.

3. **Native-speaker intuitions** intended to unpack participants’ intuitions about expressions in Afrikaaps.

The native-speaker intuitions or acceptability judgements will be assessed through the use of the following data collection methods:

   a) **Acceptability Judgment Questionnaire**
   Participants are presented with Afrikaans expressions, taken from the existing literature or constructed with the help of native-speakers. Participants will then be asked to (i) judge how natural these expressions are on a five-point scale, (ii) say how likely they are to hear someone produce the expression, and (iii) indicate the likelihood of producing these expressions themselves. Additionally, participants will be invited to suggest fixes for any expressions they felt were not completely natural to them.

   b) **One-on-one interviews with participants**
   Data collection also includes interviews with a different set of participants. During these interviews, participants will be asked to translate English texts (extracted from the questionnaire) into Afrikaaps. Translations will utilise a method known as the *Think – Aloud Protocol (TAP)* where participants will be recorded while verbalising their translations.

   c) **One-A-Day Whatsapp messenger group chat translations**
   5 separate Whatsapp messenger group chats with 5 members each, who work together to translate an English utterance to Afrikaaps. Participants have the choice of either typing out their translations or verbalising them using Whatsapp voice note feature. In order to maintain consistency, the One-a-day policy will be applied to each group so as to have 5 translations for each item on the questionnaire. This way, we will be able to see how each group of participants arrived at their answers and compare answers across groups.

Data in this talk:

(i) **Thorough reading of Trantraal's (2018) *Wit Issie ’n Colour Nie***:
   - allowed us to form a picture of how Afrikaaps behaves in relation to certain “core” properties,
   - allowed us to pick up on properties not typically discussed in the literature
(ii) Consultation with 5 native-speaker informants:

4 participants aged 20-23; 1 participant aged 46:

- gave judgments on structures constructed with the aid of a native-speaker
- some translated English expressions into Afrikaaps
- made further observations on the structures and phenomena these called to mind

All participants report native proficiency in English and Standard Afrikaans (SA) as well as Afrikaaps

The importance of combining these two data sources (a text-based corpus with native-speaker intuitions) will become clear.

3. Some initial findings on core properties of Afrikaaps

We will see that Afrikaaps is a unique, but ecologically explicable, blend of the conservative and the innovative.

We look at phenomena involving word order and inflection because:

(i) Both are known to be susceptible to change in contact situations, and
(ii) We wanted to investigate some widely held assumptions and explicit statements in the literature about contact effects on Afrikaaps word order, and what “must” / “is likely” to hold in this strongly English-influenced variety of Afrikaans.

Specifically, we consider:

(2) a. Verb Second (V2)
b. OV (V-final)
c. Verb Third (V3)
d. Verb First (V1)
e. Auxiliary het (‘have’)

3.1. Verb Second (V2)

Standard Afrikaans (SA) is derived from 17th century varieties of Dutch via a much more complicated route than is often assumed. (Remember: Afrikaaps / Afrikaans grammar ≠ “daughter of Dutch”)

Overview of V2

Like Dutch, modern SA is V2:
- Finite verb \( V_{FIN} \) moves into the C-domain (V-to-C)
- XP (subject / non-subject) moves to first position in spec-C

(3) a. Die kinders \( \text{het}_{\text{FIN}} \) gister \( \text{‘n} \) koek gebak.
   the children have yesterday a cake baked
   ‘The children baked a cake yesterday.’
V2 is a property of main clauses: V-to-C movement blocked by the presence of a complementiser:

(4)  Ek weet [dat die kinders gister ‘n koek gebak het].
I know that the children yesterday a cake baked have
‘I know that the children yesterday a cake baked have.’

Absence of V2 movement in embedded clauses with complementisers clearly shows that SA is an OV system.

Thus, though V2 can give rise to surface SVO in Afrikaans (5), it is distinct from English which lacks V2 and is a VO system (6).

(5)  The children baked a cake yesterday.

(6)  I know [that the children baked a cake yesterday].

V2 is often assumed to be vulnerable in contact situations - cf. the loss of V2 in the history of English (though consider, e.g. Yiddish).

It has been suggested in the literature that Afrikaaps has become SVO rather than V2, under English influence.

We wanted to investigate these claims in relation to Trantraal (2018) and speaker intuitions.

V2 in modern SA

Modern SA is robustly V2 (Biberauer 2016, 2017b).

Additional innovated V2 structures (not possible in Dutch; Biberauer 2017b) mean overall higher occurrence of V2: SA readily permits dropping the complementiser dat (‘that’) in embedded clauses (Kruger & van Rooy 2016a,b; Biberauer 2016)

(7)  a.  Die Pumas het bevestig [Ø hulle is hulle hoofafrigter, Jimmy Stonehouse, kwyt] the Pumas have confirmed they is their main.coach Jimmy Stonehouse lost
‘The Pumas have confirmed they have lost their head coach, Jimmy Stonehouse.’

(Source: ‘Jimmy los Pumas vir Japan’, News24; 7 January 2015)

a’.  Die Pumas het bevestig [dat hulle hul hooafrigter, Jimmy Stonehouse, kwyt is.]


b. Ek is jammer [Ø daar is nie meer van ons nie].
   I am sorry there is not more of us
   ‘I am sorry there aren’t more of us’
   (Source: ‘Liewe Suid-Afrika, ek is jammer’, Maroelamedia; 19 August 2015)

b’. Ek is jammer [dat daar nie meer van ons is nie].

b. Daar word al geruime tyd bespiegel [Ø hy wil hom by die Japanese rugbyklub Toshiba aansluit].
   ‘There has been speculation for some time that/whether he will join the Japanese rugby club, Toshiba.’
   (Source: ‘Jimmy los Pumas vir Japan’, News24; 7 January 2015)

c’. Daar word al geruime tyd bespiegel [dat hy hom by die Japanese rugbyklub Toshiba wil aansluit].

d. Ons wil graag hê [Ø jy moet langer kuier].
   we want please want you must longer visit
   ‘We’d really like you to stay longer.’
   (Source: Netwerk 24 signup page: https://www.netwerk24.com)

d’. Ons wil graag hê [dat jy langer moet kuier].

- no dat (‘that’)-drop in Dutch (Zwart 1997); thus V<sub>FN</sub> in embedded clauses cannot raise to C.

- dat-drop occurs even in the complements of verbs that wouldn’t permit dass-drop in German (cf. i.a. Vikner 1995, Biberauer 2016).

- English influence played an initial role in triggering the rise of this property (Kruger & van Rooy 2015; 2016a,b; Van Rooy 2018), given the intensive contact between (Cape) Dutch- and English-speakers since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

- But SA permits complementiser drop even in contexts where English does not:

---

7 Although the finite verb does not superficially appear to be in final position here, this is an SOV embedded clause, with the finite verb in its usual non-V2 position preceding clause-final nie (see Biberauer 2008, 2015, 2017b for discussion of how the final nie integrates with the rest of clause structure).

8 Modals always precede their selected infinitive in clause-final clusters in Afrikaans, i.e. wil aansluit and not *aansluit wil. The pre-final placement of the finite verb here thus follows from independent constraints on the structure of modal-containing verb clusters.

9 Officially, Afrikaans did not exist until the language was standardised in 1925. By the time the British took over the Cape Colony in 1806, however, the Dutch-based varieties spoken at the Cape was quite distinct from the Dutch encountered in ‘higher-function’ contexts like church and school (see much work by Hans den Besten, Paul Roberge, and also Deumert 2004 for illuminating discussion of modern-day Afrikaans’s complex origins).
(8) a. ?? It has for some time been *speculated* [Ø he wants to join Japanese club Toshiba].
(contrast (7c) above)

b. Dit *lyk my* [Ø die wind het begin waai].
   it look me the wind has begin blow
   ‘It looks to me as if the wind has started blowing.’

Vs. ?? It looks to me the wind has started blowing (Ponelis 1993:306)

b’. Dit *lyk my* [of die wind begin waai het. ]
   it look me if the wind begin blow have
   ‘It seems to me as if the wind has begun blowing.’

Irrespective of the cause (English influence), the effect of heightened complementiser drop in Afrikaans produces a rise in V2 because C in Afrikaans grammar has to be filled, either by an overtly realised complementiser or by V_{FIN} (den Besten 1977/1983 et seq.).

**Interim Lesson from Syntactic Ecology:**

Contact-induced changes in grammatical systems need not result in one system becoming ultimately more like the other.

Even if widespread complementiser-drop in Afrikaans was the result of English influence, that influence ultimately serves to reinforce V2 – an un-English property which Afrikaans shares with other West Germanic languages.

**V2 in Afrikaaps**

Given what we have seen regarding V2 in SA, we aim to establish the robustness of V2 in Afrikaaps.

**First observation:** V2 is a consistent property of Afrikaaps main clauses.

**Second observation:** *dat*-drop is also readily permitted in Afrikaaps, and also results in embedded V2

(9) a. Ôs het *gewiet* [Ø hy sallit gedoen et].
   we have known he will-it done has
   ‘We knew that he would have done it.’ (Afrikaaps; 5/5 participants)

   a’. Ôs het *gewiet* [dat hy it sal gedoen et].

b. Ek *SUPPOSE* [Ø ek het altyd gewiet wie ek is ...].
   I suppose I have always known who I is
   ‘I suppose I’ve always known who I am ...’ (Afrikaaps; Trantraal 2018:44)

   b’. Ek *neem aan* [dat ek altyd geweet het wie ek is ...]
c. ... ek is **CERTAIN** [Ø **by** het een kee iets gesê oo TIES en 
I am certain he have one time something said about ties and 
**COLONIALISM** in dieselle sin].

10 colonialism in the same sentence 
‘... I am certain he (=Nelson Mandela) once said something about ties and colonialism in the same sentence.’

(Afrikaaps; Trantraal 2018:10)

c’. ...ek is **seker** [dat hy een keer in dieselfde sin iets oor dasse en kolonialisme gesê het].

d. **Smaak my** [Ø ‘n engel het op my tong gepiepie...]
taste me an angel has on my tongue peed
‘It seems to me an angel has peed on my tongue.’

[https://www.sabreakingnews.co.za/2015/10/01/throwback-video-smaak-my-n-engel-het-op-my-tong-
gepiepie/]

d’. *Smaak my [dat ‘n engel op my tong gepiepie het...]

(Dit) smaak my is an Afrikaans innovation (precise origins unclear, but very commonly used in Afrikaaps and also in colloquial Afrikaans varieties more generally) which **requires** a dat-less complement clause.

**Thus:** In principle, there are both main and embedded-clause opportunities for Afrikaaps acquirers to learn that V2 is a property of the system.

... So why has it been suggested in the literature that Afrikaaps has, under English influence, become SVO rather than V2?

- these claims come in the context of general discussions, not specifically focused on Afrikaaps syntax and/or not concerned with the distinction between SVO and V2 (e.g. McCormick 2002a: 222; 2002b:230; Blignaut 2014:55).
- there are SVO strings in Afrikaaps: V2 with an initial subject and a finite lexical verb gives a surface SVO string.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & V & O \\
(10) a. & **Die kinders** & bak\textsubscript{VFIN} & vandag ‘n koek. \\
& the children & bake & today a cake \\
& ‘The children are baking a cake today.’
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & O & V \\
& Ek weet & **[dat die kinders** & vandag ‘n koek \textsubscript{VFIN}]. \\
& I know & that the children today & a cake \\
& ‘I know that the children are baking a cake today.’
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & V & O \\
& Ek weet & **[die kinders** & bak\textsubscript{VFIN} vandag ‘n koek]. \\
& I know & the children bake today & a cake \\
& ‘I know that the children are baking a cake today.’
\end{array}
\]

---

10 See Section 3.2 on the “leaking” (extraposition) options available in SA and Afrikaaps. PPs readily extrapose in these varieties, with extraposition being even more common in the spoken language.
But: There is no evidence of English-style SVO in Trantraal (2018). This impression is strongly backed up by our participant data (cf. sections 3.2 and 3.3 on OV and V3 respectively).

The lesson from Syntactic Ecology:

Again: even when a property is borrowed from one language (the source) into another (the recipient; cf. van Coetsem 2000), the way it integrates with the recipient is determined by the preconditions (formal make-up) of the existing system.

V2 is acquired very early; thus establishing a particular kind of connection between C and finiteness-bearing verbs and complementisers, and which does not appear to be ‘disturbed’ by high levels of contact with non-V2 systems.

3.2 OV (verb-final)

From the above discussion, we bear in mind that V2 movement in SA sometimes results in surface SVO; absence of V2 movement in embedded clauses with complementisers revealing underlying OV.

Leaking in SA

Another factor leading to patterns where the verb is superficially non-final is ‘leaking’ (extraposition):

(11) a. Sy het die speler geken wat die toernooi gewen het. [SA; CP relative clause]
    she has the player know what the tournament won has
    ‘She knew the player who had won the tournament.’

    b. Hulle het skape geboer in daardie tyd. [SA; PP adjunct]
    they have sheep farmed in that time
    ‘They farmed with sheep at that time.’

    c. Hulle het heetemal vergeet van hulle paspoorte. [SA; PP complement]
    they have completely forgotten of their passports
    ‘They completely forgot about their passports.’

    d. Hulle het skape geboer destyds. [SA; Adverb]
    they have sheep farmed that.time
    ‘They farmed sheep back then.’

    e. Hulle het heetemal vergeet daarvan. [SA; R-pronoun]
    they have completely forgotten there.of
    ‘They completely forgot about that.’

Standard Germanic OV is strict - ‘leaking’ is not readily sanctioned:

- other than clausal CP-complements (dat/dass-clauses and their complementiserless counterparts), complements precede V (OV) and adjuncts nearly always do too;
- R-pronouns are a further curiously “leakable” category in spoken varieties (J. Bayer, p.c.).
Afrikaans OV is less strict:

- As (11) shows, ‘leaking’ is readily sanctioned with complement CPs (*dat/-Ø*-introduced CP-extraposition is obligatory; cf. (7–8) above), relative-clause CPs, PPs of various kinds (11a,b), adverbs, (11c), and R-pronouns (11d).

- Crucially, though, DP-object extraposition is barred:

(12) * Hulle het gekoop die skoene.  
   they have bought the shoes

Leaking in Afrikaans

In Afrikaans, we again see many ‘leaking’ possibilities:

- (13a,b) produced during participant interviews
- Copious examples in Trantraal (2018) and other sources in the literature (13c–e)

(13) a. Hyttie skoene gekoop wat oppie rak gestaan et.  
   he’s the shoes bought what on the shelf stood have  
   ‘He’s bought the shoes that stood on the shelf.’  
   [Afrikaans; CP relative clause]

   [SA: Hy het die skoene wat op die rak gestaan het, gekoop.]

b. Ek dinke MANAGER se duties sal wies  
   I think the manager’s duties shall be  
   ommie TEAM te MANAGE oppie veld.  
   ‘I think the manager’s duties will be to manage the team on the field.’  
   [Afrikaans; PP adjunct]

   [SA: Ek dink die bestuurder se taak sal wees om die span op die veld te bestuur.]

(see also (9c) above)

c. ... BECAUSE ek het groot geword met die Kaapse Afrikaans.  
   ‘... because I grew up with the Cape Afrikaans’  
   [Afrikaans; PP complement]

   (McCormick 2002a: 223)

d. ... gan jy my vra of ek dai boek gelees et al.  
   ‘... you will ask me if I have already read that book.’  
   [Afrikaans; Adverb]

   (Trantraal 2018:118)
e. Ek is sieke al mens inne wêreld wie hou daavan [R-pronoun] I is probably all person in the world who like there of om in lang lyne te staan.
 INF.C in long lines to stand ‘I’m probably the only person in the world who enjoys standing in long queues.’

(Trantraal 2018:10)

[SA: Ek is seker al mens in die wêreld wat daarvan hom om in lang lyne te staan.]

Additionally, though, Afrikaaps has been said to permit (14)-type structures:

(14) Hulle het gesteel my skoene. (Blignaut 2014: 55)
they have stolen my shoes
‘They have stolen my shoes.’

- Complete absence of (14)-type structures in Trantraal (2018)
- We confronted our native-speaker informants with structures of this type.
- All 5 informants categorically rejected SVO (15a)
- Corrected it to SOV (15b):

(15) a. Hyt gekoepie skoene. [VO – rejected by 5/5 participants]
he’s bought the shoes
‘He’s bought the shoes.’

b. Hyttie skoene gekoep. [OV – Afrikaaps; 5/5 participants]
he has the shoes bought
‘He’s bought the shoes.’

Further: 4/5 participants changed (16a) to SOV (16b):

(16) a. Jy moet toemaak die dee! [VO – rejected by 4/5 participants]
you must closed make the door
‘You must close the door!’

b. Jy moet die dee toemaak! [OV – Afrikaaps; 4/5 participants]
you must the door closed make
‘You must close the door!’

All participants fully accepted the OV-sentences they were asked to judge:

(17) a. Hyt my vetel dat hy klaarrie hys gebou et. [OV – 5/5 participants accepted]
he’d me told that he finished the house built has
‘He had told me that he’d finished building the house.’

---

11 Afrikaaps features a large number of contracted forms. As in SA (and English), auxiliaries readily contract onto preceding subjects (and other XPs) - thus hyt = hy’t = hy het = ‘he’s - he has (see also Section 3.4 below). Additionally, articles are typically enclitic - thus gekoepie = gekoop die = ‘bought the’, Hyttie = hy het die = ‘he has the’, and vannie ‘from the’ as in the title of the Vearney biography on p.2 (see again Section 3.4 for more on reduction within the D-system).
b. Ōs het gewiet hy sallit gedoen et. [OV – 5/5 participants accepted]
   us have known he shall.it done have
   ‘We knew that he would have done it.’

c. Ōs hettie appels eenkant gesit. [OV – 5/5 participants accepted]
   us have.the apples one.side sat
   ‘We have put the apples to one side.’

**Thus:** Afrikaans seems robustly OV.

**But:**
- Why examples like (14) in the literature?
- Why did one informant find (16a) grammatical?
- Where all our informants rejected (14), 2/5 accepted SVO (18a); of the others, 1 adjusted this structure to SA-compatible (18b) and 2 to colloquial SA-compatible (18c), i.e. two OV structures:

\[(18)\]

a. Hyt gekoepie skoene wat oppie rak gestaan et.
   he’s bought.the shoes what on.the shelf stood have
   ‘He’s bought the shoes that were standing on the shelf.’

   **[Heavy NP object]**

b. Hyttie skoene wat oppie rak gestaan et gekoep.
   he’s.the shoes what on.the shelf stood have bought
   ‘He’s bought the shoes that were standing on the shelf.’

   **[V-final; cf. the SA variant of (13a)]**

c. Hyttie skoene gekoep wat oppie rak gestaan et.
   he’s.the shoes bought what on.the shelf stood have
   ‘He’s bought the shoes that were standing on the shelf.’

   **[Relative Clause “leaking; cf. (11a/13a)]**

Similarly, 3/5 accepted SVO (19a); 2/5 changed it to SA-compatible OV (19b):

\[(19)\]

a. Ōs’t gesien sy DEATH CERTIFICATE wat jy suma daar laat lê et.
   us’ve seen his death certificate what you just there let lie have
   ‘We’ve seen his death certificate, which you just left lying there.’

   **[Heavy NP object]**

b. Ōs’t sy DEATH CERTIFICATE gesien wat jy suma daar laat lê et.
   us’ve his death certificate seen what you just there let lie have
   ‘We’ve seen his death certificate, which you just left lying there.’

   **[Relative Clause ‘leaking’]**

Thus:
- SVO is possible (as in SA), but it is certainly not a neutral, non-discourse-marked order
- Informants consistently produce and judge OV structures as fully acceptable
- VO structures are more readily accepted where:

  (i) O is complex/“heavy” (cf. (18a) and (19a)). This reflects a well-known, seemingly processing-induced universal pattern (cf. i.a. Hawkins 1994, among many others), and/or

  (ii) O occurs in a particle-verb-containing imperative-like structure (cf. (16a)), where objects may follow particles even in colloquial SA imperatives:

\[(20)\]

Sit neer daardie tasse!
   put down those suitcases
   ‘Put down those suitcases!’

   **[SA]**
The lesson from Syntactic Ecology:

A significant amount of ‘leaking’ - which gives non-V-final surface orderings - is still compatible with an OV grammar. O

DP-V structures are the crucial input to look out for when assessing the OV vs VO status of a grammar.

From an acquisition perspective, the ‘Head Parameter’ (however we want to characterise it) is set very early (cf. i.a. Wexler 1998 on Very Early Parameter Setting/VEPS, and Tsimpli 2014).

In the presence of a clear O

DP-V signal, acquirers will not be perturbed by the wealth of ‘leaking’ options in the grammar. Acquirers – unlike linguists - are not aware of the difference between ‘rigid’ and ‘non-rigid’ OV (cf. i.a. Cinque 2005).

3.3 V3 (Verb third)

Recent research on modern-day V2 systems shows that V3 is not completely ruled out, as was long assumed.

(21) [Die man,] [die/hom] ken

VFIN ik niet. [Dutch] that man D-pronoun/him know I not

‘That man, him I don’t know.’ (Den Dikken & Surányi 2017: 544)

- Haegeman & Greco (2018) highlight an Adjunct-Subject-V

F

IN pattern that is available in West Flemish, though not many other Dutch varieties (or in SA).

- Mainland Scandinavian has long been noted to permit V3 with specific adverbs (cf. Holmberg 2015 for discussion).

- W Germanic has also long been noted to permit so-called Contrastive Left Dislocation (cf. (21) above; cf. den Dikken & Surányi 2017 and Müller 2017 for discussion; cf. Salvesen 2016 for cross-Germanic consideration and discussion following on from (21)).

V3 Patterns in Urban Multi-Ethnolects

Urban multi-ethnolects spoken in countries like Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Norway permit V3 of the kind illustrated in (22a), schematised in (22b) (cf. Walkden 2017 for discussion).

(22) a. [Morgen] [ich] geh

VFIN arbeitsamt. [Kietzdeutsch] tomorrow I go jobcentre

‘Tomorrow I will go to the job centre.’ (Wiese 2009: 787)

b. Adv

FRAMESETTER - Subject - V

FIN

Walkden (2017) argues that the key consideration for urban multi-ethnolect V3 is:

- High proportion of L2 speakers whose production serves as input to new generation of speakers
- New generation adopts the V3 grammar as their own
**V3 in Afrikaans**

**The expectation we investigated:** (22)-type V3 should also be a feature of Afrikaans:

- Modern-day Afrikaans is an urban multi-ethnolect.

- Modern-day speakers are always also proficient in English, and most have basic/functional proficiency in French, Urdu, Arabic, Somali, Hausa, etc.

- Though a large portion of the speaker base today is L1, the initial speakers were L2 speakers. *(many were enslaved from diverse locations e.g. India, Ceylon/Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea; some were Khoesan speakers - see i.a. Ponelis 1993: chapter 1).*

- Though modern-day Afrikaans is an L1, we might expect its generally assumed strongly L2 origins + persistent contact with English to produce (22)-type V3, or possibly even more prolific V3.

**But:**


- All participants **rejected** the urban multi-ethnolect V3 examples presented to them

- 3/5 suggested the fix in (23b) – V2 pattern with adverb initial

- 2/5 suggested the fix in (23c) – V2 pattern with subject pronoun initial

(23) a. [Môre] [ek] gaan na die stasie toe. [V3: FrameAdv-S-VFIN; 5/5 rejected]
    tomorrow I go to the station to
    *Intended:* ‘Tomorrow I’m going to the station.’

b. [Môre] gaan ek na die stasie toe. [V2: initial FrameAdv; 3/5 proposed]
    tomorrow go I to the station to
    ‘Tomorrow I’m going to the station.’

c. [Ek] gaan môme na die stasie toe. [V2: initial subject; 2/5 proposed]
    I go tomorrow go I to the station to
    ‘I’m going to the station tomorrow.’

- 5/5 participants **rejected** (24a)

- 4/5 suggested the V2 fix in (24b)

- 1/5 made no suggestion

(24) a. [Innie aan] [my ma] maak vi ôs hot chocolate. [V3: FrameAdv-S-VFIN; 5/5 rejected]
    In-the evening my mother makes for us hot chocolate
    *Intended:* ‘In the evenings, my mother makes us hot chocolate.’

b. [Innie aan] maak my ma vi ôs hot chocolate. [V2: initial FrameAdv; 4/5 proposed]
    In-the evening makes my mother for us hot chocolate
    ‘In the evenings, my mother makes us hot chocolate.’

**However:** V3 is possible in Afrikaans but it takes two forms: (i) contrastive left dislocation (25), and (ii) and double adverbial fronting (26)

These permissible V3 patterns are familiar from West Germanic more generally:
(25) Contrastive Left Dislocation

a. [Die man.] [die/hom] ken ik niet. [Dutch]
   that man D-pronoun/him know I not
   ‘That man, him I don’t know.’ (Den Dikken & Surányi 2017: 544)

b. [Haai man] [hy] willie saamwêkkie. [Afrikaaps]
   that man he wants-not together-work
   ‘That man, he refuses to cooperate.’ (accepted by 5/5 participants)

c. [Die NEXT dag][toe] maak die persoon [...] ‘n ANNOUNCEMENT ...
   the next day then make the person an announcement
   ‘The next day, this person made an announcement...’
   (Trantraal 2018: 61; confirmed by 5/5 participants)

d. [Middae] [dan] wil hy net weer gaan slaap. [Afrikaaps]
   afternoons then wants he just again go sleep
   ‘In the afternoons, he simply wants to go back to sleep.’ (accepted by 5/5 participants)

(26) Double adverbial fronting

a. [Fast alles] [im Sitzen] bewältigte Joaquim Rodriguez [German]
   almost everthing in sitting managed Joaquim Rodriguez
   on the way to.the peak
   ‘Joaquim Rodriguez managed to ride almost all parts of the road to the peak without
   getting out of his saddle.’
   (Müller 2017: 220)

b. [Altyd] [as ek inne bank staan,] wonne ek hoekom kom ekkie meer bank toe nie.
   always when I in.the bank stand wonder I why come I not more bank to
   ‘Always, when I’m inside the bank, I wonder why I don’t come to the bank more.’
   (Trantraal 2018: 9; confirmed by 5/5 participants)

c. [Oppe Maandag] [innie Bellville] issie treffiek daarem baie dik.
   on-a Monday in-the Bellville is-the traffic really very thick
   ‘On Mondays, in Bellville, the traffic is very heavy.’
   (accepted by 5/5 participants)

Thus:  
- Afrikaaps’ V3 profile appears to fit that of “regular” (non-contact) Continental OV Germanic rather than the modern-day urban multi-ethnolect V3;

- or, indeed, what we see in English, where V3 is widespread with all initial adverbs

- The picture we get is of a variety built on the same “old” Continental OV Germanic foundation as SA

- V2 and OV are very stable properties of Afrikaaps
**Why?**
- Afrikaans is widely regarded as one of the - if not the - oldest Afrikaans varieties (van Rensburg 2016).
- Long-standing and, in part, very intensive contact with a range of VO systems throughout its history, including Arabic alongside English.
- There is a 300-plus year tradition of Islam in the Cape (cf. Dangor 2008, Davids 2011). And the earliest Afrikaans was in fact written in the Arabic script.
- Since the mid-19th century, teaching at madrasahs in the Cape was in ‘Cape Dutch’, which was transliterated in Arabic as the children were not literate in the Latin script.
- A long-standing culture in which educational (i.e. ‘high’-function) activity takes place in a form of Dutch introduced by learned teachers.
- Additionally, some innovations in SA (e.g. generalised tendency to drop complementisers → embedded V2; section 3.1) have, ironically, served to reinforce the language’s V2 character.
- Another acquisitionally salient innovation: negative imperative structure (cf. Biberauer 2018a):

(27) a. *Moenie ... O-V\_\_NON-FIN nie!*  
must.not .... O-V\_\_NON-FIN POL  
‘Don’t ...VO!’

b. *Moenie jou paspoort vergeet nie!*  
must. not your passport forget POL  
‘Don’t forget your passport!’

c. *Moenie vergeet jou paspoort nie*  
must.not forget your passport POL  
(VO strongly barred in moenie structures)

➢ Signals:  
(i) V-to-C/Force (=high C; cf. Biberauer & Roberts 2015),  
(ii) OV  
(iii) Negative Concord (nie ... nie), a property which is also strikingly preserved in Afrikaans (cf. also Wit issie ‘n COLOUR nie)

**What is very clear:** Afrikaans is a very different urban multi-ethnolect to that described by Walkden (2017). There are clear formal traces of its “old” roots, which have not been restructured by contact.

**The lesson from Syntactic Ecology:**

Certain properties (e.g. V2) are fundamental preconditions in syntactic ecologies, and various (innovated) properties build on them, ultimately reinforcing them and ensuring their stability.

Afrikaans acquirers receive various cues that it is a (high/Force-type) V2 system (e.g. embedded V2, innovated negative imperative). Once this foundational property is in place, acquirers build the rest of the grammar on top of it, ensuring its stability (cf. again Biberauer 2017a, 2018b).
Thus, [Adv\_FRAMESETTER-Subject-\_FIN] or even more extensive V3 is not an inevitable consequence of a V2 system in extensive contact with one or more (S)VO varieties (this is something that SA and other matrilect variants of Afrikaans also shows us; Biberauer 2016).

As a more general insight into contact-induced language change: the proportion of L2 speakers in a contact community seems key in creating the circumstances under which V2 becomes vulnerable.

In relation to Afrikaaps: stability of V2 (and OV) follows directly if this variety originated as an L1 acquired by children who establish the essential V2 character of their language very early, not as an L2 variety as is often assumed (cf. again V2 as a Very Early Parameter Setting/VEPS; Wexler 1998; Tsimpili 2014).

### 3.4 V1 (Verb first)

V1 orders are possible in W Germanic: (yes/no questions (28a), narrative inversion (28b), topic drop (28c)).

Colloquial Afrikaans has also innovated a V1 structure where an initial “pure” expletive it is missing (cf. Vikner 1995, Lasnik 1995) – recall (9d), repeated as (28d):

(28) a.  
\[
\text{Weet jy dalk hoe laat dit is?} \quad \text{[SA]}
\]
know you perhaps how late it is
“Do you perhaps know what time it is?”

b.  
\[
\text{Gaan hulle almal toe weer huistoe.} \quad \text{[SA]}
\]
goa they all then againhome to
“So they all went home again.”

c.  
\[
\text{Speaker A: Kaaf dir doch einen neuen Mantel!} \quad \text{[German]}
\]
buy you mp\textsuperscript{12} a new coat
‘Buy yourself a new coat, man!’

Speaker B:  
\[
\text{Hab ich schon (getan)!} \quad \text{[German]}
\]
have I already done
‘I have already!’ (i.e. object das - ‘that’ is dropped in B’s response)

d.  
\[
\text{Smaak my [Ø ‘n engel het op my tong gepiepie…]} \quad \text{[Colloquial Afrikaans]}
\]
taste me an angel has on my tongue peed
‘It seems to me an angel has peed on my tongue.’

[non-colloquial: \text{Dit smaak my [Ø ‘n engel het op my tong gepiepie…]}]

### Superficial V1 in Afrikaaps

**Unique to Afrikaaps**: a superficially V1 structure:

(29) a.  
\[
\text{Is skoon, is stil, CELLPHONE USE IS FORBIDDEN en ammel praat sag.} \quad \text{[Trantraal 2018: 9]}
\]
is clean is quiet and everyone speak soft
‘It’s clean, it’s quiet, cellphone use is forbidden and everyone speaks softly.’

\textsuperscript{12} MP = modal particle. There are hard-to-translate elements which also play a large role in Afrikaans - consider the use of mos, sommer, darem, and similar.
b.  *Is stil inne voorhys virre oomblik.*
   is quiet in the front house for a moment
   ‘It’s quiet for a moment at the front of the house.’  
   (Trantraal 2018: 33)

c.  *Isse ANIMATED MOVIE, oppe DISC, wat ek gelien et vir my kleinenefies ...*
   is an animated movie on a disc what I borrowed have for my grand nephews
   ‘It’s an animated movie on a disc, which I borrowed for my grand nephews.’
   (Trantraal 2018: 48)

SA counterparts of these structures are *dis*-initial.

*Dis* = the lexicalised contraction of *dit is* = ‘that/it is’.

NB: *Is* here can involve either expletive (cf. 29a,b) or referential *dit* (cf. 29c).

---

**Afrikaaps Pronominal System: Initial Explorations**

The Afrikaaps pronominal system seems to have been restructured:

- *d*-initial and *d*-less forms make it possible to capture distinctions that cannot be lexically disambiguated in SA

- SA *dit* and *dis* are ambiguous between *it*/*that* and *it’s*/*that’s* (30).

- Afrikaaps has developed a new lexical distinction between these two: *it/is* = *it/it’s*; *dai/dais* = *that/that’s* (31)

  (30)  
  a.  *dit* - ‘it’ or ‘that’  
  b.  *dis* - ‘it’s’ or ‘that’s’  
  c.  *daardie* - ‘that’, which can be colloquially reduced to *daai*

  (31)  
  a.  *it* [ət] - ‘it’  
  b.  *is* [əs] – ‘it’s’  
  c.  *dai* [dai] - ‘that’  
  d.  *dais* [dais] - ‘that’s’

NB: The *it* in (31a) is not an English borrowing: Afrikaaps speakers pronounce English *it* [i:t] while the Afrikaaps *it* is [ət], as indicated above.

---

(32)  
  a.  *It* gan bars!
     it go burst
     ‘It’s going to burst!’
     (Small *Kanna hy kô hystoe*, p.45; Hendricks 2016:24)

  b.  *It* wasse goeie jaa vi ôs.
     it was a good year for us
     ‘It was a good year for us.’
     (Trantraal *Rapport Weekliks*, 10/1/2016, p.15; Hendricks 2016:24)
c. Is sieke wee ou Boela se vis.
   It’s probably again old Boela’s fish again.’
   (Small Kanna hy kô hystoe, p.42; Hendricks 2016:24)

d. Ek dinkie is funny nie.
   ‘I don’t think it’s funny.’
   (Trantraal 2018: 109)

(33) a. Dais wassie laste kee wat ek vi Amelia gesien et.
   That was the last time what I for Amelia seen have
   ‘That was the last time I saw Amelia.’
   (Trantraal 2018:24)

       b. Dais wêk orait yt.
       That work already out.
       (where dai picks up on the the description of the contents of
       ‘That works out okay.’ the final part of Friday’s school timetable)

c. Dais waa POLITICAL ACTIVISTS soes Noam Chomsky my veloo
   that’s where political activists like Noam Chomsky me lose
   ‘That’s where political activists like Noam Chomsky lose me.’
   (Trantraal 2018: 9)

d. Dais hoekom Jimmy so dikvellag is, ...
   that’s why Jimmy so obtuse is
   ‘That’s why Jimmy is so obtuse ...’
   (Trantraal 2018: 71)

d- seems to serve a particular morphosyntactic function in Afrikaaps, unlike in SA (cf. Kayne 2018 for
analogous argument in relation to the English th- system):

- the - a
  there - where
  that - what

- th signals definiteness; wh- signals polarity

Non-pronominal determiners based on these forms also reflect a distinct use for d-:

- In a translation exercise, a participant translated (34) from English into Afrikaaps as shown in (35):

  (34) Speaker A: It seems like that man never has any money.
       Speaker B: But his wife always has money.

  (35) Speaker A: It lyk asof daarri man nooit ienage gelt hettie.
       it seems as if that man never any money has not

       Speaker B: Maa sy vrou et altyd gelt.
       but his wife has always money

- The participant commented that instead of ‘daarrie man’ (d-initial determiner) in (35), he would have
used ‘haai man’ (d-less determiner) in a context like (36):
Speaker A: Joe willie vi sy eie kos betaalettie. Joe wants. not for his own food pay. not ‘Joe doesn’t want to pay for his own food.’

Speaker B: Ja nee, haai man hou sy gelt styfvas. yes-no that man holds his money tight-fast ‘I agree, that man hangs onto his money tightly.’

- In (35), Speaker A starts by pointing someone out to speaker B. This involves explicit deictic, speaker-hearer oriented / “locating” meaning. The speaker uses a d-initial form to affect this meaning.

- But in (36), Speaker A establishes “Joe” as the referent. Referring back to this participant requires no explicit deictic information. Rather, what is required is an anaphoric element. The speaker uses a h-initial form to do this.

Overall: d-less forms are those not requiring any explicit deictic / speaker-hearer-oriented / “locating” meaning; in the terms of Wiltschko (2014), they anchor without having to ground specifically with reference to the discourse (cf. Biberauer 2018c for further discussion)

Crucially, there are two d-less forms in Afrikaaps: itilis (‘it’/’it’s’) and h-initial haai (anaphoric ‘that’).

What we see, then, is an explicit articulation of the SA pronoun system:

(30’) a. dit - ‘it’ or ‘that’ [(colloquial) SA]
b. dis - ‘it’s’ or ‘that’s’
c. daardie - deictic and colloquial ‘that’, which can be colloquially reduced to daai

(31’) a. it [at] - ‘it’ [Afrikaaps]
b. is [as] – ‘it’s’
c. dai [dai] - deictic ‘that’
d. dais [dais] - deictic ‘that’s’
e. hai [hai] - anaphoric ‘that’
f. hais [hais] - anaphoric ‘that’s’

The enclitic use of articles also feeds into the input that Afrikaaps acquirers get that d- is “not just definite”, i.e. that it serves a particular morphosemantic function:

(37) a. Hyt my vetel dat hy klaarrie hys gebou et. (klaar (d)ie > klaarrie) he’d me told that he finished.the house built has ‘He had told me that he’d finished building the house.’

b. Ôs het gewiet hy sallit gedoen et. (sal (d)it > sallit) us have known he shall.it done have ‘We knew that he would have done it.’

c. Ôs hettie appels eenkant gesit. (het (d)ie > hettie) us have.the apples one.side sat ‘We have put the apples to one side.’
Cf. also \textit{vannie} (= ‘from.the’, P+article contraction) in the title of Jeremy Vearney’s (2018) biography, \textit{Jeremy vannie Elsies} (see p.2 above): Elsies = Elsiesrivier, the name of an Afrikaaps-speaking suburb in Cape Town.

The use of \textit{van} + \textit{die} = \textit{vannie} typifies the Afrikaaps way of referring to locations the community is familiar with; thus also \textit{vannie Bellville}, and \textit{vannie Lavis} (= Bishop Lavis).

Afrikaaps adds an article where some colloquial Engishes drop one (\textit{going pub}/Tesco’s; cf. Biggs 2014).

Colloquial SA would also permit enclitic forms here, and for (37a,b), where the phoneme preceding the article/neuter pronoun is voiced, the reduced SA forms would be identical to those given here.

\textbf{But:} the reduced SA form for (37c) would be \textit{heddie} or \textit{herrie} and not \textit{hettie}, which suggests different inputs to the reduction processes:

- a /d/-initial form in colloquial SA, which thus alters the voicing of the auxiliary’s final stop
- a /d/-less form in Afrikaaps, which thus leaves the final /t/ unaffected.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Thus:} \textit{is}-initial structures like those in (29) are actually /d/-less \textit{dis}-initial, i.e. “regular” V2, structures.
\end{center}

Where does Afrikaaps \textit{is} come from? \textbf{An interaction of two factors:}

\textbf{Factor 1:} \textbf{Retention} from the Dutch pronominal system

(38) Modern Dutch pronoun paradigm (adapted from Taalportaal, \url{http://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-13998813298162864})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>\textit{ik} [ik],</td>
<td>\textit{mij} [me\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{wij} [we\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{ons} [\textit{ɔns}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{k} [ak][k]</td>
<td>\textit{me} [ma]</td>
<td>\textit{we} [\textit{ɔ}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{jij} [je\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{jou} [j\textit{u}],</td>
<td>\textit{u} [y]</td>
<td>\textit{u} [y]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{je} [\textit{ja}]</td>
<td>\textit{je} [\textit{ja}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{hij} [he\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{hem} [he\textit{m}],</td>
<td>\textit{zij} [ze\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{hen} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ie} [i]</td>
<td>\textit{'m} [\textit{an}][\textit{m}]</td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
<td>\textit{hun} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{zij} [ze\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{haar} [ha\textit{r}],</td>
<td>\textit{zij} [ze\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{hen} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{zo}]</td>
<td>\textit{(d)r} [d\textit{a}r][\textit{ar}][\textit{r}]</td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
<td>\textit{hun} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{het} [h\textit{at}],</td>
<td>\textit{het} [h\textit{at}],</td>
<td>\textit{zij} [ze\textit{l}],</td>
<td>\textit{hen} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{\textit{t}} [\textit{at}][\textit{t}]</td>
<td>\textit{\textit{t}} [\textit{at}][\textit{t}]</td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
<td>\textit{hun} [he\textit{n}],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{ze} [\textit{z}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SA retained only forms deriving from the strong pronoun series in Dutch, i.e. all weak pronominal forms have been lost (a common occurrence in L2 acquisition scenarios)

- Afrikaaps may have retained the weak neuter pronoun (\textbf{bolded} in (38)), retaining its original meaning as the demonstrative system reorganised itself (Dutch \textit{deze} > Afrikaans \textit{daardie} >\textit{daarie} > \textit{dai} [Note general lack of coda [r] in Kaaps])
**Factor 2:** Reanalysis *dit* and *dis* as *d*-initial forms became established as deictic / (speaker-hearer-oriented) items, i.e. *dit* > *d-it*, parallelling *d-aar* and *d-aardie*.

- Afrikaans *is* could be an innovation that itself builds on an innovation.
- *Dis* in standard Afrikaans is a novel extension of the enclitic copula/auxiliary reduction pattern also seen in forms like *hy’s/sy’s/hulle’t* (he’s, she’s, they’ve).
- This pattern mirrors English, but contrasts sharply with Dutch, where it seems to be the norm for the pronoun, and not the (richly inflected) copula/auxiliary, to reduce (see again (33) above).^{13}
- SA verbs do not bear any person agreement marking (there is thus less agreement than in English); auxiliaries and copulas may reduce, as in English.

(39) a. **Sy’t** haar prysgeld aan liefdadigheid geskenk. (Sy’t < Sy het)
   she’d her prize money to charity donated
   ‘She’d donated her prize money to charity.’

   b. **Daar’s** altyd moles daar. (Daar’s < Daar is)
   there’s always trouble there
   ‘There’s always some kind of drama there.’

   c. **Dis** ‘n baie goeie idee. (Dis < Dit is)
   that/it’s a very good idea
   ‘That’s/It’s a very good idea.’

And the same is true in Afrikaans, as we have already seen in some of the above examples.

(40) a. **Hyttie** skoene gekoep wat oppie rak gestaan et. (Hyt = Hy’t < Hy het)
   he’s/the shoes bought what on the shelf stood have
   ‘He’s bought the shoes that stood on the shelf.’ (cf. (13a))

   b. **Maa dais** COOL wan ek haat die AFRIKAANS TEACHERS. (Dais = Dai’s < Dai is)
   but that’s cool because I hate the Afrikaans teachers
   ‘But that’s cool because I hate the Afrikaans teachers.’ (Trantraal 2018: 19)

   c. **Is** warm ma Charlie dra ‘n wol mussie ...
   it’s warm but Charlie wear a woollen hat
   ‘It’s warm, but Charlie is wearing a woollen hat ...’ (Trantraal 2018: 71)

The reduction of the already-reduced SA *dis* may thus have played a role in facilitating the introduction of a lexically encoded distinction between ‘it’ and ‘that’.

---

**Thus, the interaction of Factors 1 and 2 appear to have produced the current system**

And is this simplification or complexification of the existing system? It might be simplistic to think entirely in such terms.

---

^{13} There do seem to be Dutch varieties that permit auxiliary- and copula reduction; the Brabant variety is one (Cora Pots, p.c.).
A further elaboration of the d-initial / h-initial distinction in some speakers

Some speakers appear to have extended the function of d- / h- beyond the deictic / anaphoric meanings, respectively.

For such speakers: d-initial/h-initial forms function as markers of number agreement in the noun phrase:

- d-initial forms mark agreement with singular nouns (41)
- h-initial forms mark plural agreement (42)

(41) a. [Dai jaar] toe össie World Cup gehost het
that.SG year when we.the World Cup hosted have
‘That year when we hosted the World Cup’

b. [Dai vrou] kennie van trug bringie.
that.SG woman knows.not of back bring.not
‘That woman does not like return (borrowed) things.’

(42) a. [Hai jare] toe ek nog ‘n kintjie was
that.PL years when I still a child was
‘Those years when I still was a kid.’

b. [Hai vrouens] maak altyd skandaal
that.PL women make always scandal
‘Those women are always causing a commotion.’

This extension of the d-initial / d-less contrast to mark number agreement in the NP clearly represents an Afrikaans innovation, as SA makes no number distinctions in the determiner system:

(43) a. daai vrou (‘that woman’)

b. daai vrouens (‘those women’)

This extension = excellent example of how grammars “recycle” existing properties (in this case: d-initial / h-initial) to affect new distinctions in those systems (in this case: number-sensitive agreement (41-42)).

The lesson from Syntactic Ecology:

Don’t be misled by familiar-looking properties (here: V1 in a V2 system).

Establishing an accurate characterisation of clausal properties (here: V1 or V2) may require careful consideration of the formal make-up of the nominal system (here: the D-system).

“Relics” from older systems may not serve the same purpose as they did in the original system; they may be repurposed to facilitate new distinctions (cf. it here).

Spoken-language systems often feature formally encoded distinctions that aren’t available in standard varieties which facilitate more precise expression of here-and-now-relevant information (cf. also the classic AAVE uninflected vs null copula case).
3.5. Auxiliary HET (‘have’)

Afrikaans is typically described as a maximally inflectionally impoverished language: no agreement morphology survives, as we have seen in Section 3.4 above.

However – possibly in parallel with developments in the nominal domain – Afrikaans het (past-tense ‘have’) exhibits a clear alternation between:

- a full form het
- a reduced (h-less) form et or ‘t.

The generalisation:

- Second-position HET can be full or reduced; can be stress-bearing
- Final HET must be reduced; cannot be stress-bearing
- Clear contrast between auxiliary HET and lexical het in final position: like auxiliary HET, lexical het can be full or reduced in second-position; in final position, lexical het cannot be reduced.

(44) Auxiliary het (data from one participant’s responses in a translation task)

a. Speaker A: *Ek'† vi Rosie gesê sy moetti kommi.*
   I-have for Rosie told she must.not come.not
   ‘I told Rosie not to come.’
   Speaker B: *Oh, hulle'† gewonne hoeko sy nooit gekommeti.*
   oh they-have wondered why she never come-has-not
   ‘Oh, they wondered why she never came.’

b. Speaker A: *Rosie'† gedink hulle ga weg vi Christmas.*
   Rosie-has thought they go away for Christmas
   ‘Rosie thought they were going away from Christmas.’
   Speaker B: *Nee, hulle het voo Christmas weg gegan. Hulle's nou t'†rug.*
   no they have before Christmas away gone. they-are now back
   ‘No, they went away before Christmas. They’re back now.’

c. *Amal'† ko kyk wat gebee et.*
   Everyone-has come look what happened has
   ‘Everyone came to see what happened.’

d. *Sy'† vi 'n wiek gehuilo to sy haa ma se ring veloo et.*
   she-has for a week cried when she her mother’s ring lost has
   ‘She cried for a week when she lost her mother’s ring.’

e. Speaker A: *Ekke kannie gloe dat hy wee vergietetjie!*
   I can.not believe that he again forgot-has-not
   ‘I can’t believe that he forgot again!’
   *Is dij sieke dat hy gewietet hy moet ko?*
   are you sure that he knew-has he must come
   ‘Are you sure that he knew he needed to come?’
Speaker B: *Hy het gewiet, ja!* 14  
he has knew, yes  
‘He did know, yes!’

Speaker B: *Ek is sieke dat hy gewietet, ja!* 15  
I am sure that he knew-has, yes  
‘I am sure that he knew, yes!’

When confronted with the sentence pair in (45), where final auxiliary *het* is ‘artificially’ stressed, another participant commented that it seems unnatural:

(45) Speaker A: *Ekke kannie gloe dat hy weet vergietetjie!*  
I can.not believe that he again forgot-has-not  
‘I can’t believe that he forgot again!’

*Is dy sieke dat hy gewietet hy moet ko?*  
are you sure that he knew-has he must come  
‘Are you sure that he knew he needed to come?’

Speaker B: *Ek is sieke dat hy gewiet *het*, ja!*  
I am sure that he *did* know, yes  
‘I am sure that he *did* know, yes!’

(46) Lexical *het* (data from one participant’s responses to a translation task)

a. *Amal wiet hat hyrrie gelt het.*  
everyone knows that he.the money has  
‘Everyone knows that he has the money.’

b. *Dalk voel dyj alien, maa dyj wiet mos hat dyj vi my het.*  
maybe feel you alone but you know PRT that you for me have  
‘Maybe you feel alone, but you know you have me.’

c. *Wie wiet of hy nog als het?*  
who knows if he still everything has  
‘Who knows if he still has everything?’

Final reduced *het* is also found in other Afrikaans dialects spoken to the north-west of the Afrikaaps-speaking area, in the so-called *Sandveld*:

(47) *Innie koshuis waar ons kleintyd gebly’t, wassit Hansie se werk gewees*  
in.the residence where we small.time stay-PP have was.it Hansie’s work be-PP  
on om Woensdae en Saterdae die donkie te gestook’t ...  
INF.C Wednesdays and Saturdays the boiler to stoke.have  
‘In the hostel where we stayed in our youth it was Hansie’s job to fire the boiler on Wednesdays and Saturdays ...  

---

14 Translation prompt:  
*Speaker B: He *did* know, yes!

15 Translation prompt:  
*Speaker B: I am sure that he *did* know, yes!*
And it seems to be another property that may be a retention from earlier (higher-register) varieties of Afrikaans (cf. again Conradie 2007: 220):

(48) seijn vrouw sou  seik geweesst (< gewees’t < gewees het)
≈ zijn vrouw zou ziek geweest hebben/zijn
‘his wife would have been ill’

[Standard Dutch; letter 224 from 1812, discussed in van Oordt 1952]

Auxiliary *het* in SA also exhibits numerous properties that suggest that it has become effectively a clitic (Conradie 2007), e.g.:

(i) the fact that it lacks an infinitive form (contrast BE: *is* - *wees*, and lexical HAVE is *het* - *hê*);

(ii) the fact that it cannot be separated from its associated participle - *om te gesien het* but
*om gesien te het*, where BE and BECOME behave quite differently - *om gesien te word*
vs *om te gesien word*

Auxiliary *het* in Afrikaans appears to be well on the way to becoming a piece of participial tense inflection (cf. also Conradie 2007, 2016, Zwart 2017, who, however, mainly discuss SA):

In addition to the defectivity and adjacency facts mentioned above, which also hold in SA, Afrikaans also exhibits:

(i) systematic *h*-drop, and
(ii) consistent assimilation with the preceding participle, i.e. a degree of phonological integration not visible in SA.

→ Remorphologization again?

Thus, in addition to (essentially) the innovated (non-Dutch) enclitic copula and auxiliary forms that it shares with SA, Afrikaans features an innovative inflectional tense marker, the endpoint of a grammaticalisation process that evidently has not run its full course in other Afrikaans varieties.

**The lesson from Syntactic Ecology:**

Again, contact varieties may, if the formal circumstances are conducive, develop formal distinctions absent in a corresponding standard

Here: a systematic distinction between V2 HET (full form or enclitic on a subject pronoun) and V-final HET (enclitic/affixed to a participle)

The high degree of encliticisation in Afrikaans may be the formal property that allows this variety to “go all the way” in reducing HET to inflectional morphology (recall oppie - on.the = ‘on the’; isse - is.a = ‘is a’; hyte - he.(ha)s.a = ‘he has a’, etc).
4. Conclusion

In this talk, we have highlighted:

- the importance of viewing contact languages as ecologies where “everything hangs together”: existing properties of an existing system determine how contact phenomena are integrated into the system.

- unhelpfulness of viewing contact languages as ‘simple’ amalgams of pieces of different languages which linguists try to disentangle (cf. the more general view on bilinguals since at least Grosjean 1989).

- the importance of considering mixed languages from the speaker-acquirer’s point of view, i.t.o. input.

- the acquirer’s input is simultaneously less extensive than the complete grammatical descriptions that linguists have at their disposal, and richer, in that acquirers seem to be able to approach their input in a “less is more” way (cf. Yang 2016, Biberauer 2018b).

- the importance of recognising that contact systems do not just gravitate to simplified forms, but innovate grammatical distinctions not present in the source systems.

Thus, contact systems are systems which change, develop, and innovate in just the same ways that other systems do.