Journal of Germanic Linguistics **14.1** (2002):3–56.

Khoekhoe Syntax and Its Implications for L2 Acquisition of Dutch and Afrikaans

Hans den Besten

University of Amsterdam

A provisional typological comparison demonstrates that Khoekhoe, Dutch, and Afrikaans are highly similar with respect to a couple of minor features. Therefore, Cape Dutch Pidgin (CDP), which came about as a relexified and pidginized version of Khoekhoe, could often develop compromises between Dutch and Khoekhoe syntax. Exceptions were the use of SOV without V2 and (possibly) the use of certain postpositions. Furthermore, there is evidence showing that CDP and Orange River Afrikaans (ORA) are diachronically related. An investigation of the sentential structure of Khoekhoe, however, shows that the second position (P2) phenomenon differs considerably from V2 in Dutch: P2 is symmetric and is applied in all clause types. Yet, except for a temporary pro-drop phenomenon in *wh*-clauses, P2 did not really affect the pidgin. Once finite verbs were acquired, the picture changed, and new (optional) subordinate V2 and V1 patterns could be introduced into Cape Dutch and Afrikaans under the influence of Khoekhoe Dutch/Afrikaans.

1. Introduction.

In an earlier study on cases of possible syntactic interference in the development of Afrikaans (den Besten 1978) I claimed that speakers of Khoekhoe would not have been able to change the basic word order of Cape Dutch since—being SOV speakers themselves—they could easily learn the underlying SOV order of Dutch. Only the acquisition of the verb-second (V2) phenomenon of Cape Dutch, which is absent in Khoekhoe, may have posed problems for them. But in the pertinent paper I suggested that this acquisition problem may have been less dramatic than it seems in that Khoekhoe makes use of a clearly defined second position comparable to the V2 position of Dutch.

Khoekhoe-speaking L2 learners of Cape Dutch therefore only had to learn how to fill this position with a finite verb. Since there are no finite verbs in Khoekhoe, it follows that Khoekhoe speakers learning Dutch also had to learn how to amalgamate a verb with what in Khoekhoe

happens to be a separate tense morpheme.

Whatever the merits of the latter considerations, it is clear that in a sense the Khoekhoen—as speakers of an SOV + second position language—seem to have been well equipped for learning an SOV + V2 language, namely, (Cape) Dutch (and later Afrikaans). It is no wonder that in spite of all the syntactic differences that obtain between Dutch and Afrikaans, their basic word orders still are identical: SOV + V2.

We may note in passing that the Khoekhoen, who constituted about one-third of the Cape Colonial population by the end of the eighteenth century, were not the sole SOV speakers at the Cape who had to learn Dutch. The same applies to the slaves from India and Sri Lanka—who constituted about a quarter of all the slaves imported between 1652 and 1808 (cf. Shell 1994:41)—since the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages of the Indian subcontinent can all be classified as SOV (however, as far as I can see, without having a second position; cf. Masica 1993 and Steever 1998). We may therefore conclude that SOV was a feature shared by various languages in the Dutch Cape Colony.[1] Interesting though this observation may be, it is of no further importance for the topic of this paper: the syntax of Khoekhoe and its implications for the acquisition of Dutch or Afrikaans as a second language. Let us therefore return to the discussion of the hypothesis put forward in den Besten 1978.

This hypothesis has hardly changed over the years. In a sense it was tacitly assumed in later publications (such as den Besten 1986, 1987, 1989) since these studies rather stress the importance of the Khoekhoe Dutch pidgin of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, whose syntax (inter alia SOV without V2) is partly modeled after the structure of Khoekhoe, the implicit suggestion being that syntactic properties of Khoekhoe could have reached Afrikaans only through the filter of this pidgin or subsequent creole varieties. The main reason for this auxiliary hypothesis (which was never made explicit) was the observation that Khoekhoe does not seem to have a verb phrase (VP). It was further assumed that the pidgin—by getting rid of certain Khoekhoe functional

[1] It goes without saying that the Low and High German-speaking immigrants from the fragmented German empire also had to learn (Cape) Dutch. Yet the pertinent languages resemble Dutch so closely—albeit in different ways, depending on dialect—that the very fact that they are SOV + V2 is of no significance at all. In the pertinent context they may be regarded as dialects (or rather groups of dialects) of Dutch. We may therefore assume that immigrants from the German empire could easily acquire the local dialect, Cape Dutch.

elements and their projections—had to project a VP in order to accommodate elements that in Khoekhoe are part of a higher functional projection. (See den Besten 1986:191–221, 1987:36–37, 1989:230–233.) This pidgin VP, which left the general OV order of Khoekhoe intact, gave the Khoekhoen easy access to the Cape Dutch VP.

Now note that the combination of the original hypothesis of den Besten 1978 and the (implicit) auxiliary hypothesis of den Besten 1986, 1987, and 1989 seems to leave the original idea of there being similarities between V2 in (Cape) Dutch and the second position in Khoekhoe untouched, although it is not clear whether that is justified. However, I will not go into this matter here because there are other, more basic problems to discuss.

First of all, contrary to what I thought in 1986, there is evidence for a VP in Khoekhoe (den Besten 1989:232–233), which weakens the auxiliary hypothesis in its present form. Secondly, despite the evident similarities between a second position with, and one without V2, Khoekhoe and Dutch differ as regards the use of this position, both in declarative and in interrogative contexts. Consequently, the original hypothesis about the Khoekhoen's acquisition of Cape Dutch V2 must also be revised. Therefore, a new discussion of the typological distance between Dutch and Khoekhoe in terms of the syntax of verbs and the possible implications of such considerations for L2 acquisition of Dutch or Afrikaans by speakers of Khoekhoe is called for, which is the main topic of this paper.

We start with a section on a couple of primary and secondary typological properties of the syntax of Dutch, Afrikaans, Orange River Afrikaans, and Khoekhoe (section 2), excluding the second position of Khoekhoe, which will be dealt with in section 4. It is concluded that these languages diverge from one another mostly in terms of secondary properties, one such property being V2. Section 3 gives an overview of what we know about relexified Khoekhoe and Khoekhoe Dutch pidgin and about the relationship between the pertinent pidgin and Orange River Afrikaans, which is mainly spoken by people of (partially) Khoekhoe descent. One of the conclusions is that in terms of word order the pidgin can be characterized as a compromise between Khoekhoe and Dutch, which was facilitated by the many typological similarities between the two languages, although there was a tendency to follow Dutch patterns in cases of conflict—the exception being V2. After these diachronic considerations, section 4 presents a discussion of the syntax of the second position (P2) and the VP in Khoekhoe. Consequences of these

considerations for the processes of pidginization and L2 acquisition of Dutch in the mouths of native speakers of Khoekhoe are discussed in section 5, together with possible implications for the syntax of Afrikaans.

2. Typological and Other Linguistic Considerations.
Consider the typological statements in 1. They concern Dutch and Afrikaans (and in principle all of their regional or social varieties) (1a–b),[2] Orange River Afrikaans, the variety of Afrikaans that is supposed to have undergone the strongest Khoekhoe substrate influences and which therefore occasionally has been referred to as "Hottentot Afrikaans," that is, Khoekhoe Afrikaans (1c), and Khoekhoe in all of its varieties (1d). As regards the latter, note that Khoekhoe is usually treated as a subfamily of Central Khoesan consisting of Nama (Namibia and small parts of South Africa), Korana and Griqua (South Africa, most probably extinct), and the extinct variety of Cape Khoekhoe, although Nienaber (1963) would also like to distinguish an East Cape variety for morphophonological reasons that do not concern us here.[3]

[2] Obvious exceptions to this general statement are Black Afrikaans and Flytaal, which are in principle SVO and without V2. Furthermore, most probably due to contact with SVO languages such as Malay, Asian Creole Portuguese, and English, some varieties of Afrikaans allow optional extraposition of an NP (DP) across a verb, which creates VO patterns, sometimes as subpatterns of more complicated sequences such as V-AUX-O or IO-V-O; compare, for example, Kotzé (1984), who treats this phenomenon under the heading of *eindrelevering* ('extraposition', literally 'drawing attention to (something) at the end'). NP (DP)-extraposition yields a further complication for the basic word order statement, however without canceling the SOV property. Note that also so-called rigorous (and non-V2) SOV languages such as Nama can make use of NP-extraposition (cf. Hagman 1973:212–213). NP-extraposition can also be observed for Middle Dutch and Middle High German, but there is no reason to assume that NP-extraposition in nonstandard Afrikaans derives from Dutch. After all, there is no evidence for NP-extraposition in seventeenth-century Dutch.

[3] Korana and Griqua (insofar as the latter has been described at all) demonstrate certain lexical and morphophonological connections with Cape Khoekhoe, which is not surprising given the history of the pertinent groups. However, Engelbrecht (1936) has shown that there is also a variety of Korana whose lexis and morphophonology demonstrate clear ties with Nama. It seems reasonable to assume that Cape-like Korana belongs to those groups that emigrated from the south to the Orange River area, whereas Nama-like Korana must be a continuation of indigenous Khoekhoe dialects of the same region.

(1) a. Dutch: SOV + asymmetric V2
b. Afrikaans: SOV + asymmetric V2
c. Orange River Afrikaans: SOV + asymmetric V2
d. Khoekhoe (all varieties): SOV + no V2 (to be revised below)

Regarding the statements in 1, the following remarks are in order: First, the statements in 1a–c are in accordance with the classical approach to Dutch and German word order defended in Koster 1975, which can be easily extended to the analysis of Afrikaans as is shown in Waher 1982 (similarly for Orange River Afrikaans). From a typological point of view, "SOV + asymmetric V2" is the simplest way to describe the basic word orders of the three linguistic varieties mentioned.[4] The pertinent statements abstract away from the obvious differences between Dutch on the one hand and Afrikaans and Orange River Afrikaans on the other insofar as the optional use of embedded V2 is concerned (cf. Waher 1982 and Ponelis 1979, and see below).[5] Second, the typological statements in 1 are valid whether we analyze SOV as an underlying or as a derived property (for the latter approach see Kayne 1994 and Zwart 1993, 1997). Third, the statement "SOV + no V2" for Khoekhoe is based mainly on grammatical descriptions of Nama and Korana. There are no grammars for Cape Khoekhoe or the East Cape variety, but the sentential and phrasal material from these dialects that is occasionally quoted by Nienaber (1963) demonstrates clear Khoekhoe characteristics, although one has to consult his sources to find evidence for "SOV + no V2."[6]

[4] Also compare Hawkins 1983, a study in the Greenbergian tradition, which reclassifies German (in Greenberg's original classification SVO) as SOV + V2. It is perhaps ironic that Hawkins's expanded list still classifies Dutch, which in all relevant respects is similar to German, as an SVO language. But that is due to the fact that this is a direct quote from Greenberg's Appendix II (Greenberg 1966).

[5] In a recent paper Feinauer (1998) claims that from a typological point of view, Afrikaans is a typical SVX language. This claim is based on a rather unorthodox use of implicational universals and is not in accordance with standard practice in linguistic typology. Ever since Greenberg 1966, the basic word order type of a given language is established through careful examination of the position of the verb with respect to its arguments. The syntax of other parts of speech (including so-called auxiliaries) is irrelevant, unless (and only insofar as) they share a syntactic property with the verb, as is the case with the Afrikaans auxiliary, which shares V2 with the verb.

[6] For Nama (nowadays also called Khoekhoe or Khoekhoegowab, literally 'Khoekhoe language'), see Rust 1965, Hagman 1973, and Olpp 1977. For

The typological statements in 1 concern sentential syntax. As can be deduced from these statements, the pertinent languages differ only in terms of the secondary V2 feature. Note that these languages also have much in common in terms of basic word order properties of phrasal syntax: attributive APs and nonadpositional possessive phrases have to appear in prenominal position in all of the four languages, while Khoekhoe differs from the other languages only in that it lacks the subclass of adpositionally marked possessives, which have to be postnominal in Dutch and both types of Afrikaans.[7]

Note that my typological claim seems to be at odds with the observation that there are also postnominal APs and possessive phrases in Khoekhoe. However, in view of the fact that such postnominal phrases are marked as DPs, it is more likely that they are appositive DPs containing empty nominal constituents, which means (among other things) that postnominal possessive phrases in Khoekhoe are appositive free possessives.[8]

Korana, see Engelbrecht 1928 and 1936, Maingard 1962, and especially Meinhof 1930, which also contains a sketchy appendix on Griqua. As for Cape and East Cape Khoekhoe, Nienaber 1963, a dictionary of older Khoekhoe on an Afrikaans-Khoekhoe basis, is our sole source for the latter two varieties, although—with very few exceptions—information is provided only on lexis, morphology, and phonology . Yet syntactic information on Cape and East Cape Khoekhoe can be gleaned from some travelogues, where, unfortunately, only very few native utterances can be found, as well as from a couple of translations by nonnative speakers, including J. W. Grevenbroeck's translations of the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Apostles' Creed into Cape Khoekhoe published in that order in Leibniz 1717:365–384 and "The Lord's Prayer in the Hottentot Language" in Campbell 1815 [1974:388–389]. In this small but precious corpus we can find evidence for quite a few syntactic characteristics that are also typical for Nama and Korana: subject clitics following preposed elements, postverbal object clitics, SOV word order but no V2, postpositions, postverbal negation, and a sentence-initial negative imperative marker. However, note that the texts in Leibniz 1717 are in need of further analysis, both lexical and syntactic. Due to the absence of several words from these texts in Nienaber 1963—and/or due to the absence of an index of the Khoekhoe words treated in that book—I have not always been able to decipher individual sentences.

[7] The possessive-final marker *di* of Khoekhoe is not a postposition; see den Besten 1978.

[8] Two examples illustrating the point are: *om-i gei-b* 'house-3sg.M big-3sg.M', literally 'the house, the big one', and *xū -n khoi-s di-n* 'thing-3pl.C person-3pl.F POSS-3pl.C', literally 'the things, the woman's' vs. *gei om-i* 'big house-3sg.M.',

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Therefore the four languages discussed seem to differ only in terms of minor features. Nevertheless, there are two basic features of phrasal syntax with respect to which a real difference can be found: i. tensed relative clauses are postnominal in Dutch/Afrikaans but prenominal in Khoekhoe (disregarding the use of appositive free relatives, which are postnominal, of course); ii. generally speaking, adpositions in Dutch and (Orange River) Afrikaans are prepositions, while Khoekhoe has postpositions. Further complications such as the Dutch/Afrikaans particles—postpositions and the so-called circumpositions (collocations of pre- and postpositions)—will not be discussed here, although Afrikaans circumpositional phrases are briefly touched on in section 3 below.[9]

So much for phrasal syntax. However, there are some more fine-grained details of sentential and verbal syntax that have not been discussed yet.

First of all, the SOV property of a language L may have to be qualified in that there may be so-called wrapping structures, that is, structures in which the constituents of a VP seem to wrap themselves around a constituent that is supposed to be outside that VP, more specifically around an auxiliary (wrapping structure A) or around a TMA marker (wrapping structure B). It so happens that the SOV property of each of the four languages under discussion has to be qualified in this way, although they differ as to which type of wrapping structure they choose.

Wrapping structure A shows up in Dutch (2a) and in both varieties of Afrikaans: it is the well-known verb (projection) raising phenomenon.

(2)	a.	... dat	hij	het	boek	wou / kon	lezen
		... that	he	the	book	wanted / could	read

Note in this context that the pertinent auxiliaries do not have to be finite and can also be stacked, as in *wou kunnen lezen* 'wanted be-able read'.

---

that is, 'the big house' and *khoi-s (di) xū -n* 'person-3sg.F (POSS) thing-3pl.C', that is, 'the woman's things', respectively. (Examples are based on Rust 1965:27, 33. For the grammatical glosses see note 37 and example 17g.) Compare the grammars of Nama and Korana mentioned in note 6 or the overview in den Besten 1978. For a discussion of the DP (NP) in Nama see Hagman 1973: ch. 2 and Haacke 1976.

[9] For the Khoekhoe data see the grammars of Nama and Korana mentioned in note 6, Haacke 1976, or the overview in den Besten 1978. For adpositions in Dutch and Afrikaans see van Riemsdijk 1978 and Oosthuizen 2000 respectively.

Also note that there are a few auxiliaries that may or must follow the verb.[10]

There are various proposals in the literature on how to analyze Dutch/Afrikaans verb (projection) raising. I adopt here—without further discussion—the scrambling analysis indicated in 2b:

(2) b. ... dat hij [$_{DP}$ het boek] wou / kon [$_{XP}$ dp lezen]
... that he the book wanted / could dp read
[dp = the trace of DP; XP = VP or an extended projection thereof]

This is also—following various other assumptions—the analysis for Afrikaans verb (projection) raising defended by Robbers (1997).

While wrapping structure A is a typical feature of Dutch and both varieties of Afrikaans, wrapping structure B is attested for Khoekhoe, as is indicated in the general word order formula for Khoekhoe in 3, with T indicating a tense particle:

(3) $XP_1 \ldots XP_n - T - V \quad (n \geq 1)$

It goes without saying that a structure as indicated in 3 may be another candidate for the scrambling analysis, as was already suggested in passing in den Besten 1989:232–233. This is discussed in section 4.2 below.

Now it so happens that not only the SOV property has to be qualified but also the V2 property of Afrikaans and Orange River Afrikaans, while Dutch can still be represented as a "classical" asymmetric V2 language. The same may still be true for very normative (stilted) Standard Afrikaans.[11] In nonstandard and colloquial Afrikaans, and partly also in

[10] Although the West Germanic verb (projection) raising phenomenon is a hotly debated topic among formal syntacticians of various theoretical convictions, wrapping structures have not received much attention among typologists yet, maybe because it is not a widespread phenomenon. By way of a curiosity, I mention the occurrence of a verb raising-like phenomenon in Batticaloa Portuguese, a Portuguese Creole with SOV base order. Smith (1979:202–203) points out that some of the Batticaloa Portuguese auxiliaries, namely, *poy* 'can' and *kerə* 'want, intend', immediately precede the verb. Similarly, Batticaloa TMA markers immediately precede the verb (often as clitics), unlike the TMA markers of Batticaloa Tamil, which are suffixal or enclitic (Smith 1979:198–201). This means that both wrapping structure A and wrapping structure B are present in Batticaloa Portuguese.

[11] I therefore disregard the use of V2 or V1 in certain adverbial clauses in Dutch

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

modern written Afrikaans, the following deviations from the asymmetric V2 norm can be found, although they are by no means obligatory and differ in acceptability:

(4) a. embedded V2 in *that*-clauses with and without initial *dat* 'that', e.g.:

Ek	dink	(dat)	hy	sal	dit	môre	lees.
I	think	(that)	he	will	it	tomorrow	read

(Ponelis 1979:440–441, 446, 531; Donaldson 1993:368; Waher 1982)

b. embedded V2 in subordinate clauses headed by *wh*-phrases, e.g.:

Ek	weet	nie	hoekom	het	hy	dit	gedoen	nie.
I	know	not	why	has	he	it	done	not

(Ponelis 1979:530; Donaldson 1993:327, 371)

c. embedded V1 in clauses headed by *of* 'whether', e.g.:

Ons	weet	nie	of	het	hy	dit	gedoen	nie.
we	know	not	whether	has	he	it	done	not

(Ponelis 1979:531)

Although embedded declarative V2 is not completely unheard of in the Germanic V2 languages, the specific combination of phenomena described in 4 is; on the other hand, phenomena similar to 4b–c can be found in Irish English, which is a contact variety of a (residual) V2 language. Furthermore note that in spite of traditional assumptions about V1 (which is supposed to be a special variant of V2), the finite verb does not block the occurrence of the complementizer in *of*-clauses. Therefore, we may wonder whether the finite verb in embedded V2 interrogatives occupies the same position as the finite verb in V2 main clauses headed by a *wh*-phrase. More specifically: it cannot be excluded that *wh*-clauses as in 4b have to be analyzed as follows:

(5) $[_{CP}\ [_{XP}$ + WH] C $[_{FP}$ Spec V_{fin} [. . .]]]

where C and Spec are empty, although the *wh*-phrase may have moved

---

and (Standard) Afrikaans. This property, which occurs in all Germanic V2 languages, is marginal compared to the deviations from asymmetric V2 in colloquial and nonstandard Afrikaans.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

through [Spec, FP] (FP being some functional projection).[12]

Finally, note that V2 in Afrikaans also differs from V2 in Dutch in that it may interact with V-to-V incorporation, yielding so-called complex initials, that is, sequences of more than one verb in finite position:[13]

(6) a. Daar bly staan hy.
there keeps stand he

b. Toe laat val hy dit.
then let fall he it

Complex initials stick to the canonical AUX-V order of Dutch and Afrikaans verbal clusters, but older Orange River Afrikaans also made use of the order V-AUX, which yielded "inverted" complex initials such as *hardloop kom* 'running come(s)' or *siet wil* 'see want(s)'. These should be distinguished from cases like 7, which can still be heard in Orange River Afrikaans (cf. Rademeyer 1938:72–73, 81–84):

(7) Stammak die ding daar
stand-make the thing there
'Put the thing over there.'

In colloquial Afrikaans *staanmaak* (lit.) 'stand-make' is a separable compound or particle verb; that is, *staan* 'stand' serves as verbal particle of *maak* 'make'.[14] The canonical order for Afrikaans particle verbs is Prt-V, except when V2 is applied, which yields V… Prt in the pertinent main and subordinate clauses. Therefore *stammak* in 7 should be analyzed as a particle verb with an incorporated particle, which is in

[12] In V-final *wh*-clauses in colloquial and nonstandard Afrikaans the *wh*-phrase may be followed by the complementizer *dat* 'that'. Therefore, we may wonder whether something similar is possible in embedded interrogative V2 clauses. Although the literature does not mention examples of this kind, I have come across one case of the required type (… *hoekom dat het* … '… why that has …'), while some informants recognized similar examples as a phenomenon that can be heard. For the time being, I regard this as insufficient evidence. Furthermore, note that the structure in 5 does not imply that C has to be lexical.

[13] We owe the term "complex initials" to Ponelis (1993). For V-to-V incorporation, see Ponelis 1979:244–245, Donaldson 1993:364, and Robbers 1997.

[14] Compare Robbers' construction 1 for causative *maak* (Robbers 1997:97–99, 223–224). For some speculative thoughts on a Khoekhoe Afrikaans origin for the V-*maak* construction see den Besten, Luijks, and Roberge (forthcoming).

accordance with the fact that Orange River Afrikaans particle verbs with adpositional and other types of particles also undergo incorporation, as in the following example:[15]

(8) Maar naderhand toe om-draai hy sommer hier halfpad.
but afterwards then around-turn he just here halfway
(Rademeyer 1938:86)

This is ungrammatical in other types of Afrikaans and it goes without saying that particle incorporation is not grammatical in Dutch either.

In sum, the four languages under consideration share SOV and certain DP-internal ordering patterns, while the Dutch/Afrikaans group makes use of prepositions as opposed to postpositions in Khoekhoe. Dutch, Afrikaans, and Orange River Afrikaans share such secondary features as V2 and the adpositional possessive, which are absent in Khoekhoe. As regards "wrapping," another secondary feature, the Dutch/Afrikaans group and Khoekhoe make use of different strategies. Furthermore, the Afrikaans group differs from Dutch in allowing three (or maybe rather two) types of embedded V2 as well as V-to-V incorporation (albeit optionally), while Orange River Afrikaans differs from other types of Afrikaans in that it allows particle incorporation.

It is clear that the language contact situation in and around the Cape Colony never led to changes in a couple of basic syntactic properties of Cape Dutch. On the other hand the languages of the Afrikaans group have developed new (secondary) properties, which may very well be due to language contact, for instance with Khoekhoe.

3. Some Considerations concerning the Interaction between Dutch/Afrikaans and Khoekhoe in the Early Period.[16]

3.1. Khoekhoe in Contact with Dutch/Afrikaans: Relexification and Pidgin Formation.

We know precious little about what was going on in the language contact situation that involved Khoekhoe and Dutch/Afrikaans, but some things are known. First of all, although some colonists were willing to learn (a bit of) Khoekhoe, they usually conversed with the Khoekhoen in (Cape) Dutch or in Pidgin Dutch. This pidgin, Cape Dutch Pidgin, of which we have a limited but useful corpus, started with the Khoekhoen and was taken over by the slaves. Furthermore, over time a new linguistic variety

[15] See Rademeyer 1938:63 and Du Plessis 1984:162–163.
[16] This section is based on den Besten 1978, 1986, 1987, and 2001.

arose: relexified Khoekhoe, which probably has to be interpreted as one aspect of the overall process of language shift from Khoekhoe to Cape Dutch/Afrikaans. However, two pidgin sentences from the earliest period indicate that relexification may have been a factor in the construction of the pidgin, too. Therefore, I first discuss relexification.

We are informed about relexified Khoekhoe through a letter by Theophilus Hahn to Hugo Schuchardt (dated February 21, 1882, quoted in den Besten 1986:216, 226). Hahn first mentions relexified imperatives such as *Loop-tse* 'go-you'(< *!gun-tse*) with Afrikaans *loop* 'go'. Then follows a discussion of the "Khoekhoe" translation, produced during a sermon, of the phrase *Von Natur gänzlich verdorben*, that is, 'completely depraved by nature' (in Dutch, according to Hahn: *Van Natuur geheel-enall bedorven*), which—without Hahn's interpolated annotations—runs as follows: *Heeltemalse Natuura-xu bedorven-he*. As Hahn himself indicates, 9 is a relexified version of the Khoekhoe phrase in 10:

(9) Heeltemal-se Natuur-a-xu bedorven-he
completely-ADV nature-OBJ-from depraved-PASS
[ADV= adverbial marker; OBJ = case; PASS = passive marker]

(10) Hoaraga-se ǂũb-a xu ǁgau-ǁgau-he

We may therefore conclude that relexification of Khoekhoe did not affect grammatical particles, postpositions, or even pronominal clitics (see above).

Now there are two early pidgin utterances that show relexification effects of this type. First of all, the "English Hottentot" Herry (= Harry) is quoted as saying *Goo Goo reght* (lit.) 'Go go straight' (1655; Godée Molsbergen, 1916(I):18), while 'Go (away)' seems to be what he actually meant. However it could be argued that *Goo reght* should be interpreted as Engl. *go* plus the Khoekhoe imperative/hortative marker *-re*, which was misunderstood as [rɛx], the local pronunciation of Du. *recht* 'straight' (see den Besten 1989:232).

Less contaminated data are provided by ten Rhyne (1686; cited in Schapera and Farrington 1933:140), who quotes the sentence *Was makom?* (lit.) 'what (?) do?', which he translates into Latin as *quid facitis?* 'What are you (pl) doing?' However, *was*, which looks like German *was* 'what?', should be analyzed as Dutch *wat* 'what?' plus the Khoekhoe clitic *-ts* 'you (2sg masc.)'.[17] In spite of this enclitic pronoun,

[17] See den Besten 1986:217 and 1987:27. Ten Rhyne visited the Cape in 1673.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Was makom? must be a pidgin sentence since the verb ends in the pidgin suffix *-om* while the sentence does not contain a Khoekhoe TMA particle. As is pointed out in den Besten 1986, 1987, and 1989, Cape Dutch Pidgin may have developed out of pidginized relexified Khoekhoe (a kind of foreigner talk) that was partly adapted to Dutch syntax. Apparently, speakers sometimes forgot the difference between relexified Khoekhoe and pidginized (and adapted) relexified Khoekhoe, producing grammatically mixed sentences, which under circumstances could pass for relexified Khoekhoe proper.[18]

Examples of pidgin sentences without any Khoekhoe grammatical particle can be found in 11:[19]

His use of the second person plural form *facitis* in his Latin rendering of *Was makom?* is most probably due to his Dutch *Vorlage*, since spoken Hollandic Dutch *jij* 'you (2sg)' had to be rendered in normative seventeenth-century written Dutch as *gij*, a southern Dutch pronoun that could be either second person singular or plural but whose original meaning is second person plural only (cf. formal *vous* in French).

[18] Both *Was makom* and *Goo reght* are grammatically mixed, while **Goo-re(ght)* could pass for relexified Khoekhoe. It cannot be excluded that there are more grammatically mixed sentences in my pidgin data base. Thus, in Kolbe 1727(I):121 we find two instances of a particle *'k*, which shows up in combination with an auxiliary *hemme* 'have' (*'k hemme*), although there are two more instances of *hemme* without *'k* in the same context (cf. examples 46a and 51a). This particle may be the Khoekhoe declarative marker *ge* and/or the remote past marker *ge*, but unfortunately such interpretations yield problems that I have not been able to solve yet.

[19] Although example 11b contains genuine material, *daar van* 'away' (lit. 'there from') is a germanism (< German *davon*). The southern Dutch second person object pronoun *V* (i.e., *u*) in 11a is also dubious since it belongs to the written register of seventeenth-century Dutch. Therefore, the Khoekhoen who pronounced this threat most probably said *jou* (2sg) or *jull(i)e* (2pl). Note that in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a new (invariant) formal pronoun *u* developed in colloquial middle class Dutch. Because of the latter feature, the early period and the aggressive nature of the confrontation described, we can exclude the possibility that the pertinent Khoekhoen were using invariant formal *u*.

(11) a. 't Za lustigh, duijtsman een woordt Calm,
tza quiet, Dutch-man/men one word say,
ons V kelum
we you cut-throat
(1672; Franken 1953:113)

b. gy dit Beest fangum zoo, en nu dood maakum zoo,
you this animal catch so, and now kill so,
is dat braa, wagtum ons altemaal daar van loopum zoo
is that good, wait we all away run so
(1705–1713; Kolbe 1727(I):502)

Except for *is dat braa* in 11b, all clauses in 11a–b are (S)OV, which is in accordance with Khoekhoe basic word order and which is one of the reasons for regarding Cape Dutch Pidgin as the product of pidginization and relexification of Khoekhoe, a kind of relexified Khoekhoe foreigner talk.[20] The co-occurrence of V2 and SOV sentences in one sequence of pidgin sentences may be genuine though, because there are more attestations of such mixed sequences.[21] Most or all of the pertinent V2 sentences may be fixed expressions that the Khoekhoen learned from the Dutch.

The following (incomplete) overview of syntactic and morphological properties of the pidgin (gleaned from den Besten 1986, 1987, and 2001) demonstrates, however, that Cape Dutch Pidgin was not fully Khoekhoe in nature and had some exclusively Dutch properties:

(12) a. 1. SOV; 2. no V2; 3. no Khoekhoe particles (with a few exceptions);
b. tense adverbials, such as *(al) gedaen* (lit.) '(already) done/ready' for the perfect;
c. preverbal negation, that is, negation in the inner field, as in Dutch;
d. a marker *-um/-om/-me* on the verb and on a few nouns and adjectives (possibly deriving from two allomorphs of the Cape Khoekhoe person-gender-number marker for 3sg.masc.);[22]
e. a prenominal demonstrative pronoun *die* 'that, those';

[20] See den Besten 1986, 1987, and 1989.
[21] See den Besten 1987.
[22] See den Besten 1987 for the hypothesis that *-um/-om/-me* may originally have been a Cape Khoekhoe VP-nominalizer.

f. 1. no articles in the early period; 2. with demonstrative *die* developing into a definite article;
g. *die man* 'that man' as an anaphoric and deictic pronominal expressions (also a property of Cape Khoekhoe);
h. 1. prenominal possessives; 2. which are optionally marked: DP-(POSS)-N;
i. attributive adjectives in prenominal position;
j. if any adpositions, prepositions only (no postpositions have been attested).

Note that the properties 12a1–2; 12d; 12e; 12f1; 12g; 12h1–2; and 12i can all be related to Khoekhoe or Cape Khoekhoe, which seems sufficient to relate the pidgin as a whole to Khoekhoe, while the tense adverbials (12b) are a pidgin solution for the problem caused by the omission of all Khoekhoe particles. If we now restrict the set of Khoekhoe properties to the proper subset of Khoekhoe ordering properties, that is, 12a1 and 2, 12e, 12h1, and 12i, we can see that all of these properties except for the absence of V2 (12a2) are in accordance with Dutch syntax. The Khoekhoen apparently refrained from using postnominal attributive phrases (in fact appositive DPs with empty NPs in Khoekhoe—see above), while the Dutch had to think in terms of infinitival verbs to get "SOV without V2" right, which must have been hardly problematic for them: this was their own contribution to the formation of the Cape Dutch Pidgin. Furthermore, the use of preverbal negation and prepositions (i.e., 12c and 12j) indicates that even word order patterns that were obligatory in Khoekhoe but foreign to the Dutch, namely postverbal negation (SOV-NEG) and postpositions, were shunned, which means that the pidgin may be seen as a Dutch-Khoekhoe compromise, as is also indicated by the gradual development of a definite article (cf. 12f2).[23]

Note in this context that the switch from postverbal to preverbal negation may have been fairly unproblematic for speakers of Khoekhoe. Their postverbal negative markers *tama* 'NEG' and *tite* 'NEG.FUT' may have been unavailable for relexification anyway since they could count

[23] See den Besten 1986 for an overview of negative sentences in Cape Dutch Pidgin and den Besten 2001 for one extra datum. *Weet niet* 'know not' in the quote from Bövingh 1714, in note 31 below, is a set expression with V2 and therefore does not count as a pidgin sentence in the proper sense. For negation in Khoekhoe, see den Besten 1986 or the grammars mentioned in note 6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as grammatical particles. However, in Khoekhoe, negative quantifiers—including negative adverbs—precede the verb (in conjunction with postverbal *tama* or *tite*), and Khoekhoe speakers could therefore easily interpret Dutch *nie(t)* 'not' as a negative adverb.

As far as I can see, there was no comparable way to get used to prepositions, and it may therefore be interesting to know that there is also indirect evidence for postpositions in Cape Dutch Pidgin. This evidence can be found in the nineteenth-century SVO pidgin that developed under the influence of the massive influx of slaves and "prize Negroes" from Mozambique.[24] The new pidgin borrowed some features of the original pidgin, unless it was a restructured version of the older SOV pidgin.[25] One feature that may have been borrowed from the older pidgin is the postposition *saam* 'with' (< Dutch *saam/samen* 'together'), since it is unlikely for Bantu speakers to have developed postpositions:

(13) a. nie bemoei ander mense sam
[I] not interfere other people with
(letter by the "Ingesete van Stellebos" or 'resident of Stellenbosch' [1831, Nienaber, 1971:54])

b. aldaa zij had mooij kapraat, mijn zaam
there (?) she have nicely spoken, me with
(Isaac Albach, a Frenchman, in the diary of Louis Trigardt [1836–1838] in le Roux 1977:61)

These observations may shed new light upon the occurrence of "un-Dutch" circumpositions in nonstandard Afrikaans, that is, circumpositions whose constitutive parts connote an apparent redundancy. Compare the following examples:[26]

(14) a. in hierdie straat in
in this street in

b. met die mes saam
with the knife with

Circumpositions such as those in 14 may very well be compromises

[24] For the influx of the Mozambican slaves and "prize Negroes," see Shell 1994:41–42, 45–46.
[25] See den Besten 2001.
[26] Compare Rademeyer 1938:80; Ponelis 1979:177, 327; Donaldson 1993:357–359; Oosthuizen 2000.

between Dutch prepositions and Khoekhoe/pidgin postpositions on analogy with Dutch circumpositional structures such as *met* DP/NP *samen* 'with DP/NP together (= together with DP/NP)'.

Note that the above considerations do not tell us anything about the accessibility of Dutch phenomena such as V2 for speakers of Khoekhoe. However, they do tell us that there was a considerable amount of Khoekhoe substrate features in Cape Dutch Pidgin, while the grammatically mixed sentences seem to show that (relexified) Khoekhoe and Cape Dutch Pidgin were not completely separate systems for native speakers of Khoekhoe. This implies that the hypothesis according to which syntactic properties of Khoekhoe could have reached Afrikaans only through the filter of the pidgin or subsequent creole varieties (cf. section 1) is too strong in its present form.

Nevertheless it seems reasonable to assume that there are connections between Cape Dutch Pidgin and Afrikaans and that the pidgin has been a factor in the genesis of Orange River Afrikaans, which is spoken by people of mainly Khoekhoe descent and which might as well be called Khoekhoe Afrikaans. Furthermore, it is equally reasonable to assume that this Khoekhoe Afrikaans had a wider geographical distribution in the past than it does now and that early varieties of Khoekhoe Afrikaans must have influenced East Cape Afrikaans and its offshoot, Voortrekker Afrikaans.

3.2. Evidence for a Diachronic Relationship between Cape Dutch Pidgin and Orange River Afrikaans.

Given the assumption that Cape Dutch Pidgin has been a factor in the genesis of Orange River Afrikaans, a natural question to ask is what may count as a Cape Dutch Pidgin residue in twentieth-century Orange River Afrikaans.

Unfortunately, the properties of Cape Dutch Pidgin summed up in 12 cannot be used as a checklist here since Orange River Afrikaans shares a few features with Dutch/Afrikaans that were absent—or not fully present—in the early pidgin, such as V2, a definite article, an obligatory prenominal possessive marker (*se*), and prepositions and circumpositions. Furthermore, other features such as SOV, preverbal negation, prenominal demonstratives and adjectives, and prepositions are shared by Dutch, Afrikaans, and Orange River Afrikaans. And finally, due to the introduction of finite verbs (a prerequisite for V2), Orange River Afrikaans does not need tense adverbials, while the verbal ending *-um/-om/-me* seems to have been given up before the nineteenth

century.[27] In spite of all this, there is some evidence that Orange River Afrikaans may be related to the old pidgin as we know it, that is, to the limited corpus of pidgin data that we possess.[28]

Thus Cape Dutch Pidgin and Orange River Afrikaans (as well as other nonstandard varieties of Afrikaans) share the verb *dood* 'to die', which derives from Dutch/Afrikaans *dood* 'dead', while Standard Afrikaans uses *sterf/sterwe* 'to die'(< Dutch *sterven*), as is pointed out in Roberge 1994b:74–75.[29] Furthermore, Roberge (1994b:73–75) refers to the early nineteenth-century traveler Lichtenstein, who claimed that the Khoekhoen often omitted temporal auxiliaries when speaking Dutch. Roberge reasons that this may very well mean that the Khoekhoen made use of the participial prefix *ge-* to express past tense or perfect, which is a phenomenon that (still) sporadically occurs in our twentieth-century Orange River Afrikaans corpora, as in the following example:

(15)	Baas	hulle	hom	**geroep**	die	galsbôom.
	master	they	it	called (ptc.)	the	gall-tree (?)
						(van Rensburg (ed.) 1984(I):213)

Although this may seem circular, there is evidence for the use of this tense-marking prefix *ge-* in nineteenth-century pidgin: Roberge (1994a:66–68, forthcoming) points to the pidgin Afrikaans of the Frenchman Isaac Albach, as reported by Trigardt (1836–1838, in le Roux 1977), while data from other sources is provided by den Besten (2001). Therefore, example 15 represents a residue of (a late variety of) Cape Dutch Pidgin in Orange River Afrikaans.[30]

---

[27] Compare the nineteenth-century pidgin data in den Besten 2001. As for the tense adverbials, note that *(al) gedaen* lit. '(already) done/ready' has survived in a new guise with new functions in Afrikaans *(al) klaar* 'already' (lit. '[already] ready') and in the Afrikaans completive marker *klaar*. See also den Besten 1987:19–20, 21–22, and 1989:238; Roberge 1994b:77–78.

[28] However, see Roberge 1994b for an attempt to reconstruct features of the pidgin on the basis of Orange River Afrikaans data.

[29] Also see den Besten 1987:17–19. Note that all varieties of Afrikaans have given up Dutch *doden* 'to kill' in favor of the particle verb *doodmaak* lit. 'dead-make', which can be traced back to the pidgin and ultimately derives from Dutch *doodmaken* (cf. den Besten 1987:17–18). In Dutch and Standard Afrikaans the particle *dood* can only be an adjective. In Orange River Afrikaans, however, this particle can also be a verb. Compare the case of *staanmaak* 'put', lit. 'stand-make'.

[30] See Luijks 2000 for similar cases in the letters of the nineteenth-century Nama

Besides the cases discussed by Roberge (1994a, 1994b), there is also phonological evidence for a diachronic relationship between Cape Dutch Pidgin and Orange River Afrikaans. In Orange River Afrikaans the Dutch/Afrikaans diphthong <ui> is sometimes realized as an [y], which is the Middle Dutch predecessor of <ui>, so to speak (e.g., *uut* instead of *uit* 'out'). The same is reported for Cape Dutch Pidgin.[31]

Given the above considerations, it is a pleasant coincidence that Wikar (1779) provides us with linguistic material that connects the type of Dutch of the Orange River area of the late 1770s both with the early pidgin of the seventeenth century and with twentieth-century Orange River Afrikaans. Wikar (1779, in Godée Molsbergen, 1916(II):82) mentions a kind of tax called *kortom*, which is also talked about by ten Rhyne (1686, in Schapera and Farrington 1933:136, 152). The word itself is a nominalization (by means of the pidgin suffix *-um*/*-om*/*-me*) either of Dutch *kort* 'short' or of Dutch *korten* 'to cut back'.[32] Furthermore, Wikar quotes the following possessive construction (in reference to baboons):

(16) de oude tyden zijn mens
the old times his/POSS human
(Wikar 1779, in Godée Molsbergen, 1916(II):94)

This is a typical example of an Orange River Afrikaans possessive construction. Remarkably similar cases from the twentieth century are

leader Jan Jonker Afrikaner.

[31] See den Besten 2001. For [y] instead of <ui> in Orange River Afrikaans, see Rademeyer 1938:49, Links 1989:19–20, and van Rensburg 1984:346. Links (1989:19–20) notes for the Namaqualand variety that [y] also substitutes for the *ui*-2, an original diphthong. This must be the hypercorrect result of a counterrule against ongoing diphthongization. Evidence for the comparable use of [i] instead of the more recent Dutch/Afrikaans diphthong <ij/y> is nearly nonexistent. Rademeyer (1938:50–51) and Links (1989:21) could not find anything of the kind in Orange River Afrikaans (except for Links's datum [klimɑ:] for *kleinma*, which involves an original diphthong). But in the Griqua Afrikaans texts of van Zyl (1947:4, 9) I found *nabie* instead of *naby* 'near' (as an adverb and a preposition, respectively), while van Rensburg (1984:345) mentions *altit* instead of *altyd* 'always'. This corresponds nicely to the pidgin form *altit* instead of *altijd* in Joh. Georg Bövingh's *Kurze Nachricht von den Hottentotten* (1714:20), quoted by Schoeman (1997:121): *Weet niet, Hottentotten manier, Hottentott altit so* 'Know not, Hottentots way, Hottentot(s) always so'.

[32] In fact Wikar provides more lexical material that is reminiscent of the early pidgin, but *kortom*, with its pidgin suffix, is the most striking example.

discussed by Spruijt (1993: 67, 93, 124).[33]

3.3. Concluding Remarks concerning Cape Dutch Pidgin.
As we have seen in section 3.1 (relexified) Khoekhoe and Cape Dutch Pidgin were not completely separate systems for native speakers of Khoekhoe, while we may derive from section 3.2 that Cape Dutch Pidgin has been a factor in the genesis of Orange River Afrikaans. The latter probably means that we should view Cape Dutch Pidgin as a (protracted) stage in the acquisition and/or construction of Cape Dutch and (Orange River) Afrikaans, while the former implies that Cape Dutch Pidgin may have been a temporary vehicle—but not necessarily a filter—for Khoekhoe substrate influences. In fact, after the disappearance of the pidgin, the substrate still was able to exert its influence due to a stage of Khoekhoe-Orange River Afrikaans bilingualism at least among certain speakers.

However, as regards the first stage in the acquisition of Cape Dutch/Afrikaans by speakers of Khoekhoe the following can be said:

As we have seen in section 3.1, in terms of word order Cape Dutch Pidgin may be thought of as a compromise between Khoekhoe and Dutch, which was facilitated by the fact that there are several word order similarities between these two languages. However, there are three areas of word order where compromises were not possible: negation, V2, and adpositions.

Apparently, in the case of negation, Dutch word order was easy to access for the Khoekhoen (for which see section 3.1 and note 23), while postpositions (which did not have to relexify in relexified Khoekhoe) had to compete with prepositions. Both issues are topics for future research.

In the case of V2, though, Khoekhoe rather than Dutch "won out," albeit temporarily, because eventually Orange River Afrikaans, the successor of Cape Dutch Pidgin, would develop a V2 rule. In order to establish whether the late appearance of V2 is accidental or not, we will have to discuss the sentential syntax of Khoekhoe in more detail.

[33] See Roberge 1994b:67–72 for a discussion of invariant *se* and the possessive construction in Orange River Afrikaans.

4. Sentential Structure in Khoekhoe.

4.1. Introductory Remarks.

Because we do not possess a grammar of Cape Khoekhoe, and even the few extant texts (translations) produced by nonnative speakers have not been (fully) analyzed, we are forced to make claims about seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Khoekhoe on the basis of what we know about modern Nama and (now extinct) Korana, for which grammars are available. This is potentially dangerous, but there is no other way to circumvent the problem.

In the remainder of this paper, which deals with the sentential syntax of Khoekhoe, I restrict myself to what is known about Nama. Nama is the best-described Khoekhoe language to date, although it is my impression that also in terms of sentential syntax Korana has many things in common with this language, as I briefly elaborate upon in section 4.4.

The following incomplete list of syntactic properties of Nama serves as a reference for sections 4.2 and 4.3; although some of the properties will be revised, most of them are illustrated in one way or another:

(17) a. basic word order is SOV;
b. 1. the tense particle and the imperfective aspect particle (if present) immediately precede the verb: S-O-T-(ASP)-V; 2. the perfective aspect particle (if present) follows the verb: S-O-T-V-(ASP);
c. in certain constructions T may follow the verb;
d. 1. in declaratives and interrogatives the negative marker *tama* follows the verb; however, 2. negation + future is expressed by means of one postverbal marker, *tite*;[34]
e. topicalization and *wh*-movement target a clause-initial position;
f. the first position of a clause is signaled by the declarative particle *ge* or by *kha* in questions;
g. an NP (DP) takes a pgn-marker: an enclitic personal pronoun that marks the NP for person-gender-number (hence "pgn") and can be seen as the phrase-final head of the DP: (XP*)-N-D;
h. subject doubling (discussed below) can be defined in terms of the pgn-marker: … cl_i … $[_{DP}\ [_{NP}$ … N] D_i] …

In the following two subsections I first deal with the sentential syntax of

[34] Negation in imperative-hortative sentences is expressed by means of the (nearly) sentence-initial marker *tā* 'don't'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nama at the CP level (section 4.2) and then with the syntax of the Nama VP (section 4.3). The conclusions are: first, that there is a VP in Nama (contra den Besten 1986, 1987, 1989); and second, that despite evident similarities the syntax of the second position in Nama differs in various respects from the syntax of V2 in Dutch. Consequences for L2 acquisition of Dutch/Afrikaans by speakers of Khoekhoe are discussed in section 5.

4.2. CP and AgrP in Khoekhoe.[35]

Since there are various differences between the syntax of declarative clauses and the syntax of questions in Nama I treat them separately.

4.2.1. Declarative Clauses.

Consider the following two formulas for word order in declarative main clauses in Nama. Such declarative structures have the P2 (= Position 2) property, which means that they have a well-defined second position that may be filled with the declarative particle *ge* (also known as the "*ge*-subjectivum"):[36]

(18) a. DP_i – *ge* – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)[37]
[+nom]
[SUBJ]

[35] Although this section deals with Nama material only, I stick to the name "Khoekhoe" in the titles of the subsections since Nama is supposed to be exemplary for the Khoekhoe subfamily as a whole. As soon as the new Namibian name for Nama, namely, Khoekhoegowab or Khoekhoe, has gained international recognition, it may be possible to redefine the other Khoekhoe languages as dialects of "Khoekhoe" (= Nama). For the time being, we must live with the potential ambiguity of the name "Khoekhoe."

[36] See Hagman 1973:202–211, 215–216; Rust 1965:56–58, 100–104; and the scattered remarks in Olpp 1977:18–33. According to Rust (1965:57), *ge* in 18b is optional, while Hagman (1973:216) claims that this only holds for short sentences with a fronted verb. (See also Olpp 1977:103.)

[37] In my discussion of Nama syntax the following abbreviations are used: ASP 'aspect', C 'common ('neuter', indefinite) gender', cl 'enclitic pronoun', DECL 'declarative marker', dep 'dependent case', du 'dual', EmbN 'embedding noun', EXCL 'exclusive, F 'feminine', FUT 'future tense', Imp 'imperfective', M 'masculine', NEG 'negation', nom 'nominative', OBJ 'object', Perf 'perfective', pl 'plural', prt 'particle', POSS 'possessive', PRES 'present tense', Q 'question marker', RC.PST 'recent past', RM.PST 'remote past', sg 'singular', SUBJ 'subject'. Persons are indicated by numbers: 1, 2, 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. XP =cl_i – *ge* – (YP_i) – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[–nom] [+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]

According to 18b, the subject undergoes clitic doubling if another phrase is moved into first position (cf. 17h). The clitic will be from the nominative paradigm, while the doubled subject must be in the dependent case. The latter usually deletes if it is a pronoun. Compare the following examples from Rust 1965:121:[38]

(19) a. Tita ge ti ǁnaoba goro gurin ei-!â ge mû.[39]
1sg DECL 1sg.POSS uncle five years ago RM.PST see
[+nom] [+dep]
'I have seen my uncle five years ago.'

b. Ti ǁnaoba-ta_i ge ($tita_i$) goro gurin
1sg.POSS uncle=1sg DECL (1sg) five years
[+dep]
ei-!â ge mû.
ago RM.PST see

These examples clearly illustrate the formulas in 18a and 18b: a nominative subject in first position in 19a and clitic doubling plus optional deletion under "inversion" in 19b. They also illustrate the similarity between P2 and V2 structures: if we disregard clitic doubling, use Dutch lexical items, and put the finite auxiliary *heb* 'have' in the position of declarative *ge*, we get Dutch V2 sentences: *Ik heb mijn oom vijf jaar geleden gezien* 'I have my uncle five years ago seen' versus *Vijf jaar geleden heb ik mijn oom gezien*.

For the sake of completeness, I add the following variants of 19a–b with a proper name substituted for *tita*:[40]

[38] All of the examples are quoted in accordance with the spelling of my sources, with minor adjustments for technical reasons in the case of Hagman's diacritics. Syntactic annotations (brackets, subscripts, etc.) are mine. Furthermore, only full DP arguments of verbs are annotated for case. (Note that most postpositions assign nominative case.)

[39] In 19b I have added the optional pronoun *tita* to facilitate the comparison.

[40] *Johanneb* 'John' derives from the German/Afrikaans (and ultimately biblical) name *Johannes*. It ends in the pgn-marker *-b* for 3sg.M since *-s* counts as 3sg.F. Compare Nama *Jesub* 'Jesus'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(20) a. Johanneb ge ti ǁnaoba goro gurin
John DECL 1sg.POSS uncle five years
[+nom] [+dep]
ei-!â ge mû.
ago RM.PST see

b. Ti ǁnaoba-b_i ge Johanneba$_i$ goro gurin
1sg.POSS uncle=3sg.M DECL John five years
[+dep] [+dep]
ei-!â ge mû
ago RM.PST see

Compare also the following example from Rust 1965:124:

(21) Hoaraga ti ûi-hâb !na-ta ge ǁna !āsa
all 1sg.POSS life in=1sg DECL that town
[+dep]
mû tama hâ
see not ASP
'Never did I see that town before.'

Example 20 illustrates the formulas of 18 for sentences with nonpronominal subjects. In this instance dependent case marking on the "inverted" subject (*-a*) is visible. Example 21 shows that XP in 18b can also be a nonargument.

Now note that the P2 syntax of Nama declaratives is complemented by a pattern that seems to be derived from pattern 18a. This third pattern involves the fronting of a constituent that may not be used as a fronted element in pattern 18b or in questions (see below). Consequently, "inversion" is excluded, while the pattern seems to encompass a P2 subpattern consisting of the subject DP and *ge*:[41]

(22) (XP*) – [V – T – (ASP)] – DP$_i$ – *ge* – ...
[+nom]
[SUBJ]

Note, furthermore, that inside the special constituent, V and T + (ASP) invert in order for the sentence not to start with a tense particle; note also that the special constituent may attract other phrases (XP*) whose presence at the beginning of the clause makes such an inversion

[41] See Rust 1965:104; Hagman 1973:208–209, 211, 216.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unnecessary. Compare the following examples (taken from Rust 1965:104 and Hagman 1973:209 respectively):

(23) a. [!gû go] khoin gé
go RC.PST people DECL
[+nom]
'The people have gone.'

b. 1. tarásà [kò ǂaí] 'áop ke neetse
woman RC.PST call man DECL today
[+dep] [+nom]
'The man just called the woman today.'

2. neetse [kò ǂaí] 'áop ke tarásà
today RC.PST call man DECL woman

(These extra preposings may in fact be part of the XP dominating T + (ASP) – V.) So much for this deviating pattern.

Although P2 in Khoekhoe and Germanic V2 look quite similar, clitic doubling does not seem to make sense in this comparison. However, it does make sense if we follow a hypothesis put forward by Huybregts (1997). According to Huybregts, the CPs of Khoekhoe and Dutch are quite similar—in both languages Agr is realized on C:

(24) [$_{CP}$ Spec C/Agr FP]

In Dutch Agr on C is visible through asymmetric V2 in main clauses (which permits Agr to be realized on the amalgamated head of V and T) and through agreement phenomena on subordinators in dialects. For Khoekhoe, things are slightly different. Apparently, Agr in second position can be realized without attraction of V + T. Furthermore, we have to assume that nominative case can only be assigned through Spec-head agreement (SHAgr) with the Agr head and that there is spell-out of Agr if and only if there is no SHAgr between Agr and its Spec, while dependent case must be a default-elsewhere case (elsewhere = not in [Spec, AgrP]). When spelled out, Agr is enclitic and will "lean to the left."

Yet, there is a slight problem with Huybregts' hypothesis: in subordinate clauses we can find the same word order phenomena as in 18, however without *ge*.[42] Compare the following example from Rust 1965:96:

[42] See Rust 1965:94–98; Hagman 1973:224–226, 256–258.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(25) [[|Ai-‖gams ei-ta ‖an hâ] !keisa]
[[Windhoek in=1sg live ASP] EmbN]
-ts ge nî ǂan
=2sg.M DECL FUT know
'You must/should know that I am living in Windhoek.'

Note that the subordinator *!kei-* is not a complementizer but a semantically empty noun with an appropriate pgn-marker, in this case *-s* '3sg.F', which is also used for nominalization. Whenever necessary, the pertinent "embedding" DP, the *!kei-s* DP, is marked for dependent case (*-a*).[43] Therefore *!kei-s-a* does not cause any problem for Huybregts' hypothesis.

However, in light of examples like 25 we have to conclude that unlike V2 in Dutch, P2 (Agr2) in Khoekhoe is symmetric.[44] Furthermore we have to assume that Khoekhoe main clauses involve an extra functional projection whose head is *ge*. Therefore symmetric P2 (Agr2) must apply at the level of AgrP. The projection of *ge,* which may be CP or something else, dominates AgrP and by attracting Agr to its head inherits the properties of AgrP.

4.2.2. Yes/no-*Questions and* wh-*Interrogatives*.
Since the syntax of questions in Nama involves various unexpected details, I subdivide the present section into three subsections. Section 4.2.2.1 discusses the word order of questions in main clauses and section 4.2.2.2 word order in subordinate questions. Section 4.2.2.3 wraps up the discussion.

[43] Subordination can also be achieved by marking the clause with the clause-final pgn-marker *-s* '3sg.F' or the singular indefinite/neuter pgn-marker *-ì* (for 'whether'); see, for example, Hagman 1973:233–234. Whether this implies the presence of an empty noun I do not know.

[44] In fact things are slightly more complicated, since we are talking about three P2 phenomena: V2, Agr2, and the *ge*-phenomenon. V2 in Dutch and the *ge*-phenomenon in Nama are asymmetric. Agr2 in Nama clearly is symmetric. But what about Agr2 in Dutch? Even if we claim that all dialects of Dutch—whether they have agreeing complementizers or not—are endowed with the complex category C/AGR, we cannot claim that Agr2 in Dutch is symmetric, unless any C-initial subordinate is redefined as containing an abstract operator in its specifier.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4.2.2.1. Main-Clause yes/no-*Questions and* wh-*Interrogatives*.

A. Main-Clause *yes/no*-Questions.[45]

Consider the following incomplete set of formulas for *yes/no*-questions in Nama. Unlike *yes/no*-questions in Germanic, which seem to be V1/P1 (unless we define them as V2 with an abstract *wh*-operator in [Spec, CP]), their Nama counterparts are P2, where the second position is filled with *kha* or zero, which can be supported by a subject clitic provided there is "inversion." Furthermore, unlike the Germanic V1 questions, whose [Spec, CP] is either unfilled or occupied by an abstract operator, [Spec, CP] in Nama *yes/no*-questions can be filled with any eligible XP, as in declaratives. However, note that an argument DP in first position in *yes/no*-questions has to bear dependent case, also if it is a subject. This observation is problematic for the theory of AgrP and case assignment in Nama; see section 4.2.2.3 below. And finally, note that the semantic focus of a *yes/no*-question is on the (initialized) element in first position, that is, on DP in 26a and on XP in 26b:

(26) a. DP – (*kha*) – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[+dep]
[SUBJ]

b. XP $=cl_i$ – (*kha*) – (DP_i) ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]

However, there is a further complication in that the subject of 26b may go to a left-peripheral position, without canceling the clitic on XP. This is Hagman's analysis ("reinitialization"), but it seems to me that we cannot exclude the possibility of a left dislocation analysis. However, whichever is the correct analysis, in *yes/no*-questions conforming to the 26c variant the semantic focus is on both DP and XP.

(26) c. DP_i – XP $=cl_i$ – (*kha*) – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[+dep] [+nom]
[SUBJ]

The following sentences taken from Hagman 1973:267–268 illustrate the formulas in 24a–c. Since Hagman does not often use the question particle (which is optional after all), I mark the abstract second position assumed by him (Int) with Q:

[45] See Rust 1965:104–105; Hagman 1973:259–260, 266–269.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(27) a. ǁʔĩĩpa Q ǁaǵ'e kè ǂ'ũũ?
3sg.M Q meat RM.PST eat
[+dep] [+dep]
'Did he eat the meat?'

b. ǁaǵ'e =p_i Q ǁʔĩĩpa $_i$ kè ǂ'ũũ?
meat=3sg.M Q 3sg.M RM.PST eat
[+dep] [+dep]

c. ǁʔĩĩpa $_i$ ǂ'ũũ̃ =p_i (Q) kè ǁaǵ'e
3sg.M eat=3sg.M (Q) RM.PST meat
[+dep] [+dep]

Note that the tense particle in 27c has moved to a "third position," that is, to a position between the second position (cl + [*kha*/*kxa*]) and the "inverted" subject. T-movement serves here as a repair strategy to undo the unwelcome result of V-fronting, in other words, a sentence ending in a tense particle.

Whether the subject in 27c is left-dislocated or fronted, the direct object of the same sentence may front to the position between the subject and the fronted verb (Hagman 1973:269); compare the following case from Rust 1965:105:

(28) Tarasa$_i$ mariba !kho-!oa=s_i go ?
woman money get=3sg.F RC.PST
[+dep] [+dep]
'Did the woman get the money?'

Therefore, Nama *yes*/*no*-questions may be P2 sentences, but the pertinent P2 structures only constitute a proper subpart of the syntax of such sentences. In most cases, however, P2 seems to suffice as a descriptive statement: sentences of the type in 26a–b are P2. If we may analyze the subjects in 26c, 27c, and 28 as left-dislocated elements, we could claim the same for sentences of the type in 26c, in which case we only have to analyze sentences like 28 (which constitute an infrequent type of *yes*/*no*-questions) as being partly P2, since *mariba !kho-!oa* 'money-get' cannot be a fronted VP (cf. section 4.3).

However, note that left dislocation (or reinitialization) of the subject seems to be a prerequisite for object fronting in 28. If that is correct, the sentence-initial subject is part of the core structure of such sentences, which implies that sentences of the type in 26c cannot be strictly P2 either.

Finally, note that it may be wise to keep *kha* (which is a modal question particle comparable to Dutch *dan*, German *denn*) and the second position apart; compare the following example from Rust 1965:105:

(29) Gunisa$_i$ kha [mû=si$_i$ tama]=du Q hâ ?
wagon Q-prt [see=3sg.F NEG]=2pl.C Q PerfASP
'Didn't you (pl) see the wagon, then?'

In 29 the P2 core is the sequence [*mû=si$_i$ tama*]=*du* Q *hâ*, since *-du*, which happens to be ambiguous in terms of case, must be the subject clitic for semantic as well as for syntactic reasons: subject clitics may cliticize onto the constituent V + NEG (cf. section 4.3), while object clitics must cliticize onto a verb. We know that the abstract position Q following the subject clitic need not be filled by *kha*. Since *kha* occupies another position in this sentence (after which seems to be a left-dislocated object), we have to conclude that *kha* cannot be exclusively linked to the Q position.

B. Main-Clause Interrogatives.[46]
Nama main-clause interrogatives are plainly P2 in structure, which may, however, be due to the fact that I do not have examples of multiple *wh*-questions. However, here, too, the subject must bear dependent case under all circumstances. (For a discussion of this problem see section 4.2.2.3 below.)

(30) a. DP – (*kha*) – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[+wh]
[+dep]
[SUBJ]

b. XP =cl$_i$ – (*kha*) –(DP$_i$) – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)
[+wh] [+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]

Compare the following examples from Rust 1965:45, 47:

[46] See Rust 1965:44–47, 105–106, 118–119; Hagman 1973:262–265; Olpp 1977:82, 84–88.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(31) a. Mâ khoiba ǁnati go mî?
which person-sg.M so RC.PST say
[+dep]
'Who said that?'

b. Matigose ta kha ǁkhâb !na nî ho?
how much 1sg Q-prt month in FUT get
'How much shall I get per month?'

There is only one complication: left dislocation of the subject (reinitialization in Hagman's terminology) is possible (Hagman 1973:265):

(32) saákxo$_i$ taré'e =kxò$_i$ neepá ra hĩĩ?
2du.M what =2du.M here ImpASP do
[+dep] [+dep] [+nom]
'What are (the two of) you doing?'

Since main-clause interrogatives in Nama seem to be well-behaved P2 structures, I am inclined to analyze 32 as a true case of left dislocation unlike—possibly—the "left-dislocated" or "reinitialized" subjects in *yes*/*no*-questions.

4.2.2.2. Subordinate yes/no-*Questions and Interrogatives.*
Embedded questions can be created by means of the embedding noun *!kei-* (see above), which Hagman (1973) renders as *!xai-* and Olpp (1977) as *!khae-* with indefinite/common *-i* as the preferred pgn-marker, although feminine singular *-s* is also possible according to Rust (1965:45, 95) and Olpp (1977:82–83, 135). However *!kei-*/*!xái-*/*!kae-* may be left out so that the pgn-marker *-s* (according to Hagman (1973:234) also *-ì*) is the sole sign of subordination. Addition of the dependent case marker *-a* yields the endings *-sa* and *-e* (< *-i* + *-a*).

A. Subordinate *yes*/*no*-Questions.[47]
Word order in embedded *yes*/*no*-questions in Nama seems to be P2, which means that the complicated patterns of 24c and 26 probably are main-clause phenomena. Just like declarative *ge*, the question marker *kha* is not used in subordinates:

[47] See Rust 1965:45, 95–97, 130; Hagman 1973:256, 258; Olpp 1977:135–136.

(33) a. … [[DP – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)] *!xái'ì* / *!xái'è*] …
[+nom]
[SUBJ]

b. … [[XP =cl_i – (DP_i) ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)]
[+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]

!xái'ì / *!xái'è*] …

Note that I am claiming that the subject in 33a is in the nominative even though this topic is not discussed in the grammars I have consulted for this study. Furthermore, note that according to Rust (1965:45) and Olpp (1977:135), a *yes/no*-question embedded under *!kei-/!khae-* should start with the word *ise*. This is contradicted by one of Olpp's own examples (see 34b below) and by Rust (1960:sub *ob*), who calls *ise* optional, while Hagman (1973) does not even mention it. *Ise* may be a *wh*-phrase (comparable to English *whether*). Its presence triggers clitic doubling plus or minus subject drop, as in 34c. Compare the following examples:

(34) a. [[Ise=ts nî ǁkhawa mû te] !khae-e]
[[whether=2sg.M FUT again see 1sg] EmbN]
=ts ge a ǀū
=2sg.M DECL PRES not-know
'Whether you will see me again you don't know.'
(Olpp 1977:136)

b. [[ǁÊigu nî sîsẹn] !keië] =ta ge a ǀû
[[3pl.M FUT work] EmbN] =1sg DECL PRES not-know
[+nom] [+nom]
'I don't know whether they will work (or: would be working).'
(Rust 1965:97, ex. 20)[48]

[48] Rust's own translation is "Dass sie arbeiten würden, weiss ich nicht," probably because indefinite *!keië* also marks embedded declaratives whose truth value is in some doubt. However, in this case the difference between 'that' and 'whether' seems to be very small.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

c. tiíta ke kè l'úú 'ií [[ũ=ts
1sg DECL RM.PST not-know ASP [[go=2sg.M
ta] !xái'è]
Imp ASP] EmbN]
'I did not know whether you were going.' (Hagman 1973:258)

B. Subordinate Interrogatives.[49]
Embedded *wh*-clauses are P2, like their main-clause counterparts. However, there is one important difference—embedded [+wh] subjects are nominatives:

(35) a. …[[DP – ... – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)] *!xái'ì / !xái'è*]…
[+wh]
[+nom]
[SUBJ]

b. … [[XP =cl$_i$ – (DP_i) – … – T – (ASP) – V – (ASP)]
[+wh] [+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]
!xái'ì / !xái'è] …

Compare the following examples from Olpp 1977:82, with which I conclude this overview of word order patterns in Nama:

(36) a. ǁîb go dî [[tarib go mî] !khae-e]
3sg.M RC.PST ask [[who RC.PST say] EmbN]
[+nom] [+nom]
'He asked who said that.'

b. Mîba te, [[matikō gomana =b$_i$
tell 1sg [[how-many cows =3sg.M
[+dep] [+nom]

go saoba$_i$ ǁama] !khaesa]
RC.PST 2sg-father buy] EmbN]
[+dep]
'Tell me how many cows your father bought.'

Note the movement of the tense particle *go* toward the third position of the embedded clause in 35b.

[49] See Rust 1965:95, 97, 119, 45–47; Hagman 1973:265–266; Olpp 1977:82–83, 85–86.

4.2.2.3. Wrapping Up: The Syntax of Questions in Khoekhoe.
Due to the complexity of word order phenomena in main-clause questions and the differences between *yes/no-* and *wh*-questions it was necessary to devote a considerable amount of space to a presentation of the facts, apart from some speculations on the underlying syntax. Therefore it is time for more definitive conclusions.

Let us start with the observation that both embedded *yes/no*-questions and subordinate interrogatives are P2 while main-clause questions demonstrate at least partial P2 behavior. This suggests symmetric P2 for questions. And since P2 is also symmetric in declaratives, we had better try to get rid of the deviations from the P2 pattern that we found in main clauses. As I have already suggested, nearly all of the deviations can be explained away by assuming left dislocation of the subject instead of a special subject-fronting rule (such as Hagman's reinitialization).[50] I assume without further discussion that left-dislocated DPs (which probably occupy the specifier of some higher functional projection) get dependent case. (Compare examples 25c, 26, and 27.) The sole problem left is then the matter of double fronting constructions as in 26, which I leave for future research.[51]

In accordance with the analysis for declaratives, we could claim that questions embedded in a *!kei*-clause are AgrPs and that main clauses project an extra CP-like level. However, we also need a functional projection to accommodate *wh*-phrases. Therefore, a subordinate clause will involve the following sequence of syntactic heads:

[50] Note that Hagman's description in terms of subject demotion and reinitialization hardly makes sense in modern minimalist and/or antisymmetric approaches to generative syntax, which is due to the concept of demotion (cf. Kayne 1994 and Chomsky 1995). Long-distance subject fronting may be a way out, but it is doubtful whether we will be able to find a syntactically insightful analysis for such a concept. On the other hand, left dislocation is independently available and is also needed for example 29. (Also compare Rust 1965:97, ex. 17.)

[51] One of the questions to be answered is whether such structures constitute the exception to the rule that there is no VP-fronting in Nama.

(37) … [$_N$ *!kei-*] … (WH) … Agr … T … (Asp) … V …
where each head H_x selects H_{x+1} on its right ($x < 6$)

Apparently, Agr can raise to WH and hand over its properties to WH so that a *wh*-subject will be nominative. On the other hand, we may have to assume that Agr or WH/Agr cannot raise to the head of the *kha*-CP in main clauses, while what is in [Spec, AgrP] or [Spec, WHP] has to move to the specifier of the *kha*-CP, in order to explain the use of dependent case for subjects in first position in main-clause questions. However, this is all very speculative and requires further research.

Finally note that we have observed instances of tense movement in examples 27c, 34a, and 36b. Tense movement (in fact T+(ASP)-movement) targets a position to the left of the "inverted" subject and in main clauses to the right of declarative *ge*, as can be derived from Hagman 1973:207–208). (See example 40a in section 4.3.) In light of example 36b, we have to conclude that this P2-like phenomenon is also symmetric.

This having been established, we can now address the problem of whether there is a VP in Khoekhoe.

4.3. The VP in Khoekhoe.

The problem of whether there is a VP in Khoekhoe can be defined as follows: in Nama the tense particle, which is supposed to be outside the VP, immediately precedes the verb. Furthermore, VP-topicalization does not seem to exist, while V-topicalization does exist. Therefore, I concluded in den Besten 1986 that Nama does not have a VP.

However, if topicalization only moves phrases, then the topicalized V must be a phrase and thus a remnant VP, that is, a VP depleted of its XPs, which must have moved to the left across T and (ASP).

(38) Spec C/Agr ... T [$_{VP}$ ... V ...]

This implies that the S-O-T-V order of Khoekhoe is a derived one: elements from inside the VP must scramble up into the domain of the TP (IP). Note that the VP itself may be OV or VO underlyingly. That is open to debate, unless we follow Kayne's Antisymmmetry Hypothesis (Kayne 1994), which dictates VO as an underlying order.

Now there happens to be evidence for a VP in the form of nominalized VPs. Such VPs do not contain T particles and are OV (my rephrasing of what Hagman [1973:234–235] says) with the pgn marker *-s* '3sg.F' as the nominalizer.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Compare the following example from Hagman 1973:234:[52]

(39) [‖nãã`n hòá`nà ‖nãũ]=s
[that all hear]=3sg.F

Furthermore, there is evidence that in the case of V-topicalization something phrase-like is being moved. First of all, in negative sentences V + *tama* 'NEG' is fronted. *Tama* is a word, not an affix. So what is topicalized is a phrase of some kind. Second, if there is an auxiliary (e.g., *gei* 'make, let', *kha* 'can, be able'), V + AUX will be topicalized, which is again evidence for phrasal movement. Finally, note that the fronted V may end in: i. an object clitic (e.g., *-bi* 'him'); ii. a reflexive suffix (*-sen* 'X's self'); or iii. a reciprocal suffix *(-gu* 'each other')—which makes sense if objects are VP-internal arguments that have to move out, unless they can cliticize onto the verb.

Therefore, we may assume that finite clauses in Nama contain remnant VPs, which apparently is an obligatory phenomenon in that environment, unlike VPs in German and Dutch, which may—but do not have to—be remnant constituents. Compare the following annotated examples taken from Hagman 1973.[53]

(40) a. [$_{VP}$ t t Màa]$_i$ =p$_j$ ke kè-rè$_k$ 'áopà$_j$
[give] =3sg.M DECL RM.PST-ImpASP man
[+nom] [+dep]
‖'ĩĩpà hàípà t$_k$ t$_i$
3sg.M stick
[+dep] [+dep]
'The man was giving the stick to him.' (Hagman 1973:208)

[52] See also Rust 1965:64–65 and Olpp 1977:111–112 for further considerations and data.

[53] For Dutch and German see den Besten and Webelhuth 1990 and Müller 1998. Compare the following Dutch examples:

(i) a. [$_{VP}$ [Dat boek]$_i$ gelezen]$_j$ heeft hij niet t$_j$
[[that book] read] has he not

b. [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ Gelezen]$_j$ heeft hij [dat boek]$_i$ niet t$_j$
[read] has he [that book] not

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. [$_{VP}$ t ǂNũũ tama]$_{I}$=s$_{j}$ ke |õãsà$_{j}$ neepà
[sit not] =3sg.F DECL daughter here
[+nom] [+dep]
'The daughter is not sitting here.' (Hagman 1973:209)

Why remnant VP-formation is obligatory in Nama is something for future research.

4.4. Sentential Structure in Khoekhoe: Some Concluding Remarks.[54]
Although the remnant VPs of Khoekhoe make those languages somewhat similar to Dutch, the other findings make Khoekhoe less similar than I claimed in earlier publications (den Besten 1978, 1986, 1987, and 1989), and consequently the typological statements of section 2 can finally be revised:

(41) a. Dutch: SOV + asymmetric V2 + asymmetric V1
b. Afrikaans: SOV + asymmetric V2 + asymmetric V1
c. Orange River Afrikaans: SOV + asymmetric V2 + asymmetric V1
d. Khoekhoe (all varieties): SOV + symmetric P2 only

That is to say, despite the similarities between P2 in Khoekhoe and V2 in the Dutch/Afrikaans group, P2 in Khoekhoe is symmetric, whereas V2/V1 is asymmetric. Furthermore, whereas Dutch/Afrikaans *yes/no*-questions are V1, *yes/no*-questions in Khoekhoe are P2 (both in main and in subordinate clauses), and a redefinition of V1 as V2 with an empty operator in [Spec, CP] does not really help to reduce the differences, since structures of the type [OP – Vf …] and [XP – Agr …] only superficially share the P2 property but nothing else.[55]

Note that 41d is supposed to hold of Korana, too, although no evidence has been provided. However, in view of what is said in Meinhof 1930:59–62 and, more cautiously, in Maingard 1962, and in view of the sentential material that can be found in these publications as well as in Engelbrecht 1928, it seems to me that Korana declaratives,

[54] For another attempt to come to grips with Nama syntax in the framework of Chomsky's Minimalism, see Luijks 2000.

[55] Khoekhoe and Dutch/Afrikaans imperatives have not been dealt with in this paper, among other things, in order to keep the load of information on Khoekhoe within manageable limits. However, here, too, the bottom line is: in Dutch/Afrikaans V1, in Nama P2 (including the phenomenon of subject-drop). See Rust 1965:8, 60–62, 122; Hagman 1973:272–275; and Olpp 1977:103–104, 108–109.

yes/no-questions, and interrogatives are P2 and that P2 in Korana is symmetric (although the evidence for the latter is slight).[56] I have to add, though, that these statements hold with respect to the following four provisos. First, case marking in Korana cannot be compared with case marking in Nama either in terms of patterns or in terms of morphemes.[57] Second, unlike declarative *ge* in Nama, the Korana declarative marker *tje* is infrequent. Third, clitic doubling with "inverted" subjects is not obligatory—partly because third person pronominal subjects (clitics included) may be dropped.[58] Fourth, the incidence of tense movement and DP-extraposition seems to be higher than in Nama.

In view of the differences in case assignment between Nama and Korana, it seems appropriate to put case aside as a potential factor in the acquisition of Dutch and Afrikaans by the Cape Khoekhoen as long as we do not know more about Cape Khoekhoe. On the other hand, it seems reasonable to assume the following sentential properties for Cape Khoekhoe:

(42) a. SOV word order;
b. remnant VPs in finite clauses, besides nominalized VPs;
c. P2 in all clause types, which involves:
d. topicalization and *wh*-movement,
e. (optional or obligatory) clitic doubling with "inverted" subjects, and
f. optional T(+ASP)-movement to a position to the right of the P2 position.

Given this set of properties, we can now return to questions concerning pidgin formation and L2 acquisition of Dutch by native speakers of Khoekhoe—and especially to the question of why V2/V1 was acquired so late.

5. Consequences for Pidginization and L2 Acquisition.

5.1. SOV and the VP in Cape Dutch Pidgin.

Let us start with the first two properties of Khoekhoe mentioned under 41—namely, SOV and (remnant and nominalized) VPs—and put them aside quickly.

---

[56] I found P2 in relative clauses (as in Nama) and in *wh*-interrogatives embedded under the semantically empty noun *!χae-b*, which makes it probable that other embedded clauses are P2 too.

[57] See Meinhof 1930:37–38, Maingard 1962:14–15.

[58] See Meinhof 1930:44, 60; Maingard 1962:18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

First of all, the importance of SOV order of Khoekhoe for the creation of the Cape Dutch Pidgin has been discussed in sections 1 and 3 of this study, and our present insights do not add anything new in that respect.

Second, the conclusion that there is a VP in Khoekhoe considerably simplifies the way we have to think about the process of pidgin formation that created Cape Dutch Pidgin. We no longer have to assume that dropping the tense and aspect particles, and consequently their maximal projection(s), forced the Khoekhoen to create VPs ex nihilo, albeit with the help of UG, as I did in den Besten 1986, a publication that denied the existence of a VP in Khoekhoe while assuming base generation of objects and adverbials under TP (IP). If there is a VP in Khoekhoe, which surfaces as a remnant VP, unless it is nominalized, in other words, is part of a DP, then no creation ex nihilo is necessary.

Furthermore, it cannot be excluded (contra den Besten 1986) that some Khoekhoe speakers stuck to the full functional structure of Khoekhoe, albeit with empty functional heads, while others created pidgin sentences by putting subject DPs and nominalized VPs together. Either procedure is sufficient to yield SOV pidgin sentences.

This having been said, let us now turn to other aspects of sentential syntax involving phenomena such as XP-movement, head movement, and P2.

5.2. P2 Phenomena and Cape Dutch Pidgin.

It seems to me that adult Khoekhoe speakers may have had easy access to the following aspects of Dutch and (at later stages) of incipient Afrikaans:

(43) a. topicalization and *wh*-movement;
b. remnant VPs (or extended projections thereof) in verb (projection) raising contexts.

I will set 43b aside and concentrate on 43a.

Notice that 43 does not mention V2, even though it is an instance of P2. The reason is that Germanic V2 and Khoekhoe P2 differ considerably in their respective realizations of the general P2 word order phenomenon. For Dutch/Afrikaans V2, we have to assume attraction of V by T and Agr and attraction of Agr by C in main clauses. Schematically, this can be represented as 44a or 44b for subordinate clauses and 44c or 44d for main clauses, the choice in each case

depending on one's theoretical convictions.[59]

(44) in subordinate clauses

a. … C … v … t … Agr/T /V …
b. … C … Agr/T/V … t … v …

in main clauses

c. … C/Agr/T/V … v … t … agr …

d. … C/Agr/T/V … agr … t … v …

where x represents the trace of X, X being a head

For Khoekhoe, however, we have to assume optional movement of T(+ASP) to a position to the right of Agr and movement of Agr to C in main clauses, while there is no C in subordinate clauses. Schematically (and with some simplifications), this can be represented as 45a–b for subordinate clauses and 45c–d for main clauses:

(45) in subordinate clauses

a. … Agr… F/T … t … V … and

b. … Agr… F … T … V …

in main clauses

c. … C/Agr … agr … F/T … t … V … and

d. … C/Agr … agr … F … T … V …

where: i. x represents the trace of X, X being a head, and ii. F represents the functional head position to which T(+ASP) optionally moves.

A comparison of 44 and 45 must lead to the conclusion that Khoekhoe-speaking L2 learners of Dutch and incipient Afrikaans may have recognized the P2 characteristics of the Dutch/Afrikaans main clause—partly because they could recognize topicalization and *wh*-

[59] Under the minimalist approach of Chomsky (1995), more sophisticated assumptions can be made, allowing syntactic features of subordinate Agr to move up to C while leaving the corresponding lexical features in situ (for which see Zwart 1993 and 1997; compare also Huybregts' ideas [1997] about Dutch and Nama syntax.)

movement—but that attraction of V by T and Agr and C must have been problematic for them because in Khoekhoe T, Agr, and C were independent, nonaffixal heads. Not pronouncing these heads did not immediately lead to movement of V to T, Agr, and C.

Equally problematic for the Khoekhoen must have been the following aspects of Dutch/Afrikaans sentential syntax:

(46) a. the absence of clear cases of topicalization in subordinate declaratives;
b. the absence of topicalization in embedded and unembedded *yes/no*-questions;
c. the asymmetric behavior of V2 and V1.

That is to say, only Dutch/Afrikaans *wh*-movement was unproblematic for them, because it is symmetric (i.e., cyclic), while topicalization and V2/V1—though being (partly) recognizable—were problematic because of their asymmetric, that is, main-clause, behavior. Furthermore, Dutch/Afrikaans topicalization had an extra quirk (at least from the point of view of Khoekhoe) in that it could not be used in main-clause *yes/no*-questions.

Given these considerations, the implications for the formation of Cape Dutch Pidgin are not immediately clear. However, here, too, we may expect to find compromises between Khoekhoe and Dutch syntax comparable to the syntactic compromises discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.3.

It goes without saying that *wh*-movement could be introduced into the pidgin, because Dutch and Khoekhoe share this property. Topicalization, however, had to be dealt with carefully. The Khoekhoen may have found a temporary solution by restricting the relevant P2 structures to sequences with a subject in first position. Note that such a solution would imply the absence of topicalization of nonsubjects in main-clause declaratives, which is unnecessary but harmless from the point of view of Dutch.

Unfortunately, the set of known pidgin sentences is too small for us to reject or confirm this hypothesis, even though it seems to be more or less confirmed by the fact that nearly all clauses in our corpus start with a subject phrase. The sole exceptions are a few sentences starting with an adverbial:

(47) a. wagt om als gy de dubbeltjes betaalt hemme,
wait if 2sg/pl the dimes paid have,
ik ja strakjes voort lopum zoo [60]
1sg yeah later away run so
(Kolbe 1727(I):121)

b. en daarom ons ook zoo makum.
and therefore 1pl also so do
(Kolbe 1727(I):520)

Furthermore, the first clause in example 11a, *duijtsman een woordt Calm* 'Dutchman/men one word say', could be interpreted as a preposed unmarked conditional.[61]

Now whether or not the Khoekhoen shunned the use of topicalization in Cape Dutch Pidgin, they certainly made use of *wh*-movement and here we can find an interesting side effect of the way Cape Dutch Pidgin came about.

---

[60] Note that the second person subject pronoun *gy* should be *jy/jij* '2sg', the Hollandic variant. *Gy/gij*, a southern Dutch pronoun, belongs to the written register of the period. (In his pidgin sentences Kolbe never uses *jij/jy*.) Furthermore, *ja* seems to be the German sentence adverbial *ja*. Kolbe uses it twelve times in his pidgin sentences. Finally, *voort* 'away' is a germanism (German *fort*).

[61] Another candidate is *Mashy doot* (with Portuguese Creole *maski* 'in spite of, although, etc.', misspelled as *Mashy*) in *Mashy doot, Icke strack nae onse grote Kapiteyn toe* '**maski** death/dead/die, 1sg later/presently to our great chief to', which is reported by ten Rhyne (1686, in Schapera and Farrington 1933:140). Ten Rhyne renders this phrase in Latin as *Eja occidite!* 'Well, kill-2pl!', which definitely mistranslates *Mashy* (i.e., *masky*) and possibly also mistranslates *doot*, since 'to kill' should rather be *doden* or, with the pidgin suffix *-um/-om*, *dodom* (< Dutch *doden*), apart from the fact that the preferred expression was *doodmakum* 'dead-make' as in present-day Afrikaans (*doodmaak*). Furthermore, note that *maski* + content word was a syntactic pattern in the pidgin (den Besten 1987:18). It is evident that ten Rhyne mistook *doot* for the Dutch imperative *dood* 'kill', which is not in accordance with the *maski* pattern. Nevertheless, the person from whom he obtained this example may have known better, since ten Rhyne's Latin translation of *Icke strack . . .* is as follows: *Ego si moriar, statim ad summum nostrum Capitaneum proficiscar*, which either means 'If I will die, I will immediately travel to our highest chief' (*moriar, proficiscar* 1sg future indicative) or 'If I were to die, I would immediately travel to our highest chief'(*moriar, proficiscar* 1sg present subjunctive).

5.3. Pro-Drop as a Side Effect.

As I argued in section 3.1, Cape Dutch Pidgin probably began as a relexified and pidginized variant of Khoekhoe, which implies (among other things) that grammatical particles—including pronominal clitics—had to be suppressed. This has immediate consequences for the syntax of clauses with preposed material, more specifically in this case: *wh*-phrases.

As we have seen, whenever in Nama (and Korana) a nonsubject is fronted, the following pattern obtains:

(48) … XP =cl$_i$ – (*ge/kha*) – (DP$_i$) – …
[+nom] [+dep]
[SUBJ]

ge/kha only in main clauses

Therefore, in order to derive correct *wh*-interrogatives in the pidgin, Khoekhoe speakers had to leave out the particle *kha* and the enclitic pronoun. Since, however, the subject phrase in 48 is optional if it is a pronoun, it is possible to hypothesize that relexification and pidginization of this Khoekhoe pattern may have caused optional pro-drop effects in Cape Dutch Pidgin.

There is some evidence in Kolbe 1727 to support this hypothesis. On the one hand, we find the sequence *waar om ons . . .* 'why we . . .' without pro-drop (Kolbe 1727:2, 66; cf. also 47a–b); on the other hand, there is a sentence (used in two different contexts) that seems to involve pro-drop:

(49) wat maakum zoo?[62]
what [3sg] do so?

(Kolbe 1727(I):502; (II):163)

Independent evidence can be found in the letter by the "Ingesete van

[62] In both instances the interpretation '3sg' is fully acceptable and is supported by Kolbe's own translation for the first occurrence of this sentence. Unfortunately, we cannot exclude the possibility that *wat* in 49 was actually recorded as *was*, that is, as a combination of Dutch *wat* 'what' plus Khoekhoe *-ts* '2sg.M' and Khoekhoe *-s* '2sg.F', (because such interpretations are permitted by the respective contexts) and that Kolbe or someone else changed this element, which looks like German *was* 'what?', into Dutch *wat* 'what?'. Compare *Was makom?* 'what=2sg.M do? (ten Rhyne 1686, in Schapera and Farrington 1933:140) discussed in section 3.1. However, the examples in 50a–b show that *wat* may be genuine.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Stellebos" (Resident of Stellenbosch, 1831, in Nienaber 1971:54), which also contains other remnants of the old pidgin (cf. section 3.1).[63]

(50) a. ik vrag wat wil hef
1sg ask what [3sg.M] want have

b. ikke vrag, . . . wat moet mak
1sg ask, . . . what [1sg] must do

c. ik vrag warme, zal dood slaan
1sg ask wherewith [1sg] shall dead beat

Therefore, we may safely assume that Cape Dutch Pidgin, which was SOV with *wh*-movement and little or no topicalization, made use of pro-drop under inversion.[64] As far as I can see, the latter feature, which lacked the support of a licenser of the right type and which was not part of the syntax of Cape Dutch, did not survive as a feature of Orange River Afrikaans. Small wonder, then, that it did not make it into Standard Afrikaans and related dialects either.[65]

This having been said, we can now turn to the problem of the acquisition of Dutch asymmetric P2 word order by speakers of Khoekhoe, because alongside and after Cape Dutch Pidgin, a post-pidgin developed that shows asymmetric V2 and V1, as in Cape Dutch and Afrikaans.

[63] Note that the language used in this letter is SVO, with the order Prt-V for particle verbs. With a few exceptions, V2 is not applied. See den Besten 2001.

[64] Clitic doubling of the subject with optional deletion of a subject pronoun can be found in more syntactic environments in Nama; see Rust 1965, Hagman 1973, and Olpp 1977. Therefore, the *maski* construction of Cape Dutch Pidgin, touched on in note 61, may also involve pro-drop; that is, the pertinent example *Mashy doot* could be glossed as '*maski* [1sg] dead/die', that is, 'although/even though I will die'. Since the other examples of the *maski* construction involve transitive infinitival verbs without overt arguments (cf. Franken 1953:204, n. 32), my hypothesis requires a passive interpretation of the pertinent verbs, for example, *Masqui ophangen, ik ben niet bangh* '*maski* [1sg] hang [= be hanged], 1sg am not afraid' (1687).

[65] Note that there also was pro-drop under inversion and in subordinate clauses in the bureaucratic Dutch of the period. Most probably this was a latinism (perhaps supported by knowledge of Italian and/or Portuguese). I doubt that it ever was part of spoken Dutch.

5.4. Acquiring V2/V1 and Possible Consequences.
Let us summarize the aspects of Dutch syntax that must have been problematic for Khoekhoe speakers:

(51) a. the amalgamation of V, T, and Agr and the attraction of Agr/T/V by C;
b. the absence of clear cases of topicalization in subordinate declaratives;
c. the absence of topicalization in embedded and unembedded *yes/no*-questions;
d. the asymmetric behavior of V2 and V1.

It goes without saying that "problematic" does not mean "insurmountable." Already in the early period, we have examples of Khoekhoen using correct Dutch word order (cf. Raidt 1991:126), and Orange River Afrikaans sides with Dutch and Standard Afrikaans against Khoekhoe, despite a long period of bilingualism.

The acquisition of 51a–d was the final step in the linguistic assimilation of the Khoekhoen. However, due to the presence of the pidgin, this probably was not a simple case of L2 acquisition.

I assume that over time the pidgin developed finite verbs. This most probably happened in tandem with the disappearance of the verbal ending *-um/-om/-me*. Now, for the (re)production of Dutch SOV subordinates, embedded right-branching CPs with *dat* 'that' and *of* 'if, whether' were needed. However, it is unclear whether such CPs were already available in the early pidgin. Embedded *yes/no*-questions are absent in my data base, and the few embedded declaratives that are available indicate that unmarked subordinate declaratives were normal; compare the following two examples:[66]

(52) a. Kobes ik jou ja 'k hemme versproken, ik
Kobes 1sg 2sg yeah ?? have promised, 1sg
zoo lang zal by u blyven, tot jou Husing
so long will with 2 stay, until 2sg to-Husing
de dubbeltjes betaalt hemme,
the dimes paid have

(Kolbe 1727(I):121)

[66] For the object forms *jou* '2sg' and *u* '2' see note 19. Note that *jou* in the subordinate clause is a subject. For *ja* see note 60. The participle *versproken* is a germanism (German *versprochen*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b. Die Volk, ja denkum ons beesten; ha!
the/those people, yeah think 1pl animals: ha!
(Kolbe 1727(II):30)

Parataxis may have been in use as well; consider the following example:

(53) Vrouw, jou Tovergoeds bra bytum, dat is
woman, your magic-stuff [=medicine] really bite, that is
waar, maar jou Tovergoeds ook weer gezond makum,
true, but your magic-stuff also again healthy make,
dit is ook waar
this is also true
(Kolbe 1727(II):528)

Therefore, the introduction of a *dat*-CP may have been part of the transition from Cape Dutch Pidgin to some sort of Dutch/Afrikaans, while subordinate SOV order was in a sense an old feature of the pidgin.

For speakers of Khoekhoe, both embedded AgrPs as in (52a–b) and AgrPs preceded by *dat* must have been potential domains for P2, while the new version of P2 they were learning—with V2—was restricted to main-clause AgrPs or CPs. But they probably soon found out that embedded declaratives without *dat*—insofar as they are possible in colloquial Dutch at all—require V2. By applying V2 to the embedded AgrPs of the pidgin, the Khoekhoen may have ultimately triggered the high frequency in Afrikaans of a construction that is marginally present in colloquial Dutch. However, this was only possible because the Cape Dutch speakers recognized something in the speech of the Khoekhoen and assimilated it. Compare 54 (= 4a):

(54) Ek dink (dat) hy sal dit môre lees.
I think (that) he will it tomorrow read
(cf. Ponelis 1979:440–441, 446, 531;Waher 1982; Donaldson 1993:368)

Note that the Khoekhoen may also have applied V2 to AgrPs with a preceding complementizer, in accordance with symmetric P2 in Khoekhoe. The resulting structure is marginal in Afrikaans, which may be due to the fact that it is even less than marginal in colloquial Dutch.

Similar developments may be assumed for the high frequency of V2 in embedded *wh*-interrogatives compared with the marginal status of V1 in embedded *yes/no*-questions. Compare the examples 55a–b (4b–c):

(55) a. Ek weet nie hoekom het hy dit gedoen nie.
I know not why has he it done not
(cf. Ponelis 1979:530 and Donaldson 1993:327, 371)

b. Ons weet nie of het hy dit gedoen nie.
we know not whether has he it done not
(cf. Ponelis 1979:531)

Recall that both types of questions are P2 in Khoekhoe, while Dutch distinguishes between V2 in main-clause *wh*-interrogatives and V1 in main clause *yes/no*-questions. However, assuming an empty operator in *yes/no*-questions can reduce the syntactic differences between V2 and V1 somewhat:

(56) a. $[_{XP}$+WH $]_i$ V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

b. $[_{OP}$ e $]_i$ V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

Applying these structures to embedded AgrPs, in accordance with P2 in Khoekhoe, would have yielded:

(57) a. … C $[_{AgrP}$ $[_{XP}$+WH $]_i$ V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

b. … C $[_{AgrP}$ $[_{OP}$ e $]_i$ V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

However, in Dutch a *wh*-phrase may not be preceded by a complementizer. Furthermore, in nonstandard Dutch and Afrikaans—and so probably also in Cape Dutch—a *wh*-phrase can be followed by a complementizer *dat*, for example, *hoe (dat)* 'how (that)'. Therefore, the following compromise is necessary:

(58) a. … $[_{XP}$+WH $]_i$ C $[_{AgrP}$ t_i V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

b. … $[_{OP}$ e $]_i$ of $[_{AgrP}$ t_i V_j [… t_i … t_j …]

Since 55a/58a is marginally possible in colloquial Dutch, its high frequency in Afrikaans may be due to the Khoekhoen, whose innovation was recognized and picked up by the speakers of Cape Dutch. On the other hand 55b/58b is nonexistent in Dutch, which may explain its low frequency in Afrikaans.

To conclude, the acquisition of finite verbs and asymmetric V2 and V1 by the Khoekhoen may have led to certain V2- and V1-like innovations in the syntax of Afrikaans subordinate clauses, due to interference from Khoekhoe, which is a symmetric P2 language.

However, these innovations could only come to fruition insofar as they were recognized and assimilated by the speakers of Cape Dutch.

5.5. Some Remarks on Complex Initials.

The preceding subsection in essence claimed that the acquisition of Cape Dutch V2/V1 by the Khoekhoen triggered interference from Khoekhoe in that the P2 phenomenon of Khoekhoe, which had been nearly invisible in Cape Dutch Pidgin now was tried out in Pidgin or Creole Dutch subordinate clauses in the guise of V2/V1.

One of the side effects of the acquisition of V2/V1 was the rise of complex initials as in 59a–b (= 6a–b).

(59) a. Daar bly staan hy.
there keeps stand he

b. Toe laat val hy dit.
then let fall he it

As I have claimed elsewhere (den Besten 1988), V-to-AUX incorporation is more likely to arise in an SOV language without V2 than in an SOV plus V2 language, since V2, which can easily separate a verb and an auxiliary in an SOV language, provides evidence against incorporation. Once an SOV language without V2—in this case Cape Dutch Pidgin—develops such a rule, incorporation will become visible. Note that this implies that complex initials in other types of Afrikaans must be a borrowing from Khoekhoe Afrikaans.

I furthermore claimed that originally Cape Dutch Pidgin (and early Orange River Afrikaans) must have been SOV-AUX (just like Khoekhoe) on account of the occasional occurrence of V-AUX order in verbal clusters and complex initials in Orange River Afrikaans. Some examples from Rademeyer 1938 illustrating this point are:[67]

(60) a. dan [hardloop kom] hy daar vandaan
then [run comes] he there from
(Rademeyer 1938:86)

b. … en julle [siet wil] nie
… and you-PL [see want] not
(Rademeyer 1938:126)

[67] Compare also du Plessis 1984:149 for some last remnants of this V-AUX word order.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(61) a. hy had geseet bly or: hy had ge-[seet bly]
he has sat (ptc.) keep he has *ge*-[sit keep]
(Rademeyer 1938:72)

b. ons had kôp gegaan
we have buy gone
(Rademeyer 1938:72)

Note, however, that the Dutch/Afrikaans AUX-V order (*wil sien*, *gaan koop*, etc.) does not have to be a more recent development in Orange River Afrikaans. It is also possible that there was a mixture of V-AUX and AUX-V right from the start, which was gradually narrowed down to AUX-V, except where Cape Dutch/Afrikaans requires V-AUX order.[68]

As far as incentives for verbal fusion are concerned, we might, of course, appeal to universal tendencies, but in my 1988 article I also tried to find an answer in the structure of Khoekhoe: I referred to a small set of verbs in Nama that can also serve as auxiliaries, including *ǂan* 'to know', */u* 'not to know', *ǁkha* 'be able', *ǁoa* 'no to be able', *ǂgao* 'to want' (cf. Rust 1965:52–53, 120). The two verbs topicalize together, which is reminiscent of the phenomenon of complex initials in Afrikaans:

(62) a. [$_{VP}$!Gû ǂgao]=ta ra
[go want]=1sg PRES (Rust 1965:52)

b. [$_{VP}$ Mîba =te ǁkha]=ts a?
[tell =1sg can]=2sg.M PRES? (Rust 1965:53)

Unfortunately, the similarities I suggested are rather weak: complex initials are (finite) verbs and—as we now know—the topicalized constituents in 62 are VPs, while there is no evidence for incorporation. In fact the clitic pronoun on the main verb in 62b can be seen as counterevidence.

Therefore, it may well be that verbal incorporation came about without Khoekhoe substrate influences. Yet, a word of caution is in order. In den Besten 1988 I claimed that due to its erratic character, Khoekhoe V+V compounding could not have been a direct trigger for Afrikaans incorporation. This claim was due to Hagman's cautious approach of V+V compounding in Nama (Hagman 1973:133–136);

[68] V-AUX holds for auxiliaries that govern a participle when they are construed with just one verb: *het* 'have', *word* 'be', etc. Superficially, particle verbs like *staanmaak* (lit.) 'stand-make'(= 'to put') also are V-AUX.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542702046020 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compare similar remarks in Rust 1965:75–76 and the overview in Olpp 1977:123–124. Yet, Nama V+V compounding is not that erratic at all. All sorts of semantic patterns can be found, while the general format seems to be that the second verb has to serve as the "derivational affix," to put it vaguely. But I have to admit that most of these patterns do not correspond to Dutch/Afrikaans AUX+V collocations, in that the "derivational affix" seems to correspond to a Dutch/Afrikaans verbal prefix or a particle. The exceptions seem to be V + *tsâ* and V + *!gû* (with *tsâ* 'to try' and *!gû* 'to go' respectively; cf. Olpp 1977:123–124).

Therefore, it is unclear whether we may attribute the rise of complex initials to interference from Khoekhoe, although we cannot exclude the possibility that the Khoekhoen recognized the rich system of AUX+V patterns as being akin to their own V+V compounds. Yet, for the time being this is mere speculation.[69] The upshot of all this is that we may still assign the origins of Afrikaans verbal incorporation to Cape Dutch Pidgin but have to be careful about positing a Khoekhoe substrate feature in this case.

Note that something similar may apply to fused particle verbs in Orange River Afrikaans as in example 63 (= 8).[70]

(63) Maar naderhand toe om-draai hy sommer hier halfpad.
but afterwards then around-turn he just here halfway
(Rademeyer 1938:86)

Incorporation of the particle is unlikely in an SOV plus V2 language, and in fact it was never borrowed into other varieties of Afrikaans. Apparently, the speakers of Cape Dutch Pidgin learned Dutch particle +

[69] The same applies to the idea that |Xam speakers may have been responsible for the incorporation phenomenon in (Orange River) Afrikaans. This idea is based upon two observations. First, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many |Xam speakers were absorbed by Orange River Afrikaans or pidgin-speaking Khoekhoe communities (Traill 1996). Second, according to Potyka (1990:34–35), the composite verbal of |Xam, which is rather frequent (about 40% of the sentences in the Bleek corpus), consists of maximally three adjacent verbal elements expressing [type of event] – ([where it happens]) – [how it ends], in that order (basic order SVO). Since the similarities of such verbals with Afrikaans and Orange River Afrikaans complex initials are of a very general, nonspecific kind, we refrain from positing Southern Khoesan influences here.

[70] See Rademeyer 1938:63 and du Plessis 1984:162–163.

V collocations in their underlying order.[71] This order surfaces in Dutch subordinate clauses and in main-clause-final infinitives and past participles, but the Khoekhoen may have learned the particle + V order from the Dutch version of their pidgin, which must have been based upon Dutch infinitival speech.

The pattern as such is purely Dutch. We may even wonder whether there is such a thing as a particle verb in Khoekhoe. What comes closest are the many compound verbs of the type V+P in Nama and Korana.[72] But there is no evidence for a V+Prt pattern in older Orange River Afrikaans. It is therefore not impossible that the Khoekhoen learned Dutch particle verbs as whole lexical items, which would immediately explain the incorporation facts. On the other hand, if Prt-V-incorporation is a younger phenomenon, Khoekhoe V+P verbs may have provided an indirect model. But this, too, is mere speculation.

6. Concluding Remarks.

The conclusion that can be drawn from section 5 is the following: Khoekhoe sentential syntax provided the necessary means to construct an SOV language with a VP through relexification and pidginization of Khoekhoe. Since the Dutch P2 construction, that is, V2, was not immediately acquired, and since there was a tendency to find a compromise between Dutch and Khoekhoe syntax, the Khoekhoen may have refrained from (often) applying topicalization, which is symmetric (cyclic) in their own language. Once they acquired V2/V1, however, the symmetric P2 syntax of Khoekhoe was tried out with full force in Cape Dutch, which created a couple of embedded V2/V1 phenomena whose present-day acceptability and frequency of occurrence ultimately go back to the still fairly "Dutch" intuitions of the native speakers of Cape Dutch who had to assimilate these new patterns. Although the Khoekhoen could have tried to acquire Cape Dutch/Afrikaans as a new language alongside Cape Dutch Pidgin, incorporation phenomena in Afrikaans and Orange River Afrikaans indicate that V2/V1 was added to, or grafted upon, an earlier SOV grammar, namely, the grammar of Cape Dutch Pidgin. But in so doing, the Khoekhoen pushed the pidgin, which already was a compromise between Dutch and Khoekhoe syntax, further in the direction of Cape Dutch, while influencing the latter at the same time.

---

[71] Compare *dood maakum* 'dead-make (= kill)' in 11b.

[72] See Rust 1965:75, Hagman 1973:136–137, and Olpp 1977:125 for Nama, and Meinhof 1930:48 for Korana.

REFERENCES

Campbell, John. 1815. Travels in South Africa. 3rd edn. London. (Rpt. 1974. [Africana collectanea, 47.] Cape Town: Struik.)
Chomsky, Noam. 1995. The minimalist program. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
den Besten, Hans. 1978. Cases of possible syntactic interference in the development of Afrikaans. Amsterdam Creole Studies 2, ed. by Pieter Muysken, 5–56. (Publikaties van het Instituut voor AlgemeneTaalwetenschap, 20.) Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
————. 1986. Double negation and the genesis of Afrikaans. Substrata versus universals in creole genesis, ed. by Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith, 185–230. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
————. 1987. Die niederländischen Pidgins der alten Kapkolonie. Beiträge zum 3. Essener Kolloquium über "Sprachwandel und seine bestimmenden Faktoren" vom 30.9.–2.10.1986 an der Universität Essen, ed. by Norbert Boretzky, Werner Enninger, and Thomas Stolz, 9–40. Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
————. 1988. Universal-Grammatik und/oder Zweitsprachenerwerb: Der Fall Afrikaans. Beiträge zum 4. Essener Kolloquium über "Sprachkontakt, Sprachwandel, Sprachtod" vom 9.10.–10.10.1987 an der Universität Essen, ed. by Norbert Boretzky, Werner Enninger, and Thomas Stolz, 11–44. Bochum: Studienverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
————. 1989. From Khoekhoe foreignertalk via Hottentot Dutch to Afrikaans: The creation of a novel grammar. Wheels within wheels. Papers of the Duisburg Symposium on Pidgin and Creole Languages, ed. by Martin Pütz and René Dirven, 207–249. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
————. 2001. What became of the Cape Dutch pidgin(s)? Was ich noch sagen wollte ... A multilingual Festschrift for Norbert Boretzky on occasion of his 65th birthday, ed. by Birgit Igla and Thomas Stolz, 205–222. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
————, and Gert Webelhuth. 1990. Stranding. Scrambling and barriers, ed. by Günther Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld, 77–92. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
————, Carla Luijks, and Paul T. Roberge. Forthcoming. Reduplication in Afrikaans. Twice as meaningful: Reduplication in pidgins and creoles, ed. by Sylvia Kouwenberg. London: Battlebridge.
Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993. A grammar of Afrikaans. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
du Plessis, Hans. 1984. Sintaktiese variasie in die Afrikaans van Griekwas. In van Rensburg (ed.), 135–195.
Engelbrecht, J. A. 1928. Studies oor Korannataal. (Annale van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch VI, B, 2.) Cape Town: Nasionale Pers.
————. 1936. The Korana: An account of their customs and their history. With

texts. Cape Town: Maskew Miller.
Feinauer, Ilse. 1998. Afrikaans—tipologies 'n tipiese SVX-taal. Sintaksis op die voorgrond: Vir die dertigjarige herdenking van Fritz Ponelis se Grondtrekke van die Afrikaanse sintaksis, ed. by Rufus Gouws and Ilse Feinauer, 78–88. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.
Franken, J. L. M. 1953. Taalhistoriese bydraes. Amsterdam and Cape Town: A. A. Balkema.
Godée Molsbergen, E. C. (ed.). 1916. Reizen in Zuid-Afrika in de Hollandse tijd. Vol. 1: Tochten naar het Noorden 1652–1686. Vol. 2: Tochten naar het Noorden 1686–1806. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some universals of language with particular reference to the order of elements. Universals of language: Report of a conference held at Dobbs Ferry, New York, April 13–15, 1961, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, 2nd edn., 73–113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Haacke, Wilfrid H. G. 1976. A Nama grammar: The noun-phrase. Master's thesis, University of Cape Town.
Hagman, Roy S. 1973. Nama Hottentot grammar. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.
Hawkins, John A. 1983. Word order universals. New York: Academic Press.
Huybregts, Riny. 1997. Lecture on Nama syntax. TIN-dag (Linguistics in the Netherlands, 28), January 18, 1997, University of Utrecht.
Kayne, Richard S. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kolbe, P. 1727. Naaukeurige en uitvoerige beschryving van de Kaap de Goede Hoop. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Lakeman.
Koster, Jan 1975. Dutch as an SOV language. Linguistic Analysis 1.111–136.
Kotzé, Ernst F. 1984. Afrikaans in die Maleierbuurt. Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe 24.41–73.
le Roux, T. H. (ed.) 1977. Die dagboek van Louis Trigardt. 3rd edn. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1717. Collectanea etymologica. Hannover: Nicolaus Förster.
Links, Tony. 1989. So praat ons Namakwalanders. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
Luijks, Carla A. 2000. The realisation of syntactic principles in nonstandard Afrikaans: The correspondence of Jan Jonker Afrikaner (1820–1899). Doctoral dissertation, University of Cape Town.
Maingard, L. F. 1962. Korana folktales: Grammar and texts. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
Masica, Colin P. 1993. The Indo-Aryan languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Meinhof, Carl. 1930. Der Koranadialekt des Hottentottischen. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
Müller, Gereon. 1998. Incomplete category fronting: A derivational approach to

remnant movement in German. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Nienaber, G. S. 1963. Hottentots. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.
———— (ed.). 1971. Afrikaans in die vroeër jare. Johannesburg: Voortrekker Pers.
Olpp, Johannes. 1977. Nama-grammatika, soos verwerk deur H. J. Krüger. Windhoek: Inboorlingtaalburo van die Departement van Bantoe-onderwys.
Oosthuizen, J. 2000. Prepositions left and right in Afrikaans. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics 33.67–90.
Ponelis, Fritz A. 1979. Afrikaanse sintaksis. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.
————. 1993. The development of Afrikaans. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
Potyka, Franz. 1990. Satzeinleitungen und -verbindungen im |Xam (Südbuschmann): Probleme der |Xam-Syntax. Master's thesis, University of Cologne.
Rademeyer, J. H. 1938. Kleurling-Afrikaans: Die taal van die Griekwas en Rehoboth-Basters. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
Raidt, Edith H. 1991. Afrikaans en sy Europese verlede. 3rd edn. Cape Town: Nasou.
Robbers, K. B. M. 1997. Non-finite verbal complements in Afrikaans: A comparative approach. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.) The Hague: HAG.
Roberge, Paul T. 1994a. On the origins of the Afrikaans verbal hendiadys. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics 28.45–81.
————. 1994b. The formation of Afrikaans. (SPIL PLUS, 23.) Stellenbosch: Department of General Linguistics, University of Stellenbosch.
————. Forthcoming. On reconstructing a linguistic continuum in Cape Dutch (1710–1840). Variation and reconstruction, ed. by Thomas D. Cravens. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Rust, Friedrich. 1960. Deutsch-Nama Wörterbuch. Windhoek: Rheinische Mission in Südwestafrika.
————. 1965. Praktische Namagrammatik. Auf Grund der Namagrammatiken von H. Vedder und J. Olpp. Cape Town and Amsterdam: A. A. Balkema.
Schapera, Isaac, and Benjamin Farrington (eds.). 1933. Early Cape Hottentots, described in the writings of Olfert Dapper (1668), Willem ten Rhyne (1686) and Johannes Gulielmus de Grevenbroek (1695). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.
Schoeman, Karel. 1997. Dogter van Sion: Machtelt Smit en die 18de-eeuse samelewing aan die Kaap, 1749–1799. Cape Town, Pretoria, and Johannesburg: Human & Rousseau.
Shell, Robert C.-H. 1994. Children of bondage. A social history of the slave society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652–1838. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
Smith, Ian R. 1979. Convergence in South Asia: A creole example. Lingua 48.193–222.

Spruijt, M. M. 1993. Aspekte van die naamwoordkonstruksie in Griekwa-Afrikaans. Master's thesis, University of Zululand.
Steever, Sanford B. 1998. The Dravidian languages. London: Routledge.
ten Rhyne, W. 1686. Schediasma de Promontorio Bonae Spei. In Schapera and Farrington (eds.), 76–157.
Traill, Anthony. 1996. !Khwa-Ka Hhouiten Hhouiten, "The rush of the Syrom": The linguistic death of |Xam. Miscast: Negotiating the presence of the Bushmen, ed. by Pippa Skotnes, 161–183. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
van Rensburg, M. C. J. 1984. Aspekte van die klankleer van die Afrikaans van die Griekwas. In van Rensburg (ed.), 1.272–362.
———— (ed.). 1984. Finale verslag van 'n ondersoek na die Afrikaans van die Griekwas van die tagtigerjare. 2 vols. (in 5 parts). Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Free State.
van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1978. A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.) Lisse: Peter de Ridder.
van Zyl, D. H. 1947. 'n Griekwa-"ietsigeit" (Iets oor die Griekwas). Cape Town, Bloemfontein, and Port Elizabeth: Nasionale Pers.
Waher, Hester. 1982. The position of the finite verb in Afrikaans. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics 8.51–78.
Wikar, H. J. 1779. Berigt aan den Weleedelen Gestrengen Heer Mr. Joachim van Plettenbergh. In Godée Molsbergen (ed.), 2.78–138.
Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1993. Dutch syntax: A minimalist approach. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.
————. 1997. Morphosyntax of verb movement: A minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Universiteit van Amsterdam
Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen
Theoretische taalwetenschap
Spuistraat 210
1012 VT Amsterdam
The Netherlands
[h.den.besten@hum.uva.nl]