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Introduction
This paper compares the D-systems of Standard Afrikaans (StdA) and a Cape Tonian spoken variety of Afrikaans, namely Kaaps.

Even in a highly deflected language like Afrikaans, we show that variation arising in vernacular contexts can be systematised to produce novel morphosyntactic distinctions.

Key proposal: The differences between StdA and Kaaps reflect what may be the initial stages of a (re)morphologisation process, driven in large part by child-acquirers, that is taking place in Kaaps.

We argue that complexification in the Kaaps D-system:
• challenges proposals in terms of which grammatical simplification is inevitable in contact-influenced systems.
• originates as variation in adult speech which becomes systematised for information structure purposes.
• is in large part due to how child acquirers structure variable input to arrive at a cohesive system.

Roadmap:
1. Kaaps
2. Brief introduction to SEcoKa
3. Data sources
4. Overview of StdA
5. The Kaaps D-system
6. Discussion
7. Concluding Remarks

1. Kaaps: a spoken variety of Afrikaans
Kaaps is spoken on the Cape Peninsula (Hendricks & Dyers 2016) – see the map overleaf.

Kaaps is…
• a matrilect: learned by children, spoken as home language.
• ‘dynamic’, fast changing; Much inter- and intra-speaker variation.

The research presented here has been conducted as part of a South African NRF-funded project entitled ‘The Syntactic Ecology of Kaaps’ (SEcoKa), project number: TTK180406318288. We are grateful to Firdous Butoni, Cheván Van Rooi, and Larnelle Lewies for their contributions.
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Multilingualism
- Kaaps speaking individuals and communities are multilingual; many/most are home language English speakers.
- Other languages represented in the Kaaps speaking population include Arabic, Urdu, Hindi, IsiXhosa, IsiZulu, SeSotho (and other African languages).
- Kaaps today is partly characterised by the high degree to which speakers integrate the range of linguistic resources at their disposal (Williams 2016) – linguistic hybridity.

Historically
- Despite the dynamicity and innovation, Kaaps is also an ‘old’ language.
- Kaaps’ predecessor(s) spoken in Cape Town’s City Bowl (especially Bo-Kaap and District Six - Hendricks 2016; Kotzé 2016) since the early Cape-Dutch period.

Better-known about Kaaps:
- lexical borrowing / blending
- phonological properties

Lesser-known about Kaaps:
- (morpho-) syntactic properties
- the nature of grammatical hybridity: When Kaaps speakers draw on linguistic resources originating in different grammars, what emerges?

Figure 1: Map of the Cape Peninsula
2. The Syntactic Ecology of Kaaps

- 3 year NRF-funded project (2019-2021)
- General project goals:
  - Describe aspects of Kaaps grammar
  - Better understand grammatical variation:
    - within (speakers of) Kaaps
    - between Kaaps and other Afrikaanses
  - Better understand the nature of grammatical hybridity & innovation
- Project website: https://secoka.wixsite.com/secoka

3. Data Sources

There are three main sources of data for this talk, namely

- **Text-based corpus:**

- **Elicitation:** translation from English to Kaaps, via WhatsApp
  - 21 Kaaps speaking participants (aged 19-47), organised into chat groups of 2-4.
  - One item per day for 28 days.
  - Required both a typed and an audio recorded (via the ‘voice note’ function) response.
    - ~1148 audio clips (number of participant responses varies from day to day)
    - ~170 minutes of recorded data
  - No monolingual participants: all are proficient speakers of Afrikaans and English; other languages spoken by participants include isiXhosa, isiZulu, seSotho, Arabic, Dutch, German, and French.

- **Focus group and interviews:**
  - 5 participants in focus group conversations
  - Recorded conversations from one-on-one semi-structured interviews

3.3 Format of the data in this presentation

Data in this presentation will appear in the following format:

(1) Ek *scheme* ŵs kry *ice-cream* vinaand.
    I *scheme* we get ice-cream tonight
    ‘I suggest we get ice-cream tonight.’

[Kaaps; 20190429 TRNS_WR AAAP]

- Data type key:
  - TRNS_WR: WhatsApp elicitation; typed response
  - TRNS_VN: WhatsApp elicitation; voice note
  - INT: Focus group interview
- Lexical borrowing / blending is italicised - cf. *scheme* and *ice-cream* in (1).
- English prompts for data collected in the WhatsApp elicitation are given as footnotes throughout.
4. Overview of the Standard Afrikaans D-system

This section provides an overview of relevant aspects of the D-system in StdA.4

- Articles
- Locatives
- Pronouns:
  - 3rd person neuter forms
  - Demonstratives

4.1 Articles

The StdA indefinite and definite articles, respectively, are:

- ‘n (pronounced [ə]) and [Dutch: een]
- die (pronounced [di]) [Dutch: de / het]

These articles consistently precede their associated nominals as morphologically independent elements, but are frequently enclitics in colloquial StdA.

(3) (a) ‘n / die duur jas. (b) oppe / oppie mooi tafel. (pronounced [-ə]: [-i])
a the expensive jacket on.a on the nice table
‘An / the expensive jacket.’ ‘On a / the nice table.’

4.2. Locative adverbs

The StdA distal and proximal locative adverb, respectively, are

- daar (‘there’), and [Dutch: daar]
- hier (‘here’) [Dutch: hier]

The presentational/existential expletive in StdA derives from the distal locative adverb daar (typically the case in West Germanic languages):

(4) (a) There is nothing to do (here/there).
(b) Daar is niks om (hier / daar) te doen nie. [Dutch: er]
there is nothing C.INF here there to do not
‘There is nothing to do (here/there).’

4.3. Pronouns

As far as reference is concerned, there are three types of nominal constituent:

(i) **Referring-expressions and proper nouns** always have independent reference and thus cannot be anaphoric and, i.e. they must be free.
e.g. John poured a drink.

(ii) **Reflexive pronouns** are always co-referential with an antecedent, i.e. they must be bound.
e.g. John poured himself a drink.

---

4 Unless otherwise stated, all examples in this section are constructed by the authors as they are entirely uncontroversial, and can also be verified on the basis of descriptive reference works like Donaldson (1993).
(iii) **Pronouns** may have independent reference (i.e. they may be free), but they may also be co-referential with an antecedent (i.e. they may be bound).

    e.g. John, said he urgently requires drink.

**Expletives** have no reference at all – neither independently nor that which comes from an antecedent (*It seems that John urgently requires a drink*).

In this paper, we focus on a subset of (iii), namely the 3rd person neuter pronoun (*'it'*), and the demonstratives (*'this'* and *'that'*).

When these pronouns have independent reference (are free) and the referent is an entity in the local spatio-temporal vicinity of the utterance, we call them *deictic*.

*Deictic* (i.e. free) 3rd person neuter pronouns and demonstratives are compatible with pointing.

    e.g. John said he wanted this, not that.

When a pronoun is co-referential with an antecedent (is bound), it may be bound by:

(a) A nominal constituent, typically a DP. We call such pronouns *individual anaphors*, and note that they track major discourse participants.

    e.g. John baked a cake, but accidentally burned it.

(b) A (sub-)clausal constituent, typically a CP or vP, which are propositions or events. We call such pronouns *predicate/proposition anaphors* (Snider 2017).

    e.g. John climbed the mountain, and said it was worth the effort.

The demonstratives can be used either pronominally (in place of a noun, e.g. *I enjoyed this*), or attributively (co-occurring with a noun, e.g. *I enjoyed this workshop*).

### 4.3.1 The 3rd person neuter pronoun

The StdA 3rd person neuter form is *dit*

As in English, it functions both as an *expletive* (5) and *(co-)*referential pronoun (6):

(5) (a) **Dit** reën vandag.

    it rain today

    ‘It is raining today.’ [quasi-argumental / weather expletive; Dutch: *het*]

(b) **Dit** vat drie dae vir die geld om in jou bankrekening te verskyn.

    it takes three days for the money to appear in your bank-account to appear

    ‘It takes three working days for the money to appear in your bank account.’

    ["pure" anticipatory expletive; Dutch: *het*]

As a *(co-)* referential pronoun, *dit* can be:

- Bound (co-referential), functioning as a
  - individual anaphor (6a)
  - predicate/proposition anaphor (6b)
- Free (referential), functioning as a *deictic pronoun* (6c).
6 (6) (a) Ek sien die blik waarna jy gesoek het. Dit is heeltemal leeg. I see the container which-after you searched have it is completely empty ‘I can see the container that you were looking for. It is completely empty.’ [Dutch: het]

(b) Ons het gister op die strand gaan stap. Dit was baie lekker. we have yesterday on the beach go walk it was very nice ‘We went walking on the beach yesterday. It was lots of fun.’ [Dutch: het]

(c) Ek wil dit graag hè. I want it please have ‘I would like to have this (with pointing)’. [Dutch: dit]

Note from (6):
• The bound use of dit (i.e. when it is an individual and predicate/proposition anaphor) is unmarked because it is unstressed;
• The free (deictic) use is marked because it is stressed: dit.

In all of these uses, dit may surface in the form of lexicalised dis (> dit is (it’s)) in contexts where it would have preceded a copula:

(7) (a) Dis altyd maar sonskyn in die Kaap. it’s always just sunshine in the Cape ‘It’s always sunny in the Cape.’

(b) Ek was nie seker oor hierdie rok nie, maar hulle sê dis goed genoeg. I was not sure about this dress not but they say it’s good enough ‘I wasn’t sure about this dress, but they tell me it’s good enough.’

(c) Dis ‘n goeie idee! that’s a good idea ‘THAT’s a good idea’

4.3.2 Demonstratives
The StdA distal demonstrative daardie (‘that’ – in Dutch: dat / die) and proximal demonstrative hierdie (‘this’ – in Dutch: dit / deze) are morphologically complex:

• daardie (lit. there.the = ‘that’) is constructed from the distal locative adverb daar (‘there’) + the definite article die (‘the’)
  Colloquially, daardie is frequently reduced to daai.

• hierdie (lit. here.the = ‘this’) is constructed from the proximal locative adverb hier (‘here’) combines with the definite article die (‘the’)

(8) (a) Ek wou ’n appeltart hè na die ete, nie daardie (ding) nie. I wanted an apple-tart have after the meal not there.the thing not ‘I wanted to have an apple tart after the meal, not that (thing).’
 Ek het nie geweet wat jy verkies nie, toe bring ek maar hierdie (ding).
I have not known what you prefer not then bring I just here the thing
‘I did not know what you preferred, so I brought this (thing).’

Demonstratives functioning as deictic (free) pronouns are unmarked.

Demonstratives functioning as individual anaphors and predicate/propositional (bound) anaphors are marked by virtue of the availability of a neutral form, dit; they therefore convey a non-neutral speaker perspective: As a predicate/proposition anaphor:

- **Proximal hierdie** is cataphoric (must precede the antecedent) (9a);
- **Distal daardie** is ‘posterior’ in that it follows the antecedent and acceptability improves as the distance between the pronoun and the antecedent increases (9b).
- **3rd person neuter pronoun dit** is unmarked.

(9) (a) **Dit / hierdie,** is nie lekker om te sê nie, maar [ek vind jou baie irriterend]i.
\[\text{it this is not nice to say not but I find you very irritating.} \]

(b) Hulle het voorgestel dat ons eers ná die vertoning eet...
They have suggested that we only after the performance eat
(i) …**Dit / daardie** klink nie soos ‘n goeie idee nie.
\[\text{it that sounds not like a good idea not} \]
(ii) …nadat ons vanmiddag die berg uitgeklim en geswem het.
\[\text{after we this afternoon the mountain out-climbed and swam have} \]
**Dit / daardie** klink nie soos ‘n goeie idee nie.
\[\text{it that sounds not like a good idea not} \]
‘They suggested we eat only after the performance… (after we climbed the mountain and swam this afternoon…) That doesn’t sound like a good idea.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of the StdA D-system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTICLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEFINITE (‘a’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITE (‘the’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLETIVE (‘there’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENTIAL (‘there/here’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd PERSON NEUTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLETIVE (‘it’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUND – INDIVIDUAL / PREDICATE-PROPOSITIONAL (‘it’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE – DEICTIC (‘it’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMONSTRATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUND – INDIVIDUAL / PREDICATE-PROPOSITIONAL (‘this/that’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE – DEICTIC (‘this/that’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* marked use
5. The Kaaps D-system
Generally speaking, the Kaaps D-system
• features a richer array of forms than StdA does.
• has been restructured in such a way that there are systematic contrasts in onset (absent in StdA).

The description of the Kaaps facts is organised on the basis of their onset properties:
Section 5.1: d-initial elements
Section 5.2: elements which are d-less (lacking a phonologically contrastive onset)
Section 5.3: h-initial elements
Section 5.4: locative pronouns

5.1 d-initial forms in Kaaps (die, dít, dai, dié)
Kaaps has a set of d-initial items, all of which are also available in (spoken) StdA. We shall see that these forms additionally have d-less correlates in Kaaps that are not available in StdA (cf. §5.2).

• die: the definite article (‘the’)

(10) (a) Die clue was innie title, as jy daa an dink.
    the clue was in the title if you there on think
    ‘The clue was in the title, if you think about it.’
    [Trantraal 2019:10]

(b) Dai wassie laaste kee wat ek vi Amelia gesien et.
    that was the last time what I for Amelia seen have
    ‘That was the last time I saw Amelia.’
    [Trantraal 2018:24]

As (10) shows, the definite article, like the indefinite article, is typically an enclitic; incorporation into the preceding element produces assimilation effects that obscure their onsets: wassie > was die (‘was the’) in (10b), innie > in die (‘in the’) in (10a).

However, even when obscured, the /d-/ onset of the definite article seems to be underlyingly present:
- Definite articles are d-initial in sentence-initial position and following intonation breaks (10a).
- /d/ > /t/ when the definite article encliticises onto a vowel-final form: byrrie > by die (‘at the’) (rhotacisation).

• dít: the d-initial deictic form of the 3rd person neuter pronoun

(11) Gie dít #it vi my!
    give it for me
    ‘Give that to me!’
    [20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

As (11) shows,
- The deictic use of the 3rd person neuter pronoun requires a d-initial form in Kaaps
- Use of the d-less form it is ungrammatical
- the d-less from it is a necessarily unmarked pronominal

---

5 Participants in the focus group produced this expression in response to an English translation prompt for which they were given the following context: A child is playing with a fragile or ornament. The speaker reaches for the object and says Give me that!
• **dai:** the distal demonstrative

(12) (a) Dai oopatjie sense sieke my disapproval. That grandpa.DIM sense probably my disapproval

‘That little grandpa probably senses my disapproval.’

[Trantraal 2018:63, line 14]

(b) “Los dai…” leave that

‘Leave that (stop what you’re doing).’

[Trantraal 2018:61, line 18]

• **dié:** the proximal demonstrative

(13) (a) Ek het vi Joe gesê ek wil dai skoene hê…

I have for J. said I want those shoes have

nie dié skoene nie.

‘I told Joe I wanted those shoes, not these shoes.’

[StdA: *hierdie*]

(12-13) show that both of the Kaaps demonstrative forms

- Can be used **attributively** and **pronominally**.
- May function as free (deictic) pronouns (12b; 13a)
- May function as bound pronouns (12a; 13b) – in this case, as individual anaphors with DP antecedents – like in StdA

Kaaps differs from StdA in that the distal demonstrative *dai* – and its corresponding copula-contracted form *dais* (‘that’s’) – is the unmarked predicate/propositional anaphor (14).

- In harnessing the distal demonstrative as the unmarked predicate/propositional anaphor, Kaaps patterns with English (see the translations of the examples in (14)), rather than StdA.
- It is crosslinguistically uncommon for discourse anaphora to be neutrally encoded by the 3rd person pronoun, as it is in StdA (Himmelmann 1996:212).

(14) (a) Dais waa political activists soes Noam Chomsky my veloo… that's where political activists like N. C. me loses

‘That’s where political activists like Noam Chomsky lose me…’

…hulle dink meer van mense as wat mense ooit van hulleself sal dink. they think more of people as what people ever of themselves will think

‘…they think more of people than what people would ever think of themselves.’

[Trantraal 2018:9, line 14]

(a’) Dis waar polieteise aktiviste soos Noam Chomsky my verloor. [StdA]

(b) Dai is Amelia vi jou. that is A. for you

‘That is Amelia for you.’

[Trantraal 2018:21 line 15]

---

6 The prompt this expression was: *I told Joe I wanted those shoes, not these ones.*
Interim Summary: The primarily deictic elements - the proximal and distal demonstratives (dié and dai, respectively) plus deictically used dit are consistently d-initial.

Although underlingly d-initial, the definite article, by contrast, is most commonly - everywhere except in clause-initial position - realised enclitically, as a d-less form. Both the definite and the indefinite article (cf. §5.2) are thus saliently enclitic, with the underlying /d/ of the definite article not being consistently realised in the way that it is for the deictic elements considered in this section.

5.2 d-less forms in Kaaps (it, is, e)
Kaaps has a number of forms which lack an onset; corresponding items in StdA are d-initial.

- **it:** the d-less 3rd person neuter pronoun (> dit (‘it’))

  (15) (a) It vat at least twee working-class salaries om 'n phone inne hyste it takes at least two working-class salaries INF.C a phone in the house to het.
  have ‘It takes at least two working-class salaries to have a phone in the house.’
  [Trantraal 2018:12, line 14]

  (b) It is practically lieg.
  it is practically empty ‘It (= the previously mentioned train) is practically empty.’
  [Trantraal 2018:57, line 6]

  As (15) shows,
  - it can be an expletive (15a)
  - it can be a bound pronoun: in (15b), it is an individual anaphor with a DP antecedent.

- **is:** the d-less equivalent of StdA lexicalised dis (‘it’s’)

  (16) (a) Is baie warm in daai kamer. it’s very warm in that room
  ‘It’s very hot in that room.’
  [20190519_TRNS_WR_AAAM]

  (b) “Naai, is orait is biete as niks.”
  no it’s alright it’s better as nothing
  ‘No, it’s (= the previously mentioned essay) alright, it’s better than nothing.’
  [Trantraal 2018:20, line 12]

  As (16) shows,
  - is can be expletive (16a)
  - is can be a bound pronoun: in (16b), is is an individual anaphor with a DP antecedent.

- **e:** the indefinite article (‘a’)
In Kaaps, the indefinite article is e (variant orthographic representation of StdA ‘n; pronounced [ə] in isolation, like in StdA, but always enclitic in non-initial position; see the discussion of definite die above)
As (17) illustrates, the indefinite article is typically an enclitic.

5.3 h-initial forms in Kaaps
Kaaps features an $h$-initial variant $hai$ (‘that’) of the distal demonstrative, which functions as a pragmaticalised determiner. The proximal demonstrative $dié$ has no $h$-initial correlate.

Pragmaticalised determiners convey intersubjective information about the speaker’s attitudes and speaker-hearer relations.\(^7\)

\begin{quote}
  e.g. This guy comes up to me in a bar… [narrative indefinite specific this]  
  If I ever get my hands on that John, it’ll be the end of him. [evaluative that]
\end{quote}

As a pragmatic demonstrative in Kaaps, $hai$ serves at least two discernible functions, namely (i) as a recognitional marker (§5.3.1), and (ii) as an evaluative marker (§5.3.2).

5.3.1 $hai$: the distal demonstrative as a recognitional determiner

**Recognational determiners** ‘invite the listener to co-construct the referent through shared knowledge’ (Ekberg et al. 2015; Kinn 2019).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(18)] (a)   Ek hoor $hai$ kar het gebriek.\(^8\)
      I hear that car has broken
      ‘I hear that car (you know the one, right?) broke.’
      \[20190413_TRNS_VN_AAAA]\n
  (b)   Amal wat nou Zuma se naam hoo picture $hai$ showerkop.\(^9\)
      everyone what now Z. POS name hears pictures that showerhead
      ‘Everyone who hears Zuma’s name now just pictures that (infamous) showerhead.’
      \[20190514_TRNS_VN_AAAA]\n
  (c)   Ek wiet jy dink hyt $hai$ hond van jou gevat…\(^{10}\)
      I know you think he has that dog of yours took
      ‘I know you think he took that dog of yours (the one we know is missing)’
      \[20190522_TRNS_VN_AAAA]\n\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item[(19)] (a)   Oh yes. Ek gan nou soema opsign op $hai$ link ne.
oh yes I go now PRT up-sign on that link PRT
      ‘Oh yes. I’ll now just quickly sign up via that link, ok!’
      (\textit{hai link} = a link where, in a conversation that took place a week ago, participants were asked to sign up for a study)
      \[20190428_AAAC; p.c]\n\end{enumerate}

\(^7\) Cf. Kinn (2019) and sources therein on pragmaticalised determiners in other Germanic languages.

\(^8\) The prompt for this expression was: \textit{I heard that the car broke down.}

\(^9\) The prompt for this expression was: \textit{Now, everyone who hears Zuma’s name just pictures that showerhead.}

\(^{10}\) The prompt for this expression was: \textit{I know you think he took that dog of yours...}
Ek is vesieke dat hy nie al hai gel hettie. I am sure that he not all that money has not ‘I am sure that he doesn’t have all that money.’

Hai serves a recognitional function.

- It can be felicitously accompanied by you know? or remember?
- ‘The intended referent is to be identified via specific, shared knowledge rather than through situational clues or reference to preceding segments of the ongoing discourse’ (Himmelmann 1996:227).
- Allows for first-mention uses
  - Unlike various techniques for tracking referents (e.g. definite NPs / individual anaphors like personal pronouns, and demonstratives)

5.3.2 hai: the distal demonstrative as an evaluative marker

Another function of hai is to mark a speaker’s evaluation (often negative).

(20) (a) A: Ek hoor die kar het gebriek. …
  I hear the car has broken
  ‘I hear the car broke down.’
D: Hai kar was sorn oek gemors man, ek se jou. That car was PRT a piece rubbish man I tell you
  ‘That car was nothing but a piece of rubbish, I’m telling you.’

(b) A: Hennie sê Suzan hette nuwe rooi hoet.
  Hennie says S. has a new red hat
  ‘Hennie says that Susan has a new red hat.’
B: Ek kan glo hai vrou het twee nuwe hoette. I can believe that woman has two new hats
  ‘I could believe that woman has two new hats.’

(c) Rosie het gedink sy sou daai jacket dra, nie hai ene nie.
  R. has thought she would that jacket wear not that one not
  ‘Rosie thought she would wear that jacket, not that (ugly) one.’

(d) Ek wonne hoe hai president van ôs dit sal handle.
  I wonder how that president of ours this will handle
  ‘I wonder how that president of ours will handle this.’

- In (20a): the car is regarded as a piece of rubbish;

---

11 English prompt for this expression was: I’m sure that he doesn’t have all that money.
13 The prompt for this expression was: A: I heard that the car broke down… D: That car was rubbish, I’m telling you.
14 The prompt for this expression was: A: Hennie says that Susan has a new red hat. B: I could believe that that woman even has two new hats.
15 The prompt for this expression was: I wonder how that president of ours will handle that!
• In (20b): the woman has more new clothing than the speaker deems acceptable;
• In (20c): a participant explains -
  “if you use daai & haai in the same sentence as in [20c]... it could imply that you [sic] degrading the other jacket”;
• In (20d): implicit lack of confidence towards the president, very undermining.

**Interim Summary:** As a recognitional and evaluative marker, *hai* encodes an additional, **intersubjective layer of meaning**...  
• Not necessarily encoded by definite articles, personal pronouns, or “regular” demonstratives.
• Intersubjective interpretations are available for demonstratives in English and StdA
  *But* neither English nor StdA has a special form encoding this function
  The *h*-onset appears to be emerging as such in Kaaps.

\[ Hai = an emerging pragmatically-oriented demonstrative \]

### 5.3.3 *dai* vs. *hai*: a grammatically active distinction

In Kaaps the occurrence of *hai* vs. *dai* is **syntactically** conditioned:

(21) (a) **Dai** / *hai* kan ‘n problem wies.\(^{16}\)
  that can a problem be ‘That could be a problem.’
  \[20190520\_INT\_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA\]
  (b) Ek wonne hoe **hai** president van ons **dai** / *hai* sal hanteer.\(^{17}\)
  I wonder how that president of ours that will handle
  ‘I wonder how that president of ours will handle that.’
  \[20190520\_INT\_AAAZ\]

*Hai* and *dai* are also assigned different interpretations:
• *dai* is used **deictically** - cf. (21), (23a), and (24a), all compatible with pointing.
• *hai* is not available as a deictic pronoun – cf. (23b) and (24b), **not** compatible with pointing.

(22) (a) Gie **dai** ding:\(^{18}\)
  give that thing
  ‘Give (me) that thing!’ (✓ with pointing)
  \[20190520\_INT\_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA\]
  (b) Ek nodig **dai** pen.\(^{19}\)
  I need that pen
  ‘I need that pen.’ (✓ with pointing)
  \[20190520\_INT\_AAAG/AAAZ/AABA\]

\(^{16}\) This example was produced during the focus group interview by all five participants in response to an English translation prompt. The context provided for the prompt was that the speaker and a friend are planning a surprise party for the friend’s brother, and the friend has just told the speaker that the brother is planning to see a movie on the same night as the party. The speaker says *That could be a problem.*

\(^{17}\) The prompt for this expression was: *I wonder how that president of ours will handle that!*

\(^{18}\) This expression was produced during the focus group interview by all five participants in response to an English translation prompt. The context provided for the prompt was that a child is playing with a fragile ornament. The speaker reaches for the object and says *Give me that thing!*

\(^{19}\) The prompt for this expression was: *I need that pen.*
(23) (a) Kós gaan na **dai Chinese takeaways** op Main Rd. toe.\(^{20}\)
let us go to that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.
‘Let’s go to that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.’ (✔ with pointing)  
[20190520_INT_AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

(b) Kom ôs gaan na **hai Chinese takeaways** toe op Main Rd.
let us go to that Chinese takeaways to on Main Rd.
‘Let’s go to that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.’ (✘ with pointing)  
[20190520_INT_AAAF]

(24) (a) **Dai** vrou kan ek regtig nie verdra nie.
that woman can I really not stand not
‘That woman (over there) I really can’t stand.’ (✔ with pointing)  
[20190520_INT_AAAF]

(b) **Ek kan hai vrou** nie verdra nie!
I can that woman not stand not
‘I can’t stand that woman!’ (✘ with pointing)  
[20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

In (23b) and (24b), **hai** is not uttered in the spatio-temporally local vicinity of the referent;
• **[hai Chinese takeaways]** = a restaurant that is familiar to both speaker and hearer.
• **[hai vrou]** = a person who is known to both speaker and hearer.

⇒ **dai** and **hai** are not simply variants of a single lexical item.

5.4 The d- vs. h-initial distinction among Kaaps locative and existential pronouns
In this section, we first discuss the forms and uses of the distal and then the proximal pronoun.

5.4.1 Distal **daa** vs. **haa**: two ways of saying ‘there’ in Kaaps
The existential expletive pronoun ‘there’ is based on the distal locative form **daa** (‘there’),
and alternates between d-initial and h-initial forms: **daa/haa** (‘there’) (25-26):

(25) (a) ...En as ôssie mee it kan **afforditie**
and if we not more it can afford have not
‘and when we couldn’t afford it any more’
was **haa** net **dai depressing amputee phone line**…
was there just that depressing amputee phone line
‘there was simply that depressing dead phone line (but no phone)…’
[Trantraal 2018:12, line 16]

(b) ...om jouself te **convince daa** isse regte kans dat jy sal bel.
INF.C yourself to convince there is a real chance that you will phone
‘...to convince yourself there’s a real chance that you’ll phone.’
[Trantraal 2018:13, line 9]

\(^{20}\) This is a focus group interview example, produced by four of the participants in response to the English translation prompt **Let’s go that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.**
(26) (a) **Haa/daa** wasse man byrrie dee wie vi jou gesoek et.
   ‘There was a man by the door who for you searched has’
   [20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

(b) **Haa** wasse tyd toe…
   ‘There was a time when’
   [20190520_INT_AAAZ]

(c) **Haa** gie die man vi jou vyf rand. Hoe sê mens?
   ‘The man is giving you five rand. What do you say?’
   [20190522_AAAF; PC]

The **distal locative adverb** ‘there’ can function as a
- ‘Individual’ anaphor for tracking referent places, typically PPs
- *Deictic (free/referential) pronoun*

There is a strong tendency for **daa** to be used in preference to **haa** as both an individual anaphor (27a-b) and a deictic pronoun (27c).

(27) (a) **Jy gan niks minner as vyf uren van jou liewe oppie Sondag**
   you go nothing less as five hours of your life on a Sunday
   **daa** moet *vegetate* ie.
   ‘there’ = the Pentecostal church, previously mentioned
   [Trantraal 2018:11, line 1]

(b) …En **daa** gan bel.
   ‘…and go there to phone.’
   (‘there’ = the payphone at the fisheries, previously mentioned)
   [Trantraal 2018:13, line 4]

(c) **Sit it daa / ??*haa nee.*21**
   put it there down
   ‘Put it down there.’ [20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

- ****haa** as a pragmaticallyalised locative adverb**
   Interestingly, **haa** sometimes occurs in what appear to be deictic contexts:22

(28) (a) **Jy moet ’n lid **dáá** oppie vullis blik sit.**
   you must a lid there on the rubbish bin put
   ‘You must put a lid on the rubbish bin over there.’
   [20190418_TRNS_VN_AAAN]

---

21 The context created for the focus group participants around this expression was as follows: You and a friend are carrying a heavy box. You indicate a spot in the corner and say *Put it down over there.*

22 The prompt for this expression was: *The teacher said to put a lid on that bin over there.*
Die menee het gesê om mie blik **haa** anne kant se deskel op te sit. 'The teacher said to put a lid on the bin over that side.'  

[20190418TRNS_VN_AAAC]

We suggest that
- **haa** in (28b) would be encoding *shared knowledge* to do with place, i.e. a *recognitional* use in the locative series.
- In such cases, **haa** would *not* take its referent from the spatio-temporally local environment (i.e. it is *not* deictic pronoun)
- Thus, in the case of (28b), **haa** should be interpreted as ‘*that side of the building which neither of us can see right now, but with which we are both familiar*’.

Support for a pragmatic use of **haa**: (28b) seems to involve an ‘intermediate’, speaker- and hearer-referencing interpretation of the locative pronoun, found in both Kaaps and StdA (29):

(29) (a) **Gee gou ** **daar** die skroewedraaier aan. give quickly there the screwdriver on  
Quickly pass me screwdriver (it’s close to you but far from me).’  

[StdA]  

(b) “**Skryf ’n paa stukkies haa, jou ma se poes...**” write a few pieces there you mother.f***er  
‘Write something there, you mother f***er.’  

[Trantraal 2018:17, line 12]  

(c) **Gie h aa / daa** gou ’n vyf rand, man. give there quickly a five rand, man  
‘Just give (me) five rand, man.’  

[20190521_AAAF; PC]  

- We designate this use ‘*close to you; far from me*’.  
- In StdA, ‘*close to you; far from me*’ encoded by **daar** (31a); in Kaaps, **haa** is available (38b-c)

**‘Close to you; far from me’ ≠ deixis**: It is an intersubjective meaning which based on speaker’s perception of what is (physically or emotionally-psychologically) closer to the hearer than to the speaker.

This allows us to give a consistent assessment of what h- ‘means’: something intersubjective/ pragmatically-oriented, crucially referencing both speaker and hearer (close to you; far from me).

**Interim Summary**: The *h*-initial variant **haa** of the distal locative **daa** (‘there’) is like the *h*-initial variant **hai** of the distal demonstrative **dai**:  
- **Haa** is available to encode intersubjective, pragmatically-oriented meanings in the locative series  
- Namely, **haa** can express (i) a recognitional version of ‘*that PLACE*’, and (ii) the ‘*close to you; far from me*’ function  
- ‘Close to you; far from me’ is an intersubjective / pragmatically-oriented use:
the speaker is the deictic centre
the use depends on the speaker’s perception of what (physically or emotionally-psychologically) closer to the hearer than to the speaker.

But can the same assessment of *h- in hai and haa* be applied to the proximal locative form *hie*, which is also *h*-initial?

### 5.4.2 hie: proximal ‘here’ is always speaker-centred
Unlike with the distal locative demonstratives, there is no alternation between a *d*-initial and *h*-initial variant in the proximal locative, which always takes the form of *h*-initial *hie* (‘here’).

(29)  
(a) Ek het djou mos gesê dat djy moet toemaak hieso.  
I have you PRT told that you must closed-make here.so  
‘I told you, didn’t I, that you should close this here.’  
[20180804_INT_AAAI]

(b) Kykhie, osse mense het opgegroei met Kaaps.  
look.here we people have up.grown with Kaaps  
‘Look, we grew up speaking Kaaps.’  
[20180809_INT_AAAC]

In (29a), *hie* is functioning as a deictic pronoun; in (29b), *hie* is marking a ‘close to me’ speaker perspective; in both cases, *hie* is *h*-initial.

Following well-established ideas in phenomenology and pragmatism about human conceptions of space, we suggest:  
- **HERE** is in fact a *fundamentally intersubjective / pragmatically-oriented* notion.
  - **Cartesian conceptions:**
    - Space is homogenous, constituted by points, lines, and dimensions.
    - Such points, lines, and dimensions are undifferentiated in quality: none are ‘special’ / privileged in relation to others – *everywhere is anywhere*
    - No special place for the speaker.
  - **Lebenswelt (‘life-world’; Husserl) conceptions:**
    - Space is oriented, constituted by embodied experiences.
    - HERE is ‘special’ / privileged among other places, functions as a *zero point*, the origin of the deictic field (Bühler, 1982)
    - HERE is the place of the speaker (and cannot be defined in terms of objective Cartesian dimensions).
  - We side, thus, against a Cartesian notion of space, in favour of a ‘Lebenswelt’ conception of space.

The *h*-initial items in the Kaaps D-system, *hai, haa*, and *hie*, all encode the intersubjective / pragmatically-oriented ‘layer’ of meaning

---

23 These definitions are based on the discussion in Waldenfels (2007:108-113).
Table 3: Summary of the Kaaps D-system (organised by onset)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onset-less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>it</em> ('it')</td>
<td>3RD PERSON NEUTER</td>
<td>Expletive, Bound pronoun (individual, predicate/propositional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>is</em> ('it’s')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-ie</em> ('a')</td>
<td>INDEFINITE ARTICLE</td>
<td>Indefinite determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-ie</em> ('the')</td>
<td>DEFINITE ARTICLE</td>
<td>Definite determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d-initial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>die</em> ('the')</td>
<td>DEFINITE ARTICLE</td>
<td>Definite determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dít</em> ('it')</td>
<td>3RD PERSON NEUTER</td>
<td>Free pronoun (deictic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dai</em> ('that')</td>
<td>DISTAL DEMONSTRATIVE</td>
<td>Bound (individual, predicate/propositional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dais</em> ('that’s')</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free (deictic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dié</em> ('this')</td>
<td>PROXIMAL DEMONSTRATIVE</td>
<td>Bound (individual, predicate/propositional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>daa</em> ('there')</td>
<td>EXISTENTIAL PRONOUN</td>
<td>Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h-initial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hai</em> ('that')</td>
<td>DISTAL DEMONSTRATIVE</td>
<td>Pragmatic determiner (recognitional, evaluative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>haa</em> ('there')</td>
<td>EXISTENTIAL PRONOUN</td>
<td>Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hie ('here')</td>
<td>PROXIMAL LOCATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Discussion

Table 4: Overview of the differences between StdA and Kaaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StdA</th>
<th>Kaaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.* ‘n ‘a’</td>
<td>(-)e ‘a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die ‘the’</td>
<td>DEFIN ART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. -ie ‘the’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. die ‘the’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. dit / dis ‘it’ / ‘it’s’</td>
<td>3.NEUTER.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. it / is ‘it’ / ‘it’s’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. dit ‘it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. daar ‘there’</td>
<td>DIST. LOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hier ‘here’</td>
<td>PROX. LOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. daa ‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. haa ‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. daardie ‘that/those’</td>
<td>DIST. DEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierdie ‘this/these’</td>
<td>PROX. DEM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that StdA speakers also produce enclitic articles in regular fast speech – recall (3)
Observations & generalisations:

- The Kaaps system is more complex than that of StdA.
  - Kaaps has *d*-less definite articles and 3rd person neuter pronouns which StdA does not (except in fast or relaxed speech)
  - Kaaps has *h*-initial locatives and demonstratives which StdA does not

- **Generalisation A:**
  3rd person neuter pronoun in Kaaps (the unmarked referential and expletive uses) are *d*-less items (*it, is*)
  Non-initial definite determiners are also consistently *d*-less, forming a natural class of enclitic elements with the indefinite determiner.
  Not true for StdA, where all the 3rd person neuter and definite determiner forms are *d*-initial (except in rapid/relaxed speech)

- **Generalisation B:**
  Deixis in Kaaps is expressed by *d*-initial items (*dít, dää, dääi, díe̞t*)
  Not true for StdA (*dít, daar, daardie, hiérdie*)

- **Generalisation C:**
  Pragmatic functions expressed by *h*-initial items (*hai, haa, hie̞*)
  Not true for StdA, which has no contrastive *h*-initial initial items

⇒ Kaaps may be in the process of morphologising distinctions that do not exist as such in StdA: the *d*- and *h*- onsets may become morphological exponents bearing formal features.

### 6.1 Contact, Kaaps ... and complexification?!

Recall that Kaaps is heavily contact-influenced (§2) ... so we might expect simplification (on the view that contact leads to grammatical simplification; see i.a. Jeffers & Lehtise 1979, Givón 1980, Múhlháusler 1980, Whinnom 1980, Kuster 2003, McWhorter 2005).

- **But:** also recall that Kaaps is a matrilectal variety with a long history.

**Trudgill's (2011) Sociolinguistic Typology:** Alternative approach to contact-induced grammatical change:

- Many L1 speakers (typical of long-term co-territorial language contact) ⇒ additive complexification
- Extensive adult L2 use ⇒ simplification
- **NB:** Child vs. adult language acquisition
  - child acquirers are known to regularise variable input (Hudson Kam & Newport 2005, among many others)
  - though adults do this too if the pragmatic conditions are right (Perfors 2016)

Complexification of the D-system in Kaaps

- is not unexpected, given Trudgill’s ideas.
- undermines (simplistic) approaches to contact where simplification is expected/predicted.
If child acquirers are driving complexification, it is important to investigate matters from their perspective.

6.2 Acquisition

Afrikaans is a largely analytical, minimally fusional language.

- Why should acquirers begin to postulate agglutination-style morphology at all?
- Why only in one small corner of their grammar?
- And, why should Kaaps acquirers do this and StdA acquirers not?

Assuming a Maximise Minimal Means (MMM) framework, we propose that

- Kaaps acquirers receive evidence that $d$- and $h$- onsets in the D-system correspond in systematic ways to pieces of functional meaning (Generalisations A, B, and C)
- In contrast, StdA acquirers receive no evidence of such systematicity.

What is MMM?
- a 3 Factors model of how mental grammars are shaped (see Biberauer 2017, 2018b, 2019a)

(30) UG (Factor 1) + PLD (Factor 2) + MMM (Factor 3) ➔ adult I-language

- **UG** = a sparse Universal Grammar (pace the “classic” rich UG view)
  - key component: formal feature template, leading acquirers to consistently encode grammatical regularities in terms of formal features $[F]$.

- **PLD** = the Primary Linguistic Data, often referred to as the input, but more properly the intake (see i.a. Evers and Van Kampen 2008, Gagliardi 2012, Lidz and Gagliardi 2015).
  - systematic departures from Saussurean arbitrariness = cues to the presence of $[F]$s.
  - child acquirers are “little inflection machines”(Wexler 1998:43)

- **MMM** = a general-cognitive bias - which is specifically assumed to be active in acquisition - to maximise the use that is made of existing knowledge (‘means’)
  - the bias to maximise available knowledge has 3 important consequences in the acquisition context:
    (a) early-acquired properties will serve as the foundation/point-of-departure for later-acquired properties
    (b) formal features ($[F]$s) will be “recycled” wherever possible:
      (i) Feature Economy: postulate as few $[F]$s as possible
      (ii) Input Generalization: maximise the use of postulated $[F]$s

Thus:
In assessing what acquirers may deduce from the input, we need to take into account which aspects of this input they can attend to, i.e. their intake.

Crosslinguistic acquisition sequence of demonstratives, pronouns and articles:
• Demonstratives > *I/*it* pronouns > Articles\textsuperscript{24}  
  o In the demonstrative domain, deictic use precedes anaphoric (Diessel 1999, Van Kampen, 2004)  
  o In the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Person pronoun domain, referential use precedes expletive (Kirby 2005, Kirby and Becker 2007)

Given **Generalisations A, B, and C**, we know that

- By paying attention to demonstratives and their distinctive initial onsets, Kaaps child acquirers - but not StdA acquirers (cf. *hierdie*) - will learn early on that situation-deictic items are always \textit{d}-initial.  
  - Importantly, they will not subsequently encounter systematically \textit{d}-initial definite determiners (*die* mostly being realised as an enclitic, and only being \textit{d}-initial when it is in a “strong”, clause-initial position); therefore the initial deixis-related association with initial \textit{d}- remains (contrast StdA acquirers).

- This demonstrative pattern will be in place by the time the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person neuter pronouns are acquired. By paying attention to these pronouns, Kaaps child acquirers will learn the \textit{d}-initial situation-deictic items contrast systematically with \textit{d}-less referential (and eventually also expletive) uses

$\rightarrow$ the onset is analysable as a distinct morphological unit.

- Establishing the \textit{d}-onset as a distinct morpheme lays the necessary formal groundwork for introducing other ‘moving parts’ as interpretively contrastive onsets in the D-system, e.g. the pragmatically-oriented \textit{h}-onset

- This may very plausibly have its origin in a **debuccalisation** process that has occurred in many other spoken varieties. Debuccalisation involves the loss of an oral consonant’s original place of articulation feature, which moves to the glottis, resulting in the production of an /h/-related sound. It is a very natural lenition-type process, and also occurs in varieties of Afrikaans other than Kaaps.

- Adults are likely to be the (unconscious) initiators of the \textit{h}-related change as we would expect this fast-speech debuccalisation process to be attested most in context where speakers are not using demonstratives for pointing, contrast or other types of emphasis > old information > familiarity ... which may breed contempt! (consider the pejorative uses)

- Because Kaaps acquirers encounter the very distinctive onset-contrast just outlined - \textit{d}-signifies deixis, while deictically neutral D-elements lack this onset - they are (unconsciously) attuned (“primed”) to the potential significance of onsets.

- And another property of Kaaps - the salient use of \textit{vir}-marking on familiar/specific/otherwise significant/to-speaker nominals - constitutes a further cue that there is speaker-hearer-oriented structure at the outermost edge of the Kaaps DP (see Biberauer 2019b for evidence that \textit{vir}-DPs are DPs and not PPs).

\textsuperscript{24} **Demonstratives**: these are among 1st 10-50 words (Diessel 1999); **Pronouns**: *I* and *it* are earlier than other pronouns, appearing in 2nd year (13-24 months for English; Gotzke and Gosse (2007)); **Articles**: indefinite article precedes definite article, but both only appear later in the 3rd year (37-30 months for English), with mastery during the 4th year (28-46 months for English).
The Peripheral Speaker-Hearer Hypothesis (Biberauer 2018a)

Speaker-Hearer encoding (outermost phase edge)

\( \text{qp} \)

Phase head (e.g. C, v, D, n, etc.)

\( \text{qp} \)

Contentful phase-head complement(s) (e.g. T, V, Num, N, etc.)

➢ converging cues might encourage the postulation of new onset-oriented morphology in the Kaaps D-system
➢ both adults and children are involved in this change

7. Some Concluding Remarks

Intensive language contact does not necessarily lead to grammatical simplification.

• The Kaaps data support Trudgill’s (2011) view that sociolinguistic context is an important factor
  o Where there are L1 speakers and thus child acquirers, we tend to see complexification.

Thus, acquirers play an important role in structuring variable input, particularly in strongly interactively based vernacular varieties.

We presented an empirical picture:

• Systematic contrasts in onsets of the Kaaps D-system serve as input to acquirers.
• On this basis, acquirers postulate a formalised system in which the onsets of D-items are morphologically ‘moving parts’ of the system – they have been ‘morphologised’.
• These systematic cues are absent in StdA.
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