1. Introduction
This paper compares the D-systems of Standard Afrikaans (SA) and Kaaps.

Kaaps is often simultaneously described as the oldest and also the most heavily English- and more generally contact-influenced variety of Afrikaans.

Kaaps’ morphosyntax has never been systematically investigated, a lacuna which the newly initiated SEcoKa (=Syntactic Ecology of Kaaps) project aims to fill.

Here, we show how differences between the D-systems of SA and Kaaps exemplify ways in which variation arising in strongly vernacular contact varieties can be systematised to produce novel morphosyntactic distinctions, even in a highly deflected language like Afrikaans.

Key proposal: The differences between SA and Kaaps reflect a (re)morphologisation process that has taken place in Kaaps, but not SA.

It will become clear that:

(Re)morphologisation in a heavily contact-influenced language like Kaaps challenges ideas on which grammatical simplification is inevitable in contact systems.

In this case, the (re)morphologisation cannot be attributed to any straightforward contact-induced transfer from another system.

We will argue that complexification in the D-system of Kaaps is due to how child acquirers have structured variable input to arrive at a cohesive system.

Roadmap:
Section 2: About Kaaps
Section 3: Background on the data
Section 4: Data
Section 5: Analysis

2. About Kaaps
Kaaps today is…

An L1 spoken variety of Afrikaans.4

---

1 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.
2 University of Cambridge & University of Stellenbosch
3 University of the Western Cape
4 Also sometimes called Cape Vernacular Afrikaans (Hendricks 1978:13-26; Le Cordeur 2011:763-766) and Afrikaaps (a recent endonym, coined in a play and documentary of the same name: Valley 2010; Williams 2016)
A ‘dynamic’ variety in the sense that it is fast changing and there is a lot of inter and intra-speaker variation.

A heavily contact-influenced variety:

Kaaps speaking individuals and communities are typically multilingual, and most Kaaps speakers are also home language English speakers.⁵

One readily observable effect of the intense and prolonged contact between Kaaps and English is the high degree of blending with English that is the norm in Kaaps

Spoken mainly on the Cape Peninsula, which includes Cape Town’s inner city, the Cape Flats, and a region along the West Coast.

**Figure 1: Map of the Cape Peninsula**

Historically speaking…

Kaaps is an ‘old’ variety of Afrikaans: many features more closely resemble continental West Germanic than modern SA does (cf. Biberauer & Pretorius 2018).

---

⁵ Other languages represented in the Kaaps speaking population include Arabic, Urdu, Hindi, isiXhosa, isiZulu, SeSotho (and other Southern Bantu languages), Somali, French, and other languages spoken by migrants and migrant communities living in Cape Town.
Kaaps’ predecessor(s) was spoken by the working class of the City Bowl’s culturally and linguistically diverse Bo-Kaap and District Six after abolition of slavery (1834).

Later (1950 onwards) Kaaps speakers moved to the Cape Flats and the rest of the Cape Peninsula.6

Kaaps was one variety of Afrikaans which was circumvented as a resource for standardisation in the late 1800s.

3. Background on the Data
There are three main sources of data for this talk, namely

- A text-based corpus in the form of Nathan Trantraal’s (2018) collection of short stories entitled Wit Issie ‘n Colour Nie (‘White isn’t a Colour’)
- Data collected from 30 participants in the form of an elicitation task conducted via WhatsApp
- Data collected from a focus group interview with 5 participants

3.1 Trantraal (2018)
Nathan Trantraal is a writer of short stories, plays, poems, and newspaper articles. Much of his work is written in Kaaps.

Trantraal (2018) is autobiographical, a collection of short stories about growing up on the Cape Flats. One story recalls taking Standard Afrikaans as a school subject. Trantraal writes:

…Om jou hystaal te dryp was, om ôse Afrikaans menee te quote “’n gruwel in die aangesig van God”. Wat of course ironic was, wan Afrikaans wassie ôse hystaal ie.

(Trantraal 2018: 15-16)

Translation:
…To fail your home language subject was, to quote our Afrikaans teacher “an abomination before God”. Which was of course ironic, because Afrikaans wasn’t our home language. [TB & EP]

The amount of Kaaps in mainstream printed media is currently on the rise; among many things, Trantraal (2018) is an act of language activism.

3.2 WhatsApp Elicitation
Participants are given a sentence or short dialogue to translate from English into Afrikaans:

- Participants were given one item per day for 28 days.
- Responses are written and audio recorded by participants themselves using the ‘voice note’ function.

6 In 1950 the Group Areas Act declared District Six a “whites only” zone, which sanctioned the forced removal and confiscation of land from people living in District Six who were classified as ‘Coloured’ under the Apartheid government.
• Participants organised into chat groups of 2-4 people.
• 21 Kaaps speakers (aged 19-47); 9 ‘non-Kaaps’ speakers (aged 33-71). In the rest of the talk, we will use “SA” as a cover term for Standard Afrikaans as well as the data from our non-Kaaps-speaking participants.
• 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.

The researchers occasionally asked participants for grammaticality judgements based on their translations.

Not all 30 participants responded to each item; the number of participant responses to each item varies.

Data elicited from participants through WhatsApp appears in the following format:

(1) Ek scheme ôs kry ice-cream vinaand.  
I scheme we get ice-cream tonight  
‘I suggest we get ice-cream tonight.’ [Kaaps; 20190429_TRNS_WR_AAAP]

As mentioned, Kaaps features a high degree of blending with English. All instances of blending are italicised in the data (cf. scheme and ice-cream in (1) above).

The English prompts for participant responses to the WhatsApp translation task are indicated in footnotes throughout.

3.3 Focus Group
A subset of 5 Kaaps speakers who participated in the WhatsApp elicitation task took part in a focus group discussion where they:

• Provided oral translations to more English prompts.
• Provided grammaticality judgements.

Data elicited from participants in the focus group discussion appears in the following format:

7 It is important to bear in mind that many of the Kaaps-speaking participants are proficient SA-speakers too, and at the same time speakers belonging to the ‘non-Kaaps’ group may be proficient in other regional or home varieties of Afrikaans, in addition to SA. Furthermore, the non-Kaaps speakers do not form a homogenous group, as many were born and raised in different parts of the country and currently belong to different communities of practice.

8 Speakers were assigned to the Kaaps or non-Kaaps groups based on whether they self-identified as speakers of Kaaps. A small number of self-identified Kaaps speakers were not born on the Cape Peninsula and have not been residing there for a period exceeding 5 years. The Kaaps spoken by these participants is sometimes strikingly different from that of the ‘Peninsula Kaaps’ speakers. Thus, it is important to bear in mind that self-identification should not be the only criterion upon which the morphosyntactic features of Kaaps are investigated.
4. Data

4.1 3rd Person Neuter Pronoun & Expletive ‘it’

The SA 3rd person neuter pronoun is dit (3), whereas in Kaaps it frequently takes the form of it (4) – the (a) examples illustrate the expletive and the (b) examples anaphora.

(3) (a) Dit vat drie werksdae vir die geld om in jou bankrekening te verskyn.

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

(b) Ek sien die blik waarna jy gesoek het. Dit is heeltemal leeg.

‘I can see the container that you were looking for. It is completely empty.’

(4) (a) It vat at least twie working-class salaries om 'n phone innei hys te het.

‘It takes at least two working-class salaries to have a phone in the house.’

(b) It is practically lieg.

‘It (=the previously mentioned train) is practically empty.’

Another form, is, is also available to some Kaaps speakers (5a), but only as an expletive: (5b-c) show that Kaaps it, but not is, can encode anaphora.

(5) (a) Is was baie donke in daai kamer. (=quasi-argumental it)

‘It was very dark in that room.’

(b) Ek soek my slietel. Jy het it/*is sieke érens sien lè.

‘I’m looking for my key. You’ve probably seen it lying around somewhere.’

---

9 Unless otherwise stated, all SA examples in this handout are based on the authors’ knowledge of SA.
'n Tikkop convince ees hulleself vanne storie voo hulle it/*is\(^{10}\) vi jou a drug.addict convinces first themself of a story before they it for you tell ‘A drug addict first convinces themselves of a story before they tell it to you.’

[Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:22, line 6]

SA also features an innovated lexicalised contracted form dis (lit.: it.is, ‘it’s’, where the pronoun component may be either referential or expletive it) (6), which in Kaaps tends to be d-less (7) – in the (a) examples, the pronoun component is expletive; in the (b) examples, it is referential.

(6) (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.’ [SA]

(7) (a) Is baie warm in daai kamer. it's very warm in that room ‘It’s very hot in that room.’ [Kaaps; 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.’ [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:20, line 12]

Clearly is in (7; henceforth *is\(^1\)) which is a reduced form of SA dis (‘it’s’; see Biberauer & Pretorius 2018 for further discussion), should not be confused with is in (5a; henceforth *is\(^2\)), which is a form of the Kaaps expletive pronoun which co-occurs with a copula (*was* in (5a)).

**Interim Summary:** Kaaps features a d-less 3\(^{rd}\) person neuter pronoun *it* (which for some speakers may be *is\(^2\)*) where SA features a d-initial *dit*.

Kaaps also features a d-less form *is\(^1\)* of the innovated SA contraction *dis*.

### 4.2 Introducing the Kaaps distal demonstrative: dai (‘that’)

Importantly, the Kaaps D-system does also feature a set of d-initial items.

One d-initial element in Kaaps is the distal demonstrative *dai* (‘that’) (9), which is *daardie* in SA or *daai* in informal registers (8).

NB: The SA demonstratives - *hierdie* (lit. here.the = ‘this’) and *daardie* (lit. there.the = ‘that’) - are innovations, contrasting with Dutch *dit* (‘this’) vs *deze* (‘this, these’) and *dat* (‘that’) and *die* (‘that, those’).

---

\(^{10}\) Ungrammaticality checked and confirmed by AAAF, AAAG (p.c.).
(8) (a) **Daardie / daai** gebeurtenis sit steeds nogals swaar by ons.

That happening sits still rather heavy at us

‘That event still makes us feel rather uneasy.’ [SA]

(b) **Sit daai neer.**

Put that down.

[Colloquial SA]

(9) (a) **Dai** oupatjie *sense* sieke *my disapproval.*

that grandpa.DIM sense probably my disapproval

‘That little grandpa probably senses my disapproval.’ [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:63, line 14]

(b) “Los *dai*…”

leave that

‘Leave that (stop what you’re doing).’ [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:61, line 18]

Examples (8-9) feature contexts in which SA *daardie/daai* and Kaaps *dai* overlap.

However, in Kaaps, *dai/dais* also surface as a **discourse anaphor**, where SA has *dit/dis* (10).

In this sense, Kaaps resembles English, which also employs the distal demonstrative pronoun for this function (see the English translations in (10)).

Note: Kaaps *dai* (‘that’) has a corresponding lexicalised contraction *dais* (‘that’s’; also available in colloquial SA), analogous to *dit/dis* (*it/it’s*) of the SA 3rd person neuter and the corresponding *it/is* of the Kaaps 3rd person neuter.

(10) (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.’ [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:9, line 14]

(a') **Dis** waar polietise aktiviste soos Noam Chomsky my verloor. [SA]

(b) **Dai** is Amelia vi jou.

that is A. for you

‘That is Amelia for you.’ [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:21 line 15]

(b') **Dit** is Amelia vir jou. [SA]

In Trantraal (2018), *dit/dis* occurs exclusively in direct speech, when SA is being spoken or written by one of the characters (11).

(11) (a) **Dit** was ‘n dag wat ek nooit sal vergeet nie.

it was a day what I never will forget not

‘It was a day that I’ll never forget.’ [SA; Trantraal 2018:14, line 11]
(b)  Ek het nooit gedink dis eienaardig dat…
    ‘I never thought it was strange that’  [SA; Trantraal 2018:18, lines 5 & 13]

(c)  “Dis ons se kant hierdie.”
    ‘It’s our side, this.’  [SA; Trantraal 2018:51, line 13]

For Trantraal (2018), dit/dis are thus markers of SA, and it/is and dai/dais in the (4-5), (7) and (10-11) contexts are markers of Kaaps.

Kaaps speakers in general do find it possible to use dit/dis alongside it/is in non-emphatic/-contrastive contexts, which is expected given speakers’ access to two grammars.

In emphatic/contrastive contexts, however, dai/dais is preferred to the stressed dit/dis of SA.

(12-13) show that although 2/12 Kaaps-speaking participants employed stressed dis for emphatic predicate anaphora, 10/12 employed dai/dais.\(^{11}\)

In contrast, 6/8 SA-speaking participants employed stressed dit/dis, and only 2/8 employed daais (none made use of daai)\(^{12}\).

(12)  A:  Ek scheme ôs kry ice-cream vinaand.\(^{13}\)
      ‘I suggest we get ice-cream tonight.’

      B:  Nou dis nou ‘n idee!
          ‘Now that’s an idea!’  [Kaaps; 20190429_TRNS_WR_AAAP]

(13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>dit is</th>
<th>dis</th>
<th>da(a)is</th>
<th>dai is</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaaps</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Summary of 20190429_TRNS_VN]

In Kaaps, like in SA, stressed dit is available as a deictic pronoun (12); in Kaaps, it is not available for this function:

---

\(^{11}\) The one Kaaps-speaking participant who translated this questionnaire item with dis was born in Grabouw (residing there still), and the other was born in Swellendam (resided there until 2015). Grabouw and Swellendam both fall in the Overberg district (east of the Cape Peninsula), so it may be that Overberg Kaaps/Afrikaans differs from Peninsula Kaaps in that dis occurs (more frequently). It is worth noting that the Overberg community is predominantly Afrikaans-speaking and therefore not the ‘linguistic melting pot’ that the Cape Peninsula represents, where English is dominant, and the communities highly multilingual.

\(^{12}\) A SA-speaking participant explains that she cannot say dais in this context:
    daai I use as a shortened version of daardie (lit. there-the; ‘that’) and I wouldn’t say ‘daardie is ’n goeie idee’ (‘that is a good idea’). I’d say ‘dit is’ (‘it is’) and shorten to ‘dis’ (‘it’s’) [TB & EP translation].

\(^{13}\) English translation prompt for (12): A: I scheme we get ice cream tonight. B: Now that’s an idea!
Recap & Interim Summary:
Kaaps *it/is* can be expletive or referential
(Kaaps *is* – for those speakers who have this form – is exclusively expletive)

In SA, *dit/dis* encode all the functions of Kaaps *it/is*.

In Kaaps, *dit/dis* is available alongside *it/is* in non-emphatic/contrastive contexts; in emphatic/contrastive contexts, SA employs stressed *dit/dis* whereas Kaaps shows a preference for *dai/dais*.

The distribution of Kaaps *d*-initial distal demonstrative *dai/dais* is broader than SA *daardie/daai* in that, in addition to its default deictic use, it is used as a discourse anaphor.

In both Kaaps and SA, stressed *dit* is available to encode deixis.

4.3 The *d*-less distal demonstrative *hai* (‘that’)
Kaaps *dai* has a *d*-less counterpart, namely the *h*-initial *hai* illustrated in (15), which does not exist as such in SA.

(15) (a) **Hai** situasie gaan moeilik wies om op te los.
that situation goes difficult be INF.C PRT to solve
‘That situation is going to be difficult to solve.’

(b) **Hai** jare wassit moontlik om Chappies te koep mette vuf sent.
those years was.it possible INF.C Chappies to buy with.a five cent
‘In those years it was possible to buy Chappies (bubblegum) for five cents.’

(c) Ek kan **hai** vrou nie verdra nie!
I can that woman not stand not
‘I can’t stand that woman!’

SA demonstrative *daai* is sometimes pronounced as *haai*.

In SA, this seems to be determined by extralinguistic factors such as production speed.

Whereas we do not expect the analogous extralinguistically conditioned occurrences of *hai* not to occur in Kaaps, there are reasons to believe that the occurrence *hai* vs. *dai* in Kaaps is also syntactically conditioned:

14 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 ornament. The speaker reaches for the object and says *Give me that!*

[9]
• Both *dai* and *hai* occur in sentence-initial position (cf. 9a; 10; compare with 15a-b), and are more generally capable of occurring in the same contexts.

• *hai* and *dai* appear to have different functions. Contrast the structures in ((15c – repeated as 16a) and (16b):

(16) (a) **Ek kan hai vrou nie verdra nie!**
     I can that woman not stand not
     ‘I can’t stand that woman!’
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

(b) **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.’  [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF]

(16b) was a spontaneously produced alternative translation to (16a). Importantly, (16b) is accompanied by pointing, whereas (16a) is not.

Another striking difference between *dai* and *hai* is that *dai* can be used pronominally and adjectivally (cf. 9-10 above), whereas *hai* can be used adjectivally (cf. 15 above), but never pronominally (17):

(17) (a) **Dai / *hai kan ‘n problem wies.**
     that can a problem be
     ‘That could be a problem.’
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

(b) **Ek wonne hoe hai president van ons dai / *hai sal hanteer.**
     I wonder how that president of ours that will handle
     ‘I wonder how that president of ours will handle that.’
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAZ]

How the use of the *dai/hai* contrast in Kaaps is conditioned warrants further attention; this is the focus of the next section.

At this point, we know that Kaaps features an *h*-initial demonstrative *hai* which is syntactically conditioned, alongside the *d*-initial demonstrative *dai*.

We know that the use of *dai* can be deictic (accompanied by pointing), whereas this is not the case with *hai*.

Further, we know that *dai* can be used both adjectivally and pronominally, whereas *hai* can only be used adjectivally.

---

15 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.*

16 English translation prompt for (17b): *I wonder how that president of ours will handle that!*
**4.4 Factors conditioning the use of dai and hai**

As established above, adjectival *dai* can be used to mark deixis (= have exophoric reference, be accompanied by pointing) – cf. (16b) above as well as (17), where *dai* is always accompanied by an appropriate pointing or reaching action.

(18)  (a) Gie *dai* ding!\(^{17}\)  
     give that thing  
     ‘Give (me) that thing!’  
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

     (b) Ek nodig *dai* pen.\(^{18}\)  
     I need that pen  
     ‘I need that pen.’  
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

     (c) Kōs gaan na *dai* Chinese takeaways op Main Rd. toe.\(^{19}\)  
     let us go to that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.  
     ‘Let’s go to that Chinese takeaways on Main Rd.’  
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

One participant in the focus group interview translated the prompt for (18b) not with *dai*, but with *hai*, as illustrated in (19).

(19) Kom ōs 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.’  
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF]

Importantly, *hai* in (19) is not accompanied by pointing.

The participant explains that (19) is not uttered in the spatio-temporal vicinity of the restaurant in question, but in a different location altogether: *hai* Chinese takeaways does not refer to a restaurant that can be seen across the road, but to a restaurant that is familiar to both speaker and hearer (= **recognitional** function).\(^{20}\)

(20) provides further illustration from our participant data of this **recognitional** (= shared knowledge between speaker and hearer) function of *hai*:

(20)  (a) Ek hoor *hai* kar het gebrieek.\(^{21}\)  
     I hear that car has broken  
     ‘I hear that car broke.’  
     [Kaaps: 20190413_TRNS_VN_AAAA]

---

\(^{17}\) (18a) 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!*

\(^{18}\) English translation prompt for (18b): *I need that pen.*

\(^{19}\) 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.*

\(^{20}\) This speaker indicated that if he were standing across the road, pointing at the restaurant in question, he would rather utter (i):

(i) Kom ōs gaan *daanatoe*.
     let us go there-to-to (‘Let us go there’)  
     [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF]

\(^{21}\) English translation prompt for (20a): *I heard that the car broke down.*
(b) Amal wat nou zuma se naam hoo picture hai showerkop. everyone what now Z. POS name hears pictures that showerhead ‘Everyone who hears Zuma’s name now just pictures that showerhead.’

Is basically automatic.\(^\text{22}\)

it’s basically automatic
‘It’s basically automatic.’ [Kaaps; 20190514_TRNS_VN_AAAA]

(c) Ek wiet jy dink hyt hai hond van jou gevat…\(^\text{23}\)
I know you think he has that dog of yours took ‘I know you think he took that dog of yours…’ [Kaaps; 20190522_TRNS_VN_AAAA]

(d) Oh yes. Ek gan nou soema o.signup 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!’
(hai link = a link where, in previous conversation, participants were asked to sign up for a study) [Kaaps; 20190428_AAAC; p.c]

(e) Ek is vesieke dat hy nie al hai gel hettie.\(^\text{24}\)
I am sure that he not all that money has not ‘I am sure that he doesn’t have all that money.’ [Kaaps; 20190427_TRNS_VN_AAAY]

Regarding the use of hai in (20d), another participant (AAAC) explains that “we haven’t seen the geld”, but the speaker and hearer both know which money is being spoken about.

Hai, then, is available where the antecedent represents prior shared knowledge for both speaker and hearer.

Furthermore, hai is available in contexts where there is affective engagement from the speaker (evaluative function) which this case always entails a negative evaluation on the part of the speaker (21).

(21) (a) A: Ek hoor die kar het gebriek. …
I hear the car has broken ‘I hear the car broke down.’

D: Hai kar was soma n stuk gemors man, ek se jou.\(^\text{25}\)
that car was PRT a piece rubbish man I tell you ‘That car was nothing but a piece of rubbish, I’m telling you.’ [Kaaps; 20190413_TRNS_WR_AAAK]

\([^\text{22}]\) English translation prompt for (20b): Now, everyone who hears Zuma’s name just pictures that showerhead. It’s basically automatic.

\([^\text{23}]\) English translation prompt for (20c): I know you think he took that dog of yours…

\([^\text{24}]\) English translation prompt for (20e): I’m sure that he doesn’t have all that money.

\([^\text{25}]\) English translation prompt for (21a): A: I heard that the car broke down… D: That car was rubbish, I’m telling you.
(b) A: Hennie sê Suzan hette nuwe rooi hoet.  
H. says S. has a new red hat  
‘Hennie says that Susan has a new red hat.’

B: Ek kan glo haai vrou het twee nuwe hoette.26  
I can believe that woman has two new hats  
‘I could believe that woman has two new hats.’

[Kaaps; 20190412_TRNS_VN_AAAA]

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

[Kaaps; 20190517_AAAH; p.c.]

(d) Ek wonne hoe hai president van ôs dit sal handle.27  
I wonder how that president of ours will handle this.  
‘I wonder how that president of ours will handle this.’

[Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

Regarding (21c), the participant who provided it explained that “if you use daai & haai in the same sentence as in [21c]… it could imply that you degrading the other jacket”.

Regarding hai in (21d), all participants in the focus group reported that it conveys an implicit lack of confidence and sounds undermining.

Interim Summary:
Kaaps dai primarily encodes deixis but is also used as a discourse anaphor.

Kaaps hai cannot encode deixis, and when it is used anaphorically, it expresses an additional “layer” of meaning (e.g. in recognitional or evaluative uses).

4.5 Proximal demonstrative
The Kaaps proximal demonstrative ‘this’ tends to take the form of (stressed) dié,28 whereas it tends to take the form hierdie in SA, especially when used pronominally.

Stressed dié is available in SA as a proximal demonstrative form, but is perceived as very formal and seems to be most common in writing.

(22) (a) My broe watte kak is dié?  
my brother which shit is this  
‘Bro, what the hell is this (what have you done)?’

[SA: hierdie]

[Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:19, line 17]

26 English translation prompt for (21b): A: Hennie says that Susan has a new red hat. B: I could believe that that woman even has two new hats.
27 English translation prompt for (21d): I wonder how that president of ours will handle that!
28 As noted above, Dutch also features a die demonstrative. Importantly, though, this is the distal ‘that’ form (for common gender nouns, both singular and plural), and not the proximal ‘this’ form which is at stake here.
(b) Nou skryf ek ma dié instead. [SA: hierdie]
now write I just this instead
‘So now I’m writing this (= short story) instead.’
[Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:30, line 12]

(c) My neighbour is mos ’n stewige ou.
my neighbour is PRT a sturdy guy
Nou dié (man) kom klop soema op my dee.29
now this man comes knock PRT on my door
‘My neighbour is a sturdy guy, right? Now this guy just comes knocking on my
doors.’
[Kaaps; AAAF; AAAH; p.c.]

(d) My vrinne drink ammel Red Bull inne exam tyd,
my friends drink all R. B. in the exam time
‘My friends all drink Red Bull in the exam time

(i) …ma ek like nie dié storie nie. [SA: hierdie]
but I like not this story not
‘…But I don’t like this situation.’
[Kaaps; AAAF; AAAH; p.c.]

(ii) …ma ek like nie dié nie. [SA: *hierdie]
but I like not this not
‘…But I don’t like this (= drinking red bull in the exam time).’
[Kaaps; AAAF; AAAH; p.c.]

In Kaaps, thus, dié encodes argument (22a-c) & (22d)(i) and predicate (22d)(ii)
anaphora.
Strikingly, SA hierdie is not available for predicate anaphora (22d)(ii).

Kaaps dié also encodes deixis (23a-b), which is again encoded by hierdie in SA (23a’-b’).

In (23), both Kaaps and SA forms are stressed – dié and hiérdie, respectively – as
expected in a contrastive context.

(23) (a) Ek het vi Joe gesê, ek wil dai skoene hê, nie dié nie.30
I have for J. told I want those shoes have, not these not
‘I told Joe I want those shoes, not these.’ [Kaaps; 20190515_TRNS_WR_AAAC]

(a’) Ek het vir Joe gesê dat ek daardie skoene wou hê, nie hiérdie nie.
I have for Joe told that I those shoes wanted have not these not
‘I told Joe I wanted those shoes, not these.’ [SA; 20190515_TRNS_WR_BAAI]

---

29 Some participants point out that the pronominal use of die in this example conveys a teasing / flirtatious attitude on the part of the speaker, signalling some affective engagement / evaluation. A similar reading is available in colloquial SA with die in this context, e.g. when a speaker is enjoying telling a story.
30 English translation prompt for (23a): I told Joe I wanted those shoes, not these ones.
### Interim Summary:
The Kaaps proximal demonstrative is *dié*, and encodes deixis as well as argument and predicate anaphora.

The SA proximal demonstrative *hierdie* encodes argument anaphora and deixis, but not predicate anaphora.

In Kaaps, thus, both the proximal and distal demonstrative are *d*-initial elements: *dié* and *dai*; in contrast to SA *hierdie* and *daardie*, respectively.

The proximal demonstrative *dié* has no *h*-initial correlate.

#### 4.6 Locative and Existential Pronouns: *daa/haa*

As in West Germanic more generally, the locative adverbial and existential expletive in SA both take the form *daar* (‘there’) (24).

(24) (a)  *Sit al die rooi stoele daar* neer, en die bloues hier.  
put all the red chairs there down and the blues here  
‘Put all the red chairs there, and the blue ones here.’

(b)  *Daaar is drie bome in my tuin.*  
there are three trees in my garden  
‘There are three trees in my garden’  

---

31 It may be worth noting that the only Kaaps speaking participant who translated the proximal demonstrative as *hierdie* is a school principal by profession.

32 Two participants translated the English proximal prompt *not these* as *nie die annes nie* (lit.: not the others not; ‘not the others’); the other two translated it with a distal demonstrative *nie dai ones/skoene nie* (lit.: not those ones/shoes not; ‘not those ones/shoes’).

33 English translation prompt for (23b): *Rosie thought you would wear that jacket, not this one.*
The Kaaps existential expletive alternates between a d-initial / h-initial daa/haa (‘there’), and speakers do not appear to show any strong preference either in any particular context:

(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)…’
       [Kaaps; 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.’
            [Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:13, line 9]

(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
       ‘There was a man at the door looking for you.’
       [20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

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

       (c)  Haa gie die man vi jou vyf rand. Hoe sê mens?
            There gives the man for you five rand  how says one
            ‘There the man is giving you five rand. What do you say?’
            [20190522_AAAF; PC]

(25)  shows that Trantraal (2018) makes use of both daa and haa.

(26a) shows that the focus group participants all indicated that they had no preference for either, and (26b-c) show that they spontaneously produced expressions with a haa existential expletive.

Interestingly, none of the Kaaps-speaking participants in the WhatsApp groups used haa as an existential expletive, preferring daa (27).

(27)  (a)  Daa was net 2  chips oor innie bort…
       there were just two chips  left in.the plate
       ‘There were only two chips left in the plate…’ [Kaaps; 20190517_TRNS_AAAAL]

         (a’)  

         | Speakers | daa | daar | Total |
         |----------|-----|------|-------|
         | Kaaps    | 8   | 2    | 10    |
         | SA       | 1   | 6    | 7     |

[Summary of 20190517_TRNS]

---

34 English translation prompt for (27a): There were two chips left on the plate…
(b) **Daa** was ’n awkward silence toe sy realise wat sy gedoen it.\(^\text{35}\)

there was a awkward silence then she realise what she done has

‘There was an awkward silence when she realised what she had done.’

[Kaaps; 20190518_AAAM]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Speakers} & \text{daa} & \text{daar} & \text{Total} \\
\hline
\text{Kaaps} & 10 & 0 & 10 \\
\text{SA} & 0 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

[Summary of 20190518_TRNS]

Why the discrepancy in the pictures created by (26) and (27)?

We are investigating the possibility that the results in (27) are a reflex of a methodological insensitivity of the WhatsApp format to strongly context-sensitive and pragmatically-orientated forms which are not reflected in the standard variety.

In Kaaps, there is a definite preference for *d*-initial *daa* in the locative pronoun – both anaphoric (28a-b) and deictic uses (28c):

(28) (a) Jy gan niks minner as vyf ure van jou liewe oppe Sondag

you go nothing less as five hours of your life on.a Sunday

**daa** moet vegetate ie.

there must vegetate not

‘You will spend no fewer than five hours of your life vegetating there each Sunday.’ (‘there’ = the Pentecostal church, previously mentioned)

[Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:11, line 1]

(b) …En **daa** gan bel.

‘…and go there to phone.’

(‘there’ = the payphone at the fisheries, previously mentioned)

[Kaaps; Trantraal 2018:13, line 4]

(c) Sit it **daa** /hhaa née.\(^\text{36}\)

put it there down

‘Put it down there.’ [Kaaps; 20190520_INT_AAAF/AAAG/AAAH/AAAZ/AABA]

As (28c) shows, the focus group participants indicated a strong dis-preference for the *h*-initial *haa* in the deictic use.

Nonetheless, *haa* does sometimes occur in deictic contexts. Consider the contrast in the pair in (29).\(^\text{37}\)

(29) (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.’

[Kaaps; 20190418_TRNS_VN_AAAN]

---

\(^{35}\) English translation prompt for (27b): There was an awkward silence when she realised we knew what she had done.

\(^{36}\) 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.

\(^{37}\) English translation prompt for (29): The teacher said to put a lid on that bin over there.
(b) Die menee het gesê ommie blik haa anne kant se deskel op te sit. the teacher has said INF.C. the bin there other side POS lid on to put ‘The teacher said to put a lid on the bin over that side.’

[Kaaps; 20190418TRNS_VN_AAAC]

Given what the rest of the data on the Kaaps D-system shows, it seems surprising that

(i) the d-initial daa is available as an existential marker, by analogy with the expletive it/is, a context from which d-initial dit is barred.
(ii) the h-initial haa is available as an deictic pronoun, by analogy with the distal demonstrative hai which is barred from deictic contexts

As we will see in Section 5, however, this pattern in fact seems to mirror the more general structure of the Kaaps D-system.

Interim Summary: haa/daa are both available for the existential expletive function, but haa is more marginal as the locative pronoun, for which daa seems more readily acceptable to speakers.

5. Analysis

5.1. Preliminaries

Key proposal: The differences between SA and Kaaps reflect a (re)morphologisation process that has taken place in Kaaps, but not SA.

Specifically, the onsets of the Kaaps (non-1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person) D-system have been reanalysed in such a way that /d/ and /h/ signify systematic contrasts not present in Afrikaans.

| Table 1: An overview of the differences between SA and Kaaps |
|---|---|---|
| **SA** | **Kaaps** |
| 1. dit ‘it’ 3\textsuperscript{rd}PERS REFERENCE & EXPLETIVE PRN | a. it ‘it’ 3\textsuperscript{rd}PERS REF. & EXPL. PRN |
| b. is\textsubscript{2} ‘it’ EXPLETIVE DIT |
| 2. dis ‘it’s’ CONTRACTED REF & EXPL PRN + ‘IS’ | is\textsubscript{1} ‘it’s’ |
| 3. daardie ‘that/those’ DEICTIC DEMONSTRATIVE | a. dai ‘that’ UNMARKED DEICTIC & ANAPHORIC |
| b. hai ‘that’ PERSPECTIVAL DEICTIC & ANAPHORIC |
| hierdie ‘this/these’ | dié ‘this/these’ |
| 4. daar ‘there’ LOCATIVE ADVERB & EXISTENTIAL EXPL. | a. daa ‘there’ UNMARKED LOC. ADV & EXISTENTIAL EXPL. |
| b. haa ‘there’ PERSPECTIVAL LOC. & EXISTENTIAL EXPL. |
Some significant generalisations that emerge from this overview:

(30) **A.** Kaaps 3rd person pronouns (referential and expletive) are $d$-less ($it/its_1/2$), in contrast to their SA counterparts ($dit - it/its_1$ and $dis - is_2$).

**B.** The unmarked deictic and discourse-anaphoric elements are consistently $d$-initial ($dai, dië and daa$), in contrast to their SA counterparts ($daardie/daai, hierdie, daar$).

**C.** The marked deictic and discourse-anaphoric elements are consistently $h$-initial ($hai$ and $haa$), in contrast to their SA counterparts, $daardie/daai$ and $daar$.

A tempting scenario:


---

The Kayne/Leu proposal (simplified): **Dem $=$ Definite + Deictic (HERE/THERE)$^{38}$**

b. Following Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002), Cowper & Hall (2004), and much subsequent work i.a. also within nanosyntactic approaches, **the D-system consists of an articulated series of functional projections**, to some extent paralleling what we see in the clausal domain

c. Again following Kayne and Leu, and work in i.a. the nanosyntactic tradition, **onsets may spell out individual functional heads**.

---

38 This composition is transparent in SA **hierdie** (lit: here.the) and **daardie** (lit: there.the), as it is in Swedish (i) and Colloquial Norwegian (ii) (data from Leu 2007:144):

(i) a. det här the here
   b. det där the there
      ‘this one’
      ‘that one’

(ii) a. den her-re klokka the here-INFL watch
    b. det der-re huset the there-INFL house
       ‘this watch’
       ‘that house’
Proposed onset-functional structure mapping (Take 1):

a. /d/ ≈ “high” C-related demonstrative, capable of signifying both deixis and, by extension anaphoricity  
   (cf. Guardiano 200939; cf. also Diessel 1999, 2006; Van Gelderen 2011).

b. /h/ ≈ speaker-hearer-oriented D  
   (cf. much work by i.a. Carol Tenny, Peggy Speas, Alessandra Giorgi, Halldór Sigurðsson, Virginia Hill, Liliane Haegeman, the UBC eh-lab)

Table 2: The upper functional structure of the nominal domain (Take 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SHP</th>
<th>DemP</th>
<th>DefP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>d-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaps</td>
<td>h-</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>non-d-initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ the SA D-system is a *syncretic* system
➢ the Kaaps D-system is *formally articulated* in a way that it is not in SA

In the following sub-sections, we will:

- briefly offer some further evidence supporting the feasibility of an articulation along the lines of (31/32) for Kaaps - Section 5.2; and
- suggest a somewhat more detailed formal analysis of the Kaaps vis-a-vis SA systems, which also takes into account the question of how a system of this kind might arise, and how it might be acquired - Section 5.3.

5.2. *An articulated D-system in Kaaps? Some reinforcing data*

Recall Generalization (30A):

Kaaps 3rd person pronouns (referential and expletive) are *d-less* (it/is1/2), in contrast to their SA counterparts (*dit - it/is1 and dis - is2*).

But: The definite determiner in SA = *die* (*‘the’*), the bleached form of the Dutch distal demonstrative.

➢ Doesn’t this undermine the proposed decomposition of the Kaaps D-system?

(33) a. *Is stil inne voorhys virre oomblik.*  
   is quiet in.the front.house for.a moment  
   ‘It’s quiet for a moment at the front of the house.’ (Trantraal 2018:33)

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)

39 Guardiano argues on the basis of comparative evidence that two Demonstrative positions need to be identified within the nominal spine: (i) a lower (roughly nP/first-phase-edge) position associated with less grammaticalised and thus more strongly deictic demonstratives, and (ii) a higher, more grammaticalised position, also associated with “extended” uses of demonstratives, e.g. as discourse anaphors, of the kind that are also relevant here (see also i.a. work by Dorian Roehrs and Marit Julien).
c. Ek is siëke al mens inne wêreld wie hou daavan om in
I is probably all person in.the world who like there.of INF.C in
lang lyne te staan.
in long lines to stand
‘I’m probably the only person in the world who enjoys standing in long
(Trantraal 2018:10)

➢ Kaaps articles generally encliticise onto preceding elements, resulting in assimilation
effects:

Crucially, West Germanic obstruent devoicing remains active in Kaaps (as in SA),
with the consequence that the encliticised definite article will never surface in [d]-
initial form.
i.e. the (continued) action of a characteristically West Germanic property has
played into the reanalysis of part of the D-system.

Thus: The realisation of Kaaps definite articles does not provide input
undermining Generalisation (30A).

Generalisation (30A) is reinforced by the behaviour of another component of the D-system -
crucially, a high-frequency one.

5.3. A (slightly) more detailed formal analysis against the backdrop of the relevant contact
and acquisition context

Recall the initial formal characterisation of the difference between SA and Kaaps sketched in
Section 5.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: The upper functional structure of the nominal domain (Take 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ the SA D-system is a syncretic system
➢ the Kaaps D-system is formally articulated in a way that it is not in SA

The purpose of this section is to refine this proposal a little, and, particularly, to highlight
contact and acquisition perspectives that (appear to) facilitate insight into the observed
developments.
5.3.1. **Contact, Kaaps ... and complexification?!**
- As outlined in Section 2 above, Kaaps is heavily contact-influenced, particularly, but not exclusively, by English. ... so we might expect simplification.

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

- In the context of approaches to contact like Trudgill’s (2011) Sociolinguistic Typology, long-term co-territorial language contact is expected to lead to additive complexification (whereas simplification arises in situations of short-term contact involving extensive adult L2 use).

  ➢ The “remorphologisation” that produces the articulation of the D-system in Kaaps is not unexpected, given a Trudgillian take on its sociolinguistic context.
  ➢ It does undermine (simplistic) approaches to contact in terms of which this must produce simplification, however.

5.3.2. **Acquisition: a Three Factors perspective**
- Why should acquirers of a largely analytical, minimally fusional language like Afrikaans begin to postulate agglutination-style morphology in one small corner of their grammar?

Or, more accurately, **why should Kaaps acquirers of a largely analytical, minimally fusional language system begin to postulate agglutination-style morphology in one small corner of their grammar while SA acquirers seem content with the existing system (though see the penultimate CGSW34 talk ...)?**

[Note that if Kayne (2008, 2018) is right about English *th-* encoding [definite], the same question holds for English.]

- Our proposed answer: systematic departures from Saussurean arbitrariness, and an acquisition bias to Maximise Minimal Means/MMM (Biberauer 2017)

(33) UG (Factor 1) + PLD (Factor 2) + MMM (Factor 3) \(\Rightarrow\) adult I-language

- **Factor 1 (UG):** a content-wise “poor” component (cf. Chomsky 2005) which lacks in-built parametric specifications, and also doesn’t supply the child with an in-built [F]-inventory (*pace* Chomsky 2001); it does provide the child with a formal feature [F]-template, which drives the acquirer to encode grammatical regularities in the input in terms of [F]s.

- **Factor 2 (PLD):** the key input for the acquisition of morphosyntax = that featuring systematic departures from the idiosyncratically arbitrary form-meaning mapping that defines content words, i.e. classic Saussurean arbitrariness.
  - e.g. doubling/agreement (2 predictable forms that co-occur to give a predictable meaning); ellipsis (predictable absence of form that predictably gives rise to meaning); apparent homophony (a single form that occurs in predictable positions to give predictable meanings); function words (words with predictable shape and position), etc.
Factor 3 (MMM): Minimise the [F]s postulated and maximise their use across domains, i.e. MMM = a general-cognitive bias, assumed to be active in all humans, but to produce more consistent behaviour in child acquirers than in older (L2) learners, owing to the fact that they start out with the same very minimal “means”, whereas older learners have a wider range of linguistic and cognitive resources to harness in attempting to maximise the available means (cf. Biberauer 2018b).

- Factors 1-3 interact to drive acquirers to make the most of the regularities they can access at every stage of the acquisition process (initially, only prosodic properties; then edge properties; then content vs function distinctions; then consonant- and vowel-based distributional cues to facilitate learning of lexical and inflectional properties respectively; etc) > a “Goldilocks” approach (see Biberauer 2018b, 2019)40

Back to Kaaps (and SA):

The reason Kaaps, but not SA acquirers have innovated agglutination-style morphology in the D-system relates to the fact that the former, but not the latter receive evidence of systematic departures from Saussurean arbitrariness in their input.

NB: In assessing what acquirers may deduce from the input, we need to take into account not just what’s in the adult system, but also what child acquirers are likely to hear in child-directed speech (i.e. their input), and which aspects of this input they are able to attend to (i.e. their intake; cf. i.a. Evers & van Kampen 2008, Gagliardi 2012, Lidz & Gagliardi 2015 on the ‘input’/’intake’ distinction).

- What’s known about the crosslinguistic acquisition sequence of demonstratives, pronouns and articles:41

(34)  
  a. Demonstratives > I/it pronouns > Articles
  b. (i) Demonstratives: among 1st 10-50 words (Clark 1978, Diessel 1999)
      (ii) Pronouns: I and it are earlier than other pronouns, appearing in 2nd year
           (13-24 months for English; Gotzke & Gosse 2007)
      (iii) 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)

  o Demonstratives: deictic use precedes anaphoric (Diessel 1999, van Kampen 2004)
  o 3rd Person: referential use precedes expletive (Kirby 2005, Becker & Kirby 2007)

40 The essence of the ‘Goldilocks’ idea - originally due to Kidd, Piantadosi & Aslin (2012, 2014), who investigated the development of vision and hearing respectively - is that child acquirers pay attention only to input that is at the “just right” level of complexity: unduly difficult input is “ignored” (till it can be appropriately accessed) and unduly simple input is “ignored” because its information content has already been fully exploited, and is thus “boring”. “Less” can thus be “more” for child acquirers as they navigate the input. By contrast, making successive “just right” calls is what adults struggle to achieve, given their excess of resources - unless specifically directed (cf. Perfors 2016).

41 This is necessarily based on production, which may be delayed relative to comprehension and, hence, initial acquisition. Nevertheless, recurring early/late patterns in production can reasonably be taken to be indicative of earlier vs later acquisition.

23
• In an MMM system, the early vs late distinction in acquisition becomes crucial as the formal features ([F]s) that define early properties will serve as the basis for the formal characterisation of later properties (e.g. early [F]s may be extended to later-acquired properties, or provide the basis for the introduction of a new [F] which sub-divides the class of elements characterised by the early [F], given a “successive-division”-style system of categories; see Biberauer 2017)

(35) SA D-system input
(i) Articles: a. die (‘the’) b. ‘n (‘a’)
(ii) 3rd person neuter pronoun: a. dit (‘it’) b. dis (‘it’s)
(iii) demonstratives: a. hierdie (here.there = ‘this’) b. daardie (there.the = ‘that’)

➢ /d/ could potentially be analysed as [definite] (as in Kayne’s take on English) but this pattern isn’t likely to be evident to the acquirer early on, given that the clearest cues are the definite article (i.e. the latest-acquired element; (34bi) above) and the 3rd person pronoun (acquired after demonstratives; (34bi) and (34bii) above; this may also render Kayne’s proposal acquisitionally suspect ...).

(36) Kaaps D-system input
(i) Articles: a. -ie (‘the’) b. ‘n (‘a’)
(ii) 3rd person neuter pronoun: a. it (‘it’) b. is1 (‘it’s)
(ii) demonstratives: a. daai (‘that’) b. die (‘this’)
(plus more marginally/for some speakers, is2 (expletive ‘it’) and hai (affective ‘that’)

➢ the earliest-acquired elements - demonstratives ((34bi) above) are consistently /d/-initial, and clearly contrast with another early-acquired element, the 3rd person neuter singular ((34bii) above). Since both elements are typically used to refer to inanimate (3rd person) entities, we might expect acquirers - who don’t yet have the more complete class of 3rd person forms - to oppose/contrast them, rendering it plausible that they will notice the systematic contrast in play. The acquisition of the d-less definite article subsequently reinforces the d- vs non-d pattern observed in the demonstrative/inanimate 3rd person pronoun domain.

• Something else that seems to be relevant:

(37) There are three phases in the development of spatial deictic terms such as here and there. Initially, children will use these terms indiscriminately to direct attention or reference. Thirty-month-old toddlers will use these terms in association with a gesture to indicate meaning. This and that [which emerge earlier than here and there - cf. again Clark 1978, Diessel 1999, 2006; TB/EP] continue to be used indiscriminately until four years of age. Children interpret these terms as near the speaker, far from the speaker, near them or far away from them. Children seem to prefer to use themselves as the point of reference. In the second phase, children use this and here correctly but overgeneralize these terms when they should use that and there. Children may correctly use all four terms when using themselves as the reference point. In the final phase of development, the deictic point of reference is mastered. Children master here and there before this and that.


o Phase I: undifferentiated [deictic]; further distinctions aren’t accessible to the child (“Goldilocks”)
Phase II: Egocentric ([I-speaker] ≠ [speaker]) preference - also evident in early acquisition of I - leads to over-specific specification of proximal forms.

Phase III: [I-speaker] > generalised [speaker] > deictics used correctly.

NB: The emergence of something like [I-speaker] creates a sub-class of [+deictic] elements that need not be d-initial (e.g. hie - ‘here’); in contrast to [+deictic, +I-speaker], [+deictic, -I-speaker] elements must be d-initial.42

Thus: on an MMM perspective, Kaaps acquirers may, then, plausibly assign something like the formal feature [+deictic] to d-initial dai and die, and [-deictic] to non-d-initial it and later ie (thereby making maximal use of the early-acquired feature [deictic]).

Table 3: The upper functional structure of the nominal domain (Take 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SHP</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>DefP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaps</td>
<td>h-</td>
<td>d- [+deictic, -speaker]</td>
<td>non-d-initial [-deictic, -speaker]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3. Contact again: speakers, hearers, and peripheral significance

• So far, we have proposed the ‘morphologisation’ of initial d- as [+deictic] in the domain of 3rd person referential D-elements.

• The extension to anaphoric uses - which are consistently later-acquired (see again Diessel 1999, 2006, van Kampen 2004) - does not undermine this proposal, as (i) anaphoric uses are discourse-deictic, and (ii) making maximum use of an early-acquired feature naturally leads to bleaching of its originally specific content (effectively, multiple/diverse uses of the same [F] in different contexts produces the same effect as multiple/diverse uses of a given lexical item; cf. the extensive literature on grammaticalisation).

• The fact that Kaaps features a d-initial there-expletive (daa) also does not undermine the proposal as this constitutes another extension of the original [+deictic] feature, and Kayne (2008, 2018) provides extensive arguments supporting the retention of a [+deictic] feature in there-expletives.

BUT: How can we account for the availability of h-initial counterparts to [+deictic, -speaker] dai (‘that’) and daa (‘there’)?

• Specifically, what about Generalisations (30B) and (30C), in light of the fact that there appears to be distributional overlap between d- and h-initial forms?

• Recall that h-initial forms are far less frequent, and are also subject to a distributional restriction that does not hold of d-initial forms: they can only occur in attributive positions (cf. 19-21 above)

• hai, then, is necessarily an adjectival demonstrative with an overt restrictor N, whereas dai can function both adjectivally and pronominally (cf. 17-21 above).

• This attributive restriction is significant, given our understanding of the way in which new agreement relations are established: new attributive agreement relations always precede new predicative agreement relations (cf. Corbett 1979, van Gelderen 2011)

---

42 Something similar would need to be true for English, if Kayne’s [definite] analysis of th- is to hold: I, we, you (sg & pl), and it are all [definite], but not th-initial. Introducing [+speaker] here would, again, “rescue” I, we, and you, although it remains as a problem.
And, against the backdrop of a “morphologised” $d$-initial (distal) deictic system, we can also understand what looks like an earlier-stage “morphologisation” of $h$-initial deictics as following from the privileged position that phase edges generally - and so also word edges (cf. Marantz 2007) - seem to have when it comes to the expression of speaker-hearer-related meaning (cf. Biberauer 2018a, and recall the affective connotations Kaaps speakers highlighted in connection with their use of $h$-initial forms):

(37) **The Peripheral Speaker-Hearer Hypothesis (PSHH; simplified)**
Speaker-hearer perspective is formally encoded at the edges of phasal domains.

- Simplifying grossly, this entails the basic design template in (38):

(38) **Speaker-Hearer encoding** (outermost phase edge)

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

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

- Since affective meanings do not have to be expressed - unlike other grammaticalised elements of meaning (e.g. tense or definiteness) - we can understand the optionality of the $h$-initial forms: they are simply an affectively marked alternative to the “basic” $d$-initial deictic forms.

| Table 4: The upper functional structure of the nominal domain (Take 3) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| SA | SHP | CP | DefP |
| $d$- | $d$- | $d$- |
| **Kaaps** | $h$- | $d$- | non-$d$-initial |
| [+speaker, +hearer] | [+deictic, -speaker] | [-deictic, -speaker] |

6. Conclusion
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: where there are L1 speakers we tend to see complexification.

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

In this talk, we presented an empirical picture where systematic contrasts in onsets of the Kaaps D-system – which are absent in SA – serve as input to acquirers. What is clear is that L1 acquisition needs to be properly taken into account to understand this picture.

We argued that systems are built up bit by bit on an MMM basis, were speakers try to make maximal use of early-acquired features which are then generalised.

The very fine details of the analysis still need to be worked out in more detail.
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