



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

In search of a submerged phonology: the case of early Cape Dutch Pidgin

den Besten, H.

Publication date

2009

Document Version

Submitted manuscript

Published in

Gradual creolization: studies celebrating Jacques Arends

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

den Besten, H. (2009). In search of a submerged phonology: the case of early Cape Dutch Pidgin. In R. Selbach, H. C. Cardoso, & M. van den Berg (Eds.), *Gradual creolization: studies celebrating Jacques Arends* (pp. 219-241). (Creole language library; No. 34). Benjamins.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

In search of a submerged phonology: the case of early Cape Dutch Pidgin

Hans den Besten

0 Introduction ¹

Whoever is working with early creole or pidgin data as documented in 17th or 18th century sources as Jacques Arends was when he was still among us has to face the problem of whether such data are trustworthy enough in terms of syntax, phonology, etc. Some of the early Sranang sources Jacques was working with do not seem to be phonologically faithful enough. This particularly applies to the frequent use of <e>, which suggests a schwa, in J.D. Herlein's materials (Arends & Perl 1995: 73–75). I would like to show that similar, and in fact more serious, problems can be encountered in the study of early Cape Dutch Pidgin (henceforth CDP) until about 1720.² There is a clear contrast between the fairly Dutch outlook of most of our CDP data and Baron van Reede's complaint about the Khoekhoen's pronunciation of Dutch (section 2). In section 3 I'll show that data from Khoekhoe word lists of the early period can tell us something about that pronunciation. In the next section I will discuss to what extent this 'deviant' pronunciation shows up in our pidgin data (section 4). Section 5 finally will show that there may have been a paragogic schwa after word-final [t] and [k] (provided these segments were not deleted), which may change our ideas about the occurrence of adjectival inflexion in early CDP.

Sections 2 through 5 constitute what one might call an exercise in pidgin philology. However, the object of this exercise, CDP, is also part of a long development, which led to modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans (a.k.a Orange River Afrikaans). Therefore the "exercise" will be preceded by a section addressing the problem of continuity between CDP and modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans in general (section 1) and will be followed by a section on possible phonological connections between these two languages (section 6).

1 CDP and modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans

CDP may have its origins in two pre-colonial, Khoekhoe-Dutch and Koekhoe-English, trade-jargons (cf. den Besten 1987, 1989). However, from the founding of the Cape Colony in 1652 onward a pidgin variety developed whose lexicon was mainly Dutch, with admixtures from English and Khoekhoe and with a few words from the languages of the slaves. Although CDP must have played a role in the creation of West Cape Afrikaans it is difficult to find any un-Dutch feature that is shared by CDP and Cape Afrikaans. This is partly due to the fact that the most salient feature of word order in CDP, i.e. SOV without V2 – which is excluded in Dutch root clauses – is absent in Cape Afrikaans – as well as in all other varieties of Afrikaans. Other salient syntactic features of CDP such as Pro-drop under inversion or the postposition *saam* cannot be found in Cape Afrikaans either.

¹ I thank the editors and the anonymous reviewer. Their questions, remarks and criticisms have considerably contributed to my paper in its present form.

² 1720 is somewhat but not completely arbitrary – somewhat, because 1725 or 1730 might do as well; not completely, because this is more or less the caesure period between the old genre of the travelogue and a new encyclopedic approach, with less interest for "broken Dutch".

Yet, it would be ill advised to assume that there is no continuity whatsoever between CDP and the varieties of modern Afrikaans. But we should look where most influence may be expected. And that is not Cape Afrikaans but Khoekhoe Afrikaans – since we owe CDP and Khoekhoe Afrikaans mainly to the Khoekhoen, while it is known that many of the Khoekhoen of the interior were not indigenous to that region but rather immigrants from the Western and the Eastern Cape, for which see Nienaber (1989) and Penn (1995, 2005). This warrants the assumption of an unbroken chain of linguistic varieties connecting CDP and present-day Khoekhoe Afrikaans. And the diachronic evidence seems to support this. To quote a couple of cases from den Besten (2007): Pro-drop under inversion is attested for 1705–1713, the period Kolb was at the Cape, two letters from 1801 and two texts from the early 1830s. Furthermore, unmarked possessives can be found in van Riebeeck’s daily register for the year 1658, and in later texts up until 1801,³ while the postposition *saam* ‘with’ (< du. *saam(en)* ‘together’) – which must be much older than its first attestation from 1831 – is attested for 1936 and is still living on in the petrified PP *handsaam* ‘with the hand(s)’ (< cdp *hand saam* ‘[THE] hand ([PI]) with’). (Cf. den Besten 2007: 148–149, 153–154, 157.) To this can be added the word *kortom* ‘little/bit / portion; the chief’s bartering tax’, which connects the Western Cape in 1673 with the Orange River area in 1778 (den Besten 2007: 155) and the word *Courcour* ‘bird’ from 1673 (a Dutch onomatopoeia), which can be related to the Korana lexical items *kukurub* ‘rooster’ and *kukurus* ‘hen’ – much in the same way as in Nama (Khoekhoegowab) *anib / anis* ‘male / female bird’ has come to mean ‘rooster / hen’ (cf. Nienaber 1963 sub **hoenders II** and **voël I** and **II**).⁴

Now one could dismiss the syntactic evidence as being due to a common substrate – and that factor certainly played a role – but that will not do for the two lexical items mentioned, nor can Khoekhoe substrate explain the partial preservation of the realization of the Dutch-Afrikaans diphthong <ui> as [y]. In the 17th and the early 18th centuries this pronunciation was still common among many (especially lower class) speakers of (Hollandic) Dutch. Furthermore, it is also attested for CDP. So when the Khoekhoen withdrew into the interior this phonological feature, which has no counterpart in the Khoekhoe substrate, was part of their pidgin and – with the gradual change from CDP into Khoekhoe Afrikaans – became part of the latter. And despite the overall influence of southern (West Cape and East Cape) Afrikaans relicts of the [y] can still be found (cf. Rademeyer (1938), van Rensburg (1984) and Links (1989).) Note that similar things can be said about the Dutch-Afrikaans diphthong <ij/y> and its predecessor [i].⁵

³ Only recently did it occur to me that there may be evidence as late as 1927: *die nasie taal* ‘the nation language’, *die Hottentots register* ‘the Hottentots register’ (?), and (less likely) *die Grieka nasie* ‘the Griqua nation’ (Beach 1938: 316 – 317).

⁴ *Kukuru-* betrays its foreign origin through its number of syllables: three instead of the maximum of two for native roots in Khoekhoe. Since Khoekhoe roots may not end in a consonant other than m or n a root vowel –u has been added to *kurkur* [= *Courcour*]. Compare for something similar *tapaga-{b/s}* ‘tobacco-plant’ (in older sources *tabakab* ‘tobacco’), which derives from du./afr. *tabak* ‘tobacco’. The root vowel protected the second r against deletion while the first r was dropped. Note that *kukuru-* (which derives from a Dutch onomatopoeia for ‘bird’) does not conform to the Cape and East Cape Khoekhoe pattern for an onomatopoeia for ‘chicken, rooster, hen’, which requires an initial click (C) followed by two velar consonants (K): CuKeKVr(V) Furthermore, note that the word for ‘rooster’ (Swedish *tupp*), which the Swede Thunberg recorded in the East Cape in 1773, i.e. *KóUKE-KURR* (read *llkukekur*), must be an adaptation of the CDP word *ku(r)kur* towards this pattern. Otherwise the word-final [r], which is un-Khoekhoe, remains unexplained. (For the data cf. Nienaber (1963) sub **hoenders II**.)

⁵ Evidence for the use of as yet un-diphthongized [y] and [i] by the early colonists and in CDP and for the continued use thereof in Khoekhoe Afrikaans is discussed in den Besten (2005: 213–215). Note that unlike the evidence for undiphthongized [y] evidence for undiphthongized [i] in Khoekhoe Afrikaans is scarce.

Therefore, Khoekhoe Afrikaans is not completely devoid of CDP remnants. And this may even be true for syntax: Rademeyer (1938: 79–80) mentions the possibility of leaving out articles as in *daar kom lou sôs duwel aan* ‘there comes [THE] lion like [THE] Devil on [= approaching]’ or *eek had geweertjie wat ...* ‘I had [A] gun which ...’ and Links (1989: 33–34) discusses the possibility for certain nouns to express a plural reading with a singular (i.e. unmarked) form as in *baie bobbejaan* ‘many baboon-[S]’. Such phenomena are reminiscent of CDP, which originally did not have articles or plural endings. And since syntactic phenomena like Pro-drop under inversion, which was mentioned above and which seems to be absent in modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans can be found in 19th century texts attributed to Khoekhoen there is some continuity between the syntax of CDP and the syntax of Khoekhoe Afrikaans but the thread is thin.

This having been said we may wonder whether there also is some sort of continuity between CDP and modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans in the field of phonology beyond the single case of <ui>/[y] and <ij>/[i] mentioned above. However in order to make such a comparison possible we first have to reconstruct what may have been the pronunciation of CDP. That is what the next four sections will be about.

2 Baron van Reede’s complaint: “Haer uijtspraek valt swaer”

On 24 April 1685 – only five days after his arrival in the Cape settlement – the visiting commissioner of the Dutch East Indies Company, Baron H.A. van Reede (a.k.a. van Rheede), wrote the following lines concerning the Khoekhoen (“Hottentots”) in his diary:

Hier is een gewoonten onder al ons volck, dat *lerende dese inlanders de Nederduijdsche spraek, en dat deselve die op haer manieren seer krom en bijnae onverstanelijk spreken*, soo volgende onse haer daerin nae, jae soodanigh, de kinderen van onse Nederlanders haer dat mede aenwennende een gebroken spraek gefondeert werd, die onmogelijck sal wesen naederhand te verwinnen, veel min onder de Hottentots de Duijdsche taele in te voeren, *daer het deselve niet en gebreekt aen bequaemheijt, sprekende alle woorden prompt uijt, sonder eenigh gebreck, indien men haer die maer wel voorsegt, waeromtrent wel nodigh was, wat meer agt geslaegen wiert.* (24 April 1685; van Reede 1685; 1941: 36 – italics mine)

This is a very complex, stilted and partly ungrammatical piece of 17th century Dutch prose, which could be rendered as follows (in equally bad prose):

There is a custom here among all our people that – *these natives learning the Dutch language and that the same speak it their way, in a very inarticulate and nearly unintelligible manner* – our people imitate them in that, yeah to such a degree that – the children of our Dutchmen also accustoming themselves to that – a broken language is founded, which it will be impossible to overcome afterwards, let alone to introduce the Dutch language among the Hottentots, *where the same don’t lack the ability, pronouncing all words in a straight manner, without any defect, provided one says those to them correctly, with respect to which it might be necessary that a bit more attention would be paid [to it].*

This passage has been the object of much debate in Afrikaans historical linguistics, but little or no attention has been paid to the clear implication that not only was the syntax of the Khoekhoen’s variant of Dutch “bad” (*seer krom* ‘very broken’) but also the phonetics or pronunciation (*bijnae*

onverstanelijk ‘nearly unintelligible’). This ‘bad’ pronunciation of Dutch seems to be what van Reede is most concerned about. This is confirmed by the following quote from the same diary:

Haer uijtspraek valt swaer, en hebben moeijten haere meijninge te doen verstaen, doch als het geschiet, bevint men haer niet onredelijk. (4 July 1685; van Reede 1685; 1941: 202)

That is:

Their pronunciation is hard [to follow] and [they] have difficulty getting their intentions across; but when that happens one finds them not unreasonable [or: not without reason].

Unfortunately, if we consult our CDP sources there is little evidence for van Reede’s statements. But that may be due to adherence to the Dutch writing system: “whatever people say, stick to the norms of the writing system.” Yet, we do find some deviations from the norm, although in some cases interference from German may be a decisive factor.

But the best evidence for the question of how the Khoekhoen pronounced their pidgin Dutch words (at least in the early period) can be found in the glossary of Saldanha Bay Cape Khoekhoe composed by the Frenchman Étienne de Flacourt during a stop-over in that area in 1655, when he was on his way back from Madagascar to France (de Flacourt 1658). De Flacourt probably did not know Dutch or English and so he renders a couple of Dutch and English words the way he heard them. That he elicited such words at all is due to the fact that he wanted to have names for European realia (e.g. corn, pipe, mug, cat) and for European concepts (God, grand seigneur). Furthermore some words were necessary for commerce (water, brandy, to give, etc.). Nienaber has dealt with these pidgin data in his book on Cape Khoekhoe (Nienaber 1963) but I will quote them from the original – without neglecting Nienaber’s discussion of the data.⁶

3 De Flacourt’s data (1658)

3.1 Two introductory remarks

Unfortunately, page numbering in de Flacourt (1658) is somewhat chaotic: 55 – 55 – 57 – 58 – 58 – 59 – [white page] – 61. Therefore I will refer to those pages as 55a – 55b – 57 – 58a – 58b – 59 – [no page number] – 61 respectively. (Nienaber (1963): 55 – 56 – 57 – 58 – 58 – 59 – [no page number] – 61 respectively.)

Given the circumstances – a stopover at Saldanha Bay – de Flacourt did an admirable job but was bound to make mistakes. Thus *amara* (p. 55b) is supposed to mean ‘fire’ (fr. *feu*) while it is a sentence (‘It is giving light’); and *camin* (p. 55b) is supposed to mean ‘to write’ (fr. *escrire*) but in actual fact it means ‘ostriches’. In both cases we need our imagination in order to come up with scenarios that may explain the discrepancies between what de Flacourt wanted to elicit and what he got. In the case of *amara* this is relatively easy: a gesture towards a fire may have triggered *amara* ‘It is giving light’. In the case of *camin* things are not straightforward. Nienaber (1963: sub **vuur I**) suggests that de Flacourt may have been using an ostrich feather for writing and quite naively wanted to know the Khoekhoe verb for writing. His interlocutors did not

⁶ Practically all of these English and Dutch pidgin words have been taken up in section 8.5 of Groenewald (2002). This section (Groenewald 2002: 245–265) is a commented list of pidgin data (words, sentences and phrases) from the period until 1720.

understand him and responded with the noun *camin* ‘ostriches’ (common gender plural).⁷

More could be said about these two cases, but the main point is that we sometimes need scenarios in order to understand the outcome of de Flacourt’s fieldwork. In this study I will follow Nienaber’s example.

3.2 A first set of data

De Flacourt’s glossary is printed in two columns, with French on the left and Khoekhoe (or Dutch or English) on the right. I quote a couple of cases from page 55a, adding in a third column Nienaber’s etymologies:

(1)	EAV ⁸ ,	<i>Oüata.</i>	[du./eng. <i>water</i>]
	Eav de vie	<i>Oüatar</i>	[du./eng. <i>water</i>]
	[...]		
	Ris	<i>Conanh</i>	[du. <i>koren</i> ‘corn, grain’]
	Pipe	<i>Pesché</i>	[du. <i>pijp</i> ‘pipe?’]
	[...]		
	Boutaille	<i>Baquery</i>	[du. <i>beker</i> ‘mug’]
	[...]		
	Cuiure	<i>Pras</i>	[eng. <i>brass</i>]
	Boeuf	<i>Bossets</i>	[???

Before discussing what these words can tell us about the pronunciation of Dutch (and English) words in early CDP I would like to make some remarks about the way de Flacourt represents Khoekhoe sounds. Let us start with the enigmatic word *bossets*. This looks like French plural nouns ending in *-ets*. However, de Flacourt represents front mid vowels by means of <e>, <é> and in one or two cases also by means of <ai>. Therefore, <ts> most probably stands for [ts].⁹ That is to say, de Flacourt – while making use of French spelling conventions of course – does not use silent word-final consonants such as <t> and <s>. But he does use a silent <h> (1) in <gh> in order to indicate that <g> may not be pronounced as a sibilant before <e> or <i> and (2) in <nh> as in *conanh*, which prevents *-an-* from being read as a nasal vowel. A clear example of <Vn> indicating a nasal vowel is *-on* in de Flacourt’s *mon* ‘1 see, 2 [without pgn- (or: person-gender-number)-marker] eye’, which corresponds to the words *mû* ‘to see’ and *mû-s* ‘eye’ [with pgn-marker] in Nama. Cf. Nienaber (1963) sub **sien I** and **oog**.¹⁰ However note that we do not know whether word-final <nh> indicates

⁷ Comparing *amara* with relevant nouns and verbs in Nama and Korana Nienaber came to the conclusion that *-ra* must be the aspectual particle *ra*. He could have added that *-ma-* must be the subject clitic: *!’am-ma ra* ‘give-light=it ASP). – *Camin* can be reconstructed as *lami-n, -n* being an enclitic pronoun 3PLCOMM, which serves as a nominal marker.’

⁸ *EAV* is written in capitals because it is the first word of this glossary. Furthermore the <E> straddles two lines so that *Eav de vie* is pushed to the right.

⁹ Since *-ts* can only be an enclitic personal pronoun 2MSG, *Bossets* must be a sentence. *Bo-* may be a variant of the pre-colonial pidgin word *boo* ‘bovine animal’ (see Nienaber (1963) sub **os II**). In that case not *bosse-* but *-s(s)e-* should be a verb. However, whether that verb means ‘to say’ (cf. engl. *say*, afr. *sê* ‘say’) is not clear.

¹⁰ The circumflex (in the older orthography a tilde) indicates that the vowel is nasal. – The evidence for *mon* ‘1 see, 2 eye’ is somewhat confusing: (a) “Oreil *Mon*” (p. 58b), (b) “Que mon oeil voye *Hare mon*” (p. 59) and (c) “Que ie voye *Haresi, haremon*” (p. 61). *Oreil* in (a) must be a mixture of *oeil* ‘eye’ and *oreille* ‘ear’. Since the latter appears on the next line – with archaizing <au>: “Aureille *Nahou*” (p. 58b) – it may well be that the printer misunderstood a correction **or* which was meant for *aureille*. (Cf. “Oreille *Naho*”, p. 58a.) Note that (b) shows that de Flacourt knew

an [n] or a velar nasal. In the latter case *conanh* corresponds to afr. *koring* (possibly a Dutch dialect word) rather than to du. *koren*.¹¹

If we now return to the quotation from de Flacourt (1658) and put *bossets* aside we can notice two things that are irrelevant for the issue at hand. First of all, there are meaning differences between some of the Khoekhoe loan words and their etymological sources (*oüatar*, *conanh*, *baquery*). This shouldn't bother us: de Flacourt's glossary is the outcome of very primitive fieldwork and there may be all sorts of reasons for such differences in meaning. Secondly, du. *beker* and *pijp* have been nativized and have acquired a pgn- (or: person-gender-number-) marker: *-y* in *baquery* is an allomorph for the marker 3MSG and if Nienaber (1963 sub **pyp I**) is right du. *pijp* has been reanalyzed as containing another allomorph for 3MSG, i.e. *-b*, for which for some reason or other *-si* '3FSG' (here with palatalization *-sché*) has been substituted.¹²

This having been said, we are in a position to answer the question of what van Reede was so concerned about. Let us start with the vowels. What do we find? First of all: English/Dutch schwa could turn into an a-like sound, as in *oüata*, *oüatar* and *conanh*. This is a well-known non-standard phenomenon in Afrikaans nowadays, for which no counterpart can be found in metropolitan Dutch.¹³ Secondly, Dutch [e] could turn into an a-like sound, for which also compare "manger *Atré*" (p. 58b), which actually means 'eat-IMP' (du. *eet!*). Finally, the diphthong in *pijp* seems to have been monophthongized. (But cf. the discussion of *brito* in section 3.3.)

As for the consonants, three phenomena can be noted. First of all, syllable-final [r] may be dropped, witness *oüata* / *oüatar*. This is confirmed by three other entries, two of which happen to be identical:

(2)	Miroir,	<i>Bosela</i>	(p. 55b)
	mouton	<i>Mouscap</i>	(p. 58b)
	mouton	<i>Mouscap</i>	(p. 59)

Nienaber (1963: sub **skaap II**) has suggested that *mou-* in *mouscap* might be onomatopoeic, which seems unlikely to me. *-Scap* (from du. *schaap* 'sheep') is enough to indicate a sheep and the onomatopoe has the wrong vowel. However, there is an (obsolete) Dutch word *moerschaap* (lit. 'mother-sheep' i.e. 'ewe' and that seems to make sense. Consequently, we have to assume syllable-final r-drop. Similarly for "Miroir, *Bossela*". Nienaber (1963: sub **spieël**) is at great pains to explain

that *mon* could mean 'eye'. However *Hare mon* does not mean "May my eye see" but 'Come-IMP. Look!'. Similarly for *Haresi* and *Haremon* sub (c). The element *-si* either is engl. *see* or the imperative of du. *zien* 'see'.

¹¹ A velar interpretation of <nh> might help us solve the etymology of *hainanh* / *henanh* 'fish hook' in "Hameçon *hainanh*" (p. 55a) and "Haim ou hmeaçon [sic], *Henanh*" (p. 59). Nienaber, who only quotes *hainanh* (Nienaber 1963: sub **vishoek**) believes this may be the Afrikaans interjection *einã* 'ouch', which is a Khoekhoe loanword. [This hypothesis cannot be refuted by pointing out that de Flacourt's word-initial <h> in Khoekhoe words serves to symbolize [h] or a click, since in certain regional varieties of Afrikaans *eina* is pronounced with a word-initial click (WAT: ii, 477 – also compare nama *fi* 'ouch').] However, <ai> (which usually indicates a diphthong in this glossary) apparently is a mistake for <e> (an intrusion from French orthography) and *-anh* does not indicate a nasal vowel. Furthermore, there is not the slightest evidence that afr. *eina* can be pronounced as *einã*. If, on the other hand, we may read *-anh* as *-ang* *hainanh* / *henanh* could be related to engl. *herring* or du. *haring* 'herring'. (De Flacourt's glossary is full of misunderstandings.). However, it seems to me that <Vnh> should also be available for Vn sequences. Compare, "Balei *Tauh*" (p. 55b). A *balai* is a broom or a large brush. But *tauh* is neither Khoekhoe, nor English or Dutch. However, if we change *tauh* into *tanh* we get du. *ton* 'cask, barrel' (with o ~ a allophony). *Ton/tanh* may be referring to the bucket one can put one's broom or brush into while mopping or scrubbing the deck.

¹² Pgn-markers are enclitic personal pronouns. – The marker/pronoun *-b* is devoiced in word-final position.

¹³ I do not want to claim, though, that this nonstandard a is solely due to the Cape Khoekhoen. The slaves from eastern Indonesia certainly played a role as well.

this as a Khoekhoe creation: *mû-se-la* (with *mû* ‘see’). However, the adverbial ending *se* does not make sense in this context, the first vowel is not nasal and *la* is an unknown morpheme. Furthermore, *b ~ m* allophony is not attested for Cape Khoekhoe.¹⁴ However, the solution is simple: if we chop off the Khoekhoe morpheme *-a* we are left with a word for ‘brush’, more specifically afr. *borsel*, a dialect variant of the Dutch noun *borstel* ‘brush’. This word has undergone syllable final r-drop while an *-a* has been added. The latter morpheme can also be found in ethnic names like *Namaqua* and *Korana*, both being plurals with an extra *-a*. This *-a* may be the dependent case marker *-a*, which is also used to mark the predicate nominal in an equational predicate phrase.¹⁵

The second phonological phenomenon that can be observed in the data in (1) is *r ~ n* allophony, as in *conanh*. The same allophony, but now the other way around, can be observed in “Bouton *Corobé*” (p. 55b). *Corobé* derives from du. *knoop* ‘button’. Since *-bé* may be the archaic pgn-marker *-bi* ‘3MSG’ this may be another case of reanalysis (cf. *pesché*). *R ~ n* allophony has also been observed for Cape Khoekhoe (Nienaber 1963: 183). Nienaber also notes variation between *l* and *r* (pp. 182–183) but there is no loanword evidence for that in de Flacourt’s glossary.

Finally, in “Cuiure *Pras*” we notice a voiceless [p] instead of a [b00], which can be related to Nienaber’s observation for Cape Khoekhoe that the voiced stops [b], [d] and [g] vary with their voiceless counterparts. This variation is due to the fact that Khoekhoe doesn’t make a voicing distinction. In the modern spelling of Nama (Khoekhoegowab) the choice for <b/d/g> or <p/t/k> respectively is decided on the basis of the tonal melody of the pertinent word. (Cf. Haacke and Eiseb (2002).)

3.3 Further sets of data

For some additional data consider the following four entries from de Flacourt (1658: 55a). The first three of them constitute a block and the fourth entry may be part of that block as well:

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------------|
| (3) | Monsieur | <i>Samon</i> |
| | Grand | <i>Bei</i> |
| | Grand Seigneur, | <i>Moy Samon</i> |
| | Dieu | <i>Ga</i> |

Nienaber (1963) is quoting the two *samon* entries sub **meneer I** and **groot meneer** respectively without adding any comments – which implies that he had nothing to say about these words. Groenewald (2002), who quotes de Flacourt (1658) via Nienaber (1963), mentions *samon* in his list of possible pidgin data (section 8.5), most probably because of the European concept (‘sir, mister’). However, the Khoekhoen that uttered *samon* meant something different: *sa mû(m)* ‘2SGPOSS eye’.

This doesn’t seem to make sense. However, maybe De Flacourt tried to elicit the Khoekhoe translation for fr. *grand seigneur* by assuming a classical European theatrical pose for such a person with his right or left arm somewhat raised and his hand pointing back to his face. We should not forget that de Flacourt did not have time to learn how to speak Khoekhoe. So he had to point

¹⁴ Nienaber may have thought of the phonologically conditioned allomorphy of the 3MSG marker in Cape Khoekhoe. Cape Khoekhoe has i.a. the following allomorphs: *-ma* after *m*, *-na* after *n*, *-m* after other nasality in the stem (stem-internal *m* or *n* or nasal vowel), elsewhere *b(i)*. This cannot be an argument for an *m ~ b* allophony in Cape Khoekhoe.

¹⁵ For the morphosyntax of Nama (Khoekhoegowab) see Rust (1963), Olpp (1977) and Hagman (1973) and for the morphosyntax of Korana see Meinhof (1930), Engelbrecht (1936) and Maingard (1962).

at things or he had to make gestures. Cf. section 3.1 and the case of the mirror that happened to be a brush in section 3.2: in all of these cases de Flacourt’s gesturing or pointing was not understood. In the case under discussion something similar may have happened. De Flacourt ‘played’ the grand seigneur. His Khoekhoe informants, who did not know this European gestural language of course, thought he meant his eye(s) and replied **sa mû(m)* ‘2SGPOSS eye’ or *samon* in de Flacourt’s spelling. When de Flacourt (in the same elicitation setting, or later) discovered that the word for ‘big’ was *bei* he may have tried out **bei samon*, which triggered *Moy samon*. Considering that at the time <oy/oi> uniformly represented [wɛ] in standard French de Flacourt’s informants may have used the Dutch word *mooi* ‘beautiful’ or [moi], which they may have pronounced with their own diphthong [ɔɛ] (as in the word *Khoekhoen*). Under this interpretation they said: “Beautiful, your eye.”

Let us continue with the fourth entry in (3): “Dieu *Ga*”. Here we notice an o ~ a allophony, which can also be observed in Cape Khoekhoe words (Nienaber 1963: 186) and apocope of a final [d] or [t].¹⁶ Especially the latter is important: Khoekhoe words do not end in a [t] or a [k]; whereas Dutch and English words often do.¹⁷ On the other hand phonological words in Khoekhoe may end in a [p] (pgn-marker 3MSG) or [ts] (enclitic pronoun 2MSG). Unfortunately, de Flacourt’s glossary does not offer much evidence of the relevant type: besides *Ga* (< du./engl. *God*) we find for word-final [p]:

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|----------------|--|
| (4) | a | mouton | <i>Mouscap</i> | (< du. <i>moerschaap</i> ‘ewe’, pp. 58b, 59) |
| | | Nauire | <i>Sips</i> | (< engl. <i>ships</i> , p. 58b) |
| | b | Pipe | <i>pesché</i> | (< du. <i>pijp</i> ‘pipe’ p. 55a), |
| | | Bouton | <i>Corobé</i> | (< du. <i>knoop</i> ‘button’, p. 55b) |

Mouscap and *sips* confirm that [p] did not have to be deleted, while *pesché* and *conobé* are neutral in that respect.¹⁸

As for word-final [k], there are no examples. As for word-final [t] and [d] there is additional evidence:

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|---------------|---|
| (5) | a | Cloche | <i>Brito</i> | (< du. <i>brijpot</i> ‘porridge pot’, p. 55b) |
| | b | Pain | <i>Bre Ba</i> | (< engl. <i>bread</i> , p. 58a) |
| | c | vn autre [sc. negre] | <i>Baraba</i> | (p. 59) |

In this short list there actually are just two words: *brito* and *bre ba* [= *breba*] / *Baraba*. *Baraba* ‘Mr. Bread’ is either a nickname or a name of convenience, like the name *Saldan* (p. 59): neither name contains a click. *Breba* / *baraba* can be analyzed as *bre-* / *bara-* (< engl. *brea(d)*) + kh.

¹⁶ *Ga* ‘God’ may derive from engl. [g]od or from du. [ɣ]od. But it is unclear whether in early CDP Dutch initial <g> was pronounced as a [g]. Cf. “Donner *Ghemé*”, “Donnez moy *Ghemaré*.” (both p. 59). In view of “Dix *Ghißi*” (p. 58a), where <gh> must represent [g] (cf. Nienaber 1963: sub **tien I**), we should read [g]emé, [g]emaré. Here both an English and a Dutch etymology seems to be possible. However, since in Khoekhoe Afrikaans [g] is restricted to word-internal position it may well be that *Ga*, *ghemé* and *ghe-* are English etymons.

¹⁷ It is suggested in den Besten (2004: Appendix) that the Cape English Pidgin negative marker *no* (three occurrences) derives from engl. *not* and not (only) from engl. *no* (be it the quantifier or the interjection).

¹⁸ As for *sips*, this may derive from engl. *ships*. Cf. cdp *doggues* ‘dog’ (1673; ten Rhyne 1686; 1933: 154). The use of the latter frozen plural is confirmed by the name of *Captⁿ Dogges Meester* ‘chief dog(s)’s master’ (28 August 1685; van der Stel 1685–1686; 1932: 5).

–*b* ‘3MSG’+ the dependent case marker –*a*.¹⁹ The word *brito*, however, deserves extra attention since it seems to differ considerably from du. *brijpot*, both in structure and in meaning.

The semantic difference can be easily explained. Fr. *cloche* means ‘1 bell, 2 bell jar’. De Flacourt’s informants probably knew what a bell looked (and sounded) like. So they must have been shown a bell jar. Not knowing what it was, they took the word for a similarly shaped object, a porridge pot, in Dutch: a *brijpot*. In those days Modern Dutch diphthongization was still on its way; so the <ij> could be pronounced as a diphthong [ɛi]/[ɪi] or as a monophthong [i]. This explains *bri-* instead of *brij-/brei-*. The explanation for –*to* instead of –*pot* is – strange though it may sound – equally straightforward. First of all, word-final dental stops could be dropped (cf. *Ga*). Secondly, the stops were more or less interchangeable in Cape Khoekhoe (at least for European ears). A similar case of *p* → *t* can be found on p. 55b: “Chat *Tousche*”. *Tousche* derives from *poesie*, a variant of standard du. *poesje*, the diminutive of *poes* ‘cat’.²⁰

3.4 An addendum from Nienaber (1963)

There are exceptionally many Dutch words in de Flacourt’s glossary of Cape Khoekhoe. Other sources of this type usually contain one or two pidgin words, especially such as do not look Dutch. Consider the following data that I gleaned from Nienaber (1963) sub **os V**. I present the data in three columns. In the first column appears the name of the author with an indication of the year he may have heard or read this word. In the second one follows the word with its original translation, sometimes in two languages. And in the third I specify the language or languages the etymon has been translated into, which is followed by a gloss:

(6)	Schreyer 1669	<i>tibbesas</i> “Ochsen”	German ‘oxen’
	ten Rhyne 1673	<i>debitja</i> “juvenci”	Latin ‘young bulls’
	Witsen I 1691	<i>dwiessa</i> “ossen; boues”	Du./Lat. ‘oxen’
	Valentyn 1705	<i>durie-sa</i> “een os”	Dutch ‘an ox’
	Kolbe 1708	<i>durié-sá</i> “bos; een os”	Lat./Du, ‘an ox’

Note that Schreyer actually is not a glossary and that Witsen I, Valentyn and Kolbe go back to the same source, albeit the latter two to a second ‘edition’ thereof (cf. Nienaber 1963: introduction). Since Witsen I and Valentyn+Kolbe represent one glossary in two versions there are considerable similarities between the ways the words are represented in these three glossaries. Since Witsen I represents the original version most probably the secretary who had to produce a fair copy of the second version made a transcription mistake (*-w-* → *-ur-*), while Kolbe has embellished the word (which is not unusual for him – witness Nienaber (1963)). Therefore, we have three variants, not five. Furthermore, I’ll assume that *debitja* stems from another transcription mistake and goes back to

¹⁹ According to Nienaber (1963: sub **brood II**) this word is almost exclusively quoted – both for Cape and for East Cape Khoekhoe – without the pgn-marker: *bara* (1626), *bree* (5 times; 1691–1787), *pree* (1788), *BRè* (1773), *BRAE* (1775 – 1776). The first –*a-* of *bara* and *Baraba*, which breaks up the nonnative cluster *br-*, is reminiscent of the first –*e-* in the word for ‘bread’ in Nama (Khoekhoegowab): *pere-b* (older spelling *bere-b*). As for *b(a)ra-* vs. *bree-*, compare the [e] ~ a allophony discussed above.

²⁰ Nienaber (1963), who does not seem to be aware of the reading ‘bell jar’ for fr. *cloche*, recognizes *brito* as a loanword because of the onset *br*. Since *brito* constitutes a block with *chef* and *coffre* he decides that a *brito* may be a kitchen utensil. His solution **braaipan** (?), i.e. ‘frying pan (?)’ is not fully convincing: [ai] → [i] is unlikely and the disappearance of the final [n] is unexplained.

**debies*a – my reason being that in Khoekhoe a palatal sound (in this case <tj>) may only occur in front of a front vowel²¹ while a handwritten “long <s>” can be misread as a <j>.

The word under discussion can be divided into six segments distributed over three syllables, although *dwiessa* is a contracted form. Now if we regard the syncopated vowel of *dwiessa* as an empty filler of the second segment, we can observe the following variation:

- (7) segment 1: [t] ~ [d]
 position 2: [i] ~ <e> ~ zero
 position 3: [b] ~ [v]
 position 4: [e] ~ [i]

Nienaber mentions an hypothesis put forward by Wandres (1918), according to whom this word may derive from du. *de ossen* ‘the oxen’ (the [n] not pronounced). Nienaber offers an alternative but he has to smuggle in the vowel for position 4. However, Wandres’ hypothesis is weak as well because it does not explain the origin of <b/w> in position 3, nor does it explain the vowel in position 4. Now, if we consider that Wandres may be right about the original status of *ti-/de-/d-* (a determiner), that in Khoekhoe an intervocalic [b] may be weakened ([b] → [v]) and that the word-final <a> may be the element we also found in *bossela* (see above) we reconstruct *de b[e]s/b[i]s* or *die b[e]s/b[i]s*, or in Dutch spelling: *de bees/bies* and *die bees/bies*, which is pidgin Dutch for ‘the bovine animal(s)’ and ‘that/those bovine animal(s)’ respectively. Note that in Dutch this would be *het beest* and *dat beest* (neuter) in the singular and *de beesten* and *die beesten* in the plural. In CDP there is no neuter gender and therefore the determiner is *de* or *die*. Cdp *die* means ‘1. that, those’, 2. the’. The absence of word-final [t] is due to the founder dialect of Afrikaans. And originally there was no separate form for the nominal plural in CDP.

This having been said we can return to (7). Note that (7a) supports the voiced ~ unvoiced allophony for stops. But note that we only have evidence going one way: *brass* → *pras*, *die* → *ti*. Furthermore we have evidence for lenition of the intervocalic [b] and for raising of [e].

4 What can be found in the usual pidgin data?

The results of section 3 are summed up under (8) and (9) for vowels and consonants respectively. I’ll start with the vowels:

- (8) a An a-like schwa
 b [e] → [a/α]
 c [oi] pronounced as [wɛ] or [ɔɛ]
 d Raising of [e]

In so far as I know there are no traces of these phenomena in our pidgin phrases and sentences, although (7a) and (7d) are well-known nonstandard phenomena of modern Afrikaans. But (7b) is attested in the pidgin nickname for the Gorachouquas: *Taback-Teckemans* / *Tabak-tekemans* / *Toback Tackmans*, a translation of du. *Tabaks-dieven* ‘tobacco thieves’ (for which see section 5 below). And

²¹ Cf. Nienaber (1963) sub **tien II**, and Beach (1938: 213).

there is evidence for raising of the back vowel [o] in the pidgin word *brokwa* ‘bread’ (Dutch *brood* ‘bread’ + Kh. *-gu* ‘3PIM’ + Kh. suffix *-a*): *Brokwa* (1682; Tappe 1704: 132).²²

Since things are somewhat different for the consonants I have ordered stops before sonorants and word-initial sounds before word-medial sounds, etc.:

- (9) A.1 Word- or syllable-initial stops
 a Word-initial [p] → [t]
 b [b/d/g] ~ [p/t/k] voicing allophony [only devoicing found]

The [t] ~ [p] allophony is unattested in the usual pidgin data, but there is some evidence for the [± voice] allophony. First of all we have one case of word-medial [t] → [d]: *beidden* instead of *bijten* ‘to bite’ (1688; Meister 1692: 253). And secondly, there is [b] ~ [p] variation between *boe maakem goet*, which ten Rhyne (1686; 1933: 154) explains as *pulvis pyrius* ‘gunpowder’, and *Pu makum goeds* / *Pumackum goeds*, which Kolb (1727: I, 59, II, 177) describes as a word for any kind of fire-arms. This “word” seems to mean something like ‘boo [= boom] making stuff’. So we have another case of devoicing here.²³ However, Kolb also offers us a case of voicing when he mentions *Buschbasch* as a word for a mixture of dagga (South African cannabis) and tobacco (Kolb 1727: II, 14, 95). This is du. *poespas* ‘mixture (of food), hodge-podge, mishmash’ – hardly recognizable because of the [b], the German grapheme <u> (= [u] = du. <oe>), as in *Pu makum goeds*) and <sch>, which may also be a German grapheme, indicating a (slightly?) palatalized pronunciation of the [s] (apart from the fact that for many speakers of Modern Dutch the reading ‘hodge-podge, mishmash’ – rather than ‘fuss’ – is completely unknown).

²² *Brokwa* can be found – with some spelling variation – in a couple of sources, i.a. in Dapper (1668 [1933]: 70). We may have a much earlier example of raising recorded in 1623 by the Icelander Jón Ólafsson – at least according to Nienaber (1963) sub **brood I**: *várucka* ‘bread’. However, both the translation Nienaber is quoting from (Ólafsson 1932: 73) and the Icelandic text edition underlying this translation mention *vúracka*: ... *en vort brauð kalla þeir vúracka* ‘and our bread they call *vúracka*’ (Ólafsson 1908–1909: 240). Yet, Nienaber may very well be on the right track. I would like to conjecture that Ólafsson originally “heard” *varúcka* (with Scandinavian <v> = [v] and not with an accent over the <a> since <á> represents a diphthong in Icelandic, which does not make sense in this context). In the course of time between 1623 and the early 1660s *varúcka* reshaped in his memory as *vúracka*, which made more sense from an Icelandic point of view because now stress was initial. However that makes no sense from a Khoekhoe point of view: an a- or schwa-like vowel – but not an [u] – may break up a cluster (as in *Baraba* in (5c) or as in Nama *pere-b* ‘bread (formerly *bere-b*, < English *bread*). Other aspects of this word are fairly straightforward: (a) Kh. *-gu* ‘3PIM’ + *-a* may reduce: *-gua* > *-ga* (so: *kwa* > *-cka*), (b) <ú> is a grapheme in Icelandic orthography for an u-like sound. (c) Ólafsson probably heard a lenited b (= <v>) due to a preceding demonstrative ending in a vowel. (Also cf. n. 19.) – That Ólafsson’s phonetic memory cannot be fully trusted is confirmed by his rendering of a dancing ditty used by three of the indigenous *Capher* (note: not *Hottentottar*, p. 240). According to him they said *hottentott* (p. 241). However, no word and hence no sentence in Khoekhoe ends in a [t]. The final <t> clearly is due to Dutch influence (most probably mediated by Danish and Norwegian sailors and probably no earlier than the late 1640s) since the real dancing ditty ended in an [o] or [u] (as heard by French visitors among others – cf. Raven-Hart 1971). Out of this line the Dutch developed the ethnonym *Hottentot*, which they later turned into the more Dutch sounding *Hottentot*, which then was absorbed by the Khoekhoen as the new (touristic) dancing ditty. (Also cf. Nienaber 1989: 514 ff.)

²³ *Boe maakem goet* (1673; ten Rhyne 1686; 1933: 154), *Pu makum goeds* / *Pu mackum goeds* (1705–1713; Kolb 1727: I, 59 & II, 177). These may very well be sentences (“boom-make=it; [THE] stuff;”) rather than words. – Another word, where Kolb heard [p] and others [b] is discussed in Nienaber (1963) sub **begroeting II**. Furthermore, *arbeitem* (1694; Langhanß 1715: 119) could be seen as another case of devoicing (du. *arbeitem* → cdp *arbeitem*) but it is also possible that *arbeitem* is the product of a germanization of cdp **werkem* – since *arbeiten* ‘to work’ is the normal, everyday word in German as against *werken* ‘to work’ in Dutch.

- (9) A.2 Intervocalic stops
 c Intervocalic [b] → [v]

Intervocalic lenition of [b] → [v] may in fact be the manifestation of another case of allophony. Cf. the data in the Nama (Khoekhoegowab) dictionary of Haacke and Eiseb (2002). However, Afrikaans only seems to have taken over the lenition of intervocalic [b], for even though there has been a change from Dutch V(C)[v]V to Afrikaans V(C)[v]V as in afr. *Duiwel* ‘Devil’, *lieuwe* ‘dear’ (inflected) and *halwe* ‘half’ (infl.) we don’t find an allophone [b] instead of [v] – except for two or three cases in early 20th century Khoekhoe Afrikaans (see den Besten 1999). Similar cases from the time around 1700 are: *de dieber* instead of du. *de Duvel/Duivel* ‘the Devil’ (1694; Langhanß 1715: 111) and – in spite of their German appearance: *sterbem* (< du. *sterven* ‘die’) and *storben* (same source, p. 119).²⁴ Therefore it may be of some interest that Bövingh changed the pidgin utterance *Niet Tover-Frow* ‘Not magic woman’ (Bövingh 1712: 7) into *niet tower frou* in Bövingh (1714: 19).

- (9) A.3 Word-final stops
 d Word-final [d/t] deleted [expected for [k], but not found]

In our ordinary pidgin data only one case can be found: *mosco qua* (18 February 1661; van Meerhoff 1661; written as *mos coqua* in the Cape copy of the report (1957: 484) and as *moscoqua* in the The Hague copy of the report (1916: 54)). *Mosco qua* ‘very angry/aggressive’ is a variant of *moeske quaad* (1672–1675; de Neyn 1697: 222). It contains du. *kwaad / quaed* ‘angry’.²⁵ However, also see section 5.

- (9) B Sonorants
 e [r] ~ [n] allophony ([l] ~ [r] allophony not found)
 f Syllable-final r-deletion

As for sonorants, no cases of the [r] ~ [n] allophony can be found in our pidgin sources but we do have two cases of the [l] ~ [r] allophony: first of all the case of *de dieber* mentioned above. Furthermore *lustig* instead of *rustig* ‘quiet’ (1672; Franken 1953: 113) and *schurt* instead of *schuld* ‘guilt, fault’ in *‘t is myn schurt niet* ‘it is my fault not’ (1705; Valentyn 1726; 1971: II, 68). And finally, there is massive evidence to the effect that the geographical name *Saldanha-Bay* was often pronounced with an [r] in the early colonial period – although strictly speaking nothing of that evidence can be attributed to the Khoekhoen.²⁶ Interaction between [l] ~ [r] allophony and syllable-final r-drop has not been found.

²⁴ *Storben*, which is part of the subordinate *is storben* ‘has [3MSG] died’, is somewhat problematic: it should be *gestorben/gestorven* and so *is storben* ‘has [3MSG] died’ may be a misinterpretation of *as sterben* ‘when [3MSG] die’. (Cf. du. *dat* ‘that’ which has become afr. *dit* ‘it, that’.)

²⁵ Note that the opposition *mosco* ~ *moeske* provides yet another example of raising. This is confirmed by the variant *musku* (with German <u> = [u]) in *musku slim* ‘very smart’ (1705–1713; Kolb 1727: I, 491).

²⁶ See e.g. Böeseke (1966): *Baij van Sardanje / Sardanja* (1657; p. 5), *Sardanje Baij* (1684; p. 179), *Sardanjebay / SARDAANHEBAIJ* (1684; p. 183), *Sardanhebay* (1684; p. 184). Similarly for the Saldanhars living there: *Sardanjars* (1657; p. 12), *Sardanjaers* (1657; p. 13). – In de Flacourt (1658), in which no instances of the [l] ~ [r] allophony can be found, *Saldan(ha)* keeps its [l]: “Terre de Saldagne *So Idania*” (p. 61), “vn autre [sc. negre] *Saldan*” (p. 59). – Also see the many variants for *Saldanhamans* in Smit (1662–1663): e.g. *saerdinus*, *Serdienes*, *Serdienis*, *Serdinies*, *serdienemans*, etc. Here folk-etymology (*Saldanha* > *Sardinia*) seems to play a role.

Syllable-final r-deletion as such however is attested twice – in both cases with the same word (*hie* ‘here’ [= *hier*]):

- (10) Hette Hie
 Has [= is] here
 (13 September 1655; Muller 1655; 1952: 417)
- (11) a Nur hie / darna niets; ...
 Only here / after-that nothing; ...
 (1708; Bövingh 1712: 7)
- b Nur hie, darna niet, ...
 Only here, after-that not/nothing, ...
 (1708; Bövingh 1714: 20)

The sentence in (10) was accompanied by a gesture: the Khoekhoe women who had been asked about the ritual they had been performing just a minute ago pointed to the sky while uttering (10). This index in the sky can be incorporated into (10) – either according to Dutch V2 syntax (\uparrow *hette hie*) or according to Khoekhoe syntax with remnant VP topicalization ($[_{VP}$ *hette*] \uparrow *hie*).

The sentence in (11) was the grumpy reaction of a Khoekhoe to whom reverend Bövingh had been trying to explain the resurrection of the flesh. However, Bövingh is representing this nameless Khoekhoe as if he were speaking in a mixture of Dutch and German: *darna* and *niets/niet* are certainly Dutch and cannot be German – in spite of the German way of writing *du. daar-* as *dar-* – *nur* is German and cannot be Dutch while *hie* can, but does not have to, be German. As regards the latter: at the time the Middle High German variant *hie* ‘here’ could still be used as an archaism in German (instead of germ. *hier*). So Bövingh may have understood the pidgin Dutch word *hie* (< *hier* ‘here’) as a German word. But what about *nur*? Bövingh’s interlocutor certainly did not say **noer* (germ. <u> = du. <oe> = [u]) because there is no such word in Dutch. Nor could he have meant ‘only’, because that should have been *alleen* (*maar*) or *enkel(d)*. But he may have said *noe* ‘now’, which is attested for 20th century Khoekhoe Afrikaans.²⁷ Bövingh only knowing the variants *nu* (= [ny]) and *nou* and acquainted with syllable-final r-deletion incorrectly interpreted cdp *noe* as germ. *nur*.

A similar ‘hypercorrect’ interpretation may underlie the use of *bier* ‘beer’ in “*Boebasibier, lac.*” (lat. *lac* ‘milk’), which I interpret as deriving from *boeba si bie*, as indicated by the reversed arrow:

- (12) Boebasibier ←
 Boeba si bie
 Cow his beer/drink/milk
 (1673; ten Rhyne 1686; 1933: 154)

Bie is ambiguous between *bie* ‘beer’ (< du. *bier*) and c.kh. *bi* ‘drink, milk’ without pgn-marker.²⁸ The structure follows the rules of the Dutch colloquial DP_i – pron._i – NP possessive (as in *Jan z’n boek* ‘John his book’) *si* being an as yet undiphthongized variant of afr. *sy* ‘his’. The gender-neutral use of a Dutch 3MSG possessive must be a pidginism. The hypercorrect interpretation of *bie* as *bier* ‘beer’ may have been a running gag in the Cape settlement at the time.

²⁷ See van Zyl (1947: 4, 5, 22, 33, etc.).

²⁸ Cf. Nienaber (1963) sub **milk I** and **II**.

In conclusion, the following pieces of evidence for a Khoekhoe Dutch accent could be found in the ordinary pidgin data: [b/d/g] ~ [p/t/k] voicing allophony, word-internal [b] ~ [v] allophony, word-final [t]-deletion, [l] ~ [r] allophony, and syllable-final [r]-deletion. This evidence partly confirms and partly extends our findings on the basis of de Flacourt (1658) and Nienaber (1963). All the evidence taken together suggests that a newcomer like Baron van Reede needed some training to understand the Khoekhoen's pidgin Dutch.

However, we should bear in mind that the findings of this paper are fragmentary and only tell us something about the early period (up until ca 1720). Certain phonological practices seem to have fallen out of usage, others have been retained or modified – witness the 20th century descriptions of Khoekhoe Afrikaans.²⁹

One such a practice that has not been retained is postvocalic word-final stop deletion. But that may be due to a competing phenomenon: a paragodic schwa.

5 A paragodic schwa?

In den Besten (1987: 32) it is argued that *bijteman* ‘bite-man [= biter]’ and *Taback-Teckemans* ‘tobacco-steal-men [= tobacco thieves]’ may contain the verbal ending *-um*: **bijtum-man* and *Teckum-mans* respectively.³⁰ However, that was an ill-conceived hypothesis, because in the same article I had suggested that *-um* may be a nominalizing pgn-marker and such markers never show up inside nominalizations. Therefore it may be better to analyze the connecting <e> in *bijteman* and *Teckemans* as a paragodic schwa or some other murmured vowel. Such a vowel could have been a means to keep word-final postvocalic [t] and [k] from deleting – which could have built the bridge to Khoekhoe Afrikaans in which word-final postvocalic stops do **not** delete. Possible confirmation stems from the following variant: *Toback Tackmans* (*Dagregister* 1 April 1669, quoted by Godée Molsbergen 1916: 121).

Additional evidence for a paragodic schwa is offered by Muller (1655) and Ziegenbalg (1706). In Muller's report we find the verbal form *hette*:

- (13) Hette Hie [= (10)]
 Has [= is] here
 (13 September 1655; Muller 1655; 1952: 417)

Hette derives from *het*, a dialectal finite form of the Dutch verb *hebben* ‘have’, which has survived in Afrikaans as ‘1. have (fin. main verb), 2. have (auxiliary).’

The following quote from one of Ziegenbalg's letters involves an attributive adjective which could be argued to be uninflected – even though a schwa is appended to it:

- (14) Gutte Christenman
 Good Christian-man
 (30 April 1706; Ziegenbalg 1706; 1957: 28) .

²⁹ See Rademeyer (1938), van Rensburg (1984) and Links (1989).

³⁰ *Bijteman* was used as a cry for help when two Khoekhoen accompanying Pieter van Meerhoff were attacked by a lion: *Mr. Pieter, Bijteman!* ‘Master Pieter, [A] bite-man’ (5 February 1661; 1662; 1957: 480). – For *Taback-Teckemans* / *Tabacq-Teeckemans* / *Tabak-tekemans* ‘tobacco-steal-men [= tobacco-thieves]’ see Nienaber (1989).

Note that Ziegenbalg – though using his personal spelling for the German word *gut*, i.e. *gutt*³¹ – does not write **gutter*, i.e. he does not inflect *gutt* as a German adjective. *Gutte* rather looks like a German adjective with a Dutch inflexional ending. The solution seems to be the following: du. *goed* ‘good’ ends in an underlying [d], which must be devoiced in word-final position, i.e. when the word is not inflected: *goe[t]*. The inflected form is *goe[d]e*, or preferably – with colloquial lenition (as in Afrikaans): *goe[j]e* (written *goeie*). However, the Khoekhoen most probably did not inflect their adjectives in CDP, witness data in Langhanß (1715) and Kolb (1727).³² Consequently they said *Goe[t] Christenman* and with a paragogic schwa *Goete Christenman*. Ziegenbalg – hearing a ‘German’ [t] – reproduced that as *Gutte Christenman*.

If this hypothesis can be upheld, attributive adjectives with an underlying stem-final [t] which end in *-te* may also be analyzed as being uninflected elements with a paragogic schwa. In order to see the consequences compare the following two pidgin sentences:

- (15) grot Capitain pissem
 [The] great chief piss
 (1694; Langhanß 1715: 119)
- (16) grote Capitain is boven quad ←
 grote Capitain boven quad
 [THE] great chief above angry [BE]
 (1712–1717; Büttner 1716?;1970: 41)

Note that (16) originally must have lacked a copula since Büttner by inserting *is* between *Capitain* and *boven* has broken up the NP/DP *grote Capitain boven* ‘[THE] great Captain above’.³³ Both subject-DPs lack a definite determiner, a typical feature of the early pidgin but they seem to differ as regards the attributive adjective. However, if the *-e* of *grote* is a paragogic schwa both *grot* in (15) and *grote* in (16) are uninflected adjectives.

A similar claim can be made about the attributive adjectives *grote* ‘great’ and *witte* ‘white’ (twice) in the pidgin fragments recorded by ten Rhyne (1686; 1933: 140): these may be uninflected adjectives with paragogic schwas. Furthermore, it could be argued that the subject *icke* ‘1SG’ (twice; at the same page) – which looks like the Dutch focus pronoun *ikke* (usually used in isolation) – may be *ick* ‘1SG’ plus a paragogic schwa.³⁴

However, the hypothesis as such is mere speculation. To get more certainty we need attributive adjectives ending in sonorants. Unfortunately we do not have such data.

6. Continuity and a comparison with Khoekhoe Afrikaans

³¹ Cf. *können gutt nieder-Teutsch reden* (p. 28) and *von gutter disposition* and *etwas guttes* (p. 29).

³² In Langhanß’s travelogue we find *grot Capitain* ‘[THE] great chief’ (1694; Langhanß 1715: 119), for which compare (15), and Kolb (1727) provides us with the following cases: *die oud volk* ‘the old people [= our forebears]’ (vol. I, p. 520), *Ons Tovermanns* ‘our magic-men’, *die Duits Tovervrouw* ‘the Dutch magic-woman’ (I, 538), *Hottentots manier* ‘Hottentottic custom’ (II, 131), and *Hottentotsch manier* ‘id.’ (II, 167).

³³ The “great Captain above” is a deity who is sometimes mentioned in opposition to the “Great Captain below” (Raven-Hart 1971: 21, 118, 147, 234, 269, 321). – Note that Langhanß adds the following explanation – originating from the Khoekhoen themselves – to his pidgin sentence (14): *der Capitain bey den Leuten / so oben wohnen / schlägt sein Wasser ab* ‘the chief who is with the people that are living on high lets his water flow.’

³⁴ However, on the same page can also be found inflected *onse* ‘our’: *onse grote Kapiteyn*.

Given our findings on the pronunciation of early CDP we can now return to the problem of continuity between the pronunciation of CDP and the pronunciation of Khoekhoe Afrikaans. In fact we already know part of the answer: yes, there is at least partial continuity between CDP and KhA in so far as relicts of the old [y] instead of the Dutch/Afrikaans diphthong <ui> are concerned. Yet, the massive presence of diphthongal pronunciations for the <ui> shows that in the course of time the Khoekhoen have (partially) adapted their version of Afrikaans to the other varieties. In this respect the history of Khoekhoe Dutch phonology does not differ from the history of Khoekhoe Dutch syntax: there is very incomplete evidence for early CDP up until ca. 1720, practically no evidence for the period between ca. 1720 and 1800 and then suddenly some texts in some sort of Afrikaans mixed with pidginisms (besides very limited late pidgin materials). So the pidgin did not develop “freely” but partly under the influence of Dutch/Afrikaans: V2, articles and the diphthongs <ui> and <ij> were imported and gradually certain pidgin features disappeared.

But there is also a difference: insightful from a syntactic point of view though the few “Khoekhoe Afrikaans” texts from the 19th century may be, they do not provide us with phonological insights. Therefore, I will make use of three sources for 20th century Khoekhoe Afrikaans: Rademeyer (1938) on the Griquas and the Rehoboth-Basters, van Rensburg (1984) on the Griquas, and Links (1989) on the people living in South African Namaqualand.

Let us start with the vowels. The a-like schwa mentioned under (8a) is mentioned by each of the three authors. Examples are *droewag* ‘sad’ (< *droewig*), *bataal* ‘pay’ (< *betaal*), etc. [cf. Rademeyer 1938: 47, van Rensburg 1984: 330, Links 1989: 17–18]. Raising (with breaking) of [e] and [o] is mentioned by Links (1989: 8, 15), e.g. *tiën* ‘against’ (< *teen*) and *groeët* ‘big’ (< *groot*), and also (without breaking) by van Rensburg (1984: 322,), e.g. *vrieslik* ‘aweful’ (< *vreeslik*) and (at least in diphthongs) by Rademeyer (1938: 51), e.g. *noeit* ‘never’ (< *nooit*).³⁵ The other phenomena mentioned in (8) do not have clear counterparts in the rich variation described by these three authors.

Similarly, only part of the phonological variation of consonants in CDP can be found back in modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans, to wit: (a) the [b/d/g] ~ [p/t/k] voicing allophony, e.g. *petal* ‘pay’ (< *betaal*), *beidekant* ‘outside’ (< *buitekant*), *soldade* ‘soldiers’ (< *soldate*) [cf. Rademeyer 1938: 52–53, van Rensburg 1984: 277, 295, 297, Links 1989: 22], (b) the inverse of [b] → [v] in *skrybe* ‘write’ (< *skrywe*) [cf. Rademeyer 1938: 55, and compare den Besten (1999)], (c) syllable-final r-deletion, e.g. *ampe* ‘nearly’ (< *amper*), *rivie* ‘river’ (< *rivier*) [cf. van Rensburg 1984: 290].

On the basis of these observations we may conclude that also in phonology there is a thin line of continuity between early CDP and modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans.

7 Concluding remarks

On the basis of de Flacourt (1658) and Nienaber (1963) we have pieced together evidence for a Khoekhoe accent in early Cape Dutch Pidgin that seems to confirm Commissioner van Reede’s

³⁵ Raising of mid vowels seems to be a rare phenomenon in Khoekhoe Afrikaans, whereas it is wide-spread (**without** breaking) in (West) Cape Afrikaans, which must be due to one or more of the Asian substrates that have shaped Cape Afrikaans. This is confirmed by the phonology of Dutch loans in Indonesian, as can be found in Teeuw (1996), e.g. *branwir* ‘fire brigade’ (< du. *brandweer*), *tonil* ‘stage, theater’ (< du. *toneel*), *parkir* ‘to park’ (< du. *pakeren*) and *buncis* ‘beans’ (< du. *boontjes*), *setrum* ‘electricity’ (< du. *stroom*), *kol / kul* ‘cabbage’ (< du. *kool*). Most probably the slaves from India/Sri Lanka also played a role, but there is hardly any evidence for raising in the Dutch loan words in Sinhala collected by Sannasgala (1976).

complaint about the Khoekhoen's unintelligible pronunciation of Dutch – unintelligible for newcomers, that is. However, it is also clear that we will never know what the Khoekhoe version of CDP really may have sounded like since our pidgin sources usually represent CDP material pretty much by means of standard Dutch orthography – thereby blurring differences in pronunciation. On the other hand, even though our knowledge is fragmentary I have shown that it may be worth our while to make a comparison with what is known about Khoekhoe Afrikaans – even though the line connecting early CDP and modern Khoekhoe Afrikaans seems to be thin.

References

A Literature

- Arends, J. & M. Perl. 1995. *Early Suriname Creole Texts. A Collection of 18th-century Sranan and Sramaccan Documents*. Frankfurt: Vervuert / Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Beach, D.M. 1938. *The Phonetics of the Hottentot Language*. Cambridge: Heffer.
- den Besten, H. 1987. Die niederländischen Pidgins der alten Kapkolonie. In *Beiträge zum 3. Essener Kolloquium über "Sprachwandel und seine bestimmenden Faktoren" vom 30.9. – 2.10.198[6] an der Universität Essen*, N. Boretzky, W. Enninger and Th. Stolz (eds), 9–40. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- den Besten, H. 1989. From Khoekhoe Foreignertalk via Hottentot Dutch to Afrikaans: The Creation of a Novel Grammar. In *Wheels within Wheels. Papers of the Duisburg Symposium on Pidgin and Creole Languages*, M. Pütz and R. Dirven (eds), 207 – 249. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Verlag Peter Lang.
- den Besten, H. 1999. Speculations on [χ]-elision and intersonorantic [v] in Afrikaans. In *Language genesis*, R.P. Botha (ed.). *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 32: 45-66.
- den Besten, H. 2004. Where the historian and the creolist meet: the linguistic analysis of "quotations" and other data in the Cape Archives and in old travelogues. In *Interpretations of colonial representations. Reflections on alterity, social history, and intercultural contact*, S. Huigen and J. Kommers (eds), 81-111. Saarbrücken: Verlag für Entwicklungspolitik Saarbrücken.
- den Besten, H. 2005. Kloeke en het Afrikaans. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 121; 211-224.
- den Besten, H. 2007. Relexification and pidgin development. The case of Afrikaans. In *Deconstructing creole*, U. Ansaldo, S. Matthews and L. Lim (eds), 141–164. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Engelbrecht, J.A. 1936. *The Korana, an account of their customs and their history, with texts*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller.
- Groenewald, G. 2002. *Slawe, Khoekhoen en Nederlandse pidgins aan die Kaap; 'n Kritiese ondersoek na die sosiohistoriese grondslae van die Konvergensieteorie oor die ontstaan van Afrikaans*. MA-thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Haacke, W.H.G. and E. Eiseb. 2002. *A Khoekhoegowab dictionary with an English–Khoekhoegowab index*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan.
- Hagman, R.S. 1973. *Nama Hottentot grammar*. PhD diss., Columbia University.
- Links, T. 1989. *So praat ons Namakwalanders*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Maingard, L.F. 1962. *Koranna folktales. Grammar and texts*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand Press.
- Meinhof, C. 1930. *Der Koranadialekt des Hottentottischen*. Berlin: Reimer / Hamburg: Boysen.

- Nienaber, G.S. 1963. *Hottentots*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Nienaber, G.S. 1989. *Khoekhoense stamname. 'n Voorlopige verkenning*. Pretoria / Cape Town: 1989.
- Olpp, J. 1977. *Nama-grammatika*, soos verwerk deur H.J. Krüger. Windhoek: Inboorlingtaalburo van die Departement van Bantoe-onderwys.
- Penn, N. 1995. The Orange River Frontier Zone, 1700–1805. In *Einiqualand: Studies of the Orange River Frontier*, A.B. Smith (ed.), 21 - 109. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Penn, N. 2005. *The Forgotten Frontier. Colonists ad Khoisan on the Cape's northern frontier in the 18th century*. Athens: Ohio University Press / Cape Town: Double Storey Books.
- Rademeyer, J.H. 1938. *Kleurling-Afrikaans. Die taal van die Griekwas en Rehoboth-Basters*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Rust, F. 1965. *Praktische Namagrammatik. Auf Grund der Namagrammatiken von H. Vedder und J. Olpp*. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Sannasgala, P.B. 1976. *A study of Sinhala vocables of Dutch origin with Appendices of Portuguese and Malay / Javanese Borrowings*. Colombo: The Netherlands-Alumni Association of Sri Lanka.
- Teeuw, A. 1996. *Indonesisch–Nederlands woordenboek met medewerking van I. Supriyanto*. 4th, rev. and exp. ed. Leiden: KITLV.
- van Rensburg, M.C.J. 1984. Aspekte van die klankleer van die Afrikaans van die Griekwas. In *Finale verslag van 'n ondersoek na die Afrikaans van die Griekwas van die tagtiger jare*, M.C.J. van Rensburg (ed.), vol. I, part 1: 272–348. Bloemfontein: UOVS.
- van Zyl, D.H. 1947. *'n Griekwa- 'Ietsigeit' (Iets oor die Griekwas)*. Cape Town: Nasionale Pers.
- Wandres, C. 1918. Alte Wortlisten der Hottentottensprache. *Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen* 9.
- WAT: Schoonees, P.C. et al. (eds). 1950–. *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal*. Pretoria: Staatsdrukker / Stellenbosch: Buro van die WAT.

B Sources

- Böeseken, A.J. 1966. *Memoriën en instructiën 1657-1699*, afgeskryf, toegelig en persklaar gemaak deur ---. Cape Town: Staatsdrukker.
- Bosman, D.B. and B. Thom (eds). 1952–1957. *Dagregister gehouden by den oppercoopman Jan Anthonisz van Riebeeck*, 3 vols. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Bövingh, J.G. 1712. *Curieuse Beschreibung und Nachricht von den Hottentotten / ... Gedruckt im Jahr 1712*.
- Bövingh, J.G. 1714. *Kurtze Nachricht von den Hottentotten ... Bey dieser zweiten Auflage/ von den bey der ersten eingeschlichenen Fehlern gesaubert/ und mit eigener Feder ans Licht gebracht Von Johann Georg Bövingh, Missionario*. Hamburg: Bey Caspar Jahkel.
- Büttner, J.D. 1716? [1970]. *Waare Relation und Beschreibung von / Cabo de Goede Hoop / und derselber natuurlicher Inwoonderen Natur- / Gebräuchen, Thun, und Wesen, nebst hiesigen / Landes Gewächsen, und den zahmen und wilden / Gedierten / zusammen getragen / durch / Johan Daniel Büttner*. In *Johan Daniel Buttner's account of the Cape, Brief description of Natal, Journal extracts on East Indies*, G.S. Nienaber and R. Raven-Hart (eds). 13–119. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Dapper, O. 1668 [1933]. *Kaffrarie of Lant der Kaffers, anders Hottentotten genaemt* reprinted from *Naukeurige beschrijvinge der Afrikaensche gewesten van Egypten, Barbaryen, Libyen, Biledulgerid, Negroslant, Guinea, Ethiopen, Abyssinie*. Amsterdam: Jacob van Meur. In *The*

- Early Cape Hottentots described in the writings of Olfert Dapper (1668), Willem ten Rhyne (1686) and Johannes Gulielmus de Grevenbroek (1695)*, I. Schapera (ed.), 1–77. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.
- de Flacourt, É. 1658. Chap. XXV: Langage des Sauvages de la Baye de Saldaigne an [sic : au] Cap de Bonne Esperance. In *Petit recueil*, É. de Flacourt, 55–61. Paris.
- de Neyn, P. 1697. *Lust-Hof der Huwelyken, Vrolycke Uyren*. Amsterdam : Willem Lamsvelt e.a.
- Franken, J.L.M. 1953. *Taalhistoriese bydraes*. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Godée Molsbergen, E.C (ed.). 1916. *Reizen in Zuid-Afrika in de Hollandse tijd*. Vol. 1. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Kolb[e], P. 1727. *Naaukeurige en Uitvoerige Beschryving van De Kaap de Goede Hoop ... waarby een Beschryving van den oorsprong der Hottentotten ...* 2 vols. Amsterdam: Balthasar Lake-man.
- Langhanß, Ch. 1715. *Neue Ost-Indische Reise ...* Leipzig: Michael Rohrlachs seel. Wittib und Erben.
- Lehman, A. 1957. *Alle Briefe aus Indien. Unveröffentlichte Briefe von Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg*. Berlin: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt.
- Meister, G. 1692. *Der orientalisch-indianische Kunst- und Lustgärtner ...* Dresden /Leipzig: C. He-
kel.
- Muller, W. 1655. [report of an expedition by land.] In Bosman & Thom (1952: 416–421).
- Nienaber, G.S. 1963. – See list A.
- Nienaber, G.S. 1989. – See list A.
- Ólafsson, J. 1918–1919. *Æfisaga Jóns Ólafssonar Indiafara samin af honum sjálfum (1661)*, edited by S. Blöndal. Copenhagen: S.L. Møller.
- Ólafsson, J. 1932. *The Life of the Icelander Jón Ólafsson, traveller to India* written by himself and completed about 1661 A.D. with a continuation, by another hand, up to his death in 1679. Transl. from the Icelandic ed. of S. Blöndal, by B. Phillpotts. Vol. II, ed. by R. Temple and L.M. Anstey. London: Hakluyt Society.
- Raven-Hart, R. (ed.) 1971. *Cape Good Hope 1652 – 1702. The first fifty years of Dutch colonisation as seen by callers*. Two vols. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Smit, F. 1662–1663. *Journal gehouden by my Frederick de Smit van de heen ende wederreysse gedaen in 't lant van Africa by Pieter Cruythoff ...* In Godée Molsbergen (1916: 66-113).
- Tappe, D. 1704. *Funffzehen Jährige Curiöse und denckwürdige auch sehr gefährliche Ost-Indianische Reise-Beschreibung ...* Hannover & Wolfenbüttel: Gottfried Freytag.
- ten Rhyne, W. 1686 [1933]. *Schediasma de Promontorio Bonae Spei; ejusve tractus incolis Hottentottis*. Corrected and briefly annotated by Henr. Scretta S. a Zavorziz. Schaffhausen: Joh. Mart. Oswald. – with a translation and a foreword by B. Farrington. In *Early Cape Hottentots, described in the writings of Olfert Dapper (1668), Willem ten Rhyne (1686) and Johannes Gulielmus de Grevenbroek (1695)*, I. Schapera (ed.), 78–153. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.
- Valentyn, J.F. 1726 [1971]. *Beschryvinge van de Kaap der Goede Hoop met de zaaken daar toe behoorende*, Dordrecht and Amsterdam: Joannes van Braam and Gerard onder de Linden [part of a larger work] – annotated edition with English translation, P. Serton et al. (eds), 2 vols, Cape Town: VRS,
- van der Stel, S. 1685–1686 [1932]. *Dagh Register gehouden op de voiage gedaen naer der Amacquas Land onder 't beleydt vanden E Heer Symon vander Stel. Commandeur van Caap de Goede Hoop. &C*. In *Simon van der Stel's journal of his expedition to Namaqualand, 1685-1686*, 3-110, London, etc.: Longmans. Green, and Co. / Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co.

van Meerhoff, P. 1661. [report of an expedition by land] according to the Cape copy in Bosman and Thom (1957: 478–491); according to the The Hague copy in Godée Molsbergen (1916: 46–62).
van Reede tot Drakestein, H.A. 1685 [1941]. Journaal van zijn verblijf aan de Kaap, medegedeeld door A. Hulshof. *Bijdragen en mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap* 62: 1–245.
Ziegenbalg, B. 1706. [Letters from Cape of Good Hope] In Lehmann (1957: 22 – 31).