

Associative DPs

Hans den Besten

0. Introduction

In a couple of languages, such as Afrikaans, Ewe, Papiamentu and Icelandic, can be found constructions consisting of a DP denoting a person or persons which is followed or preceded by a non-singular pronoun, e.g. Afr. *Jan-hulle* '(lit.) John-they/them'. Due to its meaning this type of construction is referred to as 'extended plural', 'group plural' or 'associative'. For reasons that will become clear below I prefer the term 'associative'.

Constructions of the type $[_{DP} X] + \text{Pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}$ or $\text{Pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]} + [_{DP} X]$ usually are translated as 'X and his/her/their folks', although that is somewhat imprecise, as I will show below.

This paper will concentrate upon the analysis of the associative in Afrikaans. A syntactic structure will be proposed and it will be shown that there is a single semantics underlying the various readings of the Afrikaans *X-hulle* construction. Furthermore, some remarks will be made about the binding properties of such associative DPs. By way of a note it will be shown that the analysis proposed can also be applied to the associative in Old Icelandic. The paper will conclude with some remarks about the syntactic analysis chosen.

1. Associative DPs in Afrikaans: previous scholarship

An extensive discussion of the Afrikaans associative construction with its various meanings can be found in Kempen (1969: 291-296). Additional data is provided by the WAT vol. 4: 448. Donaldson's recent [...] *Grammar of Afrikaans* provides a succinct and almost complete summary of what is known about this construction (Donaldson 1993: 126, 136). Surprisingly, Ponelis' Afrikaans syntax (Ponelis 1979) does not discuss the *X-hulle* construction at all.

The absence of information on the Afrikaans associative in Ponelis (1979) may be due to the fact that according to the standard analysis the *X-hulle* construction is a case of morphology, more specifically compounding. The standard analysis is expounded in le Roux (1923: 80), Kempen (1969: 291-296) and Donaldson (1993: 50).

According to le Roux (1923: 50) *X-hulle* has come about through the juxtaposition of a substantive and a pronoun, whereby *hulle* has acquired the force of an

inflexional ending expressing a plural or collective concept in the case of animate beings. Although later scholars such as Kempen (1969) and Donaldson (1993) have given up the idea of *X-hulle* being a plural ending, the old idea of *X-hulle* being a case of compounding still persists.

This analysis may be due to previous discussions in Afrikaans diachronic studies, because for a while the prevailing idea was that *X-hulle* is a Creole plural similar to plural structures in Ewe (a Niger-Kordofan language) and in Papiamentu and Negerhollands (two Creole languages).

Thus in Ewe the plural of a common noun will be expressed by adding the 3rd person plural pronoun *wo* to the singular noun, e.g. *ame* 'human being' and *ati* 'tree' vs. *amewó* 'human beings' and *atíwo* 'trees' respectively (cf. Westermann (1907: 50)). Similarly, in Papiamentu *e kas* 'the house' contrasts with *e kasnan* 'the houses', *nan* meaning 'they, them' (cf. Dijkhoff (1983)). Corresponding plural structures in Negerhollands are 18th century Negerhollands [*D/d*]ie *Man sender* 'the man them' (= 'the men', cf. Magens (1770: 10)) and its 20th century counterpart *die man sinu* 'id.' (cf. de Josselin de Jong (1926)).

The idea that the Afrikaans *X-hulle* construction may be a Creole structure on a par with the structures just mentioned was first vented by du Toit (1905: 86-87), whose suggestions were extended by le Roux (1923: 80-83). Although du Toit's interpretation of *X-hulle* as being a plural was gradually abandoned in favor of a more complex semantic analysis, the idea of it being a case of morphology was not even given up by Kempen (1969) who rejected the Creole status of *X-hulle* in favor of a Germanic derivation.

Quite suprisingly du Toit (1905) and le Roux (1923) did not realize that despite its number *X-hulle* is not the plural of *X*, as may be clear from the following example:

- (1) Pa-hulle
Dad-them
'1. Dad and his folks, 2. Dad and another person, especially Mum:
Mum and Dad, my/our parents'

Furthermore, they apparently did not know that similar associative constructions can also be found in Papiamentu and Ewe (cf. Dijkhoff (1983) and Martha Dijkhoff p.c. for Papiamentu; Felix Ameka p.c. for Ewe). Compare the following Papiamentu example:

- (2) Marianan
Maria=them
'1. Maria and her folks, 2. Maria and another person'

Although this suggests another analysis for the pronominal plurals mentioned above, I will refrain from going into that discussion here nor will I enter into the debate concerning the possibly Creole status of the Afrikaans *X-hulle* structure.

What interests me here is whether the residue of that debate, i.e. the view that the Afrikaans associative is a case of morphology, is right.¹

There are good reasons to assume that the *X-hulle* construction is syntactic rather than morphological.

First of all, the X in *X-hulle* can be a coordinated DP as in (3) below:

- (3) Piet en Koos-hulle
 Piet and Koos-them
 '1. Piet and Koos and their folks, 2. Piet and Koos and another person,
 3. Piet and Koos'

Furthermore, these coordinated DPs can contain determiners as in (4):

- (4) die Van der Merwes en die Steenkamps-hulle
 the Van der Merwes and the Steenkamps-them
 'i.e. both of the families, also together with others'

Finally, *hulle* can also be added to a simple DP of the type DET + N, as in (5):

- (5) die kinders-hulle
 the children-them
 'the children (plus or minus one or more persons)'

We may therefore conclude that *X-hulle* is a syntactic collocation of a DP (X) and a plural pronoun *hulle* 'they, them'.

2. An alternative analysis

If *X-hulle* must be viewed as a syntactic structure with a DP and a 3rd person plural pronoun *hulle*, it may be tempting to analyze it as an asyndetic coordination, as in (6):

¹ Similar questions can be asked about the Ewe and Creole plurals and associatives discussed above. Discussion in Westermann (1907: 50) and in Dijkhoff (1983) and Muller (1989) shows that the pertinent Ewe and Papiamentu plural pronouns are free rather than bound morphemes. Note that no associative of the type X + pron. has been attested for Negerhollands yet. But most probably the conclusions drawn for Ewe and Papiamentu plurals and associatives carry over to Negerhollands plurals.

- (6) [DP DP₁ [C₀ e] [DP₂ Pron._{plur.}]]

This may seem an attractive analysis to derive the 'and his/her/their folks' reading for cases like *Pa-hulle* 'Dad-them' and *Piet en Koos-hulle* 'Piet and Koos-them'. Yet it demonstrates a serious defect in that it leaves unexplained why the reference of the pronoun in *X-hulle* is dependent upon the reference of X.

That is to say: *Pa-hulle* in the reading 'Dad and his folks' does not mean 'Dad and THEM' because there is no independent reference for *hulle* 'them'. In order to make the referential properties of *hulle* explicit we should rather rephrase 'Dad and his folks' as something like 'the group surrounding and including Dad'.

Also note that the intonational structure of *X-hulle* differs from the coordinate structure *X en hulle* 'X and them' in that main stress does not fall on *hulle* but on X, which again argues against an asyndetic coordination analysis.²

However, there is yet another problem for the asyndetic coordination analysis which has to do with the cardinality of the associative construction.

Given a structure like (6) above one would expect that the number of people denoted by *X-hulle* will be at least two persons larger than the number of people denoted by X. However that is not true if we consider the various readings for (1) and (3) above, repeated here as (7a,b):

- (7) a *Pa-hulle* [= (1)]
 '1. Dad and his folks, 2. Dad and another person, especially Mum etc.'
 b *Piet en Koos-hulle* [= (3)]
 '1. Piet and Koos and their folks, 2. Piet and Koos and another person, 3. Piet and Koos'

As we can see neither the second reading of (7a) nor the second or the third reading of (7b) is predicted by the asyndetic coordination analysis.

Note that this is not an idiosyncrasy of the examples in (7a,b). Whenever X in an *X-hulle* construction is singular, there will be two readings, as in (7a). Whenever such an X is plural there will be three readings, as in (7b). An extra

² Note that this has implications for the analysis of the associative construction in Frisian, which seems to contain an explicit coordinator *en* as in *Heit-en-hjar* '(lit.) Dad-and-them' (= '1. Dad and his folks, 2. Dad and another person, especially Mum') and as in *Heit-en-dy* '(lit.) Dad-and-that one/those' (= 'id.'). For the data see Kempen (1969: 293-296), who also refers to a minor associative pattern of the same type in Afrikaans as in *Pa en dié* '(lit.) Dad and that one/those' (= *Pa-hulle*). In view of the readings attached to these *X-en*-pronoun constructions a mere coordination analysis is unlikely and it may be of no coincidence that — unlike what happens in truly coordinated DPs/NPs — main stress is assigned to the lefthand conjunct (X).

example of the latter type is provided by (5) above, while the picture is somewhat blurred in the case of (4), due to the sloppy rendering of its reading(s).

Since the asyndetic coordination analysis does not work, I would like to suggest an alternative structure:

- (8) [DP₁ DP₂ Pron._{plur.}]

In this structure the plural pronoun is the head of DP₁ while DP₂ is its complement. I will furthermore assume that, in a sense to be made more precise, the denotation of DP₂ is subsumed under the denotation of the plural pronoun.

This idea is inspired by what we know about the syntax and semantics of Dutch and German (and Afrikaans) structures of the following type:

- (9) a [QP een [NP fles [NP rode wijn]]]
 b [QP eine [NP Flasche [NP roter Wein_{NOM}]]]
 a bottle red wine
 'a bottle of red wine' [(9a) Dutch, (9b) German]

Note that instead of a QP with the indefinite articles *een* and *eine* I could also have chosen a DP with the definite articles *de* and *die* ('the') respectively.

As for the semantics of the double NP in (9) the referent of the lower NP is contained in or by the referent of the headnoun of the higher NP. This corresponds to the subsumption relation I am assuming for DP₂ and the plural pronoun in the Afrikaans associative construction in (8).

Furthermore note that in the appropriate syntactic context the headnoun of the higher NP in (9) will determine the inflexion on the finite verb. No such thing can be demonstrated for the plural pronoun in (8), however, since there is no (person-)number agreement in Afrikaans.

Fortunately the corresponding associative structure of Old Icelandic, which is exemplified in (10a,b) (cf. Heusler (1967: 120-121, 123-124), can help us out here:

- (10) a [DP₁ Pron._{dual/plur.} DP₂]
 b þeir Gizorr
 they-plur._{NOM} Gizorr_{NOM}
 '1. Gizorr and his folks, 2. Gizorr and another person'

In the right syntactic contexts the non-singular pronoun of (10a) will determine agreement on the verb. However note that this feature does not differentiate between asyndetic coordination and a double DP analysis.

As for further parallels between the double DP analysis of (8) and the double NP analysis of (9), note that the embedded NP in (9) will vary in case in accordance with the higher NP and its QP or DP. Similarly, in the Old Icelandic asso-

ciative construction there is case-agreement between the pronoun and the embedded DP_2 .³

Further discussion of the syntax of the associative constructions of Afrikaans and Old Icelandic will be deferred to section 6. We will now first discuss the semantics of the Afrikaans associative.

3. The semantics of the Afrikaans associative DP

Given the discussion in the previous section it is more or less clear how we can go about the semantics of the Afrikaans associative construction, at least for those cases where the number of people denoted by DP_2 in (8) is smaller than the number of people denoted by the full construction:

- (11) The set of individuals denoted by DP_2 in (8) constitutes a proper subset of the set of individuals denoted by the pronoun (*totum-pars* reading):

$$\{x \mid x \in DP_2\} \subset \{y \mid y \in \text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}\}$$

where DP_2 and $\text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}$ are shorthands for the sets of people denoted by DP_2 and by $\text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}$ respectively

By means of this semantic description we now have reduced the two readings of a DP like *my broer-hulle* '(lit.) my brother-them', i.e. 1. 'my brother and his folks' and 2. 'my brother and another person, especially his wife or his girl friend', to one reading: 'the group of individuals which my brother is part of'. And we now also predict the first two readings of *Piet en Koos-hulle* '(lit.) Piet and Koos-them', i.e. 1. 'Piet and Koos and their folks' and 2. 'Piet and Koos and another person', because the real reading according to (11) is something like: 'the group of individuals which Piet and Koos are part of'.

Yet the semantic description of *X-hulle* as presented in (11) will never lead to a reading where the force of *hulle* seems to be reduced to nought, i.e. in the case of the third reading for *Piet en Koos-hulle*: 'Piet and Koos'.

I therefore propose to slightly revise (11) by assuming the following:

- (12) In case of structure (8) the following holds for the set of individuals denoted by DP_2 :

$$\forall x (x \in DP_2) \supset (x \in \text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]})$$

³ However, there is a minor variant of the double NP construction in German which allows the use of the Genitive *roten Weines* 'of red wine' instead of the agreeing NP *rot-... Wein*.

where DP_2 and $\text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}$ are shorthands for the sets of people denoted by DP_2 and $\text{pron.}_{[-\text{sing.}]}$ respectively

From (12) we can derive that (11) only holds if the embedded DP of an Afrikaans associative construction is singular. In case of a plural embedded DP a weaker statement holds:

$$(13) \quad \{ x \mid x \in DP_2 \} \subseteq \{ y \mid y \in \text{pronoun}_{[-\text{sing.}]} \}$$

where ...

To see why this is so, let us apply (12) to a case like *Piet en Koos-hulle* '(lit.) Piet and Koos-them'. According to (12) Piet and Koos must be members of the set of individuals denoted by the plural pronoun. Since this set may be larger than two, two of the three readings of *Piet en Koos-hulle* follow immediately, i.e. 1. 'Piet and Koos and their folks' and 2. 'Piet and Koos and another person'. In these cases the set of individuals denoted by DP_2 is a proper subset of the set of individuals denoted by *hulle*.

However, since (12) can be applied distributively, the following situation can arise:

Piet must be a member of the set of individuals denoted by *hulle*. Since that set may only consist of two members, Koos, who must also be a member of it, suffices to complete the set. And since we also have to apply (12) to Koos, Piet may serve as the extra member to complete the set.

And so it follows that the set of individuals denoted by DP_2 may also be equivalent to the set of individuals denoted by *hulle*. Or to put it differently: *Piet en Koos-hulle* '(lit.) Piet and Koos-them' may also mean: 3. 'Piet and Koos'. However, it may by now be clear that *Piet en Koos-hulle* in the latter interpretation refers to a much more close-knit group than does the simple coordination *Piet en Koos* 'Piet and Koos'.

Note that this implies that under circumstances *X-hulle* may look like a 'normal' plural, at least in one of its readings. This will be the case if DP_2 contains a plural common noun instead of a proper name, as in (14):

- (14) a my kinders-hulle
 my children-them
 '1. my children and one or more other children, 2. my children'
 b die seuns-hulle
 the boys-them
 '1. the boys and one or more others, 2. the boys'

Whether this has consequences for the analysis of pronominal plurals in Ewe and Papiamentu is open to debate.

4. *Special cases*

Interestingly, the Afrikaans *X-hulle* construction has also penetrated into the realm of 2nd person pronouns. First of all, the reverential pronoun *u* 'you_{rev.}', which is unmarked for number, has developed a 'plural' *u-hulle* '(lit.) you_{rev.}-them' (cf. Kempen (1969: 291), Jenkinson (1982: 125) and Donaldson (1993: 126)). It follows from the semantics of *X-hulle* as described in (12) that *u-hulle* must have 2nd person plural reference, since a 2PL pronoun can refer to one or more addressees plus one or more third persons.

This may well be related to the addition of *-hulle* to the so-called integrated vocatives or appellatives of Afrikaans. An extensive discussion of such integrated appellatives can be found in Ponelis (1979: 39-40, 67, 229, 385-386). Also compare Donaldson (1993: 124-125). Here only a resumé will be given.

In Afrikaans appellatives like *Pa* 'Dad' can be used as 2nd person pronouns. Therefore such 'nominal pronouns' can be used as a subject and a possessive in (15) without violating the binding theory and as a subject of an imperative with V1 order as in (16):

- (15) *Pa* kan *Pa* se motor hier maar trek
 Dad can Dad 's car here just pull
 'You can pull your car here, Dad'
- (16) *Moenie Oom* vir my pla nie!
 Must=not Uncle ObjM me tease not
 'Don't you, Uncle, tease me!'

Furthermore, integrated appellatives may be used as inherent reflexives, due to the fact that all Afrikaans personal pronouns may serve as inherent reflexives (cf. Ponelis (1979: 227), Donaldson (1993: 290-291, 294-296), and, for a theoretical treatment of a similar phenomenon in Frisian: Everaert (1991)). The result for integrated appellatives is shown in (17):

- (17) *Oom* moet *Oom* gedra
 Uncle must Uncle behave
 'You must behave yourself, Uncle'

Integrated appellatives are lexically related to (3rd person) names like *Pa* 'Dad' and *Oom* 'Uncle'. This may have been the incentive to create associative 2nd person plural expressions as in (18):

- (18) a Sal *Pa-hulle* my kan help?
 Will Dad-them me be-able help?
 'Would you, Daddy and X, be able to help me?'
 b Maar hoe het *Oom en Tannie-hulle* ons dan gevind?
 But how have Uncle and Aunt-them us then found?
 'But how did you, Uncle and Aunt, find us then?'

Since 2PL pronouns either denote a set of two or more addressees or a set consisting of x addressees plus y other persons (x and $y \geq 1$), it follows from the semantics of *X-hulle* as described in (12) that integrated appellatives like *Pa-hulle* must have 2nd person plural reference.

Surprisingly, even Donaldson's [...] *Grammar of Afrikaans* (Donaldson 1993) does not treat of this phenomenon. However compare Kempen (1969: 291) and especially Jenkinson (1982: 125) and (1984: 253).

5. Afrikaans associative DPs and Binding Theory⁴

If *X-hulle* with an integrated appellative as a filler for *X* is a 2nd person pronominal expression, we predict that 2nd person *X-hulle* can be bound as a reflexive possessive and as an inherent reflexive and can be an inverted subject in a V1 imperative. This is the case indeed, witness (19)-(21):

- (19) *Oom-hulle* kan *Oom-hulle* se kar hier maar trek
 Uncle-them can Uncle-them 's car here just pull
 [*Oom-hulle* = you, Uncle, and others]
 (20) *Oom-hulle* moet *Oom-hulle* gedra
 Uncle-them must Uncle-them behave [*Oom-hulle* = you, Uncle,
 and others]
 (21) Moenie *Pa-hulle* vir my pla nie!
 Must=not Dad-them ObjM me tease not [*Pa-hulle* = you, Dad,
 and others]

Furthermore we also predict that 2nd person *X-hulle* can be bound across clause boundaries, as in (22):

- (22) Sal *Tannie-hulle* kyk of *Tannie-hulle*
 Will Auntie-them look (= try) if Auntie-them
 die boek kan lees?
 the book can read? [*Tannie-hulle* = you, Auntie, and others]

⁴ I hereby thank Fritz Ponelis, Christo van Rensburg and Bruce Donaldson for their help.

Now note that this cannot be due to the pronominal status of the head of *X-hulle* since 3rd person *X-hulle* is an R-expression and so cannot be bound, which is not surprising given the referential status of *hulle* in *X-hulle*. Compare the following examples:

- (23) *Piet-hulle* koop *hulle* boeke altyd hier
 Piet-them buy their books always here
- (24) As *Piet-hulle* *hulle* nie gedra nie, moet
 If Piet-them them not behave not, must
hulle maar loop
 they just go-away
- (25) *Piet-hulle* wil weet of *hulle* môre kan
 Piet-them want know if they tomorrow can
 kom kuier
 come visit

Substitution of *Piet-hulle* for bound *hulle* in (23)-(25) leads to awkward results.

For reasons of space other problems in the field of Binding Theory (such as partial binding) will not be discussed here.

6. By way of a note: Comparative data from Old Icelandic

In section 2 brief mention was made of the associative construction of Old Icelandic. A good description can be found in Heusler (1967: 120-121, 123-124). The construction is still existent in Modern Icelandic (Halldór Sigurðsson, p.c.).

The (Old) Icelandic associative DP differs from the Afrikaans construction in various respects. First of all, the non-singular pronoun has to precede DP₂. Secondly, the pronoun may be dual or plural, whereas Afrikaans does not differentiate between plural and dual. Thirdly, unlike Afrikaans Old Icelandic can use non-singular pronouns of all persons. (Differences having to do with person-number agreement as well as with case-agreement I will leave out of consideration.)

Modulo these differences rule (12) gives the right results if applied to the Icelandic structure (10a) above, as can be deduced from the following examples:

- (26) a vit Gunnarr
 we-dual_{NOM} Gunnarr_{NOM}
 'Gunnarr and I; both of us, I and Gunnar'
- b þeir Gizorr
 they-plur._{NOM} Gizorr_{NOM}
 '1. G. and his folks, 2. G. and another person'

- c Sonr þeira Þorgeirs var Þórþr
 Son them_{GEN} Þorgeir_{GEN} was Thórd
 'a son of Þorgeir and his wife was Thórd'
- d Hann var faðer þeira Eiríks ... ok Ólafs
 He was father them_{GEN} Eirík's ... and Ólaf's
 'He was father of Eirik and Olaf' (given the context)

I leave it up to the reader to do the necessary computations.

Note that DPs like (26a) must be pronominal expressions. Given the above discussion of the Afrikaans data it figures that the relevant DPs in (26b,c,d) are R-expressions but I have as yet no independent evidence to support this claim.

7. *Reconsidering the analysis*

Although we have reached rather firm conclusions as to the semantics of associative DPs, questions may be asked as regards their syntactic structure.

First of all, I have assumed in this paper — contra Longobardi (1994) and Delsing (1993) — that only definite noun phrases are DPs and that indefinite ones are QPs and sometimes maybe NPs.

This assumption may turn out to be wrong, in which case the syntactic description of the pronominal associative has to be revised so that only definite DPs may occupy the position of DP₂ in (8) and (10a).

Furthermore, the word order differences between the Afrikaans *X-hulle* construction and its Old Icelandic counterpart suggest a syntactic treatment with a uniform underlying structure. Following Kayne's antisymmetry approach (Kayne 1994) we might assume the following D-structure:

$$(20) \quad [_{DP_1} \dots \text{Pronoun}_{[-\text{sing.}]} DP_2]$$

In Icelandic DP₂ will remain in situ in the syntax, whereas in Afrikaans DP₂ overtly moves to the Spec of DP₁. (Similarly for Papiamentu and Ewe.) However, as yet I have no independent evidence to support this idea.

Finally one might question the parallelism between pronominal associative structures and double NPs as in Du. *een/de [fles [rode wijn]]* 'a/the bottle of red wine' because more structure may be needed to distinguish the latter construction from constructions with postnominal possessives. However, in so far as I can see extra structure may be needed for the analysis of possessives but not necessarily so for double NPs of the type discussed (cf. for instance what is said about possessives in ch. 8 of Kayne (1994)).

In this paper I have provided an account for pronominal associative structures. On the basis of the Afrikaans *X-hulle* construction I have shown that such structures can be analyzed as double DPs and that the various readings attached to them can be given a unified treatment. Additional sections deal with referential and binding properties of *X-hulle* DPs.

References

- Delsing, L.-O. (1993) *The Internal Structure of Noun Phrases in the Scandinavian Languages. A Comparative Study*. PhD diss., University of Lund.
- Dijkhoff, M.B. (1983) 'The process of pluralization in Papiamentu' in L.D. Carrington, D.R. Craig and R. Todd-Dandaré, eds., *Studies in Caribbean Language*, Society for Caribbean Linguistics, St. Augustine, Trinidad, 217-229.
- Donaldson, B.C. (1993) *A Grammar of Afrikaans*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York. *Mouton Grammar Library* 8.
- Everaert, M. (1991) 'Contextual determination of the anaphor/pronominal distinction', in J. Koster and E. Reuland, eds., *Long-distance anaphora*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 77-118.
- Heusler, A. (1967) *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, 7th, unaltered edition, Winter, Heidelberg.
- Jenkinson, A.G. (1982) 'As ek jy is en jy is hy, wie's ons?', in G.J. van Jaarsveld, ed., *Wat Sê Jy. Studies oor Taalhandelinge in Afrikaans*, McGraw-Hill, Johannesburg, 101-126.
- Jenkinson, A.G. (1984) 'Morfologie', in M.C.J. van Rensburg, ed., *Finale verslag van 'n ondersoek na "Die Afrikaans van die Griekwas van die tagtigerjare" onderneem met finansiële steun van die RGN, uitgevoer aan die Universiteit van die Oranje-Vrystaat*, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein, 229-253.
- de Josselin de Jong, J.P.B. (1926) *Het huidige Negerhollandsch (Teksten en woordenlijst)*, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks* 26, no. 1.
- Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 25.
- Kempen, W. (1969) *Samestelling, Afleiding en Woordsoortelike Meerfunksionaliteit in Afrikaans*, Nasou, Goodwood. [2nd, revised edition of W. Kempen (1962) *Woordvorming en funksiewisseling in Afrikaans*]
- Longobardi, G. (1994) 'Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-movement in Syntax and Logical Form', *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Magens, J.M. (1770) *Grammatica over det Creolske Sprog, som bruges paa de trende Danske Eilande, St. Croix, St. Thomas og St. Jans i America. Sammenskrevet og opsat af en paa St. Thomas Indfød Mand Gerhard Giese Salikath*, Kopenhagen.
- Muller, E. (1989) 'Lokalisashon di nan den e konstrukshon sustantivo + adhetivo', in [Instituto] L[ingwístiko] A[ntiano]/F. Martinus (prod.) *Homenahe na Raúl Römer*, Departement van Onderwijs, Willemstad, Nederlandse Antillen, 64-80.
- Ponelis, F.A. (1979) *Afrikaanse Sintaksis*, Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- le Roux, J.J. (1923) *Oor die Afrikaanse sintaksis. I Woordgroepe en volsin*, Swets en Zeitlinger, Amsterdam.
- du Toit, P.J. (1905) *Afrikaansche studies*, Siffer, Ghent. *Uitgaven der Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie*, 5^e reeks: *Uitgaven der Commissie voor Nieuwere Taal- en Letterkunde* 14. Diss. U of Ghent.
- WAT 4 (1961): *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* vol. 4: H-I, Die Staatsdrukker, Pretoria.
- Westermann, D. (1907) *Grammatik der Ewe-Sprache*, Reimer, Berlin.