

Introduction: ‘*n Klein ietsie* for Johan Oosthuizen

Theresa Biberauer

Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom & General Linguistics,
Stellenbosch University, South Africa

Alexander Andrason

Department of African Languages, Stellenbosch University, South Africa
E-mail: andrason@sun.ac.za

1. Introduction

To those of a “classificatory” bent, Johan Oosthuizen will undoubtedly “count” as someone of the generative persuasion. His own work has certainly been strongly influenced by different incarnations of Chomsky’s programme, and anyone who has had the pleasure of engaging in a linguistic discussion with him will know how readily he can spot a piece of data that just doesn’t seem to be doing what it should be, if we take generative theory (most recently, minimalism and cartography) into account. A lesser known fact about Johan is that he has always had a real interest in Relevance Theory. Actually, though, as both editors of this special edition have learned, Johan is not primarily someone with much of an interest in labels; language - like physics and jazz - is something that fascinates him and that he is therefore always keen to discuss with others who share that fascination, regardless of any specific points of departure that they might have.

Against that backdrop, we - whom those of a pigeonholing orientation would almost certainly place into two quite different “camps”, general cognitivist (Alex) and generativist (Theresa) - are delighted to offer Johan a festschrift that, we feel, begins to do justice to the range of his interests. Before we give an overview of the contributions to this volume (section 2), a brief perspective from each of us on an aspect of our experience of what makes Johan such an unusual and memorable colleague.

Alex:

One of Johan Oosthuizen’s most remarkable qualities is surely the openness that he demonstrates - without compromising his firm generative stance - to engaging creatively with scholars who hold different theoretical views, or who belong to different linguistic frameworks to himself. In Stellenbosch, this has been particularly evident in his relationship with cognitive linguists, alongside whom he has now worked for many years. Two interdepartmental, interdisciplinary research groups - one dedicated to the issue of

coordination and the other to verbal serialization - and the workshop on Left Dislocation organized at Stellenbosch University in 2015 are just three of the reflexes of what has been possible, thanks to Johan's willingness to engage. At all three of those events, Johan's knowledge of the generative framework, his passion for pursuing a unifying, formal account of linguistic variation, and, above all, his determination to transcend description in order to reach a more profound theoretical understanding of grammatical phenomena - filtering out the universal from the accidental - offered the non-generative, cognitively or typologically oriented, participants much food for thought. Johan's non-dogmatism has unquestionably played a key role in making Stellenbosch a place where there is a connecting bridge between two frameworks that are often regarded as nigh-incompatible, generative syntax and cognitive grammar.

The interdisciplinary, meta-theoretical, and universalistic aspirations that underlie Johan's scholarship - and that also characterize those of many cognitivists - are not the only reason why Johan's generative views have been warmly received in cognitive circles, however. This warm reception is, above all, the consequence of Johan's respectful and humble nature: he not only generously shares his own knowledge with scholars working within other frameworks and approaches, but also eagerly learns from those scholars' expertise and experiences. This attitude has been a crucial component in the construction in Stellenbosch of a platform where generativists and cognitivists could coexist and cooperate in an atmosphere of mutual respect, appreciating the two theories' independent contributions and significance.

Theresa:

Researchers with a strong interest in theory quite frequently have a lesser interest in the sometimes quite crazy-seeming things "actual languages" get up to. Those who have heard Johan on the topic of matters like what an inventory of light noun (*n*)-types might look like will have a sense of how strong his theoretical interests are; very strikingly, though, Johan also has an unusual ear for data, particularly Afrikaans data. He is one of those people who will first respond to the content of what you have just said, pause, and then remark on how peculiar a given formulation that you had employed actually is when you consider it more closely. For example, I hadn't really thought much of elliptical *Ek is veronderstel om te* (literally: I am supposed INF.C to, i.e. "I am supposed to.") as a perfectly okay response in modern-day colloquial Afrikaans¹ until Johan asked what the tree for this structure - which is completely out in Dutch (Cora Pots, p.c.) - would look like. Not so simple; although the structure does demonstrate rather clearly how different Afrikaans *te* is to its Dutch source and its German relative, *zu*.

¹ Consider:

A: *Moet jy ook die registrasiegeld betaal?*
 must you also the registration-money pay
 "Must you also pay the registration fee?"

B: *Ek is veronderstel om [SILENT: die registrasiegeld/ dit] te [SILENT: betaal].*
 I am supposed INF.C the registration-money it to pay
 "I am supposed to [pay the registration fee/it]."

If the above is correct, *Ek is veronderstel om te* in this case appears to require discontinuous deletion. What is certainly clear is that Afrikaans *te* is quite independent of the lexical verb it is associated with, unlike its Dutch and German counterparts.

Te (“to”) may be a little word, but it is precisely the kind of unusual, but grammatically rather important element that Johan’s work has, over the years, shed a lot of light on. His proposal that Afrikaans’s distinctive clause-final *nie* should be analysed as a Polarity rather than a second Negative head, as concurring elements at the time were typically analysed (cf. i.a. Haegeman & Zanuttini 1996, and Zanuttini 1997), was ground-breaking, for example. And his work on, among other things, the more fine-grained analysis of the Afrikaans adpositional system, the fine structure of the Afrikaans left periphery, and the Afrikaans reflexive system also all deserve careful attention, as much for the empirical details that it highlights as for the theoretical proposals that it contains.

Given Johan’s interest in little things, in Afrikaans and its relatives, in the odd things that are possible in different languages in Southern African and beyond, and in all the empirical and theoretical puzzles that present themselves to linguists who take the trouble to look and listen, we very much hope that he will enjoy the wide-ranging contributions in this volume.

2. The contributions to this festschrift

The twenty papers making up this volume have been organised into four Parts, each of which we will now briefly outline.

2.1. Part I: Afrikaans centre-stage

Fittingly, given Johan’s career-long interest in the linguistics of his mother-tongue, Part I focuses on Afrikaans.

The Afrikaans periphrastic past - typically realised by what appears to be the combination of an invariant *het* (“have”) auxiliary and a *ge*-initial past participle - is the central focus of **Jan-Wouter Zwart**’s contribution. While superficial comparison with Dutch and German, both of which have similar constructions, might suggest that this is not an area in which Afrikaans has much to offer the comparatively or the theoretically oriented linguist, Zwart shows that nothing could be further from the truth: not only has Afrikaans *het* lost the inflectional and positional flexibility available to its perfect counterpart in Dutch; it can also be shown to have become formally defective in a way that suggests that it may today be a temporal affix rather than an independent temporal auxiliary (see Conradie 2007 for a similar conclusion, arrived at on more diachronically oriented grounds). As Zwart notes, this finding has potentially very significant consequences for our understanding of the structure of Afrikaans verb clusters - another locus of significant departure from Dutch and West Germanic more generally - and also for our understanding of the much-discussed Verb Second (V2) phenomenon.

Staying with “little elements”, **Erin Pretorius** turns the focus to another class of elements that have typically been thought to behave in Afrikaans as it does in Dutch and other languages: that instantiated by the lexical items *binne* (“inside”), *buite* (“outside”), *bo* (“upstairs”), *onder* (“downstairs”), *voor* (“in the front”) and *agter* (“at/in the back”). The standard analysis of these elements is that they are intransitive adpositions, i.e. members of category P that fail to take a Ground complement the way a transitive P like *in* in *in die sand* (“in the sand”) does. Pretorius, however, shows that an analysis that adequately accounts for the properties of the Afrikaans elements given above must necessarily analyse these elements precisely as elements which lexicalise this apparently “missing” Ground element; that is, a

descriptively adequate and properly predictive account of their structure should treat them not as a species of P-element, but, instead, on a par with locative nouns like the R-pronouns and *home*-class nouns also found in Afrikaans and elsewhere in Germanic. Both Zwart and Pretorius, then, highlight the importance, firstly, of extremely careful analytical work when one approaches apparently familiar structures and elements in Afrikaans, and, secondly, the importance of keeping an open mind about widely accepted and superficially plausible-seeming linguistic classifications.

In contrast to the first two, the focus of **Theresa Biberauer and Jean-Marie Potgieter**'s contribution is a barely-discussed Afrikaans structure, namely what one might want to call *negative exclamatives*. These are structures like *Hoe wonderlik is dit nie!* (literally: how wonderful is it not, i.e. "How wonderful it is!") which contain a negative element that, however, fails to contribute to the structure's positive interpretation. These structures also occur in languages like German and Italian (see Delfitto and Fiorin 2014), and it is clear that Afrikaans negative exclamatives share some of the core properties of the corresponding structures in these languages. At the same time, though, there are indications that Afrikaans negative exclamatives may exhibit some unique peculiarities, owing to the Afrikaans-specific components that come together in this structure: its apparently crosslinguistically unique negation system, featuring the final *nie* that Oosthuizen (1998) first so illuminatingly analysed as a Pol-element (see section 1 above); the distinctive V-final versus V2 alternations that Afrikaans permits in another polarity-related context, namely its embedded interrogatives (cf. Biberauer 2017); and the to date undescribed correlations and non-correlations between prosodic and interpretative focus mappings in this language. Afrikaans negative exclamatives, the authors argue, merit more detailed future attention.

The same conclusion can be drawn from **Robyn Berghoff**'s contribution, which focuses on another area of Afrikaans syntax that has benefitted from Johan Oosthuizen's perceptive investigation: the left periphery of the Afrikaans clause, or that domain in which we expect to find, alongside fronted *wh*-elements, discourse-marked elements like topics and foci of different kinds. Contrary to what one might expect for a V2 language - in which, usually, only one phrasal element precedes the final verb - Botha and Oosthuizen (2009) demonstrate, on the basis of consideration of a range of suitably discourse-marked (i.e. non-neutral) structures, that Afrikaans appears to have rather a richly articulated left periphery, or CP-domain; in fact, they show that the Afrikaans left periphery does not appear to be entirely identical to the articulated CP that has been proposed for other well-studied European languages. Berghoff's concern is with a specific left-peripheral ordering option that Botha and Oosthuizen's modified template rules out. This ungrammatical structure, she argues, may, like others that have profitably been considered elsewhere in generative syntactic investigation, serve as a diagnostic for what a truly explanatory account of Afrikaans's left-peripheral structure might look like. Her proposal in the present case is that the illicit order can be understood as one which violates Grohmann's (2003) anti-locality constraint, i.e. it follows from an element in the ungrammatical structure having to undergo unduly local movement within a given domain in order to generate the structure, which, consequently, falls foul of Grohmann's ban on insufficiently distant movement.

The final paper in this Part has a much broader focus than those that went before: writing in Afrikaans, **Christo van Rensburg** sets his sights on the remarkably complex and ever-fascinating question of that language's route towards standardisation. More specifically, he

considers the context at the start of the previous century, when Lord Milner was Governor at the Cape and eager to unite all of South Africa under the British flag. Milner's objective, at a time where both English and Dutch counted as official languages, was to establish English as the exclusive language of higher functions in South Africa. Van Rensburg highlights the efforts, against this backdrop, of Cornelis Jacobus (C.J.) Langenhoven in making the case for Afrikaans - the language actually spoken by those of Dutch extraction - to be used, in preference to Dutch, as the medium of instruction for Afrikaans-speaking pupils. Today most famous as the writer of the words of *Die Stem* ("The Call") - which served as South Africa's national anthem until 1994, and part of which now constitutes the Afrikaans and English components of the current national anthem - Langenhoven was a member of parliament in 1914 when he constructed some clever arguments to convince the Dutch-oriented South African Academy for Language, Literature and Art (the *Zuid-Afrikaansche Akademie voor Taal, Letteren en Kunst*) to support his plan to introduce Afrikaans as a language of choice in schools. These arguments, which somewhat unexpectedly secured the support of the *Akademie*, are the focus of van Rensburg's contribution.

2.2. Part II: Beyond Afrikaans - linguistic diversity in southern Africa

Part II widens the focus beyond just Afrikaans, but retains a firm focus on southern Africa, demonstrating some of the linguistic diversity attested in this region.

Theresa Biberauer, Marie van Heukelum and Lalia Duke take as their point of departure the *no* that surfaces in *How are you? No, I'm fine.* sequences in South African English (SAE). This *no*, which frequently surprises non-SAE speakers, is, the authors show, also found in other contexts in other varieties of English; its prominence in SAE, however, they relate to the more general prominence of specifically hearer-directed YES- and NO-forms in this variety and the languages with which it is in contact, notably Afrikaans and also Bantu languages like isiXhosa. This strong hearer-orientedness is argued to reflect more than just a difference in usage; appealing to recent generative work on the "syntacticization of discourse" and on crosslinguistic differences in the formal make-up of answering systems, the authors propose that speakers of SAE, Afrikaans and Bantu languages spoken in southern Africa (and beyond) have at their disposal an extensive inventory of YES- and NO-forms that are syntactically represented in a manner distinct from the familiar propositionally oriented anaphoric *yeses* and *nos* of standard English.

The next two papers in this Part focus on South African Sign Language (SASL). **Anne Baker**'s contribution is specifically concerned with aspects of the form of poetry in SASL. Baker's purpose is to consider the nature of some of the devices that sign languages have at their disposal in order to facilitate literary expression. Her paper centres on a specific SASL poem, *Soweto* by Modiegi Moime. This Baker uses to demonstrate the multi-layered meaning that can be created in sign language poetry owing to the fact that it can draw on both manual and non-manual components (eyebrow movement, facial expressions, head movements, etc.).

The interaction of manual and non-manual components is also central to **Kate Huddleston**'s paper. This contribution specifically focuses on the ways in which negation is encoded in SASL, picking up on recent typological work that has suggested that sign language negation systems may be categorised as either manual dominant or non-manual dominant (cf. Zeshan 2006). Like most other aspects of SASL at this point, the formal make-up of its negation

system is understudied. The single previous study on this topic - De Barros and Siebörger (2016) - had, however, suggested that SASL may belong to the non-manual dominant type. Against this backdrop, Huddleston's paper presents preliminary data from a new study, which will investigate SASL negation more systematically. She shows that SASL in fact appears to make use of a range of negation-marking strategies, including one - the so-called *polar Question-Answer clause* - which has not attracted attention in the negation literature to date. Like Baker's, this contribution, then, highlights the richness of a linguistic system that unquestionably deserves more detailed attention in future research.

This richness is also very apparent in the next three papers in this Part, all of which are concerned with languages from the Khoe family. It seems fair to say that this family is probably Johan's most recent linguistic passion: one of his last undertakings at Stellenbosch University, for example, was his involvement in the documentation of Tjwao, an under-researched, severely endangered language of the eastern Kalahari-Khoe family.

Appropriately, then, Tjwao is also the focus of one of the contributions to this volume. **Anne-Maria Fehn** and **Admire Phiri** present original data relating to personal pronouns and nominal gender-number marking in this language. On the basis of an examination of the use of personal pronouns, and the forms that case inflections and plural marking may take, Fehn and Phiri conclude that the patterns found in Tjwao deviate substantially from what has been described for other Kalahari Khoe varieties. These differences, the authors hypothesize, might have a bearing on our understanding of the diachrony of the nominal marking that characterises the entire Khoe language family.

Menán Du Plessis, in turn, ventures into the field of toponomastics, and analyzes the etymology of the four rivers "*haka !gariku*" mentioned in a previously unpublished fragment in the Khoekhoe variety that was once spoken by the Korana people of South Africa. Du Plessis deals in detail with the etymology of the river whose identity and whose original Khoekhoe name is the most problematic - the so-called fourth river. She concludes that the fourth river most likely was the |Kx'aba, the Qhaba, or the Mgqaba. The name is an example of a folk etymological re-analysis, in which two or more original names and their meanings conflate due to formal syncretism, inter-generational transmission, and cross-linguistic convergence.

Alexander Andrason's focus is the role of Khoekhoe languages in shaping the phonetics and phonology of the most prominent African language spoken in the Western Cape and taught at Stellenbosch University - isiXhosa. Andrason examines the thesis according to which ideophones - or forms that evoke ideas in sound - are likely to carry original donor material to a given target language owing to their phonological aberrancy and tendency to be transferred in a relatively unaltered manner. The author analyzes a sample of the eighteen, most credibly Khoekhoe-sourced ideophones found in isiXhosa, testing them for the aberrant features crosslinguistically associated with ideophones: the presence of unusual sounds and sound configurations, a distinctive use of length and tones, and the presence of harmony effects. Andrason concludes that Khoekhoe-sourced ideophones exhibit a high degree of phonological aberrancy and, therefore, might have played a relevant role in the Khoekhoe-isiXhosa transfer, being possibly responsible for the introduction of certain phonological novelties to the isiXhosa sound system.

The final paper in this Part, by **Alexander Andrason** and **Marianna Visser**, has an even broader comparative focus: the synchronic variation of cognate objects of weather verbs in six African languages of South Africa, namely Sepedi, Sesotho, Tshivenda, isiXhosa, Xitsonga, and isiZulu. Andrason and Visser argue that the similarities and the differences exhibited by the cognate objects in those languages have a diachronic foundation, revealing a universal grammaticalization path. This path leads from prototypical cognate objects, which disallow object agreement (pronominalization) and promotion to subjects in passive constructions, to prototypical objects, for which both agreement (pronominalization) and promotion are fully grammatical. The six languages analyzed by the authors attest to the various stages of this path, including those that are intermediate and categorially fuzzy. Therefore, Andrason and Visser suggest, the paper provides further support for the modelling of grammatical categories (cognate objects, adjuncts, and arguments) in terms of a continuum and for their gradient, non-essentialist, and non-discrete understanding.

2.3. Part III: The peculiarities of Germanic

The four papers making up Part III have a common focus on Germanic and the empirical and theoretical challenges that it poses.

Tarald Taraldsen's contribution considers structures like *Gee my maar 'n rooie!* (literally: give me but a red-E, i.e. "Oh, just give me a red one!"), the kind of instruction one might imagine Johan - or, indeed, Tarald - issuing in a wine-drinking context, for example. Both Afrikaans and Dutch feature these *one*-less, *-e*-marked NP-ellipsis (NPE) structures; as was the case with the apparently shared periphrastic past in Zwart's paper, Taraldsen, however, demonstrates that Afrikaans NPE must be formally rather different to its Dutch counterpart. In the latter, grammatical gender evidently plays a significant role in determining *-e*-realisation, whereas grammatical gender is no longer encoded in the Afrikaans nominal system. To account for the retention in Afrikaans of the originally gender-regulated pattern, Taraldsen proposes a particular relation between formal gender features and the semantic notions 'count' and 'mass'. Intriguingly, certain Scandinavian varieties would seem to provide further evidence of the proposed relation.

Norbert Corver's contribution is also concerned with a suffixal peculiarity, this time one that surfaces in Dutch and Frisian varieties: the appearance of what seems to be functional material corresponding to definite and indefinite articles low down in the nominal extended projection. Giethoorn Dutch *miende* - literally: mine-DE, i.e. "mine", where *de* is a definite article in Dutch - is a case in point. Corver's proposal is that forms like this do indeed feature a functional element that has - atypically, if we consider standard wisdom since Grimshaw (1991) on the internal make-up of extended projections - been merged low down in the structure, in the position usually reserved for the extended projection-initiating lexical element. That is, *-de* in our Giethoorn example is in fact merged at the base of the nominal extended projection, conceivably as a root that is then nominalised to initiate a nominal extended projection.

Jochen Zeller's contribution is also concerned with "small stuff" at the bottom of the extended projection, and with the potential theoretical insights that may be obtained from paying close attention to the mechanisms via which such material can plausibly be integrated into a larger structure. His particular concern is with the theoretical insight that becomes

available if one considers the “low-down” question of how structure labelling is achieved at the sub-word level. In the context of the by now much-discussed labelling algorithm of Chomsky (2013), labelling can only be achieved by elements endowed with some formal feature specification; as such, roots, if these are taken to be syntactically inert, featureless elements, would not be expected to contribute to labelling. Drawing on data from German - which could be replicated across West Germanic - Zeller, however, provides evidence from the derivation of particle verbs and particle nouns that a category-neutral root may project. Chomsky’s proposal that roots do not qualify as labels therefore seems to be undermined by the properties of this Germanic dataset.

The final contribution in this section differs from the other three in not specifically being concerned with a “small” element; **Roland Hinterhölzl** does, however, focus on a Germanic syntax-defining property - Verb Second (V2) - which he proposes to deconstruct in a way that suggests that this “big property” may also be best understood if one approaches it from the perspective of its constituent parts. In contrast to what one might think of as the “traditional” approach to V2, in terms of which this property might be viewed as following from the setting of a single parameter - sometimes called the V2 Parameter (see Holmberg 2015) - Hinterhölzl argues that V2 as it manifests in West Germanic at least is regulated by two distinct requirements. The first of these, the so-called *Phase Condition*, requires that the phase head be lexicalised, and the second, an interface condition, determines the identity of the phase head that permits a flexible phase edge. This latter condition in particular is then argued to facilitate insight into the kinds of V2-V3 alternations observed in West Germanic varieties like Kiezdeutsch and West Flemish.

2.4. Part IV: Beyond Germanic and Africa - puzzles ancient and modern

The volume’s final Part contains papers dedicated to languages removed in both time and space from southern Africa: Biblical Hebrew and Quechua, as it is spoken in modern-day Ecuador and Peru. The former is a language to which Johan has continuously been exposed through enduring friendships and scholarly collaboration, while the latter are varieties that Pieter Muysken’s association with Stellenbosch has more recently added to the linguistic discussion menu in Johan’s home department.

Christo van der Merwe addresses the issue of fronting, a topic that has been passionately debated in Biblical Hebrew scholarship in recent years (cf. Andrason, Westbury and van der Merwe 2016 for an overview). Van der Merwe proposes to analyze the phenomenon of fronting from a constructional perspective, thus understanding it as a motivated polysemy pattern that encodes a set of semantic-pragmatic functions. He argues that progress in making sense of the currently 30% of fronting cases that do not seem amenable to ready explanation may be made if at least some of these cases are associated with the function of expressing exhaustive exclusion. He motivates his proposal by observing that Biblical Hebrew does not feature any other grammaticalised construction or other form to realise this function, whose opposite is readily expressed by the quantifier לְ “all, whole, every”.

Cyntha Miller-Naudé and **Jacobus Naudé** examine another polemical issue in Biblical Hebrew syntax: left dislocation (cf. Holmstedt and Jones 2014, Andrason, Westbury and van der Merwe 2016). The authors concern themselves, in particular, with the distinction of left dislocation found in verbless clauses from the so-called *tripartite verbless clauses*, i.e. clauses

that consist of two nominal phrases and a linking pronominal element. Via the prosodic evidence available from the Masoretic system of conjunctive and disjunctive accents, which to a degree reflects the prosodic phrasing of the original text, allowing it to, to some extent, to “speak”, Miller-Naudé and Naudé show how it is possible to differentiate, syntactically and prosodically, two types of verbless clauses: left-dislocated verbless clauses, on the one hand, and regular tripartite verbless clauses, on the other. According to the authors, these two types of clauses contain two different pronominal elements and, more generally, reflect two different underlying structures. Very small clues - in this case, the Masoretic accents - can facilitate the kind of fine-grained analysis that one might not have thought possible in respect of an ancient language.

Christian Locatell battles with another issue hotly debated in Biblical Hebrew scholarship: the nature of grammatical semantics in light of its inherent polysemy and the perspective from grammaticalization theory (Andrason 2011, 2016). Locatell examines how the polysemy of grammatical meaning and its grammaticalization have been approached by cognitive linguistics and by more formal theories, in particular, generative grammar, in studies devoted to Biblical Hebrew. He observes that cognitive linguistics and generative grammar give dissimilar prominence to polysemy and grammaticalization when analyzing idiolects – a difference that is certainly motivated by the distinct methodological stances of the two theories and their research objectives. Nevertheless, in the study of a language system that emerges from inter-generational corpora, such as the Hebrew Bible, the understanding of grammatical meaning as grammaticalization-driven polysemy is unavoidable. That is, at the level of language community, forms are polysemous and this polysemy, inevitably, has a grammaticalization-driven foundation. Therefore, the description and analysis of grammatical forms and meanings at the level of what we might think of as “corporalects” may constitute a common ground for both generative and cognitive linguists, even though they continue to disagree on the structure of particular idiolects.

The final paper in this section and in the volume overall is also concerned with grammaticalization. The markers expressing the genitive and benefactive case in Ecuadorian and Peruvian Quechua are **Peter Muysken**'s object of study. He observes that these case markers have, in the Ecuadorian variety, become formally indistinguishable. According to Muysken, this surface fact should not, however, be taken to reflect a comparable merger at the level of the underlying representation. The strongest evidence in favour of this conclusion comes from attested dialect variation, which demonstrates that there is no unified category genitive-benefactive. Rather, the genitive and the benefactive systematically constitute two independent categories. Muysken thus concludes that grammatical micro-variation may reveal complex underlying patterns that are invisible on the descriptive surface.

Little things, then, should never be under-estimated, and, as all of the papers in this volume show, language systems, no matter their genetic and historical heritage, their location, their age, or their modality, reward careful study.

References

Andrason, A. 2011. The Biblical Hebrew verbal system in light of grammaticalization: The second generation. *Hebrew Studies*, 52: 19-51.

Andrason, A. 2016. The complexity of verbal semantics - an intricate relationship between QATAL and WAYYIQTOL. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 16(4): 1-96.

Andrason, A., J. Westbury and C. van der Merwe 2016. *Left dislocation. An exploration in linguistic typology. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 50.

Biberauer, T. 2017. Optional V2 in modern Afrikaans: a Germanic peculiarity. In B. Los and P. de Haan (eds). *Word order change in acquisition and language contact: essays in honour of Ans van Kemenade*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 79-99.

Botha, M. and J. Oosthuizen. 2009. Die struktuur van die linker-sinsgrens in Afrikaans. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 37: 1-68.

Chomsky, N. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua*, 130: 33-49.

Conradie, J. 2007. The final stages of deflection: the case of Afrikaans *het* 'have'. In J. Salmons and S. Dubenion-Smith (eds). *Historical linguistics 2005. Selected papers from 17th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, Wisconsin, 31 July - 5 Aug. 2005*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp. 207-221.

De Barros, C. and I. Siebörger. 2016. Sentential negation in South African Sign Language: A case study. *Literator*, 37(2): 1-13.

Delfitto, D. and G. Fiorin 2014. Negation in exclamatives. *Studia Linguistica*, 68(3): 284-327.

Grimshaw, J. 1991. Extended projection. Unpublished manuscript, Brandeis university.

Grohmann, K. K. 2003. *Prolific domains: on the anti-locality of movement dependencies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Haegeman, L. and R. Zanuttini. 1996. Negative Concord in West Flemish. In A. Belletti and L. Rizzi (eds). *Parameters and functional heads. Essays in comparative syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.117-179.

Holmberg, A. 2015. Verb second. In T. Kiss and A. Alexiadou (eds). *Syntax. An international handbook of contemporary syntactic research*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 343-384.

Holmstedt, R. D. and A. R. Jones. 2014. The pronoun in tripartite verbless clauses in Biblical Hebrew: resumption for left-dislocation or pronominal copula? *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 59(1): 53-89.

Oosthuizen, J. 1998. The final *nie* in Afrikaans negative sentences. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 61-94.

Zanuttini, R. 1997. *Negation and clause structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeshan, U. (ed.). 2006. *Interrogative and negative constructions in sign languages*. Nijmegen: Ishara Press.