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Despite regular objections, creole research tends to regard Europeans-to-non-Europeans ratios in colonial settings as a decisive factor in degrees of restructuring. As a result, relatively high proportions of Europeans are seen as the explanation for the emergence of partially restructured varieties. Quite problematic, however, is that some colonial settings with relatively low proportions of Europeans show little historical evidence of restructuring. To address this apparent paradox while avoiding too locale-specific explanations, I attempt to sketch a unified sociolinguistic account of restructuring, or the absence thereof. Central to the account I propose is the notion of upward social mobility in colonial societies, whose linguistic impact I illustrate by means of a comparison between Orange River Afrikaans (ORA)¹ and Cape Malay Dutch (CMD), i.e. two partially restructured non-European varieties of Dutch that arose at the colonial Cape. I emphasize that ORA, which developed in socially fluid frontier settings, seems in certain respects to display less restructuring than CMD, which developed in increasingly segregated settings. I present the fact that Europeans were less represented where ORA developed than where CMD did as evidence that social mobility might to an extent override European/non-European demographics as a factor in degrees of restructuring. I finally discuss the extent to which a socio-historical reconstruction of ORA and CMD can shed light

¹ ‘I generally refer as ‘Afrikaans’ to all Dutch-derived varieties spoken in South Africa past 1925, i.e. the date when the label ‘Afrikaans’ was introduced in the South African Union’s constitution, and probably gained hegemony in folk taxonomies as a result (cpr. Deumert 2004: 59–63; Scholtz 1980: 115). By implication, I refer as ‘(Cape) Dutch’ to all Dutch-derived varieties spoken in South Africa before 1925. This explains my choice for the label ‘Cape Malay Dutch,’ which is in line with a strong tendency among late 19th/early 20th century Cape Malays to refer to their language variety as ‘Dutch’ (Davids 1991: 129–133). However, by want of evidence of a distinctive contemporary label applied to varieties of Cape Dutch spoken along the Orange River, I conform to the practice of referring to these varieties as ‘Orange River Afrikaans’ irrespective of the date at which the label ‘Afrikaans’ came in official use.
on historical sociolinguistic developments elsewhere than the Cape, such as in particular colonial Iberian America.

1. Introduction

Despite regular objections, creole research tends to regard Europeans-to-non-Europeans ratios in colonial settings as a decisive factor in degrees of restructuring. As a result, relatively high proportions of Europeans are seen as the explanation for the emergence of partially restructured varieties, as opposed to the so-called ‘radical’ creoles which emerged in certain Caribbean plantation societies where Europeans fast became heavily outnumbered by Africans or Afro-descendants. Quite problematic, however, is that some colonial settings with relatively high proportions of Africans and Afro-descendants, such as in particular the northern part of South America’s regions under Spanish and Portuguese dominion, show little historical evidence of restructuring, whereas, according to established demographic reasoning in creole research, they should. Should sociolinguistic accounts of restructuring perhaps shift their focus onto factors other than purely demographic in order to accommodate cases which, thus far, have been regarded as ‘anomalies’ requiring locale-specific explanations? If so, what should these factors be?

I attempt to answer this question by arguing that the presence or absence of restructuring, and degrees of restructuring, are determined by tensions between collective pressure for developing a Medium of Community Solidarity (Baker 2000) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, incentives for non-Europeans to appropriate the acrolectal\(^2\) norm. My claim is that where colonial societies afforded non-Europeans the possibility of upward social mobility across ethnic boundaries, that is, where the social status enjoyed by Europeans was at least notionally achievable by non-Europeans within or on the fringes of colonial society, restructuring was less likely to take place than in colonial societies marked by strong segregationist ideologies enforcing social inequality between Europeans and non-Europeans.

I substantiate this claim using a case study that involves a language variety often referred to as a ‘creoloid’, namely, Cape Dutch, which arose at the colonial Cape from the late 17th century onwards. Two basilectal Cape Dutch varieties associated with non-Europeans come under scrutiny: Orange River Afrikaans (ORA), which developed in the context of a socially fluid frontier society on Cape Colony’s

---

2. For the purpose of this paper, I use ‘acrolectal’ interchangeably with the terms ‘standard’ and ‘European’, except where a distinction is compelled by historical evidence. As it turns out, a distinction is compelled in the case of Cape Dutch, where ‘acrolect’ could mean Standard Dutch, or simply the less basilectal variety of Dutch spoken by the European elite (see Section 4).
fringes, and Cape Malay Dutch (CMD), which developed in the context of a highly segregated colonial society. Although it seems that differences in levels of restructuring must often be left to guesswork (Neumann-Holzschuh & Schneider 2000), I discuss indications that CMD underwent more restructuring than ORA, and relate these indications to the patterns of social mobility characteristic of the societal structures in which the two varieties developed.

This article is organized as follows. First, I review the factors that have been described as influential in the emergence of partially restructured varieties while testing the relevance of these factors against the problematic case of colonial Ibero-America. Second, I introduce the sociolinguistic features of colonial Cape society, as well as the various hypotheses that were made in connection with the emergence of Cape Dutch. I then proceed to describe some of the defining features of ORA and CMD while resituating these two varieties in the socio-historical perspective of the colonial Cape. I finally propose a sociolinguistic account of restructuring which relies on the socio-historical assessment of social mobility in colonial environments.

2. Creole research and social mobility

However diverse, most social perspectives in creole research agree in seeing in the non-European populations’ access to the superstrate language a dominant social factor, if not the overarching social factor, in the dynamics of restructuring which led, among other things, to the emergence of creole languages. Access to the superstrate language has for a large part been measured in terms of demographic relations between Europeans and non-Europeans: Colonial settings where a linguistically diverse non-European population co-existed with a sizeable European population seem to have been less conducive to restructuring than settings where Europeans formed a small minority (Arends 2006: 316). It is generally assumed that full-fledged creoles (i.e. significantly restructured varieties with ‘typical’ creole features) have arisen in colonial settings whose populations comprised no more than 20% Europeans, a cut-off point proposed by Bickerton (1981: 4), and regularly referred to ever since in creole research. By contrast, the demographic conditions for the emergence of partially restructured varieties with few of the ‘typical’ creole features, are less sharply pinpointed. Wherever such

3. Bakker et al. (2011) list SVO word order, pre-verbal TMA marking, and little or no morphology, as the structural characteristics of creoles.

4. Partially restructured varieties have been called ‘semi-creoles’ and ‘creoloids’ (cf. Mesthrie 2008).
varieties emerged, the European population exceeded 20% of the totals, but not to the point of numerically ‘overwhelming’ non-Europeans (Holm 2000: 136). The explanatory power of macro-demographic data alone (often used at the expense of micro-demographic data, see Baker 2000: 44) seems questionable considering, for example, the fact that the American South saw the emergence of a partially restructured English variety, i.e. African American Vernacular English (AAVE), which is endowed with more creole features than any Spanish variety that seems to have seen the light in Spanish America (Parkvall 2000: 197), even though the share of Europeans in the population of the American South was higher than in many Spanish American colonies.5

In a range of cases where macro-demographic factors alone cannot account for degrees of restructuring, creole research has sought to combine them with a time factor, namely, the period of time elapsed till a non-European population reaches numerical parity with, or outnumbers, its European counterpart (Parkvall 2000). A relatively long period of European majority, or of relative parity between Europeans and non-Europeans, yields marginally restructured varieties that subsequent non-European arrivals acquire, however demographically preponderant they become (Mufwene 1996). Combining time factors with macro-demographics still cannot account for a range of linguistic developments. An example is Réunionnais Creole (RC). RC first underwent but partial restructuring in an environment where Europeans were initially dominant in number, a process whose legacy is nowadays preserved in the local European population’s varieties. Later on, RC underwent more extensive restructuring in the wake of mass non-European in-migration (Chaudenson 2000, see further Section 6). The apparent irrelevance of macro-demographic explanations, with or without regard for time factors, has encouraged locale-specific explanations. For example, McWhorter (2000) ascribes the apparent absence of creolization in Spanish America to the fact that Spain possessed no slave dépôt in West Africa, whence a Spanish-based pidgin could have been exported. But why, then, is there also hardly any trace of creolization of Portuguese in Brazil, while the Portuguese did have slave dépôts in West Africa where Portuguese-based pidgins did arise? Answers to that question typically surmise that Brazil forms a sociolinguistic exception. Upon their arrival, Afro-Brazilians were faced with Língua Geral rather than with Portuguese, while African languages stayed in use for a relatively long time, and there is an opinion that these two facts could have reduced the scope for creolization (cf. Holm 2000: 48). But the various attestations of Africans adopting Portuguese from an early

5. For a diachronic overview of the racial composition of Spanish America’s population, see Mörner (1967). Concise diachronic data for the American South are found in Holm (2000: 32–36).
stage,\textsuperscript{6} and also of them spreading it into the interior,\textsuperscript{7} seem to undermine these explanations (see further Section 6).

It seems that, in order to have explanatory power, demographic data must be handled in conjunction with specific social factors. Among these social factors I see as crucial that of upward social mobility across original intergroup boundaries, by which I refer to the scope for non-Europeans to achieve, or at least progress towards, a social status comparable to that of Europeans. That scope is determined by what Mintz (1969: 12) describes as the ‘codes of social relations governing the statuses and social interactions of different groups’. The more ‘liberal’ these codes are, that is, the more they allow in practice for manumission (in the case of slave-holding societies) and/or for the emergence of non-European social strata (economically and genetically) intermediate between the European ruling group and the non-European labouring classes, the less likely the occurrence of restructuring.\textsuperscript{8} Mintz’ reasoning reflects notions established in acculturation models elaborated by social psychology: High-status groups that display an acculturative orientation tend to linguistically assimilate low-status groups, whereas low-status groups are less likely to assimilate to high-status groups when these display a self-segregating behaviour (cf. Giles 1979; Bourhis et al. 1997). However, subsequent sociolinguistic models of creolization do not seem preoccupied with the linguistic impact of what Giles (1979) calls ethnolinguistic ‘boundary hardness’. Instead, they tend to account for restructuring as a universal response of low-status groups to colonial power structures, however divergent the forms that these power structures assumed and the social responses they triggered.

Representative of those sociolinguistic models, that proposed by Baker (2000) follows the assumption that creoles arose among non-Europeans in colonial contexts of racial segregation with the symbolic purpose of functioning as in-group solidarity-marking codes (i.e. what he calls ‘Mediums of Community Solidarity’, or MCS, which in his model develop out of ‘Mediums of Interethnic Communication’.

---


\textsuperscript{7} Freyre (1933[1986]: 285) observes that ‘runaway slaves had spread among the Indians a knowledge of the Portuguese language and the Catholic religion before any white missionary had done so’, and that their mixed offspring showed fluency in Portuguese.

\textsuperscript{8} Mintz (1969) names two other factors which he considers relevant to restructuring, namely, the relative proportions of European and non-European groups (which partly relates his perspective to Bickerton’s), and ‘sorts of community settings’, whereby the overarching distinction he makes is one between plantation and non-plantation societies. For the purpose of this paper, I am focusing on the factor he calls ‘codes of social interaction’, which I subsume in the concept of ‘social mobility’.
or MIC). By contrast, Chaudenson (1992) postulates that non-Europeans in colonial contexts were engaged in a collective – and to an extent unsuccessful – effort to acquire European norms, whose prestige they more or less consistently acknowledged. Although Singler (2006: 341–2, 343–4) presents these two views as fundamentally irreconcilable (and in fact dismisses Chaudenson’s view), they may as well be complementary if viewed from the perspective of acculturation dynamics established by social psychology: The extent to which assimilation into a high-status group is collectively experienced as an option by the low-status group is, from an acculturation perspective, likely to determine the need for an MCS. An indicator of how soft high-status social groups’ ethnolinguistic boundaries were in the specific colonial context of the plantation seems to be subsumed in two factors which Arends (2006) quite unspecifically describes as playing a part in restructuring, namely, the ‘free-to-enslaved ratio’ and the (historically largely synonymous) ‘mulatto-to-black ratio’. The fact that these ratios were distinctively high in certain slave-owning colonial societies which witnessed little or even no restructuring suggests that they should be incorporated in models of language dynamics in colonial contexts.

The Spanish, and also Portuguese, colonial regimes differed significantly from their Northern European counterparts for the continuous accessibility of legal freedom that they afforded both in theory and in practice to African slaves (Mörner 1967, Klein & Vinson 2007, Daniel 2006). As a result, non-Europeans in colonial Ibero-America – where colour stigmas prevailed in much the same terms as in other colonial societies – were given scope for appropriating ‘whiteness’ (which I refer to in Du Bois’ sense mostly as a social status symbol with possibly, yet not necessarily, racial connotations, see McMullan 2009). While ‘whitening’ strategies in colonial Ibero-America most visibly involved miscegenation (Mörner 1967), it seems reasonable from an acculturation perspective to assume that they also included efforts at appropriating European speech norms. In this context, actual exposure to large numbers of Europeans may have contributed less to language acquisition than motivation, especially in a context where at least the clergy was available as a target group (Chaudenson 1992: 124–125). Generally, this hypothesis could be supported by the fact that but few traces of significant restructuring have been found in colonial Ibero-America (McWhorter 2000, Lipski 2005). It could also be supported by comparing accounts of language behaviours among Afro-descendants in colonial Ibero-America and Afro-descendants in the American South: Linguistic convergence of non-Europeans to Europeans seems to have been encouraged – or at least not obstructed – by Europeans in the former,
while it was frowned upon in the latter. European hostility to non-European efforts at assimilation is one factor which could explain the preservation until today of creole-like features in AAVE (Rickford 1999).

One can expect objections to be raised at using patterns of social mobility across ethnolinguistic boundaries to explain the sociolinguistic differences between colonial Ibero-America and the American South. These objections are likely to be derived from the increasingly critical perspectives taken on the alleged ‘mildness’ of Iberian slavery, which is hard to confirm or dismiss by sheer lack of systematic historical evidence (see further Daniel 2006, Klein & Vinson 2007). However, sociolinguistic developments in other colonial environments might lend credibility to social mobility as an essential factor in restructuring. This is what I attempt to verify in the following sections, which are devoted to historical sociolinguistic developments at the colonial Cape.

### 3. The colonial Cape and the emergence of Cape Dutch

Founded in 1652 by the Dutch East Indian Company (VOC) as a refreshment station on the sea route to the East Indies, the Cape of Good Hope originally bore resemblance to European forts dotting coastal Africa and Asia: A male-dominat-ed European society, in which small numbers of slaves were present, it was surrounded with indigenous populations, namely, the Khoikhoi, who were during the initial stages of contact intentionally left in a state of nominal political independence (Elphick 1985: 95–103, Boxer 1965: 187–9). Soon, however, it began to develop a reliance on slave labour, increasingly imported from Asia and Madagascar (Armstrong & Worden 1979: 129–30, Elphick & Shell 1979). It also began to acquire the attributes of a European settlement colony from the 1680s onwards, a period which saw the arrival of European settler families in significant numbers (Giliomee 2004: 11). As a result of European demographic expansion (and its assorted diseases), the traditional social structure of the surrounding Khoikhoi

---

9. See Lipski’s description of *habla palangana* and *negro catedrático*, i.e. the register of Afro-Peruvian and Afro-Cuban house servants, respectively, as hypercorrect Spanish varieties (2002: 136). Based on historical testimonies, Lucchesi (2009: 69) summarizes the Brazilian mulatto’s linguistic behaviour as follows: ‘O mulato sempre quis “falar dificil”, porque via a classificação social de quem sabia “falar dificil”. In reference to the American South, Dillard (1972: 207, 212) remarks that ‘the Negro’s occasional use of Standard English drew (…) resentment...’ as it implied laying claim to equality with whites. This resentment manifests a strategy of elite closure, which was also observable in colonial Louisiana: Louisiana French planters refrained from addressing blacks in anything else than French Creole, for fear of implying equality in social status (in Holm 1989: 389).
polities soon began to collapse, compelling the Khoikhoi to provide cheap labour
to European settlers, and to often amalgamate with the slave labour force in the
process (Elphick 1985: 170–5, 219–34, Worden 1985: 30, 35–6). Meanwhile, the
Cape colonial society had developed a dual character. On its western fringes, close
to the Cape of Good Hope settlement (later on Cape Town), a slave-holding farm-
ing society had developed around a number of large wine-growing estates. On its
eastern fringes, a frontier society had come about where Europeans, Khoikhoi,
and their mixed-blood offspring co-existed in notional equality (Legassick 1979,
Giliomee 1979, Marais 1962). This general societal context remained largely stable
until the abolition of slavery (1834) following the early 19th century British take-
over of the colony, and is generally considered to be the setting in which Cape
Dutch emerged.10

The Dutch Cape Colony’s linguistic history is patchy, especially the history of
linguistic developments among its non-European populations. There is evidence
from as early as the second half of the 17th century that non-Europeans, both
Khoikhoi and slaves, had begun to use Dutch-based varieties, first in the form of a
pidgin which must have served the purpose of a MIC (see Section 2). Den Besten
(1989) was first to propose a comprehensive scenario of language genesis at the
Cape, of which the main underpinning was that the Cape Khoikhoi had a linguis-
tic ‘founder effect’ on what he called ‘proto-Afrikaans I’, i.e. the Cape Dutch vari-
ety which den Besten alleges was spoken by both Khoikhoi and slaves. The main
argument that Den Besten (1989: 270) uses to support his claim that the Cape
Dutch variety spoken by slaves was derived from that spoken by the Khoikhoi is
the fact that Cape Dutch pidgin sentences uttered by Khoikhoi and slaves exhib-
ited the same distinctive Khoikhoi SOV order. The scarcity of 18th/19th century
linguistic data on language use among Cape Colony’s non-Europeans has been
an incentive for treating Orange River Afrikaans (ORA) – a variety of Afrikaans
that emerged in Cape Colony’s interior, nowadays spoken by a population with a
largely Khoikhoi ancestry (Ponelis 1998: 14) – as a synchronic window into the
period during which Cape Dutch was being nativized by non-Europeans. In den
Besten’s reasoning, the fact that – unlike Caribbean Dutch-based creoles – ORA
displays the Dutch SOV cum V2 order has one prominent explanation: It forms
a partial calque of Khoikhoi SOV (1989, 2002). How to explain, however, the ad-
justment from the strict SOV order of Khoikhoi to the Dutch SOV cum V2 order

10. Various dates have been – controversially – assigned to the emergence of Cape Dutch as
a distinctive variety (see Roberge 1994b for an in-depth discussion). Yet, if it remains open to
discussion how much of Cape Dutch was firmly in place by the end of the Dutch period, evi-
dence points towards a ‘discernible slope toward deflection’ (of Cape Dutch) from 1700 onwards
(Roberge 1994a: 22).
found in ORA? While seeking further substratal explanations for this adjustment, den Besten (1989, 2002) surmises that certain societal factors may also have been at play, such as in particular the relatively high demographic representation of Europeans at the Cape (den Besten 1989: 273). I argue in the following that Khoikhoi substratal influence and demographics were merely secondary factors in the adoption of not only Dutch SOV cum V2 into ORA, but also of a range of linguistic features more reflective of acrolectal Dutch than of current Afrikaans.

The first representative population census held at the Cape dates from 1798. It shows that Khoikhoi and Bastaards11 together accounted for c. 33,5% of Cape Colony’s population, while Europeans and slaves accounted for c. 24,8% and 39,4%, respectively, the rest (2,3%) being formed by Free Blacks (Elphick & Giliomee 1979: 524). Based on these figures, what could make a creolist argue that Europeans were too significantly represented for significant restructuring to take place is that the ratio of Europeans to non-Europeans was located beyond Bickerton’s 20% cut-off point, past which the likelihood of creolization decreases (see Section 2). Besides, it is not warranted to see in indigenous populations – such as the Khoikhoi – a factor conducive to radical restructuring: Among the outcomes of restructuring among indigenous populations feature ‘fort creoles’, i.e. creoles that bear more resemblance to their superstrates than do plantation creoles (whose speakers descend from displaced populations), while exhibiting considerable substratal influence.12 However, to see in ORA the descendant of a ‘fort creole’, such as den Besten (1989: 226) does, conflicts with the rare direct evidence of Khoikhoi substratal influence in that variety (cf. Roberge 1994a for a critical overview of possible substratal elements in ORA). Explaining the relative invisibility of the Khoikhoi substrate based on putatively high Europeans-to-non-Europeans ratios is problematic. Since there is no evidence that Khoikhoi had nativized Dutch before the early 17th century smallpox epidemics that saw most of them retreat into the interior (Elphick 1985: 213, Nienaber 1963: 97–8), it can be assumed that they nativized it in inland regions where the European element was much less represented than near the colony’s power centre, i.e. certainly well below the Bickertonian 20% cut-off point.13 I propose in Section 4 a socio-historical account

11. Bastaards are the outcome of unions between Europeans and Khoikhoi (Marais 1962). I describe this group in more detail in Section 4, and the Free Blacks in Section 5.

12. The term ‘fort creole’ was coined by Bickerton (1981) in reference to creoles that emerged in and around European forts and settlements, often in mixed relationships and in contexts involving no population displacement. Fort creoles display more similarities with their superstrates than do plantation creoles or maroon creoles.

13. The number of Khoikhoi had precipitously declined by 1798 (cf. Elphick & Giliomee 1979: 524, Elphick 1977: 235–6). However, they remained demographically preponderant in the
of non-European Cape Dutch varieties in Cape Colony’s interior, of which I consider historical ORA data as representative. The apparent lack of restructuring in those historical ORA data is primarily accounted for by other factors than the demographic representation of Europeans (or substratal influence).

Whereas Cape Colony’s interior was semi-nomadic and overwhelmingly Khoikhoi, the Cape of Good Hope and its direct surroundings was sedentary and relied heavily on slave labour (cf. Guelke 1979, Elphick & Shell 1979). Although this mere fact could warrant a full restructuring scenario, creolist perspectives taken on Cape Dutch such as Roberge (1994a: 13) depict that region’s socio-economic environment as unfavourable to the emergence of a local Dutch-based creole on the ground of not only high ratios of Europeans to slaves (hovering between 1:2 and 1:1, see Armstrong & Worden 1979: 129), but also of the relatively low average numbers of slaves owned by Europeans. Those 19th century manuscripts written by the descendants of Free Blacks/slaves in a distinctive variety of Cape Dutch (which I refer to as Cape Malay Dutch), of which some has been transliterated (see Section 5), have been largely ignored, or treated as idiolectal and thus implicitly unlikely to shed light on linguistic developments at the Cape, however idiosyncratic their linguistic features (such as in particular the occurrence of SVO) turned out to be (Davids 1991: 279–82, see further Section 5). Similarly, synchronic features of Cape Afrikaans, an Afrikaans variety spoken in the western Cape whose speakers are mostly descendants of slaves/Free Blacks (van Rensburg 1989), have been deemed unusable for historical reconstructions of Cape Dutch due to the changes that that variety has allegedly undergone as a result of intense contact with English. This gap in the Cape’s linguistic history has been filled by

---

14. For the purpose of this article I mean by ‘interior’ the geographic area covered by what Ponelis (1993: 63) calls ‘Northwestern Afrikaans’, which implicitly subsumes what creolists have rather been calling ORA. Northwestern Afrikaans extends along the west coast from approximately 200 km. north of Cape Town to the Richtersveld at the Orange River mouth and into southern Namibia, extending eastwards along the Orange River to the Douglas-Kimberley area in the Northern Cape.

15. When he does comment on Cape Malay Dutch, Ponelis (1993, 1981) does so in reference to the Bayanûdin, i.e. a 19th century manuscript written in Cape Dutch by a Turkish emissary at the Cape and transliterated by van Selms (1979), emphasizing the author’s L2-speaker identity as an explanation for the grammatical idiosyncrasies found in the text.

16. This goes in particular for SVO in Cape Afrikaans (i.e. the Afrikaans variety nowadays spoken by the descendants of the slaves and Free Blacks, see further Section 5), which Kotzepté (1989:
'Proto-Afrikaans I', which den Besten (1989, 2002) assumed the slaves took over from the Khoikhoi, albeit infusing it with a few Asian phonetic and morphosyntactic features in the process (den Besten 2001). Based on a range of specific linguistic features relatively well-documented across the historical varieties of Cape Dutch, namely, the realization of initial consonant clusters, inflectional patterns in finite verbs, the negation, and the position of the verbal element, I propose in Section 5 an alternative socio-historical account of linguistic developments in Cape Colony’s initial European settlement area in which the local socio-economic settings are – unlike in previous accounts – not assumed to be unfavourable to significant restructuring.

4. Cape Dutch on the colonial frontier

Den Besten (1989) considers ORA to be the direct descendant of what he calls ‘Hottentot Dutch’, i.e. the Cape Dutch pidgin originally developed by the Khoikhoi in the vicinity of the European settlement at the Cape of Good Hope (see further den Besten 2001). When not marshalling his substratist interpretations, den Besten accounts for ORA’s relative typological proximity to Dutch as due to, among other societal factors, the relatively large demographic representation of Europeans at the Cape of Good Hope (see e.g. den Besten 1989: 273). Den Besten does not, however, comment on the quality of the Khoikhoi’s exposure to Dutch, which overall seems to have been quite low during the period which he sees as decisive in the formation of Hottentot Dutch, i.e. the period preceding the early 17th century smallpox outbreak which led to their mass-withdrawal into the interior (den Besten 1989, 2001, see further Section 3). The explanation for the Khoikhoi’s low exposure to Dutch during that period is twofold. Being legally free while in the initial stages retaining their political autonomy allowed the Khoikhoi to keep some measure of physical and cultural distance from Dutch colonial society. But they were all the while also to a large extent excluded from it, dwelling as a result on the fringes of the Cape of Good Hope settlement rather than within it (Worden et al. 1998: 66). Given this context of social separation, the sporadic attempts made in the 17th century to (culturally and legally) integrate Khoikhoi individuals in European colonial society before the smallpox epidemics did not yield convincing results (Elphick 1977: 205, Gerstner 1997: 25). Cultural (including linguistic) retention among the inland Khoikhoi during the 18th and 19th centuries should have been facilitated not only by the small size of the fledgling local population of European settlers (as a result of which exposure to Europeans was minimal), but
also by the strict segregation enforced by some of these settlers at the expense of the Khoikhoi (especially on the eastern frontier, see Guelke 1979: 93–8; Giliomee 1979: 458–9; Nienaber 1963: 97–8). What, given this context, may have triggered among the Khoikhoi not only a large-scale process of language shift to Dutch, but also one that led to a variety of Dutch such as ORA in which creolists see a distinctive acrolectal streak?

The interior witnessed the emergence of a socially stratified society, which featured an intermediate non-European social category distinguished by the closeness of its connections with Europeans and Cape colonial society. From the late 18th century, members of that intermediate social category could even elevate themselves into a hegemonic social position by founding polities beyond the pale of colonial control (see infra). Representative of that social category were the Bastaards, who were the offspring of mixed unions between early European nomadic pastoralists (i.e. the ‘trekboeren’) venturing into the interior and Khoikhoi women (Guelke 1979: 93, Marais 1962: 10–11). Also included in that social category were the Bastaard-Hottentots, whose name originally implied mixed slave and Khoikhoi parentage before more generally coming to refer to Khoikhoi individuals attached or formerly attached to European farmers (Penn 2005: 20–2). At the bottom of this hierarchy featured Khoi-Sans indentured to European farmers, as well as those groups of Khoikhoi and San who through self-insulation from colonial society managed for a while to maintain varying degrees of de facto political independence on the fringes of Cape Colony (Legassick 1979: 364–8, Marais 1962: 13–29). When these different groups began to adopt Dutch as a second or first language is difficult to gather from the historical record. It is quite certain, however, that 18th century Bastaards and Bastaard-Hottentots knew Dutch due the compulsory commando duties they were subject to (Penn 2005: 137–9).17 Dutch may have been less represented among independent Khoikhoi groups, and it was even reported in the early 19th century that independent San groups within Cape Colony hardly knew Dutch at all (cf. Penn 2005: 241). Two interrelated factors assisted in the spread of Dutch in the interior. The first factor was evangelization, whose appeal to non-Europeans in the interior proved strong on two accounts. First, it often involved collaboration with missionaries who were in a position to facilitate non-European populations’ participation in the colonial trade. Second, the acquisition of Christian credentials was a strategy for approximating the social prestige held by Europeans in a context where ‘Christian’ had been made largely coterminous with ‘European’ (Elbourne & Ross 1997: 35–6;

17. Subjection to commando duties alongside Europeans obviously required fluency in Dutch, as Europeans generally did not learn Khoikhoi except in isolated frontier conditions (Elphick 1985: 210).
The second factor was the emergence on the northern frontier of new polities organized around ethnically amalgamated groups referred to as the Oorlams and Griquas. The core of these groups was initially formed by Bastaards and Bastaard-Hottentots who, through their migrations beyond Cape Colony’s northern boundaries, as well as through their frequent close association with missionaries, had come to rally, if not subjugate, unacculturated Khoikhoi and San groups (Legassick 1979: 368–9, Ross 1976).

Evangelization in the interior went hand in hand with literacy in Dutch. The prestige value associated with Dutch is reflected in the anxiety expressed in 19th century Oorlam and Khoikhoi settlements north of the Orange River (in modern-day Namibia) for children to receive instruction from the missionaries in ‘only Dutch, nothing but Dutch’, and what seems to be the rejection of Nama (a northern offshoot of Khoikhoi) as a backward language (Steyn 1980: 126). The high demand for Dutch had to do with its status-elevating value. Much more than the legally ‘free’ status bestowed by colonial society upon Bastaards and Bastaard-Hottentots, privileged access to the missionaries was what defined in practice non-European individuals’ social status in the late 18th/19th century interior. Membership of the missionaries’ inner circles was first and foremost conditioned by the knowledge of Dutch – and thus by the capacity to act as intermediaries between them and monolingual Khoikhoi-speakers. As such, the knowledge of Dutch during that period often assumed the form of an attribute of social hegemony which Bastaards and Bastaard-Hottentots could wield over unacculturated Khoikhoi and San, as missionaries observed in early 19th century Oorlam polities (Dedering 1997: 163–4), where the knowledge of Dutch brought with itself potential for upward social mobility, be it in the form of close access to missionaries, or in the form of political hegemony over unacculturated non-Europeans, little scope must have been present for developing an alternative linguistic norm consciously set against European norms, or in other words, for developing a Dutch-based MCS (see Section 2). The linguistic features of the correspondence of Jan Jonker Afrikaner (a 19th century Oorlam chieftain from modern-day southern Namibia, hereafter ‘JJA’18), which comprises letters written between 1863 and 1881, analysed in detail by Luijks (2000, 2009), suggests that pursuing European linguistic norms was the aim of those who had a privileged contact with missionaries.

Among the linguistic features of JJA’s correspondence quantified by Luijks are three features widely described in the literature in connection with the theme of restructuring in Cape Dutch, namely, verbal morphology, the negation, and the

---

18. Jan Jonker Afrikaner (1820–1889) was taught to read and write by Hugo Hahn, a representative of the Rheinische Missionsgesellschaft, to whom he subsequently remained close (Luijks 2000: 75).
SOV cum V2 order. Morphological reduction in finite verbs in the present tense,\(^{19}\) a phenomenon which correlates with the emergence of the Standard Afrikaans verbal paradigm (Deumert 2004: 140), is observable in JJA’s usage, although the Dutch paradigm retains a significant presence (Luijks 2000: 199). Bare stem forms are generalized in the singular, except occasionally in the first person where hyper-correct –en endings may occur (e.g. *ik weten*, Std. Dutch *ik weet*, ‘I know’, Luijks 2000: 199). Bare stems are also generalized in the plural, except where Dutch-like pronominal forms are used instead of Afrikaans-like ones, in which case the stem takes on the –en ending.\(^{20}\) These data reflect late 19th/early 20th European Cape Dutch written usage as illustrated by the Corpus of Cape Dutch Correspondence (CCDC), where a significant morphological distinction remained in place between singular and plural finite tense forms, although the use of Afrikaans-like pronominal forms tended to trigger bare verbal stems as it did in JJA’s usage (Deumert 2004: 141–2, 284–5). An explanation for the comparability of verbal inflections in JJA’s correspondence and in the CCDC could be that, however loosely reflective of Standard Dutch, European Cape Dutch patterns were regarded as prestigious by non-Europeans in the interior. The same logic could explain why JJA consistently uses the Dutch single negation pattern (1) instead of the brace negation pattern (2). (Luijks 2009: 165), nowadays characteristic of Standard Afrikaans (2).

1. *Zoo kan ik ook niet weggegaan van huis af van de reigen*
   ‘So I couldn’t leave home because of the rain’
   (JJA, Luijks 2000: 233)

2. *Die pendeltuig kon nie-1 gelanseer word nie-2*
   ‘The shuttle could not be launched’
   (Ponelis 1993: 453)

---

\(^{19}\) The Dutch present tense paradigm for main verbs has three distinct forms: Stem (1SG, 2SG), stem with inflectional –t (3SG, 2PL), and stem with inflectional –en (Booij & van Santen 1995: 70–75). None of these distinctions remain in Standard Afrikaans, although traces of inflectional –t and –en remain in fossilized form (cf. Ponelis 1993: 383, 392, 411).

\(^{20}\) The 19th century Standard Dutch forms *wij* ‘we’ and *zij/zulle* ‘they’ are used in 27,5% and 48% of cases, respectively, as in *wij (...) hadden* ‘we had’ and *zy (...) verdienen* ‘they earn’, as opposed to the Afrikaans-like/non-standard forms *ons* ‘we’ and *hulle/henne(n)* ‘they’, used in 72,5% and 52% of cases, respectively, as in *ons moet* ‘we must’ and *henen maak* ‘they make’ (Luijks 2000: 96, 123, 199–200)
The brace negation, a syntactic feature of possible creole origin,\textsuperscript{21} seldom occurred in late 19th/early 20th European Cape Dutch written usage,\textsuperscript{22} as it was probably a stigmatized feature (Deumert 2004: 203). Non-Europeans in the interior are likely to have been aware of the stigma attached to that feature, and may accordingly have tried to avoid it.\textsuperscript{23} Another hegemonic acrolectal feature in JJA’s usage that points towards acrolectal pressure is SOV cum V2 (see example 3 with SOV cum V2 in the main clause, and SOV in the subordinate clause), whose generalization seems at odds with the strict SOV order of Hottentot Dutch (example 4, see further Luijks 2009: 166 and Section 3), while it is in line with European Cape Dutch usage (Ponelis 1993: 313, 320–1). Although Luijks attempts to provide a substratist explanation for SOV cum V2 in JJA’s usage,\textsuperscript{24} the fact stated in Section 3 remains: V2 represents a break from the strict SOV order characteristic of Khoikhoi and its Nama offshoot, which – following Luijks’ general argument – is not hard to reconcile with a systematic and conscious attempt at approximating acrolectal norms, the ultimate goal pursued by the Oorlams in Luijks’ own words (2000: 201).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (3) \textit{De zuidelyk Hoofden […] heb Wens van u te mogen horen}
\textit{Hebrew} Wens van u te mogen horen
\textit{The southern chiefs have wish of you to may hear}
\textit{The southern chiefs wish to hear from you’}
\textit{(JJA, Luijks 2000: 220, verbal elements underlined)}
\item (4) \textit{jou tovergoeds bra bytum, dat is waar, maar jou tovergoeds ook weer}
\textit{Your magic-stuff really bite that is true but your magic-stuff also again}
\textit{gezond makum}
\textit{healthy make}
\textit{‘Your medicine really hurts, that is true, but your medicine also heals’}
\textit{(Hottentot quoted by Kolbe 1727, quoted in den Besten 2002: 188, verbal elements underlined)}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{21} I refer to Roberge (2000) for a review of all competing theories on the origin of the Afrikaans brace negation. Although not a universal creole feature, multiple negators are found in a large range of creoles, in which they do not necessarily reflect substratal influence (Holm 1988: 172–4).

\textsuperscript{22} Deumert (2004: 202) observes that the brace negation pattern is used in only 21% of sentences featuring a negation in the CCDC.

\textsuperscript{23} This observation accords itself with the relative underrepresentation of brace negation patterns in modern-day ORA varieties (Stell 2011: 170–3).

\textsuperscript{24} According to Luijks (2000: 268), the application by Khoikhoi-speakers of the Dutch V2 rule may have been facilitated by an analogy between the position of the Dutch finite verb and the position of Khoikhoi clause-typing particles.
Casting JJA’s usage as a conscious effort at approximating acrolectal norms accords itself with various accounts of non-European linguistic usage in the interior. Whereas they show that the distinctive features of Afrikaans were widespread in local spoken usage, archival data from 19th and early 20th century Genadendal, i.e. a historically Khoikhoi settlement that sprang up from the early 18th century around the first mission station in Cape Colony’s interior, suggest that at least some of its inhabitants were also orally and literally proficient in acrolectal Dutch, and held it in higher esteem than the Afrikaans standard which Afrikaner nationalists had begun to promote from the late 19th century.\(^{25}\) The high value attached to acrolectal Dutch is also reflected in the observations made by Von Wielligh (1925: 238), who noted among the Griquas tendencies towards linguistic hyper-correction resulting in the infelicitous use of lexical items from the Dutch literary register. Due to its interest in uncovering a creole stage in Cape Dutch, it has been characteristic of research performed on historical ORA data to overwhelmingly focus on deviations from Standard Dutch norms, or on outwardly Dutch features that can be explained as the outcome of Khoikhoi substratal influence, i.e. one of den Besten’s explanations for ORA’s SOV order (see Section 3). However, the strong societal pull towards acrolectal Dutch norms seems the only plausible explanation for a considerable range of acrolectal Dutch features, or features approximating acrolectal Dutch patterns in ORA. Apart from inflectional patterns and SOV cum V2, one of those features not discussed by Luijks, yet relevant to a comparison with Cape Dutch in the western Cape (see Section 5), is initial consonant clusters. The fact that there is no trace of Dutch initial consonant clusters ever being syllabized in ORA seems inconsistent not only with creole phonotactics, but also with Khoikhoi phonotactics (see Roberge 1994a: 15 for a discussion in this regard).\(^{26}\) Although not dismissing the role that Khoikhoi may have played in

\(^{25}\). Indications of a broad spectrum of Dutch-based varieties in Genadendal are mostly found in quotes attributed to different characters of Khoikhoi origin in Benno Marx’ novel *Benigna van Groenekloof of Mamre: Een verhaal voor de Christen Klerlinge* (1873), and commented upon by Conradie as part of an unpublished oral intervention held in 2004. The high esteem in which Standard Dutch was held in Genadendal shows in a letter by the fictitious character ‘Alspraat’ published in *De Bode* (The Genadendal Mission’s publication) in 1905, reproduced and commented upon by Belcher (1987: 31). Tellingly, the author of that letter ‘takes a stand against the agenda of the 2nd Afrikaans Language Movement, advocating instead the maintenance of Standard Dutch (see further Du Plessis 1986: 69–72 and Conradie 2004).

\(^{26}\). Khoi-San languages do have consonant clusters, of which the range is limited in word-initial position to mostly combinations of a click and another consonant. Word-initial consonant clusters in Khoekhoeegowab that do not involve a click are generally loanwords, such as e.g. *skers* ‘scissors’, Dutch *schaar*, Afrikaans *skêr* ‘scissors’. Some Dutch/Afrikaans loanwords in Khoekhoeegowab show syllabization of their root-initial consonant clusters, such as e.g. *boroxos*
spreading SOV cum V2 in inland Cape Dutch varieties (Section 3), there seems to be a case for putting that syntactic structure on a par with word-initial consonant clusters (and the other features described above) as linguistic manifestations of a collective pursuit of acrolectal Dutch norms in the interior. The ultimate outcome of that collective pursuit seems to be that, among all modern-day Afrikaans varieties spoken by Coloureds in South Africa and Namibia, that spoken by Northern Cape Coloureds27 (with whom ORA is nowadays associated) is in grammatical terms most closely related to White Afrikaans and Standard Afrikaans, i.e. the historical successors to the acrolectal Dutch varieties spoken by Europeans in Southern Africa (Stell 2011: 226–32, see further Deumert 2004 and Uys 1983 for comprehensive discussions on the transition from Standard Dutch to Standard Afrikaans as a written standard).28

Yet, Europeans seem to have perceived Cape Dutch varieties in the interior as distinct from their own variety of Cape Dutch. That perception is suggested by Von Wielligh’s early 20th century disparaging observations on Namaqualand Griqua speech, which was no more than a ‘backward’ variety in his own words (1925: 238). How could it have sounded ‘backward’ (and implicitly distinct) if the pull towards acrolectal Dutch norms was so strong among non-Europeans in the interior? The answer probably lies with the Europeans locally perceived as the bearers of acrolectal Dutch. The scope for acrolectal input on the northern frontier was limited by the linguistic behaviour of the locally present European settlers and pastoralists – noted for amalgamating with the Khoikhoi in the 18th century (Guelke 1979: 93, Marais 1962: 10–11) – who probably spoke a distinctive form of Cape Dutch bearing the marks of Khoikhoi learner varieties. As a result, that region harboured in Von Wielligh’s opinion ‘the lowest form that Afrikaans has evolved into among whites’: ‘Degraded’ and ‘maimed’, its lexicon was ‘deformed’ as a result of ‘adequate words and idioms (…) getting lost’ and ‘borrowings from the language of the Hottentot and Bushman being resorted to’ (Von Wielligh 1925: 145–6). The missionaries may also have played a part in limiting the scope for acrolectal input: Those who ministered in the interior generally did on behalf of churches other than Dutch churches, and were as such often L2 Dutch-speakers

27. The label ‘Coloured’ came in general use with British colonial administration. It owes its upsurge to a reaction against republican leaders’ attempts to include in the term ‘Native’ those non-European groups (generally of Cape Malay and Khoikhoi ancestry) which had benefited from the Cape franchise (Adhikari 1996: 9).

28. The data that Stell (2011) used to arrive at this conclusion consist of a range of morpho-syntactic variables, including among other things variables involving the position of the verb.

Social mobility as a factor in restructuring (cf. Elbourne & Ross 1997). In other words: Whereas prospects of social advancement produced in the interior collective incentives for acquiring acrolectal Dutch, and proved strong enough to not trigger the emergence of a fully restructured variety of Dutch, limited exposure to native acrolectal speakers from the colony’s power centre perhaps promoted unintentional linguistic distinctness. Yet, collective incentives for acquiring acrolectal Dutch had a linguistic impact that made non-European Cape Dutch varieties in the interior stand out against those spoken by non-Europeans in the western Cape, among whom fewer incentives were felt for pursuing acrolectal Dutch norms.

5. Cape Dutch in the western Cape

The reconstruction of linguistic developments among non-Europeans in the western Cape has been dominated by den Besten’s assumption that a single non-European variety of Cape Dutch common to both Khoikhoi and slaves locally emerged. Slaves, den Besten argues, must have adopted Hottentot Dutch, as Hottentot Dutch was already firmly in place in pidginized form when the slaves arrived (Section 3). However, the possibility that slaves had a linguistic impact at the Cape has been acknowledged. Some defining features of modern-day Afrikaans have been traced to languages imported by the slaves (i.e. mostly Asian Creole Portuguese and Malay), such as in particular reduplication and the use of the preposition vir as an animate direct/indirect object introducer (den Besten 2000, Raidt 1976). Yet, the variety nowadays described as Cape Afrikaans, which is associated with the descendants of the slaves (see Section 3), has not generally been noted in creolistic literature for ‘classic’ creole-like features as ORA has been, such as in particular for the use of what seems to be preverbal aspectual markers (Roberge 1994a: 76). This befits historical accounts of linguistic developments in the western Cape that emphasize local factors generally not deemed favourable to restructuring: A relatively balanced Europeans-to-slaves ratio, a relatively low average number of slaves owned by Europeans, and the enduring use of lingua francas other than the European superstrate (Section 3). Other factors which bore on the local scope for restructuring, and which have been largely left undiscussed as such, are the levels of upward social mobility that existed in the colonial western Cape. Indications of levels of upward social mobility in the colonial western Cape are manumission patterns and the social position of Free Blacks and their descendants.

The importation of slaves to the Cape, at first mostly from Asia, and towards the end of the Dutch period mostly from Madagascar, was perceived as the most practical remedy to the local labour shortage at a stage when Khoikhoi labour could not yet be relied upon. Employed generally as rural labourers or skilled artisans,
the slaves were most often owned by private individuals, or by the VOC (Elphick & Shell 1979, Armstrong & Worden 1979, Worden 1985). The Cape’s beginnings as a slave-holding society were marked by relatively liberal regulations for manumission (Elphick & Shell 1979: 211). However, it must be emphasized that manumission rates at the Cape never equalled those usual in Ibero-America, being, for example, six times lower than in colonial Brazil (Elphick & Shell 1979: 206). As a result, a limited (and proportionally ever decreasing) population of Free Blacks (vrijezwarten) emerged, mostly Asian and/or Cape-born, and largely concentrated in Cape Town where they were specialized in artisan trades. The Free Blacks’ status seems to have considerably deteriorated in the 18th century, where their legal parity with Europeans was regularly questioned by the authorities, and eventually denied (Worden 1985: 147, Elphick & Shell 1979: 215–6). There are suggestions that the Free Blacks grew into a tight-knit community at the same time as segregation at their expense increased. Among those suggestions are that the Free Blacks increasingly set themselves apart from European colonial culture, as shown chiefly in the continuous growth in Cape Town’s Bo-Kaap area of a Muslim community whose leadership was Free Black (cf. Worden et al. 1998: 127, Elphick & Shell 1979: 193).29 These Muslim Free Blacks formed the core of what emerges in early 19th century observers’ accounts as the ‘Cape Malays’ (Bradlow & Cairns 1978: 83–4).

The importation of Asian slaves led to Asian Creole Portuguese gaining a foothold at the Cape as an inter-ethnic lingua franca (Valkhoff 1966). Albeit to a more limited extent, Malay also played a role as a lingua franca at the Cape, presumably first between slaves originating in the Insulindian archipelago, then until the mid-19th century as a ritual language associated with Islam (Ponelis 1993: 17, Davids 1991: 299–300). The presence of Asian Creole Portuguese and Malay at the Cape have been counted among the factors allegedly preventing the full restructuring of Dutch at the Cape (Section 3). But it seems to me that too much has been made of the local linguistic impact of these languages. To begin with, their use cannot have been quite generalized, as the Malagasy in general and those Europeans who had not previously served in the East were not likely to have known them (cf. Valkhoff 1966: 171).30 Also, it seems that slaves – especially slaves owned by the VOC – were altogether more exposed to Dutch than were their Khoikhoi counterparts,

---

29. One of the conditions for manumission at the Cape was conversion to Christianity. As a result, masters were conspicuously reluctant to have their slaves baptized, which proved another incentive for them to adopt Islam (Worden 1985: 97–8, Shell 1997: 271).

30. Elphick (1985: 213) mentions the case of a 18th century Khoi who had apparently learnt French on a Huguenot farm. However anecdotal, it does suggest that some of the Huguenot settlers used for a while French rather than any other language as a medium of interaction with their non-European workforce.
as they were more than the latter represented at VOC schools (Elphick 1977: 206, Giliomee 2004: 61). Last but not least, a fact highlighted by Ponelis (1993: 26) is that incentives existed for slaves to acquire Dutch as the knowledge thereof was one of the conditions for manumission. As a result, there cannot be any doubt that the Free Black community – who until the late 18th century lived among Europeans (Worden et al. 1998: 64–5, 127) – initially were acquainted with acrolectal Dutch. However, those Free Blacks who had privately remained Muslims despite their notional conversion to Christianity often knew Malay as a religious medium, and began at some point to develop a specific variety of Cape Dutch, i.e. Cape Malay Dutch (Davids 1991: 299–300). Cape Malay Dutch (CMD) must have met the Free Black community’s need for an MCS, a need exacerbated by the increasing segregation enforced from the 18th century at their expense. In widespread use as a religious medium from the 19th century, i.e. when Cape Town’s Muslim population was experiencing growth as a result of absorbing freed rural slaves probably unfamiliar with Malay,31 CMD shows in its 19th century written form linguistic signs of insulation from acrolectal Dutch, reflected in a range of basilectal features that make it stand out against ORA. The linguistic features of CMD can be studied in 19th/20th century Cape Malay religious literature, noted for its use of the Arabic script (Davids 1991).

Among the more accessible Arabic CMD texts, those I am using here to illustrate those linguistic features are the three texts transliterated by van Selms (1951, 1953, 1979): die Betroubare Woord, on which van Selms (1953: 66) put the date 1856, the Bayanudîn (1869), and the Su’âl wa Jawâb, whose date of publication is controversial.32 The other texts are the main two samples of transliterated Cape Malay texts reproduced in Davids (1991), namely, one extract from Sirâjul-idahi (1894), and one from Ma-sa ‘il abi Laith (1910). Each text has a different Cape Malay author, except for the Bayanudîn, which was written by a Turkish-speaking Ottoman emissary, and as such seems to display a number of idiosyncratic L2 features (Ponelis 1981). The texts display evidence of phonotactic restructuring in the form of syllabized consonant clusters, a feature of possible Malay (or Creole) origin (see Section 4). Although not providing quantitative data in this regard,

---

31. See Shell (1997: 275) and Worden et al. (1998: 108) for the ethnic diversification of Cape Town’s 19th century Muslim community. The seemingly abrupt transition from Malay to CMD in 19th century Cape Muslim madaris and manuscripts (Davids 1991: 299–300, 1987: 46) strengthens the hypothesis that CMD had long been the dominant language among the Free Blacks.

32. Van Selms (1951: 22) tentatively puts the date 1868 on that text while Davids (1991: 164) traces the text to the year 1918. I am rallying with Davids’ opinion due to the acquaintance he claims with the author.
Klopper (1983: 284–5) found syllabization of word-initial consonant clusters to be characteristic of the speech of older Cape Malay speakers (while waning or absent in the speech of younger generations). Examples of syllabized word-initial consonant clusters in the Cape Malay texts are the words *sitan* (‘stand’, Std. Dutch/Af. *staan*) or *pelek* (‘place’ Std. Dutch/Af. *plek*). How representative of actual speech is this orthographic usage, considering that the Arabic script does not typically allow (yet does not thoroughly preclude) the concatenation of two consonants in word-initial position? Davids (1991: 168–71) shows that Cape Malay authors exerted a choice between syllabization and consonant clustering in word-initial position, and thus saw themselves at liberty to stray from Arabic orthographic conventions for the sake of reflecting actual pronunciation. The fact that syllabization of word-initial consonant clusters cannot just be a reflection of Arabic orthographic conventions is perhaps more clearly suggested by the fact that syllabization also occurs in word-medial position (e.g. in the word *ghaparaat* ‘talked’, derived from Dutch *praten* ‘to talk’), where Arabic orthographic conventions theoretically allow for consonant clustering. Chart 1 shows the distribution of syllabization of root-initial consonant clusters in word-initial and word-medial position in the texts:

![Chart 1](chart.png)

**Chart 1.** % of cases of syllabization of root-initial consonant clusters in word-initial and word-medial position vs. consonant clusters

---

33. I am using the transliteration conventions employed by van Selms and Davids.

34. The number of cases of initial (non-)syllabization (n1) and medial (non-)syllabization (n2) for each text is as follows: *Die Betroubare Woord*, n1 = 72, n2 = 50; *Bayanudin*, n1 = 296, n2 = 93; *Sirajul-Idahi*, n1 = 20, n2 = 5; *Ma-sa ‘il abi Laith*, n1 = 11, n2 = 19; *Su’al wa Jawab*, n1 = 101, n2 = 27.
Closest to systematic syllabization are the *Bayanudîn* and *Sirâjul-idahi*, whereas consonant clustering is more represented in the other texts. A significant gap between word-initial and word-medial contexts is found only in the *Su‘âl wa Jawâb*. If the texts provide a reliable indicator of actual pronunciation, then free variation must have occurred between syllabization and consonant clustering in CMD before syllabization eventually began to fade out, as Klopper (1983) observed among older Cape Malay generations.

Another feature of the Arabic CMD texts that set them clearly apart from linguistic usage in JJA’s correspondence and in the CCDC is verbal morphology. In the Arabic texts, there are no traces of a distinction between singular and plural, and bare verb stems are dominant. The only exception to this pattern is formed by athematic Dutch verbs (e.g. *gaan* ‘go’, *staan* ‘stand’), which alternately display –*n* and –*t* endings in both singular and plural uses in all texts (example 5 shows an example of –*t* ending used in a plural function). In this respect, the Arabic CMD texts seem to not differ from the CCDC, where Deumert (2004: 144–5) observed similar patterns of free variation. A dual pronominal system comprising both Dutch-like forms and Afrikaans-like forms is absent: Afrikaans-like forms are hegemonic (*oens* or *oensei* ‘we’, *hoeili* or *hoeil* or *hoejali* ‘they’). Generalized in the Arabic CMD texts while absent in JJA’s usage and much less represented in the CCDC is the brace negation (6, underlined), which occurs in 100% of cases in the *Betroubare Woord*, 80% in the *Bayanudîn*, 95% in *Sirâjul-idahi*, 100% in *Ma-sa ‘il abi Laith*, and 96% in the *Su‘âl wa Jawâb* (see further Section 4). The generalization of that feature in the Arabic CMD texts raises questions as to its origins and its diffusion in the Cape Dutch continuum. Substratist views as those held by den Besten (1989), who saw in it a calque of a Khoikhoi structure, seem to lack justification in view of the facts that Nama negation is never entirely sentence-final, and that it was absent in Hottentot Dutch (cf. Roberge 2000; see further Section 4). Roberge (2000) breaks with substratist views and regards the brace negation as a discourse-based feature that was grammaticalized by non-Europeans. In view of the data described in this section and in Section 4, as well as of current ORA usage, Roberge’s claim should perhaps be qualified: The brace negation might have been mostly grammaticalized by non-Europeans in the western Cape, less so in the interior.

(5) dan ghaat tiragh die rûhei naadie lighaamas
    Then go back the spirits to the bodies
    ‘Then the spirits return to the bodies’ (*Su‘âl wa Jawâb*)

A defining syntactic feature of the Arabic CMD texts is the occurrence of SVX (whereby X stands for objects, adverbials, and prepositional complements, i.e. elements associated with the ‘midfield’ in Standard Dutch/Afrikaans grammar, see Ponelis 1979: 506–23) alongside Standard Dutch SXV. A continuum of syntactic types can be found which range from strict SVX (including SVO, see example 7) to strict SXV (including SOV, see example 8) with SXVX intermediate forms. In those intermediate forms, the object can feature either before or – more generally – after the main verb (9).

(7) Ek moet vertaal die riesaalat

AUX INF OBJ

‘I must translate the Message’ (Ma-sa ’il abi Laith)

(8) As een mens voewarait zakat ghee

CONJ SBJ ADV OBJ give

‘If someone pays zakat beforehand’ (Sirâjul-idahi)

(9) As hai vir die aarme ghaghee het ietj

CONJ 3SG ‘to the poor’ PST.PTCP AUX OBJ

‘if he has given something to the poors’ (Bayanudin)

The data shown in Chart 2 show that adverbial and prepositional phrases are more likely than objects to feature in the midfield of CMD clauses. The occurrence of SVX/SVO is highest in the Bayanudin. While SVX occurs less frequently in the other texts, the distribution of SVO in Ma-sa ’il abi Laith and Su’âl wa Jawâb is comparable to that in the Bayanudin. The fact that SVO occurs more than does SOV in Die Betroubare Woord strongly suggests that SVO in CMD cannot be attributed to English influence, as exposure to English among Cape Malays was limited at the time when that book was written,36 and should instead be attributed to contact with Malay and Asian Creole Portuguese (both SVO, see den Besten 2001), or to universal restructuring processes associated with creolization.37

36. Non-Europeans in the 19th century had but limited access to education (Horell 1970: 14). Besides, the Cape Malay community tended to shun western-modelled education (Davids 1991: 150–1).

37. Bickerton (1984) considers SVO to be the unmarked syntactic order in creole languages, see further Roberts (2001).
If SOV was the order of Cape Dutch Pidgin, as den Besten (1989) assumed, that order was either not nativized, or it subsequently came to recede in favour of SVO/SVX by the beginning of the period spanned by the CMD texts. SVO/SVX in CMD coincided with the retention of substratal features from Malayo-Polynesian languages or creole features, such as syllabized consonant clusters and the brace negation. Even though the data presented above are perhaps too limited in range to categorically describe CMD as more basilectal than ORA, there still remains scope for claiming that basilectal features in CMD were under less acrolectal pressure than were basilectal features in ORA. A linguistic confirmation for this claim can be found in the Cape Malay texts using the Roman alphabet that began to see the light from 1898, and of which a few short samples are reproduced in Kähler (1971: 190–7). According to Davids (1991: 96–9), the Roman CMD writing tradition emerged as an attempt to reach out to a more diversified public potentially including (newly converted) Europeans. To meet this aim, Cape Malay writers made, according to Davids, a conscious attempt at writing what they perceived was acrolectal Dutch. As a result, some features found in the CMD Arabic texts are absent in the Roman CMD texts, or are amplified. The Roman CMD texts also

---

38. In order to not bias the figures in favor of SVX/SVO, no account is taken of the position of objects in dependent clauses, which tend to favor SVO in European Cape Dutch and colloquial Afrikaans (Ponelis 1993: 341–345).

39. The number of cases of SVX/SXV (n1) and SVO/SOV (n2), whereby V=past participle or infinitive), are distributed as follows in each text: Die Betroubare Woord, n1 = 149, n2 = 82; Bayanudin, n1 = 566, n2 = 366 ; Sirâjul-Idahi, n1 = 45, n2 = 20 ; Ma-sa ‘il abi Laith, n1 = 27, n2 = 16; Su’al wa Jawâb, n1 = 155, n2 = 56.

40. In my subsequent linguistic comments I rely only on those samples for which Kähler was able to establish a date of publication, and which precede 1925 (i.e. when Afrikaans became official and omnipresent in the educational system). These are altogether seven samples out of the 11 reproduced in Kähler.
display features which are absent in the Arabic CMD texts. Syllabization is entirely absent in the Roman CMD texts, while (hypercorrect) verbal inflections appear in the singular (yet never in the plural unlike in JJA’s correspondence or in the CCDC).41 The brace negation, dominant in the Arabic CMD texts, is less represented in the Roman CMD texts than the Dutch single negation (2 cases of brace negation vs. 5 of single negation). This suggests that these features were linguistic stereotypes of which Cape Malay writers were aware, and hypercorrectly attempted to avoid. A distinctive linguistic feature of the Arabic texts which, however, remains relatively untouched in the Roman texts is SVX (7 cases out of 20 clauses with midfield elements and featuring infinitives or past participles) and SVO (11 cases out of 12 clauses with objects and featuring infinitives or past participles). In other words, SOV seems to not have been part of the Cape Malay writers’ stylistic repertoire, including its most hypercorrect components.

The above-described differences between CMD and ORA can be explained in the perspective of upward social mobility presented in Section 2. Intensifying segregation in the 18th and early 19th centuries made a Muslim lifestyle appealing (Worden 1985: 97–8, Shell 1997: 271), which was linguistically reflected in a need among the Cape Malays for a distinctive MCS. So deeply rooted was that MCS that the few attempts made by Cape Malay writers in the late 19th/early 20th century to write acrolectal Dutch produced no more than largely deflected varieties whose syntax starkly contrasted with European Cape Dutch varieties (cf. Davids 1991: 96–104). To summarize: Restructuring (whether it involves creolization universalia or substratal influence) could – from a Bickertonian demographic point of view – have significantly affected the Cape Dutch varieties spoken by non-Europeans in the interior (see Section 4). However, there is instead evidence that some features typically associated with restructured varieties of the ‘creole’ type were most significantly represented in the Cape Dutch varieties spoken by non-Europeans near the centre of European power, where – following a Bickertonian demographic point of view – they were least expected. Possibly as a result, Cape Afrikaans, which subsumes the linguistic legacy of CMD, is nowadays the Coloured Afrikaans variety which in grammatical terms most distant from White Afrikaans and Standard Afrikaans (Stell 2011: 226–32). These observations undermine the primacy of the demographic and substratist logic in historical accounts of non-European Cape Dutch varieties and compel us to take account of the collective incentives among their speakers to approximate the European colonial elite’s linguistic norms.

41. The data are quite limited: Out of 22 finite verbal forms (15 singular, 7 plural, excluding the verb ‘to be’, realized as is in both the singular and plural), 3 display an ending, in all cases –en, used twice in a 1SG form, and once as a 3SG form.
6. Discussion

Besides resorting to substratist explanations, reconstructions of linguistic developments among non-Europeans at the Cape place much emphasis on intergroup demographic differentials in and around the initial European settlement. This emphasis may have been ill-considered given that ORA may in fact have emerged away from the initial European settlement. Also, they largely overlook CMD data, while CMD data seems to upset established demographic accounts of restructuring. What this paper highlights is that different attitudes towards the acrolectal norm at the colonial Cape might well have been the overriding factor in whether that acrolectal norm was significantly approximated or rejected by non-Europeans. When acrolectal Dutch was perceived as a gateway to an achievable social status comparable to that held by Europeans, strong incentives for acquiring it were present among the early slave population, and faded away as segregation intensified in the western Cape, even though the surrounding European population by far exceeded 20%. Strong incentives for acquiring acrolectal Dutch also developed in the late 19th century interior (where Europeans were far less present) at a time when mission stations began to offer alternatives to colonial subjugation. Historical accounts of non-European Cape Dutch varieties hardly emphasize the possible correlation between their characteristics and the presence or absence of incentives for appropriating acrolectal Dutch. Acknowledging that correlation entails that den Besten’s reconstruction of linguistic developments at the Cape should be partly reviewed, especially with regard to the slaves and their descendants. If – as the Cape Dutch Pidgin sentences suggest – the slaves had acquired the SOV order during Cape Colony’s initial stages, then pressure to adhere to SOV had clearly diminished among their descendants by the time of the CMD texts, while scope for restructuring may have conversely increased. The general notion that levels of restructuring can vary in reflection of patterns of social mobility has already been proposed in reference to colonial Louisiana. The more specific idea – relevant to the western Cape’s linguistic history – that decreasing levels of social mobility can trigger restructuring where no or little restructuring previously took place can find support in La Réunion’s sociolinguistic history.

It has been a matter of controversy whether Louisiana Creole French (LCF), which shows a high degree of geographic variation, should be traced to one or different sources. Much of that controversy has to do with the linguistic impact of the late 19th century arrival of Haitian slaves in Louisiana – where a slave population was already present – and the concomitant introduction of labour-intensive cotton and sugar cultivation (Klingler 2003: 79–91). It has been noted that LCF as spoken on the banks of the Mississippi – where Louisiana’s large sugar and cotton estates were located – show more basilectal features (some of which seem
outwardly imputable to Haitian Creole) than LCF in the Cajun-dominated inland regions, where it conversely shows more acrolectal French features (Holm 1989: 390). Klingler (2003: 90–1) attributes the linguistic contrasts between inland and riverine LCF to, among other things, differences in intergroup relations: Plantation society and its rigid social hierarchy favoured the retention of basilectal features (or their temporary adoption from Haitian slaves), while the (initially) egalitarian orientations of Cajun society (Brasseaux 1992: 4–3) conversely favoured levelling with acrolectal French (see further Neumann 1985, 1984).

A comparable scenario, in which the idea of increasing scope for restructuring features centrally, is found on Bourbon Island (modern-day Réunion). In a context where only one quarter of that French colony’s original population were slaves and roughly half of it European (Chaudenson 1974: 455), French underwent only partial restructuring, giving rise in the 17th century to a variety of French referred to as Lete Ki (Baker & Corne 1982: 111). The introduction of the plantation system and the concomitant mass-importation of slave labour to the island in the early 18th century brought about a more extensively restructured French variety whose synchronic offshoot is referred to as Créole des Bas (spoken in the lowlands). Créole des Bas emerged in a context where manumission rates were low and relations with white settlers tense, and is opposed to Créole des Hauts (spoken in the highlands), descended from Lete Ki and associated with local whites (Baker & Corne 1982: 12, 111, Widmer 2005: 13–14, Bourquin 2005: 24–5, 40).

While the two scenarios described above seem to strengthen the case for treating social mobility centrally in accounts of restructuring, both of them also can fit in a Bickertonian demographic account of restructuring: Both riverine LCF and Créole des Bas emerged in demographic micro-environments where Europeans stood well below Bickerton’s 20% cut-off point. The only other environments outside of Cape Colony’s interior and hinterland where, despite the weak presence of Europeans, restructuring did apparently not take place as it should have taken place according to a Bickertonian demographic logic, seem to be found mostly in colonial Ibero-America. But putting colonial South Africa on a par with colonial Ibero-America could expose itself to objections derived from socio-historical theories which I briefly introduced in Section 2. One of these theories is based on McWhorter’s assumption that no Spanish-based creole arose in Spanish America

42. Whereas Europeans formed more than half of La Réunion’s population in 1714, they subsequently came to hover between 17% and 21% of the totals (cf. Bourquin 2005: 21, Widmer 2005: 14). Besides, La Réunion’s current social geography reveals a racial polarization between lowlands and highlands, which finds its roots in the 19th century (Chaudenson 2000: 365–6). The number of slaves in Louisiana’s Sugar Bowl increased fourfold in the first half of the 19th century (Follett 2007: 24). Concentrations of 100 slaves or more were usual on sugar estates (Heuman 2003: 486–7).
due to the fact that no Spanish-based pidgin emerged on the African coasts. The theories concerning Portuguese Brazil are based on the assumption that lingua francas other than Portuguese, such as Língua Geral or Angolan languages, must have obstructed the emergence of a Portuguese-based creole.

Linguistic developments at the colonial Cape could undermine these theories. CMD developed among a dislocated Asian population with hardly any previous exposure to Dutch in its original environments, as well as in a context where L1s or lingua francas other than Dutch subsisted for a long while. CMD could perhaps be considered more restructured than any of its documented Brazilian vernacular Portuguese counterparts by virtue of the phonotactic and syntactic restructuring it underwent. The reasons why restructuring failed to occur in Brazil in the same terms as it did in the western Cape seems to be linked to colonial ideologies, and can still be glimpsed in modern-day variation dynamics in the Brazilian and Afrikaans speech communities. Upward social mobility in the form of ‘branca-mento’ in Brazil has favoured the spread and emulation of the standard variety whereas the legacy of South African Apartheid is obstructing similar dynamics in the Afrikaans speech community (cf. Daniel 2006, Stell 2011), much in the same way as dynamics of racial segregation in the US seem to have allowed AAVE features to endure if not to generalize.

Conclusion

I proposed in this paper social mobility as an overriding factor in restructuring based on linguistic developments among non-Europeans at the colonial Cape. I emphasized that the socio-historical conditions surrounding the emergence of Orange River Afrikaans and Cape Malay Dutch seem to not reflect scenarios of restructuring that rely on Europeans to non-Europeans ratios. However, the case for social mobility as a universal explanation for restructuring or its absence temporarily seems weak on two accounts. First, the demographic underrepresentation of Europeans and the lack of non-European upward social mobility often seem to go hand in hand in many colonial environments where restructuring took place, which could unduly favour perceptions of unequal Europeans to non-Europeans ratios being the primary factor in restructuring more than intergroup boundary

43. Descriptions of Brazilian Portuguese emphasize social class rather than race/ethnicity as a factor in variation (see e.g. Avezedo 2005: 211–4).

44. I refer to Rickford’s discussion on the controversy surrounding Labov’s claim that African American Vernacular English is diverging from European American Vernacular English (Rickford 1999, see further Fasold 1987 and Labov & Harris 1986).
hardness. Second, the sociolinguistic history of Ibero-America – where there seems to be a correlation between relatively high levels of social mobility and lacking evidence of restructuring – has been dominated by assumptions that local linguistic developments have to be explained by locally specific factors unrelated to social mobility. It is hoped that the example of the colonial Cape goes some way towards casting doubt on the validity of locale-specific explanations, and towards spurring more comparative research on the linguistic impact of social mobility across colonial settings.
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