

The Afrikaans auxiliary *het* ‘have’ from clitic to desinence

Jac Conradie

University of Johannesburg

Keywords: Afrikaans, periphrastic perfect, preterite loss, reanalysis, univerbation

The Afrikaans auxiliary *het* [hɛt] ‘have’ has undergone a development from its full form as a Dutch finite dialectal form of *hebben* ‘to have’ to a clitic in verb-second context and an inflectional ending (alternating with the full form) in clause-final position, e.g.

Sy’t ([səit]) *gewen*, *maar hy kon ook gewen het* ([hɛt] or [ət])
she.have.AUX win.PST.PTCP but he can.PRET also win.PST.PTCP have.AUX
‘She won, but he could also have won.’

The common clause-final [ət] pronunciation of *het* (the written form) is reflected in the spelling used in the Kaaps variety of Afrikaans, viz. *gedoenit* ‘have done’, with a glide (spelt *r*) inserted after long vowels and diphthongs in Kaaps in particular, e.g. *gegeerit* ‘have given’ and *gehourit* ‘have kept’.

Het, which is predominantly an auxiliary but also serves as main verb (meaning ‘to have, possess’), is one of the ten most frequent lexical items in the language. Its status as an inflectional ending when used clause-finally, however, depends on the fact that, unlike all other auxiliaries, it is completely inseparable from the past participle it governs, even in infinitival phrases – which always require an infinitive after the particle *te* ‘to’:

Om <*gister*> *te geslaag* <**gister*> ***het*** <*gister*>, *was nie maklik nie*.
COMP <yesterday> to succeed.PST.PTCP <yest.> have <yest.> was NEG₁ easy NEG₂
‘To have succeeded yesterday was not easy.’

Through the reanalysis of past participle + *het* as verb + ending, univerbation has taken place and the “new” verb – a periphrastic perfect functioning as past tense – now follows *te* ‘to’ in its entirety.

Several factors in the earlier history of Afrikaans contributed to this development. The elimination of the inherited clause-final variant order of auxiliary + past participle, as in Dutch *hebben geslaagd* ‘have succeeded’, assured auxiliaries of a fixed position *after* the past participle. The collocation of past participle with *het*, in particular, was probably strengthened by the rise in frequency of *het* as auxiliary. This, in turn, was brought about (i) by the replacement of *is* ‘to be’ by *het* ‘to have’ as auxiliary of unaccusative verbs, and (ii) by the increased usage of the periphrastic perfect as general past tense after the demise of the synthetic preterite used in this function. The use of the perfect, again, was facilitated by the across the board regularisation and deflection of inherited past participles, e.g. *gesproken* > *gespreek* for the strong verb *spreek* ‘speak’ and *gewerkt* > *gewerk* for the regular verb ‘work’. Furthermore, the loss of participial suffixes signalled the removal of an important impediment to univerbation.

In sum, the replacement of the synthetic preterite, which is still ongoing in the case of the modal auxiliaries *sou* ‘would’, *moes* ‘had to’, *kon* ‘could’ and *wou* ‘wanted to’, by the periphrastic perfect with *het*, is followed closely by the univerbation of past participle + *het*, whereby a new synthetic tense form is created.

