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1 Introduction

1.1 The Tuu family

+ Tuu (formerly 'Southern Khoisan') one of the least known language families on the globe
  > most languages already extinct without adequate description
  > introduced as a genealogically defined group by Bleek (1927), then 'Southern Bushman',
  with an internal REFERENCE classification: S1-6

+ almost unanimously accepted as a family; but difficult internal genealogical classification
  > usually Taa language complex opposed to the !Ui subbranch comprising all other attested
  varieties including those of the Lower Nossop (cf. Köhler 1981, Hastings 2001)

Figure 1: Preliminary classification of Tuu (based on Güldemann 2005: 12)
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Taa (DoBeS + EuroBabel projects)
- Lone Tree !Xoon (Traill), Njamani (Westphal), Njulen [S5] (D. Bleek), etc.
- !Ui
  - N!ng [S2] (ELDP project)
  - !Khomani (Doke, Maingard), !Nhuki (Westphal), Langeberg (D. Bleek), etc.
- [Xam] [S1]
  - Strandberg + Katkop (W. Bleek, Lloyd), Achterveld (W. Bleek)
- Vaal-Orange
  - !Ungkue (Meinhof), !U'fe (D. Bleek)
- Outliers
  - !Xegwi [S3] (Lanham, Hallowes, Ziervogel), !Gâte (Anders)

Note: (main researchers or projects), varieties under discussion

1.2 The data sources on Lower Nossop varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Location of contact</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Notebook in UCT archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Xam</td>
<td>southern Kalahari</td>
<td>&lt; 1870</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Halbe 1870c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>!Auni</td>
<td>Kyky</td>
<td>29-30/10/11</td>
<td>Bleek</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>A3.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>!Gb-kui</td>
<td>Kyky</td>
<td>29-31/10/11</td>
<td>Bleek</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>A3.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>!Abbe</td>
<td>south of Kyky</td>
<td>02/11/11</td>
<td>Bleek</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>A3.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>!Auni</td>
<td>Tweerivieren</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Bleek</td>
<td>Bleek 1937</td>
<td>A3.29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>!Nkwe</td>
<td>Tweerivieren</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Story</td>
<td>Story 1999</td>
<td>F1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 according to Eberhard and Twentyman Jones (1992)

Table 1: The major data sources on Tuu varieties of the wider Lower Nossop area

+ linguistic research of very short duration, from a current perspective very unsystematic
elicitations, unreliable transcriptions and defective structural analyses (particularly by
Bleek)
1.3 The sociolinguistic background

+ various indications for considerable linguistic contact with other groups before first linguistic research

> non-San, particularly strong Khoekhoe adstratum:

… all the |nunas are descended from a Bushman ancestor who married as the result of a war a half nama [= Khoekhoe herders] & bushman [= local San foragers] woman (father bushman - mother nama)

from these are descended the |nunas or |auni (…) namely by intermarriage of pure |auni with the half breed

The Katias are descended from Bushmen who as the result of war got possession of Kafir women [= Bantu] & married them

The marriages took place about 3-4 generations back (Bleek A3.5: 334)

> other San, particularly with southern neighboring language N|ng belonging to |Ui branch of Tuu (cf. Dart 1937) - bilingualism also in elicitations:

There were three or four Bushman tribes represented in the camp: the ǂkhomani, whose speech Professor Doke and Dr. Pienaar were studying, the |auni, to whom I devoted my time, the |namani, who had been living among the Nama and only spoke the Nama language, and a few women of the Khatia or Vaalpens tribe who married |auni and |namani men. One of these spoke the real dialect of her people [= |haasi], and I hope Mr. R. Story will give us some information on that subject.

|auno, as the |auni call their language, is one of the Southern Group of languages. It is somewhat like the ǂkhomani language, yet is a step nearer to the Central Bushman Group, which means that it is nearer to the Hottentot tongues. Of course the fact, that the families at the Exhibition come from the mutual border of their respective countries, and have intermarried a good deal, tends to bring their speech nearer together. (Bleek 1937: 253)

2 Shared morphosyntactic features

2.1 Agreement and nominal classification

2.1.1 Taa

+ certain grams and lexical stems obligatorily cross-reference/ index a nominal with respect to person, gender, and number = possible "alliteration" in case of appropriate nominal ending and more than one clitic host

(1) n|aun gi|aan lxan |aun
    see:2b egg:2b big:2b one:2b
to see one big egg
Figure 2: Gender system of West !Xoon with agreement classes and thematic segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Core semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 tantum</td>
<td>mass nouns and substances, personal names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2a</td>
<td>miscellaneous (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a/2a</td>
<td>parts which belong to a larger unit cognitively (92): body parts (41), lexicalised compounds, diminutives, deverbal nominalisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b/2b</td>
<td>miscellaneous (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>alienated body parts (??meat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tantum</td>
<td>mass/non-count nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>humans, kinship terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Gender assignment in West !Xoon (325 simplex nouns, after Kießling 2008)

2.1.2 |Haasi|
---|---|
- One and the same gram changes its vowel depending on the noun it is in construction with
- One and the same noun triggers the same vowel on a gram irrespective of the construction
> indicates an agreement system with several morphosyntactic contexts:

2.1.2.1 Oblique marker kM before valency-external participant - cf. (2) of Taa

(7) i |a|ba n i n tsá ká |k|g xuu
give hat PURP 1S ?put MPO:1S head
give the hat so that I can put (it) on my head [give me the hat so that I may put (it) on] (Story F1.18: 14-169 ~1999: 27-164)

(8) kxe=kí ká ?gaa
kxé tsí kí ká ?gaa
we sit on the ground (Story F1.18: 15-175 ~1999: 28-170)

(9) si kx'=á kí ?hau: gu
si k'xuu kí ?hau gu
let us take the skin off the lion [skin the lion] (Story F1.18: 12-103 ~1999: 26-101)

2.1.2.2 Genitive marker kM before possessor - cf. (3) of Taa

(10) kha=kí ká ?gai
khaa ká ?xai
my sister's child [it is my sister's child] (Story F1.18: 12-86 ~1999: 25-85)

(11) 'нд: kí ?haidaba
nqaan kí ?haidaba
Abraham's hut [it is Abraham's hut] (Story F1.18: 15-179 ~1999: 28-174)
2.1.2.3 Postnominal attributive linker $kM$ - cf. (4) of Taa

(12) $k^n$ $g$ $k$ $j$ $f$n$'$ $s$ $a$ $k$ $t$ $l$ $i$

\begin{verbatim}
?I TAM2 get child ?A beautiful
I have a beautiful child (Story F1.18: 14-154 ~1999: 27-149)
\end{verbatim}

(13) $j$n$'$ $s$ $a$ $g$ $i$ $c$ $k$ $j$ $e$ $j$h$n$ $g$ $i$ $c$ $x$ $s$ $i$
$n$ $j$a$sa$ $k$i $k$ $j$ $j$h$n$ $k$ $a$ $u$ $s$ $u$ $s$
1S brother ?I TAM2 get dog ?I big
my brother has a big dog (Story F1.18: 14-156 ~1999: 27-151)

2.1.2.4 Sentence-initial anaphoric subject pronoun in $kM$

(14) $k$n$|$ $a$ $j$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
?I TAM1 smoke
I smoke (Story F1.18: 11-46 ~1999: 25-46)
\end{verbatim}

(15) $j$h$'$ $s$ $a$ $k$ $d$ $g$ $a$ $a$ $j$ $w$ $a$, $k$ $j$ $a$ $j$h$w$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
$j$h$sa$ $k$ang$ a$ $t$ $j$ $a$ $w$ $a$, $k$ $j$ $a$ $j$h$w$ $a$
child GEN:1S A NEG TAM1 dead ?:A TAM1 sleep
my child is not dead, he sleeps (Story F1.18: 10-11 ~1999: 24-11)
\end{verbatim}

2.1.2.5 Marker (of sentence type?) $kM$ after subject noun or pronoun - cf. (5)

(16) $l$g$g$ $k$ $j$ $a$ $j$ $h$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
g$aa$ $k$ $a$ $j$ $j$h$u$ $n$ $g$
ground ?:A TAM1 burn 1S
the ground burns me [the ground is hot] (Story F1.18: 14-140 ~1999: 27-137)
\end{verbatim}

(17) $j$h$'$ $s$ $a$ $k$ $d$ $g$ $k$ $j$ $t$ $w$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
$j$h$sa$ $k$ang$ $k$ $j$ $t$ $w$ $a$
child GEN:1S ?:A be.grown
my child is big [my child is bigger] (Story F1.18: 12-88 ~1999: 26-87)
\end{verbatim}

2.1.2.6 Bare vowel after subject noun (cf. also (15))

(18) $j$ha$'$ $d$ $a$ $b$ $a$ $k$ $j$ $u$ $e$ $s$ $i$

\begin{verbatim}
$j$ha$'$ $d$ $a$ $b$ $k$ $i$ $j$ $s$ $u$ $s$ si
PN ?I be old
Abraham is old (Story F1.18: 11-45 ~1999: 25-45)
\end{verbatim}

(19) $j$h$u$ $g$ $u$ $k$ $j$ $a$ $u$ $m$

\begin{verbatim}
$j$h$u$ $u$ $k$ $i$ $j$ $a$ $u$ $m$
lion ?:I TAM1 roar
the lion roars (Story F1.18: 13-137 ~1999: 27-134)
\end{verbatim}

(20) $j$h$g$ $k$ $j$ $a$ $j$ $u$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
$j$h$g$ $k$ $i$ $j$ $u$ $a$
dog ?:I TAM1 bark
the dog barks [the dogs bark] (Story F1.18: 13-139 ~1999: 27-136)
\end{verbatim}

(21) $O$w$w$ $k$ $j$ $h$ $m$ $s$

\begin{verbatim}
$O$w$w$ $k$ $j$ $h$ $m$ $s$
meat ?:I be raw
the meat is raw (Story F1.18: 14-165 ~1999: 27-160)
\end{verbatim}

(22) $k$j$'$ $k$ $h$ $a$ $j$n$:$

\begin{verbatim}
$k$j$'$ $k$ $h$ $a$ $n$ $j$a$an$
?:I ?:I stay water
he is in the house (Story F1.18: 10-6 ~1999: 24-6)
\end{verbatim}

(23) $k$ $k$ $j$ $a$ $a$ $a$ $k$ $i$ $O$w$w$

\begin{verbatim}
$K$ $K$ $j$ $a$ $a$ $a$ $k$ $i$ $O$w$w$
$K$ $K$ $j$ $a$ $a$ $a$ $k$ $i$ $O$w$w$
?:U ?:U TAM1 eat MPO:I meat
they eat meat (Story F1.18: 10-23 ~1999: 24-23)
\end{verbatim}

2.1.2.6 Bare vowel after subject noun (cf. also (15))

(24) $i$ $g$ $j$ $n$ $j$ $j$h$g$ $i$ $k'$ $a$

\begin{verbatim}
$g$ $j$ $g$ $i$ $l$ $j$h$g$ $i$ $k'$ $a$
give milk PURP dog I drink
give the dog milk that it may drink [give the dog milk to drink] (Story F1.18: 11-41 ~1999: 24-41)
2.1.2.7 Summary: The emergent gender system of Haasi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Oblique marker</th>
<th>Oblique Genitive marker</th>
<th>Post-nominal attributive linker</th>
<th>Sentence-initial pronoun kM</th>
<th>Post-subject marker</th>
<th>Plain post-subject marker</th>
<th>Thematic agreement element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S.PRO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ν/?N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ground’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘lion’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘child’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘meat’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H.S.PRO</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H.P.PRO</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘dog’</td>
<td>?X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The behavior of example nouns across different grammatical contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement class</th>
<th>Attested nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/?E</td>
<td>meat, tsamma, milk, water (1 with A); fire, sun, wind, wood, stone, tree, shade, thirst; house, ?camp, Kalahari; dog (S), lion (S), wildebeest (S), snake (S); woman (S), man (S), brother (S); personal names (S, 2 with A - person as a small child!!!), who (S); goat (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>foot, mouth, arm, body, head, name, hand; ground, day; dog (P, x), lion (P), ostrich (?P), woman (P); child, girl (S and P); ?rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>humans (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (n) number of possible counter-examples in another agreement class

Table 4: Distribution of nouns attested in the corpus across agreement classes

2.1.3 ’Auni and ’Abbe

+ material far less reliable, but clear examples for similar constructions with agreement hosts that vary with noun, sometimes the same agreement class as in Taa

(25) * he ṣi ti Opoë
e aan ti Goe
E eat MPO:I meat
he eats meat (Bleek A3.5: 313)

(26) * e sha ke l’ka’a
e saan ke la’a’a
E sit MPO:E ground
she sits on the ground (Bleek A3.5: 314)

(27) * i sändiki somm ḱè
i saan di ki sum jeen
1P.I sit ? MPO:I shade ?inside
we sit in the shade (Bleek A3.5: 348)

(28) * lori ke i ntau si tuu
lorry-P I load 1P,E people
the lorries were loaded up [the lorries loaded us up] (Bleek A3.30: 469)
2.2 Quantifier constructions and the lexical paradigm

+ Lower Nossop varieties with complex quantifier constructions
  - display complex linking elements
  - structurally diverse depending on the quantifier: ‘one’ vs. rest
  - partly involve numerals borrowed from Khoekhoe: jam ‘two’, ntšona ‘three’

2.1.3.1 ‘one’

(29) [Auni]

ŋqing te ʃi-ʃi
house ?AGR:E be.(al)one?
one hut (Güldemann 2002: 190)

(30) [Haasi]

ʃhasa ka ʃiŋ.ka
child ?AGR:A be.(al)one
one child (Güldemann 2002: 193)

(31) West Xoon (Taa)

ʘqaqe ʃi-ʃi
child.3(E) one-3(E)
one child

2.1.3.2 ‘two’

(32) [Auni]

ŋqing ʃa ti ʃi jam
house ?D ?AGR:I COP two
two huts (Güldemann 2002: 191)

(33) [Haasi]

ʃhasa ka ʃi laam.a
child ?AGR:A COP two
two children (Güldemann 2002: 193)

(34) West Xoon (Taa)

ʘqaqn ki nʃi.m
children.4(U) two
two children

2.1.3.3 ‘three’

(35) [Auni]

ŋqing ʃai si ntwona.a
hut ?P COP three-
three huts [the huts are three] (Güldemann 2002: 192)

(36) [Haasi]

ʃhasa ki si juu.a ka
child ?AGR:I COP three
three children (Güldemann 2002: 194)

(37) West Xoon (Taa)

ʘqaqn ki nʃi.m
children.4(U) three
three children

2.1.3.4 ‘many’

(38) [Auni]

tai tu si ʃani
men AGR:U COP many
many men (Güldemann 2002: 189)

(39) [Haasi]

ʃhasa ki si too.oo.ka
child ?AGR:I COP many
many children (Güldemann 2002: 194)

(40) West Xoon (Taa)

ʘqaqn ki nʃi.m
children.4(U) REL:4 be.many REL:4
many children

+ constructions in [Auni and [Haasi differ according to quantifier - special role of ‘one’:
  - copula si ‘be’ before most quantifier lexemes
  - ʃa~ŋsha with ‘two’, ʃai with ‘three’ (as grammaticalized numerals (32), (35)
  - agreement host (possibly a relative marker) cf. (38), but partly conflicting data: cf.
    (30)/(33) vs. (36)/(39) or (29) vs. (32)
  > postnominal linker possibly without vowel change: ???/ki/ < /ka/ #_/si/
variation in Lower Nossop also encountered within Taa:
- difference of 'one' vs. 'two'/'three' vs. 'many'
- no linker with class-inflecting quantifier: (31)
- no linker with invariable quantifier: (34), (37), (41)
- circumpositional agreement - initial + final relative marker: (40)
- postnominal linker with agreement - facultative use of final relative: (41)
- postnominal linker without agreement - gerund-like: (42)
- copula kM 'be' before quantifier: (42)

(41) East !Xoon of Bere (Taa)
ii !ain ba a-e |hoye te !ali
1P P? IPFV eat-3ii honey.3ii?(E) REL:3ii be.much we eat much honey

(42) Ngwatle (Taa)
ʘ qaqa ka ke !u-e
child.3i(E) GER? COP:3i one-3i one child

+ lexical paradigm of Lower Nossop varieties, if anything, partly related etymologically to Taa rather than !U!:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Nossop</th>
<th>Taa (Traill 1994)</th>
<th>!U! (Bleek 1937)</th>
<th>Haasi (Story 1999)</th>
<th>!Khomani (Maingard 1937)</th>
<th>!Xam (Bleek 1956)</th>
<th>!Ungkue (Meinhof 1929)</th>
<th>!Xegwi (Lanh./Hall. 1956)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one' jV, jV' (255)</td>
<td>h(a-u) (278)</td>
<td>jk'a (22)</td>
<td>kw'o? (459)</td>
<td>oe (185)</td>
<td>Nwaa (105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two' inV, !nâ- (146-7)</td>
<td>jona jona (254-5)</td>
<td>lcma: (23)</td>
<td>tu (244)</td>
<td>tu, tu (448, 492)</td>
<td>pu (183)</td>
<td>k'uu, c'uu (116)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'three' jde (283)</td>
<td>jai ... lwona (254, 272)</td>
<td>iu a k'a (23)</td>
<td>mona (244)</td>
<td>Ino'na (479)</td>
<td>mona (185)</td>
<td>gwna (102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many' jdi (247)</td>
<td>jkani (273)</td>
<td>lx z k'a (22)</td>
<td>cbe'ce (244)</td>
<td>k'wai (339, 340)</td>
<td>Nai ? (188)</td>
<td>q'!q (117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (...) – sources and page numbers; bold – compared standardized transliterations; 
[...] – uncertain correspondence set

Table 5: Quantifier lexemes across the Tuu family (Güldemann 2002: 194)
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Abstract
North of the confluence of the Nossob, Auob, and Molopo Rivers in the Kalahari, several speech varieties of San groups have been attested, if only poorly, by linguistic data, notably ǀAuni and (Ku)ǀHaasi. Their relationship to the Tuu family (aka “Southern Khoisan”) and their closer affiliation with each other, allowing one to subsume them under the term “Lower Nossob”, are so far undisputed. However, their exact position within Tuu is equivocal. While most early scholars have assigned them to the ǃUi branch of Tuu (e.g., Köhler 1981), there are robust linguistic and sociolinguistic indications that (a) a closer genealogical relation to the Taa group of Tuu is more probable (Güldemann 2002) and that (b) this genealogical affiliation has been obscured by subsequent language contact with the northernmost ǃUi language complex Nǁng. The paper will elaborate on the data presented in the latter article in providing more grammatical evidence for the Taa affiliation of the Lower Nossob varieties.