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The colloquial Dutch auxiliary het ‘have’ has a history of being invasive. Having “started life” as a 3rd person singular, it spread to the 1st and 2nd persons and the plural, and during the development of Afrikaans competed with, and replaced Dutch forms such as heb(t), heeft and hebben. An important structural victory was ousting mutative zijn (i.e. Zij is naar huis gegaan > Sy het huis toe gegaan), and when the preterite disappeared as a past tense category and the perfect, i.e. past participle + het, had to help fill the gap, the frequency of het rose once again. In one corpus of spoken Afrikaans (Kroes 1982, Hoofkorpus) het is 16 times more frequent than is, with both in auxiliary function. Het also ousted infinitive hê in verbal strings marking the irrealis, such as moes harder gewerk het ‘should have worked harder’ and even in infinitive phrases such as om te gewerk het ‘to have worked’ (Dutch te hebben gewerkt).

In some varieties of Afrikaans, the infinitive of the main verb, hê, yielded to het, cf. om daardie donkie te het ‘to have that donkey’ in 20th cent. Griqua Afrikaans, and dat ons Hem meer moet liefhet ‘that we should love Him more’ in a Moravian booklet from 1873 (Benigna van Groenekloof of Mamre). Even the irregular past participle gehad ‘had’ is regularised to gehet, as in het nie klagte gehet nie ‘didn’t have complaints’ in Griqua Afrikaans, and het doubling occurs, as in laat (= dat) ek die gelukwense ... het geontvang het ‘that I received congratulations’, in Namaqualand.

It may be argued that het has been grammaticalised further than other auxiliaries towards becoming a clitic. This is supported inter alia by its phonetic reduction to [ət] or [t], in particular sentence-finally; in Griqua Afrikaans it may even be completely absent in SOV structures such as relative clauses, e.g. die mense wat opgestan ‘the people who got up’.

One of the questions to be asked is when these changes took place in the predecessors of today’s standard Afrikaans. Even though S.J. du Toit, in his Comparative Grammar of English and Cape Dutch of 1897, supplies gehad hê
‘have had’ and gewees hê ‘have been’ as past tense forms, and ek sal/sou geloop hê ‘I will/would have walked’ as futures, het crops up in his historical novel, Di Koningin fan Skeba, of 1898, viz. Hiir moet daarom fanseléwe mense gewees het. ‘Surely there must have been people here long ago.’

Apart from its constructional history in varieties of Afrikaans, het also needs to be looked at from other angles. A number of syntactic or morpho-syntactic phenomena need to be captured in a theory, for example:

- the obligatory juxtaposition of auxiliary het and a past participle, viz.
  
  \[
  \text{dat } \text{<gedoen}> \text{ moes } \text{<gedoen}> \text{ word}, \text{ but } \\
  \text{dat } \ast \text{<gedoen}> \text{ moes } \text{<gedoen}> \text{ het};
  \]

- the a-symmetrical selection of auxiliaries between V2, where \textit{was} gewees is preferred, and sentence-final gewees \textit{het}, with only het;

- the intrusion of a past participle between \textit{te} and \textit{het}, as in \textit{om te gedoen het}, \text{ vs om gedoen te word/ wees/ hê};

- the selection of the irregular past participle \textit{gehad} with \textit{het} as against \textit{gehê} with certain other auxiliaries, cf. \textit{(lief-)gehad het}, but \textit{(lief-)gehê word/ wees}, which may be an active-passive or a tense contrast.

Other aspects that require consideration, apart from historical, dialectal and (morpho-)syntactic aspects, are the acquisition of het as auxiliary, and the prescriptive status of \textit{het} in varieties of Afrikaans where het has completely replaced hê.