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‘Alles Gescheite ist schon gedacht worden, man muß nur versuchen, es noch einmal zu denken.’ From Goethe’s Maximen und Reflexionen
Preface

The last time a monograph devoted entirely to the question of anglicisms in Afrikaans appeared was in 1937. (cf. Rousseau 1937) Since then a great deal has changed. The Afrikaner has become much more bilingual than he was in those days and he has lost even the passive knowledge of Dutch that was prevalent back in the thirties, so soon after Afrikaans replaced Dutch as the other official language of South Africa. Most Afrikaners are now even less a product of the platteland than they were earlier this century; there is no longer a geographic and cultural gap between them and their English speaking compatriots. These new circumstances have led to a degree of English influence on Afrikaans that is without compare in the world of European languages. And yet the world is largely ignorant of this unique linguistic situation. It is my hope that this book will be read both inside and outside South Africa: in the former case I hope it may serve as a useful update on what is occurring in the language as a result of the intimate contact with English and one day serve as a record of the situation as it was in the 1980's (as Rousseau's book has recorded for posterity the situation prevailing in the 1930's); and in the latter case I hope that those involved in research on bilingualism will now take cognisance of the relevance of the South African situation to their field of science and not pretend it doesn't exist just because they find the politics of the country concerned distasteful.

Throughout this book I have employed, in line with common practice, the Harvard method when referring to other sources. Full details of the works cited can be found in the bibliography at the back.

Although the word Diets is no longer current in Holland because of the negative connotations it acquired during World War II, it is still frequently used in South Africa where these connotations do not exist and where it occurs as an indispensable collective term for Dutch, Frisian and Afrikaans. As English does not have such a term, I have taken the liberty of using it indiscriminately with this meaning as if it were English.

Many of the examples given in the corpus in chapter seven appear in lists. It was not always practical for the notes to which the numbers in those lists refer, to be placed at the foot of the pages concerned; in such cases the notes will be found at the end of the lists, sometimes several pages further on. Where it was technically feasible for the numbers to refer to conventional footnotes, these will be found on the page in question.

To avoid confusion arising in situations where (cf. p. 50), for example, may refer either to a work under discussion at that point or to a page of this
book, such page numbers are in italics when reference is being made to the latter, e.g. (cf. p. 50).

Preface to the second edition

Due largely to the fact that this book has been widely prescribed at South African universities, I was offered the unexpected pleasure of being able to prepare a second edition within a year of the appearance of the first. This edition differs from the first in several small but important ways. Firstly, it has been improved typographically and secondly and more importantly, it has taken into consideration many of the criticisms of the first that were made in the many reviews of the book. In addition, Marja van de Vathorst of Utrecht has gone through the corpus with a careful eye to weeding out the expressions which slipped through as examples of anglicisms in Afrikaans but which appear to be known in Dutch after all. Many other refinements and small corrections have been made to the text as a whole.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABN</td>
<td>Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands (Standard Dutch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr.</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANS</td>
<td>Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Afrikaanse Woordelys en Spelreëls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt.</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig.</td>
<td>figurative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flem.</td>
<td>Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>Oxford English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.o.</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.t.</td>
<td>something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNT</td>
<td>Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One

1.0 Introduction

In the society of the Republic of South Africa there is a maze of language contact situations. There is the former contact situation that arose between the indigenous Hottentots and Bushmen (the Khoisan peoples) on the one hand and the immigrants of Bantu origin from points further north on the other. Then there is the contact situation that currently exists between various Bantu languages themselves that has intensified this century with the increasing urbanisation of South Africa's Blacks. There is then in turn the contact situation that is occurring as the various Bantu languages become more and more exposed to English and/or Afrikaans. In addition there is the contact situation, chiefly in Natal, between the various Indian languages and Zulu or the Indian languages and English, and, to a far lesser degree, Afrikaans. Last but not least there is the obvious, and from the European point of view most important and interesting contact situation that exists between English and Afrikaans, the two official languages of the White minority and lingua francas of many of the non-White population. The ideas of empire that gave birth to my own nation (Australia) brought together, at much the same time in history, English and Dutch in South Africa to create a contact situation which was inevitably to give rise to a symbiotic relationship between the two, but one in which the influence was to be, for historical and socio-economic reasons (cf. 2.1.1), more in the one direction than the other.

Although the last word has possibly not been said even about the influence of Afrikaans on English, there is certainly no doubt that there is still much to be said about the reverse process. That will constitute the content of this book. Probably no single aspect of Afrikaans linguistics warrants more attention today than the effect the English language has had, and is continuing to have, on Afrikaans. Possibly because of the volatility of the topic and the difficulty of approaching it with a degree of empiricism, even the Taalkommissie of the Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns has not been able to apply its talents to date to producing an authoritative analysis of the extent of English influence. The Taalkommissie is aware of this shortcoming and of the necessity of such a document appearing in the not too distant future, (cf. p. 6-7) I hope that this work may go some way towards assisting the Taalkommissie in its enormous task of compiling a modern authoritative work on anglicisms (an ambiguous term at this stage, cf. 2.00) in Afrikaans which will be generally accepted throughout South Africa as the standard work on the subject. I
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would be very pleased if my research could make even a modest contribution to this most urgent of publications.

I consider it important that the outside world be made acquainted with this unique aspect of South African civilisation and perhaps learn something from it:

‘The linguistic situation of the Republic of South Africa is exceptionally interesting to the student of language contact and bilingualism. It offers a context of languages, dialects and linguistic communities which has no exact parallel elsewhere and which for this reason alone deserves study.’  
(Van Wyk 1978: 29)

For this reason I chose to write in English and not in Afrikaans. Writing in English is definitely why, to the continual irritation of many Afrikaans academics, the opinions of Valkhoff (1966, 1972) on Afrikaans reached so many people outside South Africa with his two publications which many South Africans consider heretical. It is perhaps unfortunate that a work such as this, which also deals with an aspect of the impurity of Afrikaans, should be accessible to a world-wide public while all those works which concentrate on the opposite are not. Perhaps Afrikaans academic circles should learn something from this if they could only overcome the feeling, which I assume they have, that to write in English is to undermine the position of the very thing they seek to nurture and protect, for example:

‘Oor die vanselfsprekende verantwoordelikheid van elke Afrikaanssprekende om in Afrikaans te publiseer, wil ek nie eers praat nie’. (Odendal 1984: 197)

1.1 The uniqueness of the linguistic situation in South Africa, with reference to Afrikaans in particular

Much has been written on bilingualism, both general studies as well as case studies. Works on specific bilingual situations such as Haugen's (1953) on Norwegian in America, Ostyn's (1972) on Flemish in Chicago and Clyne's (1967, 1977) on Dutch in Australia deal with quite different situations from that in which English and Afrikaans find themselves. This situation is quite unique for a number of reasons.

To begin with, this is the only case in British colonial history where English had to compete with the language of another civilised western power which, from the beginning, has been and still is for the time being,
the language of the majority of White settlers. The White population still splits approximately 60/40 in favour of Afrikaners.

The fact that the direction of the influence has been predominantly from the language of the minority to the language of the majority does, it is true, have a parallel in Belgium, but there are also distinct differences from the Belgian situation. The bilingual Fleming is always able to look to the language of Holland as a guide to what his language is like in a context isolated from deep-rooted French influence. The French Canadian, to quote another obvious example, can look to Paris for guidance in instances where he suspects his speech has been corrupted. Immigrants in America or Australia, whose speech is also highly susceptible to interference from the language of the host community, can also look to ‘home’ to correct their errors. The Afrikaner on the other hand, can look nowhere else. What constitutes ‘correct’ Afrikaans? A knowledge of Dutch is as good as non-existent in South Africa today and would be considered unacceptable for ideological reasons anyway, quite apart from Dutch now being an impractical norm to apply. Afrikaans, unlike all other emigrant European languages spoken in bilingual and multilingual societies, is in the process of establishing its own standard. Perhaps a certain analogy exists with Yiddish which, although still basically German despite a substantial ad-mixture of Hebrew and Slavonic, is totally isolated from Germany and for both practical as well as ideological reasons, German cannot serve as a model for what is ‘correct’ Yiddish either. Yiddish, however, like Afrikaans in the nineteenth century, still suffers from a lack of true standardisation.

Afrikaans is no longer spoken anywhere in total isolation from English. The high degree of bilingualism among Afrikaners in particular, but also more and more among English speakers, is unique, as is the integration of English and Afrikaans speaking people. Malherbe (1966: 20) claimed that 60% of the Whites were bilingual (undoubtedly even higher now) and that this high figure is due not merely to the fact that both official languages are taught at school, but also and chiefly to the widespread geographic and social interspersion of English and Afrikaans speaking people in South Africa. Linguistic diffusion inevitably follows cultural diffusion. On the failure of British attempts in the nineteenth century to replace Cape Dutch by English, Du Toit (1965: 130) had the following to say:

‘Tog het dit daarin geslaag om die taal in meerdere of mindere mate rooi te verf en om hom ’n hele ent op die weg na ’n “Afrikaanse” mengtaal te stoot, die eerste stap... tot die eentaligheid waarin tweetaligheid soms sy logiese einde vind.’

In 1978 Van Wyk added:
Multilingualism is a reality which no South African can escape. Monolingualism is rare, being confined mostly to underdeveloped areas with homogeneous communities’ (p. 29)

where he is of course also referring to non-Europeans. English is not a foreign language to the Afrikaner, it is his second language and his proficiency in it is an admirable and unique achievement.

Of course anglicisms as such are not unique to Afrikaans, but the magnitude of the influence English is having on the language must surely be. Their ubiquitous presence in Afrikaans makes agreement on what constitutes the standard language even more difficult to achieve than it is in more linguistically homogeneous societies and makes attaining that ideal all the more elusive:

‘Dit is eweneens ’n feit dat hierdie ideaal nie deur Afrikaanssprekers - of die sprekers van enige taal - bereik word nie.’ (Van Rensburg 1983: 134)

This applies to Afrikaners more than to the speakers of many other European languages, particularly with regard to those anglicisms which are not (yet) regarded as standard Afrikaans to the extent that they are also considered acceptable in written style; to use Van Rensburg’s terminology, they are still regarded as nie-standaardtaalvorme.

The hostility that still exists in some Afrikaans circles to English, and the consequent trend towards (exaggerated) purism, is something the Flemish situation shares, but it does not occur in the bilingual migrant situations cited above which many modern studies of bilingualism have been based on. I feel such studies of the linguistic performance of migrant groups bear little relevance to the South African situation. I found them in fact to be of very little help in gaining a better understanding of the predicament in which Afrikaans finds itself.

Another fascinating and totally unique facet of the language problem in South Africa is the language policy of the government vis-à-vis the large non-White population, particularly in the light of the homeland policy whereby, once independence is granted, these nations are free to implement their own language policy which inevitably favours English, even if lip service continues to be done to Afrikaans. Such sovereign states are then also free to televise, for example, and the strictly bilingual policy of the SABC is faced with English dominated competition. The competition Afrikaans faces with English in South Africa is analogous to that which
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Dutch faces vis-à-vis French in Belgium, but the odds are overwhelmingly stacked against Afrikaans, which is no longer the case in Belgium.

Yet another unique aspect of this particular contact situation is the close affinity of English and Afrikaans; after all, had the Normans never invaded Britain, English and Dutch would probably be mutually intelligible today. Clearly such close historical ties with so many morphological structures, syntactic patterns and even parallel analytical development in common have created a climate in which the mutual influence is able to go to far greater lengths, and take a much more subtle course than would be the case if the two languages were not as closely related, such as is the case in Belgium and Canada. A possibly valid comparison with a similar development in the history of Germanic languages is provided by the enormous influence of German on the dialects of Scandinavia during the late Middle Ages; German, particularly the Low German of the Hanseatic League, is also very closely related to Scandinavian. The cities of Denmark, Norway and Sweden were bastions of German language and culture, as the cities of South Africa have always been English dominated, and the contact with German came in an age prior to the standardisation of Danish and Swedish, as was the case in South Africa, and thus when standardisation did finally occur in Scandinavia, a large German legacy was inevitable and indispensable; linguistic integration had rendered certain German elements inseparable from the indigenous.

Finally, Afrikaners find themselves today in the unique position of being able to draw on a double linguistic heritage, Dutch and English, of which the latter, remarkably enough, is more often than not the less foreign of the two.

1.2 The importance of the topic being studied again

In case there is anyone who would still feel inclined to query the validity of the topic under discussion, I quote from the writings of one of South Africa’s most prolific and most adamant supporters of the equality and purity of Afrikaans, the late Hennie Terblanche:

‘Dat die taal wat sy idioom en sinsbou betref deur Engels beïnvloed is, kan ’n mens geensins ontken nie. Dit blyk veral duidelik as daar na die spreektaal geluister word - en hier geld dit die spreektaal van alle lae van die bevolking, van die mense in die bus, die massa op ’n vergadering en diegene in die werkwinkel, tot by die onderwyser, die lektor, die professor en selfs die lede van die taalliggame. Ek wil my egter nie net by die spreektaal bepaal nie, maar ook die taal van die koerant
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Over fifty years have passed since Rousseau (1937) did a detailed study of English influence on Afrikaans for the University of Cape Town and much has changed since then. Valkhoff (1966: 18) commented:

‘After J.J. le Roux's study nobody seems to have had a mind to study the anglicisms thoroughly. To a connoisseur of Dutch, English and Afrikaans, they are very evident and do not consist of loanwords only: the whole structure of the language has been influenced.’

The short monograph of Le Roux's he refers to appeared in the fifties and is one of very few on the topic anyway. (cf. 3.3.1) Of course there have been numerous articles in journals and countless articles in newspapers and popular magazines such as Die Huisgenoot on various aspects of English influence. But it is time for another comprehensive study, given the enormous changes that have occurred since Rousseau's thesis was written. In actual fact it is an issue for the Taalkommissie of the Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns. It was the Akademie that recognised the urgency of the issue back in the 1930's and it consequently offered a prize for the best analysis of the subject, a prize which was ultimately awarded to Rousseau for his thesis (submitted in 1933) and which subsequently appeared as a book in 1937: Die invloed van Engels op Afrikaans - 'n sosiologies-taalkundige ondersoek. (cf. 3.2.2) But already in 1946 Terblanche recognised the need for the Akademie itself to produce something definite. Johan Combrink reiterated this need in Handhaaf in July 1978:

‘Daar moet op die hoogste vlak van Afrikaanse taalgesag,
It is now over twenty years later and we are still waiting. The situation is of course an ever changing one from one generation to the next. There is a perceptible generation gap with regard to the frequency and acceptability of many anglicisms. South Africa is after all now a more perfectly bilingual country than it was in the thirties and because of the electronic media and education, the whole nation is now exposed to more English wherever one lives, be it in a metropolis, a dorp or even on a farm. The volatility of the issue probably means that whatever study is done, it may soon be out of date, but it can always later assume the value of a time capsule, as Rousseau's work has to me.

A systematic diachronic analysis of the influence of English on Afrikaans would be as interesting as it is impossible, due to the lack of written texts in Cape Dutch during the period of first contact with English in the nineteenth century. In fact, with the exception of the works of Changuion (1844) and Mansvelt (1884) plus a few isolated articles from the beginning of the twentieth century, nothing substantial was written on the topic until the 1930's. In this thesis an attempt will be made to evaluate these earlier works in order to give some diachronic perspective to the topic, but this treatment of the topic is essentially, by necessity, synchronic in approach. Such a synchronic study must be based to a degree on an abstraction because it looks at developments still in progress and because it will concentrate on the standard language, itself an abstract concept. (cf. 4.1)

Perhaps the most important innovation of this work compared with all previous writings on the subject, is that it will look at the role English influence has played in inducing true language change within Afrikaans, without my assuming in any way the role of language purifier, as so many of my predecessors have done.

Previous scholars such as Rousseau (1937) and Le Roux (1952) were possibly not in a position to recognise many of the interference phenomena they observed as already constituting linguistic change, although they invariably from time to time felt compelled to admit that one or other structure seemed to have acquired burgerreg. These days, more than sixty years after the official recognition of Afrikaans and an era in which virtually the whole of Afrikanerdom is bilingual and has long since turned its back on the language of Holland - even to the extent where Dutch is now
more foreign to them than English - one can look once again at the comments of
scholars of the past on English influence and ascertain where their observations
have stood the test of time or where subsequent developments have taken Afrikaans
on a different course. A reappraisal of these older works on Afrikaans in the light of
more recent developments is as informative about the direction the language is
headed as it is important to understand the attitudes, often quite emotional in nature,
of the many people who have written on various aspects of the influence of English
on Afrikaans since Changuion first dealt with the issue in 1844.

1.2.1 Why the topic has been avoided for so long

When I first contemplated writing a dissertation on this subject in 1973, I was amazed
that what seemed such an obvious subject for a PhD had been tackled only once
before, and that as long ago as 1933. Another ten years passed before I found
myself in a position to be able to commence. In that period, to my further
astonishment, still no substantial monograph or thesis had appeared on the topic.
Clearly there had to be an explanation - I offer the following.

Linguistics is now a much more sophisticated discipline than it was back in the
1930's when so much was written on anglicisms in Afrikaans (cf. 3.2). The need
must also have seemed so much greater then than now, but this is deceptive: then
it was predominantly superficial lexical interference that was the centre of attention
plus the fact that it was felt that the newly recognised official language that had
replaced Dutch was in need of some tender loving care. With Dutch still within easy
living memory, people did not hesitate to refer back to it as the norm and regard
anything that deviated from it as suspect. The extensive relexification - if I dare to
use that term from creolistics - from Dutch which occurred in the 1930's, is evidence
of the influence the language of Holland still wielded in South Africa at that time. (cf.
Van Rensburg 1983: 139) Nowadays people neither have a knowledge of Dutch
nor is it agreed any more that Dutch is a yardstick which Afrikaans can be validly
measured by. Consequently it has become all the harder to decide what is 'correct'
or 'incorrect' and what is or isn't due to English influence. Lacking any totally empirical
means by which one can identify English influence - there is little doubt that the
scholars of the thirties were often too simplistic in this regard - it seems to me that
people in more recent times have tended to shy away from the topic, one can even
say have been intimidated into leaving it alone. Is it not a formidable task to measure
up to the prerequisites stipulated as necessary for the research worker into anglicisms
as enumerated by Combrink (1984: 100) in the most recent work on the subject?:
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‘Om na te gaan of 'n bepaalde element in Afrikaans wel aan Engelse invloed toe te skryf is, is nie 'n kitswerkie wat sommer enigiemand kan doen nie, dis 'n taak vir een of meer deskundige spesialiste. Dié kontrolering verg onder meer (i) goeie kennis van 18de-, 17de-, 16de en Middeleeuse Nederlands, asook die Nederlandse dialekte van dié tyd; (ii) goeie kennis van dieselfde tydperk se Platduitsse dialekte, want op een tydstip was hier meer Platduitsers as Nederlanders aan die Kaap; (iii) goeie kennis van vandag en vroeër jare se Engels, in ander dele van die wêreld en in Suid-Afrika.’

One must agree with Combrink that anyone privy to such a wealth of knowledge would be admirably equipped to face the task, but isn't such a person een schaap met vijf poten? Neither I nor Combrink himself, I fear, could satisfy all these requirements. But is the difficulty of the task ahead sufficient reason for it to be continually ignored? The interference and subsequent linguistic change currently occurring in Afrikaans under English influence is not going to go away but, on the contrary, is assuming gigantic proportions. In the same article Combrink (1984: 99) maintains Afrikaans runs the risk of becoming a mengtaal:

‘...volgens die taalbewusste meningsvormers beweeg Afrikaans die afgelope twintig jaar in hierdie rigting, en nogal vinnig.’

I have heeded Combrink’s warning even if I am not able to measure up to all the requirements enumerated by him. The necessity of his warning becomes obvious to anyone who reads the many ill-considered and often irresponsible statements that have been made on anglicisms in Afrikaans, not seldom by influential people. To a degree, of course, every school-teacher is an influential person and in this matter he/she can do irreparable damage to the linguistic performance of his/her students and above all to their self-confidence in their self-expression. I fear many teachers in South Africa have a great deal to answer for here, as Boshoff (1964: 33) so rightly complained:

‘Ons het ons byna 'n eeu lank teen die oorneem van Engelse woorde geweer, maar oogluikende Anglisismes aanvaar, omdat baie van ons daagliks Engels gehoor en gebruik het en omdat ons taalraadsmanne en onderwyskragte dikwels taalkundig nie voldoende geskoold was om hulself rekenskap te kan gee van wat eintlik 'n isme is nie.’
In the past patriotic feelings have perhaps played a role in the topic being largely ignored:

‘Dis met ’n mate van teensin dat ’n mens al hierdie Anglisimes op papier stel en dus as ’t ware publisiteit daaraan verleen.’ (Le Roux 1952: 48)

Nowadays, however, I feel sure that either no-one dares tackle the subject for fear of not meeting criteria such as those stated by Combrink above and thus of venturing out onto thin ice, and/or alternatively one does not quite know where to begin as English has spread like a cancer into every facet of Afrikaans, although certain aspects of the language have undoubtedly been more susceptible to influence than others. This raises a further complication in studying the influence of English on Afrikaans: how does one empirically distinguish between mere interference phenomena on the one hand and true linguistic change on the other, for such is the degree of influence on Afrikaans today that the latter has occurred and is continuing to occur.

The topic is vast and I may well be reproached with having attempted to tackle too broad a field in this book, but to have limited myself to certain aspects of the influence of English on Afrikaans would have been to do what so many of my predecessors have done. Only Rousseau has tackled the whole topic head on; it is time for that to be done again, even at the risk of certain issues being covered perhaps in less detail than others. I refer to Smith’s articles in *Die Naweeq* (2/12/48, 10/2/49) on whether welaf is or is not an anglicism in Afrikaans as an example of the degree of detail into which one can go on one tiny issue. If the research worker is expected to give such a detailed account of every word or expression where English influence is suspected, the task of tackling the issue as a whole would be so mammoth, it would never be completed.

Although the relative scarcity of recent articles and above all total lack of recent monographs and theses on the topic are undoubtedly a reflection of the unwillingness of Afrikaans academics to approach it, I would venture to maintain that there is also, whether they are aware of it or not, an inability among even those involved in Afrikaans/Nederlands as an academic discipline, to recognise fully and objectively the degree of English influence in their language. If, on the other hand, the lack of recent works is a reflection of the feeling that there is nothing new left to say, I hope this book will dispel that idea.

1.2.2 Neglect of Afrikaans by Dutch scholars.

It should be regretted that more interest is not shown in Afrikaans by
neerlandici in Holland. Some of the prerequisites for identifying English influence set out by Combrink (1984) above are inevitably the preserve of Dutch academics. Unfortunately their talents are now seldom, if ever, directed at the study of the history of Afrikaans, which was not the case earlier this century. Nowadays the Dutch seem to make a naive equation between showing an interest in Afrikaans and being pro the present South African regime. The current hostile attitude to anything South African in Holland also intimidates any Dutch academics from making the valuable contributions to a further understanding of the factors that have shaped Afrikaans that many of them would surely be capable of making.

Strangely enough there is still no definite study of the influence of English, or German for that matter, on Dutch either; only the influence of French has been done in detail (Salverda de Grave 1913). The influence of English on Dutch is certainly much more superficial than its influence on Afrikaans. However, German, primarily because of the close affinity between it and Dutch, must have had a much more subtle, far-reaching influence on Dutch, a process which has perhaps much in common with the influence English has had on Afrikaans, once again because of the affinity of the two. (cf. 2.1.4) It is interesting to note that as early as 1925 De Vooys remarked on the influence of German and English on Dutch that ‘Germanismen en Anglicismen trokken meer de aandacht van taalzuiveraars dan van taalgeleerden.’ (De Vooys 1925: 71) The same can be said of English influence on Afrikaans. Another interesting parallel from the Low Countries is reflected in the following statement about gallicisms in Flemish:

‘De Franse tussenkomst in Vlaanderen kan “gemakkelijk” - daarom nog niet deskundig - worden tegengegaan zolang er een duidelijke signaalwerking is waardoor die invloed herkenbaar is. Dit geldt voor de leenwoorden en de bastaardwoorden. Met leenvertalingen uit het Frans of gallicismen ligt het niet zo eenvoudig.’ (Suffeleers 1979: 186)

1.2.3 The importance of a study of the English-Afrikaans contact situation to the world at large

The linguistic diversity of South Africa, and specifically the contact situation between English and Afrikaans with their mutual influence, deserves far greater attention by the world at large than it has had to date, particularly - as I hope to show in the course of this work - with regard to what this case study can teach us about linguistic change in general. Perhaps
the processes I will be describing here have a wider validity, both in the present world and above all in explaining linguistic change throughout history. (cf. p. 5)

1.3 The contribution this work hopes to make to a further understanding of anglicisms in Afrikaans

Nobody working in a field of science today is able to work in isolation without being indebted in some way or other to the work of his predecessors in that discipline. In that regard this work is certainly no exception; much of what I discuss has been dealt with by numerous scholars at various times in the past. No-one, however, has yet dealt with everything that I treat here nor has anyone dealt with everything I discuss in as much detail as I do here, although inevitably I deal with some aspects of the (possible) influence of English on Afrikaans in more depth than others. At times specialisation is simply impossible when tackling such a broad topic, but also on occasions the work of my predecessors has been so thorough as to be difficult to improve upon. In such instances I make due reference to those works.

Because of the vastness of the subject and its extreme importance to South Africa, some critics might feel that certain aspects of the influence of English on Afrikaans are not dealt with by me in the detail they deserve. Such issues must be relegated for the time being to the category of perspectives for further research. (cf. 8.00) Nevertheless, I will attempt to give a working framework of all aspects of the topic while some, particularly those never or scarcely dealt with before, will be covered more thoroughly. In fact, I fear this book may pose more questions than it will answer, but sometimes it is as important to ask the right questions as it is to give the right answers; at very least the former must precede the latter, for I feel sure that in the case of the English-Afrikaans contact situation and the influence resulting from it, some important questions have never ever been posed. What I don't answer, or cannot (yet) answer, perhaps others can find solutions for.

So many people before me have labelled phenomena in Afrikaans as English inspired when on further reflection it has appeared that this is quite possibly not the case. I suppose the reason is because none of us can live up to the expectations of Combrink (1984), previously mentioned on pp. 8-9. I will possibly also commit some such errors on occasions and it will be the task of those who follow me to point out where I too have found ‘a red under every bed’. I do tackle the problem from a different point of view, however, and will perhaps not make as many mistakes, because I have had the benefit of learning from those of my predecessors, or at least will make different errors of judgement; only subsequent research will tell. This will
probably remain a problem in the analysis of English influence on Afrikaans to a degree, although change is now so rapid that we may better be able to monitor changes occurring in the future than we have to date. Smith (1962: 71) said of Rousseau's (1937) work:

‘Hoewel daar allerlei menings in die werk aangetref word waaromtrent die lesers dit nie met die skrywer eens sal wees nie, tog moet elkeen erken dat ons hier vir die eerste keer ‘n ernstige en omvattende wetenskaplike verhandeling oor die vraagstuk het...’

Similarly with this work: if the reader, although he may not agree with me on every point, at least concedes that the issue deserved treatment again and is convinced I have made some new contribution to an understanding of it, however modest or controversial that contribution might prove to be, I will feel it was worth it, just as Rousseau's was. Both books can ultimately be regarded as records at their respective times in history of the state of affairs in Afrikaans with regard to English influence; as Von Humboldt said in 1836:

‘There can never be a moment of true standstill in language, just as little as in the ceaselessly flaming thought of man. By nature it is a continuous process of development...’ (Aitchison 1981: 15)

Further on Aitchison herself says:

‘What we are short of, are detailed records of language changes actually in progress.’ (p. 46)

As Rousseau's work has proven to be just that, mine may too.

Ultimately this book is about language change, but one specific form thereof - change arising in a language contact situation. The overall issue of linguistic change is a controversial one, because so often hard evidence of the processes involved is lacking. I would venture to suggest that harder evidence than is available in the South African situation under discussion would be difficult to find, which is not to maintain that this influence can necessarily always be proven - possibilities and probabilities often have to suffice.

I do not intend to concentrate on the causes of bilingual interference in South Africa, something competently done in great detail by Rousseau, but simply on the results and to postulate that we have now reached a stage where the influence English is having on Afrikaans has gone well beyond
the realm of interference and has given rise to linguistic change. In 1964 Boshoff stated:

‘Dat Afrikaans in die toekoms moontlik meer aan Engels sal ontleen, is baie waarskynlik, maar die vraag is hoe, waar, waarom en wanneer.’ (p. 39)

Some answers to those questions will be offered here. I would even go so far as to suggest that the influence of English has now reached a degree where Afrikaners cannot be completely fluent in Afrikaans without a knowledge of English to a greater or lesser degree; in order to be completely articulate in all fields they need to be able to draw on both national languages, e.g. their repertoire of swearwords, (cf. 7.29.1)

It is not possible to give a complete inventory of English influence on Afrikaans as the topic is so vast and is, of course, an ongoing process. What I do wish to present, however, is a theoretical framework on the basis of my quite extensive, and yet by necessity limited, corpus, by which all forms of English influence can be classified. I want to focus on underlying principles rather than on merely enumerating countless instances and yet to do this, one’s corpus must be large enough to allow the sort of generalisations linguists are interested in. And yet I am aiming at a categorisation which is intelligible to the layman as well as the trained linguist because it is a topic of utmost importance to every White South African, whether English or Afrikaans speaking.

Combrink (1984: 100-101) writes:

‘Daar het sedert 1917 tale stukke verskyn waarin die skrywer(s) leiding probeer gee oor taalsuiwerheid en Engelse invloed op Afrikaans... Maar, elke leidinggewer het (a) sy eie interpretasie aan die term Anglisisme gee, (b) ’n eie, unieke versameling Afrikaanse taalbouses tot Anglisismes verklaar, en (c) ’n eie, unieke groep van sy Anglisismes “toegelaat”, of soos dit ook gestel word, as “ingeburger” beskou.’

I hope to differ from these previous writers in the following way. With regard to (a), I want to look objectively at what others understand by the term. With regard to (b), I too give a ‘unique’ list of anglicisms collected by me but without insisting that all are definitely the result of English influence - I merely postulate the possibility or probability of that being the case. And finally, with regard to Combrink's point (c), not being a native-speaker of Afrikaans, or even a South African for that matter, I am in no position to label phenomena as definitely ingeburger. I intend merely to discuss the concepts of inburgering/acceptability and standard
Afrikaans in this context and leave the Afrikaans speaking reader to assess, according to the norms of his idiolect, how far the absorption of these linguistic phenomena has gone. The following statement by De Villiers (1977: 1) would seem to endorse my approach as being the only safe one to take although he himself advocates the importance of linguists regarding the setting of norms as part of their task:

‘Baie taalkundiges van die twintigste eeu was en is gekant teen wat hulle normatiewe grammatica noem, nl. reglementering, taalreëls, voorskrifte, ens. Die afkeer is verstaanbaar want baie taalvoorskrifte is afkomstig van skoolboeke en van taalrubriek en -praatjies wat geneig is om allerlei sake te vereenvoudig tot 'n skerp skeiding tussen korrek en verkeerd, met beklemtioning van foute, meermale gebaseer op verouderde opvattings, en op persoonlike, stillistiese voor- en afkeure wat as reëls of wetenskaplike sekerhede aangebied word.’

I think it is possibly even an advantage in this case not being an Afrikaner, for the temptation to pass value judgements must be quite considerable for those who are.

Finally, because of the vast array of opinions on this topic in South Africa, both past and present, I hope the synthesis I will offer here of all the major, and often not so major, works and statements on anglicisms in Afrikaans will in itself be considered a useful contribution to scholarship.

1.3.1 Why consideration of Coloured Afrikaans is excluded from this study

It is a lamentable facet of South African life that virtually all deliberations on the position and future of Afrikaans fail to take the Coloured population into consideration, particularly as they are as numerous as White mother tongue speakers of the language and until the end of the nineteenth century the former even outnumbered the latter. I too have unfortunately been forced to ignore the language as spoken by the Coloured population of the Republic. This should not, however, be taken as any indication of my support for the distinction that is made by many in South Africa between White and Coloured speakers of Afrikaans; it is simply the result of my having to limit the object of my research somewhere for fear of it becoming too unwieldy. In addition, Coloured Afrikaans was inaccessible to me as a non-native-speaker of the language and as one virtually isolated from any contact with Coloureds due to the areas in which I have resided in
South Africa, as well as in part to the constraints of apartheid. More importantly, however, the degree to which English has affected the spoken Afrikaans of Coloureds is far greater than that of Whites. To illustrate the problem I quote Van Wyk (1978: 47):

‘At present there are two situations which may contain the germs of diglossia. One is the use in informal contexts of a typical variety or dialect of Afrikaans by Coloured speakers in the Cape Province. It differs phonologically, lexically and, to a lesser extent, syntactically from the standard Afrikaans used by most of these speakers in formal situations. The sociolinguistic implications of the use of these two forms of Afrikaans in one community have not yet been studied fully. It is therefore difficult to decide whether it is a case of diglossia, of different dialects, or of different styles of the same language.’

Be that as it may, of greater relevance to this work is the fact that when it comes to written style and ‘official’ usage, the Afrikaans of Coloureds does not diverge from the norms of White Afrikaans and the standard language is what I am chiefly concerned with here.

1.4 The methodology

1.4.1 Sources of the corpus

From 1974-84 the South African embassy in Canberra regularly kept me supplied with copies of Die Burger, the leading Capetonian Afrikaans daily, and Suid-Afrikaanse Panorama, a glossy magazine on various facets of South African life that appears separately in both official languages. These publications were the first and only source of material at my disposal while resident in Australia. I spent the period February to October 1983 in Bloemfontein where I greatly expanded my corpus by reading the Afrikaans press extensively, as well as gleaning a considerable amount of material from the radio and television broadcasts of the SABC. I chose to do the research for this book in Bloemfontein as it is the only substantial urban environment in South Africa that is predominantly and over-whelmingly Afrikaans, and is simultaneously the site of a university. Not being a native-speaker of Afrikaans and thus unable to apply my own taalgevoel to what I heard and read, and as my interest was in ingeburgerde Anglisismes rather than interference phenomena, I considered it necessary to immerse myself in the ‘purest’ environment available, which Johannesburg, Cape Town or Pretoria would certainly not have been. Even in Bloemfontein, a bastion of Afrikanerdom where very little
English is used, I was continuously confronted with examples of deep-rooted English influence. This seemed more significant to me in such an environment than if I had been confronted with similar circumstances in the other cities of South Africa where one is continually employing one's bilingualism and is thus more susceptible to inference. Coetzee (1948: 21) remarked after discussing examples of English influence:

‘So ’n voorbeeld dien om ons daarop bedag te maak dat vanuit die hoek van die Engelsprekende heelwat invloed op Afrikaans uitgeoefen sal word, afgesien nog van die Anglisismes wat Engelskundige Afrikaanssprekendes self invoer.’

After what I was confronted with in Bloemfontein, I would question whether Afrikaners need any help from English speakers in absorbing English influence; I doubt in fact whether the latter have had any significant role to play in so many anglicisms having been assimilated into Afrikaans.

I have not limited myself to collecting examples from the written language, despite attitudes such as the following:

‘Die belangrike rol wat die skryftaal by standaardisasie speel, kan ook nie onderskat word nie. Van Wyk (1978) wys, met verwysing na Steyn (1976) se weergawe van ’n paar sintaktiese onvastighede in Afrikaans, daarop dat (soos Labov reeds bewys het) ’n vorm nog nie goeie Afrikaans is as hy nog nie in die skryftaal aanvaar is nie.’ (Coetzee 1982: 276)

To gain acceptance in the written language, the phenomena must begin somewhere, clearly in the spoken language, even if to begin with one would simply class them as examples of interference. Eventually they can occur with great frequency and yet still not always be particularly evident in writing:

‘Dit is deur middel van die gesprokene taal dat taal gevorm word en waar dit groei - óf sal sommiges beweer, waar dit ten gronde gaan - en sekerlik verander.’ (Hauptfleisch 1983: 63)

Besides, what constitutes the standard language (cf. 4.00) and what is skryftaal, as, for example, the many omissions from HAT of common everyday expressions (which I have often seen in writing too) prove?

---

2 Pienaar (1931: 175) refers to papier-Anglisismes, a small category of anglicisms which occur only in writing, not in speech, for example: wie instead of wat as a relative pronoun with reference to personal antecedents.
I have not felt obliged to give specific references to the sources of my corpus. Firstly, it would have been unwieldy to do so given the size of the corpus, and in the case of those I have collected from personal conversations and the electronic media, it would have been impossible. Secondly, and more importantly however, if a concrete (written) reference is required to substantiate the existence of a word or structure to prove its existence, it is apparently unusual or uncommon and thus is not relevant enough for inclusion in this study. The stance I have taken here is supported by De Bruto (1970: 38), where he points out that one must be sure one is not just dealing with an individual's *taalgebruik* but that what one has observed and recorded is evidence of *sisteemverdringoing*. My approach here is also identical to that taken by Le Roux (1968: 165):

‘Gedereende geruime tyd het ek voorbeeldige opgeteken uit die mond van beskaafde en ontwikkelde Afrikaners, en veral uit koerante, tydskrifte en die werke van bekende skrywers. Bronne vermeld ek nie: die ruimte laat dit nie toe nie en dit kan aanleiding gee tot onnodige kleinsierigheid aan die kant van die skrywer en ongeregverdigde gevolgtrekkings aan die kant van die leser.’

### 1.4.2 Identifying English influence

A bilingual situation such as exists in South Africa must give rise to linguistic interference. The question hardly needs to be posed whether interference, and as a consequence thereof influence, has occurred. Rather one needs to take cognisance of the fact that it **has** taken place, and will continue to. Then one should trace these influences, and, having identified them, one should attempt to classify them and describe what has occurred. That is to be the task of this work, as well as looking at the theoretical explanations of linguistic change with regard to this particular language contact situation.

The difficulties one has to contend with in conclusively identifying phenomena in Afrikaans as English inspired have been hinted at by the guidelines set out by Combrink (1984: 100). (cf. p. 8-9) Smith (*Die Naweek*, 2/12/48) suggests the following criteria, some of which overlap with Combrink’s:

1. Ons eie taalgevoel - maar ons moet darem enigsins oortuig wees dat dit behoorlik ontwikkel en gesond is.
2. Die taal van onvervalste Afrikaners - veral van ons ouer mense in streke wat die minste aan Engelse invloed blootgestel was.
3. Sewentiende-eeuse Nederlands, wat die grondvorm van
Afrikaans is - veral die sewentiende-euse Nederlandse volkstaal, soos ons dit in die klugte en ander volksliteratuur kan sien.

4. Die streekprake of dialekte van Nederlands...

5. Die moderne Nederlandse standaardtaal, wat net soos Afrikaans, uit die sewentiende-euse Nederlands ontwikkel het, en wat nie alleen tot onlangs toe dié erkende skryftaal van alle Afrikaners was nie, maar wat ook vandag nog ons skryftaal en hoëre spreektaal beïnvloed en verruk.

I would like to add the following comments to these points of Smith’s. On point 2, Rousseau (1937: V) also advocates Boere-Afrikaans rather than Dutch as a means of identifying English influence. I feel inclined to question whether this method had much validity even then, but it certainly would not be valid now because of the effect of the mass media and the higher degree of bilingualism that now exists. In fact, in a review of Taalgoggas in die daelikse lewe by Twee Oud-onderwysers (1937) Smith (1962: 75) wrote:

‘Dr. Rousseau het Boere-Afrikaans as die beste toetssteen vir die ontdekking van ‘n Anglicisme beskou, maar vir die Twee Oudonderwysers is die Dietse taaleie die beste maatstaf’,

but here it is obvious that Smith sees these two guidelines as ultimately amounting to the same thing(!).

Further to Smith’s points 3 and 4, Valkhoff (1972: IX) reproduced Van Haeringen’s review of Scholtz’s Taalhistoriese Opstelle ‘as a warning to those South African Nederlandicists who think that they can explain everything in the development of Afrikaans by latent tendencies of seventeenth century Dutch and Dutch or Flemish dialects.’ Also with regard to point 4, it is interesting to note that Hasselmo (1961: 199), in his study of American Swedish, commented that ‘dialectal variations sometimes pose a problem by being indistinguishable from expected influences from English’.

In an article on the observations of M.D. Teenstra, a Dutchman who visited the Cape in 1825 and commented on how different Cape Dutch was, Franken (1953: 177) stated:

‘Dit is nie ‘n toevalligheid dat onder die dagboekhouers en reisbeskrywers die belangrikste uitspraak insake die Kaap se

---

3 The influence of standard Dutch is undoubtedly less now than when Smith was writing in 1948, but nevertheless the role that Dutch continued to play in shaping Afrikaans throughout the nineteenth century and even after the official recognition of the language in 1925, has often been ignored or underestimated. (cf. Uys 1983)
Hollands en die bewuste poging om dit weer te gee, gekom het van Nederlanders nie. Hulle het beskik oor 'n basis van vergelyking, wat aan die meeste andere wat Duitsers, Franse en Skandinawiërs was, ontbreek het.'

Even today Afrikaners must admit that a Dutchman has a unique vantage point from which to observe phenomena in Afrikaans that are unique to that language. Smith gives due recognition to the importance of modern standard Dutch in identifying English influence on Afrikaans in point 5. This attitude is supported by De Bruto (1970: 37):

‘Moet mens nie ook die huidige Nederlands tot vergelykingsbasis verhef nie?’

Nevertheless, Odendal (1973: 30) warns against taking the criterion of Dutch too far:

‘In die geval van Afrikaans moet ons daarteen waak om Nederlands as norm te aanvaar en wat daarvan afwyk, as korrup te beskou’.

Langenhoven (1935: 105) made an interesting comment which is of relevance here:

‘Oor die algemeen is dit te verwag, en vind ons dit ook, dat die Hollander wat Afrikaans via Nederlands aangeleer het, hom baie minder aan Anglisismes sal besondig as die Afrikaner wat lank en sterk onder Engelse taalinvloed was. Maar daardie Hollander, ook as hy meer en meer daartoe kom om sy eie neerlandismes te vermy, moenie vir hom verbee dat hy van Nederlands Afrikaans maak eenvoudig deur weglating van verbuigings nie.’

My own experience of Afrikaans has borne out the truth of what he says, particularly with regard to having to (re-)introduce anglicisms into my Diets idiom in order to move closer to Afrikaans idiom.

I concede that Dutch can no longer be used as the norm in the way that the Twee Oud-onderwysers (1937) and even Rousseau (1937) used it, but where else can one begin when attempting to isolate the influence of English on Afrikaans from all the other factors that have contributed to the independent path that Afrikaans has opted to take away from Dutch? A knowledge of Dutch among South African linguists is nowadays not what it was nor, in my opinion, what it should be, and this situation could well become worse with present relations between Holland and South Africa.
being as they are. Such a knowledge is imperative for a thorough study of anglicisms in Afrikaans. The first generation of Afrikaans linguists did receive their training in Dutch, either in Holland or South Africa (e.g. S.P.E. Boshoff, J.L.M. Franken, D.B. Bosman, J.J. Smith), but they were more interested in die ontstaan van Afrikaans and in puristic aspects, than in the 'impurities' of the language.

There have been people in the past who have greatly oversimplified the identification of anglicisms in Afrikaans. There was a claim in Die Huisgenoot, for example, that Dutch is the only norm ‘waaraan ons kan toets wanneer ’n woord of uitdrukking ons uit Engels bereik het.’ (Redaksioneel 29/8/52.) Schonken, on the other hand, also writing in Die Huisgenoot, maintained that:

“’n Gemaklike manier om dit uit te vind is veelal om die uitdrukking letterlik of woordelik in Engels oor te sit. As hierdie vertaling dan ’n verstaanbare goeie Engelse spreekwyse met presies dieselfde betekenis uitmaak dan het ons in 90 uit die 100 gevalle met ’n Anglisisme te doen.’” (July 1918)

This is of course a dubious statement if for no other reason than the fact that it underestimates the Indo-European heritage common to both English and Afrikaans, as well as common cultural factors such as classical antiquity and the Bible. The latter, for example, has provided all the languages of Europe with many expressions which are often no longer recognised as being biblical in origin, e.g. ‘to cast pearls before the swine’ - pêrels voor die swyne werp (Matt. 7: 6), ‘the salt of the earth’ - die sout van die aarde (Matt. 5: 13), ‘a wolf in sheep's clothing’ - ’n wolf in skaapsklere (Matt. 7: 15). As a final condemnation of Schonken's over-simplified approach I quote Combrink (1984: 96) again from an article where he spends pages enunciating the many things Afrikaans and English have in common:

‘Uit hierdie beknopte oorsig blyk dit dat daar talle redes is waarom Afrikaans en Engels duisende parallele taalbouwels het. Dit is onregverdig om, sonder verdere onderzoek, ’n taalbouwel wat in Afrikaans gebruik word, as ’n Anglisisme te bestempel bloot omdat dié taalbouel ’n parallel in Engels het. Maar hiermee word nie die feit weggepraat dat Engels wel ’n diepgaande invloed op Afrikaans gehad het en nog het nie.’

The problem of distinguishing English influence from the common heritage is indeed quite considerable, as the following expressions will serve to illustrate: dit belowe om goed te word, in die ope lug, dagdroom
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These are examples that are found in English, Afrikaans and Dutch; therefore what is the source? A common cultural and linguistic heritage of course. But the problem is greater still, as the following expressions illustrate: *die kind met die badwater uitgooi, hulle is op goeie voet, die aap uit die mou laat*. These are expressions of examples of expressions that exist in Dutch too, and which one would thus be inclined to see as belonging to that part of Afrikaans inherited directly from Dutch, but the form they have assumed in Afrikaans resembles the idiom of English rather than that of Dutch. In these cases Dutch says *het kind met het badwater weggooien, zij staan op goede voet, de aap komt uit de mouw* (different meaning also), (cf. footnote 8, p. 180) Thus there are degrees of English influence to be found in the idiom of Afrikaans. Without a knowledge of Dutch there is nothing whatsoever to indicate that an expression such as *dit reën katte en honde* does not belong to the common linguistic and cultural heritage shared by English, Afrikaans and Dutch.

The real point is not ultimately whether a given structure definitely is or is not by origin an anglicism in Afrikaans, but whether it is perceived by the majority of native-speakers to be acceptable Afrikaans, regardless of whether it replaces or complements an equivalent Afrikaans expression or not. Compilers of descriptive and even prescriptive works such as *HAT* and *WAT* must in future take this much more into account than has been the case so far, and base their decisions on whether to incorporate a given expression or word on common usage, and not on their own value judgements.

Proof of the source of any given ‘suspect’ phenomenon in Afrikaans is virtually impossible; if one first has to prove that something is English in origin before one may even postulate that this is the case, a start will never be made in investigating the degree to which English has influenced Afrikaans. What constitutes absolute proof anyway, particularly when the two languages are as closely related as English and Afrikaans?

‘Theories are all very well, but in the end they have to be proved or disproved. And just because one has proof that one element of Afrikaans originated in some specific way, say under the influence of the Dutch dialect Hollands, this does not constitute proof that all the structural aspects of Afrikaans are of Hollands descent. What I am implying is that the truth about the origin of Afrikaans has many facets.’ (Combrink 1978: 70)

This comment of Combrink’s is of particular relevance to the many phenomena one often reads of as having occurred in older Dutch or still occurring in Dutch dialects. Just because certain typically Afrikaans structures that differ from ABN are to be found in Dutch dialects or in
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seventeenth century Dutch, one cannot at all necessarily conclude that they are the source thereof in Afrikaans; that may or may not be the case, or a combination of factors may have contributed to the presence of a given linguistic form in Afrikaans. (cf. 6.3) Smith (Die Naweek, 10/2/49), in his discussion on the expression welaf, states that Schonken mentions it occurs in the dialect of Oud-Ablas. Smith then quotes Rousseau:

‘Om ’n verdagte Afrikaanse taaleenheid op rekening van ’n miskien onbeduidende Nederlandse dialek te skuwe net omdat dit daar aangetref word, getuig van veel minder wetenskaplike sin as om dit aan die in Suid-Afrika so kragtige Engelse invloed toe te skrywe.’

Francken (1912: 280), in his discussion of certain possible anglicisms in Afrikaans, states:

‘Deze vormen behoeven dus nog geen Anglicismen te zijn. Daarmede is niet gezegd dat ze het niet kunnen zijn... Evenals er Anglicismen en Anglicismen zijn, zijn er ook aanhalingen en aanhalingen.’

In other words, just because a particular construction occurs somewhere in literature, that is not to say that it is common and thus, in this context, that Dutch is the source of it in Afrikaans. Some concrete examples of the sort of debate that has arisen with regard to whether certain Afrikaans phenomena are or are not Dutch in origin, are given here to illustrate the problem. Probably more common than sowel...as in Afrikaans today is the expression beide...en which many prescriptive works, regardless of its common usage, still insist is an anglicism that should be avoided. Smith (1962: 67) maintains that it occurs in the Statenvertaling of the Bible but quite correctly adds the rider ‘dat ’n uitdrukking nietteenstaande sy bestaan in Nederlands tog direk uit Engels in Afrikaans kan gekom het’. In other words, one must not ignore the possibility - often even the probability - of English being the source of many phenomena in Afrikaans, even though one may have concrete evidence of their former presence in standard Dutch or in the dialects. The same argument applies to the meaning of braaf, for example, where Le Roux (1952: 35), to name but one who has discussed this word, maintains it meant ‘brave’ in seventeenth century Dutch and thus ‘Engels kan hoogstens ’n behoudende invloed gehad het’ - that is to say, the contributing factor theory (cf. 6.3), which is open to debate. Then there are the semantics of bly, which Le Roux puts in the same category as braaf. This word has also often been the regarded as ‘suspect’ in Afrikaans (it is even recorded by Changuion in 1844), but no South African writer on the topic seems to have been aware that ‘to stay’ in
the meaning of ‘to live’ is, at least these days, peculiar to South African English. Brachin (1970: 126) even suggested that bly may well be a translation of rester and thus of Huguenot origin (which is highly unlikely), although Hegmann (1983: 72) countered that theory by pointing out that the OED gives ‘to remain’ as meaning ‘to have one’s abode, to dwell (obsol.).’

Terblanche writes that he had always regarded agter skool bly as an anglicism because agter can only be used with place in Afrikaans but ‘Onderzoek het egter aan die lig gebring dat agter in MNL en sewentiende-eewe Nederlands i.v.m. “tyd” gebruik is, en aangesien dit aansluit by die Afrikaanse agterbly (b.v. jy moet agterbly) kan agter skool bly nie sonder ’n redelike mate van twyfel as ’n Anglisisme beskou word nie.’ (Die Brandwag, 25/10/46)

Finally, Smith (1962: 67) pointed out that it is always possible, although I feel that this is seldom the case, that a given structure that occurs in Dutch as well as Afrikaans may well be an anglicism in Dutch too. He then gives several examples, among which die trein mis and uitvind, where I would question his reasons for regarding these expressions as anglicisms in Dutch.

Scholtz (n.d:45) commenting on L.H. Meurant's Afrikaans, states:

‘Uit die aard van die saak word net aandag gegee aan konstruksies wat nie Nederlands is nie. Ook hier kan die moeilikheid hom voordoen dat dit nie te sê is of ’n bepaalde konstruksie weselijk van Nederlands afwyk nie. Die waarneembare verskille is dikwels ook so weinig skerp dat hul nie met ’n paar woorde kan verduidelik word nie... Dikwels lê die verskil in die voorkeur wat aan ’n bepaalde konstruksie gegee word.’

Further on, on page 46, he quotes the example of ek hoop so (Dt. ik hoop het), often regarded as English in origin, which he discovered in the writing of a Huguenot settler from the time of W.A. van der Stel. This could be significant given that French has the same idiom here as Dutch.

‘Wil ons nou die aard en omvang van taalvermenging in ’n spesiale geval grondig bestudeer, dan moet ons van die grondooreenkoms maar veral van die grondverskille wat tale aanbied, duidelijk bewus wees’. (Malherbe 1937)

What Malherbe calls the grondooreenkoms is of particular interest and importance in the contact situation under discussion here. Not only the
inherited common features of English and Dutch/Afrikaans, but also the parallel
development with English that particularly Afrikaans, as opposed to Dutch, has
undergone since 1652 has led past scholars to wrongly postulate English influence,
e.g. Du Toit (1897: iv), Valkhoff (1972: 29).

Kempen (1969: 610) warns that ‘As ’n taalkundige ’n taalvorm Anglisisties noem,...
moet hy grond onder sy voete hê.’ Combrink (1984: 100) implies the same thing.
One cannot deny that these scholars’ warnings must be heeded when embarking
on this topic, but nevertheless I feel that such statements are likely to intimidate one
into ignoring the many cases where English influence, although it cannot be proven,
is at very least possible and often even probable. At times the basis for my claims
will indeed rest merely on possibility. In taking this attitude I am, however, supported
by Le Roux (1952: 12) who maintained that ‘By gebrek aan bewys vir die teendeel
moet ons dus aanneem dat die gemelde uitdrukking in Afrikaans ’n Anglisisme is’,
although his use of aanneem here goes too far for my liking too.

The above cases will have to suffice at this stage to illustrate the many difficulties
that confront the research worker in attempting to identify English influence in
Afrikaans. They should serve to help understand why perhaps in recent times
scholars have been intimidated into keeping their distance from the topic.

In addition to the knowledge of Dutch at my disposal as a basis for comparison as
a primary step towards recognising where English has been the motivating factor
in the development of Afrikaans along a separate tangent to standard Dutch, I found
the following procedures also of some use. I noticed that many of my observations
of Afrikaans coincided with my experience as a teacher of Dutch to native-speakers
of English. I then went in search of the common errors made by these people when
speaking Dutch and found quite a number of them to be present in Afrikaans too,
either ingeburger, on the way to becoming so, or still at the level of interference; for
example, no distinction between onthouden and zich herinneren, confusion of
brengen and nemen, omission of the reflexive pronoun with certain verbs, to name
but a few.

Ostyn’s (1972) dissertation on English interference in the Dutch of Flemish immigrants
living in Chicago and Nijenhuis’ (1967) semi-popular Het Nederlands in Australië
were also referred to in order to see what interference phenomena they had
ascertained in their respective bilingual situations. I then followed these up in
Afrikaans and found many of them also present there. This exercise was conducted
more out of interest than as a serious means of expanding my corpus. Nevertheless,
examples found in
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Ostyn and Nijenhuis which coincide with Afrikaans usage, are referred to in the course of this work.

There is also that small number of cases where South African English and Afrikaans share a structure which is foreign to both British English and Dutch. In such instances it can be difficult to ascertain where the source is, for example *bly* in the sense of ‘live, dwell’, which was referred to above; the pronunciation of ‘i’ in stressed syllables as [ə] and word order in indirect questions such as *kan jy vir my sê hoe laat is dit?* - can you tell me what is the time? (instead of ‘...what the time is?’); *alles van die beste* - everything of the best (South African English for ‘all the best’).

In deciding on whether a given example is or is not possibly due to English influence and thus worthy of inclusion in my corpus, I found it advisable also to keep German usage in mind. If something is unknown to modern Dutch, but present in German, this would seem to be an indication of common Germanic origin and thus claiming English influence in such a case could be irresponsible, e.g. the use of *meen* instead of *bedoel* where German also uses *meinen*. Generally keeping German usage in mind would seem to be supported by Ponelis (1979: 442) where in his monumental work on Afrikaans syntax, he makes the following statement with reference to a particular structure:

‘Sover vasgestel kon word, ken Duits en Nederlands nie skoon bysinne
[i.e. with omission of *dat* in hierdie verbande nie, dus kan Engelse
inwerking wat dit betref nie uitgesluit word nie.’

In the realm of what is commonly referred to as ‘international’ vocabulary, for want of a better name, English is undoubtedly the channel through which many loanwords reached Afrikaans, which is not so in Holland where until relatively recently it has been predominantly through French. It is of course often difficult to prove when such words were borrowed into Afrikaans and whether they came via Dutch or were direct borrowings from English in South Africa - the Norman heritage of England is the complicating factor here. Afrikaans does however have many loanwords which, although compiled from Latin and Greek roots, are unknown to Dutch or even French, the most common source of the majority of these words in Dutch until relatively recent times, e.g. *applikant, bewerasie, kompeteer, motoris*. Then there are those which, although found in Dutch, have a meaning in Afrikaans more akin to that of the English cognate than the Dutch one, e.g. *eventueel, definitief*. In order to be assimilated into Afrikaans such words required French garb and have thus become indistinguishable from loanwords that have come from French via Dutch, or more correctly those that could have come from that
source. Of relevance here is Hiemstra's (1963: 9) observation with regard to a common puristic avoidance of such words in Afrikaans:

‘dat die afgekeurde woorde, al is hulle nie op sigself in Afrikaans aan Engels ontleen nie, tog in ’n dergelike aanwending onder Engelse invloed gebesig word; ten aansien van hulle frekwensie, so nie hulle herkoms nie, kan hulle dus wel Anglisismes wees.’

This international vocabulary is not of course at all difficult to trace in Afrikaans, but proving the source thereof is a different matter. I would feel inclined to add to Combrink's requirements set out on pages 8-9 'a good command of French'.

The only practical means of monitoring, with any degree of consistency, whether examples in the corpus which are not found in modern ABN have ever occurred in Dutch, is by consulting the Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal. This dictionary is as complete a record as we have of every new word that has appeared in Dutch texts since the late sixteenth century. Boshoff and Nienaber (1967: 18) do mention one reservation one should keep in mind when referring to the WNY for enlightenment on Afrikaans issues:

‘Ons moet onthou dat die gegewens insake Nederlandse dialekte in WNT dikwels betrekking het op die hedendaagse dialekte en derhalwe met versigtigheid gehanteer moet word.’

He goes on to suggest that one also make use of Kiliaen's late sixteenth century dictionary which refers to the dialects the words occur in.

I have made only haphazard reference to WAY as its present incomplete state prevents consistency and as I feel that even what has appeared so far, some of which is already more than thirty-five years old, does not reflect reality any more with regard to the recognition of English structures. One wonders in fact whether it did even in 1950. Instead I have opted for HAT. It is admittedly only a handwoordeboek, but quite a substantial one at that. It is at least complete and whatever competition it may have and whatever criticisms there may be of it, it simply is now regarded as the dictionary of Afrikaans by die majority of people, at least until such time as WAT is completed (and revised?). Reference is sometimes made to HAT's attitude to examples in the corpus and HAY's treatment of anglicisms in general is discussed under 3.4.2.
Chapter Two

2.0 What is an anglicism?

2.1 The reasons for the interference-cum-influence

I have no intention of looking at the psychological processes behind interference phenomena in bilingual individuals, as Rousseau did for example, firstly because such principles apply to all bilingual situations and are not peculiar to South Africa, and secondly because they pertain more to the field of psychology than linguistics. The socio-political causes of interference in South Africa will be dealt with in only a perfunctory fashion, because this aspect was so thoroughly and competently covered by Rousseau that it would be difficult to improve upon; it is of course also an aspect of the topic whose validity has not been lessened by the passage of time, unlike his corpus. But aspects of the socio-political causes of interference and linguistic change, where they are peculiar to, or are of particular importance to, the South African situation, are dealt with here.

The regional frequency of anglicisms, and the degree to which these may be gradually contributing to dialect formation in Afrikaans, is another aspect of the topic which I do not deal with here. As a non-Afrikaner and a non-resident of the Republic, I am incapable of looking at that aspect of English influence on Afrikaans and, as far as I am aware, no-one else has done so either, although the possibility of its existence is hinted at in an article by Du Plessis (1983: 43) on *Johannesburgse omgangstaal*. One would expect the influence to be greater in Cape Town, the Eastern Province and the Rand than in the Free State and the Western Transvaal, for instance, but there are as yet no empirical data to prove this is the case.

2.1.1 The historical facts behind the contact between English and Afrikaans

The historical facts of the British take-over of the Cape and subsequent legislation aimed at anglicising the Afrikaner are known backwards by any White child that goes through the South African schools’ system. On the basis of these facts one may feel justified in seeing 1795, the year of the first British occupation, as the obvious terminus a quo of English influence on the Dutch dialect of the colony. However, history does not provide us with much evidence at all with which to fix a date from which English, the language of the administration from 1795 - with the exception of the years
1803-1806 when the Cape was briefly returned to the Dutch - began to make inroads into the idiom of the Dutch population. Tracing the early history of English influence on the language, one is faced with the same problem which has confronted the many scholars who have attempted to research the origins of Afrikaans - the almost total lack of texts in Afrikaans prior to the 1860's. One can probably assume that English influence did not reach much beyond Cape Town during the first period of British occupation, but how great it was and how far it stretched after 1806 is also very difficult to determine. Nevertheless, few would disagree that from the time of the arrival of the 1820 settlers in the Eastern Province, the scene was set for extensive mutual influence of the two languages. Their arrival was also followed in the 1820's by the notorious anglicisation policies of Lord Charles Somerset. That these policies were ultimately unsuccessful goes without saying, but the degree to which they contributed already at that early date to the influence that English was to have on Afrikaans, can only be guessed at. Boshoff (1921: 408) maintains that in 1828 there were only 7,000 Englishmen in the colony, as opposed to 25,000 Dutchmen; 5,000 of these English people had come as 1820 settlers, which means there were proportionately very few English speaking people indeed in the Cape prior to 1820.

The earliest concrete evidence of English influence that has come down to us is the famous work of A.N.E. Changuion (1844) De Nederduitsche taal in Zuid-Afrika hersteld. Pheiffer (1979: 3) refers to him as the first bewuste dokumenteerder of English influence. Changuion, being a Dutchman newly arrived in the Cape, was disturbed at the degree to which Cape Dutch deviated from the idiom of Holland and he set about to help remedy the situation with this work which he wrote in his capacity as a teacher. Of course his interest is directed at everything in Afrikaans that deviated from what he considered to be correct Dutch, not just at English interference, but nevertheless a considerable number of his observations deal with this aspect. Changuion's book is looked at in more detail in 3.1.1. Suffice it to say here that of the 424 lemmas in his list of 'mistakes', 32 are marked (E.) and 14 are clearly implied as being of English origin. In addition, I presume another 4 of the phenomena he noted are English in origin although he does not acknowledge them as such. This means that circa 12% of his corpus of noteworthy divergencies in Cape Dutch, collected only 24 years after the arrival of the 1820 settlers, is the direct result of interference from English. Although much of Changuion's corpus has since passed into oblivion, several of his anglicisms are now an indispensable part of Afrikaans.

The terminus a quo is thus open to some debate, the terminus ad quem, the point at which English influence will cease, will undoubtedly never come. Any study of the topic can only ever capture on paper the state of affairs at
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that particular point in history, for the process is an ongoing and never-ending one.

Heese published a study in 1971 entitled *Die herkoms van die Afrikaner 1657-1867*. This provides some interesting statistics on the English contribution to Afrikaner blood, without any comment being passed on the linguistic ramifications thereof, however. In the period 1808-1836 the British contribution was particularly high and English blood contributed to 35.3% of births in mixed marriages, but the overall contribution of English blood to Afrikaner stock was only 2.6% at this time:

‘Die Britse bydrae is nie so hoog soos die groot getal Engelse stamvaders sou laat vermoed het nie. Dit is so omdat die Britse bydrae so laat eers plaasgevind het’. (p. 36)

Heese also maintains that a large number of English speaking people settled in the small dorps of the platteland, even in the Boer republics. He claims that 1,272 of the 2,868 foreign progenitors for the period 1838-1867 were English, i.e. 44.5%. Once again, however, the overall total is still quite low because of the relatively late arrival of the English - in 1867 it was 5.3%.

In the eighteenth century there were more non-White speakers of Afrikaans than White. By the end of the nineteenth century the proportion was fifty-fifty. Ponelis (in a lecture delivered in Bloemfontein in 1983), leaning on Heese’s research, saw the English as the main contributing factor to the *verblanking* of the Afrikaner. In addition he postulated that English did not get a grip on the Coloureds of Cape Town for quite a long time and that for decades in the nineteenth century the Coloureds were virtually the only Dutch speaking people in the city.

During the previous century English became, and has remained, the language of contact with the outside world. But Afrikaans did not live in complete isolation from Dutch, which always remained a potential source of vocabulary with which to counteract English vocabulary. To a certain degree this is even still the case, although becoming less and less so, and a great deal of relexification took place as late as the 1930’s, after Afrikaans had replaced Dutch as the country’s second official language. From the beginning English has been, and has remained, the language of the minority in the White community. Nevertheless ‘...het Engels vanweë sy bevoorregte posisie in die Kaapkolonie en in Natal en ten gevolge van ’n doelbewuste Angliseringsproses wat veral van die Kaap uit op allerlei gebiede tot in die Republieke gepropageer is, ‘n sterker houvas gekry as wat die getalsterkte van die Engelssprekendes sou laat vermoed het. (Boshoff & Nienaber 1967: 29) Further on Boshoff and Nienaber quote
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Lord Henry de Villiers who predicted in 1876 ‘dat nòg Hollands nòg Afrikaans ’n “toekoms” in Suid-Afrika het en dat alleen met Engels iets bereik sou word.’ (p. 29)

Much has been written about the threats to the continued existence of Afrikaans in the nineteenth century in the face of competition from English, but such writings always completely ignore the Coloured, whose only medium of expression was Afrikaans, as well as the fact that the threat was not nearly as great in the Boer republics where the language of administration and education was Dutch. It is curious that so little attention has been paid to the linguistic situation in the Orange Free State and Transvaal in the nineteenth century; scholars have been overwhelmingly concerned with the Cape and have ignored the republics to a great extent. Boshoff (1921: 409) has the following to say on the situations in the Cape and the Boer republics:

‘...soos die Eerste Afrikaanse-Taalbeweging van 1875 af in die Kaap Kolonie die vervormingsproses van Afrikaans deur Engels gestuit het, so sou die Twede Afrikaanse-Taalbeweging van omstreeks 1905 af al meer en meer ’n krachtige reaksie in die lewe roep teen ’n herhaling van dieselfde proses in die Vrystaat en Transvaal en ’n voortsetting daarvan in die Kaap Kolonie.’

Du Toit (1965: 128) offers the following on developments north of the Orange where decisions were made ‘...teen direkte taaldwang van Engelse kant in die twee republieke in die Noorde. Maar selfs ook hier is die aanleer van Engels van regeringsweë aangemoedig. Die Transvaalse regulasies van 1866 al maak voorsiening vir onderwys in die Engelse taal. Onderwysers met kennis van Engels kry die voorkeur by aanstellings.’ Du Toit maintains it was not uncommon for people in the Transvaal to send their children to schools in the Cape to learn English as in the Transvaal after 1882 Dutch was declared the only possible medium of instruction, although ‘die wet word nie streng gehandhaaf nie.’ (p. 128) He says that English was even more popular in the Free State than in the Transvaal at this time as it had already become the language of commerce in the north as well as the south. The zenith of anglicisation was reached in the British concentration camps during the Boer War where the exclusive medium of instruction in camp schools was English, with the exception of classes in divinity. The post-war period finally brought a gradual reversal of the English injustices of the previous century, but meanwhile a favourable climate for the continued influence of English had been created which nothing would reverse.

Pienaar (1931: 172-3) quotes the example of J.H.H. de Waal's novel
Johannes van Wyk (1904), the first of the so-called Second Language Movement, to illustrate the extent of English influence at that time. De Waal was a member of the Leidsche Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde and president of the Afrikaanse Taal Vereniging and yet the original version of his novel ‘laat duidelik sien hoe De Waal moes worstel om koers te kry tussen Engels en Hollands deur... Op oortuiende wyse blyk hier dat Afrikaans al mooi op weg was om ‘n mengeltaal te word onder Engelse invloed, veral in Kaapland, en dat die Afrikaanse Taalbeweging nog net betyds gekom het om ‘n gestadige verval in hierdie rigting te stuit... En as eerste pennevrug van die tweede Afrikaanse Taalbeweging het hierdie roman ook meteen die absolute noodsaaklikheid en bestaansreg van die beweging geregverdig.’ Johannes van Wyk was revised five times between 1904 and 1921 and each time more anglicisms were removed: ‘Uit die vyfde druk blyk egter dat Johannes van Wyk aan ‘n ongeneeslike kwaal ly.’ (p. 174)

It is a strange quirk of fate that whereas the primary threat to Afrikaans in the nineteenth century was in the Cape, nowadays it is in the Transvaal with the extraordinarily dominant role that Johannesburg plays in South African society, it being the seat of the SABC, the English press (read by many Afrikaners) and the commercial heart of the nation.

Coetzee (1939: 17) sees the growth of the Reef as being the most important factor in the development of English influence:

‘Hulle [i.e. the English] invloed op die taal van die Hollands-Afrikaanse Koloniste het egter baie gering gebly tot en met die ontdekking van diamante en goud in Suid-Afrika in die derde kwart van die vorige eeu.’

That this was the case in the Transvaal cannot be questioned but Changuion's (1844) and even Mansvelt's (1884) works attest to that not being the case in the Cape.

Referring to the early nineteenth century colonists in South Africa, Pheiffer (1979: 2) says of them:

‘Hulle het hul nie verset teen die invoering van Engels nie, maar waaroor daar wel gegriefheid ontstaan het, was die verdringing en verlies van die Nederlandse taal en kultuur wat beoog is.’

The result of the introduction of English combined with the colonists'
stubborn refusal to give up their native Dutch, is Afrikaans as we know it today, or, to quote Du Toit (1965: 128):

‘Vir sover dit die algehele uitroeiing van Afrikaans, wortel en tak, en die onmiddellijke vervanging daarvan deur Engels betref, het die politiek van die negentiende-euse maghebbers aan die Kaap misluk; waar hulle egter wel in geslaag het, was om die bodem te berei vir, en ten dele ook te beplant met, ’n skaar van Anglisismes.’

Afrikaans may well have acquired the majority of its typical phonological and morphological traits before the arrival of the British at the end of the eighteenth century, but the process of change did not stop there: a new era of change, a different sort of change, simply dawned, (cf. 4.5) It is interesting to note in this regard that, as Viljoen pointed out in 1896, it was not uncommon at that time for people to see many of the analytical changes that had occurred in Afrikaans as the result of English influence, whereas it is unquestionably accepted these days that this situation had already been reached prior to the arrival of the British and is simply the result of parallel development in both Cape Dutch and English. (cf. 6.2) Even Du Toit (1897:iv), a foundation member of the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaanders, was guilty at the time of exaggerating the influence English had had on the grammar of the language:

‘It is striking in Cape Dutch, that the body of the language (the dictionary) remained purely Germanic; in fact the purest Germanic language in existence; but the soul of the language (the grammar), the inflexions and idioms are greatly modified according to the French (by the Huguenots) and English. Everywhere in the inflexions, idioms syntax etc. we meet the influence of those two languages, while hardly a dozen French and some 50 English words have been taken up in Cape Dutch.’

The dissension that existed among Afrikaners after the formation of the Genootskap in 1875 between those who supported maintaining Dutch and those who supported its abolition in favour of Afrikaans, may well ironically have furthered the position of English. The situation we have today where Afrikaners feel English to be less foreign than Dutch had apparently already been reached by the late nineteenth century, as the following quote from Langenhoven (1926: 112) indicates:

‘In our opinion no greater injustice could be done to our country than by forcing upon us a worthless and insignificant language (Dutch), especially after it has clearly been shown
that the rising generation takes to English more easily and appreciates it more readily than Dutch.'

Langenhoven made this statement in 1893 during his student days when he was a member of the debating society at the University of Stellenbosch.

In *Die Huisgenoot* of 16/3/34 Du Toit (1965) gives a brief history of the anglicisation of the Afrikaner, particularly in the nineteenth century. He maintains that by the end of the century the language was not the same as at the beginning:

‘In hierdie tydsverloop het daar baie aandie inhoud en wese van die taal verander: dit het geword ’n instrument waarvan ontwikkeldes hulle ook kon begin bedien. Veel hiervan was natuurlik die resulataat van ontlening en aanpassing aan die skryftaal, Nederlands - dog vir baie het die taal hom ook verbred en verdiep deur die opname van elemente uit Engels.’

Another comment on the degree of English influence from the beginning of this century is provided by De Wet (1906) in *De Unie*:

‘Het is opmerklik hoe, zelfs van onze knapste liedten, die de graden van B.A. en M.A. hebben behaald, gedurig in Anglicismen vervallen. Dit bewijst, dat de oude, afgezaagde stelling: Laat ’t kind Engels leren, want Hollands komt vanzelf, nu moet omgekeerd worden: Laat ’t kind Hollands leren, want Engels komt vanzelf... Tans is die lucht als ’t ware met Engels bezwangerd, en iedereen ademt ’t onwillekeurig in.’

As the reader will have observed, De Wet wrote in Dutch, being a member of the anti-Afrikaans lobby that was losing ground by this time. He gives two reasons for opposing Afrikaans, one of them being: ‘omdat we dan gevaar lopen om al de Anglicismen en Barbarismen te behouden.’ Dutch would always remain the medium of Holland *in bruikleen* in South Africa with the possibility of looking back to usage in Holland ‘to mend one's ways’, as it were. But Afrikaans with its anglicisms, and even because of them, is a far truer mirror of South African society and culture.

Many of these early statements on the influence English was having on Dutch/Afrikaans attribute the problem to the state of education at the time and the fact, for example, that Dutch lessons were often, if not usually, given in English. But nowadays, where the situation with regard to
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education is vastly different from the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the problem exists just as much, if not more so.

After the Boer War, with the beginning of the *taalstryd*, 'increasingly language became a political issue and hostility to English developed in predominantly Afrikaans speaking communities. In these communities English declined in quality and quantity, accelerated by the dwindling numbers of English speakers in the smaller towns in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal... The lowest ebb [in the standard of English among Afrikaners] was probably in the 1950's... Impressionistically, one would judge the low ebb of English in the Afrikaner population in the 1950's as having passed. A new motivation to competence in English exists for younger members of this population, particularly those who are better educated and are urban dwelling.' (Lanham 1978: 21) It is a curious state of affairs that the better educated Afrikaner, who has a high competence in English, is likely to speak a purer Afrikaans than a working class man whose mastery of English is imperfect: exaggerated use of anglicisms is considered *platvloers* in South Africa. It seems that competence in English is no guide at all to the degree of interference in the Afrikaans of a given speaker; the higher the register, the purer (more Dutch?) his language is likely to be, whereas the lower the register, the more infiltration of English one can expect to find, for example: swearwords and general slang. (cf. 7.29.1)

2.1.2 The nature of the contact situation in which English and Afrikaans find themselves

In their controversial book on the Broederbond, Wilkins and Strydom (1980: 137) make the following comment on acculturation tendencies in South African society:

‘...we can only envisage either the deliberate Afrikanerising of the English speakers or the silent acceptance of the unintentional but certain Anglicising of the Afrikaner.’

Clearly the latter is already proving to be the case. But what these authors say of the two factions of White society applied equally to their languages:

‘Namate die Afrikaans- en Engelsprekende bevolkingsgroepe in die Republiek van Suid-Afrika in die toekoms nader na mekaar toe groei, moet ons selfs ontlenings oor en weer verwag...’. (Boshoff i.a. 1964: 34)

Boshoff does not give any indication, however, of the degree to which the
mutual influence differs between the two languages, which is undoubtedly the case. Le Roux (1952: 2) comes nearer to the mark when he states:

‘Die feitlike toestand [as far as bilingualism in South Africa is concerned] is dus dat, terwyl daar die natuurlike strewe by die toonaangewendes onder beide Engels- en Afrikaanssprekende groepe is om hulle moedertaal so suwer as moontlik te hou, daar ’n groot groep sg. Afrikaanssprekendes is wat aan die afsak is na ’n mengetaal. Hierdie groep word nie in ewewig gehou deur ’n ooreenkomstige groep Engelssprekendes nie.’

If what Le Roux says here was valid in 1945, when he first wrote it, how much more must it be the case now?

Coetzee’s (1948: 21) remark that English speaking people, in learning Afrikaans, have made a contribution to the frequency of anglicisms in that language has already been questioned on page 17. Le Roux (1926: 334) too, writing on so-called ismes in general in Afrikaans, wrote:

‘n Ander manier waarop die moedertaal beïnvloed word, is dat vreemdelinge dit baie praat en sodoende woorde, woordbetekenisse of konstruksies van hulle eie taal daarin oorbring, wat dan weer deur die oorspronkelike sprekers van die taal oorgeneem word.’

This is a theory which is laboured by Raidt throughout her book in German on the history of Afrikaans (1983): she continually emphasises her belief in the contribution of foreign language speakers to the development of Afrikaans, as opposed to the contribution from their languages per se. In this I would feel inclined to agree with her in as far as her theory refers to contact with the Khoisan peoples, Malays, Germans, Huguenots etc. during the period of the so-called ontstaan van Afrikaans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. I do not think it applies, however, to the contact with English. Here we are without doubt concerned with influence emanating from the language and Afrikaners’ familiarity with it, rather than with interference phenomena in the Afrikaans of English speakers. In this regard the English element in Afrikaans differs from all other so-called ismes in Afrikaans about which so much has been written.

Bosman (1923: 41), quoting Boshoff, who in turn is quoting Postma, advocates the reverse theory to Raidt:

‘Ds. Postma soek die verklaring dus nie in ’n adapsie van die taal deur vreemdelinge en ’n terugwerking daarvan op die taal
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van die Afrikaanse volk nie, maar 'n aanpassing deur die volk self van hulle taal aan hulle omgewing.'

Here, once again, reference is being made to the factors that shaped Afrikaans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and in that context I cannot endorse it. It does, however, in my opinion apply quite neatly to the process that is occurring in Afrikaans with regard to English influence. The Afrikaners' omgewing, now that the vast majority of them are urbanised or at very least within easy reach of the electronic media, is unavoidably and increasingly dominated by English as English is their inherited window on the world - in fact an invaluable asset which they now acquire with a minimum of effort - through which increasing contact with that wider world is maintained. The days of the laager mentality are past for the majority of Afrikaners, a situation made possible to a large extent by their contact with English.

Because of the degree of cultural assimilation to which the Afrikaner has been subjected, often unwittingly or even unwillingly, the following process is occurring:

'Die Engels-onkundige neem onbewus Engelshede oor van ander Engels-onkundiges, wat dit op hulle beurt by Engelskundiges gekry het'
(Reksioneel, Die Huisgenoot 29/8/52)

where by Engelskundiges I assume the author means bilingual Afrikaners. Surely the frequent number of anglicisms one hears even in the Afrikaans of pre-school children, whose bilingual abilities have scarcely been developed if at all, are an indication that we now have to do with linguistic change in this particular contact situation which has long since gone beyond the realm of mere interference phenomena, although it cannot be denied that many phenomena are, at least for the time being, still at this stage.

Diglossia, as originally defined by Ferguson (1959), referred to two varieties of a language - a higher and lower variant where the lower is not written - being used side by side as in the case of High German and Swiss German in Switzerland. Undoubtedly the relationship of Dutch to Afrikaans in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries often fitted this mold. This definition of diglossia was, however, expanded somewhat by Fishman in 1967 to cover situations where two separate languages, as opposed to variants of the same language, compete with each other for a function in the social spectrum of a bilingual community. (cf. Timm 1980: 33) This revised definition can now be applied, with some qualification, to the relationship between English and Afrikaans in South Africa, certainly in the past and perhaps even in the present. Prior to the official recognition and consequent nurturing of Afrikaans, that language hovered in a
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diglossia relationship between Dutch on the one hand (still referred to by many in South Africa as *Hooghollands*) and English on the other. It was under these conditions that Afrikaans, to a greater extent than Dutch in South Africa, was influenced by English; but because the line between Afrikaans and Dutch was often a thin one, English must also gradually have begun to affect the higher variant. Nevertheless speakers of Dutch could always look back to the Dutch of Holland to determine what was ‘correct’; this was not the case with the lower variant. Thus, when Afrikaans replaced Dutch, it opened the flood-gates to English influence in the official written language as well as in the spoken language. (cf. H.C. de Wet's comment p. 34)

Schonken (1914: 193), writing in 1914, by which time the pro-Afrikaans lobby was making great gains, has the following to say on the intellectual development of the Afrikaner:

‘Tot op laten leeftijd telt men in ’t Engelsch, houdt men briefwisseling in het Engelsch, dicht, zingt en leest man bijna uitsluitend in het Engelsch, spreekt men aardrijkskundige, en technische woorden op zijn Engelsch uit...’

What he is describing is the de facto diglossia situation where the social function that English played at the time is obvious from the phenomena he mentions. It is maintained that formerly English was even the language used for telephone conversations, which gave rise to the joke that a Black servant, when asked by her master to answer the phone for him, replied *Maar Baas, ek kannie Engels praat nie.* Such diglossia functions of English were still prevalent long after the time that Schonken was writing, for example: counting in English and making out cheques in English.

Few in South Africa today would think of the relationship between English and Afrikaans in terms of diglossia any more but I agree with Van Rensburg (1983: 18) that the concept has not altogether died out yet, despite the progress made by Afrikaans since the turn of the century to achieve equality with English:

‘Waar daar van twee amptale sprake is, soos in Suid-Afrika, is diglossie ’n opmerklike verskynsel onder baie sprekers: vir hulle is daar ’n duidelijk onderskeibare verskil tussen die funksies van Afrikaans teenoor die funksies van Engels. Hierdie onderskeiding hoef nie in alle gevalle getref te word nie. Vir die sprekers wat, desondanks die tweetalige taalsituasie, nie kan ooreenkom oor watter taal die hoë-funksie taal en watter taal die lae-funksie taal is nie, bestaan daar ’n tweetalige taalsituasie sonder die voorkoms van diglossie’.
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While some may argue that the former situation no longer exists in South Africa, the latter referred to by Van Rensburg is certainly the more common in South Africa these days. Baetens Beardsmore (1982: 5) calls this form of bilingualism ‘horizontal bilingualism’.

What exactly constitutes bilingualism is difficult to define because of the wide variance of competence displayed by speakers in the second language and the impossibility of measuring it. Baetens Beardsmore (1982: 3) maintains that ‘the field of investigation is evident but not as precise as one might wish’.

Van Wyk (1978: 39), in his description of language contact and bilingualism in South Africa, concludes that all attempts to assess the degree of one’s bilingualism have been futile. He also looks at the distinction made between natural and artificial bilingualism: the former ‘is acquired in a spontaneous and unplanned fashion’, whereas the latter ‘is the result of deliberate and systematic teaching’ (p. 37). It is obvious that the processes of acquisition which underlie this difference are not mutually exclusive but may supplement and reinforce one another. Later he adds:

‘It is evident from what has been said that early natural acquisition of a second language is not general in South Africa. Late natural acquisition occurs more frequently and artificial acquisition is quite general. This pattern of acquisition has its effects on the degree of bilingualism attained by South Africans.’ (p. 39)

The combination of late natural acquisition - these days with TV and increased integration and intermarriage of Afrikaners and English in an urban environment it is going to come earlier than was the case in the past - and the artificial acquisition the child is confronted with from the first year of primary school through to matric, must put Afrikaans children, as well as more and more English children too probably, in a unique position to achieve a degree of bilingualism on a broad scale that can only be envied by other societies where two or more languages function side by side. The Flemish situation, for example, differs markedly from South Africa in this regard: nowadays young Flemings are most likely to be more proficient in English than in French by the time they leave school.

Mackey (1972: 554) maintains of bilingualism that ‘It does not belong to the domain of “langue” but of “parole”’. He goes on to say that ‘It is impossible not to confuse bilingualism - the use of two or more languages by the individual - with the more general concept of language contact, which deals with the direct or indirect influence of one language on another resulting in changes in “langue” which become the permanent property of
monolinguals and enter into the historical development of the language.' Mackey is talking in general terms here but his comments apply absolutely to the South African situation if one subscribes to the theory that English influence on Afrikaans has now reached the stage of instigating quite deep-rooted language change. (cf. 4.5) The discrepancy between competence and performance that exists even in monolinguals is greater still in the case of bilingual individuals, particularly in speakers who are bilingual to the degree that most Afrikaners are. For many Afrikaners English and Afrikaans have become to a certain extent indivisible: they require their intimate knowledge of English in order to be completely articulate in their mother tongue. English words, and particularly English phrases and idioms, have important functions in certain subject areas. (cf. Combrink 1984: 98 point if for example) Particularly the informal register of even educated Afrikaners is laced with English. Nowadays one continually hears reference to so-called studentetaal (= slang of a particular group, i.e. groeptaal, cf. footnote p. 65), which is nearly always regarded as something negative by those who comment on it, whereas it is in fact the inevitable product of a bilingual society and above all of South African society where the vaktaalburos, for example, have coined a vast amount of artificial terminology, particularly for higher social functions, and these efforts have not been entirely without some success. There will always be a discrepancy between the theory and the practice of linguistic purism, even among the upper echelons, as the language of tertiary students indicates, but further down the social ladder the success is going to be still more restricted due to the undeveloped linguistic sensitivity of such people because of their lack of eloquence and above all because of their indifference to the language they use. Finally, with regard to studentetaal, I think it is correct to say that many modern young Afrikaners feel comfortable with their bilingualism and that this is reflected in the ease with which they slip from one language into the other, with or without a degree of interference occurring.

The intimate acquaintance Afrikaners have of English is very well illustrated by the following anecdote of Smith's (1962: 41) where he is discussing the occurrence of the English swearword ‘bloody’ in Afrikaans:

‘Dat die woord egter taamlik algemeen aan Afrikaners bekend is, blyk uit die feit dat by ’n sekere koncert [sic!] onlangs die gehoor aan ’t lag gegaan het toe ’n sanger doodnestig en baie duidelik die woorde “die plêdie dou” uitgespreek het.’ (Originally appeared in a column in Die Suiderstem between 1936-39.)
In the same book (p. 59-60) Smith discusses the difficulty of getting Afrikaners to accept *verafrikaansing* of the spelling of English loanwords e.g. *hendikep, tenk, trem, sleng*:

‘Die feit is dat die meerderheid van beskaafde Afrikaners oor die hele land in hierdie woorde nog wel deeglik die Engelse a soos in Engels man uitspreek, en dat die uitspraak met e vir hulle hinderlik is.’ (p. 60)

Further on, on page 64, where he is discussing the *verafrikaansing* of international vocabulary, he states:

‘In ons schryftaal word die reël dan ook vrywel algemeen toegepas. Maar in ons spreektaal hoor ons nog elke dag die Engelse uitspraak van woorde soos pedaal, paraffin, vaseline, taxi, kondukteur, en honderde ander. En hoeveel van ons gebruik nie die Engelse klem in artillerie, cypres, grammofoon, kongres, telefoon, telegraaf en telegram nie?’

All these examples of Smith's simply substantiate the degree of indivisibility of the two languages in the minds of many Afrikaners, plus the fact that English is most certainly a *second* language to Afrikaners and not a *foreign* language; in my opinion one could not find a better illustration of the distinction between the two.

The *taalgevoel* of the Afrikaner has now been affected by his knowledge of English to such an extent 'dat intuísie in verband met die moedertaal nie genoegsame leiding gee nie, o.m. omdat die ideale eentalige moedertaalspreker in ons gesofistikeerde wêreld nie bestaan nie (seer sekerlik nie in die Afrikaanse spraakgemeenskap nie).’ (Odendal 1978: 70) Aitchison (1981: 52) uses the term 'language fuzziness' to describe the phenomenon of native-speakers feeling that something doesn't quite sound right but not knowing why. The term can be quite appropriately applied to the dilemma the bilingual Afrikaner so often finds himself in: the situation where, as Odendal puts it, his intuition lets him down. Later in her book, Aitchison (1981: 176) states that why linguistic change was not observed by earlier writers is because they 'intentionally ignored fluctuation and fuzziness, and in so doing, eliminated from their grammars all symptoms of ongoing language change.' Thus this wavering *taalgevoel*, unreliable intuition or linguistic fuzziness perhaps deserves to be taken more seriously in South Africa and should not be swept under the carpet as merely wrong and of no further consequence.

There is a tendency among bilinguals to reduce the number of differences between the two languages, what Grüner (1980: 5) calls *reduksie*-
interferensie. Vildomec (1963: 173) describes the phenomenon as follows:

‘Many phenomena of the mutual interference of languages may be reduced to one single rule or law: a tendency to save efforts.’

One reduces the effort by reducing the number of distinctions between the two languages and thus increases the efficiency:

‘... the bilingual realises an extraordinary saving in storage. He no longer has to keep track of the constraints of two linguistic systems.’ (Martinet 1952: 26)

Efficiency in communication, and not purity of the medium of that communication, is the main concern of the average speaker. Retaining distinctions where they can be eradicated, puts a burden on the memory; eradicating them, particularly in such closely related languages as English and Afrikaans, comes easily.

Afrikaners are often as well acquainted, sometimes even better acquainted, with English idiom than with their own, for their high degree of bilingualism has now reached a stage where they are often unaware of the difference. Langenhoven (1935: 101-2) wrote something to this effect as early as 1935 - how much more must it be the case now, fifty odd years later?:

‘Deurdat Engels vir ons so bekend is dat ons hom nie meer as 'n vreemde taal voel nie, kom baie Engelse idiome ons nie as eienaardige Engelse vorms van spreekwyse voor nie maar as gewone taalvorms, en dan dra ons hulle letterlik oor sonder om bewus te wees van wat ons doen. Dis dan eintlik nie 'n sonde van onkunde nie maar van te veel kennis.’

Knowing two languages, which sometimes categorise differently, the awareness of categories and distinctions in one language gives rise to a need in the other to be able to categorise in a similar fashion there and make similar distinctions. This ‘need’ is not felt by monolingual speakers - a category which no longer exists among Afrikaners - and thus they cope with what they have at their disposal. The bilingual individual could too, but prefers not to: he has greater semantic demands which his bilingualism both causes and satisfies. Langenhoven (1935: 102) provides a good concrete example of this need: in discussing the use of maak as an auxiliary, he gives an example and goes on to comment on it:
But the Dutch cope admirably without resorting to *maken* and are unaware of any semantic shortcoming in their language. Mansvelt (1884: 180) provides an even better example, in reverse, of acquaintance with a concept in one language leading to feeling the need for an equivalent in another language. He was a native-speaker of Dutch - admittedly greatly prejudiced against Afrikaans - and was not convinced that the ‘primitive’ verbal system of Cape Dutch, with no imperfect or pluperfect tenses, permitted conversation on a higher plane. We know of course that the verbal system of Afrikaans, greatly simplified as it is compared to that of Dutch and English, is no impediment to understanding at all. Mansvelt simply felt a need that he was unable to fulfil in Afrikaans because of his awareness of the category in his mother tongue. Le Roux (1952: 26-27) sums this situation up very nicely:

‘Ook gebeur dit dikwels datonderskeidinge in die een taal gemaak word wat nie gebruiklik is in die ander taal nie. Om dieselfdeonderskeiding in die ander taal te kan maak, word dit dan soms nodig om omslagtige omskrywinge te gebruik, maar die behoefte aan so ’n onderskeiding word eers gevoel deur bekendheid met die eerste taal.’

The reverse can also be the case, however, and here we have to do with another form of reduction interference. It is not uncommon for English to have one word for a concept where Dutch and Afrikaans have two because they perceive a certain semantic distinction which the English either do not see or do not consider worthy of making, for example: English has only one word for ‘sign’ while Dutch and Afrikaans have two, *bord* and *teken*. These two are not at all synonymous in Dutch but the distinction between them has become blurred in certain contexts in Afrikaans. There are many such examples of semantic distinction no longer being made in Afrikaans because, I would postulate, no such distinction exists in English. This is the reverse phenomenon to the ‘need syndrome’ discussed earlier. (cf. synonymous couplets, 7.15)

It was noted by Uijlings (1956: 77) that bilingualism ‘leads to uncertainty in speech. It is this hesitation which often leads to hypercorrect forms...' The concept of hypercorrection as such is discussed under 5.3. An inferiority complex in linguistic matters is not uncommon among Afrikaners and has been greatly contributed to by the irresponsible and uninformed prescriptions dished up to them by ignorant schoolteachers. In the days before the official recognition of Afrikaans, when Afrikaners were
required to write Dutch when putting pen to paper, the situation must have been even worse than now, but then the cause of their linguistic insecurity was different. Lodewyckx (1911: 103), a Fleming who spent some time in the Cape early in the century, made the following observation at the time:

‘Toch kan moeilik ontkend worden, dat het feit van een zeer gebrekkig Afrikaansch te spreken, doorspekt met Engelsche woorden en wendingen, voor vele Boeren eene oorzaak van ondergeschiktheid is. Deze ondergeschiktheid voelen zij zelf, evengoed tegenover Nederlanders uit Europa als tegenover Engelschen.’

1925 did little to halt the inroads English was making, however. Firstly, cutting ties with the language of Holland removed the only means by which one could monitor and correct one’s taalgebruik and secondly, recognition of Afrikaans in lieu of Dutch coincided with the increased urbanisation of the Afrikaner. Pienaar (1931: 181), writing at this time, commented:

‘En nou dat Afrikaans reeds op skool en universiteit die aandag en studie erlang wat dit dit s lank moes ontbeer het, kan ’n mens verwag dat dit ook nie meer as beslis noodsaaklik (as gevolg van die tweetalige kultuur) ’n verdere vervorming onder die invloed van Engels sal ondergaan nie’. (first published in 1919)

He could not have been more wrong. Undoubtedly he and his contemporaries saw the official recognition of Afrikaans as a great improvement on the situation as it had been, but new dangers lay ahead in the form of continued and increased urbanisation and better education, and thus greater acquaintance with English, i.e. die vertweetaliging van alle Afrikaners. In the course of time no corner of the country would remain isolated from English influence.

After discussing a trilingual situation in India, where the three languages concerned have been in contact for more than 600 years, Aitchison (1981: 119) maintains that that situation ‘illustrates the fact that with enough time and enough contact, there is no limit to the extent to which languages can affect one another’.

Although Afrikaners go to separate schools, universities and churches and have Afrikaans speaking equivalents of the Boy Scouts, Rotary, Freemasons etc., the degree of integration of the two communities has now reached a point where a blend is an inevitable result, and the drift is
unavoidably more in the one direction than the other. The following statement by Suffeleers (1979: 175), in which he is in fact referring to the situation in Flanders where there is strict geographic separation of the two language communities, unlike in South Africa, is all the more valid in the case of Afrikaans and English:

‘In directe en indirecte contactsituaties blijken talen invloed op elkaar uit te oefenen doordat de taalgebruikers elementen uit de ene taal - vooral uit het vocabulaire - overnemen als ze de andere taal gebruiken. Dit universele verschijnsel van de interferentie is in Vlaanderen evenwel niet het gevolg van taalcontact zonder meer, maar - ruimer nog - van cultuurcontact.’

2.1.3 The linguistic diffusion as a result of cultural assimilation in South Africa

That cultural diffusion inevitably leads to linguistic diffusion is a well-known fact. Grosjean (1982: 157) makes the point, however, that biculturalism and bilingualism do not necessarily go hand in hand - one can be bilingual and yet monocultural, as is the case with many Blacks in South Africa, for example. But this cannot be said of the Afrikaner. The differences between English and Afrikaans culture are nowadays too minimal to call the Afrikaner bicultural - his culture is a blend of the two and thus he too is monocultural, but in a different sense from that intended by Grosjean. Nevertheless the Afrikaner often believes, or chooses to believe, that he has a culture which is intrinsically different from that of his English speaking compatriots. Barnouw (1934: 40) made the following, now famous observation of Afrikaans culture:

‘The effect of this anglicising process is a strange anomaly, of which the Afrikaners themselves are apparently unaware. Their outlook on life, their conceptions of the world abroad, their methods of Government and business administration, their ideas of sportmanship, even their manners and forms of social intercourse, bear the trade-mark Made in England. A foreign observer will notice this similarity more easily than an Afrikaner, who intent on being and proving himself to be un-English, is more keenly aware of the little differences that mark his Afrikaans individuality.’

Boshoff (1963: 65) also quoted this passage from Barnouw and added the following futile comment:
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‘Mense wat aan ons taal wil dokter solank dit die toestand is, het geen werkelikheidsin nie: hulle span die kar voor die perde.’

Boshoff would have done well to heed the words of De Vooys (1925: 4-5):

‘De taal is de spiegel der kultuur... De vreemde woorden zijn geen lastige indringers, maar onmisbare en dus welkome gasten... Die menging van vreemde bestanddelen als begeleidingsverschijnsel van diepgaande [culturele] invloed kan dus op zichzelf moeilik [sic!] als een bederf, een ontanding beschouwd worden.’

In an earlier work in which he discusses anglicisms in Dutch, De Vooys (1914: 124) stated:

‘De onderzoeker van het Anglicisme moet meer doen dan Engelse woorden verzamelen en alfabeties ordenen: hij moet in dit dode materiaal leven brengen door er een stuk kultuurgeschiedenis van te maken.’

But his task was easier than mine. The contact between English and Dutch has not been nearly as intimate as that between English and Afrikaans, not only because of a wider geographical and cultural gap, but because Dutch bilingualism, admirable as it is, cannot be compared with that of the Afrikaner - to a Dutchman English is a foreign language, to an Afrikaner a second language. Consequently the influence goes way beyond the realm of vocabulary, which is all De Vooys is referring to. Previous studies, in particular Rousseau’s, have looked extensively at the cultural areas from which words have been borrowed into Afrikaans from English. It is therefore unlikely that I can shed any new light on that aspect of the influence of English on Afrikaans and I thus do not intend to linger on it.

Afrikaans has been referred to as the vertaaltaal by uitnemendheid (Du Toit 1965: 125), particularly at an official level, despite the fact that the majority of bureaucrats are Afrikaners. But even at the colloquial level it often applies. In this respect Afrikaans suffers from the same disease as Dutch in Belgium, but there at least many of the bureaucrats involved in the process are French speaking. That public notices in Natal often betray the fact that they have clearly been compiled in English first and then translated, is not altogether surprising in that province, but why the same should be the case on municipal signs in Bloemfontein and Pretoria, for example, is somewhat curious. According to Combrink (1967: 68)
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'omtrent 90% van alle Afrikaanse advertenties word in Engels geskep en die Afrikaanse ekwivalent word agterna gemaak.'

All this would seem to indicate that the native tongue of the compilers is only part of the explanation - the sphere in question would also seem to be a contributing factor even when the task is being performed by Afrikaners. It is claimed by some that the ability of Afrikaans to compete on an equal level with English in all spheres of society is dependent on its ability to satisfy the vertaalbaarheidseis put on it. Boshoff (1964: 38) complained that ‘Solank die taal van ons wetgewende, regsplegende, onderwysende, sportliefhebbende, handeldrywende, nywerheidondernemende en vaktaalmakende liggame nie meer aandag geniet nie, sal Engelse invloed 'n toenemende rol speel.’ This complaint is probably less valid now than in 1964 but if that is the case, it is because of the success the language has had in meeting the demands of translatability, partially thanks to the efforts of the various vaktaalburos. Even Dutch in Belgium, despite being able to look north for guidance, resorts to loans and loan translations for technical terminology, as Suffeleers (1979: 193) explains, because of the Flemings' intimacy with French:

‘Waar de moedertaal wegen de discontinuïteit ten aanzien van de noordelijke cultuurtaal niet toereikend blijkt te zijn, valt men, overnemend of vertalend, op de “vertrouwde” Franse terminologie terug.’

Combrink (1968: 8) feels there is only one means of survival for Afrikaans, given the odds it is up against:

‘Daar moet ook deeglik besef word dat Suid-Afrikaanse Engels onuitputtelike voedingsbronne het, nl. die Engels van Engeland, die VSA, Kanada, Australië en Nieu-Seeland. Afrikaans het daarenteen hoegenaamd geen standhoudende voedingsbron behalwe die skeppingskrag en die trotse gees van sommige van sy sprekers nie.’

Le Roux (1952: 10) on the other hand, sees another device at the disposal of Afrikaans in this respect:

‘Ook voel die volk aan dat, hoewel Afrikaans sy eie norm geword het, dit nie beteken dat alle bande met die verlede verbreek moet word nie. Hy voel dus dat ons geregtig is op die hele Nederlandse woordeskat - al verwerp ons dele daarvan -

---

1 Odendal (1984: 197) deals with the dominant role of English in television advertising and complains that the problem is not just one of translation but also of of conception.
endat, wanneer nuwe behoeftes ontstaan, dit die natuurlike bron is waaruit ons moet put, indien nodig.'

The Taalkommissie does, as I understand it, take Dutch usage into consideration when deliberating on issues, but the common man, the everyday user of Afrikaans, is nowadays both unaware of, and disinterested in, what the Dutch say - Dutch is a foreign language to him and of no relevance to his South African circumstances. Le Roux's remark is valid enough in theory, as is Combrink's, but I feel practice is proving to be otherwise - translation is the main means by which Afrikaans is combating the threat and meeting the challenge, at least at an official level, although less so at the level of the spoken word.

English is, and will remain, the language of the majority in the private sector of commerce, as well as the language through which contact with a wider world is maintained and in that wider world English has become what Latin was to the Roman world.

Scholtz (1940: 143), writing in 1940, was correct in my opinion in seeing bilingualism itself, not just the co-existence of the two languages in the country, as a cause of concern:

‘Tweetaligheid sowel as die ekonomiese, staatkundige, letterkundige en kulturele bande tussen Suid-Afrika en Engeland maak die verengelsing van Afrikaans nie 'n hersenskim nie, maar 'n steeds dreigende gevaar.’

The political connections he refers to may well be different now, but his point still retains a certain validity, even if America has now replaced England in importance on the world stage. The Afrikaner’s need to be bilingual in all spheres of life has led to new needs in his language and thus new demands being put on it. These have been largely met by translation, whether officially or otherwise. And if bilingualism inevitably brings with it a host of Bedürfnislehnwörter, it is also accompanied by many Luxuslehnwörter that the purists may well oppose, but usually with little success.² On the cultural assimilation that has accompanied the growing bilingualism of the Afrikaner since his shift to the cities, Barnouw (1934: 41-42) suggested the following hypothesis:

‘It is perhaps a subconscious awareness of this assimilation that makes the Afrikaners so aggressively anti-British. If you feel yourself becoming what you do not want to be, you are apt to overemphasize your otherness. And they who are consciously aware of the danger are the most active protestants

² These terms were first used by Tappolet (1914).
of the intrinsic difference between Boer and Briton. That explains why racial animosity runs highest in South African centres of learning. The intellectuals feel themselves the guardians of the racial inheritance. The Taal cult is their trust…'

- even if academics and their speech are not typical of the population as a whole. I like to see this statement of Barnouw's in connection with the following catch-cry of the nineteenth century Flemish activist Hugo Verriest: De taal is gans het volk. This is so often quoted by Afrikaners but it has a validity in South Africa beyond the realisation of those who cite it: the amount of English that has been absorbed into Afrikaans and has become part and parcel of it, reflects perfectly the blended culture which Afrikaners and English now share:

‘...the differences which stamp them Britons and Afrikaners are outweighed by the similarities by virtue of which they are all South Africans.’ (Barnouw 1934: 51)

The linguistic assimilation which was going hand in hand with cultural assimilation in South Africa was put in the following terms by a Dutch subscriber to Die Huisgenoot who was living in Cape Town in 1935:

‘Maar hoe sou ’n mens anders kon verwag? Nederlands word lankal nie meer as taal onderwys nie; die grense tussen Engels en Hollands, in woordeskat en veral idioom, word onseker. En die slordige Afrikaans van ons groot kleurlingbevolking vir wie geen skoolmediumwessie of liefde vir hul taal skyn te bestaan nie, werk daaraan mee… In Londen of Nu-York is dit baie makliker vir Nederlanders om hul taal suwer te hou as hier, waar ’n mens in die omgangstaal soveel Engelse woorde en idiooms hoort en, veral met die werkmense, moet gebruik om verstaan te word. In ons onderbewussyn lê die mooi masjinerie van ons taalgebruik. Dit het vrywel afsonderlike taalrade vir die afsonderlike taal, dog by Afrikaans loop die Engelse en Hollandse drade herhaaldelik na mekaar toe.’ (31/5/35)

This is in fact an early observation by a layman of a process which is now recognised as integral to all bilingual situations. Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968: 188) sum up the process as follows:

‘Linguistic and social factors are closely interrelated in the development of language change. Explanations which are confined to one or other aspect, no matter how well constructed,
will fail to account for the rich body of regularities that can be observed in empirical studies of language behaviour.'

2.1.4 The inherent affinity of the two languages

The inherent affinity which English and Afrikaans share is of two kinds:
   a) their common Germanic background
   b) parallel analytical development.

a) The first affinity factor is one that is also shared by Dutch, both Dutch and English stemming from very closely related Low German dialects which established themselves in their respective areas during the period of the Great Migrations. Therefore, the 'degree of facilitating kinship' (Whitney, 1881: 10) that exists between English and Afrikaans has made the ground fertile from the outset for interference to occur. Van Wyk (1978: 50) lends weight to the importance of this factor when he quotes the reverse situation being the case in Bantu languages; despite the head-on collision these languages have experienced with those of the White community, 'Afrikaans and English influence on Bantu syntax and pronunciation is practically nil, obviously because of the considerable structural differences between the two groups of languages.'

b) The second affinity factor is one that is not shared by Dutch to the same degree. Although even Dutch is decidedly more analytical and less dependent on inflection than German, for example, English and Afrikaans have progressed much further along the path from synthesis to analysis. The following are examples of this parallel analytical development in English and Afrikaans: loss of adjectival inflections (only partially so in Afrikaans), loss of gender, loss of feminine endings from nomina agentis (still optional in Afrikaans but generally speaking compulsory in Dutch), generalisation of s plurals (often still alternating with e plurals in Afrikaans), generalisation of he as the auxiliary in perfect tenses, simplification of conjugations to the point where conjugated forms and the infinitive have fallen together (almost the case in English with the exception of the third person singular) and finally, and most importantly in the context of this book, loss of all formal distinction between nouns and verbs, thus facilitating change of function. (cf. 7.16) As has been mentioned before (p. 25), Du Toit (1897: iv) and Valkhoff (1972: 29) wrongly attributed such similarities between English and Afrikaans to influence of the former on the latter. Langenhoven (1926: 114-115) had realised already in the 1890's that these similarities were not the result of interference and appealed to the analytical congruency between the two languages in his efforts to support the movement for the recognition of Afrikaans and the abolition of Dutch as a national language:
'Now as to grammar, Africander Dutch certainly resembles English much more than Dutch. It has dropped all unnecessary inflections, and anyone who will take the trouble of carefully analysing the characteristics of the three languages, will observe the similarity in grammatical structure between English and Africander Dutch, and the dissimilarity of these two to Dutch.' (written in 1893)

The common Germanic background of English and Afrikaans implies among other things similar stress patterns, given that one of the characteristics of Germanic languages is stress on the first syllable, except in the case of certain derivatives (e.g. verstaan, begryp, kinderagtig, etc.). But whereas indigenous vocabulary in the two languages takes the stress on the first syllable, the large body of Norman French vocabulary in English and of Latin and Greek derived words in both English and Afrikaans, as well as the many French loanwords in Dutch/Afrikaans, usually require a stress not found in indigenous words. But as such words have become assimilated into English, the stress has shifted in many cases to the first syllable, e.g. chauffeur, bureau. The often criticised tendency in Afrikaans to stress bisyllabic words such as kontak, konflik and aspek on the first syllable as well as polysyllabic nouns such as mikrofoon, minister and telegram, although generally accepted as English inspired, is therefore not in fact foreign to the established stress pattern of Afrikaans. In this regard, what is occurring with these words is comparable to the process to which chauffeur and bureau have already fallen victim in English. De Bruto (1970: 42) had the following to say on this issue in Afrikaans:

‘Om die vreemde Franse (Romaanse) klempatroon te verkies bo dit wat heeltemal in die Afrikaanse patroon val, maar wat daarom juist nader aan Engels staan, maak dit ’n arbitrêre keuse. Linguistics sal hoogstens, binne ’n groot vergelykingsraamwerk, gesê kan word dat die Afrikaanse patroon net verhaas kan gewees het deur Engelse beïnvloeding en dat om subjektiwe taalpolitieke redes, hier dus ook sprake van Anglisismes is.’

De Villiers (1970: 249) provides quite a convincing argument to support the theory that pronunciations such as feddereaal and kollenel, instead of feddereaal and koolonel (i.e. with a short vowel in an open syllable) are also as natural to Afrikaans as they are to English, without English having mediated in any way.

At this point the concepts of pseudo-anglicisms (skyn-Anglisismes) and contributing factors (versterkende faktore), both of which are dealt with...
in detail under 6.00, should be mentioned. The difficulty of identifying English influence on Afrikaans, formidable anyway because of the large number of factors that possibly shaped the language in the pre-literary period, is all the greater in the case of two languages which are historically so closely related. The common genetic material that English, Dutch and Afrikaans have inherited, according to the laws of natural selection, from their Low German ancestors can have led to certain phenomena having been retained in English and Afrikaans while they are not, or are no longer, attested in standard Dutch or even in twentieth century dialects. Such phenomena, if they can be isolated, are termed *skyn-Anglisismes* in the Afrikaans literature on the topic. On the other hand, it is possible that Dutch has or had two structures, one of which is shared by English. The fact that the structure which resembles the English one has become the more common or even the only one in Afrikaans, while (now) being absent from Dutch or at least uncommon in that language, may conceal a further refinement of the concept of pseudo-anglicisms. In this instance one can say that the occurrence of the phenomenon in Afrikaans is not in itself due to English, but that the contact with English has contributed to, or even been the main cause, in that item having been retained in Afrikaans while dying out in Dutch, or in its having acquired the frequency it has in Afrikaans compared to its frequency in Dutch. A common concrete example of this concept could well be the frequently quoted case of *braaf*, usually meaning ‘brave’ in Afrikaans, while in Dutch it can only mean ‘well-behaved’ but apparently previously meant ‘brave’ (cf. p. 131). It is usually impossible to be categorical in such cases and one must often resort to possibility and probability theories instead of exact theories.

It is obvious that when two languages have so much in common as English and Afrikaans because of common ancestry and subsequent parallel development, the ground is all the more fertile for cross pollination to occur than where this is not the case. In this respect the English-Afrikaans contact situation is unique in the modern world, at least as far as European languages in contact are concerned.

Examples of kinship facilitating the synthesis of forms can be found in the realms of both phonology and morphology. When words such as *donkie, lorrie* and *storie* were adopted, they contained no phoneme which was foreign to Afrikaans; with a minimum of adaptation in spelling they even looked like Afrikaans words. The [i] ending, whether a diminutive by origin in English or not - which is certainly the case in a word like *auntie* - could be immediately perceived as such in Afrikaans where there is a great wealth of such endings. The assimilation process was then complete - phonologically, morphologically and even semantically - and at the cost of negligible adaption. As Schonken (1914: 192) remarked:

*Bruce Donaldson, The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
‘Maakt echter reeds de overeenkomst in woordenschat en armoede der verbuigingsvormen de overname makkelijk, zoo wordt de overgang nog in de hand gewerkt door opvallende overeenstemming in uitspraak en klankstelsel.’

When the words *bottel* and *stoor* were borrowed - one assumes as nouns in the first instance - they were immediately also able to do service as verbs, as well as form a compound noun, *bottelstoor*, with no necessity for medial vowels or any other form of adaption, other than spelling, to imitate the English ‘bottlestore’. It is of no relevance in this context that puristic endeavours seem to have had some success in replacing *bottelstoor* with *drankwinkel*.

Cognate vocabulary in English and Afrikaans can be totally homophonous, even if semantic distinctions exist. The English verb ‘to pool’ is phonologically identical to an Afrikaans word (*poel*) with a totally different meaning. Firstly, because of the Afrikaner’s acquaintance with the English meaning of the word and secondly, because he apparently feels there is not a direct equivalent in his language (i.e. the need theory), and thirdly, because the English word can so easily be assimilated in an Afrikaans sentence, it commonly occurs as a verb in the English sense in Afrikaans - *HAT* recognises the noun *poel* in this sense as an anglicism, but not the verb. Because of the close relationship of the two languages and because bilingualism is perhaps subconsciously overlapping in the mind of the speaker, it can be impossible in such a case to ascertain whether *poel* as a verb in Afrikaans represents a loanword or a loan meaning being applied to an indigenous word.

Closely related but not identical idiom in English and Dutch has often led to expressions in Afrikaans being truer to the English form than the Dutch, particularly as the affinity of the two languages often puts no formal constraints on such contamination taking place, for example: ‘n naald in ’n hoomied soek (Dutch says *speld*), *die handdoek ingooi* (Dutch says *de handdoek in de ring gooien*). (cf. p. 180) Dutch and Afrikaans have the expression *overhandigen/oorhandig* where English has ‘to hand over’, but English also has the expression ‘to hand in’, which is unknown in Dutch but occurs as *inhandig* in Afrikaans. There is no obvious sign of foreignness in this word to the native-speaker and it has consequently been absorbed with ease. (*HAT* regards it as an anglicism) That it may be non-indigenous by origin and that it may have ousted an indigenous expression in the process of adoption, is of no concern to the average native-speaker.

---

3 It has been claimed that *bottel* is of Portuguese origin in Afrikaans, (cf. Boshoff and Nienaber 1967: 182) Even if this is so, Portuguese can presumably only account for the occurrence of *bottel* as a noun in Afrikaans, not as a verb.
Further examples of idiom overlap because of phonological similarity with English are provided by *iets met 'n greintjie sot neem*, where Dutch uses *korreltje*, and *'n string kwalifikasies*, where *streng* cannot be used figuratively in this sense in Dutch. The latter example is interesting in another respect, however. In Germanic dialects *e* and *i* often alternate, as the following triplets illustrate: Eng. *bring*, Afr. *bring*, Dt. *brengen*; Eng. *think*, Afr. *dink*, Dt. *denken*. Afrikaans, like English, has on occasions ultimately opted for *i*. This parallel phonological development has created in *string* a homophone in both languages, possibly further contributing to its susceptibility to assume an English meaning as in the example given above.

The occurrence in both South African English and Afrikaans of [ə] in stressed syllables such as *this/dit* is a further (chance?) parallel which I do not feel qualified to comment on. Suffice it to say that the sound is also prevalent in New Zealand - in Australia it has become a shibboleth by which one can pick a Kiwi. Does this indicate that the sound has its origins in English dialect? If this is the case in South African English too, is the presence of the sound in Afrikaans the result of English influence, because it is unknown in Dutch to my knowledge? This would seem unlikely on the other hand, because, as will be discussed later (cf. 7.18), English has had very little effect on Afrikaans phonology; one would be more inclined in this context to presume that stressed [ə] in South African English is the result of the contact with Afrikaans. Or has the sound arisen spontaneously in both, or just in Afrikaans, with an influence one way or the other having played no role at all? I offer no solution here but simply mention the matter as yet another example of the confusion which the close affinity of English and Afrikaans confronts the researcher with.

The many inherent similarities between English and Afrikaans, while facilitating the inroads the former is making into the latter, are also partly to blame for the linguistic insecurity that many Afrikaners experience and can cause legitimate Afrikaans expressions and words to be avoided. Of course there are the many international words that are immediately suspect to many Afrikaners, but as De Villiers points out, this attitude can have repercussions for indigenous structures too. He maintains that *ek kan hom nie uitstaan nie* is avoided because *ek kan hom nie staan nie* is a known anglicism and *uitstaande skulde* is avoided because of *uitstaande speler* being frowned upon. (*Die Huisgenoot*, 18/11/49) Either the English inspired examples arise in Afrikaans because of a certain similarity to like sounding expressions in that language or alternatively, having arisen, are consciously avoided by linguistically aware speakers who then overextend their awareness to a point where they eradicate acceptable, uncontaminated material from their speech.
2.2 Definitions of the term anglicism

Before explaining how the term anglicism is used in this book, it is important to see how it has been interpreted by others who have written on the phenomenon in Afrikaans and to compare various dictionary definitions of the term:

2.2.1 Dictionary definitions

**WAT** (1950):

‘Enige verskynsel in 'n taal, veral 'n woord of wending, wat, hoewel dit na die uiterlik ineems lyk, so gevorm of gebesig word dat dit 'n Engelse model navolg, in stryd met die aard of idioom (taaleie) van die betrokke taal; barbarisme uit Engels afkomstig: 'n Anglisisme is nie verwerplik bloot omdat dit 'n Engelsheid is nie, maar omdat dit in die meeste gevalle iets inheems bedreig of verdring...’ (followed by a substantial list of the sorts of influence and examples.)

**WAT's definition of a barbarisme** is as follows:

‘Woord of uitdrukking wat in klank en uiterlike vorm inheems is, maar in betekenis, vorming of samevoeging so in stryd met die [Afr.] taaleie is en so 'n duidelike navolging van die idioom van 'n ander taal vertoon dat dit aanstoot gee: “Hy hardloop 'n besigheid in Kaapstad”, is 'n barbarisme van die ergste graad.’

**HAT** (1965):

‘Engelse idioom wat letterlik in 'n ander taal nagevolg is, bv. hy groei blomme i.p.v. kweek.’

**HAT** (1983):

‘Vorm wat onder Engelse invloed in 'n ander taal opgeneem word; ook, sodanige vorm wat in stryd is met die sisteem van die ontleneende taal.’
WNT (1949):

‘Uitdrukking die aan het Engelsch eigen is en die in een andere taal wordt overgenomen, in strijd met het idioom van die taal.’

VAN DALE (1984):

‘Woord, uitdrukking of constructie naar het Engels gevormd of eruit overgenomen, in strijd met het taaleigen van de overnemende taal.’

OED (1933):

‘1. Anglicised language, such as the introduction of English idiom into a sentence in another language, hence, a peculiarity of the English language, an idiom specially English.
2. An English characteristic or fashion.
3. English political principles or methods of administration.’


‘1. Anglicised language, hence, an idiom specially English.
2. An English fashion 1787.
3. English political principles or methods 1873.’

HAT and Afrikaanse woordelys en spelreëls (7th edition) spell Anglisime with a capital letter, the latter in accordance with E (Ideologie) in the chapter on capital letters. WAT did not capitalise it in 1950 nor did the first edition of HAT in 1965. Because all lemmas are capitalised in WNT and OED, it is not immediately obvious what these dictionaries recommend; an accompanying text in WNT implies it favours a capital letter in Dutch, whereas usage in English would seem to suggest that OED would favour a small letter. The word is seldom, if ever, encountered in English with a capital letter and these days never spelt with a small letter in Afrikaans. The latest Van Dale (1984) in three volumes gives the word a small letter and one never sees it written with a capital letter anymore in Dutch, although it does occur in older texts, for example: De Vooy used it in 1914 but was no longer using it in 1925. (cf. bibliography) General practice and the main prescriptive works in the English, Dutch and Afrikaans speaking areas ultimately suggest, despite some inconsistency in the past, that anglicism be written with a small a in English, anglicisme with a small a in Dutch and Anglisisme with a capital a in Afrikaans. Personally I find the inconsistency lamentable and also favour a small a in Afrikaans, but practice would seem to demand otherwise. This convention
will be respected throughout this work. The inconsistency of spelling in the quotes is that of the authors being cited.

2.2.2 Definitions of those who have written on anglicisms in Afrikaans

What follows are the opinions of several leading scholars, most of whom have made quite prolific contributions to the wealth of literature on English influence on Afrikaans. It is illuminating to see where their conceptions of the term anglicism in particular differ from one another.

Smith (1962: 67), although of course realising the limited utility of his definition in practice, maintains that anglicisms are usually regarded as being as follows:

‘Gewoonlik neem ons aan dat elke uitdrukking wat letterlik ooreenstem met die ekwivalente Engelse uitdrukking en wat nie in Nederlands vandag voorkom of vroeër voorgekom het nie, as anglicisties [sic!] in ons taal moet beskou word.’

Assuming he means by ons any Afrikaner and not linguists in particular, I doubt whether in 1962 anyone was still aware of what differed in Afrikaans from Dutch. Nevertheless there is possibly a certain truth in his claim that the common man immediately regards as suspect anything that corresponds literally with an equivalent English expression. No-one else has attempted to define an anglicism in the terms that Smith uses here. On page 62 he does, however, imply that he regards die eintlike anglicismes as translated idioms etc., and in this he is supported by Boshoff (1963).

Boshoff, in the four radio talks he delivered for the SABC in 1964, was most insistent on drawing a distinction between loanwords and anglicisms:

‘Engelse woorde is geen Anglisismes nie. Dit is die eerste wanbegrip waarvan ons ontslae moet raak.’ (p. 51)

He sees three types of influence: ‘vreemde woorde, leenwoorde (d.w.s. aangepas), Anglisimes.’

‘As ons in Afrikaans dus Engelse woorde soos lift gebruik wat hulle deur hulle uitspraak, klemtoon, betekenis of deur watter kenmerke ook al as onafrikaans of oneie laat uitken, dan is hulle eenvoudig vreemde Engelse woorde en nie Anglisimes nie... Wanneer vreemde woorde aldus ingeburger
It is clear from a statement he made in his thesis in 1921 that Boshoff (1921: 409) had always made a distinction between loanwords and anglicisms where he maintains that poets, dominees, teachers etc. are striving against ‘die gebruik van Engelse woorde en uitdrukkinge, sowel as teen die gebruik van allerlei Anglisismes.’ As will be illustrated, Boshoff (1963: 59) is not the only one to take this stance, but he is the only person who disagrees with the idea of an anglicism having to be in stryd met die taaleie to qualify for the label:

‘Dikwels word beweer dat ons ’n taalverskynsel in Afrikaans alleen ’n Anglisisme kan noem as dit met die Afrikaanse taaleie in stryd is en dit geweld aandoen.’

Compare the dictionary definitions where this is often (even usually) stipulated as a condition. Boshoff disagrees and cites the example of malgaan being an anglicism although it is identical in form to doodgaan and thus does not clash at all. The concept of clashing is dealt with later. (cf. 4.3)

De Bruto (1970: 36) introduces the idea of value judgement into the definition of an anglicism:

‘Die kwessie van Anglisismes is... in sy wese taalpolities van aard, en by so ’n benadering gaan dit basies om ’n keuse tussen goed en sleug. Word op ’n bepaalde vlak op ’n bepaalde manier ’n bepaalde leemte gevul, heet ’n Engelse bousel bv. ’n Engelse leenwoord; maar verdring hierdie bepaalde bousel die Afrikaans op ’n bepaalde manier, heet dit ’n Anglisisme.’

De Bruto gives examples of the various forms of influence as he sees them: he regards lift as a ‘vreemde woord’, jokkie as a ‘leenwoord’, brug (the game) as a ‘leenvertaling’ and partikulier (in the meaning of ‘choosy’) as an ‘Anglisisme’.

Le Roux (1968: 163), in defining an anglicism, is less interested in the distinctions insisted upon by Boshoff and De Bruto, and more interested in the role of clashing as a determining factor:

“n Anglisisme is... vir ons ’n taalelement of groep van taalelemente wat onder invloed van die Engelse taal gebruik word en wat - hier kom dit veral op aan! - in een of meer
opsigte bots met die wese van die taal.’ (first appeared in Die Huisgenoot in 1947)

What Le Roux calls botsing is what Boshoff calls in stryd met die taalie. With respect to the relevance of this concept, these two scholars are apparently diametrically opposed. I shall return to this further on.

H.J. Terblanche, founder of the Genootskap vir die Handhawing van Afrikaans, must surely have been one of the most vocal spokesmen on the topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans. In an article he wrote for Die Brandwag (6/9/46) entitled ‘Wat is ‘n Anglisisme?’ he maintains that anglicisms are (a) ‘leenwoorde’, (b) ‘basterwoorde (impressie, poeding, etc.)’, (c) ‘werklike Anglisismes (eksamenpapier, die tyd is op)’.

What De Bruto calls ‘vreemdewoorde’, as distinct from ‘leenwoorde’, Terblanche apparently sees as ‘leenwoorde’, choosing to ignore the distinction made by De Bruto.

De Villiers’ (1970: 245) statement that ‘soos u weet, word in baie kringe ‘n onderskeid gemaak tussen enersyds die leenwoord uit ‘n ander taal en andersyds die navolging van vreemde betekenisse, woordvorminge en sinswendinge, wat ons saam as Anglisismes bestempel’ implies that the distinction is not one which is made by everybody, despite Boshoff’s insistence on such a distinction existing; De Vooy’s (1914), in an article entitled ‘Hoe zijn anglicismen te beschouwen?’ discusses only loanwords, for example.

Le Roux (1926: 329), another prolific spokesman on anglicisms in his day, gives the following definition in which he too recognises the ambiguity sometimes given to the term:

‘In die meer algemene betekenis is ‘n Anglisisme, Gallisisme, Germanisme, ens., ‘n woord of uitdrukking wat na die model van Engelse, Franse, Duitse, ens. woorde en uitdrukkinge gevorm is, of uit een van dié tale oorgeneem is. In die meer beperkte betekenis is sulke ismes (na die definiesie van Prof. J.W. Muller) woorde en uitdrukkinge wat uiterlik, d.i. in klank en (buigings)-vorm inheems, maar innerlik, d.i. in woordvorming en woordvoeging, maar veral in betekenis, skakering, gevoelswaarde en kleur uithoends.’

In his well-known monograph on the topic written much later, he retains this definition, although the wording is vastly improved:

‘Barbarismes is woorde, woordverbinde, sinwendinge en
segswyse wat Afrikaans is na die uiterlike vorm (klank en verbuiging) maar op 'n vreemde manier gebruik word, bv. wat betref betekenis, funksie, woordvoeging, manier van samestelling, ens... Terwyl Anglisismes dus aan die een kant as 'n algemene term gebruik kan word om alle vorme van Engelse invloed in te sluit, word dit aan die ander kant ook in meer beperkte sin gebruik as sinoniem met barbarismes van Engelse herkoms om hulle teonderskei van leenwoorde.' (1952: 2)

Du Toit (1965: 121) had the following to say in Die Huisgenoot in 1934:

‘... 'n barbarisme, ofskoon omskryf as 'n woord uit inheemse bestanddele, maar in navolging van ander en strydig met die wette van die eie taal gevorm, berus tog in eerste instansie op 'n letterlike vertaling van die vreemde woord of uitdrukkings van die eie taal, berust ogneerste instansie op 'n letterlike vertaling van die vreemde woord of uitdrukkings van die eie taal, waarmee dit ook deur wetenskaplikes omskryf word.' (p. 121)

He refers to the ‘leenwoorde, basterwoorde en barbarismes’ as the ‘Engelse bestanddele van die Afrikaanse taal’. Ultimately Du Toit favours using the word anglicism in the broader sense to include all three categories ‘op grond én van die populiere betekenis wat ons hier aan die woord heg, én van sommige definisies, waarmee dit ook deur wetenskaplikes omskryf word.’ (p. 121)

In conclusion, I want to look at Johan Combrink's understanding of the term anglicism. Combrink has also been quite prolific on the topic but his understanding perhaps deserves more attention than what has been dealt with so far, as he is still a practising linguist, unlike nearly all those mentioned to date, but above all because he is also a member of the Taalkommissie and is thus likely to be closely connected with any publication on anglicisms put out by the Taalkommissie. In his latest article, initially compiled for the Taalkommissie, Combrink goes to great lengths to point out what English and Afrikaans have in common, thus ultimately implying what an anglicism is not (1984: 83-96). In 4.3.2, the section entitled ‘Die begrip Anglisisme’, he states:

‘Daar is byna soveel betekenisse van die begrip “Anglisisme”, as wat daar woordeboeke en taalhandleidings is. Die gevolg van hierdie veelheid van begrippe is dat die breë publiek dink (a) dat alles wat na Engels klink of lyk en wat nie alledaags is nie, ‘n Anglisisme is, (b) dat alle Engelse invloed Anglisisties is, d.w.s. sleg is vir Afrikaans.’ (p. 101)
Under (a) he is referring to what I have so far called international vocabulary. On this he goes on to say:

‘Dis natuurlik ’n infame misvatting dat hierdie woorde van Engels kom, maar die tipe taalsuiweringsveldtog wat in Afrikaans gevoer is, het tot gevolg dat hierdie misvatting die sterk gevestigde algemene opinie is.’ (p. 102)

This statement is of course correct but what Combrink neglects to mention here is that a great deal of such vocabulary has entered Afrikaans via English, as will be discussed later (cf. 7.12), and that some of it is in fact English - it is impossible for the layman to distinguish, and what is more, it is irrelevant to his purposes. After having discussed the indispensability of certain ‘true’ anglicisms, Combrink adds the following rider to his understanding of the term anglicism:

‘Mens moet hulle beskou as gevestigde Engelse ontlenings, sodat die term Anglisisme - waaraan daar ’n stigma kleef - gereserveer word vir dié Engelse invloede wat mens wil bekamp, d.w.s. wat onnodig is omdat daar goeie Afrikaanse ekwivalente bestaan, én wat nog nie algemeen gebruiklik is tot in taalbewuste Afrikaanse geledere nie.’ (p. 102)

In this Combrink does not differ in essence from what De Bruto postulated (cf. p. 58) in that both put a negative value judgement on the term.

2.2.3 The author’s understanding of the term anglicism and opinion of the definitions of others

Throughout this book the term anglicism is used in its broadest sense, incorporating what the above Afrikaans writers on the topic have referred to as ‘leenwoorde’, ‘basterwoorde’ and ‘barbarismes’. In adopting this definition I associate myself most closely, of all the authors mentioned, with S.J. du Toit whose reason for favouring the more general definition was based on both the opinion of some linguists, but above all on the common man's understanding of the word. Boshoff's radio talks seem to be reason enough to take this stance: if he had to go to such lengths to establish firmly in people’s minds what the difference is between a loanword and an ‘egte Anglisisme’, because that ‘misconception’ was so deeply rooted, what better reason can there be for not adopting his definition? It is also heartening to find that the primary definition in HAT is now in accordance with the way the term will be used here, which was not the case in the first edition, (cf. p. 55) This is not to say, however, that I can completely
identify with the popular notion of the term because of the misconception referred to by Combrink above. It is a curious thing that what the average Afrikaner regards as an anglicism, i.e. first and foremost the use of 'unnecessary' English words (but also international vocabulary that resembles English), is precisely what so many Afrikaans academics have taken great pains to emphasise it is not.

I also find it impossible to ally myself with those, such as De Bruto and Combrink, who support a definition where personal value judgement plays a role. Clearly my reason here is because of the obvious subjectivity involved and thus lack of consistency. No-one has yet come forth with an adequate definition of a 'permissible anglicism', although each scholar seems to be quite satisfied with his contribution to clarification of the issue. This goes to prove that no definition that necessitates a value judgement is, or ever can be, adequate. The only guide to the acceptability of a given anglicism is its degree of ingeburgerdheid, firstly in the spoken language and ultimately in the written language, as determined by usage - deliberations on the origin and possible alternatives are then superfluous. In this, although I cannot accept Combrink's reservation of the term anglicism for influences one wishes to oppose because they are 'unnecessary', I am in full agreement with his second rider that an anglicism cannot be regarded as ingeburgerd 'wat nog nie algemeen gebruiklik is tot in die taalbewuste Afrikaanse geledere nie' (1984: 102). Where does this put English structures which do have equivalents in Afrikaans but are nevertheless common in the Afrikaans of so-called taalbewustes?

As the various definitions given above indicate, the idea of in stryd met die taaleie or botsing is considered important by most scholars when determining what is or isn't an anglicism. HAT adds the proviso of in stryd met die ontlenerende taal as a rider to the definition, but does not include it in the primary definition, unlike all other dictionaries with the exception of the OED. It is rather ambiguous what exactly is meant by this phrase, but presumably it is synonymous with botsing (cf. Le Roux 1968: 117) and that this in turn is what Combrink (1984: 102), who avoids both terms, means by 'wat onnodig is omdat daar goeie Afrikaanse ekwivalente bestaan', i.e. Bedürfnislehngut as opposed to Luxuslehngut.

Van den Toorn (1977: 77), discussing the issue of interference in Dutch from neighbouring languages, distinguishes between loans on the one hand and barbarisms on the other,

‘waar onder men verstaat: volstrekt overbodige, tegen de structuur of woordvormingsgewoonte van de ontlenerende taal indruisende formaties. Een barbarisme wordt dus als een fout
beschouwd, maar het is niet altijd gemakkelijk vast te stellen wat echt fout is en wat nog als acceptabel geldt.'

He too avoids the phrase *in stryd met* as such, but his wording suggests that his understanding of what is implied by the phrase is quite different from the South African conception of it. As he sees it in Dutch, a given phenomenon is not merely an undesirable barbarism because it is superfluous and competes with an indigenous phenomenon, but because it is incompatible in some way with the structure or rules of word formation of Dutch. Does this difference in conception between Van den Toorn and Afrikaans linguists (with the exception of Boshoff, cf. p. 58) reflect the Dutch lack of obsession with purism which is so common in South Africa and non-existent in Holland? Van den Toorn's understanding of *in stryd met* would seem to be literal - does this also apply to the definitions in *WNT* and *Van Dale* on page 56? - whereas in South Africa it actually means *verdring die inheemse*. He too introduces a value judgement but is forced to admit that he isn't sure where to draw the line.

That the word *Anglisme* is synonymous with *fout* for Afrikaners was borne out time and time again during the period of my research in the Republic. Whenever I jotted down a 'suspect' construction, the speaker would immediately ask me, a non-native-speaker, 'what should I say then?', the implication being that if the phenomenon is English in origin, however *ingeburgerd*, there must be a 'better' way to say it. In this treatment of the topic I also distance myself from the negative connotation so commonly applied to the term anglicism.

### 2.3 Attitudes to anglicisms

The feelings of Afrikaners with regard to their language have often run quite high. The emotionalism which has so often manifested itself in language issues in South Africa in the past is something which is exceedingly difficult for a native-speaker of English to appreciate. Nevertheless, the tension in Belgian society that still flares up from time to time over language issues reminds one that it is not a concept which is exclusive to South African society. Afrikaans is after all a language which has been closely associated with the general struggle for freedom from British domination - it was at the forefront of the Afrikaners' fight for emancipation and equality which followed the Boer War. Afrikaners, with their firm conviction of their right to be in Africa and to lead a life true to the values of their forefathers, have often been compared with Israelis, the parallels of a chosen people in a promised land being obvious. But another parallel is the attitude of those two peoples to their national language, the
Jews to Hebrew and the Afrikaners to Afrikaans, one aspect of which is the way 'impurities' in the languages are regarded. Nowadays the Afrikaners' struggle for economic and cultural emancipation has been won and what the language has achieved since the turn of the century is nothing short of remarkable. The period of emancipation witnessed emotional attitudes to English influence which are fortunately only rarely found these days. There is a linguistic confidence now among Afrikaners that was previously lacking, and consequently a more objective, scientifically responsible attitude to the 'impurities' in the language:

‘due to the contribution of Betz, Haugen and Weinreich, the terminology of bilingualism became more precise; romantic terms like “degeneration” of a language, "perversion" of a language or “purity” were discarded and a more neutral linguistic nomenclature was introduced.’ (Ostyn 1972: 2)

2.3.1 Previous attitudes

According to Coetzee (1982: 282), the attitude among Afrikaners to English influence on their language prior to the official recognition of Afrikaans was quite different from what it became after 1925:

‘Veral voor die erkenning van Afrikaans as amptelike taal naas Engels in 1925 word Engelse woorde vryelik gebruik en verafrikaans. Dit blyk dat Engels nie as die groot konkurrent gesien is nie. Engelse woorde moes ook gebruik en verafrikaans word om leemtes in die bestaande woordeskat aan te vul.’

In fact, as has been mentioned before, Du Toit (1897:iv) (cf. p. 50) went so far as to claim that English, together with French, had made Afrikaans what it was. In a sense I agree with this statement (cf. 4.5), but not for the reasons Du Toit gives where he wrongly attributes analytical development in Afrikaans to English influence. In holding this view, Du Toit was an exception, however. Coetzeegoes on to quote the recommendations made by E.C. Pienaar and D.B. Bosman to the South African Academy in the 1930's, which reflect a new attitude:

‘Al die kommissielede is dit eens dat maatreëls moet ter hand geneem word om dié voortwoekerende euwel te stuit... Algaar is dit nie eens oor wat as anglisimes moet gebrandmerk word nie. Ons ondersteun dus in die eerste plek die aanbeveling van die drie memorandiste dat die Akademie ’n prys uitloof vir die
The prize they refer to is the one which was ultimately awarded to H.J. Rousseau for the doctoral thesis he submitted to the University of Cape Town in 1933. Van Rensburg (1983: 137) says of this early, fervently negative reaction to English influence:

‘In der waarheid was hierdie vurige Anglisismejagtery ‘n simptoom van onsekerheid oor die nuutverworne status van Afrikaans, ‘n simptoom van die gebrek aan selfvertroue.’

According to Boshoff (1963: 60), however, the situation still existed in the 1950's:

‘Met ‘n onoordeelkundige jag op Anglisismes bereik ons niks nie: ons skep daarmee net by Afrikaanssprekendes ‘n minderwaardigheidsgevoel, ‘n vreeskomples, ‘n gedurige verbouereerdheid dat hulle hul op die een of ander oomblik van onbedagsaamheid aan ‘n Anglisisme sal besondig.’

This lack of self confidence in linguistic issues is something which has still not completely disappeared. If one compares it to the definite insecurity that many Flemings experience as a result of the diglossia situation (i.e. dialect versus ABN) that so many of them still find themselves in, one is inclined to believe that it is an unavoidable ingredient of bilingualism.

But if a certain linguistic insecurity is still present in the Afrikaner as a result of the contact with English, the attitude that it is fashionable to use English words in Afrikaans is certainly a thing of the past. In 1963 Boshoff maintained: ‘... hy [doen] dit uit pronksug: hy wil sy toehoorder onder die indruk bring dat hy al ‘n mondjievol van die vreemde taal ken.’ (p. 50) I find it difficult to believe that this was still the case in 1963, particularly as Le Roux stated as early as 1932 that:

‘Daar was ‘n tyd toe baie, selfs opgevoede Afrikaners gedink het dat dit deftig staan om hulle taal te deurspek met Engelse woorde. Vandag tref ons die mees onsuwere Afrikaans nog maar net by kleurlinge, verengelstes en half-opgevoedes, en helaas! by amptenare... Deur sy bontheid doen sterk gemengde

---

4 One possible exception to this is the conscious, often exaggerated use of English words in so-called studentetaal (cf. p. 40); this is a group which is generally speaking linguistically secure and the motivation for their use of ‘superfluous’ English vocabulary is quite different from that of the working class, who are linguistically indifferent on the whole.
taal net so pynlik aan soos die veelkleurige doek van ’n kaffermeid.’ (Die Taalgenoot, May 1932)

The final sentence contains a simile which can only make one smile these days and illustrates the degree of sophistication we have apparently now attained compared with our predecessors. Interestingly enough, Le Roux (1926: 357) had written in 1926:

‘In party kringe geld dit vir deftiger om Engelse woorde te gebruik as woorde van hulle eie taal’

but by 1932 he claims that this is a thing of the past. In the same year he stated in Die Taalgenoot:

‘... daar ek ’n ontwikkelde taalgevoel beskou as ’n blyk van beskawing, kan ek sê hoe beskaafder dié spreker hoe minder Anglisismes hy gebruik, hoe onbeskaafder hoe meer Anglisismes hy gebruik.’ (July 1932)

The official recognition of Afrikaans in 1925 would seem to be the reason why a different attitude so suddenly became so commonplace. The earliest mention of the pronksugsindroom is provided by Tromp (1879: 199) who commented:


D.F. Malherbe in his Afrikaanse Taalboek (1917), the first Afrikaans grammar for Afrikaners since S.J. du Toit’s Eerste Beginsels (1876) and Vergelykende Taalkunde (1897) - both of which were totally antiquated by 1917 - is the first work to express the modern attitude. As it was such an important book in the formation of the standard Afrikaans that was to gain full recognition eight years later, it is worth citing here:

‘Die ontsiering van Afrikaans deur Engelse woorde wat sedert tientalle jare aan die gang is, sal deur behoorlike onderwijs en skriwe van ons taal langsamerhand verwijder word. Dit is nog nie so ’n groot gevaar nie. Want waar ’n taal alleen
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vreemde woorde oorneem, en daarbij nog woorde waarvoor goeie inheemse bestaan, kan hy eintlik nie veel skade lij nie. Daarvoor is Engels self’n goeie voorbeeld. Ernstiger is die indringing van die Engelse idioom want dit raak die kern van ons taallewe aan.’ (p. 16)

Barnouw (1934: 39), a Dutch American who visited South Africa in 1932, i.e. during the all important post-recognition years, seems to have got the impression that Afrikaners will simply have to resign themselves to loanwords from English in order to cope with the modern world:

‘The educated are, consequently, exposing their Dutch vocabulary to what the Afrikaans patriot might call the contagion of English, and when they are called upon to deal with subjects to which the Taal cannot do justice they will, whether consciously or mechanically, resort to English for the terms that must supply the shortage.’

The ‘resignation syndrome’, like the pronksugsindroom, is also an attitude of the past. Another example of it is provided, rather surprisingly, by Smith (1962: 64) in a column he wrote in Die Suiderstem from 1936-39:

‘Veral waar dit selfstandige naamwoorde geld, is dit in die reël doeltreffender om, net soos die Nederlanders, ‘n kort Engelse woorde oor te neem en nie ons vernu te verspil op die smeet van allerlei onpraktiese samestellige woorde soos flat, handicap, record, sandwich, scrum, en ander soortgelyke benaminge nie. Vir flat is al voorgestel hyser, hysbak, hystoestel en ligter; maar geen enkele van hierdie woorde geniet algemene erkenning nie, en lift is nog altyd verstaanbaarder as nulle almaal. Vir flat is al aan die hand gegee deelwoning, kamerwoning, verdiepingwoning, vloerwoning - ja, selfs plat!’

That it was not at all futile to oppose the automatic adoption of such English loanwords has since been borne out by the fact that there are now totally acceptable and accepted Afrikaans words for several of the concepts mentioned here by Smith. It is worth noting that of all the alternatives he suggests for ‘flat’, woonstel is not even mentioned. The clause ‘en lift is nog altyd verstaanbaarder as hulle almaal’ shows a tolerance (or is it resignation?) to English loanwords that is rarely found these days. On puristic attempts to abolish such English words from Afrikaans, Smith (1962: 64) says:
‘Ook maaksels soos toebroodjie vir sandwich en reissak vir portemanteau is misleidend, en dit is dan ook geen wonder dat hulle gebruik beperk gebly het tot ons koerante en puriste-enthoesiaste nie.’ (written in the late 1930’s)

Works on anglicisms from the 1930’s and 1940’s are full of such examples which later developments have subsequently proven wrong. As Visagie commented as early as 1946:

‘n Lys van argaistiese Anglisismes sou voorwaar interessante en leersame leesstof verskaf.’ (*Die Brandwag*, 27/9/46)

A not uncommon attitude in older writings on anglicisms is the way in which Dutch was regarded as an extension of Afrikaans to be drawn on in cases of need to provide vocabulary or to rid one’s speech of suspect phenomena, for example:

‘In ons stryd teen die Anglisisme is Nederlands vir ons onmisbaar, want hier vind ons dikwels die vereiste ekwivalent en een wat nie bots met die wese van ons taal nie, wat dus geen neerlandisme is nie.’ (Le Roux 1968: 174, but first published in *Die Huisgenoot* in 1947.)

In 1929 Smith’s suggestion for maintaining the purity of Afrikaans was

‘Alleen deur goeie Afrikaans en veel Nederlands te lees sal ons in staat wees om die suierheid van ons taal te behou.’ (*Die Huisgenoot* 22/11/29)

In the late 1930’s he was still advocating a similar policy but with a proviso attached:

‘In alle gevalle waar daar reeds ’n eg Afrikaanse of maklik verstaanbare Nederlandse woord of uitdrukking is, word die vreemde woord of isme verwerp... As die Nederlandse woord of uitdrukking vandag egter vir Afrikaans onverstaanbaar is, dan sal dit seker ’n onbegonne taak wees om eens te probeer om dit in die plek van ’n algemeen bekende en verstaanbare Engelse woord of uitdrukking te stel.’ (1962: 63)

He gives the examples of *enamel* and *beperk* for the Dutch *emaille* and *naamlose vennootschap*. In 1963 Boshoff (1963: 89) adamantly opposed Dutch being used as a yardstick by which correct Afrikaans can be measured. Commenting on the work that is being done by linguists where
they are illustrating and emphasising that Afrikaans differs from Dutch in many important respects, he says:

‘Terwyl ons taal aldus as ‘t ware op die daad betrap, beluister en bestudeer word en sy seggingskrag aangedui word, is daar in allerlei grammatikas, skoolboekies en persvoorligtings ‘n aantal beterweters aan die woord wat vir ons elke oomblik kom bedui dat wat ons werklik in Afrikaans sê, verkeerd is, omdat dit nie so in Nederlands gesê word nie, omdat dit soutiewe Nederlands is.’

Boshoff does not make this statement in support of retaining anglicisms, but it could well be quoted as grounds for doing so. Langenhoven's (1935: 103) opposition to Dutch went so far as to prefer anglicisms to hollandisms in Afrikaans. (cf. p. 77)

In another article written in 1963 Boshoff (1963: 60) concludes:

‘Anglisismes wat nie met ons taalaard in stryd is nie en nie deur ons taalgevoel verwerp word nie, asook dié wat wel met ons taaleie in stryd is en desondanks deur ons taalgevoel aanvaar word, kan as toelaatbare Anglisismes beskou word.’

An emotionally laden term often used in the past in works on anglicisms is gevaar, for example:

‘Ons moet voortdurend op ons hoede wees teen Anglisismes; dit lewer een van die grootste geve op vir die Afrikaanse taal.’ (Le Roux 1968: 162, but written in 1947); ‘Deur ons eie manier van praat onnodiglik vir ‘n vreemde praatgewoonte te verruil, verraai en verkrak ons die karakter van ons eie taal. Daarin skuil die gevaar van die sogenaamde ismes in ‘n taal.’ (Boshoff 1963: 59)

Viewing English influence in this antagonistic light is possibly not yet entirely a thing of the past, but at least such emotive terms are now usually avoided in linguistic works.

It was also not uncommon for scholars to see anglicisms in Afrikaans as not merely a threat to the language, but to the culture as a whole, for example:

‘In sowel ons eie belang as volk as in die van ons taal, die draer naamlik van ons kultuur, moet ons baie versigtig wees en
meermale ook die skyn van die kwaad vermy.’ (Le Roux 1968: 163, but written in 1947)

Precisely because the language is the ‘draer van die kultuur’, Afrikaans cannot avoid the influence of English because the Afrikaner’s culture has been anglicised to a far greater degree than he is, or at least was, aware. (cf. Barnouw’s comments, page 45) Le Roux (1968: 164) goes too far in personifying language when he states later in the same article:

‘n Taal hou tred met die geestesaktiwiteite van die Volk vir wie hy tot uitingmiddel dien. Is ‘n Volk geestelik laks en daarom minder aktief, of is hy dadelik gereed om oor te neem uit die taal van ‘n Volk wat hom op die een of ander gebied voor is, dan vertoon die taal van die eerste die onmiskenbare nadelige gevolge van sodanige handelwyse.’

Even J.J. le Roux (1939: 76), who does not usually hold the same extreme views as T.H. le Roux, felt compelled on at least one occasion to comment:

‘Ons [moet] Anglisismes bestry omdat ons in die toenemende gebruik daarvan die duidelike tekens van die verdringing en ondergang van ons kultuur sien.’

Terblanche (Die Brandwag, 6/9/46) also irrationally personifies Afrikaans when he depicts it as young and impressionable:

‘Omdat Afrikaans nog jonk en baie vatbaar vir invloede van buite is, moet ons steeds alles in ons vermoë doen om onsuwerhede uit ons taal te hou.’

The ‘vulnerability’ of Afrikaans has of course nothing to do with the age of the language - quite apart from the so-called age of Afrikaans being a debatable point anyway - but is the result of the situation in which the two languages find themselves. Undoubtedly Dutch, at least at the level of the spoken word, would have been affected to much the same extent as Afrikaans, had it remained the other official language of South Africa instead of Afrikaans.

The purification process that began in earnest in the 1930’s brought a witch-hunt with it, the effects of which are still being felt in some circles. This so-called jagtery reinforced the linguistic inferiority complex that was present in many Afrikaners. (cf. p. 65) Although he was not referring specifically to anglicisms, D.F. Malherbe felt the need to issue the following warning as early as 1917:
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In the 1940's it had apparently reached a serious level. Kempen (1946: 207) remarked that

‘Verskeie skrywers het so half en half laat deurskemer dat hulle daarvoor voel om uit te skei met die Anglisisme-jagtery. Een rede is dan dat daar deesdae soveel Anglisismes “ontdek” word dat die gewone prater van Afrikaans nie meer behoorlik vir sy buurman “môre” sou kan sê nie, of daar sal maar weer ‘n Anglisisme(tjie) by insluip.’

The contradictory nature of so many articles etc. on anglicisms was leading to desperation in some people who, according to Kempen, were giving up writing Afrikaans altogether and switching to English. An anonymous writer in Die Huisgenoot in 1944 confirms what Kempen says about the degree of contradiction prevalent at the time:

‘Selfs as jy jou woordeboek eers raadpleeg, is daar môre nog iemand wat sê jy is ‘n taalketter.’ (22/9/44)

And another writes:

‘My vrees is egter net dat ons naderhand so getrou sal goggas jag dat ons te min kragte sal oorhou vir die omspit en aanplant in ons taaltuin en naderhand ‘n stuk kaal vlakte aanhou, sonder goggas, maar ook sonder enigiets anders.’ (17/7/42)

An editorial comment in Die Huisgenoot of 1/11/57 indicates what the inevitable result of this Anglisismemverees was to be:

‘Vir sulke mense het suier taal ‘n saak vir die “geleerdes” geword. Dis bo die vuurmaakplek van iemand wat sy taal maar net van sy ma gekry het.’

If that were the case in 1957, when bilingualism among Afrikaners was not as common and when many more people still had a knowledge of Dutch than today, it is all the more valid in the 1980's.

An attitude that one encounters occasionally in older writings is a tolerance for anglicisms that, in the opinion of the writers concerned, are appropriate to the Afrikaner's way of life or outlook, for example:
‘Tenslottle dien daarop gewys te word dat ’n uitdrukking soos “skouer aan (teen) die wiel sit” (die hand aan die ploeg slaan), wat so goed aanpas by die Afrikaanse lewe, bepaald sy bestaansreg in Afrikaans verdién.’
(Terblanche, *Die Brandwag* 25/10/46)

Le Roux (1952: 39) picked on the very same example and offered a similar justification for accepting the expression:

‘Origens vertoon dié uitdrukkings wat goed aanpas by die Afrikaanse lewe, soos Skouer aan die wiel sit, die meeste lewensvatbaarheid.’ (written in 1945 and thus contemporary with Terblanche’s statement)

Such statements are linguistically irrational and are evidence of an outdated means of keeping the national image of the Afrikaner as a voortrekker alive; in such instances the proponents suddenly don’t seem to mind that the anglicism verdrijn die inheemse.

Another attempt to justify the presence of certain anglicisms in Afrikaans was the argument that a word or expression may have been - or is still - present in other Germanic languages or in Germanic itself, and is therefore acceptable, for example:

‘Feit is egter dat “iemand oor die kole haal” baie gangbaar is, en taalkundig beskou is dit nie onmoontlik dat ons hier met ’n Duitse of Nederlandse uitdrukking te doen het nie, en dat die Engelse “haul over the coals” slegs gedien het om ’n ou Germaanse segswyse hier te lande nuwe lewe in te blaas.’ (Terblanche, *Die Brandwag* 25/10/46)

The origin of the expression is ultimately of no importance, but rather its acceptability based on common usage. The notion that certain anglicisms are acceptable because they fill certain gaps in Afrikaans is also a defence that was commonly offered in the past and is still occasionally heard, for example:

‘Natuurlik moet ons selfs hier oppas vir oordrywing en nie nie teen werklik nuttige gebruiklike ismes stry nie - veral nie as sulke ismes maklik by ons eie spraakgewoontes aan te pas is nie.’ (Smith, *Die Naweek* 7/10/48)

The literature on anglicisms abounds with statements such as this. What is ‘nuttig’?; what does ‘maklik by ons eie spraakgewoontes aanpas’ mean? Even if explanations are offered, the criteria are inevitably so subjective as
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to be useless. Hiemstra (1963: 9), also realising that condemnation of all anglicisms is impossible, maintained:

‘Ontlening van die onmisbare is dus taalverryking, en afwysing van nodige leengoed beteken taalverarming.’

These are all such noble terms but are meaningless in practice. Even when scholars have not remained as vague but have given concrete examples and arguments for the defence of the retention of certain anglicisms, they are arguments that are highly subjective and unlikely to be heeded in any way by the community at large where the decisions are finally made; see Le Roux (1968: 162-3) where he defends the use of sypaadjie but condemns lighuis in favour of vuurtoring. His recommendations happen to coincide with what is in fact now used in practice, but not for the reasons he gives, particularly with regard to vuurtoring. Despite fifty years of trying to find an objective definition of an ‘acceptable’ anglicism, scholars' definitions, however satisfied they themselves may be with them, fall far short of what the common man, and even educated Afrikaners, are only too ready to accept in their speech.

2.3.2 Current attitudes

The most recent comprehensive article on anglicisms in Afrikaans is one by Combrink (1984: 105) at the conclusion of which he quotes De Villiers (1970: 245):

‘Wat ons verre voorouers gedoen het, was om oor te neem EN te vertaal. En dit is ook ons taak: oorneem EN vertaal.’

In so advocating, De Villiers points out the parallel that formerly existed between Romance and Germanic languages where the latter opted to translate vast quantities of classical vocabulary in order to keep up with new concepts, for example: Gothic dāupjan (< Gk. baptizein), geweten (< Lat. conscientia), onderwerp (< Lat. subjectum). ‘Oorneem EN vertaal’ would seem to be the modern school of thought; the vaktaalburos and a multitude of terminological dictionaries bear witness to this being the current attitude at the official level. Resignation to the ‘inevitable’ adoption of English loanwords outright in Afrikaans (cf. p. 67) is now rejected as an appropriate means of keeping up with new demands on the vocabulary of the language. Purism is now considered too important for such an easy solution to be acceptable; thus De Villiers' emphasis on ‘EN’.

---

5 HAT does not recognise lighuis, although it is still commonly heard, but both vuurtoring and ligtoring - not mentioned by Le Roux - are recognised.
The fact that this attitude is now more prevalent than previously is because in the sixty years since the official recognition of Afrikaans and the emancipation of the language and the people that has occurred during that period, Afrikaners have been educated to become far more taalbewus than earlier generations were. An unavoidable repercussion of this is 'dat wanneer opgevoede Afrikaners erg taalbewus gemaak word, hulle 'n fobie ontwikkels teenoor Engelse invloed.' (De Villiers 1970: 246) In other words, purism - sometimes taken to extremes with negative consequences such as hypercorrection - is the result. (The various ramifications of purism are looked at in detail under 5.00) The campaign against outright borrowing without translating has been so successful that it has led to negative social connotations being associated with the use of English words in Afrikaans:

‘In die onversorgde omgangstaal word baie Engelse woorde gebruik, in min of meer suier Engelse uitspraak. Teenswoordig word dit as ‘n gebrek aan beskawing gesien.’ (Scholtz 1980: 105)

This prevalent attitude to English loanwords, as well as the unjustified prejudice against Romance vocabulary in Afrikaans which resembles English (cf. Combrink 1984: 83), has given rise in South Africa to a feeling of contempt for the use of such words by the Dutch, a feeling which nowadays probably goes hand in hand with a general dislike of all things Dutch because of the political hostility between the two countries. It is true that the Dutch, proud of their traditional polyglottism, often make use of English words, some of which are now integral to the language (e.g. accountancy, cake, computer, jam, lift), while others are the result of the previously mentioned pronksugsindroom, an attitude which is still prevalent in Holland, but antiquated in South Africa. The Afrikaner sees this 'exaggerated' use of foreign words by the Dutch as a sign of linguistic weakness and his own purism as a sign of strength. Indeed, one can even talk of a feeling of linguistic superiority in this respect in South Africa, the exact opposite of what so many Afrikaners must have felt in the late nineteenth century when they were still required to write Dutch but had great difficulty in doing so.6 This feeling of linguistic superiority, if I have read the current mood correctly, is totally misplaced, however. The Dutchman resorts to the use of foreign vocabulary - these days predominantly English words and increasingly fewer French words - precisely because he feels secure in his linguistic environment and his language is not threatened. (Similar unjustified aspersions are cast on the Dutch by their southern neighbours for the same reason, cf. Sufleeeers 1979: 185) A good command of English is still a thing to be admired in Holland, whereas in

---

6 See Ponelis (1983: 13) for further comment on the feeling of linguistic superiority among Afrikaners vis-à-vis the Dutch.
South Africa it is taken for granted. In South Africa it is not considered any great achievement for an Afrikaner to speak good English; on the contrary, a lack of a good knowledge of English is considered backward. Thus while the Dutchman can still impress by using ‘superfluous’ foreign vocabulary, the Afrikaner cannot. And with regard to ‘necessary’ loanwords like those given above, Dutch does not hesitate to adopt such words because it is not under any threat. One finds a totally different attitude to loanwords, but then chiefly from French, in Belgium, for obvious reasons.

The Afrikaner's impression of Dutch, based on the facility with which that language adopts English words, is wrong for another reason however. The average Afrikaner, with his understandable layman's view of language in general, and of his own language in particular, associates purity of vocabulary with linguistic purity in general. The influence English has had on Dutch, whatever the number of loanwords may be, is extremely superficial because in all but very few cases, it has not gone beyond the level of the lexis; in Afrikaans the lexis may appear pure, but the influence on other aspects of the language has been enormous. For reasons that have been mentioned before, the average Afrikaner is unaware of this. What is more, even as far as lexical influence is concerned, English has only affected the randwoordeskat of Dutch, but it has reached the kernwoordeskat of Afrikaans. The following statement by De Vooy (1925: 4-51), although written as early as 1925, still reflects the attitude of the Dutch today to foreign influences (primarily lexical) on their language and is in sharp contrast to the way English influence in Afrikaans is perceived by many in South Africa:

‘Geen Volk, geen stam leeft geheel op zichzelf. Wat wij kultuur noemen, is het produkt van gemeenschap in ruime kring. De onmiddellijke nabijheid van volken met een machtige beschawing is een groot voorrecht, en ongelukkig het Volk dat zijn grenzen voor vreemde invloeden zou sluiten... De vreemde woorden zijn geen lastige indringers, maar onmisbare en dus welkome gasten... Die menging met vreemde bestanddelen, als begeleidingsverschijnsel van diepgaande invloed kan dus op zichzelf moeilijk als een bederf, een ontstaarding beschouwd worden... Vreemde elementen kwamen de volkskracht versterken: de kern was gezond genoeg om ze op te nemen en te versmelten. Zo ook is het taalbezet, dat wij door aanraking met andere volken verwierven, in veel opzichten meer aanwinst dan “besmetting”... [and on p. 19 he says] Een onafhanklik Volk, bewust van zijn kracht, en niet bevreesd om door vreemde invloeden

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
To conclude the discussion on the difference in attitude to English loanwords in Afrikaans and in Dutch, it is interesting to note that in South Africa one finds a higher frequency of English words in Afrikaans the lower down the social ladder one goes, whereas in Holland the reverse is the case - in Holland it is the result of linguistic security, whereas in South Africa it is the result of the opposite.

De Villiers’ (1970) and Combrink’s (1984) advice to ‘oorneem en vertaal’ is in direct contrast to Boschhoff’s (1964: 39): ‘Moenie onnodig leen of onleen nie.’ The subjectivity and ambiguity of terms such as ‘onnodig’ ‘nuttig’ in this context have been mentioned before. (cf. p. 72) The only alternative to borrowing, with or without translating, is the coining of neologisms. Afrikaans has been quite successful in many cases in creating new words to avoid resorting to loans (e.g. hysbak - lift, moltrein - underground, rekenaar - computer), but if all new vocabulary had to be created in this way, it would put tremendous demands on the ingenuity of the bodies concerned, but above all a greater resistance to general acceptance of such terms would probably be met with: translation of an item already known to Afrikaners in English is an easier pill to swallow because it is less foreign and already contains a kernel of familiarity. Thus, although neologisms will undoubtedly continue to be formed and will presumably meet with some success, they will always be outnumbered by loan translations.

In certain higher social registers, the idea that structures found in Dutch are also the preserve of the Afrikaner, still lives on. This is certainly the case in the religious sphere, where the old adage Die Afrikaner is drietalig: hy praat Afrikaans, bid in Nederlands en vloek in Engels still has some qualified validity. This attitude is also reflected in the authority that is still often given to Dutch usage. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the Taalkommissie often takes Dutch convention into consideration when deliberating on issues; secondly, in arguments such as that given by Le Roux (1952: 8) where his defence for the validity of in die loop van die tyd - seen by some as an anglicism because it corresponds literally to the English expression and is therefore replaced by met/na verloop van tyd - is that this is the Afrikaans translation of the Dutch expression in de loop des tyds. The same applies to the argument for and against op vakansie versus met vakansie (cf. Le Roux 1968: 171-2) where, when deliberating on the validity of the former in Afrikaans, one must keep in mind that the two also co-exist in Dutch.
Despite the regard given to the custom in Holland in some circles, because of the even wider gap that has emerged between Afrikaans and Dutch over the last fifty years, the following advice from Langenhoven (1935: 103) is being heeded more and more in practice, even if current prescriptive works are slow to come to terms with this new reality:

‘... 'n Anglisisme [kan] in baie gevalle ’n beter afrikanisme word as menige neerlandisme.’

_HAT_, for example, may continue to claim that _raar_ does not mean ‘rare’ and imply that _verdieping_ is better Afrikaans than _vloer_, but in practice the truth of what Langenhoven maintains is borne out.

That certain loanwords and loan expressions are considered ‘necessary’, is a concept that was discussed in the previous section. (cf. p. 72) The following statement by Scholtz (1940: 151), although made in 1940, would still find some support today, but there would now be a greater tendency to translate the word or adapt it, rather than borrow it outright (e.g. _beeld_ - image, _sleng_ - slang):

‘Oor die algemeen gesproke, kan ons sê dat, wanneer die leenwoord voorsien in ’n behoefte waartoe die eie woord nie in staat is nie, dit ’n aanwens is en nie af te keur nie.’

There is little doubt that the Afrikaner is far less concerned with the purity of his speech than with the purity of his written language. This phenomenon is hardly exclusive to his situation; De Vooys (1925: 26) quotes J.J. Salverda de Grave who described it as follows:

‘Het woord dat ons in bepaalde omstandighede het eerst voor de geest komt, is als het meest eigene te beschouwen, want door de tijdelike tweetaligheid van hun denken, is het eigen woord tijdelik op de achtergrond gedrongen. Bij rustige overweging, door scherping van hun taalgevoel zou het eigen woord weer te voorschijn komen.’

The attitude Cluver (1982: 85) takes in the following quotation is what one expects to find these days:

‘Die suffiks -ing is besonder produktief in Afrikaans [with reference to “aardingsklamp” - earthing clamp]... ’n Mens wonder... of “aarding” nie ook ’n Anglisisme is nie. Intussen het dié Anglisisme al ingeburger geraak. Ek meen dat die term “aardklamp” hier beter _sou gewees het_.’ (my italics, BCD)
Cluver accepts the reality of this word having gained acceptance, whatever its morphological faults may be, whereas a previous generation, H.J. Terblanche for example, may have insisted on *aardklamp* being ‘better’ Afrikaans and may thus have attempted to prescribe a structure like *aardingsklamp* out of existence.

If the following comment was valid in 1931, how much more must that be the case over fifty years later?:

‘Verder bestaan daar as gevolg van die tweetalige kultuur ’n massa woorde en uitdrukkinge, sommige waarvan uit ’n puristiese oogpunt miskien nog afkeuring verdien, maar die meeste waarvan reeds so ingeburger is dat hulle feitlik nie meer as Anglisismes gevoel word nie.’ (Pienaar 1931: 174-5)

Pienaar gives the following examples to illustrate his point: *besigheid* (doen), *besigheidsman*, *boikot*, *platform*, *elekse*, *opgenome*, *’n sitplek boek*, *iemand afsien*, *die ander dag* etc. Typical of the more sensible, self-assured attitude towards anglicisms which one finds among linguists today is the following:

‘Wat moet ons houding teenoor afwykende Afrikaans wees - alles toelaat, of sinswendinge bestry wat verskil van hoe Afrikaans “behoort te wees”? Laasgenoemde beteken gewoonlik: soos dit in ’n vroeë fase van die geskiedenis van die taal wás. Dit lei dan gewoonlik tot soveel reëls en beperkinge dat dit Afrikaans stroef maak en sprekers afskrik om dit te gebruik.’ (Steyn 1980: 332)

This is a realistic attitude, perhaps forced upon the Afrikaner by the circumstances of the last fifty years, but at least it takes account of the language as used and perceived by the average speaker. Steyn implies, without explicitly stating, that ‘behoort te wees’ is synonymous with Dutch usage. His attitude to Dutch is also supported by Odendal (1973: 30) whose opinion deserves mention here, not only because he is chairman of the *Taalkommissie*, but also because he is chief editor of *HAT*:

‘Nederlands kan nie aan Afrikaans voorskrif hoe hy daar moet uitsien nie. Ons gaan tog nie ons onoorganklike werkwoord “wonder” of ons dubbel-nie laat vaar omdat Nederlands dit nie het nie, of skielik ’n lidwoord vereis nie… Dit is egter

---

7 Uys (1983: 167) claims that the second vernederlandsing of Afrikaans, that of the twentieth century, was very successful ‘want selfs vandag in die laaste kwart van die twintigste eeu ly ons nog (onnodiglik?) onder die spore van hierdie tweede vernederlandsing van Afrikaans.’
Van Rensburg (1983: 136), after having discussed superceded loanwords such as *brekis, koort, juts* etc., which were so common in Afrikaans up to the 1940's, comments:

‘n Mens frons vandag maklik oor Afrikaans soos dié (In baie gevalle is die frons aangeleer).’

The emphasis that has been placed on purism, particularly at the level of the lexis, has given rise to this modern reaction to such loans. Van Rensburg's reference to *aangeleerde frons* is an astute observation of a modern attitude that was formerly lacking.

There has been so much conflict of opinion on the crucial issue of the presence of English influence in Afrikaans that modern Afrikaans linguists, above all textbook and dictionary compilers, must deliberate very carefully before committing their recommendations to paper. Le Roux (*Die Taalgroott*, June 1932) saw their task as follows:

‘Ten opsigte van Anglisismes in hierdie algemene betekenis [i.e. covering both loanwords and the so-called “egte” Anglicisms] is die gewone leek... in die reël of totaal onverskillig of ’n radikale teenander van wat hy as ’n onvermengde euwel beskou... Dis die taak van die wetenskap om tussen hierdie twee leke-standpunte uitspraak te doen.’

In this respect very little has changed since the 1930's, except that nowadays one can hope for more responsible, less emotional guidance from more enlightened linguists than was the case earlier this century. Nevertheless, vestiges of most of the previously common attitudes discussed under 2.3.1 are still encountered from time to time, regrettably even in textbooks and reference works, which perpetuate these misconceptions.

2.3.3 The author's attitude

I do not set out my attitude to anglicisms in Afrikaans here with any ambition whatsoever of trying to influence the way in which anglicisms are regarded by people in the Afrikaans speaking community, whether they be linguists or laymen. Nevertheless, even a non-native-speaker forms an opinion of the issue after all the reading I have done and what I have been
confronted with daily during my various sojourns in the Republic. As that opinion coincides in many instances with what has been advocated by some Afrikaans scholars, but in other instances is somewhat unorthodox, it does not seem out of place to express that opinion here.

Two questions need to be posed on the matter of anglicisms in Afrikaans: firstly, should one attempt to put a halt to the influence English is having on Afrikaans and secondly, can one? The answer to the first question is most probably yes, and the means by which it should be done is through education. This is the current policy and has been so for a long time.

The second question cannot be answered with a simple yes or no. There are many examples in the writings of the thirties of anglicisms which were then considered to be *ingeburgerd* by the scholars of the time, but which have since disappeared without trace, or are less frequent now than they apparently were then. This is in itself proof that something can be done to counteract the phenomenon. On the other hand, there are many anglicisms which were vehemently opposed by those same scholars some fifty years ago which are still in the language today and are still not recognised as ‘correct’ Afrikaans by current prescriptive works. (In such instances one wonders how long they have to exist to be fully accepted and gain official recognition.) There are undoubtedly also many anglicisms in Afrikaans now that were unknown to the scholars of the thirties or were at least not as common as nowadays. These factors would thus seem to support a negative answer to question two. The truth of the matter obviously lies somewhere between the two. Without the support of educational bodies to counteract the influence of English over the sixty odd years since recognition, Afrikaans would certainly have contained many more anglicisms than it does today; the fact that the campaign has been only partially successful lies in the nature of the issue. One must accept, although many Afrikaans prescriptive grammarians seem to have difficulty in doing so, that the language as used by the people and as perceived by them to be correct, will ultimately become correct Afrikaans - the many indispensable *ingeburgerde* anglicisms in Afrikaans today are living proof of this. Such anglicisms are concrete evidence that not all anglicisms in Afrikaans can be brushed off as interference phenomena which a good dose of purification will remedy, but that the contact situation with English in which Afrikaans finds itself, has led and is leading to linguistic change, (cf. 4.5) The degree to which English has shaped, and is continuing to shape, the language - because of the nature of South African society, the affinity of the two languages and the high degree of bilingualism - has given rise to an inevitable blend of idiom which simply is Afrikaans and is one of the important characteristics which distinguish it from Dutch.
The number of anglicisms which are likely to enter the language over the decades ahead, because of the forces at work in such a language contact situation, will probably be enormous and the educational system will at best only be able to stem the tide. The continuing influx of immigrants, most of whom opt to join the English speaking community, plus the understandable preference shown for English by Blacks, and increasingly by some Coloureds too, quite apart from the international forces that have always favoured the position of English in South Africa, will assure an ever increasing influence of English on Afrikaans. In the face of such odds, one could well expect an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. There are indeed Afrikaners who see no future for their language and who seem quite unperturbed about its demise, but they are a small minority. Afrikaners still remember with great pride that their ancestors, a nation of farmers, held the whole British Empire at bay for almost three years at the turn of the century, and although finally defeated, rose as a united people out of the turmoil of the Boer War to gain control ultimately of the whole country. This sort of determination, sometimes futile but always sincere, has been applied by them to language issues in the past and can be expected from them in future too. The result will be a compromise, to which the many accepted anglicisms in Afrikaans today bear witness. People such as Kruger (1969: 22) had their heads in the clouds if they really felt that a complete ‘cure’ was possible or even desirable:

‘Teen hierdie besmetting, hierdie indringing van kwaad in die murg van ons taal, sal ons vasberade moet optree. Die genesing gaan ’n langdurige en veleisende proses wees - ’n proses van bewusmaking en opvoeding.’

My attitude towards anglicisms in Afrikaans, towards accepting the inevitability of many of them and of regarding them as an asset and above all as a reflection of the cultural assimilation of English and Afrikaners, is very close to that adopted by Langenhoven (1935) when he maintained fifty odd years ago that anglicisms are often preferable to hollandisms. (cf. p. 77) In the same work, written together with the academic E.C. Pienaar in the final year of Langenhoven’s life, he went on to say:

‘As daar in ’n stuk Afrikaans geen anglisisme of neerlandisme of ander vreemde isme voorkom nie - of nou nie meer voorkom nie omdat ’n skoolmeester of redakteur dié wat daar was uitgehaal het - dan is die stuk nou nie meer on-Afrikaans nie. Maar is hy positief Afrikaans? Het hy ’n Afrikaanse geur en kleur?’ (p. 105)
De Vooy (1925: 21) made a similar anti-puristic plea with reference to Dutch, illustrated by a very appropriate example, with which I can identify:

‘Een andere dwaling bestaat daarin, dat het vreemde woord verdreven zou moeten worden, alleen omdat het van vreemde afkomst en dus een indringer is, waarbij dan vaak vergeten wordt dat het etymologies-histories “vreemde” woord het meest vertrouwde en dus meest eigene kan zijn: taalkundig beschouwd behoort paraplu tot onze “moedertaal”, terwijl regenscherm een “vreemde” woord is.’

Too many Afrikaans scholars in their treatises have attempted to draw the line between misbare and onmisbare anglicisms, which has unavoidably led to contradiction because of the subjectivity of the criteria being applied. In future the division should be one based on ingeburgerde and nie-ingeburgerde anglicisms where the decision makers are the users of the language, and works such as WAT, HAT and textbooks must take more heed of common usage. Of course in any standard language the written word lags behind the spoken word, and English influence usually begins at the level of the spoken language (cf. footnote 2 p. 17 on papier-anglisismes) - a certain time span must be allowed to give the written language time to catch up with events. It has been my impression, however, that this time span is too great in Afrikaans if one is really expected to abide by the prescriptions of certain grammars and dictionaries. To take an extreme example, A.N.E. Changuion observed the use of een in expressions such as ‘n mooi een in 1844, but in 1978 J.P. Botha and J.M.H. van Aardt were still advocating against its use - 134 years later. This can only be regarded as an unrealistic refusal to accept an undeniable linguistic change, purely and simply because the authors concerned see it as English in origin, regardless of its frequency and the degree of acceptability which the phenomenon enjoys in the speech community at large.8 The following sound advice of Rousseau (1937: 219) should be heeded by grammarians such as Botha and Van Aardt:

‘Veral as ’n Engelsheid nie as sodanig deur die gewone Afrikaner gevoel word nie, en dus nie die gewone Afrikaner sebewussyn benadeel nie, is die verstandigste gedragslyn miskien: Laissez-faire.’

Le Roux (1968: 172) stated quite correctly:

‘Bo die logika staan wat die taal betref, die lewende taalgebruik self; dit is ’n nog hoët wetboek. Die skryftaal loop nie

---

8 It is in fact questionable whether this use of een is an anglicism. (cf. 7.27.7)
sommer die volksmond na nie; die geskrewe woord moet in breër behoeftes voorsien as die gesprok woord en is daarom algemener en ook konserwatiewer. Maar die skryftaal het voortgekom uit die beskaafde spreektaal en moet steeds daarmee in voeling bly, of hy boet van sy lewe in en word houterig en stereotiep."

I find no fault with this statement, but Le Roux is himself one of the many scholars who continually prescribes forms which are at odds with accepted practice (e.g. p. 173 where he discusses stress). Malherbe (1917: 17), although his style would now be considered somewhat romantic, gave sound advice with regard to admitting anglicisms into one's written style:

‘Laat ons ons skriftaal nie aan bande lê en so vaste grense afbaken waarbuite geen skrywer mag gaan sonder om hom te besondig aan seker wette en reëls wat feilbare mense opgestel het nie.. Laat die skriftaal gedra word deur die krag wat vloe uit die lewende omgangstaal. Vir die bouer aan ons taal, die skrywer, sou ’n mens wil sê: Gaan jouw gang onbelemmerd, wees gehoorsaam alleen aan die innerlike drang wat die vorm skep waarin jouw eie wese geopenbaar word; volg selfs die beste stijl nie na nie, tensij navolging beteken deurdringing van die gekose model met die eie wesenstrekke, wat dan geen navolging meer sal wees nie. So sal ons vorm die Afrikaanse skriftaal van die toekoms, die draer van ons kultuur, die beeld van ons volksiel!’

To follow his advice, which in a nutshell amounts to writing what you as a native-speaker feel sounds correct - whatever its origins and whatever alternatives may exist in the language - would mean these days to admit a vast number of anglicisms to written Afrikaans that have been frowned upon by generations of academics and schoolteachers.

Suffeleers (1979: 186), referring to the situation in Flanders, comments:

‘Het is zonder twijfel aan ons puristisch voorgeslacht te wijten dat de termen “taalzuivering” en “taalzuiveraar” in zekere zin werden gediscrediteerd doordat die taalverzorging vaak werd geidentificeerd met een irrationele stryd tegen het vremde woord.’

I don't think the same contempt for the work of the purist of the past exists in South Africa yet, but I must concede that my feelings began to move in that direction as I made my way through the vast wealth of material that has
been written on the topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans. It is to be hoped that a new age has finally dawned in South Africa in this respect and that sensible guidelines that take account of common practice will soon be forthcoming from the *Taalkommissie* and that an end will come to the long era during which stubborn prescription not based on the realities of the South African situation will be a thing of the past.

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
Chapter Three

3.0 Previous works on anglicisms

Much if not most of what has been written on anglicisms in Afrikaans and which I have had to read as secondary literature, has been written if not by the layman, then at least for the layman; it is after all a topic which should be of importance to people at all levels of the social hierarchy in the opinion of Afrikaans academics. These scholars, in being forced to address the layman if their appeals are to meet with any success in practice at all, have often resorted to a passionate style and language, as well as having to state ad infinitum what to the trained linguist is blatantly obvious, for example that even English has borrowed many words from Latin and Greek and continues to. Also the strongly prescriptive nature of virtually everything written on the topic has tended to blur the objectivity of the writers concerned, particularly in older works. Nevertheless, even antiquated prescriptive works cannot be ignored because of the diachronic perspective they provide the linguist with. Scientific or not, they include anglicisms which either still exist, and thus one gets some idea of how long they have been present in Afrikaans and therefore whether they haven't meanwhile earned acceptance, or else they deal with anglicisms which have since disappeared altogether or have decreased in frequency, which sheds some light on the success that puristic endeavours have had to date. (cf. 5.2) With the wisdom of hindsight, by looking back on what has been written on anglicisms since the first half of the nineteenth century, we are now in a position to recognise as ingeburger, and thus as having led to linguistic change, phenomena which the scholars of the time could only perceive as interference or possibly inburgering in progress; they commented on the process whereas we can now observe the result.

The opinions on anglicisms that have appeared in print are as numerous as the theories on the origins of Afrikaans although, unlike that topic, there have been no substantial monographs written on anglicisms with the exception of Rousseau's (1937). Combrink (1978: 90) lists only the following as the main monographs on the topic: Rousseau (1937), Le Roux (1952), Van der Merwe (1968), Combrink (1968), Terblanche (1972). If Combrink were to write that article today he would undoubtedly also add his own recent contribution (1984). It should be pointed out, however, that Le Roux (1952) is not a monograph in the true sense as it is in fact a later reprint of several articles that appeared in Die Huisgenoot in 1945; Van der Merwe (1967) is a monograph of which only a very small proportion is devoted to anglicisms; and Combrink (1968) is only a 32-paged booklet.
Combrink (1978) does not mention any other pre-war works on anglicisms, probably because he regards them as too antiquated to be of any practical use now. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this chapter, Changuion (1844) and Mansvelt (1884) cannot be ignored because of their historical significance and the Twee Oud-onderwysers (1937) should not be overlooked either, as approximately half of this monograph deals with *Engelse goggas* and, as it appeared in the same year as Rousseau's thesis, is interesting to compare with that work. De Bruto (1970: 39) considered it worthy of mention when he listed the main works on anglicisms.

Although numerous Afrikaans grammars devote a certain amount of space to anglicisms, each often with its own individual list of ‘acceptable’ and/or ‘unacceptable’ examples of English influence, I intend to deal with only a few better known works as an illustration of the sort of treatment the issue has received in textbooks destined for secondary and tertiary students.

Another common denominator between the many writings on anglicisms and those on the origins of Afrikaans is the amount of nonsense that has appeared in print; in this respect one immediately thinks of Valkhoff's (1966, 1972) and, with hindsight, Hesseling's (1899) books on the origins of Afrikaans. But works on anglicisms must take the cake when it comes to quantity. I presume the reason for this is that too many people have regarded simply being an educated, language conscious native-speaker of Afrikaans as sufficient qualification to comment on what is or is not an anglicism in their language and what they personally regard as acceptable or not. The origin of Afrikaans, on the other hand, is a topic which the layman or average schoolteacher, however taalbewus he may be, is simply not in a position to comment on without a thorough linguistic training.

### 3.1 Works written prior to 1900

#### 3.1.1 A.N.E. Changuion's *De Nederduitsche Taal in Zuid-Afrika hersteld*, zijnde een handleiding tot de kennis dier taal, naar de plaatselijke behoefte van het land gewijzigd (1844, second edition 1848)

Changuion (1803-1881), whom Pheiffer (1979: 12) calls the first bewuste dokumenterder of the influence of English on Afrikaans, was professor of classical and modern languages at the *Zuid-Afrikaansche Atheneum*, later to become the University of Cape Town. He had left Holland for South Africa at the end of 1831 and had become concerned about Dutch at the Cape. In 1842, out of protest against the favouritism shown for English at the Atheneum, he resigned and founded his own Dutch medium institute.
It was at this time that the book under discussion here appeared. Although Changuion aimed ultimately at helping to rid Cape Dutch of its ‘impurities’ - he clearly did not yet recognise Afrikaans as separate from Dutch - his preface makes it obvious he was not terribly optimistic about reinstating the linguistic norms of Holland in South Africa.

At the end of his Dutch grammar, which consists of 246 pages, he adds a Proeve van Kaapsch Taaieigen which, after introductory comments covering four pages, consists of a list of South African words and expressions covering twenty-one pages (vii-xxvi). It is the Proeve, not the preceding grammar, which is of importance to the history of Afrikaans. The following comments have been taken from the introduction to the Proeve:

‘Het hoofddoel van de volgende verzameling, gelijk men al dadelijk uit den titel van ons werk kan afleiden, was om het Nederduitsch, voor zoo ver de taal, die in deze Kolonie gesproken wordt, dien naam dragen mag, van deels geheel vreemde, deels verminkte woorden en spreekwijzen te zuiveren, of althans den weg daartoe aan te wijzen... Dat deze verzameling onvolledig is, bekennen wij gaarne... In enkele gevallen hebben wij een afleiding gewaagd.’ (p. iii-vi)

The alphabetical list consists of 424 lemmas of which 32 are marked (E); occasionally he inconsistently omits the symbol but English influence is nevertheless obvious or implied, for example: ‘dressen, wkw; kleeden: ik ga my dressen.’ (p. xi) There are 14 such examples plus another 4 which to my mind may be English, for example: ‘schoon, geheel: ik heb het schoon vergeten. In Holland zegt men glad vergeten.’ (p. xxii) In other words, circa 12% of the very limited list of words and expressions which Changuion considered worthy of mention are attributable to English influence. Many of these words are no longer current in Afrikaans and the nature of the Proeve is so sketchy that it cannot be regarded as a reliable account of the extent to which English had already begun to affect Dutch at the Cape at that time. It can merely serve as an indication that the influence had indeed begun, but more importantly this book stands at the beginning of a long tradition of prescriptive works that will attempt to ‘cleanse’ Dutch/Afrikaans of English influence. In this respect it is an exceedingly important book. Even the author’s resignation to the possible hopelessness of his task, i.e. to purify the language, is a first admission in the writings on

---

1 These biographical details were gleaned from Nienaber (1950: 17-22).
2 Although Changuion obviously found this use of schoon strange enough to warrant comment, for it does correspond with the English idiom. Van Dale recognises geheel as one of the meanings of schoon and the cognate is used in a similar way in Frisian.
anglicisms that many were here to stay - in other words that the contact with English had given rise to a degree of linguistic change in the Dutch of the Cape. There is still, over 140 years later, an unwillingness to recognise that this is the case.

Changuion's lemmas are on the whole relatively uninteresting from a modern point of view, because subsequent purism has eradicated many of them from the language; alternatively, they may never have been as ingeburger as he thought. After all, Mansvelt (1884: iv), writing only 40 years later, commented:

‘Echter heb ik geen enkel woord van hem [Changuion] overgenomen zonder het eerst behoorlijk te toetsen, aangezien men bij hem woorden als eigenaardig Kaapsch-Hollandsch vindt opgegeven, die óf ook in Nederlands algemeen bekend zijn, óf die men hier volstrekt niet kent, althans ‘t tegenwoordige geslacht niet.’

A few are significant because they do still exist and some of them will become the subject of much debate over the next 140 odd years; it is useful to know that they were already current at the Cape in Changuion’s time, for example: blijven (= woon), bottel, dat is een mooije een, inbreken (horses), lijn (= reël), een wandeling nemen, partikulier (= kieskeurig), policeman, ik ben regt, settelaar.

3.1.2 N. Mansvelt’s *Proeve van een Kaapsch-Hollandsch Idioticon*, met toelichting en opmerkingen betreffende Land, Volk en Taal (1884)

Nienaber (1950: 71-72) calls this work ‘die belangrikste van alle versamelings sover’ (i.e. up to 1884) and ‘die volledigste, noukeurigste en mees wetenskaplike byenbrenging van Afrikaanse idiotismes wat tot 1884 onderneem is.’ Mansvelt collected his corpus over a ten year period. His position and concern for Dutch were similar to Changuion's, but his corpus presents merely a list without didactic commentary blatantly aimed at purification, unlike Changuion's, and apparently nothing else on the topic appeared in the intervening years, i.e. nothing that sheds further light on anglicisms in Afrikaans. He makes use of Changuion's list although his own is much more extensive. Nienaber (1950: 72) maintains, however:

‘Van sy eie lys van 188 bladseye geld ook al wat hy van dr. Changuion se *Proeve* sê, nl. dat sommige woorde en uitdruk-
Mansvelt also deals with pronunciation, not just vocabulary and expressions, and works comparatively with Dutch dialects to explain certain phenomena - already a hint of what was to be required of later linguists interested in the factors that had shaped Afrikaans. In the introduction he states:

‘Een ieder die enigszins met ’t Kaapsch-Hollandsch bekend is, zal terstond ontdekken, dat er hier geen melding gemaakt wordt van zoo vele Engelsche woorden die men dikwils, al of niet geradbraakt, in ’t dagelijks gesprek hoort bezigen. Daar zulke woorden òf uit traagheid òf uit een beklagenswaardige modezucht alleen gebruikt worden door hem, die liever een vreemd dan een eenvoudig Kaapsch of Nederlandsch woord gebruiken, heb ik gemeend, dit werkje niet te moeten ontsieren door er een aantal meest mismaakte woorden in op te nemen, die men onvervalscht in elk Engelsch woordenboek kan vinden.’ (p. v)

Nevertheless, he does include quite a number of English loanwords in his list. He states that he applies four classifications to his corpus: 1) local words arising out of local needs, 2) Dutch words that have undergone a shift in meaning in South Africa, 3) archaisms that have since disappeared from standard Dutch, 4) words borrowed from foreign languages, mainly from Malay.

His corpus consists of some 2,000 entries of which only about 50 are English words or structures - a much lower proportion than was the case with Changuion's Proeve. One should not, however, therefore conclude that English influence had lessened - quite the contrary - but his comment on page v cited above may be the explanation.

Although Mansvelt's work is an important milestone in the history of Afrikaans linguistics, it is only of very limited use to a study of anglicisms in Afrikaans today, once again because so much of what he describes is no longer current in Afrikaans. Nevertheless, some of his comments are interesting in the light of later studies that deal with the same points, more often than not without reference to the fact that Mansvelt had dealt with them as early as 1884, for example: on page 1 he discusses the o a pronunciation of long a and connects it with Dutch dialects. This pronunciation of a in Afrikaans has since been the cause of considerable debate, with suggestions that it is a shift caused by contact with English (Louw 1981: 263; Du Plessis 1983: 58). Aangaan (voortgaan) is another
much debated word which Mansvelt attributes to archaic Dutch. He does not, however, discuss the meaning ‘to happen’ which the word also commonly has these days. (cf. p. 184) He mentions braaf as meaning zeer, erg (nowadays bra in Afrikaans, e.g. *Hy is bra gesteld op sy werk* - he’s rather conscientious about his work) but does not mention the meaning ‘brave’; at times what he does not mention can be as illuminating as what he does. He comments that danki is used as in English, for example: *ja - danki* (Dutch alsjeblieft) and *nee-dankie* (Dutch dank je/u). (cf. 7.29.2)

His commentary is not limited merely to linguistics but also refers to customs etc. which are typically South African. For example, under the lemma diep (sheep dip) he adds: ‘Vooral in de Oostelijke Provincie gebruikelijk, waar de Engelsche invloed ’t sterkst is’ (p. 33), thus presumably more than in Cape Town.

Mansvelt takes up the point of long e being raised in the Boland and attributes it to English influence. (cf. Van Rensburg 1983: 142) He also discusses the use of een after an adjective, claiming it occurs in both English and Frisian, and sees eenig (any) as being *in navolging van ’t Engelsch.* (p. 41) Many modern prescriptive grammars are still trying to oppose the use of *groei* as a transitive verb; Mansvelt observed the very same phenomenon. It is therefore clearly of long standing and yet it seems to have been combatted with a considerable degree of success. Under the lemma passábel (of rivers) he comments:

‘t Is vreemd dat dit woord, hoe Fr. ’t ook klinkt en lijkt, niet in ’t Fr. bestaat, noch, zoo ver mij bekend is, bestaan heeft. Alleen in ’t Eng. heeft passable soortgelijken zin, doch ’t is ondenkbaar, dat een woord als dit, waaraan men sedert de stichting der kolonie behoefte had, eerst in later tijd aan de Eng. zou ontleend zijn. ’t Schijnt dus hier gevormd te zijn. Ook de uitspraak pleit tegen Eng. afkomst.’ (p. 123-4)

This passage is interesting firstly, because of the reasons - incorrect in my opinion - he gives for it not being English and secondly, because it is the first, and one of only very few references in the literature on anglicisms to the existence of items of vocabulary in Afrikaans that appear to be of French origin and are thus regarded as inherited through Dutch, when in fact they are English loanwords in disguise. (cf. 7.12.1)
3.2 Works written in the 1930's

After a virtual dearth of works on anglicisms since Mansvelt, in the 1930's there was suddenly a great interest in the topic and concern for the influence English was having. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the great social and political upheaval in South Africa at the time, occurring so soon after the official recognition of Afrikaans. In addition to numerous articles in the popular magazines of the age, two important monographs appeared on the topic, *Taalgoggas in die daelikse lewe* by Twee Oud-onderwysers and *Die invloed van Engels op Afrikaans* by H.J. Rousseau. Curiously enough they both appeared in the same year, 1937, and to this day are the only substantial monographs on the topic, although even the former is not devoted exclusively to *Engelse goggas*.

3.2.1 O. van Oostrum and P. Heslinga's *Taalgoggas in die daelikse lewe* (1937)

Van Oostrum and Heslinga wrote this book under the pseudonym Twee Oud-onderwysers. Section one, pages 1-49, deals with the so-called *Engelse goggas*, and section two, pages 50-82, deals with *Afrikaanse goggas*. They maintain that the replacement of Dutch by Afrikaans has eradicated a large number of ‘Engelse woorde en ander Anglisismes’ (p. 1), but that nevertheless many remain. They seem to be in no doubt that the language at the time of writing had attained a degree of purity that was lacking thirty years before, although they clearly feel that this is no reason for complacency. The attitude of the authors to Dutch on the one hand and English on the other is clearly stated at the beginning:

‘In teenstelling met sekere vegters vir Afrikaans wat uit vrees vir verhollandsing so ver moontlik wil wegbly van Nederlands, en wat daardeur by Engels te lande kom, sien die meeste taalgeleerdes alleen heil vir die heropbou van Afrikaans in nouer aansluiting by Nederlands. Ons insiens tereg, want die Dietse karakter van ons taal word bes bewaar, of in so ver dit deur vreemde invloed geskend is, weer in sy suiwereheid herstel, deur terugkeer na die bron waaruit dit voortgekom het.’ (p. 2)

In taking this stance they are diametrically opposed to what Langenhoven (1935) was advocating at much the same time in history.

For the Twee Oud-onderwysers identification of an anglicism in Afrikaans was relatively simple:

---

3 See Smith (1938: 35) for a contemporary review of this book.
‘... ’n Anglisisme is ’n woord of uitdrukking wat sy oorsprong in Engels het en indruis teen die Dietse taaleie van Afrikaans... Ons het met ’n Anglisisme te doen in elke geval waarin Engelse invloed besig is om die Dietse karakter van ons taal te ondermyn.’ (p. 4)

They add a footnote at this point in which they justify their use of the term anglicism to cover loanwords as well, their aim being to address eenvoudige lezers and not geleerdes. In keeping with the times in which they were writing, the authors are strictly prescriptive in approach and their attitude to the common man's perception of his own speech verges on arrogance; they are critical of the fact ‘dat hy [the average speaker of Afrikaans] hulle [anglicisms] nie meer aanvoel as iets wat aan die Afrikaanse taaleie vreemd is nie, inteendeel, hy leef in die salige oortuiging dat sy taal heetemal in orde is.’ (p. 4) From a modern point of view and with the wisdom of hindsight, I would maintain that the authors failed to recognise what was occurring in the speech of the individuals they are so critical of as language change.

Van Oostrum and Heslinga see it as the patriotic duty of every Afrikaner to combat anglicisms in their language, although they are prepared to concede that ‘Daar is al heelparty wat ons nie meer sal kan wekgry nie: hulle moet beskou word as genaturaliseerde vreemdelinge.’ (p. 6) They resort to vivid imagery in which English is seen as having conquered Afrikaans territory from which the enemy must be driven back and conclude: ‘Ons is goeie vriende met die Engelse, maar elkeen moet op sy eie gebied bly.’ (p. 6) The reasons the authors give for code-switching, although they may have been valid in the 1930’s, have certainly changed now; nevertheless, the phenomenon itself is still commonplace:

‘... die veskynsel dat Afrikaners onder mekaar, sommer sonder aanwysbare rede, plotseling van Afrikaans in Engels oorslaan en ewe plotseling weer van Engels in Afrikaans... Die ware rede...[is]...omdat die sprekers nie een van die twee tale goed ken nie en daarom, as hulle geen woorde in die een taal kan vind nie, maar na die ander toe oorskakel.’ (p. 6)

I would be inclined to attribute the cause of such switching these days to the high degree of bilingualism so prevalent among Afrikaners, rather than to an insufficient knowledge of both or either languages.4

4 See also p. 14 where I discuss the Afrikaner’s need of both languages to be completely articulate, not because of incomplete mastery of either, but because of his intimate acquaintance with both. (cf. also p. 40)
The book proceeds to discuss various sorts of *Engelse goggas*, which are grouped as follows:

‘a. Engelse woorde oorgeneem; b. klakkelose vertalings; c. Engelse sinsbou in Afrikaans; d. Engelse gebruik van voorsetsels; e. Engelse uitspraak van Afrikaanse woorde.’ (p. 7)

The authors attempt to present their corpus in what is presumably meant to be an entertaining fashion which may have gone down well in the 1930’s, but simply sounds corny these days, for example:

‘Die winkelier neem stok op; maar wees gerus, hy sal niemand slaan nie; hy is maar net besig met sy voorraad.’ (p. 9)

On page 8 the reader is given plausible reasons for why *skou*[^5] cannot be used as a synonym for *tentoonstelling*, but as time has shown, such academic reasoning bears little relation to the realities of how language is perceived and used by the speech community.

On pages 10-16 there are long lists of English vocabulary which was apparently commonly used in Afrikaans at the time. Comparison of these lists with what is commonly said these days provides proof that what the Twee Oud-onderwysers advocated was not always unrealistic:^[6]

‘Tog reken ons dat dit nog wel moontlik is om hul voortgang te stuit, mits die sprekers wat hulle gebruik, ’n besliste poging aanwend om in plaas daarvan die suiwre Afrikaanse woorde te stel.’ (p. 9)

At times what the writers prescribe reads like a Dutch grammar of the kind Changuion wrote, for example where they insist on the definite article being used with street names (in *die Kerkgat*, p. 36) and on a distinction being made between *onthou* (to remember - keep in mind) and *jou herinner* (to remember - recollect). (p. 27) It is always amusing when reading these older works on anglicisms, where the authors are usually so schoolmasterly and so convinced that they are correct, to catch them committing the very sins they are preaching against, for example: having just insisted on a distinction being made between *onthou* and *jou herinner*, where confusion has arisen due to English having only one lexeme to cover both semantemes, the Twee Oud-onderwysers use *bedoel* where in fact they mean *beteeken*, presumably also because English has

[^5]: Smith (1938: 36) takes up this word in his review and pinpoints its origin in Afrikaans.
[^6]: Smith (1938: 36), in his review of *Taalgoggas*, states: ‘Ek twyfel bv. daarvan of ons eers moet probeer om die woorde plat, lunch en taxi teê te werk...’ Such observations from the past are very interesting in the light of later developments.
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only one word for the two meanings, i.e. to mean (in the footnote on p. 28). Similarly on page 35 the authors quote the following sentence with particular reference to the anglicism *na Hooftkantoor*, while apparently being oblivious to the English use of *sal* instead of *wil*, something which is admittedly now considered to be standard Afrikaans (cf. 7.9.1.2):

‘Sal u so goed wees om die prinsipale (van skole) te vra om eksemplare van items waaroor hulle klagtes het, na Hooftkantoor te stuur.’

If the authors were completely consistent with their express desire to remain true to *die Dietse taaleie*, *sal* should be regarded as incorrect in this context. When reading such older writings on anglicisms where the authoritarian stance of the authors is so foreign to the approach linguists take these days, one feels inclined to do a little preaching oneself:

‘Haal eers die balk uit jou eie oog uit, dan sal jy goed kan sien om die splinter uit jou broer se oog uit te haal.’ (Matthew 7:5)

On the other hand, such ‘mistakes’ or oversights on the part of the authors are a convenient indication of the extent to which English influence had apparently given rise to language change even then. Grobler (1976: 47) looked at this book forty years later and came to the conclusion that ‘Die twee Oud-onderwyser sou “Taalgoggas in die Daelikse Lewe” ’n herdruk met geringe wysiginge kon laat beleef...’ She, like Van Oostrum and Heslinga, but with less justification than they, apparently also fails to see the phenomena in question as more than simple errors and to recognise them as examples of language change, either complete or in progress.

3.2.2 H.J. Rousseau's *Die invloed van Engels op Afrikaans. Deel 1. 'n Sosiologies-taalkundige Ondersoek* (1937)

There is no other work in anglicisms in Afrikaans that can be compared with Rousseau’s for length and degree of detail. Rousseau wrote it originally as a doctoral thesis for the University of Cape Town which he presented in 1933. It was subsequently awarded a prize by the Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie for the best work on anglicisms and it was on the direction of the Akademie that the thesis appeared as a monograph in 1937. Comparison of the book with the original dissertation shows very few, if any, changes with the exception that the latter was followed by three appendices in which the questionnaire and the examples which the author got people to pronounce and comment on were included. Rousseau apparently based his corpus on 400 questionnaires which he sent to students.
at the Unie-Korrespondensiekollege in Pretoria, of which 200 were returned. Part 2, which according to the preface of part 1 ‘sal lyste Engelshede bevat’ (p. iv), never saw the light of day. The following comment from the preface applies as much to my work as it did to Rousseau’s:

‘n Verhandeling van hierdie aard kan egter nooit volledig of volmaak wees nie.’ (p. iv)

In one very basic respect Rousseau’s intentions and mine clearly differ: ultimately he hoped that his work would be of some benefit to the purification of Afrikaans, an aim common to every Afrikaner that has written on the topic to date, whereas I aim merely to observe and present as objectively as possible, the linguistic processes which have occurred and are still occurring in this unique contact situation. Whether my work will ultimately assist purists in their efforts is another matter - it is certainly not my prime goal. Smith (1938: 30) said in praise of Rousseau:

‘In Suid-Afrika praat en skrywe ons baie oor taalsuiwerheid, maar hoeveel van ons is daar wat werkelik ‘n ernstige studie van die saak gemaak het? ...niemand het die saak tot nog toe op die omvattende wyse van dr. Rousseau aangedurf nie.’

In the opsomming (p. v) the author maintains:

‘Die taalinvloed van die Engelse kultuur het byna uitsluitlik van die Engelse spreektaal soos dit in Suid-Afrika lewe, uitgegaan, en het die Afrikaanse skryftaal meer ten goede as ten kwade, die Afrikaanse spreektaal meer ten kwade as ten goede gestrek. Dié invloed is veel wyer maar minder diepgaande as wat gewoonlik aangeneem word...

Many would still agree with his comment on the influence of English on the Afrikaans spreek- and skryftaal and there is little doubt that the influence is still greater than most realise, but whether one can still maintain that it is less penetrating, is open to question; much of what Rousseau observed as interference phenomena fifty years ago and still hoped to see eradicated from the language, or so it seems, can now be recognised for what it is - language change.

Rousseau regarded Boere-Afrikaans as the most reliable means of identifying English influence, whereas the Twee Oud-onderwysers relied on die Dietse taaleie, although for Smith (1962: 75, but written 1936-39) these amounted to the same thing. I am not in a position to argue that this was not the case in the 1930's or that Boere-Afrikaans was not a reliable
criterion at that time, but it certainly does not hold today. Rousseau concludes his resumé with the curious comment that in the battle to purify Afrikaans 'kan Duits ons waardevoller hulp bied as Nederlands.' (p. v)

Rousseau divides his book into four chapters. Chapter 1 (p. 1-36) is entitled 'Taal en Taalvermenging'. After an analysis of the psychological reasons for language interference ('taalvermenging') in general, the author looks at the forms that interference can take and classifies these broadly as 'Vreemde-woorde', 'Leenwoorde', 'Basters' and 'Ismes'. (p. 19) In seeing anglicisms as 'veral die produkte van onvoldoend-tweetaliges' (p. 5), Rousseau agrees with the Twee Oud-onderwysers (1937: 6); on this point I differ from these scholars, although the circumstances of the bilingual situation are now quite different from what they were in the 1930's. (cf. footnote 4 on p. 92) Rousseau also recognises the role of contributing factors (cf. 6.3) although he does not develop a theory beyond stating:

‘Bestaande daar reeds onsekerheid en ’n flou neiging in ’n bepaalde rigting, dan versterk ’n daarmee ooreenstemmende neiging in die vreemde taal dit in baie hoë mate.’ (p. 17)

According to Rousseau, a 'vreemde-woord' (p. 19) is a straight loan which is 'te ongebruiklik in Afrikaans om as ’n Leenwoord beskou te word' (p. 24) and which 'word egter byna altyd, al is dit hoe min, aan die inheemse klankere aangepas; van leenwoorde is dit veel meer die geval.' (p. 20) The line he draws between this category and the next is indeed a very thin one.

He classifies as ‘Leenwoorde’ (p. 20) (1) the names of things which, together with the things they designate, become part of his ‘kultuurbesit’, e.g. cultivator, and includes such hybrid forms as kidleer and horssweep. Here he mentions that such loanwords can be avoided by a) neologisms (e.g. kaalperske), b) new meanings being given to existing words (e.g. pond, voet) or c) loan translation (e.g. vonkprop, stortbad). (2) Under this subsection of loanwords Rousseau places what he calls ‘n bekende saak met ’n vreemde naam’ to contrast with (1) above, which incorporates what he calls ‘n vreemde saak met sy vreemde naam’; examples of the former are blackboard, breakfast, nice, weddien and teach where the psychological reasons for borrowing each of these are somewhat different in every case, according to Rousseau. In my opinion Rousseau's taxonomy actually leaves a lot to be desired, certainly as far as clarity is concerned; not only is the distinction he makes between various

---

7 In fact, what I have labelled as b) here, Rousseau seems to classify as a further variant of a).
Loanwords often hazy, but he does not offer a satisfactory definition of the distinction he makes between 'vreemde-woorde' and 'leenwoorde'. In as far as it is possible to pinpoint the distinction he makes, it seems he is guided chiefly by the psychology governing the adoption of each word (i.e. whether it is the result of necessity, desire to impress, brevity, etc.), rather than the form of the words concerned. I am not concerned with psychology but with linguistic forms, a point on which Rousseau's approach and mine differ markedly, which is not to say that I consider his approach invalid; on the contrary, much of what he describes in that respect is just as valid today.

Under 'Basters' (p. 22) Rousseau explains:

‘Die verskil tussen vreemde- en leenwoordke enersyds en basters en -isms andersyds bestaan daarin dat die taalgebruiker in die laasgenoemde geval, gewoonlik bewus maar soms onbewus, die vreemde simbole vervang deur simbole uit sy eie taal sodat die deur ’n vreemde simbool geskepte of beïnvloede beeld vir oënskynlik suwer eiesimbool weergegee word.’ (p. 22)

What he calls 'basterismes' or 'basterwoorde' - what the Dutch simply call bastaardwoorden - are those which have been influenced in one way or another by the contact with English because of their existence in English too. He identifies the following forms of influence:

(1) Die simbool bestaan in Nedl., maar sy betekenis (beeld) is Eng., bv. prominent, konstabel. (2) Die simbool bestaan in Nedl., maar sy verstofliking is Eng., bv. promminent, konstabel. (3) Die simbool bestaan in Nedl. maar sy verbuiging is Eng., bv. 'n populêr kêrel. (4) Die simbool het nog nooit in Nedl. bestaan nie, maar bestaan wel in Eng., bv. discussieer, denominasioneel.’ (p. 23)

Most Afrikaners are totally unaware of the role English influence is playing in such words, but this is explained by Rousseau:

‘Gewoonlik is sy vreemde bevrugting taalkundig-bewysbaar alleen as die Nedl. in die een of die ander opsig van die Afr. verskil.’ (p. 23)

---
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The author divides ‘Ismes’ (p. 23) into ‘woord-’ (e.g. eksamenpapier) and ‘beeld-ismes’ (e.g. loodneuskoëë). He also makes a distinction between what he terms ‘herhaalde ismes’ (e.g. maak as in maak ‘n lewe/aplikasie/geld; lyn as in in my lyn, langs hierdie lyn, lynne van ‘n vers) and ‘aansluitende ismes’ (e.g. boelie, rof, stop, lot, boy, -self, die ander dag, ’n kans staan, siekverlof). (p. 24) I find this distinction rather artificial, unless one is perhaps looking at it from a psychological point of view, but I think he does have a valid point when he states:

‘...soms bestaan die vreemde invloed bloot daarin dat ‘n bepaalde
taaleenheid meer as tevore, of uitsluitlik gebruik word, bv. Wat het ek met
jou te doen? (vroeër naas: Wat het ek met jou te maak?)...’ (p. 24)

He also makes mention here of Diets constructions that were on the wane or had died out, but of which the existence of a similar construction in English aided retention or the reintroduction of the phenomenon into Afrikaans (p. 24) - this refers to what I have called contributing factors (cf. 6.3), a facet of pseudo-anglicisms. (cf. 6.0)

In a sub-section of ‘Taal en Taalvermenging’ curiously entitled ‘-Ismiete’ (p. 24) Rousseau looks at the question of who is responsible for the introduction of anglicisms into Afrikaans - Afrikaans speaking Englishmen or English speaking Afrikaners? He concludes that it is difficult to assess but admits that ‘Hoemeer die Afrikaners Eng. ken...hoe meer moontlikheid...dat dit Afrikaners is wat dié -ismes skep en versprei.’ I would postulate, however, that although it may not have been clear in Rousseau's time where the source lay, it is now obvious, with the degree of bilingualism the Afrikaner has now attained, that it is to be found in his community and that the contribution of the English community in this regard is negligible. (cf. p. 17)

Rousseau gives due consideration to the various factors that have shaped Afrikaans, pointing out where apparent anglicisms may in fact be found in contemporary Dutch, Dutch prior to 1650 or Dutch dialects. These factors, together with English, he calls the ‘uiterlike toetsstene’. (p. 25) I cannot agree with his suggestion that ‘[daar] bestaan in die hedendaagse Nedl. duisende taaleenhede waaraan weens kulturele omstandighede nooit ‘n behoefte in S.-Afrika bestaan het voor die koms van die Engelse nie, so is dekstoel, Latyn neem, die voordeel van die twyfel suier in Nedl., maar -ismes in Afr.’ (p. 26) Here Rousseau completely ignores the fact that contact with Dutch, at least with written Dutch, was never lost (i.e. because of the diglossia situation, cf. p. 37), at least not until after 1925, and what existed in Dutch had every right to be regarded as Afrikaans too if the need
arose. I do agree, however, with the following sentiment expressed by Rousseau:

‘Tog is die 17e eeuwe Nedl. by ons taalgelerdes 'n kwaal geword: sodra 'n taaléenheid wat in Afr. gebruik word in die een of ander geskrifte van voor circa 1650 aangetref word, is dit 'n bewys dat dié taaléenheid in Afr. suiwere ergoed is.’ (p. 26)

This is a ‘kwaal’ which still exists. He makes a similar point in the subsection on the role of Dutch dialects:

‘Om 'n verdagte Afr. taaléenheid op rekening van 'n miskien onbeduidende Nedl. dialek te skuiwe net omdat dit daar aangetref word, getuig van veel minder wetenskaplike sin as om dit aan die in S.-Afrika so kragtige Eng. invloed toe te skrywe.’ (p. 27)

Rousseau regards the following as ‘innerlike toetsstene’ (p. 29): ‘Boere-Afrikaans’ (p. 29), ‘Materiële Kultuur’ (p. 30), ‘Gebruiksfeer’ (p. 31), ‘Gevoelswaarde’ (p. 31), ‘Betekenis’ (p. 31), ‘Opname in Afr. eenhede’ (p. 32), ‘Klank- en vormverandering’ (p. 32). The importance he attaches to the first has been mentioned before: this must be a much less reliable criterion these days, where monolingual farmers exist no more, although Rousseau does add the interesting comment that ‘Die omstandigheids dat iemand g'vn Eng. ken nie, is dan ook g'vn bewys dat hy van Eng. “smette” vry is nie’ (p. 30), which is also an indication of language change occurring, although he does not see it in those terms.

Chapter 2 (p. 37) is entitled ‘Verengelsing van Afrikaners’ and is divided into the ‘stoflike’ and ‘geestelike oorsake’ of English influence on the Afrikaans community. Under the former the author gives an excellent account of the position of Dutch and English in South Africa and how socio-political conditions led to anglicisation of Afrikaans. He is one of the few scholars who maintains, and in this I support him entirely, that many internationalisms (or ‘Engelsismes’) did not come into Afrikaans via Dutch, even though they occur in Dutch (p. 40); this is of course compatible with his argument that Dutch had little influence on Afrikaners, a point on which I do not agree with him.

The nature of many of the ‘geestelike oorsake’ (p. 55) he discusses has changed since the 1930's although the concepts as such still exist, for

---

9 He emphasises again on p. 41 how little influence he feels Dutch had on Afrikaans.
10 There is a misprint in the table of contents where chapter 2, like chapter 3, is entitled Verengelsing van Afrikaans.
example: the inferior position of Afrikaans (p. 55), the inferiority complex (p. 56) and the fact that Afrikaans is read far less than English (p. 57).

Chapter 3 returns to the categories of anglicisms mentioned on p. 19 which were discussed in general terms there. This chapter (p. 67-205) contains a very detailed discussion, illustrated with profuse examples, of the categories 'Leenwoorde' (p. 67-110), 'Basters' (p. 110-172) and 'Anglisismes' (p. 172-206). ‘Vreemde-woorde’, which he gave as a separate category on p. 19, is curiously dealt with as a sub-section of ‘Basters’ (p. 162-170) in chapter 3. The author classifies loanwords according to the social sphere to which they belong, i.e. government, railways, etc. This is an approach which I have not chosen to take in this book, as it would not contribute anything new to an understanding of anglicisms in Afrikaans and because it can also easily lead to an even greater artificiality of categorisation than is the case anyway; after all, each anglicism arises individually rather than as part of a group of foreign structures.

Many of the social conditions Rousseau refers to are now a thing of the past, for example on p. 71 where he maintains that English is the language of the courts and ‘dat selfs vandag nog baie mense skaars op Afrikaans kan tel.’ (p. 81) It is interesting to note, however, that he observed a definite trend in various spheres towards purity that was apparently previously lacking, for example under ‘verkeer’:

‘Soos in die ander gevalle, is dit interressant om hier op te merk dat, hoe jonger die saak, hoe minder Eng. dit word, bv. alleenflug (solo flight)...’

(p. 74)

Rousseau continually betrays a thorough understanding of the linguistic processes at work in a society (cf. for example his discussion of slang, bottom p. 106-107) and refrains from emotional forms of self-expression. On both these counts he differs markedly from so many of his contemporaries although his written style is inevitably somewhat dated, for example:

‘Die meeste basterwoorde in Afr. kom nie uit Frans oor Nedl. nie, maar, hoewel vermoe deur ’n spits baardjie en ’n snor wat aan die punte opswaai, uit Engeland...’

It is unfortunate - but nevertheless illuminating for linguists - that so much of his corpus is now out of date and that the book is typographically not appealing to the modern reader either, because it does contain a great deal of valid information despite such drawbacks. Rousseau's attempt to be
thorough has, I feel, led him at times to see a red under every bed, as it were, which was also Smith's (1938:32) opinion:

‘By die deurlees van die werk het ek so langsamerhand tot die gevolgtrekking gekom dat die skrywer in sy ywer vir dié goeie saak, soms ’n bietjie te ver gaan: en daar is meer as een taalverskynsel wat hy somaar sonder meer as Engels beskou, maar waaromtrent ’n mens glad nie so stellig kan praat nie.’

In his discussion of ‘Basters’, the author devotes considerable space to his methods of research in trying to ascertain the origin of a given ‘foreign’ phenomenon in Afrikaans. He considers each of the following in turn: Dutch, Afrikaans, English, one's ‘taalgevoel’, meaning, sounds, and form. His conclusions, most of which are just as valid today as then, and possibly even more so because of the inferior knowledge of Dutch these days, were arrived at on the basis of information gleaned from his questionnaires:

‘Hierdie lys het aangetoon dat die gewone Afrikaner nie tussen egte en onegte basters (angll.) kan onderskei nie; dat hy dikwels Nedl. woorde vir angll. aansien en angll. vir Nedl.; en dat ook sy uitspr. baie anglisisties is.’ (p. 130) ‘M.a.w. ons onderskeidingsvermoë tussen Afrikaners en uitlanders is vinnig op weg om afgestomp te word, en dit byna uitsluitlik weens ons gedurige samesyn met Engelse.’ (p. 126)

Rousseau concludes that:

‘Die sterkste bewys van die Eng. invloed word deur die klankte van die basterwoorde gelewer. Dit blyk des te opvallender as ons eers nagaan hoe min invloed by die Germanse woorde te bespeur is.’ (p. 134)

His conclusion that the pronunciation of Germanic words, the indigenous phonemic stock of Afrikaans, has been little affected by English is still the case, despite increased influence of English on other aspects of the language, but many would now disagree with some of his theories concerning the pronunciation of vowels in the unstressed syllables of international words. Nevertheless, the author's treatment of these ‘basterwoorde’, which includes an extremely detailed discussion of the phonology of such words (p. 139-169), is in my opinion the most important contribution Rousseau's work makes to the literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans. (cf. p. 287)
Because of his great attention to detail, so as not to lose sight of the forest for the trees, which is easily done when reading his book, Rousseau regularly follows up his arguments with summaries of the issues discussed (e.g. p. 99, 131, 170). These assist in clarifying the points he has made, although in at least one instance the resumé he offers is of little practical use and is also one which, certainly in the light of subsequent developments, I would contest: ‘Die invloed van Engels op Afrikaans: Raak die puntjies van alles maar die kern van niks.’ (p. 206), a claim which has been made by scholars on several occasions since.11

Chapter 3 concludes with a lengthy discussion of anglicisms in the narrower sense of the word where the author classifies his material according to traditional parts of speech, an approach which I too have chosen to apply to my corpus, although hopefully with a greater degree of oorsigtelikheid than is the case in Rousseau's work.

In chapter 4, ‘Slot’, he sums up his attitude to this topic which he has devoted so much time and thought to. One of his main conclusions is identical to that which I have also inevitably reached:

‘Die volksmassa praat “soos hy lekker kry”; g’n poging om ’n taal te suwer het nog ooit geslaag tensy dit ’n gloeiende volksaak was, tensy die taal werklik gans die volk was en met Afr. is dit vandag nie die geval nie.
“Liewer die gebruiklike Eng. as die ongebruiklike Diets” - dit vertolk die standpunt van bv. Langenhoven, allersuwerste verpersoonliking van die Afr. volksmaak.’ (p. 213)

Although Rousseau does not anywhere in his dissertation look at anglicisms from the point of view of language change as such, with the benefit of hindsight it is now certainly possible to start seeing the concept in that light.12 In this respect Rousseau's work, however out of date his corpus may be and his views of the social forces at work at the time, forms an invaluable record of the situation in South Africa with regard to the influence of English on Afrikaans in the 1930's. Rousseau was so thorough in his treatment of the topic, I would not be surprised if no other

---

11 I suppose it depends on one's definition of puntjies and kern whether one can agree with the statement or not; perhaps what I regard as kern, he regards as puntjies.

12 Perhaps it was too premature at the time Rousseau was writing to be sure, even if one suspected that certain phenomena were there to stay, that language change was taking place because the language had only recently achieved official equality with English and one would need to wait some time to see what effect, if any, English would have on the Afrikaans of successive generations of Afrikaners who were now being educated in Afrikaans and who were no longer burdened with Dutch as their written language, a factor which must have previously played into the hands of English.
dissertation or monograph has been written on it since because of a general feeling of 'what is there left to say?' It is really only the passage of time, rather than any serious omission or error on Rousseau's part, that has rendered the topic worthy of re-analysis.

### 3.3 Works written after 1940

#### 3.3.1 J.J. le Roux's *Anglisismes* (1952)

Because of the academic nature of H.J. Rousseau's book, J.J. le Roux's *Anglisismes* was the most widely consulted work on anglicisms until J. Combrink's *Taaltrots* appeared in 1968, but even then Le Roux did not lose popularity - there was after all so little of practical use on the topic. This book is in fact a reprint in monograph form of articles which Le Roux wrote for *Die Huisgenoot* from March - April 1945 and it is undoubtedly only due to their appearance as a monograph seven years later that those articles did not sink into oblivion as all the other articles on anglicisms in magazines such as *Die Huisgenoot, Die Brandwag* etc. have done.\(^{13}\) G.S. Nienaber edited the book and added a selection of exercises (p. 48-77) which were lacking in the original articles. The exercises emphasise the practical intent of the work which perhaps explains why it gained the renown that it did.

Le Roux devotes chapter one to 'Die Aard van Taalbeïnvloeding' before proceeding to the issue 'Wat is suiwer Afrikaans?' (p. 9) In this chapter he states, correctly, that

> 'Anglisismes word nie alleen deur indiwidue oorgeneem nie, maar ons erf ons verengelste taal oor. Ons hoor dit van ons mede-Afrikaners en ons praat hulle na.' (p. 9)

He too, like his predecessors, is not yet prepared to see many phenomena he is dealing with as language change (in progress) and yet this very statement of his confirms that this is the case. Interference phenomena are by definition individual and are not passed on to later generations. He does not by any means feel that Dutch is in a position to dictate the norms of Afrikaans, as the Twee Oud-onderwysers seemed to believe for example, but is not prepared to turn his back entirely on the past:

---

\(^{13}\) One example of excellent articles that appeared in *Die Huisgenoot* (18/11/49, 2/12/49) but which have since been forgotten, are those written by M. de Villiers. But those by S.J. du Toit (*Die Huisgenoot* 2/3/34, 9/3/34, 16/3/34, 23/3/34) were saved from oblivion by P.J. Nienaber who reproduced them in *Taalkundige opstelle* (1965).
‘... die volk [voel] aan dat, hoewel Afrikaans sy eie norm geword het, dit nie beteken dat alle bande met die verlede verbreek moet word nie... Nederlands... [kan] nog belangrike dienste bewys aan ons puristiese strewe mits daar ‘n oordeelkundige gebruik gemaak word van die Nederlandse voorbeelde.’ (p. 10)

In the same chapter Le Roux goes on to give examples of how difficult it can be at times to distinguish English influence from ‘erfgoed’, even with a knowledge of Dutch. I agree with his conclusion that in such circumstances ‘By gebrek aan bewys van die teendeel moet ons dus aanneem dat die gemelde uitdrukking in Afrikaans ‘n Anglisisme is.’ (p. 12)

Le Roux, like Combrink (1984) after him, feels compelled to devote some time to the concept of what an anglicism is not (chapter 111 - ‘Leenwoorde in Nederlands’) because of the common misconceptions in that regard and even includes a chapter entitled ‘Afrikaanse ontleninge aan ander tale’ (chapter IV) before finally proceeding to the issue at hand. He applies the following taxonomy to anglicisms, devoting a chapter to each:


As the title of the book suggests, the word ‘Anglisisme’ is understood to include all forms of English influence although the author explains on page 1 that the term is used ‘lossiesweg’ in this sense and that in fact anglicisms can be divided into ‘leenwoorde’ and ‘barbarismes’. Consequently chapter VI is entitled ‘Barbarismes uit Engels’ followed by a comment to the effect that a barbarism is an ‘Anglisisme in die enger sin van die woord.’ (p. 29)

Le Roux admits that ‘n lywige boek (p. 29) would be necessary if one were to list all common anglicisms, his aim is simply the following:

‘Al wat ek hier kan doen, is dus maar om die aandag op ‘n aantal van die mees voorkomende tipes te vestig.’ (p. 29)

Although Le Roux never actually refers to language change as such, comments such as the following amount to the same thing:

‘Besigheid in die sin van saak, winkel, kantoor, ens. het ookreeds so diep wortel geskiet dat hierdie betekenisse as Afrikaans aanvaar moet word.’ (p. 32)
He intersperses his discussion of common anglicisms - much of his corpus is still frequently heard today - with comments on the occurrence of similar constructions in modern or older Dutch, for example: *in die loop van die tyd, braaf.* (p. 35) It is interesting to note that Le Roux sees some anglicisms as regional, for example the use of *roep* instead of *noem* (p. 34) and *anders* instead of *ander* or *andere.* (p. 37)

On page 48 Le Roux concludes with the comment:

‘Dis met ’n mate van teensin dat ’n mens al hierdie Anglisismes op papier stel en dus as ’t ware publisiteit daaraan verleen. Dit sou veel beter gewees het om hulle in die vergetelboek te laat raak deur verswyging, as dit moontlik was. Maar die waarheid is dat hulle soveel gebruik word dat daardie metode nie die gewenste gevolge sou hé nie.’

The truth of what he says is borne out by the fact that most of his corpus is still alive and kicking forty years later.

3.3.2 M.A. Basson, J. Kromhout, P.G. Nel and J.H. Senekal's *Afrikaans vir die student* (1964, 1972, 1982)

In the preface the authors describe this book as “n handleiding en desnoods ’n naslaanwerk waarin hoofsaaklik foutiewe gebruikte “remediërend” behandel word.’ This work gives a far fuller, more systematic taxonomy of anglicisms than any other practical handbook of Afrikaans. It is strongly prescriptive, which led to the following comment being added to the preface of the second and later editions:

‘Naas heelwat waardering het hierdie werk vanuit enkele oorde ook kritiek uitgelok, omdat ons benadering - veral wat Anglisismes betref - te dogmaties sou wees. In hoeverre die leser wil afwyk van die erkende, suierentaalorde wat ons bepleit, is ’n persoonlike saak. Ons wil die vrye ontwikkeling van Afrikaans allerminst streem en verwelkom meningsverskil. Aan die ander kant is dit by elke lewende taal gerade om die “behoudende faktor” steeds in ag te neem.’

The treatment of anglicisms, chapter IV (p. 38-110),\(^{14}\) constitutes a third of the book; this is an indication of the importance which the authors attach to a better understanding of the concept and of the detail in which they have tackled it. Chapter four is entitled “Taalvermenging - Anglisismes”;

---

\(^{14}\) The page numbers here refer to the 1972 edition.
clearly the authors regard all the phenomena they discuss as interference phenomena and are not prepared to recognise them as examples of language change (in progress). Their attitude to English inspired structures is often ambivalent and even inconsistent, however: cf.

‘Spoorweg - Die veel voorkomende woord spoorweë staan waarskynlik ook onder die invloed van Engels maar dit het reeds so algemeen geword dat spoorweg seker nie aanvaar sal word nie.’ (p. 52)

‘Dryf, Drywer - Daar is nou deur die spoorweg erkenning verleena aan dryf en drywer, omdat, so word beweer, dan onderskei kan word tussen “manager” en “driver”. Vroeër is dit slegs gebruik as die drywer werklik iets gedryf het, soos osse, perde, vee. “Drywer” in die betekenis bestuurder bly egter o.i. ‘n Anglisisme, daarom sê ons ook nie ‘n “busdrywer” nie, maar wel ‘n busbestuurder.’ (p. 77)

Although the authors call constructions such as ‘n mooi een ‘Anglisisties’, a word which is loaded with negative connotations in the work under discussion, they then state ‘Jy is ‘n mooi een is natuurlik korrek.’ (p. 56)

The chapter concludes with a treatment of ‘vermeende Anglisismes’. Not entirely unconnected with English influence, although the authors do not deal with it in that context, is the chapter entitled ‘Taalskepping - neologismes.’ (chapter 2, p. 22-29)

This book has been around for over twenty years now and has undergone numerous reprints, the latest revised edition as recently as 1982. It has reached so many generations of students that it deserves mention here.

3.3.3 J. Combrink's Taaltrots - ‘n handleiding vir taalstudente (1968)

Taaltrots, although very modest in length and content, is one of the best known and most widely used works on anglicisms. After a brief treatment of the reasons for ‘taalsuiwerheid’, Combrink looks at the various types of ‘onsuiwerhede’, dividing them into ‘opsigtelike’ and ‘versluierde onsuiwerhede’. Under the former he offers a list of Afrikaans equivalents (chiefly neologisms and loan translations) for English words commonly

15 In the 1982 edition the authors have scrapped spoorweë, presumably because they realised it is not an anglicism.
16 In the 1982 edition the final sentence under the lemma Dryf. Drywer now reads as follows: ‘Drywer in die betekenis bestuurder word aanvaar.’ (p. 78)
used by Afrikaners; under the latter he deals with 1) ‘Anglisistiese aksent’, 2) ‘Anglisistiese uitspraak’, 3) ‘Anglisistiese skryfwyses’, 4) ‘Anglisistiese betekenis’, and 5) ‘Anglisistiese uitdrukkings en spreekwoorde’, giving numerous examples of each form of interference and offering a ‘correct’ form in each case, for example: ‘n passasier oplaai (pure Afrikaans), ‘n passasier optel (anglicism), to pick up a passenger (English). (p. 21) He concludes with a few comments on what is often referred to in the literature as ‘vermeende Anglisismes’ and the difficulty of separating true from apparent anglicisms, as well as a few words on attitude towards anglicisms.

In some respects Taaltrots has now been totally superceded by Combrink’s latest publication on anglicisms (1984). His theoretical arguments have been greatly streamlined in this recent work, but he ultimately chose to omit a list of common anglicisms which were present in the original draft (cf. p. 60). It is thus not as blatantly corrective and prescriptive as Taaltrots, but more descriptive, reflecting an approach in keeping with the 1980’s. Taaltrots is of very limited use - chiefly because of its brevity - but deserves mention as another well-known milestone in the collection of works on anglicisms.

3.3.4 H.J. Terblanche’s Regte Afrikaans (1972)

Terblanche describes the contents of this book as ‘n Alfabetiese naslaanboek van problematiese Afrikaanse woorde, uitdrukkings, gesegdes en aktuele taalvraagstukke’ (title page). It was written as a reference work ‘vir die skool, die universiteit en die huis’ (voorwoord). Hennie Terblanche became almost a legendary figure in his own time and was quite a prolific linguist, particularly on the question of anglicisms and purism. Regte Afrikaans is his best known work and was widely referred to for guidance in such issues. Whatever his opponents felt about him personally and about this book in particular, he and it did have a certain influence which cannot be ignored.

The book does not merely consist of dictionary type lemmas such as aangaan, bad and fooi, but also contains entries of general linguistic interest and relevance such as aanhalingstekens, Afrikaanse taal and Taalkommissie. Although the entry ‘Anglisismes’ covers just over nine pages (p. 15-24), many of the lemmas themselves have been included because they occur as anglicisms or are connected in some way with English influence, for example:

‘Deurval’ - “Die planne het deurgeval” is ‘n Anglisisme. Die korrekte Afrikaans is “die planne het misluk, in duie geval
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The personal nature of many of Terblanche's comments emphasises the degree to which so much of the information in the book is based purely and simply on his own individual opinion of what is or is not correct and/or is ‘better’ Afrikaans, for example:

`As sodanig - Dit is seker beter om te sê as sodanig en nie sommer as sulks te gebruik nie, maar ek sal nie wil beweer dat as sulks uit die bose is nie. Hier geld gebruiklikheid en die invloed van die word sulks wat “dit” of “so iets” beteken, baie sterk. Ek glo dat as sulks in Afrikaans gekom het om te bly, maar daarmee word as sodanig geensins op die agtergrond gestoot nie; om die waarheid te sê, ek gebruik dit self...’ (p. 26)

Such personal remarks detract from the authority that Terblanche clearly hopes the book will acquire. Often what he describes is not based on the reality of Afrikaans as perceived by the speech community, but on what Terblanche himself feels should be the case. Even if his recommendations correspond with those of the Taalkommissie, to which he often refers, Terblanche is very prone to adding his own justification for why such a term should be accepted, reasons which in my opinion bear little relevance to the acceptability of a word, for example:

`Ek weet in alle geval nie hoekom ons van drywer vir motorvoertuie weggeskram het nie, want dit is tog die natuurlikste ding ter wêreld om die drywer van 'n perdekaro onder die drywer van die motorkar, veral nog as eersgenoemde besig was om te verdwyn.’ (p. 52)

Regte Afrikaans has probably now had its day. Nevertheless, it remains an important landmark in the history of literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans, if only because it represents the philosophy of one of the best known taalstryders of the post-war period.


This book originally saw the light of day in the early 1950's when it appeared under the title *Afrikaanse Taalkwessies*. At that stage it was
The book takes the form of a dictionary in which a great number of lemmas deal with frequently occurring anglicisms. The attitude of the author is often somewhat ambivalent, as is in fact reflected in the commentary under the lemma ‘Anglisisme’:

‘Om die Afrikaanse taaleie te bevorder, is dit nodig om Anglisismes te weer, maar daar moet onthou word dat Engels ook baie verykend op Afrikaans ingewerk het: gesonde, ewewigtige oordeel is nodig, want ’n heksejag op Engelse beïnvloeding gaan ons beslis nie ver bring nie.’

In lay-out and approach this book is very reminiscent of Terblanche’s (1972) *Regte Afrikaans* although it does not go as far in its subjectivity as that work. Nevertheless, the criteria on the basis of which the author approves or disapproves of certain anglicisms are somewhat subjective; on other occasions a value judgement is avoided altogether, for example: the increasing frequency of *maindjoe* in spoken Afrikaans is merely commented on, whereas under *betaal* in the sense of *Dit betaal nie om te steel nie* the author comments:

‘... dis beslis ’n anwins vir ons taal, en dit kan gerus toegelaat word vir diegene wat dit wil gebruik, maar vir my bly die suiper Afrikaans die mooiste [followed by examples].

He concludes the commentary under that lemma with:
“n Lelike Anglisme is: *deur jou neus betaal vir iets - kyk neus.*

Similar subjective disapproval is expressed under the lemma *O.K.*:

‘*Oukei* is (ongelukkig) in die omgangstaal stewig gevestig naas *reg, in die haak, in orde; vgl. ook orraait.*

Why *maindjoe* and *orraait* don’t arouse the disapproval of the author and an internationalism such as *O.K.* does, is somewhat curious and typical of the sort of subjectivity that all writers on the topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans seem to be incapable of refraining from. On the other hand, English influenced usage of *weg* and *weet* are dealt with under those lemmas with no further comment than that they are *(Angl.)*. Presumably this is meant to infer that the alternatives the author gives are preferable, but whether the anglicisms are considered wrong is left in the air.

The author’s attitude to obviously *ingeburgerde* anglicisms is also inconsistent. Under *vloer* he comments ‘*dit het nie veel sin om dit te bly wees nie*’ but under *As dit nie vir hom was nie, sou ek verongeluk het* he says:

‘*Dat die konstruksie uit Engels kom, ly geen twyfel nie. Ofskoon prof. T.H. le Roux dit as ingeburger en as onvervangbaar beskou, verkies ek nog die Afrikaanse vorme*[followed by examples].*

Before condemning certain uses of *sukses* Van der Merwe has obviously consulted Dutch usage and concludes:

‘*Tog gee Jansonius die volgende voorbeeldde [examples]. Iets soortgelyks vind ek in geeneen van die ander toonaangewende Nederlandse woordeboeke nie. Staan Jansonius hier onder Engelse invloed? Ek meen van ja. Ons behoort dit *dus nie goed te keur nie.*’ *(my italics, BCD)*

To my mind this is a strange criterion to apply to the acceptability of a structure in Afrikaans because it apparently totally ignores how that structure is perceived and used by native-speakers of Afrikaans, regardless of what its origins may be. Under *‘n moet* and *‘n wit olifant*, however, the author is satisfied to simply comment that the expressions in question are a ‘gevestigde Engelse ontleening’. On occasions Van der Merwe employs somewhat more words to say the same thing where the implication seems to be that he accepts the structure concerned with resignation, for example:
‘**moddergooiery**': Dit is 'n leenvertaling van Eng. *mudslinging*, maar dis al so ingeburger, en veral in ons politieke lewe, dat ons dit seker sal moet aanvaar.’

Van der Merwe can also be relied upon to offer his opinion on many traditional bones of contention such as *aangaan, bly, bottelstoer, die bus mis, welaf*, etc.

Under the lemma *Engelse invloed* the author comments:

‘Geen bestaande Afrikaanse woordeboek bied by benadering 'n objektiewe en verteenwoordigende beeld van Engelse inwerking nie.’

As long as this is the case, one will have to make do with handbooks such as this, however subjective or out of touch with reality they may be.

### 3.4 Dictionaries


Discussion of *WAT*’s treatment of anglicisms is limited by the fact that it is as yet far from complete, as well as the fact that the editorial committee responsible for the most recent and future volumes differs from that which compiled the first volumes. There are a few comments in the introduction to volume one which shed some light on the editors' attitude to anglicisms and as no further comment is offered in the preface to later volumes, one must presume that that attitude has not changed significantly - at least not consciously - since 1950. On the other hand, what *has* perhaps changed, and what could be reflected in future volumes of the dictionary, is the frequency of certain anglicisms which, although they may not have been sufficiently *ingeburger* in 1950 - or there was still a lingering stubbornness to accept them - are now undeniably part of the language.

The dictionary was originally to be completed within three years and three months of January 1st, 1926. The idea was to compile “n volledige en gesaghebbende woordeboek (vol. 1, p. 1)... Daar is dus liewer te veel as te min opgeneem... ook 'n ruime plek toegeken aan die geselstaal.’ (p. iii) *Geselstaal*, as in the case of *HAT*, is often used as a synonym (euphemism?) for anglicism. In the preface to volume one it is further stated:
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Such attempts to eradicate anglicisms by offering ‘correct’ alternatives are also common to HAT and yet to my knowledge this is an approach which is unique to Afrikaans dictionaries. It is yet another indication of how unique this entire bilingual situation is that the dictionaries not only give what is correct, but also feel compelled to comment on what they consider is incorrect, which simply goes to show how common these constructions are and that many of them can no longer be regarded as mere interference phenomena. On p. iv of the introduction anglicisms are finally mentioned by name:

‘Engelse woorde en anglisismes - alleen woorde en uitdrukings wat reeds as heetemal ingebruik of onvervangbaar beskou kan word, is opgeneem. Hierdie vreemde inkruiipsels is egter tot ‘n minimum beperk en af en toe is deur middel van ‘n opmerking die aandag op foutiewe gebruik gevestig of ‘n suier Afrikaanse idioom in die plek van ‘n gebruikelike anglisisme aanbeveel.’

WAT is as inconsistent as HAT in the way in which it acknowledges English influence, but this is presumably because the latter has modelled itself on the former; after all, the current editor-in-chief of HAT as well as his predecessor, P.C. Schoonees, both worked on WAT for years. What is more, it is only fitting that the two dictionaries should attempt to stay in step with each other to avoid contradiction. Nevertheless, this is not to say that the way in which WAT and HAT acknowledge certain anglicisms is always necessarily the same, as will be illustrated.

As in HAT, words like enjin and gelling, which are derived from English, are accompanied by the symbol (<E.) whereas furlong, an unadapted loanword, is given the symbol (E.). On other occasions WAT uses (angl.), apparently where the editors consider the word concerned to be ingebruik, for example: brekfis, dip, drywer, grein.’ WAT seems to use (angl.) more often than HAT and incorporates a larger number of common anglicisms than that dictionary; does this imply a greater

---

17 Neither dictionary offers any formal explanation of symbols such as (< E.), (E.), (angl.) etc. and thus it is not always clear whether they are synonymous or do reflect a different attitude to the phenomenon concerned on the part of the compilers.
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tolerance on the part of WAT towards those anglicisms which HAT either condemns outright or omits?, for example: WAT issues no warnings on the independent use of hierdie and daardie, unlike HAT, and includes afhê, 'n graaf 'n graaf noem and iemand se been trek, which is not even acknowledged as an anglicism; none of these are mentioned in HAT. There are of course many common anglicisms which neither WAT nor HAT include, for example: uit die bloute, diens (as a verb).

HAT considers it necessary to add a warning about the ‘true’ meaning of braaf in Afrikaans, but WAT does not - it merely gives its puristic meaning. HAT offers a tip on the ‘correct’ pronunciation of garage, but WAT does not. On other occasions, presumably because it has more room at its disposal, WAT offers more information on certain anglicisms, for example:

‘agter...OPM. Net soos in ouer Nederlands en ook vandag nog in Nederlandse streektale en i/d [= in die] Afrikaanse agtermiddag, agtereen, agtermekaar, word agter dikwels i.v.m. tydaanduiding i/d bet. “na” gebruik: Ons sal agter Nuwejaar kom kuier. Meester het die kind agter skool gehou. Agter die heerlike reëns het die bosses begin uitloop. Hulle het net agter die middag hier aangekom.
In Afrikaans is dit heel waarskynlik erfgoed, ofskoon invloed van Engels (after), veral in sekere gebruikskringe, nie uitgesluit kan word nie. Uitdr. soos agter die kinders, die plaas kyk, oppas, versorg, is ook in Nederlandse en Afrikaanse spreektaal bekend.
In die Algemeen Beskaafde Afrikaans word hierdie twee gebruikte egter nie erken nie.’

On occasions WAT acknowledges English origin, whereas HAT gives the word without further comment, for example: halffhartig and kleim where WAT in the first case adds (ingeburgerde angl.) and in the second case (< claim). Sometimes WAT is cautious (unnecessarily so, in my opinion) and adds (waarsk. angl.) or (waarsk. < Eng. ...), for example: definition 4 under jou - Dan is daar al jou onvoorsiene uitgawes (omitted from HAT) and horssweep (no further comment in HAT). WAT gives examples of anglicisms which are not included in HAT, supposedly because they are no longer common, for example: doos - definition 4 (geselst.) Dosis...; jop: jop, joppe (< geselst.).

WAT has a much longer, more detailed entry under the lemma ‘anglisisme’ (with a small letter) than does HAT. (p. 202) It has a somewhat ambiguous attitude towards the examples cited under the lemma
'anglisme'. If one refers to the individual words and expressions given on p. 202 of WAT as examples of anglicisms, one finds that some are commented on under those lemmas and others are not, for example: definitions 2 and 3 under besigheid are given the symbol (angl.) whereas the transitive use of groei is not mentioned under groei. It is possible that the implication here is that these uses of besigheid are considered acceptable, but the transitive use of groei is not (yet?). Nevertheless this distinction is not actually specified and it may simply be because this use of groei was overlooked when that lemma was being written.

Should WAT ever be revised - at the moment one would be grateful if it were merely completed - it, like HAT, would do well to be more consistent in its acknowledgement and treatment of anglicisms than is presently the case.

3.4.2 Verklarende handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal (1965, 1979)

HAT, the significance of which was mentioned on p. 27, was first published in 1965 and has been reprinted almost every year since 1970. It was revised and expanded by over 300 pages in 1979 by F.F. Odendal, who had taken over as editor-in-chief in 1971. Odendal (1978: 60) emphasises how important it is for the lexicographer to be objective and that objectivity demands that ‘die leksikograaf nie preskriptief te werk moet gaan nie, dat sy definisie die gevolg moet wees van die sistematisering van werklik waargenome taalbebruik.’ At the moment, what stands in HAT is at times still at odds with what the editor says here aspires to achieve, for example: HAT gives die aap kom uit die mou, which is what the expression is in Dutch, while in practice everybody in South Africa says die aap uit die mou laat, in as far as they don't use the completely English expression die kat uit die sak laat. Nevertheless, Odendal (1978: 63) explains:

‘Dat WAT intussen [i.e. since P.C. Schoonees] besig is om te beweeg in 'n minder voorskrwywende rigtig (of ten minste die voorskrif op 'n verfynder wyse aanbied) is 'n interessante ontwikkeling.’

Presumably the same applies to HAT. Later in the same article Odendal quotes from the preface to the Random House Dictionary:

---

18 All comments on HAT in this section relate to the second impression of the second edition, 1983.
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‘The lexicographer who does not recognise the existence of long-established structures in usage has not discharged his full responsibility. He has not been objective and factual: he has reported selectively, omitting references to a social attitude relevant to many words and expressions.’ (p. 67)

Yet this is exactly what HAT does on many occasions when, for example, it omits iemand se been trek, which Pienaar (1931: 175) attested as long ago as 1931, and seker maak, which Le Roux (1968: 170, but written in 1947) attested in 1947 and expressed the doubt that the expression would ever leave the language.

In the preface to the second edition of HAT Odendal has the following to say:

‘n Innovasiewat die oorspronklike redaksie reeds ingevoer het, is die aangee van eenvoudige etimologieë by woorde van Franse, Klassieke en ander vreemde herkoms. As daar belangstelling daarvoor blyk te wees, sou by ‘n derde uitgawe ook die etimologie van ander woorde aandag kon kry. Ek hoor graag van gebruiers in die verband.’

The numerous lemmas of English origin fall into this category and warrant further attention by the editorial committee in future because of certain inconsistencies in presentation. This criticism applies even more so to the many comments that have been added to definitions where English influence has affected the situation ‘soos dit behoort te wees.’ (cf. p. 78) Some of these I would consider as belonging to the ‘foute en swakhede’ which the editor admits in the preface are still too prevalent in the book. What follows are examples of these inconsistencies.

The entries enjin, ferplie, gelling, sleng, trok and ’n wit olifant are all accompanied by the symbol (<E.), whereas slang and furlong are followed by (E.). No explanation of these symbols - or any other for that matter - is given in the preface, but presumably (<E.) means that the words concerned are derived from English whereas (E.) means that they are unadapted loanwords. Under ghries, however, the compilers have been more explicit, [E. grease], which is placed at the end of the definition rather than straight after the lemma as with the above examples. (cf. giek also) Dip, on the other hand, which has not been adapted in any way - but adaption was not necessary either - is accompanied by the abbreviation (<Eng.), as is vlot (= sierwa). Brekfis, whose origin is obvious, is nevertheless explained as a ‘Vervorming van Eng. breakfast’, whereas rofkas, whose English predecessor, (roughcast), is not immediately obvious, is
merely given the symbol (<E.). There are other obvious loanwords such as horssweep, kleim, nonsens/nonsies and platform where the English origin is not acknowledged at all. Similarly there are other words and expressions which, although not as obviously English as those just mentioned, are in my opinion anglicisms although they have been incorporated into HAT without further comment. Presumably in such cases the authors either do not realise these expressions are English in origin or, even if they do, now consider them so ingeburger that a label to that effect would serve no useful purpose, for example: aanstuur (to send on a letter), oplui, spore maak (= to make tracks, be gone), sypaadjie, sy eie beuel blaas and trem.

Some words, such as rof and dans (= dansparty), are followed by the abbreviation (angl.). The implication here seems to be that they are recognised anglicisms, but this is not actually explained at all. In other instances, however, the compilers have gone to considerable lengths to put their view of certain anglicisms, but apparently only where they condemn their use, for example:

‘inhandig’ - Anglisisme vir inlewer, ingee, indien; inluister - 1. Anglisisme vir luister (na die radio); uitvang - Opn. Uitvang in die bet. ‘betrap’ is Anglisisties; 2. vloer Opn. Die gebruik van vloer in die betekenis ‘verdieping’ is ’n Anglisisme; agter - Opn. Agter die kinders kyk moet in goeie Afrikaans wees na die kinders kyk, die kinders versorg, oppas; braaf - Opn. Braaf het nie in Afr. die betekenis van ‘dapper’ nie; raar - Opn. Raar beteken nie ‘seldsaam’ in Afrikaans nie; swang - Opn. Die fabriek is in volle gang - nie swang nie.

Note that in the last four examples English influence is not mentioned by name. In the first four examples it seems that the label Anglisisme is an indication that that particular structure is not considered correct Afrikaans in the eyes of the authors, unlike the label (angl.) mentioned above or even

19 The English origin of rofstoei, which is given the abbreviation (angl.), is not immediately obvious.
20 J.J. le Roux (1926: 355) calls oplui a barbarism.
22 It is interesting to note that HAT spells Anglisisties here with a capital letter, whereas the abbreviation angi. is given a small letter by the compilers, and the word itself does not occur as a lemma in either HAT or AWS.
23 In swang is in fact a German expression which also occurs in Dutch (in zwang) but it is almost homophonous with the English word ‘swing’ and thus, presumably, confusion has arisen here.
the designation (na Eng.) which accompanies afsien or (uit Eng.) which accompanies briek. In the case of handig, the correct alternative is given: ‘handig’ - Opm. Die uitdrukking “dit kom handig in” is ‘n Anglisisme vir “dit kom goed te pas”.’ Groei and afwys, on the other hand, are not accompanied by the warning so frequent in other prescriptive works. The opmerking under drywer is completely non-committal: ‘drywer’ - Opm. Die anglisistiese gebruik van drywer in die bet. masjinis, bestuurder van ‘n lokomotief, kom voor.’ (A busdrywer is just as common these days, however.) It is also interesting to compare the different formulation of the following ‘opmerking’: ‘hierdie’ - Opm. Die selfstandige gebruik van hierdie as onderwerp is meestal onder Engelse invloed’; ‘daardie’ - Opm. Daardie as onderwerp is nie erkende Afr. nie, bv. Daardie is ‘n mooi hoed.’

The fact that the compilers apparently felt compelled to go to such lengths within the enormous constraints of a dictionary to add such comments on certain lemmas is in itself an indication of how common these anglicisms are in Afrikaans; one cannot help feeling that (angl.) or (na Eng.) would have been a more appropriate addition than a comment of condemnation. In my opinion these expressions have all already attained burgerreg as determined by common usage.

Another inconsistency in the way origin is acknowledged in HAT becomes evident when one compares the lemmas tenk and tronk; both are accompanied by the symbol (< Port.), whereas the former, even if it may have been Portuguese originally, has certainly entered Afrikaans via English and its pronunciation in English has been the cause of its current spelling in Afrikaans. Another such example is moestas (< F.) where the actual situation is (< E. < F.), as is done under Sak, Sarel…(< G. - L. < Hebr.)

On occasions I have noticed that some anglicisms are designated (geselst.) without further reference to English, for example: enemmel, vat (in the sense of duur).

There are many common anglicisms which have been omitted from HAT, presumably either because they have been overlooked or because they were considered even less frequent or less acceptable than those which have been incorporated, for example: oplaan diens, diens (as a verb), opmaak (in the sense of versin), uit die bloute as well as iemand se been trek and seker maak which were mentioned on p. 115. On omission Odendal (1978: 69) has the following to say:

‘... net die feit dat bepaalde woorde opgeneem word en ander nie, dat daar reeds bestaan wat Monson (1973: 208) “this silent
Omission can lead to great confusion in the community, particularly on the issue of ‘acceptable’ anglicisms; the editor of Die Huisgenoot (1/11/57) correctly commented:

‘As ’n bepaalde vorm nie in die Woordenboek staan nie weet die gewone man nie of dit misgekyk of doelbewus weggelaat is nie.’

Boshoff (1963: 90) gives particularly appropriate advice in this respect when he maintains that if one is left in doubt by the standard reference works as to the acceptability of a given structure, one must not react as follows:

As ’n woord, ’n uitdrukking of wat ook al nie in ’n Afrikaanse woordenboek of grammatika te vind is nie, dan bestaan dit nie, of as dit tog bestaan, maar nie in Nederlands te vind is nie, dan moet dit as die pes vermy word, want dan is dit gevaarlik.’

It is to be hoped that when WAT is completed, it will not contain the omissions that HAT does. Meanwhile HAT is all we have and such omissions are unfortunately probably to be expected in a handwoordeboek.
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Chapter Four

4.0 Acceptability (*inburgering*) and linguistic change

In order to discuss the acceptability (i.e. *inburgering* or *ingeburgerdheid*) of anglicisms in Afrikaans, one first needs to look more closely at what is understood by standard Afrikaans. If a given linguistic structure is regarded as ‘correct’ Afrikaans, or *erken*, or *toelaatbaar*, or *ingeburger*, what in fact is meant by these vaguely synonymous terms and how does a structure qualify for such a label? Is frequency in the spoken language alone sufficient or must it also be common in the written language too to be regarded as standard Afrikaans? At what point in its assimilation into Afrikaans, with or without displacement (*verdringing*) of an indigenous phenomenon, can an anglicism be regarded as having given rise to linguistic change? These issues are all interconnected and constitute the contents of this chapter.

4.1 What constitutes standard Afrikaans and acceptability?

Most speech communities have a standard language, whether it's called the Queen's English, Schriftsprache or ABN. The speakers of every language feel the need for a term and use it without hesitation, happy in the knowledge that they know what it means and the listener or reader does too. Finding an acceptable definition of what precisely is meant by the standard language, even for languages which have had a recognised standard form for a much longer period than has Afrikaans, is so much more difficult, however, than the frequent use of the term would lead one to believe.

In Holland, both among laymen and linguists, there is far more talk of ABN than one hears of the standard language in South Africa, often with strong sociological connotations being applied to anything that is not considered ABN. This is partially due to the vast regional variation that exists in the Netherlands and the very real existence of the dialect speech.

---

1 De Vries (1980: 103) gives the following explanation of how the term and concept of ABN came into Dutch: language politicians and pedagogues, together with *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, reacted against the formal written style of the nineteenth century. They regarded the natural spoken language as primary and authoritative but ‘bekleedden hun eigen natuurlijk geachte omgangstaal met gezag: ze gaven die omgangstaal een naam, A.B.N., die een eenheid en een algemeenheid suggereerde die niet in ooreenstemming was met de werkelijkheid.’
Particularly, but not exclusively, in Belgium there is a preference for the term *Algemeen Nederlands* (cf. Odendal, 1973: 44), as *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* implies that anything that falls outside it is by definition *onbeschaaft*. As the definitions below will illustrate, Dutch scholars have had great difficulty in finding an adequate definition of what is meant by standard Dutch. Far fewer attempts seem to have been made to define standard Afrikaans and yet, because there is a greater homogeneity in the Afrikaans speech community than is the case in Holland or Belgium, a definition of standard Afrikaans should be easier to formulate, one might reason. It is precisely on the point of anglicisms, and the extent to which many of them are or are not, should or should not be recognised, that a problem arises in formulating an acceptable definition of the concept.

Two definitions from relatively recent Dutch publications will suffice to illustrate how vague the concept of ABN in fact is. Van den Toorn (1977: 64):

> ‘Men kan stellen dat hij ABN spreekt, die de woordenschat van een normaal Nederlands schoolwoordenboek over het algemeen als de zijne herkent en er zich ook actief van bedient.’

Here Van den Toorn falls back, however, on an earlier definition of Kloeke’s (1951). Koelman’s (1979: 36) definition is even vaguer:

> ‘Het ABN wordt misschien ooit een eenheid, maar is dat op het ogenblik bepaald nog niet. Eigenlijk is het een abstractie, wat duidelijk wordt zodra men probeert tot een sluitende definitie te komen.’

The two definitions of standard language by Afrikaans linguists I have chosen to discuss here are those of Odendal (1973: 44-46) and Van Rensburg (1983: 135), both members of the *Taalkommissie*. Odendal deals with the concept of *Algemeen-Beskaaf* in general without actually referring to Afrikaans, whereas Van Rensburg looks specifically at *staandaard* versus *nie-standaard* Afrikaans, although the context in which he discusses the concept has nothing to do with anglicisms. Nevertheless, both definitions can be appropriately applied to this discussion.

Odendal defines *Algemeen-Beskaaf* essentially by describing what it is not:

> ‘Eerstens is die AB nie noodwendig die taal van die meerderheid sprekers nie; dit is eerder die taal van ’n bepaalde groep
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wat om een of ander rede as die toonaangewendes beskou word... Dit is ook nie die taal van 'n individu of enkele individue nie, hoe graag enkelinge dikwels juis hulle taalgebruik as normgewend wil aansien. Dit is ook nie die taal van alle toonaangewendes nie... Dit is ten slotte nie net die taalgebruik van die toonaangewendes nie; niks verhoed die laagste op die sosiale leer om die AB aan te leer nie.'

His reference to certain individuals choosing to regard their language usage as the norm is particularly appropriate to the South African situation when it comes to anglicisms: the literature abounds with people approving or disapproving of anglicisms that they personally feel have the right to exist in Afrikaans, regardless of common practice. It is significant that Odendal, as both chairman of the Taalkommissie and chief editor of HAT, should conclude his discussion of Algemeen-Beskaaf with the following words:

‘Ons moet... in gedagte hou dat alhoewel taalkundiges soms meehelp dat die AB sy oorheersende posisie bereik en handhaaf, dit in eerste instansie die sprekers self is wat dit aan hom toegene het...’

Due to the lack of true dialect variation in South Africa as yet, although some might be inclined to label Coloured and Griqua Afrikaans as such, or even that spoken by Whites in Namaqualand or South West Africa, standard Afrikaans is based on what Odendal calls a ‘groeptaal’, rather than on a given dialect, as is the case in most European countries.

Van Rensburg gives a positive definition of standard Afrikaans and avoids the term Algemeen-Beskaaf. In my opinion it has too strong a Dutch flavour to it, and, as there is even criticism in the Low Countries of the connotation of beskaaf, the term is better not transposed to the South African situation. The term substandard, nowadays not uncommonly heard in Holland, is better also avoided because it too implies a value judgement. Van Rensburg favours the neutral term nie-standaard. His definition of standard Afrikaans is as follows:

‘Die standaardvorm van Afrikaans is 'n idealisering van hoe Afrikaans deur sy toonaangewende sprekers gepraat behoort

---

2 On the supposed lack of dialects in Afrikaans, see Pienaar (1931: 155).
3 On the difference between Afrikaans and other languages in this respect, De Klerk (1968: 219) comments: ‘Die onderskeid tussen AB (Algemeen-Beskaaf) en dialek veronderstel 'n sekere tradisie, en Afrikaans het geen lang tradisie as kultuurtaal nie, gevolglik is die identifisering van dialekte in Afrikaans nie 'n saak van min of meer algemene aanvaarding soos in baie ander lande nie.’
Before continuing with the discussion of Van Rensburg's definition, it is appropriate at this point to add the following comment by De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot, 2/12/49):

‘Ek moes waarskup dat daar net een standaardtaal is, ’n standaardtaal wat geen awykings of wisselvorme ken nie.’

The emphasis Van Rensburg puts on behoort is a reflection of the fact that this is often not the case, particularly with regard to the use of anglicisms. With this definition, however, the question arises as to who determines what behoort (gepraat/gehoor/geskryf te word). That question is perhaps answered in a roundabout fashion by Odendal's definition of the standard language. (cf. p. 121) (See also Steyn's comments on another connotation of behoort te wees, p. 78) The delineation of standard Afrikaans, as opposed to that of the standard languages of Western Europe, is much more concerned with social factors and far less with dialectal considerations. Integral to this, although it does not seem to have been foremost in the minds of the two scholars quoted, is the degree to which English influence is tolerated in the language. Integral to this in turn is whether the speaker, whether a toonaangewende or not, is even aware of many of the anglicisms he uses. As De Bruto (1970: 36) remarked:

‘Watter bousel is in Afrikaans ’n Anglisisme?, vir wie? (vir watter spreker, hoorder, taalgebruiker, taalbeskouer?).’

Both Odendal and Van Rensburg use the term toonaangewendes, whereas Le Roux (1968: 165, but written in 1947) refers to beskaafde en ontwikkelde Afrikaners and Rousseau (1937: 72) to opgevoede Afrikaners, for
example. Presumably all authors are referring to the same concept, the more modern 
toonaangewendynow being a more acceptable term than what the older scholars 
apparently considered appropriate when their works were published.

Le Roux (1952: 9-10) posed the question *Wat is suier Afrikaans?* and offered the 
following answer:

‘As u daaraan twyfel of ’n bepaalde uitdrukking suier Afrikaans is, 
vergelyk dit dan met Hollands, sal party sê. Maar ons het dan Afrikaans 
aanvaar as skryf- en kultuurtaal, en dit beteken tog in wese dat Afrikaans 
tot sy eie norm gemaak is. Buitendien het die intieme kennis van 
Nederlands sedertdien so agteruitgegaan dat dit ’n onbillike eis sou wees 
on aan die algemene publiek te stel. Gaan na die platteland, sal ’n ander 
sê, daar sal u die suierste Afrikaans hoor [maar] Engelse vakterm skiet 
nêrens so maklik wortel as by die boerebevolking nie. Nee, die norm vir 
goeie taal moet in Suid-Afrika, net soos in alle ander lande, aangegee 
word deur die mees beskaafde en ontwikkelde sprekers en skrywers.’

De Bruto (1970: 37) questions whether authors should be included on the grounds 
that their language is usually not representative of a given speech community. 
Coetzee (1948: 2) is more cautious in what he says than Le Roux and emphasises 
the intangibility of the factors concerned:

‘Jy moet jou proheer rekenskap gee van die begrip "algemeen beskaafde 
omgangstaal", van die wedersydse verhouding van die gesproke en die 
geskrewe vorm daarvan, van hoe dit ontstaan en bestaan, wie dit praat, 
die woordeskat en sinsbou en die uitspraak daarvan. En boweal moet 
mens jou afvra waar die algemeen beskaafde omgangstaal sy gesag van 
gemeenheid en van beskaafdheid vandaan haal.’

Such cautiousness is criticised by De Villiers (1977: 3):

‘Maar die gevaar dreig wel van die kant van die taalkundige dat hy geen 
standpunt wil stel nie, bloot waarnemer wil wees.’

He takes Steyn (1976) to task, for example, for regarding all his material as variante, 
without distinguishing between norme and afwykings.

If the standard language is an abstract concept, as Koelmans suggests it is in Dutch 
and as the repeated use of behoort by Van Rensburg implies it is in Afrikaans too, 
clearly ‘opinions will differ greatly as to what might or
might not be an anglicism in each specific case, firstly, because of disagreement about the concept “Afrikaans” and secondly, because of different subjective motives... Sekere Anglisismes [sal] deur ’n groter groep sprekers as sodanig erken en herken word en sommige Anglisismes [sal] soms weer deur ’n kleiner groep as sodanig aangevoel word.’ (De Bruto 1970: 36 & 38)

Exclusive thus to Afrikaans is the close correlation between determining on the one hand what constitutes the standard language, and on the other hand firstly, what is or is not an anglicism and secondly, whether a given anglicism is ‘permissible.’ If I were to limit my corpus exclusively to what some people regard as the standard language, for example textbook and dictionary compilers, there would be far fewer examples. But as Combrink (1968: 8) defines Afrikaans in general, that is the object of investigation here:

‘Afrikaans is die taal soos hy daaglik gebrui word deur ál die mense wat “Afrikaans” praat. Soos die mense praat, so is Afrikaans.’

That Afrikaans is riddled with anglicisms, many of which either are already, or undoubtedly will be, regarded by many native-speakers as belonging to standard Afrikaans, assuming that they are even recognised by such people as anglicisms to begin with, which is often not the case. (Of course the reverse, hypercorrection, is also not uncommon in South Africa, cf. 5.3)

Kloeke (1951: 3) points out one practical difficulty of confining one's investigations to that one limited circle of so-called educated or cultured speakers:

‘Beperkt men zich bij de beschrijving uitsluitend tot de taal der volopbeschaafden, dan nóg dient rekening te worden gehouden met het feit, dat bij de levende taal van het ogenblik op zijn minst drie generaties tegelijkertijd actief betrokken zijn.’

This comment is particularly appropriate in the case of anglicisms in Afrikaans, especially with regard to their acceptability. It would seem to be unavoidable that up and coming generations, so more perfectly bilingual than previous generations and reared in an age of television and home videos, will be more tolerant of anglicisms in their Afrikaans if for no other reason than that they are even less aware of, or concerned about, what constitutes an anglicism. Kloeke goes on to describe the limitations of

Bruce Donaldson, The Influence of English on Afrikaans
modern prescriptive grammars in a way that is of even more general application to Afrikaans than it is to Dutch, the object of his interest:

‘Het gesloten systeem van de “moderne” grammatica is dunkt me een fictie en wie het toch als realiteit wil handhaven, loopt gevaar een Prinzipienreiter te worden. Ik ben trouwens van mening, dat een werkelijk bevredigende beschrijving van de taal der beschafden alleen mogelijk is, wanneer men haar voortdurend beschouwt tegen de achtergrond van de taal der niet-beschafden (met al hun oude en nieuwe spreekmodes).’

His warning against regarding AB as an unassailable holy cow should also be taken all the more to heart in South Africa:

‘Die tijd ligt niet zo heel ver achter ons, dat men “algemeen” geneigd was, zich te richten naar een andere “norm”, die van de geschreven taal. Niemand zal die dogmatere tijd terug begeren, maar zou het ook kunnen zijn, dat het dogma van het primaat van de schrijftaal ongemerkt door een ander dogma is vervangen: dat van de absolute autonomie van het “Algemeen Beschaafl”?’ (p. 13)

In making these comments, Kloekie is leading up to the importance he places on the attitude of the spraakmakende gemeente, a term which occurs quite frequently in Afrikaans writing too. Even Smith (1962: 62), who is quite strongly prescriptive in what he writes, concedes:

‘As ons nou met redelike sekerheid vasgestel het dat ’n uitdrukking ’n anglicisme is, dan kom ons verder voor die gewigte vraag te staan of ons dit moet aaneem of moet verwerp. Dit is natuurlik ’n onloënbare feit dat die eindbeslissing nie by die individu nie, maar wel by die spraakmakende gemeente berus…’

He puts up an argument for the use of tentoonstelling instead of skou, for example, but concludes:

‘Natuurlik kan die spraakmakende gemeente teen my sienswyse besluit en tog die nuwe “skou” in sy woordeskat opneem. Maar die sal desnietemin strydig wees teen die Nederlands-Afrikaanse taalges…’ (p. 17)

And indeed that is what the speech community has since done in this case, vague ideals such as the Nederlands-Afrikaanse taalges having very little meaning for the common man. The spraakmakende gemeente in the case
of Afrikaans is that group which exists between the two extremes mentioned by Le Roux (1926: 362):

‘Tussen die taal van die puristiese professor en die stedeling wat ‘n Afrikaans-Engelse mengtaal praat, is die grade van verengelste Afrikaans by individuele sprekers oneindig veel.’

Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968: 106), paraphrasing the Junggrammatiker Hermann Paul, see the matter in the following terms:

‘A comparison of individual languages (which we may, at the risk of terminological anachronism but with little fear of distortion, relabel “idiolects”) yields a certain “average”, which determines what is actually normal in the language - the Language Custom.’

Although the emphasis must be put on the practices and perceptions of the speech community, this is not to say that the written language has no influence at all on the formation of the standard language:

‘Formele standaardisasie geld vir vorme wat vir die taal voorgeskryf word deur die grammatikaboekte, woordeboekte en taalakademies. Die belangrike rol wat die skryftaal by standaardisasie speel, kan ook nie onderskat word nie.’ (Coetzee 1982: 276)

As numerous examples in both Dutch and Afrikaans indicate, ‘De geschiedenis leert dat purismen, door toongevende geleerden of dichters ingevoerd, tot op onze tijd in gebruik bleven.’ (De Voos 1925: 27)

Cluver (1982: 79), although looking at the issue from the point of view of a terminologist, makes a point which is of general validity to the fixing of norms from above in Afrikaans:

‘Termnormering vind plaas binne die parameters van die grammatika van ‘n taal maar ook binne sekere sosiale parameters van die betrokke samelewing [thus English loanwords are avoided in Afrikaans]... ’n ...implikasie van hierdie aanname is dat die terminoloog oor sekere sosiologiese insigte sal beskik. In Engeland kan ‘n terminologiewese nie baie ver vorder nie, want taaldekrete (of taalnorme) sal baie moeilik deur die Britte aanvaar word. Termnormering sal deur ‘n spontane proses van konsensus moet geskied eerder as deur termvoorstrikte. Hierteenoor sal termnormering juis
maklik plaasvind in die meer gereglementeerde samelewings van die
Duitssprekende lande. Die terminoloog moet onthou dat Suid-Afrika uit
verskillende kultuurgroepes bestaan wat elk op sy manier op taalnorme
reageer.’

In his willingness to accept authority and not to question directives from above in
general, the Afrikaner differs little from the German example Cluver quotes. Perhaps
this is the reason that puristic trends in Afrikaans have had the success they have
so far.

The literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans abounds with judgements as to whether
certain structures are or should be regarded as *goeie Afrikaans, korrek, toelaatbaar,
erken, ingeburgerd* or whether they have obtained or should obtain *burgerreg.*
Presumably these terms are all more or less synonymous. The subjective attitudes
influencing the individual writers’ decisions to award linguistic phenomena such a
label or not were discussed under 2.3. The literature proves that what in many
instances was formerly considered *ingeburger* has since disappeared from the
language. One man’s (e.g. Terblanche 1972) or one generation's idea of *regte
Afrikaans* is not necessarily another's:

‘Die Ingeburgerdheid van die eenheid is moeilik vas te stel, alleen in
uitsondelike gevalle kan die toekoms voorspel word. Wat by die een
geslag ingeburgerd is, verdwyn in die volgende tydperk.’ (Rousseau 1937:
206)

Combrink (1984: 101) apparently considers the label *erken* is warranted if it is
recognised by the *Akademie,* presumably by its inclusion in the *AWS.* For purposes
of this work, however, and for practical purposes, I will often regard the presence
or absence of phenomena in *HAT* as evidence of official recognition, while keeping
in mind that decisions made by the speech community today will not be in *HAT* till
tomorrow and thus there will often be a (large) discrepancy between what one hears,
or even reads, and what *HAT* is prepared at this stage to give sanction to. (cf. 3.4.2
for a treatment of *HAT’s* attitude to anglicisms.) For such is undoubtedly the nature
of this form of linguistic change in Afrikaans: a structure must first enter the language,
usually at the spoken level, and after a prolonged period of residence, during which
time it becomes so frequent as to be ultimately considered so indispensable that
prescriptive and normalising bodies are forced by common usage to recognise it
and even finally advocate its use. This qualifying period does nevertheless often
seem to be excessively long in the case of many anglicisms found in Afrikaans.
4.2 Anglicisms as complementary and competitive structures

Weinreich, in a paper written together with Labov and Herzog (1968: 100), maintains that 'the key to a rational conception of language change - indeed of language itself - is the possibility of describing orderly differentiation in a language serving a community.' This statement can be particularly aptly applied to the observation of complementary and competitive structures occurring in Afrikaans due to the contact with English. Many structures which presumably start as interference phenomena, begin in the course of time to compete with those indigenous structures, at which stage we can find many examples in Afrikaans. After an even longer period - it is impossible to determine how long these time spans are - the indigenous phenomena may be displaced (verdring) altogether, or the new English inspired construction may continue to coexist and begin to play a complementary role, adding an additional dimension to the language.

Bloomfield (1933: 326), although not referring to bilingualism in particular, describes the variation in the speech of individuals, which can ultimately lead to language change, as follows:

‘Every speaker is constantly adapting his speech habits to those of his interlocutors; he gives up forms he has been using, adopts new ones, and perhaps oftenest of all, changes the frequency of speech forms without entirely abandoning old ones or accepting any that are really new to him.’

In other words, in the case of the Afrikaner, his bilingualism and that of his interlocutors introduce new forms (anglicisms) which can gain in frequency over old forms (indigenous structures) and even lead to displacement of the latter by the former; alternatively the two can coexist, with or without a differentiation of meaning or function (e.g. as sulks/as sodanig). Ostyn (1972: 237) describes the process in the following way:

‘Since variation in usage is an inherent feature of bilingual speech, the transferred use as well as the correct one may be found side by side.’

He is able to use the term 'correct' without further elaboration because in the situation he is describing, all the phenomena under discussion are interference phenomena. This is no longer the case with many instances of English influence in Afrikaans. Ostyn's remarks are only applicable to the South African situation in the initial stages of English influence on a given
structure; in the course of time they progress beyond this in Afrikaans because of the lack of an independent, non-English influenced norm to refer to, whereas his immigrant group is able to look back to the uncontaminated idiom of the motherland.

Ponelis (1979: 585) describes the competitive stage as part of the process of displacement:

‘Een vorm word nie oornag geheel en al deur ’n ander verdring nie; inteendeel, hulle wissel mekaar oor ’n lang tydperk af... Langsamerhand verdring die een vorm die ander dan, eers in die omgangstaal (waar die wisseling op tou gesit is) en veel later eers in die meer formele stylvlakke, soos die skryftaal.’

The literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans abounds with attitudes such as the following with regard to such competitive factors:

‘So ’n “onsuiwerheid” is net toelaatbaar indien dit ’n leemte vul in die Afrikaanse taal, m.a.w. indien dit ’n plek vul wat Afrikaans nie reeds vul of kan vul nie.’ (De Bruto 1970: 40-41, where he paraphrases Combrink 1968: 31)

The many anglicisms in Afrikaans which have either already supplanted indigenous constructions or are competing with them for a place in standard Afrikaans, are evidence that the speech community often has no regard for the sentiments expressed by Combrink:


Steyn (1976: 26) supports the premise that when variants compete with one another, the result may well be displacement of one of them; he then adds ‘Hierdie variante kan egter natuurlik ook lank naas mekaar bly bestaan’, as many of his examples illustrate. Steyn sometimes implies that the variants he discusses are English inspired, but on other occasions he makes no attempt to determine the origin, although English is the most likely source of several of his examples.

Vogt (1954: 367) sees the phenomenon of coexisting varants in the following terms:
‘At any moment, between the initiation and the conclusion of these changes, we have a state characterized by the presence of more or less free variants, so that the speakers have the choice between alternative expressions... What therefore in the history of a linguistic system appears as a change will in a synchronic description appear as a more or less free variation between different forms of expression, equally admissible within the system.’

Where anglicisms in Afrikaans are still at the stage of ‘free variation’, alternating with greater or lesser frequency with indigenous constructions, the education system may still have some success, as it seems to have had in the past, in eradicate them. Because of the conservatism of current prescriptive works, it can sometimes be difficult to ascertain when an indigenous structure has lost the race and has had to cede to the newcomer - there is often a discrepancy between what one says and hears and what one reads that one is supposed to use. Compilers of prescriptive works are usually aware of the diachronic situation and hanker after a bygone, more puristic stage of the language, whereas the speech community is only aware of the synchronic situation. Later in the same article Vogt states:

‘When it is maintained that since a language is an integrated system, any addition to it whatsoever must result in the rearrangement of previously existing patterns, this cannot be meant to be rigorously true for the vocabulary as a whole.’ (p. 369)

Applying this to the influence of English on Afrikaans, one can say with certainty that the rearrangement of previous patterns (displacement?) is not an immediate consequence of additions to the language from English because of the possible extended periods of coexistence mentioned by Steyn and that this definitely applies not only to vocabulary, but also other aspects of the language. The rearrangement of previous patterns can possibly also apply to consequences other than displacement, for example semantic shift or restriction of a structure to a particular register. In such cases constructions can be said to literally complement each other in that each new structure contributes something additional to the language, rather than them simply complementing each other in the sense of coexisting in free variation, which can always ultimately lead to displacement.

The term ‘complementary’ could also be applied to those indigenous structures in Afrikaans which resemble English structures and whose frequency in Afrikaans is thus all the more common than in Dutch, for example, because of this overlapping of English and Afrikaans idiom. In this book, however, the word ‘complementary’ is reserved for the phen-
omena discussed here under 4.2; the others are termed ‘contributing factors’ (cf. 6.3), which is in line with common practice in the literature on the matter. Nevertheless, discussion of complementary and competitive factors can overlap on occasions with that of contributing factors. An example of this is the old bone of contention braaf where most scholars feel that the meaning ‘brave’ is foreign (i.e. competes with the original meaning ‘well-behaved’), whereas others (e.g. Le Roux 1952: 35; Terblanche, Die Brandwag 25/10/46) maintain that the word meant ‘brave’ in seventeenth century Dutch and thus in Le Roux’s words ‘Engels kan hoogstens ’n behoudende invloed gehad het.’ It is interesting to note here that Le Roux, writing in 1945, considers ‘brave’ to be the normal meaning of braaf whereas HAT still disapproves of it.

4.3 Displacement (verdringing) of indigenous structures

There is constant reference in the literature about English influence on Afrikaans to the fact that the contact between the two languages is leading to displacement of indigenous structures; the reaction is always inevitably one of concern accompanied by suggestions to stem the tide. Many scholars regard anglicisms that bots (clash) or are in stryd met die taaleie (at odds with the system) as having a negative influence on the language and what constitutes botsing or this stryd met die taaleie in the majority of cases seems to be synonymous with verdringing (displacement). There is thus a multiplicity of terms, all laden with negative connotations, for what is an inevitable repercussion of the Afrikaner's bilingualism. Even De Vooys (1925: 6), writing from the relatively secure position of a Dutchman on the influence of neighbouring languages on his native idiom, comments that a certain emotional reaction to such developments is understandable:

‘Zodra het on-eigene het eigene tracht te verdringen, voelen we dat als een aanranding, en ontwaakt een instinktief verzet, dat voor geen verstandelijke redenering wijkt.’

The fact that some scholars have a different interpretation of botsing was mentioned under 2.2.2 but deserves repetition here to distinguish botsing from verdringing, a distinction which is not made by most and not made by anyone at all in these terms. Both Afrikaans and Dutch dictionary definitions (cf. 2.2.1) of an anglicism include the phrase in stryd met without additional elaboration. On further reflection, however, one wonders if the compilers of those definitions in each case had the same concept in mind. I have formed the impression that what the Dutch mean by the phrase is not what most Afrikaners mean. Van den Toorn’s interpretation (quoted on p. 62-3), although he admits it is vague, is most
probably representative of what is usually meant by in stryd met het taaleigen in Holland. In this work I intend to identify with his attitude that an anglicism can be said to clash (bots) in Afrikaans when it contains something - be it a phonological, morphological or syntactical characteristic - which is at odds with (in stryd met) the system of Afrikaans. This interpretation of the concepts of botsing and in stryd met die taaleie is totally separate from that of verdringing. I see the following as examples of clashing in this sense of the term: the presence of phonemes in loanwords that do not otherwise occur in that position in the language or in the language at all (e.g. wattelboompie, garage); the syntax of the phrases die Umgeni Waterraad (without -se or se) and busse alleenlik. Objection to clashing of this nature is more justified in my opinion than to phenomena which are apparently considered undesirable purely and simply because they displace older (Dutch?) structures but are not otherwise at odds with any aspect of the system of the language. Both can be seen as forms of linguistic change as a result of language contact, but they are essentially different in nature and frequency. The latter, new structures that are displacing older ones, are much more common than the former, those that contain features foreign to Afrikaans. The fact that the 'Dutch' constructions are gradually ceding to English inspired ones is evidence of that old adage of Langenhoven's coming true that an anglicism is often a better afrikaansism than many a hollandism. (cf. p. 77)

Boshoff (cf. p. 69), although he agrees with the traditional South African interpretation of botsing, is realistic enough to advocate not trying to oppose anglicisms which, although they may be displacing indigenous constructions, are not at odds with one's taalgevoel, i.e. resignation to a degree to displacement being inevitable. T.H. le Roux (cf. p. 58-59) is particularly opposed to any acceptance of displacement. J. Combrink (cf. p. 61) takes up a position somewhere between Boshoff and Le Roux when

5 Bassoni.a. (1972: 41) gives three conditions which an anglicism must satisfy:
   i) Dit moet na Engelse model gevorm wees;
   ii) dit moet met die Afrikaanse taaleie bots; en
   iii) dit moet bestaande Afrikaanse taalmateriaal verdring.’
   Although the authors give no further information on what they consider constitutes botsing, they apparently see it as separate from verdringing.

6 Le Roux (1968: 162-3) contradicts himself somewhat in that in his discussion of the
   Lehnübertragung sypaadjie, he maintains that in its formation it contains nothing which bots
   (in agreement with my interpretation of the term) and thus it is acceptable but that lighuis does
   bots and is therefore unacceptable. In its formation, however, lighuis is no different from
   vuurtoring and sypaadjie - his objection to it in this instance is purely on grounds of it displacing
   the Dutch vuurtoring, whereas sypaadjie fills a gap which is filled by a loanword from French
   in Dutch (trottoir). He is thus inconsistent in his understanding of botsing and in his acceptance
   or rejection of it.
he advocates the use of the term anglicism in future specifically for those phenomena which threaten to displace but have not yet completely succeeded, i.e. where the original structure is still competing for a permanent place in the idiom of the language. The attitudes to anglicisms discussed in chapter two are thus to a great extent attitudes to the concept of displacement.

Objection to *verdringing* is motivated by puristic sentiments, and purism (cf. 5.00) is essentially a subjective, sociological phenomenon that has ramifications for the language; *botsing* in my understanding of the term on the other hand, is entirely an objective, linguistic phenomenon.

**4.4 Linguistic interference and language change**

When ascertaining what constitutes linguistic change in a bilingual environment, one must attempt to distinguish between interference (*taalversteuring*) and change (*taalverandering*). Because of the gradual processes usually in force, this is not always easy to do. A bilingual society without the artificial constraints of conservative, normalising institutions such as education, academics, prescriptive works etc. will presumably experience interference phenomena more quickly entering the realm of linguistic change than is the case in all bilingual situations where European languages are involved: the third world could well have as yet undiscovered or little known examples of such a situation.

Weinreich (1964: 1), in his monumental work on languages in contact, defines interference as follows:

> ‘Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as interference phenomena.’

Van Wyk (1976: 142) objects that Weinreich does not distinguish clearly enough between what he calls *versteuring* (interference) and *beïnvloeding* (influence). Van Wyk defines the latter as ‘die oorname in moedertaalgebruik van aspekte van die grammatika van ’n ander taal.’ He uses

---

7 ‘Conservative’ is a particularly apt word here because of the connotation of conservation, i.e. of a former (often more Dutch) stage of the language.

8 Aitchison (1981: 139): ‘Although slowing down or reversals of changes are possible, ...change usually creeps in inexorably, hindered to some extent by literacy and other social factors, but not for long... it creeps in unnoticed for the most part and enmeshes the language firmly before people are aware of it.’

---

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
beïnvloeding as an all encompassing term to cover what I have previously referred to as complementary and competitive phenomena (cf. 4.2); Ponelis (1979) habitually refers to Engelse inwerking which is presumably synonymous with beïnvloeding. Van Wyk then goes on to make the connection between influence and language change:

‘In die geval van beïnvloeding is aspekte van die grammatika van een taal (bv. Engels) in plaas van en naas eiegoed [my italics, BCD] oorgeneem in die grammatikas van sprekers van ’n ander taal (bv. Afrikaans). Dit geld gevolglik vir ’n hele taalgemeenekaap of vir definieerbare onderdele daarvan. Dit is stabiele aspekte wat as deel van die moedertaal se grammatika en leksikon verwerp word voordat, en dikwels ook sonder dat, ’n ander taal aangeleer word. Beïnvloeding is m.a.w. ’n grammatiese verskynsel en gee soos klinkverandering, analogie, ens. tot “taalverandering” aanleiding.’

Up to this point Van Wyk’s opinions coincide with mine. On what constitutes interference, however, we differ markedly:

‘Daarteenoor is versteuring ’n taalgebruiksverskynsel wat eers voorkom wanneer ’n tweede taal (bv. Afrikaans) na die moedertaal (bv. Engels) aangeleer word en die direkte gevolg is van tweedetaalverwerwing. Versteuringsverskynsels is onstabil en persoonal omdat dit van persoon tot persoon en van geleentheid tot geleentheid by dieselfde persoon wissel. Egte versteuring kom juist nie in die moedertaal voor nie.’

It is curious that Van Wyk seeks to limit the use of the term interference to phenomena that occur in a second language when it is added to the repertoire of a speaker at a later stage in life; he does not apparently see, as I do, that the influence of that second language on the mother tongue - which he does acknowledge occurs - must begin as interference; the stability of influence phenomena he refers to is not present from the beginning. This is borne out by the fact that many English constructions that are now common in Afrikaans (and thus constitute beïnvloeding) are still not recognised by HAT, to name but one example, which presumably still regards them as more interference phenomena or is at least waiting for them to be so commonplace as to be worthy of the label ingeburger, i.e. as having made the transition from versteuring through beïnvoeding to taalverandering. Vogt (1954: 369) comments:

‘The majority of... interference phenomena are ephemeral and individual, others show greater regularities, being repeat-
ed over and over again by many speakers. The mechanisms of the interference appear to be the same in both cases, but the linguist is of course mainly interested in those which are not entirely sporadic and individually conditioned, but which exhibit some systematic regularities. Such interference phenomena, spreading from the speech of bilinguals to the speech of monolinguals, can be expected to tell us something about the linguistic conditions of the interference phenomena, and also about the linguistic systems in contact, their similarities and congruences, and their differences.

Vogt's remarks about the type of interference shedding light on the similarities and congruences of the two languages in contact is particularly apt in the case study under discussion here. (cf. 2.1.4)

Mackey (1972: 569) sees the distinction between interference and language change in the following terms:

‘Interference is the use of features belonging to one language while speaking or writing another. The description of interference must be distinguished from the analysis of language borrowing. The former is a feature of “parole”; the latter of “langue”. The one is individual and contingent; the other is collective and systematic. In language borrowing we have to do with integration, features of one language are used as if they were part of the other. The foreign features are used by monolingual speakers who may know nothing of the language from which such features originated.’

Nowadays no Afrikaner remains monolingual of course, but Mackey's reference to monolingual speakers ultimately using foreign structures would apply to the situation that many pre-school Afrikaans children find themselves in, although these days they too can have often achieved a considerable degree of bilingualism even before receiving formal instruction in English at school.

Linguistic change will be first attested in the spoken language and although the norm of the written language may be applied for a time to counteract it, in many instances this will fail, a fact which usage will make abundantly evident in the course of time, and then it's up to the written language to conform to the spoken language:

9 Mackey identifies the following forms of interference: cultural, grammatical, graphic, lexical and semantic as well as interference in articulation and intonation. (p. 575-6)
Language change can then be seen to definitely and undeniably have taken place but the seal of approval of the written language is not essential for one to postulate that a particular change has occurred or is occurring.

Aitchison (1981: 18) maintains that labels such as good and bad have no validity when discussing linguistic change, something Afrikaans writers on the topic have not heeded in the past. She quotes Bloomfield (1933) on the topic of linguistic change:

‘... the process of linguistic change has never been directly observed - we shall see that such observation, with our present facilities, is inconceivable.’ (p. 47)

Bloomfield is not by any means the only one to have made such a claim (e.g. Odendal 1973: 28). Aitchison takes on this challenge and goes in search of guidelines to explain language change, warning that ‘above all, anyone who attempts to study the causes of language change must be aware of the multiplicity of factors involved. It is essential to realise that language is both a social and a mental phenomenon in which sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors are likely to be inextricably entwined.’ (p. 169) Rousseau (1937) paid particular attention to these factors when he conducted his detailed study of the influence of English on Afrikaans although he did not see the influence English was having in terms of language change at the time. That this was definitely the case is quite evident now, fifty years later. Obviously it is usually difficult to observe language change because of it being a gradual process - what one generation sees as interference and thus wrong, the next sees as normal and correct, even to the point of the original structure sounding wrong or at least uncommon (i.e. displacement); or the two continue to coexist for a time (i.e. competitive factors). Kempen (1946: 207) sees this sort of development in the following terms:

‘Sodra immers blyk dat wat as individuele taalgebruik aangesien is by die meeste skrywers voorkom, verval natuurlik die beskouing daarvan as “individueel”. Verskil dit dan nog van wat in ons grammatikas staan, is dit eweneens duidelik dat ons ons opvattinge in hersiening sal moet neem.’
The common claim that linguistic change is so gradual as to be unobservable refers essentially to internal change in a language. Change resulting from languages in contact, particularly in a situation such as in South Africa with its high degree of bilingualism, is, I would postulate, more easily observed, all the more so now that a knowledge of Dutch as a corrective norm has died out. There are those who would claim that the only sort of linguistic change is that arising out of languages in contact. Vogt (1954: 368) maintained:

‘Bilingualism is a universal phenomenon, since no languages we know have been spoken over long periods of time in complete isolation. It is even possible that bilingualism is one of the major factors in linguistic changes.’

Mackey (1972: 554) takes up the same point putting it in terms with which I can completely identify:

‘It (bilingualism) does not belong to the domain of “langue” but of “parole”... It is important not to confuse bilingualism - the use of two or more languages by the individual - with the more general concept of language contact, which deals with the direct and indirect influence of one language on another resulting in changes in “langue” which become the permanent property of monolinguals and enter into the historical development of the language.’

Aitchison (1981: 136) claims that some linguistic changes can be caused by language simply being efficient. When bilingual speakers reduce the differences that exist between the two languages - what they see as pointless variety - this could well be termed efficiency; Afrikaans scholars of the past have chosen to call it slordigheid or onagsaamheid. In effect this is simply the well-known ease theory (Jespersen 1922) of linguistic change being applied and such emotional terms are examples of contemporary reactions to this historical process taking its natural course. Aitchison (1981: 155) maintains that there can be a tendency to minimise opacity and maximise transparency, i.e. to prefer constructions which are clear and straightforward, free of anaphores, for example: ek is (daarvan) oortuig dat, and omission of the reflexive pronoun from Afrikaans where English does not require one.

Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968: 107) offer an update of Paul's (1880) theories of linguistic change. His interest was directed predominantly at changes in idiolect which to him was the only object that could be studied empirically. His theory is quoted as follows by Weinreich and company:
‘Changes in language can be understood in two senses: (1) as changes in an idiolect, and (2) as changes in Language Custom. Changes in Language Custom, in turn, can arise in two ways: (1) through changes within the idiolects over which a given Language Custom is defined; (2) through additions or subtractions of idiolects from the set of idiolects over which a Language Custom is defined.’

Although neither these three authors nor I can agree with Paul in toto, his reference to the addition and subtraction of idiolects could be aptly applied to two specific developments in the Afrikaans speech community since the official recognition of the language that have given further impetus to the influence of English on the ‘Language Custom’: the gain is the knowledge of English that all Afrikaners now have, whereas the loss is the disappearance of even a passive knowledge of Dutch.

The English/Afrikaans contact situation is, in my opinion, one which linguists in general could learn a lot from. Because Afrikaans is in the process of setting its own norms, and those norms are unconsciously and even involuntarily becoming more English by the day, one has an opportunity here to observe a process of linguistic change resulting from a contact situation which is without parallel among the languages of Europe.\(^{10}\)

### 4.5 English influence and linguistic change in Afrikaans

Afrikaans has been subjected to influence from English over such a prolonged period of time, and the contact has been so intense and of such an intimate nature, that it has given rise to language change in many instances. Because of the diglossia situation with regard to English that existed in the nineteenth century, English can be said to have functioned as a superstratum for Afrikaans at that time, as did Dutch; nowadays English still plays an important, although different role - now it can be better termed an adstratum. I think it is appropriate to regard English as an adstratum in this context because of the symbiosis that exists between the two languages and the fact that ‘Engels die Afrikaanssprekendes se kontaktaal met die buitewêreld is. Dit is meesal deur Engels dat nuwe kennis, nuwe prosesse, nuwe artikels, nuwe dienste en nuwe uitvindsels na die Afrikaanssprekendes toe kom.’ (Combrink 1984: 100) What C.B. van Haeringen said of so-called *Algemeen Beschaafd Zuidnederlands*, i.e. that it ‘kennelijk uit een andere bron wordt gevoed’ than the standard language of the north

\(^{10}\) Quite possibly the uniqueness of this process extends far beyond European languages but I am not qualified to generalise beyond the confines of European languages.
(Suffeleers, 1979: 192), can be applied with equal validity to Afrikaans where that source is English instead of French.

It is traditional in many circles in South Africa to talk of the *ontstaan* of Afrikaans, but I prefer the word *ontwikkeling*. The former suggests it was born, by circa 1750 according to one school of thought, and was then passed down by word of mouth until the latter half of the nineteenth century when it began to be committed to paper. *Ontwikkeling* suggests a gradual development from 1652, but above all an ongoing process which, as with all languages, has not and will not stop. If one adopts this view of the origin of Afrikaans, English can be regarded as yet another foreign influence on the language, arriving relatively late on the scene, but one whose role in the development of Afrikaans has been considerable and is likely to increase in future.

The so-called *ontstaan* of Afrikaans, from here on referred to as its development, has been a continuum since 1652; to emphasise the development as a continuum also better accommodates those who see Afrikaans as a continuance of the earlier substandard vernacular of the Dutch settlers. (Van Rensburg 1982: 253-267) To date not enough attention has been paid to the role English has played, and is playing, in the development of the language; most studies have not looked beyond loanwords and ‘correcting’ English influence on other aspects of the language. No-one has attempted to identify what has irrevocably changed in Afrikaans as a result of the contact with English or what, on the basis of the current spoken language, seems likely to change in future.

All the languages of the world are in a continual state of change - language does not stand still (cf. p. 13) (unless completely isolated, or even then?) - and particularly these days with technological advances and the increased mobility of people in an ever shrinking world, few people live in complete isolation. With the confrontation of cultures comes a linguistic confrontation which must give rise to a certain amount of borrowing and/or interference. On the other hand, with the possible exception of the lexis of the language, language change in the languages of the industrialised world, with its mass media and educational programmes, is probably occurring at a slower rate than in the past in the period prior to standardisation. Afrikaans may well be an exception in this regard because of its unique relationship with English (cf. 2.1 - 2.1.4) and because the concept of standard Afrikaans is somewhat vaguer than is the case with other European languages. (cf. 4.1) Boshoff and Nienaber (1967: 18) talk of ‘AB in wording’ in seventeenth century Holland; can we not talk of ‘AB in wording’ in twentieth century South Africa? (cf. the many *wisselvorme* in the AWS)
Raidt (1975: 52) maintains ‘Die invloed van Engels wat eers van die negentiende eeu ’n rol speel, dus nadat die Afrikaanse taalstruktuur alreeds ontwikkel het, het nog die morfologiese nog die sintaktiese struktuur van Afrikaans aangetas.’ I would question this statement as it stands. English does seem to have had very little influence on the phonological structure of Afrikaans (cf. 7.18) - not mentioned by Raidt - but the effect it is having on the syntactical structure and to a much lesser extent on the morphological structure is undeniable.\footnote{If Raidt uses ‘syntactical’ here in the narrower sense of word order, her statement holds more water than if she uses it as a synonym for ‘grammatical’, as I think she does. Cf. Ponelis (1985: 122) for the opposite opinion.}

I feel Raidt's statement has only a limited validity, i.e. in as far as it can be applied to Afrikaans soos dit behoort te wees. (cf. Steyn, p. 78) The role which English began to play in the shaping of Afrikaans from the first half of the nineteenth century went parallel with the role that standard Dutch played over the same period; to a certain extent it could be said that the normalising influence of standard Dutch on Afrikaans up to World War II was diametrically opposed to the influence English was having.\footnote{The parallel between English and Dutch can be extended further: both existed on a diglossia basis vis-à-vis Afrikaans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.} Since the 1930's Dutch has been discarded as a norm, thus removing a traditional barrier to English influence.

It is relevant at this point to draw the reader's attention to a point mentioned earlier in this book (p. 25, 50), namely the misconception in the late nineteenth century that even what I have previously referred to as the classic traits of Afrikaans, were the result of contact with English. Nienaber (1950: 99) maintains that this was commonly believed at the time.

The opposite extreme to this point of view is to regard the influence of English as having gone no further than ontlening, a rather vague term that is usually used specifically with regard to borrowed vocabulary, although it could have a wider application (e.g. loan translations of words or phrases are also a form of ontlening). Bosman (1923: 38), in his classic work Oor die ontstaan van Afrikaans, was one who regarded English influence as being very superficial, which was undoubtedly more the case then than now:

‘Ontlening kom in alle tale voor, maar is vir die wese van die taal van weinig betekenis.’

More or less pre-empting what H.J. Rousseau was working on, Du Toit (1965: 134, but written in 1934), as opposed to Bosman, recognised what was occurring, despite the somewhat romantic phraseology he used to put his point:
‘Wie hom die moeite sou wil getroos om op elk van die terreine deur my aangedui, die Anglisismes in groter hoeveelhede te versamel, sou ’n deursneebeeld kry van die hele taalvermengingsproses wat momenteel besig is om hom in ons land te voltrek. Hy sal die twee tale hul ranke in mekaar sien streng soos slingerplante in ’n bos, ’n omarming wat terselfdertyd ’n stryd om die bestaan beteken; tussenin is daar baie dioo hout, Afrikaanse woorde veral wat verdring word en afsterwend is,’13 maar ook nuwe botsels wat die stryd om die voorrang sal voortsit. Hy sal ook opmerk hoe in die sustertaal, Nederlands, in presies dieselfde omstandighede dikkwels presies dieselfde ontleinging uit Engels of ’n ander taal gemaak word, wat tot die gevolgtrekking voer dat die Afrikaners soms op hierdie wyse in eie kring besig is om in ’n algemeen Dietse behoefte te voorsien en grond lewer vir die veldwinnende opvatting dat baie van ons Anglisismes onmisbaar is, dat hulle ’n leemte aanvul en nie maar sonder meer kan verban word nie.’

There is to be found in many works on anglicisms a consistent refusal to recognise that certain developments in Afrikaans are precisely that, and the view that the speech community does not realise the error of its ways must be exposed for the folly that it is. A good example of such a standpoint is provided by Smith (1962: 64):

‘... hoeveel van ons gebruik nie die Engelse klem in artillerie, cypres, grammafoon, kongres, telefoon, telegraaf en telegram nie? Ja, baie Afrikaners skyn nie eens te weet dat die Nederlands-Afrikaanse klem by al hierdie woorde altyd op die laaste lettergreep val nie.’

In my opinion this is a blatant example of language change in progress (or is it not now complete?) which even scholars today refuse to recognise as such; the speech community has decided what the stress in such words is to be, whatever the Dutch oriented past may have felt about the matter.

Odendal (1973: 30), following a similar line of argument to Aitchison (cf. p. 136), maintains:

“n Laaste aspek van taalverandering waarby ons kortliks moet stilstaan, is die foutiewe opvatting dat taalverandering gelykgestel moet word met taalkorrupsie of taalverval. Daar is geen

13 The same can be said of many older English loans in Afrikaans that have been replaced by neologisms.
rede om hierdie natuurlike verandering as verslegting te beskou nie, ewe
min as wat dit weer as ‘n vooruitgang gesien hoef te word, soos ander
wou.’

Although Odendal is talking of language change in general here, it is a very valid
point which can and should be applied to the specific case of English influence on
Afrikaans where there is still often enormous resistance to recognising this influence
as a factor in the ongoing development of Afrikaans:

‘Bij de taalontwikkeling gaat het er niet altijd om, wat sommige
taalgeleerden nuttig of wenselijk achten, maar wat de (beschaafde)
spraakmakende gemeente doet.’ (Kloeke 1951: 17-18)

Finally, Boshoff (1963: 88-89), an adamant opponent of anglicisms in Afrikaans,
made the following statement which sums up my own attitude perfectly, but
unfortunately Boshoff himself usually failed to practise what he preaches here: after
discussing what he considers the unnecessary influence of Dutch on Afrikaans
spelling, he says:

‘Dit word ’n veel ernstiger saak wanneer ons die innerlike van Afrikaans,
byvoorbeeld sy uitspraak, sy woordwendinge, sy woordorde, ens., in ’n
Nederlandse keurslyf wil indwing. Dan wil ons ons eie taalgeskiedenis
ongedaan maak, dan wil ons, in plaas van die ontwikkelingsweg van ons
taal met vertroue die toekoms in te volg, vreesbevange terugloop op die
paadjie waarlangs ons tot hiertoe gekom het. Ons wil foutiewe Nederlands
weer korrekte Nederlands maak.’
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Chapter Five

5.0 Purism

5.1 The reasons for purism

A desire to preserve the 'purity' of the language is common to most communities where the language is perceived to be under threat, at least as far as the standard languages of the western world are concerned. Icelandic is one such example where, although English is not the mother tongue of any of its indigenous population, the Icelanders are so few in number and so close to North America that they apparently fear for the survival of their language. They are fervently proud of their Viking past and the antiquity of their language. The Jews of Israel are another example of a people with a long tradition and a language that is integral to their relatively new identity as Israelis. Hebrew was of course for quite some time in the unique position that it was not the mother tongue of anyone who spoke it, which possibly made the need for purism all the more urgent. These are but two examples of peoples and languages that continue to survive in circumstances that in some respects resemble those with which Afrikaans has to contend. Above all, in South Africa the language has been closely associated with the emancipation of the Afrikaner and his struggle to attain complete economic and political parity with his English speaking compatriots:1

‘Wanneer men spreekt van “onzuiverheid”, van “besmetting”, dan schuilt daarachter meestal een afkeer van de vreemde natie, als gevolg van historiese herinneringen of politieke bedoelingen of gevoeligheden... We [kunnen] dan het purisme een begeleidingsverschijnsel noemen van groeiend zelfbesef, van politieke ontvoogding.’ (De Vooy's 1925: 18-19)

Visagie (Die Brandwag, 27/9/46) even goes so far as to see the struggle to purify Afrikaans and retain that purity as a third language movement:

‘Waar die Eerste en die Tweede Taalbewegings hoofsaaklik op die erkenning van Afrikaans toegespits was, daar wil die Derde Taalbeweging die Dietse karakter van ons taal onge-

---

1 This symbiosis of goals also explains why the Coloured population was excluded from all deliberations on Afrikaans; the Afrikaner completely appropriated the language during his struggle for emancipation.
Protecting the purity of his language from English influence is not entirely unconnected with the Afrikaner’s desire to protect the purity of the White race in South Africa. Since the abolition of section 16 of the Immorality Act, the latter may in the course of time prove to be the failure the former has already shown itself to be, but this is not to say the Afrikaner has not been successful in stemming the tide in both instances. Coalescence of the English and Afrikaans cultures, the product of the inseparability of the two peoples that has been consolidated this century, finds a counterreaction in the attitude of Afrikaners to their language and provides support for puristic tendencies in the speech community; as Coetzee (1939: 35) suggests

‘... die enigste teken van die ander geaardheid van ons strewinge en opvattings, is dikwels slegs die suierheid van ons taal.’

Purism has had, and still has, many supporters in South Africa, but unfortunately many of them have done more harm than good because of well intended ignorance. This prompted Odendal (1973: 77), in his discussion on ‘die norm van suierheid’ to state:

‘Die goei taalkundige sal nie, soos reeds so dikhoks gebeur het, wendinge en woorde vir Anglisimes aansien terwyl hul suier Diets is nie, soos “die trein mis” of “uitvind waar iemand woon” (en dan in eersgenoemde se plek die onafrikaanse verpas stel). Hy sal ook nie in elke Romaanse vorm wat in Afrikaans opgeneem word, soos eksellensie, evokasie, teologie, opinie, telefoon en televisie, ‘n Engelse woord sien en dit dus probeer verban nie, maar hy sal die nodige kennis hé om te weet dat sulke vorme óf deur Nederlands na ons gekom het, óf internasionaal is. (Hy sal dus ook nie, soos so baie skoolgrammatikas, probeer om hul te vervang deur die “suier Afrikaanse vorm” nie. Maar die taalkundige sal natuurlik ook die nodige kennis hé om te weet dat nie alle Romaanse vorme kritiekloos oorgeneem kan word nie, dat sommige wel deeglik Engelse invloed weerspieël.)’

He then comments:

2 It is interesting to note in this context that the word Diets is seldom used in Holland these days because of the National Socialist connotations it acquired under German occupation; the Germans of that era were also keen language purifiers.
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‘... dit is jammer dat die taalkundige nie meer dikwels die rol van taalpuris
op hom geneem het, en gevolglik die veld vry gelaat het aan die
onkundige, negatiewe kwasie-taalkundige.’

The same complaint was made by De Vooy (1925: 71) with reference to Dutch in
1925:

‘De Duitse en Engelse taalinvloeden zijn nog niet voldoende onderzocht.
Germanismen en Anglicismen trokken meer de aandacht van
taalzuiweraars dan van taalgeleerden.’

Little has changed since, even in Holland.

Combrink (1984: 99) says of linguistic purism:

‘Teoreties-taalwetenskaplik is daar geen rede hoegenaamd waarom mens
purisme kan aanbeveel nie. Die hoofdoel van taalgebruik is immers
kommunikasie, nie die gebruik van suwier taal nie.’

Combrink is but one of many who have laboured this point; nevertheless, purism
exists and feelings towards it often run very high. Purity of language, but then chiefly
in vocabulary because the common man is usually unable to recognise any other
form of interference, is often regarded in South Africa as an admirable virtue of which
one can be proud. In fact ‘suwerheid’ is even regarded as a demigod in some circles,
as the following statement indicates:

‘Inderdaad kan ons sê dat... purisme... daarvoor gesorg het dat Afrikaans
in sy woordeskat en die aanwending daarvan, die suwerste Dietse taal
gbly het.’ (Hiemstra 1963: 8)

Such exaggerated ideas of the importance of linguistic purity - after all, what is
absolute purity in language anyway? - are described by Aitchison (1981: 26) as
follows:

‘In brief, the puristic attitude towards language the idea that there is an
absolute standard of correctness which should be maintained has its
origin in a natural nostalgic tendency in man, supplemented and intensified
by social pressures. It is illogical, and impossible to pin down to any firm
base.’

De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot, 18/11/49) describes the Afrikaner's attitude to purism
in these terms:
‘... dit gaan hier om die taal as kenteken van die volk, dws. elke Engelse woord kan beskou word as ’n vlaggie van Engelsheid eerder as ’n simbool of naam vir ’n bepaalde begrip of ding. Vandaar die emosionele houding teenoor die saak.’

He admits, however, that the ultimate decision lies with the speech community, not academics:

‘Dit is vir die gewone sprekers om te besluit of hulle vir hulle wil skrap sit teen die indringing van buite en of hulle die vreemde element as buit wil beskou.’

His opinion is a sensible one where he states:

‘... die stryd vir die suiwerheid van ons taal hang saam met ’n nasionale strewe wat ek nóg wil ontken nóg kritiseer.’

5.2 The success of puristic endeavours in Afrikaans

Nienaber (1940:62), in his discussion of the vocabulary used in Klaas Waarzegger se zamenspraak en brieue uit 1861, remarks

‘Ook merk ons hoe woorde uit die parlementêre kringe in Afrikaans net begin inburger, en ander oor die administrasie van die land reeds ’n plek verower het - almal via Engels (Parlement[s], spiets, bill, wharfage, Juts[sie], gofferneur e.m.).’

Loanwords of this kind and vintage are mentioned time and time again in the literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans, and more often than not the very same examples are given. De Villiers (1976:127) comments:

‘Die oudste Engelse leenwoorde is volkome verafrikaans bv. juts (judge), koort (court), bokkie (buggy), briek (brake), reisies (races), metjies (matches), setlaar (settler), spiets (speech). (Dit is opvallend dat hierdie ou leenwoorde so sterk in status gedaal het, dat sommige van hulle vandag in opgevoede kringe onbekend is.)’

His final comment is an indication that English loanwords, although once considered completely ingeburger and possibly even indispensable, do not necessarily come to stay.3 Le Roux, for example, wrote in Die Taalgenoot (July 1932):

---

3 This applies of course to any vocabulary in a language; even indigenous words can pass into oblivion, but this is not an aim actively pursued by language conscious members of the speech community as it is in the case of languages concerned about their survival and thus their purity.
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'Niemand sal daaraan dink om te wil veg teen sulke woorde soos briek en horssweep nie.'

In hindsight we know that it was not only thought of, but in the case of briek has even been quite successful. Such examples illustrate that puristic endeavours, so often and easily scoffed at, can and do attain some degree of success.

The many writings of the 1930’s on anglicisms in Afrikaans indicate, when one compares the observations of those writers with today’s reality, how much ‘purer’ Afrikaans these days seems to be. Scholtz (1980: 105), taking up this point, remarks:

“n Menigte Engelse woorde wat in Afrikaans gekom het in die tydperk van die kwaaiste Anglisering en lank in Afrikaans in gebruik was, is later weer deur die suwer Hollands-Afrikaanse ekwivalente vervang (soos juts deur regter, en koort deur hof) of is besig om huilhouvasteverloor (soos brekfs teenoor ontbyt, briek teenoor rem, bottelstoort teenoor drankwinkel).’

Smith (1962: 42, but written 1936-39) comments on the great interest in, and wealth of, publications on linguistic purity in the late 1930’s. Van Rensburg (1983: 136) mentions that words such as brekfs, koort, koers (reisieskoers), juts, rente (i.p.v. huur), antie, toorts were commonly used right into the 1940's. An anonymous subscriber to Die Huisgenoot (20/10/44) was also prompted to comment:

‘Kyk net hoeveel Anglisisms en Engelse woorde is gedurende die afgelope tien of twintig jaar al uit die taal verwyder.’

The explanation for this relatively sudden apparent purity of vocabulary would seem to be the extensive vernederlandsing of the language (cf. Uys 1983) that took place in the all important 1930’s when official recognition had been achieved, the Bible translation had finally been completed, the SABC had been created and the way was open for Afrikaans to assert itself in every aspect of South African life. A purification of the vocabulary of

---

4 W. Kempen, writing for Ons Eie Boek in 1946, was concerned about the common man’s difficulty with writing pure Afrikaans. He conducted a survey whereby he took a reputable Afrikaans magazine (unnamed but was it Die Huisgenoot?) over the years 1920-45 and counted the number of anglicisms per 100 pages. His findings were as follows: 1920 - 95, 1925 - 35, 1930 - 29.5, 1935 - 23.5, 1945 - 22.5.
the language occurred at this time which was somewhat akin to the relexification that pidgin languages undergo when they are elevated by circumstances to creoles. (cf. Todd 1974: 50) It was also a time in South Africa's history when many Afrikaans scholars and future politicians were returning from their studies in Holland and were thus in a good position to lend support to the patriotic feeling prevalent at the time. Odendal (1978: 72), one of South Africa's best known lexicographers, sees the success in ousting the above loanwords from a somewhat different, although not necessarily unrelated, point of view:

‘So ly dit m.i. geen twyfel dat woorde soos juts, koort, slipper, tikket, lift, flat, sandwich, wat nog in die jare dertig deur bekende taalkundiges as ingeburger beskou is, uit die taal van baie verdwyn het mede onder invloed van woordeboeke e.d. nie.’

The success that has been achieved by puristic endeavours so far remains chiefly limited to the realm of vocabulary. De Voogs (1925: 3) made a remark about purism drives in general which is valid for the Afrikaans situation in particular:

‘Voor het streven naar taalzuivering is een groot deel van het publiek gemakkelijk te winnen.’

Even with general public support, however, the common man is usually incapable of recognising any purity other than lexical, and even there he is likely, as a result of ignorance, to go too far and start avoiding either truly indigenous structures that coincidentally resemble English (although they may be cognate) or turn against the international component in the vocabulary of Afrikaans because of its resemblance to English. Many Afrikaners thus support the concern for the purity of their language, but are incapable in practice of contributing anything beyond the lexical, committing excesses even there.

The purity of vocabulary, in as far as it has not been achieved by (re)introducing Dutch terminology, has been aided by loan translation (cf. p. 73) and the coining of neologisms. Scholtz (1980: 105) says of the latter:

‘Die strewe is om vir sake waarmee die Afrikaanssprekende die eerste deur medium van Engels kennis maak, ’n gesikte Afrikaanse woord te vind of te maak as daar geen bruikbare Nederlandse woord bestaan nie. So het die volgende woorde,
naas baie ander, in Afrikaans in algemene gebruik gekom: duikweg (vir subway), naweek (vir weekend) en toebroodjie (vir sandwich).

De Vooys, talking of the Dutch experience with attempts to purify the language, says:

‘De geschiedenis leert dat purismen, door toonaangevende geleerden of dichters ingevoerd, tot op onze tijd in gebruik bleven.’

A case in point in South Africa are the two words komper and rekenaar (also now less frequently rekenoutomaat), which competitive press organisations supported to keep the international term ‘computer’ at bay. This has been so successful that both words (even all three) have survived and ‘computer’ did not get a foot in the door.¹ Televisie versus beeldradio, on the other hand, is a case where the purism has definitely lost the race; beeldradio was quite common in the days prior to television and for some time after its introduction, but is now seldom if ever used.

The plethora of vaktaalwoordeboeke in Afrikaans, most of which have been compiled by the vaktaalburos, are currently the most blatant means of countering English influence on the lexis of Afrikaans. To my knowledge no systematic investigation has yet been conducted into how far the theory and the practice of terminological dictionaries diverge from one another. Coetzee (1939: 22-23) does, however, give a substantial list of English loanwords to do with mining, for example, and adds:

‘Sedertdien het ‘n nuwe geslag Afrikaanse mynwerkers Afrikaanse name gevind vir hierdie begrippe wat aanvanklik so vreemd was vir hulle voorsate dat hulle taalvermoë daardeur verstom geraak het.’

Nevertheless, whatever the contributions of bodies such as newspapers, authors, vaktaalburos and the Akademie to the purity of Afrikaans may be, ‘Sonder die medewerking van die algemene publiek, ook die oningeligte deel daarvan, kan geen taalstryd gewen word nie.’ (Hiemstra 1963: 7)

¹ The fact that universities now have departments of rekenaarwetenskap and libraries etc. are gerekenarisere may well mean that komper’s days are numbered. HAT does not recognise komper but does, curiously enough, include the lemma rekenoutomaat in addition to rekenaar; the latest volume of WAT does, on the other hand, include komper. (cf. Eksteen 1978: 111 for a discussion of this word)
5.3 The disadvantages of purism

Many Afrikaans scholars, while usually supporting puristic efforts being applied to Afrikaans, have nevertheless been quick to realise that often more harm can be done than good. The disadvantages can be legion and one could well ask oneself whether they are outweighed by the advantages. Kempen (Ons Eie Boek, Dec. 1946) summed up part of the problem as follows:

‘... die taal kan alleen op gevaar van onnatuurlikheid af heeltemal suiwer wees.’

M. de Villiers makes a similar statement, but gives more detail of the sort of unnatural language caused by the urge to use ‘pure’ language:

‘... die puris... veroorsaak heel dikwels dat die kind met die badwater uitgegooi word. Hy dryf sy mede-Afrikaners weg van spontane gesprokentaal tot allerlei gramadaolos: tot boekagtigheid, tot omslagtige korrektheid, of ook wel tot oordrewe idiomatiese beeldspraak, selfs platheid.’

In another article De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot, 18/11/49) makes the interesting observation that sometimes in the effort to avoid a (suspected) anglicism, another one is misguided employed:

‘Die sin of sinsnede wat die Anglisisme vervang, is soms ‘n ander Anglisisme, of ‘n lomp wending of enkele male verskillend van betekenis (opvallend is die neiging tot boekagtige uitdrukings) e.g. kortliks vir in kort i.p.v. kortom, is hy telefoonies verbinding vir is hy op die telefoon i.p.v. het hy ‘n telefoon, na alles vir agter alles i.p.v. per slot van sake.’

De Villiers’ image of throwing the baby out with the bathwater is most appropriate in this context in several respects. The prejudice against international vocabulary which is so prevalent among Afrikaners because of the mistaken belief that such loanwords constitute superfluous anglicisms, leads not only to a reduction in the number of synonyms at one’s disposal for stylistic variation, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to an avoidance of items of vocabulary which are not at all replacable by indigenous structures:

‘Selfs wanneer die sg. vreemde woorde nie afgekeur word nie, word gesuggereer dat hulle oortollige sinonieme is. Die feit is egter dat sinonieme byna altyd ten dele ooreenstem en ten dele verskil.’ (De Villiers 1970: 244)
Schutte (1977) shows conclusively that more often than not simply a skynkongruensie exists between the international structure and the item which the purist may feel inclined to replace it by:

‘In sommige gevalle veroorsaak die Romaanse en Germaanse items in die een konteks ‘n toutologie, maar nie in die ander konteks nie. Dit is ‘n aanduiding dat daar nie volkome oorvleueling is nie, maar dat die items in ‘n bepaalde betrekking van insluiting of uitsluiting tot mekaar staan.’

(Schutte 1977: 13)

In her work Schutte contrasts sets of cognate forms such as admireer, admirasie, admirerend, admirabel and bewonder, bewondering, bewonderend, bewonderenswaardig. (p. 14) She labels the Romance group x and the Germanic group y and illustrates the semantic field of each and their overlapping as follows:

```
( x ) and ( y ), ( x ) ( y ) or ( x ) y
```

‘n Betekenis van x is y: in die meeste gevalle kan x deur y vervang word, maar nie noodwendig andersom nie.’ (p. 12)

Schutte also takes up the point of purism often giving rise to unnatural sounding language:

‘Nog ‘n beswaar teen die Romaanse vorme is dat dit onnodige “geleerdheidsvertoon” is en dat die Germaanse woord in die proses verdring word. Dit lei dan tot doelbewuste bestendiging van ‘n Germaanse teenhanger, ook in gevalle waar daar geen werklike sinoniem bestaan nie, byvoorbeeld “knap” of “hedendaags” in plaas van gesofistikeerd.’ (p. 5)

There are instances in Afrikaans where the puristic counterpart of an international word has established itself to the (virtual) exclusion of the latter and where, compared with Dutch where the two continue to coexist, a useful distinction in meaning has been lost, e.g. ernstig/serieux where the two are seldom interchangeable in Dutch but the former is used in Afrikaans to cover the semantic field of both. The same applies to koek/cake in Dutch where the loanword is simply not tolerated in South Africa. (cf. 7.5)

De Voöys (1925: 23), once again talking from the secure position of a Dutchman whose language is under no real threat whatever its susceptib-

---

6 Schutte also contributed an article to Klasgids (November 1976: 58-61) in which the essence of her M.A. thesis is summarised.
ility to borrowing from its neighbours is, defends the retention of foreign words - and thus international vocabulary too - even when they are completely synonymous with indigenous structures:

‘Ook als de begripsinhoud van een vreemd woord geheel overeenkomt met die van een bestaand Nederlands woord, kan het eerste als onmisbaar gevoeld worden.’

He quotes A. Noreen to defend his attitude:

‘De Zweed Noreen die als ideaal van taaljuistheid de doeltreffendheid vooropstelt beweert zelfs: we hebben eer te weinig dan te veel vreemde woorden: voor verschillend doel en ten bate van onderscheiden stijl ontlenen men gerust woorden van alle kanten!’

De Vooy also refers to 0. Jespersen as another anti-purist of renown. De Vooy attacks the purists, claiming ‘Van onderscheid in gevoelswaarde tonen deze taalverarmers geen begrip.’ (p. 27) He offers some advice which could be heeded more in future by those in South Africa who are concerned about the purity of Afrikaans:

‘Wie voor taalzuiverheid waken wil, zorge er voor, de klooe tussen spreken en schrijven niet nodeloos te verbreden.’ (p. 29)

This is somehow reminiscent of the catch-cry of the GRA, Ons skryf soos ons praat, a former aim in the days when Dutch was the adversary that had to be contended with but one which is no longer pursued now that English is in that position. In defending the retention of synonymous loanwords to resort to for stylistic variation or greater precision, one should nevertheless heed the following warning by De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot, 2/12/49):

‘Natuurlik moet ons oppas dat ons nie kunsmatige logiese onderskeidinge skep nie, ’n flater wat al baie taalboekies begaan het...’,

although he is not referring specifically to loanwords here.

The image of the baby being discarded with the bathwater also applies to another facet of purism, hypercorrection. There are many words and expressions in Afrikaans which correspond with English because of the close affinity of the two languages:
On occasions, although it is impossible to generalise about exactly when this occurs, Afrikaners avoid a legitimate indigenous structure because their awareness of a similar or identical structure in English leads them to believe that the former is not correct Afrikaans. There are many well-known examples of this: *die bus verpas* (instead of *mis*), *met vakansie* (instead of *op*), *betyds* (instead of *op tyd*) *ek kan hom nie verdra nie* (instead of *uitstaan*). Smith (*Die Naweek*, 28/10/48) even goes so far as to maintain that *op my linkerhand* is said instead of *aan* because of the phonetic similarity between ‘on’ and *aan*. Is this also the motivation behind *op die telefoon* (Dt. *aan*), or is this an example of a synonymous couplet? (cf. 7.15) The former examples are commonly referred to in the literature on the topic as *vermeende* or skyn-Anglisismes. (cf. 6.00)

The degree of terminological precision that can be lost by too great an insistence on puristic avoidance of foreign, or seemingly foreign, vocabulary can constitute a considerable problem. As De Vooy’s (1925: 22) says, ‘Onder technici vinden de puristen dan ook niet veel aanhang.’ Cluver (1982: 76), writing in *Die Taalpraktisyn* on *vaktaalwoordeboeke*, complains:

‘Die oorvleueling is irriterend genoeg, maar die feit dat daar ook heelwat gevalle voorkom waar dieselfde begrip anders benoem word, is verwarrend en teenprodtukief.’

There are many cases in point in Afrikaans, even outside the realm of *vakterminologie*, where the desire to use indigenous structures leads to competitive forms that can cause some confusion until such time as one is overwhelmingly accepted as the word by the speech community. Until such a time is reached, terms can coexist in free variation - such as *komper* and *rekenaar* - which does no harm as long as everyone recognises both words as exact synonyms. A glance at the deodorants in a South African supermarket in April 1985 revealed that of those brands that used bilingual labels and avoided the loanwords *deodorant* and *antiperspirant*, only one used *sweetweerder* (Shield), while all others used the word *reukweerder*. In practice the latter seems to be more common and is recognised by HAT. The entry in HAT, however, reads as follows: *reukweerder, reukweermiddel: Reukverdrywer*. But examination of the labels on air-fresheners cum toilet sprays in a supermarket revealed that the vast majority used the term *lugverfrisser* whereas one brand (Bayfresh) used *reukverdrywer*. The potential for confusion is illustrated by this example
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whereas retention of deodorant, as in Dutch, avoids such problems. Another potentially confusing situation has been created by the substitution of the word taxi with the purism huurmotor, which can also mean a rented car, as it does in Dutch (huurauto). Both definitions are given by HAT.

Creation of puristic terms to avoid loanwords can lead to new terms coexisting without semantic distinction, as illustrated above. Equally, there is always the chance, given the existence of two words, that a semantic distinction between the two can emerge in the mind of some speakers, for example: there seems to be a variety of opinion about what a calculator is in Afrikaans: optelmasjien? - but an adding machine is not necessarily a calculator; sakrekenaar? - but not all calculators are pocket size and without the prefix, one is left with a computer. The meaning of any puristic avoidance of the word calculator can only be clear from the context. Although Smith (1962: 64, but written 1936-39) apparently did not feel in the late 1930's that hyser, hysbak, hysbus, hystoestel or ligter had much chance of competing against lift, time has proven him wrong. Hysbak and hyser, despite the multiple meanings of the latter, coexist in free variation in Afrikaans today. Interestingly enough, however, HAT makes a subtle distinction between the two which I doubt has any foundation in reality. A variety of terms is likely to ultimately aid the retention of the loanword because only then can ambiguity definitely be avoided:

‘Hoe meer ’n taaleenheid se krag daarenteen verdeeld is deur eie-talige sinonieme of sterk ander-talige eenhede wat op hom lyk, hoe meer is hy vir vreemde invloede vatbaar.’ (Rousseau 1937: V)

Van den Toorn (1977: 79) sees yet another danger in purism:

‘Bovendien heeft het consequente streven naar taalzuivering het nadeel dat men zijn taal geheel en al buiten internationale stromingen houdt en daardoor de toegang tot z’n eigen landstaal bemoeilijkt.’

As long as the purists, who have achieved a surprising degree of success in Afrikaans, are satisfied with only partial success and leave it to the speech community to accept or reject their creations, no harm can be done. Such exaggerated attempts to purify the language as Van den Toorn's example from Icelandic jafnadarmaður (socialist, lit. fair or impartial man), are rare in Afrikaans.
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Reference has been made earlier in this book to the preference of some purists for Dutch structures to replace English inspired structures in Afrikaans with which the average Afrikaner, certainly these days, is much better acquainted. The wisdom of such purists' wishes is all the more questionable when the construction they aim to retain is a gallicism in Dutch. De Bruto (1970: 41), where he discusses the new meanings in Afrikaans of words such as partikuler, eventueel and definitief as a result of the ‘klankoorlokoms’ with cognate forms in English, asks ‘opnuut ontstaan die vraag waarom die taalpolitikus die Franse “leenwoord” bo die Engelse een verkies?’ In the same article he also goes on to defend the new stress pattern in minister, telegram etc. (cf. p. 51) De Bruto's tolerance towards certain English structures in Afrikaans was supported earlier by Langenhoven (1935: 103) even in 1935 when the purists were at their most active.

Appeals such as Le Roux (1968, but written in 1947) makes for the replacement of constructions like wat van (p. 167) and bly (p. 171) by Dutch equivalents are not only all the more doomed to failure now than in 1947 because of the minimal acquaintance with Dutch, but such expressions are simply not recognisable as anglicisms without a knowledge of Dutch. If a given structure is no longer felt to be an anglicism and occurs frequently in speech, and sometimes now even in writing, nothing positive will be gained by attempting to instil in people's minds a realisation that it is English in origin and should thus be avoided. The new reality must be accepted and recognised for what it is - linguistic change. A new evaluation of such phenomena is hinted at by Combrink (1983) where he refers to as sodanig as a ‘puristiese vervanging’ of as sulks. The following astute observation is made by Suffeleers (1979: 206) who is critical of purists and who, unlike De Vooyys, is a Fleming and thus talks from that relatively insecure position that has several similarities with South Africa:

‘Het is een paradox in de geschiedenis van de taalverzorging dat het oude puristische streven om het taalgebruik door vertaling van (vooral Franse) leenwoorden “Nederlandser” te maken, precies een factor is van verwijdering van de standaardtaal, aangezien de voorgestelde “oplossingen” - meestal vrucheloos - functionerende aliënismen proberen te verdringen. De radicale purist schiet op die manier zijn doel voorbij: hij isoleert zich voor een deel van de taalgemeenschap.’

8 Combrink’s (1984) article was originally written as a confidential report for the Taalkommissie in 1983. When it eventually appeared in 1984, the list of anglicisms that accompanied the original report was not included. This example is taken from that appendix.
Louw (1959: 22), an avid supporter of purism, maintains:

‘... persoonlik glo ek dat Afrikaans vandag oor die algemeen suierder, d.w.s. korreker en beter gebruik word as ooit vantevore in ons geskiedenis!’

De Villiers’ (1970: 245) reservations in this regard are totally warranted, however:

‘Maar ons mag nie te trots wees op die vordering nie, want in die plek van talle [leenwoorde] wat verdring is, het honderde nuwes gekom.’

If this is the case for vocabulary, it is all the more so when it comes to borrowed idioms and loan translations. Suffeleers mentions that the same phenomenon occurs in Belgium:

‘J. Obrie wijst op de blinde vlek in het gezichtsveld van de meeste Vlamingen: zij menen dat taalzuiverheid erin bestaat de vreemde woorden te vermijden.’ (p. 189)

There would seem to be little doubt that puristic endeavours in South Africa have been much more successful in replacing English loanwords with neologisms and loan translations than they have been in reintroducing indigenous (Dutch?) expressions to replace the many English idioms - the speech community has translated them for itself and it unlikely to abandon them, for example: jou eie beuel blaas, iemand se been trek, iemand oor die kole haal. Valkhoff (1972: 28), who was notoriously wrong in so many of the conclusions he came to with regard to ‘impurities’ in Afrikaans, was not far from the mark, however, when he stated:

‘Generally speaking where Dutch and Flemings borrowed their culture and their terminology from the French, the Afrikaners have done so from English. Nevertheless, on account of the synchronic purism, which is prevalent in South Africa all words and idioms that had an English aspect have been eliminated by the various bureaux of terminology. In this way Afrikaans has come to look much purer than standard Dutch, which does not suffer from purists and accepts foreign loanwords very easily. Yet this “Dutch” appearance of literary Afrikaans is deceptive, for the English influence goes much deeper than meets the eye.’
5.4 Forms of purism

In all language communities where purism plays a role, excesses are likely to be committed which then bring the whole movement into disrepute. Somehow a middle road has to be found between the desire to maintain a certain purity (often a purity which wasn't even there in Dutch to begin with) and the need to be non-isolationist, practical and take common usage into account. A language is after all merely a code which can only function efficiently if all its speakers are in general agreement as to which verbal symbols are used and what they signify.

A joke is told in South Africa which goes as follows:

‘Hoekom roer die Brit sy tee links om en die Boer syne regs om? - Om dit soet te kry.’

At times one can't help feeling that certain puristic trends have no more point than this joke, i.e. that they are based on a belief that to preserve one's identity one must not only retain the traditional differences, but even create new ones. Attitudes to spelling are an example of this. Renkema (1984: 114) relates the following anecdote with regard to Dutch spelling in Holland and Belgium:

‘Toen de commissie van Belgische en Nederlandse deskundigen in de jaren na de oorlog aan het werk ging, bleek al spoedig dat de discussie over c of k sterk emotioneel gekleurd was. Vele Nederlanders hadden in de jaren ’40-’45 een hekel gekregen aan de k van de Deutsche Kulturkammer. Geef ons maar de c, zei men in het Noorden. Nee, volstrekt niet, zeiden de Vlamingen, die c is ons veel te Frans. Juist door de taal moeten wij laten zien hoe ver we van de Walen af staan.’

The decision in the late nineteenth century to adopt the Kollewijn spelling of Dutch in South Africa - actually an attempt at the time to save Dutch from displacement by Afrikaans - has permitted Afrikaans to assimilate foreign words better than Dutch. Malherbe (Die Huisgenoot, 28/9/28) appropriately refers to this practice as sjouwiniestiese spelling. In some respects the Dutch and Flemings are still paying the price for not having adopted Kollewijn's recommendations in the 1890's; on the other hand, the puristic advantages of that spelling are of lesser importance to the Dutch. Suffeleers (1979: 180) sees a connection between the sensitivity with regard to the borrowing of foreign words and the subsequent desire to apply an indigenous spelling to those that can't be dispensed with:
The above examples illustrate how much paralinguistic factors play a role in puristic tendencies.

Mention has been made before of the distinction so commonly made by Afrikaans linguists between Bedürfnis- and Luxuslehnwörter. (cf. p. 48) Ostyn’s (1972: 53) observation was that ‘For the average immigrant in general and the Fleming in particular, there are not two categories of English words, i.e. the necessary ones and the superfluous ones. The distinctions are made by zealous purists.’ It cannot be denied that the same applies to Afrikaans to a degree.

Hypercorrection is also common to all linguistic environments where social pressure exists to be puristic. The close affinity of English and Afrikaans simply means that in this particular bilingual situation, the causes of hypercorrection are exceedingly common. Although hypercorrection was discussed under the disadvantages of purism (cf. 5.3), it can equally be seen as a form of purism; SUFFELEERS (1979: 182) even goes so far as to maintain that ‘overdreven purisme [is] ...een vorm van hypercorrectie.’

From a diachronic point of view the most important single factor in retaining, or perhaps even in restoring, the purity of Afrikaans has been standard Dutch. UYS (1983: 166-7) describes what occurred in Afrikaans earlier this century when the recognition of Afrikaans brought with it an increased demand for purism:

‘Na die amptelike erkenning van Afrikaans as offisiële landstaal het die Engelse aanslag teen hierdie “jong” taaltjie in al sy felheid losgebars en weer eens sou ‘n teruggryp na Nederlands noodsaalik wees vir oorlewing... Die taalmanne van 1925 het dus nou begryp dat hulle om praktiese redes nie al te ver van Nederlands moes afwyk nie. Hulle het dus van die standpunt uitgegaan om voorkeur aan die eie Afrikaanse woord of uitdrukking te gee. Besit ons self niks geskik nie, of kan ons met niks bruikbaars vorendag kom nie, moet aan Nederlands ontleen word.’

The tendency to coin neologisms does not seem to have been as common at that time in the history of Afrikaans. It seems that would develop once the language had asserted itself and as the gap between Dutch and Afrikaans
grew wider and also possibly as it was realised that Dutch often could not provide the goods. Du Toit (1965: 134) is but one of several scholars to remark that many anglicisms occur in Afrikaans where Dutch too either uses an English word or has borrowed from another language (cf. also Smith 1962: 64) But equally, in such instances in Afrikaans these days one is more likely to find a neologism or a loan translation, occasionally with the loss of a semantic distinction that exists in Dutch, for example: Dutch cake/koek = Afr. koek, Dutch fifty-fifty = Afr. vyftig-vyftig, Dutch liften = Afr. ryloop, Dutch nasynchroniseren (< French) = Afr. oorklank, Dutch airconditioning = Afr. lugreëling, -versorging, Dutch gehandicapte = Afr. gestremde, Dutch weekend/weekeinde = Afr. naweek. It is worth noting at this point that if an English word is borrowed into Afrikaans, because of the Afrikaner’s intimate acquaintance with English, the word will always be used with exactly the same meaning as in English; the Dutch on the other hand have borrowed numerous English words that have undergone a shift in meaning, for example: cake (a particular sort), ponie (= fringe i.e. hairstyle; pronounced with a short o), pick-up (= record-player with a non-English stress on the second syllable), all-in-verzekeringspolis (= comprehensive insurance policy), catering (= home catering), marketing (= market research), planning (= time schedule). Not only does this not occur in South Africa, but puristic evasions of such words - a more common occurrence in Afrikaans in such cases - always correspond exactly in meaning with the English words they replace, for example: koek, spysenering, bemarking and beplanning all cover the same semantic field as the corresponding English words above and a ponie in Afrikaans is exactly that, a small horse (pronounced with a long o).

Even if Afrikaans has chosen in many instances to take a different path from Dutch with respect to tolerating loanwords, in more cases than one can probably now appreciate, Dutch must have baled Afrikaans out of difficulty in the past. Coetzee (1948: 13) remarked:

‘Ook in hierdie nuwe tydperk staan Nederlands beskermend teenoor die eertydse veldkind. Want dit moet ons duidelik besef: sonder die Nederlandse kultuur- en taalbronne om ryklik uit te put, kon die huidige stand van Afrikaans as amptstaal en as kultuurtaal slegs met die uiterste kraginspanning bereik word, indien wel.’

The fact that even today the Akademie does not completely ignore Dutch practice when making decisions on Afrikaans linguistic issues indicates that at least as far as attempts to keep the vocabulary of the language pure are concerned, Dutch can still function as a norm, even if only in a consultative
capacity. In 1921 Boshoff (1921: 276) saw Dutch as the only solution to the shortcomings in Afrikaans vocabulary:

‘Die tyd is nou eers pas aangebreek, dat Afrikaans sy regmatige eise sal laat geld as wettige erfgenaam en loot van die Dietse stam. Waar die inherente vormkragte van Afrikaans self tekortsik, sal Afrikaners hulle in die eerste plek moet behelp uit die oerou woordvoorraad.’

Combrink (1968: 8), writing many years after Boshoff, has quite a different attitude:

‘Afrikaans het...hoegenaamd geen standhoudende voedingsbron behalwe dié spekkingskrag en die trotse gees van sommige van sy sprekers nie.’

The synchronic approach to purism is indeed predominantly that expounded by Combrink here, as well as in his most recent publication on anglicisms (1984: 105) and by De Villiers’ (1970: 245) previously mentioned attitude of ‘oorneem EN vertaal’ (cf. p. 73).

Coining new words is not easy and achieving general acceptance of such words can be even harder. As was mentioned on p. 149, komper acquired a certain frequency thanks to the support of the Cape newspaper group, Nasionale Pers; Pienaar (1931: 168) attributes the adoption of rolprent and tikskrif (tikmasjien, tikster etc.) to the support of Die Volkstem. Decisions of the Akademie (i.e. re the AWS) or vaktaalburos need such backing if they are to be generally accepted. Sometimes neither a neologism nor a loan translation has provided the solution, but a Lehnübertragung (cf. 7.2), i.e. a word which is close in literal meaning to the English term it seeks to avoid but which is nevertheless not a literal translation, for example: blitsverkoper (best seller), duinebesie (beach buggy) bobbejaansleutel (monkey wrench) sypaadjie (sidewalk). It could be argued that such words are neologisms (cf. 7.3), which they are in a broader sense of the word, but there is a difference between them and other neologisms which bear no relation to English at all, for example: huurmotor (taxi) moltrein (underground) oorklank (to dub).

Finally, another very common form of purism in Afrikaans is the substitution of international vocabulary with indigenous synonyms, where such exist, which can lead to the problems of skynkongruensie discussed by Schutte. (cf. p. 151) Although Afrikaans has the words edisie, psigologies and unaniem, for example, and some (educated) people may not hesitate to use them, uitgawe, sielkundig and eenparig occur much more frequently.
Chapter Six

6.0 Pseudo-anglicisms (skyn-Anglisimes)

In the literature on anglicisms in Afrikaans continual reference is made to what some writers call skyn-Anglisimes and others call vermeende Anglisimes. These terms are synonymous and I have chosen to translate them with pseudo-anglicisms.

6.1 Misconceptions and witch hunts (wanopvattingen en Anglisismejag)

On reading what has been written about anglicisms in Afrikaans, one is immediately struck by the degree to which scholars have contradicted each other in the past as to which structures are or are not anglicisms and which are or are not ‘acceptable’. Too often the emphasis has been on the origin of a given phenomenon and on whether it displaces an indigenous one rather than on usage and how the speech community perceives it, regardless of its origin. That attitude, quite apart from the impossibility of scholars ever agreeing on the origin of certain structures, has contributed to the linguistic insecurity of many Afrikaners in that what their ear tells them is correct, prescriptive bodies such as grammars, dictionaries and teachers claim is incorrect. This overdeveloped sensitivity towards English inspired constructions has unfortunately commonly led to legitimate indigenous structures being avoided which, for a variety of reasons (cf. 6.2), can resemble English structures.¹ This is the most lamentable aspect of the Anglisismevrees that is so common in South Africa and which is aided by the grammars and dictionaries currently in use in educational establishments. The only way to minimise contradiction and the doubts it gives rise to in the minds of speakers of Afrikaans, is to abandon etymology as a valid criterion for accepting or rejecting a given structure: frequency can be the only valid criterion for assessing acceptability. The wisdom of such an approach is borne out all the more by the fact that so many scholars who have written on anglicisms have not regarded English origin alone as grounds for rejecting a particular phenomenon, but whether an English inspired construction displaces an indigenous one. (cf. 4.3) Thus one is

¹ De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot, 18/11/49) conducted a brief survey among circa 30 educated Afrikaners to see if they would recognise English influence: ‘...van die 137 sinne en sinsnedes waarvan die ondervraagdes moes sê of dit Anglisismes is of goeie Afrikaans, was 63 werklik Anglisismes en 74 goeie Afrikaans. Maar meer as die helfte van die proefpersone het geantwoord dat daar 82 Anglisismes was en 43 korrekte verbindings (12 uitdrukings onseker).’
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faced with a double subjectivity: 1) what is of English origin?, 2) does it displace an indigenous structure?

The traditional attitude has been that if it is English and does not displace, a structure is acceptable and therefore does not constitute an anglicism, this label usually being reserved for English structures that one wishes to oppose, rather than being used as a general term for any English inspired phenomenon in Afrikaans. But if one accepts that Dutch is an acceptable voedingsbron for Afrikaans and preferable to English, which seems to have been the attitude of many who have written on anglicisms, then one can assume that any English structure used in Afrikaans could well be replaced by whatever the Dutch say in that instance - except in the very few cases where the Dutch also resort to English vocabulary - and consequently that all anglicisms in Afrikaans displace one or other Diets structure. Therefore, from that point of view, no anglicism is necessary and thus acceptable: the Dutch cope without them, so why not the Afrikaners? Clearly such an approach, which condemns all English structures, would be as impractical as the current one seems to be where prescriptive bodies all decide subjectively and unilaterally what they consider acceptable - often with an (unconscious?) bias towards Dutch. (cf. Steyn, p. 78) Usage is the only valid determinator of acceptability and as usage changes with time, so will acceptability. Authoritative prescriptive works such as HAT and WAT require total revision with this in mind. Their compilers have lost touch with reality in many instances: if they consider a Dutch structure preferable in one instance, even if it is at odds with general practice, why not in all cases?

Because of his lack of linguistic training, the average speaker of Afrikaans falls victim to two misconceptions: 1) he does not recognise many structures as English which are, and 2) he perceives many which are not English as being so. De Villiers (19762: 32), referring in this instance to international vocabulary in Afrikaans, maintains correctly:

‘Vir die leek moet dit soms lyk asof sommige woorde met hierdie uitgange [i.e. -eer etc.] bloot vermomde Engels is. Dit is dan net die taalkundige wat - gewoonlik - weet of die betrokke woorde ‘n onlangse en regstreeksse oormame uit Engels is, en of dit al ‘n langer tyd as leenwoord gevestig is. Maar hierdie “taalkundige” kennis weerspieël natuurlik nie noodwendig die gewone gebruiker se oordeel nie.’

This statement can be applied to other vermeende Anglisismes too, although international vocabulary is certainly the prime example of this misconception in the speech community at large.
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The literature abounds with statements and counterstatements on the origin, and thus usually the acceptability, of expressions such as aangaan, 'n mooi een, storie, welaf, wonder, voel, op/met vakansie, etc. The final example even prompted Smith (1962: 54) to draw a semantic distinction between the two, a distinction which I for one do not understand; in Holland on the other hand, the former is supposedly typically Catholic and the latter Protestant, or typical of southern and northern usage respectively, if you will. Another strange extreme the phobia of anglicisms has led to is the common occurrence of verpas, a germanism, to avoid the legitimately Diets expression mis, which happens to resemble English:

‘Dis merkwaardig hoe mense ’n taalgebruik kan verwerp waarteen eintlik niks in te bring is nie, maar glad nie gehinder word nie deur ’n ander wat heeltemal foutief is en sterk af te keur.’ (Le Roux 1968: 169)

Smith (1962: 72) says of H.J. Rousseau's work:

‘In sy ywer om alle “Engelshede” op onverbiddelike wyse bloot te lê, gaan die skrywer egter soms te ver.’

Unfortunately the finger that Smith points at Rousseau here can be pointed at almost everybody that has written on the topic; alternatively, scholars have gone overboard at times in trying to prove that phenomena which resemble English and don't exist in standard Dutch have their origins in archaic or dialectal Dutch. Without a more complete knowledge of the volkstaal of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many such claims cannot be made with certainty - but nor can the reverse. It is a legitimate academic pursuit to theorise on such issues and substantiate one’s claims with documentary evidence if it can be found, but one must not for one moment be deluded into thinking that such findings bear any relevance to the language as perceived and used by the speech community. Many academics in the past have apparently considered their findings and opinions on the origins of structures in Afrikaans as bearing some relevance to the acceptability of those structures. More often than not they have done the Afrikaans speech community a disservice by each pursuing his own line of argument, however at odds it might have been with common practice, and thus sowing the seeds of linguistic insecurity so prevalent among Afrikaners today.

6.2 The difficulties of distinguishing real from pseudo-anglicisms

The inherent affinity of English and Afrikaans was discussed under 2.1.4.
The affinity factors deserve repetition here as they are usually at the root of the confusion about whether a given structure in Afrikaans has arisen under the influence of English or not.

First and foremost there is the vast wealth of cognate structures which the two languages still share from their common ancestry:

‘Dieselfde uitdrukking kan in verwante tale voorkom sonder dat die een aan die ander onleen het. ’n Uitdrukking kan sowel goeie Nederlands-en, alle dinge gelyk synde, daarom ook goeie Afrikaans - as goeie Engels wees sonder dat die een taal deur die ander beïnvloed is.’ (Le Roux 1968: 169)

In this category belong also phenomena which resemble English and which may have previously occurred in standard Dutch, or in the dialects that contributed to the formation of Afrikaans, but which are no longer encountered in Holland, cf. Francken's (1912: 279-80) arguments on *enig*, *'n mooi een* and *braaf*. Francken sums up his discussion of such points with the following remark, however:

‘Deze vormen behoeven dus nog geen Anglicismen te zijn. Daarmede is niet gezegd, dat ze het niet kunnen zijn.’

Smith (1962: 67) mentions the same reservation.

Secondly, both English and Dutch/Afrikaans have often borrowed structures from a third source. The so-called international vocabulary is the best but not the only example of this. But even a word such as *trein*, for example, which entered both English and Dutch in the nineteenth century from French, could have made its way into Afrikaans via Dutch or English. (cf. Le Roux 1952: 12)

Thirdly, there is the parallel analytical development which both English and Afrikaans have independently undergone. Only Du Toit (1897: iv) in the nineteenth century (and later Valkhoff 1972: 29) was inclined to see this as English influence on Afrikaans, but a contemporary of his, Viljoen (1896: 25) was already aware this was not the case. Interestingly enough, Suffeleers (1979: 211) mentions that a similar misunderstanding of the trend towards analysis in Holland exists in Flanders today:

‘Ook wordt in Vlaanderen het Duitse vormenstel als model van taalrykdom aanbevolen, terwyl de deflexie “verengelsing” van het Nederlands wordt genoemd.’
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Fourthly, there are those few phenomena which are unknown in both British English and Dutch and yet they occur in South African English and Afrikaans. Determining the source of these can pose problems.

Finally, one should mention a small category not discussed under 2.7.4 which only Schonken (1914: 191) identifies:

‘Hetzelfde [i.e. that contact with English in South Africa is not the source in Afrikaans] mag men beweren van een reeks woorden, die in het Kaapsch-Hollandsch reeds vóór den Engelschen tijd werden opgenomen, zoals het feit, dat wij ze ook in het Kreoolsche Neger-Hollandsch terugvinden, bewijst. Hier en ginds stammen zij vermoedelijk uit de achttiende-eeuwse matrozentaal, die veel uit de taal der destijds opkomende Engelsche zeemacht had overgenomen.’

He gives roep(noem), dagbreek, perdeskoen and dip as examples.

There are numerous ingeburgerde structures in Afrikaans which have been the subject of much debate as to their origin and which are still disapproved of by some grammarians and dictionary compilers. Curiously enough there are others which resemble English and which do not occur in standard Dutch but which, to my knowledge, have never been regarded as suspect, for example: myne, joune etc. without the definite article (cf. Scholtz 1980: 69). In other instances it can be almost impossible to ascertain whether English has served as the source of certain constructions or whether it has merely acted as a contributing factor (cf. 6.3), for example:

‘As invloed van vreemde tale in rekening gebring word by die uitbreiding van die se-konstrukisies, dan mag die moontlike invloed van Engels oor die afgelope honderd jaar en meer nie uitgesluit word nie. Die eenvormige patroon in Engels wat voorkom in John's hat, Mary's shoes, the children's books, last year's fashions, yesterday's meeting, today's news beantwoord aan die eenvormigheid in Afrikaans Jan se hoed, Maria se skoene, die kinders se boeke, verlede jaar se modes, gister se vergadering, vandag se nuus. Dat dikwels te ligtelik aan kreolismes in Afrikaans gedink is, blyk daaruit dat nou se dae sonder meer gelyk gestel is met Maleis-Portugees agora sua tempu, terwyl dit sonder twyfel ’n jong “barbarisme” is en as ‘n verafrikaansing van Engels now-a-days moet beskou word.’ (Scholtz 1980: 71)

Another good example of the extent to which opinions on origin (and thus acceptability) can diverge as a result of the difficulty in assessing the source
due to the close affinity of the two languages, is provided by the use of the auxiliaries *is/was* in the passive in Afrikaans. Terblanche (1980) makes no mention at all of English having anything to do with the use of *was* for the formation of the pluperfect passive, whereas Langenhoven (1935: 114-15), for example, rejects it outright as an anglicism. Those who do defend *was* in the passive regard it only as legitimate when used as a pluperfect, whereas in practice it is often heard where a perfect passive (= English imperfect passive) is required semantically. In such cases both Terblanche's and Langenhoven's points of view are correct. (cf. 7.10)

6.3 The role of contributing factors (*versterkende faktore*)

Scholars have often postulated that the origins of various suspect structures are to be found in older Dutch or dialects and yet because they also occur in English, which is presumably why they are considered suspect, such scholars have felt obliged to add a rider to their claims, for example:

‘Engels kan hoogstens 'n behoudende invloed gehad het’ (Le Roux 1952: 35),
‘...dit [English influence] natuurlik tot die behoud van die uitdrukking kon bygedra het.’ (Terblanche, *Die Brandwag*, 18/10/46)

Boshoff (1963: 39) describes the phenomenon as follows:

‘Ek meen dat Afrikaans meermale uit Nederlands of sy dialekte eienaardighede wat daar om die een of ander rede verlore gegaan het, behou het deurdat Engels verskynsels van 'n min of meer gelyke aard gehad het wat behoudend daarop ingewerk en die voortbestaan daarvan help bestendig het.’

The term contributing factor refers to the role English has possibly played in such cases, i.e. that of a catalyst. One can seldom prove that this is the case, as there is usually some evidence of an alternative source, but nevertheless structures that fall into this category can be considered as another form of pseudo-anglicism. In addition, one can identify two distinct kinds of contributing factor: 1) there are those which correspond with former Dutch structures and thus have a *behoudende* effect on the same structure in Afrikaans; 2) there are those which correspond with innovative developments in Afrikaans with no connection with former Dutch structures. In such cases the contributing factor in English can be said to have had a pro-
gressive, rather than a conservative effect. Examples of this are possibly certain s-plurals in Afrikaans (cf. 7.17.6) and the following concluding remark from De Bruto's (1970: 42) discussion on shifting stress in the international vocabulary of Afrikaans:

‘Linguïsties sal hoogstens binne ’n groot vergelykingsraamwerk, gesê kan word dat die Afrikaanse patroon net verhaas kan gewees het deur Engelse beïnvloeding.’

Ponelis (1979) also makes continual reference to the possibility of English constituting a contributing factor, for example: ‘Versterkende Engelse invloed kan in die volgende gevalle vermoed word.’ (p. 90)

The instances where contributing factors have been postulated by scholars in the literature on anglicisms are legion. It is also an issue on which there has been a great deal of disagreement, but this is to be expected owing to the impossibility of proving what role, if any, similar structures in English have played. Where coexistence in the two languages of similar phenomena has contributed to the frequency of one option over another, one must presumably imagine that the speaker's familiarity with a structure in English, which has a counterpart in Dutch/Afrikaans and which competes with another that is unknown in English, causes him to favour the former because it sounds all the more familiar to him - a product of his bilingualism. A case in point is perhaps the use and form of the reflexive pronoun in Afrikaans compared with Dutch. There are verbs, e.g. voel, which Afrikaans dictionaries regard as non-reflexive, as in English. There are others which the dictionaries still regard as reflexive but which are commonly used without the reflexive pronoun, e.g. *inmeng, spesialiseer - HAT* maintains *jou* is optional in the latter case but I believe it is now archaic. Alternatively, where the Afrikaner does retain the reflexive pronoun in cases where English has too, nowadays it is commonly the emphatic form with -self that is used, even when no emphasis is implied (e.g. was or *jouself was* in preference to *jou was*). In each of these cases there is a distinct point of contact (raakpunt) between English and Afrikaans which has created in the mind of the bilingual a fuzzy area, to paraphrase Aitchison (1981: 52), which has enabled such shifts to occur, all the more so as the unemphatic reflexive pronoun is a relatively semantically empty particle anyway. (cf. 7.27.5)

---

2 Schonken (1914: 191) claims *voel* was also used in this way in seventeenth century Dutch.

3 To illustrate how remote dictionaries can be from reality and how Dutch oriented they still are at times, the *Tweetalige Woordeboek* of Bosman i.a. (1984) is so conservative as to give the infinitive of some reflexive verbs with *sig* (eg. *verbeel*), although the compilers have been rather inconsistent in this regard (eg. *inmeng*).
Hasselmo (1961: 240) observed a similar phenomenon in his study of the language of Swedish immigrants in the USA:

‘... it may at least in some cases be more accurate to say that the English model has reinforced a tendency already found in the language than that it constitutes the sole source for the usage.’

Any two languages in contact can contain *raakpunte* which may give rise to interference. In the case in point, however, because the two languages are so closely related, there are all the more such points of contact which can even have a common etymology. The potential for influence is thus greatly increased and what is more, because the contact with Dutch has now become so tenuous, the way is open for linguistic *change* to occur, not merely *interference*.
Chapter Seven

7.0 The corpus

I make no claim to presenting a complete collection of English structures in Afrikaans. That would be an impossible task as the list is infinite and is being added to all the time. However, I do feel that the categories of influence under which I have classed my examples present a reasonably complete picture of the full range of the sorts of influence that English has had on Afrikaans to date. I invite others to correct me here if I have overlooked any categories or if they feel that further subcategories can be identified. Some readers may disagree with the terminology I have used - a traditional one to facilitate access by laymen to my corpus - but hopefully all will agree with the underlying interference being described.

Occasionally examples occur more than once, although I have tried to avoid this because of the size of the corpus, but it could not always be avoided where certain structures illustrate more than one English feature or where they belong as much in one section as in another - all classification of this sort is to a degree artificial and arbitrary.

I have borrowed very few examples from the many works on anglicisms. Many of the examples to be found in older literature on the topic are presumably no longer current, but I am not in a position to arbitrate on what is or is not still current, plus the fact that it is superfluous to reproduce lists of anglicisms given in other works that can be referred to anyway by the reader. What is more, I have applied my own taxonomy which bears little resemblance to that employed by my predecessors. This corpus is based almost entirely on my own observations which has resulted, I believe, in the inclusion of many examples which have not attracted the attention of previous authors on the topic. Occasionally I refer to recent, authoritative works that shed a little more light on a given issue.

I have refrained from applying the label *ingeburger* to my examples and on the whole from distinguishing structures found only in the spoken language from those that are also tolerated in the written language - actually just another way of saying that they are *ingeburger* or not. It is easy enough to make errors of judgement about whether a given structure is an anglicism or not; deciding in turn whether that structure is considered acceptable in speech only and/or in writing too, opens the way for even more controversy. I have chosen this course of action not only because I, as a non-native-speaker, am not always in a position to draw such lines, but **
because to act otherwise usually entails a value judgement, something I wish to make a point of avoiding - I do not aim to purify the language, but merely to describe it. I am sure that no two Afrikaners would agree on the acceptability or otherwise of many of the examples in this corpus, but I do believe that my examples all occur fairly frequently, at least in the spoken language. Many of the structures will be considered correct Afrikaans by all native-speakers with other Diets options now sounding unusual, archaic or even incorrect. On the other hand, many will feel on reading some of my examples that they would never use such structures in their Afrikaans - the question the Afrikaans reader should ask himself is not whether he would use it himself, but has he heard it used.

Where I contrast an Afrikaans construction with a Dutch one, I do not thereby intend to imply that therefore that Diets structure should also be considered correct Afrikaans or even necessarily that the Afrikaans structure in question is therefore an anglicism, but merely that that possibility/probability exists. Sometimes the Dutch alternative given in brackets would even be considered wrong in Afrikaans. I mention it merely for comparison and thus to highlight where Afrikaans and English coincide and Afrikaans and Dutch differ.

In many sections I have included English translations of the Afrikaans examples for two reasons: 1) to make it perfectly clear of which English structure I feel the Afrikaans one under discussion is an imitation, as otherwise the examples may be somewhat cryptic, and 2) to make the content of this chapter more comprehensible to non-South African readers. (cf. 1.2.3 for the importance of the topic to the world at large)

7.1 Loan translations

By far the largest category of English influenced structures is that of loan translations. But this is to be expected if the survival of Afrikaans is dependent on its ability to satisfy the vertaalbaarheidseis, as has been suggested. (cf. p. 47) Much of what is contained in this section is, however, the result of spontaneous translation by the bilingual Afrikaner rather than the result of the efforts of official translation bodies such as the vaktaalburos.

Categorising loan translations within this section is both difficult and artificial to a certain extent: does one classify according to syntactical or morphological formation or according to sphere of use, for example? I have been vaguely guided by formation, separating lexical items - further subdivided into compound nouns, separable verbs and other words - from
phrases and clauses, but even this division can be difficult to defend at times.

Some of the clauses given could warrant the label proverbs or proverbial expressions but these are all rather arbitrary lines one would be forced to draw that do not really bear any relevance to the role English has played in the matter.

At times it was difficult to determine whether an expression such as hy is sy sout nie werd nie belonged simply under 7.1.1 (expressions) or under 7.1.1.2 (Diets expressions with an English form - cf. p. 179). It is impossible to know exactly how such an expression entered Afrikaans.

In many instances the expressions as they stand are not necessarily anglicisms at all if one takes them literally - it is the figurative meaning that I am drawing attention to in such cases, for example: jou sokkies optrek - to pull up your socks.

7.1.1 Expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agter skedule</td>
<td>behind schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binne maklike bereik</td>
<td>within easy reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buite die kwessie</td>
<td>out of the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buite/onder beheer</td>
<td>out of/under control (fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in beheer van</td>
<td>in control of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in bevel</td>
<td>in charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in geheim</td>
<td>in secret (cf. p. 255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in rat</td>
<td>in gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na ure</td>
<td>after hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op die rak</td>
<td>on the shelf (old maid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit asem</td>
<td>out of breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit druk</td>
<td>out of print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit oefening</td>
<td>out of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit orde</td>
<td>out of order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moeg vir/van</td>
<td>tired of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dorstig vir</td>
<td>thirsty for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce Donaldson, The Influence of English on Afrikaans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>een van die dae</td>
<td>one of these days¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten alle koste</td>
<td>at all costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as sulks</td>
<td>as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ure en ure</td>
<td>hours and hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wat se naam</td>
<td>what's his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meneer so en so</td>
<td>Mr. So and so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op so en so 'n plek</td>
<td>at such and such a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op die plek</td>
<td>on the spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die heel eerste/laaste</td>
<td>the very first/last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oor en oor</td>
<td>over and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elke nou en dan/af en toe</td>
<td>every now and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aan en af</td>
<td>on and off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir 'n reënerige dag</td>
<td>for a rainy day (save s.t. -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitverkoping van 'n leeftyd</td>
<td>sale of a lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so reg soos reën</td>
<td>as right as rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volstoom vorentoe</td>
<td>full steam ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aan boord skip</td>
<td>on board ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die laaste strooi</td>
<td>the last straw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n voet in die deur</td>
<td>a foot in the door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net vir jou inligting</td>
<td>just for your information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot so ver suid soos</td>
<td>to as far south as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by ver</td>
<td>by far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so ver</td>
<td>so far (up till now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ver(s) te verstandig, duur etc.</td>
<td>far too sensible, expensive etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te pragtig etc.</td>
<td>too wonderful etc.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na/voor alles</td>
<td>after/above all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as 'n reël</td>
<td>as a rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soort van</td>
<td>sort of (colloquial filler)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die een en enigste</td>
<td>the one and only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die enigste uitweg uit</td>
<td>the only way out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Een van die dae could be seen as the legitimate successor of Dutch een dezer dagen, but the two are not synonymous. The Afrikaans expression corresponds in meaning exactly to ‘one of these days’ (i.e. possibly 20 years from now) whereas the Dutch expression means ‘one of these days in the very near future’. Is een van die dae thus an example of loan translation or of semantic shift?

2 To my knowledge this use of te and too is peculiar to Afrikaans and South African English, but it may in fact be more wide-spread. I am not sure of the source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al die pad</td>
<td>all the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al die tyd</td>
<td>all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(die) meeste van die tyd</td>
<td>most of the time (cf. p. 254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in kort</td>
<td>in short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die goeie ou dae</td>
<td>the good old days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodeoos om te sê</td>
<td>needless to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oor my dooie liggaam</td>
<td>over my dead body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans Expression</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir 'n lang tyd</td>
<td>for a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eendag</td>
<td>one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die ander dag</td>
<td>the other day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lig op petrol</td>
<td>light on petrol (a car)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit die bloute (uit)</td>
<td>out of the blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot so 'n mate</td>
<td>to such an extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tot op datum</td>
<td>to date (up till now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die man in die straat</td>
<td>the man in the street (cf. p. 255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die kersie op die koek</td>
<td>the cherry on the cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te groot vir jou skoene</td>
<td>too big for your shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aan die einde van die dag</td>
<td>at the end of the day (fig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspuiting van fondse</td>
<td>injection of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die sonskyn van my lewe</td>
<td>the sunshine of my life (a person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel dag</td>
<td>all day³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand se arm draai</td>
<td>to twist s.o.'s arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand se been trek</td>
<td>to pull s.o.'s leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand se oog vang</td>
<td>to catch s.o.'s eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand 'n vuil kyk gee</td>
<td>to give s.o. a dirty look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand hel gee</td>
<td>to give s.o. hell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand tot siens wuif</td>
<td>to wave s.o. good-bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand welkom laat voel</td>
<td>to make s.o. feel welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand sy eie medisyne gee</td>
<td>to give s.o. (some of) his own medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na iemand kyk vir hulp</td>
<td>to look to s.o. for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teen iemand draai</td>
<td>to turn against s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir iemand ogies maak</td>
<td>to make eyes at s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir iemand 'n harde tyd gee</td>
<td>to give s.o. a hard time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir iemand 'n sagte plekkie hé</td>
<td>to have a soft spot for s.o.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Although *heel dag* (= *die hele dag*) sounds like a translation of ‘all day’, Steyn (1976: 33) mentions *heel tyd* (= *die hele tyd*), which is not an English idiom - does this suggest that other factors are at work?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vir iemand jammer voel</td>
<td>to feel sorry for s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou vinger op 'n probleem</td>
<td>to put your finger on a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou mond laat water</td>
<td>to make your mouth water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou voete afloop</td>
<td>to walk your feet off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou voete vind</td>
<td>to find your feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou voet neersit</td>
<td>to put your foot down (fig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou gordel intrek</td>
<td>to pull your belt in (fig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou sokkies optrek</td>
<td>to pull up your socks (fig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou eie beuel blaas</td>
<td>to blow your own trumpet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| jou gewig agter 'n saak (in)gooi | to put your weight behind an issue
| jou gewig rondgooi | to throw your weight around
| jou rug keer op | to turn your back on
| uit jou pad gaan | to go out of your way
| agter/na jouself kyk (also jouself oppas) | to look after yourself
| dit sal die dag wees | that will be the day
| die kat uit die sak laat | to let the cat out of the bag (cf. p. 180)
| sy blaf is erger as sy byt | his bark is worse than his bite
| 'n druppel in/aan die emmer | a drop in the bucket
| dit kom uit die perd se bek | it comes from the horse's mouth
| hoe meer haas hoe minder - spoed | more haste less speed
| tussen die duiwel en die diep blou see | between the devil and the deep blue sea
| ek weet vir 'n feit dat | I know for a fact that
| feit van die saak is | fact of the matter is
| aan die verloor/-wenkant wees | to be on the losing/winning side
| toe lui 'n klokkie | then a bell rang (fig.)
| tot iemand se krediet sê | to say to s.o.'s credit
| volle krediet kry vir | to get full credit for
| ek kon nie daaroor kom nie | I couldn't get over it
| dit betaal jou nie om te | it doesn't pay you to
| 'n dokter (gaan) sien | to (go and) see a doctor
| vir 'n uitstappie/wandeling - gaan | to go for a trip/walk
| wat is verkeerd daarmee? | what's wrong with that? (fig.)
| as dit nie vir - was nie | if it wasn't for - (cf. Raidt 1969: 48, Ponelis. 1979: 76)

4 Perhaps (in)gooi here is the result of contamination with the next expression.
I'm telling you (rhetorical saying)
can you believe it! (exclamation)
the onus rests on him
to be on the lookout for
to be in line with
there's not a sign of anything
to enjoy wide publicity
to open the way for
he's got his knife in for me
my watch is three minutes fast/slow
I have no time for such people
it can't be that
they're fleeing for their lives (cf. p. 238)
to have an eye for a pretty girl
sulke mense het net hulself te blameer
such people only have themselves to blame
twee keer dink voordat...
to think twice before...

toes van die beste kry
to get six of the best (caning)
so skaars soos hoendertande
as scarce as hens' teeth
daardie brieke werk soos 'n bom
those brakes work like a bomb
soos 'n klip slaap
to sleep like a rock
dit kom handig in
it comes in handy
'n idee gaan in rook op
an idea goes up in smoke
bevrees wees dat
to be afraid that (fig.)
dis daarop gemik
it is aimed at (fig.)
die besprekings het in 'n goeie gees plaasgevind
the discussions took place in a good spirit
hy bly drie deure van my (af)
he lives three doors from me

'n produk behaal tien rand
a product fetches ten rand
hulle is meer as bereid om te
they are more than ready to
dit sal 'n spel en 'n half wees
that will be a game and a half
as/wanneer dit by - kom
when it comes to (Ponelis 1979: 76)
dit betaal nie om (te puristies te wees nie etc)
it doesn't pay (to be too puristic etc.)
wat se goed is dit?
what good is that?
dit wys vir jou net
it just goes to show you
jy sal nie ver uit wees nie
you won't be far out (guessing)
die prys gaan aan jou
the prize goes to you
ek het 'n idee of twee
I have an idea or two
die ou jaar het op 'n warm noot afgesluit
the old year finished on a warm note

op daardie noot groet ons tot 8.00
on that note we say goodbye till 8.00
iets vierkantig in die oë kyk
to look s.t. squarely in the eyes (cf. p. 210)
help yourself to
what's going to become of
not to be able to hold a candle to s.o.
for many people it will be news to know
to go back to the drawing board
to come to the point (cf. p. 229)
to bring the point home
that's not the point
butter wouldn't melt in his mouth
it has come to stay
you're one to talk

to buy something on easy terms

to talk about anything under the sun
everything under the sun

last but not least
do you think for a moment that

to lay the blame at s.o.'s feet

she's no chicken any more
to be in great demand

I wouldn't dream of saying that in Afrikaans

I can't understand head or tail

when in Rome

to pick flowers by the arm full

to ask a question

to have a/the last say

to cut prices

to paint red (the town)
to be/come on heat
to discuss in depth

to kick up a noise

to play for time

to spin a yarn

to have a sweet tooth
to have a screw loose (be crazy)

he is off his head

to receive treatment

to feel ashamed

to kick the bucket

to cut a life short
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spoed optel</td>
<td>to pick up speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n film skiet</td>
<td>to shoot a film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n nuwe bladjie omslaan</td>
<td>to turn over a new leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou geld blaas</td>
<td>to blow your money (cf. p. 188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op die verdediging wees</td>
<td>to be on the defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geboorte gee</td>
<td>to give birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reg wees</td>
<td>to be right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou gesig wys</td>
<td>to show your face (to appear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou hart kruis</td>
<td>to cross your heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na normaal terugkeer</td>
<td>to return to normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tweede plek neem</td>
<td>to take second place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wegkom met moord</td>
<td>to get away with murder (fig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voor 'n kar inhok</td>
<td>to run in front of a car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.1.1 Semantically empty verbs

Ostyn (1972: 100), in his study of the Dutch of Flemish immigrants in America, commented:

‘Verbs such as to do, to put, to go, to get, to come, to cook (instead of broil, fry etc.) are general and enter into more syntagmatic relations than the more specific items they can replace. Their valence and distribution is great and their information therefore is small.’

With reference to such words he adds on p. 269 that there is a ‘trend of preferring general core items to specific, peripheral ones of highly restricted distribution’. One can say that these verbs are relatively semantically empty, in much the same way that prepositions are too. Ostyn’s remarks apply equally to many English inspired uses of the following verbs in Afrikaans: *doen, kry, maak, neem/vat, sit (= put)* and *staan;* with some hesitation, because such uses of the word are frowned upon by many speakers, I include *(hard)loop.* Ostyn’s remarks also apply to several nouns like *ding, merk* and *punt,* although here homophony is also playing a role. (cf. 7.14)

doen - to do

- *hy doen ’n skripsie oor* he's doing an essay about

- *enige mooi kaart sal doen* any pretty card will do

(suffice)

- *ek kan doen sonder vleis* I can do without meat

- *hulle kan doen met nog ’n personeellid* they can do with another

staff member

- *witrenosters doen goed hier* white rhinos do well here

- *’n guns vir iemand doen* to do a favour for s.o.

kry - to get

- *ek sal jou terugkry* I'll get you back

- *het jy ’n woonstel gekry* did you get a flat (find, obtain)

- *kry vandag ’n bottel* get a bottle today (buy)

- *duikers kry lyk* divers get body (find)

- *kry die bus na Sun City* get the bus to Sun City (take)

- *kry vir my ’n taxi* get me a taxi (fetch, find)
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ons kom jou kry by die stasie   -   we'll come and get you from the station (fetch)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ek moet 'n snesie kry</td>
<td>I must get a tissue (fetch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kry die botter</td>
<td>get the butter (fetch)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**maak** - to make (cf. p. 98)<sup>6</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'n verskyning maak</td>
<td>to make an appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n lewe maak</td>
<td>to make a living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n bydrae maak</td>
<td>to make a contribution (to science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n oproep maak</td>
<td>to make a call (telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n voorstel maak</td>
<td>to make a suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n beslissing maak</td>
<td>to make a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jy sal dit nie maak nie</td>
<td>you won't make it (succeed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iemand iets maak doen</td>
<td>to make s.o. do s.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maak my</td>
<td>make me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir iemand ogies maak</td>
<td>to make eyes at s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jouself tuismaak</td>
<td>to make yourself at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou merk maak</td>
<td>to make your mark (cf. p. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pad maak vir</td>
<td>to make way for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vriende/maats maak met</td>
<td>to make friends with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kontak maak</td>
<td>to make contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moeilikheid maak</td>
<td>to make trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuus maak</td>
<td>to make news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R200 maak</td>
<td>to make R200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seker maak</td>
<td>to make sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin maak</td>
<td>to make sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spore maak</td>
<td>to make tracks (leave quickly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrede maak</td>
<td>to make peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**neem/vat** - to take

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'n vak neem</td>
<td>to take a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n breek vat</td>
<td>to take a break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n eed neem</td>
<td>to take an oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n kans/kanse vat&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>to take a chance/chances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. 7.1.3 for separable verbs formed with maak.

<sup>7</sup> An alternative with waag also occurs, as it does in Dutch. (cf. staan below too)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dit neem 'n maand om te geneem</td>
<td>it takes a month to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dit het my tien minute geneem om te</td>
<td>it took me ten minutes to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dit vat 'n bietjie oefening geneem</td>
<td>it takes a bit of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hy vat sy tyd</td>
<td>he takes his time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vat my woord daarvoor</td>
<td>take my word for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n mens kan net so veel vat</td>
<td>one can take just so much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy kan nie die hitte vat nie</td>
<td>she can't take the heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hy vat geen nonsens nie</td>
<td>he takes no nonsense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**sit** - to put, set

(cf. separable verbs for *aan-*,-, *af-*,-, *deur-*,-, *op-* and *uitsit*)

- **die polisie op iemand sit** - to put the police on s.o.
- **jou hart op iets sit** - to set your heart on s.t.

**staan** - to stand

- **'n kans staan** - to stand a chance
- **vir die Volksraad staan** - to stand for parliament
- **ek kan hom nie staan nie** - I can't stand him (cf. p. 180)
- **ek gaan nie daarvoor staan nie** - I'm not going to stand for it
- **hy het my 'n koffie gestaan** - he stood me a coffee
- **die werksgeleentheid wat staan geskep te word, sal...** - the employment opportunities which stand to be created, will...

**hardloop** - to run

- **die treine (hard)loop nou weer** (Dt. *lopen* but not *hardlopen*) - the trains are now running again
- **die bus (hard)loop van A na B** - the bus runs from A to B
- **dit hardloop in die familie** - it runs in the family
- **reisies hardloop** - to run races

7.1.1.2 Diets expressions with an English form

The following expressions all exist in Dutch but the form in which they occur in Afrikaans shows a certain contamination from English, although for some of them a variant truer to the Dutch original still exists too. The Dutch alternative is given in brackets. Ostyn (1972: 119) observed the same phenomenon in American Flemish:

‘Proverbs, idioms and idiomatic phrases tend to be recalled rather poorly, if at all, and they tend to undergo paradigmatic and syntagmatic processes for which they are marked in Flemish.’

- **kos voorberei (bereiden)** - to prepare food
- **die gees opgee (geven)** - to give up the ghost
- **die toon set (aangeven)** - to set the tone
daar was nie 'n siel nie  
(geen levende ziel)  -  there wasn't a soul

na strooihalms gyp  
(zich aan een strohalm vastklampen)  -  to clutch at straws

iets met 'n knippie sout  
(neem (korreltje))  -  to take s.t. with a pinch of salt
'n naald in 'n hooimied - to look for a needle in a haystack
soek (speld)
die handdoek ingooi (in de ring gooien) - to throw in the towel
die kind met die badwater uitgooi (weggooien) - to throw the baby out with the bathwater
die land met 'n ysterhand beheer (met een ijzeren vuist regeren) - to rule the country with an iron hand
die aap uit die mou laat (komen) - to let the cat out of the bag
'n storm in 'n teekoppie (glas water) - a storm in a teacup
hulle neem hul tyd om te (de tijd) - they're taking their time to...
op jou laaste bene wees (lopen) - to be on your last legs
hy is sy sout nie werd nie (het zout in de pap niet waard zijn) - he's not worth his salt
ek kan hom nie staan nie (uitstaan) - I can't stand him
ek kry koud (het koud krijgen) - I'm getting cold
hoe kan jy dit aan my doen? (aandoen) - how can you do this to me?
die appel van sy vader se oog (oogappel) - the apple of his father's eye
na die beste van sy vermoë (naar zijn beste vermogen) - to the best of his ability
daardie soort van ding (dat soort dingen) - that sort of thing
vir 'n verandering (de) - for a change
iets/iemand in 'n swak lig stel (iemand in een slecht daglicht stellen) - to put s.t./s.o. in a bad light
daar is hope tyd (een hoop tijd) - there's heaps of time

8 De aap komt uit de mouw does not mean the same thing as 'to let the cat out of the bag'.
9 Similar in structure is the anglicism tot die beste van my kennis, which does not exist in Dutch.
ons hoop vir die beste (het beste hopen) - we're hoping for the best
agter slot en sleutel (grendel) - behind lock and key
in dieselfde asem (in een adem) - in the same breath
in goeie trou (te goeder trouw) - in good faith
'n belowende jong man (veel belovende) - a promising young man
telefoonoproep (telefonische) - telephone call
in volle swang (in swang = in fashion) - in full swing (cf. p. 227)
besoekers hê/kry (bezoek) - to have/get visitors
wag staan (op wacht staan) - to stand watch
### 7.1.2 Compound nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afdelingswinkel</td>
<td>department store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afleveringsvoertuig</td>
<td>delivery vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afspitstyd</td>
<td>off-peak time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agterbank(er)</td>
<td>back-bench(er)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antiekkermis</td>
<td>antique fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asblik</td>
<td>ash can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avokadospeer</td>
<td>avocado pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babaseun</td>
<td>baby boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bal-/bolpuntipen</td>
<td>ballpoint pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bandopnemer (also Flem.)</td>
<td>tape-recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedryfsleiding (as an acad. subject)</td>
<td>business management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binneversierder</td>
<td>interior decorator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blommerangskik(ing)</td>
<td>flower arranging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boekmerk</td>
<td>bookmark (cf. p. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boerpot</td>
<td>jackpot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bofbal</td>
<td>baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrelgom</td>
<td>bubble gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branderplank</td>
<td>surf board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(brood)rolletjie</td>
<td>(bread) roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulhond</td>
<td>bulldog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagbreek</td>
<td>daybreak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dameklerk</td>
<td>lady clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damemotor-bestuurder</td>
<td>lady driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deurverkeer</td>
<td>through traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diensstasie</td>
<td>service station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draadloos, draadlose toestel</td>
<td>wireless wireless set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diestukpak</td>
<td>three piece suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drie kwartbed</td>
<td>three quarter bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dronkryer</td>
<td>drunk driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>droogskoonmaker</td>
<td>dry cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>droogwentel</td>
<td>spin-dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drukkoker</td>
<td>pressure cooker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dubbelborspak</td>
<td>double-breasted suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eeuwending</td>
<td>turn of the century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eiervrug - egg fruit
feeverhaal - fairy story
fortuinverteller - fortune teller
geboortemerk - birthmark (cf. p. 229)
generasiegaping - generation gap
geval(le)studie - case study
Grahamstad - Grahamstown
groeikoers - growth rate
groente-olie - vegetable oil
groetekaart - greetings card
groondverdieping - ground floor
haarsproei - hairspray
hoëhakskoene - high-heeled shoes
hoëtroustel - high fidelity set
hofsaak - court case
hommelby - bumble bee
inryteater, -bioskoop -fliek - drive-in theatre
jakkalsdraf - fox trot
kabinet-herskommeling - cabinet reshuffle
kalklig - lime light
kettingwinkel - chain store
kitskoffie - instant coffee
klankbaan - sound track
klaskamer - classroom
klipgooi - stone's throw
koffie(ver)romer - coffee creamer
kolilig - spot light
kombuistee - kitchen tea
kopfoon oorfoon (-fone) - headphone, earphone(s)
kosmenger - food mixer
kragboor - power drill
kragboot - power boat
kragprop - power plug
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kragstasie</td>
<td>- power station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruispad</td>
<td>- crossroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landmerk</td>
<td>- landmark (cf. p. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lappieswerk</td>
<td>- patchwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lewensgehalte</td>
<td>- quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugredery</td>
<td>- airline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugvertoning</td>
<td>- airshow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugwaardin</td>
<td>- air hostess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandjiebal</td>
<td>- basket ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modderggooiery</td>
<td>- mud slinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modderskerm</td>
<td>- mudguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moeilikheidmaker</td>
<td>- trouble-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muurpapier</td>
<td>- wallpaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neseier</td>
<td>- nest egg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutsakkie</td>
<td>- utility bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuusdekkings</td>
<td>- news coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuusflits</td>
<td>- news flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuusman</td>
<td>- newsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oefeningboek</td>
<td>- exercise book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oefenlopie</td>
<td>- practice run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omgewingsbewaring</td>
<td>- environmental conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opset</td>
<td>- set-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padkafee</td>
<td>- road café</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padongeluk</td>
<td>- road accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padteken</td>
<td>- road sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>padvark</td>
<td>- road hog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paneelklopper</td>
<td>- panel beater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papierknippie</td>
<td>- paperclip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passasierseindpunt</td>
<td>- passenger terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passer en draaier</td>
<td>- fitter &amp; turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plekmatjie</td>
<td>- place mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polkakol</td>
<td>- polka dot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potloodskerpmaker</td>
<td>- pencil sharpener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raamwerk</td>
<td>- frame work (angl. in Dt. too)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ratkas</td>
<td>gear box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roookop</td>
<td>redhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rugpak</td>
<td>back pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sagtebal</td>
<td>softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seekos(se)</td>
<td>sea food(s) (cf. p. 237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seevlak</td>
<td>sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sekskatjie</td>
<td>sex kitten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitplekgordel</td>
<td>seat belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skrootwerf</td>
<td>scrap yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skouwoonstel, -huis</td>
<td>show flat/house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleutelbedryf</td>
<td>key industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somertyd</td>
<td>summer time (as name of season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport-, reisgogga</td>
<td>sport/travel bug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spuitkannetjie</td>
<td>spray can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stadsaal</td>
<td>town hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stasiewa</td>
<td>station wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straalvegter</td>
<td>jet fighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stopteken</td>
<td>stop sign (metal traffic sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strombelyning</td>
<td>streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taakmag</td>
<td>task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n tenkvol</td>
<td>a tank full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terugflits</td>
<td>flashback(^{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terugvoer</td>
<td>feedback(^{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-hempie</td>
<td>t-shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toeriste-aantreklikheid</td>
<td>tourist attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toetswedstryd</td>
<td>test match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toonhuis</td>
<td>show house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topverkoper tee</td>
<td>top-seller tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tronkvoël</td>
<td>jailbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV-stel</td>
<td>TV set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tweeslagolie</td>
<td>two-stroke oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tydtafel</td>
<td>timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitbreiding</td>
<td>extension (telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbruikersgoedere</td>
<td>consumer goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verkoop(s)man</td>
<td>salesman (cf. p. 205-6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Dutch uses *flashbáck* and *feedback*, with an un-English stress. (cf. 7.19)
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verskil in uitkyk/lewensuitkyk - difference in outlook
vertoonlokaal - show-room
verwysingsboek - reference book
video-opnemer - video recorder
vierslaapkamerhuis - 4 bedroomed house
vierspoedkar - 4 speed car
visstok - fishing rod
vlugkelner - flight steward
voedselverwerker - food processor
vollengte film - full-length film
vonkelwyn - sparkling wine
vonkprop - spark plug
voorvereiste - prerequisite
(Vrydagaand-) gleuf (on tv) - (Friday evening) slot
warmwaterstelsel - hot water system
wegneemetes - take away(s) food
welwillendheidsbesoek - good will visit
wetenskapsfiksie - science fiction
woordverwerker - word processor
worshond - sausage dog
worsrolletjie - sausage roll
ysskaats - ice skate (n.)

algemene praktisyn - general practitioner
amptelike besoek - official visit (Dt. staatsbezoek)
betekenisvolle besprekings - meaningful discussions
bose kringloop - vicious circle
Duitse masels - German measles
'n ferm hand - a firm hand
geel bladsye - yellow pages
gevestigde tuin - established garden
goue/gulde geleenthed - golden opportunity
Hollandse Oos-Indiese Kompanjie - Dutch East India Company
huis van aanbidding - house of worship
indiepte-bespreking - in depth discussion
Keulse water - eau de Cologne
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'n knizzie sout</td>
<td>a pinch of salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koue vleis(e)</td>
<td>cold meat(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lede van die publiek</td>
<td>members of the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lopende koste(s)</td>
<td>running costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muur-tot-muur-matte</td>
<td>wall-to-wall carpets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naby-skoot</td>
<td>close-up shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n nommer-drie-yster</td>
<td>a number three iron (golf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skoon grap</td>
<td>clean joke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die Slapende Skone</td>
<td>Sleeping Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swart en wit</td>
<td>black and white (Dt. zwartwit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweedse leer</td>
<td>suède</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vader Kersfees</td>
<td>Father Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verlede nag</td>
<td>last night (cf. p. 230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verstandelik</td>
<td>mentally retarded person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vertraagde/gestremde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n vier-hout</td>
<td>a four wood (golf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'n wit olifant</td>
<td>a white elephant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.1.3 Separable verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aanbly</td>
<td>to stay on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aangaan</td>
<td>to go on, continue; to happen(^{11})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanhang</td>
<td>to hang on (telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanhelp</td>
<td>to help on e.g. <em>dit help inflasie aan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanhou</td>
<td>to hold on (telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aankom</td>
<td>to come on (to TV); <em>kom aan</em> - hurry up; <em>met goeie reën sal die veld aankom</em> - thrive (cf. also <em>aankomende verkeer</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aansit</td>
<td>to put on, pretend; to put on clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanstuur</td>
<td>to send on, forward (mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afbetaal af-, in-, op-,</td>
<td>to pay off (workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voorbybeweeg</td>
<td>to move off, in, up, out, past (weather fronts, troops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afgaan</td>
<td>to go off (oven); to go off from work, e.g. <em>om vier uur gaan ek af</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afkom</td>
<td>to come down (from Johannesburg to Cape Town, cf. <em>opgaan</em>); to get off (work) e.g. <em>hoe laat kom jy af?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) This word has been the subject of much debate, beginning with Changuion (1844: VII) who did not hesitate to label it as an anglicism. But Mansvelt (1884: 8) started the polemic about this word when he wrote:

> ‘Aangaan, voortgaan; voortgaan vordering maken. In't hedendaags Ned. wordt aangaan niet meer in dezen in gebruik; doch bij oude schrijvers (o.a. Cats) komt 't nog als zoodanig voor. 't Is dus niet, zooals men wel meent, een Anglicisme (to go on)’

But all the people who have discussed whether this word is English or not, have either looked no further than the meaning ‘to continue’ or have made no distinction between the meanings ‘to continue’ and ‘to happen’, for example, *wat gaan hier aan?*, implying that both are indigenous and not anglicisms. However, what evidence has been found to support that *aangaan* may not be an anglicism in origin, is only valid for the first meaning, not the latter, which is essentially different. Ostyn (1972: 64) also comments on the use of *aangaan* with an English meaning in American Flemish. Some of the South African scholars who discuss the issue are: Schonken (1914: 191), Smith (*Die Napweek* 21/10/48, 1962: 67), Le Roux (1968: 165-6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afkry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to get off (a day from work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afmerk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to mark down (prices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afneem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to take off (a day from work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afsien</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to see off, say goodbye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afsit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to put off, baulk s.o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afskakel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to switch off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afskop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to kick off, begin (a show)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afskud</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to shake off (an attacker, cold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afteken</td>
<td>to sign off (on radio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aftrek</td>
<td>to pull off (the road - a car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afvat</td>
<td>to take off (a day from work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afwys</td>
<td>to show off (ostentatious behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deurkom</td>
<td>to get through (an exam)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deursien</td>
<td>to see somebody through a difficult time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deursit</td>
<td>to put s.o. through (on telephone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inbel</td>
<td>to ring in (to a radio programme)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inbespreek</td>
<td>to book in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inbreek</td>
<td>to break in (a horse) (cf. Mansvelt 1884: 65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingaan</td>
<td>to go in for s.t. (a hobby)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingee</td>
<td>to give in (eyes), to give up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhandig</td>
<td>to hand in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inkom</td>
<td>to come in (to the office); also <em>dit sal handig inkom</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlaat</td>
<td>to let in, admit s.o.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlees</td>
<td>to read into (a meaning into a word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inluister</td>
<td>to listen in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inneem</td>
<td>to take in (more students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innooi</td>
<td>to invite s.o. in (cf. <em>oornooi</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inprop</td>
<td>to plug in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inroep</td>
<td>to call s.o. in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insit</td>
<td>to put in (a good word for s.o.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inslaap</td>
<td>to sleep in (<em>n inslaapbediende</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instaan</td>
<td>to stand in for s.o., replace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instroom</td>
<td>to stream in (enquiries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insweer</td>
<td>to swear in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>invat</strong></td>
<td>to take something inside; to take s.o. into town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inweeg</strong></td>
<td>to weigh in (at an airport)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oomooi</strong></td>
<td>to invite s.o. over (cf. <em>innooi</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oorslaap</strong></td>
<td>to sleep over, spend the night somewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oorwaai</strong></td>
<td>to blow over (a problem)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opbou</strong></td>
<td>to build up (problems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opbreek</strong></td>
<td>to break up (school holidays)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opdam</strong></td>
<td>to bank up (traffic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opeindig</strong></td>
<td>to end up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opgaan</strong></td>
<td>to go up, rise (prices); to go up (to Pretoria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opgooi</strong></td>
<td>to throw up, vomit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>upgradeer</strong></td>
<td>to upgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ophelp</strong></td>
<td>to help s.o. up (to stand)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opkyk</strong></td>
<td>to look up (a dictionary); be merry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opmaak</strong></td>
<td>to make up (one's mind; an excuse, story; lovers' reconciliation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opmors</strong></td>
<td>to muck up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oppak</strong></td>
<td>to pack up, to break down (a car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opsien</strong></td>
<td>to look up (to s.o.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opsit</strong></td>
<td>to put up (prices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opstoot</strong></td>
<td>to push up (productivity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>optel</strong></td>
<td>to pick up (a radio signal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>optrek</strong></td>
<td>to draw up (plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opwas</strong></td>
<td>to wash up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jouself opwerk</strong></td>
<td>to work yourself up, get anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>padgee</strong></td>
<td>to give way, collapse (scaffolding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>terugdateer</strong></td>
<td>to date back, e.g. 'n biblioteek met tydskrifte wat etlike dekades terugdateer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>terugkry</strong></td>
<td>to get s.o. back (seek retribution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toesien</strong></td>
<td>to see to s.t. e.g. hy sal toesien dat die stoele afgelever word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitdraai</strong></td>
<td>to turn out e.g. dit het snaaks uitgedraai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitfaseer</strong></td>
<td>to phase out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitkamp</strong></td>
<td>to camp out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitklaar</strong></td>
<td>to clear out, get going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitklop</strong></td>
<td>to knock out (boxing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitkom</strong></td>
<td>to come out (from England to South Africa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitlê</strong></td>
<td>to outlay (money)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uitloop</strong></td>
<td>to run out (time) (cf. p. 179)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitmaak</td>
<td>to make out, decipher e.g. <em>ek kan nie al die letters uitmaak nie</em>; to claim e.g. <em>ek is nie so alleen as wat hy wil uitmaak nie.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitmis</td>
<td>to miss out e.g. <em>hy mis baie uit.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitneem</td>
<td>to take out (insurance; a girl; a book from a library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitpraat</td>
<td>to talk out, speak up, give your opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitsel</td>
<td>to sail out (from England to South Africa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jou uitsit</td>
<td>to put yourself out, inconvenience yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitsorteer</td>
<td>to sort out (matters; a person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitspel</td>
<td>to spell out (a policy, law)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitstaan</td>
<td>to stand out, be obvious (cf. also ‘n uitstaande persoon/skuld)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitvang</td>
<td>to catch s.o. out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitwerk</td>
<td>to work out (tr. a new method; intr. e.g. <em>dit sal goedkoper uitwerk</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uitwis</td>
<td>to wipe out (a tribe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voorlê</td>
<td>to lie ahead (to be in the future)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.1.4 Other words

#### 7.1.4.1 Nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afhanklike</td>
<td>dependent (person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bemarking</td>
<td>marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besigheid</td>
<td>business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brug</td>
<td>bridge (card game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buis</td>
<td>tube (tooth-paste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ding</td>
<td>cf. 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eiendom</td>
<td>property (house and land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>houer</td>
<td>container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insypelaar</td>
<td>infiltrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koers</td>
<td>rate e.g. <em>groeikoers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krag</td>
<td>power (electricity) cf. p. 181-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kroeg</td>
<td>bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruis</td>
<td>cross (an animal breed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loods</td>
<td>pilot (plane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lopie</td>
<td>run (cricket)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prop</td>
<td>plug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raam</td>
<td>frame (bicycle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>cream e.g. <em>vel-, skeerroom; room van die oes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>span</td>
<td>team e.g. <em>spanwerk, spangees</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stel</td>
<td>set (film set)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweep</td>
<td>whip (Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tak</td>
<td>branch (of a firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treffer</td>
<td>hit (song)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kroeg occurs in many translated compounds, e.g. *hakke-, roomys-, skemer-; -man, -stoel.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>trog</em></td>
<td>trough (weather)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vark</em></td>
<td>pork (= varkl eis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>verband</em></td>
<td>bond (housing loan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>verhitting</em></td>
<td>heating (in a home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>versapper</em></td>
<td>juicer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>verskoning</em></td>
<td>excuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>verslapping</em></td>
<td>relaxation (of laws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vlak</em></td>
<td>level (water, standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>voeler(s)</em></td>
<td>(insect) feeler(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vrystelling - release (film, record)
werf - yard (backyard)

7.1.4.2 Adjectives

bogemiddeld - above-average
gebruik - used (car)
onderhandelbaar - negotiable
outyds - old time (music)
padwaardig - roadworthy
rooiwarm - red-hot
skotvry - scot free
tussenkontinentaal - intercontinental
vertraag - retarded (mentally -)
verwagtenant - expecting (pregnant)
vullend - filling (food)
warm - hot (spicy of food)

7.1.4.3 Adverbs

alklaar - already
altesaam - altogether
gerieflik - conveniently e.g. iets
gerieflik verswyg
heelhartiglik - wholeheartedly (cf. p. 209)
laas - last, e.g. ek het hom twintig jaar laas gesien
(= Dt. het laatst; Dt. laatst means 'recently')
oornag - overnight

7.1.4.4 Verbs

bank - to bank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blaas</td>
<td>to blow (a globe, your money, nose; cf. p. 218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bly</td>
<td>to stay (= to live, reside) (^{13})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dek</td>
<td>to cover (news)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponeer</td>
<td>to deposit (money in the bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herseël</td>
<td>to reseal (roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ontlont</td>
<td>to defuse (a situation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Whether *bly* is an anglicism or not is a debate which has existed since Changiouon (1844: VII). The following scholars discuss the issue, Hegman mentioning that the *OED* gives ‘to stay’ in this meaning as colonial English: Terblanche (*Die Brandwag*, 18/10/46), Le Roux (1968: 171), Hegman (1983: 72).
(ont)trek - to (with)draw (money from the bank)
ontvries - to defrost (tr. verb)
vang - to catch (a joke; s.o.'s eye, s.o. unprepared)
vertrou - to trust, e.g. ek vertrou dat...
verwag - to expect (a child) e.g. sy verwag (intr.)
voel - to feel, think
vrystel - to release (a film, record)
borsvoed - to breastfeed
diepbraai - to deepfry
dronkbestuur - to drunk-drive
toetsbestuur - to test-drive

7.2 Lehnübertragungen

The English language still has no appropriate term for what the Germans call Lehnübertragungen. The term refers to words and expressions which are not literal translations but which endeavour to render a similar image, for example: beeldsaai (to telecast) contains the verb to sow or cast (seed) and spookbeeld (ghosting on TV) contains the word ghost. Lehnübertragungen could be regarded as a subdivision of loan translations, as they always entail partial translation, but one could also argue that they are a form of neologism and that distinction between loan translations on the one hand and neologisms on the other is rather forced; but as they are in essence different from both, I feel it is relevant and significant to make a distinction.

babawagter - baby-sitter
bêrekoop - lay-buy
blitsverkoper - best seller
bobbejaansleutel - monkey wrench
broslaai - crisper
buiteklub - country club
buitelugmuseum - open air museum
burgersentrum - civic centre
diefwering - burglar proofing
deurloopstraat - through road
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>draadsitter(y)</td>
<td>fence sitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duikweg</td>
<td>subway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duinebessie</td>
<td>beach buggy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foonsnol</td>
<td>call-girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geoktrooierde</td>
<td>chartered accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rekenmeester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glanstydskrif</td>
<td>glossy magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graanvlokopies</td>
<td>corn flakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halfmaanrolletjie</td>
<td>croissant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardware (pl.)</td>
<td>hardware (collective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helfte-helfte</td>
<td>half and half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoendervleis</td>
<td>goose flesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hooftrekke</td>
<td>headlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humorsin</td>
<td>sense of humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersvader</td>
<td>Father Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinderoppasser</td>
<td>baby-sitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klankbaan</td>
<td>sound track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kortpad</td>
<td>shortcut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landteken</td>
<td>land mark (cf. p. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langspeler</td>
<td>L.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losieshuis</td>
<td>boarding house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyfbediende</td>
<td>man servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maalvleis</td>
<td>minced meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meenthuis</td>
<td>town house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasaangeër</td>
<td>pace-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penmaat</td>
<td>penpal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plkker</td>
<td>squatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plesierjagter</td>
<td>pleasure seeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rekenaarbeheerd</td>
<td>computerised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolpuntpen</td>
<td>ball-point pen (cf. p. 181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rondlooperkat</td>
<td>stray cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rylaan</td>
<td>drive, driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setyster</td>
<td>putter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigwaarde</td>
<td>face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skottelgoedwasser</td>
<td>dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skreeusnaaks</td>
<td>screamingly funny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spookbeeld</td>
<td>ghosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sypaadjie</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tref-en-trap-ongeluk</td>
<td>hit and run accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbypad</td>
<td>by-pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verenigde Volke (VVO)</td>
<td>United Nations (UNO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weensies</td>
<td>Wieners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
werfwerktuigkundige - backyard mechanic
beeldsaai - to telecast
uitsaai - to broadcast
verlê - to mislay
middeljarig - middle-aged
voorgraads - undergraduate
met sy tong in sy kies - with his tongue in his cheek
’n goeie bestaan maak - to make a good living
my Frans is verroes - my French is rusty
part en deel van Suid-Afrika - part and parcel of South Africa
in die kol wees - to be spot on
ons brand om vir jou ’n nuwe kar te gee - we’re dying to give you a new car
dit werk op my tiete - it’s getting on my tits

7.3 Neologisms

In the quest to avoid English loanwords, or international words which are felt to be English, Afrikaans has created new words, for example: where the Dutch use pullover, squash and weekend, Afrikaans prescribes oortrektrui, muurbal and naweek. Whereas muurbal and naweek are totally original creations, oortrektrui could be regarded as a Lehnübertragung or possibly a loan translation. Sometimes the distinction between a Lehnübertragung, a loan translation and a neologism is rather subtle, for example: babawagter and kinderopasser should probably be regarded as Lehnübertragungen rather than loan translations, whereas kroostrooster is a neologism.

Where Dutch uses lift, Afrikaans has a variety of synonymous neologisms - hyser, hysbak, hystoestel. The word skyfie, for example, has a double (or even a triple) puristic function, replacing what the Dutch call chip, patat and dia. Such purisms can lead to ambiguity, as HAT’s definitions of huurmotor and waenhuis indicate, for instance, (cf. p. 154)

Some of the words given below (marked *) do exist in Dutch, but with a different meaning, for example: grimeren is used in Dutch but only with reference to theatrical make-up. In such cases it is not the word as such which is a neologism but the meaning given to the word (cf. semantic shift 7.13).

afnemer - photographer
argiefbewaarplek - archive
beeldradio - TV
beeldsend - to televise
bloedoortapping - blood transfusion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blokkiesraaisel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>crossword puzzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branderplankry(ger)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>surfing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bromponie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>moped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byderwets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deurloop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>arcade (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deurpad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>jog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwelms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gedenkwaardigheid*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gestedremde</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>handicapped person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grimering, grimeer*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>make-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huurmotor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>taxi, rental car (cf. p. 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hysbak, hyser, hystoestel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaartjie(s)ondersoeker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kameelperd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>giraffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klinknaelbroek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>jeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knortjor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>go-cart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krambinder, -hegter,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>stapler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hegmasjien</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruiptrekker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>caterpillar tractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kundigheid*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>know-how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugreëling, -versorging</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>airconditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moltrein</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorhawe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>service station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motor-, waenhuis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muggievliegtuig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>microlite plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muurbal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naweek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ontkleedans, kaaldans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>strip-tease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ontvangsdame</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oorklank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>to dub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oortrektrui</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pullover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papierklavier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pianola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plakkaat*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plakker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>squatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pluimbal</em></td>
<td>badminton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rekenaar/komper</em></td>
<td>computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rekeningkunde</em></td>
<td>accountancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reukweerder/-verdrywer</em></td>
<td>deodorant (cf. p. 153)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rolbal</em></td>
<td>(lawn) bowls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rolpen, bolpen</em></td>
<td>ball-point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ryloop(er)</em></td>
<td>to hitch-hike(er)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 Competition between indigenous and international vocabulary

As mentioned on p. 160, Afrikaans often shows a preference for an indigenous word over an international synonym. Although the list below contains the occasional Afrikaans neologism (e.g. beeldradio, rolprent), most of the indigenous words are known to Dutch but are used less frequently in that language than in Afrikaans. The Afrikaner's desire to use a puristic alternative in such cases has led to the loss of the semantic distinction that often (but not always) exists between the two in Dutch, for example: ernstig/serieuze, oorspronkelijk/origineel, although Schutte (cf. p. 151) proves conclusively that the two are not always completely synonymous in Afrikaans either De Villiers (Die Huisgenoot 2/12/49) also warns against the dangers of the vervangoefeninge involving such couplets which have unfortunately been far too common in Afrikaans schoolbooks.

14 Woonwa exists in Dutch too but only refers to a Gypsy style wagon.
There are cases, which are not listed here, where Dutch prefers to use an English loanword but where Afrikaans only uses a Diets synonym, for example: *onderhoud* (interview), *vermaaklikheid* (entertainment).

It should be noted that several of the words below have derivative forms which also contrast with each other, for example: *vasteland/kontinent - vastelands/kontinentaal, geesdriftig/entoesiasties - geesdriif/entoesiasme.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Dutch Synonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aandag</td>
<td>attensie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aandenking</td>
<td>soewenier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanhaal</td>
<td>siteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aantreklikheid</td>
<td>attraksie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amptelik</td>
<td>offisieel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedrywig</td>
<td>aktief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beeldradio</td>
<td>televisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beheer</td>
<td>kontrole(er)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behoudend</td>
<td>konserwatief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestanddele</td>
<td>ingrediënte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bevrediging</td>
<td>satisfaksie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brandstof</td>
<td>petrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breukdeel</td>
<td>fraksié (van 'n seconde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beslis</td>
<td>definitief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doeltreffend (-heid)</td>
<td>effisiënt (-iënsie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drukgroep</td>
<td>pressiegroep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eenparig</td>
<td>unaniem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eerbiedig</td>
<td>respekteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernstig</td>
<td>serieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geesdriftig</td>
<td>entoesiasties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gehalte</td>
<td>kwaliteit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geldelik</td>
<td>finansieel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geskiedkundig</td>
<td>histories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlig</td>
<td>informeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klavier</td>
<td>piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leerplan</td>
<td>sillabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loods</td>
<td>piloot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mededingend</td>
<td>kompeterend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeding</td>
<td>kompeteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nywerheid</td>
<td>industrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyweraar</td>
<td>industrialis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omgewing</td>
<td>milieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onderskeidelik</td>
<td>respektiewelik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onregistrreks</td>
<td>indirek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oordragteli</td>
<td>figuratief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oorspronklik</td>
<td>origineel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openbaar</td>
<td>publiek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peil</td>
<td>nivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolprent</td>
<td>film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>crème</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sielkundig</td>
<td>psigologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speurder</td>
<td>detekstief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staatkundig</td>
<td>polities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stelsel(matig)</td>
<td>sisteem(eties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stiptelik</td>
<td>punktueel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoflik</td>
<td>materiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swartgallig</td>
<td>pessimisties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teenkanting</td>
<td>opposisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tydgenootlik,</td>
<td>kontemporêr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tydperk</td>
<td>periode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitslae</td>
<td>resultate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitstappie</td>
<td>ekskursie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitwerking</td>
<td>effek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasteland</td>
<td>kontinent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veldtog</td>
<td>kampanje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veralgemeen</td>
<td>generaliseer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verskeidenheid</td>
<td>variëiteit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verskoning</td>
<td>ekskuus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verteenwoordig</td>
<td>representeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vlak</td>
<td>nivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vraagstuk</td>
<td>kwessie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waarborg</td>
<td>garandeer, garansie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.5 Assimilated loanwords (puristic spelling)

The concept of creating new words or giving new meanings to existing words to avoid using loanwords or internationalisms which look - and sometimes also are - English, has a parallel in the spelling system of Afrikaans: many such words are dressed up in Afrikaans garb, presumably because it is believed that they will then be more readily accepted as part and parcel of Afrikaans, or alternatively, because they have already attained that status and recognition thereof is expressed in the new spelling. The Dutch would often consider the assimilation of such words in Afrikaans as extreme, for example: *sjerrie, vanielje*, but even Afrikaners seem at times to recognise certain limits, for example: *chauvinisties* and not *sjouwinisties*.

The decision at the end of the last century to adopt the Kollewijn spelling for Dutch in South Africa, part of the vain attempt to save the position of Dutch, assured ultimately that that spelling would be used for the writing of Afrikaans after the Anglo-Boer War while the Dutch have hesitated ever since about how far to go in implementing Kollewijn's recommendations but are gradually and inevitably moving towards the same position that Afrikaans has occupied since 1925. For the Dutch it is a question of simplifying their spelling, as it undoubtedly was in South Africa to begin with too. However, the Kollewijn spelling now serves a dual purpose in South Africa: in addition to the obvious advantage of simplicity, it is a perfect means of ‘disguising’ the many loanwords which Afrikaans, like all languages, is forced to adopt. This is important in a country where linguistic purism, however misconstrued that concept may be by the common man, is regarded as integral to one's independent identity as an Afrikaner.

Some scholars have expressed the opinion that retaining the spelling of the original language ultimately effects the pronunciation of that word in Afrikaans:

‘Ek glo ook dat as jy tog 'n vreemde woord moet anneem omdat dit 'n begrip vertolk wat nie by jou eie volk ontstaan het en weens plaaslike omstandighede nooit by jou volk kan ontstaan nie, dan moet daardie woord tog maar so gou as moontlik 'n Afrikaanse baadjie aankry. Behou jy die woord met sy vreemde spelling, dan veroorsaak dit nie net dikwels 'n verkeerde uitspraak by die gewone mens nie, maar soms bly jy hom aanvoel as 'n vreemde indringer en pleks dat dit jou gees verryk, belemmer dit jou spraak en daar bly in jou 'n
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I would question whether this is the case in South Africa now, certainly as far as loanwords from English are concerned. There are many cases in Afrikaans of English loanwords or international vocabulary with cognates in English that retain an English pronunciation regardless of their spelling. For the Afrikaner - but this is not the case in Holland - the pronunciation of loanwords is primary and not the spelling; his intimate acquaintance with English makes it impossible to pronounce such words in accordance with the rules for transcribing Afrikaans phonemes onto paper, for example: just because he writes *wattelboom*, this does not mean that the first part of the compound is pronounced [vatal] even though [w] is not a phoneme in this position in Afrikaans - the vowel too remains [ɔ] although written a. And how many people pronounce the initial vowel in *automaties* as [ɔ:] and not as [œu] as the spelling implies? Vogt (1954: 370) maintains that ‘Loanwords are... apt to affect the phonemic and morphemic system of the receiving language. Even if the phonemes they are composed of are thoroughly assimilated through identification with native phonemes, the new words sometimes introduce phoneme sequences hitherto unknown.’

*area*¹
*banknoot*
*basies* (adj. & adv.)
*basketbal*²
*bemark(ing)*³
*beplan(ning)*³
*bief(skyfies)*
*biefstuk*⁴
*bleddie* (cf. p. 282)
*bloekom*
*boeder*
*boeldok*
*boelie*
*boeliebief*
*Boesman*
*bokkie*⁵
*bogger(ol)*⁶, *bokker(ol)*
*bottlenek*
*bottelstoar*
*bondeltjie vreugde*
*boul(er)*
*bra*
*brekfin*
*briek*
*budjie*⁷
*bulterriër*⁸
*busseltjie*⁹
*donkie*¹⁰
*drom*
*effisiënsie*¹¹.

---
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enemmel
enjin
flennie (< flannel)
fliek (n. & v.)
fluoried
fokken
foksterriër
gelling
ghienie
gholf
ghong
ghries
ghrok, grok
hendikep
hen(d)sop(per)
hokkie
implement
jellie
jokkie
jurie
kabelkar
kafeteria
kar
kasjoeneut
kleim(pie)
klous
klub
kokkerot
kollege
kontrêpsie
kothuis
koukus
krieket
Krismis (Vader -)
kwota
kwotasie
laserstraal
lompsom
lorrie
lyk
margarien
miesies
moestas
nonsens, nonsies
paaiement
pêl
permit
petrol
pienk
piouter
ploë
poëfter
poeding
poel (tiksters-)
poliesman
ponie
program
rak
reling
re(i)ses
robbies (seldom written)
rof, rowwer
setlaar
siviel
sikspens
sjampoe
sjerrie
sjieling
skoert (< to scoot)
skorsie
sleng
snoeker
sokker
sonkie (< song)
sprinkel(aar)
spesies
spietkop
stoor (n. & v.)
storie
stres
(swot)
tékkie
tenk
tjek
trøp
trøm
trippens
trøk
trøllie
volskaals
waks (n. & v.)
wasser, waster
watteboom

Eindnoten:

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.

2. Basket has undergone a shift in stress so that it now stands side by side with kaset and thus resembles a French loanword. The same applies to permit. (cf. p. 249)

3. 1. Where the Dutch have borrowed marketing and planning from English, the Afrikaners have coined these two words. It is difficult to ascertain whether such words are assimilated loanwords in origin or neologisms.
2. Where the Dutch have borrowed marketing and planning from English, the Afrikaners have coined these two words. It is difficult to ascertain whether such words are assimilated loanwords in origin or neologisms.

4. Biefstuk is an English loanword of long standing in Dutch (< beefsteak). It presumably entered Afrikaans via Dutch for Afrikaners are unlikely to have accepted such a popular etymological form, given their superior knowledge of English.

5. Bokkie belongs to that group of commonly used, fully assimilated English loanwords (e.g. briek, juts, koort, cf. p. 146) that were regularly quoted in pre-war works on anglicisms as indispensable and which have since virtually disappeared from the language.

6. Bogger illustrates that [g] can be preserved medially in loanwords, as well as initially, but that there is then a greater tendency to substitute the unvoiced equivalent in order to fully assimilate the word. Ghrok/grok illustrates the same phenomenon in final position.

7. The assimilated spelling of this word is not a true reflection of how it is actually pronounced. Phonologically speaking it is still entirely an unassimilated English loanword as the vowel is pronounced as in English (cf. 9 below and p. 245)

8. Boelterriër, which does occur, is a more correct representation of the pronunciation of this word (compare boeldok/bulhond).

9. If one compares the first vowel in budjie, buiterriër and busseltjie, each is pronounced differently. Only in the last case does the spelling correspond to the pronunciation.

10. Donkie, jellie, jokkie, lorrie, storie and trollie are examples of a simple spelling assimilation resulting in the words possibly now being perceived differently: I think these words are of such longstanding in Afrikaans that the -ie may by now even be perceived by some native-speakers as a diminutive ending, but this is debatable Hiemstra (1980: 111) and others before him maintain that storie is not an anglicism in Afrikaans but a medieval Dutch word that has died out in Holland.

11. The word has also undergone a shift in stress to the penultimate syllable.

12. A common phenomenon in Dutch is for English loanwords to give rise to derivatives which do not exist in English, for example: liften/lifter - to hitch-hike, hitch-hiker. This is not usually the case in Afrikaans, once again probably because of the Afrikaner's intimate knowledge of English, but fliek is an example of a borrowed noun giving rise to a verb too in Afrikaans, i.e. to go to the flick. Hiemstra (1980: 45) maintains fliek was borrowed from Australian English where, however, it is always used in the plural, 'flicks'.

13. Although the AIFS allows both -ied/-ien and pronunciation of such words in Afrikaans (without final [e]) suggests they are derived from, or at least are perceived as being derived from, English. In Dutch only the latter spelling occurs but in that case it also reflects the way in which these words are pronounced. This may be a spelling pronunciation in Dutch but it may equally be because they are regarded as loanwords from French. At any rate, the presence of cognate forms in English as well as other loanwords that end in -ine (e.g. machine, margarine) has worked
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in favour of the -ied/-ien, spelling for chemical terms - the choice of one or the other spelling in such cases has repercussions in their plural formation (cf. AWS p. 8). Schoonees (volume I of WAT, 1950) was only prepared to recognise -ied/-ien and has made the -ien spelling of other loanwords compulsory, for example: dioksied, masjië, vaselië, vitamië.

14. The frequently heard interpolation fokken/fokkin - as it is never written, my spelling is somewhat arbitrary - provides food for thought on the phonetic assimilation of English loanwords in Afrikaans. There is no doubt that this adjective is English in origin and thus that the [o] is a case of sound substitution as it occurs in bokker/bogger, bokkie and drom too, for example. Are the words fok and kont then examples of the same phenomenon or are they the original Dutch words which have undergone a shift in meaning under the influence of cognate forms in English? Or has Afrikaans retained an older Dutch meaning of these words (cf. German ficken = to fuck, for example) with or without the assistance of cognate forms in English with the same meaning? Van Dale confirms that kont was formerly used with this meaning in Dutch.

15. There are many loanwords in Afrikaans - not all of them English but also of Malay or Hottentot origin, for example - which are spelt with an initial gh. Whereas this spelling was used in the Netherlands in the late Middle Ages, particularly before e and i, to indicate the fricative [x] or [ɣ] as opposed to the affricate [ʤ], it is used in Afrikaans to indicate that the words concerned are pronounced with the non-indigenous stop [g]. It is interesting to observe that Burchell (1822-24: 331), an Englishman who visited the Cape in the early nineteenth century, suggested that the guttural g of Cape Dutch 'may be partly represented by imagining such words spelled with a gh.' Afrikaans is, however, rather inconsistent in its application of the gh spelling to English loanwords, for example: ghrok or ghok, garage.

16. As commonly occurs in Dutch, English short [æ] is realised in Afrikaans as [c] and is written e, although the Dutch commonly retain a in the spelling, (cf. Afrikaans sleng/slang). Long [æ], on the other hand, is perceived by Afrikaners as ê (e.g. pêl, têkkie) although neither the AWS nor HAT seem to recognise this use of the kappie - the two examples given here do not occur in either of the works mentioned and yet têkkie is an indispensable word in Afrikaans and pêl is
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very common in the spoken language and, as the plural form pêle (also pêls) indicates, it has undergone a considerable degree of assimilation.

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.

10. Donkie, jellie, jokkie, lorré, storie and trollie are examples of a simple spelling assimilation resulting in the words possibly now being perceived differently: I think these words are of such longstanding in Afrikaans that the -ie may by now even be perceived by some native-speakers as a diminutive ending, but this is debatable. Hiemstra (1980: 111) and others before him maintain that storie is not an anglicism in Afrikaans but a medieval Dutch word that has died out in Holland.

17. Jellie has only been partially assimilated in spelling - Afrikaans never seems to have considered a dj spelling, unlike the Dutch in Indonesia, for loanwords that retain a [dʒ]. Jokkie and jurie on the other hand have been assimilated completely phonologically and thus the spelling is consistent with the pronunciation.

18. Kafeteria can presumably now be regarded as an internationalism but in Europe the third syllable always contains an a; the retention of e in Afrikaans suggests this is a thinly disguised English loanword in that language.

19. It is interesting to note that Afrikaans considered it necessary to borrow the English word 'claim' for a gold claim whereas the Dutch borrowed it at a later date in the sense of an insurance claim and also the verb claimen, which is not used in Afrikaans (= eis).

20. The puristic substitution of au with ou has now led to this sound being pronounced as it is written in Afrikaans, i.e. as [eu] and no longer as [o].

21. The spelling of klub and kollege with k constitutes a very superficial assimilation as both words are still pronounced exactly as in English.

22. Kokkerot and kothuis are examples of popular etymology.

21. The spelling of klub and kollege with k constitutes a very superficial assimilation as both words are still pronounced exactly as in English.

23. I have never seen this word written but it occurs frequently in speech. The [sì] suffix implies it has been assimilated sufficiently to require an Afrikaans spelling, but the penultimate syllable retains the English vowel [ae], (cf. note 16 above).

22. Kokkerot and kothuis are examples of popular etymology.

20. The puristic substitution of au with ou has now led to this sound being pronounced as it is written in Afrikaans, i.e. as [eu] and no longer as [o].

24. Where Afrikaans replaces /i/ with /ie/ in the spelling of English loanwords, an attempt is presumably being made to indicate that these words retain the foreign phoneme [i] where i in indigenous vocabulary is pronounced as [a], for example: krieket, piekniek, pienk, tiekie, vanielje. However, Afrikaans is still rather inconsistent in this regard - compare dip, sflinks, titel, although Mansvelt (1884: 33) wrote diep and Malherbe (1953: 84, but written in 1906) wrote tieltel.

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.

10. Donkie, jellie, jokkie, lorré, storie and trollie are examples of a simple spelling assimilation resulting in the words possibly now being perceived differently: I think these words are of such longstanding in Afrikaans that the -ie may by now even be perceived by some native-speakers as a diminutive ending, but this is debatable. Hiemstra (1980: 111) and others before him maintain that storie is not an anglicism in Afrikaans but a medieval Dutch word that has died out in Holland.

25. Despite repeated condemnation in the literature of this word, lyk in the sense of 'like' is still very common in the spoken language. It is not clear, however, whether one is dealing with the loanword 'like' which has undergone phonological assimilation, or the Afrikaans word lyk which has undergone semantic shift under the influence of a like-sounding form in English. Burchell (1822-24: 15) remarked that lyk was used in this sense when he visited South Africa in 1821. Lockwood (1965: 153) mentions that gleich is used in a similar way in Pennsylvania Dutch. (cf. p. 202-3)
16. As commonly occurs in Dutch, English short [æ] is realised in Afrikaans as [ɛ] and is written e, although the Dutch commonly retain a in the spelling, (cf. Afrikaans sleng/slang). Long [æ], on the other hand, is perceived by Afrikaners as ê (e.g. pêl, têkkie) although neither the AWS nor HAT seem to recognise this use of the kappie - the two examples given here do not occur in either of the works mentioned and yet têkkie is an indispensable word in Afrikaans and pêl is very common in the spoken language and, as the plural form pêlle (also pêls) indicates, it has undergone a considerable degree of assimilation.  

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.  

2. Basket has undergone a shift in stress so that it now stands side by side with kassie and thus resembles a French loanword. The same applies to permit. (cf. p. 249)  

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.  

24. Where Afrikaans replaces i with ie in the spelling of English loanwords, an attempt is presumably being made to indicate that these words retain the foreign phoneme [i] where i in indigenous vocabulary is pronounced as [e], for example: krieket, piekniek, pienk, tiekie, vanieje. However, Afrikaans is still rather inconsistent in this regard - compare dip, sfinks, titel, although Mansvelt (1884: 33) wrote diep and Malherbe (1953: 84, but written in 1906) wrote tietel.  

27. No change to the spelling of plot was necessary to assimilate this word, but the vowel has been assimilated as has the plural, plotte. It also frequently occurs in indigenous compounds such as plotrot.  


29. Dutch/Afrikaans have an indigenous word poel (= water). Dutch uses the English 'pool' for a typing pool whereas Afrikaans uses poel. This too (see note 14 above) is a case where it is not obvious whether the indigenous poel has acquired a new meaning or whether poel is a puristic spelling of the loanword 'pool'.  

30. In speech this word seems to be as common as the indigenous polisieman.  

31. Ponie is not just a puristic spelling but is pronounced as an Afrikaans word with a broken vowel in the stressed syllable.  

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.  

32. Program must be considered an internationalism, and not simply an English loanword, but as Dutch uses programma(s), one wonders if program(me) did not enter Afrikaans directly from English.  

24. Where Afrikaans replaces i with ie in the spelling of English loanwords, an attempt is presumably being made to indicate that these words retain the foreign phoneme [i] where i in indigenous vocabulary is pronounced as [e], for example: krieket, piekniek, pienk, tiekie, vanieje. However, Afrikaans is still rather inconsistent in this regard - compare dip, sfinks, titel, although Mansvelt (1884: 33) wrote diep and Malherbe (1953: 84, but written in 1906) wrote tietel.  

16. As commonly occurs in Dutch, English short [æ] is realised in Afrikaans as [ɛ] and is written e, although the Dutch commonly retain a in the spelling, (cf. Afrikaans sleng/slang). Long [æ], on the other hand, is perceived by Afrikaners as ê (e.g. pêl, têkkie) although neither the AWS nor HAT seem to recognise this use of the kappie - the two examples given here do not occur in either of the works mentioned and yet têkkie is an indispensable word in Afrikaans and pêl is very common in the spoken language and, as the plural form pêlle (also pêls) indicates, it has undergone a considerable degree of assimilation.  

33. From the verb is formed storing. (cf. p. 207)  

10. Donkie, jellie, jokkie, lorrie, storie and trollie are examples of a simple spelling assimilation resulting in the words possibly now being perceived differently: I think these words are of such longstanding in Afrikaans that the -ie may by now even be perceived by some native-speakers as a diminutive ending, but this is debatable Hiemstra (1980: 111) and others before him maintain that storie is not an anglicism in Afrikaans but a medieval Dutch word that has died out in Holland.  

1. The words area, implement, laserstraal, permit, petrol, program and swot have not been adapted in spelling because this was unnecessary. They are all pronounced according to the phonological rules of Afrikaans and can thus be regarded as having undergone assimilation.  

16. As commonly occurs in Dutch, English short [æ] is realised in Afrikaans as [ɛ] and is written e, although the Dutch commonly retain a in the spelling, (cf. Afrikaans sleng/slang). Long [æ], on the other hand, is perceived by Afrikaners as ê (e.g. pêl, têkkie) although neither the AWS nor HAT seem to recognise this use of the kappie - the two examples given here do not occur in either of the works mentioned and yet têkkie is an indispensable word in Afrikaans and pêl is very common in the spoken language and, as the plural form pêlle (also pêls) indicates, it has undergone a considerable degree of assimilation.
As commonly occurs in Dutch, English short [æ] is realised in Afrikaans as [ɛ] and is written e, although the Dutch commonly retain a in the spelling, (cf. Afrikaans sleng/slang). Long [æ], on the other hand, is perceived by Afrikaners as ê (e.g. pêl, tékkie) although neither the AWS nor HAT seem to recognise this use of the kappie - the two examples given here do not occur in either of the works mentioned and yet tékkie is an indispensable word in Afrikaans and pêl is very common in the spoken language and, as the plural form pêlle (also pêls) indicates, it has undergone a considerable degree of assimilation.

10. Donkie, jellie, jokkie, lorröe, storie and trollie are examples of a simple spelling assimilation resulting in the words possibly now being perceived differently: I think these words are of such long standing in Afrikaans that the -ie may by now even be perceived by some native-speakers as a diminutive ending, but this is debatable. Hiemstra (1980: 111) and others before him maintain that storie is not an anglicism in Afrikaans but a medieval Dutch word that has died out in Holland.
7.6 Unassimilated loanwords

Even highly educated speakers of Afrikaans are likely to use any number of English words in their Afrikaans in the course of a day, and such words defy listing. Nevertheless, there are some words which recur with surprising regularity in the speech of many individuals. The following is a list of such words, very few of which are ever likely to be found in writing:

- adenoids
- alright
- anyway
- army
- bioscope
- bloody
- bloomin(g) (cf. p. 282)
- bother
- brag, bragger (cf. p. 203)
- bunk
- bye bye
- ceiling
- clue
- cope
- cubbyhole
- cute
- fancy
- flippin(g) (cf. p. 282)
- flirt (n. and v.)
- garage
- gasket
- gentleman
- genuine
- grand
- image
- in any case
- issue
- job
- lapel
- like
- lot (die hele lot)
- mango
- mind you
- moan (cf. p. 202)
- never mind
- nice
- no ways
- organise
- paint(er)
- panic (verb)
- plain
- polony
- radiator
settle
skip
slang²
speedcops
(uit) spite
stupid
ta ta
tan (n. and v.)
time (v.)
township
trifle
uncle, auntie
watch
worry (v.)

Eindnoten:

1. Although the written language uses bioskoop, the unassimilated English pronunciation is very commonly heard in the spoken language. Compare note 2 below.

2. According to prescriptive works garage and radiator have been assimilated in pronunciation but in practice they have not and thus belong in this category. Unlike the other words in the list, however, they are found in the written language. The same applies to slang, sometimes assimilated to sleng. (cf. p. 199)

3. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish whether a speaker is using the loanword like outright, assimilating it somewhat to the phonology of Afrikaans by pronouncing it as [laik] or whether in fact the indigenous verb lyk is being equated with its English cognate. (cf. p. 227) Mansvelt (1884: 97) comments on the occurrence of lyk with this meaning in the late nineteenth century and Visagie (Die Brandwag, 27/9/46) seemed convinced that ek like dit belonged to the past even in 1946; he was wrong. (cf. p. 200-201)


5. Although HAT spells the word as if it has been assimilated, polonie, it has not undergone phonological assimilation at all.

1. Although the written language uses bioskoop, the unassimilated English pronunciation is very commonly heard in the spoken language. Compare note 2 below.

2. According to prescriptive works garage and radiator have been assimilated in pronunciation but in practice they have not and thus belong in this category. Unlike the other words in the list, however, they are found in the written language. The same applies to slang, sometimes assimilated to sleng. (cf. p. 199)
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7.7 Hybrid compounds and derivatives

The familiar saying *Moenie jou tale omix nie* makes use, for humorous effect, of what I have chosen to call hybrid loan translations, i.e. compound words where either the first or second element is an English loanword and the other is translated from English into Afrikaans. A subdivision of such hybrids consists of derived words where the English loanword acquires an Afrikaans bound ending in order to nominalise the English word (e.g. *stupidheid*) or to turn it into an adjective (e.g. *braggerig*) or both (e.g. *braggerigheid*). If an English verb is borrowed and is then used with a *ge-* prefix to form the past tense, this could possibly also be regarded as a hybrid derivative but I have classed such words as English loanwords as the *ge-* is of course not always present (for example when such words are used in the present tense).

Boshoff (1963: 55) refers to hybrids as *basterwoorde* but this is at odds with the way in which that term is used in all other literature on loanwords in Afrikaans and Dutch. Le Roux (1952: 1) calls them *hibrildiese samestellinge* (hybrid compounds) and *hibrildiese afleidinge* (hybrid derivatives).

The degree to which the English part of a hybrid compound has been phonologically, semantically and graphically assimilated can differ from word to word and can also be difficult to assess. *Reisigerstjek* has been graphically assimilated and the fact that Afrikaans does not normally have the phoneme [tj] presents no problems for Afrikaners although many Dutch people have trouble with that sound in English loanwords in Dutch (e.g. ‘lunch’ commonly pronounced [lœns]). In *jeughostel* no graphic assimilation is required and in *poniestert* only a minimum of phonological adaption is needed for the words to look and sound Afrikaans. As the
compounds with box are seldom if ever written, although they are commonly heard, it is difficult to assess whether the Afrikaner considers them sufficiently Afrikaans to write boks or still foreign enough to write box. Uitpass is also never written but as it is pronounced [pa:s] and not [pas], it is obviously still considered a hybrid and thus the spelling pass is appropriate. Wattelboom, on the other hand, has not been phonologically assimilated at all, despite the fact that [w] does not occur initially in indigenous vocabulary, and yet the spelling has been adapted. The compound *sultanadruijf* could well be considered an indigenous word incorporating an international element were it not for the fact that the first vowel is pronounced [ʌ] and not [œ], as in Dutch, and is thus clearly perceived by Afrikaners as being English.

```
armyoutjie
basketbal
biefskylies
boxwyn
*tiekiebox*¹⁵,¹⁶
boysenbessie
youngbessie
busstop
horssweep
jeughostel
kidleer
plotrot
paaiboelie
poniestert
reisigerstjiek
sultanadruijf
tenkskip (also Dt.)
uitpass (to faint)
uittry
wattelboom
braggerig(heid)
moanerig
stupidheid
sprinkelaar
```

¹⁶ Actually both constituent parts of *tiekiebox* are English in origin but *basket* (because of its new stress) and *tiekie* are no longer regarded as English.

¹⁵ Box is not to be found in Afrikaans dictionaries. It is thus presumably officially regarded as an unassimilated loanword but in practice it is highly likely that most Afrikaners no longer regard it as a foreign word and would write *boks*.

¹⁵ Box is not to be found in Afrikaans dictionaries. It is thus presumably officially regarded as an unassimilated loanword but in practice it is highly likely that most Afrikaners no longer regard it as a foreign word and would write *boks*.

¹⁶ Actually both constituent parts of *tiekiebox* are English in origin but *basket* (because of its new stress) and *tiekie* are no longer regarded as English.
7.8 Word formation

There are various facets of word formation in Afrikaans where it seems that English may be playing a role in the choice of formations opted for, either because of a similarity to English devices or because of a dissimilarity to English (i.e. puristic avoidance). Word formation is, however, a category where it is even more difficult than usual to be sure that one is dealing with anglicisms.

7.8.1 Compound nouns

The rules for compounding nouns in English defy description according to H.W. Fowler (1965: 255). Afrikaans traditionally has a conjunctive pattern of word formation whereas English has a disjunctive one, to use Botha and Van Aardt's (1978: 35) terminology. The rules for *losskryf* and *aanmekaarskryf* in Afrikaans are set out in the AWS and yet daily one is confronted with transgressions of these rules. It is quite possible that inconsistencies would have arisen without contact with English but the fact that English differs markedly from Afrikaans in this regard, must have contributed to the apparent confusion that now seems to exist and which seems to be increasing. Botha and Van Aardt (1978: 35) refer to it as *grafiese steuring* and Combrink (1968: 18) calls it *Anglisistiese skryfwyses*.

Confusion exists as to whether to write a compound noun as one word, two words or to hyphenate it. The decision as to which of these three options is to be applied in Afrikaans would often seem to be influenced by what English would do in such a case, even at the cost of this being against the recommendations of the AWS, for example: *straatvullis*, *hitte golf*, *hakke kroeg*, *meubel en toestel afdeling*; *boot-eiaaar*, *karavaan-park*, *wêreld-kampioenskappe*. In the last three cases English would write such compounds as two words so the hyphen seems to be a compromise between the English and the Afrikaans systems. Confusion in all these cases can be all the greater when for example *hakke kroeg* and ‘heel bar’ occur side by side on the same sign. Only cases such as these can possibly be seen as examples of graphic interference from English; this does not necessarily apply to recognised problems such as *na-ure* and *rehabilitasie-aangeleenthede* where clusters of vowels could be confusing to the eye if a hyphen were not used; nor does it apply to other recognised difficult cases such as *Barclays-Nasionale Bank* and *hoof-administratiewe amptenaar*.

The confusion even extends to compound nouns that incorporate a medial *s*, in which case one would expect it to be obvious that joining of the
elements is called for, for example: besigheids ure, streeks kantoor. Compared with Dutch, where the following issue is only rarely uncertain (e.g. geluidhinder or geluidshinder), Afrikaans is much more inconsistent in its application of the medial s in compound nouns. At times I have got the impression that the absence of such a medial sound in English compounds has contributed to its being omitted in Afrikaans, for example: Gesondheids Departement - Reiningafdeling (transcribed literally from a public sign), kwaliteit diens versus kwaliteits wonings, Pietermaritzburg Stad Vervoer Departement. In the final example I am referring to the question of stadvervoer versus stadsvervoer, quite apart from the whole expression being a rather un-Afrikaans construction.

It is often difficult to isolate possible English influence by comparing Afrikaans with Dutch in these matters, because it is obvious that Afrikaans has developed its own system that is often quite at odds with the norms of Dutch, for example: vissersman, wekswdag, werkswinkel. (cf. Basson, i.a. 1982: 101) Nevertheless, Hiemstra (1980: 115) points out, the frequent insertion of s in compounds incorporating verkoop- (= English ‘sales’) is undoubtedly in imitation of the English plural, for example: verkoopsman (compare also buiteverkope which contains a plural of the same word in imitation of the English ‘off sales’.)

There are also the many cases of compound nouns where Dutch requires a medial e or en but where Afrikaans now forms compounds as in English but where one would seem to be dealing with a spontaneous simplification rather than English influence, for example: boerbeskuit, dierwëreld, peerboom, sonskyn and wolkloos. Hiemstra (1980: 103-4) refers to such compounds as stompstervorme and suspects English influence for example in skolierpatrollie, giving preference to skollerepatrollie.

Compounds that are themselves loan translations from English constitute a particular difficulty, for example: Checkers-personeel, ’n een-keer-in-leeftyd kans, ’n drie jaar waglys, in-diepte besprekings, indiepte-studie. (cf. 7.28.7)
There are several nominal -ing endings in Afrikaans, (cf. Kempen 1969: 513-529) Under discussion here are only those derived from verbs, in which case -ing is still a productive suffix and ‘De betekenis van de afleiding op “-ing” is vergelykbaar met die van gesubstantiveerde infinitieven.’ (Geerts i.a. 1984: 96) The following list is also restricted to -ing forms not found in Dutch (except for mobiliserend and motiverend, cf. note 2). Both the homophonous and semantic similarity of these words with English gerunds in ‘-ing’ possibly accounts for the greater frequency of this ending in Afrikaans than in Dutch (Cluver 1982: 85). Puristic neologisms such as bemarking and beplanning may not have been coined had it not been for the English precedents ‘marketing’ and ‘planning’ - bemark and beplan could have served the same purpose. Nevertheless, the potential to employ -ing in such cases also exists in Dutch.

Hiemstra (1980: 58) makes no mention of English influence in his discussion of the suffix. Kempen (1969: 520), in his extremely detailed account of the functions of the ending makes only one brief mention of English influence with regard to the origin of lysting, the absence of this word from Dutch contributing to this conclusion of his. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 91-92) discuss at length the tendency to use -ing derivatives in Afrikaans where infinitives would have sufficed (e.g. roking, spoeging) without actually referring to English having played any role at all, but it does seem to be implied:

- bemarking
- beplanning
- dominering
- dreinering
- importering
- kampering
- koloniserend
- konformerend
- koördinerend
- mobiliserend
- motiverend
- parkering
- propagering
- skoolverlating
- storing(skoste) (= storage)
- vomering
- waterdigtig
7.8.3 Feminising suffixes

Barnouw (1934: 23) wrote ‘The tendency to eliminate distinctions of gender is also affecting the suffixes which in Holland Dutch differentiate female from male agents, such as -es, -in, -ster, -e, which are no longer heard in spoken Afrikaans.’

Afrikaans differs from ABN in this respect where an utterance such as Zij is (een) Hollander is impossible. Afrikaans virtually never makes the distinction with nationalities and with most professions seems to be indifferent, for example: Sy is 'n onderwyser/onderwyseres. This practice coincides with English usage, but is admittedly beginning to occur in Dutch too. I have not read a single work which has postulated that English has had anything to do with this development in Afrikaans, but it does seem possible that it could at least have played the role of a contributing factor. However, it is interesting to note the following quote from C.B. van Haeringen which Kloke (1951: 48) repeats:

‘Men noemt deze vrouwelijkheids-e [in presidente, typiste] kunstmatig, daarmede bedoelende dat hij in de levende taal geen grondslag had.’

- written by Van Haeringen in 1937. If this is so, although it is no longer the case in Dutch, Afrikaans may have preserved a former Dutch convention.

7.8.4 Adjectival use of place names

The English forms ‘Pretoria’s university’ and ‘the University of Pretoria’ have direct equivalents in Afrikaans, namely, Pretoria se universteit and (die) Pretoriaanse Universiteit, the latter form involving an issue of word formation. However, one frequently sees such place names uninflected before a noun; for example: ons Bloemfontein winkel, die Pretoria Universiteit. The form die Universiteit Pretoria strikes me as a rather forced puristic avoidance of the anglicism and die Pretoria-Universiteit is also merely an attempt (but a common one) to disguise an anglicism. The rules for the use of hyphens in the AWS do not cover cases such as (die) Pretoria-Universiteit, implying that the Taalkommissie does not recog-
nise them. Steyn (1976: 34-5) looks at this issue in the light of probable English influence. He also mentions the possibility of Die Universiteit van Pretoria, the official name of the institution. (cf. 7.26.13) Le Roux (1952: 46) too discusses the matter and Nienaber (1940: 60) quotes the following examples from the writings of Meurant:

‘De Colesberg byeenkomst, de Kaapstad/de Kaapstads mense, de Colesberg Parlements mense.’

7.8.5 Adjectival -ies versus -iek (cf. 7.12.6)

7.8.6 Adverbial -lik

Hiemstra (1980: 72-3) warns against the excessive use of -lik to create adverbs from adjectives. There is after all no formal distinction in most cases between adjectives and adverbs in Dutch and Afrikaans although Hiemstra refers to an archaic practice of adding -lik to certain adjectives to distinguish them from adverbs. If this is so, English ‘-ly’ may simply have acted as a contributing factor to the frequency with which adverbs in -lik are encountered in Afrikaans compared with standard Dutch. Those adverbs below which are followed by an asterisk are included in HAT; the others are not, but this is not to say that the frequency of those that HAT recognises over the forms without -lik is not ultimately due to English influence. Hiemstra cites, for example, the case of seker/sekerlik where he prescribes the latter only where special emphasis is implied; in other contexts he apparently regards it as an anglicism. Verhage (1965: 310) regards -lik as a formal suffix ‘wat blykaar aan die verhewe Bybeltaal ontleen is.’

In his detailed analysis of -lik, Kempen (1969: 534-39), makes no mention of English influence but comments ‘Tog is die gebruiksfrekwensie van likwoorde hoog in Afrikaans, sodat ’n nuwe vorming hier en daar ’n mens nie te erg moet verbaas nie,’ (p. 539) Gous (1974), whose M.A. deals exclusively with this morpheme, makes no mention of English influence either.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial -lik</th>
<th>HAT</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alleenlik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternatiewelik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>alternatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bewustelik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>consciously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eensydiglik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unilaterally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelukkiglik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>fortunately(^{17})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelyk(e)lik*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gevolglik*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>consequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heelhartiglik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>whole-heartedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huidiglik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nowadays (presently?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onnodiglik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unnecessarily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) Occurs in Dutch too but is only used for humorous effect.
In addition to the above there are the adverbs *grootliks* (largely), *kortliks* (briefly) and *kwartaalliks* (quarterly) which HAT recognises but where English influence cannot be excluded. They do not exist in Dutch; there is a form *kortlijk*, but it means ‘in short’. Is it also not possible that the adverbial use of *vierkantig* (where HAT gives *vierkant*) in expressions such as *iemand vierkantig in die oë kyk* is a subconscious attempt to render English ‘squarely’? HAT does in fact give one example where *vierkantig* is used adverbially: *jou vierkantig verset teen* and *Van Dale* gives *vierkantig* as an archaic variant of *vierkant*.

7.8.7 Puristic word formation

HAT gives *boikot*, *homoseksualiteit* and *kampering* whereas the forms *boikotteer*, *homoseksualisme* and *kampeerdery* also occur, as does *flirteer*. Presumably the latter are puristic attempts to avoid legitimate forms which resemble English. This phenomenon could also account for *motivering* having survived in Afrikaans while *motivasie* has not according to HAT (cf. p. 207-8) as well as accounting for the formation of words such as *prospekteerder* and *koördineerder* where Dutch uses *prospéctor* and *coördinator*.

Eindnoten:

1. All these words occur in Dutch with the ending -atie. Is it not possible that Afrikaans prefers -ing in such cases as a puristic avoidance of the English sounding -asie? (i.e. colonisation, coordination etc.) This could not apply to *vomering*, however.
2. In these two cases Dutch has forms in both -atie and -ing. In Afrikaans *mobilisasie/mobilisering* are synonymous, but *Van Dale* does not recognise *mobilisatie* for troops in Dutch. Perhaps *motivasie* does not occur in Afrikaans for the reasons given in note 1 above, all the more so as HAT attributes *motiveer* in the sense of *aanmoedig tot* to English influence.
3. Although HAT recognises this, Hiemstra (1980: 73) does not.
1. All these words occur in Dutch with the ending -atie. Is it not possible that Afrikaans prefers -ing in such cases as a puristic avoidance of the English sounding -asie? (i.e. colonisation, coordination etc.) This could not apply to vomering, however.

7.9 Auxiliary verbs

7.9.1 Modal verbs

Modal verbs in Germanic languages are noted for having changed their meanings over time as is evidenced by contrasting the meanings of cognate forms in any two or more Germanic languages or by looking at the meanings they had at earlier stages in the development of the standard languages of today. The modal auxiliaries *mag* and *sal* in particular have acquired functions in Afrikaans which they do not have in Dutch but which ‘may’ and ‘will’ also have in English. Presumably this semantic extension is the result of the contact with English, a fact which escaped Hubbard's (1980) attention in his contrastive analysis of the semantics of the modal auxiliary in English and Afrikaans.
7.9.1.1 Mag

The use of *mag* in the following two examples should be seen as a continuation of the Dutch subjunctive form *moge* (cf. Geerts, i.a. 1984: 449), in which function it is thus not an anglicism:

‘Mag dit ’n dag vir jou wees wat jy nooit sal vergeet nie
Hoe mooi dit ook mag wees’

Such uses of *mag* are subtly different from the following which are anglicisms in origin. These render Dutch *zou kunnen*. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 124) refer to *mag* with the meaning of *kan mooontlik* as probably being an anglicism and add: ‘Hierdie uitbreiding van mag se gebruiksfere voorsien in ’n behoefte en verdien aanvaarding,’ for example:

*Ek mag verkeerd wees*
*Di mag wees* (altogether an English idiom)
*Daar mag dalk oorlog kom*
*Hy mag dit miskien hê*
*Jesus red vandag - môre mag te laat wees*

7.9.1.2 Sal

There are three uses of *sal* which would seem to be English influenced:

a) in polite requests where Dutch requires *wollen*, now a less frequent possibility in Afrikaans, for example: *Sal jy asseblief iets vir my doen?* (= English ‘will’).

b) in the formulation of regulations etc., for example: *Daar sal ’n Raad wees. Die Raad sal uit tien lede bestaan. Die lede sal ’n kworum vorm.* (cf. Van der Merwe, en Ponelis 1982: 168). (= English ‘shall’) This use of ‘shall’ is in fact not unlike the use of *zult* in the Dutch version of the ten commandments, a case where Afrikaans now uses *mag*, for example: *Gij zult niet stelen*.

c) in contexts where no futurity as such is expressed but where English uses ‘will’ anyway, for example: *Sal dit al wees?* (shop-assistant to customer), *Preen sal feitlik alle vlêkke uitbaar, Baba-sjampoe sal die oë nie brand nie*.

For the formation of the future tense English has three methods at its disposal: *will*, to go, present tense. Both Dutch and Afrikaans have the same three possibilities but just as ‘will’ is used more frequently in English than *zullen* in Dutch, I believe there is also a tendency in Afrikaans to use *sal* where Dutch would prefer the present tense (although *zullen* is not usually incorrect) but English would use ‘will’, for example:
7.9.1.3 **Hoef/nodig hê**

Because the transitive verb ‘to need’ and the modal verb ‘to need’ (i.e. the negative of ‘to have to’) are one and the same in English, this has led to hoef being substituted by nodig hê in Afrikaans on occasions, for example: *Jy het (dit) nie nodig om dit aan mekaar te koppel nie.*

7.9.1.4 **Moet**

Langenhoven (1935: 104) implies that moenie is in imitation of English ‘don't’. It is true that it is unknown in Dutch but as it is not a literal translation from English, I would hesitate to support Langenhoven's claim. It is possible, however.

Because of the partial homophony of Afrikaans moes and English ‘must’, moes is sometimes heard where moet is the sense required, particularly in the compound tense *hy moes dit gedoen het* which then becomes ambiguous. (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 78) The use of moes in such compound tenses may also simply be a case of preterite assimilation. (cf. Ponelis 1979: 272) *Behoort*, on the other hand, occurs where moes (= sou moet/moes) is required, for example: *As ons net opvolgreëen kan kry, behoort die veld mooi aan te kom.* Hiemstra (1980: 25) says ‘Behoort druk ’n verpligting uit, nie ’n waarskynlikheid... nie.’

7.9.2

Peculiar to English, and now also to Afrikaans, is the extremely economic, terse custom of repeating the finite verb (usually a modal) in a previous statement (plus a subject pronoun or daar) to either affirm, question or negate that statement, also attested in Australian Dutch. (cf. Nijenhuis 1967: 25) The verbs concerned are: *is, het; kan/kon, mag, moet/moes, sal/sou, wil/wou; beter, doen, gaan*, for example:

- *Hy is ’n goeie man. Ja, hy is.*
- *Koos het griep. Het hy?*
- *Het sy dit gedoen? Ja, sy het.*
- *Jy moes dit lank gelede gedoen het. Ja, ek moes.*
- *Onthou dit. Ek sal.*
- *Jy wil nie dieselfde paadjie as hy loop nie, wil jy?*
"Jy beter iets doen. Ja, ek beter. (Dit beter wees)\(^{19}\)
Jy gaan dit betreur. Nee, ek gaan nie.\(^ {20}\)
Jy moet bedank. Ek gaan.\(^ {20}\)
Dis nie waar nie. Dit is./Is dit?\(^ {21}\)

The alternative structures required in Dutch in such instances would now be considered awkward in Afrikaans, for example: Hij is een goede man. Ja, dat is ie. Koos heeft griep. Is dat zo? etc.

7.10 Passive constructions

7.10.1

One very frequently hears was used instead of is as the auxiliary in a passive construction in the past tense. Ponelis (1979: 267) talks of 'die opkoms van was naas is' where he attributes this to two factors, English influence and 'in die tweede plek word was in plegtige skryfstyl aangewend ter uitdrukking van 'n voorverlede tyd.' Ponelis maintains that this was is not heard in the spoken language. One can thus be reasonably sure that when was is used in the spoken language, it is an anglicism; if it does coincide with a pluperfect meaning, this is likely to be purely by chance. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 220) attempt to sum up the confusion by stating 'in die lydende vorm slaan Afrikaans is op Engels was' and 'Afrikaans was op Engels had been'. I would contend, however, that the pluperfect passive does not and possibly never has existed in Afrikaans, just as wasgewees is identical in meaning in the active to was and is/het gewees. (cf. Ponelis 1979: 269) I base this claim on my personal observations of the use of was in passive constructions and it is in fact supported, even if unwittingly, by Botha and Van Aardt (1978: 143) where they state: 'Daar is nog 'n derde omskrywingswerkwoord in Afrikaans [i.e. in addition to is and word], maar die word meestal foutief gebruik onderEngelse invloed.' It is usual for Afrikaans grammars to insist on the existence of a pluperfect passive. It would be advisable for their rules to be based more on the reality of the spoken language in future.

---

\(^{19}\) This colloquial but nevertheless exceedingly common use of beter was attested by Roux in 1909. It is interesting to note that the Afrikaans is even more colloquial than the English it is modelled on, as one would always write 'I'd better' etc., although the elliptic 'had' may not always be pronounced.

\(^{20}\) Here an auxiliary is used which does not even occur in the original statement but which is implied. It should be pointed out, however, that many Afrikaners would disapprove of the use of gaan as an auxiliary in such cases.

\(^{21}\) The invariable ‘is it?’ in South African English is presumably a translation of Afrikaans is dit? (cf. Branford 1980: 118), which in its turn may be based on an English precedent where the verb did vary.
The most detailed study of this phenomenon is by Terblanche (1980) where the author does present convincing arguments to support the tenet that both a past and pluperfect passive exist in Afrikaans.

7.10.2

Although the confusion of is/was in the passive is dealt with in most accounts of anglicisms in Afrikaans, a similar, if not so common, confusion of is/word in the present passive is not discussed as frequently (cf. Terblanche 1980: 49), for example:

- Daar is nog twee ouens wat vermis is. (are missing)
- Die gebou is gewaardeer teen twee miljoen rand. (is valued at)
- ’n Mosie wat op iets gemik is. (is aimed at)
- Sanlam vra om verskoning vir enige ongerief wat veroorsaak is tydens aanbouings op hierdie perseel. (is caused - displayed during the renovations)

In such cases is could be quite grammatical, as the context is not clear, but these examples were noted in situations where a present passive was clearly implied, as in the fourth example where is would only be grammatically correct after the construction had been completed.

There are instances in Dutch/Afrikaans where a past participle can be used in combination with wees, in which case the participle functions as an adjective; but a past participle used in combination with word renders a passive. In the following examples the participles in question constitute part of a passive construction and thus word would be grammatically correct; wees is an anglicism:

- Binne 24 uur kan alles gereël wees
- Daar was ’n wet waarvolgens huwelike tussen Blankes en slavinne van volle kleur verbied moes wees

The second sentence illustrates the distinction more clearly because verbied is a past participle, whereas verbode is an adjective, although it may be argued that verbied can now be used adjectivally.

Ostyn (1972: 245) also noted confusion of zijn and worden in American Flemish and he comments on Wacker’s observation of the same tendency in American German.

7.10.3

Substitution of deur with by before agents in passive constructions is discussed on p. 262.
7.10.4

See 7.27.4.6 for a discussion of the use of subject pronouns instead of object pronouns in certain passive constructions.

7.10.5

The following passive constructions are literal translations of English idioms:

- **Hy word oorleef deur sy vader** (is survived by)
- **Hy is korrek bewys** (was proven right)
- **Ek is veronderstel om te...** (am supposed to) (= Dt. *word*)
- **Reis aanvaar te word op 1/2/85 en voltooi te word op 10/2/85.** (to be commenced - on railway ticket)
- **Die polisie is met wapens uitgereik.** (discussed on p. 217)

7.10.6

Omission of the auxiliary verb in passive constructions

7.10.6.1

In advertisements and on signs a form of *Telegramstil* is sometimes found where the auxiliary *word* is implied but not mentioned. Thus is a frequent practice in English but imitation of it in Afrikaans produces an ungrammatical construction, for example:

- **Alle petrolkaarte aanvaar**
- **Indien onafgelever stuur asb. aan...**
- **Versekerde pakette hier aangeneem**
- **Vertoon binnekort** (showing soon, cinema ad.)

It is difficult to ascertain in the final example whether this is an abbreviation of *Die film word binnekort vertoon* or *Die film vertoon (= wys) binnekort* (also an anglicism).

7.10.6.2

Sometimes, in imitation of English practice, a full relative clause containing a passive is avoided - in some cases it can be *wees* plus an adjectival past participle which is affected in this way, cf. examples 5 and 6 below - and that clause appears as an adjectival phrase not unlike the adjectival adjuncts in Dutch and German which can be used in lieu of relative clauses in formal style, but there they stand before the noun in question, for example: *De door hem in de samenleving beklede betrekking*. (cf. Donaldson 1981: 67, 164) In such cases in Afrikaans both the relative pronoun and the auxiliary *is* or *word* are omitted, for example:
7.11 Changes in the transitivity and intransitivity of verbs

Ostyn (1972: 75) stated as a general principle in his dissertation on American Flemish that 'Restricting features of lexical items tend to be deleted so as to give the words a greater distribution.' The influence of English on the transitive or intransitive use of certain verbs in Afrikaans can be regarded as an example of the sort of phenomena Ostyn is referring to. Steyn (1976: 37-8) lists a large number of intransitive verbs that he has observed being used transitively in Afrikaans. He makes no mention of English influence but all his examples correspond with English usage.

Reflexive verbs used non-reflexively could have been dealt with here too, as Steyn did (p. 49), but I have discussed the omission of the reflexive pronoun under pronouns (cf. 7.27.5).

The following verbs have acquired functions in addition to their traditional functions as found in Dutch and Afrikaans prescriptive works such as HAT, for example: proe (cf. 7.11.2.1) occurs only as a transitive verb according to HAT but in practice it is used just as frequently intransitively.

7.11.1 Intransitive > transitive

7.11.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Intransitive Form</th>
<th>Transitive Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flikker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>jou ligte flikker (in a car, = to flicker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groei</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>hy groei mielies (cf. Mansvelt 1884: 54) (= to grow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(op)lui</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ek het hom opgelui (= to ring up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>jy pas net een bed daarin, wat kan jy in hom pas? (= to fit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sink</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'n boorgat/put sink, 'n boot sink (= to sink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaak</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ek smaak jou, smaak dit (= to taste)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
verslap - die wetgewing word
verslap (= to relax)
7.11.1.2 Intransitive (i.e. verbs governing a prepositional object) > transitive

antwoord - 'n vraag antwoord, nie een keer is ek in Engels geantwoord nie (= to answer)
skei - iemand skei (= to divorce)
slaag - 'n eksamen slaag (= to pass)
trou - iemand trou (= to marry)\(^{22}\)
twyfel - twyfel jy my? (= to doubt)
voorsien - jy moet 'n handtekening voorsien (= to provide)

7.11.2 Transitive > intransitive

7.11.2.1

bekommer - moenie bekommer nie (= bekommerd wees, a puristic avoidance of 'worry')
inprop - dis iets wat by 'n muur inprop (= to plug in)
kruis - die katte kruis nie met mekaar nie (= to cross, interbreed)
meng - 'n skaaphond meng nie met ander honde nie (= to mix, associate with)
onmoet - Checkers, waar lae prys en gehalte onmoet (= to meet)

\(^{22}\) Dutch trouwen without met also occurs so the English structure has probably only acted as a contributing factor (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 104).
In the following passive construction the verb is used intransitively, in imitation of English, because in the active construction ‘weapons’ is the direct object and ‘police’ the indirect object: *Die polisie is met wapens uitgereik* - the police were issued with weapons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>optel</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>die ekonomie begin nou optel (= to pick up, improve)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dit proe lekker (= to taste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toepas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nou word egter gevind dat werkwoordskuif toepas ook wanneer... (to apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verwag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sy verwag (a child) = (to be expecting) (cf. p. 188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>die film wys nou in die stad (= to show)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.11.2.2

This intransitive use of otherwise transitive verbs, as in English, brings them into line with intransitive verbs such as loop and sit which cannot be used intransitively in this way in English, for example: hier die skoene loop lekker, die stoel sit lekker (possible in Dutch); but compare hierdie trui was goed - this sweater washes well (not possible in Dutch).

7.11.2.3

These verbs require an undefined object het in Dutch, but in Afrikaans the dit has become optional:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch Verb</th>
<th>Afrikaans Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bedoel</td>
<td>ek bedoel goed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bekostig</td>
<td>ek kan nie bekostig om te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haat</td>
<td>hulle haat om grens toe gestuur te word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>kan ’n mens nou help om te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koud kry</td>
<td>kry jy nie koud nie?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together with these dit-less constructions, Steyn (1976: 40-41) discusses those where daar+ preposition is commonly omitted, suggesting that they may all be the result of English influence and adds: 'Tog pas hulle goed in by die aard van die werkwoord' (p. 41), for example:

- ek sou (daarin) belangstel om te
drie mense is (daaraan) skuldig bevind dat hulle
Also: hy word beskuldig van sy slawe te mishandel het (= accused of having maltreated)

7.11.3

Blas exists in both Dutch and Afrikaans as a transitive (glas blaaas) and (very rarely) an intransitive verb (die wind blaaas). Under English influence it has acquired a new intransitive meaning: die gloeilamp/gasket het geblaas (not in HAT and not mentioned
under the lemma *blaas* in Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 32). Note also the loan translations *jou geld/jou eie beuel blaas*.

7.11.4

Use of the prefix *be-*, commonly employed in Dutch/Afrikaans to signify the transitivity of verbs, occurs at times in Afrikaans where English influence would seem to be playing a role:
beplan - occurs where Dutch uses the loanword *plannen* (pron. [æ]) or *van plan zijn*; in the former case it is used as a purism and in the latter case to avoid the periphrasis, i.e. a need is felt to equate one Afrikaans word with one English word.

benodig - in Dutch this word only occurs as an adjective. As with *beplan* it would seem the Afrikaner feels a need to equate ‘to need’ with one word, seeking to avoid the periphrastic *nodig hê*. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 26) make no mention of it being an anglicism and merely see it as written language. De Villiers (1985) and HAT see it as an anglicism to be avoided. It is very common, however.

bedien - theoretically Dutch/Afrikaans *dienen/dien* take the prefix *be-* when a person is served; in Afrikaans nowadays one can *bedien* food, drink and meals. Also *die dam bedien Durban*. (cf. Van der Merwe and Ponelis 1982: 22)

bewerk - according to WAT one should *bewerk 'n kleim* but *werk* occurs too - (waarsk. Angl.)

beteël - *HAT* gives both *beteël* and *teël* as synonyms; *Van Dale* gives both but only the former seems to be used, whereas the latter occurs more frequently in Afrikaans.
bemark - a neologism to cover the semantic field of ‘to market’. Dutch has no such word. (cf. bemarking p. 207)

7.12 International vocabulary

No aspect of the influence of English on Afrikaans has aroused as much confusion, and thus debate, as the presence of so much international or classical vocabulary in the language. Reference has previously been made to the fact that it is precisely those items of vocabulary which the common man regards as anglicisms and thus academics have gone to great lengths, most recently Combrink (1984), to put the record straight in this regard. Nevertheless, the reality of the matter is infinitely more complicated than asserting that because such words occur in French and Dutch, as well as English, they have thus nothing to do with English influence. Their generic origin may be French, and thus they are found in Dutch, but their historic origin in Afrikaans is undoubtedly English in many cases although it is impossible to prove in each individual case. But whether words such as kompartement (in a train), populasie and subskripsie - all of which are to be found in a Dutch dictionary although they are not (or are no longer?) commonly used in Dutch - reached Afrikaans via Dutch or English, there would seem to be little doubt that the frequency of their use in Afrikaans is a direct consequence of their indispensability in English and thus the bilingual individual’s uninhibited use of them in Afrikaans. Van Dale
recognises joumaal and ordinair as having the additional meanings of tijdschrift and gewoon but also labels these meanings as archaic. Is one thus to presume that when these words occur in Afrikaans with those meanings that they have preserved a meaning they formerly had in Dutch? This is of course possible, but it is more likely that the presence of cognate forms in English has at least assisted in retaining those meanings and it may even be solely responsible. It is impossible to ascertain.

When collecting examples for this section, I noted many items of vocabulary which at first glance appeared to be non-indigenous to Dutch/Afrikaans or which at least had meanings unknown to me in Dutch. On consulting Van Dale, I ultimately found many of these words and their unusual meanings to be present in Dutch and was forced to discard them. Nevertheless, I was left with a lingering feeling that the influence of English cannot be completely absent, even if only as a contributing factor, from words such as lisensie (drywerslisensie), natureel (= natuurlik), okkasioneel (as an adjective and an adverb), personaliteit (= persoonlikheid) and sekondêr (sekondêre onderwys) even though Van Dale maintains that these words can have that meaning in Dutch and does not give them as archaic. When one continually hears talk of kompetisie instead of konkurrensie, despite the fact that both occur in both Dutch and Afrikaans dictionaries, one cannot help but assume that konkurrensie, the infinitely more common form in Dutch, is less frequent in Afrikaans because the alternative has a near homonym in English. Presumably few would disagree with me on such issues but they remain impossible to be conclusive about. The following categories do, however, offer some kind of proof that English has had a definite role to play in the adoption and assimilation of international vocabulary in Afrikaans.

7.12.1

These words do not exist in Dutch (cf. p. 90):

akkreditasie (but accrediteren is Dutch)
aplikant, appliseer
apologeties23
area
biodegradeerbaar
dekade
deterioreer, deterosisie (former not in HAT)
dominasie, dominering24,25

---

23 This word does exist in Dutch in the religious sense, which is unlikely to be the source of the word in Afrikaans.
24 Puristic deformation of an English loanword. (cf. p. 207)
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
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estimasie, estimeer
federeer
fornikasie
fotostaat, fotostateer
in-, uitfaseer
kanselleer, kansellasie, kansellering
kommoditeit
kompeteer
kovert
motoris
ongeïnhibeer
prisonier
prosesseer
skeduleer
soneer
suspisieus

7.12.2
These words exist in Dutch but have a different meaning (English meanings given here):

affekteer - to have an effect on
akkommodasie - shelter
akkommodeer - to shelter, house
antiek - antique (noun)
basies - basic; basically
eventueel - eventually

26 Dutch uses federaliseren but I suspect that federeer is in direct imitation of ‘to federate.’
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
24 Puristic deformation of an English loanword. (cf. p. 207)
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
25 Words which have cognate forms in Dutch but as other parts of speech: domineren, fase, fotostatisch, competitie, inhibitie, prison, proces, schedule, zone/zonering, suspicie.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>formidable</td>
<td>formidable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funksie</td>
<td>party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gedetermineerd</td>
<td>determined to do something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanteer</td>
<td>to handle (influx of people, situations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honneurs</td>
<td>honours (university degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignoreer</td>
<td>to ignore (where Dutch would use negeren)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>induseer</td>
<td>to induce a birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karavaan</td>
<td>mobile house (Dutch uses caravan and woonwagen is a Gypsy style caravan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsumpsie</td>
<td>t.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kontrakteur</td>
<td>building contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwalifikasie</td>
<td>with the qualification (i.e. limitation) that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwotasie</td>
<td>price, tender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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modelleer - to model as of mannequins
paneel - panel of judges, panel beater, panel van
partikulier(e) - specific, particular; fussy; personal particulars
prefek - school prefect
promoveer - to promote (of a product; Dutch uses promote)
proses - all the meanings of English process
residensieel - residential college
solied - solid gold, wood etc. (Dutch uses massief)
simpatie, -tiek - sympathy, -etic (i.e. Dt. medelijden)
standaarde - as in 'by South African standards'
stoffasie - to show what stuff you're made of
tema - theme tune (in a movie)
uitsorteer - to sort a person out

7.12.3

These words exist in Dutch but have assumed new functions in Afrikaans:

ekwivalient - adjective and noun, only a noun in Dutch
essensieel - adjective and adverb, only an adjective in Dutch
finaal - adjective, adverb and noun (sport), only an adjective and an adverb in Dutch
kontak - noun and verb, only a noun in Dutch
monitor - noun and verb, only a noun in Dutch
7.12.4

These words exist in Dutch but according to *Van Dale* are anglicisms in that language too:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kontroversieel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opsioneel</td>
<td>not in <em>HAT</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permit</td>
<td>stress on first syllable in Dutch but on the second in Afrikaans, although it is not a current word in Dutch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permissiwiteit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plastiek</td>
<td><em>plástic</em> in Dutch and with [æ] (not unknown in Dt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospekteer(der)</td>
<td><em>prospecteren/prospéctor</em> in Dt. (in as far as it exists at all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tifoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.12.5

These words exist in Dutch but according to *Van Dale* are considered as germanisms in that language; that is unlikely to be the origin of them in Afrikaans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brutaal</td>
<td>i.e. the meaning of brutal, not cheeky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identies
plasties - i.e. made of plastic (only used figuratively in Dutch, e.g. plastische chirurgie/beeldspraak)

program

7.12.6

These words are found in Dutch but in a different form. It would seem that contact with English has had an influence on the formation of these words:

departementeel - departementaal in Dutch (puristic avoidance in Afrikaans?)
disinvestering, disinfeksie - desinvestering, desinfectie in Dutch (HAT gives dis- and des-)
entoesiasties, eksentries, fanaties - enthousiast, excentriek, fanatiek in Dutch
idioties, paranoïïes, pedanties - idioot, paranoïde and pedant in Dutch (cf. identies and plasties under 7.12.5)
kontroversie - kontroverse in Dutch (also according to HAT)
kosmopolitaans - kosmopolities in Dutch (also according to HAT)
legitimiseer - legitimateer in Dutch (also according to HAT)
plastiek - plastiek in Dutch (puristic avoidance in Afrikaans)
prostituut - prostituee in Dutch
rekommandasie - rekommandasie in Dutch and HAT

27 The distinction that exists in Afrikaans between polities and politiek (i.e. the adjective) does not exist in Dutch as Dutch only has the latter word. Could English have played a role in the coining of the former? Dutch does, on the other hand, also have the couplet kritisch/kritiek as in Afrikaans. Dutch also has excentrisch, but only in the mathematical sense. (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 57-8)
7.13 Semantic shift

It is difficult, and in fact almost superfluous, to treat semantic shift as a separate entity in this thesis, as the vast majority of the categories dealt with in chapter seven entail semantic shift as a matter of course to a greater or lesser degree. No new category is discussed here which is not mentioned elsewhere in this chapter under another heading.
7.13.1 Extension of meaning

The most common form of semantic shift caused by the contact with English is an extension of meaning whereby an Afrikaans word, if one compares it with its cognate in Dutch, has assumed new meanings while usually not losing its original Diets meanings; the semantic fields of two words which were only partially synonymous have moved closer together so that the degree of overlapping has increased, for example: prop now covers almost every situation where English uses 'plug', whether it be a noun or a verb (cf. p. 233) - prop, muurprop, inprop where Dutch uses stekker, stopcontact, insteken and only rarely does Dutch prop render English 'plug'.

Diagramatically one can represent this difference as follows:

A and B = Dutch prop (pen)
B and C = English plug
D and E = Afrikaans prop
E and F = English plug

A and D represent, for example, contexts such as een/n prop haar/hare or een/n prop in de/die keel (meanings Eng. 'plug' does not have) and C and F represent to plug a hole (a meaning Afr. prop does not have).

One of the most common forms of extension of meaning is the adoption of figurative meanings by an Afrikaans word which its Dutch cognate does not have, but which the English word of which it is regarded to be the equivalent, does (whether cognate or not), for example: die petrolprys sny, die droogte het gebreek, ryk kos, die alternatiewe uitspel. Homophony with English cognates (cf. 7.14) is often at least partially the cause of such equations of meaning being made in the mind of the speaker as most of the examples given illustrate. But the terrain gained by onthou at the cost of jou herinner, two semantically quite distinct words in Dutch, is the result of English having only one lexeme for two Dutch semantemes which are each designated by a separate word. The semantic functions of Afrikaans bring and vat/neem correspond far more closely to English bring and take than Dutch brengen and nemen do, to quote another case, for example: Eng. I'll take you home, Afr. ek sal jou huis toe vat, Dt. ik breng je naar huis.
Purism has also been the cause of semantic extension. Whereas the Dutch words *plakkaat* and *poster* are not synonymous, *plakkaat* covers the semantic fields of both in Afrikaans. Other examples of this phenomenon are: Dt. *aflandig/off-shore* > Afr. *aflandig*, Dt. *draven/joggen* > Afr. *draft*, Dt. *fiks/fit* > Afr. *fiks*, Dt. *grimering/make-up* > Afr. *grimering*.

### 7.13.2 Other forms of semantic shift

Sometimes English influence manifests itself in the semantics of Afrikaans by the frequency with which a word is used with a certain meaning. Under *schaars Van Dale* adds the comment *(zelden)* to the example *ik zag hem schaars* whereas *ek het hom skaars gesien* is quite common in Afrikaans. *Artikel* in the sense of *item* is given as definition one in *HAT* whereas in *Van Dale* it is definition five.

Another interesting isolated case is *spinasie*. As South African English (although it is also heard in Australia) ‘erroneously’ refers to the vegetable *beta vulgaris* as ‘spinach’, Afrikaans *spinasie* denotes the same plant, whereas in Holland, where *beta vulgaris* (silver beet) is virtually unknown (*snijbiet*?), *spinazie* is the name of *spinacea oleracea*. *HAT* gives *spinasie* as meaning *spinacea oleracea*, which is incorrect.

### 7.14 Semantic shift as a result of (partial) homophony

The presence of many cognate forms in the Germanic vocabulary of English and Afrikaans means that there are also many homophonous and partially homophonous words which the two languages share. Some of these are more or less synonymous, without influence in either direction having played a role (e.g. *huis-house, land-land*), but others have either totally or slightly different meanings in the two languages. The phonological similarity of such items of vocabulary in English and Afrikaans has led to Afrikaans words undergoing a shift in meaning to correspond semantically with the like sounding English cognates. Such words have undergone an extension in meaning, for example: *leeftyd*, in addition to meaning ‘age’, is frequently used in the sense of ‘lifetime’. *Ostyn* (1972: 59) noticed the same phenomenon in American Flemish, as did *Nijenhuis* (1967) in Australian Dutch.

The semantics of the international vocabulary in Afrikaans has also been affected in this way, but that is dealt with elsewhere. (cf. 7.12.2)
It can be difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether words such as *lot*, *mop*,
*poel* and *vorm* are outright loanwords in the meanings given below or indigenous
words (i.e. Dutch *lot* - fate, *mop* - joke, *poel* - pool of water, *vorm* - shape) that have
undergone an extension of meaning because of their homophony with English words
(whether cognate or not) with the new meaning.

In the case of verbs such as *bank* and *lys*, which were already present as nouns in
Afrikaans, the existence of homophonous verbs in English (to bank, to list) has led
to a change of function in Afrikaans, (cf. 7.16.1)

Many of the separable verbs given on p. 184-187 under loan translations can also
be seen as belonging to this category, for example: *aangaan* (to go on), *aankom*
to (come on), *in slaap* (to sleep in) and *uitspel* (to spell out).

A form such as *agtermiddag* is not given here because it is generally recognised in
linguistic circles as not being of English origin in Afrikaans. Nevertheless, the partial
homophony of *agtermiddag* with ‘afternoon’ could perhaps explain why it is so much
more common in Afrikaans than in Dutch which now uses *(na)middag*.

(Partial) homophony with non-cognate forms has led to clever popular etymological
forms being coined for fun, for example: *iemand op ’n paddastoel plaaas* (to put s.o.
on a pedestal) and *duisendtree* (dysentery). In at least two cases, *kothuis* (cottage)
and *kokkerot* (cockroach) such forms have actually entered the language officially.
(cf. Van der Merwe and Ponelis 1982: 214, 106)

When one part of the compound nouns that follow stands in brackets, attention is
being drawn to the homophony of the unbracketed element:

- *(bloed)*stroom - bloodstream
- bottelnek - bottleneck
- briewe(tas) - briefcase
- broodrolletjie - breadroll
- donderstorm - thunderstorm
- drywers(lisensie) - driver’s licence
- fortuin(verteller) - fortune teller
- (generasie)gaping - generation gap
- koringvlokke - corn flakes
- leeftyd - lifetime
- middelklas - middle class
- *(oog)*bal - eye ball
- *(pad-, dooie-)*tol - (road, death) toll
- *(plate)*joggie - disc jockey
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pynappel</td>
<td>pineapple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaar(wiel), spaar(bril)</td>
<td>spare wheel, glasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(spuit)kannetjie</td>
<td>spray can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(tiksters)poel</td>
<td>typing pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(verkeers)vloei</td>
<td>traffic flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vlag)paal</td>
<td>flag pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank</td>
<td>(river) bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ding</td>
<td>thing¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis</td>
<td>dish (course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fondse</td>
<td>funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fooi(e)</td>
<td>fee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grein</td>
<td>grain (wood; a grain of salt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grond(e)</td>
<td>ground(s)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kas</td>
<td>cash, case (of tomatoes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laan</td>
<td>lane (freeway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyn</td>
<td>line (in a book)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maak</td>
<td>make (brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merk</td>
<td>mark⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noot</td>
<td>note⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pes</td>
<td>pest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan, pot</td>
<td>pan, pot⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleisteraar</td>
<td>plasterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punt</td>
<td>point⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skets</td>
<td>sketch (acted parody)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skou</td>
<td>show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skut</td>
<td>shot (a good shot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoed</td>
<td>speed (10-speed bike, speed limit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoet</td>
<td>stud (farm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoof</td>
<td>stove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in volle) swang</td>
<td>(in full) swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3rd party)teken</td>
<td>(3rd party) token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veld</td>
<td>field (of science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in) vloed</td>
<td>in flood (a river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vlot</td>
<td>float (in a procession)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vorm</td>
<td>(paper) form (to be filled in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuur (= brand)</td>
<td>fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faal</td>
<td>to fail s.o., let s.o. down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groei</td>
<td>to grow (tr. verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haal</td>
<td>to hawl (s.o. over the coals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamp</td>
<td>to camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraak</td>
<td>to crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyk</td>
<td>to like&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to mean</td>
<td>meen (= bedoel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to mark</td>
<td>merk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to overcome</td>
<td>oorkóm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to plead (guilty)</td>
<td>(skuldig) pleit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to reckon (think)</td>
<td>reken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to spare (time)</td>
<td>spaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to tackle (s.o.)</td>
<td>takel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to fare (well)</td>
<td>vaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to replace</td>
<td>verplaas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to wonder</td>
<td>wonder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oncoming (traffic)</td>
<td>aankomende (verkeer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>angstig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>braaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>enig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine (a fine woman)</td>
<td>fyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last</td>
<td>laas(jaar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next (best)</td>
<td>naas(beste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oily (hair)</td>
<td>olierig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plump</td>
<td>plomp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rare</td>
<td>raar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td>uitgesproke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outstanding (excellent)</td>
<td>uitstaande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on</td>
<td>aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-up (broke)</td>
<td>hardop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scarcely (scarcely two weeks old)</td>
<td>skaars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so far (= up till now)</td>
<td>sover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eindnoten:

1. As in die in-ding, ‘n snaakse ding (fig.), jou stoute ding, jou (eie) ding doen, die interessantste ding is dat, motory is die lekkerste ding in die wêreld, daardie soort van ding/daardie tipe ding (Dt. dat soort dingen), dis die soort van ding wat, alle dinge gelyk synde, hoe is dinge?, dit van alle ding, dinge is aan die dieer. (cf. 7.1.1.1)
2. Also found in several compound nouns: grondvloer, skougrond(e), speelgrond(e).
3. Also found in several compound nouns and expressions: hooflyn (newspaper) kraglyn, pyplyn,
ditisinlynmetonspolitiek. (cf. p. 7.1.1.1)
4. Both the English noun and verb ‘to mark’ are sometimes rendered by merk: landmerk, joumerk
maak, merkwerk, vraestellemerk, afmerk (tomarkdownaprice) (cf. 7.1.1.1)
5. As in opdaardienootgroetonstot8.00, op ‘n noot van vertroue sluit.
6. The semantic fields of English pan and pot (askitchenutensils) correspond to those of Afrikaans
pan and pot, which is not so in Dutch.
7. Commonly found in translated expressions: sy sterk punt, wat is die punt daarvan?, ‘n punt hê, by die punt kom, dis nie die punt nie, die punt huis toe bring. (cf. 7.1.1.1)
9. See note 4 above.
10. This word has been the subject of considerable debate during which no-one has mentioned the possibility of the noun wonder, which is not controversial, having simply changed function. (cf. 7.16) Mansvelt (1884: 185) commented on it and Le Roux (1952: 32) sees it as English in origin and attributes its inburgering to ‘sy kortheid’, as does Terblanche (Die Brandwag, 18/10/46) who nevertheless discusses it in a column entitled ‘Twyfelagtige Anglisismes’. Both Le Roux and Rademeyer (Die Brandwag, 19/7/46) seem to find it necessary to circumscribe ek wonder more indirectly than is necessary (e.g. ek sou graag wil weet; ek is nuuskierig om te weet) when in fact it corresponds exactly with jou afvra, an expression which is still in use. De Voors (1925: 105) mentions Dutch wonderen as being considered ‘een veld winnende Anglicisme’ in poetry in 1910.
11. Whether braaf meaning ‘brave’ is an anglicism or not has been the topic of much debate (cf. p. 52, 90, 131).
12. The meanings of enig in Dutch (Geerts, i.a. 1984: 274) are such that it is difficult to ascertain where homophony with English ‘any’ has affected the semantic field of this word. Mansvelt (1884: 41) saw enig in the senses of elk and een of ander (e.g. eenig mensch kan dat doen, noem enig dorp) as anglicisms. His recording of the phenomenon is an indication of its antiquity in Afrikaans. Is that then the reason why it is no longer felt to be an anglicism or is it because Afrikaans has preserved an older meaning of the word, as claimed by Franken (1912: 279) who refers to Middle Dutch? Nevertheless, I feel it is highly likely that English has at least played a role (if it is not in fact the source) in the following functions of enig: enige oomblik, te eniger tyd/enige tyd (Dutch te eniger tyd = at some time), enigiemand, enigneen, enigiets (e.g. erwe kos enigiets tussen R20 000 en R25 000), ‘n muis vreet enige ding, in enige stad in die land (in watter stad dan ook is awkward by comparison), hulle moenie op enige tone trap nie, dit kan niemand enige goed doen nie, sy wil nooit enige kinders hé nie. The last three examples illustrate enig being used where English switches from ‘some’ to ‘any’ when a negative is involved; this particular use of enig is without any doubt an anglicism in my opinion.
13. German uses letz as Afrikaans uses laas in expressions of time. This may therefore not be an anglicism although laasnag in the meaning of gisteraand definitely sounds like an anglicism, as does laas in ek het twintig jaar laas van haar gehoor.
15. Partially homophonous aan is equated with English ‘on’ in many contexts, cf. separable verbs p. 184-7 and prepositions p. 263. It also occurs as an adverb in imitation of English usage: Het
by iets vanaan aan?, en so aan, lateraan, verderaan. Smith (Die Naweek, 28/10/48) discusses
‘idrome met “aan” wat geen Anglicismes is nie’
16. There is a large number of cases where af is equated with English ‘off’ where English influence seems to be undeniable. Consequently, af occurs in Afrikaans in parts of speech that are unimaginable in Dutch, for example: afspitstyd, af diens (opposite of aan diens), ‘n af naweek, die wyn is af. (cf. separable verbs p. 184-5) There is a variety of opinion about whether welaf is or is not an anglicism. (cf. Smith, Die Naweek, 11/11/48, 25/11/48, 2/12/48)
17. *Al, alles and almal* can all render English ’all’ in certain given contexts. Afrikaans syntax determines which is correct under the circumstances. On occasions *al*, presumably because of its phonological similarity to ’all’ is heard where Afrikaans grammar prescribes one of the other forms, for example: *Dis al van Suid-Afrikaanse materiaal gemaak, dis al, al die pad.*

18. There is some controversy about whether *jy is reg* is an anglicism or not, but the use of *reg* meaning ’correct’, as well as its use in the following expressions, does not seem to have been questioned at all. I think it is highly likely that they are modelled on English and that the adverbial use of *reg* in the last four examples is without any doubt English: *dis reg, doodreg, as ek die argument reg begryp, so reg soos reën, reg oor die land, reg deur die naweek werk, reg in die middel van Johannesburg, reg vanaf die begin.*

19. The adverbial use of *schaars* as given in *Van Dale* does not seem to correspond with its use in Afrikaans but its use in Afrikaans and English is identical in certain cases.

20. In addition to the very frequent use of *so* meaning ’thus’ - very often at the beginning of an utterance as in English - it is also commonly heard in combination with *indien* in imitation of ’(and) if so’.

21. See note 16 above for *welaf* (cf. also Mansvelt 1884: 182) and see p. 257 for a discussion of the conjunction *sowel as*. The use of *wel* in the following expressions where it is synonymous with *goed* would seem to be an anglicism: *hy het wel gedoen, ek kon net so wel nie gegaan het nie*. The frequency with which *wel* is used in Afrikaans at the beginning of an utterance (compare so in note 20 above), is probably due to English influence although this use of the word is not impossible in Dutch.
7.15 Synonymous couplets

The semantic fields of the two (and occasionally three) words in the following couplets differ somewhat from those of the cognate forms in Dutch. In all these cases English has only one lexical item to cover the semantic fields of both members of the couplet and thus it seems quite possible that the division between the two, usually quite clear in Dutch, has become blurred in Afrikaans due to them both being equated with one semanteme in English. Grüner (1980: 5) calls the phenomenon reduksie-interferensie and Ostyn (1972: 75) comments on it being a recognised phenomenon in bilingualism:

‘In the literature on bilingualism it has been noticed that if an immigrant language has several words covering a semantic area and the English language has only one, it is often this foreign element that will be introduced into the lexicon of the immigrant language. In doing so, it automatically supplants the entire set of native terms.’

I do not intend to suggest that the words in all the following couplets are totally synonymous, but in certain contexts they show a synonymity that does not exist in Dutch.
Similar ‘synonymous’ couplets where an indigenous word competes with an international loanword, are discussed in 7.4. However, materiaal/stof are mentioned here because they are a rare instance of the loanword being more common than the Germanic synonym and ignoreer/negeer have been included because both are loanwords in competition with each other.

In some of the cases mentioned below the popularity of one form over the other can be attributed to the (partial) homophony of that word with a cognate in English, for example: laas/vorig, pyp/leiding.

Generally speaking, the first word in each couplet occurs in contexts in Afrikaans where only the second is correct in Dutch, and not the reverse:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aansit/aanbezien</td>
<td>naamgeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aankleer/aantrek</td>
<td>kleden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afskrif/kopie</td>
<td>kopie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedoel/meen</td>
<td>bedoelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been/graat</td>
<td>been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behoort/moe</td>
<td>moe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beskikbaar/verkrygbaar</td>
<td>verkrijgbaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brein/harsings</td>
<td>brein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buitekant/buite</td>
<td>buiten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dink/bedink</td>
<td>denken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dis/gereg</td>
<td>dien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dop/skild</td>
<td>shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draai/keer</td>
<td>draaien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gemeensam/gebruiklik</td>
<td>gemeensam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getal/aantal</td>
<td>getal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jouself) geniet/amuseer</td>
<td>genieten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graad/mate</td>
<td>grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hang/ophang</td>
<td>hangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignoreer/negeer</td>
<td>negeren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersfees/Kersmis</td>
<td>Kersfees/Kersmis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klank/geluid</td>
<td>geluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kopie/eksemplaar</td>
<td>kopie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laasnaag/gisteraand</td>
<td>laas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laas/vorig/verlede</td>
<td>vorige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leef/woon</td>
<td>leven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loods/gesagvoerder/piloot</td>
<td>pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyk/uitsien</td>
<td>to look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materiaal/stof</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meneer/heer</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middel/midde</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodig hê/hoeft</td>
<td>to need (cf. p. 212)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nuuskierig/benieud - curious
omtrent/oor - about
onderwerp/vak - subject
onderwyser/leraar - teacher
onthou/jou herinner - to remember
oplui/opbel - to ring up
opvoeding/opleiding/opvoedkunde - education
ouderdom/leeftyd - age
prop/stekker/stopkontak - plug (cf. p. 224)
pyp/leiding - pipe
sak/tas - bag
sny/knip - to cut
soos/as - as (cf. p. 256-7)
span/ploeg - team
-sprekendes, -taliges - -speaking
suid van/ten suide van - south of
teël/pan - (roof) tile
teken/bord - sign (traffic sign etc.)
teken/spoor - sign (i.e. trace)
toevoeg/aanbou - to add
toon/vertoon - to show (cf. wys)
verf/skilder - to paint (as in art)
verhouding/betrekking - relation
verstaan/begryp - to understand
vertoning/voorstelling - show, performance
vet/dik - fat
vra/stel - to ask (a question)
vuur/brand - fire

28 According to HAT, leraar can also have the meaning of ‘teacher’, as it does in Dutch (= secondary teacher), but this meaning is exceedingly rare.
29 cf. Van Oostrum and Heslinga (1937: 27)
30 cf. Le Roux (1926: 355)
31 Ostyn (1972: 213) found the same confusion of these two words in American Flemish. In addition leeftyd is found in the meaning of ‘lifetime’ because of its partial homophony with its cognate in English. (cf. p. 226)
32 See Hiemstra’s (1980: 102) comments on handsak etc.
33 Cohen in Onze Taal 85 (4) claims that -talig is a relatively new formation in Dutch and is not used by the common man, but I am not sure whether I agree with him. If it is so, the preference for -sprekend in Afrikaans presumably has nothing to do with English influence.
waardeer/takseer - to value
wys/vertoon/laat sien - to show (cf. toon)
7.16 Change of function

As was discussed in 2.1.4, the close affinity of Afrikaans and English which, among other things, includes much common Germanic and international vocabulary and the loss of formal morphological distinction between the parts of speech, has worked in favour of many words changing their function, for example: as the word bank also occurs as a verb in English and as Afrikaans, like English, makes no formal distinction between nouns and verbs, the way was open for bank to also be used as a verb in Afrikaans. It is not necessary, however, for the words to be phonologically similar or etymologically related, as in the case of bank, for such change of function to take place, for example: where the Dutch talk of ‘service’ (i.e. of a car, washing machine etc.) Afrikaners use the loan translation diens, derived from the verb dien, but as ‘service’ in English is both a noun and a verb, its puristic translation also serves both functions in Afrikaans. When a word is borrowed from English that is both a noun and a verb in that language, there is a possibility that it will be borrowed in both senses, for example: ghries (noun and verb). The exact course of the process is not always clear, however: if the noun prop (cf. p. 224) assumed a new meaning in Afrikaans under the influence of English, was that noun then simply used as a verb too (e.g. inprop) or did the Dutch verb proppen shift in meaning along with the noun? In other words, is the verb prop a case of semantic shift or change of function?

Although there are more cases of change of function from noun to verb and verb to noun, the phenomenon is not limited to these two parts of speech:

7.16.1 Noun > verb

- bank
- blom
- dieet
- draf - to jog
- galop
- kamp
- kolf
- kontak
- lys - to list
- merk - e.g. to mark exams
- paddastoel - to mushroom
- poel
- raam
- sirkel
- spioen
- stort - to shower
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toring oor

vurk - e.g. die pad vurk

wonder (cf. p. 228)

wurm
### 7.16.2 Verb > noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breuk</td>
<td>pause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (u-)
draai |  |
| fok |  |
| gooi | e.g. 'n pragtige gooi |
| kyk | e.g. een kyk was genoeg, iemand 'n vuil kyk gee |
| maak | brand (of a product) |
| moet |  |
| mondsipoel |  |
| rook | geen rook in die eerste 6 rye (nie)³⁴ |
| swem | dankie vir die swem |
| wag | 'n lang wag |
| weggee |  |
| wen | dit betaal R50 vir 'n wen |

### 7.16.3 Noun/verb > noun/verb

- bottel
- briek
- ghries
- monitor
- trok

### 7.16.4 Noun > adjective

- ek is dors, honger, jammer, reg, spyt (cf. Le Roux 1952: 45)
- ek voel jammer vir jou
- beginsel (standpunkte)
- ekwivalent
- gemeenplaas
- gunsteling
- korttermyn (probleem) (cf. p. 7.28.7)

---

³⁴ It is not the use of an infinitive as a noun as such that constitutes the anglicism, for this is common to both Dutch and Afrikaans, but in this particular example rook is used nominally in a way that is not possible in Dutch (= Dt. niet roken).

---
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7.16.5 Adjective > noun

antiek(e) (sing, exists only as a coll. noun in Dt.)

burgerlike(s)

finaal (sport)

pedant (cf. p. 223)

terminaal (computer)
7.16.6 Noun > adverb

volprys - jy moet volprys betaal
somer/winter - die oord bied somer en winter...

7.16.7 Adverb > noun

kontant - hy is van kontant beroof; ’n bakkie vir kontant koop (= Dt. kontanter)

7.16.8 Adjective > adverb

onbepaald - die goudprys sal nie onbepaald (indefinitely) $340 per ons wees nie
tweede - hy het tweede gekom

7.16.9 Adverb > adjective

’n af dag binnenshuise versiering onlangs (attrib. adj.) (cf. Ostyn 1972: 252)
oornag - e.g. geen oornag kampeerdery ’n toe nes ’n verdere som van R50 ’n welaf Jood

7.16.10 Adjective > verb

benodig (cf. p. 219)
### 7.16.11 Preposition > adverb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>af</td>
<td>ons gaan af Kaapstad toe</td>
<td>(cf. p. 228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op</td>
<td>ons gaan op Pretoria toe</td>
<td>(cf. p. 185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>is hy in?, die kar is in vir 'n diens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voor</td>
<td>padwerke voor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.16.12 Adverb > preposition

af - af diens (cf. afhé, 'n af dag and p. 230)

7.16.13 Noun > preposition

binne-, buitekant

7.16.14 Verb > adverb/adjective

oormag - geen oornag kampeerdery (cf. 7.16.9); dit het oornag gebeur

7.17 Plural formation

7.17.1

The following nouns can be used in the plural in Dutch too but only when more than one item is referred to, for example: one set of ‘headphones’ in Dutch is een koptelefoon whereas two sets are koptelefoons; oorfone on the other hand, like ‘headphones’, has both meanings in Afrikaans:

brille
fondse
fooie
gronde, terreine
lyfwagte
oorfone
trappe, trappies
uitslae/resultate (of one game)
(buite)verkope
(water)valle

7.17.2

It is not relevant to the point under discussion here that fondse and fooie have also undergone a shift in meaning because of their resemblance to like-sounding English words. (cf. 7.14)
The following nouns cannot be quantified in Dutch, in as far as they exist in that language, and thus their use in the plural in Afrikaans is most probably English inspired:

- baba-, seekosse
- brandewyne
- inruilings
- kopsere
- liefdadighede
- magte (an individual's)
- padwerke
- telekommunikasies
- (buite)verkope
- (koue)vleise
- voedsels
- uit-, invoere
- voere (animal feeds)
7.17.3

The following proper nouns occur in the plural because they have a plural form in English:

- Gouelokkies
- Falklände
- Parlementsgeboue
- Uniegeboue

7.17.4

The following are individual cases of English inspired plurals:

- **handeskud** (Dt. de hand schudden)
- **inrye** (abbreviation of inryteaters, -bioskope which, like the English abbreviation ‘drive-ins’, can take a plural ending)
- **nie-rokers-gedeelte van die kajuit**
- **ek weet nie hoeveel brandewyne ek gedrink het nie** (= glasses of)

7.17.5

It is not usual in European languages other than English for plurals such as the following to be used (i.e. those in bold print):

- **verskeie huise se dakke** is deur ‘n storm afgeruk
- **hulle het seker in hul grafte omgedraai**
- **iemand se bloed het hierdie babas se lewens gered**
- **vrouens mag nie lang broeke dra nie**
- **die resepte is uitgewerk vir mense met redelike apyte**

In such cases those languages regard each house as having only one roof, each person as lying in only one grave, each baby as having only one life etc. In Afrikaans there is a choice between the singular and the plural; the two compete with each other in free variation. Presumably the plural forms have arisen under the influence of English, although such plurals are occasionally heard in Dutch too.

7.17.6

As a result of parallel development in Afrikaans and English, -s plurals are more common in Afrikaans than in Dutch, although not as common as in English. Although the plural **arms** (< Dutch dialect) is not the result of English influence, **dwelms** (a shortened form of **dwelmmiddels**) is most probably modelled on ‘drugs’. Although
bioskoop and masjien officially take -e in the plural, one occasionally hears -s, presumably because the speaker regards them as loanwords; kleims, sardiens, tjeks and tjops, on the other hand, officially take -s because they are still regarded as loanwords, despite the graphical assimilation they have undergone. Trems/tremme and pêls/pelle would seem to indicate that these loanwords have progressed a little further along the road to complete
assimilation, whereas *hotelle, plotte (plotjie)* and *tamponne* have gone even further - or is an -s plural in *trem* and *pêls* just as indigenously Afrikaans as an -e plural?

7.17.7

Weights, measures, currencies and expressions of time (i.e. *uur, jaar*) which are usually in the singular after numerals in Dutch, are found in the plural much more frequently in Afrikaans than is the case in Dutch. Nevertheless, *ik heb vyf uren staan wachten* is possible in Dutch although a certain emphasis on the amount of time one spent waiting is then implied, which is not necessarily the case in Afrikaans. The same applies to the use of *jaar*. The following are however most probably due to English influence:

- *'n vertraging van twintig ure*
- *twee liters, kilometers, dollars, myle*
- *twee onse goud*

7.17.8

It is very common in Afrikaans to see firms referred to as *droogskoonmakers, brilmakers, bloemiste, algemene handelaars* etc. If the firm were *Cloete en seuns algemene handelaars* there would be a logical reason for using the plural, but it occurs just as frequently when there is only one proprietor, as in English, although the singular is also quite permissible in such cases, unlike English. The form *Serva-Uitgewers* is not unknown in Dutch but it is not frequent and would not occur in the Afrikaans cases mentioned above. It is difficult to be categorical here, as a combination of factors may be playing a role, but it seems highly likely that the influence of English cannot be dismissed out of hand. *Kruideniers* occurs as a collective in imitation of English ‘groceries’, as does *droogskoonmakers* in the sense of one's 'drycleaning', i.e. collection of items.

7.17.9

There are instances in Afrikaans where a singular is used, in line with English influence, where a plural occurs in Dutch; it is possible that contact with English has played a role in such cases:

- *inligting*
- *daardie soort (van) ding* (cf. p. 228)
- *moeilikheid gee* (= trouble)
7.18 Phonological influence

No-one would dispute that English has had a greater influence on Afrikaans than Afrikaans has had on English. The reasons are sociological and are discussed in chapter two. It is therefore all the more curious that the phonological interference in some forms of South African English resulting from the contact with Afrikaans seems to be more extensive than the influence of English on the sound system of Afrikaans. (see Lanham 1978: 138-165 for examples) Generally speaking, the only permanent and constant phonological influence in Afrikaans emanating from English is to be found in English loanwords, naturally enough, and in the international vocabulary where English and Afrikaans share cognate forms. Such cases of English influence, which form the basis of this section, now constitute an irreversible facet of Afrikaans phonology and should be regarded as examples of phonological change. The far less frequent examples of interference in the pronunciation of the phonemes of indigenous words (i.e. those of Germanic/Dutch origin), which some scholars have described, are, I would maintain, to be regarded merely as interference phenomena at this stage and cannot generally speaking yet be considered as constituting phonological change under English influence.

7.18.1 Indigenous vocabulary

The following are examples of this phonological interference in the pronunciation of indigenous vocabulary. Combrink (1968: 16-17) sees omission of r at the end of a syllable in this light. Several scholars (e.g. Lanham 1967, Louw 1981, Du Plessis 1983) have observed the (growing) tendency in Transvaal to give long a a more rounded pronunciation, i.e. more like o. It seems to have escaped the notice of modern scholars that Mansvelt (1884) also observed this tendency in the Cape and commented:

‘A. (de lange) heeft in veler mond een klank die naar de Geldersche en Noordbrabantsche oa zweeft.’

Mansvelt also maintains, quite correctly, that he has read that it occurs in Amsterdam too. It would seem to me that the phenomenon as such is not necessarily English in origin, but that English may be contributing to the current growing frequency thereof. Louw (1981: 268) refers to Pienaar’s (1947) comments on the aspiration of [p], [t] and [k] and unrounding of

---

36 In his treatment of the pronunciation of South African English published in 1967, Lanham attributed most of its characteristic features to British English dialects or spontaneous development; by 1978 he seems to have changed his mind in this respect in some notable cases.
certain vowels. This aspiration is, in my opinion, haphazard enough to be regarded as an interference phenomenon which is as yet not common or consistent enough to be of relevance to a discussion on phonological change in Afrikaans. (cf. Van Wyk 1976: 142 on aspiration of [t]) Reference to the unrouding of [œy], [ø] and [y] is, on the other hand, frequent enough to warrant further comment here. Although these three sounds do undoubtedly constitute a difficulty for native-speakers of English, I can find no valid argument to assert that their unrouding by native-speakers of Afrikaans is caused by the contact with English. In a similar way it has been claimed that the raised pronunciation of [e:] and [o:] in Afrikaans is the result of English influence but it is now generally accepted that this is not the case and that the so-called Bolandse verhoging is possibly an example of Malay-Portuguese influence. (cf. Rousseau 1937: 135, Van Rensburg, and Combrink 1982: 83) Nevertheless, it is perhaps worth noting that a common characteristic of an English accent in Dutch is the raising of long e and o to a position similar to that of Dutch i and u (written ie and oe).

### 7.18.2 Loanwords

It is interesting to compare the way in which English loanwords are pronounced in Dutch with the way they are treated in Afrikaans. Because the average Afrikaner's knowledge of English is vastly superior and more intimate than that of the average Dutchman, he tends to pronounce English loanwords more or less as in English, regardless of how they are spelt. The Dutchman, on the other hand, slavishly follows the written word; to him that is primary, whereas to the Afrikaner the spoken word is primary. A good example of this is provided by the word *poeding/pudding*. The Dutchman retains the English spelling while giving it a Dutch pronunciation, whereas the Afrikaner retains the English pronunciation while giving it an Afrikaans spelling. The Dutchman is generally speaking not able to pronounce an English (or French) phoneme in a loanword used in a Dutch sentence; the word automatically undergoes a degree of phonological assimilation, for example: garage [xarəʐə], Omo [oːmoː]. The Afrikaner, however, seems to have no difficulty whatsoever in incorporating an English word, even an indispensable, frequently used one,\(^{38}\) into

---

\(^{37}\) It is interesting to note what Mansvelt (1884: 41) had to say on this issue:

‘E (de scherpe lange) klinkt in ‘t Bovenland in vele woorden als ie; waarschijnlijk door Eng. invloed, want anders - als ‘t van een Ned. dialek afstamde, waarin b.v. been als bien, twee als twe, enz., klinkt - zou die uitspraak zich hier niet tot een zekere streek bepalen.’

\(^{38}\) I do not agree that what Boshoff (1921: 413) claims is necessarily the case any more although his statement may have had more validity in 1921 when Afrikaner bilingualism had not reached the heights it has today: ‘Die graad van ingeburgerdheid van leenwoorde blyk o.a. uit die manier waarop hulle uitgespreek word.’
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an Afrikaans sentence while preserving phonemes which do not otherwise occur in
his language, for example: [əɾə:ʣ], [œumœu]. Another example is provided by the
loanwords that contain the English sound [æ]. They preserve that sound more or
less perfectly in Afrikaans, although it is not a phoneme of that language, but the
Dutch inevitably shift it to the nearest indigenous phoneme, [ɛ]. Thus a spelling *sleng*
is more justified in Dutch than in Afrikaans where such a puristic spelling is at odds
with the actual pronunciation. (cf. Smith 1962: 59-60)

De Villiers (1973: 33) comments on the occurrence of [ɪ] in Afrikaans in words (e.g.
pienk, India) where one might otherwise expect [ə]:

*Ons sê almal pienk en ons sê ook speaker met 'n lang ie, en tog is dit
teen ons klanksisteem.'*

### 7.18.3 International vocabulary

Although the claim that English has had little or no effect on the pronunciation of
Afrikaans can be considered valid as far as indigenous vocabulary is concerned,
there are several phenomena in the pronunciation of the international vocabulary
which are undoubtedly due to the contact with English, presumably because of the
presence of cognate forms in English and the extremely common, if incorrect, belief
that such words are anglicisms in Afrikaans.

Before proceeding to look at examples of this form of English influence, it is
worthwhile devoting a little time to a phenomenon which has been widely debated
in the literature on anglicisms and which has been commonly attributed to English
but which has also been commonly refuted; the latter point of view would seem to
prevail nowadays. This concerns the pronunciation of e and o in unstressed open
syllables in words of classical origin, for example: *element, president, rekreasi;*
opposisie, *polisie, prokureur.* In Dutch such vowels are still clearly pronounced long
in accordance with the rules for the pronunciation of vowels in open syllables (Actually
a similar tendency has been observed in Dutch, particularly with reference to e. cf.
Martin 1968); in Afrikaans, however, they are either reduced to short vowels or even
schwa on occasions, as in English. Consequently Rousseau (1937: 144) and Le
Roux (1952: 48) regard this phenomenon as the result of English influence, whereas
Smith (1962: 72)\(^{40}\)

---

39 Lanham (1967: 107) refers to this sound as low schwa, but high schwa is a more appropriate
way to describe the sound in Afrikaans in my opinion.

40 Smith (1938: 32) takes Rousseau to task on this point in the former's review of the latter's
book. Smith adds, however; ‘Dit is moontlik dat Engels daartoe bygedra het om hierdie
uitspraak te bevorder van 1e bestendig.’ One cannot dismiss this possibility.
questions whether other internal mechanisms are not at work here and De Villiers (1970: 249) presents a convincing argument to substantiate this claim. I am not sure to what extent teachers still prescribe the use of long vowels in such cases in Afrikaans, but I suspect that the notion has not yet disappeared completely. In this regard it can be useful to note the following comment by Paardekooper with reference to Dutch which was quoted by Kloeke (1951: 51):

‘Bij deze woorden [bedoeld zijn woorden als stesjón, benáál, peróchie, kemiës, kenáál, reviér, tebák, meziék, kenôn, cheféûr] is de vraag niet zo zeer, hoeveel mensen beelden zich in dat ze in tabak een [a] spreken, maar: is er nog wel iemand die het doet, en is er dus wel sprake van een [a]-foneem?... Een fonetisch onderzoek zal vrij zeker op die eerste vraag een ontkennend antwoord geven. In dat geval dient de realiteit van de šva-uitspraak hier aanvaard en “gestandaardiseerd” te worden.’

Paardekooper's, Kloeke's and De Villiers' claims amount in effect to asserting that this phonological change is part of the vergermaansing of such words. If one accepts this argument, the issue requires no further attention in the present work except in as far as it is yet another example of a pseudo-anglicism.

\[\text{o}e > [\text{a}]\]

The u in the closed syllable of the following words is frequently pronounced as in the corresponding English cognate forms. Most people would regard this as an interference phenomenon:

- **multinasionaal**
- **publiek**
- **reproduksie**
- **rubber**
- **Jan Smuts**
- **subkategorie**
- **Tukkies**

In the following loanwords the u is always pronounced [\text{a}]:

- **bluff**
- **bunker**
- **custard**
- **klub\textsuperscript{41}**
- **rugby**
- **sultana**
- **trust(ee)\textsuperscript{42}**

\textsuperscript{41} In this word the final b even retains its voicing, as it does in snob; it has been assimilated in spelling only.

\textsuperscript{42} The final -t in trust is foreign to Afrikaans phonology.
In these words the pronunciation also deviates from the spelling; here too the English pronunciation of the \textit{u} is retained, even when \textit{bulletin} is given a pseudo-French pronunciation, i.e. \textit{bule'tin}:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{bulhond}
\item \textit{bulletin}
\item \textit{karakul}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{[y] > [ju]}

Virtually every scholar that has commented on English influence on Afrikaans phonology has remarked on this phenomenon and usually condemned it. I contend that this must now be regarded as an irreversible shift, i.e. an example of phonological change under English influence. Compared with Dutch not only the insertion of \textit{[j]} is new but also the shift from \textit{[œ]} < \textit{[u]}, as in the category above.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{individueel}$^{43}$
\item \textit{kultureel}$^{43}$
\item \textit{museum}
\item \textit{ritueel}
\item \textit{simuleer}
\item \textit{situasie}$^{43}$
\item \textit{Uganda}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{[e] > [i]}

The raising of \textit{[e]} to \textit{[i]} in indigenous words was discussed above where it was concluded that it is not an anglicism. This is most probably not the case when it occurs in international vocabulary such as the following although a combination of factors may be at work here:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Jesus}$^{44}$
\item \textit{kafeteria}
\item \textit{magnesium}
\item \textit{media}
\item \textit{museum}
\item \textit{senior}
\item \textit{spesies}
\item \textit{Theo}
\item \textit{Armeniëër}
\end{itemize}

43 The combination of a dental consonant + \textit{[j]} has also given rise to a fricative in such words, as in English, i.e. \textit{[dʒ]} < \textit{[d] + [j]} and \textit{[e]} < \textit{[t] + [j]}.
43 The combination of a dental consonant + \textit{[j]} has also given rise to a fricative in such words, as in English, i.e. \textit{[dʒ]} < \textit{[d] + [j]} and \textit{[e]} < \textit{[t] + [j]}.
43 The combination of a dental consonant + \textit{[j]} has also given rise to a fricative in such words, as in English, i.e. \textit{[dʒ]} < \textit{[d] + [j]} and \textit{[e]} < \textit{[t] + [j]}.
44 The pronunciation of \textit{Jesus} is recognised as having been influenced by English by Van der Menwe and Ponoelis (1982: 98).
Korea  
Matabele  
Rhodesiëër  
TV

The following commonly used loanwords, some of which could be considered as international vocabulary, retain English phonemes which are otherwise unknown to Afrikaans:
The same tendency exists in Dutch ([ts] or [s]) but it seems to be stronger in Afrikaans.

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
Bilabial w is an allophone of [v] in Afrikaans which occurs only in certain limited positions (e.g. twee) but never initially as in the loanwords above. Worcester is pronounced with a [v] in Afrikaans but Wellington is not, curiously enough.

\[\text{w}\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item wattelboom (cf. p. 196, 204)
  \item whopper-pak
  \item (moenie) worry (nie)
\end{itemize}

7.19 Stress

Changes in the stress pattern of the international vocabulary of Afrikaans have occurred, or are still in the process of occurring, which are now quite irreversible in the language, despite the fact that all prescriptive works condemn the development. The similarity between the indigenous stress patterns of English and Afrikaans are discussed on p. 51. English too has instances of an indigenous first syllable stress competing with a final stress in words of French origin, for example: ‘bouquet, garage’. This development is analogous to what is happening in Afrikaans in words such as konflik and kontak: in the words in 7.19.1 some native-speakers will now regard the stress on the first syllable as the only possible stress while in Dutch all these words require a stress on the second syllable, with the exception of kano and sjampoe which always take the stress on the first syllable in Dutch.

Prescriptive works all seem to assume that vocabulary such as that given below, because it occurs in Dutch, should be regarded as indigenous in Afrikaans and should therefore retain the traditional stress pattern of such loanwords in Dutch, i.e. the French pattern. It is very difficult, or even
impossible, to ascertain exactly what the source of this vocabulary is in Afrikaans.\footnote{Boshoff (1921: 414) takes up this point and takes Smith to task on his claim that the English stress in such words is evidence of English being the source language. Smith may be right but equally the stress can have been borrowed from English at a later date - with increased bilingualism - without the word itself necessarily having entered Afrikaans via English.} It is highly likely that much of it entered Afrikaans directly from English without the medium of Dutch, as the many such loanwords that are unknown in Dutch and French prove (cf. 7.12.1) If this is the case, is there any sense in insisting on a foreign stress when the natural stress in English, the (possible) source language, is on the first syllable and when this also happens to be in line with the natural stress of indigenous words in Afrikaans? (cf. De Bruto 1970: 42 - quoted on p. 51) The word \textit{motoris}, for example, is not Dutch or French - they use \textit{automobilist} - and yet this word takes a final stress in Afrikaans and initial stress in English, definitely the source language in this case. This phenomenon is not exclusive to Afrikaans, however. In Dutch bisyllabic English loanwords of the type \textit{flash-back}, \textit{know-how}, \textit{stand-by} etc. all stress the final syllable, presumably because the first such loans (e.g. \textit{pick-up}) reached Dutch via French and that pattern was then fixed for all later loans. The Dutch, being more English oriented now than previously when a knowledge of French was more widespread, these days regard the French loanword \textit{occasion} (bargain, good buy) as English and pronounce it as such with the stress on the second syllable and not on the last. The guiding principle behind the stress here is not the language of origin of the loanword, but the association in the mind of the speaker of this word with its English cognate: the same principle applies in Afrikaans.

English too, although its natural stress usually falls on the first syllable, often stresses foreign words and place names on the second/final syllable even when in the languages that the words are borrowed from the stress occurs on the first syllable, for example: \textit{Bhután}, \textit{batík}, \textit{saróng}; presumably English people regard this stress as correct because it sounds so foreign.

\subsection*{7.19.1}

The words in this group, according to prescriptive works on the topic, require a stress on the final syllable but are in fact commonly, and in some cases even usually, pronounced with the stress on the first syllable; deviations from this pattern are referred to in the footnotes:

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{aspek}\footnote{It is noteworthy that \textit{HAT} gives only final stress for \textit{aspek}, \textit{objek} and \textit{subjek} but recognises both stresses in \textit{insek}.} \\
\textit{objek} \\
\textit{subjek} \\
\textit{insek}
\end{flushleft}
This group only differs from 7.19.1 in the number of syllables each word contains; otherwise the phenomenon is the same. Whether such trisyllabic words are more or less susceptible to initial stress than the bisyllabic words in 7.19.1, I have been unable to ascertain.

- *abattoir*
- *bulletin*\(^{51}\)
- *fantasie*
- *hospitaal* (cf. 7.19.6)
- *manuskrip*
- *mikrofoon*
- *paradoks*
- *restourant*
- *saxofoon*
- *telefoon*
- *telegram*

### 7.19.3

It is not uncommon to hear *Amsterdam* and particularly *Stellenbosch* pronounced in Afrikaans with initial stress. The former is definitely due to English and the latter presumably - even the -*sch* is commonly pronounced [ʃ] - but it is possible that an

---

48 Although Dutch has only *káno*, HAT recognises both *káno* and *kánó*, while in practice one only ever hears the latter. Has English 'canoo' shifted the scales in favour of final stress?

49 Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982) recognise both stresses without further comment.

50 I include *sjampoe* here not because it is ever pronounced with initial stress in Afrikaans, but it is in Dutch. This is probably an example of an English word, borrowed in turn from Hindi, which has been adopted directly by Afrikaans without the medium of Dutch.

51 When this word takes initial stress, it is pronounced more or less as in English; when the final syllable is stressed, the final vowel is lengthened. In Dutch, where only final stress occurs in this word, the stressed syllable is pronounced with a nasalised vowel as in French. (cf. p. 244)
internal analogy is at work; compare *Kirstenbosch* and *Rondebosch* which always take initial stress in Afrikaans, or did this also ultimately originate in English?

7.19.4

These three words, the first of which is an often cited case of English influenced stress, differ from the above examples in that the shift is
from the penultimate, not the final syllable, to the first:

- minister
- senator
- silinder

7.19.5

The shift here is from the final to the penultimate syllable:

- epilepsie
- eutanasie
- histerie
- nostalgie

*Histerektomie* is also stressed as in English although *HAT* maintains it has final stress.

7.19.6

It is curious that the following words are always pronounced with final stress, unlike in English, even though some of them (*basketbal*, *inkrement*, *permit*) are loanwords from English. In Dutch *kontext* and *standaard* are stressed on the first syllable. *HAT* concedes that this pronunciation of *standaard* sometimes occurs in Afrikaans too. Dutch, while also stressing *toilet* on the final syllable, pronounces the first syllable as in French too, i.e. [twɔ] whereas Afrikaans pronounces it as in English, i.e. [toi]. It would seem that in these words there is a conscious attempt to make them sound as un-English as possible, giving rise to a hypercorrect stress pattern. *HAT* recognises both *hóspitaal* and *hospitáál* whereas *Van Dale* recognises only the former; this could also be the result of hypercorrectism to avoid what is regarded as an English stress, but it may also be the result of analogy with other words ending in -aal that do take the stress on the ending in Dutch too, for example: *internasionaal*, *potensiaal*. The unusual stress in *akademikús*, *politikús*, *pagina*, and *platina* has nothing to do with English influence.

- basket(bal)
- inkrement
- konteks
- permit
- standaard
- toilet

Bruce Donaldson, *The Influence of English on Afrikaans*
7.20 Geographic names

Because English serves as South Africa's window on the world, the form of certain geographic terms in Afrikaans often betrays English influence.

7.20.1

As in other international vocabulary (cf. p. 244), stressed [e] is regularly pronounced as [i]: Indonesië, Kenia, Korea, Peking, Pretoria, Rhodesië/Rhodesies, Venesië. Both Tunisië and Tunesië occur, the former under English influence?

7.20.2

Certain place names contain English phonemes:

a) Kirstenbosch, Rondebosch and Stellenbosch are commonly pronounced with [ʃ].

b) Constantia is also pronounced with a [ʃ].

c) The initial sound in Genève is not [ʒ] but [dʒ].

d) The ae in Israel is pronounced as in English and not as two syllables.

e) Mauritius, a Dutch name in origin, is pronounced as in English.

f) Venesië is pronounced with a [v] not an [f]. (cf. p. 246)

g) Singapoer is pronounced with a [ŋg].

7.20.3

Some place names are pronounced with an English stress:

a) Amsterdam, Kirstenbosch and Stellenbosch sometimes take the stress on the first syllable.

b) Tsjeggoslowaak has an even stress on the first and third syllables, as in English, whereas in Dutch the first and especially the fourth are stressed.

c) Belgrado in Dutch is stressed on the first syllable, as in English.

The fact that the second syllable is stressed in Afrikaans may be connected with a certain unfamiliarity with the word or is it a hypercorrect pronunciation attempting to avoid an ‘English’ stress’?

7.20.4

Bavaries, Durbaniët and Australianer, frequently heard alongside Australiëër, are English in formation. Mediterrreens may also be modelled on English as Dutch only has Mediterraan.
The frequent reference to *Brittanje* (without *Groef*) is prob-
ably also English in origin; as far as I am aware, ‘Great’ is only omitted in English, not in other European languages.

These days the VOC seems to be better known in Afrikaans as the Hollandse Oos-Indiese Kompanie (even abbreviated to HOIK), a literal translation from English.

7.20.6

Some geographic regions occur in the plural in imitation of English: die Himalajas, die Falklande, die Solomons; uncontaminated forms would be die Himilaja (-gebergte), die Falklandeilande, die Solomoneilande. In fact, in Dutch (and German) even Fidji must be accompanied by the word eilanden; is Fidji thus not also an anglicism in Afrikaans?

Although it is hardly perceived as a plural any more, it is worth noting that Afrikaners regularly refer to Brussels (with [œ] as in Afrikaans and not [ʌ] as in English) instead of Brussel.

7.20.7

Sometimes Afrikaans employs puristic geographic terms to avoid using the English words which are used in Holland in such instances: Bombaai, Cornwallis, Wallis/Wallies/Walliser, Kantelberg (now used only in de Kantelbergse vertellingen in Dutch).

7.20.8

Ivoorkus is used in combination with the definite article, as in English.

7.20.9

The occasional use of Poland instead of Pole betrays a greater acquaintance with the English name than the Afrikaans, its use being facilitated by the fact that it looks as Afrikaans as it does English. The same applies to Antwerp and Antwerpen.

7.20.10

Maleia (compare Dutch and German Malaja) is an example of an Afrikaans transcription of an English pronunciation.
7.21 Abbreviations

Several abbreviations in Afrikaans would seem to be English inspired.

7.21.1

*Opul* (Opec), *Vigs* (Aids) and ... *en Kie* (...and Co.) are puristic translations of the corresponding English abbreviations which also have in common with those the fact that they function as acronyms.

7.21.2

*B.B.P.* (V.I.P.), *b.v.p.* (l.b.w.), *I.K.* (l.Q.), *k.b.a.* (c.o.d.) and *L.V.* (M.P.) function as words, like their English equivalents, without the words they stand for needing to be mentioned.

7.21.3

*Bpk.* (ltd.), *edms.* (pty.) and *vk. m.* (sq. m.) resemble their English equivalents in that it is apparently considered necessary to employ more than the first letter of the word being abbreviated. In addition, the plural form *mnre* (messrs) would also seem to be in imitation of English.

7.21.4

The following lexical items are in fact abbreviations of longer compound nouns which correspond exactly with similar abbreviations current in English. *Aanglip* (slip-on), *bra* (brassière), *dwelms* (drugs, < *dwelmmiddels*), *foon* (phone), *galeie* (galleys, < *galeiproef*), *gereedheids* (stand-by), *Southern Lewens* (Southern Life Assurance), *inry* (drive-in), *kaf* (caf.), *kar* (car), *naskeer* (aftershave), *sant* (sarge), *geld trek* (to draw money), *n vier-wiel aangedrewe* (a four-wheel drive).

---

52 This could alternatively be regarded as a loanword as the original form is seldom used any more even in English.
53 In addition to the abbreviation *foon*, the compound noun *oorfone* (also plural as in English) occurs too. (cf. p. 237)
54 *Gereedheids* and *lewens* both contain a genitive -s for purposes of a compound which is not complete; the second part of the compound in the former case, as in English, can be -*kaartjie* or -*vlug* etc.
54 *Gereedheids* and *lewens* both contain a genitive -s for purposes of a compound which is not complete; the second part of the compound in the former case, as in English, can be -*kaartjie* or -*vlug* etc.
55 Not only is *bioskoop* or *teater* not necessary, but *inry* is also used in the plural in imitation of ‘drive-ins’ (*inrye*).
56 Is it possible that one can either *trek* or *onttrek* money in Afrikaans because one can either ‘draw’ or ‘withdraw’ it in English?
The common colloquial saying *sien jou later* corresponds in idiom and in abbreviation with English (< see you later < I'll see you later) and is presumably English inspired.
7.22 Adjectives

7.22.1 Omission of adjectival inflection

Those cases where adjectival inflection is omitted which can be attributed to the contact with English apply only to the historically genitive ending -s after iets and niks. Ponelis (1979: 120) states that ‘Die adjektiviese -s is sterk fakultatief in die omgangstaal’. He makes no direct mention of English influence here but in Afrikaans sources omgangstaal can include deur Engels beïnvloede taalgebruik. (cf. use of geselstaal in HAT, p. 111) Nevertheless, Ponelis goes on to show that this optional -s is less common the longer the ‘adjektiefstuk’ is, for example iets te erg duur(s), which suggests that other internal factors may (also) be at work. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 88, 138) do state that this development has probably occurred under English influence.

Nominalisation of adjectives (i.e. 'n geel een versus 'n gele) cf. 7.21.7.

7.22.2 Formation of the comparative and superlative

If one consults the rules for the use of meer and meest in the comparative and superlative in the Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst (Geertsi.a. 1984: 334-5), one sees that although their use is limited, there are more cases in Dutch where such analytical constructions are permitted than in Afrikaans. (cf. Basson i.a. 1982: 57) The following comment is made after enumeration of the rules in ANS:

‘Het gebruik van omschreven trappen van vergelijking in andere dan de hier vermelde gevallen is niet voor iedereen acceptabel, bijv. Zelfs de meest ingewikkelde problemen kan hij oplossen.’

I dwell on the use of meer en meest in Dutch because Basson (1982: 57), Botha and Van Aardt (1978: 27) and Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 127), to name but a few, are quick to condemn the use of this form of comparison outside a very few limited cases (far fewer than Dutch) as an anglicism. There is presumably little doubt that English has contributed to the practice but the situation in Dutch perhaps indicates that the issue is not as straightforward as has usually been assumed in South Africa. Ponelis (1979: 279), where one might have expected a more thorough discussion of the matter, does not unfortunately really tackle it head on, but he also refrains from mentioning English influence. Ponelis is altogether rather wary in his Afrikaanse Sintaksis of postulating English influence.
Pleonastic forms such as *meer deftiger* and *mees akuutste* are particularly common in Afrikaans, as they are in substandard English. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 127) see such forms as ‘beslis’ the result of English influence. (cf. Ostyn 1972: 127) However, I believe that there is even a tendency in Afrikaans to use *meer* and *mees* with monosyllabic adjectives, which is quite rare in English, so analogy may now be promoting the practice in Afrikaans in an orbit outside English influence.

The frequent use of *nog* after superlatives is in imitation of English: *die grootste nog* - the biggest yet/ever.

### 7.23 Articles

#### 7.23.1 Omission of the definite article

Ponelis (1979: 481) uses the term ‘die-ellips’ but confines his observations to one specific instance. There are various categories where the definite article must be used in Dutch and where it is absent in Afrikaans. It is highly likely in such cases that the absence of an article in the corresponding English expressions has contributed to the omission in Afrikaans. Steyn (1976: 33) lists several cases, not all of which correspond with English usage, however.

##### 7.23.1.1 Omission before certain adjectives:

*Meeste van die tyd/meeste van die voorrade* (Afrikaans prescriptive works demand a *die* here), *volgende in Netwerk/jy is volgende, McEnroe is verste van die kamera*. Whether *verste* in the final example is the superlative of the adjective or the adverb, an article is required in both cases in Dutch.

##### 7.23.1.2

Omission before certain nouns: *tye het verander, helfte van hulle* (cf. *meeste van hulle*), *die temperatuur het onder vriespunt gedaal, hy is in moeilikheid*. In the last case HAT maintains it is correct to say *in die moeilikheid*, but I suspect the whole expression is a loan translation of ‘he is in trouble.’ (cf. Dt. *hij is in moeilijkheden*)

##### 7.23.1.3

Omission in certain prepositional phrases: *10 onder baansyfer (golf), aan bewind, na geboorte, in geheim, op hoërskool, op*
kampus, na kerk, op land, in lewe (e.g. hy het in lewe groot plesier gehad), in praktyk, bo seeviak, op televisie, op universiteit, na werk, kragtens/volgens wet.

7.23.1.4

Omission before languages, meals, seasons and street names: in Engels, uit Duits; na aandete, middagete sal kort bedien word; gereed wees vir winter; Kerkstraat, op Hoffmanplein.

7.23.1.5

Omission before certain abstract nouns, including religions: Die Instituut vir Bevordering van Calvinisme (a double example), dis 'n groter gevaar as kolonialisme, Parlement het besluit, die geskiedenis van skrif. Langenhoven (1935: 110) was adamantly opposed to the use of die in such cases; he regarded die abstrakte die as illogical. Ponelis (1979: 481) discusses the role of English in this regard giving examples such as (Die) instroming van vars lug kan plaasvind, dit verseker (die) instroming van vars lug.

7.23.1.6

The definite article is frequently omitted from the expression in die besonder, presumably in imitation of in particular, as it is from in die geheim (in secret).

7.23.2.

Insertion of the definite article: Ivoorkus is accompanied by the definite article, as in English and unlike Dutch. The Dutch/Afrikaans expression die man op straat often inserts an article or is even translated literally as die man in die straat.

7.23.3 Insertion of the indefinite article

7.23.3.1

In the following expressions Dutch does not employ the indefinite article but English does: 'n kopseer kry, 'n oog vir 'n oog, 'n tand vir 'n tand (HAT gives oog om oog etc. as in Dutch), R50 'n maand (= per), 'n soort van 'n (cf. p. 265), 'n honderd rand (cf. p. 260).

De Bruto (1970: 38) even regards the frequent pronunciation of 'n as [æ] as an anglicism but in Le Roux's (1968: 25-33) detailed study of the pronunciation of 'n he makes no mention of English influence. De Bruto is presumably incorrect. It is interesting to note that the indefinite article in Yiddish (< German ein) has also been reduced to a schwa, as it has been in other southern German dialects.
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7.23.3.2

Insertion of the indefinite article before professions and nationalities. Although the use of an article in such positions is possible in Dutch, it is not the general rule (except when the noun is preceded by an adjective). If it is used, it is heard more frequently with nationalities than with professions. No such distinction seems to exist in Afrikaans which follows English usage in practice. Ponelis (1979: 120) only deals with insertion of the article before professions. Taking examples such as Jan is/word/bly donsent aan die POK he says ‘In die omgangstaal word daar nou egter algemeen ’n hier inergeop onder Engelse inwerking: Jan is ’n donsent aan die POK.’

7.23.4

HAT recognises vir die afwisseling and makes no mention of vir die verandering (as in Dutch). In practice, however, vir ’n verandering seems to be the most common expression, the substitution of the indefinite for the definite article being presumably in imitation of ‘for a change’.

7.24 Conjunctions

7.24.1

Afrikaans has two conjunctions, as and soos, where English has only one, ‘as’. (Discussion here is limited to those meanings of as which correspond to English ‘as.’) The distinction between als and zoals is clearly defined in Dutch (cf. Geerts i.a. 1984: 664-667), as it is in theory in Afrikaans, but in practice there seems to be some confusion hi Afrikaans as to where to draw the line between the functions of the two. Presumably this occurs because of a subconscious awareness of the two being one concept in English.

7.24.1.1

Dit klink soos ’n grap (als), so hard as/soos klip (als - Van der Merwe and Ponelis 1982: 177 recognise both), vyf keer so groot as/soos Brittanje (als), dis net so ’n deel van die stad as/soos die gewelhuiise (als), as/soos volg, as/soos belowe (zoals). The forms given in brackets are those required in Dutch.

7.24.1.2

In the following cases the as/soos is superfluous but as is used in the equivalent English expressions: so gou as moontlik, sodra as/soos, sover soos ek weet, in sover as. In the last case HAT gives [in/vir] sover ek weet where only insertion of voor is possible in Dutch (The anglicism vir al wat ek weet/my betref also occurs.); is this in not
also English (i.e. in as far as) or is it the result of confusion with the semantically and syntactically different in sover/re? In the clause sover as... betref (= wat), not only the as but the whole expression is a literal translation from English, as in the case with so vroeg as 1900 (= al/reeds in 1900).

7.24.1.3

English ‘as’ can also mean namate, and thus soos is commonly heard in such contexts: die aantal huwelike tussen blankes en slavinne het toegeneem soos die bevolking vermeerder het; ek verwag dat soos ons in die winter ingaan...; soos die Bantoe al meer met hierdie dinge te doen gekry het, moes sy taal...

7.24.1.4

Unconnected with the as/soos controversy is the fact that ‘to look like’ is often rendered by lyk soos where HAT gives only op and na. My impression is that soos is the most frequently heard variant but that a subtle semantic distinction is sometimes present, for example: dit lyk soos ’n diamant - dit lyk na ’n diamant. I am not sure whether this use of soos is the result of English influence.

7.24.2

It has often been maintained that beide...en is not an anglicism despite the fact that Dutch uses sowel...als (ook) and (èn)... èn in such contexts. In Afrikaans it stands in free variation with sowel...as(ook) and, I believe, is now more commonly used than the latter. Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 14), leaning on examples found in WNT, do not attribute it to English influence but add: Engels kon dus hierdie gebruik bestendig het, maar hy het dit beslis nie veroorsaak nie. This may be so, but the existence of beide...en and sowel...as(ook) where English has only the former, plus the existence of ‘as well as’ (= asook in Afr.) has given rise to a variety of contaminated forms which are most probably the result of contact with English, for example: beide...sowel as - beide van die studenteraad se kant sowel as van die kant van die kerk, beide...asook - hy het probeer om meer lig te werp op die ontstaansgeskiedenis van beide die latere Afrikaners asook die groepie wat as Kaapse Kleurlinge bekend sou word, sowel as - dit het ’n badkamer sowel as ’n garage/dit het binne sowel as buite die huwelik plaasgevind. Smith (1962: 58) quoting a 1918 Dutch dictionary, provides hij zoowel als zijn broeder as ‘evidence’ that the last example is not an anglicism.

7.24.3

The possibility of hoekom being English inspired is not raised in any of the literature on the topic although an identical idiom exists.
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in English. WAT sees it simply as a contraction of *hoe kom dit*, the form it has in Dutch. WAT quotes an example of its use in *Die Kaapse Taalargief* from 1769, but the syntax in that case is not that of the current expression as it is followed by *dat*. Might English not have at least played the role of a contributing factor in the adoption of this structure? It is true, however, that *hoekom* occurs in cases where ‘how come’ cannot be used, i.e. in indirect questions, for example: *daar is geen rede hoekom dit nie moontlik is nie*.

Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 81) do not mention English influence either but do discuss the alternative *vir wat (= waarvoor* which they don’t give) under the lemma *hoekom*. They emphasise that *vir wat* is *omgangstaal*. Can *omgangstaal* in this instance be equated with English influence, whether consciously or otherwise?

7.24.4

*Siened dat (= aangesien)* occurs frequently enough for HAT to consider it worth mentioning as incorrect.

*Indien nie* (zo niet in Dt.) as in *hy is ’n bietjie snaaks indien nie heetemal gek nie* is not mentioned anywhere in the literature as an anglicism although I would contend it probably is. It is perhaps no longer recognised as such because it has completely replaced *so nie* in such cases but not in *ek sal jou om 10 uur kom oplaai, so nie om 11 uur*, where one would be more inclined to say ‘otherwise’ rather than ‘if not’ in English anyway.

7.24.5

Nowadays a superfluous *wat* is heard after *as* in comparatives (e.g. *hy is groter as wat ek gedog het*). The phenomenon has attracted attention among linguists but no-one seems to have noticed that ‘what’ occurs frequently in colloquial English in the same position (e.g. he’s bigger than what I thought he was). Scholtz (1980: 76), referring to Verhage (1965’?), maintains that this *wat* has replaced *dat*, another example of the overall preference for *wat* forms in Afrikaans. I can find no mention of *as wat* constructions in Verhage’s article. Nevertheless, even if the structure did occur in Dutch - it does no longer - the role of English as a contributing factor in its ever-increasing frequency cannot be disregarded.

7.24.6

*In dat (= in sover dat)* is literally translated from English.
7.25 Numerals

It is a generally accepted fact that counting, however bilingual one may be, is something one normally prefers to do in one's mother tongue but this is not necessarily the case in South Africa (cf. figures given in the HSRC report referred to below). Le Roux (1926: 359) complained:

‘Maar hierdie taalvermenging het in baie gevalle al eerder begin, want op die Engels-mediumskool is al geleer om net op Engels op te tel en af te trek, te deel en te vermenigvuldig, en iedereen wat dit deurgemaak het, weet hoe swaar dit gaan om dit later weer af te leer.’

Although Le Roux's explanation for the Afrikaner's inability to cope with his own counting system may have been valid in 1926, one cannot attribute the difficulties he still seems to have to the same cause any more. It is not uncommon for Afrikaners to read vier-en-tagtig for 48 and is his preference for reading out phone numbers cypher by cypher not also in order to avoid such errors? It should be noted that both the Dutch and the Germans, for example, have no difficulty in reading a phone number as eenenvijftig driëndertig zesenzeventig. It is of course possible that Afrikaners read a phone number as they do because that also happens to be the normal way in English, despite the fact that English does not reverse the order of its numerals.

In the early 1980's a body calling itself the Logiese Taal Hervormers submitted a request to the Akademie requesting the latter's support to officially change the counting system of Afrikaans on grounds of the English system being more 'logical' and because evidence had been collected to indicate that 'omdraaifout' were frequent in Afrikaans. The Taalkommissie ultimately rejected the proposal claiming that 'Die sentrale probleem lê nie in die aard van die Afrikaanse telwoordsisteem nie, maar in die aanwesigheid van Engels en die predominansie van die Engelse telwyse in Suid-Afrika.' (page 8 of the 'Verslag van die Taalkommissie aan die Akademieraad oor die RGN-verslag “Getallebenoeming in Afrikaans”,' Verslag nr. P33, 1981) This incident is worthy of mention because it is an indication of the extent of the problem in some people's minds.

Apart from acquaintance with English contributing to occasional difficulties with numerals in Afrikaans, there is a host of other subtle influences English has had on the way Afrikaners use their numerals.

Bruce Donaldson, The Influence of English on Afrikaans
7.25.1

The use of the indefinite article before honderd and duisend would seem to be the result of English influence, for example: 'n honderd rand, 'n duisend mense. Whether the use of en after honderd when a numeral between 1 and 20, or an even ten follows, is in imitation of English, is difficult to determine, e.g. 'n honderd en elf, tweehonderd en vyftig.

7.25.2

The preference for een-en-'n-half over anderhalf (both in HAT) could be the result of English influence as a contributing factor. The following expressions are definitely loan translations: 'n jaar en 'n half, hy is 'n goeie meter en 'n half voor (in running), die afgelope week en 'n half.

7.25.3

It is possible that Dutch expressions of time such as tien voor half vier and vijf over half vijf disappeared from Afrikaans because they were at odds with the English system of telling the time. On the other hand, half agt etc. has survived and this is also foreign to English.

7.25.4

The following expressions involving decades are modelled on English: vroeg in die 1940's (now more common than the Dutch constructions in die jare veertig/in die veertiger jare, at least in speech), in die middel sewentigs, sy is in haar dertigs. Puristic avoidance of the last expression has spawned the hybrid form 'n meisie in haar jare dertig.

7.25.5

The following plural forms involving numerals are probably English in origin: tiene (ten rand notes), twintigs (twenty rand notes, cf. in die 1940's above too), die standerd-vyfs, twee derdes so groot soos.

7.25.6

The use of dubbel and trippel (an English loanword - not in HAT) in saying phone numbers is an English custom, for example: 455666 - vier dubbel vyf trippel ses. Dubbelbed, dubbelbaanpad and dubbeldeuryskas also sound like loan translations.
The following expressions are all translated from English: *een uit vier, een uit elke acht Afrikaners, een punt vyf miljoen* (instead of *komma*), *in hul honderde/duisende, die drie/vier/ tien van ons/julle/hulle* (cf. Ponelis 1979: 121).
7.25.8

The tendency to talk in dozens, e.g. by dosyne, is undoubtedly a British legacy although the word itself is Dutch.

7.25.9

Although the Akademie decided in 1973 that biljoen would be used in the traditional British sense of a million million, it is commonly heard in the American sense of a thousand million where HAT advocates the use of miljard.

7.25.10

The following uses of ordinal numerals have arisen under English influence: die tweede beste, elke tweede Duitser, jou studie kom tweede, hy het tweede gekom (in a race), ek is in tweede (gear), Nedbank sorg vir 'n eerste in die Suid-Afrikaanse bankwese.

Indigenous structures to avoid the use of ordinals in this way are probably regarded as cumbersome, for example: jou studie kom in die tweede plek.

7.25.11

Referring to the petrol consumption of a car in the following way is in imitation of an English custom: my kar ry 14 kilometer op 'n liter.

7.25.12

The following use of heel before ordinals which are in themselves superlatives, is translated from English: die heel eerste/laaste (compare Dt./Afr. allereerste/-laaste).

7.26 Prepositions

Le Roux (1952: 41) remarks on prepositions that Deur hulle vae betekenisinhoud is die gebruik van voorsetselfs baie sterk onderhewig aan veranderinge met verloop van tyd and Ostyn (1972: 66) maintains that because of their infinite variety ‘They constitute... a serious burden on our long term memory’ and that ‘The evidence coming from American Flemish overwhelmingly supports the thesis that prepositions are highly unstable elements in language.’ The frequent falling together of certain prepositions in Afrikaans and English is thus a good example of what Ostyn refers to as ‘economy of storage’. It is highly likely that the phonological similarity between some Afrikaans prepositions and their cognate forms in English (e.g. by, in, vir) has
also contributed to contamination. For comparison the preposition required in Dutch is given in brackets.
7.26.1 by

By verre, by iets sweer, hierby (hiermee), sy is sleg - wat bedoel jy by sleg? (met), hulle het by die duisende gekom, skeur die sakkie oop by die gleufie voorsien (met), weersomstandighede verander by die uur/hulle word ouliker by die dag, by die datum/by die jaar 2000/by die tyd waar jy... The last examples are presumably an attempt to compensate for the lack of a preposition in Dutch/Afrikaans that has the same temporal connotation as English ‘by’; otherwise only voor/teen exist, although German uses bis in such contexts.

By is occasionally used in passive constructions instead of deur, for example: Die aandag word bepaal by die belangrikheid van die taal.

7.26.2 in

In die agtergrond (op), in die lang termyn (op), in ‘n rekening (in)betal (op), in sigself (op), die man in die straat (op), in die platteland (op), vroeër in die dag (op), in ander woorde (met), in my mening (na).

It is possible that the last example is not in imitation of English but the result of contamination with in my opinie (cf. Dt. na mijn mening, in mijn opinie), although HAT maintains that that expression is na my opinie in Afrikaans.

7.26.3 met

Met enkele uitsonderings na (op), vervang met (deur), wat is verkeerd daarmee (aan - but the whole expression is probably translated English)

7.26.4 na

Výf na ses grade (tot), oorskakel na (op), na die grond toe val (op), opsien na (teen).

HAT prescribes teen in the last example although I suspect that the entire expression is a loan translation (i.e. in the sense of ‘to respect s.o.’) or else a semantic shift under English influence of the original idiom (i.e. to be anxious about s.t.).
7.26.5 naas

Prins Willem, wat naas Prins Charles, die Britse troonopvolger is (na). Naas means ‘together’ or ‘in combination with’, unlike English ‘next to’. I believe I have occasionally heard it used in Afrikaans where na is required.

7.26.6 omtrent

Daar is geen twyfel omtrent nie (aan), wat kan ek daaromtrent doen (aan), wat is so besonders omtrent ‘n huis (aan), wat gaan sy doen omtrent haar bed (met), wat omtrent (= wat van). Are these possibly examples of the adverb omtrent (= about, approximately) being equated with the meanings of the English preposition ‘about’, reinforced by the fact that omtrent does exist as a preposition in Dutch/Afrikaans, but not with these exact meanings.

7.26.7 oor

Oor ’n vyf jaar-tydperk/iets oor twaalf maande afbetaal (gedurende, tydens), oor die jare heen (deur), oor tagig rand (meer as), hy werk al oor tien jaar (langer as), ek is jammer oor wat gebeur het (Eng. idiom?), mal/dol/gek oor (op). HAT gives mal oor as geselstaal, dol op and gek na. Dutch has only dol/gek op. Presumably mal oor is a loan translation of ‘mad/crazy about’ and thus HAT’s label geselstaal (cf. p. 111), and dol/gek oor are contaminated analogies.

7.26.8 op

Op die stadsraad/bestuur/personeel (in - cf. Van der Merwe, and Ponelis 1982: 148), op die telefoon (aan), op ’n spoorlyn woon (aan, by, langs), op die linkerkant (aan), op universiteit (aan die), op die grens (aan), op diens (whether op or aan, both are anglicisms. cf. Terblanche 1972: 48), geld op iets uitgee (voor), hy werk op die myne (aan), op die pil (aan), inruil op (HAT gives vir but Dt. uses tegen), daar is ’n program op die lug (Eng. idiom), op verlof (met), op die naweek (in/tydens - but the expression is unique to Afrikaans), op iets verbeter (Eng. idiom), dis op rekord dat (Eng. idiom), het jy al op ’n loopbaan besluit (Eng. idiom), hy het ’n hartaanval gehad op 32 (met - or is this a contamination with op 32-jarige leeftyd?), kind op trein verkrag (in), navorsing doen op iets/hy werk op siektes (aan).
Because both *op* and *aan*, in the meaning of ‘on’, are both rendered by the same preposition in English, confusion seems to be rife, and *op* is totally *ingeburger* and even indispensable in many expressions where it cannot originally have been used. Ponelis (1979: 329) discusses very few of these whereas in *Die Korrekte woord* (Van der Merwe, and Ponelis 1982: 148-9) there is a substantial discussion of the concept.

7.26.9 *teen*

_Hoe hoog staan die rand teen die dollar (ten opsigte van)_

7.26.10 *uit*

_Een uit elke twintig kinders/agt uit twintig/jou kans is een uit 100 (op - Ostyn 1972: 67 observed the same phenomenon in American Flemish), uit asem (buiten in Dt.), uit verband (buiten kontext in Dt.)_

7.26.11 *van*

_Tipies van (voor in Dt.), kenmerkend van (vir), van die oomblik dat (vanaf in Dt.), wat van (translation of ‘what about?’), moeg van (vir - HAT gives vir but is the idiom in the figurative sense not a loan translation?) (cf. 7.26.13, Insertion of prepositions)_

7.26.12 *vir*

_Sy doen dit vir ‘n hobby (as), vir water boor (na), vir twee redes/vir watter rede/vir die eenvoudige rede, vra vir (om), soek (vir) (naar or no preposition in Dt.), wag vir (op). Although the use of *vir* with *soek* and *wag* when personal objects are involved may have nothing to do with English influence (cf. Raidt 1969: 47) that does not explain its use with inanimate objects, (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 133) (cf. Insertion of prepositions below)_

7.26.13 Insertion of prepositions

_Sometimes a preposition occurs in Afrikaans where none is required but where English requires one: ons het dit in gemeen, ek het byna van die fees vergeet, op iets besluit, iets van iemand ontteneem, met iets wegdoen._

Bruce Donaldson, _The Influence of English on Afrikaans_
Ponelis (1979: 160) treats the topic of van-invoeging: ‘In al drie die tipes NS + NS-konstruksies kom daar variante met ingevoegde van voor wat aan Engelse inwerking toegeskryf kan word.’ He then gives examples of the three:

‘1) lys name - lys van name etc.
2) hierdie soort geelhout - hierdie soort van geelhout 'n slegte tipe mens
   - 'n slegte tipe van mens
3) iemand met die naam Gert - iemand met die naam van Gert etc, die
   Departement Nasionale Opvoeding - die Departement van Nasionale
   Opvoeding.’

From the point of view of Dutch idiom it would seem likely that the examples given under 1) are anglicisms; soort van + noun does occur in Dutch, although far less frequently than without the preposition. This does not necessarily mean that the construction is not an anglicism in Afrikaans. The very common expression daarde tipe van ding is undoubtedly a loan translation and thus I tend to agree with him in the case of tipe van. I do not think, however, that constructions of the sort die Departement van Nasionale Opvoeding are the result of English influence; in such instances the van is even obligatory in Dutch. On the other hand, I would see die stad van Pietermaritzburg as a definite anglicism. (cf. Hegman 1968: 250 where a convincing argument is presented to suggest that Die Republiek van Suid-Afrika is an anglicism)

There is a great number of expressions in Afrikaans which contain a superfluous vir where English requires ‘for’. With the exception of behalwe vir, vir seker and ek het vir geen oomblik daaraan gedink nie all examples contain a temporal vir expressing duration: sy het daar vir 'n lang tyd gebly, die potte wat vir 14 dae in die son gestaan het, die koek moet vir 'n uur bak (no preposition would be correct Diets). Die huis is vir baie jare deur die predikant bewoon, dié houer hou die wyn vars vir weke nadat hy oopgemaak is, vir eeu/jare en jare (jare, weke and eeu lank or simply omission of the preposition would be correct Diets although contamination can occur e.g. Vir 12 jaar lank staan hy aan die spits van die taalstryd - praesens historicum). With actions that began in the past and continue into the present (i.e. instances where English uses a perfect tense + ‘for’ and Dutch/Afrikaans use a present tense + al) a contamination of the Afrikaans and English is frequently heard: ek koop al vir 50 jaar hier, dit verduur ons nou al vir die afgelope 8 jaar but also vir 50 jaar doen ons dit. (cf. Raidt 1969: 47)
7.26.14 Omission of prepositions

Sometimes a preposition is omitted in Afrikaans where none is used in the corresponding English idiom:

*eendag* (*op een dag* in Dutch. NB. this expression also contains the numeral, as in Eng., whereas Dt. uses the indefinite article), *dusver* (*tot dusver* - so far), *op datum bring* (*tot op datum bring*), *hy kom naweke terug/ons is Saterdae oop* (*op*), *die pad vra* (*na*), *hierdie glas is handgemaaik* (*met die hand gemaak*), *droogtegeteisterde gebiede* (*deur droogte geteeisterde*), *iemand trou* (*met iemand trou: met* is sometimes omitted in Dutch too but it is unusual to do so - cf. p. 217) *iemand skei* (*van*), *bal/n fliek kyk* (*na voetbal kyk* - watch *telesiekieijken* occurs in Dutch, as in Afrikaans, without a preposition and thus the loss of *na* in such cases may be analogy at work and not English influence.) Ponelis (1979: 200-1) and Raidt (1983: 183) mention this phenomenon without any reference to English influence although Raidt does state that it is a ‘Merkmal der Umgangssprache’.

7.26.15

Preposition stranding is a syntactical issue which is discussed under 7.27.1 and 7.28.4.

7.27 Pronouns

7.27.1 Ramifications of preposition stranding for pronouns

Although preposition stranding as such is not unique to Afrikaans and English - in combination with R-structures it is even more common in spoken Dutch than in Afrikaans - the use of *dit/wat* instead of *daar/waar*, made possible by the separation of the pronoun from its accompanying preposition, is a distinctive feature of (spoken) Afrikaans although Ponelis (1985: 122) does quote some cases of its occurrence in Dutch. Ponelis describes the role of English in this issue as follows:

‘Hoewel Engels weliswaar nie gewone setselskeiding in Afrikaans laat ontstaan het nie, het die Engelse invloed gewone setselskeiding in Afrikaans na alle waarskynlikheid tog so

---

58 This issue is looked at in detail from a syntactical point of view by Ponelis (1985) where the author postulates the possibility of English having functioned at least as a contributing factor (p. 121-2). Steyn (1976: 51) also broaches the topic briefly and mentions the possible role of English (p. 53).
sterk gestimuleer dat gewone setselskeiding vandag in die Afrikaanse omgangstaal dié tipe setselskeiding is, en R-skeiding selfs in geskrewe Afrikaans byna heeltemal uitgesterf het.’

I support this explanation of constructions such as the following:

a) *Dit het ek nie aan gedink nie (= daar) Dit hou ek nie van nie (= daar)*

b) *Wat ons nie mee tevrede is nie, is... (= waar)*
   *Wat praat jy nou van? (= waar)*
   *Die boek wat ek al van gepraat het, is... (= waar)*

On the final example, where *wat* + preposition occurs in a relative clause, Ponelis (1985: 123) has this to say:

‘Die parallelisme tussen onveranderlike *wat* in Afrikaans en onveranderlike *that* in Engels lê voor die hand.’

One might add that not only the parallel with the English relative ‘that’ but also the alternative relative pronoun ‘which’ (like *wat*, a w-form) may have contributed to the frequency of this structure in Afrikaans. (cf. also ‘What is he talking about?’)

Du Plessis (1983: 60) seems to see such uses of *wat* as a peculiarity of JOT *(Johannesburgse omgangstaal)* and thus of non-standard Afrikaans, but Ponelis (1985: 119) correctly points out that ‘...watseiding...kenmerkend is van en oorheersend is in die hedendaagse Afrikaanse spreektaal.’ It is interesting to compare Ponelis' brief treatment of relative *wat* + preposition in his *Afrikaanse Sintaksis* (1979: 467), where he makes no mention of English influence, with this more recent analysis of the concept. Du Plessis also seems to imply English influence.

### 7.27.2

Closely related to the above functions of *dit* and *wat*, but outside contexts where preposition stranding is being applied, is the occurrence of the same pronouns in the following constructions where English influence would seem to be undeniable.

#### 7.27.2.1

Use of preposition + *dit*, for example:

*Sy is nog nie heeltemal oor dit nie (= daaroor)*

*Ek hou van dit (= hiervan/daarvan)* (cf. Ponelis 1979: 64)
Cf. Ponelis (1979: 181) for a fuller account of the phenomenon. I can find no reference in Ponelis, however, to constructions where preposition + hom/hulle with reference to an impersonal object occurs and where Dutch permits only er/hier/daar + preposition. I think this should be seen in the same light as a preposition + dit. Maintaining the original Dutch structure in Afrikaans does not enable one to distinguish between a singular and a plural prepositional object as one can and must in English, for example: Kom, neem hierdie sakke. Jy kan al jou goeters in hulle sit (= daarin).

It is equally likely that English influence has also played a role in the frequency of constructions involving preposition + hierdie/daardie (een), e.g. Ek het uit hierdie (een) gedrink. (= glas). Use of this construction in Afrikaans also enables the speaker to distinguish between ‘this’ and ‘that’ glass which uit dit does not although the Dutch/Afrikaans structure hieruit/daaruit does of course. Ponelis (1979: 90) does refer to the possible influence of English in such cases.

7.27.2.2

Use of preposition + wat in questions, for example: Vir wat wil jy dit hê? (= waarvoor)

This structure - mentioned by Ponelis (1979: 180) without reference to English influence - although it does not correspond literally with colloquial English, is a stylistic variant of Wat wil jy dit voor hê? (i.e. with preposition stranding) where wat does occur under English influence according to Ponelis (1985: 122). At least the frequency in Afrikaans of structures such as In verband met wat is dit? over waarmee constructions would seem to be the result of contact with English, even if the theoretical possibility of such forms exists in Dutch.

There are several cases of non-pronominal wat in Afrikaans which are at odds with Dutch usage but which correspond with English ‘what’, for example: hy is groter as wat ek gedink het (als in Dutch, cf. p. 258); wat van (= what about, cf. Le Roux 1968: 167); wat is jou naam?, wat bedoel jy? (both hoe in Dutch, although in certain contexts wat is used with bedoelen in Dutch too)). It is difficult to ascertain for sure whether English has contributed to the preference for wat in such instances.

Without intending to imply that English necessarily had any influence on the adoption of wat as an invariable relative pronoun (i.e. in contexts where there is no preposition), I find it interesting to note what Ostyn (1972: 202) observed in American Flemish:
‘Most likely under the influence of English *wh*-words, the distinction between the Flemish relative pronouns with or without antecedent is not always observed.’

Scholtz (1980: 76) comments on the general preference in Afrikaans for *wat* constructions in various contexts. Ponelis (1985: 118-9), on the other hand, refers indirectly to the preference for *wat/dit* structures over *waar/daar* (i.e. a preference for *R*-less forms). Ponelis (1979: 453) discusses the use of *dit* instead of *daar* in passive constructions under the influence of English, for example: *Dit word beoog om ’n studie van die gebied te maak.*

### 7.27.3 Independent use of *hierdie/daardie*

It is traditional to regard the independent use of *hierdie/daardie* as subject or object pronouns as an anglicism, although as a very well established one. *HAT* (cf. p. 117) only refers to their use as subject pronouns and warns against such structures. Ponelis (1979: 90) refers to *versterkende Engelse invloed* having played a role in *hierdie/daardie* replacing *dit* in *Hierdie/daardie sal uit Suid-Afrika ingevoer moet word, Waar het jy hierdie/daardie gekry?, Vir hierdie/daardie kon ek nie die regte onderdele kry nie.* (cf. 7.27.2.1 for the use of *hierdie/daardie* after prepositions) In the context of the same discussion he gives an example of these pronouns being used in the plural: *Hierdies is better as daardies.*

I feel inclined to question whether English influence lies behind the occurrence of *hierdie/daardie* as singular subject and object pronouns not preceded by a preposition - in combination with prepositions the possibility would seem to be greater. This is the only possible means in Afrikaans of rendering the opposition expressed by Dutch *dit/dat* given that pronominal *dat* did not survive in South Africa. This is also implied by Ponelis (1979: 90) where he states:

‘Naas Engelse inwerking moet hier daarop gewys word dat die sistematiese onderskeid ten opsigte van “nabyheid” nie by *dit* bestaan nie, en dat die behoefte aan dié onderskeid baie bydra tot die vestiging van *hierdie/daardie* in selfstandige gebruik.’

Van der Merwe in Van der Merwe and Ponelis (1982: 79) also questions whether English influence lies at the root of the issue, but he quotes an even more probable anglicism to defend his point of view:

‘Ek twyfel egter daaraan of ons hier bloot met Engelse
invloed te make het. Dis gewone Afrikaans om te sê: *Hierdie een* is 'n moeilike geval; en nou vra ek my af of ons nie dalk met ellips van *een* te make het nie in: *Hierdie is 'n moeilike geval.* (cf. 7.27.7 for this pronominal use of *een*)

### 7.27.4 Certain functions of personal pronouns

#### 7.27.4.1

From a Dutch point of view *jy/jou* are used much more indiscriminately in Afrikaans than in Dutch, even occurring in combination with each other or with other forms of address that would seem to require *u*, for example: *nou verseker jou bank alles wat vir u belangrik is*; or in combination with *dame, meneer, professor* etc. The artificiality of *u* in Afrikaans in many social contexts is commonly recognised (cf. Scholtz 1963: 52-72) and yet the traditionally Afrikaans form of polite address, the third person, now often seems too formal, giving rise to a higher frequency of *jy*. (cf. Ponelis 1979: 67; Odendal 1976: 108, 111) It seems highly likely that the Afrikaner's acquaintance with only one second person pronoun in English and the distinct social advantages of the simplicity of the English system, have contributed to the spread of *jy/jou* to contexts where the informal form of address would be unthinkable in most European languages. The precise role of English in this regard has not however yet been investigated.

#### 7.27.4.2

Ponelis (1979: 68) mentions the use of *sy* with reference to a car or ship as being the result of English influence but distinguishes this use from the indigenous practice of personifying concepts such as the moon and nature in this way. (cf. Scholtz 1966: 123)

#### 7.27.4.3

Raidt (1983: 141) sees *hulle* as an unspecified pronoun meaning 'one' (where both the speaker and the listener are excluded) as a possible anglicism. Ponelis (1979: 100) does not mention English influence in his discussion of *hulle* in this sense and Dutch usage (cf. Geerts, i.a. 1984: 265) would seem to indicate that there is no reason to suspect English influence in this case.

#### 7.27.4.4

Generic *jy/jou* (cf. Ponelis 1979: 105-6) occurs in Dutch, Afrikaans and English but the possessive pronoun is used in instances in Afrikaans and English where it is not possible to do so in Dutch, for example: *Neem jou taalkundige byvoorbeeld, heel bo-op kom jou*
aartappels (in a recipe). Ponelis (1979: 106) gives examples without reference to
English influence, for example: Die bankkoers kan invloed hê op (jou) rentekoerse.
But definition 4 under jou in WAT reads as follows: ‘Dan is daar al jou onvoorsiene
uitgawes (waarsk. Angl.).’ English influence is most likely in these cases.

7.27.4.5

The English use of the possessive hulle in the expression in hulle honderde/duisende
is mentioned under 7.25.7.

7.27.4.6

Subject pronouns are frequently used in passive constructions in Afrikaans, in
imitation of English usage, where in Dutch an object pronoun is required. In these
Afrikaans and English constructions the indirect object of the active becomes the
subject of the passive, for example: Nie een keer is ek in Engels geantwoord nie,
weet jy van die pos wat hy aangebied is, hy is drie jaar gegun om die projek te
voltooi, dit (e.g. ’n skikking) moet ’n kans gegee word om te werk (with an impersonal
indirect object).

If pronominal substitution were not applied and nouns were used instead of pronouns,
these structures would also be grammatical in Dutch, for example: Weet jy van de
post die man aangeboden is? (where die man = aan die man); compare Weet
jij van de post die hem aangeboden is? The manner of pronominal substitution
constitutes the anglicism in this case because without it there is no formal difference
between a nominal subject and a nominal indirect object.

7.27.5 Reflexive pronouns

There are several cases involving reflexive pronouns where there are striking
similarities with English and differences from Dutch where English influence has
undoubtedly contributed to the situation as it now is in Afrikaans. (cf. p. 167)

7.27.5.1

There are more reflexive verbs in Dutch and Afrikaans than in English but fewer in
Afrikaans than in Dutch. There are many cases of verbs which Afrikaans prescriptive
works insist are reflexive but which commonly occur without the reflexive pronoun,
for example:

Milnersouin sy graf omdraai
Die maatskappy gaan nie uit Suid-Afrika onttrek nie
’n Taal lewe en ontwikkel
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aanpas
aantrek, -klee
afspeel
bekommer
beweeeg
bewus wees
gereedmaak
herstel
identifiseer
inmeng
inskryf
konsentreer
omdraa
onttrek
ontwikkel
spesialiseer
verbeter
verslaap
(tuis) voel
voortplant

There is some inconsistency in the way prescriptive works treat such cases. HAT, for example, maintains jou is optional with spesialiseer. No dictionary would prescribe a reflexive pronoun for voel but the attitude to tuisvoel is ambivalent; HAT gives it as non-reflexive whereas Bosman, Van der Merwe and Hiemstra (1984) give it as reflexive.

Raidt (1983: 112) seems reluctant to attribute this phenomenon to English influence but sees it rather as an old tendency in Cape Dutch. Ponelis (1979: 228) has the following to say, where he also avoids any reference to English: ‘Wederkerendheid gaan egter wel by ’n klompie werkwoorde, veral in die omgangstaal, verlore.’ He lists the following verbs: aanmeld, afspeel, iets op die hals haal, onttrek, oorgee, regmaak, roem, uitpraat, tuis/aangetrokke/geroepe voel. In addition he maintains that ‘aansluiten en bewus wees is net in die formele skryfstyl wederkerend.’

Steyn (1976: 39) also looks at this phenomenon as one of several sintaktiese onvasthede under discussion in his article and gives examples of the following reflexive verbs being used without a reflexive pronoun: aantrek (x 2), bekommer, aanpas, klee, te pletter loop, kalmeer, vestig, aanmeld, ingrawe, verenig, regruk, hou, verslaap, assosieer (x 2), intrek, haas, lê, verseker, uittrek, skaam, kwel. He adds ‘Om misverstand te vermy, beklemtsoon ek dat hierdie woorde nie altyd almal as wederkerende werkwoorde gebruik word nie. Die gevalle wat ek opgeteken het, is in uitinge waarin die spreker dit wel bedoel het om die werkwoord wederkerend te gebruik, maar die wederkerende voornaamwoord weggelaat het. Dis ’n weglating wat ’n mens, “logies gesproke”, kan begryp, want die voornaamwoord is eintlik oorbodig.’

59 There is a subtle semantic distinction in Dutch between bewegen and zich bewegen.
60 Cf. Hiemstra (1980: 99) on the subtle distinction between omdraai and jou omdraai.
This comment of Steyn’s corresponds to Langenhoven’s (1935: 109) reaction to the same phenomenon:

‘Deurdat die “hom” as onpersoonlike refleksief onnatuurlik gevoel word in Afrikaans het die taaleie langsamerhand ’n groot aantal oorspronklik terugwerkende werkwoorde onterugwerkend gemaak. So sal niemand, behalwe ’n onkundige of aanstellerige skrywer, droom om in Afrikaans te sê “die
Steyn (1976: 53) comes closer than either Raidt or Ponelis to admitting that English influence may be at work in this issue where he carefully states, with reference to this and other syntactical variants in Afrikaans, that these developments ‘...vind plaas in ‘n rigting wat ten minste Engels lyk’ but, he adds ‘Soos ek egter betoog het, is dit nie altyd verskriklik in stryd met die “suwer Afrikaanse” patroon nie,’ supporting Raidt's statement above.

7.27.5.2

Those verbs that are reflexive in English correspond with reflexive verbs in Afrikaans. As the English reflexive pronoun is a compound formed from an object or possessive pronoun plus -self, a form which corresponds with the emphatic reflexive pronoun in Afrikaans, such verbs commonly employ this emphatic form even when no particular emphasis is implied (cf. Ponelis 1979: 83), for example: jouself afvra, gedra, ophang, verdedig, vererger, verontskuldig, was.

This Afrikaans reflexive pronoun with -self, emphatic in form but not in meaning, also occurs in several verbal idioms which are literal translations from English, for example: geniet, oppas, tuismaak, wees, weggee as in pas jouself mooi op, maak julself tuis, sy was die dag nie haarsef nie.

7.27.5.3

Sometimes the compound reflexive pronoun occurs in contexts where ‘correct’ Afrikaans requires the adverb self but where English too employs the pronoun, for example: Baie van onse onderwyskragte is dikwels nie voldoende geskoold om hulself rekenskap te kan gee van wat eintlik ‘n isme is nie. (cf. Ponelis 1979: 82)

What Ponelis (1979: 82) refers to as adnominal self is commonly replaced by persoonlik in imitation of English usage, for example: Persoonlik gebruik ek hierdie uitdrukking baie.

7.27.6

Occasionally in what purports to be formal written style wie instead of wat occurs as a relative pronoun after a personal antecedent. The distinction between animate and inanimate which can be crucial for the choice of the correct relative pronoun in English, is being applied in such cases in Afrikaans which has never made such a distinction, at least not in contexts where no preposition is involved, for example: Parkering streng verbode behalwe persone wie magtiging daartoe het, Besoekers wie van hierdie kampeerterrein gebruik wil maak,...
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7.27.7 The indefinite pronoun *een/enetjie*

Examples:

'\(n\) moeilike punt en een waaroor al baie gedebatteer is (Rousseau, 1937: 191)
\(\)
jy is een om te praat
\(\)
ek vir een sou dit nie doen nie

The use of *een* in those expressions, which is also discussed by Rousseau (p. 191), is undoubtedly of English origin, as is its use in *watter een, hierdie/daardie een.*

\(\)
die\('/n\) mooi een
\(\)
dit is 'n skaars een (compare: *dit is een van die skaarse*)
\(\)
die 1922-een
\(\)
hierdie is 'n battery-enetjie

This is one of the most controversial constructions in Afrikaans with scholars maintaining 1) it is not English in origin, 2) it is English in origin, 3) English has simply served as a contributing factor. Changuion (1844) states:

‘Een wordt in navolging van het E. overtollig gebruikt, b.v.: dat is een mooije een, geef my een groote een enz. in plaats van dat is er een mooije, geef my een groote.’

Changuion thus belongs to group two. Mansvelt (1844: 41) states:

‘Een wordt als voornaamwoord ter vervanging van ‘t zelfstandige naamwoord na een bijvoeglike naamwoord gebruikt, evenals in ‘t Friesch en ‘t Engels, b.v. das ‘n mooie eene (iene).’

Mansvelt may belong to group 2 but his mention of the presence of the construction in Frisian implies he may belong to group three. Tromp (1879: 174) seems to accept Du Toit's (1876) opinion without question, namely that ‘Uitdrukken so's die een, die ander een, ens. kom weer uit Engels.’ They thus both belong to group two.

Schonken (1914: 90) unequivocally puts himself in group one when he quotes this construction, together with others, which according to him occurred in seventeenth century Dutch. Rousseau (1937: 190-191) discusses the phenomenon in some detail, mentioning Middle Dutch, various dialects and Frisian (as does Mansvelt) but places himself ultimately in group three. Le Roux (1952: 44) belongs to group two, as do Botha and Van Aardt (1978: 38) who advise that the use of *'n bloue* etc. is preferable to *'n blou een.*
I would say that all the above scholars, with the exception of Rousseau, see the issue far too simplistically. Rousseau distinguishes various pronominal uses of *een* which escaped the notice of most scholars but even as far as article + adjective + *een/enetjie* constructions are concerned, he sees some as indigenous and others as English, for example: *Hy het die kleinste appel geneem en die grootste een aan my gegee; 'n dom seun en 'n slim een*. He does not, however, explain what the distinction he makes here is based on.

As both Rousseau and Mansvelt mention, the construction occurs in Frisian but with a difference from the examples provided (a difference that they do not comment on): although both *in readen ien* (*'n rooi een*) and *in readen* (*'n rooie*) occur in that language, *ien* is only used when the adjective is preceded by the indefinite article, *with de or it* the adjective alone (without *ien*) suffices: *de reade...* (Tiersma 1985: 52) This may be an indication that the extent of the use of *een* in such constructions in Afrikaans has been influenced by English although the phenomenon itself may well have been inherited from Dutch dialect. The fact that Changuion observed this morphological difference from Dutch as early as 1844 may also indicate that there were more factors at work than merely contact with English.

In Frisian, where influence of the adjective is grammatically determined (as in Dutch), the attributive adjective takes an -e after the definite articles *de* and *it*; after the neuter indefinite article it remains uninflected (once again as in Dutch) and precisely then the combination with *ien* (in lieu of an ending on the adjective?) is used, although adjectives referring to common gender nouns also occur in combination with *ien*. Even in Dutch there is an avoidance in speech of *een wit, een groen* where one often hears *een witje, een groentje* if the semantics of the situation permit the use of the diminutive.

In Afrikaans, where adjectival inflection is phonologically determined, adjectives such as *wit* and *groen* would not normally be inflected before a noun, but when used independently with reference to a previously mentioned noun, they do, for example: *'n witte, 'n groene* or alternatively *'n wit een, 'n groen een*. The fact that use of the plural *enes* (cf. Ponelis 1979: 575) after an adjective in such cases is still regarded very much as a colloquial (sub-standard?) form, which is not the case with the singular, may be an indication that although a construction like *mooi enes* may be modelled on *‘pretty ones’, ‘n mooi een* may not simply be in imitation of *‘a pretty one’, or that at most English may merely have served as a contributing factor.
7.28 Word order

Ostyn (1972: VI) concluded that ‘syntax is no more immune to the influence of the source language than the lexicon.’ But the syntax of Afrikaans, in the narrow sense of word order, does not yet seem to have been nearly as affected as one might have expected, given the very substantial differences that exist between Diets and English in this respect.

7.28.1 Verb not in final position

In contexts where Diets and German require the order SOV, Dutch applies the rule less strictly than German and spoken Afrikaans less strictly than Dutch. In Dutch a final finite verb, infinitive, past participle or separable verbal prefix is not required to stand at the end of its clause if what follows is an adverbial phrase introduced by a preposition, for example: *hij heeft altijd een dagtocht willen maken naar Antwerpen*. Standard Afrikaans has the same rule. The following deviations from that rule in spoken Afrikaans coincide with English practice and presumably English is the cause. (cf. Steyn 1976: 45-6)

7.28.1.1

Examples one and two below illustrate the verb occurring before adverbial expressions without a preposition and example three is too short an utterance for final positioning of *van haar* to be warranted:

- *Donderbuie sal voorkom vanmiddag.*
- *Het u verskaffingsprobleme gehad sover?*
- *Ek het gehoor van haar.*
- Also: *Vul in ’n vorm.*

Steyn (1976: 45-6) states:

‘In die spreektaal, en al hoe meer in die skryftaal, bestaan die neiging om die “agterste lid” van die werkwoordgroep (die voltooide deelwoord of infinitief dus) so gou as moontlik na die persoonsvorm (die hulpwerkwoord) uit te spreek/neer te skryf.’

Steyn makes no direct reference to English influence, however.

7.28.1.2 No SOV after *dat*

Examples one and two below are clear-cut cases of omission to apply SOV
where grammar requires it - although Steyn (1978) presents a case with Dutch precedents to justify the first example - but the next two examples illustrate a difference between Afrikaans and Dutch in this regard which has not necessarily arisen because of the contact with English although the end result is an English type construction. Afrikaans has a greater tendency than Dutch to leave nominal, verbal and adverbial particles together with the verbs to which they apply, treating them in much the same way as separable verbal prefixes where *tangconstructies* are also less commonly applied in Afrikaans than Dutch, i.e. *Hij wist dat ik haar op had gebeld/dat ik mee wou gaan*. Compare also the origin of verbs such as *beeldhouwen* and *raadplegen*:

\begin{quote}
Dan moet ons sê dat hierdie is net die eerste stap
Mama werk omdat sy is ‘n onderwyser
...omdat dit kan lig werp op die saak
Elf persent het gesê dat dit moet verstaanbaarder gemaak word
\end{quote}

Constructions akin to the above *lig werp* and *verstaanbaar maak* are more frequent in Belgium than in Holland.

### 7.28.1.3 Omission of *dat*

Whereas SVO constructions with *dat* are relatively rare, SVO constructions without *dat* are very common in Afrikaans and after verbs such as *beweer, dink, glo, hoop, sê, vertel, vertrou, voel, vrees, weet* and *wil hê* they can be said to be the general rule, although *dat* + SOV remains possible (cf. Steyn 1976: 48; Lubbe 1983: 74-84). It is well-known that *dat*-less clauses occurred in Middle Dutch (cf. Steyn 1978: 81) and Van der Horst (*Onze Taal* 1984, 7, p. 122), remarking on the frequency of such structures in letters written by Multatuli’s wife, postulates that it was much more common in nineteenth century Dutch. In both cases, however, *dat*-less clauses were accompanied by SOV word order. Steyn (1978) presents a convincing argument to support the following tenet:

‘Terwyld die gebruik van *dat* in elk geval verskillend verloop het in die twee tale [Afrikaans and English], lê dit voor die hand om te vra of die a - variant [dat + SOV] nie maar van oudsher af in Suid-Afrika bestaan het nie?’ (p. 83)

But Steyn admits that ‘Dis moontlik dat die invloed van Engels bygedra het tot die afstomping van die taalgevoeligheid vir die onderskikkende woordorde.’ (p. 89) Ostyn (1972: 69) noted the same tendency in American Flemish.
7.28.1.4 Repercussions of preposition stranding for the final position of verbs

In Ponelis' (1985) article on preposition stranding in Afrikaans, where he sees English as having probably played the role of a contributing factor (cf. 7.27.1), Ponelis concludes with some examples where English influence is undeniable and where the English pattern has consequences for the position of the verb, for example: *drie acre wat hulle boer in, wat het die ou mense altyd vertel van?* etc.

7.28.2 No inversion of subject and verb

Transgression of the rule for the inversion of subject and verb after adverbs (e.g. *Môre kom ek terug*) and subordinate clauses (e.g. *Voordat jy gaan moet jy dit doen*) is something which I seldom observed even in very colloquial Afrikaans. However, inversion is never applied after *so* (an *ingeburgerde* anglicism), despite the fact that it is after *dus*, for example: *So jy kan vergeet wat ek gesê het - Dus kan jy vergeet wat ek gesê het.* Apparently the anglicism extends beyond the mere homophony of English and Afrikaans *so* (cf. p. 231) to the syntax associated with English 'so'.

7.28.3 STOMP: subject - time - object - manner - place

Steyn (1976: 44-5) states:

‘Met allerlei voorbehoudes kan 'n mens sê dat die bywoordelike bepaling van tyd 'n bywoordelike bepaling van plek voorafgaan in 'n sin met die “normale” sinsdeelvolgorde onderwerp + persoonsvorm + ander sinsdele... en dat albei bywoordelike bepalinge voor die laaste lid van die werkwoordgroep sal staan as dié meer as een werkwoordelement bevat.’

Exceptions to the latter part of this statement are discussed under 7.28.1. As far as the first part is concerned, however, I think it is correct to say that STOMP, a rule for the priority of adverbs and the direct object - presuming that the object is a noun - which is traditional in German grammar, also applies to Afrikaans, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Ek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>gisteraand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>die koerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>lekker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>in die tuin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gesit en lees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Steyn comments in particular on the occurrence of place before time: ‘In die spreektaal is daar baie keer volgordes wat ons in “versorgde” taal sal vermy’, but once again he refrains from attributing non-observance of the TMP rule to English influence. No-one has commented on the less frequent occurrence of time before a nominal object in Afrikaans compared with German and Dutch. As OT, like PMT (e.g. I go to town by bus every day), coincides with English practice, English influence cannot be discounted.

### 7.28.4 Preposition stranding

The ramifications of preposition stranding for the use of pronouns (i.e. dit instead of daar, wat instead of waar) are discussed under 7.27.1. Where only nouns are involved and no pronominal substitution is required, preposition stranding simply has syntactical consequences (cf. Ponelis 1979: 178-9 and 1985: 106-7), for example:

> Watter boom praat jy van?
> Die miljue waarin ons nou lewe voel ons heeltemal tuis in.

Despite the fact that precedents for this have been found in Dutch, Ponelis (1979: 122) concludes ‘Desnieteenstaande is die getuienis vir ontlening aan Engels baie sterk.’

### 7.28.5 Position of alleen(lik)

It is very common to find the adverb alleen placed after the noun it qualifies, in imitation of English, instead of before it (i.e. as in slegs Blankes):

> Die rook van sigarette alleen is/word toegestaan
> Parkering vir kliente alleen
> Busse alleenlik (cf. 7.8.5 on -lik)

The following example follows a similar English syntactical pattern: belasting eksklusief. Note: Dié myn alleen lewer meer goud as Kanada, where alleen is presumably in imitation of English ‘alone’, although alleen al would be possible here in Dutch.

### 7.28.6

The following examples all show syntactical divergences from Diets syntax which are the result of contact with English:
7.28.7 Prenominal phrases

Ostyn (1972: 251) noticed in American Flemish how ‘frequent is the use of elements which would not be used in prenominal position in Flemish. Some of them are transfers from English, others seem to be relaxations of the rules governing the attributive use of lexical items’; he then gives the example *deze twee uur lange uitzending*. This type of construction is extremely common in Afrikaans and yet mention of it in the literature on anglicisms is rare. Ostyn’s observations of immigrant Flemish may be of just as much relevance to Afrikaans as there is currently also a tendency in Dutch to relax these rules, although English influence on Dutch in this regard cannot be completely discarded either; *het acht uur journaal* (compare *die sewe uur nuus*) is now established TV language but *een drie-tonner* is still preferable to *een drie ton vrachtwagen*. A couple of the following Afrikaans examples do have similar indigenous parallels in Dutch but only where the noun in the prenominal phrase has its own adjectival form, for example: *een vierbaanse weg* (*n vier laan/baan pad*) and *een vijfdaagse werkweek* (*n vyf dag werksweek*) but *over een vijfjarige tydperk* (*oor ’n vyf jaar tydperk*) is questionable. The issue is clearly closely related to word formation. (cf. p. 205) I believe, however, that one can safely assume English influence in all the following examples:

```
die jaar ou diere
’n drie jaar waglys
oor ’n vyf jaar tydperk
’n vier-en-twintig uur tydperk (cf. Hiemstra 1980: 84 where he makes a plea for etmaal)
’n drie maande lang kursus
langtermynvoordele
’n drie miljoen rand hospitaal
’n drie stuk pak (Dt. driedelig)
’n vyf stuk eetkamerstel
’n vier slaapkamer huis
’n vier laan pad
’n agt-en-sewentig plaat
die half nege trein
daar is ’n sewe uur vliegtuig
die 1983 begroting
```
It is difficult in such cases to know what to join and what to hyphenate. (cf. p. 205)

The following compound adjectives are also translated English:

‘n leergebinde boek  
die Russiesgebore kunstenaar B.D.  
‘n staatsgefinansierde maatskappy

Dutch would either rephrase by means of a relative clause (e.g. de kunstenaar R.M., die in Rusland geboren is) or use an adjectival adjunct, a possibility that does not exist in Afrikaans, for example:

een in leer gebonden boek  
de in Rusland geboren kunstenaar R.M.  
een door de staat gefinancierde maatschappij

The following prenominal constructions are also translated English: beste gehalte plante, hoë gehalte gebruikte motors, gehalte vars vleis and ‘n groot genoeg pot.

7.29 Special registers strongly influenced by English

7.29.1 Swearing

Whereas the official recognition of Afrikaans in 1925 opened the way for the emancipation of Afrikaans from Dutch and English, that emancipation took place predominantly at an official level. The infinite number of English loanwords used across a wide spectrum of fields, particularly among the lower socio-economic classes, is one example of the limits of that emancipation. Another example is the Afrikaner's slang (cf. Ponelis 1984: 40), best illustrated in the way in which Afrikanerdom swears: Afrikaners swear like Englishmen - or would it be more appropriate to say like their fellow colonials in Australia? There is nothing remotely akin to the Afrikaner’s potential to swear in Holland. Elsewhere in this work reference was made to the old saying that the Afrikaner is trilingual: Hy praat Afrikaans, bid in Nederlands en vloek in Engels. But he does not just swear in English, but à l’anglaise: to refer to an unsavoury character as a doos or to an unpleasant woman as a teeë is a translation of English idiom; the exclamations stront and kak or statements such as jy praat kak or hy is ‘n pyn all have an English ring to them. Du Toit (1965: 134) says of the many English swearwords in Afrikaans that ‘...sonder veel van
die inheemse te verdring, het hulle op dié gebied ons woordeskat verryk(!)’ [his exclamation mark]. The borrowing has not just been in the one direction, of course, because English speaking South Africans have also availed themselves of the potential to expand their vocabulary of expletives by borrowing extensively from Afrikaans, for example: donderse, helse, moerse, not a donder. Du Toit (1965: 125) maintains that such foreign expletives are employed as euphemisms, a point also made by I. Feinauer (1983), but I feel that the Afrikaner’s knowledge of, and feeling for, English is now too intimate for English swearwords to have any euphemistic value left - jou fokken dief is no more euphemistic in Afrikaans than in English. I think Le Roux’s (1926: 358) explanation is closer to the truth: ‘gewaarwording een gevoelens word kragtiger uitgedruk deur geleende woorde. Vandaar: demmit, dash it, nonsens, olraight, blooming, bleddie, cheecky [sic!], bother of bodder.’

The potential of bleddie, bloomin, flippin and fokken to be inserted in the middle of polysyllabic words is in direct imitation of a practice found in colloquial English, for example: abso-bleddie-luutniks, ‘not nece-bloody-ssarily’. The mechanics of this phenomenon are dealt with very competently by I. Feinauer (1983) but to my amazement she does not attribute its existence in Afrikaans to English influence, despite the fact that the very words that are infixed are thinly disguised loanwords. As they are seldom written, it is difficult to know whether to write blooming, bloemen, bloomin, or bloomen:

bleddie/blerrie
bloomen
flippen
fokken (cf. p. 196)
boggerol/bokkerol
boggerop/bokkerol
bogger/bokker (n. & v.)
bogger/bokker julie etc.
doos
poepol - (arsehole?)
teef

shame
not a damn/donder
waar op aarde was jy so lank?
hoe/wat/wie de/the hel/heck
jolly(wel), e.g. hy weet so jolly baie
oh, heng (< hang)
oh, hel(l)
fok off, fok all

7.29.2 Greetings, farewells, thanking and forms of address

Cultural blending in South Africa has led to Afrikaners employing English customs of greeting and thanking etc. Mackey (1972: 574) remarks on a
similar phenomenon in Amerindian languages. This is a good example of what Barnouw (1934: 41) was referring to when he wrote ‘As a social animal the Afrikaner belongs to the species called Briton’. (cf. p. 45)

The way in which asseblief and dankie are used corresponds exactly with English usage and differs markedly from Dutch and German. In fact, even Mansvelt (1884: 31) remarked: ‘Evenals de Engelschen zegt men ja-danki voor alsjeblief en nee-danki voor dank-je (u) alleen.’ Dankie on its own implies ‘yes thank you’, as in English, not the opposite, as is the case in several European languages; it also renders ‘yes please’ just as ‘thanks’ can in English. Sometimes even the position of asseblief in the sentence (cf. Basson, i.a. 1982: 79) is in imitation of English (e.g. Asseblief, gaan nou huis toe) and the very European use of alstublieft, bitte schön and s’il vous plaît etc. when handing something to someone, which has no equivalent in English, has no equivalent in Afrikaans either. Having been thanked for a service rendered, one frequently retorts with (Dit is ‘n) plesier where once again European languages commonly use a form of ‘please’. Such practices in Afrikaans are in accordance with English protocol.

The farewells bye bye and ta ta, as well as ek sien (vir) jou (later), are integrated loans from English, as are the greeting hallo daar and the standard expressions ontmoet my dogter and pas jouself op. And cheers is just as commonly heard as gesondheid.

Concluding letters with liefde and opreg is an English tradition, as is the formal title Sy Edele die Eerste Minister. Du Toit (1965: 134) observed:

```
“n Interessante gebied is dié van ons aanspreekvorme (titulatuur). Hier tref ons o.a. aan: Mr., mrs, miss, auntie, cousin, deary, darling, daddy ens., in gebruik gekom deels weens ’n wysiging in die sg. “gevoelswaarde” van die ekwivalente Afrikaanse benamings, deels uit modesug en ’n onderskatting van die eie teenoor die vreemde.’
```

His examples may not all be as valid as in 1934 when this was written, but the principle is still the same: Auntie and uncle are usually (but still not always) found in translated form nowadays and Mrs. and Master are still used in Afrikaans by non-Whites with reference to Whites. Odendal (1976: 107) comments on the increasing frequency of dame over mevrou and (me)juffrou:

---

61 I have been told that in India, even today, the terms auntie and uncle are used as general forms of address to respected persons, both in Indian English and in Indian languages by those who know no English. The parallel with their use in Afrikaans earlier this century is striking.
“n Redelike jong vorm, moontlik onder Engelse invloed is dame, veral wanneer die huwelikstaat van 'n vroulike persoon onbekend is.'
Chapter Eight

8.0 Conclusion and perspectives for further research

8.1 Conclusion

The reaction of those sceptics who do not regard the influence English has had so far on Afrikaans as now being integral to the very nature of the language and who thus presumably regard some of the tenets presented in this book as unacceptable, reminds one of the reaction of Afrikaners to Changuion’s publication in 1844 where he suggested that plat Kaapsch was not only the mother-tongue of Hottentots and slaves. Nienaber (1950: 22) describes the conflict that confronted the Afrikaner at the time as follows:

‘Dan ontstaan ’n toestand van gespannenheid: aan die een kant die werklkheid, aan die ander kant die tradisie en ou ideaal.’

The situation with regard to the degree of English influence in Afrikaans today resembles in some ways that example from nineteenth century Cape society.

If even scholars are unable to ascertain precisely what an anglicism is and what is indigenous in Afrikaans, what hope does the layman, the true custodian of the language, have? The answer is obviously no hope, but more importantly, does it matter? He, like the native-speaker of English in South Africa, should be made to feel linguistically secure enough to trust his own ear. His ear will be guided by usage, regardless of etymology and displacement of indigenous structures. Etymology would then be as irrelevant to acceptability in Afrikaans as it is in English. But it will be difficult to instil such confidence in Afrikaners as long as the main prescriptive works for which he reaches in time of doubt, are so totally remote from the everyday reality of the Afrikaans-English contact situation and continue to cling to Diets structures which, however desirable they may be from a puristic point of view, are not rooted in the reality of the spoken language. That reality is the only thing the average native-speaker is sure of, but at present he is impeded from relying on it.

The speech community has already unequivocally decided on many of the examples given in my corpus. It is time for prescriptive bodies and works to take note of this and accept these de facto decisions, even if they mean that standard Afrikaans will now deviate even more from Dutch and come closer to English; normalising bodies are at the moment inhibiting the
natural development of the language more than is usually the case with languages. I sincerely hope that this work will succeed in pumping new life into the ongoing polemic about anglicisms and perhaps usher in a new era in the way many of them are regarded. A change in attitude is urgent because, as I have attempted to illustrate, Afrikaans is in the process of becoming more and more a translated language and it is a tide which cannot and will not be turned. This metamorphosis, which is occurring as ever more English idiom is being dressed up in Diets vocabulary, is apparently the inevitable product of the unique bilingual situation that exists today in the Republic of South Africa.

8.2 Perspectives for further research

A more thorough study of many of the linguistic phenomena dealt with in chapter seven could and should be made. The vast wealth of material has prevented me from treating every aspect of English influence in the detail it may warrant. Several of the categories dealt with here could be the subject of individual monographs in themselves, but there was a need for a work that attempted to encompass all forms of influence.

As mentioned on p. 169, I purposely refrain from assessing whether the structures I discuss are sufficiently ingeburger to be regarded as correct Afrikaans by all native-speakers. My reason, apart from not being in a position to make such an assessment because I am a non-native-speaker, is also due to the lack of unanimity that I am sure one would be confronted with if one were to attempt to ascertain what is generally recognised as correct. Nevertheless, it could be useful if another scholar were to take my corpus, expand it if necessary, and devise a means of soliciting the reactions of a broad spectrum of native-speakers to these phenomena, thereby providing the Taalkommissie, for example, with empirical data upon which to base future prescriptions.

A matter which I have only briefly dealt with but which could provoke the curiosity of some scholars, is a diachronic study of some of the linguistic constructions I have observed. Clearly there would be quite substantial practical problems in adopting a diachronic approach to anglicisms, but it was obvious from the reading I did that many of them have been in the language for a long time, while others have since passed into oblivion. Such a study would add a further valuable perspective to my work.

It is hinted at by Le Roux (1952: 34, 37) that there is possibly even a regional perspective to the topic; Du Plessis’ (1983) study of Johannesburgse omgangstaal is an initial step in that direction. There is possibly
room for more such regional studies as well as for studies that look at the topic from a social and/or racial point of view.

It would also be possible to combine the historical and geographical perspectives and look, for example, at whether English had made greater inroads in the nineteenth century into the Afrikaans of the Cape Colony than into that of the Boer republics. One expects that that was quite possibly the case, but there is as yet no study that attempts to prove or disprove this tenet.

One could look too at the success or otherwise of puristic drives in certain professions. Certain *vaktaalwoordeboeke* have now been in existence for a considerable length of time, but to what extent have their recommendations been adopted by the people in those fields?

A systematic study of *HAT*'s attitude to recognised anglicisms - and eventually of *WAT*'s attitude too - could be beneficial to the consistency of future editions of that dictionary. Or the attitude to specific anglicisms in Bosman, Van der Merwe and Hiemstra's *Tweetalige Woordeboek* (1984), widely consulted by many Afrikaners instead of *HAT* for information on Afrikaans unconnected with its English equivalents, could be compared with that of *HAT* to highlight the ambivalence and inconsistency that exist with regard to many common anglicisms in the language. It is to be expected that the first volumes of *WAT* will be totally outdated in the course of time - if they are not already - with respect to anglicisms which were not recognised in the 1950's and 1960's but which Afrikaners have now accepted and in some cases have even lost all awareness that those structures were once considered anglicisms and thus unacceptable.

Rousseau's (1937) sub-chapter on *basterwoorde* (p. 110-72) is so good and basically of such lasting validity that it deserves updating and rewriting in modern phraseology with the necessary adaptions in the light of modern knowledge and the situation as it is now. (cf. p. 101)

The topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans is in fact open-ended because of the extent of the influence to date, but above all because it is an ongoing process. The subject is a controversial one but is also one of vital importance to South African society. Undoubtedly this work will not be the last word on the issue and hopefully it will provoke reactions and more importantly, further research.
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