

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.¹ 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 *onbeschaafd*. 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 *standaard* 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

wat om een of ander rede as die toonaangewende 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 toegeken het..."

Due to the lack of true dialect variation in South Africa as yet,² 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.³

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."

te word. Dit is die Afrikaans wat aan geïnstitusionele instellings gekoppel word – die Afrikaans wat in die Kerk en Skool gehoor behoort te word, van verhoë af, in Staatsdienskantore, in Kultuurliggame, ens. Dit is ook die Afrikaans wat in goedversorgde koerante behoort te staan, en in die meeste van die boeke wat Afrikaanslesers toegelaat word om te lees."

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 waarsku teen die wanbegrip dat daar net een standaardtaal is, 'n standaardtaal wat geen afwykings of wissel-vorme 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.⁴ 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

⁴ De Klerk (1968:221) does point out the explicit connection between *onbeskaafd* and English influence and describes an interesting contrast between the attitude of city dwellers and that of country folk: "Omdat Afrikaans-Engelse kontak hoofsaaklik in die stede voorkom, korreleer die oordeel beskaafd-onbeskaafd in hierdie verband met gebruiklike vorme onder die minder ontwikkelde stedeling. Hierdie toestand vorm 'n visieuse sirkel op die platteland: omdat taalkontak minder voorkom, het daar nie so 'n sterk afkeuring teen taalvermenging ontstaan nie; dus ook nie teen die vorme wat wel voorkom nie. Engelse leenwoorde is hier ook dikwels getransfonemiseer."

example. Presumably all authors are referring to the same concept, the more modern *toonaangewende* now 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 suiwer Afrikaans?* and offered the following answer:

"As u daaraan twyfel of 'n bepaalde uitdrukking suiwer 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 om aan die algemene publiek te stel. Gaan na die platteland, sal 'n ander sê, daar sal u die suiwerste Afrikaans hoor [maar] Engelse vakterme 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 algemeenheid 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 Anglicismes [sal] deur 'n groter groep sprekers as sodanig erken en herken word en sommige Anglicismes [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 gebruik word deur ál die mense wat 'Afrikaans' praat. Soos die mense praat, so ís 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 nõg dient rekening te worden gehouden met het feit, dat bij de levende taal van het oogenblik 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

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 beschaafden alleen mogelijk is, wanneer men haar voortdurend beschouwt tegen de achtergrond van de taal der niet-beschaafden (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 doctrinaire 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 Beschaafd'?" (p.13)

In making these comments, Kloeke 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 gewigtige vraag te staan of ons dit moet aanneem 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 taalgees..." (p.17)

And indeed that is what the speech community has since done in this case, vague ideals such as the *Nederlands-Afrikaanse taalgees* 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 mengeltaal 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 grammatikaboeke, woordeboeke 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 toonevende geleerden of dichters ingevoerd, tot op onze tijd in gebruik bleven." (De Vooys 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 terminologiese 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 termvoorskrifte. Hierteenoor sal termnormering juis

maklik plaasvind in die meer gereglementeerde samelewings van die Duitssprekende lande. Die terminoloog moet onthou dat Suid-Afrika uit verskillende kultuurgroepe 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 *ingeburgerd*, 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; inteeendeel, 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:

"Baie Engelse beelde [vul] geen leemte aan nie. Hulle word eenvoudig deur die bekendheid met Engels naas die ou Afrikaans gebruik en dreig om die laaste mettertyd te verdring." (Le Roux 1952:38)

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 variants 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 eradicating 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 verstandelike 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.⁵ This interpretation of the concepts of *botsing* and *in stryd met die taaleie* is totally separate from that of *verdringing*.⁶ 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 Basson i.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,⁷ normalising institutions such as education, academics, prescriptive works etc.⁸ 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."

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 taalgemeenskap 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 klankverandering, 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 onstabiel en persoonal omdat dit van persoon tot persoon en van geleentheid tot geleentheid by dieselfde persoon wissel. Egte versteuring kom juis 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 *beïnvloeding* 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."⁹

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)

"Ewe min as wat een taal as norm vir 'n ander kan dien [e.g. Dutch for Afrikaans], kan die skryftaal aan die gesproke taal voorskryf; die norm van die skryftaal is 'n foutiewe norm... die spreektaal is tog steeds die oorspronklike vorm en die geskrewe taal 'n ontoereikende en onnoukeurige weergawe van die spreektaal..." (Odendal 1973:72)

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 uitvindings 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.¹¹ 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.¹² 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:

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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.

"Wie hom die moeite sou wil getroos om op elk van die terreine deur my aangedui, die Anglicismes 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 strengel soos slingerplante in 'n bos, 'n omarming wat terselfdertyd 'n stryd om die bestaan beteken; tussenin is daar baie dooie 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 dikwels presies dieselfde ontleninge 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 Anglicismes 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, grammofoon, 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."