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 dokumenteerder* 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.[1] 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 Taaleigen* 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 zuiweren, 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)[2] 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 òf ook in Nederlands algemeen bekend zijn, òf 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 byeenbrenging 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 bladsye geld ook al wat hy van dr. Changuion se *Proeve* sê, nl. dat sommige woorde en uitdruk-

> kinge volstrek onbekend is, 'althans (onder) 't tegenwoordige geslacht'."

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 dikwijls, al of niet geradbraakt, in 't dagelijksch 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 *oa* 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 die 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 0. van Oostrum and P. Heslinga's *Taalgoggas in die daelikse lewe* (1937)[3]

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 suiwerheid 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 lesers* 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 heeltemal 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 wegkry 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 suiwer 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 Kerkstraat*, 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 *beteken*, 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. daaraan of ons eers moet probeer om die woorde flat, lunch en taxi teë te werk..." Such observations from the past are very interesting in the light of later developments.

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 Hoofkantoor*, 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 Hoofkantoor 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-onderwysers 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 werklik '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:

> "Bestaan 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 klanke 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*)[7] 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, wedding* 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 leenwoorde enersyds en basters en -ismes 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 suiwer eie-simbool 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*[8] (Nedl. proomienent – klanke), en *authoriteit* (Nedl. autoriteit – spelling). (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. *diskusseer, denominasioneel.*" (p.23)

Most Afrikaners are totally unaware of the role English influence is playing in such words, but this is explained bv 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)

[8] Much has been written on the pronunciation of such words since Rousseau, and the current feeling is that English has at most only played a contributing role in the issue. (cf. 7.18.3)

The author divides "Ismes" (p.23) into "woord-" (e.g. *eksamenpapier*) and "beeld-ismes" (e.g. *loodneuskoeël*). He also makes a distinction between what he terms "herhaalde ismes" (e.g. *maak* as in *maak'n lewe/applikasie/geld; lyn* as in *in my lyn, langs hierdie lyne, lyne 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 English-men or English speaking Afrikaners? He concludes that it is difficult to assess but admits that "Hoe meer 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* suiwer in Nedl., maar –ismes in Afr." (p.26) Here Rousseau competely 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.[9] I do agree, however, with the following sentiment expressed by Rousseau:

> "Tog is die 17e eeuse Nedl. by ons taalgeleerdes 'n kwaal geword: sodra 'n taaleenheid wat in Afr. gebruik word in die een of ander geskriffie van voor circa 1650 aangetref word, is dit 'n bewys dat dié taaleenheid in Afr. suiwere erfgoed is." (p.26)

This is a "kwaal" which still exists. He makes a similar point in the sub-section on the role of Dutch dialects:

> "Om 'n verdagte Afr. taaleenheid 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 vormveranderings" (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 omstandigheid dat iemand g'n Eng. ken nie, is dan ook g'n 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"[10] 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 interessant om hier op te merk dat, hoe jonger die saak, hoe minder Eng. dit word, bv. *alleenvlug* (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 vermom 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 klanke van die basterwoorde gelewer. Dit blyk des te opvallender as ons eers nagaan hoe min invloed by die Germaanse 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 suiwer 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, allersuiwerste 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 defintion 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 voorbeeld." (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 bewyse vir 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:

> "Leen- en Basterwoorde uit Engels" (chapter V), "Barbarismes uit Engels" (chapter VI), "Spreekwoordelike Gesegdes, Sinswendinge, Aparte Woorde, Voorsetsels, Voornaamwoorde" (chapter VII), "Funksieverandering, Samestellinge, Woordorde, Uitspraak" (chapter VIII).

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 vergeetboek 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 hê 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 gebruike '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, suiwer taalvorme wat ons bepleit, is 'n persoonlike saak. Ons wil die vrye ontwikkeling van Afrikaans allermins strem 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);[15]
> "**Dryf, Drywer** – Daar is nou deur die spoorweg erkenning verleen 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)[16]

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

> (gestort), ens.'" (p.48); **Afsny** – Meermale hoor ons die bewering dat *afsny* in verband met 'n telefoongesprek 'n Anglisisme is. Dit kan egter nie geregverdig word nie, ook nie volgens die voorbeelde onder *afsny* in WAT nie." (p.12)

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 woord *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 perdekar oor te dra op 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.

3.3.5 H.J.J.M. van der Merwe and F.A. Ponelis' *Die korrekte woord – Afrikaanse taalkwessies* (1967, 1981, 1982)

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

exclusively the work of Van der Merwe and consisted of "taalkwessies wat die nie-vakman elke dag teenkom en waaroor hy nie altyd duidelikheid het nie", among others "of hierdie of daardie uitdrukking nie 'n Anglisisme is nie." (Preface to the first edition) If the number of editions is anything to go by, the book was a great success and was expanded in each successive edition. In the preface to the third edition the author specifically mentions "...veral is die uitbreiding toe te skryf aan die opneem van honderde Anglisismes wat daagliks voorkom." In the fifth edition he adds "Na verdere navorsing en heroorweging is my bevinding ten opsigte van korrektheid of Anglisismes al dan nie in 'n hele aantal gevalle nou anders as vroeër." The latest edition, which appeared some time after Van der Merwe's death, was edited by Ponelis although, he admits, his contribution is a modest one. A book which has undergone as many reprints as this cannot be omitted from a discussion on the main works on anglicisms, although it does not deal exclusively with anglicisms by any means. The fact that it was considered worth-while reprinting in the 1980's must indicate that it has fulfilled a useful function. It is the sixth and most recent edition which is discussed here.

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 verrykend 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 suiwer Afrikaans die mooiste [followed by examples].

He concludes the commentary under that lemma with:

> "'n Lelike Anglisisme 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 to bly weer 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 voorbeelde [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 ontlening". 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. *mud-slinging*, 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, bottelstoor, 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

3.4.1 *Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse taal* (Vol. 1 – 1950, vol. 2 – 1955, vol. 3 – 1957, vol. 4 – 1961, vol. 5 – 1968, vol. 6 – 1976, vol. 7 – 1984: complete to Kor)

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:

> "Met die opneem van vreemde woorde was die Redaksie vrygewig... Oordrewe purisme pas nie in 'n woordeboek nie, want dit is meestal juis die vreemde woorde wat nageslaan word. Tog kan ons vreemde inkruipsels wat onwenslik is, duidelik aanwys en telkens die suiwer Afrikaanse woord of uitdrukking gee." (p.iii)

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 uitdrukkings wat reeds as heeltemal ingeburger of onvervangbaar beskou kan word, is opgeneem. Hierdie vreemde inkruipsels is egter tot 'n minimum beperk en af en toe is deur middel van 'n opmerking die aandag op foutiewe gebruik gevestig of 'n suiwer Afrikaanse idioom in die plek van 'n gebruiklike 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 *ingeburger*, for example: *brekfis, dip, drywer, grein.*[17] *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.

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 bossies 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 gebruike egter nie erken nie."

On occasions *WAT* acknowledges English origin, whereas *HAT* gives the word without further comment, for example: *halfhartig* 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

"anglisisme". 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)[18]

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 he 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 voorskrywende rigting (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.

> "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 Innovasie wat 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 gebruikers 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.).[19] 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*,[20] *spore maak* (= to make tracks, be gone), *sypaadjie*,[21] *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** – Opm. *Uitvang* in die bet. "betrap" is Anglisisties[22]; **vloer** Opm. Die gebruik van *vloer* in die betekenis "verdieping" is 'n Anglisisme; **agter** – Opm. *Agter die kinders kyk* moet in goeie Afrikaans wees *na die kinders kyk, die kinders versorg, oppas;* **braaf** – Opm. *Braaf* het nie in Afr. die betekenis van "dapper" nie; **raar** – Opm. *Raar* beteken nie "seldsaam" in Afrikaans nie; **swang** – Opm. Die fabriek is *in volle gang* – nie *swang* nie.[23]

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.

[21] T.H. le Roux (1968:162) discusses *sypaadjie* at length.

[22] It is interesting to note that *HAT* spells *Anglisisties* here with a capital letter, whereas the abbreviation *angl.* 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: *op/aan 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

> censorship' noem, weerspreek die gedagte van 'n objektiewe, suiwer, deskriptiewe woordeboek."

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 Woordeboek 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 woordeboek 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*.