

Dutch and Afrikaans as post-pluricentric languages

BERTUS VAN ROOY and RIAS VAN DEN DOEL

Abstract

The relationship between Afrikaans and Dutch cannot be captured adequately by the construct of pluricentrism. However, to deny a connection of a similar kind would leave aspects of the historical and current relationship unaccounted for. In comparison to typical pluricentric relations, such as those between metropolitan and postcolonial Englishes, Afrikaans shows more differences from Dutch. This is because there were more non-native speakers contributing directly to the formation of the language, and contact between the colony and metropolis was less extensive, being eventually completely severed with the imposition of British rule on the Cape colony. It took longer for a colonial dialect to stabilise, by which time the Dutch normative reference point was removed. When Afrikaans gained linguistic independence in the early 20th century, a nationalistic agenda also militated against substantial reliance on Dutch as a reference point. However, after linguistic independence, a post-pluricentric relationship emerged, where a new appreciation for Dutch as the source of spelling and vocabulary norms assisted the standardization of Afrikaans. Furthermore, externally reciprocal relations still continue to appear in domains such as literature, and even marketing, signalling an underlying symbolic value. At present, signs of renewed approaches are emerging, although these are unlikely to influence language-internal development.

Keywords: Afrikaans; Dutch; pluricentric; post-pluricentric.

1. Introduction

There is an increasing awareness, both in the academic community and elsewhere, that languages of wider communication such as English, Spanish, German and Portuguese are pluricentric in that they are subject to different sets of

local norms for oral and written production in the various countries in which they are spoken. This is equally apparent from the ability of Dutch schoolchildren to tell the difference between British and American English (Van der Haagen 1998) as it is from the option enjoyed by users of computers and mobile phones to adjust their language settings to different varieties of the same language (e.g. Brazilian and European Portuguese), or from academic publications (Clyne 1992a, 1992b; Clyne and Kipp 1999) and conferences on the subject of pluricentric languages.

One of the most typical pluricentric relationships is between metropolitan languages and their “daughters”, such as English in Britain and in the former colonies, e.g. Australia, New Zealand and Canada, but also Nigeria and India. The model of pluricentricity has also been invoked for a considerable number of other, less widely used, languages (including Swedish, Korean and Armenian), and it has even been proposed that the relationship between separate languages such as Urdu and Hindi, or Serbian and Croatian, can be discussed within this framework, especially if issues such as relative mutual intelligibility, contact and divergence are addressed (cf. Brozović 1992; Clyne 1992a; Dua 1992). This raises the question of whether such closely related but independent languages as Dutch and Afrikaans may also be analyzed using the same pluricentric framework as that proposed for English, Hindi/Urdu, or other languages.

It may be argued, for instance, that before the recognition of Afrikaans as official language in South Africa in 1925, Dutch and Afrikaans were engaged in what may be described as a kind of pluricentric relationship, but that after the “declaration of independence” of Afrikaans, as Geerts (1992: 72) puts it, this term ceased to have any relevance for the relationship between the two languages. While Dutch continued to be a pluricentric language, with potentially separate normative centers in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Surinam (cf. Geerts 1992; Willemyns 2003), its pluricentric connection with Afrikaans was completely severed. However, it could reasonably be objected that such a position does not do full justice either to the pre-1925 relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans, or to the sometimes tenuous but nevertheless enduring connection between them after 1925.

A number of remnants of a relationship between the two languages remain, which are left unaccounted for without a unifying framework. Apart from a scholarly tradition of studying Dutch language and literature within Afrikaans departments in South Africa, there are other matters which raise questions about the nature of the relationship between Afrikaans and Dutch. These would include the explosion of Afrikaans in Dutch advertising during the 2010 Soccer World Cup, and the participation of the South African government and representatives of Afrikaans language organizations at the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of the Dutch Language. There is an underlying relationship

that surfaces in the invocation of kinship to Dutch when claims are made for the international role of Afrikaans.

If one considers such factors as settlement history, political developments, language policy and codification, and perceptions of linguistic difference, it is more accurate to contend that while the relationship has never actually been fully pluricentric, at various stages it has phased in and out of what might be termed “proto-pluricentric”, “potentially pluricentric”, and at present, “post-pluricentric”. Admittedly, it may be somewhat paradoxical to posit a post-pluricentric relationship for languages that have never been pluricentric, either fully or in part, in the first place. Nevertheless, if one is prepared to concede that the prefix “post” may be used more loosely than merely in the narrow sense of consecutive events — the term “postmodern”, for instance, does not necessarily imply a logical progression from modernity or Modernism (Bertens 1995) — it may be possible to accept that, even though Dutch and Afrikaans never quite achieved the pluricentric stage of interaction between largely independent centers, their subsequent relationship does make it look as if this stage has in fact been completed — or has only narrowly been missed. At the very least, the lingering relations between the two languages continue to testify to a much closer relationship between the two than between, for instance Dutch and German — two independent but historically related West Germanic languages.

An analysis of the potentially pluricentric relations between Dutch and Afrikaans must therefore take into account the question to what extent separate normative centers existed for these languages before they diverged into separate, independent entities. It must focus on the emergence of any linguistic norms for the Dutch transplanted to South Africa — from the early Dutch settlement period up until the declaration of Afrikaans independence. This analysis of the transformation of Dutch into Afrikaans may be compared and contrasted with the ways in which normative centers emerged within other pluricentric languages, such as the gradual development of a separate American acrolectal variety of English as distinct from that of its European (British) counterpart.

While such a comparison will show that the pluricentricity of British and American English was never achieved for the European and African varieties of Dutch, this does not in any way remove the possibility of continuing interaction between Dutch and Afrikaans in the form of what we term a post-pluricentric relationship. A brief survey of this interaction from 1925 up until the present day will demonstrate how, despite mounting cultural and linguistic differences, appeals continue to be made to a once shared but increasingly elusive common stock or heritage, alternating with tellingly overstated disavowals of such a connection. Evidence for such a post-pluricentric connection may be found both in language-internal issues (such as spelling and vocabulary) and language-external issues (literature, commerce).

2. World Englishes and “*Wereldnederlands*”

Very little recent work has been done on any classification of the relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans as part of a larger superstructure — beyond the obvious claim of familial relations. An example of the latter is De Vooy’s (1970) claim that the relationship between the two languages is no longer that of mother and daughter, but that Afrikaans, on reaching maturity, has become a “sister language” (1970: 224).

The relationship between Afrikaans and Dutch has mainly been studied in terms of the two competing accounts of the development of Afrikaans. Members of the Afrikaans philological school such as Conradie (1986), Ponelis (1993) and Raidt (1991) emphasize the continuity of the development of Afrikaans from its roots in 17th century Dutch dialects, with various degrees of additional emphasis on the contribution of language contact with other languages. By contrast, an alternative account is advanced by other scholars (e.g. Deumert 2004; Roberge 2002, 2003), which emphasizes a more significant role for the contact situation, yielding a much more elaborate creole continuum, with gradual convergence between the acrolectal and more vernacular forms. In both these accounts, however, Dutch ceases to be a significant reference point after the official recognition of Afrikaans as a language in South Africa in 1925.

Concepts such as pluricentricity are not commonly applied to Dutch and Afrikaans, although there is at least one study that has employed the term “*Wereldnederlands*” [World Dutch] in an attempt to chart linguistic diversity in Dutch (Van der Sijs 2005), and which includes a chapter on Afrikaans (Ponelis 2005). Admittedly, there have been proposals to reclassify Afrikaans as a dialect of Dutch (notably Van Eeden 1998), but it would be difficult to reconcile such a position with any conception of Afrikaans and Dutch as largely independent centers of linguistic interaction.

The situation for other pluricentric languages, such as English, is quite different. In recent years, a great deal of work has been done on the issue of national and local varieties of English, and the pluricentric nature of the English language has been convincingly captured in taxonomies of linguistic diversity such as Kachru’s (1986) *World Englishes* model and Schneider’s (2007) *Dynamic Model*. Identity formation is important to both. For Schneider (2007), identity rewriting is central to the linguistic independence of a postcolonial daughter variety, in the sense that the local speech community has to distance itself from the (usually British) exonormative orientation, and at the same time convergence between Settlers and Indigenous people has to take place in the postcolonial society. Schneider (2007) applies his model to an analysis of the divergence between British and American English, the latter having evolved as a result of passing through all five stages of the developmental cycle of Post-

colonial Englishes. Already at Stage 4, which Schneider calls *Endonormative Stabilization*, two varieties of a language develop separate normative centers. What this means, in practical terms, for American English is that pluricentricism is regulated by the interaction of two opposing forces — not only should English still be sufficiently similar to British English to ensure that mutual exchange can take place in what is perceived to be the same language, but speakers of the “new” variety will also need to assert their linguistic independence, express this in a preference for local norms and practices, and take steps to codify and/or regulate these (cf. Schneider 2007: 282–291).

If there are enough parallels between British and American English on the one hand, and Dutch and Afrikaans on the other, it may be justified to invoke the concept of “World Dutches” (or “*Wereldnederlands*”) as a pluricentric language. With such an argument comes an extensive theory that gives structure to the possible understanding of the relationship between the two languages, and which has been developed in considerable detail for World Englishes. Needless to say, this is not in any way related to the contentious “*Groot-Nederlands*” or “Greater Netherlandic” ideology, which has for some become increasingly concerned with the political integration of Flanders and the Netherlands. Note that in its earlier incarnations, the concept “*Groot Nederlands*” was apparently also used in South Africa to denote the inclusion of Afrikaans speakers in some sort of spiritual affinity between speakers of different varieties of Dutch (e.g. Louw [1958], as quoted in Schutte 1984). The Afrikaans struggle for linguistic independence will be considered in the next section, when it will become clear that in the final stage before linguistic independence (the potentially pluricentric phase), Dutch was regarded as the foreign other, and affinities were disavowed. However, once Afrikaans became secure in its own right, renewed spiritual affinities were affirmed, especially in literature, as shown by Wessels (1999: 358–359).

3. European and African Dutch pre-1925: a potentially pluricentric relationship

The analysis proposed in this article contends that the relationship between British and American English is no longer comparable to that of Dutch and Afrikaans. There are a number of crucial differences between the colonial development of Dutch into Afrikaans as compared with the development of American English, since the latter does not depart nearly as much from its parent variety. The development of Cape Dutch in the 18th century was characterized by a different ratio of slave and free populations from that in America, with much more isolation and less contact with metropolitan Dutch speakers (Roberge 2003: 23), during a period — which might be termed the “proto-

pluricentric” phase — corresponding to Phases 2 and 3 of Schneider’s Dynamic model. Furthermore, it took much longer for any kind of stabilization to emerge in Cape-Dutch/Afrikaans, because of the continued influx of new slaves, reaching the period of highest level of importation more than a century after the colony was founded. The situation was further complicated by the very extensive geographical dispersion of a small population over a very large area (Roberge 2002: 95–96, 2003: 18). This is likely to have created greater linguistic distance between Dutch and Afrikaans than that between British and American English. More crucially, in the 19th century, when Schneider’s Phase 4 would have been expected, Dutch was removed from South African society by the imposition of English early in the century. When the standardization processes resurface towards the end of the 19th century, the language and the political dynamics had changed so much that a new language was standardized, rather than a new variety of Dutch.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the potential for a closer, if pluricentric, relationship was still there. In the middle of the century, a Dutch schoolmaster, Changuion, published his *Nederduitse Taal in Zuid-Afrika Hersteld* [The Dutch language in South Africa restored] (1844). He included an appendix that noted aspects of the peculiar lexicon, titled “Proeve van Kaapsch Taaleigen” [A sample of local Cape usage], in which he placed these innovations on the same level as regionalisms in the Netherlands (Changuion 1844: iii–vi). Likewise, Deumert (2004) shows that Dutch variants persisted in written Afrikaans in the period 1880–1920, if with declining frequency. The movement to simplify Cape Dutch spelling in the early years of the twentieth century, which even involved sending a representative, W. J. Viljoen, to the Netherlands in 1903 to consult with authorities there and obtain approval (Scholtz 1980: 15), also emphasizes the potential of a pluricentric relationship between the two languages right up to the turning point (ca. 1914–1927; see G. S. Nienaber 1959: 56).

Theoretically, even the new Afrikaans language could have been a candidate for a pluricentric relationship with Dutch. This possibility was perhaps still alive in the work of Hesseling (1899), the Dutch linguist whose work on the development of Afrikaans already acknowledged the name of the new language, and who defended the view that Afrikaans had not developed spontaneously from seventeenth-century Dutch. Nevertheless, the subtitle of the book read *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der nederlandsche taal in Zuid-Afrika* [Contribution to the history of the Dutch language in South Africa], and at various stages he still emphasized the bond between the mother language and its daughter. For instance, in his conclusion, he expressed the hope that the language of his tribesmen in South Africa, rather than the English of the Imperial representatives such as Rhodes and Jameson, would gain in status and power — a political rather than linguistic statement (Hesseling 1899: 156).

In reality, however, at this stage the distance from Dutch, rather than its connection to it, was increasingly being viewed as one of the defining characteristics of the new language. For example, Preller, a well-known proponent of an independent Afrikaans language, claimed in 1905 that the local Dutch-influenced acrolect was too “stiff, pretentious and cold” for the people of South Africa, and that modern European Dutch, “with its search for depth, for the analytical study of character, for a finely differentiated psychological unravelling of human propensities, in close connection with the environment and social concerns — is quite beyond us. Our country is too enormous for this, our mountains too high, our highlands too immense, and we ourselves too different” (as quoted in Pienaar [1919: 21];¹ our translation). In the struggle against English, and in order to ensure mass participation rather than an elite argument, Afrikaans carried more weight and became the rallying point for linguistic nationalism. Because of the perceived difficulty that Dutch posed, it was no longer able to serve as a vehicle of identity and a reference point for political mobilization (Botha 1926: 26; G. S. Nienaber 1959: 52; Steyn 1980: 182–186).

As Stell has argued (2005: 115), it is with this kind of nationalist rhetoric that language planners in particular tried to present Dutch as a fundamentally alien language, and thus to convince Afrikaans speakers that they had a language of their own. Whether or not the people needed convincing, the fact remains that in 1925, when Afrikaans was recognized officially as language by the South African parliament, this was clearly done with a view to asserting maximum linguistic independence from Dutch. According to Schutte (1984: 245), this was even accompanied by the burning of Dutch books — not the ideal start for a pluricentric relationship between interacting centers. If it is accurate to refer to the period leading up to 1925 as “potentially pluricentric”, then from 1925 onwards we could argue that Dutch and Afrikaans entered what may be termed a “post-pluricentric” relationship.

To explain why Afrikaans diverged much more from Dutch than American English has departed from its founder varieties, the different roles of slaves in the two countries cannot be overestimated. In South Africa, slaves were important from early in the history of the colony, and exceeded the European population within 10 years. The ratio of slaves to Europeans was much higher than in the American South, but at the same time never reached the proportion of the plantation colonies of the Caribbean where prototypical creoles developed (Roberge 2009: 213). In addition, apart from one slave quarter in Cape Town, most slaves lived as members of the families, so much so that in a very quaint history of South Africa, written in Afrikaans in 1877, the authors lament the poor treatment of the slaves by the British in the early 19th century, after the Dutch colonists had treated them so well in the 18th century (Genootschap van Regte Afrikaners [1877]). Contact between colonists, slaves and the local Khoi

population was extensive, and some degree of realization was thus much more important in the development of Afrikaans than American English, as daily interaction took place between a range of speakers of Dutch, from pidgin forms to acrolectal forms, gradually converging by the 19th century at the latest (Roberge 2002). From this point of view, it would perhaps be more appropriate to compare the relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans to that between British and African American Vernacular English.

In addition, various sources remark on the absence of normative pressures of language purists outside the Cape Town area, due to the extreme distances and large, isolated farms (e.g. Raidt 1991: 200, 238). Population migrations, such as those by the Griqua and the Voortrekkers, increased the distance from any normative centers even more. One contemporary wrote (in about 1838) about the early Voortrekkers that “[i]n most of their houses you will find a Bible. . . . But this good book is, with a few exceptions, little read and less understood. . . .” (Lindley in Hexham and Poewe [1997: 123]). With no strong system of education, some effort was expended to maintain basic literacy and numeracy, but the spoken vernacular was more or less left to develop on its own, independent of normative pressures from Dutch-language education or conservative segments of society.

At this point, however, a type of colonial Dutch might still have been a contender for standardization and decreolization. Had it been standardized by the end of the 18th century, when all its speakers still thought of themselves as speakers of (Cape) Dutch, it could have gone through what Schneider postulates as Event X, entering Phase 4 of his Dynamic model, and becoming a pluricentric variant of extra-territorial Dutch. However, history had a surprisingly different scenario for Cape Dutch. Event X was not independence and nation-building by the multicultural Cape Dutch society, but the imposition of rule by a new political master, the British. Where Schneider (2007) characterizes Event X as quasi-catastrophic in his Dynamic Model, it was certainly fully catastrophic for the Cape Dutch community in that it disrupted, rather than triggered, the development of a sense of nationhood.

In 1806, the Cape Colony was seized by the British, and from 1822, Cape Dutch was no longer an official language in the Cape Colony. Instead, a very aggressive Anglicization policy was adopted by the Colonial British government, such that the schools that were available had to teach in English (Steyn 1980: 124–131). Consequently, the more well-to-do segments of the society acquired literacy in English, and Cape Dutch was used mainly as home language, or low variety. Thus, the presence of English, combined with very low literacy levels (Roberge 2003: 17), all but removed the normative influences of Dutch on the development of Afrikaans. At the same time, the kind of identity construction that triggers the adoption of an endonormative variety of the colonial language was postponed to the end of the nineteenth century, leaving

indigenization and continued divergence to operate on the language in an unchecked fashion.

In the Cape Colony, the tide began to turn against English only from the 1860s, taking the form of a reaction against the British government. This also awoke a stronger feeling of kinship with the inhabitants of the two Voortrekker Republics in the north (Conradie 1986: 102; Roberge 2003: 24–25). Two simultaneous language movements arose, one promoting the expansion of the public functions of Dutch, and the other promoting Afrikaans. Initially, the Dutch language movement was successful, and received qualified support from members of the Afrikaans language movement, who hoped that the gains for Dutch would also later be inherited by Afrikaans (Uys 1983: 165).

Botha (1926: 26) quite explicitly points out that the attempts to resuscitate Dutch were doomed to failure, precisely because it tried to set up the Dutch language as an alternative to English. On the other hand, the Afrikaans movement eventually succeeded because of its overt nationalistic agenda — it persuaded an increasing number of white Afrikaans speakers that they were being oppressed by the English. The Afrikaans language became the rallying point, which was used to mobilize political resistance to the English administration (see also P. J. Nienaber 1959; Steyn 1980; Conradie 1986; Raidt 1991). This was a function that Dutch was incapable of performing.

By the end of the 19th century, the covert prestige of Afrikaans had increased among the less educated. Among educated segments of population, variability in written forms persisted, although quite a few speakers still wrote in something quite close to Dutch norms (Deumert 2004). Van Rijn (1914: 12), a Dutch immigrant to the Cape and a language teacher, claimed that an acrolectal version of Dutch, entitled “*Burger-Hollands*”, was in existence in the Cape Province, which distinguished itself from “*Boere-Hollands*” (i.e. Afrikaans) by its “rich vocabulary, pure pronunciation and having more inflexions” (Van Rijn 1914: 12–13;² our translation). In a footnote later in the same paragraph, he also notes that an English-speaking, female reporter wanted him to teach her Afrikaans, since, as she claimed, “*Hoog-Hollands*” [High Dutch] is not spoken or understood by anyone anymore. After making good progress, she went to Stellenbosch on an assignment and returned to her teacher Van Rijn with the charge that he taught her something that was a source of ridicule in Stellenbosch, where she was told that a lady did not talk that way (Van Rijn 1914: 13, note 1).

At this potentially pluricentric stage, the conflict was resolved in the first quarter of the 20th century, in favor of Afrikaans. Anti-English sentiment was a strong motivating factor, alongside community solidarity within the white population (Roberge 2003: 23–24). Other factors were the numerical strength of Afrikaans and the perception of Dutch and English as mechanisms of exclusion. When attempts were made in the 1900s to use a form of acrolectal Dutch as the new standard, these did not survive. A lower lect, midway between

acrolectal Cape Dutch and racially marked Colored Afrikaans won the fight for ascendancy. By the time the battle was being fought, it was probably too late for a pluricentric solution, such as in America, to be implemented.

4. Dutch and Afrikaans: a post-pluricentric relationship?

The replacement of Dutch by Afrikaans set in motion a process of standardization that led to what may be termed a post-pluricentric relationship with Dutch. Beyond the obvious assumption of mutual intelligibility, a pluricentric relationship is characterized by continuity in vocabulary, dictionaries, and norms for spelling but has different identity positions, where a (small) number of differences become vested with social meaning. In a post-pluricentric relationship, mutual intelligibility is not essential anymore, although it need not disappear. One crucial feature, however, is that while speakers may well perceive mounting cultural and linguistic differences between the varieties or languages in question, at the same time there are continual attempts to invoke a connection between them, however elusive. Even overstated disavowals of such a connection may be seen as fundamentally reinforcing the notion that the connection has not totally been severed. It should be possible to find evidence of a post-pluricentric connection either in issues such as spelling and vocabulary (which are language-internal) or in domains such as commerce or literature (which could be seen as language-external).

Spelling is a case in point. The first proposals for the spelling of Afrikaans in the period 1870–1900 had radically emphasized the differences from Dutch. But once Afrikaans was officially recognized, spelling norms were revised to return to a state much closer to the Dutch tradition, e.g. by resuscitating the contrast between ⟨v⟩/⟨f⟩ and ⟨ei⟩/⟨y⟩ on historical (i.e. Dutch) grounds, even though no traces of the corresponding phoneme oppositions remain in Afrikaans pronunciation (Uys 1983: 222–230). The Dutch language remained the official yardstick of comparison in the *Afrikaanse Woordelys and Spelreëls* (AWS) [Afrikaans word list and spelling rules] throughout the 20th century. Only with its 8th edition in 1991 was the third principle of Afrikaans spelling changed from “taking into consideration the norms of Standard Dutch (ABN)” to “remaining faithful to the established tradition of Afrikaans spelling” (Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns 1991: 11). It neglected to mention that up until that point, Dutch had been the foundation of this established tradition.

Dutch remained a useful source for vocabulary enrichment too. Once the independence of Afrikaans was recognized, and the chief culprit that undermined the “purity” of the language was identified as English, it became accept-

able to borrow and calque from Dutch to enrich the vocabulary of Standard Afrikaans for purposes of public use (or high functions). Language planners at the time officially encouraged borrowing from the common source of the Dutch language family (Uys 1983: 167–170). Scholtz (1951: 3) points out that early propagandists for Afrikaans simply claimed that Afrikaans vocabulary included the whole of the Dutch vocabulary. Uys (1983: 173–174) even refers to the head of the South African military language service, Professor Posthumus, who was sent to the Netherlands on a fact-finding mission after the second World War by the Minister of Defense, before he eventually produced the official Afrikaans military lexicon in 1954.

It is perhaps telling that some of the calques adopted into Afrikaans did not accurately reflect their meaning in modern Dutch. For instance, the Afrikaans word *lugwaardin* ('air hostess') contains the Dutch loan word *waardin*, the primary meaning of which in Dutch is not 'hostess' but 'medieval innkeeper's wife'. The willingness to adopt such terms, regardless of their present-day meaning in Dutch, testifies to the increasingly tenuous connections between the two languages. Interestingly, Afrikaans speakers will often use neologisms based on Dutch or Afrikaans words, e.g. for items associated with modern technology or a sport like cricket, where Dutch speakers would favor straightforward English loans (with mostly English spelling but Dutch pronunciation). Paradoxically, this has not only increased linguistic distance, occasionally presenting a challenge to mutual intelligibility, but it has also come to be identified as a key difference between Afrikaans and Dutch, at least in the eyes of many Dutch speakers. There are long lists of Afrikaans neologisms on the Internet, intended for the entertainment of Dutch speakers, even though these contain many inaccuracies and concocted terms. Recently, a food company advertising their ready-made version of a South African dish on Dutch television came to be criticized for using non-existent Afrikaans words to enliven the commercial in question. In a feature on Dutch television which dealt with this subject, interviewers asked random passers-by to make up their own Afrikaans neologisms, a request with which they — surprisingly enough — felt able to comply (Joerisioen 2007).

The production of fake Afrikaans words by Dutch speakers, or vice-versa, can be seen as a telltale sign that despite the linguistic and cultural divide, users of the two languages may feel that they have a certain degree of direct access to the other language. This is also evidenced by attempts by wine growers in South Africa to use fake Afrikaans/Dutch-type names for their wine labels when marketing the wines in the Netherlands.

Moving away from language-internal matters to the external, by way of illustration, the relationship of Afrikaans and Dutch can be examined in the areas of literature and marketing. The post-pluricentric relationship is clearly noticeable in the field of literature. Apart from Dutch literature still being

taught in Afrikaans departments at South African universities, the influence of Dutch literature on Afrikaans literature can be seen throughout the last century, and perhaps to a lesser extent a vestigial influence of Afrikaans on Dutch literature. As already noted, Wessels (1999) argues that the link to the “lost mother culture” of the Netherlands was reactivated after linguistic independence was secured for Afrikaans. Lindeberg (1987: 28–29) notes that poets from the 1920s, especially Celliers and Totius, relied heavily on Dutch models, to the extent that later editions of their poetry had to be modernized to undo the Dutch overlay. Totius retained these Dutch characteristics even in later life, rendering his style somewhat elevated (Lindeberg 1987: 33). The celebrated Afrikaans poets from the 1930s, notably N. P. van Wyk Louw, W. E. G. Louw and Elizabeth Eybers, were strongly influenced by the Dutch poets of the 1880s and the 1910s (Jonckheere 1988: 281, 315). In 1946–1947, the Dutch poet A. Roland Holst toured South Africa, and was responsible for N. P. van Wyk Louw receiving an honorary doctorate from Utrecht University in 1948. Roland Holst was also influenced extensively by his Afrikaans contemporaries (Jonckheere 1988: 316). Elizabeth Eybers emigrated to the Netherlands in 1961, and eventually received one of the highest Dutch literary prizes, the P. C. Hooft Prize, in 1991. The celebrated Dutch poet Lucebert, in turn, wrote a poem “Breyten Breytenbach mag de maan zien” [Breyten Breytenbach is allowed to see the moon], dedicated to the key poet of the Afrikaans literary revolution of the 1960s (Bisschoff 1988: 498).

Likewise, early Afrikaans prose fiction relied on late nineteenth century Dutch styles (Brink 1987: 90), while in the middle of the twentieth century the Afrikaans novelist H. S. van Blerk was closely linked to his Dutch contemporaries. A very telling example is the Dutch novelist J. Van Melle, who moved to South Africa and after his earlier debut in Dutch also started publishing in Afrikaans from 1933. His most famous work, *Bart Nel*, was first published in Dutch in 1936 and in revised form in Afrikaans in 1942 (Brink 1987: 109). In recent years, the Netherlands has continued to be an important point of reference for Afrikaans fiction, with the novel entitled *Dertig Nagte in Amsterdam* [Thirty nights in Amsterdam] by Etienne van Heerden winning the highest Afrikaans literary award, the Herzog Prize, in 2010. At the same time, South Africa continued to maintain a presence in Dutch literature, right through the twentieth century, serving in part as backdrop for reflections on Dutch self-perception (Jonckheere 1999: 212).

In the marketing strategy of sectors of the South African wine industry, however, Dutch plays a very different role: it symbolizes authenticity. In the Paarl Wine region, for instance, which markets itself with an English and a Dutch logo, at least 15 established wine farms have names of clear Dutch origin, as opposed to only two with obviously Afrikaans names. (The Stellenbosch region uses English and Afrikaans.) Six of these are names newly given to the

farms during the 20th and even early 21st century. These include two farms named after the new owners (De Reuck and De Leeuwenhof), one named after the region in Friesland from which a South African family hails (Veenwouden), one farm (Rhebokskloof) which resuscitated the 17th century name in 1986 and one farm, Oude Denneboom, which is a completely new creation from 1940, with a Dutch adjective but a noun which is both Dutch and Afrikaans.

Such iconic use of features of the other language was also apparent in some commercial activities deployed in the Netherlands to take advantage of the fact that the World Cup had been hosted by South Africa. Some of these were documented by the authors, using the linguistic landscaping approach as proposed in Landry and Bourhis (1997) and in Shohamy et al. (2010). Even though the products advertised had little or no connection with South Africa (e.g. cakes and biscuits with orange icing, an orange football mascot supporting the Dutch team, new potatoes with a BBQ dressing, and even a ferry trip to Newcastle), Afrikaans words and phrases were used to promote them, with varying degrees of accuracy (see Figures 1–3). The name of this football mascot, *beesie*, was intended as an Afrikaansification (if such a term exists) of the Dutch word for ‘little creature’; but in Afrikaans, *besie* (with one e) means ‘ladybird’. (The Afrikaans equivalent of Du. *beestje* would have been *gogga*.) The fact that such appeals can be made to Dutch consumers’ recognition and understanding of Afrikaans is, in our view, emblematic of the current post-pluricentric relationship.

An even more compelling indication of recognition of Afrikaans within the Dutch language family comes from the degree of participation of the South African government and representatives of the Afrikaans community, academia and language organizations at the seminar “Nederlands als wereldtaal” [Dutch as a world language] in Bruges in November 2010. This seminar, arranged by the Dutch Language Union as part of its thirtieth anniversary celebrations, discussed possible greater collaboration between the Dutch Language Union and Afrikaans, and even the possibility of incorporating Afrikaans within the Union, according to Professor Wannie Carstens, the chairperson of the Afrikaans Language Council, who attended the seminar. A memorandum of understanding was signed, with the aim of promoting exchange in the domains of language technology, reading, curriculum development and literature (Malan 2010). An understanding of the historical link has not been lost, and efforts to infuse it with new life continue to flourish. There is obviously no attempt to restandardize Afrikaans in a direction closer to Standard Dutch, but other, less direct aspects of the relationship are targeted for collaboration.

When we examine the evidence presented in this section, then, post-pluricentrism is the category we can attach to the relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans. Compared to regular pluricentric relationships, the contact



Figure 1. *A famous Dutch beer brand on sale in the Netherlands, advertised with a slogan in Afrikaans: “Dis nie duur nie” [It’s not expensive], using the very salient Afrikaans double negation, which is not employed in Dutch.*

between the two language groupings and their speakers is less immediate. The colonial mother language stopped having any language internal reference value for the colonial daughter language after an initial transition period when Afrikaans was standardized. Mutual intelligibility is less important, although some degree of intelligibility is still assumed, otherwise (authentic or fake) attempts at using the other language would prove unsuccessful in dealing with the other speech community. The main emphasis has shifted to the symbolic values that the two languages have for the other community.



Figure 2. Cakes and biscuits with orange icing being sold in the Netherlands using an advertising slogan in Afrikaans: “Netnou vir Oranje: die bobaas koekies!” [Specially manufactured for the Orange team: the best cakes ever!]. The Afrikaans *netnou* actually means ‘just now | in a little while’, rather than the literal ‘exclusively now’, which was how it was interpreted by the Dutch marketing team.

5. The future of Afrikaans and Dutch

On a language-external level, after Afrikaans’ linguistic independence, the Dutch language has come to perform a new function for Afrikaans. Conradie (1986: 122) notes that the prestige associated with Dutch was something Afrikaans wanted and therefore appropriated for itself by claiming a continued



Figure 3. *A set of beesies, the football mascots for the Holland team*

relationship and continuity with its “parent language”. In its struggle against English, to achieve equality as national language and liberate itself from being stigmatized as “Kitchen Dutch”, Afrikaans drew extensively on the continuity of a culture that originated in Holland, and claimed as part of its own heritage the literature and other cultural products of Dutch civilization (Uys 1983; Wessels 1999). Thus, right up to the present day, university departments of Afrikaans and Dutch in South Africa continue to teach Dutch literature and language history as part of the development of the Afrikaans language and literature. However, during the course of the twentieth century, the perceived relationship with Dutch became weaker. Up to the early 1990s, Dutch literature was still taught in South African secondary schools, but that has disappeared

from the curriculum in the last 15 years. It remains just below the level of consciousness, however, and resurfaces from time to time.

Meanwhile, attitudes in the Netherlands had changed from expressions of solidarity with the Afrikaners as victims of British aggression to expressions of disapproval and disassociation the more Afrikaans became tied up with the policies of apartheid. Schutte (1986) has summarized this change in attitude as “from adherence to aversion”³ (our translation). According to Jansen (1998), the aversion to apartheid policies was particularly strong in the Netherlands because of a vicarious embarrassment about the behavior of those with whose language and culture they were supposed to have such a strong affinity. Needless to say, the Dutch and Flemish cultural boycotts not only further alienated Afrikaans speakers, but also placed “an entire generation” on an “intellectual starvation diet”,⁴ as Terblanche ([1994a, 1994b], as quoted in Jansen [1998], our translation) has put it. In fact, the relationship between the two countries after the political tie was severed in the early nineteenth century has been characterized by ambivalence, where the Dutch simultaneously recognized something familiar and found something repellent in their image of South Africa (Van den Bergh 2000). This pervasive ambivalence is also attested in a great deal of recent Dutch writing on South Africa — and the Afrikaans-speaking communities in particular — ranging from widely acclaimed journalistic accounts (e.g. Vermeulen 2009) to trend-setting works of fiction such as those by Van Dis (2010). Asked why he continued to write about South Africa, Van Dis even stated that this was because there was “so much of Africa deep within us”⁵ (Kottman 2010, our translation). Despite this ambivalence, however, there is very little indication that Dutch stereotypes concerning Afrikaans speakers have greatly affected their appreciation of the language itself as anything other than “charming” or “amusing”. If the Dutch Language Union is serious about and successful in incorporating Afrikaans in their brief, closer contact may ensue, if perhaps still at a language-external level, as it is unlikely that extensive restandardization of Afrikaans will take place to decrease the linguistic distance.

Afrikaans was used as expression of white nationalistic identity during the apartheid era. In the greater racist ideology of Apartheid, even Jan van Riebeeck, the Dutch commander who established the first colonial settlement in South African was reinterpreted and appropriated as symbol of the entire European relocation and “civilization mission” (or invasion, if seen from the other side) in the mid-twentieth century, particularly culminating with the tercentenary celebrations in 1952 (Rassool and Witz 1993: 449). With political change eminent after the 1976 revolt against the imposition of Afrikaans as co-medium of instruction in black schools in the township Soweto, Afrikaans was gradually repositioned (Du Plessis 1992). A new ideology came to the fore where the language was increasingly promoted as the natural language of all

South Africans (cf. Beningfield 2004), and thus its connections with European Dutch had to be underplayed. The Afrikaans speech community had always been a divided one, with race the principal divider (Slippers et al. 2010: 145–150; Steyn 1980: 120, 227). This makes sense against the backdrop of competing accounts of the origin of Afrikaans: the account that stresses continuity from Dutch emphasizes the role of the European descendents in the development of the language, where the creolist account makes more prominent the role of other languages operating on the Dutch superstrate to yield Afrikaans. If, as is presently happening, the role of the descendants of slaves and indigenous peoples is to be highlighted in the new struggle for Afrikaans, then it is self-evident that any over-emphasis on the Dutch roots of the language would merely continue to act as a reminder of the divisions in the speech community.

Even at the famous Afrikaans Language Monument in Paarl, Dutch is presented as merely one of the European contributor languages of Afrikaans, on a par with others. Posters and signs currently on display at the Monument and the Language Museum in Paarl present this alternative version of history, and provide lists of Afrikaans words that are purportedly German but that in fact only exist in Dutch (e.g. *agter slot en grendel* ‘under lock and key’).

After the abolition of apartheid and the gradual restoration of cultural ties, attitudes in the Netherlands have begun to change. Possibly as a result of the absence for several decades of cultural exchange, however, the general public are unaware of even some of the most basic facts about Afrikaans, such as its name (called “*Zuid-Afrikaans*” [South African] by many in Holland) and the ethnic make-up of its native speakers (believed to be exclusively white). Yet the use of Afrikaans in commercial products, the production of series such as *Stellenbosch* (Van Jaarsveld 2007) which saw Dutch actors performing in Afrikaans, and the use of Afrikaans surrounding the publicity around the World Cup are just some examples of a returning interest in the language. The same is true of linguists. A fairly recent article by Paardekooper (2008: 38–39) even resuscitates the “colonial lag theory” for the relationship between Dutch and Afrikaans, claiming that Afrikaans is, for 80 to 90 per cent, a “variety of 17th-century Dutch”, and has preserved a number of features that European Dutch has lost.

Meanwhile, in the new South Africa, Afrikaans now shares its official status with 10 other languages. As part of the constitutional negotiations in 1992–1993, arguments were even presented for the retention of Afrikaans as the official language which explicitly mentioned its connection to a “world language” such as Dutch. Many Dutch speakers believe their language to be so marginal that they can use it as a secret code abroad to make rude comments about others, and would be very surprised how much power and influence is attributed to their language by their South African cousins. At the same time, there is increased perception in the Netherlands that the connection with

Afrikaans is a useful one, allowing, in the words of Jansen (1998: 682; our translation), “a window on Africa”,⁶ in the same way that Dutch has historically provided Afrikaans speakers with a window on Europe. This is one of the advantages, one might add, of a post-pluricentric relationship.

North-West University, South Africa
Utrecht University

Correspondence address: Bertus.VanRooy@nwu.ac.za

Notes

1. „ . . . de stelselmatig in studiekamers gekweekte exotikon onzer joernalisten, auteurs en predikanten is te stijf, te aanstellerig en te koud voor ons volk. Het hedendaags Nederlands met zijn streven naar verdieping, naar ontledende karakterstudie, naar fijn onderscheiden zielkundige uitrafeling der menselijke eigendommelijkheden, in nauw verband met omgeving en maatschappelijke toestanden — is bokant onze vuurmaakplek. Daarvoor is ons land nog te wijd, zijn onze bergen te hoog, is ons ho'eveld te onafzienbaar, en zijn wijzelven te anders” (Preller 1905:48).
2. “rijker woordeschat, zuiverder uitspraak en meer buigingsvormen” Van Rijn (1914: 12–13).
3. “adhesie en aversie” Schutte (1986).
4. “Een hele generatie is op een intellectueel hongerdieet geplaatst” Terblanche (1994a, 1994b).
5. “omdat er zoveel Afrika in onszelf zit” Kottman (2010).
6. “een venster op Afrika” Jansen (1998: 682).

References

- Beningfield, Jennifer. 2004. Native lands: language, nation and landscape in the Taal Monument, Paarl, South Africa. *Social Identities* 10(4). 509–525.
- Bertens, Hans. 1995. *The idea of the postmodern: a history*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bisschoff, Anna-Marie. 1988. Vernuwning na die Tweede Wêreldoorlog [Innovation after the Second World War]. In Jacques van der Elst, C. Heinrich, F. Ohlhoff & Hendrik Johannes Schutte (eds.), *Momente in die Nederlandse Letterkunde* [Moments in Dutch literature], 487–497. Pretoria: Academica.
- Botha, M. C. 1926. Die kultuur-historiese agtergrond van die eerste Afrikaanse taalbeweging [The cultural-historical background to the first Afrikaans language movement]. In *Gedenkboek ter eere van die Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners (1875–1925)* [Commemoration in honor of the Society of Real Afrikaners], 21–33. Potchefstroom: Afrikaanse Studentebond.
- Brink, André P. 1987. Die Prosa ná 1900 [Prose after 1900]. In Ernst Lindeberg (ed.), *Inleiding tot die Afrikaanse Letterkunde* [Introduction to Afrikaans literature], 86–159. Pretoria: Academica.
- Brozović, Dalibor. 1992. Serbo-Croatian as a pluricentric language. In Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*, 347–380. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Changuion, Antoine Nicolas Ernest. 1844. *Nederduitsche Taal in Zuid-Afrika Hersteld* [The Dutch language in South Africa restored]. Cape Town: Richert, Pike & Co.

- Clyne, Michael. 1992a. Pluricentric languages: an introduction. In Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*, 1–9. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clyne, Michael (ed.). 1992b. *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clyne, Michael & Sandra Klipp. 1999. *Pluricentric languages in an immigrant context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Conradie, Charl Jacobus. 1986. *Taalgeskiedenis* [Language history]. Pretoria & Cape Town: Academica.
- Deumert, Ana. 2004. *Language standardization and language change: the dynamics of Cape Dutch*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- De Vooy, Cornelis Gerrit Nicolaas. 1970. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal* [History of the Dutch language]. Wolters-Noordhoff: Groningen. <http://www.dbnl.org/titels/titel.php?id=vooy001gesc01> (accessed 12 December 2010).
- Du Plessis, Theo. 1992. Veranderende opvattinge rondom Afrikaans sedert die sewentigerjare [Changing views about Afrikaans since the seventies]. In Webb, V. N. (ed.) *Afrikaans na Apartheid* [Afrikaans after apartheid]. Pretoria: JL van Schaik. (p. 91–115.)
- Dua, Hans R. 1992. Hindi-Urdu as a pluricentric language. In Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*, 381–400. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geerts, Guido. 1992. Is Dutch a pluricentric language? In Michael Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric languages: differing norms in different nations*, 71–91. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Genootschap van Regte Afrikaners. 1877. *Die geskiedenis van ons land in die taal van ons volk* [The history of our country in the language of our people]. Paarl.
- Hesseling, Dirk C. 1899. *Het Afrikaansch: Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Taal in Zuid-Afrika* [Afrikaans: contribution to the history of the Dutch language in South Africa]. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hexham, Irving & Karla Poewe. 1997. The spread of Christianity among whites and blacks in Transorangia. In Richard Elphick & Rodney Davenport (eds.), *Christianity in South Africa: a political, social and cultural history*, 121–134. Cape Town: David Phillip / Oxford: James Currey.
- Jansen, Ena. 1998. De culturele relatie Nederland-Zuid-Afrika: vroeger en nu [The cultural relationship the Netherlands-South Africa: earlier and now]. *Ons Erfdeel* 41. 677–683. www.dbnl.org/tekst/_ons003199801_01/_ons003199801_01_0146.php (accessed 12 December 2010).
- Joerisioen. 2007. Afrikaans voor beginners. [Video posted on YouTube.] <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2bLrSjx5Kv0> (accessed 17 December 2010).
- Jonckheere, Wilfred. 1988. Periode van vernuwing en idealisme [Period of renewal and idealism]. In Jacques van der Elst, C. Heinrich, F. Ohlhoff & Hendrik Johannes Schutte (eds.), *Momente in die Nederlandse Letterkunde* [Moments in Dutch Literature], 239–318. Pretoria: Academica.
- Jonckheere, Wilfred. 1999. *Van Mafeking tot Robbeneiland: Zuid-Afrika in de Nederlandse literatuur* [From Mafeking to Robben Island: South Africa in Dutch literature]. Nijmegen: Vantilt.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English: the spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kottman, Pieter. 2010. 'Ik ben een bang mens' [I am a frightened person]. *NRC Boeken* 13 Sep 2010. www.nrcboeken.nl/interview/%E2%80%98ik-ben-een-bang-mens%E2%80%99 (accessed 12 December 2010).
- Landry, Rodrigue & Richard Y. Bourhis. 1997. Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: an empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16(1). 23–49.
- Lindeberg, Ernst. 1987. Die Poësie ná 1900 [Poetry after 1900]. In Ernst Lindeberg (ed.), *Inleiding tot die Afrikaanse Letterkunde* [Introduction to Afrikaans literature], 27–85. Pretoria: Academica.

- Louw, William Ewart Gladstone. 1958. *Vaandels en voetangels* [Banners and man-traps]. Cape Town: Balkema.
- Malan, Marlene. 2010. Nederland reik uit na Afrikaans: 'brief' oor samewerking geteken [The Netherlands reaches out to Afrikaans: 'letter' on cooperation signed]. *Rapport*, Sunday 5 December: 19.
- Nienaber, Gawie S. 1959. Die taalstryd na 1902 [The language struggle after 1902]. In M. S. du Buisson (ed.), *Die Wonder van Afrikaans* [The wonder of Afrikaans], 48–59. Johannesburg: Voortrekkerpers.
- Nienaber, Petrus J. 1959. Die geboorte van die Afrikaanse gedagte [The birth of the idea of Afrikaans]. In M. S. du Buisson (ed.), *Die Wonder van Afrikaans* [The wonder of Afrikaans], 36–47. Johannesburg: Voortrekkerpers.
- Paardekooper, Petrus Cornelis. 2008. Afrikaans is Nederlands [Afrikaans is Dutch]. *Neerlandia* 112(1): 38–39.
- Ponelis, Friedrich Albert. 1993. *The Development of Afrikaans*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Ponelis, Friedrich Albert. 2005. Nederlands in Afrika: het Afrikaans [Dutch in Africa: Afrikaans]. In Nicole van der Sijs (ed.), *Wereldnederlands: oude en jonge variëteiten van het Nederlands* [World Dutch: old and new varieties of Dutch], 15–30. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers.
- Preller, Gustav. 1905. Laat't ons toch ernst wezen! [Let us be in earnest!]. *Herzog-Annale*, 1(2): 25–50 [1952]. Accessible at: http://www4-win2.p.nwu.ac.za/dbtw-wpd/images/BATL/hertzogannale_okt1952_25-50.pdf (Date of access 26 September 2011.)
- Raidt, Edith H. 1991. *Afrikaans en sy Europese verlede* [Afrikaans and its European past]. Cape Town: Nasou.
- Rassool, Ciraj & Leslie Witz. 1993. The 1952 Jan van Riebeeck Tercentenary Festival: constructing and contesting public national history in South Africa. *The Journal of African History* 34(3): 447–468.
- Roberge, Paul T. 2002. Afrikaans: considering origins. In Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Language in South Africa*, 79–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberge, Paul T. 2003. Afrikaans. In Ana Deumert & Wim Vandenbussche (eds.), *Germanic standardizations: past to present*, 15–40. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Roberge, Paul T. 2009. Afrikaans and creolization. In Hans den Besten, Frans Hinskens & Jerzy Koch (eds.), *Afrikaans: een drieluik* [Afrikaans: a triptych], 209–233. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scholtz, Johannes du Plessis. 1951. Nederlandse invloed op die Afrikaanse woordeskat [Dutch influence on the vocabulary of Afrikaans]. (Inaugural lecture, University of Cape Town, 3 April 1951.) Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Scholtz, Johannes du Plessis. 1980. *Wording en ontwikkeling van Afrikaans* [Birth and development of Afrikaans]. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Schutte, Gerrit J. 1986. *Nederland en de Afrikaners: adhesie en aversie* [Netherlands and the Afrikaner: adhesion and aversion]. Amsterdam: Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut.
- Schutte, Hendrik Johannes. 1984. Betrekkinge tussen Nederlands en Afrikaans: krisis en keuse [Relationships between Dutch and Afrikaans: crisis and choice]. *Tydskrif vir Nederlands en Afrikaans* 2(3): 243–258.
- Shohamy, Elana, Eliezer Ben-Rafael & Monica Barni (eds.). 2010. *Linguistic landscape in the city*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Slippers, Jana, Anské Grobler & Neels van Heerden. 2010. Afrikaans se unieke posisie en uitdagings in 'n veeltalige Suid-Afrika [The unique position of Afrikaans and challenges in a multilingual South Africa]. *Acta Academica* 42(1): 132–167.

- Stell, Gerald. 2005. Afrikaans en Nederlands: het spanningsveld tussen ‘Taaleie’ en ‘Suiwerheids-ideaal’ [Afrikaans and Dutch: tension between ‘the own’ and the ‘ideal of purity’]. *Handelingen* 59. 111–128.
- Steyn, Jaap C. 1980. *Tuiste in eie taal* [At home in one’s own language]. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns. 1991. *Afrikaanse woordelys en spelreëls* [Afrikaans wordlist and spelling rules], 8th edn. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Terblanche, Otto. 1994a. 30 jaar betrekkinge: Die Suid-Afrikaanse perspektief [30 years’ relations: the South African perspective]. *Zuid-Afrika* 71(9). 160–161.
- Terblanche, Otto. 1994b. Kulturele samewerking noodsaakelik [The need for cultural cooperation]. *Zuid-Afrika* 71(10). 180–181.
- Uys, Mariette Deleen. 1983. *Die vernederlandsing van Afrikaans* [The Netherlandization of Afrikaans]. Pretoria: University of Pretoria PhD thesis.
- Van den Bergh, Erik. 2000. Dutch images of South Africa reflected in travel diaries. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 91(4). 458–462.
- Van der Haagen, Monique. 1998. *Caught between norms: the English pronunciation of Dutch learners*. Nijmegen: University of Nijmegen PhD thesis.
- Van der Sijs, Nicole. 2005. *Wereldnederlands: oude en jonge variëteiten van het Nederlands* [World Dutch: old and new varieties of Dutch]. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers.
- Van Dis, Adriaan. 2010. *Tikkop: Roman* [Meth-head: a novel]. Amsterdam: Augustus.
- Van Eeden, Petrus. 1998. *Afrikaans hoort by Nederlands: ons Afrikaanse taalverdriet* [Afrikaans goes with Dutch: our Afrikaans language sorrow]. Howick: Brevitas.
- Van Jaarsveld, Michiel (Director). 2007. *Stellenbosch*. [Drama Series]. Amsterdam: Motel Films (in collaboration with VPRO, VARA & NPS).
- Van Rijn, C. J. 1914. *Het zeer nauwe verband tussen het Afrikaans en het Nederlands vooral voor Onderwijzers* [The very close relationship between Afrikaans and Dutch especially for teachers]. Cape Town.
- Vermeulen, Bram. 2009. *Help, ik ben blank geworden: bekentenissen van een Afrika-correspondent* [Help, I became white: confessions of an Africa correspondent]. Amsterdam & Rotterdam: Prometheus.
- Wessels, Andries. 1999. “A rich and rare land”: the experience and expression of nationalism in poetry among reluctant colonists in Ireland, South Africa and Quebec. *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 25(1/2). 352–371.
- Willems, Roland. 2003. Dutch. In Ana Deumert & Wim Vandenbussche (eds.), *Germanic standardizations: past to present*, 93–125. Amsterdam: Benjamins.