

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 What is an anglicism?

2.1 The reasons for the interference-cum-influence

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

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

2.1.1 The historical facts behind the contact between English and Afrikaans

The historical facts of the British take-over of the Cape and subsequent legislation aimed at anglicising the Afrikaner are known backwards by any White child that goes through the South African schools' system. On the basis of these facts one may feel justified in seeing 1795, the year of the first British occupation, as the obvious terminus a quo of English influence on the Dutch dialect of the colony. However, history does not provide us with much evidence at all with which to fix a date from which English, the language of the administration from 1795 – with the exception of the years

1803-1806 when the Cape was briefly returned to the Dutch – began to make inroads into the idiom of the Dutch population. Tracing the early history of English influence on the language, one is faced with the same problem which has confronted the many scholars who have attempted to research the **origins** of Afrikaans – the almost total lack of texts in Afrikaans prior to the 1860's. One can probably assume that English influence did not reach much beyond Cape Town during the first period of British occupation, but how great it was and how far it stretched after 1806 is also very difficult to determine. Nevertheless, few would disagree that from the time of the arrival of the 1820 settlers in the Eastern Province, the scene was set for extensive mutual influence of the two languages. Their arrival was also followed in the 1820's by the notorious anglicisation policies of Lord Charles Somerset. That these policies were ultimately unsuccessful goes without saying, but the degree to which they contributed already at that early date to the influence that English was to have on Afrikaans, can only be guessed at. Boshoff (1921:408) maintains that in 1828 there were only 7,000 Englishmen in the colony, as opposed to 25,000 Dutchmen; 5,000 of these English people had come as 1820 settlers, which means there were proportionately very few English speaking people indeed in the Cape prior to 1820.

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

The terminus a quo is thus open to some debate, the terminus ad quem, the point at which English influence will cease, will undoubtedly never come. Any study of the topic can only ever capture on paper the state of affairs at

that particular point in history, for the process is an ongoing and never-ending one.

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

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

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

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

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

Lord Henry de Villiers who predicted in 1876 "dat nòg Hollands nòg Afrikaans 'n 'toekoms' in Suid-Afrika het en dat alleen met Engels iets bereik sou word." (p.29)

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

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

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

Pienaar (1931:172-3) quotes the example of J.H.H. de Waal's novel

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The result of the introduction of English combined with the colonists'

stubborn refusal to give up their native Dutch, is Afrikaans as we know it today, or, to quote Du Toit (1965:128):

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

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

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

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

"In our opinion no greater injustice could be done to our country than by forcing upon us a worthless and insignificant language (Dutch), especially after it has clearly been shown

that the rising generation takes to English more easily and appreciates it more readily than Dutch."

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

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

"In hierdie tydsverloop het daar baie aan die inhoud en wese van die taal verander: dit het geword 'n instrument waarvan ontwikkelde hulle ook kon begin bedien. Veel hiervan was natuurlik die resultaat van ontlening en aanpassing aan die skryftaal, Nederlands – dog vir baie het die taal hom ook verbreed en verdiep deur die opname van elemente uit Engels."

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

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

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

Many of these early statements on the influence English was having on Dutch/Afrikaans attribute the problem to the state of education at the time and the fact, for example, that Dutch lessons were often, if not usually, given in English. But nowadays, where the situation with regard to

education is vastly different from the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the problem exists just as much, if not more so.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Boshoff does not give any indication, however, of the degree to which the

mutual influence differs between the two languages, which is undoubtedly the case. Le Roux (1952:2) comes nearer to the mark when he states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Ds. Postma soek die verklaring dus nie in 'n adapsie van die taal deur vreemdelinge en 'n terugwerking daarvan op die taal

van die Afrikaanse volk nie, maar 'n aanpassing deur die volk self van hulle taal aan hulle omgewing."

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

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

"Die Engels-onkundige neem onbewus Engelshede oor van ander Engels-onkundiges, wat dit op hulle beurt by Engels-kundiges gekry het" (Redaksioneel, *Die Huisgenoot* 29/8/52)

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

Diglossia, as originally defined by Ferguson (1959), referred to two varieties of a language – a higher and lower variant where the lower is not written – being used side by side as in the case of High German and Swiss German in Switzerland. Undoubtedly the relationship of Dutch to Afrikaans in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries often fitted this mold. This definition of diglossia was, however, expanded somewhat by Fishman in 1967 to cover situations where two separate languages, as opposed to variants of the same language, compete with each other for a function in the social spectrum of a bilingual community. (cf. Timm 1980:33) This revised definition can now be applied, with some qualification, to the relationship between English and Afrikaans in South Africa, certainly in the past and perhaps even in the present. Prior to the official recognition and consequent nurturing of Afrikaans, that language hovered in a

diglossia relationship between Dutch on the one hand (still referred to by many in South Africa as *Hooghollands*) and English on the other. It was under these conditions that Afrikaans, to a greater extent than Dutch in South Africa, was influenced by English; but because the line between Afrikaans and Dutch was often a thin one, English must also gradually have begun to affect the higher variant. Nevertheless speakers of Dutch could always look back to the Dutch of Holland to determine what was "correct"; this was not the case with the lower variant. Thus, when Afrikaans replaced Dutch, it opened the flood-gates to English influence in the official written language as well as in the spoken language. (cf. H.C. de Wet's comment p.34)

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

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

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

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

"Waar daar van twee ampstale sprake is, soos in Suid-Afrika, is diglossie 'n opmerklike verskynsel onder baie sprekers: vir hulle is daar 'n duidelik onderskeibare verskil tussen die funksies van Afrikaans teenoor die funksies van Engels. Hierdie onderskeiding hoef nie in alle gevalle getref te word nie. Vir die sprekers wat, desondanks die tweetalige taalsituasie, nie kan ooreenkom oor watter taal die hoë-funksie taal en watter taal die lae-funksie taal is nie, bestaan daar 'n tweetalige taalsituasie sonder die voorkoms van diglossie".

While some may argue that the former situation no longer exists in South Africa, the latter referred to by Van Rensburg is certainly the more common in South Africa these days. Baetens Beardsmore (1982:5) calls this form of bilingualism "horizontal bilingualism".

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

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

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

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

Mackey (1972:554) maintains of bilingualism that "It does not belong to the domain of 'langue' but of 'parole'". He goes on to say that "It is impossible not to confuse bilingualism – the use of two or more languages by the individual – with the more general concept of language contact, which deals with the direct or indirect influence of one language on another resulting in changes in 'langue' which become the permanent property of

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

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

"Dat die woord egter taamlik algemeen aan Afrikaners bekend is, blyk uit die feit dat by 'n sekere konsert [sic!] onlangs die gehoor aan 't lag gegaan het toe 'n sanger dooernstig en baie duidelik die woorde 'diep lê die dou' uitgespreek het." (Originally appeared in a column in *Die Suiderstem* between 1936-39.)

In the same book (p.59-60) Smith discusses the difficulty of getting Afrikaners to accept *verafrikaansing* of the spelling of English loanwords e.g. *hendikep, tenk, trem, sleng*:

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

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

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

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

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

There is a tendency among bilinguals to reduce the number of differences between the two languages, what Grüner (1980:5) calls *reduksie*-

interferensie. Vildomec (1963:173) describes the phenomenon as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Knowing two languages, which sometimes categorise differently, the awareness of categories and distinctions in one language gives rise to a need in the other to be able to categorise in a similar fashion there and make similar distinctions. This "need" is not felt by monolingual speakers – a category which no longer exists among Afrikaners – and thus they cope with what they have at their disposal. The bilingual individual could too, but prefers not to: he has greater semantic demands which his bilingualism both causes and satisfies. Langenhoven (1935:102) provides a good concrete example of this need: in discussing the use of *maak* as an auxiliary, he gives an example and goes on to comment on it:

"As hy dit nie wil doen nie sal ek hom dit maak doen. Om te sê 'ek sal hom dit laat doen' of 'ek sal hom dwing om dit te doen' druk nie uit wat ons wil sê nie."

But the Dutch cope admirably without resorting to *maken* and are unaware of any semantic shortcoming in their language. Mansvelt (1884: 180) provides an even better example, in reverse, of acquaintance with a concept in one language leading to feeling the need for an equivalent in another language. He was a native-speaker of Dutch – admittedly greatly prejudiced against Afrikaans – and was not convinced that the "primitive" verbal system of Cape Dutch, with no imperfect or pluperfect tenses, permitted conversation on a higher plane. We know of course that the verbal system of Afrikaans, greatly simplified as it is compared to that of Dutch and English, is no impediment to understanding at all. Mansvelt simply felt a need that he was unable to fulfil in Afrikaans because of his awareness of the category in his mother tongue. Le Roux (1952:26-27) sums this situation up very nicely:

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

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

It was noted by Uijlings (1956:77) that bilingualism "leads to uncertainty in speech. It is this hesitation which often leads to hypercorrect forms..." The concept of hypercorrection as such is discussed under 5.3. An inferiority complex in linguistic matters is not uncommon among Afrikaners and has been greatly contributed to by the irresponsible and uninformed prescriptions dished up to them by ignorant schoolteachers. In the days before the official recognition of Afrikaans, when Afrikaners were

required to write Dutch when putting pen to paper, the situation must have been even worse than now, but then the cause of their linguistic insecurity was different. Lodewyckx (1911:103), a Fleming who spent some time in the Cape early in the century, made the following observation at the time:

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

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

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

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

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

Although Afrikaners go to separate schools, universities and churches and have Afrikaans speaking equivalents of the Boy Scouts, Rotary, Freemasons etc., the degree of integration of the two communities has now reached a point where a blend is an inevitable result, and the drift is

unavoidably more in the one direction than the other. The following statement by Suffeleers (1979:175), in which he is in fact referring to the situation in Flanders where there is strict geographic separation of the two language communities, unlike in South Africa, is all the more valid in the case of Afrikaans and English:

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

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

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

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

Boshoff (1963:65) also quoted this passage from Barnouw and added the following futile comment:

"Mense wat aan ons taal wil dokter solank dit die toestand is, het geen werklikheidsin nie: hulle span die kar voor die perde."

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

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

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

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

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

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

"omtrent 90% van alle Afrikaanse advertensies word in Engels geskep en die Afrikaanse ekwivalent word agterna gemaak."¹

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

"Waar de moedertaal wegens de discontinuïteit ten aanzien van de noordelijke cultuurtaal niet toereikend blijkt te zijn, valt men, overnemend of vertalend, op de 'vertrouwde' Franse terminologie terug."

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

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

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

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

¹ Odendal (1984:197) deals with the dominant role of English in television advertising and complains that the problem is not just one of translation but also of conception.

en dat, wanneer nuwe behoeftes ontstaan, dit die natuurlike bron is waaruit ons moet put, indien nodig."

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

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

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

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

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

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

² These terms were first used by Tappolet (1914).

of the intrinsic difference between Boer and Briton. That explains why racial animosity runs highest in South African centres of learning. The intellectuals feel themselves the guardians of the racial inheritance. The Taal cult is their trust..."

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

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

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

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

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

"Linguistic and social factors are closely interrelated in the development of language change. Explanations which are confined to one or other aspect, no matter how well constructed,

will fail to account for the rich body of regularities that can be observed in empirical studies of language behaviour."

2.1.4 The inherent affinity of the two languages

The inherent affinity which English and Afrikaans share is of two kinds:

- a) their common Germanic background
- b) parallel analytical development.

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

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

"Now as to grammar, *Africander Dutch* certainly resembles English much more than Dutch. It has dropped all unnecessary inflections, and anyone who will take the trouble of carefully analysing the characteristics of the three languages, will observe the similarity in grammatical structure between English and *Africander Dutch*, and the dissimilarity of these two to Dutch." (written in 1893)

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

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

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

At this point the concepts of pseudo-anglicisms (*skyn-Anglisismes*) and contributing factors (*versterkende faktore*), both of which are dealt with

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

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

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

"Maakt echter reeds de overeenkomst in woordenschat en armoede der verbuigingsvormen de overname makkelijk, zoo wordt de overgang nog in de hand gewerkt door opvallende overeenstemming in uitspraak en klankstelsel."

When the words *bottel*³ and *stoor* were borrowed – one assumes as nouns in the first instance – they were immediately also able to do service as verbs, as well as form a compound noun, *bottelstoor*, with no necessity for medial vowels or any other form of adaption, other than spelling, to imitate the English "bottlestore". It is of no relevance in this context that puristic endeavour seems to have had some success in replacing *bottelstoor* with *drankwinkel*.

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

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

³ It has been claimed that *bottel* is of Portuguese origin in Afrikaans. (cf. Boshoff and Nienaber 1967:182) Even if this is so, Portuguese can presumably only account for the occurrence of *bottel* as a noun in Afrikaans, not as a verb.

Further examples of idiom overlap because of phonological similarity with English are provided by *iets met 'n greintjie sout neem*, where Dutch uses *korreltje*, and *'n string kwalifikasies*, where *streng* cannot be used figuratively in this sense in Dutch. The latter example is interesting in another respect, however. In Germanic dialects *e* and *i* often alternate, as the following triplets illustrate: Eng. *bring*, Afr. *bring*, Dt. *brengen*; Eng. *think*, Afr. *dink*, Dt. *denken*. Afrikaans, like English, has on occasions ultimately opted for *i*. This parallel phonological development has created in *string* a homophone in both languages, possibly further contributing to its susceptibility to assume an English meaning as in the example given above.

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

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

2.2 Definitions of the term anglicism

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

2.2.1 Dictionary definitions

WAT (1950):

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

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

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

HAT (1965):

"Engelse idioom wat letterlik in 'n ander taal nagevolg is, bv. hy *groe*i blomme i.p.v. kweek."

HAT (1983):

"Vorm wat onder Engelse invloed in 'n ander taal opgeneem word; ook, sodanige vorm wat in stryd is met die sisteem van die ontlenende taal."

WNT (1949):

"Uitdrukking die aan het Engelsch eigen is en die in een andere taal wordt overgenomen, in stryd met het idioom van die taal."

VAN DALE (1984):

"Woord, uitdrukking of constructie naar het Engels gevormd of eruit overgenomen, in stryd met het taaleigen van de overnemende taal."

OED (1933):

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

Shorter Oxford (1984):

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

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

will be respected throughout this work. The inconsistency of spelling in the quotes is that of the authors being cited.

2.2.2 Definitions of those who have written on anglicisms in Afrikaans

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

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

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

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

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

"Engelse woorde is geen Anglicismes nie. Dit is die eerste wanbegrip waarvan ons ontslae moet raak." (p.51)

He sees three types of influence: "vreemde woorde, leenwoorde (d.w.s. aangepas), Anglicismes."

"As ons in Afrikaans dus Engelse woorde soos *lift* gebruik wat hulle deur hulle uitspraak, klemtoon, betekenis of deur watter kenmerke ook al as onafrikaans of oneie laat uitken, dan is hulle eenvoudig vreemde Engelse woorde en nie Anglicismes nie... Wanneer vreemde woorde aldus ingeburger

geraak het, dan noem ons hulle leenwoorde, ontleende woorde of ontlenings. Maar ook die leenwoorde uit Engels is nog geen Anglisismes nie." (p.51-2)

It is clear from a statement he made in his thesis in 1921 that Boshoff (1921:409) had always made a distinction between loanwords and anglicisms where he maintains that poets, dominees, teachers etc. are striving against "die gebruik van Engelse woorde en uitdrukkings, sowel as teen die gebruik van allerlei Anglisismes." As will be illustrated, Boshoff (1963:59) is not the only one to take this stance, but he is the only person who disagrees with the idea of an anglicism having to be *in stryd met die taaleie* to qualify for the label:

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

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

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

- „Die kwessie van Anglisismes is... in sy wese *taalpolitie*s van aard, en by so 'n benadering gaan dit basies om 'n keuse tussen goed en sleg. Word op 'n bepaalde vlak op 'n bepaalde manier 'n bepaalde leemte gevul, heet 'n Engelse bousel bv. 'n Engelse leenwoord; maar verdring hierdie bepaalde bousel die Afrikaans op 'n bepaalde manier, heet dit 'n Anglisisme."

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

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

"'n Anglisisme is... vir ons 'n taalelement of groep van taalelemente wat onder invloed van die Engelse taal gebruik word en wat – hier kom dit veral op aan! – in een of meer

opsigte bots met die wese van die taal." (first appeared in *Die Huisgenoot* in 1947)

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

H.J. Terblanche, founder of the *Genootskap vir die Handhawing van Afrikaans*, must surely have been one of the most vocal spokesman on the topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans. In an article he wrote for *Die Brandwag* (6/9/46) entitled "Wat is 'n Anglisisme?" he maintains that anglicisms are (a) "leenwoorde", (b) "basterwoorde (*impressie, poeding, etc.*)", (c) "werklike Anglisismes (*eksamenpapier, die tyd is op*)". What De Bruto calls "vreemde woorde", as distinct from "leenwoorde", Terblanche apparently sees as "leenwoorde", choosing to ignore the distinction made by De Bruto.

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

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

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

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

"Barbarismes is woorde, woordverbindings, sinwendinge en

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

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

"... 'n barbarisme, ofskoon omskryf as 'n woord uit inheemse bestanddele, maar in navolging van ander en strydig met die wette van die eie taal gevorm, berus tog in eerste instansie op 'n letterlike vertaling van die vreemde woord of uitdrukking en veronderstel vanself die prysgewing deur die spreker van die vryheid wat hy het om hom makliker en meer regstreeks van 'n leenwoord te bedien."

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

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

"Daar is byna soveel betekenis van die begrip 'Anglisisme', as wat daar woordeboeke en taalhandleidings is. Die gevolg van hierdie veelheid van begrippe is dat die breë publiek dink (a) dat alles wat na Engels klink of lyk en wat nie alledaags is nie, 'n Anglisisme is, (b) dat alle Engelse invloed Anglisisties is, d.w.s. sleg is vir Afrikaans." (p.101)

Under (a) he is referring to what I have so far called international vocabulary. On this he goes on to say:

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout this book the term anglicism is used in its broadest sense, incorporating what the above Afrikaans writers on the topic have referred to as "leenwoorde", "basterwoorde" and "barbarismes". In adopting this definition I associate myself most closely, of all the authors mentioned, with S.J. du Toit whose reason for favouring the more general definition was based on both the opinion of some linguists, but above all on the common man's understanding of the word. Boshoff's radio talks seem to be reason enough to take this stance: if he had to go to such lengths to establish firmly in people's minds what the difference is between a loanword and an "egte Anglisisme", because that "misconception" was so deeply rooted, what better reason can there be for not adopting his definition? It is also heartening to find that the primary definition in *HAT* is now in accordance with the way the term will be used here, which was not the case in the first edition. (cf. p.55) This is not to say, however, that I can completely

identify with the popular notion of the term because of the misconception referred to by Combrink above. It is a curious thing that what the average Afrikaner regards as an anglicism, i.e. first and foremost the use of "unnecessary" English words (but also international vocabulary that resembles English), is precisely what so many Afrikaans academics have taken great pains to emphasise it is not.

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

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

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

"waaronder men verstaat: volstrekt overbodige, tegen de structuur of woordvormingsgewoonte van de ontleende taal indruisende formaties. Een barbarisme wordt dus als een fout

beschouwd, maar het is niet altijd gemakkelijk vast te stellen wat echt fout is en wat nog als acceptabel geldt."

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

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

2.3 Attitudes to anglicisms

The feelings of Afrikaners with regard to their language have often run quite high. The emotionalism which has so often manifested itself in language issues in South Africa in the past is something which is exceedingly difficult for a native-speaker of English to appreciate. Nevertheless, the tension in Belgian society that still flares up from time to time over language issues reminds one that it is not a concept which is exclusive to South African society. Afrikaans is after all a language which has been closely associated with the general struggle for freedom from British domination – it was at the forefront of the Afrikaners' fight for emancipation and equality which followed the Boer War. Afrikaners, with their firm conviction of their right to be in Africa and to lead a life true to the values of their forefathers, have often been compared with Israelis, the parallels of a chosen people in a promised land being obvious. But another parallel is the attitude of those two peoples to their national language, the

Jews to Hebrew and the Afrikaners to Afrikaans, one aspect of which is the way "impurities" in the languages are regarded. Nowadays the Afrikaners' struggle for economic and cultural emancipation has been won and what the language has achieved since the turn of the century is nothing short of remarkable. The period of emancipation witnessed emotional attitudes to English influence which are fortunately only rarely found these days. There is a linguistic confidence now among Afrikaners that was previously lacking, and consequently a more objective, scientifically responsible attitude to the "impurities" in the language:

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

2.3.1 Previous attitudes

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

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

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

"Al die kommissielede is dit eens dat maatreëls moet ter hand geneem word om dié voortwoekerende euwel te stuit... Algaar is dit nie eens oor wat as anglisismes moet gebrandmerk word nie. Ons ondersteun dus in die eerste plek die aanbeveling van die drie memorandiste dat die Akademie 'n prys uitloof vir die

beste verhandeling oor Anglisismes in Afrikaans en onderneem om die bekroonde werk in druk uit te gee." (p.282)

The prize they refer to is the one which was ultimately awarded to H.J. Rousseau for the doctoral thesis he submitted to the University of Cape Town in 1933. Van Rensburg (1983:137) says of this early, fervently negative reaction to English influence:

"In der waarheid was hierdie vurige Anglisismejagtery 'n simptoom van onsekerheid oor die nuutverworwe status van Afrikaans, 'n simptoom van die gebrek aan selfvertroue."

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

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

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

But if a certain linguistic insecurity is still present in the Afrikaner as a result of the contact with English, the attitude that it is fashionable to use English words in Afrikaans is certainly a thing of the past.⁴ In 1963 Boshoff maintained: "... hy [doen] dit uit pronksug: hy wil sy toehoorder onder die indruk bring dat hy al 'n mondjievool van die vreemde taal ken." (p.50) I find it difficult to believe that this was still the case in 1963, particularly as Le Roux stated as early as 1932 that:

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

⁴ One possible exception to this is the conscious, often exaggerated use of English words in so-called *studentetaal* (cf. p.40); this is a group which is generally speaking linguistically secure and the motivation for their use of "superfluous" English vocabulary is quite different from that of the working class, who are linguistically indifferent on the whole.

taal net so pynlik aan soos die veelkleurige doek van 'n kaffer-meid." (*Die Taalgenoot*, May 1932)

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

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

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

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

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

"De taal, die men te Pretoria spreek, is het gewone Boeren-Afrikaansch, doorspekt met Engelsche woorden. Op de zelfde wijze, als wij in Holland ter verfraaiing (?) onzer taal, eene menigte (en dikwerf nog wel verkeerd toegepaste) Fransche woorden en uitdrukkingen gebruiken, is dit in het deftig Afrikaansch in nog grotere mate met het Engelsch het geval. Bijna om het andere woord hoort men een Engelschen term, waarvoor het Afrikaansch zelf wel degelijk eigen woorden heeft, in het gesprek gesmokkeld."

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

"Die ontsiering van Afrikaans deur Engelse woorde wat sedert tientalle jare aan die gang is, sal deur behoorlike onderwijs en skrywe van ons taal langsaamerhand verwijder word. Dit is nog nie so 'n groot gevaar nie. Want waar 'n taal alleen

vreemde woorde oorneem, en daarbij nog woorde waarvoor goeie inheemse bestaan, kan hy eintlik nie veel skade lij nie. Daarvoor is Engels self 'n goeie voorbeeld. Ernstiger is die indringing van die Engelse idioom want dit raak die kern van ons taallewe aan." (p.16)

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

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

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

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

That it was not at all futile to oppose the automatic adoption of such English loanwords has since been borne out by the fact that there are now totally acceptable and accepted Afrikaans words for several of the concepts mentioned here by Smith. It is worth noting that of all the alternatives he suggests for "flat", *woonstel* is not even mentioned. The clause "en lift is nog altyd verstaanbaarder as hulle almaal" shows a tolerance (or is it resignation?) to English loanwords that is rarely found these days. On puristic attempts to abolish such English words from Afrikaans, Smith (1962:64) says:

"Ook maaksels soos toebroodjie vir sandwich en reissak vir portemanteau is misleidend, en dit is dan ook geen wonder dat hulle gebruik beperk gebly het tot ons koerante en purist-enthousiaste nie." (written in the late 1930's)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He gives the examples of *enamel* and *beperk* for the Dutch *emaille* and *naamlose vennootschap*. In 1963 Boshoff (1963:89) adamantly opposed Dutch being used as a yardstick by which correct Afrikaans can be measured. Commenting on the work that is being done by linguists where

they are illustrating and emphasising that Afrikaans differs from Dutch in many important respects, he says:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"In sowel ons eie belang as volk as in die van ons taal, die draer naamlik van ons kultuur, moet ons baie versigtig wees en

meermale ook die skyn van die kwaad vermy." (Le Roux 1968:163, but written in 1947)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"'n Derde gevaar om teen te waak is te dogmaties optree by die vasstelling van wat korrekte Afrikaans is." (p.17)

In the 1940's it had apparently reached a serious level. Kempen (1946:207) remarked that

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

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

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

And another writes:

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

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

"Vir sulke mense het suiwer taal 'n saak vir die 'geleerdes' geword. Dis bo die vuurmaakplek van iemand wat sy taal maar net van sy ma gekry het."

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

An attitude that one encounters occasionally in older writings is a tolerance for anglicisms that, in the opinion of the writers concerned, are appropriate to the Afrikaner's way of life or outlook, for example:

"Tenslotte dien daarop gewys te word dat 'n uitdrukking soos 'skouer aan (teen) die wiel sit' (die hand aan die ploeg slaan), wat so goed aanpas by die Afrikaanse lewe, bepaald sy bestaansreg in Afrikaans verdien." (Terblanche, *Die Brandwag* 25/10/46)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The literature on anglicisms abounds with statements such as this. What is "nuttig"?; what does "maklik by ons eie spraakgewoontes aanpas" mean? Even if explanations are offered, the criteria are inevitably so subjective as

to be useless. Hiemstra (1963:9), also realising that condemnation of all anglicisms is impossible, maintained:

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

These are all such noble terms but are meaningless in practice. Even when scholars have not remained as vague but have given concrete examples and arguments for the defence of the retention of certain anglicisms, they are arguments that are highly subjective and unlikely to be heeded in any way by the community at large where the decisions are finally made; see Le Roux (1968:162-3) where he defends the use of *sypaadjie* but condemns *lighuis* in favour of *vuurtoring*. His recommendations happen to coincide with what is in fact now used in practice, but not for the reasons he gives, particularly with regard to *vuurtoring*.⁵ Despite fifty years of trying to find an objective definition of an "acceptable" anglicism, scholars' definitions, however satisfied they themselves may be with them, fall far short of what the common man, and even educated Afrikaners, are only too ready to accept in their speech.

2.3.2 Current attitudes

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

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

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

⁵ HAT does not recognise *lighuis*, although it is still commonly heard, but both *vuurtoring* and *lgtoring* – not mentioned by Le Roux – are recognised.

The fact that this attitude is now more prevalent than previously is because in the sixty years since the official recognition of Afrikaans and the emancipation of the language and the people that has occurred during that period, Afrikaners have been educated to become far more *taalbewus* than earlier generations were. An unavoidable repercussion of this is "dat wanneer opgevoede Afrikaners erg taalbewus gemaak word, hulle 'n fobie ontwikkel teenoor Engelse invloed." (De Villiers 1970:246) In other words, purism – sometimes taken to extremes with negative consequences such as hypercorrection – is the result. (The various ramifications of purism are looked at in detail under 5.00) The campaign against outright borrowing without translating has been so successful that it has led to negative social connotations being associated with the use of English words in Afrikaans:

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

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

⁶ See Ponelis (1983:13) for further comment on the feeling of linguistic superiority among Afrikaners vis-à-vis the Dutch.

South Africa it is taken for granted. In South Africa it is not considered any great achievement for an Afrikaner to speak good English; on the contrary, a lack of a good knowledge of English is considered backward. Thus while the Dutchman can still impress by using "superfluous" foreign vocabulary, the Afrikaner cannot. And with regard to "necessary" loanwords like those given above, Dutch does not hesitate to adopt such words because it is not under any threat. One finds a totally different attitude to loanwords, but then chiefly from French, in Belgium, for obvious reasons.

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

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

overweldigd te worden, ziet in vreemde woorden geen bederf,
maar verrijking van zijn taal."

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

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

In certain higher social registers, the idea that structures found in Dutch are also the preserve of the Afrikaner, still lives on. This is certainly the case in the religious sphere, where the old adage *Die Afrikaner is drielig: hy praat Afrikaans, bid in Nederlands en vloek in Engels* still has some qualified validity. This attitude is also reflected in the authority that is still often given to Dutch usage. Firstly, as previously mentioned, the *Taalkommissie* often takes Dutch convention into consideration when deliberating on issues; secondly, in arguments such as that given by Le Roux (1952:8) where his defence for the validity of *in die loop van die tyd* – seen by some as an anglicism because it corresponds literally to the English expression and is therefore replaced by *met/na verloop van tyd* – is that this is the Afrikaans translation of the Dutch expression *in de loop des tyds*. The same applies to the argument for and against *op vakansie* versus *met vakansie* (cf. Le Roux 1968:171-2) where, when deliberating on the validity of the former in Afrikaans, one must keep in mind that the two also co-exist in Dutch.

Despite the regard given to the custom in Holland in some circles, because of the even wider gap that has emerged between Afrikaans and Dutch over the last fifty years, the following advice from Langenhoven (1935:103) is being heeded more and more in practice, even if current prescriptive works are slow to come to terms with this new reality:

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

HAT, for example, may continue to claim that *raar* does not mean "rare" and imply that *verdieping* is better Afrikaans than *vloer*, but in practice the truth of what Langenhoven maintains is borne out.

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

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

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

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

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

"Die suffiks -ing is besonder produktief in Afrikaans [with reference to 'aardingsklamp' – earthing clamp] ... 'n Mens wonder... of 'aarding' nie ook 'n Anglisisme is nie. Intussen het dié Anglisisme al ingeburger geraak. Ek meen dat die term 'aardklamp' hier beter *sou gewees het*." (my italics, BCD)

Cluver accepts the reality of this word having gained acceptance, whatever its morphological faults may be, whereas a previous generation, H.J. Terblanche for example, may have insisted on *aardklamp* being "better" Afrikaans and may thus have attempted to prescribe a structure like *aardingsklamp* out of existence.

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

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

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

"Wat moet ons houding teenoor afwykende Afrikaans wees – alles toelaat, of sinswendinge bestry wat verskil van hoe Afrikaans 'behoort te wees'? Laasgenoemde beteken gewoonlik: soos dit in 'n vroeër fase van die geskiedenis van die taal wás. Dit lei dan gewoonlik tot soveel reëls en beperkinge dat dit Afrikaans stroef maak en sprekers afskrik om dit te gebruik."⁷ (Steyn 1980:332)

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

"Nederlands kan nie aan Afrikaans voorskryf hoe hy daar moet uitsien nie. Ons gaan tog nie ons onoorganklike werkwoord 'wonder' of ons dubbel-nie laat vaar omdat Nederlands dit nie het nie, of skielik 'n lidwoord vereis nie... Dit is egter

⁷ Uys (1983:167) claims that the second *vernederlandsing* of Afrikaans, that of the twentieth century, was very successful "want selfs vandag in die laaste kwart van die twintigste eeu ly ons nog (onnodiglik?) onder die spore van hierdie tweede vernederlandsing van Afrikaans."

hoogste tyd dat voorskrywers – en grammatika- en woorde-boekskrywers – hulle dit erns maak om tussen die twee tale te onderskei en om die een nie as norm vir die ander te gebruik nie."

Van Rensburg (1983:136), after having discussed superceded loanwords such as *brekfis*, *koort*, *juts* etc., which were so common in Afrikaans up to the 1940's, comments:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.3 The author's attitude

I do not set out my attitude to anglicisms in Afrikaans here with any ambition whatsoever of trying to influence the way in which anglicisms are regarded by people in the Afrikaans speaking community, whether they be linguists or laymen. Nevertheless, even a non-native-speaker forms an opinion of the issue after all the reading I have done and what I have been

confronted with daily during my various sojourns in the Republic. As that opinion coincides in many instances with what has been advocated by some Afrikaans scholars, but in other instances is somewhat unorthodox, it does not seem out of place to express that opinion here.

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

The second question cannot be answered with a simple yes or no. There are many examples in the writings of the thirties of anglicisms which were then considered to be *ingeburgerd* by the scholars of the time, but which have since disappeared without trace, or are less frequent now than they apparently were then. This is in itself proof that something can be done to counteract the phenomenon. On the other hand, there are many anglicisms which were vehemently opposed by those same scholars some fifty years ago which are still in the language today and are still not recognised as "correct" Afrikaans by current prescriptive works. (In such instances one wonders how long they have to exist to be fully accepted and gain official recognition.) There are undoubtedly also many anglicisms in Afrikaans now that were unknown to the scholars of the thirties or were at least not as common as nowadays. These factors would thus seem to support a negative answer to question two. The truth of the matter obviously lies somewhere between the two. Without the support of educational bodies to counteract the influence of English over the sixty odd years since recognition, Afrikaans would certainly have contained many more anglicisms than it does today; the fact that the campaign has been only partially successful lies in the nature of the issue. One must accept, although many Afrikaans prescriptive grammarians seem to have difficulty in doing so, that the language as used by the people and as perceived by them to be correct, will ultimately become correct Afrikaans – the many indispensable *ingeburgerde* anglicisms in Afrikaans today are living proof of this. Such anglicisms are concrete evidence that not all anglicisms in Afrikaans can be brushed off as interference phenomena which a good dose of purification will remedy, but that the contact situation with English in which Afrikaans finds itself, has led and is leading to linguistic change. (cf. 4.5) The degree to which English has shaped, and is continuing to shape, the language – because of the nature of South African society, the affinity of the two languages and the high degree of bilingualism – has given rise to an inevitable blend of idiom which simply is Afrikaans and is one of the important characteristics which distinguish it from Dutch.

The number of anglicisms which are likely to enter the language over the decades ahead, because of the forces at work in such a language contact situation, will probably be enormous and the educational system will at best only be able to stem the tide. The continuing influx of immigrants, most of whom opt to join the English speaking community, plus the understandable preference shown for English by Blacks, and increasingly by some Coloureds too, quite apart from the international forces that have always favoured the position of English in South Africa, will assure an ever increasing influence of English on Afrikaans. In the face of such odds, one could well expect an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. There are indeed Afrikaners who see no future for their language and who seem quite unperturbed about its demise, but they are a small minority. Afrikaners still remember with great pride that their ancestors, a nation of farmers, held the whole British Empire at bay for almost three years at the turn of the century, and although finally defeated, rose as a united people out of the turmoil of the Boer War to gain control ultimately of the whole country. This sort of determination, sometimes futile but always sincere, has been applied by them to language issues in the past and can be expected from them in future too. The result will be a compromise, to which the many accepted anglicisms in Afrikaans today bear witness. People such as Kruger (1969:22) had their heads in the clouds if they really felt that a complete "cure" was possible or even desirable:

"Teen hierdie besmetting, hierdie indringing van kwaad in die murg van ons taal, sal ons vasberade moet optree. Die genesing gaan 'n langdurige en veeleisende proses wees – 'n proses van bewusmaking en opvoeding."

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

"As daar in 'n stuk Afrikaans geen anglisisme of neerlandisme of ander vreemde isme voorkom nie – of nou nie meer voorkom nie omdat 'n skoolmeester of redakteur dié wat daar was uitgehaal het – dan is die stuk nou nie meer on-Afrikaans nie. Maar is hy positief Afrikaans? Het hy 'n Afrikaanse geur en kleur?" (p.105)

De Vooys (1925:21) made a similar anti-puristic plea with reference to Dutch, illustrated by a very appropriate example, with which I can identify:

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

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

"Veral as 'n Engelsheid nie as sodanig deur die gewone Afrikaner gevoel word nie, en dus nie die gewone Afrikaner se bewussyn benadeel nie, is die verstandigste gedrag slyn misken: Laissez-faire."

Le Roux (1968:172) stated quite correctly:

"Bo die logika staan wat die taal betref, die lewende taalgebruik self; dit is 'n nog hoër wetboek. Die skryftaal loop nie

⁸ It is in fact questionable whether this use of *een* is an anglicism. (cf. 7.27.7)

sommer die volksmond na nie; die geskrewe woord moet in breër behoeftes voorsien as die gesproke woord en is daarom algemener en ook konserwatiewer. Maar die skryftaal het voortgekom uit die beskaafde spreektaal en moet steeds daarmee in voeling bly, of hy boet van sy lewe in en word houterig en stereotiep."

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

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

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

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

"Het is zonder twijfel aan ons puristisch voorgeslacht te wijten dat de termen 'taalzuivering' en 'taalzuiveraar' in zekere zin werden gediscredeerd doordat die taalverzorging vaak werd geïdentificeerd met een irrationele stryd tegen het vreemde woord."

I don't think the same contempt for the work of the purist of the past exists in South Africa yet, but I must concede that my feelings began to move in that direction as I made my way through the vast wealth of material that has

been written on the topic of anglicisms in Afrikaans. It is to be hoped that a new age has finally dawned in South Africa in this respect and that sensible guidelines that take account of common practice will soon be forthcoming from the *Taalkommissie* and that an end will come to the long era during which stubborn prescription not based on the realities of the South African situation will be a thing of the past.