CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

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

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

would be very pleased if my research could make even a modest contribution to this most urgent of publications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

To begin with, this is the only case in British colonial history where English had to compete with the language of another civilised western power which, from the beginning, has been and still is for the time being,

the language of the majority of White settlers. The White population still splits approximately 60/40 in favour of Afrikaners.

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

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

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

In 1978 Van Wyk added:

> "Multilingualism is a reality which no South African can escape. Monolingualism is rare, being confined mostly to underdeveloped areas with homogeneous communities" (p.29)

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

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

> "Dit is eweneens 'n feit dat hierdie ideaal nie deur Afrikaanssprekers – of die sprekers van enige taal – bereik word nie." (Van Rensburg 1983:134)

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

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

Another fascinating and totally unique facet of the language problem in South Africa is the language policy of the government vis-à-vis the large non-White population, particularly in the light of the homeland policy whereby, once independence is granted, these nations are free to implement their own language policy which inevitably favours English, even if lip service continues to be done to Afrikaans. Such sovereign states are then also free to televise, for example, and the strictly bilingual policy of the SABC is faced with English dominated competition. The competition Afrikaans faces with English in South Africa is analogous to that which

Dutch faces vis-à-vis French in Belgium, but the odds are overwhelmingly stacked against Afrikaans, which is no longer the case in Belgium.

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

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

1.2 The importance of the topic being studied again

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

> "Dat die taal wat sy idioom en sinsbou betref deur Engels beïnvloed is, kan 'n mens geensins ontken nie. Dit blyk veral duidelik as daar na die spreektaal geluister word – en hier geld dit die spreektaal van alle lae van die bevolking, van die mense in die bus, die massa op 'n vergadering en diegene in die werkwinkel, tot by die onderwyser, die lektor, die professor en selfs die lede van die taalliggame. Ek wil my egter nie net by die spreektaal bepaal nie, maar ook die taal van die koerant

> en die boek noem. Daarby sluit ek my eie skryftaal in, want ek weet dat dit nie van Engelse beïnvloeding vry te pleit is nie. Ten spyte van taalinligting en -voorligting gaan beïnvloeding op hierdie gebied voort, en dit kan in die toekoms selfs nog groter afmetings aanneem. Ek glo egter dat die Afrikaanse taal 'n gesonde kern sal behou en as taal sal bly voortleef, al is dit nie heeltemal in die vorm wat taalkundiges vandag nastreef nie... Ek meen dat die invloed van Engels op ons idioom en sinsbou diepgaande sal wees. Die spore is nou reeds onteenseglik daarop en daarin merkbaar." (Terblanche 1963: 170-171)

Over fifty years have passed since Rousseau (1937) did a detailed study of English influence on Afrikaans for the University of Cape Town and much has changed since then. Valkhoff (1966:18) commented:

> "After J.J. le Roux's study nobody seems to have had a mind to study the anglicisms thoroughly. To a connoisseur of Dutch, English and Afrikaans, they are very evident and do not consist of loanwords only: the whole structure of the language has been influenced."[1]

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

> "Daar moet op die hoogste vlak van Afrikaanse taalgesag,

[1] Following this statement Valkhoff lists ten examples of what he, as a Dutchman, considered to be blatant English influence, but his examples were ill-chosen and he attempted to correct himself in 1972. (Valkhoff 1972:28-9) His statement was perfectly valid but its validity was undermined by his carelessly researched examples.

> d.w.s. deur die Taalkommissie van die Akademie, 'n deskundige ondersoek na die Anglisismes in Afrikaans ingestel word, en die resultate van hierdie ondersoek moet gepubliseer word as dié gesaghebbende vraagboek oor die status van bepaalde bousels in Afrikaans". (p.14)

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

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

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

Previous scholars such as Rousseau (1937) and Le Roux (1952) were possibly not in a position to recognise many of the interference phenomena they observed as already constituting linguistic change, although they invariably from time to time felt compelled to admit that one or other structure seemed to have acquired *burgerreg*. These days, more than sixty years after the official recognition of Afrikaans and an era in which virtually the whole of Afrikanerdom is bilingual and has long since turned its back on the language of Holland – even to the extent where Dutch is now

more foreign to them than English – one can look once again at the comments of scholars of the past on English influence and ascertain where their observations have stood the test of time or where subsequent developments have taken Afrikaans on a different course. A reappraisal of these older works on Afrikaans in the light of more recent developments is as informative about the direction the language is headed as it is important to understand the attitudes, often quite emotional in nature, of the many people who have written on various aspects of the influence of English on Afrikaans since Changuion first dealt with the issue in 1844.

1.2.1 Why the topic has been avoided for so long

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

Linguistics is now a much more sophisticated discipline than it was back in the 1930's when so much was written on anglicisms in Afrikaans (cf. 3.2). The need must also have seemed so much greater then than now, but this is deceptive: then it was predominantly superficial lexical interference that was the centre of attention plus the fact that it was felt that the newly recognised official language that had replaced Dutch was in need of some tender loving care. With Dutch still within easy living memory, people did not hesitate to refer back to it as the norm and regard anything that deviated from it as suspect. The extensive relexification – if I dare to use that term from creolistics – from Dutch which occurred in the 1930's, is evidence of the influence the language of Holland still wielded in South Africa at that time. (cf. Van Rensburg 1983:139) Nowadays people neither have a knowledge of Dutch nor is it agreed any more that Dutch is a yardstick which Afrikaans can be validly measured by. Consequently it has become all the harder to decide what is "correct" or "incorrect" and what is or isn't due to English influence. Lacking any totally empirical means by which one can identify English influence – there is little doubt that the scholars of the thirties were often too simplistic in this regard – it seems to me that people in more recent times have tended to shy away from the topic, one can even say have been intimidated into leaving it alone. Is it not a formidable task to measure up to the prerequisites stipulated as necessary for the research worker into anglicisms as enumerated by Combrink (1984:100) in the most recent work on the subject?:

> "Om na te gaan of 'n bepaalde element in Afrikaans wel aan Engelse invloed toe te skryf is, is nie 'n kitswerkie wat sommer enigiemand kan doen nie, dis 'n taak vir een of meer deskundige spesialiste. Dié kontrolering verg onder meer (i) goeie kennis van 18de-, 17de-, 16de en Middeleeuse Nederlands, asook die Nederlandse dialekte van dié tyd; (ii) goeie kennis van dieselfde tydperk se Platduitse dialekte, want op een tydstip was hier meer Platduitsers as Nederlanders aan die Kaap; (iii) goeie kennis van vandag en vroeër jare se Engels, in ander dele van die wêreld en in Suid-Afrika."

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

> "...volgens die taalbewuste meningsvormers beweeg Afrikaans die afgelope twintig jaar in hierdie rigting, en nogal vinnig."

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

> "Ons het ons byna 'n eeu lank teen die oorneem van Engelse woorde geweer, maar oogluikende Anglisismes aanvaar, omdat baie van ons daagliks Engels gehoor en gebruik het en omdat ons taalraadsmanne en onderwyskragte dikwels taalkundig nie voldoende geskoold was om hulself rekenskap te kan gee van wat eintlik 'n isme is nie."

In the past patriotic feelings have perhaps played a role in the topic being largely ignored:

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

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

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

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

1.2.2 Neglect of Afrikaans by Dutch scholars.

It should be regretted that more interest is not shown in Afrikaans by

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

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

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

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

The linguistic diversity of South Africa, and specifically the contact situation between English and Afrikaans with their mutual influence, deserves far greater attention by the world at large than it has had to date, particularly – as I hope to show in the course of this work – with regard to what this case study can teach us about linguistic change in general. Perhaps

the processes I will be describing here have a wider validity, both in the present world and above all in explaining linguistic change throughout history. (cf. p.5)

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

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

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

So many people before me have labelled phenomena in Afrikaans as English inspired when on further reflection it has appeared that this is quite possibly not the case. I suppose the reason is because none of us can live up to the expectations of Combrink (1984), previously mentioned on pp. *8-9*. I will possibly also commit some such errors on occasions and it will be the task of those who follow me to point out where I too have found "a red under every bed". I do tackle the problem from a different point of view, however, and will perhaps not make as many mistakes, because I have had the benefit of learning from those of my predecessors, or at least will make different errors of judgement; only subsequent research will tell. This will

probably remain a problem in the analysis of English influence on Afrikaans to a degree, although change is now so rapid that we may better be able to monitor changes occurring in the future than we have to date. Smith (1962:71) said of Rousseau's (1937) work:

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

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

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

Further on Aitchison herself says:

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

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

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

I do not intend to concentrate on the **causes** of bilingual interference in South Africa, something competently done in great detail by Rousseau, but simply on the **results** and to postulate that we have now reached a stage where the influence English is having on Afrikaans has gone well beyond

the realm of interference and has given rise to linguistic change. In 1964 Boshoff stated:

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

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

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

Combrink (1984:100-101) writes:

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

I hope to differ from these previous writers in the following way. With regard to (a), I want to look objectively at what others understand by the term. With regard to (b), I too give a "unique" list of anglicisms collected by me but without insisting that all are definitely the result of English influence – I merely postulate the possibility or probability of that being the case. And finally, with regard to Combrink's point (c), not being a native-speaker of Afrikaans, or even a South African for that matter, I am in no position to label phenomena as definitely *ingeburger*. I intend merely to discuss the concepts of *inburgering*/acceptability and standard

Afrikaans in this context and leave the Afrikaans speaking reader to assess, according to the norms of his idiolect, how far the absorption of these linguistic phenomena has gone. The following statement by De Villiers (1977:1) would seem to endorse my approach as being the only safe one to take although he himself advocates the importance of linguists regarding the setting of norms as part of their task:

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

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

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

1.3.1 Why consideration of Coloured Afrikaans is excluded from this study

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

South Africa, as well as in part to the constraints of apartheid. More importantly, however, the degree to which English has affected the spokenAfrikaans of Coloureds is far greater than that of Whites. To illustrate the problem I quote Van Wyk (1978:47):

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

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

1.4 The methodology

1.4.1 Sources of the corpus

From 1974-84 the South African embassy in Canberra regularly kept me supplied with copies of *Die Burger*, the leading Capetonian Afrikaans daily, and *Suid-Afrikaanse Panorama*, a glossy magazine on various facets of South African life that appears separately in both official languages. These publications were the first and only source of material at my disposal while resident in Australia. I spent the period February to October 1983 in Bloemfontein where I greatly expanded my corpus by reading the Afrikaans press extensively, as well as gleaning a considerable amount of material from the radio and television broadcasts of the SABC. I chose to do the research for this book in Bloemfontein as it is the only substantial urban environment in South Africa that is predominantly and overwhelmingly Afrikaans, and is simultaneously the site of a university. Not being a native-speaker of Afrikaans and thus unable to apply my own *taalgevoel* to what I heard and read, and as my interest was in *ingeburgerde Anglisismes* rather than interference phenomena, I considered it necessary to immerse myself in the "purest" environment available, which Johannesburg, Cape Town or Pretoria would certainly not have been. Even in Bloemfontein, a bastion of Afrikanerdom where very little

English is used, I was continuously confronted with examples of deep-rooted English influence. This seemed more significant to me in such an environment than if I had been confronted with similar circumstances in the other cities of South Africa where one is continually employing one's bilingualism and is thus more susceptible to inference. Coetzee (1948:21) remarked after discussing examples of English influence:

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

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

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

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

To gain acceptance in the written language, the phenomena must begin somewhere, clearly in the spoken language, even if to begin with one would simply class them as examples of interference.[2] Eventually they can occur with great frequency and yet still not always be particularly evident in writing:

> "Dit is deur middel van die gesproke taal dat taal gevorm word en waar dit groei – óf sal sommiges beweer, waar dit ten gronde gaan – en sekerlik verander." (Hauptfleisch 1983:63)

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

[2] Pienaar (1931:175) refers to *papier-Anglisismes,* a small category of anglicisms which occur only in writing, not in speech, for example: *wie* instead of *wat* as a relative pronoun with reference to personal antecedents.

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

> "Gedurende geruime tyd het ek voorbeelde opgeteken uit die mond van beskaafde en ontwikkelde Afrikaners, en veral uit koerante, tydskrifte en die werke van bekende skrywers. Bronne vermeld ek nie: die ruimte laat dit nie toe nie en dit kan aanleiding gee tot onnodige kleinserigheid aan die kant van die skrywer en ongeregverdigde gevolgtrekkinge aan die kant van die leser."

1.4.2 Identifying English influence

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

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

> "1. Ons eie taalgevoel – maar ons moet darem enigsins oortuig wees dat dit behoorlik ontwikkel en gesond is.
> 2. Die taal van onvervalste Afrikaners – veral van ons ouer mense in streke wat die minste aan Engelse invloed blootgestel was.
> 3. Sewentiende-eeuse Nederlands, wat die grondvorm van

> Afrikaans is – veral die sewentiende-eeuse Nederlandse volkstaal, soos ons dit in die klugte en ander volksliteratuur kan sien.
> 4. Die streeksprake of dialekte van Nederlands...
> 5. Die moderne Nederlandse standaardtaal, wat net soos Afrikaans, uit die sewentiende-eeuse Nederlands ontwikkel het, en wat nie alleen tot onlangs toe dié erkende skryftaal van alle Afrikaners was nie, maar wat ook vandag nog ons skryftaal en hoëre spreektaal beïnvloed en verryk."[3]

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

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

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

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

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

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

[3] The influence of standard Dutch is undoubtedly less now than when Smith was writing in 1948, but nevertheless the role that Dutch continued to play in shaping Afrikaans throughout the nineteenth century and even after the official recognition of the language in 1925, has often been ignored or underestimated. (cf. Uys 1983)

> Hollands en die bewuste poging om dit weer te gee, gekom het van Nederlanders nie. Hulle het beskik oor 'n basis van vergelyking, wat aan die meeste andere wat Duitsers, Franse en Skandinawiërs was, ontbreek het."

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

> "Moet mens nie ook die huidige Nederlands tot vergelykingsbasis verhef nie?"

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

> "In die geval van Afrikaans moet ons daarteen waak om Nederlands as norm te aânvaar en wat daarvan afwyk, as korrup te beskou".

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

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

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

I concede that Dutch can no longer be used as the norm in the way that the Twee Oud-onderwysers (1937) and even Rousseau (1937) used it, but where else can one begin when attempting to isolate the influence of English on Afrikaans from all the other factors that have contributed to the independent path that Afrikaans has opted to take away from Dutch? A knowledge of Dutch among South African linguists is nowadays not what it was nor, in my opinion, what it should be, and this situation could well become worse with present relations between Holland and South Africa

being as they are. Such a knowledge is imperative for a thorough study of anglicisms in Afrikaans. The first generation of Afrikaans linguists did receive their training in Dutch, either in Holland or South Africa (e.g. S.P.E. Boshoff, J.L.M. Franken, D.B. Bosman, J.J. Smith), but they were more interested in *die ontstaan van Afrikaans* and in puristic aspects, than in the "impurities" of the language.

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

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

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

> "Uit hierdie beknopte oorsig blyk dit dat daar talle redes is waarom Afrikaans en Engels duisende parallelle taalbousels het. Dit is onregverdig om, sonder verdere ondersoek, 'n taalbousel wat in Afrikaans gebruik word, as 'n Anglisisme te bestempel bloot omdat dié taalbousel 'n parallel in Engels het. Maar hiermee word nie die feit weggepraat dat Engels wel 'n diepgaande invloed op Afrikaans gehad het en nog het nie."

The problem of distinguishing English influence from the common heritage is indeed quite considerable, as the following expressions will serve to illustrate: *dit belowe om goed te word, in die ope lug, dagdroom*

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

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

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

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

This comment of Combrink's is of particular relevance to the many phenomena one often reads of as having occurred in older Dutch or still occurring in Dutch dialects. Just because certain typically Afrikaans structures that differ from ABN are to be found in Dutch dialects or in

seventeenth century Dutch, one cannot at all necessarily conclude that they are the source thereof in Afrikaans; that may or may not be the case, or a combination of factors may have contributed to the presence of a given linguistic form in Afrikaans. (cf. 6.3) Smith (*Die Naweek,* 10/2/49), in his discussion on the expression *welaf,* states that Schonken mentions it occurs in the dialect of Oud-Ablas. Smith then quotes Rousseau:

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

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

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

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

the meaning of "to live" is, at least these days, peculiar to South African English. Brachin (1970:126) even suggested that *bly* may well be a translation of *rester* and thus of Huguenot origin (which is highly unlikely), although Hegmann (1983:72) countered that theory by pointing out that the *OED* gives "to remain" as meaning "to have one's abode, to dwell (obsol.)."

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

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

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

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

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

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

What Malherbe calls the *grondooreenkoms* is of particular interest and importance in the contact situation under discussion here. Not only the

inherited common features of English and Dutch/Afrikaans, but also the parallel development with English that particularly Afrikaans, as opposed to Dutch, has undergone since 1652 has led past scholars to wrongly postulate English influence, e.g. Du Toit (1897:iv), Valkhoff (1972:29).

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

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

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

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

Ostyn and Nijenhuis which coincide with Afrikaans usage, are referred to in the course of this work.

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

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

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

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

source. Of relevance here is Hiemstra's (1963:9) observation with regard to a common puristic avoidance of such words in Afrikaans:

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

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

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

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

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

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