

The Earliest Stage of Language Planning

Contributions to the Sociology of Language

65

Editor

Joshua A. Fishman

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

The Earliest Stage of Language Planning

The “First Congress” Phenomenon

Edited by
Joshua A. Fishman

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 1993

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of
the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Earliest stage of language planning : the "first congress"
phenomenon / edited by Joshua A. Fishman.

p. cm. — (Contributions to the sociology of lan-
guage ; 65)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 3-11-013530-2 (cloth : acid-free paper)

1. Language planning — Congresses. I. Fishman, Joshua
A. II. Series.

P40.5.L35E18 1993

306.4'49 — dc20

92-47497

Deutsche Bibliothek — Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The **earliest stage of language planning** : the "first congress"
phenomenon / ed. by Joshua A. Fishman. — Berlin ; New York :
Mouton de Gruyter, 1993

(Contributions to the sociology of language ; 65)

ISBN 3-11-013530-2

NE: Fishman, Joshua A. [Hrsg.]; GT

© Copyright 1993 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30.

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or
mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval
system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Typesetting and Printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin. — Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer,
Berlin. Printed in Germany.

A candle in memory of the Tshernovits Conference:
Gone but not forgotten

אַ נר-תמיד לזכרון דער טשערנאָוויצער קאָנפערענץ:
פאַרגאַנגען נאָר נישט פאַרגעסן

Contents

Introduction: Exploring an overlooked sociolinguistic phenomenon (The First Congress for Language X) <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	1
The First Language Congress for Afrikaans <i>Lloyd Holliday</i>	11
The Academic Conference on the Reform of Belorussian Orthography and Alphabet (Minsk 1926): A unique non-event? <i>Paul Wexler</i>	31
The First International Catalan Language Congress, Barcelona, 13 – 18 October, 1906 <i>Joan Martí i Castell</i>	47
Integration vs. particularism: The undeclared issue at the first “Dutch Congress” in 1849 <i>Roland Willemyns</i>	69
The First Congress for Hebrew, or When is a congress not a congress? <i>Lewis Glinert</i>	85
The First Congress of Hindi <i>Raja Ram Mehrotra</i>	117
The first efforts to promote and develop Indonesian <i>Anton M. Moeliono</i>	129
The emergence of the Korean script as a symbol of Korean identity <i>Harald Haarmann</i>	143
The first philological conference for the establishment of the Macedonian alphabet and the Macedonian literary language: Its precedents and consequences <i>Victor A. Friedman</i>	159

The First Congress for Malay <i>Asmah Haji Omar</i>	181
The First Congress of Mayan Languages of Guatemala (1949) <i>Julia Becker Richards</i>	199
Language purism and propaganda: The First Congress for Polish <i>Karol Janicki and Adam Jaworski</i>	219
The First Workshop on Quechua and Aymara Writing <i>Nancy H. Hornberger</i>	233
The First Congress for Tok Pisin in 1973 <i>S. A. Wurm</i>	257
The First Turkish Language Congress <i>Jacob M. Landau</i>	271
The 1928 Ukrainian orthography <i>Andrij Hornjatkevyč</i>	293
Senegalese languages in education: The First Congress of Wolof <i>Omar Ka</i>	305
The Tshernovits Conference revisited: The First World Conference for Yiddish, 85 years later <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	321
The “First Congress” phenomenon: Arriving at some general conclusions <i>Joshua A. Fishman</i>	333
Topical Index	349

Introduction:

Exploring an overlooked sociolinguistic phenomenon (The First Congress for Language X)

Joshua A. Fishman

Before the beginning

Before arriving at the realization that there was a more generalizable sociolinguistic phenomenon such as “first congresses”, there was in my mind no more than the awareness of two such congresses: the Indonesian congress of 1928, which has been mentioned briefly several times (e. g., Alisjahbana 1976) and the Yiddish congress of 1908, which I myself have investigated (Fishman 1980, 1988 a and 1988 b). Since both of these conferences are recognizably similar in their intimate relationship to more encompassing nationalist political (or at least cultural) autonomy movements, it is perhaps understandable why I reached the premature conclusion that all first congresses were of this type. Even had that been the case, there would have been ample reason to explore the phenomenon further. From the little I knew of the Indonesian case (I had visited Indonesia in the early 70s in connection with my co-directorship of the Language Planning Processes Project and I had the rare opportunity of meeting then with individuals who had been present at the 1928 congress), it was clear to me that it was different from the Yiddish congress in many ways: in type of organizational sponsorship, in its exposure to colonial governmental regulation and, above all, in its focus on a lingua franca (i. e., not on a native vernacular of Indonesia) as its language of future national unity. There must be other dimensions of difference, I said to myself, and I decided that after I completed my exploration of the Yiddish congress I would return to the exploration of those other dimensions and to doing so on an even broader base of contrasted cases, provided, of course, I could locate the other first congresses that my intuition told me must have been convened, at least in the nationalist context. The conclusion of the 1988 celebrations of the 80th anniversary of the Yiddish congress (and the publication of my final studies concerning that congress

during that year) “liberated” me, so to speak, to expand this topic comparatively, although I still assumed that the phenomenon in question was essentially restricted to the nationalist context.

Why should this phenomenon be explored?

The sociology of language is centrally concerned not only with societally patterned behavior *through* language but with societally patterned behavior *toward* language, whether positive or negative. Not only are language attitudes of concern in this connection but also all aspects of the organized (indeed, even centrally organized) behaviors toward language which have begun to be known as “language planning”. Language congresses are easily recognizable as early efforts at both corpus planning and status planning, i. e., efforts to purify, enrich and/or standardize the language itself, on the one hand, and efforts to protect, foster and require the language, on the other hand. When language planning efforts succeed in the sociopolitical realm they turn increasingly (and, ultimately, solely) to corpus planning. Although the two, status planning and corpus planning, should theoretically not be too far “out of synch” with one another, many empirical questions remain as to whether first congresses differ in the amount of attention which they pay to these two aspects of language planning and, if so, whether such differences are possibly related to the degree of status security that exists at the time that first congresses are convened.

The various models of the language planning flow-chart (see, e. g., Fishman 1973, Rubin et al. 1977, Eastman 1983, Cobarrubias—Fishman 1983, and Cooper 1989) all posit a beginning stage at which time no authoritative policy decisions have yet been reached. First congresses pertain to just such a “pre-natal” or embryonic stage, when the faithful are being rallied for the first time so that a course of action can be decided upon, responsibilities can be allocated, priorities can be set and authorities can be empowered. It is primarily because of its explicit recognition of this early and formative stage, indeed, perhaps even just the beginning of this earliest stage, that the study of first congresses may constitute a conceptually and strategically worthwhile step ahead in the ongoing efforts to better understand the entire language planning process flow-chart. The decisions and the errors that characterize this stage may long remain to guide and to complicate the subsequent stages of the

entire process, perhaps particularly for the languages of less fortunate speech communities which fail to be overtaken by advantageous events that can break them out of their initial problematic contexts.

Characteristics of our sample

A few months of intensive correspondence quickly confirmed the correctness of my initial hunch that there must have been many, many first congresses. Of the 30-some that were ultimately confirmed in this fashion (none being excluded for substantive reasons, i. e., all were retained, even if they did not seem to fit into the preconceived mold of nationalist related congresses, except for obviously academic congresses convened for obviously academic purposes), 18 are represented in this volume. The dozen or so that fell by the wayside did so either because the scholars familiar with them had competing commitments that made it impossible for them to meet a generous deadline or because no one could be located to handle them. A set of ten questions was circulated to all participants to serve as a guide to their discussions, but no attempt was made to meticulously keep them to each of these points or to keep them from including others. Although, as mentioned, obviously academic first congresses for obviously academic purposes alone were ruled out, any academically sponsored or hosted first congresses aiming at immediate and broader status and/or corpus impact *were* admitted into the universe of study.

The 18 first congresses with which we have wound up in this volume seem to be fully representative of the total universe that was initially located.¹ Table 1 shows the continental distribution of the languages that these 18 first congresses deal with. Clearly, European congresses constitute a plurality, but the phenomenon we are about to investigate is also clearly not a European one alone, and Asian congresses seem to have occurred almost as frequently as European ones. It remains to be seen whether the congresses in one part of the world have differed materially, either in input or in consequences, from those occurring elsewhere.

With respect to the time frame of the first congresses, Table 2 reveals that we are dealing almost entirely with occurrences during the past 150 years. The only and obvious exception to this generalization is the Korean case. Roughly one third of the remaining cases took place before World War 1, roughly one third between World War 1 and World War 2, and one third since approximately the end of World War 2. It will be inter-

Table 1 Continental distribution of the languages whose first congresses are discussed in this volume

Europe: n = 8

Belorussian
Catalan
Dutch in Belgium
Macedonian
Polish
Turkish*
Ukrainian
Yiddish

Americas: n = 2

Mayan Languages
Quechua and Aymara

Africa: n = 2

Afrikaans
Wolof

Asia: n = 6

Hebrew**
Hindi
Indonesian
Korean
Malay
Tok Pisin

* Turkish pertains to both Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia.

** The Hebrew first congress took place in Palestine but was essentially planned, directed and primarily attended by European-born Zionists.

esting to note, as we familiarize ourselves with the 18 cases that follow, whether those congresses occurring roughly at the same time (e. g., prior to World War I) share any common features, particularly with others occurring in the same region and, if so, whether they do so more than they share common features with congresses in other regions and periods in history.

It would appear from Table 2 that there have been no European first congresses, other than the Polish one, since the end of the Second World War, i. e., that only Third World first congresses have been convened since then. On the other hand, among the roughly half dozen first congresses held before the First World War, three pertain to European settings and two more (Hebrew and Afrikaans) pertain to European configurations "transported" to Africa and the Near East. These widely

Table 2 When did the first congresses take place?

Korean	about	1450
Dutch in Belgium		1849
Hindi		1893
Afrikaans		1896
Hebrew		1903
Catalan		1906
Yiddish		1908
Belorussian		1926
Ukrainian		1927
Indonesian		1928
Turkish		1932
Macedonian		1944
Mayan languages		1949
Malay		1952
Tok Pisin		1973
Wolof		1981
Quechua-Aymara		1983
Polish		1984

differing proportions of European involvement in first congresses probably reflect the strikingly differing rates of sociocultural modernization characterizing Europe, on the one hand, and most of the rest of the world, on the other hand. Our original nationalist association with first congresses would agree well with the above contrast, since nationalist directed liberation and modernization efforts typically occurred much earlier in Europe than elsewhere. But, if, as appears likely from the mere naming of the cases included in this volume, other types of modernization and vernacular consciousness movements must also be considered in connection with first congresses, then the discrepant Korean case among the pre-World War 1 first congresses and the discrepant Polish case among the post-World War 2 first congresses both deserve special attention in order to clarify their anomalous timing and the nature of their claim to first congress status.

The agendas of first congresses

How the “firstness” of first congresses comes to expression would seem to be the heart of the matter. Is this “firstness” recognizable in connection with characteristics of those who organize/sponsor the congresses, attend

them, make presentations at them, the topics or balance of topics constituting their agendas, their opponents (or the characteristics of those who refuse to attend them, if there are such), their resolutions or decisions, their follow-through to post-congress implementation, their rate of success and the degree to which they are remembered in subsequent years and become part of the lore and mythology of speech communities? Our contributors were asked to give particular attention to these questions and, fortunately, many of them did so. Nevertheless, if the above questions are to be seriously pursued from the point of view of what exactly makes a first congress different from subsequent congresses, it will be necessary to examine a representative sample of subsequent congresses as well and that task goes considerably beyond the limits of the current effort. Accordingly, we may not be able to come to grips with the issue of “firstness” *per se*, but the issue of agenda characteristics can be addressed to some extent nonetheless, and it can be contextualized in connection with other characteristics of the languages involved and the first congresses convened on their behalf.

The question of “success”

The most difficult question that can be addressed to a first congress is whether it was “successful”, i. e. whether its resolutions or the efforts which it set into motion can be said to have attained their goals to some immediate and substantial degree. Causality is always difficult to demonstrate unambiguously in socio-historical studies because of the co-occurrence of many different processes and influences. In connection with those whose first congress was associated with nationalist movements for liberation and modernization one would have to demonstrate that subsequent changes in language status or corpus are directly relatable to the first congresses *per se* rather than to any of the myriad other co-occurring and subsequently occurring nationalist efforts. Furthermore, any pursuit of this issue must take into account the possible differences between first congresses in terms of their sponsorship, organization and size, on the one hand, and such contextual issues as the nature of the opposition to them and the degree of political and cultural tension by which they are accompanied and surrounded, on the other hand. Thus there probably should not be the same standard of “success” for a brief congress involving a dozen individuals and for another involving over 700 participants for a full week.

Similarly, failure too can come due to entirely extraneous factors, factors that essentially have nothing to do with the first congress other than proximity in time. Nevertheless, it would be instructive to know which of our 18 first congresses were the most successful, more or less in their own right, by virtue of events which they themselves set in motion, and whether the more successful congresses (by some criterion of success) as a whole can be differentiated from the less successful ones on one or more of the formal dimensions that have been mentioned above.

In summary

First congresses are worthy of study because they may provide us with insight into the earliest stage (the pre-stage) of the total language planning process. Increasingly, people and peoples have organized to make their vernaculars conform to the image of “the good language” to which they separately subscribe. They have organized to provide their vernaculars with greater longevity and to assure them the most prestigious functions (or co-functions) of their respective sociocultural establishments. In order to discharge these functions appropriately, these people and peoples have organized to make their vernaculars more all encompassing, more standardized in grammar, spelling and even pronunciation, freer of influences or “contamination” from other languages (particularly, from historically contra-indicated languages), more in accord with a model of the language characteristic of a particularly favored geographic region, social stratum or historical period.

Obviously, there is a great deal of decision making involved in the total language planning process and first congresses constitute the very beginning of the long chain of decisions and implementations yet to come. This beginning, of course, is itself the byproduct of circumstances and decisions that have come before it. However, the beginning is also, willy-nilly, the progenitor of countless directions, choices, priorities, successes and failures yet to come.

Having been largely overlooked by sociolinguistic scholarship before, we are about to depart on the first world-wide tour of first congresses, in the hope of mapping out some of the major features of this generally unreported or at least drastically under-reported phenomenon. After our initial spade-work is done, others can then undertake contrasting tours of this same phenomenon, or even re-analyze the data that we will present,

in accord with a variety (and doubtlessly with an improved array) of theoretical and methodological preferences of their own choosing. We can only claim to have been the first to recognize the potential of this topic and, like the first congresses that we will now begin to describe, we can only hope that we will not be the last to seriously attend to the phenomenon that is of concern to us.²

Notes

1. Several of the write-ups of first congresses that could not be completed in time for inclusion in this volume will be presented in a special issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* to be devoted to this topic. This issue, now expected to appear in 1993, will provide readers with an opportunity to judge whether any of proposed integrative conclusions to be suggested in Chapter 20 are cross-validated on a new sample of cases.
2. This introduction was written to reflect the state of our knowledge pertaining to first congresses prior to, rather than after, undertaking the collective efforts reflected in this volume. It eschews any pretense at omniscience or at being able to predict what the ultimate conclusions would be, even though these conclusions were already known to this writer when this introduction was written.

References

- Alisjahbana, Takdir S.
1976 *Language planning for modernization: The case of Indonesian and Malaysian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cobarrubias, Juan—Joshua A. Fishman (eds.)
1983 *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Cooper, Robert L.
1990 *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eastman, Carol. M.
1983 *Language planning: An introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
1980 "Attracting a following to high-culture functions for a language of everyday life: The role of the Tshernovits Language Conference in the 'Rise of Yiddish'", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 24: 43–73. [Reprinted in *Yiddish: Turning to life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (1991). 255–283.]
1988 a "Der hebreyshe opruf af der tshernovitser konferents", *Afn shvel* 271: 8–13. [Reprinted in *Yiddish: Turning to life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (1991). 284–290. Translated into English ("The Hebraist response to the Tshernovits Conference") in *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau*, vol. 1. Alan Kaye et al. (ed.), Wiesbaden, Otto Harrasowitz, 1991, 437–448.]

- 1988 b “Nosn birnboyms dray tshernovitser konferentsn”, *Tsukunft* 95, 1: 85–90.
[Translated into English (“Nathan Birnbaum’s three ‘rendezvous’ in Tshernovits”) in Gregory Guy et al. (eds.), *Festschrift for William Labov*, in press.]
- Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.)
1973 *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Rubin, Joan—Bjorn Jernudd—Jyotirindra DasGupta—Charles Ferguson—Joshua A. Fishman (eds.)
1977 *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague: Mouton.

The First Language Congress for Afrikaans¹

Lloyd Holliday

There were more than 5 language congresses concerning the language of the Afrikaners at a “national”² level between 1890 and 1910. Since the first of these conferences was in essence a conference to promote the use of Dutch, my focus in this chapter falls on the second conference, which was quite consciously called *Di Eerste Afrikaanse Taalkongres* [The First Afrikaans Language Congress]. Despite its title, paradoxically this conference marks the closing years of the 1st Language Movement which was spearheaded by the *Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners* (GRA) [Fellowship of True Afrikaners]. The proceedings of and motions tabled at this conference were a direct reflection of the preceding years of the history of the GRA and its leadership, which therefore form a substantial part of this chapter. Although that was not its intention, retrospectively the conference was more of a consummation of past efforts than a provider of a new stimulus to the Afrikaans language, except in one decision. The motion to start a new journal, *Ons Klyntji* [Our Little One], in addition to the GRA’s weekly newspaper *Die Afrikaanse Patriot* [The Afrikaans Patriot], the only other exclusively Afrikaans publication, provided a new forum to spread the written form of the language. In reality, however, the publication of the journal was the work of a handful of the original remaining members of the GRA, and did not depend on the Congress for support.

Background and status of Afrikaans by mid 19th century

Afrikaans, currently one of the two official languages of South Africa and spoken by about 16% of the population (Holliday 1989; in press) as a mother tongue, evolved from Dutch. Within 50 years after the Dutch colonized the Cape in 1652, travellers remarked on the local non-standard Cape Dutch dialect. (see Valkhoff 1971; Botha 1983; Jordaan 1974; Markey 1982; Gilbert and Makhudu 1984; Den Besten 1978; Combrink 1978; for arguments about whether Afrikaans is a creole or not). By the

mid 19th century it had become for many people in southern Africa of more than one ethnic origin, their mother tongue and only language. Watts (1976: 43–44) estimates that in the whole of southern Africa there were in 1890/1891 248,000 speakers of English and 372,000 speakers of Afrikaans from European ethnic origin. To the latter number of Afrikaans speakers at the end of the 19th century must also be added approximately 400,000 speakers of Afrikaans from various other ethnic origins including indigenous inhabitants (Steyn 1980: 124).

However, this language, referred to as Kitchen Dutch or Cape Dutch, was not regarded as a literary language suitable for use in the church, state or education. Of Afrikaans, the Chief Justice of the Cape Colony, Lord J. H. de Villiers, an anglicized Afrikaner, said in 1876:

Poor in the number of its words, weak in its inflections, wanting in accuracy of meaning and incapable in expressing ideas connected with the higher spheres of thought, it will have to undergo great modification before it will be able to produce a literature worthy of the name. [The effort] would be more usefully employed in appropriating that rich and glorious language which is ready to our hands as a literary language of first rank. (quoted in Steyn 1980: 139)

Others, including members of the Cape Dutch Reformed Synod of October 1880, cast a racist slur on the language calling it the “Hotnotstaal”³ [language of the Hottentots] (see Scholtz 1975: 78, 93, 96–99; Steyn 1980: 167–171, 468; Davenport 1966: 38). In what was by the 1860s a British Colony with two independent Trekker Republics to the north, English culture was predominant. The educated Dutch-speaking aristocracy in the cities increasingly embraced the English language, politics, and culture, whilst in the rural areas “the spoken language was generally an immature form of Afrikaans, unsupported ... by any significant cultural activity; and unsupported by a literature ...” (Davenport 1966: 3).

Afrikaans itself had no legal status until 1925, but the legal status that Dutch had enjoyed at the time of the British occupation in 1806 had gradually been eroded as the Cape government pursued an active policy of Anglicization and by the 5 July 1822 proclamation of Lord Charles Somerset, Governor of the Cape Colony, English became the exclusive language of government and justice, also to be encouraged in the Dutch Reformed Church. From 1865 English became the exclusive medium of education in the Cape Colony.

In the northernmost Trekker Republic of the Transvaal, the 1858 constitution (Steyn 1980: 133) contained no stipulation of an official

language, even though the constitution itself was written in High Dutch. The constitution of the Orange Free State declared Dutch to be the official language, and made several prescriptions re language use, including the stipulation that Dutch must be the medium of education for at least half of the school subjects from standard two upwards (Steyn 1980: 133). However, English exercised a great influence in both states, especially the Transvaal, beginning with the gold rush that started in 1886, so that by 1900 it was certainly the predominant language.

But despite competition from two fully fledged languages, English on the one hand spoken by the politically and economically dominant group, and Standard Dutch on the other accepted by these very selfsame speakers of Afrikaans in the 19th century as their real mother tongue, Afrikaans emerged by the mid 20th century as one of the two official languages of South Africa and a language of tertiary education fully capable of supporting all the higher functions of language.

Antecedents to the First Afrikaans language movement

The movement to gain acceptance for Afrikaans as the national language and mother tongue of the Afrikaner people was initiated in 1874 as part of a larger resurgence of Afrikaner nationalism (Davenport 1966; Roberge 1990). The Conservative Party having won the 1874 election in Britain, Lord Carnarvon renewed British endeavors to form a confederation of southern African states under British hegemony, similar to the 1867 federation of Canada. In 1868 Basutoland (current day Lesotho) was annexed. The 1867 discovery of diamonds, led to the annexation of the diamond fields in 1871, which was disputed by the Orange Free State. Further north the opening in 1873 of the Lydenberg gold mines began what was eventually the Gold Rush to the Witwatersrand in 1886. In 1872 The Cape Colony was granted responsible government and Sir Theophilus Shepstone annexed the Transvaal Republic in 1877. This led to disputes between the British government and the two sovereign Trekker Republics, which “divided Cape Afrikaner’s loyalties and made them conscious of their blood ties with the emigrant trekkers” (Davenport 1966: 11).

In the larger arena of official public life centered around Cape Town, as far as language was concerned, the fight was for a wider acceptance of High Dutch, not Afrikaans. In Cape Town, Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), the editor of the *Volksvriend*, amalgamated his paper with

De Zuid Afrikaan in 1871. His newspaper campaigns led directly to the formation of Dutch-speaking farmers' associations, known as *boeren vereeniging*. Onze Jan later became the leader of the *Afrikaner Bond*⁴ and led the struggle for Afrikaner nationalism in the Cape Parliament, but he always remained a supporter of Dutch as the national language (Lantern 1975: 56–57).

The language movement for Afrikaans, itself, began in Paarl, a town in the wine-growing area of South Africa, some 30 miles from the capital of Cape Town, and for the most part appealed to “that part of the people that lived in mental poverty, that understood Dutch to some extent but could not express themselves adequately and easily through it” (Nienaber 1959). It is significant that the movement started not in the capital where English predominated, nor in the trekker republics where Dutch was the language of government, nor even in the rural regions of the Cape Colony least under British cultural influence, but in an area with a long settled and stable Afrikaner population, which enjoyed a good education, a rich cultural and religious life, as well as being within easy access of the capital and its press.

The original settlers of this area were French speaking Huguenots who came to the Cape circa 1688. Many of the early participants in the Afrikaans language movement were proud of this heritage,⁵ in particular its leader the Rev. S. J. du Toit. One could speculate that, although by this time the Huguenots had long been fully assimilated to the Dutch-speaking population and French had died out circa 1750 (Steyn 1980: 111), because they owed less psychological allegiance to the motherland and its language, i. e. High Dutch, these descendants of the Huguenots were more prepared than their counterparts of Dutch and German descent, to forge a wholly new African destiny for themselves as “Afrikaners” by promoting for socio-political purposes the indigenous Dutch “creole” that was in reality the everyday language of the majority of the non-Bantu⁶ non-English speaking population.

Founding of the GRA

The Rev. S. J. du Toit graduated from the Stellenbosch Theological School in 1872, and after various temporary posts in the Cape and Transvaal, he accepted the pastoral call of the newly established North Paarl Congregation on 28 Sept. 1875.

In the meantime on 7 September 1872 Dr Arnoldus Pannevis writing under the pseudonym *Een Vriend van het Nuttige* [A Friend of the Useful] suggested in *De Zuid-Afrikaan* [The South African] that the Bible be translated into Afrikaans for the sake of those who did not understand the Dutch State Bible. His chief aim was not the promotion of Afrikaans, but to make the Bible available to the so-called Cape Coloured community. C. P. Hoogenhout, also a Dutch immigrant, a school teacher near Wellington, was converted under the influence of Pannevis and they became lifelong friends. Hoogenhout supported the idea in the press and he actually translated Matthew 28 into Afrikaans. In 1873 he wrote *Die Geskiedenis van Josef voor Kinders en Huissouwens, in hulle eie Taal Geskrywe deur een vriend*. [The History of Joseph for children and households, written in their own language by a friend]. It was published by G. J. Malherbe of Paarl, son-in-law of the Rev. van der Lingen, who had exercised an important influence on the Rev. S. J. du Toit.

However, not everyone supported the idea of translating the Bible. The Editor of *De Gereformeerde Kerkbode* [The Reformed Church Messenger] maintained that the lack of comprehension was not due to the language of the Dutch State Bible, but a lack of education, hence an Afrikaans translation was not needed (Scholtz 1975: 69). In the journal *Elpis* it was maintained that since the Afrikaans language did not exist it was absurd even to consider a translation. In the press articles by Hoogenhout in 1873–1874 continued to debate the merits of Afrikaans.

In July 1874 the Rev. S. J. du Toit under the pseudonym *Een Ware Afrikander* wrote, albeit in Dutch, three influential articles, thereby de facto assuming the leadership of the movement to promote Afrikaans. His arguments for Afrikaans laid the foundation of the program for the entire subsequent movement. In the first one he wrote:

The language of a nation interprets the character of the nation. People cannot form a nation without a language. Take away from a people their language and you are taking away the wisdom of their forefathers, left to them in the form of idioms and proverbs, etc. ... And what has been done up to the present and will be done in the future about the Afrikaans language and the Afrikaner nation? Systematically, all sense of nationality has been destroyed and with it our language is suppressed in our Parliament, in our courts of law, in our schools, and has even been started in our churches (*Zuid Afrikaan*, 8 July 1874, quoted in Scholtz 1975: 70).⁷

In the second article he argues for the status of Afrikaans:

People tell you that Afrikaans isn't a language, because it is composed of Dutch, French, Hottentot, etc. However, the manner in which the English language is patched together is wisely hidden (*Zuid Afrikaan*, 11 July 1874, quoted in Scholtz 1975: 70).

In the third article he inveighs against Anglicization:

Eventually a start has also been made in our churches with sermons, confirmations and the celebration of holy communion in English, etc.; even though those who built the church understand not a word of it. Strangers are taking your place, and you remain silent ... And most unfortunate of all, our ministers – ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church – are helping to promote this ... Proof of this is not only the needless preaching in English in many congregations; but also institutions such as the Huguenot School and the Good Hope Seminary. Afrikaners do you still not know your direction? It is time that you awake! Maybe it is too late! (*Zuid Afrikaan*, 22 July 1874, quoted in Scholtz 1975: 70)

These letters were probably a consequence of du Toit's observations of the Huguenot Seminary in Wellington opened in January 1874, during his residence in Wellington as assistant pastor and likewise his encounters of services in English at the Groote Kerk in Cape Town during his residency as assistant there in 1873 (Scholtz 1975: 71).

The catalyst for the foundation of the GRA was a letter written without the knowledge of his colleagues by Dr Pannevis in November 1874 to the British and Overseas Bible Society asking for help in translating the Dutch State Bible into Afrikaans and recommending the Rev. S. J. du Toit as translator. The London based society wrote to the Rev. G. Morgan their representative in Southern Africa asking him for further information, also noting that "We are by no means inclined to perpetuate jargons by printing the Scriptures in them ..." (Scholtz 1975: 73). At a conference of ministers which the Rev. du Toit did not attend the matter was raised by the Rev. Morgan and received a mixed reception. D. F. du Toit, the brother of the Rev. S. J. du Toit, convened a meeting of all parties interested in an Afrikaans translation of the Bible for 5 July 1875 at the house of Gideon Malherbe in Paarl.

What happened at the meeting is unknown, but it had been the intention to choose three delegates to discuss the matter with the Rev. Morgan (Scholtz 1975: 74). It is probable that at this meeting it was decided to formally constitute a society, because on 14 July 1875 eight persons met at the house of Gideon Malherbe to constitute the *Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners* (GRA) [The Society of True Afrikaners]. Those present were: Rev. S. J. du Toit; his brother D. F. du Toit (later known as "Oom Lokomotief"); their cousin Daniel Francois du Toit ("Dokter"); Gideon Malherbe (previously married to the Rev. van der Lingen's third daughter, deceased); his nephew, P. J. Malherbe, also nephew to the Rev. S. J. du Toit; S. G. du Toit; C. P. Hoogenhout; August Ahrbeck, the son

of German immigrants of the Lutheran faith, and at the time a student at Stellenbosch, later at the Theological Seminary, ordained in 1883. Also expected at the meeting were the Rev. Dempers, a missionary preacher who lost much of his Zion Church congregation owing to rumors that he would soon be preaching in "Hottentotstale" [Khoikhoi Languages] and the Rev. van der Rijst, born in the Netherlands in 1828 and who came to the Cape 1856 as a teacher of religion, ordained in 1861.

The GRA kept its identity a secret at first and the Rev. S. J. du Toit sent the Rev. Morgan a personal letter informing him that the time was not yet ripe for an Afrikaans translation of the Bible. Their aim summarized in the Society's motto, "to stand for our language, our nation and our country" (*Die Afrikaanse Patriot*, 15 Jan. 1876: 4), was explicitly political and an undisguised agenda for the promotion of the Afrikaner. Each member was expected to believe in salvation through the death of Jesus Christ and every meeting was to open and close with a prayer. Each member signed that he/she would protect till their death the secrets of the society even if they resigned from it (Scholtz 1975: 76).

There were never more than 80 members of all five branches eventually established, according to the attendance registers of all meetings. Neither did the founding members attend all meetings very regularly. Since the second meeting the Rev. S. J. du Toit became President of the GRA and its moving force.

Their first task was to establish a journal. On 15 January 1876 the first edition of *Die Afrikaanse Patriot* [The Afrikaner Patriot] mouthpiece of the GRA appeared. One thousand copies of the first edition were distributed free. Rapidly the *Patriot* became a popular paper in the eighties because amongst other things it supported Paul Kruger's Presidency of the Transvaal. The editor was known as *Oom Lokomotief* [Uncle Locomotive], an editorial alias that covered many people, and eventually became the nickname of D. F. du Toit, brother to the Rev. S. J. du Toit. However, initially most of the editorial work was done by the Rev. S. J. du Toit, who above all others in his writings educated the Afrikaner spiritually, cultivated a unified political and national consciousness, and brought about an awareness of the right of Afrikaans to exist as national language of the Afrikaners. Nevertheless, the reader must be warned in advance that while it remained a vehicle for Afrikaner nationalism, the *Patriot* and the Paarl movement flourished. But, as soon as the Rev. S. J. du Toit, its leader, adopted after 1890 for a variety of reasons, a political stance of allegiance with Cecil John Rhodes against Paul Kruger, the first language movement declined.

In 1877 the *Patriot* became a weekly, and in 1878 assumed the full-scale format of a newspaper. From 50 subscribers in 1876 it grew to 950 in 1878. It was the very first newspaper to appear entirely in Afrikaans and it would be the only one until the 1930s. In the first edition the manifesto appealed to God's will in the Bible (Gen. 11) that there should be different languages and the concluding paragraph carries the following exhortation:

True Afrikaners, we call on you to acknowledge together with us that the Afrikaans language is the mother tongue that our Dear Lord gave us; and to make a stand with us through thick and thin for our language; and not to rest before our language is generally acknowledged as the national language of our country (*Die Afrikaanse Patriot*, 15 January 1876).

In July 1876 GRA bought its own printing press. It had severe financial difficulties and members had to bail it out with contributions from their personal funds. These contributors eventually established the printing company D. F. du Toit & Co. in July 1878 with the Rev. du Toit's nephew as manager. In the meantime the Rev. S. J. du Toit himself suffered an ugly personal attack, presumably because of his activities in connection with the GRA, in the form of a serious case of slander that jeopardized his position as a minister of religion in the community. He was accused of having sexual relations with the maid servant of De Roubaix on 6 July 1877 in a store room of the aforesaid in Paarl. He was found innocent by the Cape Synod on 9 October. It appears that a group involved in a plot against him disguised themselves as the Reverend in order to act out a crime so as to slander him (Scholtz 1975: 46–50).

In 1880 the Dutch Reformed Synod in Cape Town debated the evils of the *Patriot* for three days and a motion of severe censure for its criticism of ministers of the church and its institutions was passed. However, two influential newspaper, *De Zuid-Afrikaan* and *Het Volksblad*, both wrote that the Dutch Reformed Church would better adopt a more patriotic attitude and love for the national language and the history of the people. As *Het Volksblad* (28 October 1880) put it the reason why the *Patriot* had become a force in the land is that "the journal is written in a language and presents ideas that the population understands" (quoted in Scholtz 1975: 98). In the *Patriot* (17 December 1880) itself, Dr Pannevis comments about one of the participants (Rev. Hofmeyr) in the synod debate as follows: "I hear Jannie Hofmeyr, with his stiff little neck spoke so that the spit flew (whether he wet the minutes so that he had to rewrite them, I didn't hear); they say he was by turn, purple, blue and green" (quoted in Scholtz 1975: 98).

Proposal of the First Language Congress

In 1877 J. H. Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), editor of the Cape Town newspaper *De Zuid-Afrikaan* (Zuid Afrikaan: 18/25 August 1877) proposed a “Society for the promotion of the use of Dutch” to combat the overwhelming influence of English. A preliminary body was established which attempted to buy *The Patriot* from the GRA. The offer was seriously considered because of the press’s financial difficulties, but after collecting money and obtaining a bank loan, the GRA rejected the offer. Nothing came of the proposed Dutch Association until 1890.

In the meantime the various political organizations that led to the unified body of the *Afrikaner Bond* in 1883 had been established. Also the First War of Independence broke out in the Transvaal in 1880 and within a year the subscription of the *Patriot* had increased from 2,000 to 3,700 (Scholtz 1975: 99). It ended with the defeat of the British at the Battle of Majuba Hill in 1881, and the *Patriot* celebrated the Transvaal armistice by printing the 1 April 1881 edition in blue ink.

In 1880 The Cape Synod had requested the Cape Parliament to grant Dutch a more positive role in schools. In 1882 was Dutch allowed as language of debate in the Cape Parliament (see Scholtz 1975: 101 – 102). The 1880s were characterized by various skirmishes on behalf of Dutch (see Scholtz 1975: 102 – 103) so that in April 1890 the time was ripe for the formation of the Dutch Language Organization originally proposed by Onze Jan in 1877. Hence an open letter by Prof. Nico Mansvelt of the Victoria College in Stellenbosch directed at all supporters of the Dutch language in South Africa, called for a language congress for Dutch in Cape Town later that year to coincide with the sitting of the Cape Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church.

At this congress in Cape Town on 31 October and 1 November 1890, the *Suid-Afrikaanse Taalbond* [South African Language Union] was established with the purpose of fostering the Dutch language and a feeling of national identity. About an equal number of supporters of Dutch and Afrikaans were present. The conference attempted to avoid which language Dutch or Afrikaans was the national language by stating the aim of the Taalbond as follows: “Fostering of the knowledge of the national language and the cultivation of a feeling of national identity” (Van Niekerk 1920: 26).

In the meantime the Rev. S. J. du Toit had obtained the appointment of Superintendent of Education in the South African Republic (Trans-

vaal), starting in 1882, and he had moved to Pretoria, where he remained until 1890. Thus as he could not be present, he sent 71 Theses about Afrikaans to D. F. du Toit (also known as “Dokter”), to present to the conference. These were later published as *Afrikaans our National Language. 71 Theses or Propositions*. The title was an overt allusion to Luther who on the same date, 31 October, 373 years before, had presented his 95 Theses.

These theses, which form the basis of the agenda for the First Language Congress for Afrikaans held in 1896, concerned the position of Afrikaans as a language, as mother tongue, national language, written language, Bible language, medium of instruction, and language of the church. In the preface to the published version, du Toit explicitly says that changing the language laws of a country and bringing forth a written language from a spoken language is not the task of one man. He refers to the fact, (without naming them), that there are associations in England, Germany, France, and Belgium, whose purpose is continually to adjust the written language to the spoken form of the language. He criticizes the October 1890 Language Congress for dodging the issue of what is meant by the national language. He points out that there are in fact three parties with different opinions: 1) those who say write as you speak; 2) those who say Dutch⁸ as in the Netherlands, 3) those who want a simplified form of Dutch. The South African Taal Union, established at the October Language Congress, he claims is operating from a point of view hovering between positions number 2 and 3. And he proceeds to propose the first language congress for Afrikaans:

We must call together a real Afrikaans Language Congress of the first and second class mentioned above, namely of those who favor Afrikaans, and those who are favor Dutch (du Toit 1891: v – vi).

The purpose of the congress would be to discuss which group had grasped the reality of the situation and to achieve unity of purpose and effort, failing that to achieve co-operation between the two parties. The reality of the situation was that by this time Afrikaans had lost conjugated forms of the verb. For example, *Ik ben, gij zyt, hij is* had become *Ek is, jy is* and *hy is*. In addition, the distinction between strong and weak verbs, except in certain idiomatic uses, had disappeared, and the tense system had been simplified to a basic three-tense system. Word gender had disappeared. *De man* and *het boek* had become *die man* and *die boek*. A double negative system had come into general usage, possibly as result of a regional Dutch dialect used at the Cape becoming reinforced by the

indigenous non-native speakers of Dutch who had a double negative system in their native languages. A mere spelling reform would not have captured the nuances of the “new” language, nor would it have served as effectively as Afrikaans later did, as a political rallying point for Afrikaner nationalism.

In the fifth thesis he proclaims that: “The language itself is the highest legislator. Thus you cannot prescribe language rules for a language, you must derive them from the language. The written language must follow the spoken language, not vice versa” (du Toit: 1891: 14). In the section concerning the national language, he claimed that it was no longer possible to restore Dutch to the primary position it held at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was rather the case that Dutch in South Africa depended on Afrikaans, which possessed much more “suitability and viability” (du Toit 1891: 89) as the national language. It was unfortunate, he declared, that Dutch had shown itself to be antagonistic towards Afrikaans in its first years. He makes an analogy between Afrikaans and a young tree: “The thick roots of the old tree protects its [Afrikaans] young roots against the English ax, the stiff branches shelters its young shoots against storms, and the old tree gradually dies away, and just as quickly it [Afrikaans] takes its place” (du Toit 1891: 82).

A further purpose of the congress would be to consider if the time was not ripe to gain acceptance of Afrikaans as official language. The overt political nature of the language struggle in South Africa is made clear in du Toit’s forty-second thesis: “It is the duty of everyone who is against the general domination of English in South Africa, to co-operate for the preservation of the National Language, even though there are differences amongst them about the form” (du Toit 1891: 88). In the forty-sixth thesis he states: “The language that you speak in your home, and in the market, and in the Legislature, and that you read in your newspaper, must be acknowledged as the official language in schools, in the state, in the church, and everywhere” (du Toit 1891: 94). The sixty-fourth and -fifth theses contain a powerful plea for mother tongue education: “Most of our children have so little time to go to school, so that they learn just enough Dutch and English to forget it again, consequently they actually learn nothing, whereas if they had spent the time receiving an education in their mother tongue, they could have learnt quite a lot of useful knowledge for their later lives” (du Toit 1891: 122). And a powerful political argument is added: “A general development of the spirit of the nation can only take place in the national language” (du Toit 1891: 123).

However, before a conference was convened to discuss these theses, the supporters of Dutch began a movement in 1894 to reform the spelling of Dutch to make it more “serviceable” for Afrikaners (Standard Encyclopedia: 69; Kannemeyer 1987: 31) and at a conference in Stellenbosch on 19 December 1895, a steering committee was elected to organize a conference to determine the form of simplification. The leaders were Dr. W. J. Viljoen, Prof. of Dutch at the Victoria College, the first Afrikaner to have written a doctoral thesis on Afrikaans at Strassburg, and Prof. P. J. G. de Vos. And on 4 and 5 January 1897 the first conference for the simplification of the Dutch language was held in Cape Town. It was attended by many influential persons from as far afield as the Transvaal. The conference named an Executive Commission to consult with authoritative bodies in the Netherlands to ensure that their simplification would proceed in accord with similar notions in the Netherlands and not be in conflict with Dutch idiom (Scholtz 1980: 12).

The First Language Congress for Afrikaans

A letter marked private and confidential, and signed by the editorial board of the *Patriot* invited recipients to attend a meeting on 14 August 1895, the 20th birthday of the GRA, at the Paarl Press. The purpose was to discuss organizing an Afrikaans Language Congress on 4 and 5 October 1895 in Paarl. The agenda proposed referred in detail to the 71 Theses discussed previously. To whom it was sent is not known. However, it can be presumed that it was an attempt to gain supporters for Afrikaans before the upcoming December conference in support of simplified Dutch mentioned above.

Why the first Afrikaans Language Congress occurred only the next year and not in October 1895, as mentioned in the letter, is also not known, but appropriately it took place on 15 and 16 January 1896 in the Town Hall of Paarl, on the 20th anniversary of the first publication of the *Patriot*. The published proceedings (GRA 1896) claim an attendance of approximately a hundred, although only eighty names are listed in the proceedings and ninety in a summary of the proceedings in *Ons Klyntji* (March 1896: 3), in which a group photograph of the delegates appears. Delegates from the Orange Free State and the Transvaal were prevented from attending due to the recent Jameson Raid of 29 December 1895, when an attempt was made with the connivance of the Prime Minister

of the Cape, Cecil John Rhodes, to topple the government of President Kruger (Davenport 1966: 162).

Since an open invitation to the Second Afrikaans Language Congress of January 1897 was issued in *Ons Klyntji* (November 1896: 184), it can be safely assumed that the anyone was free to attend the First Congress and that it had been similarly advertised. Those wishing to attend were asked to write to D. F. du Toit & Co. as soon as possible in order that they could firstly, be sent certificates with which they could purchase half price tickets on the colonial train service; and secondly, so that free accommodation could be arranged for them with friends or in private boarding houses close to the center of the town. Delegates are warned in the journal that if the numbers are too great not all will be able to be provided with free accommodation, but certainly not at English Hotels. Prospective delegates are reminded that during January there is an abundance of fruit and grapes in Paarl, that the Annual (presumably agricultural) Show will be held the week after the congress, and that delegates can easily spend a few days at the beach.

Pienaar (1943: 190) notes that two of the founding members of the GRA are not listed as being present, i. e. D. F. du Toit, (brother of the Rev. S. J. du Toit), also known as “Oom Lokomotief” from his editorship of the *Patriot* for many years; and C. P. Hoogenhout. They had severed ties with the *Patriot* and the Rev. S. J. du Toit in 1892 because of his changed political stance since his return from the Transvaal. Indeed Oom Lokomotief had written to a correspondent on 17 April 1890 that “if the *Patriot* doesn’t break with the Reverend, then the Reverend will break the *Patriot*” (quoted in *Lantern* June 1975: 48). His words became true, as the *Patriot* declined. Who knows what other erstwhile supporters declined to attend because of the Rev. S. J. du Toit’s new found support for Rhodes under whom he now hoped South Africa would be united politically?

His change of heart had come about for several reasons. While in the Transvaal in 1883–1884 he was part of President Kruger’s official delegation to Europe. He became the director of the Paarl-Pretoria Gold Mine and Exploration Co. in 1886 with a capital of £ 60,000. In 1888 he resigned his education post to devote himself to his business interests. In 1889 before a business trip to Europe he consolidated his business interests in one company with a capital of £ 140,000. Before leaving for Europe he was again offered the post of superintendent of education with a specific provision from Pres. Kruger that he find staff in Europe in order to establish a university in the Transvaal. While overseas, his gold mining

concerns went bankrupt and he lost his entire fortune. On his return he also found at a time when he needed employment that petitions against his taking up the post of Superintendent of Education had been delivered to Pres. Kruger by Dutch advisors who objected to the Rev. S. J. du Toit's policy statements in Europe (Scholtz 1975: 151 – 190). He had also opposed the Adendorff trekkers who wanted to break away from the Transvaal and establish yet another independent republic in Mashonaland, the area on which Rhodes had focussed his eyes, and which he obtained via the British South Africa Charter Company. He had met Rhodes and become an ardent supporter of his which earned him the enmity of many of his former supporters who saw his change of heart as a sell out of Afrikaner nationalism to British imperialism. The Rev. du Toit's political change is difficult to assess. It was perhaps not so much his personal bitterness with the Transvaal government that motivated him, but a growing realization that a unified South Africa would only be possible under the aegis of the British flag.

Nevertheless, the Congress appears from its detailed 16 page published report of the proceedings (Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners 1886), to have been a great success and to have been conducted in an extremely orderly fashion. The Congress was divided into morning and afternoon sessions, plus two evenings of entertainment, at which there were instrumental items, singing, the recitation of Afrikaans poems, and a firsthand account by the son of one of the Great Trek leaders, Sarel Cilliers, about the trekkers' experiences. The drinks were provided by the Paarl Berg Wine and Brandy Company. Noteworthy academic figures like Prof. Lion Cachet, Prof. Postma, and Prof. Logeman,⁹ attended; while apologies were read from those who regretted their absence like J. H. Hofmeyr (Onze Jan), Rev. Hofmeyr of the State School in Pretoria, and the Chairman of the Afrikaner Bond, amongst others.

The first resolution passed after some hectic debate was:

that the Afrikaans Language Congress declares itself in favor of the principle write as you speak, that is to use as the basis and regulation of the written language, the cultured spoken language of our land, and to develop the language along with our people (GRA 1896: 6).

During this debate the Rev. S. J. du Toit stepped down from the Chair to deliver his comments. It is interesting that he mentions that during the past 20 years the *Patriot* Office put out some 93,000 books in Dutch and 81,000 books in Afrikaans, apart from the thousands of books imported from the Netherlands. His point at the time being that the

Afrikaans Language Movement had “not only started people reading, but had also set them writing” (GRA 1896: 7).

The next resolution concerned the issue of a Comparative Grammar and Dictionary of Afrikaans. Many delegates opposed the Rev. S. J. du Toit’s appeal for a bilingual English-Afrikaans/Afrikaans-English Dictionary, which they felt would help to promote English rather than foster Afrikaans. A working commission was appointed to consider the matter and reported the following morning to the congress in favor of Afrikaans only. During another heated debate the Rev. S. J. du Toit declared that he now realized this congress should keep to purely Afrikaans, and although he still thought a bilingual dictionary necessary, it could be carried out by others. A Commission consisting of the Revs. S. J. du Toit & F. S. du Toit, Dr. Hoffman; with as supervisors: Prof. Cachet,¹⁰ Logeman, and S. Postma, Dr. Brill, and Dr. Viljoen,¹¹ was appointed to carry out the production of such a grammar and dictionary. But, whatever the congress’s misgivings, in 1897 *A Comparative Grammar of Afrikaans and English* was published. And in 1902 the *Patriot Dictionary* appeared.

A debate about spelling rules was also left to a committee. Another overnight working committee declared itself in favor of a decision to found a new monthly journal for creative literature in Afrikaans. This was possibly the most important contribution the Congress made to the development of Afrikaans. The delegates gave the go-ahead and Prof. Postma suggested the title *Ons Klyntji* [Our Little One]. At the close of the congress there were 500 subscribers, and the first edition appeared in March 1896, with the motto: “Small beginning, keep on winning”. The journal became popular and in one year the number of subscribers increased to almost 3,000. It continued to appear until 1906.

Two further issues were debated on the last afternoon of the congress. The congress did not support the Rev. S. J. du Toit’s plan for a translation of the Bible into Afrikaans, since they felt this initiative belonged to the church, and that the congress was not competent to judge such translations. Nevertheless, the congress passed a resolution declaring its opinion that Afrikaans must become the language of the church, and thanked the Rev. S. J. du Toit for the start he had made in translating the Bible (GRA 1896: 14; Pienaar 1943: 192–193). The congress also passed a resolution that Afrikaans must become the medium of instruction in schools, but that since no textbooks were available, it appointed the GRA to plan the publication of Afrikaans school books and report to the next congress. It was decided to hold the congress at Paarl again the following year and an organizing committee was appointed. The congress closed

with a prayer and that evening a second round of entertainment took place in the Town Hall, which included many interested parties besides delegates to the congress.

The Second Afrikaans Language Congress

Some of the leading figures present at the first Congress, Prof. Cachet, Prof. Logeman, Prof. Postma, and the Rev. Postma, sent their regrets that they were unable to be present at the Second Congress. Whether this was indicative of the growing discontent with the Rev. S. J. du Toit's politics is not known. Certainly, the editorial policy of *Ons Klyntji* was criticized for concerning itself with religion and politics, since it was popular with children, and, as one member put it, since *Ons Klyntji* was only one year old, it "might easily get a slap in the mouth" (GRA 1897: 10). On other issues the congress was more unanimous, such as in expressing its support for Afrikaans, despite the fact that Dutch was the official language of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, and recognized in the Cape Colony. And although the intention to hold a third Congress was taken, no firm decision was reached where it would be held. The organizing committee appointed this time did not include the Rev. S. J. du Toit, and the congress never materialized.

Conclusion

The Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1901 can be said to mark the end of the first language movement for Afrikaans. It arose as a vehicle for the expression of Afrikaner nationalism, but only as long as it supported that nationalism which it had helped to awaken in the first place, did it enjoy unmitigated support from the Afrikaner masses. Afrikaans did not initially enjoy the support of the intelligentsia since it not only already had the established Dutch language as a contender for the intellectual vehicle of Afrikaner nationalism, but was also locked in a cultural struggle against English, a major international language, which was promoted by an active policy of Anglicization. It may also be noteworthy that the core of the original leadership of the movement and its supporters were in some socio-psychological sense slightly distanced from the major group. For example, they came from Huguenot ancestors who had continued to

live in the areas they originally settled. No matter what the case might be, it was only after this initial group's efforts to spread the gospel of the acceptability of the written form of Afrikaans to the common man that other members of the intelligentsia, spurred on by the rising tide of Afrikaner nationalism, became involved in a renewed struggle for Afrikaans after 1901. This tide of nationalism was not just a response to perceived oppression by British rule, but distinctly encouraged by highly visible military successes against the British, notably the Battle of Majuba during the Transvaal War of Independence, the Jameson Raid, and the Anglo-Boer War.

After the Anglo-Boer War a number of local Afrikaans language associations formed, were the prelude to the establishment of a permanent professional academic body to oversee all aspects of the development of Afrikaans. At a meeting of the National Convention in Cape Town during 1908, the Afrikaner political leaders called for a conference in January to effect a rapprochement amongst all the factions. This led to a Congress in Bloemfontein on 1 and 2 July 1909 at which the *South African Academy for Language, Literature and Art* was established. This small prestigious organization of members elected from the ranks of



Figure 1 The Afrikaans Language Monument

academics, writers, and cultural leaders, has continued to direct the development of Afrikaans to the present day. While the Paarl movement led by the Rev. S. J. du Toit is indelibly part of the consciousness of the educated Afrikaans speaking public and commemorated by the Afrikaans language monument at Paarl (see Figure 1), the First Language Conference for Afrikaans of 1896 is largely overlooked or perhaps rather overshadowed by the 1909 Conference described above, which established the South African Academy.

Notes

1. My sincere thanks to the following people whose kind help with the research made this paper possible: Ms. A. Burgers of the Afrikaans Language Museum, Paarl, South Africa, for supplying photocopies of archival material; my parents for their help in finding and posting materials; and Peter Veldsman for locating and sending me Rev. Scholtz's Ph. D. thesis on Rev. S. J. du Toit.
2. The word "national" is applicable although no formally united country existed until the Union of South Africa in 1910.
3. Derogatory term for language spoken by indigenous population of southern Africa, as opposed to "Hottentotstaal" (see page 17), the Dutch name given to Khoikhoi languages.
4. Originally proposed by Rev. S. J. du Toit in the *Patriot* (June 1879), and incorporated J. H. Hofmeyr's Boeren Vereeniging in 1883 during Rev. du Toit's absence in London, the Afrikaner Bond under Hofmeyr's leadership came close to controlling the Cape Parliament in 1883–1884 elections.
5. For instance, an example of their pride in their Huguenot origins can be seen in Rev. S. J. Du Toit's action in starting a committee in 1880 to collect money for a school which would provide a Christian national education. *Die Gedenkschool der Hugenoten* opened its doors in February 1882 and the old Du Toit family farm Kleinbosch was purchased for the school.
6. A great number of non-Europeans, indigenous Khoikhoi and ex-slaves of various ethnic origins also spoke Afrikaans as their mother tongue by this time.
7. All translations from the original Dutch or Afrikaans are by the author of this chapter and have been kept as literal as possible.
8. The official name of the national language of the Netherlands is *Algemeen Beskaafde Nederlands*, commonly referred to as Dutch in English.
9. Professors of theology.
10. Prof. Cachet was born in Amsterdam to a Jewish family that had converted to the Christian faith. This may be another example in support of the thesis that the intellectual promoters of Afrikaans were largely from socio-culturally non-mainstream Dutch origins.
11. This Dr. Viljoen is recorded as being from Stellenbosch, but his initials are not given so that we do not know if it is the same man as Dr. W. J. Viljoen mentioned previously as a proponent of Dutch.