

I. ALGEMENE BEGINSELS

I.1 Goedkeuring en Afkeuring van Name

I.1.1 Dit is somtyds nodig vir die Komitee (soos dit vir die 1951-komitee was) om 'n naam wat aan hom voorgelê word, af te keur. Die redes vir afkeuring van name wat vir die 1951-uitgawe gegeld het, was soos volg:

- “(i) Wanneer hulle maklik vertaalbaar is; want dit veroorsaak verdubbeling en bring praktiese moeilikhede mee.
- (ii) Wanneer hulle uit 'n persoonsnaam sonder meer (d.w.s. sonder 'n voor- of agtervoegsel) bestaan, want dit veroorsaak verwarring.
- (iii) Wanneer die naam (bv. by die telefoon-, telegraaf- en posdiens) maklik met 'n ander naam verwar kan word.
- (iv) Wanneer die naam reeds in die Unie of in SWA bestaan.
- (v) Wanneer die voorgestelde naam 'n bekende oorsese naam is.
- (vi) Wanneer die naam (veral met die oog op die beperkte ruimte van die datumstempels van die poskantoor of van die spoorweë se stasienaamborde) te lank, lomp saamgestel of onprakties is.”

In die praktyk word tans by die oorweging van goed- of afkeuring byna net van redes (iii) tot (vi) gebruik gemaak.

I.1.2 Wat rede (i) betref, het die ondervinding geleer dat 'n groot persentasie Engelse en Afrikaanse plekname maklik vertaalbaar is, al was dit dan maar net 'n kwessie van die vertaling van een van die komponente van sulke name, soos -baai/Bay, -Noord/North, -Oos/East, -rivier/River, -stad/Town, -straat/Street, -Suid/South, -weg/Road, -Wes/West. Dit wil voorkom asof daar nie veel gedoen kan word om die aanwas van hierdie groep vertaalbare name te stuit nie.

I.1.3 In die geval van rede (ii) kan gesê word dat daar reeds 'n groot aantal goedgekeurde name in die Lys voorkom wat “uit 'n persoonsnaam sonder meer” bestaan. Die Komitee ontvang nog versoeke om name van hierdie tipe goed te keur uit hoofde van die president wat deur dergelike bestaande name geskep is. In albei gevalle, (i) en (ii), keur die Komitee sulke versoeke nie altyd af nie as hy daarvan oortuig is dat die betrokke naam geen verwarring sal veroorsaak nie.

I.1.4 In die afgelope jare is daar heelwat name voorgelê wat moontlik as in stryd met kriterium (vi), d.w.s. as “te lank” en “onprakties” beskou kan word, bv. *Groot-Visrivier-kampeerplek*, *Lyttelton Industrial Township*, *Rand Leases Residential Township*. Om genoemde rede kan sulke name afgekeur word, nie omdat die Komitee daarop aandring dat hierdie kriterium sonder uitsondering toegepas moet word op alle name van dié tipe (waarvan enkeles tog wenslik, selfs onvermydelik kan wees) nie, maar hoofsaaklik omdat hy meen dat die skepping van sulke name in groot getalle liever ontmoedig behoort te word.

I.1.5 Dit gebeur wel soms dat die Komitee te doen kry met name wat foneties onaanneemlik, of onesteties, onweloweglik, neerhalend of aanstootlik is. Sy beleid is dan om die aansoeker daarop te wys en vriendelik te versoek of hy nie wil oorweeg om 'n aanneemliker naam voor te lê nie.

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

I.1 Approval and Rejection of Names

I.1.1 The Committee is sometimes obliged (as was the 1951 Committee) to reject names submitted to it for approval. The criteria applied for the rejection of names for the 1951 edition were as follows:

- “(i) If they are too easily translated, since this leads to dual forms and gives rise to practical difficulties.
- (ii) If they consist of no more than the name of a person (i.e. with no prefix or suffix added), as this is apt to cause confusion.
- (iii) If they are likely to be confused with other names (e.g. in services such as those of Posts and Telegraphs or Telephones).
- (iv) Names already in existence in the Union.
- (v) Well-known overseas names that may be suggested.
- (vi) Names that are too long, too clumsy or unpractical (more particularly in view of the limited space available on Post Office date-stamps or name-boards on railway stations).”

At present, when the approval or rejection of any name is being considered, criteria (iii) to (vi) are applied almost exclusively.

I.1.2 With regard to criterion (i), experience has shown that a large percentage of English and Afrikaans place names are easily translatable, even if this amounts to no more than the translation of one of their components, e.g. Bay/-baai, East/-Oos, North/-Noord, River/-rivier, Road/-weg, South/-Suid, Street/-straat, -town/-stad, West/-Wes. There is very little, it seems, that can be done to check the proliferation of this group of translatable names.

I.1.3 In the case of criterion (ii), it should be pointed out that the List already contains a large number of approved names consisting “of no more than the name of a person”. The Committee continues to receive requests for the approval of this type on the strength of the precedent created by similar existing names. In both cases, (i) and (ii), such names are not always rejected by the Committee if it is satisfied that they will not cause confusion.

I.1.4 In recent years a number of names have been submitted which may be regarded as inconsistent with criterion (vi), i.e., as being “too long” or “unpractical”, e.g. *Groot-Visrivier-kampeerplek*, *Lyttelton Industrial Township*, *Rand Leases Residential Township*. Such names may be rejected for the reason mentioned, not because the Committee insists on the rigid application of this criterion to all names of this type (some of which might be desirable or even unavoidable), but mainly because it feels that the coining of very long names in large numbers should rather be discouraged.

I.1.5 It does occasionally happen that the Committee has to deal with names that are phonetically unacceptable, or have something unaesthetic, obscene, derogatory or objectionable about them. Its policy in such cases is to point this out to the applicant and to suggest that he consider submitting a more acceptable name. Obviously the Committee's aim in

Dit spreek vanself dat die Komitee se oogmerk in al sulke gevalle is om tegemoetkomend te wees en leiding te gee, terwyl hy daarby die beginsels wat van sy eerste opdrag af vaststaan, in gedagte hou.

- 1.1.6 Nietemin lê aansoekers somtyds name voor wat die Komitee verplig is om af te keur en wel om genoemde of ander gegronde redes. Hoe ook al, die Komitee wil graag van hierdie geleentheid gebruik maak om sy dank en waardering teenoor sulke aansoekers uit te spreek vir hulle geduld en samewerking in pogings om vir lastige probleme oplossings te vind wat in die reël nie net vir hulle nie maar ook vir die Komitee bevredigend of minstens aanneemlik blyk te wees.

1.2 Dubbelvorme

- 1.2.1 In 'n land soos Suid-Afrika waar verskeie tale gepraat word, of op die een of ander tydstip in sy geskiedenis gepraat is, kan verwag word dat hierdie feit in sy plekname weerspieël sal word. En so is dit ook. Ons vind name uit die Khoen- (Hottentots) en San- (Boesmans) tale (ook verskillende dialektiese vorme daarvan), Bantoe-name (uit die verskillende Bantoe-tale), Nederlandse, Franse, Duitse, Portugese, selfs Italiaanse, Spaanse en Griekse name, en veral Engelse en Afrikaanse name. In die geval van Afrikaans en Engels, wat histories so na aan mekaar verwant is, kan ook verwag word dat 'n groot aantal plekname in die een taal in vertaalde vorm in die ander gebruik sal word. So het daar mettertyd dubbelvormige name vir dieselfde plekke ontstaan waarmee daar in enige lys van plekname in Suid-Afrika rekening gehou moet word.
- 1.2.2 Soorte vertaalde name.—By 'n beskouing van hierdie vertaalde plekname, waarby feitlik uitsluitend die probleem van dubbelvorme ontstaan, kan daar drie soorte onderskei word:
 - 1.2.2.1 Waar die naam met 'n eienaam as een van sy dele saamgestel is en die eerste deel 'n eie- of 'n windstreeknaam, en die tweede 'n soort- of 'n eie- of 'n windstreeknaam is, bv.:
 - Beaufort West vertaal met Beaufort-Wes.
 - Bezuidenhoutsvallei vertaal met Bezuidenhouts Valley.
 - Boshoffweg vertaal met Boshoff's Road.
 - Caledon Square vertaal met Caledonplein.
 - Devenish Street vertaal met Devenishstraat.
 - Florida Lake vertaal met Floridameer.
 - Gordon's Bay vertaal met Gordonsbaai.
 - Oos-Rand vertaal met East Rand.Die oorgrote meerderheid ($\pm 53\%$) van vertaalde vorme bestaan uit hierdie tipe.
 - 1.2.2.2 Waar die eerste en die tweede deel gewone woorde in die oorspronklike taal is maar die eerste in die vertaalde vorm onvertaal bly, bv.:

- Bay Road vertaal met Bayweg.
- Bergrivier vertaal met Berg River.
- Buffeljagsrivier vertaal met Buffeljags River.
- Coronation Road vertaal met Coronationweg.

all such instances is to be helpful and to give guidance, while at the same time bearing in mind the principles established from its initial terms of reference.

- 1.1.6 Nevertheless applicants sometimes do submit names which the Committee is obliged to reject for the above or other sound reasons. However, the Committee wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to extend its thanks and appreciation to many such applicants for their patience and co-operation in finding, for a number of awkward problems, solutions which usually prove to be satisfactory or at least acceptable to them as well as to the Committee.

1.2 *Dual Forms*

- 1.2.1 In a country like South Africa where various languages are spoken or have been spoken at some stage in its history, one may expect this fact to be reflected in its place names. And so, in fact, it is. We find Khoisan (Hottentot) and San (Bushman) names (including various dialectal forms), Bantu names (borrowed from the various Bantu languages), Dutch, French, German, Portuguese, even Italian, Spanish and Greek names, and especially English and Afrikaans names. In the case of English and Afrikaans, which are so closely related historically, one may also expect to find a large number of place names in the one language being used in translated form in the other. So, in course of time, dual forms of names have established themselves for the same places — forms that have to be taken into account in any list of place names in South Africa.

- 1.2.2 *Types of translated names.*—An examination of these translated place names, with which the problem of dual forms is almost exclusively associated, will show that three types can be distinguished:

- 1.2.2.1 Where the name is composed of a proper name as one of its parts and the first part is a proper name or a point of the compass and the second a generic name or a proper name or a point of the compass, e.g.:

Beaufort West translated as Beaufort-Wes.

Bezuidenhoutsvallei translated as Bezuidenhouts Valley.

Boshoffweg translated as Boshoff's Road.

Caledon Square translated as Caledonplein.

Devenish Street translated as Devenishstraat.

Florida Lake translated as Floridameer.

Gordon's Bay translated as Gordonsbaai.

Oos-Rand translated as East Rand.

The majority (approximately 53%) of the translated forms consist of this type.

- 1.2.2.2 Where the first and the second parts are common words in the original language but where the first part remains untranslated in the translated form, e.g.:

Bay Road translated as Bayweg.

Bergrivier translated as Berg River.

Buffeljagsrivier translated as Buffeljags River.

Coronation Road translated as Coronationweg.

Dasseneiland vertaal met Dassen Island.

Doringbaai vertaal met Doring Bay.

Hierdie tipe maak omtrent 32% van die vertaalde vorme uit.

1.2.2.3 Waar al die dele van die naam vertaal word:

Bloedrivier vertaal met Blood River.

Bosbokrand vertaal met Bushbuckridge.

Coffee Bay vertaal met Koffiebaai.

Drieankerbaai vertaal met Three Anchor Bay.

Green Point vertaal met Groenpunt.

Pilgrim's Rest vertaal met Pelgrimsrus.

Veertien Strome vertaal met Fourteen Streams.

Ongeveer 15% van die vertaalde name is van hierdie tipe.

1.2.3 Voorkeur by dubbelvorme weens vertaling

1.2.3.1 *Voorkeur en die asterisk.*—Die Komitee van 1951 het dit nodig gegag dat “dubbelvorme, Engelse en Afrikaanse, vir dieselfde plekname sover moontlik vermy moet word”, maar toegegee dat die gebruik van sulke dubbelvorme “dikwels onvermydelik” is “in die geval van belangrike plekname of plekname van meer as net plaaslike bekendheid”. Hy noem gevalle soos *Kaapstad—Cape Town; Simonstad—Simonstown; Oos-Londen—East London; Alexanderbaai—Alexander Bay*, en voeg daaraan toe dat “aan plekname wat op *-baai* of *Bay*, *-brug* of *Bridge*, *-rivier* of *River*, *-straat* of *Street* eindig in amper alle gevalle dubbelvorme toegeken is”. Die destydse Komitee was egter van mening dat “waar dit om praktiese redes (bv. beperkte ruimte van datumstempels, ens.) wenslik gegag word om die een of die ander vorm” (dit wil sê die oorspronklike of die vertaalde naam) “*vir offisiële gebruik*” te kies, hy leiding moet probeer gee “*deur die voorkeurvorm met 'n asterisk aan te dui*”. By beslissings hieromtrent het hy “hom laat lei deur oorwegings soos die volgende:

- Die afkoms en taalkundige samestelling van die naam.
- Die ouderdom van die naam.
- Die bevolkingsbestanddeel wat in die betrokke omgewing die oorwig het”.

1.2.3.2 *Erkenning van vertaalde vorme.*—Die gebruik van die asterisk as aanduiding van voorkeur het regverdiging daarvoor verskaf dat net een vorm, bv. op briefhoofde, datumstempels en naamborde by spoorwegstasies, ens., aangebring hoef te word—waaraan natuurlik groot voordele verbonde is. Terselfdertyd is dit duidelik dat dit byvoorbeeld by name soos *Kaapstad/Cape Town* nie gedoen kan word nie, en die rede lê voor die hand: die “ander” taalgroep het 'n bepaalde reg (uit hoofde van die Grondwet) om in sulke gevalle aan te dring op die vorm wat vir hom tradisioneel geword het en wat hy natuurlik en altyd in die samehang van sy eie taal gebruik, en dit afgesien van bogenoemde oorwegings en afgesien van watter een van die drie soorte vertalings (sien 1.2.2.1—1.2.2.3) hy gebruik. Billikheidshalwe kan geen beswaar hierteen ingebring word nie. Daarenbowe, as gelykstelling in gevalle soos *Kaapstad/*

Dasseneiland translated as Dassen Island.

Doringbaai translated as Doring Bay.

This type accounts for approximately 32% of the translated forms.

1.2.2.3 Where all the parts of the name are translated:

Bloedrivier translated as Blood River.

Bosbokrand translated as Bushbuckridge.

Coffee Bay translated as Koffiebaai.

Drieankerbaai translated as Three Anchor Bay.

Green Point translated as Groenpunt.

Pilgrim's Rest translated as Pelgrimsrus.

Veertien Strome translated as Fourteen Streams.

Approximately 15% of the translated forms belong to this type.

1.2.3 *Dual forms due to translation: Preference*

1.2.3.1 *Preference and the asterisk.*—The 1951 Committee considered it necessary that “dual forms of names, English alongside of Afrikaans, should be avoided as far as possible”, but conceded that “in the case of places of importance or of more than merely local interest”. . . the use of such dual forms is “often indispensable”. As examples it mentioned cases such as *Cape Town—Kaapstad; Simonstown—Simonstad; East London—Oos-Londen; Alexander Bay—Alexanderbaai*, and added that “Place names ending in *Bay* or *-baai*, *Bridge* or *-brug*, *River* or *-rivier*, *Street* or *-straat*, have almost always been given two forms”. The Committee of that time, however, felt that “where it was considered necessary, for practical reasons (such as e.g. the limited space available on date-stamps), to choose between the one or the other” (i.e. the original or the translated name) “for official purposes”, it should “give some guidance by indicating the preferable form with an asterisk”. In deciding issues of this nature the Committee was “guided by considerations such as the following:

- The derivation and the linguistic composition of the name.
- The age of the name.
- The preponderating population group in the locality concerned.”

1.2.3.2 *Recognition of translated forms.*—The asterisk as an indicator of preference has served to justify the provision of one form only in letter heads, on date-stamps and name boards at railway stations, etc., which, of course, has considerable advantages. At the same time it is clear that this cannot be done in cases such as *Cape Town/Kaapstad*, and the reason is obvious: the “other” language group have a definite right (in terms of the Constitution Act) to insist, in such cases, on the form that has become traditional for them and that they use naturally and consistently in the context of their own language, irrespective of the above-mentioned considerations and irrespective of which of the three types of translation (see 1.2.2.1–1.2.2.3) they use. In all fairness no objection can be raised against this. Further, if equal status can be accorded in cases such as *Cape Town/Kaapstad* and *Simonstown/Simonstad*, the argument that this cannot be done in cases such as *Alexander Bay/Alexanderbaai*, *Bushbuck-*

Cape Town en Simonstad/Simonstown toegeken kan word, dan lyk die argument nie baie sterk dat dit in gevalle soos Alexanderbaai/Alexander Bay, Bosbokrand/Bushbuckridge, Grahamstad/Grahamstown, Oos-Londen/East London en Witrivier/White River nie gedoen kan word nie. Om hierdie rede gaan die huidige Komitee van die standpunt uit dat die toenemende gebruik van vertaalde vorme 'n voldoende feit is wat eenvoudig erken moet word, maar staan hy terselfdertyd nie volkome gelyke behandeling van dubbelvorme vir die doeleindes van die Lys voor nie.

1.2.3.3 Behandeling van gelykgestelde en voorkeurvorme in kolom III.— Vir die doeleindes van hierdie paragraaf is dit nodig om die gebruik van die vier kolomme van die Lys te verduidelik:

Kolom I gee die lys van plekname in alfabetiese volgorde;

Kolom II dui vir elke plek die provinsie, gebied of buurstaat aan waarin dit geleë is;

Kolom III verstrek nadere inligting, veral oor die ligging van die plek;

Kolom IV toon wat deur die naam aangedui word.

Uitvoeriger verduidelikings word in afdeling 5.2 gegee. Hier gaan dit slegs oor die keuse van vorme in die inskrywings in kolom III. In kolom I is daar egter reeds om en by 300 gevalle waarby vertaalde vorme opgegee word. As gelyke status in elkeen van hierdie gevalle toegeken word, sal ons elke vertaalde vorm van die paar in kolom III moet herhaal, wat opgevat kan word as 'n voorskrif dat sulke vertaalde vorme, bv. op amptelike stempels, briefhoofde en naamborde, saam met die oorspronklike vorme aangebring moet word. Uit die Komitee se ervaring met kolom 4 in die 1951-uitgawe is hy daarvan oortuig dat so 'n voorskrif nóg die een nóg die ander taalgroep sal bevredig, omdat albei groepe dit as onnodig en onprakties beskou.

Die beswaar teen die herhaling van nie-voorkeurvorme in kolom III is allesins geregverdig—'n beswaar wat die huidige Komitee wil vermy. Hiertoe is dit nodig dat hy sy standpunt duidelik stel:

Enige stelsel van *gelykstelling* of van *voorkeur* wat in kolom I toegepas word, sal bepaal wat in kolom III gedoen moet word. Daar is 'n paar moontlikhede:

- (a) *Gelykstelling* van enige paar name in kolom I, dit wil sê waarby daar geen voorkeuraasterisk staan nie, sal meebring dat in sulke gevalle die gelykgestelde vertaalde vorme in kolom III herhaal moet word. (Dit is wat die 1951-komitee in hierdie gevalle gedoen het.)
- (b) *Voorkeur* vir 'n vorm in kolom I, dit wil sê waarby daar 'n voorkeuraasterisk staan, sal meebring—òf
 - (i) dat albei vorme in kolom III gegee word [soos in AP (1951) gedoen is] maar dat die voorkeuraasterisk ook daar aangebring moet word—wat nie in AP (1951) gedoen is nie;
òf
 - (ii) dat net die voorkeurvorme wat in kolom I aangedui is, in kolom III gebruik moet word—wat die 1951-komitee ook nie gedoen het nie.

ridge/Bosbokrand, East London/Oos-Londen, Grahamstown/Grahamstad and White River/Witrivier does not seem to have much force. This is why the present Committee feels that the increasing use of translated forms represents an established tendency which simply has to be recognised. At the same time it is not in favour of dual forms being accorded completely equal treatment for the purposes of the List.

1.2.3.3 *Treatment of equivalent forms and of preferred forms in column III.*—For the purposes of this paragraph it is necessary to explain the use of the four columns of the List:

Column I lists place names in alphabetical order;

Column II shows for each place the province, territory or neighbouring state in which it is situated;

Column III gives further information, particularly on the location of each place;

Column IV shows what the name designates.

More detailed explanations are given in section 5.2. Here the only point at issue is the choice of forms in the entries in column III. In column I translated forms have already been given in approximately 300 cases. If equal status were to be given in each of these cases, we should have to repeat each and every translated form of the pair in column III, which might be interpreted as an instruction, as it were, that such translated forms should be given along with the original forms in letter heads, on date-stamps and name boards. From its experience with column 4 in the 1951 edition, the Committee is convinced that such an instruction would satisfy neither of the language groups, since both groups consider this to be unnecessary and impracticable.

There is every justification for the objection to the repetition of non-preferred forms in column III—an objection the present Committee wishes to avoid. To this end, it is necessary for the Committee to explain its point of view:

Any system by which equal status or preference is accorded to certain names in column I will determine what should be done in column III. There are certain possibilities:

- (a) *Equal status* accorded to any pair of names in column I, that is, where there is no asterisk indicating preference, will involve the repetition in column III of the translated forms given equal status. (This is what the 1951 Committee did in these cases.)
- (b) *Preference* given to a form in column I, i.e. where there is an asterisk indicating such preference, will require—either
 - (i) that both forms be given in column III [as was done in OPN (1951)] but that the indicator of preference be used there as well—which was not done in OPN (1951);
 - or
 - (ii) that only the preferred forms indicated in column I be used in column III—which the 1951 Committee did not do either.

Die Komitee het by sy behandeling van onderskeidelik gelykgestelde en voorkeurvorme besluit om van moontlikhede (a) en (b) (ii) gebruik te maak.

- 1.2.3.4 *Nuwe betekenis en doel van die asterisk.*—Die voormalige gebruik van die asterisk as 'n aanduiding van voorkeur vir offisiële gebruik het die onverwagte en nie-bedoelde uitwerking gehad dat die voorkeurvorm alom beskou gaan word het as die *enigste erkende vorm*. Dit was bepaald nie die bedoeling van die 1951-komitee nie. Hoe ook al, dit is 'n opvatting wat die huidige Komitee nie wil aanmoedig nie, juis omdat, soos reeds gesê, hy meen dat vertaalde vorme nou 'n erkende neiging in die landstale verteenwoordig. Desnieteenstaande wil hy die noodsaaklikheid van die “onnodige” en “onpraktiese” herhaling van vertaalde vorme waar moontlik in kolom III vermy. Met hierdie oogmerk wil die Komitee ook 'n “keuse” by dubbelvorme in kolom I doen en daarby ook van die asterisk gebruik maak, maar dan in 'n ander sin en met 'n ander doel wat kortliks gestel kan word.

Die begrip “voorkeur” wat die Komitee van 1951 gebruik het, kan “uitsluiting van ander” beteken, en dit is nie onwaarskynlik nie dat die begrip in hierdie sin aanleiding gegee het tot die genoemde minder juiste opvatting. Daarom beveel die Komitee aan dat dit vervang word deur die begrip “voorrang” wat nie *uitsluiting* van die vorm waaraan nie voorrang verleen is nie, inbegryp nie, en dat die asterisk wat dan by “voorrangvorme” in kolom I gebruik word, opgevat word, nie as aanduiding van die *enigste erkende vorm* nie, maar bloot as aanduiding dat die vorm met die asterisk die vorm is wat in kolom III vir die besondere doeleindes van hierdie kolom gebruik sal word. Die Komitee vertrou dat hierdie aanbeveling daartoe sal lei dat die opvatting dat 'n bepaalde vorm die *enigste erkende vorm vir offisiële gebruik* is, geleidelik sal verdwyn.

- 1.2.3.5 *Kriteria vir bepaling van voorrang.*—Die vraag ontstaan nou of ander kriteria vir die bepaling van voorrang as vir die bepaling van voorkeur aangewend moet word. Die Komitee vind die oorwegings waardeur die 1951-komitee hom by beslissings omtrent voorkeur laat lei het, volkome gegrond en allesins bevredigend, ook vir die doel van die bepaling van voorrang. Hierdie oorwegings is die afkoms, die taalkundige samestelling en die ouderdom van die pleknaam, en die bevolkingsbestanddeel wat in die betrokke omgewing die oorwig het.

- 1.2.3.6 *Opsomming: behandeling van dubbelvorme.*—Met hierdie verduideliking kan (a) die manier van behandeling van dubbelvorme ten gevolge van vertaling in die betrokke kolomme nou opsommenderwyse en (b) die voordele daarvan uiteengesit word:

(a) In kolom I (die ou kolom 2) word nog soos in die verlede *alle* dubbelvorme weens vertaling opgegee, en hulle word, ook soos in die verlede, in twee groepe verdeel:

- (i) Die eerste is die uiters geringe (numeries gesproke) groep bestaande uit gevalle soos *Kaapstad/Cape Town, Simonstad/Simonstown*, ens., waar daar eintlik geen sprake van voorrang

In its treatment of equivalent and preferred forms, the Committee has decided to make use of possibilities (a) and (b) (ii), respectively.

- 1.2.3.4 *New signification of the asterisk.*—The former use of the asterisk as an indicator of preference for official purposes has had the unexpected and unintended effect that the asterisked form has generally come to be regarded as the *only recognised* form. This certainly was not the intention of the 1951 Committee. Be that as it may, it is a notion the present Committee does not wish to encourage, for the very reason that, in its view, as stated above, translated forms now represent an established tendency in the national languages. None the less, it wishes to avoid, as far as possible, the “unnecessary” and “impracticable” repetition of translated forms in column III. With this in view, the Committee also wishes to make a “choice” between dual forms in column I and to use the asterisk in doing so, but in a different sense and for a different purpose, which may be set out briefly.

The concept “preference” used by the 1951 Committee may connote „exclusion of others”, and it is not unlikely that the concept in this sense gave rise to the incorrect notion referred to above. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the concept “precedence”, which does not connote *exclusion* of the form not accorded precedence, be substituted for it, and that the asterisk, which will then be used to indicate forms taking precedence (herein referred to as “precedence forms”) in column I, be regarded, not as indicating the *only recognised* form, but as indicating that the form with the asterisk is the form that will be used in column III for the specific purposes of this column. The Committee trusts that this recommendation will in time lead to the disappearance of the notion that any particular form is the *only recognised* one *for official purposes*.

- 1.2.3.5 *Criteria for determining precedence.*—The question now arises whether, in determining precedence, other criteria than those used in the case of preference should be applied. In the Committee’s view the considerations by which the 1951 Committee was guided in its decisions concerning preference are fully justified and satisfactory in every way for the purpose of determining precedence as well. These considerations are the derivation, the linguistic composition and the age of the place name, and the predominating population group in the locality concerned.

- 1.2.3.6 *Summary: treatment of dual forms.*—Having explained our new approach above, we will now endeavour to show, in the form of a summary, how we propose to apply the new method of treatment of dual forms, arising from translation, in the relevant columns, and to give some of the advantages to be derived from it.

(a) As in the past, *all* dual forms due to translation will still be given in column I (the old column 2), and they will, also as in the past, be divided into two groups:

- (i) The first is the (numerically) extremely small group comprising cases such as *Cape Town/Kaapstad, Simonstown/Simonstad*, etc., where, strictly speaking, there is no longer any question of

meer is nie, en gevalle soos *Mobiele Poskantoor/Mobile Post Office, Nasionale Park/National Park* waar daar uit hoofde van die tweetaligheidsbeleid geen voorrang kan wees nie.

By hierdie groep dubbelvorme word daar in kolom I geen voorrangasterisk by enigeen van die vorme geplaas nie en om hierdie rede word albei vorme in kolom III weergegee.

- (ii) Die tweede groep bestaan uit verreweg die grootste aantal dubbelvorme in die Lys, waarby die kriteria in 1.2.3.5 genoem, toegepas en voorrang bepaal kan word. Die asterisk word by die vorm geplaas wat die voorrang het om te toon dat dit die vorm is wat in kolom III gebruik sal word. Om hierdie rede word daar geen dubbelvorme uit hierdie groep in kolom III gegee nie. Daar sal bv. voorrangvorme, soos *Grahamstown* en *Witrivier*, voorkom, maar nie ook *Grahamstad* en *White River* nie. Hierdeur sal aan elke taal die reg geskied wat hom toekom.
- (b) Aan die toepassing van hierdie onderskeidende manier van behandeling op die twee verskillende groepe dubbelvorme in kolom III is daar voordele verbonde, waarvan 'n paar genoem kan word:
- (i) Die besparing van heelwat werk en drukkoste. (Op feitlik elke bladsy kom daar, volgens die ou stelsel, van een tot vier en meer geleenthede voor waar dubbelvorme in die betrokke inskrywings-reël gegee sou moet word.) Hierdie besparing is op sigself reeds 'n deurslaggewende faktor;
 - (ii) die verwydering van die vervelende en, in die oorgrote meerderheid van gevalle, onnodige herhaling van die vertaalde vorm van 'n baie groot aantal plekname wat deur alle gebruikers van die Lys verwelkom sal word, veral dié wie se werk vereis dat hulle dit dikwels, selfs daaglik, moet raadpleeg;
 - (iii) die gerief daarvan dat kolom III nou met 'n oogopslag laat sien watter name gelyke status (aanwesigheid van albei vorme) en watter voorrangstatus (afwesigheid van een van die vorme) het sonder dat kolom I eers nageslaan hoef te word; en
 - (iv) die bevredigende besef dat ondanks die inkorting wat met bogenoemde gepaard gaan, die een taal nie bo die ander bevoordeel is nie.
- 1.2.3.7 Homonieme: gevalle van gelyk- of byna gelykluidende name vir verskillende plekke.**—Daar is dubbelvorme van 'n ander aard as dié wat hierbo behandel is en wat die poskantoor- en spoorwegdienste baie meer las besorg. Ons het hier op die oog gevalle waar twee of meer verskillende plekke dieselfde naam of min of meer gelykluidende name het (homonieme of kwasi-homonieme), al is daar verskil van spelling. So is daar bv. verskillende plekke met die name *Balfour*, *Frankfort*, *Heidelberg*, *Middenburg* en *Richmond* (om maar 'n paar van die bekendstes te noem) en baie plekke wat miskien enigsins minder goed bekend is: *Bosplaas*, *Claremont*, *East Lynne*, *Lakeview*, *Malvern*, *Melrose*, *Northdene*, *Rosebank*, *Sandpan* en *Sunnyside*.

precedence, and cases such as *Mobile Post Office/Mobile Poskantoor*, *Nasionale Park/National Park* where, by virtue of the policy of bilingualism, there can be no precedence.

Neither of the forms in this group will be marked with an asterisk indicating precedence and for this reason both forms will be given in column III.

- (ii) The second group consists of the vast majority of dual forms in the List, where the criteria referred to in 1.2.3.5 can be applied and precedence can be determined. Here the form taking precedence will be marked with the asterisk to show that this form is the one that will be used in column III. For this reason no dual forms from this group will be given in column III. For instance, precedence forms, such as *Grahamstown* and *Witrivier*, will appear in that column, but not *Grahamstad* and *White River* as well. This will ensure that justice will be done to each language.
- (b) There are certain advantages to be derived from the application of this method of treatment to distinguish between the two groups of dual forms in column III, a few of which may be mentioned:
 - (i) A considerable saving in work and printing costs. (According to the old system, dual forms would have had to be given in from one to four and more entries on practically every page.) This saving in itself would have been a deciding factor;
 - (ii) the exclusion of the wearisome and, in the vast majority of cases, unnecessary repetition of the translated forms of a very large number of place names, which will be welcomed by all users of the List, especially by those whose work entails its frequent, even daily consultation;
 - (iii) the convenience of being able to see from a glance at column III which names enjoy equal status (presence of both forms) and which take precedence (absence of one of the forms) without first having to refer to column I;
 - (iv) the gratifying realisation that, notwithstanding the exclusion of certain forms from column III, neither language has been given an advantage over the other.

1.2.3.7 Homonyms: cases of the same or similar-sounding names for different places.—There are dual forms of a kind different from those dealt with above which cause far greater trouble to the Railways and the Postal Services. We refer to cases where two or more different places have the same name or very similar names (homonyms or near-homonyms), even though there may be some difference in their spelling, for example the various places known as *Balfour*, *Frankfort*, *Heidelberg*, *Middelburg* and *Richmond* (to mention only a few of the better known places) and many places perhaps rather less well known: *Bosplaas*, *Claremont*, *East Lynne*, *Lakeview*, *Malvern*, *Melrose*, *Northdene*, *Rosebank*, *Sandpan* and *Sunnyside*.

As voorbeelde van name wat in een of albei van die amptelike tale min of meer gelykluidend is en dikwels verwarring veroorsaak, kan ons o.a. noem: *Allandale—Allandale*, *Elmadal—Elmadale*, *Greyton—Greytown*, *Hamberg—Hamburg* en *Ladismith—Ladysmith*. In die vorige uitgawe is 'n beroep op die publiek gedoen om sowel in sy eie belang as in dié van die betrokke dienste bereid te wees om van ou gevestigde name af te sien en ander in die plek daarvan te aanvaar. Af en toe gebeur dit nog dat aansoekers name voorlê wat reeds vir ander plekke bestaan, maar gelukkig gebeur dit al hoe minder. Homonieme en byna gelykluidende plekname veroorsaak allerlei soorte probleme waaronder misverstand, vertraging en ongerief sekerlik nie die minste is nie. Ondanks die mooi samewerking van die publiek is dit egter twyfelagtig of dit ooit moontlik sal wees om homonieme en gedeeltelike homonieme geheel en al uit te skakel. Al wat ons kan hoop, is dat die bestaande moontlikhede van verwarring nie vererger sal word deur meer gevalle van hierdie soort verdubbeling nie. Interessantheidshalwe kan genoem word dat daar in die huidige Lys ruim 80 gevalle voorkom van gelykluidende of byna gelykluidende plekname, waaronder daar ook etlike gevalle is van drie plekke met die dieselfde naam, bv. drie Rietfonteins, al drie in Transvaal; drie Rivieras, twee in Transvaal en een in Kaapland; drie Waverleys, twee in Transvaal en een in Kaapland; drie Claremonts, ook twee in Transvaal en een in Kaapland.

1.3 Spellingkonvensies

Soos sy voorganger, die Komitee wat vir AP (1951) verantwoordelik was, het die huidige Komitee probeer om sover moontlik die erkende spel- en skryfwysereëls van die betrokke tale in die ortografie van Afrikaanse, Engelse en inboorlingplekname te volg. Hy het egter in sekere gevalle en in sommige opsigte afgewyk van die beginsels wat die 1951-komitee toegepas het. Daarmee wil hy nie te kenne gee dat hy alle probleme nou opgelos het nie. Daar bly nog inkonsekwensies in die skryfwyse van Afrikaanse en Engelse name en besondere moeilikhede in verband met inboorlingname, sowel in hulle egte as hulle vereuropeeste vorme, wat volkome reëlmatigheid onmoontlik maak. Wat hier bedoel word, sal onder die verskillende hoofde hieronder algaande duideliker word.

1.4 Diakritiese Tekens

1.4.1 *Standpunt van die 1951-komitee.*—Die 1951-komitee het van die algemene standpunt uitgegaan dat geen diakritiese tekens by Afrikaanse en Engelse plekname in algemene gebruik wat van persoonsname gevorm of aan vreemde tale (bv. Frans en Duits) ontleen is, geskryf word nie, soos *Cillie*, *Bon Chretien*, en *Gluckauf*. Hy was van mening dat daar 'n sterk neiging tot weglating van sulke tekens in hierdie gevalle was. Wat

As examples of names of similar pronunciation in either or both of the official languages, and consequently often the source of confusion, the following may be mentioned: *Alandale—Allandale, Elmadal—Elmadale, Greyton—Greytown, Hamberg—Hamburg*, and *Ladismith—Ladysmith*. In the previous edition an appeal was made to the public to show their willingness to forego some of the old-established names and accept new ones in their stead when occasion demanded, as this would serve their own interests no less than those of the services concerned. It still happens occasionally that applicants submit names already given to other places, but fortunately there has been a marked decrease in the number of such applications. Homonyms and similar sounding place names give rise to all sorts of problems, of which misunderstanding, delays and inconvenience are certainly not the least. However, notwithstanding the excellent co-operation of the public, it is doubtful whether it will ever be possible to eliminate homonyms and partial homonyms completely. All that can be hoped for is that the existing possibilities of confusion will not be aggravated by more cases of this type of dual form. As a matter of interest it may be mentioned that the present List contains no fewer than 80 cases of the same or very similar-sounding place names, including several cases of three places with the same name, e.g. three Rietfonteins, all three in the Transvaal; three Riviervas, two in the Transvaal and one in the Cape; three Waverleys, two in the Transvaal and one in the Cape; three Claremonts, also two in the Transvaal and one in the Cape.

1.3 Spelling Conventions

Like its predecessor, the Committee responsible for OPN (1951), the present Committee has endeavoured, as far as possible, to follow the recognised rules of the respective languages in the orthography of Afrikaans, English and indigenous place names. It has, however, in certain cases and in some respects, deviated from the principles adopted by the 1951 Committee. In saying this the present Committee does not wish to suggest that it has now solved all problems. There still remain inconsistencies in the form or styling of Afrikaans and English names as well as special difficulties in connection with indigenous names, both in their true and in their Europeanised forms, which make absolute regularity impossible. What we have in mind here will become clearer as we proceed under the various headings below.

[Note.—For the term *styling*, equivalent to Afrikaans *skryfwyse*, see the article on “The Writing of Compounds” beginning on page 30a of Webster’s *Third New International Dictionary* (1961).]

1.4 Diacritical Signs

1.4.1 *The 1951 Committee’s approach.*—The 1951 Committee held in general that diacritics should be dispensed with in Afrikaans and English place names in common use that are derived from the names of persons or from foreign languages (e.g. French and German), such as *Cillie, Bon Chretien* and *Gluckauf*. In its view there was a distinct tendency to omit such signs in these cases. For Afrikaans, however, it made certain excep-

Afrikaanse name betref, het hy egter uitsonderings gemaak by name waar sulke tekens onvermydelik was en dus name, saamgestel met woorde soos *Droë*, *Hoë* en *Voël*, met die vereiste deelttekens geskryf.

In die geval van Duitse name het die Komitee besluit om geen diakritiese tekens te gebruik by name van plekke in die destydse Unie nie (bv. *Gluckauf*) maar wel om die umlautstekens (¨) aan te bring by name van plekke in Suidwes-Afrika (*Grünau*, *Lüderitz*, ens.)

By Bantoeplekname het die Komitee 'n stelsel van transkripsie toegepas [sien AP (1951), *Voorwoord*, Hoofstuk VII 5 (c)] waarby die aanbring van diakritiese tekens vermy is.

By Khoen (Hottentots) en San (Boesmans) was die Komitee van mening dat diakritiese tekens onprakties en onnodig was omdat dit die herhaalde gebruik van "nie-Romeinse" letters en tekens sou vereis en omdat die betrokke name feitlik nie meer Khoen of San was nie, maar Europees [sien AP (1951), *Voorwoord*, Hoofstuk VII 4 (b)].

1.4.2 Standpunt van die huidige Komitee.—Sedert 1951 is daar verreikende veranderinge in die amptelike spellingkonvensies vir sommige van die inboorlingtale aangebring. Dit het gelei tot die aanname van 'n voorstel van die Bantoeaalkundige lede van die huidige Komitee dat diakritiese tekens volgens die jongste Bantoe-ortografieë herstel moet word. Die Komitee het dit toe ongeregverdig geag om sulke diakritiese tekens vir die ander tale weg te laat en besluit om, waar enigsins moontlik, die gebruik daarvan volgens die eise van elke taal as algemene beginsel te aanvaar. Dit, terloops, is in ooreenstemming met 'n besluit van die V.V.-konferensie oor die Standaardisering van Geografiese Name (Genève, 1967) wat die behoud van sulke tekens by die internasionale gebruik van geografiese name in die betrokke tale aanbeveel het (E/CONF. 53/3).

1.4.3 Beperkte uitvoerbaarheid van beginsel.—Veral in die geval van name wat voor bogenoemde besluit insake diakritiese tekens geneem was, goedkeur is, stuit die herstel van sulke tekens as beginsel op sekere moeilikhede wat die konsekwente toepassing daarvan onmoontlik maak. Die vernaamste hiervan is dat die ou vorms van aansoek (om die goedkeuring van name), selfs waar hulle nog beskikbaar is, geen noukeurige gegewens in hierdie opsig bevat nie; sodat in die meeste gevalle nou nie sonder meer vasgestel kan word of name met of sonder diakritiese tekens oorspronklik voorgelê is nie. Dit geld sowel van Afrikaanse as van Franse, Duitse, Bantoe-, Khoen- en Sanname. Daar is ook die probleem om te beslis of die skryfwyse van name in sekere gebiede reeds so tradisioneel geword en miskien so vervorm geraak het dat 'n terugkeer tot die juiste skryfwyse nie meer doenlik is nie.

Vir sover dit die inboorlingtale betref, word die skryfwyse waarvan die huidige Komitee hom bedien het, en die uitsonderings wat hy noodgedwonge moes maak, in Hoofstuk 4 hieronder (*Name uit Inboorlingtale*) breedvoerig uiteengesit.

tions in names where the use of such signs was unavoidable, and accordingly used the required diaeresis in names compounded of words such as *Droë*, *Hoë* and *Voël*.

In the case of German names the Committee decided to dispense with the umlaut (¨) mark in names of places in the then Union of South Africa (e.g. *Gluckauf*), but to use the umlaut in names of places in South-West Africa (*Grünau*, *Lüderitz*, etc.).

In Bantu place names the Committee applied a system of transcription [see the OPN (1951) *Preface*, Chapter VII 5 (c)] which made it possible to avoid the use of diacritics.

In the Khoin (Hottentot) and San (Bushman) languages the Committee felt that diacritical signs were impracticable and unnecessary because this would entail the continual use of non-Roman symbols and diacritics and because the names in question were for practical purposes no longer Khoin or San but European [see 1951 OPN, *Preface*, Chapter VII 4 (b)].

1.4.2 *The present Committee's approach.*—Since 1951 there have been extensive changes in the official spelling conventions for some of the indigenous languages. These have led to the acceptance of a proposal by the Bantu language experts on the present Committee that diacritics be restored in accordance with the most recent Bantu orthographies. As a result the Committee felt that the omission of diacritics for the other languages was no longer justified and decided to accept as a general principle their use in accordance with the requirements of each language. This, incidentally, is in line with a resolution passed by the U.N. Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names (Geneva, 1967) which recommended the retention of the diacritical signs of the various languages concerned in the international use of geographical names (E/CONF. 53/3).

1.4.3 *Limited applicability of principle.*—Particularly in the case of names approved before the above-mentioned decision on diacritics was taken, certain difficulties are being encountered in regard to the restoration of such signs, as a principle, which make the consistent application of the principle impossible. One of the most important of these is the fact that the old application forms (for the approval of names), even where they are still available, do not contain accurate particulars in this respect; so that in the majority of cases it is now impossible to determine, on the basis of these forms alone, whether a name was originally submitted with or without diacritical signs. This applies to Afrikaans as well as to French, German, Bantu, Khoin and San names. There is also the problem of determining whether the form or styling of certain names in certain areas has become traditional or distorted to such an extent that a return to their correct form or styling is no longer feasible.

As regards the indigenous languages, the orthographies applied by the present Committee and the exceptions it was obliged to make in doing so, are set out in detail in chapter 4 below (*Names from Indigenous Languages*).

By Engelse name kom die probleem van diakritiese tekens nie voor nie.

In paragrawe 1.4.3.1 tot 1.4.3.8 word die konvensies uiteengesit wat die Komitee aan die hand doen vir die gebruik van diakritiese tekens by name afkomstig uit ander tale as Engels en die inboorlingtale.

- 1.4.3.1 Waar deelttekens by Afrikaanse name onvermydelik is, word al sulke name daarmee geskryf, bv. *Breëdal*, *Breërivier*; *Goedgeleë*, *Skoongeleë*; *Hoëbaken*, *Hoëdorings*; *Klein-Australië*, *Woes-Arabië*; *Muisvoëlkraal*, *Voëlgeraas*; *Noordweë*; *Spieëlkop*; *Vlieëkraal*.
- 1.4.3.2 Omdat daar 'n besliste neiging in die Afrikaanse skryftaal is om *môre* met 'n kappie te skryf, word nie net *Môregloed* nie, maar alle name met *môre* saamgestel, met die kappie geskryf, bv. ook *Môredou*, *Môreglans*, *Môreilig*, *Môremis*, *Môreskof* en *Môrewag*. (Die skryfwyse sonder kappie word egter in al hierdie gevalle ook erken.)
- 1.4.3.3 Sekere Afrikaanse name wat bestaan uit of saamgestel is met vanne wat met of sonder diakritiese tekens geskryf kan word, kry, weens die onsekerheid in 1.4.3 hierbo genoem, geen sodanige tekens nie, bv. *Buchner*, *Kotze*, *Kruger*, *Lotter*, *Lotz*, *Luckhoff*, *Ludeke*, *Moller*, *Muller* en *Wolhuter*. Dit geld nie in individuele gevalle waar daar geen onsekerheid is nie, bv. *Cillié*, *Löttersbrug*, *Möllershek*. Daarenteen kry alle name bestaande uit of saamgestel met die vanne *Cronjé*, *Fouché* en *Naudé* die skerp aksent (') op die beklemtoonde slot *-e* wat by die uitspraak van hierdie vanne algemeen gehoor word, bv. *Cronjérus*, *Cronjésplaas*; *Fouchéspos*, *Fouchésrus*; *Naudé*, *Naudéshof*.
- 1.4.3.4 Afrikaanse plekname bestaande uit of saamgestel met Hebreeuse name met klinkers wat di-sillabes vorm, soos *i-e*, *o-e*, *a-a*, word met deelttekens geskryf, bv. *Daniël Brinkpark*, *Daniëlskuil*, *Jatniël*, *Joëlsdrif*, *Pniël*, en (moontlike) gevalle met *a-a*, bv. *Aäron* en *Baäl*. Maar Hebreeuse name met klinkerkombinasies *a-e*, *u-e*, *a-i*, bv. *Israelskop*, *Michaelshoogte*, *Samuel*, en (moontlike) gevalle met *a-i*, bv. *Efraim*, word sonder deelttekens geskryf. (Engelse name aldus met Hebreeuse elemente saamgestel, kry geen deelttekens nie, bv. *Joelridge*.)
- 1.4.3.5 Nederlandse name met *ij* kry die vereiste puntjies op die *ij*, bv. *Nietvoorbij*, *Vrijzee*; so ook gevalle van vanne wat Nederlandse *ij* behou, bv. *Van der Bijl*, *Vanderbijlpark*.
- 1.4.3.6 Name van Franse herkoms word met die vereiste aksente geskryf, bv. *Bon-chrétien*, *Chateau-de-Montréal*, *La Crête*, *Mon Désir*, *Mon Rêve*, *Très Jolie*, *Val-de-Grâce*. Ander name kry die aksent waarmee hulle vir goedkeuring voorgelê is, bv. *Amméville*, *Andé* en *Charé* (SWA). Die geval *François* (SWA) kry die cedille.
- (Opm.—Volgens gesaghebbende woordeboeke, asook die Franse *Petit Larousse*, word *Bon-chrétien* ('n soort peer) soos hier met 'n koppelteken, 'n klein letter *c* en die skerp aksent op die eerste *e* geskryf.

The problem of diacritics does not arise in the case of names of English origin.

Paragraphs 1.4.3.1 to 1.4.3.8 below outline the conventions proposed by the Committee for the use of diacritical signs in names originating from languages other than English and the indigenous languages.

- 1.4.3.1 Where the diaeresis is unavoidable in Afrikaans names, all such names are written with this sign, e.g. *Breëdal*, *Breërivier*; *Goedgeleë*, *Skoongeleë*; *Hoëbaken*, *Hoëdorings*; *Klein-Australië*, *Woes-Arabië*; *Muisvoëlkraal*, *Voëlgeraas*; *Noordweë*; *Spieëlkop*; *Vlieëkraal*.
- 1.4.3.2 Since there is a distinct tendency in written Afrikaans to write *môre* with a circumflex, not only *Môregloed* but all names compounded with *môre* are written with this sign, e.g. *Môredou*, *Môreglans*, *Môrelig*, *Môremis*, *Môreskof* and *Môrewag*. (But in all these cases the spelling without a circumflex is also recognised.)
- 1.4.3.3 Certain Afrikaans names consisting of or compounded with family names which may or may not be written with diacritical signs have, owing to the uncertainty referred to in 1.4.3 above, been given without such signs, e.g. *Buchner*, *Kotze*, *Kruger*, *Lotter*, *Lotz*, *Luckhoff*, *Ludeke*, *Moller*, *Muller* and *Wolhuter*. This does not apply in individual cases where there is no uncertainty, e.g. *Cillié*, *Löttersbrug*, *Möllershek*. On the other hand, all names consisting of or compounded with the family names *Cronjé*, *Fouché* and *Naudé* have been given the acute accent (´) on the stressed final –e generally heard in the pronunciation of these names, e.g. *Cronjérus*, *Cronjésplaas*; *Fouchéspos*, *Fouchésrus*; *Naudé*, *Naudés-hof*.
- 1.4.3.4 Afrikaans place names consisting of or compounded with Hebrew names with vowels forming di-syllables, such as *i-e*, *o-e*, *a-a*, are written with diaereses, e.g. *Daniël Brinkpark*, *Daniëlskuil*, *Jatniël*, *Joëlsdrif*, *Pniël* and (possible) cases with *a-a*, e.g. *Aäron* and *Baäl*. But Hebrew names with the vowel combinations *a-e*, *u-e*, *a-i*, e.g. *Israelskop*, *Michaelshoogte*, *Samuel*, and (possible) cases with *a-i*, e.g. *Efraim*, are written without the diaeresis. (In English names compounded with Hebrew elements the diaeresis is not used, e.g. *Joelridge*.)
- 1.4.3.5 Dutch names with *ij* are written with the required dots on the *ij*, e.g., *Nietvoorbij*, *Vrijzee*; this also applies to cases of family names retaining the Dutch *ij*, e.g. *Van der Bijl*, *Vanderbijlpark*.
- 1.4.3.6 Names of French origin are written with the required accents, e.g. *Bon-chrétien*, *Chateau-de-Montréal*, *La Crête*, *Mon Désir*, *Mon Rêve*, *Trés Jolie*, *Val-de-Grâce*. Other names are given the accents with which they were submitted for approval, e.g. *Amméville*, *Andé* and *Charé* (SWA). *François* (in SWA) is written with the cedilla.

(Note.—According to authoritative dictionaries, including the French *Petit Larousse*, *Bon-chrétien* (a variety of pear) is written, as here, with a hyphen, a small letter *c* and the acute accent on the first *e*.

Volgens Harrap se *Dictionnaire Bordas* (1972) word Franse plekname met middelkomponent *au, aux, de, des, en, et, la, les, sur, ens.*, met koppeltekens geskryf, soos *Fontenay-aux-Roses, Val-de-Marne, Chalon-sur-Saône*, om maar enkeles te noem. Die Suid-Afrikaanse pleknaam *Mount-aux-Sources* word van die begin af in die meeste amptelike publikasies ook met koppeltekens geskryf.)

- 1.4.3.7 Name van Duitse herkoms van plekke, sowel binne as buite Suidwes-Afrika, word met die vereiste umlautsteken geskryf, bv. *Grünau, Gründörner, Grüental; Glückauf, Glückstadt*.
- 1.4.3.8 Name van sekere plekke in ander lande wat aan plekke in Suid-Afrika gegee word, kry die diakritiese tekens van die oorspronklike, bv. *Lüneburg, Overijssel, Zürich*.
- 1.4.4 *Oorgangstadium*.—Die Komitee is maar alte bewus daarvan dat die hele aangeleentheid van diakritiese tekens nou in 'n oorgangstadium en derhalwe uiters onbevredigend is. Daarom wil hy meteens daarop wys dat waar sulke tekens aangebring is waar hulle tevore nie bestaan het nie, hy geen dwang wil uitoefen nie; name op naamborde, stempels, briefhoofde, ens., wat reeds bestaan, hoef nie nou noodwendig verander te word nie. Die gedagte is maar net dat die aanvaarde en tradisionele gebruik van diakritiese tekens volgens die eise van die betrokke taal, waarby dikwels noodsaaklike onderskeidings gemaak word, *in die Lys* gehandhaaf word. Dit staan die betrokke persoon, liggaam of owerheid volkome vry om van sulke tekens vir sy besondere doeleindes gebruik te maak of nie. Om die *Lys* egter in hierdie opsig so juis en volledig moontlik te maak, word lede van die publiek wat daarop gesteld is dat bv. hulle name met die nodige tekens geskryf word, vriendelik versoek om die Komitee van hulle wense in hierdie opsig in kennis te stel, sodat veranderinge in latere uitgawes van die *Lys* of aanvullings daarvan, of selfs deur middel van corrigenda-lysies, aangebring kan word.

According to Harrap's *Dictionnaire Bordas* (1972), French place names with any of the middle components *au, aux, de, des, en, et, la, les, sur,* etc., are written with hyphens, e.g. *Fontenay-aux-Roses, Val-de-Marne, Chalon-sur-Saône*, to mention only a few. The South African place name *Mount-aux-Sources* has, from the earliest times, also been written with hyphens in most official publications.)

- 1.4.3.7 Names of German origin of places both in and outside South-West Africa have been written with the required umlaut mark, e.g. *Grünau, Gründörner, Grüental; Glückauf, Glückstadt*.
- 1.4.3.8 Names of certain places in other countries given to places in South Africa are written with the diacritics of the original, e.g. *Lüneburg, Overijssel, Zürich*.
- 1.4.4 *Transition stage*.—The Committee is only too well aware of the fact that the whole question of diacritical signs is now in a transition stage and therefore most unsatisfactory. No compulsion, however, is intended where diacritical signs now appear in names previously given without them; names on existing name boards, date-stamps, letter heads, etc., need not necessarily now be changed. The idea is simply that the accepted and traditional use of diacritical signs in accordance with the requirements of the language in question, through which essential distinctions are often made, is being upheld *in the List*. The person, body or authority concerned is entirely free to use or not to use such signs for his or its particular purposes. In order, however, to make the List as accurate and complete as possible in this respect members of the public who insist on the correct spelling of their names are invited to inform the Committee of their wishes in this regard, so that any necessary corrections can be made in future or supplementary issues of the List, or even by means of corrigenda lists.