

# A usage-based description of expletive infixation constructions in Afrikaans

**Benito Trollip**

South African Centre for Digital Language Resources (SADiLaR)

North-West University

Potchefstroom, South Africa

*benito.trollip@nwu.ac.za*

## Abstract

Expletive infixation constructions (EICs) are well-described in English, but not in other languages. The form, meaning and use of EICs in Afrikaans, an understudied Germanic language, have not been described in much detail yet. This study serves to fill this descriptive gap by offering a usage-based description of these constructions in written Afrikaans. The meanings of EICs tend to range from contempt for or sarcasm toward the target (when proper nouns are used) to surprise or enthusiasm (when other parts of speech serve as source words). It is clear from the corpus data that expletives infixed in proper nouns appear to be a productive use case of EICs in Afrikaans. Further research is warranted with the possibility of comparing these constructions in Afrikaans and English.

## 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Expletive infixation is a word-forming process through which language users infuse words with evaluative meaning by inserting expletives/taboo words. An example from English is *fan·fucking·tastic*, where the expletive *fucking* has been infixed into *fantastic*. Most studies on these constructions describe them as they are found and

used in English, while the form, meaning and use of these constructions in languages like Afrikaans are still understudied. Examples of expletive infixation constructions in Afrikaans include *die·fokken·selfde* ‘the·fucking·same’ and *fan·fokken·tasties* ‘fan·fucking·tastic’ given in (1) and (2). All the examples in this article are taken from either the Comprehensive corpus of the Virtual Institute for Afrikaans (VivA 2022a) (hereafter VivA-CPC) or the Exclusive corpus (VivA 2022b) (hereafter VivA-CPE). In these examples *fokken* ‘fucking’ is inserted after the first syllable in the words *dieselfde* ‘the same’ and *fantasties* ‘fantastic’.<sup>2,3</sup>

- (1) *Alle Suid-Afrikaners is nie diefokkensefde nie.*  
‘All South African are not **the·fucking·same**.’
- (2) *Dit was fanfokkentasties, maar wragtag te kort, moerse anticlimax.*  
‘It was **fan·fucking·tastic**, but really too short, massive anticlimax.’

The question that this article aims to address links directly to the scarcity of descriptive studies on these constructions in languages other than English: How and with which meaning(s) are these constructions realised in written Afrikaans?

<sup>1</sup> This article is a reworked version of a section in the unpublished thesis of Trollip (2022a).

<sup>2</sup> For a complete description of the notation conventions used in this article, consult Trollip (2022: 14-15). The dot operator (·) will be utilised to indicate morpheme boundaries instead of a hyphen, keeping with the tradition of Bauer (2003). The dot operator is used as to not obfuscate the form of some of

the Afrikaans EICs where hyphens are used to orthographically mark the insertion of the expletive.

<sup>3</sup> Note that examples are taken from the corpora as is, meaning that inconsistent or incorrect capitalisation, punctuation and spelling is not corrected. In the examples the English glosses are translated with English equivalents and the EICs are morphologically annotated with the dot operator and rendered in bold.

In section 2 a concise background pertaining to the choice of term will be discussed with reference to some existing sources. Rather than a section solely dedicated to all the existing descriptions of these constructions, the existing literature will be integrated into the sections about the form, meaning and use. The form of expletive infixation constructions will be detailed and formalised in line with the practice in Construction Grammar (Booij, 2010) in section 3. In the fourth section the meaning possibilities will be detailed, while the use of these constructions in contemporary Afrikaans usage data will be described in the fifth section. The frequencies of the constructions will be relativised and described by incorporating word frequency classes and productivity calculations. This article will conclude with suggestions for future work and the limitations of this study.

## 2 Broad background and choice of term

Expletive infixation is currently a relatively understudied phenomenon in Afrikaans: Combrink (1990) and Van Huyssteen (2017a) mention expletive infixation in passing, while Feinauer (1981) studied it in more detail. The most recent description of these constructions is that of Trollip (2022a): These constructions are described as part of the broader category of what is termed *morphological evaluative constructions*.<sup>4</sup> Combrink (1990: 69) refers to expletive infixation as a “heel besonder WV-reël” ‘a very unique word-forming rule’. In other descriptions of these constructions, linguists use different terms to refer to the same phenomenon. McMillan (1980) makes use of *expletory insertion*, *emotive intensifier insertion*, *lexical infixing* and *derivational infixing* in their discussion, while McCarthy (1982) and Kavalir (2018) refer to *expletive infixation*. Blevins (2014) briefly refers to these constructions in her chapter on infixation as *tnesis*. Both Bauer (2015) and Zingler (2024) make use of *expletive insertion*, while Feinauer (1981) initially opts for *vloekwoordinvoeging* ‘curse word insertion’ and

later for *vloekwoordinsetting* ‘curse word insetting’ (Feinauer 1983). In Combrink (1990) and Van Huyssteen (2017a) reference is made to *vloekwoordinlywing* ‘curse word incorporation’. For the purposes of this article, and following Trollip (2022), expletive infixation construction (hereafter EIC) will be used.

## 3 The form of EICs

The form of EICs is systematic and easily identifiable, particularly in the form where hyphens are inserted to signal the insertion of the expletive. The placing of the expletive is dependent on the construction used as the base, even though it is generally accepted that the insertion is made between syllables. When more complex constructions, like compounds or multiword proper nouns, function as the base of the EIC the insertion can be between the different words within in the construction. The form of EICs can be represented schematically like the schemas in (3). Note that /a/ in the scheme mostly indicates syllables of the same word. For the purposes of some constructions such as compounds, multiword proper nouns or acronyms, /a/ need not only be syllables but can also be complete words or merely letters.<sup>5</sup>

(3) (a)  $[/a^1 (-) [\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} (-) /a^{2 \dots n}]_X \Leftrightarrow$  [an emphasised form of SEM<sub>x</sub>],  
where /a/ = syllable / letter / number / morpheme / affix / stem / proper noun,  
where X = mostly an adjective/adverb but could also be a noun (including a proper noun), interjection, or numeral,  
where  $[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} = \textit{·flippen·} / \textit{·fokken·} / \textit{·friecken·} / \textit{·bleddie·} / \textit{·blierrie·}$

>  
(b)  $[/a^1/a^2 (-) [\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} (-) /a^{3 \dots n}]_X \Leftrightarrow$  [an emphasised form of SEM<sub>x</sub>], where /a/ = syllable / letter / number / morpheme / affix / stem / proper noun, where X = mostly an adjective/adverb but could also be a noun (including a proper noun), interjection, or

<sup>4</sup> When considering the available literature there is a general assumption that EICs can be morphologically categorised as constructions that are formed through infixation (Yu 2007; Kavalir 2018; Haggins and Archibald 2020). That being said, Zingler (2024) recently argued that expletive insertion is not a form of infixation, but rather of discontinuous compounding. He justifies his position by claiming that the infixed expletives are independent words rather than infixes, that they are morphologically complex and that they occur with a range of word classes. The focus of this article is not

on debating the morphological nature of expletive infixation, but it is important to keep in mind that there are differing stances when it comes to the grammatical nature of EICs.

<sup>5</sup> The subscript labels in the schemas are CN (referring to the infix being category neutral and that it does not change the part-of-speech of the main word) and SEM<sub>x</sub>/SEM<sub>y</sub> schematically referring to the conceptual input of the pre-infixed word.

numeral, where  $[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} = \textit{flippen} \cdot / \textit{fokken} \cdot / \textit{frieken} \cdot / \textit{bleddie} \cdot / \textit{blerrie} \cdot$

>

(c)  $[/a^1/a^2/a^3(-)[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN}(-)/a^{4..n}]_X \Leftrightarrow$  [an emphasised form of SEM<sub>X</sub>], where /a/ = syllable / letter / number / morpheme / affix / stem / proper noun, where X = mostly an adjective/adverb but could also be a noun (including a proper noun), interjection, or numeral, where  $[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} = \textit{flippen} \cdot / \textit{fokken} \cdot / \textit{frieken} \cdot / \textit{bleddie} \cdot / \textit{blerrie} \cdot$

>

(d)  $[/a^1(-)[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN}(-)/a^{2..n}]_Y \Leftrightarrow$  [an emphasised form of SEM<sub>Y</sub>], where /a/ = syllable / letter number / morpheme / affix / stem / proper noun, where Y = intensified adjective, word from a foreign language, compound or compounded numeral, where  $[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} = \textit{flippen} \cdot / \textit{fokken} \cdot / \textit{frieken} \cdot / \textit{bleddie} \cdot / \textit{blerrie} \cdot$

>

(e)  $[/a^1/a^2(-)[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN}(-)/a^{3..n}]_Y \Leftrightarrow$  [an emphasised form of SEM<sub>Y</sub>], where /a/ = syllable / letter / number / morpheme / affix / stem / proper noun, where Y = intensified adjective, word from a foreign language, compound or compounded numeral, where  $[\cdot b \cdot]_{CN} = \textit{flippen} \cdot / \textit{fokken} \cdot / \textit{frieken} \cdot / \textit{bleddie} \cdot / \textit{blerrie} \cdot$

The schemas in (3) are related based on commonalities in their form and meaning: The schemas in (3a)–(3c) are identical with slight differences in form, i.e. the number of syllables, letters, numbers, morphemes, affixes, stems, or proper nouns before the infixated expletive, while (3d) and (3e) are differentiated based on the type of construction that is being infixated. An example of (3a) is *skyn·fokken·heiligheid* ‘hy·fucking·pocrisy’ because there is one syllable/word/morpheme before the infix, in comparison to *asse·flippen·blief* ‘flipping please’ as an example of (3b) because the infix follows two syllables. As another variant, and representing (3c), the neologism *bekotsens·fokken·waardig* ‘causing one to fucking

puke’ with three syllables preceding the infix. The schemas in (3d) and (3e) require intensified adjectives, foreign words, compounds or compound numerals as input: An example of (3d) is *in·fokken·sane* ‘in·fucking·sane’ because the base construction is an English word and the infix follows one syllable/word/ morpheme. To illustrate (3e) one can consider *pikstik·fokken·donker* ‘pitch, pitch fucking dark’ because the base construction is an intensified adjective and the infix follows two syllables/words/morphemes.

More examples of this construction that illustrate its versatility in Afrikaans are *Elton·fokken·John*, *ge·blerrie·mors*, *ge·fokken·noeg*, *MIDDEL·FOKKEN·FINGER*, *SAU·fokken·K*<sup>6</sup> and *stapel·fokken·gek* illustrated in (4)–(9). Characteristic of these constructions’ form is the appearance of one of five possible disyllabic expletives between the syllables or words of a two- or multisyllable word or construction, with or without hyphens on either side of the expletive. From the examples in (4)–(9) it appears that these constructions can take a variety of constructions as base components, from multi-word proper nouns to adverbs.

- (4) Die poeslike JMPD het my al so baie gevang van agter af ek voel soos **Elton·fokken·John**.

*The fucking JMPD have caught me from behind so often I feel like **Elton·fucking·John**.*

- (5) Die hele rugby sisteem is in sy dinges en julle verstaan dit net nie, julle is deel van die **geblerriemors**.

*The whole rugby system is ruined and you don’t understand it, you are part of the **bloody-mess**.*<sup>7</sup>

- (6) Gabba besluit hy’t nou **ge·fokken·noeg** gehad.

*Gabba decided he’d had **e·fucking·nough** now.*

- (7) jou kop is so plat soos 'n fokken cd jy loerseekir tussen jou voortanne deer hoe kry 'n mes armant se bryn so groot soos 'n erkie? jy blaas hom op bwahhhaaahaaahaaahaaaa <VET

<sup>6</sup> SAUK is the Afrikaans abbreviation for the public broadcaster, the SABC (South African Broadcasting Corporation).

<sup>7</sup> The translation of “gemors” (a disyllabic word in Afrikaans) is ‘mess’ (a monosyllabic word in English); to enable a meaningful translation of the EIC, the expletive

was added as an adverb to the front of the word. As noted by Bauer (2015), monosyllabic base words do not allow for expletive infixation.

**MIDDELFOKKENVINGER >**

*your head is as flat as a fucking cd you probably peek through your front teeth how do one get armant's brain as big as a pea? you blow it up bwahhhaaahaahaahaaaaa <FAT MIDDLE-FUCKING-FINGER>*

- (8) Kyk maar na paragraaf so-en-so, subparagraaf dit-en-dat, die rentekoers is net so 'n bietjie hoër, meneer Milos. ' En toe rasionaliseer die **SAU-fokken-K**.  
*Just take a look at paragraph such-and-such, subparagraph this-and-that, the interest rate is just a bit higher, mister Milos. 'And then the **SAB--fucking--C** rationalised.*

- (9) Hy sê om elke dag daarna te luister, is genoeg om hom **stapelfokkengek** te maak.  
*He says to listen to it every day is enough to make him **completely-fucking-crazy**.*

McMillan (1980: 163) identifies five morphological forms of expletive infixation in English. These five forms are listed in (i)–(v) and matched with the relevant example in (4)–(9). Apart from McMillan's five categories, a common form of EICs in Afrikaans is in intensified adjectives. The use of expletive infixation in English intensified adjectives is discussed as a syntactic variant in McMillan (1980: 168). In Afrikaans, *stapel-fokken-gek* in (9) is only one example where the intensive meaning of the adjective is further strengthened by the expletive.

- (i) Within morphemes, like in the Afrikaans *ge--fokken--noeg* in (6);
- (ii) On the boundary between bases and affixes, like in the Afrikaans *ge-blerrie-mors* in (5);
- (iii) Between the components of compounds, like in the Afrikaans *MIDDEL-FOKKEN-VINGER* in (7);
- (iv) Within acronyms where numbers could also appear, like in the Afrikaans *SAU--fokken--K* in (8) and
- (v) Between the syllables of proper nouns that could be one or more words, like in *Elton--fokken--John* in (4).

Bauer (2015) makes use of a Google search for EICs to investigate language users' preference for

prosodical or morphological motivations when forming these constructions. According to Bauer (2015: 125), it appears that users, in addition to considering morphology and phonology, also consider orthography. In the cases where the insertion is prosodically motivated, difficulties could arise for users when committing EICs to orthography. His conclusion is that the considered placement of the expletive is determined by frequency, semantic transparency and the relative frequency of prefixed constructions and their bases (Bauer 2015: 126). The more frequent a word is in its expletive-free form, the stronger the motivation for a prosodical insertion point is. When the expletive-free bases are semantically transparent and have high usage frequencies, users generally prefer morphological insertion points.

Afrikaans language users form EICs in three ways, namely by simply augmenting the expletive within the word, orthographically marking the expletive by means of hyphens (and possibly brackets) on either side, or by writing the expletive in capital letters. Examples of these variants in which *briljant* 'brilliant' is used as the base word are given in (10)–(12). No literature or spelling rule could be found that regulates the writing of these constructions, but users seem to have a (small) preference for hyphen use: In Table 1, where EICs with *·fucking·* are shown, from the 54 constructions in VivA-CPC and the 127 constructions in VivA-CPE, 26 (~48%) and 72 (~57%) are written with hyphens, respectively.

- (10) Gin wonder die IRA het die bliksems so gebom nie fokken main ek dink alhoewel ons gaan miskien daai vrouman van ons olympics toe stuur aweh!!!!  
**Brilfokkenjant!**  
*No wonder the IRA bombed the bastard so fucking main I think even though we are maybe going to send that women-man of us to the olympics aweh!!!!*  
**Brill-fucking-iant!**
- (11) Ek was by laasjaar se Kings of Chaos concert gewees en dit was **bril-fokken-jant**.  
*I went to went to Kings of Chaos' concert and it was **brill-fucking-iant**.*
- (12) Ek laaik nog steeds daai storie van die wyse manne wat presente gebring het omdat dit Krismis was. Hahahaha  
**BrilFOKKENjant!**  
*I still like that story of the wise men who brought presents because it was*

*Christmas.*

**Brill-FUCKING-iant!**

Hahahaha

‘completely·fucking·crazy’ and *inter·fokken·kontinentale* ‘inter·fucking·continental’.

In her study, Feinauer (1981: 142–160) points out that, in addition to semantics (see section 4), three formal aspects influence expletive infixation: the number of syllables in a word, syllable weight and morpheme boundaries. Regarding the number of syllables in a word, Feinauer points out that a word must consist of at least two syllables in order to enable expletive infixation. The three example constructions in (13)–(15) are indicative of this, as each consists of three or more syllables. According to her, heavier and more syllables on either side of the expletive increase the possibility that a word can be used as a basis for expletive infixation. However, in order to confirm this statement of Feinauer, more data than these examples are needed.

- (13) Gaan maak 'n draai by die Drie Rondawels se uitkykpunt (**asem-fokken-rowend**) oppad terug en as jy regtig dan moet eet, skiet gou in by Forever Resorts in Blyderivier Canyon vir 'n cheaperige restaurantete.

*Visit the Drie Rondawels lookout point (**breath--fucking--taking**) on your way back and if you really have to eat, quickly pop in at Forever Resorts in Blyderivier Canyon for a cheapish restaurant meal.*

- (14) Ek weet waarvan ek praat - my kroos het redelik onlangs op 'n streep hul lisensies (**uit-bleddie-eindelik!**) gekry.

*I know what I'm talking about - my brood acquired their licences (**final-bloody-ly**) one after the other quite recently.*

- (15) Onmiskienbaar Franna, maar heelwat anders as beide Fokofpolisiekar en Van Coke Kartel. **Verfokkenfrissend** van Coke. Kry nou by iTunes.

*Undeniably Franna, but very different to both Fokofpolisiekar and Van Coke Cartel. **Re-fucking-freshing** van Coke. Get it on iTunes now.*

The second formal aspect Feinauer mentions is that expletives generally appear before stressed syllables, as is evident from the examples in (13)–(15). Despite her claim, we can see from the available data that it is not a strict requirement for the expletives to be placed before a stressed syllable. Examples from the data where the expletive appear elsewhere than before a stressed syllable are *stapel·fokken·gek*

The third formal aspect she mentions is morpheme boundaries: Expletives that frequently occur on morpheme boundaries ensure a greater degree of recognisability of the original word (Feinauer, 1981: 149–150). In all three examples in (13)–(15) *fokken* is indeed placed between recognisable morpheme boundaries. According to Van Huyssteen (2017a: 197), expletive infixation often takes place without regard to the morphological structure of the base word. This claim is in contrast with the examples in (13)–(15), as well as with Feinauer (1981). Further research in this regard, and by implication more data, is needed.

Although morpheme boundaries normally play a role because expletives are mostly infixed at boundaries to remain recognisable to the speaker, morpheme boundaries are especially important in compounds (Feinauer 1981: 154–155). This characteristic is evident in *Liefde--FOKKEN--groete* and *Lyn--fokken--stane* in (16) and (17) where the expletive is infixed between the components of the compound. However, the occurrence of compounds as base components for expletive infixation is not common in the corpus collections that were used. The data is discussed in more detail in section 5 of this article.

- (16) David, jou grammatika: mens plaas die woord-speserye by die deel waar mens wil hê die geur moet meer uitkom - jy is opreg in jou goeie wense vir haar dus wil jy daardie deel van die sin beklemtoon en dus is dit " **Liefde-FOKKEN-groete**, David " né?

*David, your grammar: one places the spicy words at the part where one wants the flavour to come through - you are earnest in you good wishes for her therefore you want to emphasise that part and therefore it is "**Loving--FUCKING-regards**", David" right?*

- (17) Kaptein se concerns: **Lyn-fokken-stane**. Dis nie rocket science nie, maar dit is wel statisties die plek waar jy die maklikste 'n try-scoring assault can launch.

*Captain's concerns: **Line--fucking--outs**. It's not rocket science, but it is statistically the place from where you can launch a try-scoring assault most easily.*

Apart from the characteristics of these constructions discussed already, Feinauer (1981: 152) comments on the initial and final sounds of syllables and identical consonant deletion; compare *krimi--fokken--neel* 'crimi·fucking·nal', *on--fokken--nuuswaardig* 'un·fucking·newsworthy' and *Ver--fokken-niet* 'in·fucking·vain' in (18)–(20). According to Feinauer, the choice of expletive would be determined by the initial and final sound of specific syllables: Where the beginning of a syllable is identical to the end of the expletive, that expletive will more often be replaced by another (for example *·blerrie·*). She gives three examples where *·fokken·* could be replaced by *·blerrie·* for this reason, namely *kolo--fokken--nel*, *ge--fokken--neuk* and *ge--fokken--noeg* (Feinauer 1981: 152). However, all three examples in (18)–(20) show that Afrikaans users still use *·fokken·* even if it is adjacent to an *-n* in the base word. She adds that when this does happen, as in these three cases, the two consonants will merge for phonetic purposes in a process called identical consonant deletion. All three constructions in (18)–(20) include the *-n* of *·fokken·* and the *-n* of the syllable following the expletive; both are therefore realised by the language user. All constructions from the data, as summarized in Table 1, indicate that this deletion does not occur orthographically and that users do not consider the initial and final sounds of syllables in this way when writing these constructions.

- (18) Dis **krimi-fokken-neel** om nie jou 50 overs klaar te maak nie.  
*It's crimi·fucking·nal to not finish your 50 overs.*
- (19) In ander niksseggende nuus wat net so **on-fokken-nuuswaardig** is, het ek onlangs my kombuis oorgedoen.  
*In other meaningless news that is just as un·fucking·newsworthy, I recently renovated my kitchen.*
- (20) Hy gaan maak die venster oop om sy kop skoon te kry voor hy voor sy rekenaar neersak. **Ver-fokken-niet** of hy kan konsentreer.  
*He goes to open the window to clear his head before he descends on his computer. In·fucking·vain if he can concentrate.*

#### 4 The meaning of EICs

EICs are affective forms of the base; the evaluative content that the user wishes to

communicate is signalled by the expletive. According to Feinauer (1981: 150–151), expletive infixation usually occurs with predicates, since non-predicates in most cases have a referential function. Feinauer does not specify what she means by predicate, but from her examples of predicates and non-predicate nouns it appears that she considers adjectives and adverbs to be predicates (Feinauer, 1980: 151). After Feinauer (1981: 151) presents examples to respondents, she concludes that for non-predicates to serve as a basis for expletive infixation, they must be affectively charged or possess the possibility to be affectively charged. However, this is a less interesting statement, since any word can be affectively charged when it is used with an expletive. In our opinion, the expletive contributes the required "affective charge", rather than its use being dependant on existing or inherent affect; examples include *LEES·FOKKEN·TEKENS* 'PUNCTU·FUCKING·ATION' and *Werner--·bleddie--·Schutte* 'Werner·--bloody·--Schutte' in (21) and (22). In both examples the base word is a "non-predicate" which is then affectively charged by means of the expletive.

- (21) Let nou mooi op sussie,  
**LEESFOKKENTEKENS** en  
SPELLING asseblief Sorry Prof, hier's hy.  
*Concentrate carefully now sister, PUNCTU·FUCKING·ATION and SPELLING please Sorry Prof, here it is.*
- (22) Dan gaan sy haar wasgoed was, klere inpak vir 'n aand of twee en na Nicol toe ry. **Werner-bleddie-Schutte** gaan haar nie ontstel nie.  
*Then she is going to do her washing, pack clothes for a night or two and drive to Nicol. Werner·--bloody·--Schutte won't upset her.*

Expletive infixation also offers a language user a unique opportunity to form evaluative constructions from words that cannot normally be modified by expletives. Two cases are *Liefde·FOKKEN·--groete* 'Loving·--FUCKING·--regards' and *enso·fokken·voorts* 'et·fucking·cetera' in (23) and (24). Both constructions do not occur with *fokken* as an adverb; *\*fokken liefdegroete* 'fucking loving regards' and *\*fokken ensovoorts* 'fucking etcetera' do not exist.

- (23) David, jou grammatika: mens plaas die woord-speserye by die deel waar mens wil hê die geur moet meer uitkom - jy is opreg in jou goeie wense vir haar dus wil jy daardie deel van die sin beklemtoon en dus is dit " **Liefde-FOKKEN-groete**, David" né?

*David, your grammar: one places the word spices at the part where one want the flavour to come through - you are earnest in you good wishes for her therefore you want to emphasise that part and therefore it is "Loving--FUCKING-regards", David" right?*

- (24) Ah, die Blou Bul is nie in die semi's nie, die BB.....Lalalalallalal **ensofokkenvoorts!**

*Ah, the Blue Bull is not in the semi's, the BB.....Lalalalallalal et-fucking-cetera!*

## 5 The use of EICs in Afrikaans corpora

The prevalence of EICs in VivA's corpus collections is summarized in Table 1 (*fokken*), Table 2 (*blerrie* and *bleddie*) and Table 3 (*flippen*). The collections of online Afrikaans corpora that were available on VivA's website (<https://viva-afrikaans.org>) have been used. According to Van Huyssteen (2018) the texts included in VivA's corpora can be classified as edited, semi-edited and unedited. Part of VivA-CPC consisted of text from fiction and language descriptions, which are edited texts, as well as Wikipedia articles that can be seen as semi-edited. The Leipzig corpus, that also formed part of VivA-CPC, can be classified as partly unedited. For evaluative constructions like EICs, edited texts are probably less than ideal seeing that the informal nature of EICs is a core component. VivA-CPE is less edited, seeing that it includes anonymous commentary (hereafter NWU commentary corpus) and the collection of historical texts of the Tracing History Trust (hereafter the NWU/THT corpus), as well as the content from [watkykgy.co.za](http://watkykgy.co.za) (hereafter the WKJ corpus). For the present purposes the entire VivA-CPC has been used and only the WKJ corpus and NWU commentary corpus of VivA-CPC.

### 5.1 Metrics for describing the data

The measure that will be used to describe the use or distribution of EICs in the data is the word frequency class (hereafter N). The N-value makes it possible to compare the frequency of EICs with the frequency of the most common word in the corpus collections, the determiner *die* 'the'. The frequency of *die* is used in tandem with the raw frequency of the EICs to calculate the N-value of each EIC in the corpus. The N-value is used as the metric to interpret the presence of EICs, following Van Huyssteen (2017b). The formula used to calculate the N-value is given in (23). In both corpus collections, the N-value of *die* is 0. EICs with a raw frequency of 0 are not included in this article, seeing that a frequency of 0 is not acceptable input for the calculation of the N-value.

- (25)  $[N=0.5-\log_2 + (\text{frequency of the most frequently occurring word})]$

Van Huyssteen (2017b:337) uses a N-value of between 4 and 18 as a measure to judge whether a word should be included in the *Afrikaanse Woordelys en Spelreëls*<sup>8</sup> (Taalkommissie, 2017): This range means words occurring between four and eighteen times less than the most frequently occurring word. For the purposes of the description of EICs, rather than inclusion in a wordlist and considering the systematicity of EICs, N-values can be grouped together. The grouping of N-values is based on a limited pilot study of Afrikaans evaluative construction (i.e. the use of the prefixoids *hond*÷ 'dog' and *perd*÷ 'horse' as well as intensifying prefixes like *super*÷ 'super' and *hiper*÷ 'hyper'). The groupings identified are the following:

- Very high;  $N \leq 14$  indicates a very high occurrence of an EIC
- High;  $14 < N \leq 17$  indicates a high occurrence of an EIC
- Average;  $17 < N \leq 20$  indicates an average occurrence of an EIC
- Low;  $20 < N < 24$  indicates a low occurrence of an EIC

<sup>8</sup> The Afrikaans Wordlist and Spelling Rules.

- Very low;  $N \geq 24$  indicates a very low occurrence of an EIC

In addition to the frequency, the productivity of EICs is also of interest. The formula in (26) to measure linguistic productivity, measures productivity in its narrow sense: The relationship between the number of hapax legomena ( $n_1$ ) – constructions only appearing once – and the total frequency of all the constructions of the same type (T) are used to calculate productivity (P) (Baayen and Lieber, 1991). The higher the P-value, the more productive the process. In Van Huyssteen (2018:408) the P-value of *heid* is established at 0.2 and in Afrikaans *heid* is accepted as a very productive word-forming affix. Despite the limited data used for this article, the P-values will be calculated and reported as a means to further contextualise the discussion of the use of lesser-known constructions in Afrikaans, like EICs. For more on the productivity of morphological evaluative constructions in Afrikaans, see Trollip (2022).

$$(26) P = \frac{n_1}{T}$$

## 5.2 Description of the data

Seeing that the description of EICs is based on the corpus data in these two collections, only the forms that appear there are considered. The data being considered is therefore orthographical

representations of EICs. Only constructions written as one word (with or without hyphens) will form part of the study. It must be stated from the outset that the data has not been normalised with respect to forms with and without hyphens since the hyphens relate to the recognisability of the base word.<sup>9</sup> Purely based on the size of the tables one can already see that *fokken* is preferred by language users when forming these constructions.

If one considers Table 1, there are 54 EICs in VivA-CPC and 127 EICs in VivA-CPE. The construction with the lowest N-value, and therefore the highest frequency, in both VivA-CPC and VivA-CPE is *asse--fokken--blief* with N=21 (low prevalence) and N=16 (higher than expected prevalence) respectively. Both N-values are lower than the variants written without hyphens (N=23 and N=17 respectively). The difference in N-values may indicate users who either think hyphens should be used in these constructions or are not yet comfortable writing the constructions without hyphens. Other constructions where the hyphenated forms are used less than the hyphenated form do not appear in the data. Most constructions in both collections are hapax legomena (constructions that only appear once), with only 10 constructions in VivA-CPC and 26 constructions in VivA-CPE not being hapax legomena (hereafter hapaxes). The occurrence of new constructions is therefore common according to Table 1; for *fokken* in VivA-CPC P=0.61 and in VivA-CPE P=0.56.

1

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die</i> = 15529096			<i>die</i> = 1209996		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
asse-fokken-blief	21	7	asse-fokken-blief	16	24
Befokkenslis	22	3	Assefokkenblief	17	10
ver-fokken-seker	22	4	Verfokkenseker	17	7
Assefokkenblief	23	2	vir-fokken-seker	17	8
Assefokkenblieftog	23	2	Fanfokkentasties	18	4
Onbefokkenkostigbaar	23	2	Ongefokkenlooflik	18	5
Ongefokkenlooflik	23	2	Uitfokkenstekend	18	4
Stapelfokkengek	23	2	ver-fokken-seker	18	5
Ver-fokken-niet	23	2	Brilfokkenjant	19	3
vir-fokken-seker	23	2	bril-fokken-jant	19	2
audio-fokken-naaifees	24	1	dirt-fokken-cheap	19	2

<sup>9</sup> The data is available as part of a bigger dataset of Afrikaans morphological evaluative constructions (see Trollip, 2022b).

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die = 15529096</i>			<i>die = 1209996</i>		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
be-fokken-fok	24	1	ensofokkenvoorts	19	2
Bull-fokken-shit	24	1	Hi-fokken-steries	19	2
Des-nie-teen-fokken-staande	24	1	kak-fokken-duur	19	2
En-fokken-core	24	1	Klipfokkenhard	19	2
Fanfokkentasties	24	1	onfokkenmoontlik	19	2
Fi-na-fokkenly	24	1	on-fokken-moontlik	19	2
ge-fokken-donner	24	1	onfokkenoorspronklik	19	2
gefokken-fluiter	24	1	Onge-fokken-looflik	19	2
Gefokkenvloekery	24	1	Onsamefokkenhangend	19	2
half-fokken-vyf	24	1	Oppifokkenkoppi	19	2
helderfokkenblou	24	1	pre-fokken-sies	19	2
hond-fokken-duur	24	1	Presifokkendent	19	3
in-fokken-sane	24	1	uit-fokken-eindelik	19	3
Inteen-fokken-deel	24	1	virfokkenseker	19	3
kak-fokken-duur	24	1	Absofokkenluut	20	1
LEESFOKKENTEKENS	24	1	A-fokken-men	20	1
Lemmer-fokken-Bosman	24	1	asem-fokken-rowend	20	1
Musiekliedhebersparrafokkendys	24	1	Assefokkengrootblief	20	1
On(fokken)moontlik	24	1	asse-fokken-groot-blijf	20	1
onfokkendenkbaar	24	1	Ata-fokken-ri	20	1
onfokkenmoontlik	24	1	BE-Fokken-FOK	20	1
ongefokkenhoord	24	1	befokkenslis	20	1
on-ge-fokken-looflik	24	1	be-fokken-slis	20	1
Onuitfokkenputlik	24	1	Bekotsensfokkenwaardig	20	1
Onverfokkenbiddellik	24	1	Bra-fokken-vo	20	1
ouder-fokken-dom	24	1	Bull-fokken-shit.	20	1
papfokkensopnat	24	1	damfokkenduikers	20	1
pikstikfokkendonker	24	1	Dan-fokken-Roodt	20	1
Pisfokkenkoud	24	1	defini-fokken-tief	20	1
pre-fokken-sies	24	1	Des-nie-teen-fokken-staande	20	1
SAU-fokken-K	24	1	diefokkenselfde	20	1
Slam-fokken-DUNK	24	1	dood-fokken-ernstig	20	1
Stikswartfokkendonker	24	1	Eeeiii-fokken-naaa	20	1
Uit-fokken-eindelik	24	1	e-fokken-pos	20	1
uitfokkenstekend	24	1	Elton-fokken-John	20	1
Vasgefokkenketting.	24	1	enterfokkentaing	20	1
Veer-fokken-tien	24	1	fan-fokken-tastiese	20	1
verfokkenseker	24	1	Fe-fokken-nomenale	20	1
verfokkenvlakste	24	1	Foefokkentoggie	20	1
verfokkenwurg	24	1	gefokkendink	20	1
vis-fokken-motte	24	1	ge-fokken-duik	20	1
Witfokkenwarm	24	1	ge-fokken-enter	20	1
Zimfokkenbabwe	24	1	ge-fokken-fine	20	1
			ge-fokken-fire	20	1
			ge-fokken-irriteer	20	1
			ge-fokken-kerm	20	1
			ge-fokken-lukkig	20	1
			ge-fokken-noeg	20	1
			gefokkenpraat	20	1
			gefokkensê	20	1
			gefokkensingery	20	1
			gefokkenspin	20	1
			gefokkensteel	20	1

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die = 15529096</i>			<i>die = 1209996</i>		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
			gefokkenstenig	20	1
			gefokkensukkel	20	1
			ge-fokken-swaai	20	1
			gefokkenvlieg	20	1
			ge-fokken-woonlik	20	1
			gods-on-fokken-moontlik	20	1
			heelte-fokken-mal	20	1
			high-fokken-heals	20	1
			hom-fokken-self	20	1
			honder-en-fokken-vyftig	20	1
			hond-fokken-duur	20	1
			hondfokkenkak	20	1
			HORFOKKENMONE	20	1
			In-fokken-credible	20	1
			Inteen-fokken-deel	20	1
			interfokkenkontinentale	20	1
			Jirrejissesfokkengot	20	1
			kinder-fokken-kak	20	1
			Knop-fokken-kop	20	1
			Konsenfokkentreer	20	1
			krimi-fokken-neel	20	1
			Krokkefokkendiltrane	20	1
			Liefde-FOKKEN-groete	20	1
			Lyn-fokken-stane	20	1
			malfokkenhond	20	1
			MIDDELFOKKENVINGER	20	1
			musiek liefhebbersparrafokkendys	20	1
			Non-fokken-stop	20	1
			on-fokken-nuuswaardig	20	1
			onfokkensigbaar	20	1
			on-fokken-vergeeflik	20	1
			onge-fokken-lukkig	20	1
			Oppi-fokken-Koppi	20	1
			ouder-fokken-dom	20	1
			Yusuf Pa-fokken-wie	20	1
			Panfokkenyaza Lefokkensufokkenfi	20	1
			Pikfokkenswart	20	1
			pisfokkenkoud	20	1
			Poesfokkenjammer	20	1
			poes-fokken-snaaks	20	1
			powerfokkenforce	20	1
			pro-fokken-tective	20	1
			sam-fokken-blief	20	1
			Se-fokken-blief	20	1
			semi-fokken-gloss	20	1
			Siesfokkentog	20	1
			skynfokkenheiligheid	20	1
			Slam-fokken-DUNK	20	1
			soet-fokken-sappig	20	1
			Ster-Kinefokkenkor	20	1
			stink-fokken-ryk	20	1
			ter-fokken-loops	20	1
			Uitfokkeneindelik	20	1

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die</i> = 15529096			<i>die</i> = 1209996		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
			Un-fokken-real	20	1
			Verfokkenfrissend	20	1
			verFOKKENvelig	20	1
			virfokkenniet	20	1
			vrotfokkendronk	20	1
			wel-deur-fokken-dagte	20	1
			Wielie-fokken-Walie	20	1
			wikkifokkenpedia	20	1
			wit-fokken-warm	20	1
			ysterfokkenvark	20	1

Table 1: Word frequency class (N) of EICs with ·fokken·

A pattern that emerges from the constructions in VivA-CPC is that the expletive is usually placed after the first (*be·fokken·slis*), second (*Onge·fokken·looflik*) or third (*defini·-·fokken·-·tief*) syllable, but before the stressed syllable. However, exceptions are cases where foreign language words like *Encore* in *En·fokken·core*, intensified adjectives like *stapelgek* ‘completely crazy’ in *stapel·fokken·gek* ‘completely·fucking·crazy’, and compounds like *vismotte* ‘silver-fishes’ in *vis·-·fokken·-·motte* ‘silver·fucking·fishes’ form the basis of the construction.

A form of expletive infixation that has not yet been sufficiently described in the literature is the infixation of names or proper nouns. McMillan (1980: 163) illustrates the versatility of the construction to combine across parts of speech early on in his study. McMillan (1980: 163-164) refers to expletives in single or multi-word proper nouns but does not discuss the phenomenon in more detail. Feinauer does not elaborate on expletive infixation in other parts of speech in her study. She does however discuss expletives in “persoonsnaamgroepe” ‘personal name groups’<sup>10</sup> briefly, but not the cases where an expletive is infixed into a “ungrouped” proper noun (Feinauer 1981: 156–157). She singles out the contextually affective and phonological requirements for these types of constructions but does not discuss them in more detail. However, for a proper noun to be the basis of expletive infixation, she states that it must be “affectively charged” through the context of the

utterance. Examples in Afrikaans are *Zim·fokken·babwe* and *Lemmer·-·fokken·-·Bosman* as in (27) and (28).

- (27) Ja, die lot was hoeka op 'n "feite sending" na Rhodesia (**Zim·fokken·babwe**) om te leer hoe om die stemme "reg" te tel.  
*Yes, as a matter of fact the lot was on a “fact finding mission” to Rhodesia (**Zim·fucking·babwe**) to learn how to count the votes “correctly”.*
- (28) En ná skool sluit hy by die weermag aan om 'n man te wees. Toe kom **Lemmer·fokken·Bosman** in sy lewe.  
*And after school he joined the military to be a man. Then **Lemmer·-·fucking·-·Bosman** came into his life.*

The 10 constructions in the corpus collections in which a proper noun serves as a base are all hapaxes. Examples not yet discussed are *Ata·-·fokken·-·ri*, *Dan·-·fokken·-·Roodt*, *Pan·fokken·yaza* *Le·fokken·su·fokken·fi*, *Oppi·fokken·koppi* (with and without hyphens either side of *fokken·*), *Yusuf Pa·-·fokken·-·wie* and *Ster·Kine·fokken·kor*. It is worth noting that *fokken·* in *Ata·-·fokken·-·ri* and *Ster·Kine·fokken·kor* is placed after the stressed syllable, similar to *helder·fokken·blou* and *En·-·fokken·-·core* (in VivA-CPC) among others. The infixation of proper nouns in VivA-CPC (*Lemmer·fokken·-·Bosman*, *SAU·-·fokken·-·K* and *Zim·fokken·babwe*) all follow the “usual” pattern where the expletive is placed before the stressed syllable.

<sup>10</sup> From Feinauer’s description and examples, this term refers to a name and a surname being used together.

In *Pan·fokken·yaza Le·fokken·su·fokken·fi* the author uses *·fokken·* three times to express an extremely negative stance. In the recursive infixation of the latter construction, which follows an unknown pattern, the repetition of *·fokken·* is used as a stylistic device to express intense frustration or negativity. This construction therefore links with the idealised cognitive model MORE FORM IS MORE MEANING (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 127–128).

The use of *·fokken·* to indicate different emotional values becomes particularly clear when comparing *Oppi·fokken·koppi* with *Pan·fokken·yaza Le·fokken·su·fokken·fi*. In the example sentences in (29) and (30), the most important difference appears to be that *Oppi·fokken·koppi* has a positive meaning, while *Pan·fokken·yaza Le·fokken·su·fokken·fi* has a negative meaning. This aspect of expletive infixation, namely, to give both a positive and negative connotation to a word, links directly to Feinauer's statement about the influence of an affective context, which was discussed earlier.

- (29) Eina, alles is seer. Was weer vet pret. Goed om te weet ek was nie die enigste alkoholgedrewe motherless zombie by Wedding DJ's nie.

**Oppifokkenkoppi!**

*Ouch, everything is sore. Was a lot of fun again. Good to know I wasn't the only alcohol-driven motherless zombie at Wedding DJs.*

**Oppi·fucking·koppi!**

- (30) Natuurlik sit die LUR van Onderwys in Gauteng, **Panfokkenyaza**

**Lefokkensufokkenfi** agter alles.

*Of course, the MEC of Education in Gauteng, Pan·fokken·yaza*

*Le·fokken·su·fokken·fi sits behind everything.*

The difference between the expletive infixation of proper nouns compared to the cases where *fokken* is used adverbially is evident from a comparison of *Oppi·fokken·koppi* in (29) with *fokken Oppikoppi* in (31). The former is a morphological evaluative construction while the latter is a syntactic evaluative construction with the same meaning. The use of *fokken* in both these ways, to convey the same message in different ways, should be studied in more detail in the future.

- (31) Granted, so paar het in die bome beland, want dit is after all **fokken Oppikoppi**, met like bome en shit.

*Granted, a few landed in the trees, because it is **fucking Oppikoppi** after all, with like trees and shit.*

When considering the constructions in Table 2, it appears that 27 constructions have been formed with *·bleddie·* and *·blerrie·*. There are only 22 unique constructions in which *·bleddie·* or *·blerrie·* are used, of which 7 have a proper noun as a base component. All the EICs in VivA-CPE are hapaxes (N=20), while *uit·-bleddie·-eindelik* (N=22) in VivA-CPC has the highest frequency, with only 3 hits. The use of *·blerrie·* and *·bleddie·* in the types of texts found in VivA-CPE is particularly limited if the EICs listed in Table 2 are considered. Language users also seem less inclined to use hyphens with *·bleddie·* and *·blerrie·* than in the case of *·fokken·*. This may indicate language users who can identify the base word more easily than in the cases where *·fokken·* is used. It may also point to *·blerrie·*'s established use in specific Afrikaans constructions, rather than its productive expansion into new constructions.

The use of *·flippen·* and *·frieken·*, as euphemised forms of *·fokken·*, seems to be limited. There are only a few hits with *·flippen·* in VivA-CPC and VivA-CPE, most of them in VivA-CPC. A summary of the hits is provided in Table 3. Of the 31 constructions, 24 are hapaxes, such as *uit·flippen·stekend* 'out·flipping·standing' and *vrek·flippen·moeg* 'dead·flipping·tired'.

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die = 15529096</i>			<i>die = 1209996</i>		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
<b>·blerrie·</b>					
uit-bleddie-eindelik	22	3	uit-bleddie-eindelik	20	1
Ongebleddielooflik	23	2			
Werner-bleddie-Schutte	23	2			

Armin-bleddie-van-der-Walt	24	1			
Assebleddieblief	24	1			
Asse-bleddie-blief	24	1			
Ekstrableddiepolasie	24	1			
flambo-bléddie-jant	24	1			
On-bleddie-gelooflik	24	1			
Ongebleddieskik	24	1			
onge-bleddie-twyfeld	24	1			
Porse-bleddie-lyntjie	24	1			
van-bleddie-Niekerk	24	1			
Ver-bleddie-domp	24	1			
WhatsbleddieApp.	24	1			
<b>·bleddie·</b>					
Heelblerrietyd	23	2	Beblerriaglik	20	1
Porse-blerrie-lyntjie	23	2	geblerriemors	20	1
Absoblerrieluut	24	1	geblerriesê	20	1
Asblerrieпоester	24	1			
defini-blerrie-tief	24	1			
Verblerriedomp	24	1			
Verblerrieseker	24	1			
Wawydblerriewakker	24	1			

Table 2: Word frequency class (N) of EICs with *·bleddie·* and *·blerrie·*.

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die = 15529096</i>			<i>die = 1209996</i>		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
Wian-flippen-Tredoux	20	16	asseflippenblief	19	2
asse-flippen-blief	22	3	asse-flippen-blief	19	2
Uit-flippen-eindelik	22	3	asseflippenblieftog	19	2
Fan-flippen-tasties	23	2	Onge-flippen-looflik	19	2
Josh-flippen-Conradie	23	2	as-se-flippen-blief	20	1
kurk-flippen-trekker	23	2	fanflippen-tastiese	20	1
Onge-flippen-looflik	23	2	poli-flippen-tiek	20	1
Asemflippenrowend	24	1	Vir-flippen-seker	20	1
Asseflippenblief	24	1			
Blake-flippen-Constanzo	24	1			
Brilflippenjante	24	1			
Donnerflippenstorms	24	1			
ge-flippen-sê	24	1			
Genade-flippen-water	24	1			
Hannah-flippen-Malan	24	1			
Hoedaflippenhel	24	1			
Hoer-flippen-ja	24	1			
kurk-flippen-droog	24	1			
Nicol-flippen-le	24	1			
Onflippenmoontlik	24	1			
Ongeflippenlooflik	24	1			
Perflippenfek	24	1			
Per-flippen-soonlike	24	1			
Pre-flippen-sies	24	1			
Proflippenfessor	24	1			
roos-flippen-kleurige	24	1			
Tinus-flippen-Viljoen	24	1			
uit-flippen-stekend	24	1			
Verflippenfomfaai	24	1			
Vrekflippenmoeg	24	1			

VivA-CPC			VivA-CPE		
<i>die</i> = 15529096			<i>die</i> = 1209996		
EIC	N	Hits	EIC	N	Hits
Waddeflippenflop	24	1			

Table 3: Word frequency class (N) of EICs with *flippen*.

The P-value for *flippen* (P=0.44) in VivA-CPC points to a degree of productivity in edited texts. The P-value in VivA-CPE (P=0.4) is similar, but unfortunately only 6 constructions were part of the calculation. In the case of *frieken* only *tronk·frieken·voëls* ‘jail·fricking·birds’ occurs as a hapax in VivA-CPE; there are no hits in VivA-CPC.

### 5.3 Further remarks

Due to Feinauer (1981) recording observational Afrikaans data, it can be said with a certain degree of certainty that EICs in Afrikaans started being used around the 1970s. It is likely that its use in Afrikaans arose under the influence of English, as

these constructions do not exist in Dutch. Further evidence would be that the Afrikaans expletives that are part of EICs are borrowed from English (*fokken* for the English *fucking* and *blerrie/bleddie* for the English *bloody*). This statement is supported if one considers the N-gram<sup>11</sup> in Figure 1. According to Figure 1 these constructions first appeared in written English in the 1970s and began to be used more frequently in the 1980s. The three constructions searched for in English are *abso-fucking-lutely*, *fan-fucking-tastic* and *un-fucking-believable*.

Figure 1: The use of *fucking* in English in Google Books Ngram Viewer (Michel et al. 2011).

One Afrikaans construction that deviates from the usual infixation of *fokken*, *·blerrie/·bleddie* and *flippen* is *on·bliksem·s·gelooflik* ‘un·fucking·believable’<sup>12</sup> in (32). This construction occurs three times in VivA-CPE and is noteworthy due to the use of *·bliksem·s·* ‘lightning·LK·’ as the infix, and the insertion of the expletive before an unstressed syllable. The forms with *·blerrie·*, *·fokken·* and *·flippen·* typically have the expletive before *-loof*; the heaviest syllable in *ongelooflik*. In *on·bliksem·s·gelooflik* ‘un·fucking·LK·believable’, the author therefore wants to make the word even

more noticeable by using an unusual infix expletive, as well as adding the expletive in an unusual place in the word. Other constructions in which *·bliksem·s·* is the infix are not mentioned in other sources and were not found in the data. The use of *bliksem*, as a typical Afrikaans expletive, suggests the “nativisation” of the construction.<sup>13</sup>

(32)Maar nee, hang aan, die tape sny af na die uiters opwindende intro sequence en ons sit vir mekaar en kyk soos doosbreine.

<sup>11</sup> [https://bit.ly/fucking\\_infiks](https://bit.ly/fucking_infiks)

<sup>12</sup> A literal translation would be ‘un·lighting·LK·believable’ in which the LK indicates a linking morpheme.

<sup>13</sup> I wish to thank Daniel van Olmen for pointing this out.

Ongefokkenlooflik. Absofokkenluut  
**onbliksemsgelooflik.**  
*But no, hang on, the tape cuts off after the  
very exciting intro sequence and we sit and  
look at each other like shitheads.  
Unfuckingbelievable. Absofuckinglutely  
un-lightning-believable.*

## 6 Conclusion

Describing the form, meaning and use of EICs in Afrikaans was posited as the aim of this article. It is clear how versatile and productive EICs are in Afrikaans, specifically when considering the data for *fokken*. One aspect that stood out is how infixation enables a user to imbue words with an evaluative meaning which do not normally allow for intensification through taboo adverbs. The use of expletives in proper nouns was also discussed, with the conclusion that negative and positive meaning evaluations can accompany the incorporation of proper nouns as the bases for EICs. In future work it would be interesting to see how English compares to Afrikaans, seeing as EICs tend to be discussed as a predominantly English phenomenon.

## Limitations

The description offered in this article only considered the way EICs are realised in written form in a specific corpus collection of Afrikaans. Due to a general lack of bigger and alternative corpora, a limitation of this study is that it did not take into account how these constructions are used in spoken (and possibly more informal) contexts. Another way in which this study is limited, is that a complete or comprehensive comparison with English was not included. A future direction that this research could take would be to include usage data from English in an effort to compare the similarities and differences in the way these constructions are utilised.

## Ethics statement

Research ethics approval to conduct this study (being part of a doctoral dissertation) was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee for Language Matters (ECLM) of the North-West University (NWU: 00706-21-A7).

## Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Professor Gerhard van Huyssteen for his support during the study and his insight into the topic. The author also thanks the reviewers for their helpful comments, suggestions and insights.

## References

- Harald Baayen and Rochelle Lieber. 1991. Productivity and English derivation: a corpus-based study. *Linguistics*, 29:801-844.
- Laurie Bauer. 2003. *Introducing linguistic morphology*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Laurie Bauer. 2015. [Expletive insertion](#). *American Speech*, 90(1):122–127.
- Juliette Blevins. 2014. *Infixation*. In R. Liber & P. Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*, 136–153. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Geert Booij. 2010. *Construction morphology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Johan G.H. Combrink. 1990. *Afrikaanse morfologie: Capita exemplaria*. Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- Anna Elizabeth Feinauer. 1981. Die taalkundige gedrag van vloekwoorde in Afrikaans. Unpublished MA thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch.
- Anna Elizabeth Feinauer. 1983. Vloekwoordinsetting in Afrikaans. In M.C.J. van Rensburg (ed.) *LUSA 1983*, p.133-154. Universiteitspers U.O.V.S, Bloemfontein.
- Emma Haggins and John Archibald. 2020. [Foot recursion in interlanguage grammars](#). *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle*, 30(1):31–41.
- Monika Kavalir. 2018. *Expletive infixation: how its stylistic effect is decoded and transposed by L2 speakers*. In Walczyński, M., P. Czajka & M. Szawerna (eds.), *On the verge between language and translation*. 19–38. P. Lang, Berlin.
- George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- John J. McCarthy. 1982. [Prosodic structure and expletive insertion](#). *Language*, 58(3):574–590.
- James B McMillan. 1980. [Infixing and interposing in English](#). *American Speech*, 55(3):163-183.
- Jean-Baptiste Michel, Yuan Kui Shen, Aviva Presser Aiden, Adrian Veres, Matthew K. Grey, Google Books Team, Joseph P. Pickett, Dale Hoiberg, Dan Clancy, Peter Norvig, Jon Orwant, Steven Pinker, Martin A. Nowak and Erez Lieberman Aiden. 2011.

Quantitative analysis of culture using millions of digitized books. *Science*, 331(6014):176–82.

Taalkommissie van die Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns. 2017. Afrikaanse woordelys en spelreëls. 11th ed. Cape Town, Pharos.

Benito Trollip. 2022a. Morfologiese evalueringskonstruksies in Afrikaans. Unpublished PhD thesis, North-West University, North-West.

Benito Trollip. 2022b. Afrikaans morphological evaluative constructions dataset. South African Centre for Digital Language Resources.

Gerhardus Beukes Van Huyssteen. 2017a. *Morfologie*. In Carstens, W.A.M. & N. Bosman (eds.), *Kontemporêre Afrikaanse taalkunde*. 2nd ed., 177–214. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Gerhardus Beukes Van Huyssteen. 2017b. Die aard, doel en omvang van die Afrikaanse woordelys en spelreëls. Deel 1. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, 57(1-2):323-345.

Gerhardus Beukes Van Huyssteen. 2018. 'n Korpusondersoek na huidiglik. *Literator: Journal of Literary Criticism, Comparative Linguistics and Literary Studies*, 39(2), 1-10.

VivA (Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans). 2022a. Korpusportaal: Omvattend 1.10. <https://viva-afrikaans.org>. Date accessed 24 April 2022.

VivA (Virtuele Instituut vir Afrikaans). 2022b. Korpusportaal: Eksklusief 1.11. <https://viva-afrikaans.org>. Date accessed 24 April 2022.

Alan C.L. Yu. 2007. *A natural history of infixation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tim Zingler. 2024. Expletive insertion: a morphological approach. *English Language and Linguistics*, 28:32–43.