Arguments for creolisation in Irish English*

Raymond Hickey
University of Essen

1   Introduction

The area of creole studies has enjoyed up to the present undiminished interest among linguists descriptive and theoretical alike and the results of this research has been of considerable significance in the illumination of language variety over time and space and has proved fruitful to considerations of language genesis.

In the last decade or so historical stages of English, most notably Middle English, have also been examined with a view to possible classification as a creole (Domingue 1977; Bailey and Maroldt 1979; Poussa 1982; Görlach 1986; Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Dalton-Puffer 1995; Danchev in press; on Romance, Schlieben-Lange 1979). The claims of the pro-creolists, notably Bailey and Maroldt, have provoked strong reactions from other linguists who have gone to considerable lengths to dismantle the creolisation hypothesis for Middle English and northern varieties of Old English (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988, for instance).

Despite the adverse criticism which such attempts at attributing creole status to historical varieties of English has met with I nonetheless deem it appropriate to consider the question with regard to Irish English which has had quite a different history from mainland English and where the synchronically ascertainable effects of sustained contact with Irish justify at least an objective evaluation of possible creole status in the decisive period of genesis for Irish English.

In view of the intensity of reaction by opponents of creolisation and the negative light in which the scholarship of the proponents is viewed I should stress at the outset that I see no inherent advantage in classifying a stage of a language or variety as a creole. Quite the opposite: both the terms 'creole' and 'creolisation' must be defined clearly as a lack of terminological stringency leads to fuzziness which does a disservice to the field. Given this standpoint let me begin with an attempt at definition and with an outline of the main features which are a *sine qua non* for classification as a creole. Here I recognize three main types of definition.

1.1   External definition

By this is meant that the criteria for definition refer to factors outside of the language, ultimately to its sociolinguistic history. External definitions are favoured for instance by such authorities as Holm (1988, 1994) when examining the independent varieties of English in the Caribbean: 'no particular set of syntactic features alone will identify a language as a creole without reference to its sociolinguistic history' (1994:372). Clearly in a case such as this, where the political and demographic history of the region, with its

large numbers of linguistically uprooted and displaced inhabitants, was highly conducive to creole genesis, it is sufficient to refer to this history should there be dissenting voices on the status of varieties of English in this region.

However, definitions resting solely or even largely on external factors suffer from one essential weakness, namely that it is ultimately a matter of opinion when one regards the sociolinguistic environment as having been that for the origin of a creole. This point is not usually the focus of attention of creolists as there is tacit agreement that the non-standard varieties of certain key areas such as the Caribbean or West Africa are accepted as creoles. Distinctions are then made on a vertical axis by lectal divisions or the notion of cline (see below). Furthermore recognizably different varieties in a geographical area may often be viewed as comprising a whole. Holm (1994) talks of Creole (with a capital C) which would seem to imply some kind of unity if not sociolinguistically at least internally as a structural complex.

1.2 *Acquisitional definition*

This type of definition sees a creole as a language which arises in a situation where a generation of speakers develops its language from a drastically reduced and imperfectly acquired form of a colonial lexifier language. Note that this definition is relational as its point of reference is not a set of features of the language itself but a previous stage of the lexifier and/or substrate language with which it is compared.

The standard wisdom with types of definition acknowledges an historical development from jargon (not stabilized or regular and with no fixed norms) to pidgin and then to creole, the defining feature of the latter being the existence of speakers for whom this is their native language. Of course to fulfill the needs of a first language a pidgin has to be expanded considerably in grammar and lexicon in the process of creolisation. The duration of the transition from jargon through to creole leads to classifications for the interim stages such as 'stable pidgin', 'expanded pidgin', etc. The possibility of a quick switch from jargon to creole (Bollée 1977) is captured by the term 'abrupt creolisation'.

1.3 *Structural definition*

According to this definition a creole is a language which has undergone considerable restructuring with respect to the lexifier language and probably with regard to the substrate native language(s) as well (if such a language or languages provided input, Versteegh 19??). This definition is also relational as it of necessity involves an examination of the grammar of the lexifier language. However, if restructuring can be narrowed down to an independent restricted set of features then it increases in value as an internal definition.

Restructuring can be taken to involve certain essential elements which, if missing, diminish the status of a language as a creole. First and foremost among these is the tendency towards analytical type. The simplification of the morphology which this involves is frequently reached by utilizing common independent morphemes as substitutes for bound morphemes in the grammar of the lexifier language. A clear example is where a deictic element in pre-head position is used as the exponent of the (inflectional) grammatical category and can be seen, for instance, with *them* as a plural marker in English-based creoles. Pre-head position for grammatical elements is also

seen in verbal phrases in the pre-verbal markers for tense, mood and aspect (more on this presently).

It should be remarked in this context that restructuring is to be distinguished carefully from reanalysis or lack of analysis. The latter can arise from such phenomena as a failure to recognize morpheme boundaries, e.g., *to marrid; to fishin* (Holm 1994:361) but is not to be confused with the active alteration of the grammar of the incipient creole which represents restructuring.

The remarks above refer to the lexifier language and not a possible substrate. Of course there may be many structures which plausibly derive from a substrate in the genesis of a creole and it is the relative weight accorded to the substrate which constitutes the main difference between the universalist and substrate hypotheses in creole studies (Muysken and Smith 1986, Alleyne 1986 and Mufwene 1986). In principle the same processes may affect substrate and lexifier input to an incipient creole. One respect in which restructuring is considered equally possible from above and below, so to speak, is the promotion of aspect often with an attendant demotion of tense. This feature is widely attested in those varieties/languages on which there is general agreement as to their creole status, e.g., the various forms of imported English in the Caribbean area.

1.3.1   Assessing status of change

For classification as a creole it is not enough just to have structural changes such as movement to analytical type, particularly not if this can be accounted for by internal developments which were active before the external situation which is supposed to have lead to a change to creole. For instance the decline of inflections in the history of English may well have been due to internal factors or earlier contact with Celtic speakers in Britain (Hickey, 1995b); therefore this should this not be misinterpreted as an indication of creolisation during the Norse and Norman French periods. Furthermore the lack of pre-verbal modifiers and phonological simplification along with the continuing existence of such syntactic features as the passive or clause subordination speak clearly against creole status for Middle English. Those alterations in the grammar of English, such as the changes in the system of personal pronouns, e.g., the borrowing in the north of forms in *th-* from Scandinavian, can be accounted for internally and the rise of a form like *she* is diametrically opposed to the tendency observed in many creoles where sex distinctions are frequently not realised morphologically.

Lexical borrowing is an indication of contact, direct or indirect, but can by no means serve as a sign of creolisation. Hence the many day-to-day loans from Scandinavian which entered English at the end of the Old English period, and the occasional replacements to be found, point to close contact and mutual intelligibility but not to an interruption in linguistic continuity which is a prerequisite for creole genesis.

1.4   Classificational difficulties

The consideration of the three main types of definition above illustrates the difficulty of divising an absolute criterion for creole classification. In the opinion of the present author the only two (related) characteristics which putative creoles can be said not to share with other languages is that (i) they have arisen *ex ovo* in a relatively short time within recorded history and (ii) that the linguistic input from which speakers created these languages was not the native language of their parents.

There may well, however, be differences in the time scale: for example Jamaican creole is a case with brief pidginisation, abrupt creolisation and for many speakers gradual decreolisation and Tok Pisin is one with gradual expansion of an original pidgin and later creolisation. The latter case would offer evidence for the gradualist view of creolisation (Arends and Bruyn, 1994:111f.) which sees it as a process which takes considerably longer than the generation or two assumed for abrupt creolisation. Creole genesis does however imply a distinct interruption in the transmission of language in the sense of a fully-fledged native language of a preceding generation. The process then leads to nativisation, i.e., the creation of a creole, from a pidgin which, irrespective of its degree of stabilisation, nonetheless shows alteration of its structures with the shift in status, e.g., the switch from adverbials as indicators of aspect to a system of preverbal markers.

For the present paper there is no need to pursue the issue of how a variety arose as a creole and the time span involved in this process any further. Rather it is more germane to the matter at hand to distinguish carefully between classification as a creole and the occurrence of structural elements typical of a creole. It is obvious when considering a variety such as Irish English that it did not arise quickly (English has been spoken in Ireland since the late Middle Ages, see below) so that scenarios of abrupt creolisation are implausible for the Irish historical context.

Although the outright classification of Irish English as a creole is rejected here less absolute characterisations should be mentioned in this connection. First and foremost is a notion which has been floated recently, Schneider's 'cline of creoleness' (see Schneider 1990 and Schneider this volume) a postulated scale along which creoles would seem to differ in a non-discrete manner from a least standard to a more standard form.[1] The notion of 'cline' is intended to supersede the division of creoles into three discrete entities basilect, mesolect and acrolect. For Irish English a cline of deviation from southern British English can certainly be observed and probably had even greater validity in previous centuries.

1.4.1 Other terms in the field

Obviously the term 'pidgin' refers to an indentifiable stage in the early development of a new language, the later creole, so that when considering established languages, such as English in its different varieties, from the point of view of similarities with pidgins/creoles only the term 'creolisation', as a process with structural parallels to creole genesis (see next section), would appear appropriate as there are always native speakers of the varieties being considered. I will not examine the usefulness of related, less established terms such as 'creoloid' or 'semi-creole' as such labels imply a steady state of a variety at a level of intermediacy between a naturally transmitted variety of an established language and a creole proper where it is impossible to reach agreement with other scholars in the fields on just what are the defining features of such a half-way house.

1.4.2 Creoles and creolisation

This is the essential distinction for the matter at hand; it is a distinction between an object and the process which engendered it. A creole is a language with the characteristics outlined above and discussed in detail below. Creolisation on the other hand is a process whereby the universal features of language structure, unaffected by later counter-forces which arise throughout the history of a language, come to the fore and forge the

typological profile of a language. Traces of these features may still be discernible in a variety in which case one can speak of a degree of creolisation in its history. For the remainder of this paper I will thus be concerned with creolisation as a process operative in the genesis of Irish English and with an outcome still visible in the present-day forms of the variety. I am deliberately neglecting the question of the status of many structures in particular their social values as this would necessitate another paper. For instance the habitual aspect with *do be* is quite stigmatised but the immediate perfective with *after* is universally accepted and is sociolinguistically unmarked.

1.5 Further matters of terminology

Outset and *target language*. These terms refer to Irish, a Q-Celtic language formerly the majority language of Ireland, and English, the language switched to by the majority of the Irish, essentially between the 17th and 19th centuries. The term 'outset' has two advantages. It implies a temporal precedence of outset over target language which is correct in the case of the shift from Irish to English and it also stresses that speakers start from here acquisitionally without necessarily suggesting that the outset language was the necessary source of any unexpected structures which appear in the target language which is a definite implication embodied in the term 'donor' or 'source' language.

1.5.1 Terms for English spoken in Ireland

In the last two decades or so the term *Hiberno-English*[2] (derived from Latin *Hibernia* 'Ireland' and *English*) has enjoyed a certain vogue. It would seem to have replaced the older term *Anglo-Irish* although some authors, notably Patrick Henry and Loreto Todd, have attempted to distinguish between the two (but arrive at opposite meanings for each term). It is a label which is better avoided in linguistics as it is already used in literature and politics and if taken literally would mean an English form of Irish ('Anglo-' as a modifier to the head 'Irish'). The term *Irish English* seems to the present author to be the most neutral and least in need of explanation and has the additional advantage of being parallel to other terms for varieties of English such as Welsh English, Canadian English, etc. Further distinctions for sub-varieties can be introduced as required.[3]

2 The external history of Irish English

The involvement of England with Ireland is a long and complicated story. For the purpose of the present article only a brief outline of English in Ireland is offered. The first point to grasp is that there are two periods in the history of Irish English, a medieval one and an early modern one.

2.1 The medieval period

The first period began in the late 12th century when Anglo-Norman adventurers landed in the south-east of the country and established base there. There were English speakers in their retinue, largely from the west of England, and these formed the core of the communities of English settlers on the east coast from Waterford up to Dublin (Curtis

1919, Cahill 1938). Later during the 13th century larger parts in the north and west were subdued by the Normans after the initial invasion of 1169.

Both the Anglo-Norman and English settlers of this initial period were progressively assimilated by the native Irish so that by the end of the 16th century English was reduced to only a small section of the population in the main cities and towns of the east of the country and one or two rural pockets also in the east.

There are very few linguistic documents from the early period. The main one is a collection of poems called the *Kildare Poems*; besides these there are one or two other small pieces and some municipal records chiefly from Waterford and Dublin. The *Kildare Poems* are noted for their standardness. Given the fact that they were written in an environment in which Irish or Norman French were the vital languages, one can assume that the author or authors were deliberately writing what they regarded as a supra-regional form of the English of the early 14th century (Hickey 1993).

The turning point in the fortunes of English in Ireland is the establishment of the House of Tudor in England (Moody and Martin 1994: 174-188); the Reformation which they favoured led to a religious split between England and Ireland and the necessity to subjugate the unruly Irish was deemed urgent to prevent Catholic rebellion spreading from Ireland.

2.2   *The early modern period*

The re-establishment of English power got under way in the 17th century after the decisive military defeat of the Irish in 1601 in Kinsale, Co.Cork. It attained a new quality with the Cromwellian settlements of the 1650's (Foster 1988:101-116). These were undertaken to recompense mercenaries for services rendered during the political struggles in England following the deposition of Charles I in 1649 and were much more effective than the settlements in Munster (in the south) in the late 16th century.

The plantations of the mid 17th century can be taken to mark the beginning of the second, modern period of English in Ireland. All characteristics of contemporary Irish English are taken to stem from the beginning of the early period, though there is evidence in the phonology of popular Dublin English that elements survived from the late medieval period. The difficulty with this contention lies in the paucity of documents from medieval times so that for all questions of grammar no reference can be made to the first period.

At this stage one should bear in mind that the development of the north and south of the country had already begun to diverge. The key event for the province of Ulster was the arrival of large numbers of settlers from Lowland Scotland as of the early 17th century (after the political vacuum left by the exodus of Irish leaders in 1607, Moody and Martin 1994:189-203). They were Protestant Presbyterians and spoke varieties of Lowland Scots. The Scots tended to settle in the north-east (with a few other pockets) and immigrants from northern England settled in the centre and south of the province. Given the quantity of settlers and the fact that they were non-aristocratic settlers who farmed the land and established towns as their bases their linguistic influence on the local population was far greater than that of earlier settlers in the south. It is this Scottish input which to this day is responsible for the very clear linguistic demarcation between Ulster (in essence the state of Northern Ireland and a couple of adjacent counties such as Donegal which are politically part of the Republic of Ireland) and the remainder of the country to the south.

2.2.1   The significance of the 17th century

The 17th century is of relevance to the theme of the present paper for a further reason. Not only did speakers from the west of England settle in the south of Ireland but substantial numbers of Irish moved voluntarily or under coercion to the New World. To be precise, speakers of Scotch-Irish varieties of English emigrated from the north to America in the 17th and 18th century and those from the south of the country were transported to the Caribbean somewhat before. For instance Cromwell was responsible for the shipment of native Irish to Barbados and Montserrat where the Irish worked as indentured servants and gained the term 'Black Irish' or 'Redlegs' (Harlow 1926; Sheppard 1977). There are many parallels, above all syntactic, between Irish English and non-standard varieties of English in the Caribbean and some authors (Williams 1986 and 1988 for instance) would see these as evidence of Irish input in the formation of Caribbean creoles. Others such as Rickford (1986) are more cautious in their assessment of the role of Irish speakers of English. Again one must bear in mind that similarities between creoles can as always be postulated as deriving from general structural tendencies in creoles due to the nature of their genesis (more on which below).

In the first half of the 19th century the rapidly increasing population of Ireland (particularly in the south and west) led to a depletion of agricultural resources with attendant famine culminating in the Great Famine of the late 1840's (de Fréine 1966, 1977). During this event and for decades afterwards large-scale emigration took place, to Britain (above all Merseyside) and to the United States. However the forms of southern Irish English taken to America in the 19th century would appear not to have played any role as input in the development of forms of American English.

Allow me to return to the 17th century in the south of Ireland and the spread of English from then onwards (O'Baoill 1990:150). A couple of general facts need to be highlighted here.

To begin with one should remark that when viewing the development of Irish English it would be desirable to distinguish the English of native speakers of Irish from that of the descendants of planters. Unfortunately there are no satisfactory means for doing this. It is true that references exist to the English of the planters, for instance in the caricatures of Swift (Bliss 1977), but leaving such minor sources aside, there is no body of material which documents the English of those 17th century settlers after their arrival in Ireland. The question of quantity is also of relevance here. The number of planters was not that great so that their effect on the general development of Irish English should not be overestimated. It is also unlikely that the language of the planters was affected by contact with Irish speakers and that then the latter learned their English from later generations of planters who spoke such a contact variety. This scenario, planter English - contact variety - later acquisition by the Irish, does not pass muster as the number of planters was too small for this to be likely. Furthermore for a contact variety to arise among planters, they would have had to be in contact with English-speaking Irish for their English to be affected by the broken English of this latter group. But how could rural Irish speakers of English have predated the planters? What is more probable is that the Irish acquired English slowly, altering it in the process and that with the general spread of this majority variety the distinctiveness of planter English was lost so that there is no recognisable derivative from this historical group today.

Returning for a moment to the urban population, one can cite Kallen who in his detailed survey of population distribution in the 17th century (1994:156-163) points out that the concentration of English speakers in the towns would have meant that their influence would have been greater than their mere numbers suggest. Exposure to English

was also different in the towns and the countryside and this urban-rural split is still evident (see Filppula 1991); there was also a degree of survival of English in the towns of the east, above all Dublin, and this is responsible for the very obvious differences between urban varieties of the east and the rest of the Republic of Ireland today. In addition there was in the towns a large degree of bilingualism, indeed in Dublin in the age of Swift (early 18th century) there were Anglophone and Gaelic literary circles which existed side by side (Ó Háinle 1986).

The manner in which the native Irish acquired English must also be taken into account. There was obviously no formal instruction. Indeed education for the native Catholics was forbidden under the Penal Laws which were not repealed until the end of the 18th century. It must be assumed then that for the vast majority of rural Irish the planters or other Irish were the source of English.

This must have applied in the initial stages as then the rural natives would not have had sufficient contact, if any at all, with those dwellers in the towns who would have had English from the first period of settlement. This scenario in which a small number of English planters conveyed the language to the native Irish would also explain why the language of these planters had apparently been so strongly influenced by Irish: the quantitative relationship was skewed in favour of the Irish so that the English could not but be influenced by the numerically superior[4] albeit socially inferior Irish (see Thomason and Kaufman 1988:43+129). This kind of distribution also obtained in the late 12th and 13th centuries vis à vis the Anglo-Norman overlords who under pressure of numbers (among other reasons) yielded to Irish and adopted it as their native language in later generations (Hickey in press).

The situation just sketched can be taken to have applied on a broad front for the 17th century. But the transmission of English to following generations of Irish was not always directly from the settlers. Rather the Irish of the 18th and 19th centuries must have learned English from Irish compatriots who were fortunate enough to have been exposed to English, however imperfectly. Again one must stress that there was little if any formal education. While it is true that so-called hedge schools existed whereby self-made teachers gave instruction to Irish in a non-institutionalised manner (Dowling 1971) these could not have serviced the entire country.

Note that there is little or no distinction in present-day Ireland between those who are descended from native Irish and those whose ancestors were planters in the 17th century. This situation is markedly different from that in Northern Ireland where this distinction is made, above all on religious grounds, that is it forms the basis for the segregation of the Protestant and Catholic sections of the Northern Ireland community. In the south there is a small Protestant section of the community which is definitely not native Irish. The language of this section of the southern population does not, however, differ significantly from that of the Catholic majority.[5]

2.3   *Duration of shift*

In summary allow me to stress the two main aspects of the development of Irish English in the early modern period.

1)   A long switch-over period lasted from at least the mid 17th century to the second half of the 19th century and was characterised by extensive if poor bilingualism among the native Irish. Imperfect acquisition of English would have meant for a speaker of Irish that the latter would have had a continuing influence on the

former.[6] In addition the acquisition of English was regarded as desirable for social advancement in Irish society.

2)   There was no displacement of population in Ireland; there was nothing like the mixture of (West African) backgrounds which characterised the forced immigrants in the Caribbean area in the early phase of the slave trade. Nonetheless there was a concentration of native population with the expulsion of the Irish to west of the Shannon (reflected in Cromwell's dictum 'to hell or to Connaught') in the mid 17th century.

3)   The substrate language Irish was widely spoken and thus continually available. There was never a situation in which the Irish were deprived of a native language. Before the language shift was completed, English was acquired not for communication among the Irish but between these and English speakers.

The historical picture one is left with is that of a gradual dissemination of English from east to west and from urban centres to rural districts over a period of at least two centuries, from the Cromwellian era in the mid 17th century to the post-Famine period, i.e., to the second half of the 19th century. Such a long period of bilingualism would have furthered the transfer of structure from the outset language to the target one. The use of speech habits and patterns from Irish on an individual level lasted long enough for these to spread to the entire community of Irish speakers of English as general features of their variety of the new language.

3   Access to English

The question of the access of the Irish to English is a thorny one. As indicated above in the first period there was a small number of English immigrants who settled in the towns of the east coast. The only genuine remnant of this period is the extreme south-east corner, comprising the baronies of Forth and Bargy, and the area of Fingal just north of Dublin. The evidence forthcoming on these traces of medieval English speak for a radically altered variety. The glossaries of Vallencey (1788) and Poole (see Barnes 1867) are, judging by the aberrant orthography (Hickey 1988), quite unlike anything spoken in Ireland today with the possible exception of popular Dublin speech.

At the beginning of the early modern period access to this older type of English would only have been available in the few urban centres. For the vast majority of Irish living in the countryside there was no contact with indigenous Irish speakers of English. Instead the exposure was gradual via those who had acquired English through contact with urbanites and/or with the relatively small numbers of English people living in Ireland or through self-education, the opportunities for which were minimal given the ban on education for Catholics.

When compared to historical situations in which pidgins arose the linguistic plight of the Irish was probably better. For instance given the conditions of slavery in which the deported Africans were kept in the Caribbean (Holm 1994:329) their access to English was very restricted, basically consisting of the restructured English which their immediate predecessors would have brought from West Africa, itself derived from contact (direct or indirect) with English-speaking traders.[7] The common assumption that the children of slaves were exposed to 'highly variable and possibly chaotic and incomplete linguistic input' (Holm 1994:330) did not apply to the Irish as they always

had recourse to Irish. Later they only abandoned English after it had been acquired as a native language. Thus the Bickertonian notion of an innate blueprint for language, his biogram (see Bickerton 1984, 1988 and below) coming to the fore when there is insufficient linguistic input, has never held at any stage in the development of Irish English.

3.1   Role of superstrate varieties

When and for how long the Irish were exposed to English is one facet in the complex of access to the language. The second and equally important one is what varieties of English the Irish had as their input when acquiring the new language. Recent authors such as Kallen and Harris have repeatedly pointed out that to ignore this question is to fail to grasp a vital strand in the genesis of Irish English.

Broadly speaking it is valid to maintain that western varieties of English predominated among the kinds of English brought to the south from the beginning of the 17th century onwards. For the first period there is evidence of a south-western input (for instance in the parallels between the dialect of Forth and Bargy and that of Dorset as pointed out early on by the Dorset poet William Barnes who edited the main glossary in this dialect). In the early modern period the extension of western input would seem to have been further north, up as far as Lancashire.

The western nature of early modern Irish English input is relevant when considering the development or, at the very least, the reeinforcement of habitual categories in Ireland. The west of England is an area which retained periphrastic *do* for longer than did the north and east. Hence it is legitimate to assume that it was well represented in the input to southern Irish English in the 17th century (see section 5.3.1.3. *Habitual* below).

There are other indications of western input. For instance the verbs *have* and *be* usually have a single inflected form for the present, namely *have* and *is*.

(1)   a.   *is* for *am, are, is*   *We's up to our eyes in work.*
       b.   *have* for *have, has*   *She've a grand job at the glass.*

Furthermore verbs tend to show a single form for preterite and past participle.

(2)   a.   *When John come in, he sat down to the telly.*
       b.   *She done a lot of work in the house.*
       c.   *I seen him in town the other day.*

This area of morphology shows a great deal of variety in the early modern period as demonstrated quite clearly by Lass (1993) and for modern English by Cheshire (1993). The matter is not simply that of the transition from strong to weak conjugational type but what the manifestation and distribution of the strong verb forms are.

Again many anomalies of Irish English can be attributed to the English input. For instance Irish speakers frequently confuse verb pairs distinguished by direction such as *bring, take*; *rent, let*; *learn, teach*. But this is a feature found with west English authors, for example, with Shakespeare.

(3)   Caliban.   You taught me Language, and my profit on't
                        Is, I know how to curse; the red-plague rid you

For *learning me* your language!

(*The Tempest*, Act I, Scene 2)

However, not all verbal peculiarities of Irish English are immediately traceable to west English input. One remarkable feature is seen in the epistemic use of negated *must*, noted by Trudgill as distinctively Irish, (1986:140f.).

(4)   *He musn't be Irish as he was born in France.*   Irish English
       He can't be Irish as he was born in France.   non-Irish English

In the pronominal area the distinction of first and second person plural can be safely assumed to have been present in the input as may well have been the case with the dative of disadvantage, as in *She broke the glass on me*.

3.2   The retentionist standpoint

Language is an internally structured system and its inherited established categories would according to many authors have priority over contact as a source for idiosyncratic features unless the evidence to the contrary is unambiguous. This standpoint has been dubbed 'retentionist' (Filppula 1993:207-209) by authors dealing with Irish English and its acceptance or dismissal forms a divide among the scholars of the field. The strongest claim for the status of input varieties is Harris (1986:192f.) to the extent of dismissing substratist views and backgrounding universalist explanations. Lass (1990a) is another author who favours the retentionist view for the phonology of Irish English.[8] A major difficulty with the retentionist view as propounded by the authors mentioned is that it has not been relativised[9] by a sufficient consideration of both the external conditions under which the Irish shifted slowly to English and of the parallels, phonological and syntactic, which exist between Irish and English despite the obvious typological discrepancy between the two languages. It is hoped to redress this imbalance in the relevant sections to be found below.

3.3   Effects of supraregionalisation

The discussion above raises the question of what one is to regard as Irish English for an investigation such as the present one. Clearly there are, or up to recently were, varieties of Irish English which showed considerable influence from Irish, particularly in the reported cases of literal translations of idioms from Irish. For instance Henry (1977:33+36) and Adams (1983:11) provide many examples of sentences which are only interpretable against the background of structure in Irish.

(5)   a.   *The bate (beat) of him ishn't in it.*   (Irish English)
             Níl a bhualadh ann.
             [is-not his beat in-it]
             'He has no equal.'
       b.   *The mother ishn't too good to him.*   (Irish English)
             Níl an mháthair an-mhaith aige.
             [is-not the mother very-good at him]
             'His mother is not very well.'

The scholars such as Harris, Kallen and Filppula who have (rightly) rejected the entirely substratist hypothesis for Irish English frequently refer to such attestations to criticise a slavishly contact view of the genesis of Irish English. Such instances nonetheless raise the question of what is taken to constitute Irish English.

For the present paper it is regarded as the supraregional vernacular variety of English in the south of Ireland without undue concern for the issue of stigmatisation of salient features of this variety. This is admittedly casting a wide and somewhat diffuse net, but by taking the supraregional variety of the south one is detached from forms still immediately affected by contact with Irish. Furthermore this supraregional variety has a degree of stability, and one can assume that the features it shows (for instance its aspectual categories) are central and not incidental to Irish English.

4   The contact case in Irish English

To open this section consider that between two or more languages there are many possible situations of contact, four of which are listed below. These differ more in degree than kind but are still discernibly different.

	Type	*Effect*
1)	Contact, but little if any bilingualism (French in Middle English)	Only loan-words, cultural borrowings
2)	Contact with approximation of one or both languages to the other (late Old English and Norse)	Koineisation or dialect levelling, some structural permeation with similar languages
3)	Contact with language shift (Irish -> English)	Grammatical interference, speech habits of outset transferred to target
4)	Contact but restricted input, uncontrolled acquisition (Caribbean creoles)	Pidginisation, grammatical restructuring, creolisation if there is no linguistic continuity of any kind

In this grouping Irish English occupies the third position but with leanings towards the fourth this accounting for remarkable parallels between it and the languages subsumed under 4).

The distinction between interference and restructuring is essential here. The first is a process of structural transfer between two languages and the second involves a creative reorganisation of the grammar of a language on the basis of putative universals. The latter will be considered below. Before this however the case for contact should be dealt with.

4.1   *What is unaltered on contact?*

There would seem to be a general principle whereby the 'deeper kernel' of grammar in a

language (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:5) is more resistant to change because it (above all inflectional morphology) is so highly structured.[10] For any highly structured subsystem there is a standard wisdom that if it travels then only when it fits easily into the recipient language. One is dealing here of course with closed classes; the lexicon on the other hand is always open to incoming words and can equally donate words to another language. However, it is a common error to conclude that a lack of numerous loanwords critically weakens the case for any structural interference having occurred, i.e., that there is no structural borrowing without lexical borrowing. This does not apply to Irish English which has syntactic interference, through shift, but practically no lexical loans from Irish.

The resistance to structural influence is connected with the duration and extent of contact. For instance long-term substratum interference can lead to a typological reorientation of a language but within a time frame of several centuries at least. That is definitely too large for the switch from Irish to English which was long enough for considerable influence but not for a major typological realignment of English, especially seeing that there was no linguistic discontinuity in Ireland.[11]

4.2   The notion of mixed language

A mixed language is taken to be one where different linguistic levels stem from different languages. The most common configuration is for the morphology and syntax to derive from one source and the lexicon from another. The latter, as an open class, can easily be mounted or dismantled in the course of a language's development and this phenomenon is known in the history of creoles as re-lexification.

The significant distinction between a mixed language and a creole is that the grammar of the latter is created by speakers in an environment in which little grammar or none is available as input and the former arises where for external reasons speakers choose to combine linguistic levels from disparate sources. One of the languages may have already existed independently as is the case with the well-known Media Lengua which resulted from the re-lexification of Quechua with Spanish vocabulary (Appel and Muysken, 1986:156f.). Ma'a (Mbugu, Goodman 1971) is another example of a mixed language as it has Cushitic lexicon and Bantu morphology.

This phenomenon is one which rests on typological similarity between inputs or at least easy segmentability of the source grammar. For instance the adoption of Bantu morphology was facilitated given the agglutinative and hence easily segmentable character of Bantu grammar. Anglo-Romani (Hancock 1984) is an example from Britain with Romani lexicon and English grammar.

As a model for the genesis of Irish English the mixed language type must be rejected seeing as how the Irish switched to English, altering it in the process, but did not retain any of the grammar of Irish. It would not be sufficient to point to similarities in syntax between outset and target in the Irish situation as a mixed language must show actual elements from two languages and not as in Irish English the reflection of categories from the outset language.

4.3   A code-switching model

Among the models for language mixing which have been the object of intensive research in recent years is that of code-switching (see the representative selection of essays in

Eastman 1992) and it would appear appropriate to consider this briefly within the context of the present investigation. The best worked out model in this area is that of Carol Myers-Scotton whose work has contributed much to understanding the psycholinguistic mechanisms and structural constraints underlying code-switching and borrowing, the latter being a phenomenon which she subsumes under the heading of code-switching. For the languages involved in a code-switching situation Myers-Scotton makes an essential distinction between *matrix* and *embedded* languages (1992:19-28). The former is the language which provides the morphosyntactic frame and from which the *system* units (morphemes of various kinds) stem and the latter donates lexical material (*content* units) and possibly, under structural restrictions dictated by the matrix language,[12] morphological material as well.

The following is a sketch of a code-switching situation which would have lead to modern Irish English. It is a virtual scenario as there is no evidence for it. The probability of it having corresponded to reality at any stage must be judged by the reader.

Historically Irish would have been the matrix language from which most morphology stemmed. Recall that the language which donates material to the matrix language is termed the embedded language and this would originally have been English. If one assumes this directionality then one is in essence postulating that Irish English is a re-structured form of Irish which adopted English lexical material to fill the morphosyntactic frames of Irish. There are one or two points of grammar where this view is plausible, namely in the realisation of the perfective aspects. However the stance taken by the present author is that the Irish switched to English by first acquiring it as a second language and later by Irish being abandoned by following generations. The peculiarities of this variety arose by the search for categorial equivalence among those Irish acquiring English in an uncontrolled context.

There are two major difficulties with a code-switching view of the genesis of Irish English. The first is external. The motivation for code-switching is, apart from obvious cases of lexical gaps, generally taken to be driven by the connotative and/or indexical functions of the elements adopted into the matrix language. It is difficult to see how many English lexical items would have fulfilled that requirement for the Irish as they were not in contact with English society and would not have been au fait with non-Irish social phenomena which they would then have glossed with English words via code-switching in Irish.

The second difficulty is that were Irish English restructured Irish then one would expect its syntax to be much closer to Irish. Even in those instances where this is the case, with the aspectual categories of Irish English, the word order is not that of Irish.[13] And of course matters such as the post-specification of Irish have no equivalent in Irish English nor is the heavily nominalised syntax reflected in the non-contact Irish varieties of English. Finally there would have to have been total re-lexification to account for the lack of Irish lexical items in Irish English (on this see section 5.5 below). However, the historical attestations of Irish English from the late 16th century onwards offer no evidence for any intermediary stages which would have necessarily existed in this scenario.

What one does observe in Modern Irish is code-switching within Irish (Stenson 1990, 1991) but not so much in the English spoken by native speakers of Irish (chiefly in the surviving pockets of Irish in the west of the country). This code-switching is characacterised by a high degree of morphological integration, for instance in the use of the initial mutations and final palatalisation (markers of grammatical categories in Irish) on code-switched lexical items. If this happens now then it would have happened three centuries ago when Irish was in a much more vital position as the language of the

majority of the population. This would then have meant that all this grammatical marking would have had to disappear in a process similar to decreolisation. But again there are no signs of this having happened in the history of Irish English.

Among the literary parodies of Irish English which are available from the end of the 16th century one has lexical sugaring, the sprinkling of words from Irish to lend a flavour of genuineness to the language of these literary pieces. Again one must also bear in mind that, apart from very few borrowings like *tilly* 'small amount' (from Irish *tuileadh*) or *twig* 'understand' (from Irish *tuigim*) and the occasional use of Irish words in English for special effect, such as *plámás* 'flattery', there is no measurable lexical influence of Irish on English. There is nothing like the influence of French or Scandinavian on English although the period of contact was considerably longer.

4.4   The typology of Irish

The points where transfer occurs is dependent on the structural match between the two languages in question. In general it is true that Irish is typologically very different from English. Irish not only shows differing surface features such as syntactic post-specification (see section 6.1 below) but the entire organisation of its syntax is unusual compared to English. The main difference is that Irish is a nominalising language. Grammatical relationships and much of the semantics are expressed by means of nouns and supporting prepositions (for introductory remarks see Hickey 1985a). Within the scope of this paper it is not possible to go into this matter in detail. Suffice it to give one example to convey the flavour of Irish syntax. Nouns with prepositions indicating grammatical relationships are found where English has lexicalised verbs with an object.

(6)   a.   *Rinne mé dearmad fúithi.*
             [did I forget-noun under-her]
             'I forgot her.'
       b.   *Níl teacht agat air.*
             [is-not coming at-you on-it]
             'You cannot help it.'

There is a complex system of prepositional pronouns in Irish, some sixteen paradigms, each of which consists of a directional preposition and an incorporated personal pronoun. This system is not reflected in Irish English except in one single instance and that is one where the prepositional pronoun in question does not show inflectional variation but would seem to have taken on a lexical meaning, indicating existence[14] and, as an extension of this, possession.

(7)   a.   *Tá morán daoine ann.*
             [is lot people in-it]
             'There are a lot of people there.'
       b.   *Níl a leithéid ann ar chor ar bith.*
             [is-not his like in-it at all at all]
             'There is nothing to compare with him.'
       c.   *Tá seans maith ann anois.*
             [is chance good in-it now]
             'There is a good chance now.'
       d.   *Tá seacht punt agam.*

[is seven pounds at-me]
'I have seven pounds.'

This use of *ann* 'in-it' to express existence has been transferred into Irish English and is an almost stereotypical feature of Irish English.

(8)   a.   *It's bad weather that's in it today.*
             'The weather is bad today.'

Despite the major typological discrepancies between the two languages there are a few remarkable parallels between Irish and English. One concerns the use of location as a metaphor for action in progress.

(9)   a.   *Fiche bliain ag fás.*
             [twenty years at growing]
             Twenty years a-growing.

This fits neatly into English as can be seen from the translation of the above Irish sentence. In fact there is a model for this in archaic forms of English as in *I am on writing* for *I am writing* which with phonetic attrition of the preposition *on* gave the prefixed schwa much as it did in phrases like *asleep* and *alive* from (much) earlier *on slǣpe* and *on līfe*.

    A second parallel is the use of the same preposition *on* with a personal pronoun to indicate relevance of an action.[15]

(10)   a.   *They stole the car on me.*
        b.   *Ghoideadh an gluaisteán orm.*
             [was-stolen the car on-me]

A third syntactic similarity is to be found in the positioning of the past participle. This is placed after the object in Irish. There are good precedents for this in English and again the practice of doing this may well have been present in the input varieties to Irish English (as shown clearly by Harris 1983).

(11)   a.   *I've the book read.*
             Tá an leabhar léite agam.
             [is the book read at-me]
        b.   *He's the work done.*
             Tá an obair déanta aige.
             [is the work done at-him]

A last parallel worthy of mention here is the lack of the *for to*-filter in Irish English (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977, Henry 1995). This obviously has precedents in the history of English and was probably not valid for the varieties of English brought to Ireland at the beginning of the early modern period, let alone during the first period.

(12)   a.   *Chuaigh sé go Baile Atha Cliath   chun gluaisteán a cheannach.*
             [went he to Dublin   for car COMP buy]
        b.   *He went to Dublin for to buy a car.*

The comments here concern the formal coincidence in both languages. The option of placing the past participle either before or after the object has been functionalised in Irish English and is clearly associated with perfective aspect, more on which below.

4.5 The search for categorial equivalence

If it is true that children in a situation of creole genesis have little or no grammar in their linguistic input to fall back on, then it is equally true that in the language shift in Ireland Irish formed the backdrop against which the incipient variety of English was moulded.

If one reduces for a moment the situation of a community to that of the individual then it would appear plausible that he/she would have expected and searched for equivalents to the distinctions and structures present in the outset language Irish. This phenomenon, which I postulate historically for Irish English and which is to be readily observed in second-language acquistion, is what I term here 'the search for categorial equivalence'[16].

Consider the following example. Irish has an immediate perfective which is formed by the use of the prepositional phrase *tar éis* 'after' which is employed temporally in this case.

(13)   a.   *Tá siad tar éis an obair a dhéanamh.*
             [is they after the work COMP do]

The pivotal elements in this construction are listed below; the complementiser *a* is of no semantic significance.

(14)   (i)   prepositional phrase *tar éis*
        (ii)   non-finite verb form *déanamh*
        (iii)   direct object *obair*.

Now it would appear that the Irish constructed an equivalent to this using English syntactic means. Item (i) was translated literally as 'after', (ii) was rendered by the non-finite V-*ing* form yielding structures as below.

(15)   *They're after doing the work.*

Note that with a translation for (i) and a corresponding non-finite form for (ii) the task of reaching a categorial equivalent would appear to have been fulfilled. Importantly the word order Object + Verb was not carried over to English (**They're after the work doing*). This illustrates a principle of economy: only change as much in L2 as is necessary for other speakers in the community to recognize what L1-structure is intended.

The structure dealt with above does not have any model in archaic or regional English. With others however one can point to the existence of formal equivalents, notably of the word order Non-finite Verb + Object. In this case there may well have been an equivalent to the same Irish word order used to indicate a resultative perfective.

(16)   a.   *Tá an leabhar léite aige.*
        b.   *He has the book read.*

Although there were undoubtedly instances of the word order of the English sentence

above, this does not mean that non-standard input varieties of English are in any way responsible for the continuing existence of the word order in Irish English. This could just as well have disappeared from Irish English as it has in forms of mainland English. However the retention in Irish English and the use of the word order to express a resultative perfective can be accounted for by the desire of Irish learners of English to reach an equivalent to the category of resultative perfective which they had in their own language.

 Among sociolinguists this phenomenon has been observed before. The additive transfer of syntactic features to English can, for example, be captured neatly by Guy's notion of imposition (1990:49f.) whereby speakers in a language-shift situation impose categorial equivalents to structures of the outset language onto the target language. In traditional terms the process of calquing is similar as it involves as much translation into the target language as is necessary for the structure to be recognised as an equivalent to the substrate model by speakers during the process of language shift.

 Moving from the individual viewpoint to that of the community one can maintain that if a majority of speakers hit on the same equivalents for outset structures and if there is no external reason for rejecting these (such as stigmatisation) then such equivalents can establish themselves as quasi-permanent features of the variety in question.

4.6 *Neglect of distinctions*

If the search for categorial equivalence has any validity then one would expect that the reverse, the neglect of distinctions in the target but not in the outset language, would also be found. This is indeed the case. Many authors have remarked on the relative infrequency of the present perfect in Irish English (as early as Hume 1878, see Kallen 1990). As this category does not exist in Irish one can surmise that it was neglected by learners of English in the period of language shift. Actions which began in the past and continue into the present, or which are relevant to the present are expressed by the simple present or past, whichever is appropriate. There may be some misinterpretation here as with the following sentence which in more standard forms of English would refer to a remote past.

(17) a. *He never went to Dublin.*
   b. *He's never been to Dublin.*

This phenomenon has been called the 'extended present' or 'extended now' (by Harris and Kallen after McCoard 1978) and implies a greater use of the present than is normal in other forms of English. But it can be viewed from two vantage points. Either it is an extension of the present (the Irish perspective) or a neglect of the option of present perfect (the English viewpoint). The Irish practice which has obviously been a contributory factor can be illustrated by the following example.

(18) a. *I know her since a long time now.*
   b. *Tá aithne agam uirthi le tamall fada anois.*
    [is knowledge at-me on-her with time long now]
   c. *He's married for ten years.*
   d. *Tá sé pósta le deich bliain.*
    [is he married with ten years]

The 'extended present' is not so much an independent aspectual type as a case of differing assignment of present and past to semantic settings in English and Irish English. For instance with the temporal adverbs *already* and *yet* Irish English prefers the simple past tense (i.e., *not* the present).

(19) a.   *I paid for the trip already.*   (for 'I have paid...')
      b.   *I didn't pay for the trip yet.*   (for 'I haven't paid...')

4.7   The force of habit: Verb marking in Irish English

In view of the discussion of creolisation below one may remark on the fact that Irish English always shows verb marking. The lack of inflectional endings which are known from creoles and which are regarded as a central feature of their analytical type is not to be found here. For basilectal varieties of creole English in, say, the Caribbean there are no verbal inflections and verbs are preceded by particles indicating tense or aspect, these often having forms deriving from their English etymological sources.

One should bear in mind that Irish is a language with a rich morphology and that speakers with this as their outset language are likely to pay attention to verbal morphology given its significance in Irish, in particular as it is the diversity of inflectional endings which enables the phenomenon of *pro*-drop for which Irish is known (see section 7 below).

There are parallels to this kind of behaviour in other situations. For instance native speakers of Russian have fewer difficulties with the gender system of German than do say English speakers because, although the genders of individual words do not always correspond, they are accustomed in principle to paying attention to the category gender from their native language.

5   The case for creolisation

Although the strong version of creolisation, where there is an interruption in language transmission and the creation of new structures with virtually no linguistic input, can be firmly rejected as a historical scenario for Irish English the question is still valid whether features to be found in creoles are shared by Irish English given the uncoordinated and uncontrolled manner in which the Irish acquired English as of the 17th century.

For the remainder of this paper I choose to understand by creolisation a group of specifiable structural tendencies which are to be found in a large group of geographically independent languages which have in common that they arose in situations with very little input from which to derive the structures of their grammars. For the three linguistic levels which represent closed classes the features listed below are regarded as indicative of creolisation. No feature is exclusively a defining one but there is recognisable feature clustering in those languages whose sociolinguistic origins point towards creole status.

1)   *Phonology* Cluster simplification; fricative fortition Deletion of /h/; shift of dentals to alveolars

2)   *Morphology* Root constancy and a propensity towards transparency of grammatical categories with one form : one meaning

3)   *Syntax* A match between the temporal sequence of events reported and that of elements in a sentence with prespecification and modifier plus head as the canonical order. No passive or clause coordination. A tense-mood-aspect system in which aspectual distinctions are accorded the same if not greater priority as tense.

5.1   Phonology

It is a general observation that creoles have restricted phonological inventories and phonotactics. This may be a result of the simplification of a preceding pidginisation phase or may reflect inherent tendencies of creoles themselves. Of course one may as always be dealing with a combination of features. When looking at the phonology of Irish English one notes a couple of features which could be interpreted as relevant to the issue at hand. The main ones are (i) stop fortition and (ii) cluster simplification.

5.1.1   Stop fortition

A salient feature of (southern) of Irish English is the general lack of the dental fricatives /θ, ð/. These have on the whole been fortified to corresponding dental stops [t̪, d̪]. In some instances, notably popular Dublin English and rural varieties of the south and south-west, there is also a shift back from a dental to an alveolar point of articulation, i.e., English /θ, ð/ appear as [t, d]. This seems at first sight to be a remarkable parallel with Caribbean creoles or with African American English in the United States. And indeed given the Irish input to new world varieties of English, that of southern Irish in the Caribbean in the 17th and 18th centuries,[17] one might be tempted to reformulate this parallel as an historical connection.

Taking the non-existence of /θ, ð/ in other creoles, which were definitely not in contact with any form of Irish English, into account forces one to sound a strong note of caution here. For instance Tok Pisin has fortition of dental fricatives and of /f/ (Wurm and Mühlhäusler 1985), to give an example from outside the arena of Atlantic creoles.

However, one is still left with the interpretation of stop fortition as an indicator of creolisation within Irish English. Closer scrutiny of the situation in Ireland casts doubt on stop fortition as a creolisation phenomenon. In Irish, which until the beginning of the 19th century, was the native language of most of the rural population, dental fricatives do not exist (these disappeared from Irish in the 13th century at the latest, O'Rahilly 1926:163-168). A careful look at the allophony of the Irish coronal stops /t, d/ reveals that the realisation of /θ, ð/ in Irish English as dental stops [t̪, d̪], or as alveolars [t, d] in Dublin city and in the south and south west of the country, is the result of contact: the allophones of the Irish stops, dental or alveolar, have the same geographical distribution as the realisation of the English fricatives. Hence it is unlikely that one is dealing with a reversion to an 'unmarked' alveolar place of articulation as the realisation of the statistically unusual dental fricatives of English.

The domain of stop fortition in creoles subsumes the entire area of anterior fricatives. The labials /f, v/ often close to stops or at least show a number of allophones different from the labio-dental articulation types characteristic of the lexifier input language. In general scholars see substrate languages as exerting an influence on the

allophony of labial fricatives. Holm maintains that input African languages tend not to have /v/ (1994:370f.) or that in a case like Bahamian [v, w] are allophones of a bilabial fricative phoneme /ß/. In addition one should add that it is just about possible that the former London confusion of /v/ and /w/, which was still found in the 18th century, may have had an effect on the situation in Caribbean creoles.

In Irish English there is a certain amount of fluctuation in the representation of both [f] and [ʍ] in early modern texts (Bliss 1979:231+248f.). This can be seen easily in the two forms of the one Irish surname *O'Faoláin*: *Wheelan* with [ʍ], formerly [ɸ], and *Pheelan* with [f]. The reason for this is that the allophones of /f/ and /v/ in Irish were and are (in the West and North) bilabial rather than labio-dental and that both the labio-dental fricative [f] and the voiceless labio-velar approximant [ʍ] were viewed as acceptable equivalents to the Irish phonemes.

5.1.2 Cluster simplification

The simplification of clusters in Irish English can be taken to refer exclusively to syllable codas. All the onset types found in British English are found unaltered in Irish English, except those involving dental fricatives which are fortified to stops (see previous section).

Syllable codas can be affected in one of two ways. The first is an allegro phenomenon whereby one or more segments in a coda remains unrealised as in *recognize* [rɛkə(g)naiz], *texts* [tɛksts]. However the deleted segments are all recoverable in slower speech styles so that such performance phenomena do not need to be accorded systematic status.

The second means of avoiding heavy codas is to introduce an epenthetic vowel. This is a salient feature of southern Irish English pronunciations.

(20) a. *film* [fɪlɪm]
      b. *arm* [aɹʌm]

This process is one of resyllabification which leads to the first sonorant migrating to the onset of the new syllable after epenthesis, the result being a simplification of the input syllable coda. Such epenthesis is very common in Irish where clusters of sonorants are generally illegal in syllable codas. The solution to the heavy coda problem is thus the same in Irish and Irish English so that the former can with justification be suspected as the source of the phenomenon. One should also bear in mind that epenthesis is a typically areal phenomenon, for instance it is found in Dutch and in the forms of Rhenish German to the east and south of the Netherlands (Hickey 1985b).

The phenomenon of cluster simplification in creoles should be seen in the wider context of syllable structure. Prototypically creoles show simple onsets and open syllables, the simplest form being CV.[18] This is certainly in accord with universal notions of onset and rhyme with codas arising through migration backwards from the onset of a following syllable at some later stage, due to a process like contraction or cliticisation.

5.1.3 Palatalisation

One of the more salient correspondences between forms of Irish English and Caribbean creoles is the palatalisation of velars before low front vowels. This can be seen in varieties of northern Irish English with such words as *cat* [kjæt], *gap* [gjæp] and is reflected in Caribbean creoles where both substrate influence from West African languages (Holm 1994:369f.) and British dialect input are seen as having played a role. In either case palatalisation cannot be seen as a typically creole process in the sense of the universalists, i.e., as a reduction of markedness vis à vis either substrate or lexifier languages. Furthermore palatalisation as a morphological process and a means of making lexical distinctions has a clear (substrate) parallel in Irish.

5.1.4 Lenition

The weakening of alveolars which is so marked a feature of southern Irish English should not be thought of as in any way indicative of creolisation. This is found in Irish English and effects alveolars in intervocalic and post-vocalic, final position (Hickey 1984a) and can be seen as a realisation of alveolar lenition which has many manifestations in different varieties of English. It could also have been supported by the phenomenon of (morphological) lenition in Irish, which although it has quite a different distribution and status, nonetheless frequently involves a shift from stop to fricative.

5.1.5 The position of [h]

The appearance of [h] in a language, if it can be traced, is most often attributed to a lenition process whereby a stop or supra-glottal fricative is weakened to [h]. This is certainly true for, say, Greek and Andalusian Spanish where [s] was weakened to [h] and this alternation is, and has been, part of the synchronic morphology of Irish;[19] in Germanic an initial velar/uvular [χ] was weakened accordingly and in Old English in medial position (for so-called *verba contracta*) the [h] stemming from [x] disappeared entirely. If the historical evidence for [h] in attested languages points to a derived sound, then it should not be expected in a creole and would *ceteris paribus* be assumed to disappear from input in a situation of creolisation.

The difficulty in using the lack of [h] as an indication of creolisation in Irish English is that because it is a central phoneme in Irish with an important role in the morphology, Irish speakers were less likely to have abandoned this sound, despite any degree of putative creolisation in the genesis of Irish English. Structurally the position of [h] in Irish English is quite firm as this variety has both [w] and [ʍ] (where the voiceless approximant can phonologically be interpreted as /w/ + /h/, Hickey 1984b), both with support from Irish (see above) and certainly as a retention from conservative English input. The demise of [h] which is such a prominent feature of British urban dialects was probably not to be seen in the input varieties for the early modern period and is not found today in Irish English either.

The phonology of creoles is not exhaustively accounted for by the above features. Many have clear traces of substrates, for instance Saramaccan has labio-velar stops /kp, gb/ and it has phonological tone, both obvious remnants of a West African input (Bakker, Smith and Veenstra 1994:170f.). The syllable timing of Jamaican English creole can probably be viewed in this light as well.

It is imperative to conclude this section with a reference to a third interpretation of the data discussed. This is that both native-language transfer on the part of the Irish learning English in the long switch-over period from the mid 17th to the late 19th century and the operation of creole-like forces of unmarkedness are responsible for the outcome in present-day Irish English. This view may be considered indecisive and it admittedly does not address the question of the relative weighting of the factors involved, but it at least avoids the pitfall of monocausality which is so often the reason for skewed interpretations of data in language contact situations.

5.2   Morphology

A major feature of the morphology of Irish English is the use of a special pronominal form for the second person plural (Hickey 1983). In the supra-regional standard of the south this is generally *ye* which is realised as [jɪ] with the singular form *you* appearing as [jʊ] or [jə]. The source of the plural form obviously lies in the varieties of English brought to Ireland in the 17th century.

In popular Dublin English and in some of the urban dialects of an eastern band stretching from Dublin in the centre of the east down to Waterford in the south east, the local form of the second person plural is *you* + /z/, i.e., [jʊz]; there is a combined form *yez* [jɪz] which is quite common in the north of Ireland as well.

The forms with a final /-z/ derive from a process of attaching a general plural morpheme to an unaltered base. This type of agglutination is indicative of creolisation as it rests on the principle of stem constancy. Furthermore is can hardly be accidental that the form is found in less standard forms of Irish English. Nor can one appeal to Irish as the motivating factor for the morphological transparency of *youse* or even for *yez* as here the second person pronouns are completely different from each other, viz. *tú* 'you'-sg and *sibh* 'you'-pl. Note in this context that no survivals of older English second person singular pronouns, *thou/thee*, are to be found.

A more dubious issue is the use of personal pronouns as determiners which is most common in eastern dialects as in *them boys*. This usage corresponds to the principle of separate grammatical morphemes in creoles but it most definitely has parallels in mainland Britain (particularly western England) so that superstrate input is sufficient to account for the phenomenon. This also applies to the common use of object forms of personal pronouns in subject position.

5.3   Syntax

Allow me to open this section with some comments on language typology as this is germane to the issue at hand. Creoles as new languages are quintessen~ tially analytical in type. If one accepts that phylogenetically all languages are analytic then creoles cannot show inflection as they are at the beginning of a typological cycle which takes some considerable time to realign the language involved and favour a different organisational principle for the grammar of a language.

Principle	*Realisation*	*Force at work*
analysis	free morphemes	maximum lexicalisation
agglutination	bound morphemes	semantic bleaching, metaphorical extension

inflection	clitics, affixes	phonetic blurring, attrition
(incorporation)	(highly allomorphic root inflection)	(acceptance of great morphological variation for higher order structural reasons)
analysis	free morphemes	lexicalisation dominant again

Originally there is a one-to-one relationship of form and meaning but various forces resulting from the uses to which language is put lead to alternative structures which collide with the principles of linearity and isomorphism, e.g., topicalisation with fronting or the formation of passives, indirectness (allusiveness, non-commitment, politeness), expressiveness of various kinds (non-literal and metaphoric structures) all contribute to the weakening of linearity as a dominant principle in language (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 38f.).

Even a cursory glance at the morphology of Irish English shows that although there may be one or two instances of agglutination (as in the case of the second person plural pronouns) there can be no question of any principle of analysis being dominant in the morphological sphere.

The syntax presents a somewhat different picture. The essential question is whether the rearrangements which have taken place can be seen as part of a recognisable global strategy in Irish English and, if so, whether this is in accord with the syntactic profile of typical creoles. To approach this question one must examine the verbal phrase[20] and in particular the aspectual system represents at once the greatest innovation in Irish English and provides the clearest evidence.

5.3.1   The TMA system

Once again if one accepts the view that creoles are indicative of language genesis in general, then the predominance of aspectual over tense distinctions and the use of pre-verbal particles to realise these can be taken as linguistically primitive. Consider for a moment the order of modifying elements in verb phrases.[21]

(21)   subject negator TMA-marker verb (uninflected)

This order is typical of widely diverse pidgins and, as Crowley rightly notes (1992:271), represents a departure from the order of both subsrate and lexifier languages. If tense and aspect markers are formally separate then the latter are located nearer the verb and is not inflected as all markers can only occur within the pre-specifying analytical structure. Furthermore, it is a valid observation that verbal aspect overrides mood and tense marking in pidgin situations.[22]

It is observations such as the above which diminish the acceptability of any exclusively substrate hypothesis whereby the salient structures of creoles derive in the main from the input languages, 'from below'. It furthermore illustrates the type of active alteration of input models which is characteristic of the restructuring found in creoles.

General statements of the verbal phrase in creoles go beyond the order of elements before the verb. With regard to aspect one can state a priority among the types. Bybee, who sees aspect as the category most basic to the verb (1985:141), remarks that the most common aspectual distinction is that between perfective and imperfective with that between habitual and continuous the next most common. Other authors do not give a ranking for types but list the possibilities. According to Holm (1988:148ff.) there are four basic aspectual distinctions in the verb complex (of creoles).

(22)   a.   progressive   b.   perfective
       c.   habitual   d.   irrealis

Of these the first and fourth are present in English and have been maintained in Irish English. The second and third types are to be the focus of attention for the remainder of this section.

5.3.1.1 Perfective

There are two basic types of perfective aspects in Irish English which have been commented on by many authors in the present century dealing with the matter. By those writing in the last decade or so (Harris, Kallen, Filppula) one of two terminologies has been adopted, the first from David Greene, an Irish scholar (see Greene 1979), and the second from James McCawley in an article on aspect in English (included in the collection McCawley 1976, see especially pp.263-268; Harris and Kallen also draw on McCoard 1978). Greene refers to the perfective with *after* in English (and *tar éis* in Irish) as PI and to the perfective with the word order past participle + object as PII. The use of numbers after the letter P is of little help to those unfamiliar with Greene's classification and this will not be adopted here. McCawley has various divisions in his classification of perfectives and has introduced the term 'hot news' to refer to the use of the English present perfect to convey new and unexpected information as in *They've stolen my bicycle!* This terminology has been taken up by authors on Irish English and applied to the perfective with *after*, first by Harris (1984:308; 1993:160) later by Kallen (1989:7-9) who follows McCawley's divisions and discusses the subtypes he distinguishes in detail. McCawley recognized four kinds of perfective indicating (a) 'universal' perfect, (b) 'existential' perfect, (c) 'hot news' perfect and (d) 'stative' perfect. Kallen found attestations in his corpus of Dublin English for each of these subtypes (more on this below). In the subsequent discussion he uses the term 'hot news' most as the factor of recency would seem for him to be the most prominent in this aspectual type (Kallen 1989:13f.).

      The approach adopted by the present author is that of a prototypical use of this perfective for immediate relevance with additional components which can be foregrounded in appropriate contexts. Two descriptive terms are to be used here which are found elsewhere (Hickey 1995a) and which are self-explanatory. The first is *resultative perfective* (also used by Harris, 1993:160 and Trudgill 1986:149f. though Kallen 1989:17 uses the term 'accomplishment perfect' which is found among authors looking at aspect within the context of functional grammar, e.g., Brigden 1984). The second is *immediate perfective* referring to the *after* construction.

5.3.1.1.1   Resultative perfective

This is telic in nature (Dahl 1985) and stresses that a certain result has been reached due to the action expressed by the verb.

(23)   a.   *She has the table set.*
       b.   *They have the house built.*

Irish English exploits the option of placing the past participle after the object to express this aspectual type. This has sources both in input varieties of English and in Irish where the non-finite verb form follows any governed object. What Irish English does not show is the phenomenon found in many creoles where a verb meaning 'done' or 'finished' is employed as an indicator of perfective aspect (Jamaican and Krio with (English-derived) *don* and Haitian and Mauritian with (French-derived) *fin* are examples).

It would appear that in the course of the history of Irish English a contrast developed whereby the two alternatives for the order of past participle and direct object can be exploited semantically.

(24) a. *Have you read any of his early novels?*
      b. *Have you the book I lent you read?*

The first of these questions is general, i.e., the action could have taken place any time. The second has a much more definite time focus. The person asking the question is inquiring whether the action which is assumed to be recent has in fact been completed.

5.3.1.1.2   Immediate perfective

This is an aspectual type which is uniquely Irish in its expression. The model for it is definitely to be found in Irish as the outset language and the motivation for its formation is the search for an equivalent to this aspectual category in English as discussed above. As might be expected it is attested early: by 1690 it had appeared in texts illustrating Irish English. The semantic essence is the notion of immediacy which connects the action reported to the current discourse.

(25)   *We're after finishing our dinner.*

Initially this construction was found with future reference and both Greene (1979:126) and Bliss would seem to be baffled by this use though Bliss admits that this is not just a mistaken representation on the part of an English author. The instances in question are combinations of irrealis and perfective which have receded in Irish English since.

(26) a. *You vill be after being damn'd.*
      b. *He will not be after hanging his Countrymen.*
                                              (Bliss 1979:299-301)

Kallen (1994:173) touches on the use of *after* in sentences with future or irrealis reference and suggests that this arose from the merger of inherent features of English *after* (as in *He's after a good job*) with universal principles of TMA systems under conditions of language contact and variability. The more restricted use of *after* nowadays is viewed by Kallen as 'a sort of decreolisation in which the variable range of significance for *after* is limited in accord with the demands of the English TMA system.' This is a rather vague interpretation. For one thing the use of *after* in the sense of 'looking for' is not common in Ireland (although it could conceivably have been) and for another it is uncertain what is meant by the 'demands of the English TMA system'. The more probable reason is that the use of the *after* perfective in Irish includes the future but that the English has a normal future which covers this option and with time the immediate perfective settled down as a contrasting aspectual type to the resultative perfective. One

should also mention that the use with future reference is not illegal in present-day Irish, but it is less common. However, given an appropriate context it is perfectly acceptable as in the following example. Equally the resultative perfective can also show future reference.

(27)　a.　*If you don't hurry up, they'll be after leaving by the time you get there.*
　　　b.　*I'll have the book read by tomorrow, I promise you.*

5.3.1.2 The grammaticalisation hypothesis

One of the interesting observations of Greene (1979:128f.) in his discussion of perfectives in Irish and Irish English is that the use of *tar éis* 'after' with a non-finite verb form was restricted initially (in the early modern period of Irish) to reporting events of immediate relevance and that it evolved afterwards into a more general perfect form whereas the Irish English use of *after*, which is plausibly derived from the Irish model, did not experience such a broadening of its range of applications.

　　　Kallen (1990) has taken up this point and proposed a hypothesis whereby the Irish who were learning English grammaticalised all the semantic/ pragmatic categories they could distinguish using the means available from both Irish (by calquing) and from the input varieties of English. This view stresses the independence of speakers in the language shift period whereby they attempted to reach one meaning : one form by creating distinctions from the options available in both the outset and target languages.

　　　Recall that Kallen (1990:122f.) recognises four categories of perfect (*sic!*) which he classifies as follows, linking up with McCawley's classification.

(28)　a.　extended present　　　*I know him for a long time.*
　　　b.　*be* perfects　　　　　*Are they gone yet?*
　　　c.　*after* perfects　　　　*He's after losing the keys.*
　　　d.　accomplishment perfect　*He has the book read.*

Kallen proceeds to scrutinise both contemporary evidence from his own Dublin corpus and historical evidence from Bliss' collection of early modern texts (Bliss 1979) examining his own initial assumption that 'every surface marker of the Hiberno-English perfect encodes a distinct semantic/pragmatic category'. His conclusion is that neither the contemporary nor the historical material confirms the grammaticalisation hypothesis which he sees as not sufficiently 'subtle and complex' (1990:132).

　　　In my opinion the negative conclusion reached by Kallen is correct given the attempt to discover watertight distinctions between perfectives in Irish English. However, the linguistic behaviour of speakers in the early modern period, just touched upon by Kallen, offers a powerful explanation for the manifestations of aspectual categories in Irish English. In a situation of prolonged uncontrolled second-language acquisition (Schumann 1978, Andersen (ed.) 1983), it is quite plausible that speakers arrived at a configuration of aspectual categories which was fed on the one hand by distinctions in the Irish substrate and on the other by settings present in the input varieties of English.

　　　The principle on which the aspect system functions is seen differently in the present paper and the following section is intended to show how an alternative interpretation can offer a more appropriate and fitting framework for the classification of aspectual distinctions.

5.3.1.3 Prototype interpretation

One observation made by authors on the aspectual distinctions in Irish English is that it is difficult to state just exactly what the meaning of a particular type is and that one and the same semantic type can be found in different tense/aspect configurations. This overlap would seem to be a source of puzzlement to scholars. The reason for this lies in a misunderstanding of the semantics and the syntax of aspectual categories. A different interpretation of aspect which does not insist on static links between form and meaning is more likely to be able to handle real-life attestations such as those in Kallen's Dublin corpus or in the Tape-Recorded Survey of Hiberno-English Speech or the Belfast material gathered under the guidance of the Milroys and exploited by Harris (1984:306).

      First of all one must note that there are two basic perfective distinctions in Irish English, the immediate and resultative mentioned above. The 'extended present' and the '*be* perfect' are temporal phenomena and should not be confused with aspect. The sentence *I know him for ages* has no additional aspectual connotation compared to its more standard equivalent *I've known him for ages*. Equally *They're gone to get some milk* has no further aspectual implication beyond the more standard sentence *They've gone to get some milk*.[23]

      The two perfective aspectual types are first and foremost semantic categories in Irish English. They indicate the manner in which an action is viewed by a reporter and the relevance it has for the current discourse.[24] These are two axes along which aspect can be distinguished, irrespective of the manifestation in a particular context.[25] In this respect it is convenient to conceptualise aspectual distinctions as consisting of prototypes which can be more or less matched by actual sentences. They can be treated in a manner similar to that of lexical semantics in the classical expositions of prototype theory (Rosch 1977, 1978; Taylor 1989) where a particular token (of, say, a bird) can be regarded as a prototype of a class. Other tokens may, however, deviate from this and be located towards the periphery of the semantic space occupied by the item in question.

      In addition one can put the two major perfective types in relation to the major temporal divisions in the past. Recall that time anterior to the point of discourse has two divisions, above all in creoles, recent past and remote past. The two basic distinctions in perfective aspect in Irish English can be seen as in part parallel to the recent - remote divide. The immediate perfective corresponds to the recent past and the resultative perfective to the remote past.

(29)   *Categories of tense and aspect*
                Past tense   Perfective aspect
                Recent   Immediate perfective
                Remote   Resultative perfective

The second aspectual type is the easiest to deal with as the match between manifestation and prototype is closest. It is used to inform an interlocutor that an action has been completed. No information is conveyed on how this happened or about its relevance to the present discourse apart from the fact of informing someone that the action has been successfully completed.

      In his consideration of the resultative perfective Henry talks about the verb-final construction as being subjective, Greene (1979:132) with reference to Visser (1973: paragraph 2001) to there being an emotional interest in the result reached. Perhaps this can be put in more objective terms. With this construction there is a degree of expectancy

that the action described by the verb will indeed have been carried out and its use in a sentence is to convey precisely this information.

(30)   *They've the car fixed now.*

5.3.1.3.1   The immediate perfective

The manifestations of this aspectual prototype shows a much greater range than the resultative perfective. As Kallen (1991:62f.) has shown from his corpus of Dublin English, the *after* variable as an aspectual marker occurs in different types of context. But some uses are more central than others. Common to all instances is the notion of immediacy, hence its classification as the aspectual counterpart to the recent past.

5.3.1.3.2   Relevance to present

The chief application of this aspectual type is to denote immediate relevance of a recent action to the time of discourse. It is normally found in reported speech and has a high frequency of occurrence with *on* and a personal pronoun which expresses the dative of disadvantage.

(31)   *She's after eating the yoghurt on me.*

5.3.1.3.3   Information and reproach

The *after* construction is frequent when the speaker is chiding his/her interlocutor in an exchange (Kallen 1991:66). This component of its use can be seen as an extension of the relevance element. Note that this accounts for its frequent occurrence in reported speech and its rarity in more formal styles. What is remarkable with this usage is that the action is being repeated verbally for the hearer who in this case is the perpetrator.

(32)   *You're after ruining the stew on me.*

5.3.1.3.4   Use in the negative

The relative infrequency of the negative with the *after* construction lies in its function of reporting a matter of relevance to an interlocutor. The situations in which such a report is required in the negative are rare but there are clear instances where negation occurs.

(33)   a.   *You shouldn't take out the car at night when you've only*
              a provisional licence.
        b.   *Don't worry, I'm not after crashing it.*

5.3.1.3.5   Pragmatics and discourse restrictions

There is a high informational value associated with the *after* construction. This semantic

component may give the clue to analysing the differentiation made by speakers in their use of the immediate and resultative perfect. The latter implies that the speaker was aware the action was either being carried out or at least pending[26]. This does not hold for the immediate perfective which is apparently why the term 'hot news' enjoys such popularity among authors on the subject.

(34) a. *Máire is after wetting herself.*
          I know.
      b. *I'm after finishing my homework.*
          Ah, you don't say.

There are shades of meaning involved with both types of perfectives which make them mutually exclusive in certain situations. For instance an implication of the resultative perfect is that the goal of the action is intended and, importantly, known to the person(s) listening whereas the immediate perfective often contains an element of surprise, hence the ungrammaticality of the first of each pair of the following sentences. Note that outside of Irish English it would be usual to find an expletive adjective which would convey the element of surprise and dismay.

(35) a. **He's the soup bowl dropped.*
          He's after dropping the soup bowl.   Irish English
          He's dropped the goddamn soup bowl.   non-Irish English
      b. **They've the window broken.*
          They're after breaking the window.   Irish English
          They've broken the bloody window.   non-Irish English

5.3.1.3.6   Less central applications

Recall that the resultative perfective implies that the action completed was the definite intention of the person(s) carrying out the action. This element of intention is so strong that when describing an event in the past for which this does not necessarily hold the immediate perfective is used instead. Here one has a less central use of this perfective.

(36)   *They're after giving the staff a pay rise already this year.*
           *They've a pay rise given to the staff already this year.

Indeed the element of intention can determine which of the perfectives is to be used in a given context.

(37) a. *They're after putting up street lights.*
          (in the process of building the housing estate)
      b. *They've the street lights put up now.*
          (this was the work they set out to accomplish today)

It was noted above that the resultative perfective has a narrow range of applications. This is now understandable given the less central uses of the immediate perfective.

(38)   *resultative*   *immediate perfective*
           intention   —   neutral report   —   high relevance to hearer

The middle of the field, as it were, is occupied by an extension of the immediate perfective to include neutral reports as in examples (36) and (37) above. Hence there is no necessity to extend the scope of the resultative perfective. It is true that such instances of the immediate perfective do not have the high relevance for the hearer which a sentence like *Your after ruining the stew on me* has but they are still instantiations of the category 'immediate perfective', just as much as a flightless bird is of the category of flying animals. It may not be near the prototype but that by no means expels it from the category.

5.3.1.3.7   Sociolectal differences

Lastly one should remark that there are differences in the use of *after* constructions across the social spectrum. While it is slightly less stigmatised than the use of *do* to form an habitual, its use does nonetheless taper off towards the higher end of Irish English registers as Kallen (1990:134) rightly notes. What is obvious when comparing sociolects within Ireland is that certain cooccurrence restrictions hold for the upper group of sociolects. For instance the combination of *after* and *being* (as in *He's after being here all day*) is not so common in the supra-regional variety of the south. This is not by any means to say that the *after* construction disappears so that the comments above on range and application nonetheless have validity for supra-regional forms of Irish English.

5.3.1.4 Habitual

The second major component of the Irish English TMA system is the habitual.[27] There are clearly two sources for it. On the one hand there is an obvious Irish model which is expressed by a form of the verb *bí* 'be'. This contrasts with the verb *tá* 'be' which tends to indicate location, existence or state in a general sense.

(39)   a.   *Bíonn siad amuigh ag iascaireacht go minic.*
                 [be-habitual they out at fishing often]
                 'They are out fishing very often.'
        b.   *Tá siad amuigh ar farraige anois.*
                 [be they out on the sea now]
                 'They are out at sea now.'

The second source is the input varieties of English. Before coming to these a few words on the realisation of the habitual are called for.
        It is one of the great parallels between Irish English and various creoles that it uses an unstressed form of *do* along with the verb *be*, or occasionally of inflected (unstressed) *do* alone, to express habitual aspect.

(40)   a.   *They do be out fishing often.*
        b.   *She does come over to our place after dark.*

There are two questions which need answering here. Firstly, did this type of structure arise in Ireland and, secondly, why were these means of forming an habitual chosen by the Irish?[28]

The first question allows of no definite answer. There is evidence for south-west English input for the habitual with *do*. Older sources such as Barnes (1863) and Elworthy (1877) and, in the middle of this century, Ellegård (1953) remark on this (as Harris has noted, 1986:186-189, see also Wakelin 1977:120f., Ihalainen 1976, and Weltens 1983). The instances which have been found on mainland Britain cluster in the south-west, and this is, along with the general west, a key area for input varieties of English in Ireland. If one were so inclined one could push back the contact case to mainland Britain and postulate that it was Celtic influence in Cornwall which originally led to the appearance of an habitual with *do* there. Indeed there have been isolated cases of authors suggesting an influence of P-Celtic on mainland British English (see Dal 1956 and Poussa 1990 for examples). There is ultimately no satisfactory answer to this question as there is no way of tracing any kind of historical continuity, and so it will not be pursued here.

The second question concerns the reason why *do* was recruited for the purpose of indicating an habitual in English. Recall that affirmative, declarative *do* is a feature which dropped out of English in the 17th century. It was retained longer in western varieties and writers like Shakespeare evince a consistently high use of it (Hope 1995). Bear in mind also that western and south-western varieties of English formed the input to (southern) Irish English in the early modern period. One can thus take it that periphrastic *do* was on the decline in 17th century English but nonetheless present. The scenario which I am assuming for Irish English is one where periphrastic *do*-forms did in fact occur in the input varieties but were semantically empty (affirmative *do* peaked around 1580 in England but then dropped off, Denison 1985, Kroch 1989, Ogura 1991). Unlike the emphatic *do* or the *do* forms in marked sentence types like interrogatives and negatives, their presence in declarative sentences alongside simple types without *do* would have shown to the speakers of Irish in the process of learning English that the formally more complex sentence types with *do* were semantically non-functional.

5.3.1.4.1 Usurpation

Instances such as those just quoted offer a good opportunity for what I have termed in another paper 'usurpation' (Hickey 1995a). By this is meant that speakers in an interlingual context functionalise elements in the target language for their own ends. In this context one should mention the term *exaptation* used by Roger Lass (1990b:79-82) which he defines as 'the opportunistic co-optation of a feature whose origin is unrelated or only marginally related to its later use'. This is quite similar to my 'usurpation'. However the latter refers to (decaying) elements of the target language being put to some use in the contact variety which is motivated by a grammatical category in the outset language, here habitual aspect (in this respect usurpation could be viewed as a special instance of exaptation). For this to happen the language learners must realise, usually unconsciously, that some element is present but becoming increasingly non-functional in the target language (the present view assumes that speakers intuitively recognise the statistical frequency, the central or peripheral status, and the functional load of elements in a target language, and in their own of course). And this is precisely what the situation of periphrastic *do* must have been in the western varieties of English which provided the input to Irish English in the south in the 17th century.

For usurpation to occur speakers must realise that a form or structure is waning but still present in the linguistic input they are exposed to. It would thus not seem correct to postulate, as Harris (1986) and Guilfoyle (1983) do, that simple and periphrastic *do*-forms occurred as random surface variants in the input varieties for Irish English at

the beginning of the early modern period. Decline of a feature does not mean that it occurs randomly and if anything sociolinguistics teaches us that at any given point in time there is a relatively stable statistical occurrence of forms, whether on the increase or decrease, seen diachronically.

The stance taken by Guilfoyle was that the Irish imposed order on the random occurrence of *do* by the application of Lightfoot's Transparency Principle (see Lightfoot 1979 and Romaine's criticism 1981) whereby children attempt to establish derivational regularity by reanalysis if the former derivational path is no longer retrievable for them. Now whatever the merits of this principle are, it is taken to apply to cases of reanalysis where the original and the new interpretation are semantically linked such as with the by now classic case of the English modals which derive from former lexical verbs with full inflectional paradigms (as still to be seen in modern German, for instance). But it is not obvious that *do* should be used for indicating an habitual aspect. In fact many varieties of English use it to express a perfective as in *He done stole the car*. Furthermore the change in the application of *do* is not from one function to another as with the modals but from afunctionality (hence the demise of periphrastic *do* in standard forms of English) to a new specific function, here the exponent of an habitual aspect.

If speakers have a feeling for what variants are on the decline then it is additionally understandable that they should have hit on periphrastic *do* as the form to usurp and employ as a formal equivalent for the Irish habitual aspect. Note furthermore that the lack of stress on *does* is a requirement for those varieties which use it as an habitual marker. This is a remnant of the 17th century situation before *do* was used for emphatic purposes (this also applies to creoles, Holm 1994:375).

The connection between Irish English and creoles, above all of the Caribbean, in this respect would appear to be multi-faceted. On the one hand one can assume a degree of historical continuity, especially as Irish immigrants to Barbados in the mid 17th century are likely to have carried the habitual use of *do* plus *be* with them, and from there one knows that later there was a not inconsiderable dissemination of English to other parts of the Caribbean and indeed to the coast of South Carolina, possibly supplying superstrate input for Gullah, the sea island creole of this area (Hancock 1980, Littlefield 1981).

The mention of America necessitates remarking on a salient difference between varieties of English in the north and south of Ireland. There is a well-known distribution of habitual *bees* in the north of the country[29] and of *does be* in the south. This according to Rickford (1986) accounts for the differential distribution of the two habitual structures in Caribbean English, where southern Irish English existed in the 17th century, and African American English, which arose in the southern United States (in particular the south-east and its immediate hinterland, the Appalachians) which as of the late 17th century had a large contingent of immigrants from the north of Ireland, originally Scotch-Irish. Note here that as Holm (1988:160, quoting Rickford 1980) points out there is a case to be made for *bees* to be a derivative of *does be* with deletion of *does* as an internal development in some Caribbean creoles such as Bahamian.

Before closing this section it is necessary to point out that there is of course the possibility of a convergence of factors in the rise of habitual aspect in Irish English. The existence of special habitual forms in all varieties of Irish English would point to a strong substrate motivation for its occurrence. The dialects of Irish all have a use of the present of verbs with habitual force and show a special form of the verb *be* with precisely this semantic content: *bíonn* as opposed to *tá* which tends to indicate existence or state in a general sense (see examples above).

5.4   *Grammatical bleaching*

There is no accepted term for the phenomenon which is to be discussed in this section. Essentially it is the reverse of grammaticalisation and could be labelled de-grammaticalisation, reverse/inverse grammaticalisation or the dominance of the 'pragmatic mode' (Givón 1979:223). In analogy to the established term 'semantic bleaching' which indicates a loss of semantic content I have chosen to label it here 'grammatical bleaching' as it too refers to a reduction in the grammatical nature of the phenomenon involved. A dominance of the pragmatic mode according to Givón involves loose conjunction rather than tight subordination, more typical of the syntactic mode, and shows a greater preponderance of topic-comment structure rather than subject-predicate structure.

It is true of both pidgins and creoles (in their initial phase at least) that they favour parataxis, clause subordination being a feature which develops with the grammaticalisation of other elements (which are broadly pragmatic, indicating modality, temporality, given information, etc., Hopper and Traugott 1993:177-184). Equally in cases of uncontrolled second-language acquisition-cum-shift one would expect subordination to be abandoned in favour of simpler juxtaposition.

5.4.1   *Clause coordination*

Turning to Irish English one finds that there are instances of the abandonment of hypotactic constructions for paratactic ones. Consider the following examples.

(41)   a.   *She met her husband and he coming down the road.*
       b.   *He went out and it raining.*

It would appear here that concessive or temporal clauses are linked with the conjuction *and*, neglecting the syntactic means which English puts at the speaker's disposal, viz., *although* and *while*.

The origin of such structures has been the object of research in particular by Filppula (see Filppula 1991 for instance) who has found instances in older varieties of English (attested in the Helsinki Corpus of Diachronic English for the 16th and 17th centuries) and occasionally for the English of Somerset. However the more important input would seem to be Irish which utilises the same syntactic means as seen below.

(42)   a.   *Bhuail sí leis a fear céile agus é ag teacht aníos an bóthar.*
                [hit she with her man self and he at coming down the road]
                'She met her husband while he was walking down the road.'
       b.   *Chuaigh sé amach agus é ag cur báistí.*
                [went he out and it at putting rain-gen]
                'He went out although it was raining.'

Filppula has cast doubt on the exclusively Irish origin of the structure but concedes that the high frequency of such structures is peculiar to Irish English. However this does not mean that it is entirely a matter of transfer. Recall that semantic-pragmatic forces hold sway over structural properties in situations of extreme contact (Hopper and Traugott 1993:214). For this reason there would have been no acquisitional motivation on the part

of speakers to introduce a distinction on a structural level which could be realised purely in discourse, i.e., pragmatically. Added to this, but not necessarily prior to it, is the fact that clause co-ordination predominates in Irish anyway so that the desire for categorial equivalence in English to Irish structures would not have motivated speakers to introduce a distinction which they did not favour in the outset language.

Furthermore the matter would have received support from later generations of Irish children for whom of course parataxis would acquisitionally predate hypotaxis and in the case of these concessive and temporal clauses coordination would simply not have been superseded by subordination.

5.4.2 Clefting

If the 'pragmatic mode' is taken to be characteristic of speakers of Irish learning English in the uncontrolled and deficient environment of the early modern period then it should not be surprising that there was a greater preponderance of topic-comment structures in their language. Foremost among the devices used in Irish English to realise such communicative aims is clefting which has a greater syntactic range of realisations (with various adverbial qualifiers) and a greater acceptance in this variety than in comparable extraterritorial forms of English, let alone in mainland English.

(43) a. *It's to Galway he's gone today.*
      b. *It's often he went home.*

Filppula who has done most work on topicalisation in Irish English states (1993:212) that the degree to which it is represented in Irish English goes beyond the amount of structural rearrangement one might expect, given the dominance of topic-comment linear organisation over subject- predicate word order. He accepts that either substratal influence from Irish or from early vernacular input varieties is responsible for the high incidence of topicalisation devices in the syntax of Irish English.

One must distinguish here between the motivation for such discourse strategies occurring and the means chosen for their realisation. If one compares the Irish equivalents to the above sentences then it is obvious that the copula with a dummy *it* has an exact correspondence in Irish.

(44) a. *Is go Gaillimhe a chuaigh sé inniu.*
          [is-it to Galway COMP went he today]
      b. *Is go minic a chuaigh sé abhaile.*
          [is-it often COMP went he to-home]

It is difficult to be precise about the motivation for the use of such structures. On the one hand they can be due to the greater tendency towards topicalisation in the language-acquisition situation of the Irish and on the other they could be interpreted as an attempt to reach categorial equivalence in English to devices common in Irish. One could, here as with clause coordination, push the question back further and consider the origin of both devices in Irish itself. There is of course no simple answer and the wish to find one is ultimately misguided. What is appropriate, however, is to identify and discuss the various forces which have motivated the occurrence and establishment of such structures in Irish English.

5.5   Remarks on the lexicon

The lexicon is a further level on which a comparison with pidgins and creoles is possible. The most salient feature of the lexicon in the latter type of language is its restricted nature. The reduced lexicon of pidgins is linguistically primitive in a trivial way: no language can start off with a fully developed lexicon. The means used to increase the lexicon, semantic expansion, polysemy, paraphrase, and word-formational innovations, are also predictable in the absence of a source for new words or the disinclination to borrow from other languages, for whatever extra-linguistic reason.

However reduced the language of a pidgin may be it will have had some input which is augmented on pidgin expansion or creolisation. As the term 'lexifier language' implies, the colonial language in question is seen as the source of the greater portion of the lexicon, though substrate influence becomes a decided possibility when words are identified as probably originating here. Furthermore the lexicon can be treated as separate and as having a different source from the grammar as evidenced in extreme form in Sylvain's one-liner that Haitian creole 'is an Ewe language with French vocabulary' or in the cases of mixed languages.

Some of the lexical devices applied in creoles, such as reduplication or periphrastic equivalents of single lexical items in non-creoles, are often regarded as indicative of creoles. These do not need to be viewed as inherent structural tendencies of creoles but as a result contingent on the restricted lexical input from the substrate and lexifier languages. Indeed features of open classes like the lexicon are poor candidates for structural characteristics of creoles. Hence lexical feature correspondence between creoles and Irish English are not accorded much weight. For instance reduplication is found in Irish English in the phrase *at all at all* which is used as an intensified form of the simple *at all*.

(45)   a.   *She didn't worry about the children at all at all.*
                        Níor rinne sí imní ar na leanaí ar chor ar bith.
                        [not did she worry on the children at all at all]

But this can be accounted for if one looks at the phrase *ar chor ar bith* in Irish which has the same intensified meaning and the same rhythmic contour, $[\text{ˌ- ˈ- ˌ- ˈ-}]$, as the Irish English instance of reduplication (Hickey 1990).

The question of lexification and/or later relexification is not a concern in the present paper seeing as how the vocabulary of English has been little affected within Irish English and given that Irish has donated very few lexical items to the English spoken in Ireland and even fewer to varieties in countries such as the United States and Australia with large Irish immigrant populations. This fact should be seen within the wider context of language retention by the Irish which is almost non-existent abroad. The abandonment of Irish was connected with the twin desires to sever all ties with an Irish background characterised by abject poverty and for rapid integration into the new society. The use of specifically Irish lexical items would have run counter to both of these wishes and have made the immigrants linguistically obtrusive in their new environment, especially given high speaker awareness of lexis. This argumentation can be applied internally to Irish English as well.

6   The universalist interpretation

Any consideration of the idiosyncrasies of Irish English must attempt to balance the weight accorded to the three factors operative in its genesis.[30]

(46)   a.   substratal influence
        b.   retention from earlier varieties (superstratism)
        c.   universalist tendencies

These factors are not really mutually exclusive. If substrate languages evince well-developed TMA systems then these could be attributed to the effect of universal principles in the genesis of these languages, albeit at much greater time depth. The major objection to the substrate hypothesis is against using it as an undifferentiated source for all features which are in need of explanation.

        The last of the above factors is to form the focus of attention in the present section. Universals can be easily appealed to in a non-chalant way, so that if one seriously wishes to enlist this source for a linguistic account of language genesis one must state clearly what one means and differentiate various kinds of universals.

        For the matter at hand the first distinction is between universals found during pidginisation and those characteristic of creolisation. The former are in essence universals of uncontrolled second-language acquisition and the latter are those of language genesis. There is overlap certainly but the difference is marked enough to warrant the distinction to be made at the outset.

        A significant commonality of pidginisation and creolisation is the favouring of analytical structures.[31] Both use free morphemes rather than bound ones. This would seem to result initially (in the jargon and early pidgin phase) from learners attempting to interpret bound morphemes of the lexifier language and, if and when understood, lexicalising them as free morphemes, this leading to morphological simplification, i.e., to an analytical alignment in typology, irrespective of the language which is the native base in the second-language-learning situation of pidginisation. Of course there may have been substrate reinforcement[32] as in the case of west African native input such as Kwa languages to the incipient creoles of the Caribbean area (Holm 1988:144).

        Among the clear differences between pidgins and creoles is one which is relevant here, viz., the realisation of TMA categories. Pidgins tend to use adverbials for this purpose while creoles exploit the option of preverbal specification by means of free morphemes (frequently deriving from lexical words in the lexifier language).

        In an uncontrolled language learning situation the desire for semantic transparency (Seuren and Wekker 1986) is maximised, which facilitates the shift to analysis. The optimality requirements of such situations specify that there be a high degree of isomorphism in the grammar, which leads to the reanalysis and restructuring of lexifier and/or substrate elements to function as pre-specifiers is both the nominal or the verbal area.

        For creoles this leads to the generalisation that inflection precedes lexis. This may ultimately have to do with linear processing preferences in language whereby incidental information (inflection) is offered before more central information (lexical item). Deviations from this order in non-creole languages could then be attributed to the effect over time of lower-order language-internal considerations such as cliticisation and absorption of grammatical formatives or semantically bleached lexical items which leads to post-modifying inflection.

The general preference for pre-specification means that SVO is chosen as the word order for non-topicalised declaratives; furthermore the implications of this order would seem to hold for the nominal area, namely the sequences Adjective + Noun and Genitive + Noun. Prespecification has a dimension within the verbal phrase as well. It implies that any morphological marking will occur before the lexical verb. Hence TMA markers are to be expected pre-verbally in creoles (Bakker, Post and van der Voort 1994).

The question arises here to what extent a universalist stance as just outlined provides an explanatory model for Irish English. A creolisation view demands that semantic transparency be at a premium and this would account for why pre-verbal markers, such as *after* and *do,* are found in aspectual constructions in Irish English.

Before leaving this discussion of perfectives, one should mention an analysis for Caribbean creoles which was first proposed by Rickford (1974) and has been discussed since. Basically Rickford maintains that the impetus to form habitual categories in creoles comes from West African substrate input (see also Harris 1986:184f.). In this interpretation the means used were originally from the substrate languages but by a process of relexification were gradually replaced by English lexical material in the sequence *does be → does → be*. What is impressive here is that the intermediary points on this cline are in fact attested (see Schneider (1990) for further discussion). But it could be that the development went in the opposite direction, i.e., that *does be* was the southern Irish English input and *bees* the northern one which filtered through to the Caribbean and the southern United States respectively along with substratal reinforcement in the former area due to the West African background. The use of *does* alone and the attested phonologically reduced form [də] would have been arrived at by a process of simplification of two morphemes to one to start with and then of a closed to an open syllable.

There are other points in Irish English where one could postulate the operation of universal principles, if only in combination with substrate input. It is a frequent observation that cross-linguistically location often provides the starting point for structures indicating existence by metaphorical extension. As has been remarked above, Irish uses locative prepositions in this way, and this use has been carried over to Irish English in one existential use as in the following sentence.

(47)   *Níl ach drochsheans ann.*
             [is-not but bad-chance in-it]
             'There only a bad chance in it.'   Irish English
             'There is only a slim chance.'   non Irish English

The transfer of the phrase 'in it' can have one of two reasons. Either it is the operation of the universal extension of location to existence or it is a contact phenomenon from Irish which is translated literally. Or of course it is both.

Locative extensions are assumed to play a role in the genesis of aspect as well. Hopper (1982) assumes this to apply and it could have been a factor in the successful transfer of the immediate perfective with *after* from Irish to English. Certainly a locative origin for the use of *tar éis* in Irish is quite likely, seeing as how the language makes extensive use of locative prepositions to express grammatical relationships or semantic content, for instance in the use of locative proximity to indicate possession as in the following example.

(48)   a.   *Níl pingin amháin aige.*
            [not-is penny one at-him]
            'He has not got a single penny.'

       b.   *tar éis* :
            1) 'after' locationally   >   2) 'after' temporally   >
            3) just completed   >   4) immediate perfective

6.1   The biogram hypothesis

Any consideration of universalism in creole studies would not be complete without mention of Bickerton's biogram hypothesis (specifically on its possible application to Irish English data, see Corrigan (1993); for general remarks from a recent source, see Arends, Muysken and Smith (1994:322); recent works by Bickerton which are of relevance are Bickerton 1984, 1988). In essence Bickerton sees creoles as creations of children whose sole linguistic input was the pidgin of their parents, that is an input so impoverished as to trigger innate universal knowledge of how languages are structured, i.e., the bioprogram. Bickerton (1975) proposes that the creole verb expresses

(49)   one tense opposition   [±anterior]
            one aspectual opposition   [±punctual]
            one modality distinction   [±irrealis]

He assumes that they are part of the bioprogram and that the categories express semantic primitives. Their ordering as tense, mood and aspect in pre-verbal position reflects the order in which their neural infrastructure was wired during the course of the evolution of the human brain. Bickerton argues that the TMA system is a human linguistic universal (Romaine 1988:265). There are later modifications of this list by Bickerton; one of the essential additions is the category [ñperfective].

    Although the external situation for the Irish during the critical period of language shift was not one of extreme heterogeneity and impoverishment of linguistic data which Bickerton takes as providing the right setting for the activation of the biogram, nonetheless it is remarkable that each of his verbal categories are present in Irish English: the tense opposition exists as present versus past, the two aspectual oppositions appear as perfective versus non-perfective and habitual versus non-habitual with the irrealis category is available as future and conditional.

    As a model of language genesis the biogram is relatively inflexible and many authors regards it as having been superseded by the principles-and- parameters approach of recent generative grammar (see below), though acknowledgement of Bickerton's contribution to the field is to be found repeatedly (Muysken in Arends, Muysken and Smith 1994:11).

6.2   Scenario with strong substrates

The universalist stance assumes a high degree of independence of the emerging creoles from their native backgrounds. This is no doubt the case where the population which provided the later creole speakers was displaced as in the case of the Caribbean with forced immigration from West Africa. However, there have been investigations of both

stabilised pidgins and creoles which are to be found in the same area as the substrate languages which formed their input (notably Melanesia, see Keesing 1991). In these instances the structures of the new languages are seen as calques of substrate-language input features in the lexifier language of the region, usually English, which have arisen due to the desire to reach equivalence in the superstrate for structures known from the substrate languages.

Any comparison of the historical situation in Ireland with that of other areas of the world with creoles should at least consider a region like Melanesia. The Caribbean which has been looked at in detail by scholars such as Harris (1986) and Rickford (1986) was chosen because of the attested immigration of Irish settlers there in the 17th century. However, comparing the later rise of creoles in the Caribbean with internal developments in Ireland has the decisive weakness that in the former region the substrate input was no longer available during language formation. Substrate input in the Caribbean can only have occurred in the first generation, particularly as the white slave traders were careful to mix the natives to avoid plotting among members of the same ethnic or linguistic community. Such an influence may have become incorporated into the embryonic creoles and propagated itself as an independent property of these forms of language but there was not the continuing direct influence of a substrate as there was in Ireland, and indeed in Melanesia, well into the 19th century.

One consequence of continual exposure to the substrate is that its categories exert an influence on the development of the creole or contact variety. An instance of this is the distinction in Tok Pisin between *yumi* 'we'-inclusive and *mipela* 'we'-exclusive, this being introduced into the pidgin on account of a similar distinction in the substrate languages on which it arose (Crowley 1992:269).

7   The generative view

Within recent versions of generative grammar, i.e., in the framework of the principles-and-parameters approach, it has been recognised that creoles are of particular relevance.[33] This is because they are seen as embodying unmarked values for parameters, the marked values having arisen in other languages due to later internal grammatical changes or shifts. The assumption here is that any new language not bound by the constraints of an older established language would assign maximally restrictive values for parameters to produce a minimal, least specific and hence more general grammar within a short time.

To open this discussion allow me to deal with two essential features of Irish syntax. As has been remarked already in this paper, Irish is typologically quite distinct from English. The first feature to comment on is the surface VSO order of declarative sentences. This has a general form as a rule of post-specification and applies to verbs and subjects as well as to nouns and qualifiers (adjectives and genitives) in the manner of a Greenbergian implicational universal.

(50) a.   *Chuaigh sé thar sáile.*   VSO word order
            [went he abroad]
      b.   *An teanga álainn.*   Noun + Adjective
            [the language beautiful]
      c.   *Hata Sheáin.*   Noun + Genitive
            [hat John-gen]

In generative terms one can state that Irish differs from English in having a rule raising a verb to INFL position from the SVO position in D-structure when the verb occurs in a non-subordinate clause, i.e., a tensed clause with an inflectionally marked verb (McCloskey 1991:263; Corrigan 1993:111f.), whereas in English this position never contains lexical verbs although modals and auxiliaries may occupy it.

There is virtually no record of VSO word order in Irish English,[34] although a few instances of nominal post-specification are to be found (again see Bliss 1979:308f.). This could be an inherited feature from earlier varieties of English (vestigially present in expressions like *God almighty*) and may have been stylistically favoured in written texts but not present in the spoken language. Leaving these examples aside one can confirm the inviolability of the English typological feature 'pre-modifying' for Irish English.

The second aspect of Irish syntax which is germane to the present discussion is the feature of *pro*-drop whereby verb forms are not necessarily accompanied by personal pronouns indicating person and number. It is a necessary but not sufficient condition (see German) that a language with *pro* drop have a rich morphology which provides the requisite information on the categories of person and number without pronouns. Hence *pro*-drop is not found with future forms in Irish as these are not inflectionally unambiguous.

(51)   a.   *Chuamuid abhaile gan iad a fheiceáil.*
            [went-we home without seeing them]
            'We went home without seeing them.'
       b.   *Chonacas rud áitiúil inné.*
            [saw-I thing funny yesterday]
            'I saw something funny yesterday.'
       c.   *Inseoidh mé leo amáireach é.*
            [tell I to-them tomorrow it]
            'I will tell it to them tomorrow.'
       d.   *Inseoidh sé leo amáireach é.*
            [tell he to-them tomorrow it]
            'He will tell it to them tomorrow.'

In English the lack of morphological marking on verbs militates against *pro*-drop so that the Irish setting for the parameter of INFL realisation on S-structure does not appear in Irish English.

It is obvious that for the Irish learning English as of the 17th century, there would been too little verb morphology left in English for a satisfactory identification of subjects on the basis of the verb alone. Given this outset, the native speakers of Irish were forced to abandon their own negative setting for the *pro* parameter. In addition the surface realisation of *pro* in Irish English is in keeping with the 'minimal hypothesis' advanced by Rizzi (1986:55), which specifies that when constructing a grammar a child, or an unguided learner in a deficient second-language learning situation, assumes a parameter setting which leads to the most restrictive result - in this case a positive setting - as this does not necessitate the addition of INFL to the set of licensing heads.

7.1   Raising from subject position

Although the more obvious correlates of *pro*-drop such as null-subjects did not transfer to Irish English there is one respect in which at least southern Irish English differs markedly from more standard forms of British English. Recall that a positive setting for

pro-drop (on Irish, see McCloskey 1984 and Stowell 1989) usually means that subject raising from *that*-clauses in interrogative sentences is legal (as in Spanish), a movement rule which does not apply to English but which would appear to have lead to a tolerance of it in Irish English as in the following example which is a syntactic equivalent of the Irish structure:

(52)   *Who¡ did you say that* [e¡] *did the work?*
         Cé dúirt tú a rinne an obair?
         [who said you that [he,she,etc.] did the work]

8   Conclusions

The aim of the present paper has been to consider what evidence there is for assuming that, during its rise at the beginning of the early modern period, Irish English went through a process of creolisation and to see whether this can still be recognised at the present. During this examination its was established that there are parallels to creole genesis, but also significant differences. The specific structures arrived at by the Irish in their variety of English did not arise against a background of disrupted transmission, that prototypical for creoles, but from communicative needs in a situation of imperfect second-language acquisition and of slow shift from one language to the other. There was pressure in the Irish situation just as there is in the creole one. In the latter because of the necessity to have at least one language, in the former because of the desire by the native Irish to shift to the colonial language for reasons of social advancement but with less than optimal exposure to it.

The scenario assumed for early Irish English is one of imperfect bilingualism in which Irish would have been the vernacular, in the sense of the most natural and vital of two available languages, and English a language which was picked up through patchy and piecemeal exposure. This type of situation is one which could well have furthered the appearance of structural patterns, which are generally connected with creoles and which are attributed some kind of universal status, such as the widespread occurrence of analytical structures and the predominance of pre-specification as a principle in the organisation of grammatical and lexical information.

The different linguistic levels offer varying support for a creolisation stage in the rise of Irish English. Phonology is weakest as its characteristics are either not shared by creoles or, where they are, they could just as well have derived from substratal input. Morphology supplies a few instances of analytical patterning, chiefly with personal pronouns, but here there are significant parallels with both the Irish substrate and the west country English input varieties. The lexicon is the weakest of all levels in this respect as it shows practically no influence from Irish and little deviation from mainland English, historically for reasons which have to do with the attitudes of speakers to their own native language.

The level of syntax provides the clearest support for any assumption of creolisation. Two (related) characteristics in particular strengthen the case here. The promotion of aspect over tense and pre-verbal marking of aspectual categories. Again if one accepts that interrupted linguistic transmission and imperfect bilingualism with a paucity of input represent similar external circumstances, then the organisational and not just formal parallels between Irish English and established creoles can be viewed as due to the foreground~ ing of universal language structures where notions of prescriptivism and standards play little or no role and the linguistic creativity of speakers is at a maximum.

Notes

*   This paper started out as a modest contribution on the relevance of Irish English to creole studies to remind Jacek in a gently ironic manner that there is more to life and English studies than the history of mainland English. But it grew and grew and I came to recognise that to deal with the matter in any satisfactory manner would require quite a lot of space which I have been audacious enough to take knowing full well that I am likely to be accused of abusing my editorial privileges. For those who feel this way I apologise in advance for the liberties I have taken. *Mea culpa.*

1   Schneider (1990) in his examination of 14 localities in the Caribbean area gives distributional tables for preverbal markers and forms of the copula. He also looks at locative constructions with *de* (*di*), the use of analytic plurals with *dem* as plural marker, and questions of pronoun morphology. Such a scalar characterisation of features could be appropriate for Irish English with the proviso that with this variety one is dealing with structural parallels to creoles rather than a form which can be described entirely as a creole.

2   Rickford (1986:246, fn) maintains that Hiberno-English is a collective term for all varieties of English in Ireland and that Irish English is restricted to those speakers for whom Irish is their first language; this suggested usage is not, however, supported by other scholars in the field.

3   The north-south divide in Ireland is an important one linguistically with its chief manifestation to be found in the realm of phonology. For the syntactic matters to be discussed here it is not so central, but where differences exist, as with the realisation of an habitual aspect, these will be pointed out. Note that I am deliberately ignoring more specific terms used for the English of the Irish, notably *blarney* and *brogue*, as these have quite different intentions and scope.

4   This point has general validity, for instance the sheer quantity of exposure can determine the direction of influence, hence phenomena like the Cockneyfication of London English (Wells 1994) despite social differences between popular and educated Londoners.

5   Indeed it is a moot point whether the two major confessions of the north can be distinguished linguistically; Todd 1984 propounds this view which is not widely accepted, however.

6   Indeed if this were not the case, if the Irish learned English and changed over to it fully within their lifetime, the country would have been English-speaking by the 18th century, which is quite obviously not the case.

7   The extent to which creolisation had already taken place is much disputed. Hancock assumes with his 'domestic hypothesis' (Hancock 1986) that it had, whereas other authors, such as Muysken, contest this.

8   In this vein, see Lass and Wright (1985) on salient features of South African English.

9   There is an inherent danger here of attributing arbitrary features of Irish English to English input simply because these features occur on the English mainland. Dillard's warning not to succumb to the cafeteria principle (Dillard 1970) has not lost its relevance since first applied to the analysis of creoles.

10   And it is not surprising that inflectional morphology along with core vocabulary is used as a defining criterion for determining genetic relationships.

11   The resistance view concerning structural alterations on contact is in my opinion basically correct, but if the social situation is extreme enough this can be overcome. It is a question of forces again: if the external social force is sufficient the language-internal resistance to structural interference can be overcome. Thomason and Kaufman are quite clear on this point: 'it is the social context, not the structure of the languages involved, that determines the direction and the degree of interference' (1988:19).

12   See the discussion of the Matrix Language Frame Model (1992:21-23).

13   Myers-Scotton includes in her model the notion of 'embedded language island' by which she means that whole phrases from the donor language may be transferred to the recipient language. But this does not seem to be majority usage for the African languages she investigated and within the Irish context it would necessitate that speakers code-switched whole chunks of English syntax into Irish, which then passed from lexicalised phrases to syntactic structures which could have been used productively.

14   This could be universal or from Irish, but nonetheless universal; cf. for instance German *Die Übersetzungen sind da*. 'The translations are available/ready' (lit.: 'there')

15   Compare the Pertinenzdativ of German as in *Er ist mir abgehauen* 'He has run off on me' (Polenz 1968).

16   See Hickey (1995a) for a fuller discussion.

17   The Scotch-Irish from Ulster who emigrated to America somewhat later are not of relevance here as the fortition of dental stops does not apply to the north of Ireland where this sub-group of Irish came from.

18   This feature is also shared by many West African languages which served as substrate in Caribbean creole genesis (Holm 1988:108f.).

19   Cf. *saol* /si:l/ 'life' : *a shaol* /q hi:l/ 'his life' where the (masculine) possessive pronoun *a* causes lenition of the following consonant.

20   One of the possible indicators of creolisation, the existence of serial-verb constructions (Holm 1988:183ff.), is not be found in Irish English. It is of course a moot point whether such structures in Caribbean creoles are the remnants of African substrate influence or a more universal feature of creole syntax.

21   The order of TMA elements in creoles is always tense-mood-aspect-verb. However, Bybee (1985) found that for non-creole languages an order mood-tense-aspect-verb is overwhelmingly common (88%), i.e., tense occurs nearer to the stem. This may have to do with a drag on tense markers towards the lexical stem with the development of inflection in languages over time.

22   Corrigan (1993:107) assumes this for Irish English as well.

23   If one looks at other languages one finds that the temporal range covered by a tense can vary, e.g., German where there is no present perfect like that in English and where the present is used with future reference also, *Ich kenne ihn seit einer sehr langen Zeit*. 'I've known him for a long time'; *Ich reise nach Israel*. 'I'm going to Israel'.

24   Both aspectual types apply only to dynamic verbs hence the illegality of sentences like *I've Sheila known* or *I'm after knowing German*.

25 The prototype interpretation outline below allows for overlap in the realisations chosen. Hence the fact that Kallen found examples of *after* and V-*ing* for all four perfect types in McCawley's classification is neither surprising, nor does it invalidate the central semantic component of immediacy which is prototypical for this kind of aspect.

26 Kallen would seem to grasp this when he offers a classification according to speech acts (1991:64ff.) and when he points out that the *after* construction is frequent in narrative situations.

27 There is broad terminological agreement with regard to this aspectual type among scholars in the field. Kallen (1989:4) uses the compound term 'generic/habitual' to encompass all the uses of this aspect which he registered in his corpus of Dublin English.

28 It would appear that the habitual nature of the English simple present as in *She cooks for her sister at the week-end* was not regarded as a sufficient equivalent by Irish speakers (Harris 1986:177). Perhaps because the English structure is interpreted habitually by contrast with the progressive, whereas the Irish structure with *bí* is inherently habitual, it was felt necessary to attain a dedicated equivalent to it.

29 This is generally acknowledged to have been transferred from Scots and that the latter has this form as a remnant of the distinction between forms of the verb *wesan* (for generic statements) and of *beon* (for habitual actions), which was clear in Old English though, later lost in all but the extreme north, i.e., in Scots (Traugott 1972:89,191f.).

30 There are different terms for the these distinctions. One notable pair is *nature* (universalism) and *nurture* (substratism) used by Corrigan (1993:113f.).

31 Another would be phonotactic simplification, but this would appear, at least in the pidginisation phase, to depend on the phonological system of the substrate.

32 Singler (1983:74) points out quite rightly that 'the degree to which a pidgin or creole displays substratal influence is a function of the homogeneity of the substratal input'. This observation should be borne in mind so as to avoid attributing attested features of creoles eclectically to any West African language which happens to show a similar phenomenon.

33 After considering Bickerton's standpoint, Corrigan rejects it in favour of a principles and parameters approach which she finds satisfactorily accounts for a variety of idiosyncrasies of early Irish English. She also sees in the shift in parameter setting in Early Modern English a reason for the liberal clefting practice in Irish English.

34 A few much quoted sentences (Corrigan 1993:116f.) are to be found in Bliss's collection of 17th and early 18th century texts which show null subjects and VSO, but these are very much the exception rather than the rule. Corrigan also notes that for the Armagh (northern Ireland) material examined by her there are no instances of null subjects and VSO.

References

Adams, George Brendan 1983. 'Linguistic cross-links in phonology and grammar', *Teanga* 3: 7-11.

Adamson, Sylvia - et al. (eds.) 1990. *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English HistoricalLinguistics*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Alleyne, Mervyn C. 1980. *Comparative Afro-American. An historical-comparative study of English-based Afro-American dialects of the new world. Linguistica Extranea Studia, 11* (Ann Arbor: Karoma).

1986. 'Substratum influences - guilty until proven innocent', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 301-315.

Andersen, Roger (ed.) 1983. *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition.* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House).

Anderson, L. 1982. 'The 'perfect' as a universal and as a language-particular category', in Hopper (ed.) 227-264.

Arends, Jacques - Adrienne Bruyn 1994. 'Gradualist and developmental hypotheses', in Arends, Muysken and Smith 111-120.

Arends, Jacques - Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.) 1994. *Pidgins and creoles. An introduction*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Bailey, Charles-James N. 1982. 'Irish English and Caribbean Black English: Another joinder', *American Speech* 57: 237-239.

Bailey, Charles-James N. - Karl Maroldt 1979. 'The French lineage of English', in Meisel (ed.) 21-51.

Bailey, Guy - Natalie Maynor 1985. 'The present tense of 'be' in white folk speech of the southern United States', *English World Wide* 6,2: 199-216.

Baker, P. - C.Corne 1986. 'Universals, substrata and the Indian Ocean creoles', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 163-183.

Bakker, Peter - Norval Smith and Tonjes Veenstra 1994. 'Saramaccan', in Arends, Muysken and Smith (eds.) 165-178.

Barnes, William 1970 [1886]. *A glossary of the Dorset dialect with a grammar of its word shapening and wording*. (St.Peter Port, Guernsey: Toucan Press).

Barnes, William (ed.) 1867. *A glossary, with some pieces of verse, of the old dialect of the English colony in the baronies of Forth and Bargy, County of Wexford, Ireland formerly collected by Jacob Poole*. (London: J. R. Smith).

Benzie, W. 1972. *The Dublin orator: Thomas Sheridan's influence on eighteenth century rhetoric and belles lettres*. (Leeds: University of Leeds, School of English).

Bickerton, Derek 1975. *Dynamics of a creole system*. (Cambridge: University Press).

1981. *Roots of language*. (Ann Arbor: Karoma).

1984. 'The language bioprogram hypothesis', *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7: 173-221.

1988. 'Creole languages and the bioprogram', in Newmeyer (ed.) 268-284.

Bliss, Alan J. 1972. 'Languages in contact: Some problems of Hiberno-English', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 72C.

1977. *'A dialogue in Hybernian style between A and B' and 'Irish eloquence' by Jonathan Swift*. (Dublin: Cadenus Press).

1979. *Spoken English in Ireland 1600-1740. Twenty-seven representative texts assembled and analysed*. (Dublin: Cadenus Press).

Bollée, Annegret 1977. *Zur Entstehung der franzÓsischen Kreolendialekte im*

Indischen Ozean: Kreolisierung ohne Pidginisierung. (Geneva: Droz).

Boretzky, Norbert   1983. *Kreolsprachen, Substrate und Sprachwandel.* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz).

Brigden, N. 1984. 'Towards a functional grammar of aspect in Finnish', in de Groot and Tommola (eds.) 179-198.

Brinton, Laurel   1988. *The development of English aspectual systems. Aspectualizers and post-verbal particles.* (Cambridge: University Press).

Burchfield, Robert (ed.) 1994. *The Cambridge history of the English language. Vol.5: English in Britain and overseas: Origins and development.* (Cambridge: University Press).

Burrowes, Audrey - Richard Allsopp 1983. 'Barbadian Creole: A note on its social history and structure', in Carrington et al. (eds.) 38-45.

Butterworth, Brian - Bernard Comrie and Östen Dahl (eds.)   1984. *Explanations for language universals.* (Berlin: Mouton).

Bybee, Joan 1985. *Morphology. A study of the relation between meaning and form.* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Bybee, Joan - Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Bybee, Joan - William Pagliuca   1985. 'Cross linguistic comparison and the development of grammatical meaning', in Fisiak (ed.) 59-83.

Bybee, Joan - Östen Dahl   1989. 'The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world', *Studies in Language* 13: 51-103.

Cahill, E. 1938. 'Norman French and English languages in Ireland, 1170-1540', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 51: 160-173.

Carrington, Lawrence D. - et al. (eds.)   1983. *Studies in Caribbean language.* (St.Augustine: Society for Caribbean Linguistics).

Cheshire, Jenny 1993. 'Standardization and the English irregular verbs', in Stein and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) 115-134.

Cheshire, Jenny (ed.)   1991. *English around the world. Sociolinguistic perspectives.* (Cambridge: University Press).

Chomksy, Noam - Howard Lasnik 1977. 'Filters and control', *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 425-504.

Chung, Sandra - James McCloskey 1987. 'Government, barriers and small clauses in Modern Irish', *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 173-237.

Comrie, Bernard 1989 [1981]. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Corrigan, Karen   1993. 'Hiberno-English syntax: Nature versus nurture in a creole context', *Newcastle and Durham Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 95-131.

Crowley, Terry 1992. *An introduction to historical linguistics.* (Auckland: Oxford University Press).

Curtis, Edmund 1919. 'The spoken languages of medieval Ireland', *Studies* 8: 234-254.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems.* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Dal, Ingerid. 1952. 'Zur Entstehung des englischen Participium Praesentis auf *-ing*', *Norsk Tidskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 16: 5-116.

Dalphinis, M.   1985. *Caribbean and African languages. Social history, language, literature and education.* (London: Karia Press).

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane 1995. 'Middle English is a creole and its opposite', in Fisiak (ed.) 35-50.

Danchev, Andrei   1988. 'Language contact and language change', *Folia Linguistica*

22,1-2: 37-53.

Davis, A. 1984. 'Behind the *for-to* filter: *For-to* infinitives in Belfast English and the theory of government', *Sheffield Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* 1: 56-71.

Day, R. (ed.) 1980. *Issues in English creoles*. (Heidelberg: Julius Groos).

de Fréine, Séamus. 1965. *The great silence*. (Cork: Mercier). 1977. 'The dominance of the English language in the 19th century', in ÓMuirithe (ed.) 127-149.

DeCamp, David - Ian Hancock (eds.) 1974. *Pidgins and creoles: Current trends and prospects*. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press).

Denison, David 1985. 'The origins of periphrastic *do*: Ellegård and Visser reconsidered', in Eaton et al. (eds.) 44-60.

Dillard, Joey Lee 1970. 'Principles in the history of American English - paradoxy, virginity, and cafeteria', *Florida Foreign Language Reporter* 8:1: 32-33, 46. 1972. *Black English. Its history and usage in the United States*. (New York: Random House). 1992. *A history of American English*. (London: Longman).

Dolan, Terence P. (ed.) 1990. *The English of the Irish. Irish University Review, Commemorative Issue for Alan Bliss* 20:1.

Domingue, Nicole Z. 1977. 'Middle English: Another creole?', *Journal of Creole Studies* 1: 89-108.

Dowling, Patrick J. 1971. *A history of Irish education*. (Cork: Mercier).

Duncan-Rose, Caroline - Theo Vennemann (eds.) 1988. *Rhetorica, Pragmatica, Syntactica: A festschrift for R.P.Stockwell*. (Routledge: New York).

Dunn, Richard S. 1972. *Sugar and slaves: The rise of the planter class in the West Indies, 1624-1713*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).

Eastman, Carol (ed.) 1992. *Code-switching*. (Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters).

Eaton, Roger - et al. (eds.) 1985. *Papers from the 4th international conference of English historical linguistics*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Edmondson, Jerold A. - Crawford Feagin and Peter Mühlhäusler (eds.) 1990. *Development and diversity. Linguistic variation across time and space. A festschrift for Charles-James N.Bailey. Publications in Linguistics 93* (University of Texas at Arlington: The Summer Institute of Linguistics).

Ellegård, Alvar 1953. *The auxiliary* do. *The establishment and regulation of its use in English. Gothenburg Studies in English 2* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell).

Elworthy, Frederic T. 1877. 'The grammar of the dialect of West Somerset', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 79: 143-257.

Fasold, Ralph - Deborah Schiffrin (eds.) 1989. *Language change and variation*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Faverey, M. - B.Johns and F.Wouk 1976. 'The historical development of locative and existential copula constructions in Afro-English creole languages', in Steever, Walker and Mufwene (eds.) 88-95.

Filppula, Markku 1990. 'Substratum, superstratum and universals in the genesis of Hiberno- English', in Dolan (ed.) 41-54.

1991. 'Urban and rural varieties of Hiberno-English', in Cheshire (ed.) 51-60.

1993. 'Changing paradigms in the study of Hiberno-English', *Irish University Review* 23:2: 202-223.

Fisiak, Jacek (ed.) 1988. *Historical dialectology*. (Berlin: Mouton-de Gruyter).

1990. *Further insights into contrastive linguistics*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

1995. *Language change under contact conditions*. (Berlin: Mouton-de Gruyter).

Foster, Robert F. 1988. *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*. (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Givón, Talmy 1979. *On understanding grammar*. (New York: Academic Press).
 1982. 'Tense-aspect-modality: The creole prototype and beyond', in Hopper (ed.) 114-163.
Goodman, Morris   1971. 'The strange case of Mbugu (Tanzania)', in Hymes (ed.) 243-254.
Greenberg, Joseph 1966. *The languages of Africa*. (The Hague: Mouton).
Greene, David 1979. 'Perfects and perfectives in modern Irish', *Ériu* 30: 122-141.
Groot,C.de - H.Tommola (eds.) 1984. *Aspect bound*. (Dordrecht: Foris).
Guilfoyle, Eithne 1983. 'Habitual aspect in Hiberno-English', *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 22-32.
 1986. 'Hiberno-English: A parametric approach', in Harris, Little and Singleton (eds.) 121-132.
Guy, Gregory R. 1990. 'The sociolinguistic types of language change', *Diachronica* 7: 47-67.
Görlach, Manfred 1986. 'Middle English - a creole?', in Kastovsky and Szwedek (eds.) 329-344.
Görlach, Manfred - John Holm (eds.)   1986. *Focus on the Caribbean*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins). *Varieties of English around the World, General Series*
Haiman, John - ed. 1985. *Iconicity in syntax*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
Hancock, Ian 1971. 'West Africa and the Atlantic creoles', in Spencer (ed.) 113-122.
 1980. 'Gullah and Barbadian: Origins and relationships', *American Speech* 55: 17-35.
 1984. 'Romani and Angloromani', in Trudgill (ed.) 367-383.
 1986. 'The domestic hypothesis, diffusion and componentiality: An account of Atlantic anglophone Creole origins', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 71-102.
Hancock, Ian (ed.) 1986. *Diversity and development in English-related creoles*. (Ann Arbor: Karoma).
Handler, Jerome S. - Frederick W.Lange 1978. *Plantation slavery in Barbados: An archaelogical and historical investigation*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Harlow, Vincent T. 1926. *A history of Barbados, 1625-1685*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Harris, John 1983. 'The Hiberno-English 'I've it eaten' construction: What is it and where does it come from?', *Teanga* 3: 30-43.
 1984. 'Syntactic variation and dialect divergence', *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 303-327.
 1986. 'Expanding the superstrate: habitual aspect markers in Atlantic Englishes', *English World-Wide* 7: 171-199.
 1991. 'Conservatism versus substratal transfer in Irish English', in Trudgill and Chambers (eds.) 191-212.
 1993. 'The grammar of Irish English', in Milroy and Milroy (eds.) 139-186.
Harris, John - David Little - David Singleton (eds.) 1986. *Perspectives on the English language in Ireland: Proceedings of the First Symposium on Hiberno-English, Dublin 1985*. (Dublin: Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College).
Haugen, Einar   1969. *The Norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior*. (Bloomington, Indiana: University Press).
Heine, Bernd - Ulrike Claudi - Friederike Hünnemeyer 1991. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Hendrick, R. (ed.) 1990. *Syntax and semantics, Vol.23: The syntax of the modern Celtic languages*. (San Diego: Academic Press).

Henry,Alison 1992. 'Infinitives in a *for-to* dialect', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10: 279-301.

1995. *Belfast English and Standard English. Dialect variation and parameter setting*. (Oxford: University Press).

Henry,Patrick Leo   1957. *An Anglo-Irish dialect of North Roscommon*. (Zürich: Aschmann and Scheller).

1958. 'A linguistic survey of Ireland. Preliminary report', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap [Lochlann, A Review of Celtic Studies]* Supplement 5: 49-208.

1960. 'The Irish substantival system and its reflexes in Anglo-Irish', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 28: 19-50.

1977. 'Anglo-Irish and its Irish background', in Ḟ Muirithe (ed.) 20-36.

Heuser, Wilhelm   1904. *Die Kildare-Gedichte. Die ältesten mittelenglischen Denkmäler in anglo-irischer Überlieferung*. (Bonn: Hanstein).

Hickey, Raymond 1983. 'Remarks on pronominal usage in Hiberno-English', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 15: 47-53.

1984a. 'Coronal segments in Irish English', *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 233-251.

1984b. 'Syllable onsets in Irish English', *Word* 35: 67-74.

1985a. 'Salient features of Irish syntax', *Lingua Posnaniensia* 28: 15-25.

1985b. 'The interrelationship of epenthesis and syncope, evidence from Irish and Dutch', *Lingua* 65: 229-249.

1986. 'Possible phonological parallels between Irish and Irish English', *English World Wide* 7: 1-21.

1988. 'A lost Middle English dialect: The case of Forth and Bargy', in Fisiak (ed.) 235-272.

1990. 'Suprasegmental transfer: On prosodic traces of Irish in Irish English', in Fisiak (ed.) 219-229.

1993. 'The beginnings of Irish English', *Folia Linguistica Historica* 14: 213-238.

1995a. 'An assessment of language contact in the development of Irish English', in Fisiak (ed.) 109-130.

1995b. 'Early contact and parallels between English and Celtic', *Vienna Working Papers in Linguistics VIEWS*) 4,2: 87-119.

1996. 'Lenition in Irish English', *Proceedings of the Conference on Language in Ireland, June 1994*

forthcoming. 'Language contact and typological difference: Transfer between Irish and Irish English', in Kastovsky and Mettinger (eds.)

Hickey, Raymond - Stanisław Puppel (eds.) 1996. *Language history and linguistic modelling. A festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th birthday*. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).

Holm, John 1986a. 'Substrate diffusion', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 259-278.

1986b. 'The spread of English in the Caribbean area', in GÓrlach and Holm (eds.) 1-22.

1988. *Pidgins and creoles, Vol.1: Theory and structure; Vol.2: Reference survey*. (Cambridge: University Press).

1994. 'English in the Caribbean', in Burchfield (ed.) 328-381.

Hope, Jonathan 1994. *The authorship of Shakespeare's plays*. (Cambridge: University Press).

Hopper, Paul (ed.)   1982. *Tense-aspect. Between semantics and pragmatics*. (Amsterdam: Benajmins).

Hopper, Paul - Elizabeth Traugott 1993. *Grammaticalization*. (Cambridge: University

Press).

Hornstein, Norbert - David Lightfoot (eds.) 1981. *Explanation in linguistics. The logical problem of language acquisition.* (London: Longman).

Hume, Abraham 1878. *Remarks on the Irish dialect of the English language.* (Liverpool: T.Brakell).

Hymes,Dell (ed.) 1971. *Pidginization and creolization of languages.* (Cambridge: University Press).

Ihalainen, Ossi 1976. 'Periphrastic *do* in affirmative sentences in the dialect of East Somerset', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 67: 608-622.

Jones,Bernard 1992. 'William Barnes and the south west dialect of English', in Rissanen et al. (eds.) 556-565.

Kallen, Jeffrey 1986. 'The co-occurrence of *do* and *be* in Hiberno-English', in Harris, Little and Singleton (eds.) 133-147.

  1989. 'Tense and aspect categories in Irish English', *English World Wide* 10: 1-39.

  1990. 'The Hiberno-English perfect: Grammaticalisation revisited', in Dolan (ed.) 120-136.

  1991. 'Sociolinguistic variation and methodology: *after* as a Dublin variable', in Cheshire (ed.) 61-74.

  1994. 'English in Ireland', in Burchfield (ed.) 148-196.

Kastovsky, Dieter - Aleksander Szwedek (eds.) 1986. *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries. In honour of Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday.* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).

Kastovsky, Dieter - Arthur Mettinger (eds.) forthcoming. *Language contact in the history of English.* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).

Kaye, Jonathan - Hilda Koopman, Dominique Sportiche, André Dugas (eds.) 1983. *Current approaches to African linguistics. Vol.2.* (Dordrecht: Foris).

Keesing, Roger M. 1991. 'Substrates, calquing and grammaticalization in Melanesian Pidgin', in Traugott and Heine (eds.) 315-342.

Kittay, Eva 1987. *Metaphor. Its cognitive force and linguistic structure.* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Kroch,Anthony S. 1989. 'Function and grammar in the history of English: Periphrastic *do*', in Fasold and Schiffrin (eds.) 133-172.

Lass, Roger 1990a. 'Early mainland residues in southern Hiberno-English', in Dolan (ed.) 137-146.

  1990b. 'How to do things with junk: Exaptation in language evolution', *Journal of Linguistics* 26: 79-102.

  1993. 'Proliferation and option-cutting: The strong verb in the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries', in Stein and Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) 81-114.

Lass, Roger - Susan Wright 1986. 'Endogeny vs. contact: Afrikaans influence on South African English', *English World Wide* 7: 201-223.

Le Page, Robert B. - Andrée Tabouret-Keller 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* (Cambridge: University Press).

Lehiste, Ilse 1988. *Lectures on language contact.* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Lehmann, Christian 1986. 'Grammaticalization and linguistic typology', *General Linguistics* 26: 3-23.

Lightfoot, David 1979. *Principles of diachronic syntax.* (Cambridge: University Press).

  1981. 'Explaining syntactic change', in Hornstein and Lightfoot (eds.) 209-240.

  1988. 'Creoles, triggers and universal grammar', Duncan-Rose and Vennemann (eds.) ???.

  1991. *How to set parameters. Arguments from language change.* (Cambridge, Mass.:

MIT Press).

Littlefield, Daniel C. 1981. *Rice and slaves: Ethnicity and the slave trade in colonial South Carolina*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press).

Markey, Thomas L. 1982. 'Afrikaans: Creole or non-creole?', *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 49: 169-207.

Matthews, William 1939. 'South Western dialect in the early modern period', *Neophilologus* 24: 193-209.

McCawley, James 1976 [1971]. 'Tense and time reference in English', in McCawley 257-272.

 1976 [1971]. *Grammar and meaning: Papers on syntactic and semantic topics*. . (London: Academic Press).

McCloskey, James 1984. 'Raising in Modern Irish', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 441-485.

 1986. 'Inflection and conjunction in Modern Irish', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4: 245-281.

 1991. 'Clause structure, ellipsis and proper government in Irish', *Lingua* 85: 259-302.

McCoard, Robert 1978. *The English perfect: Tense-choice and pragmatic inferences*. (Amsterdam: North Holland).

Meisel, Jürgen (ed.) 1979. *Pidgins - Creoles - Languages in contact*. (Tübingen: Narr).

Melchers, Gunnel - Nils-Lennart Johannesson (eds.) 1994. *Nonstandard varieties of language*. (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell).

Milroy, James - Lesley Milroy (eds.) 1993. *Real English. The grammar of the English dialects in the British Isles. Real Language Series* (London: Longman).

Moody,Theodore W. - Francis X.Martin (eds.) 1994 [1967]. *The course of Irish history*. (Cork: Mercier).

Mufwene, Salikoko 1900. 'Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in creolistics', *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 12: 1-23.

 1986. 'The universalist and substrate hypotheses complement one another', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 129-161.

Mufwene, Salikoko (ed.) 1993. *Africanisms in Afro-American language varieties*. (Athens/London: University of Georgia Press).

Muysken, Pieter (ed.) 1981. *Generative studies on creole languages*. (Dordrecht: Foris).

Muysken, Pieter - Norval Smith (eds.) 1986. *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis. Papers from the Amsterdam creole workshop, April 1985*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Myers-Scotton, Carol 1992. 'Comparing codeswitching and borrowing', in Eastman (ed.) 19-39.

Mühlhäusler, Peter 1980. 'Structural expansion and the process of creolization', in Valdman and Highfield (eds.) 19-55.

Newmeyer, Frederick (ed.) 1988. *Linguistics. The Cambridge survey. Vol.2*. (Cambridge: University Press).

Niles,Norma 1980. *Provincial dialects and Barbadian English*. PhD thesis. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan).

Ó Baoill, Dónall 1990. 'Language contact in Ireland: The Irish phonological substratum in Irish English', in Edmondson, Feagin and Mühlhäusler (eds.) 147-172.

Ó Baoill, Dónall (ed.) 1985. *Papers on Irish English*. (Dublin: Irish Association of Applied Linguistics).

Ó Háinle, Cathal 1986. 'Neighbours in eighteenth century Dublin: Jonathan Swift and Seán Ó Neachtain', *Éire - Ireland* 21: 106-121.

Ó Muirithe, Diarmuid (ed.) 1977. *The English language in Ireland*. (Cork: Mercier).

O'Rahilly, Thomas F. 1926. 'Notes on Middle Irish pronunciation', *Hermathena* 44: 152-195.

  1932. *Irish dialects past and present*. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan).

Ogura, Mieko 1993. 'The development of periphrastic *do* in English: A case of lexical diffusion in syntax', *Diachronica* 10: 51-85.

Poussa, Patricia 1982. 'The evolution of early Standard English: The creolisation hypothesis', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 14: 69-85.

  1990. 'A contact-universal origin for periphrastic *do* with special consideration of Old English-Celtic contact', in Adamson et al. (eds.) 407-434.

Rickford, John R. 1974. 'The insights of the mesolect', in DeCamp and Hancock (eds.) 92-117.

  1977. 'The question of creolization in Black English', in Valdman (ed.) 199-221.

  1980. 'How does *doz* disappear?', in Day (ed.) 77-96.

  1983. 'What happens in decreolization?', in Andersen (ed.) 298-319.

  1986. 'Social contact and linguistic diffusion: Hiberno-English and New World Black English', *Language* 62: 245-290.

  1988. *Dimensions of a creole continuum*. (Stanford, California: University Press).

Rizzi, Luigi 1986. 'Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*', *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501-558.

Romaine, Suzanne 1981. 'The transparency principle: What is is and why it doesn't work', *Lingua* 55: 277-300.

  1988. *Pidgin and creole languages*. (London: Longman).

Rosch, Eleanor H. 1977. 'Human categorization', in Warren (ed.) 1-49.

  1978. 'Principles of categorization', in Rosch and Lloyd (ed.) 27-48.

Rosch, Eleanor H. - B.B.Lloyd (eds.) 1978. *Cognition and categorization*. (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates).

Roy, John Dennis 1986. 'The structure of tense and aspect in Barbadian English Creole', in Görlach and Holm (eds.) 141-156.

Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte 1979. 'L'origine des langues romanes - Un cas de créolisation?', in Meisel (ed.) 81-101.

Schneider, Edgar 1990. 'The cline of creoleness in English-oriented creoles and semi-creoles of the Caribbean', *English World-Wide* 11:1: 79-113.

  1996. 'The cline of creoleness in negation patterns of Caribbean English creoles', in Hickey and Puppel (eds.)

Schumann, J. 1978. *The pidginization process. A model for second language acquisition*. (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House).

Seuren, Pieter - Herman Wekker 1986. 'Semantic transparency as a factor in creole genesis', in Muysken and Smith (eds.) 57-70.

Seuren, Pieter - Salikoko Mufwene (eds.) 1990. *Issues in creole linguistics*. Special Issue of *Linguistics* 28:4.

Sheppard, Jill 1977. *The 'Redlegs' of Barbados* (Millwood, NY: KTO Press).

Singler, John V. 1983. 'The influence of African langauges on pidgins and creoles', Kaye et al. 65-77.

Singler, John V. (ed.) 1990. *Pidgin and creole tense-mood-aspect systems*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Spencer, John (ed.) 1971. *The English language in West Africa*. (London: Longman).

Sproat, R. 1985. 'Welsh syntax and VSO structure', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 173-216.

Steever, S.B. - C.A.Walker and S.S.Mufwene (eds.) 1976. *Papers from the parasession*

on diachronic syntax. (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society).

Stein, Dieter - Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade (eds.) 1993. *Towards a standard English, 1600-1800*. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).

Stenson, Nancy 1990. 'Phrase structure congruence, government, and Irish-English code-switching', in Hendrick (ed.) 167-197. 1991. 'Code-switching vs. borrowing in Modern Irish', in Ureland and Broderick (ed.) 559-579.

Stowell, T. 1989. 'Raising in Irish and the projection principle', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 317-361.

Sylvain, Suzanne 1936. *Le créole haÝtien*. (Wettern: Impr. de Meester).

Taylor, John R. 1989. *Linguistic categorization. Prototypes in linguistic theory*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Thomason, Sarah G. - Terence Kaufman 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press).

Todd, Loreto 1984. 'By their tongue divided: Towards an analysis of speech communities in Northern Ireland', *English World-Wide* 5: 159-180.

Traugott, Elizabeth 1972. *A history of English syntax. A transformational approach to the history of English sentence structure*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

 1977. 'Pidginization, creolization, and language change', in Valdman (ed.) ???.

Traugott, Elizabeth - Bernd Heine (eds.) 1991. *Approaches to grammaticalization. 2 Vols*. (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

Trudgill, Peter 1986. *Dialects in contact*. (Oxford: Blackwell).

Trudgill, Peter (ed.) 1984. *Language in the British Isles*. (Cambridge: University Press).

Trudgill, Peter - Jack K.Chambers (eds.) 1991. *Dialects of English. Studies in grammatical variation*. (London: Longman).

Ureland, P.Sture - George Broderick (eds.) 1991. *Language contact in the British Isles. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe*. (Tübingen: Niemeyer).

Valdman, Albert (ed.) 1977. *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Valdman, Albert - Arnold Highfield (eds.) 1980. *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*. (New York: Academic Press).

Vallancey, Charles 1787-1788. 'Memoir of the language, manners, and customs of an Anglo-Saxon colony settled in the baronies of Forth and Bargie, in the County of Wexford, Ireland, in 1167,1168,1169', *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 2: 19-41.

Versteegh, Kees 19??. 'The substratum debate in creole linguistics', *Diachronica* ???.

Visser, F.Th. 1963-73. *An historical syntax of the English language. Parts I-III*. (Leiden: Brill).

Wagner, Heinrich 1959. *Das Verbum in der Sprachen der britischen Inseln*. (Tübingen: Niemeyer).

Wakelin, Martyn F. 1977 [1972]. *English dialects: an introduction*. 2nd edition. (London: Athlone Press).

Warren, N. 1977. *Studies in cross-cultural psychology*. (London: Academic).

Weinreich, Uriel 1953. *Languages in contact*. (The Hague: Mouton).

Wells, John C. 1983. 'The Irish element in Montserrat Creole', in Carrington et al. (eds.) 124-129.

 1994. 'The Cockneyfication of R.P.?', in Melchers and Johannesson (eds.) 198-205.

Weltens, Bert 1983. 'Non-standard periphrastic *do* in the dialects of south west Britain', *Lore and Language* 3:8: 56-64.

Williams, Jeffrey P.   1986. 'Hiberno-English and White West Indian English - the historical link', in Harris et al. (eds.) 83-94.

  1988. 'The development of aspectual markers in Anglo-Caribbean English', *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 3: 245-263.

Wurm, Stefan - Peter Mühlhäusler (eds.) 1985 *Handbook of Tok Pisin (New Guinea Pidgin)*. (Canberra: Australian National University).