The purpose of the present paper is to examine the question of contact between two typologically quite different languages, Irish and English, and the role of this in the development of a specifically Irish variety of English since the beginning of the early modern period in the seventeenth century. Care should be taken to note that the concern in the present paper is with the origin of features of Irish English and not with their further development in latter-day non-contact situations.\(^1\) There will be no definitive statement made as to whether contact is responsible for the many idiosyncratic characteristics of Irish English particularly in its syntax. Ultimately proof of contact as a source of non-standard features in a variety is never forthcoming no matter how convincing a case can be made for contact origins. In the final analysis it is a matter of belief whether one accepts a contact hypothesis or not. However, one can render contact more probable by presenting the case in a linguistically convincing manner.\(^2\) One of the major difficulties is that the contact case for Irish English has been exaggerated by Celtic scholars, perhaps because of a false sense of loyalty to Irish. Indeed many linguistically sound analyses of Irish English have come from authors who do not favour contact as the default source for non-standard syntactic structures.\(^3\) The time would appear to have come to redress the balance somewhat not simply by restating uncritically the stance of older authors but by offering a new analysis, above all by considering in more detail the structure of Irish and by taking into account all necessary factors, such as syntactic principles, morphological type, intonational patterns, etc. and by assessing the systemic status of elements suspected of having their origin in contact.

1 Preliminaries on contact

Contact-based explanations are as old as historical linguistics itself. Broadening out for a moment from Irish to the group of languages to which it belongs one sees that the possible influence of Celtic on neighbouring languages has had more than its fair share of attention from linguists. The reason for this lies not so much in an undue affinity with the Celtic world as in the doors it opens for contact theories seeing as how the Celts from their first appearance in history have been in contact with many peoples whose languages developed unexpected features. A comprehensive assessment of these is not the aim of the present study but it would be perhaps appropriate to mention the main instances with a view to arriving at a clearer picture of types of contact.
Contact with Germanic

One of the defining features of the Germanic branch of Indo-European is initial stress accent which separates it from other more conservative sub-groups of the family such as Slavic or Baltic. The fixing of stress can be postulated to have occurred by about around 500 B.C., for both Celtic and Germanic (Salmons, 1984: 269ff., 1992: 87ff.). Salmons notes that accent shift, particularly a fixed, stress accent is a common feature in language contact situations and postulates that in Germanic it could have stemmed from Celtic going on the assumption (1984: 274) that the Celtic group was dominant over the Germanic one.\textsuperscript{4}

Contact with Western Romance

(1) The development of /y/ The notion that the high front rounded vowel of French derived from Celtic contact was apparently an idea first proposed by G.-I.Ascoli. A good earlier examination of the arguments for and against this are to be found in Wartburg (1950) where he has a chapter ‘Die Auswirkung des Gallischen’ (The effect of Gaulish) in which he enumerates the changes which he sees as being due to Celtic influence such as the development of $ct > xt > it$ (due supposedly to frequent palatalization in Celtic languages). For $u > ū$ in French he gives a very detailed treatment (1950: 36-51). Wartburg is a good example for an author who is sceptical about presupposing that contact is the source of a hitherto unexplained feature. Basically he says there are three objections to Celtic influence here: 1) sometimes /u/ causes velarisation and not fronting, 2) the shift to /y/ is not complete in French and 3) its distribution is not co-terminous with that of the Celtic area of Gaul.

Modern argumentation is based on the alternation of /i/ and /u/ in Welsh; also found in Celtic words such as BRUS, BRIS which give Old French bruiser (Mod Fr. briser) and English bruise. Note that /y/ is not found in Celtic anymore. The Welsh alternation is between /i/ and a centralized /i/. In Scottish Gaelic and Ulster Irish there is a fronted realisation of /u/ [u] but this is unconditional, ie not due to anything like umlaut.

(2) Lenition in Western Romance The particularistic case of /y/ in French is a weak case for contact origin.\textsuperscript{5} Paradoxically, the more general assumption that the weakening of consonants in Western Romance could be due to substrate influence from Celtic speakers is on a much sounder footing. Lenition is a general feature of French and Iberian Romance and of course of all the Celtic languages. The arguments for Celtic origin have been put forward on a number of occasions, the best presentation being that of Martinet (1952) where he claims that both the historical loss of intervocalic and final consonants in French and the present-day alternations in Spanish of the same kind as the lenition which has been morphologised in all the Celtic languages.

This line of argument has been taken up by many authors since such as Delattre who maintains (1964: 322ff.; 1969/70) that the lax pronunciation of the Celts in Gaul had a significant effect on the pronunciation of Vulgar Latin in this region and compares Old French with modern English in the strong stress on a syllable in a word with accompanying weak stress on other syllables (the syllable-timing of Modern French is a relatively recent development). Delattre is sometimes vague in his statements and not all his arguments are equally convincing, see the opposing views of Fowkes (1966) who examines modern Welsh to partly dismantle some of Delattre’s more extreme claims about features of Celtic and Old French.

The curious fact of this putative influence is that as a general directive in Celtic
consonant lenition may well have migrated to the Romance dialects with which it was in contact. This is quite clearly the case in Ireland where the same lenition as a general make-up feature of Irish has spread into English. The case for contact, however, breaks down if one tries to maintain a one-to-one correspondence of lenited elements on a segmental level.

(3) **Head marking** Nichols in her examination of typological features within a very large cross-section of languages suggests (1992: 273f.) that the head-marking (rather than dependent-marking) tendencies of colloquial French could be a response to contact in general, specifically the result of contact with Celtic or ‘the result of pure peripherality of location’.

### 1.1 Types of contact

Any discussion of language contact and ensuing transfer must take the various types of contact and the results for the languages involved in this contact into account. For the present discussion one must distinguish two basic types. The first is *direct transfer* where the effect is immediate, frequently with alteration in the structure of the recipient language. Immediate influence on closed classes of a language (morphology and syntax) presumes intensity of contact and a lack of external constraints such as a notion of standard, perpetuated by general education and a literate public.

The second main type can be termed *delayed effect* contact. The effect is not immediate. There is no structural upheaval in the recipient language but a gradual penetration due to prolonged exposure to another language by large bilingual sections of a community. Characteristic for such a scenario is low-level influence in a general sense: ‘speech habits’ migrate from one language to another. These may lead later to structural if not indeed typological change. The development of Gaulish French [y], if it has its origins in contact with Celtic (see above), must have occurred in this manner. This view of gradual change is of course more Neogrammarian than one which presupposes the sudden appearance of a contact phenomenon in a recipient language. If Celtic had /y/ at the time of the initial development of Latin to French in Gaul (which is by no means certain) then an abrupt appearance could only have occurred in a scenario which assumes lexical diffusion: the Romance speakers started borrowing words from the Celts and among these words would have been some with /y/ and this pronunciation would have then spread to encompass native sections of their vocabulary causing a shift of U to /y/.

### 1.2 Sources for features

When viewing the characteristic features of Irish English one can recognise three possible situations. It is by no means possible to assign features unambiguously to these positions as the evidence is undecisive.

Features which only have an Irish source The view is commonly held that virtually the only Irish English structure which can definitely be attributed to direct Irish influence (Harris, 1984:319f.) is the use of after and present participle to express an immediate perfective aspect (see section 5 below). This is certainly the easiest case as there is no model in other varieties or archaic forms of English which could have been an input to Irish English in this case. In addition, it represents a quite natural metaphorical extension of a locative statement to the temporal sphere (Hickey 2000) and hence could
travel well across a language barrier. However, there are a number of other phenomena which can be traced back to Irish if they are analysed properly, see the section on convergence below.

*Features from Irish or dialect/archaic forms of English* This group is that which has provoked the contact sceptics to turn away from Irish as a source. The following are two clear examples. (i) The distinction between second person singular personal pronouns in Irish English (*you* for the singular and various forms for the plural: *ye* [jì], *youse* [jùz], *yez* [jìz], the differential use of the latter is sociolinguistically significant). (ii) The use of the word order O(V(non-finite)) to indicate the resultative perfective aspect: *I’ve the book read* ‘I am finished reading the book’ which contrasts with *I’ve read the book* ‘I read it once’. The object-verb word order has of course precedents in the history of English and corresponds to the original Germanic sentence brace which is still to be seen in German (*Ich habe das Buch gelesen*). But equally it has an equivalent in Irish in which the past participle always follows the object: *Tá an leabhar léite agam* lit.: ‘is the book read at-me’.

*Features which have no Irish model* Care should be taken here: some features which exist represent transfer on a general level and might not be recognised as such although they have a substratal source. A case in point in lenition in Irish English (see below). Apart from such deceptive cases there are phenomena which do not have any parallel in Irish. Certain aspects of Dublin English can be treated under this heading, such as the breaking of long vowels or more recent changes such as the Dublin vowel shift (retraction of /ai/ and raising of /o, œ, œ+/; Hickey 1998, 1999) which represent developments independent of Irish and not immediately traceable to the varieties of English imported into Ireland.

2 The speech community in early modern Ireland

The presence of English in Ireland can be divided into two main periods. The first is that from the initial invasion of Anglo-Norman overlords and the English in their retinue (1169 onwards) up until the renewed campaign of Anglicisation by the Tudors which culminated in the defeat of the Irish at the Battle of Kinsale in 1601 and the subsequent suppression of specifically Irish forms of social organisation. The second period begins after this and continues up to the present day. The external circumstances were provided by the plantations of large parts of the south of Ireland by English who were assigned land, largely as a reimbursement for services as mercenaries in the years of military strife during and after the Civil War (1642–9). At the beginning of the seventeenth century, English was spoken in the towns of the east coast from Dublin in the centre down to Waterford in the south east and in Galway and Limerick in the west where English survived from the first period. There were also a few isolated rural pockets of English speakers. But in all these locations Irish was the vibrant language of the majority, in the countryside this was totally so, as the former rival here, Anglo-Norman, had long since been abandoned when the Norman settlers of the 12th and 13th century assimilated to the numerically superior Irish who surrounded them.

*Status of early modern period* The critical period for the contact situation which obtained in Ireland is from the renewed settlement of Ireland in the seventeenth century to
the wholesale decline of Irish as a first language after the Great Famine and the subsequent mass emigration in the nineteenth century (de Fréine, 1966). For this time span one must bear other salient aspects in mind. The first is that there was no organised education in English for the Catholics, ie for the vast majority of the population, this having been prohibited by the so-called Penal Laws which started in 1695. Any formal instruction which the native Irish may have had was gained from so-called hedge-schools,8 an uncoordinated system of self-taught wandering teachers who eked out a living teaching the local population the rudiments of written English and a small selection of other subjects (Dowling, 1968 [1936], 1971). This situation is interesting in itself. Bliss (1977) maintained that the hedge-school system led on the one hand to different stress patterns in Irish English with respect to standard English: Either (i) through a lack of knowledge due to the sole experience of English in written form or (ii) because of old stress patterns preserved as archaic features in Irish English and on the other hand to an abundance of malapropisms: Confusion among phonetically similar words or wrong semantic application of a word. Indeed it is no coincidence that the term ‘malapropism’ comes from a figure (Mrs. Malaprop) in the Irish play The Rivals (1775) by Richard Brinsley Sheridan. For the development of a unique feature of Irish English what is important to note is that no normative forces were operative in the period of greatest transition from Irish to English. The Irish were motivated to learn English as it led to social opportunity, or at least was the precondition for this arising. But the process of transition was a long one which meant that there was a protracted period of better or worse bilingualism which obviously facilitated transfer from Irish to English.

Planners and their English One can accept that at the beginning of the modern period, Irish was by far and away the dominant language in Ireland. This situation changed, initially on a legal level when English was reinforced as the official language. By the middle of the seventeenth century the practical effects of English influence were beginning to be felt as large numbers of non-aristocratic English moved to Ireland to settle there permanently. These immigrants form the layer in Irish society known as planters. They would seem to have been socially identifiable as a group and in the early 18th century no less an author than Swift was to ridicule the English they spoke which had come under the strong influence of Irish. This he did in his Irish eloquence and A dialogue in the Hybernian stil which exhibit lexical items as characteristics of planter English. Now note that these pieces were written just two generations after the Cromwellian plantations. One would indeed expect that lexical items would be the first forms of interference to appear in the English of these settlers.

The planters were dialect speakers mainly from the west and north-west of England. When in Ireland their contact with speakers of south-eastern mainland English was negligible. One indirect piece of evidence of this is the fact that no bundles of dialect features corresponding to established features of mainland English dialects are to be found in Ireland. This would seem to point to an adoption of Irish speech habits and a levelling of dialect differences after settlement in Ireland.

Of greater significance is the considerable contact of the planters with their Irish servants and tenants, something which would suggest an influence of the speech of the latter on the former. This opinion is shared by most scholars on the subject. Bliss (1976:557), for instance, supports the view that the planters were cared for by Irish nurses and had contact with the children of the native Irish something along the lines of the model for the development of the English of whites in the south of the United States with respect to the African American population.

For early modern Irish English, it is not what the planters spoke that is of
relevance but what type of English the Irish learned. True the planters will certainly have passed on their variety of English to their offspring, but the sheer numbers of the local Irish would make their language the more likely of the two to have been formative in the genesis of a specifically Irish form of English.9 One should add furthermore that the planters ceased to be an identifiable social group in the course of the 18th century. On a social level they doubtlessly merged into the urban Irish who were in somewhat better positions than their rural counterparts. On the other hand many planters who were affluent became part of that (Protestant) rural gentry which is known in Ireland as the ascendency class, part of the lower aristocracy and better-off farmers of the 18th and 19th centuries, much admired by Yeats and much derided by later more realistic writers such as Louis MacNiece (Foster, 1988:167ff.).10

The main consideration remains the manner in which the overwhelmingly large Irish-speaking section of the population acquired English. Taking both extremes of the second period one can recognise that Ireland moved from an almost-entirely Irish-speaking community to a largely English-speaking country in which there are some very small pockets of Irish speakers along the western seaboard and in which there is a general consciousness of the Irish language for vaguely nationalistic but non-linguistic reasons.

When examining the manner in which the Irish acquired English from the mid-17th to late-19th centuries it has been noted above that there was no means of formal instruction. The upshot of the lack of education and the obvious fact that the planters did not teach the Irish English in any systematic way is that the Irish acquired English of their own accord, to a limited extent through informal tuition but more often than not by picking up as much English as they could from those members of their community who could already speak English. This held for many urban dwellers and for those who had contacts with the English. The details of the process are not known as there are no historical documents on the subject. But it is known that the Irish soon realised that the acquisition of English was to their social advantage. Prominent political figures like Daniel O’Connell (early 19th century) urged the native Irish to acquire English as best they could in order to increase their chances of social advancement. MacNamara (1973:36) says that the Irish have indulged in instrumental bilingualism11 as there were distinct advantages to be accrued from a knowledge of English but were not motivated by the desire to integrate themselves into and identify with the community of English speakers. Furthermore it is remarkable that the numerous Irish emigrants to the United States in the 19th century abandoned their native language virtually instantaneously. There is no diaspora form of Irish,12 contrast this with many other European ethnic groups which showed and to some extent still show a high degree of language retention.

The fact that the Irish learned English from each other has several consequences. One is that the switch-over to English was a very slow process. It really only got under way in the course of the 19th century when the native population was decimated by the Great Famine of the late 1840s and subsequent massive emigration set in, chiefly to America, often via England, this fact feeding the Irish section of the population in Merseyside, Liverpool being the natural port of arrival for the Irish on their crossing to Britain.

Before 1850 there are no reliable census data on the number of Irish speakers. The first census was in 1851 (Adams, 1974, 1979) but this shows that for large sections of rural Ireland well over half the population13 spoke Irish and this two centuries after the energetic re-Anglicisation of Ireland had begun. It is safe to assume that those Irish, above all in rural areas, who knew English did not have anything like native knowledge. Rather they would have typically used it in certain well-defined situations where they
had dealings with English speakers: in contact with urban dwellers such as merchants, with native English-speakers such as bailiffs and tax collectors, or at least with those whose English was better than average and who would have, for reasons of social aspiration, chosen to neglect what Irish they had.

2.1 Possible creolisation

The scenario depicted above is one of imperfect bilingualism in which Irish would have been the vernacular in the sense of the most natural and vital of the two languages for the speakers in question. This type of situation is one in which they could well have been incipient creolisation of English as some authors have suggested going on linguistic evidence (Corrigan, 1993). Before attempting a conclusion about the possible creole nature of early Irish English it would be instructive to consider just what features would be required to legitimately classify it as a creolised variety of English. For a much fuller discussion of the issues touched on here, see Hickey (1997a).

Phonology Creoles have restricted phonological inventories and phonotactics. English-based creoles typically shift dental fricatives to stops and simplify clusters. Irish English has it is true plosive equivalents to English dental fricatives, i.e. [t, d] for /θ, ð/ but there is no marked simplification of clusters, for instance sequences of fricative and plosive are legal, e.g. desk is [desk]. Clusters may be broken up by vowel epenthesis (see below) but this is clearly a transfer phenomenon from Irish. Plosives for dental fricatives can also be interpreted in this light.

Grammar Restructuring of, and not just transfer from, the lexifier language is characteristic of true creoles, indeed this is their defining internal feature, analytic plurals being a clear example where say a deictic element in pre-head position is used as exponent of the grammatical category in question. Them has been a likely candidate as plural marker in the formation of English-based creoles. There is nothing like this shift to an analytic type in Irish English.

The verbal area in creoles is that which offers most similarity with Irish English. The first salient characteristic of the verbs in creoles, and one which is not found in Irish English, is serialisation where two or more verbs are concatenated in a sentence like ‘He went look buy sugar’. The second feature is the use of pre-verbal particles for modification purposes, typically to express tense, modality or aspect (Schneider, 1990: 89ff.) e.g. go for the future done for past state (as in ‘He done marry his sister’, Feagin, 1991).

Irish English offers two instances of this type of modification which are possibly from Irish.

1)  \textit{Do + be} to express habitual aspect as in \textit{He does be in his office every morning}.

2)  \textit{After +} present participle to express immediate perfective aspect as in \textit{He is after drinking the beer}.

In this connection one should mention front-focussing structures like \textit{it}-clefting which are characteristic of Caribbean creoles and Irish English.
Fronting is not solely a feature of creoles; furthermore Irish influence on the development of Caribbean forms of English cannot be excluded (Bailey, 1982; Williams, 1986, 1988; Roy, 1986).

**Lexicon** Given the initial impoverished lexicon of creoles, they tend to use polysemy, semantic extension or periphrasis to cover the lexical range required of them certainly in later creolisation, constructions like Tok Pisin gras bilong fes ‘beard’, gras bilong hed ‘hair’ being standard examples of this phenomenon. Again there is no evidence of this in Irish English.

Reduplication is found in creoles but is absent from Irish English with the exception of the phrase *at all at all* ‘not at all’ where it would seem to have derived from the rhythmic similarity with the semantically equivalent Irish phrase *ar chor ar bith* (Hickey, 1990).

**External circumstances** A number of facts would seem to point away from a creole interpretation of Irish English. Firstly the Irish were too close to England and too often confronted with more or less standard forms of the language by speakers either originating from England or in the case of urbanites from the east indeed native speakers of the language. Secondly the Irish shared a common native language. 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. Anything like abrupt creolisation is ruled out for Irish English as there was no shift in population.14

Imperfect acquisition of English would mean for a speaker of Irish that the latter would have had a continuing influence on the former. 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.

In a situation of imperfect bilingualism structural transfer is at a premium (Weinreich, 1953; Haugen, 1969). Lexical transfer does not presuppose such a scenario. Just consider the many instances of cultural borrowing where the two languages in question are not in speaker contact (Modern German and English for instance).

Now looking at the deviant features of Irish English today, one finds a fair share of them in syntax, an area not affected by indirect language contact.

### 2.2 Code-switching

In recent years much attention has been paid to code-switching, for instance in the speech of Latin American (mostly Mexican) immigrants in the south-west of the United States and it has been examined as a possible locus of language change.15

The simplest kind of code-switching involves lexical items from one language strewn into sentences in another language. Certainly this is a phenomenon which is observable in present-day Irish vis à vis English (Stenson, 1990, 1991). The motivation for this is usually extra-linguistic. A speaker of Irish referring to a phenomenon which he/she associates with the English-speaking areas of the country will probably use English key-words, for example ‘cancer, operation, therapy’ when talking of disease as this is something which would be associated with (major) hospitals which are not

(1) a It’s to Dublin he’s gone today.
   b It’s her brother who rang up this morning.

---
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located in the Irish-speaking areas. During the development of Irish English the situation would have been the reverse: speakers could be expected to have used code-switching for terms which they associated with their native Irish domestic background. Such code-switching may have been a temporary phenomenon during the period of transition from Irish to English, a pre-stage to lexical borrowing before the elements used in the second language are more or less permanently established. However there are no references to this codeswitching and it is not parodied by those authors who chose to caricature Irish English at the beginning of the modern period (Bliss, 1979).

Syntactic code switching is a different matter. Basically there are three types: tag-switching, inter-sentential (Pfaff, 1979), intra-sentential switching (Poplack, 1980). The second is the most structurally dependent (Berk-Seligson, 1986; Clyne, 1987) requires certain joints or cross-over points at which one can dock onto the second language. Such points are typically clause breaks or major constituent boundaries. The structure which follows must be in keeping with the syntactic expectations of the beginning of the sentence and be syntactically interpretable to other members of the bilingual community. Prosody plays an important role here as well: a large degree of agreement in the number of stressed (and perhaps) unstressed syllables favours syntactic code-switching. The syntactic contact phenomena of Irish English may have had their origin in this type of switching seeing as how the deviant structures often match the prosodic structure of the Irish original. The absence of such a match could be used to explain why certain central features of Irish were not transferred into English such as the system of prepositional pronouns. Here the elements which correspond functionally to subjects are placed in clause-final position (see examples under (16) below). There is no way, however, in which English could have a stressed element expressing subjecthood at the end of a clause or sentence so that transfer is excluded. Indeed none of the attestations of Irish English, even those showing heavily influenced syntax, involve translations of prepositional pronouns to indicate the subject of a sentence in English.

### 2.3 Convergence

Among the possible scenarios for language contact there is that of language convergence where two or more languages come to resemble each other in the course of time. There are well-known cases such as that of the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian contact area (with retroflexion of consonants as a shared feature for instance, Emeneau, 1956; Gumperz, 1971) or that of the the Balkans (for a comprehensive discussion of features, see Schaller, 1975). These models are not, however, applicable to Ireland. The main reason is that English (in Ireland) has not been influenced in its morphology if one neglects the retention of a distinction between singular and plural with second person pronouns which has had support due to the similar distinction in Irish. Furthermore although Irish latterly has been influenced by English (Ó Cuív, 1951:54) there is a chronological staggering involved here: English came under the influence of Irish from the beginning of the early modern period onwards and Irish in the present-century shows the effects of the decline in monoglot speakers in the transfer phenomena which appear. But this is not a convergence of linguistic systems on a more or less equal footing and it is only this would lead to features arising comparable to say the post-positive article or the loss of the infinitive or the pleonastic use of personal pronouns found in most of the Balkan languages.

If one moves from a consideration of structural elements to that of low-level phonetic phenomena then one finds that there are areal features in Irish and English in
Ireland. Two examples of this are particularly salient. The first is vowel epenthesis and the second consonant lenition.

**Epenthesis** This is determined in both Irish and Irish English by phonotactics. In Irish there are severe restrictions on the types of clusters which can occur, thus a sequence of two sonorants is impermissible, particularly one where the first is a liquid.

(2) a *feilm* [fʰeɪlm] ‘farm’
    b *arm* [aɾm] ‘arm’

The distribution of epenthesis varies within the different dialects of Irish. Its scope is greatest in Munster Irish (in the south, Breatnach, 1947:16f.) where it occurs, as elsewhere, in clusters of liquid and fricative. Here, however, the usual condition that the cluster affected by epenthesis be within a single syllable does not apply (second example below).

(3) a *garbh* [garəv] ‘rough’
    b *dorcha* [dɔɾəɾə] ‘dark’

Now this epenthesis has spread to all varieties of (southern) Irish English the latter adopting the phonotactic rules of Irish in this respect. The scope is not quite as great as in Irish, for instance clusters of liquid and fricative are not affected (4a) but it applies universally to sequences of *l* and a following sonorant (4b+c).

(4) a *swerve* [swərv]
    b *film* [fɪlm]
    c *helm* [hɛlm]

**Metathesis** Connected with epenthesis is the metathesis of consonants which is widely attested in Irish (de Bhaldraithe, 1945:115f.; Ó Cuív, 1944:127f.; de Búrca, 1958:136f.) and also found to a limited extent in English in Ireland. The motivation for the most common cases would appear to be the resolution of phonotactically unacceptable clusters. In Irish this is historically well documented. For instance in the Anglo-Norman period (late 12th to 14th centuries) many loans from French entered Irish with affricates. Where these were in initial position they were simplified, in internal or final position the elements of the affricates were metathesised practically without exception.

(5) a *chaumbre* > *seomra* /sɔməra/ ‘room’
    b *page* > *páiste* /pəsɪɛsta/ ‘child’
    c *college* > *coláiste* /kələsɪəsta/ ‘college’

In Irish English metathesis has the frequent function of resolving heavy syllable codas consisting for instance of */r/* and a sonorant, a purpose which is fullfilled by epenthesis is the cases of */l/* and a sonorant, see above.

(6) a *pattern* [ˈpætərn]
    b *modern* [ˈmɒdrən]
Lenition The relationship between Irish and Irish English with regard to lenition may at first appear tenuous as there is a lack of phonetic correspondence in its manifestation. In Irish lenition is a morphological phenomenon which has its origins in phonetic weakening of obstruents in intervocalic (sandhi) environments in pre-Old Irish. Its main realisation is (and has been for the entire period of English in Ireland) the fricativisation of stops and the glottalisation or loss of fricatives. This occurs under certain grammatical conditions.

(7) a ciáll \[\text{\textipa}{k\text{i}a\text{l}}\] ‘sanity’
b a cháil \[\text{\textipa}{\sigma \text{x}\text{i}a\text{l}}\] ‘his sanity’
c saol \[\text{\textipa}{\text{s}\text{i}:l}\] ‘life’
d do shaol \[\text{\textipa}{\text{d}\text{o}\text{ hi}:l}\] ‘your life’

The existence of morphological lenition and the similar process of nasalisation in Irish represents one of the major typological differences in the grammars of Irish and English. There is obviously nothing similar to it in the morphology of Irish English. And yet if one considers lenition in a more general light as a phonological directive to weaken segments in inherently weak environments then there is a good deal of common ground between both languages. In Irish English alveolars in intervocalic positions and before a pause are weakened to corresponding fricatives ([\text{\textipa}{\text{t}}]) symbolises an apicoalveolar fricative, Hickey, 1984).

(8) a Italy \[\text{\textipa}{\text{i}\text{t}\text{o}l}\] b tight \[\text{\textipa}{\text{t}\text{a}l}\]

It would seem that the principle of lenition as a weakening process has been transferred to English in Ireland but not of course its manifestation in the donor language. Here one can see that lenition as a directive has been able to straddle the typological divide between both languages.

The above considerations show that while one would look in vain for structural similarities between Irish and English there are shared peripheral phenomena which are usually associated with the textbook linguistic convergence areas such as the Baltic with regard to tone or the Balkans as mentioned above. If one also takes northern Ireland and Scotland into account then more such features can be distinguished. For instance the high mid realisation of /u:/, i.e. [\text{\textipa}{\text{u}}], is an areal feature which holds for most of Scotland, large parts of Ulster and notably for Ulster (Donegal) Irish. Another feature is the lack of phonemic vowel length. For many varieties vowel length is predictable on the grounds of the phonetic environment as specified in the Scottish Vowel Length Rule (Aitken, 1981). This also applies to Ulster Irish English showing a continuum from Scotland down the south west into northern Ireland.

3 Characterising Irish syntax

Before examining structures in Irish English a brief characterisation of Irish should be offered to set the framework for later discussion. Probably the most well-known fact about Irish is that, like other Celtic languages, it has a verb-subject-object word-order as seen clearly in the next example.
(9) Chuaigh sé thar sáile bliain ó shin.
(went he over sea year from this)
‘He went abroad a year ago.’

This word-order is absolute in Irish. If one wishes to topicalise some element in a sentence by fronting (the normal means in Irish) then this is done by clefting with subordination of the main clause.

(10) Is thar sáile a chuaigh sé bliain ó shin.
(it-is over sea that he went year from this)
‘He went abroad a year ago.’

Irish has roughly the same division of word classes as does English. However, the status of these is quite different. Irish is what one can call a nouncentred language. By this is meant that apart from denoting objects, entities, ideas, etc. Irish uses nouns with great frequency when referring to actions as well. Here a support verb is found with a noun carrying the main semantic load.

(11) Rinne sé dearmad faoi.
(did he forget-noun under-it).
‘He forgot it.’

In such structures what in English would be a direct object appears in the genitive in Irish.

(12) Lig siad fios bhur rúin linn.
(released they knowledge your secret-genitive with-us)
‘They revealed your secret to us.’

A further function of the genitive which testifies to its established position in Irish is its use after nouns where in English one would have an adjective.

(13) Mo theanga dhúchais.
(my tongue inheritance-genitive)
‘My native tongue.’

As might be expected Irish makes use of the various avenues opened up by this nominalisation. Thus with the word for ‘length’ fad one has it applies in a number of situations in which English would have an adjective or adverb.

(14) a Tá a thrí fad ann.
(is its three length in-it)
‘It’s three times as long.’

b Chuir sé a fhad eile leis.
(put he its length other-adj with-it)
‘He made it as long again.’

c Tá fad na teanga air.
(is length tongue-genitive on-him)
‘He is very talkative.’
d  *Fad is a bhí mé ann.*
(length and comp was-rel I in-it)
‘As long as I was there.’

It will have been noted that in the above sample sentences there occur forms which unite prepositions and pronouns in a single word. These are the prepositional pronouns of Irish which play a central role in the syntax of the language. There are sixteen of them in all and they can combine with any one of the seven personal pronouns; below a selection is offered to give an impression of what these synthetic forms look like.

(15) Base form 1SG./PL. 2SG./PL. 3SG.M./PL. 3SG.F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ag ‘at’</th>
<th>agam</th>
<th>agat</th>
<th>aige</th>
<th>aici</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agaimh</td>
<td>agatb</td>
<td>aige</td>
<td>aici</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar ‘on’</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>uirthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orainn</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td>ort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faoi ‘under’</td>
<td>fúm</td>
<td>fút</td>
<td>fúithi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fúinn</td>
<td>fút</td>
<td>fúithi</td>
<td>fúthu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le ‘with’</td>
<td>liom</td>
<td>leat</td>
<td>leis</td>
<td>léi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linn</td>
<td>leat</td>
<td>leis</td>
<td>léi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A central part of the semantics of Irish is realized by extended use of locative and deitic prepositions in combination with personal pronouns. To convey some of the flavour of such structures consider the following sentences.

(16) a  *Tá dhá orlach agam air.*
(is two inch at-me on-him)
‘I am two inches taller than him.’

b  *Nil dul uaidh agat.*
(is-not going from-it at-you)
‘You cannot escape it.’

c  *Nil teacht agam air.*
(is-not coming at-me on-it)
‘I cannot reach it.’

d  *Nil an teanga ó dhúchas aige.*
(is-not the language from inheritance at-him)
‘He is not a native speaker.’

e  *Is fada liom uaim í.*
(is far with-me from-me she)
‘I miss her a lot.’

Indeed the prepositional pronouns can express a subject relation with a verb (first example below) or subject relevance with a type of passive (second example) when used with the common impersonal form of a verb.

(17) a  *Rugadh mac di.*
(born-impersonal son to-her)
‘She gave birth to a son.’

b  *Múchadh an tine orm.*
(extinguish-impersonal the fire on-me)
‘The fire was put out on me.’ i.e.
‘Someone put out the fire which I had started, was attending, etc.’

Lastly one should mention that contrast is often realized by a different choice of prepositional pronoun as can be seen in (a) and (b) below and that a verb is frequently missing with such constructions, the prepositional forms being sufficient (c) and (d).

(18) a  Rinne sí gáire liom.
         (did she laughter with-me)
         ‘She smiled at me.’

b  Rinne sí gáire fúm.
       (did she laughter under-me)
       ‘She laughed at me.’

c  Seo chugainn i.
       (here towards-us she)
       ‘Here she is coming towards us.’

d  Fúithi féin atá sé.
       (under-her herself that-is it)
       ‘It’s up to herself.’

4 What gets transferred?

The above very brief sketch of Irish is hopefully sufficient to convey an impression of just how typologically different Irish is from English without even considering the morphology, let alone the phonology of the language. The central question is now: which if any of the above structural types get transferred into English?

Nominalised syntax (Henry, 1960) in English is typical for contact speakers in the western seaboard today and is regarded by the English monoglots of the rest of the country as rather antiquated nowadays, somewhat reminiscent of stage Irish and typical of writers such as Synge who attempted to capture something of the flavour of Irish syntax in the English they employed, albeit it with considerable poetic license.

Now consider in general what items of a language get transferred most easily to another. There is little doubt that free-standing discourse elements pass from one language to another quite easily, cf. German with sure, sorry, ok, bye-bye from English. In Irish one has well from English and in Irish English one had formerly the filler arrah from Irish with more or less the meaning of ‘no matter, whatever’.

Looking at other elements in a language one can ascertain that idioms and individual lexical items travel well as they too are stand-alone elements in a language and can be prised out of the donor language without any structural consequences. Contrariwise elements which have their origin in semantically transparent regular paradigms do not move easily assuming a strong typological difference between donor and recipient language. Consider this latter fact in connection with Irish. The prepositional pronouns sketched above have not been transferred into English as they are part of the morphological and semantic lattice of Irish and obviously this cannot have been transferred to English. However, if a prepositional pronoun were separate from the others already within Irish it could be regarded as susceptible to transfer as the following example would appear to show.

(19) a  ‘Twas a bad day that was in it.
         B’é droch lá a bhí ann.
b) That’s all that’s in it.
Sin an méad atá ann.
(that the amount comp-is in-it)

In Irish the third personal pronoun with the preposition *in ‘in’, ie *ann ‘in-it’ was hived off from the remaining elements of this paradigm and developed an existential sense from the originally locative one much as German did with the verbal phrase *da sein* (lit.: ‘be there’, ie ‘exist’). After its detachment from the paradigm the existential indicator *ann* was free-floating and a prime candidate for transfer as can been seen from the above instances.

One should perhaps not be too dogmatic about transfer of a productive paradigm from donor to recipient language. There is one situation in which this is nonetheless attested in Irish English. What it involves is reinterpretation of structures which already exist in the target language. The case is point is the use of the preposition *on* with a personal pronoun to express the relevance of an action to an individual (much as the ethical dative in German). This re-interpretation can be seen in the first instance below where the literal meaning is replaced in Irish English by an interpretation in which the relevance of the action to the subject expressed by the pronoun is indicated. In the example two below this second interpretation is the only possible one.

1. (20) a Thit an dréimire orm.
   (cf. German *Mir ist die Leiter heruntergefallen*.)
   (on-me is the ladder fallen-down)
   ‘The ladder fell down on me.’

     b They crashed the car on me.
     ‘They crashed my car, the car I was looking after, etc.’

The transfer of this kind of grammatical category is facilitated where certain conditions are met. Among these are the following: there should be an available morpheme in the recipient language which does not show too much allomorphy and should not be homophonous with markers of other categories and the morpheme used should be immediately translatable, ie other speakers in the contact situation should be able to identify and isolate it.19

4.1 The question of acceptance

A consideration which is important when examining what gets transferred in a contact situation is just how this transfer arises. I think it is fair to assume that transfer begins on an individual level. Somebody starts by shifting a structure from his/her first language to the second language. This single incidence of transfer must, if it is to establish itself in the contact variety of the second language, be interpretable for other contact speakers. This imposes a restriction on restructuring the second language. The higher the degree of transparency with an interference form the greater the chance of its being accepted or spontaneously arising on several fronts so to speak, ie of it occurring with large numbers of speakers.

This view of how transfer arises holds for a particular type of contact situation where there is no prestige group within the community of contact speakers. If this were the case, however, then an item of transfer could diffuse through the community from its
origin within a prestige group, in an extreme case from a single individual of high status in this group. The latter kind of scenario applies to German today vis à vis English (where there is no speaker contact involved). Certain key sectors of society such as the visual media, fashion, technology, industry and science are usually the source of a loan which is often accepted generally due to the high status of such sectors of the community.

4.2 Pressure for transfer

An additional question must be addressed within the sphere of transfer. This concerns the motivation for transfer. To answer this one must make a two-fold distinction among types of transfer. The first is what one can term low-level transfer which shows slight consciousness among speakers and which derives ultimately from speech habits, mainly phonetic, which are so ingrained as to be impossible to abandon when speaking a new language. The second type is systematic transfer the origin of which can be seen in the search of speakers, conscious or unconscious, for equivalence of categories between the outset and the target languages. This situation can lead to remoulding in the recipient language when categories from the donor language are found missing. The phenomenon can be clearly recognised with a switch-over from one language to another by an entire community over a relatively long period of bilingualism as is attested for the history of English in Ireland from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries.

If one bears in mind that pressure to transfer results from the desire to express a category not available in the target language then one can explain why the canonical VSO word order of Irish has not been carried over into Irish English. This structure is of no informational value and hence does not represent a category for which contact speakers would have felt a need in English. VSO word-order is an aspect of Irish syntax but it does not represent a category for which there is no ready equivalent in English. However, there are several such categories a couple of which will be looked at briefly now.

5 Perfectives in Irish and Irish English

There are two major aspectual types in Irish, the habitual and the perfective. Both occur frequently and show no restriction to any subset of verbs. The first is the resultative perfective. This emphasises that the state which is envisaged as the end point of an action has indeed been reached. It is a telic construction (Dahl, 1985) much like the telic Aktionsarten of German as with verbs like aufessen ‘eat up’, aufbrauchen ‘use up’ which imply arriving at a pre-defined endpoint. The following are examples of the resultative perfective in Irish English (Hickey 2000).

\[(21)\] a He has the job done.
\[\text{Tá an obair déanta aige.}\]
\[\text{(is the work done at-him)}\]

b They have the house built.
\[\text{Tá an teach tógáilte acu.}\]
\[\text{(is the house built at-them)}\]

Given the telic nature of the resultative perfective construction, it is not applicable to sentences with stative verbs (Harris, 1984:312), so that an example like the following is impermissible:
(22) *I have something about Russian grammar known.

The second type of aspect common in Irish is the **immediate perfective**. Here the stress is placed on the fact that the action denoted by the verb has just taken place.

(23) a He’s after breaking the window.
    Tá sé tar éis an fluinneog a briseadh.
    (is he after the window comp break-non_finite)

b She’s after eating her dinner.
    Tá sí tar éis a dinnéir a ithe.
    (is she after her dinner comp eat-non_finite)

The above sentences carry the implication that the action is very recent and would typically be used in a narrative situation. It is not the attainment of a goal which is stressed but the fact that the action has just been completed.

Now consider the sentences in (21) for a moment. The Irish sentence in each case has the usual initial verb, the subject NP (functionally an object) followed by the non-finite verb form and closing with a prepositional pronoun. In the Irish English construction the only restructuring which has taken place is that the order of non-finite verb form and object is reversed. The prepositional pronoun is ignored. This is in keeping with the view that in the process of transfer an equivalence between major categories is enough, here verb and object. Indeed this stands to reason if one considers that transfer in a contact situation first arises on an individual level. Were too much restructuring undertaken then the likelihood of acceptance by others in the contact community would diminish. Furthermore in sentences of the kind in (21) above, any transfer of the prepositional pronouns ‘at-him’ or ‘at-them’ would not be of any informational value as the subject reference is conveyed in English quite simply by the finite verb form.

A further point should be made in connection with sentences of the kind in (21). This is that the intonational pattern of Irish is carried over into Irish English. In the Irish original there is strong stress on both the object and the non-finite verb form i.e. Tá an /obair /déanta aige. In Irish English both these elements also carry strong stress so that (21a) is pronounced ‘He has the /work /done’ and not ‘He has the /work \done.’

Indeed the role of intonation in the identification of possible transfer structures should not be underestimated. Consider the clause coordination below which is regarded by some authors, but by no means by all, as resulting from Irish.

(24) Chuaigh mé ag siúl /agus /é ag cur /báistí.
    (went I at walking and it at putting rain)
    ‘I went for a walk /and /it /raining.’
    *‘I went for a walk \and \it /raining.’

What is important here is that the coordinating conjunction, the dummy subject and the non-finite verb form all carry primary stress in both Irish and Irish English, an indication that the construction in the latter is the result of transfer from Irish (Ó Siadhail, 1984). Note that the unstressed elements *ag cur* (literally: ‘putting’) are of no relevance here as it is the number of stressed syllables which must match, the length of a foot is immaterial. In addition of course the meaning of the sentence in both languages is ‘I went for a walk in spite of the fact that it was raining’.
6 Supportive transfer

With many structures in Irish English, syntactic or morphological, Irish may have played a supportive role but it is by no means the only source which needs to be considered. This may of course have been the case with the word-order ‘object + past participle’ discussed above. There are many other features of Irish English which could be retentions from earlier forms of English, particularly if one bears in mind that the speakers of the varieties brought to Ireland in the early modern period were in the main from the west or north west of England (the south-west played a greater role in the settlement of Ireland at the end of the medieval period, as of the late 12th century, Hickey 1997b). Arguments for two sample features of Irish English are offered here to show what the correspondence between Irish and English would look like.

The first concerns the occurrence of for with an infinitive. The use of for as a general preposition of purpose in English as in He asked for help is quite well established. The use with the infinitive is of course non-standard but very much present in localised forms of Irish English. The argument for supportive transfer from Irish derives from the fact that here the preposition chun, which has the general meaning ‘for’, is found with infinitives.

(25) *He went to Cork for to buy a car.*  
    *Chuaigh sé go dtí Corcaigh chun gluaisteán a cheannaigh.*  
    (went he to Cork for car to buy).

An instance from the area of morphology is the retention of a separate form for the second person plural personal and possessive pronouns. The actual manifestations of these vary greatly in Irish English and some of the differences are attributable to the linguistic distinction between the north and south of the country, the form yez being more typical of the north, the form ye more general in the south, while youse is stigmatised (in the south) as popular Dublin English. Whatever the form found, the distinction between singular and plural is one which is present and active in Irish as can be seen in the glosses for (a) and (b) below.

(26) a  
    *Have ye [ji] got yeer [jir] homework done yet?*  
    *An bhfuil bhur cleachtannaí déanta agaibh fós?*  
    (interrog is your-pl exercises done at-you-pl already)  

b  
    *What are the two of ye [ji] up to?*  
    *Cad tá an beirt agaibh ag déanamh?*  
    (what is the two at-you comp doing)

7 What about the lexicon?

A brief glance at Irish English is enough to recognise that of all linguistic levels the lexicon is that which shows least transfer as an open class which enjoys high consciousness among speakers.25 If large amounts of lexical borrowing is an indication of superstrate status (recall the examples of Modern German and English or Middle English and Central French) then the lack of this would point to the low status of the potential donor language. This would appear to be indeed the case. It is obvious that cultural borrowings from Irish into English are not to be expected given the discrepancy
in status between the two languages which increased steadily in the second period of English in Ireland.

But there is a further twist to this. The lexicon of Irish is quite different from that of English. Irish has few borrowings from Latin compared to English and neo-classical neologisms exist in theory but are scarcely used by native speakers. Furthermore, the Irish lexicon, with its heavy reliance on nouns where English would use adjectives often conveys to speakers of other languages a sense of pathos and pseudo-poeticness which is not felt by speakers of Irish. Take the sentence Tá fad na teanga air. (is length tongue-genitive on-him) ‘He is very talkative’ mentioned above. If translated literally (‘The length of the tongue is on him’) it evokes a sensation of floweriness which results from the metaphoric use of ‘length’ and ‘tongue’. Added to this is the fact that for many English-speaking Irish this heavily nominalised syntax is regarded as antiquated usage, smacking of stage Irish. With attitudes like this it is not surprising that those Irish striving to acquire English would not have wished to transport such lexical elements or structures into the new language.

8 Conclusion

In the present paper the main typological differences between Irish and English have been enumerated and discussed. It has become apparent that only some of these differences are of relevance to a consideration of transfer between the two languages. One can maintain that when a category is lacking in the target language there will be pressure to transfer from the source language and hence the possibility of interference is greatest. This perhaps why on the one hand there has been no transfer of VSO word order from Irish but there have been attempts to represent the aspectual distinctions of Irish not found in English. This is all the more understandable if one bears in mind that most of the Irish learned English in a situation of uncontrolled adult second language acquisition where categorial equivalence to structures found in the first language (Irish) would have been expected in English and constructed through transfer, if not already present, as with the different distinctions of verbal aspect. Furthermore, one must distinguish carefully between the transfer of a distinction in principle and the exponence used to realise this distinction in the target language. This perspective can help to explain how lenition in Irish English is a phenomenon linked to Irish although the phonetic manifestation varies greatly across the two languages.

Notes

1 This has been done elsewhere, for instance by Kallen (1989, 1990) in his treatment of aspectual types in Dublin English.

2 As has been done in more recent contributions such as Filppula and Ó Baoill, see other references in Filppula and Ó Baoill (1990).

3 See the various publications by John Harris such as Harris (1983, 1984, 1986, 1991).

4 Salmons (1984:118) is inconclusive on the direction of influence (Celtic to Germanic or vice versa) and just points to Celtic domination.
This applies to similar cases such as tracing Spanish /h/ from Latin F back to a Basque substratum in Ibero-Romance. It is true that Basque originally did not have /f/ (only latterly in loanwords) but the /h/ from F might just as well have been an internal development in Spanish. Of course the articulatory motivation for this may well stem ultimately from lenition as a make-up feature of Spanish which in its turn may be a contact feature. This puts the contact source at one remove but in fact increases its plausibility.

See Appel and Muysken (1986) for a taxonomy of contact.

There were a number of attempted large-scale settlements in the late 16th century undertaken by the Tudors in the centre of the country and in the central-south in Munster (in 1585, Hayes-McCoy, 1967:183) but their demographic effect was marginal).

This is a reference to the practice of instruction out of doors to facilitate quick dispersal if confronted suddenly with the authorities.

Thomason and Kaufman (1988:43) assume that there was no emulation of English features of Irish speakers by the descendants of settlers but that given that the first group was very much more numerous their ‘speech habits prevailed anyway’.

There is arguably an accent of Irish English which is fairly close to standard forms of southern British English and which is known as the ‘ascendancy accent’. However, this has never been linguistically defined and the features it exhibits are in the opinion of the present author more likely if anything to be discourse features and in general non-linguistic.

The distinction between ‘integrative’ and ‘instrumental’ bilingualism derives from Lambert, see Gardner and Lambert (1972). In essence the difference is that integrative bilingualism is practised by the speakers of a community who wish to partake in the social life of the second language’s community. Instrumental bilingualism characterises those speakers who learn a second language for utilitarian reasons without any subjective commitment to it.

Or practically none, see Kallen (1993).

Estimates for the beginning of the 19th century (Hindley, 1990:9), ie in the pre-Famine period (Freeman, 1957), suggest that over two-thirds of the south was still overwhelmingly Irish-speaking, that is the linguistic Anglicisation of the country did not tip the balance in favour of English until after the Great Famine in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Note that not all authors agree on these estimates, Ó Cuív (1986: 384ff.) is more conservative in his assumptions concerning the numbers of native speakers in the pre-1851 period.

Given the clear defining features of creoles the designation is treated as binary.
Terms such as semi-creole or creoloid are not regarded as appropriate in the present context.


16 Sankoff and Poplack (1981) visualise two constraints: (i) the free morpheme constraint (no switching at a point of bound morphemes) and (ii) the equivalence constraint: switches tend to occur at points where the juxtaposition of elements from both languages does not conflict with a syntactic rule from either language. In their government and binding analysis DiSciullo, Muysken and Singh (1986) and Singh (1985) maintain that switching is only possible between elements which are not related by government, ie where the last element before a switch may be dominated by a previous category but does not itself dominate a further category.

17 This would certainly apply to alveolars in English which are often tapped (in forms of American English) or reduced to a glottal stop (forms of urban British English) as in [raɪə] and [raɪə] respectively.

18 Jakobson (1931) mentions polytony as a typical phenomenon which occurs in language areas: the Baltic area with most Scandinavian languages, North German (dialectally), North Kassubian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Livonian and Estonian. In all these languages (except Lithuanian and Latvian) this is an innovation (p. 137f.). See Lehiste (1988: 65ff.) for a critical re-appraisal of Jakobson's original ideas.

19 See Holm (1988, I:67) for a discussion of similar conditions for substratal influence in the genesis of pidgins and creoles.

20 This type of language shift is dealt with by Edwards (1992), Romaine (1989:38ff.) and by Hoffmann (1992:186ff.). Hoffmann (1992:190ff.) sees the prestige of the second language as largely responsible for the shift and quotes the decline of the Celtic languages as an instantiation of this.

21 There is evidence that even in Dublin Irish was used side by side with English in a literary capacity as late as the eighteenth century. A group of poets, the most noted of whom was one Seán Ó Neachtain, had set up base in Dublin and were active writers and contemporaries of Swift (Ó Cuív, 1986: 393f.). Ó Neachtain is the author of a burlesque Stair Éamuinn Uí Chléire which is of linguistic interest because in it he ridicules the efforts of the Irish to speak English and gives examples which show a heavy influence of Irish syntax (Ó Cuív, loc. cit.).

22 The complex of syntactic influence of Irish on English has been treated in particular detail by Filppula, see Filppula (1982, 1986, 1990, 1991) as representative publications.
23 For a discussion of the different definitions of the terms aspect and Aktionsart in the linguistic literature, see Brinton (1988:3ff.).

24 The term hot news is frequently used by authors dealing with aspect in Irish English, see Kallen (1989:11) and Harris (1991:201) for recent examples. This goes back to McCawley (1971) in his classification of aspect types. It is the equivalent of the term immediate perfective which I use here. The designation resultative perfective is standard usage, again see Harris (1991:202). With reference to the treatment of perfective constructions offered in Greene (1979) some authors speak of PII (= resultative perfective) and PI (= immediate perfective). As these cryptic labels are difficult to remember correctly they will not be used here. The resultative perfective with after is recorded for the first time quite early on (1690).

Other typically Irish syntactic structures surface much later, for instance the habitual present with do + be appears in print only at the beginning of the 19th century (Bliss, 1976:558).

25 Thomason and Kaufman (1988:129) note the large amount of phonological and morphosyntactic interference from Irish into Irish English and the comparative lack of lexical transfer and indeed postulate that the few items there are may well have been introduced by English speakers confronted with Irish rather than by speakers of Irish English themselves.

26 These are recorded in the main Irish-English dictionary, see Ó Dónaill (1977).
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