na Cille, or indeed in the general speech of the people as represented by the Hartmann/de Bhaldraithe research project of the early 1960s now being edited and published by Arndt Wigger. The influence of English on this type of Irish is minimal and is limited to lexicon. There is little, if any, English influence on the phonology, morphology or syntax. It is as if English never existed. The same cannot be said of the type of Irish spoken today.

It is this understanding of language change that informs my contention that the language I call Traditional Late Modern Irish (i.e. Irish since c. 1700) is on its last legs, and that it will be extinct, for all intents and purposes, by about 2050, by which time the last speakers will all be dead. The ratio between older usage (i.e. that which conforms with Late Modern Irish) and new usage (i.e. that which does not and which is represented by what I will term Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish) is about 80:20 at the moment. As happened in the case of the change from Middle to Modern Irish, I believe the ratio will continue to change so that in another 50 years the ratio will be 20:80.

The most telling characteristic of Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish is that a monoglot speaker of Traditional Late Modern Irish would struggle to understand much of it, especially a lot of what is found in our contemporary literature. In other words, knowledge of English is a pre-requisite to the understanding of Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish. This is caused, in the main, by the unnatural influence of English phonology and syntax on the contemporary language so that much of contemporary Irish is really nothing more than an imitation of English.

While no one is immune from the influence of English, the main offenders are the media, journalists of every description, and the thousands who are learning Irish as a second language, but who do not understand that they need to learn it correctly.

3. Lexical and Syntactic Equivalence

The main characteristics of this new type of Irish manifest themselves in three areas: Phonology, Morphology and Syntax. I will confine myself to Syntax. While there is, generally speaking, a certain amount of lexical equivalence between any two languages, it is the difference in (or lack of) syntactic equivalence which distinguishes them from each other, and which makes them two distinct and different languages.

---

A very simple example of what I mean is seen in the common idiom, found in many languages, that expresses the universal concept that different people have different ways of doing things. In English, it is usually rendered by *When in Rome, do as the Romans do*; in German by *Andere Länder, andere Sitten*. The usual literary equivalent of this in Irish is (or used to be, at any rate) *Ní lia tír ná gnás*, i.e. ‘There are more customs than there are countries’.

When we compare these three proverbs, we see that they express (more or less) the same concept. However, there is no direct lexical nor syntactic equivalence between them. Rather, the equivalence can be described as indirect. It is *indirect* as there is no similarity between the words (nor indeed the syntax) used in the phrases which express the concept.

It is more than likely that your typical speaker of Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish will be familiar with the concept contained in the above, but unfamiliar with the way Traditional Late Modern Irish expresses it. Faced as he is with this dilemma (on a daily basis) the speaker of Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish will fall back (as he always does) on his native language, English. In this, his mother tongue, the concept is embodied in the expression *When in Rome, do as the Romans do*. This is *transferred* (as opposed to *translated*) directly into Irish as something like *Nuair a bhíonn tú sa Róimh, déan ar nós na Rómhánach*. Here the equivalence is said to be direct. Needless to say, the new expression stinks of Anglicism and corrodes the linguistic integrity of the traditional language.

Other examples of the type of thing Irish is faced with are some of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time will tell</td>
<td>Is maith an scéalaí an aimsir</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time will tell</td>
<td>Inseoidh (an t-) am</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one is perfect</td>
<td>Ní bhíonn saoi gan locht</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one is perfect</td>
<td>Níl aon duine foirfe</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence is golden</td>
<td>Is binn béal ina thost</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence is golden</td>
<td>Tá (an) ciúnas órga</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is happening therefore is that the lexical (but more alarmingly the syntactic equivalence) between the two languages is becoming more and more direct, something which is leading to the transformation of Traditional Late Modern Irish into Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish.

However, this transformation is limited not just to lexicon and syntax. It is taking its toll on Morphology, as well. The reason for this is very simple. As Eng-
lish is no longer an inflexional language, there is no equivalent in English to inflected nominal or adjectival forms (as found in the genitive or nominative plural). Nor is there any equivalent to the initial mutations (Lenition and Nasalization) found in Irish.

In terms of Phonology, we are faced with the same problem. There is no equivalent in English to the grammatical function of the palatalization of consonants to distinguish, for example, between singular and plural forms of the noun or to distinguish between 1st and 2nd sg. preterite verbal forms. This is one of the many reasons that palatal consonants are disappearing in Irish. Another reason is that the phonological system of Irish is being slowly eroded and abandoned due to its replacement by that of English. This is heard mostly in the speech of non-native speakers, but native speakers are not free from this disease either (*Gaeilge an Chlochair*).

Added to this is the suspicion that there is an unwritten policy at work in both TG4 and RTÉ NOT to use native speakers for television or radio advertisements. Much of what passes for Irish language broadcasting on TG4 and RTÉ is presented by non-native speakers who insist on pronouncing Irish with English phonology, English syntax and idiomatic conventions. The two best-known are Hector and Manchán, two of TG4’s most popular ‘stars’. However, the killer of all this is that people keep saying that they love these programmes because they can follow the Irish. That speaks volumes. If the truth be told, if these people were to speak English the way they speak Irish, they would be ridiculed and severely condemned.

In many ways, it could be argued that what is happening to Irish today is something akin to what happened to the English language in Ireland in the 19th century when it came in contact with Irish to produce Hiberno-English. The language contact which happened between Irish and English in the 19th century left its mark on three major aspects of the English language – phonology, syntax and lexicon. Similarly today, these are three of the facets of Irish which most obviously betray the influence of English.

4. The Official Languages Act and the Translation Industry

In the last few years, there has been an unprecedented increase in the amount of Irish being written both within and without Ireland. This is due, in no small part, to the Official Languages Act 2003 introduced as a sop to the Irish language movement and as part of a longer-term strategy to eventually isolate the Irish speaking community in Ireland. The act stipulates that all public bodies departments and organs of state must provide certain documents in English and in Irish.
This new development is not without its difficulties. In 1893, when *Conradh na Gaeilge* was founded, native Irish speakers made up over 90% of the Irish-speaking population with the remaining 10% coming from the rest of the population. Today, the situation is the opposite with 90% non-native speakers and 10% native. Thus, the majority of those working in the translation industry are non-native speakers. This, of course, is one of the taboos of translations studies, i.e. the translator should never translate into a target language that is not his first language. In practical terms, this means that you have people, whose grasp of the Irish language is inadequate, working as translators. However, what is happening is not translation, but imitation (*Aithris* vs. *Aistriúchán*) as all too often these translators follow the syntax and idiomatic conventions of English, thus producing what amounts to little more than English in Irish drag.

The translation industry poses a huge threat to the long term vitality of the Irish language. Translators account for the largest proportion of those writing Irish today. Never in the history of the language was so much Irish being written as today. It is difficult to say how much Irish is being written every year, but if we were only to take the annual reports which all public bodies must translate into Irish under the Official Languages Act 2003, we come out with a figure around 6,500,000 words. That is a lot of Irish and a lot of damage to the language. The reality of all of this is that the reader is faced with a type of Irish which is so poor that it has to be translated back into English to understand it. As their grasp of the language is inadequate, you will find very little understanding among most translators of correct or appropriate register. As for the concepts of localization, cultural referencing or internalization, they are as foreign to most of those working in the translation industry as a day without rain to an Irishman.

One of the most contentious areas in which Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish is to be found is in the realm of Terminology. The need for modern terminology has not been caused by the practical everyday requirements of Irish speakers, but by the demands of the translation industry. Much of the terminology being coined by terminologists in Ireland flouts some of the most basic rules of Traditional Late Modern Irish. Very often, it displays a total lack of understanding of the way the language works. The latest example I came across is the term for dental hygienist, i.e. *sláinteolaí déadach*. Now of course anyone who has heard of Fearghus Déadach or Dubhdhéadach will know that the word *déadach* means ‘having teeth’. So *sláinteolaí déadach* actually means a toothed hygienist. What we should expect is *sláinteolaí fiacla* with the noun *fiacail* being used

---

3 Cf. DIL *sv détach.*
to form a genitive plural with adjectival force. But as this concept does not exist in English it will not be found in Irish.4

A further difficulty is the fact that most speakers of Irish today, be they native or non-native, have little if any knowledge of the riches of Traditional Late Modern Irish. They have never been exposed to it and probably never will either. Thus, Irish can no longer draw on the storehouse of the traditional language to form new terms. Another difficulty is that if one were actually to translate something according to the correct and traditional usage of the language, we would be confronted with the problem faced by Aodh mac Duach Dhuibh, king of Oirghialla, in the Early Modern Irish satirical text Tromdhámh Ghuaire, when he was forced to utter “Is maith an duan cibé do thuigfeadh í!,”5 i.e. ‘It’s a great poem (leg. translation) if only I could understand it’.

5. Dynamics of Language Change and Language Death

Language Contact and Language Change is nothing new. Irish is no different. Irish came into contact with whatever language(s) were spoken here when the first Q-Celts arrived in Ireland. It came into contact with British Latin, Ecclesiastic Latin, Old Welsh, Old Norse, Norman French and of course with English.

However, the contact that Irish had with English cannot be compared to any of the previous contacts. English was the only language which managed to become the dominant and prestige language and to cause 99% of the population to abandon their own language.

There are a number of other differences between the changes which happened to Irish in the past and those changes happening today. These are differences we ignore at our peril. The biggest and most significant difference is that the changes which Irish underwent in the past and which led to the transition from Old to Middle to Early and Late Modern Irish were all caused and engineered by native speakers. The change, while triggered and aided by certain external social and political developments, was not an imposed process, but an internal one. The change happening today is, for the most part (as 90% of speakers are non-native) an imposed, external process which is both unnatural and artificial.

Another major difference is that the prestige language (English) is also the world language. It is spoken by everyone in Ireland. It is both an internal and external linguistic enemy. Not only are we being bombarded with English by the

4 While the term consan déadach for a dental consonant does exist, it is perfectly acceptable as déadach means, in this case, ‘stemming from the teeth’.
5 Joynt (1941: l. 70-71).
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international media (America & UK), but the Irish state has an unwritten policy of linguistic assimilation in place since the early 1950s. It was aided in this work by the so-called national public broadcaster RTÉ and, of course, by the Catholic Church which bears much responsibility for the spread of English in the Gaeltacht and the erosion of the indigenous language.

The other main difference between this period of change and all others is that the Irish language is at death’s door. Some, like myself, would contend that the language is moribund. Many – such as Government ministers – will even attempt to (though they should not) deny that the Gaeltacht itself is doomed to die. Think of this: how can a language which needs its own official Act and its own Language Commissioner to protect it from the government of the State in which it is the first official language, not be doomed to die?

6. Lack of Exposure and Critical Mass

The greatest difficulty facing the language, however, is that the number of Irish speakers is simply too low. In 1990, the late Breandán Ó hEithir stated in a report commissioned by Bord na Gaeilge (which they tried to suppress and have yet to publish) that the number of native Irish speakers stood at 10,000. This figure may be a bit too pessimistic; perhaps 30,000-40,000 is nearer to the truth.

The paucity of speakers means that we lack a vibrant Irish language community in which the language could invent, in a natural and unconscious manner, the terminology needed by a modern language. This lack of critical mass is what causes the another obstacle in the growth of the language – the lack of exposure. Exposure to various and many sources is how we learn new words and phrases. The only place your average Irish speaker will learn new phrases is on Raidió Na Gaeltachta. There are not enough occasions on which to interact with other Irish speakers and thereby pick up new phrases and words. On top of this, there are not enough people who speak Irish well enough from whom you would want to learn anything. This problem of lack of exposure is further compounded by the fact that there is no tradition of reading in the Irish language among Irish speakers. The only people who read Irish are academics or writers. Native speakers of Irish do not read their own language. There is no Bild-Zeitung in Irish. Why?

7. Conclusion

It is generally accepted that Language Change and Language Death are by definition mutually exclusive, i.e. you cannot have both. Language Death can be caused by two things: genocide or the abandonment of a language by those who
traditionally spoke it in favour of another. The big question facing the Irish language today is whether that which is happening to the language today amounts to Language Change or Language Death. In this regard, I cannot but think of the words of T.F. O’Rahilly: “When a language surrenders itself to a foreign idiom, and when all its speakers become bilingual, the penalty is death” (O’Rahilly 1932: 121).

This is a question which has been very successfully ignored by all concerned with the Irish language, at home and abroad, especially those who earn their crust from Irish in the Universities and who should know better. A bit like the way the majority of Irish academics have said absolutely nothing about the rape of Teamhair na Rí by the thugs in the National Roads Authority with their building of the M3 motorway.

While Irish may have become more popular in the last few years, the linguistic undercurrent which permeates much of this popularity points to – in my opinion – the demise of the language as we know it. There is a linguistic dichotomy in Ireland which we are unwilling to face up to. What we fail to understand in Ireland is that a threatened language cannot survive if, on the one hand, Irish is no more than a commodity for those who have the luxury of speaking the prestige language as their first language, while on the other, the Gaeltacht – the community which supports the first language of the child – continues to die.

People point to the growth of Gaelscoileanna, TG4, etc., but I always ask myself where the tens of thousands of children who have passed through the Gaelscoileanna system since the early 1970s have disappeared.

While the number of Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish continues to rise, I ask myself why it is that Gaeltacht children must still use lazily and badly translated textbooks in school? How is it that by the age of seven a Gaeltacht child understands that English is the prestige language and that Irish is something it speaks at home with its parents? How is it that by the time a Gaeltacht child enters the second level education system, it speaks, reads and writes better English than Irish?

These questions, as well as the question of whether Non-Traditional Late Modern Irish represents Language Change or Language Death, are the hard questions we need to address in Ireland if we are to be true to ourselves and to the language we choose to speak.
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Abstract

Conventional wisdom since the earliest studies of Irish English has attributed much of what is distinctive about this variety to the influence of the Irish language. From the early philologists (Joyce 1910, van Hamel 1912) through the classic works of Henry (1957, 1958) and Bliss (1979) down to present-day linguistic orientations (e.g. Corrigan 2000 a, Filppula 1999, Fiess 2000, Hickey 2000, Todd 1999, and others), the question of Irish-language influence may be disputed on points of detail, but remains a central focus for most studies in the field. It is not our intention to argue with this consensus, nor to examine specific points of grammar in detail, but, rather, to suggest an approach to this question which (a) takes for its empirical base a sample of the standard language, rather than dialectal material or the sample sentences so beloved of many papers on the subject, and (b) understands Celticity not just in terms of the formal transfer of grammatical features, but as an indexical feature of language use, i.e. one in which English in Ireland is used in such a way as to point to the Irish language as a linguistic and cultural reference point. In this sense, our understanding of Celticity is not entirely grammatical, but relies as well on Pierce’s notion of indexicality (see Greenlee 1973), by which semiotic signs ‘point to’ other signs.

Our focus in assessing Celticity, then, derives in the first instance from an examination of the International Corpus of English (ICE). We have recently completed the publication of the Irish component of ICE (ICE-Ireland), a machine-readable corpus of over 1 million words of speech and writing gathered from a range of contexts determined by the protocols of the global International Corpus of English project. The international nature of this corpus project makes for ready comparisons with other varieties of English, and in this paper we will focus on comparisons with the British corpus, ICE-GB. For references on ICE generally, see Greenbaum 1996; for ICE-GB, see especially Nelson, Wallis and
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Aarts 2002; and for ICE-Ireland, see papers such as Kirk, Kallen, Lowry & Rooney (2003), Kirk & Kallen (2005), and Kallen & Kirk (2007). Our first approach will be to look for signs of overt Celticity in those grammatical features of Irish English which have been put forward as evidence of Celtic transfer (or of the reinforcement between Celtic and non-Celtic historical sources); our second approach will be to look at non-grammatical ways in which texts in ICE-Ireland become indexical of Celticity by less structural means such as loanwords, code-switching, and covert reference using ‘standard’ English in ways that are specific to Irish usage. We argue that, at least within the standard language as we have observed it, Celticity is at once less obvious than a reading of the dialectal literature might suggest and, at the same time, more pervasive than a purely grammatical approach would imply.

1. Introduction

The question of Celticity in Irish English is as old as the interest in Irish English itself. Stanihurst, writing in the 16th century, was not a linguist or a historian in the modern sense, but his note concerning speakers in Wexford who ‘have so aquainted themselves with the Irishe, as they have made a mingle mangle, or gallamaulfrey of both the languages … as commonly the inhabitants of the meanner sort speake neyther good English nor good Irishe’ (Stanihurst 1577: 2v) sets a tone – both in recognising the fact of language contact and in a prescriptivist antipathy towards it – which has continued down to the present day. Early writers such as Hume (1877-78), Burke (1896), and most notably Hayden & Hartog (1909) and Joyce (1910), all assume a crucial role for Irish in the development of Irish English, with Hayden & Hartog (1909) making a clear distinction between the transfer of features from Irish into English by Irish-speakers and the retention of Irish-influenced features by English speakers for whom Irish ‘is an unknown tongue’ (id.: 941). In phonology, syntax, and lexicon, the themes of historical retention from British English and transfer from Irish have remained as the foundation on which much of the study of English in Ireland has been based, regardless of whether the focus is historical (Hogan 1927, Bliss 1979, Harris 1993), dialectological (Henry 1957, 1958; see also Adams 1986), theoretical (Corrigan 2000 a, b), or otherwise, e.g. Lass (1987), Filppula (1986, 1991, 1999), Hickey (1986, 2000, 2004), Moylan (1996), Todd (1999), Kallen (1996, 2000, 2005) and so on (see also Kirk 1997, and Kallen 1999 for reviews).

Accepting, then, the conventional view that the study of Irish English inevitably raises questions of its relations to the Irish language, we point out that Celticity is not a uniform phenomenon. It may refer to processes in which the English of native Irish speakers is influenced by language transfer or by convergence with English-language interlocutors (suggesting a transfer model); it may refer to the remote historical effects of language transfer among English-language native speakers (suggesting a substratum model); or it may refer not so much to
structural aspects of Irish English, but rather to the indexical features found in metaphorical code-switching (Blom and Gumperz 1972), idiomatic expression, or other ways in which the Irish use of English points to the co-existing use of Irish. The transfer and substrate models tend to write the conscious will of the speaker out of the analysis, as if Celticity were a matter of ‘interference’ (to use the traditional term) which arises more or less involuntarily through the influence of Irish on speakers of English. We suggest, however, that Celticity may well arise from conscious choice, from the desire of a speaker to point towards the Irish language as an act belonging to a particular speech community. In this model, we suggest that evidence of Celticity in a corpus depends not only on the frequency of overt borrowings or structural transfers, but also on the function of particular elements in making a reference to the Irish language and to elements of culture associated with it.

Though space limitations preclude a full discussion of these three models of Celticity in Irish English, we also suggest three ways in which Celticity could be measured empirically, relying on structure, frequency, and salience. We presume that where a structure is found only in a supposedly Celtic English, but not found in other types of English, and where that structure matches one found in a historically relevant Celtic language, there is a prima facie case for Celticity. Structural comparison requires subtle analysis. Two Englishes may show evidence of the same structural pattern over a range of data, but analysis of the constraints on the use of the pattern may show affinities with Celtic languages in one type of English, but not in another. Arguments over so-called subordinating and, as in He wouldn’t give me a penny an’ he rotten with money (Burke 1896: 787), are of just this type. Ó Siadhail (1984), Filppula (1991), and Häcker (1999) all agree that there are apparent parallels between the Irish English construction and some uses of and found in other varieties of English. For Ó Siadhail (1984) and Häcker (1999), these parallels argue against a Celtic source for the Irish English construction. Filppula (1991), on the other hand, divides the Irish data into detailed subcategories, and noting the non-existence of some of these categories outside the Celtic Englishes, argues that the Irish English usage is plausibly derived from Irish.

One advantage of corpus methodology is that it allows for calculation beyond simple structural comparison: frequencies of use can also be compared. Though our discussion here lacks comparative corpus data with Irish, we find that comparisons across varieties of English have at least suggestive value for determining Celticity. Where a feature is present in Irish English but completely absent from other varieties, a plausible case for Celtic influence can be made to the extent that Irish actually has a corresponding structure which could credibly serve as a source. (To pick a trivial counter-example: the word maracycle, denoting a

---

1 This position is anticipated in the review by Vendryes (1958-59) of Henry (1957), in which Vendryes rejected terms such as ‘substrat,’ ‘superstrat,’ and ‘adstrat,’ and observed instead that ‘le fait essential du bilinguisme n’est pas à chercher sur le terrain, mais dans le cerveau et dans la volonté de ceux qui parlent’.
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long-distance bicycle tour, often for charity, is not in the OED but does arise in ICE-Ireland. Google searches show its use to be overwhelmingly based in Ireland. Even if the word is of Irish provenance, though, we can see no evidence that it is in any way inspired by Irish.) Salience is a more difficult concept to operationalise, but as Auer, Barden & Grosskopf (1998) demonstrate, a mixture of structural and perceptual features (which include stereotyping and representation in lay dialect literature) may provide vital insights into the factors which promote or inhibit what they refer to as ‘long-term dialect accommodation’. As we enter the area of stereotypes and popular representations, we allow for the role of language attitudes and beliefs about language to be taken into account. On this reckoning, what language users themselves believe about language becomes important. If, for example, Irish English speakers believe that the word *craic* is an Irish word and that use of the word indexes a particularly Irish form of social interaction, then the etymological argument that the word historically comes into Irish from the Northern English or Scots word *crack* in an equivalent sense is of secondary importance. If we are to account for usage on the part of real speakers, knowing that a speaker is intending to index Celticity by using the word *craic* has more explanatory power than arguing that the speaker is unknowingly using an English word of Northern origin.

For the study of Irish English, the ICE methodology offers several innovations. ICE does not depend on introspection, casual observation, or questionnaire elicitation. It is based on a collection of texts (each of 2,000 words) in 15 different situational categories of the spoken language and in 11 functional types or domains of the written language. Together, these categories generate 300 spoken texts and 200 written texts, totalling one million words in machine-readable form. The categories and the number of texts in each are identical across national components, so that each text category may be directly and systematically compared across corpora: for details see Greenbaum (1996), Nelson, Wallis & Aarts (2002), and the ICE website. When we address ‘the Celticity question,’ it will be our approach to compare text categories in ICE (NI) and ICE (ROI) with equivalent categories in ICE-GB. Our basic question, then, will be to examine

---

2 We are grateful to the many students from Trinity College Dublin and Queen’s University Belfast who assisted in data collection and to the host of speakers, writers, and broadcasters who have kindly given permission for their contributions to be included in ICE-Ireland. Our assistants in the AHRB-funded project on the sociolinguistics of Standard English in Ireland, Orla Lowry and Anne Rooney, have been of invaluable assistance to us. We also wish to thank others who have been involved in the project at different stages, notably Goodith White, Francisco Gonzalvez Garcia, the late Ciaran Laffey, Tom Norton, Hildegard Tristram, Irene Forsthoffer, Marlies Lofing, Margaret Mannion, Mary Pat O’Malley, and Joel Wallenberg. Funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (formerly Research Board), from the Royal Irish Academy and the British Council Social Sciences Committee has been essential to the development of this project and is gratefully acknowledged.

3 For further information about ICE-Ireland, see Kallen & Kirk (2001), Kirk et al. (2004), and Kallen & Kirk (2007).
the extent to which putatively Celtic features are shared across identical categories in each corpus.

2. Grammatical Features

Our first level of analysis is to consider grammatical features that have been argued to show evidence of substratal transfer from Irish to English. We examine here the occurrence of these features in selected ICE text categories which range across formal and informal contexts; we have only occasionally analysed data from the corpus as a whole. Our preference at this point for preferring such small-scale analyses recognises their role in the consideration of text-type specific patterns that may be lost in the wealth of data found within the larger corpus. A feature may be rare in the corpus overall, but common within a given category, and it strikes us as unwise to overlook the details in such cases. The number of grammatical features that could be analysed for potential Celticity is extensive; what follows is a selection of variables which have received particular attention in previous studies.

2.1. Perfective Aspect

No single topic in Irish English syntax has inspired more research than that of perfective aspect. From the early commentators such as Hayden & Hartog (1909) and van Hamel (1912), down to the present (e.g. McCafferty 2005), one form or another of what can loosely be termed perfective aspect has attracted the attention of substratumist, retentionist, theoretical, and other approaches alike. The contrast between the perfect in Irish English and in ‘standard’ English as put forward by Harris (1984) has remained influential, not only for its categorisation of types (or uses) of the perfect, but for the strong case Harris makes for the non-identity of different dialects of English; the different approaches taken by Kallen (1989, 1990, 1991), Filppula (1997 a, 1999), Hickey (2000), McCafferty (2005), Ó Corráin (2005), and others have all to be considered, as well. All the types found in typologies such as those of Harris (1984) and Filppula (1999) are to be found in ICE-Ireland. Without discussing whether typologies should be based on form, meaning, or discourse status, we concentrate here on four categories which are particularly relevant due to their salience in ICE-Ireland and their potential as a mark of Celticity: (a) the perfect with after; (b) the form which typically uses auxiliary have followed by an object NP and a perfect participle (Kallen’s (1989) ‘Accomplishment Perfect,’ Filppula’s (1999) ‘Medial Object Perfect,’ and what we refer to here as the pseudo-perfect); (c) a perfect form in which a present-tense form of a stative verb is extended in its temporal

---

4 Our discussion does not distinguish grammatically between perfect and perfective; we simply use the former as a noun and the latter as a modifier.
reference (the ‘Extended Now’ for Harris (1984) and Filppula (1999), or ‘Extended Present’ in Kallen (1989)); and (d) what Filppula (1999) refers to as the ‘indefinite anterior’ perfect (or IAP), in which the past tense form carries perfective force.

2.1.1. The after-perfect

The perfect in Irish English has attracted attention since the earliest scientific treatments, e.g. Hume (1877-78), Hayden & Hartog (1909), and van Hamel (1912). It has long been asserted that the use of *after* as a marker of the perfect in Irish English owes its origins to transfer from an Irish-language substratum. The issue is somewhat complicated because of other uses of *after* in British English (cf. Kelly 1989), but in recognition of the historical arguments put forward most recently by Ó Sé (2004) and of the uniqueness of Irish English perfective *after* within ICE corpora, we test the use of perfective *after* as evidence of Celtic influence in the standard language in Ireland.

As pointed out in previous research (e.g. Kallen 1989), the use of the after-perfect is sensitive to a variety of semantic, discoursal, and sociolinguistic factors. Harris’s (1984, 1993) well-known use of the designation ‘hot news’ for the after-perfect emphasises recency and immediacy in the use of this form, and though empirical study in Dublin (Kallen 1991) and Galway (Fiess 2000) shows that the form is not actually restricted to what can reasonably be called ‘hot news,’ it is nevertheless relatively rare in more temporally and referentially remote contexts. The social class factors identified in Kallen (1991) also suggest that middle-class speakers are less liable to use the form in public contexts than are working-class speakers. Given these conditioning factors, after-perfects could not be expected to be equally prominent in all ICE categories: Scripted speeches and Parliamentary debates, for example, are far less likely to contain such forms than Face to face conversations.

The entire spoken component of the ICE-Ireland corpus (comprising approximately 713,369 words) contains seven examples of the after-perfect with BE + verb, each of them in southern texts. These examples are given here: (1)-(3) are from Face to face conversations, (4) from a Classroom discussion, (5) from a Business transaction, and (6) from a Sports commentary.

The comprehensive treatment by Ó Sé (2004) points out that, especially in Munster Irish, many attested examples of the Irish perfect with *tar éis* or *tréis* ‘after’ ‘cannot sensibly be translated as recent perfects’ (id.: 232). The possibility raised by Ó Sé of mutual dialectal influences between Irish and English perfect usage has yet to be examined in detail.

All quoted examples from ICE-Ireland are shown in ICE transcription format, starting with the ICE text number and speaker code: example (1) thus shows Speaker A from text S1A-046. For more detail, see Kallen & Kirk (in press).
A new fella is after taking over uhm one of the pubs at home And he 's after coming back from England you know And he 's an old family friend of ours And he 's a howl

And his blood sugar was real low They thought he was after going into a coma with diabetes

The wife and children are after going off there the other day

But I think you were saying all the copies are out in the libraries

Yeah all the copies are out when I was looking I 'm after booking one

No Jesus you 're not That 's no problem There 's nothing new after coming in anyway so Try again in another couple of days

There 's a comeback from Barrett ... In the opening round I thought for a while that Walsh was going to win inside the distance but he 's after running into a couple of hard ones here from Barrett And Barrett the sort of

Although there are no examples in ICE (NI) of the verbal -ing construction with after, there is at least one example with a noun phrase which is interpretable as a perfect:

I 'm not that long after my dinner.

Filppula (1999: 105-6) notes this form as being rather rare, but we have certainly heard it often enough from a variety of speakers to consider it unremarkable.

The frequency of after percepts in ICE-Ireland is, by this count, very low: if we consider HAVE percepts by comparison, we note that within the ICE (NI) Face to face conversation files alone, there are some 44 tokens of the present perfect using auxiliary HAVE with the main verb form been alone. Counting other main verbs and other tenses of HAVE would multiply the number of 'standard' percepts in the corpus greatly, leaving after percepts as statistically very rare indeed.

This low occurrence of the after perfect is also reflected within interviews from the Tape-Recorded Survey of Hiberno-English (see Adams, Barry & Tilling (1985)). Harris's (1984: 316-17) analysis of TRS material revealed only 3 examples of the after-perfect, each of which had been spoken by 'urban speakers' – no rural speakers in the sample used the construction at all. In contrast, the speakers identified by Harris as urban use 50 examples of the 'standard' perfect with have, while the rural speakers show 48 such uses.

Also based on TRS material, the Northern Ireland Transcribed Corpus of Speech (Kirk 1991; see also Kirk 1992) yields five examples of the after perfect from approximately 240,000 words, as seen in (12)-(16) below. In these examples, the co-occurrence of only and just with after provide the ‘hot news’ interpretation which may be lacking in other examples.
Assessing Celticity in a Corpus of Irish Standard English

Filppula (1999: 101) describes the occurrence of after-perfects in his corpus of recorded interviews as being ‘generally low,’ noting that 25 after-perfects in a sample of 158,000 words show the construction to be virtually absent in material from Clare and Kerry (accounting for only 3 tokens in 74,000 words), even though a higher level of usage can be found in Dublin, with 12 tokens in 42,000 words.

How should we view such data as evidence for the Celtisation of Irish Standard English? From the amount of interest generated in the after-perfect in Ireland, it might appear that this form is used consistently instead of the ‘standard’ international perfect with HAVE; indeed, Harris’s (1984) approach excluded the HAVE perfect from the Irish English system. By this logic, the low occurrence of after-perfects in ICE-Ireland would appear anomalous. From this perspective, it might appear that the perfect in standard Irish English is mostly ‘standard’ and shows only residual use of the Irish-influenced after-perfect.

Comparisons between ICE-Ireland and the more dialectal material of the TRS and Filppula’s corpus, however, suggest that the after construction is not as pervasive generally as the amount of scholarly attention devoted to it would suggest. When we consider the sociolinguistic and discourse constraints on the use of the after-perfect which have been noted in other studies cited here, it is fair to say that Irish Standard English, in displaying the after-perfect, does stand out from other standard Englishes in ways that are salient to language users, and that may contribute to the cross-dialectal breakdowns in communication or other such effects referred to, for example, by Milroy (1984), Harris (1985 b), and Wall (1990). In this sense, despite the low statistical occurrence of after relative to HAVE perfects in the ICE-Ireland corpus, we are satisfied that it reaches a level of salience which corresponds to more vernacular levels of usage in a way that indicates meaningful Celticity.
2.1.2. ‘I have my dinner eaten’: The Pseudo-Perfect

The labels ‘Accomplishment Perfect’ (Kallen 1989) and ‘Medial Object Perfect’ (Filppula 1999) have been applied to our second category of perfect, but we refrain from using these labels here. The structure in question is transitive and includes a form of HAVE plus an associated noun phrase, followed by a perfect-marked verb form. Harris (1984, 1985 a) discussed this structure in some detail, arguing that it does not represent a simple re-ordering of object and participle relative to the ‘standard’ English perfect, but is instead ‘a looser expression consisting of two underlying subjoined clauses’ (Harris 1985 a: 50). In this analysis, the clause with HAVE uses this verb as a full lexical item rather than as an auxiliary, and focuses on state rather than the action referred to by the following lexical verb. Kallen’s (1989) use of the term ‘accomplishment’ focuses on the relationship between the object noun phrase and the main verb and suggests that this verb refers to a dynamic state of affairs in which the noun phrase represents a culmination of activity (as in I have half the grass now cut). Filppula’s term is more purely structural, noting that the object of the transitive main verb is interposed between the auxiliary and main verb, rather than following it. In all these earlier analyses, there is a general tendency to assume that the agent of the action denoted by the main lexical verb is co-referential to the subject of the clause headed by HAVE, thus distinguishing the Irish English perfect from inter alia, causatives such as I had a dress made in which the agent of made is not the subject of the clause in which made occurs.

Though the identification of this type of perfect usage is not as straightforward as with the after-perfect, we have identified 34 examples of this construction in ICE-Ireland. Many tokens of this form could be seen as simple structural reversals, in which reversing the order of the noun phrase and the perfect participle would make no difference to the meaning, at least as far as literal truth value is concerned. In such examples, the subject of the clause is clearly identical with the agent of the main verb. In other cases, however, which illustrate key features of the construction as we understand it, the subject of the main clause with HAVE is not co-referential to the agent of the main verb. These examples are not causatives (as they might superficially appear to be to those unfamiliar with Irish English), but, rather, refer to a possessive or stative state of affairs which results from the action depicted by the main verb. In the discussion which follows, we thus distinguish between (A) those examples where the subject of the main clause is also the agent of the action denoted by the main verb and (B) cases where the subject of the main clause is not co-referential to the agent of the main verb, either because there is an obvious distinction between them or because the relationship is unspecified. To make the discussion easier to follow we further subdivide each category by subject type.
Group A: Subject of the main clause = agent of action denoted by main verb:

First Person

(13) <S1A-003$E> <#> <{> <[> No this was on Friday </]> </]> <#> You see I have Jonathan 's number written on his card <#> I have his home number written on it which I 'd taken and that was the only phone number in the wallet 

(14) <S1A-029$B> <#> And uhm <,> sweets were rationed and not that I bought many of them but they were <.> ra </.> rationed and we had to give coupons for them <#> And of course when I went into the shop to get some sweets <,> and handed in the coupons I thought I had them paid for <&> laughs </&>

(15) <S1A-049$A> <#> Can you imagine <,> if Eamonn found out <S1A-049$B> <#> I know yeah yeah </>/

(16) <S2A-058$A> <#> And what I have actually done is <,> I won't draw it out for you because I have it already drawn on a piece of yellow crepe paper this time

Second Person

(17) <S1B-017$C> <#> <[> When </]> </> when do you want them for sorry <S1B-017$A> <#> Uhm today is it <,> <#> Well I suppose if you can have them done by this afternoon yeah great <,> <#> Is that possible

Third Person

(18) <S1A-001$B> <#> She 's very pleased with it so she is <,> very pleased <#> So she has her schoolbag packed with her pencil case and that and her <,> bits and pieces that she 'll never have out for the first six months you know <&> laughs </&>

(19) <S1A-006$C> <#> But he cos I cos when he said last night then I was saying I was thinking och no maybe he has something organised cos he was saying aw you know.

(20) <S1B-078$D> <#> I think she had people lined up for the four posts but because it was so delayed they 've all since got other jobs

(21) <S1A-058$D> <#> But she 's was saying about the magnets that this guy who she met at this conference had he goes around he travels around to all these conferences I think he was American <,> but he had a rucksack specially made with a magnetic strip in the back so that when he had it the magnet was directly on his spine

(22) <S1A-087$A> <#> They probably have him chained <,> so he won't get out

(23) <S2A-042$A> <#> So <,> if a company are using a spreadsheet to uh budget <,> we 'll say for the coming six months <,> and they think that they have their spreadsheet done <,> then they hear that the price of petrol is going to go up
**Group B:** Subject of the main clause ≠ agent of action denoted by main verb:

**First person**

(24) <S1B-035$E> Oh I’ve fantastic memories of Christmas Tom ... <#> And up till in my time I have own family myself two boys and two girls and I carried on that tradition <>, <#> And my daughters <>, I’ve two daughters married today <,> and they are carrying on that tradition still that the sitting room door is locked until Christmas morning and then in and presents are opened

(25) <S2B-015$D> Quiet <,> it’s <,> people aren’t on the street still <#> We’ve had no post delivered this morning [from an ICE (ROI) face to face conversation]

(26) <S1B-035$D> Yeah like we we would still have a <,> uh names on a share of them like you’d have Cronin’s Black and you’d have Polly and there was a horse won the Grand National there a few years ago we had a cow calved that day I think it was Grit Arse I would have a cow of that name.7

**Second person**

(27) <S1A-007$A> Oh look at your nails Oh my God <{> <[> They’re absolutely <]</> gorgeous <S1A-007$B> Oh I got the gel thing <,> do you know the gel tips you can get <{}/><{> They’re great <S1A-007$F> Apparently they do all sorts of weird and wonderful things <S1A-007$B> They do <,> they do sort of like silk tips and fibreglass and you know <#> I think you start off with gel <{1}</> and <{1} and <{}/><{> then you can sort of <{2}</> <{2} <,> <{2} work your way up ... <S1A-007$F> Once you have them done then do you sort of do you need to always like you’ll probably have those for like ten years or something will you <#> <{<?><{> You know do you keep getting topped up <{}/>

(28) <S2B-033$A> ... <#> So for instance in Gulliver’s Travels <,> you have a tremendous contrast set up between the massive Brobdingnagians on the one hand and the pygmy-like Lilliputians on the other

**Third person**

(29) <S1B-035$D> Yeah obviously it’s slightly different probably from the picture painted now in Alice Taylor’s recent book ... <#> Uh obviously you’ve had lot of changes in farming practice now <#> Personally we’re not in winter milk <,> I still have a few cows milking but obviously you’ve a lot of people who’ve cows calved already at this time of the year

(30) <S1B-007$A> ... <#> Can you tell us what a primary victim is then <S1B-007$C> Uhm that was <,> that’s somebody who has had the actual harm done to them <,> no in fact was actually at the accident or the incident personally there

(31) <S2B-027$A> Last night here in Sebastopol Street as we were leaving my Dad’s house <,> we saw a man being arrested ... <#> They got the guy here near the bottom of the street and they ran him up the street to some jeeps waiting up at

---

7 Grittar won the 1982 Grand National horse race; we assume a humorous reference.