

# Aavioghey as y Breear: Language Revitalization and the Manx Verbal System

1

## Abstract

Many minority languages across Europe and elsewhere, including in the Celtic-speaking world, underwent linguistic obsolescence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In some cases, this ultimately progressed to language death. Manx, the autochthonous Goidelic Celtic language of the Isle of Man, was one such case. In more recent times, the Manx language has seen a revival, which has increased speaker numbers. Manx represents an atypical situation among minority languages, as the present-day speaker community is, with few exceptions, made up of speakers who have had no direct contact with traditional native speakers.

Therefore, the present-day Manx speaker community bears closer resemblance to that of Cornish, as well as those of urban varieties of Irish and Scottish Gaelic, than to speaker communities in traditional Celtic language heartlands. This article discusses the language use of speakers of Revitalized Manx. It investigates some aspects of linguistic structure in the language use of three groups of speakers who have acquired the language in different contexts: teachers of Manx, speakers who received Manx instruction through the medium of English, and speakers who have received Manx-immersion education. An analysis of a number of verbal forms reveals differences in these three groups of Manx speakers, which may be correlated with the amount and type of input in Manx these speakers have received. The article discusses these findings in the wider context of processes influencing the linguistic production of speakers of revitalized minority languages.

## Introduction

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, many language varieties underwent language endangerment. This was the case for all of the surviving Celtic languages, (e.g. Scottish Gaelic: Dorian 1978, Welsh: Jones 1998b), including Manx Gaelic. The ‘death date’ of Manx is often regarded to be 1974, which is the year of the death of Ned Maddrell, the ‘last native speaker’ of the language (Stowell and Ó Bréasláin 1996). The exact ‘end point’ of the traditional variety of Manx is contentious (see discussion in Lewin 2016, 2021). However, it is likely that first language transmission of Manx had been disrupted much earlier than 1974, likely in the nineteenth century, as Maddrell’s generation already exhibit atypical acquisition of Manx. That said, 1974 at least marks a definitive cease in Manx’s transmission as a first language in the community. This was the ultimate conclusion of a long decline in speaker numbers, with speakers shifting to English as a result of trade, immigration, and cultural Anglicization (see Broderick et al. 1999, Clague 2009, Wilson et al. 2015 for further discussion).

However, the language had some degree of continuity in the community (Broderick et al. 1999, Gawne 2000, 2003, Lewin 2021) as it continued to be spoken as a second language. Today, Manx is heavily minoritized, classed as ‘critically endangered’ by UNESCO’s Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger (Moseley 2010). Since the 1990s there have been marginal examples of L1 acquisition of Revitalized Manx by children in the home environment<sup>2</sup>, however the vast majority of Manx speakers acquire the language through means other than first language transmission in the home.

In this paper, I examine the language use of speakers of Revitalized Manx as an example of a Celtic minority language community with no extant native speakers. This situation is, at the moment, atypical for minority languages, though not unique to Manx – other European

minority languages also find themselves in this position. This situation is likely to become more commonplace in the future, both within and outwith the Celtophone world. Therefore, an analysis of Revitalized Manx provides a useful insight into other minority language speaker communities, both present and future. I aim to provide some preliminary answers to the following questions about the language use of the current Manx speaker community:

1. How do speakers of Revitalized Manx use synthetic and analytic forms of verbs?
2. Are there differences in the use of verbal forms between Revitalized Manx speakers?
3. To what extent can we explain these findings as the results of processes at work in the linguistic production of speakers of revitalized minority languages?

The introduction section of the paper briefly discusses language death, language revitalization and its impact on linguistic structure. The methodology section outlines the design of my study, and the variables and participants chosen. The results of the investigation are in the subsequent sections, with discussion of these following that. The final section provides concluding remarks and suggestions for further research on Revitalized Manx.

## Language Death

The term 'language death' describes a cross-linguistically observed sociolinguistic process. For Jones (1998b), language death is itself the culmination of language obsolescence: a process whereby a language is ousted from its traditional territory by another variety, as speakers shift, abandoning their traditional language in favour of another (Fishman 1991). Speakers may perceive that language shift in the direction of a more prestigious or sociolinguistically dominant variety may afford them greater financial freedom, better employment opportunities, or increased social capital, facilitating the abandonment of the traditional variety, e.g. as was observed in Welsh (Jones 1998b).<sup>3</sup> If a language shift

continues uninterrupted, i.e. if all members of the community shift to another variety with no reversal of shift back to the traditional variety, language death results.

Structural changes often occur during language obsolescence and death. Such changes include so-called grammatical ‘simplification’, under- and over-generalization of marked features, loss of optional variability and stylistic differences, lexical loss, and transfer of features from the community-dominant language (see Dressler et al. 1972, Dorian 1978, Campbell and Muntzel 1989, Palosaari and Campbell 2011, Thomason 2015, Schmidt 1985, Jones 1998b, 2005 for discussion and examples).<sup>4</sup>

Manx’s obsolescence was marked by a suite of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical changes (see Broderick et al. 1999, Kewley-Draskau 2004/2005, Lewin 2017a, Lewin 2017b for further discussion). Most relevant to the current discussion is that, in the Manx verb phrase, we observe tense and aspect increasingly being expressed periphrastically, at the expense of the use of inflection (Kewley Draskau, 2004/2005). Broderick et al. (1999) describe the past tense production of speakers of ‘Late Manx’ (defined here as the Manx spoken during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) in this way, with past tense verbs often expressed with a construction consisting of the auxiliary *ren* (‘did’) followed by the verbal noun (Kewley Draskau 2004/2005).

However, Lewin (2017b) makes the important point that we should be wary of conflating the linguistic norms of nineteenth-century Manx with those present in the production of the last native speakers in the mid-twentieth century. Manx was undergoing rapid language obsolescence during these two centuries, which undoubtedly had an impact on morphosyntactic norms in the language. It is likely that this period was one of rapid linguistic change, which the ‘Late Manx’ definition above obscures. This rapid change is reflective the change in rates and types of transmission of the language associated with language

obsolescence. Namely, the acquisition of Manx by the last native speakers may have been incomplete, and their production in Manx likely exhibits some effects of language attrition. Therefore, although we can state that frequent use of the analytic auxiliary construction was a feature of the last native speakers of Manx, the same may not necessarily hold true of nineteenth-century varieties.

With regards to earlier stages of the language, this structure was present in eighteenth-century Manx, albeit less frequently attested than synthetic structures that expressed the simple past through the use of an inflected verb (Kewley Draskau, 2004/2005). Past forms of regular verbs often came to be expressed periphrastically in so-called Late Manx (ibid.). However, the inflected forms of common irregular verbs, e.g. *hie* ('went') and *honnick* ('saw'), remained in the language, apparently having been fossilized due to the frequency with which they occur in speech (ibid.). Nevertheless, this analytic structure in the simple past seemed to be more productive in twentieth-century Manx than the more synthetic equivalent, an example of diachronic morphosyntactic simplification. An increase in analyticity may, of course, be a part of natural language change. That said, given that this change occurred in within the social context of rapid language shift, it is likely that it is at least in part attributable to language death processes (Jones 1998b; Kewley Draskau 2004/2005).

## Language Revitalization

An obsolescing variety may not undergo language death if individuals in its linguistic community take action to revitalize their language (Jones 1998b). Linguistic revitalization involves increasing the domains and roles in which the language is used (Bentahila and Davies 1993). It also involves recruiting people to acquire and use the language; facilitating the transmission of the language, and expanding the language to new demographics

(Bentahila and Davies 1993, O'Rourke and Pujolar 2013: 55). Manx's revitalization began in earnest during the twentieth century. As a result of the efforts of language revivalists during the *aavioghey* ('revival'), a community of Revitalized Manx speakers now exists.<sup>5</sup> (See Clague 2009, Wilson 2009, Wilson et al. 2015, Ó hIfearnáin 2015a, Ó hIfearnáin 2015b for more discussion.)

The creation of this new community involved teaching Manx to both adults and children, both in immersion and English-based instruction settings. Manx-immersion education is available from ages 3-11 in the *Mooinjjer Veggey* preschool, followed by the *Bunscoil Ghaelgagh* primary school. Children can learn Manx as a second language from ages 4-18 (Wilson 2009). These revitalization efforts in the domain of education have succeeded in "developing a cohort of competent, young Manx speakers" (ibid.: 17).

The number of Revitalized Manx speakers has continued to increase. According to the 2021 Isle of Man census, just over 2,200 people claimed to be able to speak, read, or write Manx (Isle of Man Government 2022). As of 2010, it was estimated that around a hundred of these could be classed as "highly fluent" (Ó hIfearnáin 2015a: 54), though this has likely since increased (Ó hIfearnáin 2015b: 111). The growth in speaker numbers is particularly noticeable among young speakers, with the number of 10-14-year-old Manx speakers having jumped from 64 to 340 from 1991 to 2001 (Clague 2009: 176). This figure is also likely greater 21 years on. However, as Clague (ibid.) notes, this is not necessarily indicative of the fluency or linguistic competence of these young speakers, nor of the frequency with which they use the language, especially in domains other than education (Wilson 2009: 25, Sallabank 2013: 219). This discrepancy remains a problem when evaluating the 'success' of language revitalization programmes.

## The Language Use of Revitalized Manx Speakers

The linguistic production of speakers of Revitalized Manx clearly differs both from that of terminal native speakers and of speakers of earlier varieties (Kewley Draskau 2006, Lewin, 2021). Evidently, the gap in time between these generations of speakers evidently makes synchronic comparison between these groups impossible. Most speakers of Revitalized Manx acquire their language in domains other than the home. Various processes are at work in the linguistic production this kind of speaker profile in revitalized minority language communities that are not in operation for traditional native speakers, such that the former “may be distinguishable from native speakers through their linguistic structures” (O’Rourke and Walsh 2020: 25, see Jaffe 2015, Walsh and O’Rourke 2015, Nance 2015, Ó Broin 2015, Ó Murchadha and Ó hIfearnáin 2018, O’Rourke and Walsh 2020 for further discussion and examples). The few existing studies of Revitalized Manx speakers’ language use suggest that these speakers’ linguistic norms differ from those in pre-revitalization Manx (e.g. Brew 2017 on nominal gender; Lewin 2021’s overview of revitalized Manx). For Kewley Draskau (2006: 85), post-revitalization Manx shows evidence of “the re-establishment of categories and functions” that were reduced during its obsolescence. Kewley Draskau (2004/2005: 245) claims that young present-day Manx speakers in immersion education employ the “inflected preterite of regular verbs [...] with increasing confidence, in all modes, to express past events”.

One process that this paper identifies as being at work in Revitalized Manx speakers’ linguistic production is grammatical simplification (e.g. as discussed by Mayeux 2015 with reference to L2 Louisiana Creole speakers).<sup>6</sup> Synchronic simplification is associated with adult second language acquisition and language attrition. In order to “compensate for partial or incomplete acquisition” (Winford 2003, 217), speakers may lexically and grammatically reduce the target variety. Simplification may be internally- or externally-motivated (Winford

2003); i.e. part of ‘natural’ language processes, or influenced by contact. It is often difficult to disentangle one from the other; simplification may have multiple causation (Treffers-Daller and Mougeon 2005, 96). Simplification may be employed in various domains, e.g. preferring analytic expression over synthetic (Trudgill 2011), as seen in Welsh and Breton (Thomas 1991, Davalan 1999), or reducing marked features in the target variety (Trudgill *ibid.*, Gathercole and Thomas 2009, Jones 1998b).

Revitalized Manx speakers’ language use may also show linguistic transfer effects. ‘Transfer’ here refers to the unconscious use of L1 knowledge during communication by an L2 speaker or acquirer (Siegel 2009). This may present as the movement of phonemes, aspects of semantic meaning, pragmatic conventions, or morphosyntactic structures from language A to language B (Treffers-Daller and Mougeon 2005: 94). Transfer may be ‘overt’ or ‘covert’ (Mougeon and Beniak 1991). The former “produces a new usage in a variety”, such that it is “possible to observe a qualitative departure from traditional linguistic norms” (Jones 2005: 161). Covert transfer “does not produce a qualitative deviation”, only a statistical one; it is “manifested by the decline of a form with no counterpart in the superordinate language” (*ibid.*).<sup>7</sup>

This article explores to what extent the processes outlined above can explain the morphosyntactic production of Revitalized Manx speakers. It employs a corpus of spoken linguistic production from speakers of Revitalized Manx of different ages and linguistic backgrounds. The paper examines the frequency and context of use of synthetic and analytic verbs in the speech of various speakers with different linguistic backgrounds, addressing the questions outlined above.



The following sections illustrate the variables analysed and the methods of data collection used.

## Methodology

### Participants

This study examines the linguistic production of a range of Revitalized Manx speakers, aiming to compare the production of speakers with different linguistic backgrounds. To accomplish this, I worked with 15 participants, split into three groups based on linguistic background. These participants were recruited through various means. Some were already known to the researcher, and the researcher was put in touch with further participants through these initial contacts. The organisation *Culture Vannin* was also integral in identifying participants who attended adult Manx classes and conversation groups.

The first participant group was made up of teachers of Manx. These were all language professionals, who as part of their varied roles teach Manx in various settings, including primary and secondary teaching, both Manx-medium and otherwise, as well as adult education settings. Despite the fact that these language professionals have contributed to the Manx language community in any number of ways, their role as teachers is emphasised in this article to highlight the fact that their language use serves as an important part of the linguistic model to which the younger speakers have been exposed. All of the younger speakers in this study acquired Manx either wholly or partially as a result of exposure to the speech of this generation of language professionals, and indeed often to the speech of the individual members of the teacher group sampled in this study.

All participants in the teacher group were known to each other, having worked together as part of various organisations, such as the *Bunscoill Ghaelgagh* (Manx-language Primary School), the *Unnid Gaelgagh*, which provides peripatetic Manx teaching to all other Island schools, as well as organisations offering adult education in Manx, such as *Culture Vannin* and University College Isle of Man. Many of the members of this group have taught Manx in multiple settings. This group was expected to have a much higher exposure to and frequency of use of Manx, as Manx is an important part of their jobs and social life. Therefore, they were expected to have a greater competence in Manx as compared to the two younger speaker groups. They were also expected to have a much greater degree of metalinguistic knowledge about Manx and its historical development, which may inform their attitudes towards and use or avoidance of certain constructions. The members of this group varied in age, but were older than those in the two younger groups (detailed below).

This group was compared with younger Manx speakers (aged 18-mid-20s), in order to analyse the linguistic production of speakers who acquired Manx through education. As aforementioned, younger speakers may acquire Manx through immersion education or less intensive means. The former education type naturally results in greater exposure to the language during acquisition. This difference in education type was found to be a factor explaining linguistic differences between young speakers of revitalized Welsh (Jones 1998b) and Irish (Henry and Tangney 1996). This study therefore compares the production of two groups of younger speakers of Manx: immersion-educated, and those who learnt through other means, such as English-based instruction, with each other as well as with that of their teachers.

## Variables

I chose to analyse several morphosyntactic variables, specifically verbal forms. Comparison of different verb structures available to Revitalized Manx speakers enabled me to examine the possible effects of simplification and transfer in their language use. The study aimed to compare both the difference in frequency between analytic and synthetic verb forms in the past and future tense between the three groups for regular and irregular verbs.

As in earlier stages of the language, there are two different constructions available to speakers to express the simple past and future in Revitalized Manx. The first is a synthetic structure, which in the past is formed through initial consonant mutation in the main finite verb in the verb phrase, as opposed to an auxiliary being used. Future tense formation is achieved through suffixation in the independent form of the verb. An analytic construction is also available, involving an auxiliary tensed for either past or future followed by the main verb in the form of a verbal noun (Draskau 2008).

It is important to note that, despite having different diachronic trajectories, synchronically the synthetic and analytic forms of verbs (as shown below) are in complementary distribution in revitalized Manx, and in theory are in free variation for speakers. This is true of both regular and irregular verbs. For example, a Manx speaker may express ‘I went’ (irregular in Manx) either analytically or synthetically, as both constructions are available and in common use. The same is true of ‘I learned’ (regular in Manx). This paper examines the relative frequency of use of both constructions across groups of speakers, elucidating possible factors influencing the patterns of variation observed in the synchronic language. This evidently has implications for the relative productivity (or lack thereof) of these constructions in Revitalized Manx.

Analytic and synthetic constructions for regular verbs are exemplified below:

(figure 1a here)

Figure 1a: Analytic and synthetic regular verb constructions in Manx

The synthetic construction is more grammatically complex than the analytic construction. It also involves varying degrees of inflectional morphology, an L2-difficult phenomenon (Meisel 2011). Therefore, we would expect increased simplification in the production of Revitalized Manx speakers to be reflected in the more frequent use of the analytic forms of verbs in the past and future tenses. Conversely, more frequent use of the synthetic forms of these verbs may indicate that simplification plays a smaller role in a speaker's production.

However, with the addition of possible transfer effects the picture becomes more complicated. The simple past and future forms of verbs in English are expressed synthetically and analytically respectively (e.g. 'I went' vs 'I will go'). Therefore, transfer from English (the L1 of all Revitalized Manx speakers in this study) would support the increased use of the synthetic in the past tense, but the analytic in the future tense.

That said, as in many languages, many of the most frequently encountered and early acquired verbs in Manx are irregular (e.g. those listed in Draskau 2008). In Manx, irregular verbs in the past and the future may also be expressed either synthetically or analytically. Irregular verbs in the analytic past and future follow the same pattern as their regular counterparts. However, the synthetic forms of irregular verbs involve some degree of stem alternation or replacement, rendering the verbal paradigms less grammatically transparent. Some examples are illustrated below:

(figure 1b here)

Figure 1b: Analytic and synthetic irregular verb constructions in Manx

We may expect irregular constructions to behave differently for Revitalized Manx speakers. In second language acquirers of English, inflected verb forms seem to be stored in the memory, with the most frequent irregular forms being accessed more quickly and easily by

speakers than the regular paradigm (Bowden et al. 2010). We may therefore expect speakers of Revitalized Manx to produce the synthetic form more frequently for common irregular verbs than for regular verbs, with the latter being produced more frequently with the analytic construction.

One of the most common irregular verbs in Manx is the verb *jannoo* ('doing') (Draskau 2008). As outlined above, 'do' in Manx, as well as being a main verb, is also used as an auxiliary in the analytic past and future. Therefore, expressing that one 'did' something using the analytic construction necessitates the use of 'do' both as an auxiliary and a main verb in the same construction. This is illustrated below:

(figure 1c here)

Figure 1c: Analytic and synthetic irregular 'do'-constructions in Manx

Simplification and transfer effects may interact with the ongoing grammaticalization of *ren* as a past tense auxiliary. Analysing 'do' separately enabled me to separate this construction from other irregular verbs in the past. If there are differences in the use of 'do' and other irregular verbs, this may warrant further investigation into the extent to which *ren* has been grammaticalized for various speakers of Manx.

## Data Collection

I conducted both linguistic interviews and a translation task to examine the above variables. The interviews were conducted one on one with the participant and the researcher, who is also a Manx speaker. They lasted for 30-45 minutes.

As tokens of morphosyntactic variables occur less frequently in speech than, say, those of phonological variables, the linguistic interviews were semi-structured, enabling indirect

elicitation of the variables outlined above. This was done through the use of prompts that encouraged participants to produce forms in the past (e.g. “What did you do yesterday?”) and the future (e.g. “What will you do this weekend?”). The interviewer addressed the participants in English during this task to reduce the influence on participants’ production of the relevant forms in Manx. Forms were only accepted if they fit the profile of the variables as outlined above. Any forms given in English were excluded from analysis.

The interviews took the form of a casual conversation, in a neutral familiar location or over video chat. The researcher is a member of the Manx linguistic community and known to many of the participants, which aided in reducing the impact of any ‘outsider effect’. In order to best recreate natural conversation, as stated in Labov’s Vernacular Principle (1972b: 112, Schilling 2013: 108), topic prompts of personal (e.g. as above), universal, and community interest (e.g. “What do you think the future of Manx will be?”) were chosen, although the conversations usually diverged naturally from these prompts. As well as making the participants more comfortable, these efforts served to produce data that better reflected spontaneous conversational linguistic production.

Participants were also asked to individually complete a language production task (henceforth the ‘translation task’) with basic vocabulary designed to directly elicit the above variables (Rose et al. 2020). Each participant had English sentences read to them by the interviewer, and they were asked to orally translate these into Manx (similar to Dorian 1981: 118). The interviewer then transcribed the responses. This task had two purposes. Firstly, it ensured that sufficient tokens of all variables would be present in the data (Rose et al. 2020). It also enabled comparison between the speakers’ spontaneous production in casual conversation and production which allowed for more conscious recall. If differences are found between the tasks, this may indicate that some forms may be a part of speakers’ competence, but not necessarily their spontaneous production. Forms were omitted from analysis if they differed

from those prompted in meaning or structure, e.g. near-synonyms of verbs (such as ‘listen’ for ‘hear’) or English forms.

## Results

This section analyses the results of the investigation. I will present the relative frequency of the analytic and synthetic forms for each verb type in both the conversation and translation tasks for each variable across the three speaker groups.

I employed basic inferential statistical methods to help shed light on differences in verbal production between groups of Revitalized Manx speakers. The data analysis of both tasks tested whether the difference in frequency of use of each variable between groups was significant. I compared the frequencies of use of the synthetic form of each variable between all three groups. The teachers’ frequency of use was compared to that of both younger speaker groups, and the frequencies of use of both the immersion- and instruction-educated younger speakers were compared with each other.

The study involved independent observations of the frequencies of two categorical variables; one dependent, namely the frequency of use of a particular form, and one independent, namely the speaker group. As such, Pearson’s Chi-Square test for independence was employed to test whether the observed frequencies of the level of the dependent variable varied significantly across levels of the independent variable (Gries 2013: 325, Oakes 1998). As some of the expected frequencies for certain variables were low, Yates’ correction for continuity was employed to prevent overestimation of statistical significance for small data (Yates 1934, Oakes *ibid.*: 25). If the Chi-Squared test returned a p-value of less than 0.05, as is the standard in corpus linguistics (Gries *ibid.*: 317), this indicates that it is likely that the

difference in use between the two tested groups is statistically significant. The following section discusses the results of these analyses.

## Past Tense Verbs

Figure 2a shows the overall distribution of synthetic and analytic past forms across all three speaker groups. Figure 2b shows the production of synthetic tokens visually, highlighting trends in speakers' past tense production.

Figure 2a. Table showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the past tense (Figure 2a. near here)

Figure 2b. Graph showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the past tense (Figure 2b. near here)

These results show that the synthetic was employed more frequently for irregular verbs than regular verbs across all participants. However, note that the data showed differences between speaker groups with regard to this. The teachers used the synthetic form most frequently overall, followed by the immersion-educated younger speakers, with the instruction-educated speakers employing the synthetic past the least frequently. The frequency of use was not statistically significantly different between the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers, but both of these groups' productions were significantly different to that of the instruction-educated speakers.

In terms of the two verb types, the immersion-educated speakers produced the synthetic regular past more frequently than the teachers in terms of percentage. However, it should be noted that the immersion-educated group produced a very small number of regular tokens in total. We note that the difference between regular and irregular synthetic production was



most noticeable in the instruction-educated speakers, who produced no regular synthetic tokens.

Tokens of ‘do’ were expressed more frequently in the synthetic than the analytic by both the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers, who preferred *ren [mee]* to *ren [mee] jannoo* for ‘[I] did’ (for example). That said, for both of these speaker groups, ‘do’ had a lower rate of synthetic expression than other irregular verbs. The instruction-educated speakers produced the analytic *ren [mee] jannoo* most frequently, although it should be noted that ‘do’ had a higher rate of synthetic expression than other irregular verbs for these speakers. In addition, the immersion-educated speakers’ preference for the synthetic *ren [mee]* was only slight, especially considering the low token numbers, therefore it seems likely that both younger speaker groups regularly produce *ren [mee] jannoo*.

## Past Tense – Translation

Figure 2c shows the use of synthetic and analytic past forms in the translation task across the speaker groups. Figure 2d presents the production of synthetic tokens visually.

Figure 2c. Table showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the past tense (translation task)

(figure 2c. near here)

Figure 2d. Graph showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the past tense (translation task)

(figure 2d. near here)

The results from this task show that the synthetic form was again used more frequently with irregular verbs than with regular verbs across all three groups. However, what is especially noticeable is that more synthetic regular verbs were produced overall in this task than in the

conversational data. The results from this task also show that there are differences between groups with regards to the frequency of use of the synthetic form, with the teachers producing it most frequently, followed by the immersion-educated group, then finally the instruction-educated group. Again, the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers show similar production, with no significant difference found between these two groups. The instruction-educated speakers, however, did show a statistically significant difference in production from the other two groups; they produced significantly fewer synthetic tokens, preferring the analytic form. Tokens of 'do' were not elicited in this task.

## Future Tense Verbs

Figure 3a shows the overall distribution of synthetic and analytic future forms across all three speaker groups. Figure 3b displays the production of synthetic tokens more visually, highlighting trends in speakers' future tense production.

Figure 3a. Table showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the future tense (figure 3a near here)

Figure 3b. Graph showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the future tense (figure 3b near here)

These data showed less frequent use of the synthetic form across all groups as compared to the past tense. Again, the overall results showed that the synthetic form was used more frequently with irregular verbs than with regular verbs, which held true for all groups. No synthetic regular verbs were produced by any participant. There were differences in the production of the synthetic future between speaker groups. The teachers again produced the synthetic the most frequently of all three groups. The immersion-educated speakers

experienced much more of a ‘drop-off’ as compared to their past tense production; for the future tense their total synthetic production was the same percentage frequency as the instruction-educated speakers. The immersion-educated group’s production was therefore statistically significantly different to that of the teachers, but not to that of the instruction-educated group.

## Future Tense – Translation

Figure 2c shows the overall distribution of synthetic and analytic future forms in the translation task across all three speaker groups. Figure 2d displays the production of synthetic tokens visually.

Figure 3c. Table showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the future tense (translation task)

(figure 3c near here)

Figure 3d. Graph showing percentage frequency of synthetic forms in the future tense (translation task)

(figure 3d near here)

Here synthetic forms were produced less frequently overall than in the past tense, although more synthetic future forms were produced overall in this task than in the linguistic interview data. That said, the token numbers in this task are still relatively small, especially for the younger speaker groups. Overall, the results from the translation task again showed that the synthetic form was produced with similar frequency in the production of the immersion- and instruction-educated speakers, with no significant difference found between these two groups. The immersion-educated group produced synthetic forms with similar frequency for both irregular and regular verbs. The instruction-educated speakers seemed to ‘outperform’ the

immersion-educated speakers with regards to their production of irregular synthetic forms, however all of these forms were produced by one participant. This speaker was very much an outlier in this group in terms of their overall production. For the teachers, the majority of regular verbs produced were in the synthetic form, at a similar frequency to their production of irregular synthetic forms.

## Future Auxiliary Use

Figure 3e shows the overall distribution of future auxiliaries in the analytic future across all three speaker groups. Figure 3f displays the production of future auxiliaries visually.

Figure 3e. Table showing percentage frequency of different future auxiliaries  
(figure 3e near here)

Figure 3f. Graph showing percentage frequency of different future auxiliaries  
(figure 3f near here)

Differences were found between the use of future auxiliaries in the production of analytic futures across the three groups, prompting further data analysis. Overall, the participants all used the 'be'-auxiliary most frequently in the conversation task. The immersion-educated speakers noticeably preferred the 'be' form, producing very few tokens of the 'do'-auxiliary. For both the teachers and instruction-educated speakers, the 'do'-auxiliary was produced much more frequently than in the immersion-educated group. The teachers and instruction-educated speakers therefore pattern more similarly in their use of the 'be' and 'do' auxiliaries, with the immersion-educated speakers producing a significantly different pattern.

This may be due to the prevalence in the immersion-educated speakers' production of a future construction involving *goll dy* ('going to') followed by the verbal noun, as shown in the following example from one immersion-educated speaker:

*Ta mee goll dy goll dys shen...* [sic.]

be.pres 1.sg going to going to.loc that

"I am going to go there/to that..."

This construction accounted for almost a third of the immersion-educated speakers' production of analytic future tokens.

The results below show speakers' future auxiliary production in the translation task. Figure 3g shows the overall distribution analytic future auxiliary forms in the translation task across all three speaker groups. Figure 3h displays the production of future auxiliary tokens visually.

Figure 3g. Table showing percentage frequency of different future auxiliaries (translation task)

(figure 3g near here)

Figure 3h. Graph showing percentage frequency of different future auxiliaries (translation task)

(figure 3h near here)

In the translation task, no tokens of the 'going to'-auxiliary were produced by any participant. Due to this, the immersion-educated speakers showed a much higher production of tokens of the 'do'-auxiliary than in the conversational data. The teachers produced the 'do'-auxiliary much more frequently than the 'be'-auxiliary in this task, which was at odds with their production in the conversational data. Both groups of younger speakers produced the 'be'-

auxiliary tokens most frequently; in this task younger speakers show more similar production to each other, and a statistically significantly different production to that of the teachers.

The following section discusses the above results.

## Discussion

The previous section presented the results of my investigation where I compared patterns of use of a number of verbal forms in the linguistic production of different speakers of Revitalized Manx. The following sections will discuss what this analysis has revealed about these speakers' production.

It should be noted that the following describes broad processes at work in Manx speakers' production, which are reflected in statistical differences across three possible groupings of speakers. The Manx speaker community is small, and the linguistic models for speakers unclear and fluctuating (Ó hIfearnáin 2015b). Therefore, the nature of intra-community morphosyntactic variation, and the influence of 'grammatical idiolect' on any generalizations made about processes at work in the linguistic production of speakers of revitalized Manx, will be considerable. We should therefore note that the trends discussed below are likely to be in operation to different degrees for individual speakers. Nevertheless, the statistical analysis conducted on this data suggests that the groupings identified by this author are reflected in the operation of simplification and transfer to different degrees.

Past

The synthetic past is clearly present in the language use of speakers of Revitalized Manx: all speaker groups employed these forms. Synthetic constructions are produced much more frequently overall in the past tense than in the future. As previously mentioned, we would expect the presence of simplification to manifest in the frequent use of the analytic past tense. When the results from the past tense are compared to those of the future, it seems as though simplification plays a lesser role in the former than in the latter.

However, the greater use of the synthetic past may be linked to covert transfer from L1 English. The simple past in English is expressed synthetically (e.g. 'I went'). Covert transfer in Revitalized Manx would present as increased synthetic past use, and the frequency of the expression of the analytic form would be reduced due to it having no structural counterpart in the L1 English (Jones 2005: 161). Speakers of Manx are also likely to have had more exposure to the past tense than the future, especially if they acquired the language through education and do not use it frequently outside of limited settings. In addition, it is worth noting that the acquisition of the synthetic past is likely to be less 'L2 difficult' (Meisel 2011) for acquirers, as it does not involve as much inflectional morphology (i.e. suffixation). Both of the above would lead to greater use of the synthetic past during spontaneous production. These results therefore show multiple causation.

The picture is yet more complex when we consider differences between verb types. The above results suggest that simplification plays some role in speakers' expression of the past tense, exemplified by the apparent difference in productivity between regular and irregular verbs in the synthetic past. Synthetic past forms were employed more frequently overall with irregular verbs than regular, with the exception of the immersion-educated speakers, although this could be an effect of the low token number of regular verbs produced by this group.

Second language acquisition phenomena may offer some explanation for this link between the synthetic past and irregular verbs. The majority of the irregular verbs elicited in both tasks were common irregular verbs in Manx (e.g. those in Draskau 2008). Such verbs seem to be stored differently in second language acquirers, which affects their use in speech. For example, in second language acquirers of English, the inflected forms of verbs seem to be stored in the memory as complete items. These acquirers seem to be able to access the most frequent inflected forms of irregular verbs more quickly and easily than those inflected forms that belong to regular paradigms (Bowden et al. 2010). This may explain why speakers of Revitalized Manx more frequently produce the synthetic form for common irregular verbs in the past tense, with both regular verbs and less frequent irregular verbs often being produced analytically. Simplification, in the form of increased analyticity, may be at work in the past tense production of Revitalized Manx speakers, in that the analytic construction seems to be the most productive way of forming the past tense, with only frequent irregular verbs ‘marked’ for the synthetic. This may suggest that some degree of fossilization is in effect in the production of the synthetic past tense.

One exception to this concerns the frequent irregular past tense form of *jannoo* (‘do’). The synthetic past of this verb is formed by stem alternation, as in *ren mee* (‘I did’). The form *ren* serves both as an auxiliary verb for analytic constructions in the simple past and a main verb in the past tense (e.g. *ren mee shen* – ‘I did that’). According to the above explanation, we might expect this synthetic construction involving *ren* to be very frequent, as ‘do’ is a common irregular verb, but in the data, this was not the case. The speakers regularly produced the following:

a. *ren mee jannoo*

do.past 1.sg doing

‘I did.’



This was more frequently produced by the younger speakers. This may suggest that, among this group in particular, the primary function of *ren* is as a past tense auxiliary rather than a main verb. This may suggest that, for some younger speakers whose production is already heavily analytic, *ren* is more grammaticalized, having undergone more semantic bleaching, and thus functions principally, or possibly only, as a past tense auxiliary.

The difference between the older and younger speaker groups may be further exacerbated by prescriptive beliefs that exist among some older speakers of Manx with more meta-linguistic knowledge, namely the belief that the repetition of the verb ‘do’ in *ren mee jannoo* is redundant, rendering the construction ill-formed. This belief is attested in some grammars of Manx, and may be an example of what Lewin (2021) terms a “hyper-archaism”. For Lewin (*ibid.*: 15), these are forms “considered historically ‘correct’, even when these may in fact have been obsolete or ungrammatical in attested periods of the traditional language”. Speakers who hold such beliefs about the *ren mee jannoo* construction may be likely to avoid it in their production. This may therefore be an example of variation and change in post-revitalization Manx that is influenced by some degree by the linguistic ideologies of Revitalized Manx speakers (see Lewin 2021 for more potential examples). The possible avoidance of *ren mee jannoo* by some speakers seems to be a modern preoccupation, as this construction is attested in earlier stages of the language. That said, more data on the linguistic ideologies of current Manx Speakers would be needed to substantiate this (and indeed any) claims of links between linguistic ideologies and language variation and change in Revitalized Manx.

The three speaker groups also showed simplification to different degrees. In both tasks, the teachers used the synthetic past form more frequently than the younger speakers. That said, this difference was only statistically significant between the teachers and the instruction-

educated speakers. The difference in frequency of use of synthetic past forms was also statistically significant between the immersion- and the instruction-educated speakers, with the former producing the synthetic past more frequently than the latter. This therefore suggests that, with regards to the past tense, the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers have a more similar production, as opposed to that of the instruction-educated speakers.

The level of exposure to Manx that the speaker groups have had to Manx could explain these differences. Inflectional morphology is a notoriously 'L2 difficult' phenomenon (Meisel 2011). That said, its acquisition may become less difficult for speakers that have had more exposure to the target language. In this case, the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers will have received much more exposure to Manx, through working, studying, and/or socialising through the medium of Manx. According to Bowden et al. (2010), L2 learners initially rely on explicitly learned rules to produce inflected forms. However, with increased proficiency their production undergoes proceduralization and thus becomes increasingly L1-like, which might result in the greater production of synthetic forms by such speakers in spontaneous speech. Following Bowden et al. (2010), the production of the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers is likely to be more L1-like, namely with greater ease of production of synthetic forms, than that of the instruction-educated speakers.

Conversely, the instruction-educated speakers will have received less exposure during their acquisition of Manx, meaning their production showed less evidence of proceduralisation of synthetic past forms. Additionally, Meisel et al. (2013: 151) show that L2 speakers who did not reach a sufficient threshold of exposure during acquisition are more likely to show simplification of the Tense-Aspect-Mood system in their target language. These findings therefore suggest that speakers who received less exposure to the minority language are more

likely to show greater evidence of simplification in their production than those who have received more input: in this case the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers.

## Future

The synthetic forms of future tense verbs in the future were produced much less frequently by participants than past tense verbs. The analytic construction therefore is therefore the more productive method of forming the future tense for speakers of Revitalized Manx. As for the past tense, we would expect the presence of simplification to manifest in the frequent use of the analytic form. The results of this study suggest that morphosyntactic simplification plays a greater role in the future tense more than the past for Manx speakers.

This greater simplification observed in the future tense may also be the result of externally-motivated simplification caused by covert transfer from L1 English. The simple past in English is expressed synthetically, as noted above, however, the simple future is expressed analytically (e.g. ‘I will go’). This analytic expression of the future in English is more superficially structurally similar to the analytic future in Manx:

a. *nee eh goll*  
 do.fut 3.sg.masc going  
 “He will go.”

Therefore, there is greater scope for covert transfer in the future than in the past, as any reanalysis by speakers of the Manx future as a construction to be expressed analytically would find support from structures in the L1 English. This results in lower frequency of use of the synthetic future in their production. Whilst there is still precedent for internally-motivated simplification to take place in the past tense, and it does to varying extents, interlanguage analyses for analytic simple past expression would receive less support from

the L1, as there is no equivalent analytic construction in the linguistically dominant variety. However, as noted by Mougeon and Beniak (1991), it is very difficult to prove the existence of covert transfer, especially if it is possible that these findings can be explained in terms of internally-motivated simplification. Nevertheless, it is likely that the greater degree of analyticity in the Revitalized Manx future is a result of multiple causation, including both externally- and internally-motivated simplification.

The degree of simplification observed in future tense verbs differs depending on verb type. Many of the same L2-acquisition processes discussed above are likely at work in the future as in the past, albeit seemingly to a more extreme degree. The synthetic form of the future tense was generally not used for regular verbs – in the conversational data, not even a single regular synthetic token was produced by any participant. This suggests that for Revitalized Manx speakers the synthetic form of the future tense is limited to a few specific forms, mostly common irregulars. However, synthetic regular future forms were produced in the translation task by the teachers and the immersion-educated speakers, which indicates that these forms are part of these speakers' competence, but not necessarily a part of their production in spontaneous speech. The synthetic future should therefore be characterized as a partially fossilized form in this variety, at the very least significantly less productive than the past tense.

These results also revealed that there were differences between speakers with regards to the degree of simplification employed. The teachers still produced the synthetic form the most frequently, however for this variable their production was significantly different from that of both younger speaker groups. These two groups' productions were not significantly different from each other. The younger speakers of Manx show greater effects of simplification than their teachers for this variable. This may be explained similarly to the past tense findings in terms of the teachers' production; that production of the synthetic form is positively

correlated with exposure to the language, which contrasts with the increased fossilization, resulting from less complete acquisition, observed among some of the younger speakers.

One question that arises from this is why, unlike in the past tense, the immersion-educated speakers' production is more similar to that of the instruction-educated speakers rather than that of the teachers. Perhaps this speaker group makes greater use of covert transfer in their production, which manifests as greater use of the analytic form in the future tense, but would support more frequent use of the synthetic past tense. Perhaps they have had insufficient exposure to future tense verbs as compared to the past tense, leading to increased simplification. Further research would be needed to test these claims. There are also likely other factors at play for this group with regards to the future tense, which will be discussed in the following discussion of auxiliary use.

### Future Auxiliaries

In the results from the conversational data the 'be'-periphrasis was the most frequent form used for the analytic future tense across all speaker groups. The 'do'-periphrasis was also used as a significant minority in most groups, particularly by the teachers. From this, we might be tempted to conclude that the 'be'-periphrasis is emerging as the 'default' auxiliary to mark the future for speakers of Revitalized Manx.

However, there are differences between the speaker groups, particularly in the results of the translation task, which would complicate this conclusion. Namely, in this task the teachers dramatically increased their use of the 'do'-auxiliary, such that this was their most frequently used construction. This may be indicative of an aspectual distinction employed by the teachers. All of the sentence prompts in the translation task were given in the simple future in English (e.g. 'I will go'). Any aspectual information was less explicitly given in the

conversation task. As such, the fact that the teachers respond overwhelmingly to prompts in the simple future with the ‘do’- auxiliary may indicate that, for them, this form expresses this aspectual information. We might conclude from this that, in the norm of the teachers, there exists an aspectual binary in the future as expressed by the two auxiliaries, as shown below:

a. i. *nee eh goll* PERFECTIVE

do.fut 3.sg.masc going

“He will go.”

ii. *bee eh goll* PROGRESSIVE

be.fut 3.sg.masc going

“He will be going.”

The younger speaker groups do increase their production of the ‘do’-auxiliary in the translation task, but not nearly to the extent of their teachers. This may indicate that the above aspectual distinction, or lack thereof, separates their production from that of their teachers. They may also be developing their own norms, independent of those of the teachers, as discussed below.

The results also revealed that another auxiliary construction, the *goll dy*-future, was used almost exclusively by the immersion-educated speakers. They would produce sentences such as the following:

*ta mee goll dy goll dys shen...* [sic.]

be.pres 1.sg going to going to.loc that

“I am going to go there/to that...”

This construction is attested in earlier stages of Manx, being seemingly marginal in Classical Manx and attested in Late Spoken Manx. It is also attested in the other Gaelic languages, and the cross-linguistic grammaticalization of ‘to go’ as a future auxiliary is common, this development having occurred in several European languages (c.f. French near-future constructions e.g. *je vais aller*, among others). This development has also notably occurred in English, in which ‘going to’ has become fully grammaticalized as a future auxiliary. The presence of this construction might therefore be a natural development in Revitalized Manx, with speakers employing a common linguistic metaphor and increasing the frequency of use of an existing construction, perhaps to express a specific temporal distinction (i.e. near future). This would be the simplest explanation for these findings, but would not fully address why this form was overwhelmingly used by the immersion-educated speakers only.

The lack of *goll dy*-future tokens in both the production of the teachers and of the instruction-educated speakers suggests that this construction does not form part of the linguistic model the immersion-educated speakers received during acquisition. That said, the author suspects this construction may well feature in the linguistic competence of Manx teachers, and that the fact that the almost complete absence of this form in both tasks suggests that the prescriptive attitudes of the teachers contribute to their lack of production of the *goll dy*-future (and, presumably, of actively teaching this form to their students). The perception of this structure as overly ‘Anglicized’, and the accompanying negative attitudes sometimes expressed by Manx speakers towards forms perceived as such, likely plays a role. This is further supported by the lack of discussion of this future auxiliary in any Manx grammar book known to the present author. Evidently, more data is needed to explore this further. However, this author would question whether the immersion-educated speakers would have the degree of metalinguistic knowledge necessary to be aware of this construction that was seemingly marginal in earlier stages of Manx and that is not present in their linguistic model.

All of the above suggests that the current iteration of the *goll dy*-future is an innovation by the immersion-education group that shares a structural similarity to a construction that previously existed in earlier stages of Manx. We might therefore posit that the frequent production of the *goll dy*-future by the immersion-educated younger speakers is another example of covert transfer, wherein an existing construction available in Manx is increased in its frequency of use by some Manx speakers as a result of its structural similarity to another construction in the speakers' L1, in this case the 'going to' future form in English.

I would therefore posit that, among younger speakers of Manx, this construction is a calque on the English 'going to + verb' future construction, and may in fact be an example of overt transfer (Mougeon and Beniak 1991). This is a process whereby a construction based on a construction in a speaker's L1 is introduced into the target L2, thus leading to a qualitative difference in the L2. Therefore, the *goll dy* construction may be an example of a contact-induced change resulting from second language acquisition processes, in this case imposition. In van Coetsem's (2000) framework, imposition is a process associated with the transfer of more 'stable' linguistic components from the source language (SL) to the recipient language (RL) in a contact situation. The 'going to + verb' future form is a syntactic construction: one of the most stable linguistic components. Therefore, for this construction to be transferred from the SL English to the RL Manx, SL agentivity would have to be in place, meaning that, for the speaker(s) involved, English would be the most linguistically dominant variety, which is the case for our immersion-educated speakers. On an individual level, imposition is therefore common in second language acquisition, with features of the 'learner language' being imposed upon the 'target language', at least until the acquisition of the latter is more complete (van Coetsem 2000). If this acquisition is incomplete or imperfect, the features introduced by imposition during SLA are likely to remain in the learner's production in the target language. If this occurs in a number of speakers, this may result in changes in the RL



on the community level, and ultimately the emergence of a new linguistic norm (Winford 2003). This may be what is happening for the immersion-educated speakers; we have a community that consists entirely of second language acquirers, who have reduced exposure to the target language, and increased exposure to the SL, after age 11. This feature that was therefore introduced during second language acquisition by imposition is therefore never ‘overridden’, and has resulted in a change in this group’s linguistic norms.

However, the question remains as to why these speakers would resort to transfer when other analytic future constructions are readily available in Manx. We could put this down to pressures of production forcing speakers to use their L1 knowledge to express more than their L2 competence can cope with (Siegel: 2009). Van Coetsem (2000: 74) also notes that there may be sociolinguistic motivations for transfer, especially from a more socially dominant language, which may be at play. However, it may be that these speakers are innovating in order to express some *aktionsart* information not available to them in Manx, leading this group to create a new temporal distinction on the model of their L1 English. This has precedence in changes which are a result of imposition, such as the creation of new aspectual categories in Irish English as a result of second language acquisition by Irish Gaelic L1 speakers (Hickey 2007: 149). Declerck et al (2006) state that, in English, ‘going to + verb’ can be used as a ‘pure future’ form to express a premeditated intention, or as a so-called ‘future-ish’ form to “express the idea that a postpresent situation is predictable at t0 because its origin lies in the present” (Declerck et al. 2006: 345- 6). The immersion-educated speakers may be expressing a post-present distinction in Manx, leading to an innovative future construction emerging in their production.

This form is likely not felt to be an example of good language use, as it is not produced when the future is directly elicited in the translation task. For the immersion-educated speakers, then, this form may only be felt to be appropriate in certain contexts, such as a conversation

with a peer, and not in a ‘test-like’ context. This may be an example of a developing register difference in these speakers, in which the ‘*goll dy*’ future is produced in low registers. The immersion-educated speakers had no difficulty producing the ‘do’ and ‘be’ auxiliaries when prompted in the higher register translation task; these forms are clearly part of the immersion-educated speakers’ linguistic competence. Further exploration of the ‘*goll dy*’ auxiliary is needed to ascertain the role of this form for some speakers of Revitalized Manx.

## Concluding Remarks

The above findings give some glimpses into what the morphosyntax of spoken Revitalized Manx looks like, and what linguistic norms are emerging among speakers. The study used original spoken data from speakers of Revitalized Manx, and explored the following questions:

1. How do speakers of Revitalized Manx use synthetic and analytic forms of verbs?
2. Are there differences in the use of verbal forms between Revitalized Manx speakers?
3. To what extent can we explain these findings as the results of processes at work in the linguistic production of speakers of revitalized minority languages?

The findings of this study shed light on the ways in which speakers produce verb forms. Processes that have been found to be at work in the acquisition of speakers of revitalized minority languages (e.g. in Mayeux 2015; Hornsby 2015), namely simplification and transfer, have some degree of explanatory power in the case of the verb production of speakers of Revitalized Manx. There is evidence that both processes are in operation in their linguistic production, but the presence of and interaction between these processes varies between verb type. Factors such as the regularity and tense of the verb in question play a role for speakers when producing analytic and synthetic verbs.

Differences were indeed found in the production of these speaker groups, but the degree and nature of that difference varies. For past tense verbs, the production of the teachers and the immersion-educated younger speakers are more similar, whereas for the future, the immersion-educated students patterned more similarly to their instruction-educated counterparts. To further shed light on the differences between groups of Manx speakers, comprehensive studies of the linguistic models, both spoken and written, to which younger Manx speakers are exposed during their acquisition of the language will be essential. As well as the linguistic processes identified by this author, linguistic models and modes of acquisition will undoubtedly influence speakers' production, perhaps leading to differences.

The results of this study also raised interesting implications as to the apparent prestige of the synthetic and analytic form, which is likely linked to the issue of linguistic models as raised above. In all the verb types discussed, the synthetic form of the verb seems to be held in higher prestige than the analytic by speakers of Revitalized Manx. This form was produced much more often in the translation task than in the linguistic interviews. The translation task allowed the participant more time to employ forms consciously, and, due to the presence of the researcher, presented a more pressured, 'test-like' environment. The task therefore lent itself to the greater production of forms that are felt to be appropriate to produce in such an environment, such as regular synthetic verbs. These forms are part of most speakers' competences, but are not found so frequently in spontaneous production. Similarly, we might also expect this task to produce a dearth of forms felt to be inappropriate outside of casual, spontaneous production, such as the *goll dy*-future, which proved to be the case. These findings further evidence that there exists in the Manx-speaking community some perception of register difference, likely linked to ideas of 'good' and 'bad' language use (as discussed in Ó hÍfearnáin 2015b). As yet, there has been little discussion in the literature regarding exactly which linguistic forms speakers feel are included in formal or casual use, or which forms are

viewed positively or negatively. In this domain, exploration of this author's preliminary findings on aspectual, and possibly register, differences in the use of 'be'- and 'do'- auxiliaries in the analytic future are essential. Further study of all of the above, especially in the domain of morphosyntax, would be eagerly welcomed by the present author.

This study was limited in scope, and therefore presents many opportunities for further research on speakers of Revitalized Manx. It would be interesting to analyse their production of the synthetic and analytic forms of verbs in different grammatical persons more systematically. It would also be useful to analyse the verbs in this corpus with regards to frequency, perhaps in contrast with written corpora, to investigate more closely its role in the use of synthetic and analytic forms by speakers. More generally, the corpus collected and the findings from this study could be used as a point of reference for variation and change in Manx. In particular, this study's limited discussion of the role of language ideology highlighted the need for further studies into the linguistic ideologies held by current members of the revitalized Manx speaker community, and the nature of the link between these ideologies and language use, variation, and change in post-revitalization Manx.

In the case of Manx, it is important to consider that, in the absence of an active community of traditional speakers to transmit the language, whatever linguistic norms emerge among today's speakers may represent the norms of Manx as it will be spoken in the future, should the language be passed on to future generations. The findings of this study beg the question of how stable the emerging linguistic norms of these groups are, especially the younger speakers in this study, who represent the first 'generation' of Manx speakers to have acquired the language from childhood through immersion education. It will be interesting to see from future studies whether the linguistic norms for Manx are still in the process of stabilising, and whether observed differences will be maintained, or whether Manx's unclear and fluctuating linguistic model (Ó hIfearnáin 2015b) will eventually settle. Real- and apparent-time studies

of the evolution of Manx would therefore be of interest, both academically and from a language planning perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Bernadette O'Rourke and Jennifer Smith for their comments on this manuscript, as well as two anonymous reviewers. Any remaining faults are my own.

<sup>2</sup> At least one of the participants in this study stated that their first acquired language was Manx, but they all now use English most frequently.

<sup>3</sup> We might note the traditional Manx saying: *Cha jean oo cosney ping lesh y Ghailck* ('You won't earn a penny with Manx').

<sup>4</sup> Structural changes associated with language death may present differently across a given speaker community (e.g. Dorian 1978 on East Sutherland Gaelic). It should also be noted that many of the changes observed in language death are also observed in 'healthy' language change; the difference being that in obsolescing varieties change often takes place to a greater degree and over a shorter timespan (Dorian 1981: 4, Palosaari and Campbell 2011). For Jones (1998b), only when the linguistic changes outlined above occur at an accelerated rate and within a socio-political context of language shift can a variety be classed as obsolescent.

<sup>5</sup> There has been some debate over the terminology of language death and revitalization, including the use of the terms 'revitalization' and 'revival' in the Manx context (e.g. Lewin 2016). Dorian (1994) distinguishes between 'revitalization', which refers to reversing language shift in linguistic communities where the minority language still has L1 speakers, and 'revival', where records such as documentation are used to bring an 'extinct' language 'back to life' (Lewin 2016: 14). The situation of Manx does not fit neatly into either of these categories. This article is not concerned with entering into this debate. I have chosen to use the term 'revitalization' throughout this article not in refutation of any arguments to the contrary, but because it is the term most commonly encountered in linguistic discourse on endangered varieties.

<sup>6</sup> 'Simplification' is a rather unfortunate term; its use in this article does not imply any value judgement.

<sup>7</sup> The explanatory adequacy of transfer in language change is debated (Treffers-Daller and Mougeon 2005, Mougeon and Beniak 1991), as its presence is often difficult to prove. Covert transfer is particularly difficult to detect. This is especially true in cases of language revitalization, where there is likely no speech community that has not undergone language contact with which to compare norms (Jones 2005, 162).

## References

- A. Bentahila & E. Davies, 'Language revival: restoration or transformation?' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 14/5 (1993), 355-373.

---

H. W. Bowden, M. P. Gelfand, C. Sanz, & M. T. Ullman, 'Verbal Inflectional Morphology in L1 and L2 Spanish: A Frequency Effects Study Examining Storage versus Composition', *Language Learning*, 60/1, (2010), 44–87.

Amy Brew, *Morphophonology of Manx*. (University of Oxford: MPhil Thesis, 2017).

George Broderick, Carl J. S. Marstrander, & ProQuest (Firm), *Language death in the Isle of Man: an investigation into the decline and extinction of Manx Gaelic as a community language in the Isle of Man*, (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999).

L. Campbell & M. C. Muntzel, 'The Structural Consequences of Language Death' in Nancy.C. Dorian (ed.), *Investigating Obsolescence*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

M. Clague, 'Manx language revitalization and immersion education', *Journal of Interdisciplinary Celtic Studies*, 2 (2009), 165-198.

F. van Coetsem, *A general and unified theory of the transmission process in language contact* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2000).

N. Davalan, (1999). Interférences linguistiques chez les enfants scolarisés en breton. In Francis Favereau (ed.), *Le bilinguisme précoce en Bretagne, en pays celtiques et en Europe atlantique*, 97–118. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Renaat Declerck, Susan Reed & Bert Cappelle, *The grammar of the English verb phrase* (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006).

W. Dressler, D. Greene, H. Wagner, & E. Ternes, 'A propos de la grammaire du discours en breton', *Études Celtiques*, 13/1 (1972), 153-170.

N.C. Dorian, 'The fate of morphological complexity in language death: evidence from ESG', *Language*, 54 (1978), 590-609.

Nancy C. Dorian, *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).

- 
- N. C. Dorian, 'Purism vs. compromise in language revitalization and language revival', *Language in Society*, 23 (1994), 479-494.
- Joshua A. Fishman, *Reversing Language Shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1991).
- V. C. M. Gathercole, & E. M. Thomas, 'Bilingual first-language development: Dominant language takeover, threatened minority language take-up', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12/2 (2009), 213–237.
- Philip, Gawne, 'Aithne na nGael: Life after death' In Gordon McCoy & Maolcholaim Scott (eds.). *Aithne na nGael: Gaelic identities*, (Belfast: Ultach Trust, 2000), 129–43.
- Philip Gawne, 'Y Ghaelg as ynsagh ayns Mannin', in Maolcholaim Scott & Róise Ní Bhaoill (eds.), *Gaelic-medium education provision: Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland, Scotland and the Isle of Man*, (Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona, 2003), 133–44.
- S. T. Gries, 'Basic Significance Testing', in Robert Podesva, & Devyani Sharma (eds.) *Research methods in linguistics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- A. Henry, & D. Tangney, (1996) 'Functional categories in child L2 acquisition of Irish', *Proceedings of the twentieth annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, (Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press, 1996), pp. 118–127.
- Raymond Hickey, *Irish English: History and present-day forms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- M. Hornsby, 'The 'new' and 'traditional' speaker dichotomy: bridging the gap', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231 (Special Issue: New Speakers of Minority Languages, 2015), 107–126.
- Isle of Man Government, *Isle of Man Census Report 2021* (Douglas: Isle of Man Government, 2002).

- 
- A. Jaffe, 'Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231 (Special Issue: New Speakers of Minority Languages, 2015), 21–44.
- Mari. C. Jones, *Language Obsolescence and Revitalization: linguistic change in two sociolinguistically contrasting Welsh communities* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998b).
- M. C. Jones, 'Transfer and changing linguistic norms in Jersey Norman French', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8/2 (2005), 159–175.
- J. Kewley Draskau, 'Language Death and Resurrection in the Isle of Man: The Continuity of Manx Gaelic Exemplified by the Use of Inflected Verb Tenses', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 24/25 (2004/2005), 229-246.
- J. Kewley Draskau, 'Interlingual Contact: Some Modals with Variable Morphology in Manx Gaelic', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*. 10 (2006), 85-120.
- Jennifer Draskau, *Practical Manx* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008).
- William Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972).
- C. Lewin, *The revivability of Manx Gaelic: a linguistic description and discussion of Revived Manx*, (University of Aberystwyth: MPhil Dissertation: 2016).
- C. Lewin, Scholarship and Language Revival: Language Ideologies in Corpus Development for Revived Manx, *Studia Celtica Posnaniensia*, 2/1 (2017), 97-118.
- C. Lewin, "'Manx hardly deserved to live": perspectives on language contact and language shift', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 64/1 (2017), 141-206.
- C. Lewin, 'Continuity and hybridity in language revival: The case of Manx', *Language in Society*, (2021), 1-29.
- Oliver F. Mayeux, *New Speaker Language: The morphosyntax of new speakers of endangered languages*, (University of Cambridge: MPhil Thesis, 2015).



---

W. McLeod & B. O'Rourke, "'New speakers" of Gaelic: perceptions of linguistic authenticity and appropriateness', *Applied Linguistics Review*, (2015).

Jürgen M Meisel, *First and Second Language Acquisition: Parallels and Differences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Jürgen M. Meisel, Martin Elsig, & Esther Rinke, *Language acquisition and change: A morphosyntactic perspective* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013).

Christopher Moseley, (ed.) *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edn. (UNESCO Publishing, Paris, 2010).

Raymond Mougéon, & Edouard Beniak, *Linguistic consequences of language contact and restriction: the case of French in Ontario, Canada* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

C. Nance, "'New" Scottish Gaelic speakers in Glasgow: A phonetic study of language revitalization', *Language in Society*, 44 (2015), 553-579.

Michael P. Oakes, *Statistics for Corpus Linguistics* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008).

B. Ó Bróin, 'New Urban Irish: Pidgin, Creole, or Bona Fide Dialect? The Phonetics and Morphology of City and Gaeltacht Speakers Systematically Compared', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, 15 (2014), 69-91.

T. Ó hÍfearnáin, 'Sociolinguistic vitality of Manx after extreme language shift: authenticity without traditional native speakers', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231 (Special Issue: New Speakers of Minority Languages) (2015a), 45-62.

T. Ó hÍfearnáin, 'Back to the Future: Standard and language standards in contemporary Manx Gaelic', *Sociolinguistica*, 29/1 (2015b), 99-120.

---

N. Ó Murchadha & T. Ó hIfearnáin, 'Converging and diverging stances on target revival varieties in collateral languages: the ideologies of linguistic variation in Irish and Manx Gaelic', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, (2018), 458-469.

Bernadette O'Rourke, *Galician and Irish in the European Context: Attitudes Towards Weak and Strong Minority Languages*, (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

B. O'Rourke, 'Language Revitalization Models in Minority Language Contexts: Tensions between Ideologies of Authenticity and Anonymity', *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 24/1 (2015), 63-82.

B. O'Rourke & F. Ramallo, 'The native-non-native dichotomy in minority language contexts: comparisons between Irish and Galician', *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 35/2 (2011), 139-159.

B. O'Rourke & J. Pujolar, 'From native speakers to 'new speakers' – problematizing nativeness in language revitalization contexts', *Histoire Épistémologie Langage, le locuteur natif*, 35/2 (2013), 27-67.

B. O'Rourke & J. Pujolar, 'New speakers and processes of new speakerness across time and space', *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6/2 (2015), 145-150.

B. O'Rourke, J. Pujolar, & F. Ramallo, 'Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231 (Special Issue: New Speakers of Minority Languages) (2015) 1-20.

Bernadette O'Rourke & John Walsh, *New Speakers of Irish in the Global Context. New Revival?* (London: Routledge, 2020).

---

Naomi Palosaari, N. and Lyle Campbell, 'Structural aspects of language endangerment', in Peter K. Austin and Julia Sallabank (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 100-119.

Removed Pilgrim from references

F. Ramallo, B. O'Rourke, & J. Pujolar, 'New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231 (2014) (Special Issue: New Speakers of Minority Languages).

Heath Rose, Jim McKinley, & Jessica B. Baffoe-Djan, *Data collection research methods in applied linguistics* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020).

Natalie Schilling, 'Surveys and Interviews', in Robert Podesva & Devyani Sharma (eds.), *Research methods in linguistics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Julia Sallabank, *Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

A. Schmidt, 'The Fate of Ergativity in Dying Dyirbal', *Language*, 61/2 (1985), 378-396.

Jeff Siegel, 'Language Contact and Second Language Acquisition', in William C. Ritchie & Tej K. Bhatia (eds.) *The New Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (Bingley: Emerald, 2009), pp. 569–589.

Brian Stowell and Diarmuid Ó Bréasláin, *A Short History of the Manx Language* (Belfast: An Clochán, 1996).

P. W. Thomas, 'Children in Welsh-medium education: semilinguals or innovators?', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12 (1991), 45-53.

Sarah G. Thomason, *Endangered Languages: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

---

J. Treffers-Daller & R. Mougeon, 'The role of transfer in language variation and change: Evidence from contact varieties of French', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8/2 (2005), 93-98.

Peter Trudgill, *Sociolinguistic typology: social determinants of linguistic complexity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Donald Winford, *An introduction to contact linguistics* (Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 2003).

G. N. Wilson, 'But the Language has got children now: Language Revitalization and Education Planning in the Isle of Man', *Shima: The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures*, 3/2 (2009).

G. Wilson, H. Johnson, & J. Sallabank, "'I'm not dead yet'": a comparative study of indigenous language revitalization in the Isle of Man, Jersey and Guernsey', *Current issues in language planning*, 16/3 (2015), 259-278.

F. Yates, 'Contingency table involving small numbers and the  $\chi^2$  test', *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1/2 (1934), 217-235.