The revivability of Manx Gaelic:
a linguistic description and discussion of Revived Manx

MPhil Thesis

Christopher Lewin

Prifysgol Aberystwyth

Adran y Gymraeg ac Astudiaethau Celtaidd

2016

As dooyrt eh rhym, Vac y dooinney, vod ny craueyn shoh aa-vioghey? as dreggyr mee, O Hiarn Yee, ayd's ta fys.

Reesht dooyrt eh rhym, Jean phadeyrys er ny craueyn shoh, as abbyr roo, O shiuish chraueyn chirrym, clasht-jee goo yn Chiarn.

Myr shoh ta'n Chiarn Jee dy ghra rish ny craueyn shoh, Cur-my-ner, ver-yms er ennal dy gholl stiagh ayndiuish, as nee shiu aa-vioghey. As nee'm fehyn y choyrt erriu, as ver-ym er feill dy heet seose erriu, as coodee-ym shiu lesh crackan, as ver-ym ennal ayndiu: as bee shiu bio, as bee fys eu, dy nee mish y Chiarn,

Er shoh ren mee phadeyrys, myr va mee sarit; as myr va mee phadeyrys, va tharmane ry-chlashtyn, as cur-my-ner gleayshaghey, as haink ny craueyn dy cheilley, craue gys e chraue.

As tra va mee er yeeaghyn, cur-my-ner haink fehyn as feill seose orroo, as ren crackan gaase harrystoo: agh cha row veg yn ennal ayndoo.

Eisht dooyrt eh rhym, Jean phadeyrys gys y gheay, jean phadeyrys, vac y dooinney, as abbyr rish y gheay, Myr shoh ta'n Chiarn Jee dy ghra, Tar veih ny kiare geayghyn, O ennal, as sheid ennal ayns ny merriu shoh, dy vod ad ve bio.

Er shoh ren mee phadeyrys, myr doardee eh dou, as haink yn ennal ayndoo, as ren ad aa-vioghey, as hass ad seose er nyn gassyn, sheshaght-caggee erskyn earroo mooar,

Eisht dooyrt eh rhym, Vac y dooinney, ta ny craueyn shoh slane thie Israel: cur-my-ner t'ad gra, Ta ny craueyn ain shirgit, as ta nyn dreishteil er vailleil, er nyn son ain, ta shin giarit jeh.

Shen-y-fa jean phadeyrys, as abbyr roo, Myr shoh ta'n Chiarn Jee dy ghra, Cur-my-ner, O my phobble, neem's ny oaiaghyn eu y osley, as ver-ym erriu dy heet seose ass ny oaiaghyn eu, as ver-ym lhiam shiu stiagh gys thalloo Israel.

(Ezekiel 37: 3–12)

Declarations

Word Count of thesis: 59,336

DECLARATION This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed .... (candidate) Date ....

STATEMENT 1 This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where *correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s). Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed .... (candidate) Date ....

[*this refers to the extent to which the text has been corrected by others]

STATEMENT 2 I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed .... (candidate) Date ....

NB: Candidates on whose behalf a bar on access (hard copy) has been approved by the University should use the following version of Statement 2: I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loans after expiry of a bar on access approved by Aberystwyth University.

Signed .... (candidate) Date ....

This summary sheet should be completed after you have read the guidance notes. The completed sheet should be submitted by you to your Department/School/Institute at the time of submission of your work and the supporting documentation.

Candidate's Surname/Family Name	Lewin
Candidate's Forenames	Christopher Paul
Candidate for the Degree of	MPhil
Academic year the work submitted for examination	2015–16
Full title of thesis	The revivability of Manx Gaelic: a linguistic description and discussion of Revived Manx

Summary:

The present thesis provides a linguistic overview of the revived variety of Manx Gaelic, the Celtic language of the Isle of Man currently spoken by a few hundred people who have learnt it as a second language, and a small number of children raised bilingually. The introductory chapter presents an overview of the recent history and current situation of Revived Manx; the academic literature on both varieties of Manx; the study of language revival in general; and the ideological issues surrounding the terminology of language 'revival' and of language 'death'. In Chapter 2 an overview is given of the linguistic features of Revived Manx (RM) with comparisons to the traditional variety (Traditional Manx, TM), with sections on phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax, and lexis, idiom and style. In Chapter 3 RM is placed in the wider context of the phenomenon of language variety, with particular focus on comparisons with Revived Hebrew (and the problems with such comparisons); the concept of interlanguage; language revival as language contact; and existing language ideologies prevalent in the RM community. Finally consideration is given to the future prospects of the language, and recommendations are made concerning ideological clarification and corpus planning.

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction to Revived Manx

1. Introductory remarks

The present thesis provides a linguistic overview of the revived variety of Manx Gaelic, the Celtic language of the Isle of Man currently spoken by a few hundred people who have learnt it as a second language, and a small number of children raised bilingually. In Chapter 2 an overview is given of the linguistic features of Revived Manx (RM) with comparisons to the traditional variety (Traditional Manx, TM). In Chapter 3 Revived Manx is placed in the wider context of the phenomenon of language variety, and consideration is given to the future prospects of the language. The present introductory chapter presents an overview of the recent history and current situation of Revived Manx (§2); the academic literature on both varieties of Manx (§3); the study of language revival in general (§4); and the ideological issues surrounding the terminology of language 'revival' (§5) and of language 'death' (§6). Finally, the aims and scope of the thesis are presented in greater detail (§7).

2. Recent developments and the situation of Revived Manx today

According to the 2011 census, 1,823 individuals out of a resident population of 84,497, i.e. 2.16% of the population of the island claimed to be able to speak, read or write Manx. A slightly lower total of 1,662 (1.97%) are claimed to be able to speak the language, 796 (0.94%) can write it and 1,079 (1.28%) can read Manx (Isle of Man Census Report 2011). Detailed questions on proficiency are not contained in the census, and it is self-reporting, so it is likely that some of these individuals possess only a limited knowledge of the language. Based on the estimates of individuals active in the movement at a forum in 2010, Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 54) suggests that there were then around 100 'higher fluent members of a Manx speaker community'. According to estimates obtained from Manx-speaking informants by Ager (2009: 44), numbers of fluent speakers were somewhere between 50 and 500, depending on one's definition of 'fluency'. A significant development is that not all Manx speakers now know each other:

> They were sure that the number had grown in recent years to the extent that not all fluent Manx speakers could now say that they knew all the others, which had certainly been the case for almost all the 20th century.
> (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 54)

This agrees with the present author's own experience of the Revived Manx community from the early 2000s onwards: at the beginning of this period, occasional major Manx events such as the Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh (Manx Language Society, YCG) Christmas carol service or the Feailley Ghaelgagh (latterly the Cooish, 'chat' or 'matter') would attract the vast majority of active Manx speakers, and the same faces would appear at every event, whereas recently the number of events has grown and the community has become more diffuse, with the result that new faces are quite usual (cf. Ager 2009: 42). There also seems to have been a loosening of formal structures as membership of social networks in which Manx is spoken have become more important than, and less synonymous with, membership of bodies such as YCG. The formal awarding of the *Fainey* (Appendix §2) has become defunct since the 1990s, and the process of becoming recognized as a 'speaker' rather than a 'learner' of Manx is no longer marked by a formal ritual. This function may to some extent have been taken over by the GCSE and A-level equivalent examinations, which are taken by older learners as well as school children; moreover it may be the case that membership of the community is defined more implicitly and sub-consciously:

> members of such a community participate in linguistic variation within a system, sharing interpretive norms in that they have a common belief, for example, of what it is to speak a particular language or variety, thus defining group membership.
> (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 58)

Manx has become well established as part of the education system. The peripatetic teaching of Manx in the schools is largely on the same pattern as that established in the early 1990s, although the team has grown somewhat and as of 2012 there were nine teachers trained by the Manx Unit of the Department of Education able to teach Manx within their own schools (Broderick 2015: 34). The situation in the secondary schools has gradually improved, with some of them now offering Manx on the timetable as a modern language alongside other options such as French or German (Clague 2009: 176, Ager 2009: 31), although uptake of Manx is still much higher at the primary than the secondary level. The number of pupils in the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh (Manx medium primary school) is now 70 (school year 2015–6),[1] with long waiting lists for places. The school has a good reputation in the island community, and parents choose to send their children there not just out of interest to the Manx language but for

---

[1] Julie Matthews, personal communication 05.08.2015.

a variety reasons, including the perceived general benefits of bilingualism, smaller class sizes, and a wish to build on the success of Mooinjer Veggey (Clague 2009: 187).

The growth of Manx education and the increased profile of the language in public life have meant that knowledge of at least a few phrases such as *moghrey mie* 'good morning' is now widespread in the community. Greetings in Manx are heard on a daily basis on the radio, and in announcements on the Steam Packet ferries and at the Isle of Man airport, and frequently at public meetings and entertainments. Bilingual signage is now widespread on government buildings and vehicles, and also on a number of shops and other private businesses, where "open" and "closed" and "no smoking" signs supplied by Culture Vannin are often seen. However, most utilitarian signage such as traffic -signs continues to be monolingually English, and most public use of the language seems generally to be viewed as symbolic rather than practical.

A key figure in past decade or so has been Adrian Cain, the current *Greinneyder* or Manx Language Development Officer for Culture Vannin (formerly the Manx Heritage Foundation). His work has focused on public relations and building partnerships with businesses and charities as well as the government, and also on building links and sharing ideas with other language revitalization movements and experts. He is widely seen as the lynchpin of the language community and is involved at some level in co-ordinating most Manx events and projects, in conjunction with the established language organizations such as YCG. Cain's email lists, Twitter account and the Learn Manx website which he administers play an important rôle in spreading news about events, lessons etc. and in making learning and reading materials available to the community.

Cain has also been instrumental in revamping Manx adult classes, and training new and existing teachers to use a new methodology and course materials, *Saase Jeeragh* ('direct method'),[2] which was launched in 2009 (Cain 2009: 1), based ultimately on the Ulpan methodology developed in Israel for the rapid teaching of Hebrew by oral instruction. A more immediate inspiration was this methodology's application in Wales, and in the summer of 2009 Elwyn Hughes of the University of Wales, Bangor, came to the island to give a demonstration Welsh lesson to those interested in developing the method for teaching Manx (ibid.). Most of the adult classes around the island now use this method, although with some customization according to the preferences and circumstances of teachers and students. Cain has innovated by arranging classes in lunch breaks as well as the more traditional evening slots, and by

---

[2] The name is inspired by a course of the same title by J. J. Kneen (1911).

offering classes inside workplaces in co-operation with businesses. As of summer 2015, twelve classes using the *Saase Jeeragh* methodology are running, with two new classes due to begin in the autumn.[3] More traditional classes involving study of the written language and the Bible etc. continue to be offered by Caarjyn ny Gaelgey ('Friends of Manx'). A variety of more informal conversational sessions are held in cafés, pubs etc. in order to allow those with an intermediate level of Manx to practise speaking in a supportive and relaxed environment. It appears, however, that many learners view the social aspect of Manx lessons and activities as more important than gaining full fluency, and according to an estimate by Brian Stowell quoted in Ager (2009: 41), only about 5% of those who attend adult classes attain fluency.

Other events, such as Manx-medium Scrabble evenings, Manx dinners, and Manx medium trips off island for groups of intermediate learners, have also proved popular. The new cohorts of enthusiastic learners who have emerged from Saase Jeeragh classes, who may not have yet achieved full fluency but nevertheless wish to be proactively involved in the language movement, have been represented since 2013 by the new organization Pobble ('People') (Cain 2013), set up under the guidance of Adrian Cain to represent learners and to lobby for new advances in Manx provision, such as extending Manx-medium education beyond Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, and establishing a language and cultural centre. In the face of the economic difficulties of recent years, with spending cuts being implemented by the Manx government, it has not so far proved possible to fulfil these aims; nevertheless Pobble and the other Manx language organizations continue to campaign to safeguard what has been achieved so far and to plan for the future.

Fluent speakers tend to use Manx in their own personal friendship groups and social networks, and in some cases within families, independent of Manx related events and activities, which are often heavily orientated towards the needs of the large numbers of learners rather than the smaller pool of fluent speakers. Another important domain where Manx is spoken is the few Manx-speaking workplaces, such as the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, where Manx is the social and professional language of the staff-room as well as the medium of instruction, and the peripatetic Manx Unit. Manx is also often heard in social use at events relating to the Manx traditional music scene. A number of ex-Bunscoill pupils, now coming of age, are involved in the traditional music scene and have chosen to continue to speak Manx among themselves and to other Manx speakers. It is as yet unclear, however, how many graduates of the Bunscoill will continue to use Manx in the future and how important this cohort of speakers may be over

---

[3] Adrian Cain, personal communication 04.08.2015.

the coming years. As in the 1990s, a few families are currently seeking to raise their children with Manx as a first language (Ager 2009: 40).

Another area which has seen growth in the past few years has been publishing in Manx. Little original material has been produced, but a number of translations have been produced, especially of children's books such as Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *The Gruffalo* by Julia Donaldson. A number of books have been translated and published recently by Culture Vannin which have adult storylines but simple language, originally intended in English for those with reading difficulties, but adapted into Manx to serve the needs of intermediate learners. Many of these books have been released with accompanying audio CDs. YCG is also still involved in publishing material, sometimes in conjunction with Culture Vannin, and Caarjyn ny Gaelgey have also published volumes in recent years. There is a monthly bilingual column in the *Isle of Man Examiner* dealing with a wide range of current affairs, as well as Manx and minority language issues. No regular magazine in Manx currently exists, as it has been found that earlier efforts were expensive to produce, and it is difficult to find enough writers with sufficient free time and confidence. One difference from earlier periods is that modest payment is available to Manx writers, translators and teachers from Culture Vannin's Manx language budget, so it is no longer necessary to rely entirely on uncompensated volunteers, although a good deal of Manx language activism remains entirely voluntary. In addition to the Learn Manx website, Adrian Cain runs two Facebook pages, one mainly in English for beginners and supporters, and one intended to be mostly in Manx; both of these pages are widely used by those interested in Manx. 2013 saw the release on DVD of *Caarjyn as Fenee*, a dubbed Manx version of the cartoon series *Friends and Heroes*, the company responsible for which is based in the island. Apart from this, little in the way of films or cartoons has been produced in Manx in recent years, although Culture Vannin have made available a large number of short videos of interviews in Manx and other material on Youtube.

Broadcasting in the form of short news bulletins in Manx began in 1970 (Broderick 2015: 36), and a limited amount of Manx-medium or bilingual programming has existed ever since. At present two long-running bilingual programmes, *Claare ny Gael* ('Programme of the Gaels') and *Shiaght Laa* ('Seven Days'), as well as a further programme with some Manx-related content, *Moghrey Jedoonee* ('Sunday Morning'), are broadcast on a weekly basis. Since 2011, extra funding from the BBC has enabled two weekly programmes entirely in Manx to be broadcast, a current affairs programme *Traa dy Liooar* ('Time Enough') and a light entertainment / music show *Jamys Jeheiney* ('James on Friday') (ibid.: 37). These programmes have a limited but dedicated audience.

Most Manx language planning initiatives are co-ordinated and steered by Culture Vannin and Adrian Cain. Their most recent language plan includes the following main objectives for language planning:

- Planning for language acquisition – includes supporting language transmission in the family, pre-school and at Manx Medium education level.
- Planning for language use – includes developing the use of Manx in the public, private and voluntary sectors.
- Status Planning – the visibility of the language needs to be raised and Government encouraged to work towards compliance with the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages.
- Corpus planning – the need for linguistic standardisation and the development of specialised terminology.
  (Culture Vannin 2013)

Most recent efforts have focused on the first three areas. The more technical aspects of corpus planning, such as standardizing orthography, and producing dictionaries and grammars etc., remain fairly underdeveloped, and in general a fairly *laissez-faire* attitude prevails. Coonceil ny Gaelgey has been expanded since the 1990s (Stowell 2005: 406) and now has about twelve members, although some of them are more active than others in contributing to discussions. Four quarterly meetings are held per year in St. John's, but most discussion is now via email. New members of the Council are appointed by the *Greinneyder*, and the Council itself is chaired by Chris Sheard, Culture Vannin's official Manx translator. Typically, requests for translations are sent in to Sheard via email by public bodies, private individuals or businesses. Sheard will then make a provisional translation and ask the other members for suggestions for improvement. Terminology lists of existing translations are occasionally released, but so far the Council has not been proactive in making general recommendations on points of usage. Culture Vannin's (2013: 10) language plan includes 'publication of a Manx-English / English-Manx pocket dictionary for learners' as an aim, but little progress towards this goal has been achieved, and reference works on the language remain limited and dated. However, Culture Vannin has made considerable amounts of Manx material, including a searchable version of the Manx Bible, available online, which are of great use to students of the language.

3. The study of Manx

3.1. Traditional Manx

> It is, perhaps, too much to expect that Manx, that Cinderella of Gaelic tongues, should ever attract many students.
> (O'Rahilly 1972: xi)

The academic study of Manx within Celtic Studies and linguistics has been limited, and has relied on the enthusiasm of a small number of scholars prepared to go against a tendency to view the study of Manx as a topic of little interest (Stowell 2005: 400). This tendency seems to be due to the bias in early Celtic Studies towards the ancient and mediaeval rather than modern languages (cf. the following quotation from Thomson (1969: 177), and a perception of Manx as an impoverished and anglicized dialect boasting little in the way of literary achievement (O'Rahilly 1972: 120–1)).

> While I can give no convincing imitation of Prince Charming yet I must confess that I have long been captivated by this Cinderella among the Gaelic tongues. Indeed, she is a Cinderella among the Celtic ones as a whole, for Cornish, her counterpart in the British group, has, by reason of possessing some generally rather late medieval remains, appeared more glamorous in the eyes of historically minded students of Celtic than Manx, which can boast of nothing of more certain antiquity than the sixteenth century.
> (Thomson 1969: 177)

> Manx is to-day practically a thing of the past. When it first comes into notice, a little over three centuries ago, it has no written literature of its own and is cut off from the literary heritage of its sister languages […] From the beginning of its career as a written language English influence played havoc with its syntax, and it could be said without much exaggeration that some of the Manx that has been printed is merely English disguised in a Manx vocabulary. Manx hardly deserved to live. When a language surrenders itself to foreign idiom, and when all its speakers become bilingual, the penalty is death.
> (O'Rahilly 1972: 120–1)

A further factor which has led to Manx being understudied is no doubt the fact that many of the necessary materials have been relatively inaccessible. A large proportion of the Manx MS corpus (principally the carvals and sermons held in the Manx Museum in Douglas) has remained uncatalogued until recently. Nevertheless, most areas of Traditional Manx language and literature have been studied to some degree, and a brief summary of existing work will be given here.

No comprehensive historical grammar or dictionary of the language has yet been completed. Brief overviews of the history and grammar of the language are available in Thomson (1992, 2000), Broderick (2010) and Williams (1994). A grammar, dictionary and phonology of the Manx of the last native speakers are provided by Broderick (1984–6). A grammar and lexicon of the seventeenth century Manx of Phillips' Prayer Book translation are provided by Thomson (1953) and (1954–7). The most complete account of the history and decline of the traditional language is given in Broderick (1999); see also Hindley (1984), Price (1984: 71–83), Broderick (1991), König (1996), Stowell and Ó Bréasláin (1996) and Stowell (2005). Miller (2007) is a case study of language shift in the village of Cregneash.

In the absence of a comprehensive treatment of the morphology, syntax and idiom of the language, much important description of linguistic features is found in the notes of various editions of or commentaries on Manx texts, including translated religious prose (Broderick and Thomson 1979, Thomson 1981, 1997, 1998; Lewin 2011a, 2015b), translated religious poetry (Thomson 1995), secular folksong (Thomson 1960–2, Broderick 1980–1, 1981a, 1982a, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c, 1990), and original secular prose (Broderick 1981b, 1982b, 1983; Lewin 2014a). Articles dealing with specific morphosyntactic features of Manx include Thomson (1952) on the syntax of the verb, Broderick (2011) on the imperfect and secondary future, and Lewin (2016) on the syntax of the verbal noun. General work on Manx phonetics and phonology includes Rhŷs (1894), Marstrander (1932), Carmody (1953), Jackson (1955), Wagner (1958–69) and Broderick (1984–6 III). Articles on specific topics include Thomson (1960) on svarabhakti, Thomson (1976) on the stressed vowel phonemes of the idiolect of Thomas Christian, one of the terminal speakers, and Ó Sé (1991) on prosodic change and lexical diffusion. O'Rahilly's (1932 [1972]) chapter on Manx covers phonological features such as stress as well as other aspects of the language. Manx lexis and lexicography are the topic of Thomson (1961–2, 1963, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1991) and Ifans and Thomson (1979–80). A number of other linguistic and historical topics relating to Manx are dealt with by Thomson in various unpublished lectures and essays now deposited with his papers in the Manx National Heritage Library (MS 13047), e.g. Thomson (1986).

3.2. Revived Manx

The existing academic literature on Revived Manx is fairly limited. Most of the existing work deals with the externals of the language revival movement, i.e. the history and sociology of the revival, language policy, ideologies of the speaker community, etc., rather than the formal

linguistic properties of the language itself and its relationship with Traditional Manx. This is presumably because a detailed study of the structure of the language requires considerable study of and familiarity with Manx, whereas historical and sociological aspects are more accessible to those without previous experience of Manx, or Gaelic / Celtic languages more generally.

Outlines of the history of the revival movement include König (1996), Stowell and Ó Bréasláin (1996), Broderick (1999: 173–87), George and Broderick (2010), Stowell (2005) and Ager (2009). Mannette (2012) is a field study of adult learning of Manx especially in non-formal settings. Clague (2009) looks at parental attitudes to Manx medium education. Language ideologies among the Revived Manx speaker community are addressed by Ó hIfearnáin (2007, 2015) and Lewin (2015). Formal linguistic features of Revived Manx are examined in Clague (2004–5) (discourse markers modelled on English), Kewley Draskau (2005) (inflected verb tenses) and (2006) (use of the conditional as a past habitual), Lewin (2015a) and Broderick (2013a, 2013b, 2015) (different strategies for coining neologisms, and certain other lexical differences between TM and RM). Broderick (2013b) and (2015) also contain a summary of recent developments in Manx education and broadcasting.

Most of these works take for granted that there is essentially a single linguistic variety called 'Manx', and do not make a clear distinction between the traditional and revived languages; nor do they consider in depth the formal linguistic relationship between the two varieties, or the extent to which language revival might be said to have succeeded or failed in formal linguistic terms. Scholars may justify this approach with reference to the dominant language ideology of Revived Manx speakers themselves:

> The current resurgence of Manx Gaelic (still popularly cited by some scholars as an example of language death) arouses controversy. The apologists of 21st century Manx echo Haugen's balanced conclusion, regarding American-Norwegian, that whether or not the language currently spoken is 'true' in the light of some idealised classical gold standard, it is THEIR language, the language of the modern speakers. The purists, however, decry the putative *Kunstsprache* character of 21st century Manx, questioning its pedigree and continuity from earlier forms.
> [fn. explaining '21st century Manx'] The term somewhat prematurely adopted by Broderick, which later obliged unfortunate coinages such as 'Later Manx', for the language which did not know when its time was up […] In place of the terms 'Later Manx', 'Neo-Manx', 'Revived Manx', I propose to use the unequivocal term '21st century Manx'.
> (Kewley Draskau 2005: 229)

Here Kewley Draskau frames the terms she dislikes, such as 'Late Manx', 'Neo-Manx', 'Revived Manx' etc., as ideologically biased towards a 'purist' viewpoint which looks down on the revived language, while claiming that her term '21st century Manx' is 'unequivocal'. Arguably, however, a framework and terminology which ignores or downplays the most significant objective watershed in Manx linguistic history—the transition from natively acquired Traditional Manx as a community language to Revived Manx as the language of a network of L2 activist speakers—and is based on the rhetorical assumption that there is only one Manx language which has never died, is far from being ideologically neutral. Kewley Draskau's reference to 'some scholars' and 'Neo-Manx' perhaps echoes Fargher's reference to 'the living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century, or 'Neo-Manx' as the scholars would have it' (Fargher 1979: vi); cf. also Abley (2004: 113) 'Some linguists call the result "neo-Manx." Fortunately their strictures don't trouble the people who go on using the language, creating fresh traditions every day'. The identity of these anonymous scholars or linguists is not revealed, and the term 'Neo-Manx' seems rarely to be used except by its detractors in order to reject it. Given the perceived indifference or even derision of the Celtic Studies scholarly community towards Manx in general in the past, some degree of paranoia and insecurity in this matter can perhaps be understood, but not left unchallenged. Manifestation of the revivalists' own ideology in academic work on the revival may be seen in the following passage from König (1996: 52), in which Manx is described as Fargher's 'mother tongue', despite the fact that in a literal sense his mother tongue was English:

> One of the most important factors in ensuring that the Manx language would survive as a living language was Douglas Fargher's English-Manx Dictionary […] this dictionary […] was an enormous achievement, showing the author's great dedication to his mother tongue.
> (König 1996: 52)

As far as much of this work goes, the assumption that there is a single variety called 'Manx' may be fairly unproblematic, if the main aim of the research is to examine social movements and policies rather than formal linguistic properties of the language itself. Nevertheless, this approach may sometimes lead to a distortion in the analysis of the sociolinguistic situation of the Revived Manx community, since the more external aspects of the revival movement and community, and the ideologies of the speakers, are often inextricably linked with more purely linguistic considerations. We might consider, for example, König's analysis of the rôle of Fargher's dictionary in the Revived Manx community:

His dictionary made it possible to discuss subjects like television, space travel and even atomic physics in Manx Gaelic […] The author certainly succeeded in providing "some sort of basic standard upon which to build the modern Manx language of today and tomorrow" (Fargher 1979: vi), and although the modern world and its language have moved on since Fargher's time, his work is still most precious to today's Manx speakers and forms the basis of all Manx conversation.

(König 1996: 52)

This passage implies that it was impossible to discuss subjects like atomic physics etc. before the appearance of the dictionary, ignoring the fact that many neologisms had been developed and were in use within the small community of speakers in earlier decades,[4] not to mention the fact that Manx speakers are at liberty to borrow from English specific lexis where no pre-existing Manx word exists or is remembered. Moreover, the degree to which Fargher in fact 'succeeded' in providing a basic standard of Manx is a moot point, and a more complex issue than König portrays it (cf. §3.2). It is clearly not the case that the dictionary 'forms the basis of all Manx conversation'. While König's dissertation is very strong on historical detail (providing the best account to date of aspects of the history of the revival such as the founding of YCG and the development of governmental support for Manx in the 1980s), the lack of detailed consideration of linguistic issues, as is evident in the passage discussed here, means that it is not as complete an account as might be desirable.

Mannette (2012: 24) also presents the ideological assertion that Manx never died as if it were neutral objective fact:

Maddrell's death seems to have created a divide in the world on and off the island in terms of the language's future […] Off the island, reports lamented the demise of yet another language; on the island, the language was still being spoken.
Indeed, this incorrect assertion of the language's "death" was such a strongly held belief off the island, that as late as 2009, UNESCO, in its Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger, claimed the language was extinct.

(Mannette 2012: 24)

The possibility that both UNESCO and the Manx revivalists might be correct—i.e. that Manx was extinct according to one definition, and alive according to another, and that the task of the scholar might be to examine these conflicting definitions in more detail, and perhaps suggest a

---

[4] In fact Brian Stowell had written an article on atomic physics in Manx in 1977 (Carswell 2010: 197–8).

revision of them, rather than simply engaging in a rhetorical rejection of one ideological position while accepting the other without question—is not considered. Nor is the possibility explored of viewing Traditional Manx and Revived Manx as two distinct, though closely related, language varieties, one of which is extinct and the other alive (see §6 below for further discussion of the UNESCO episode).

Ager (2009: 1) has as specific research questions, among others: 'Can languages be revived?' 'How was Manx revived?' and 'What is the current state of Manx?'. However, only the external sociological aspects of these questions are addressed, as is shown in his answer to the question of whether languages can be revived (Ager 2009: 49):

> It is possible to revive languages. The likely success of such efforts depends on such factors as the state of a language when the revival begins, the level of community and official support, the economic viability of the community, and the dedication and determination of the revivalists. The details of each revival initiative are different, but they have many aspects in common and can learn from one another, as indeed they do: there are contacts between many of the revival efforts in Europe, for example.
> (Ager 2009: 49)

Specifically linguistic factors that might impact on the success or failure of language revival, such as the genetic and typological relationship between the revivalists' L1 and the target language, the amount and nature of material in the traditional language and its availability, the amount and quality of resources in and about the language, the amount and quality of learners' socialization in the language, etc., are not mentioned or considered (unless included under 'the state of a language when the revival begins'). The question of whether a revived language represents the resurrection of the traditional language, or is to some extent a new language, is not addressed, or is assumed to be irrelevant.

Ó hIfearnáin (2007 and 2015) discusses certain linguistic variables in relation to the language ideologies of Revived Manx speakers, including orthography (Ó hIfearnáin 2007), use of 'native idiom', 'Gaelic accent', speaking like the native speakers, 'grammatical accuracy', 'good vocabulary' and 'general fluency' (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 56). However, these variables are not discussed in detail, nor is the actual linguistic usage of speakers compared with their consciously stated beliefs. Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 57) claims that 'levels of fluency achieved by certain speakers create of themselves a linguistic authority which provides a new target variety for learners, albeit something of a "moving target" in the words of one of the 2010 Manx-speaking discussants', and moreover that '[a]lthough there are disagreements, there is a group assumption about what the language sounds like, how its grammar works, what

its vocabulary might be, and also what it looks like in a written form' (ibid: 48). However, the nature of this 'target variety', and of the 'disagreements' and the 'group assumptions', is not explored further.

These critiques of the existing literature are not meant to cast aspersions on the value of these studies so far as they go, since the external and institutional aspects of the Manx revival are clearly of great importance in understanding the linguistic situation of Manx in the Isle of Man today. Nevertheless, it is clear that a gap in the literature exists as far as the study of the formal linguistic structure of Revived Manx, and its relationship with Traditional Manx, are concerned. Hitherto, only a few limited studies of certain particular linguistic features have been carried out, as outlined above. There is a need for a general overview of the linguistic structure of Revived Manx, to complement work on the external sociological aspects of the revival movement, and to serve as a basis for further, more in-depth investigations of particular linguistic features. This will be the primary purpose of the present thesis.

4. Language revival and revival linguistics

The revival or reclamation of "dead" languages—i.e. those which no longer have any L1 speakers of the traditional variety—may be seen as a sub-category of the more general practice of language revitalization, or 'reversing language shift', to use Fishman's (1991) well-known term. Although language revitalization efforts in the modern sense have been underway since at least the nineteenth century, the study of language revitalization as a field of linguistics is a fairly recent development. According to Hinton (2003: 45), most work on language revitalization, with the exception of some early pioneers, dates from around 1990, and developed out of earlier work on 'language maintenance' and 'language death' (ibid. 44–5, 49). Especially important for the development of the theoretical basis of the discipline was Fishman's (1991) book *Reversing Language Shift*, which set out a series of stages of language endangerment and revitalization, with a focus on the disruption of intergenerational transmission. Fishman's model is widely used, but far from universally accepted.

The study of the revival of languages with no native speakers is even less developed. Often terms such as 'revitalization', 'revival', 'reclamation' etc. are not clearly distinguished; for example, Bentahila and Davies (1993: 357) use the term 'revival' to cover 'all organised efforts to strengthen the position of a relatively weak, endangered or apparently dead language'. Much of the literature on the revival of Manx, on the other hand, talks in terms of revitalization or reversing language shift (e.g. Stowell 2005), comparing Manx with other Celtic languages

such as Irish, Welsh and Scottish Gaelic, as if the situation of a language with only L2 speakers is directly comparable to that of languages which still have L1 communities and at least some degree of intergenerational transmission. Nevertheless, some scholars, such as Dorian (1994), have made a distinction between 'revitalization' of languages which still have L1 speakers, and 'revival' of extinct languages on the basis of documentation. More recently, Zuckermann and Walsh (2011) have argued for the establishment of a specific branch of linguistics, 'revival linguistics' or 'revivalistics' (Zuckermann 2013a), to study comparatively the revival of "dead" or "sleeping" languages.

One reason that the study of the linguistics of language revival is underdeveloped is the paucity of examples of the successful revival of languages without L1 speakers. There is only one widely acknowledged example of a fully successful revival—in the sense that it has resulted in the emergence of a large and sustainable L1 community with stable and consistent intergenerational transmission—that of Hebrew. Zuckermann (who is a native speaker of Revived Hebrew) has therefore taken the study of Revived Hebrew, or 'Israeli' to use his term, as the basis of revival linguistics, and argues that the insights from the Hebrew situation can be applied to any other revived language, and that there are universal constraints on language revival (Zuckermann 2009: 46, Zuckermann and Walsh 2011: 119–20). For example, Zuckermann and Walsh (2011) seek to apply lessons from the Hebrew revival to that of Kaurna, an extinct / revived Australian Aboriginal language spoken in Adelaide. Amery (2013b), one of the main scholar-activists involved in the Kaurna revival, claims however that 'Zuckermann is too hasty to embrace hybridity and the influence of English and to prejudge the outcome', suggesting that more circumspection is required in the application of a Hebrew-based theory of language revival.

The central concept of Zuckermann's model is 'hybridity' (Zuckermann 2009), the idea that a revived language will inevitable have more than one genetic parent, primarily the traditional variety of the target language, and the L1(s) of the revivalists. This is similar to the traditional concepts of substrate and superstrate in language contact, although Zuckermann denies that these terms are appropriate for a language contact situation (Zuckermann 2009: 46); cf. discussion in Ch. 3 §4. Thus Zuckermann (2009: 63) claims that 'Israeli is a Eurasian (Semito-European) hybrid language: both Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European'. On a similar basis, one might posit that Revived Manx is a hybrid Anglo-Celtic or Celto-Germanic language. Zuckermann's concept of hybridity stands in contrast to two earlier contrasting understandings of the revival of Hebrew (Zuckermann 2011: 45), the first that Revived Hebrew is a direct continuation of Biblical Hebrew, either because Hebrew never really died (e.g. Haramati 1992)

or because the revival was fully successful, i.e. Revived Hebrew is entirely Semitic (e.g. Rabin 1974), and the second that Revived Hebrew is really a relexified dialect of Yiddish, i.e. fundamentally Indo-European (e.g. Horvath and Wexler 1997). Two other important concepts in Zuckermann's model are the 'founder principle' (Zuckermann 2009: 46), which is the claim that it is the L1 of the founder population of the revived language (i.e. Yiddish in the case of Hebrew) which will have the most influence on the development of the new hybrid variety, even if numerically greater populations with different L1s later assimilate into the community, and the 'congruence principle', which claims that '[i]f a feature exists in more than one contributing language, it is more likely to persist in the emerging language' (ibid.: 48). Zuckermann (2009: 48) also claims that, in the case of Revived Hebrew at least, 'forms' (e.g. basic morphology) tend to be Semitic, but 'patterns' (syntax, idioms, phraseology) are often Indo-European.

For the purposes of the present study, the following kinds of situation will be accepted as language revival, as opposed to revitalization in the context of a predominantly L1 community: (1) revival from documentation only, (2) revival from documentation + limited L2 use, (3) revival from documentation + contact with terminal speakers and (4) revival in parallel with the persistence of L1 communities. What they all have in common is that the revival speaker community is made up entirely or predominantly of L2 speakers,[5] and this community exists with no input or very limited input from L1 speakers of the traditional variety.

(1) Revival from documentation only

In a situation of this kind (e.g. Cornish and Kaurna), there is a chronological gap between the death of the last native speaker of the traditional variety and the learning of the language by the first revivalist, a gap during which there is no-one at all with anything approaching a fluent or in-depth knowledge of the language. The language must then be pieced together from an often fairly limited corpus of texts (frequently Bible translations and the like), glossaries and field-notes etc., and audio recordings if the revivalists are very fortunate. Due to the incompleteness of such material, a degree of reconstruction and guesswork will often be required, based perhaps on comparison with related better attested or still spoken languages (such as Welsh and Breton in the case of Cornish), as well as extensive coining or borrowing of neologisms. In the case of Kaurna, the 'historical…corpus in total consists of about 3,500 to

---

[5] And perhaps L1 speakers of the L2 variety if intergenerational transmission has succeeded in at least some families.

4,000 words recorded in nineteenth and early twentieth-century sources', mainly collected by two German missionaries (Amery 2013a: 113). Extant Cornish literature amounts to about 100,000 words, 'or the length of one modern novel' according to Price (1984: 139).[6]

(2) Revival from documentation + limited L2 use

The pre-eminent example here is Hebrew itself, which, although it had no L1 speakers and no vernacular speech community for many centuries from c. AD 200, was in constant use in Jewish communities for religious, legal and literary purposes:

> For approximately 1,750 years […] Hebrew was 'clinically dead'. A most important liturgical and literary language, it occasionally served as a *lingua franca*—a means of communication between people who do not share a mother tongue—for Jews of the Diaspora, but not as a native language.
> (Zuckermann and Walsh 2011: 114)

As Zuckermann and Holzman (2013: 65) note, Hebrew was used 'only in masculine, public and scholarly settings' and this was not sufficient for direct continuity between Biblical and Revived Hebrew, or for the avoidance of hybridization when revernacularization took place.

Other examples of attempts to revive liturgical or ritual languages to vernacular usage include Iqladiyus Labib's attempt in the nineteenth century to revive Coptic (i.e. Egyptian), which had been replaced by Arabic as a vernacular by the seventeenth century but is still used as a liturgical language by the Coptic Church (Basta 1991). Efforts to use Latin as a language of speech and of creativity over the centuries among the educated elite of the Western world may be considered to be somewhat similar, although this is neither strictly speaking revival of a dead language in the sense of the other languages discussed here (since Latin did not die, but evolved into the present-day Romance languages), nor revival in the sense of reclamation of a vernacular by a particular community.

(3) Revival from documentation + contact with terminal speakers

This was the situation with Manx. In this scenario there is a complete break of intergenerational transmission, yet there is chronological overlap between the lifetimes of the terminal speakers of the traditional variety and the period of the early revivalists, who have some degree of

---

[6] This figure would now be somewhat higher, given the discovery of the text *Bewnans Ke* (Thomas and Williams 2007).

contact with L1 speakers and to some extent acquire the language as an L2 from them. Learning from written texts, course-books etc. may nevertheless be more important, as it may not be possible to visit native speakers on a frequent enough basis to learn entirely orally, the native speakers may be old, in poor health, rusty or forgetful, or may be reduced speakers to begin with owing to the conditions in which they themselves acquired the language, when language shift might already have been well advanced. If there are a large number of revivalists but only a handful of traditional speakers, it may be feasible for only a small proportion of learners to spend sufficient time with the traditional speakers. More intensive ways of allowing revivalists to learn a language directly from older L1 speakers have been developed in some revival movements in recent decades, such as the master-apprentice method where the learner spends large amounts of time one-to-one with the native speaker in his or her home, learning the language and in return helping the speaker with domestic tasks, and giving them a positive feeling that their cultural and linguistic knowledge is valued and not doomed to be lost (Hinton 2002). This method has been used for a number of Native American languages. Language nest programmes can also be instituted in which the native speakers are involved in the care of young children, allowing for some degree of direct acquisition of the language by the children from L1 speakers.

(4) Revival in parallel with the persistence of L1 communities

Many language revitalization movements have much of the character of the revival of extinct languages, even though L1 communities may continue to exist. For example, there are still rural Gaeltacht communities in Ireland in which Traditional Irish is spoken as an L1 by a majority of the population and in which intergenerational transmission has not entirely ceased, but networks of L2 speakers (and their children, who may be L1 speakers of an L2 variety of Irish) in urban areas may spend most of their time as learners and speakers of Irish with little or no contact with Gaeltacht speech. The different linguistic characteristics of L1 Gaeltacht Irish and L2 urban Irish, as well as cultural and socioeconomic differences between the two speech communities, have led to some commentators to speak of a growing 'schism' between the two varieties (Ó Broin 2010). In Belfast, a group of Irish-language activists, all of them L2 speakers, have since the 1980s established a community in the Shaw's Road district in which Irish is used as a vernacular and in which intergenerational transmission has been established; however, this community has been developed with little input from or contact with L1 Gaeltacht speakers. Many members of the community express little interest in the traditional

variety, believing that 'it is all Irish' and having 'no particular feelings about the potential value of contact with Gaeltacht Irish' (Maguire 1991: 156–8). A similar split has been noted between the traditional, dialectal L1 Breton of the surviving, mostly older native speakers in Britanny, and the 'Neo-Breton' of the activist L2 community, which tends to shun French loanwords in favour of puristic neologisms unfamiliar to the L1 speakers, while being more susceptible to subconscious French influence (Jones 1998, Hornsby 2005). There are similar conflicts over neologism-heavy L2 Maori (Reedy 2000).

The distinctions between these categories are not absolute; for example, some languages fall between type 1 and type 3, in that a very limited knowledge of the language still exists among older people ('rememberers') in the former speaker community when revival efforts begin; for example, in the case of Miami, a few elders remember 'a few nouns, names, and fixed phrases' and '[s]ome can speak in general terms about how the language sounded and what the social contexts of its use were' (Wesley 2007: 27). A language may also belong in both category 2 and 3; for example, Manx continued to be used throughout the early revival period and until the present day as a ceremonial L2 in the promulgation of laws at the annual Tynwald ceremony. Languages in category 4 may pass into category 3, as the L1 communities become moribund and disappear, although in the case of languages such as Irish, Scottish Gaelic and Breton it is unlikely that there will be a clearly identifiable 'last native speaker' of the traditional variety, as a few exceptional families are likely to maintain intergenerational transmission. In these cases the distinction between the traditional and revived variety may be blurred, as speakers with a traditional variety lineage mingle and have children with L2 speakers.

Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 48) argues that a distinction should be made between 'revived languages' such as Hebrew and Cornish, which have been resurrected after a prolonged interruption of transmission, and languages such as Manx in which the revival speakers have a more direct connection with native speakers of the traditional variety, which he terms 'extreme language shift' (ELS) languages:

> what distinguishes Manx, Monegasque and other ELS languages from re-constructed and revived languages is the perception among both speakers and non-speakers in the wider community that an organic link has been maintained with the traditional language and that there has been no break in transmission, which implies the existence of an authentic target variety. Although there are disagreements, there is a group assumption about what the language sounds like, how its grammar works, what its vocabulary might be, and also what it looks like in a written form. In contrast, revived

Cornish for example, a Celtic language related to Breton and Welsh, also enjoys a certain vitality as a spoken language but was reconstructed after at least a century's gap between the demise of the last speakers and the revival movement, leading to disputes about the authenticity of competing varieties or versions of the language and their associated speakers and proponents. From the perspective of speakers and potential speakers of ELS varieties, their languages can be seen as what Spolsky (2003) terms "revitalization" by activists through home language acquisition and through educational policy which is also accompanied by "regeneration" in activities in wider society, sometimes only of a symbolic or profiling nature. Taken together, as discussed in more detail below, these are not popularly constructed as the "revival" of a lost language and attendant culture but as its protection, linguistic development and social expansion.

(Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 48)

The distinction proposed by Ó hIfearnáin captures well the perception of the continuity of Manx in the majority ideology of the revival community—i.e. how it is 'popularly constructed'—and therefore offers an important insight in terms of an analysis of the language ideologies involved. However, it is not clear that it is a particularly useful distinction in terms of the formal linguistic properties and commonalities of the three categories of (a) languages in unbroken intergenerational transmission, (b) revived languages and (c) 'ELS languages'. It seems to the present author that the latter two categories share much more in common in terms of the linguistic phenomena found in them, the challenges faced in their propagation, and even, indeed, in the kinds of ideological standpoints found in their speaker communities, than exist between languages with unbroken intergenerational transmission and 'ELS' languages.

Concerning the examples mentioned by Ó hIfearnáin, the following observations may be made. The specific problems that the Cornish revival has faced stem not necessarily, or primarily, from the prolonged gap between the demise of the last native speakers and the beginning of the revival, but from particular, language-specific issues surrounding the nature and chronology of the attested material, the small numbers of revivalists, and influence from strong-willed and opinionated individuals. It is unclear that there is in fact 'an authentic target variety' or 'a group assumption about what the language sounds like, how its grammar works, what its vocabulary might be' in the case of Revived Manx: the disagreements, which Ó hIfearnáin recognizes exist, are certainly less acute, and happen not to have manifested themselves in consciously articulated polemics and factions, but this is a question of degree and circumstance, not qualitative difference. There is broad agreement on Manx orthography, but this is because Manx had a fairly standardized and well-attested orthography used for most of the attested existence of the traditional language, and especially in its most prestigious

publications, such as the Bible and Cregeen's dictionary. The same broad agreement on orthography is true of Hebrew, which had a much longer interruption of transmission than Cornish. There were debates and disagreements in the revival of Hebrew, but these were soon largely neutralized by the rapid emergence of a Hebrew-dominant native speaker community which perpetuated the language and stabilized its form via intergenerational transmission (in a similar way to that in which a chaotic pidgin becomes a relatively stable creole). That disagreements and uncertainty about the target variety exist in Revived Cornish and Revived Manx is because they remain in an indefinite 'founder population' situation (cf. Zuckermann 2009: 46–47), overwhelmingly dominated by L2 speakers with a high level of metalinguistic (self-)consciousness and opinions, and significant variation of competencies, knowledge of different varieties, and conceptions of what the languages should be like.

It is not clear either that Revived Hebrew and Cornish speakers generally conceive of their languages as 'reconstructed' because of the chronological gap between the extinction of the L1 variety and the beginning of revival. Rather, similar ideological tendencies to those found in the Manx revival community are evident with Hebrew and Cornish with respect to denying or downplaying the 'death' of the language, and emphasizing the degree of continuity between the two varieties. With Cornish this may be seen in the (probably exaggerated) claims of the continuance of Cornish intonation etc., as well as Cornish lexis, in West Cornwall English (cf. Payton 1997). As for Hebrew, the importance of its use as a liturgical language and as a *lingua franca* in ensuring continuity is stressed, and the received assumption among the Israeli public and many academics is, as discussed above, that Revived Hebrew is just that—a complete resuscitation of Biblical Hebrew, with all its linguistic features, plus necessary expansion and modernization of lexis.

5. Terminology: 'Revived' and 'Traditional'

As observed above, the sociolinguistic literature on Manx usually refers to the older L1 variety of the language and the contemporary L2 variety of the revival movement as 'Manx', without further qualification. For the purposes of the present study however, and in line with the basic assumption that the most fundamental watershed and dichotomy in Manx linguistic history is that between these two varieties, consistent terms are needed for them. Following Lewin (2015) and Broderick (2013a, b, 2015) I use the terms 'Traditional Manx' (TM) and 'Revived Manx' (RM).

Although the traditional variety is often referred to as "native speech," and popularly within the RM community by such vague terms as "old Manx," "the Manx of the old native speakers," etc., the term "Native Manx" was rejected because presumably any of the children who have been brought up with Revived Manx as an L1, or who might emerge in the future, are "native speakers" of a kind of Manx, but not of Traditional Manx. The term 'traditional' is used loosely by Stowell and Ó Bréasláin (1996: 20) in relation to 'Ned Maddrell, recognised as the last native speaker of what might be called 'traditional' Manx'. Cf. also Ó Curnáin's (2007: 58–60) use of 'traditional' and 'non-traditional' Irish, although the latter refers to the reduced acquisition of younger generations (comparable to the "last native speakers" of Manx). The word "revived" was chosen for the newer variety because the term "revival" is commonly used to describe the Manx language movement,[7] and because "revival" seems to be the most common term for the process of revitalization of languages with no L1 speakers (cf. Zuckermann's 'revival linguistics', and George and Broderick's (2010) chapter on 'The Revived Languages' of Cornish and Manx). Other terms such as 'reclamation' (> 'Reclaimed Manx' etc.) and 're-creation' (cf. Reid 2010) are increasingly used especially with relation to indigenous Australian and American languages, but are not used here as they are not in common use with relation to Celtic languages. Terms such as "Modern Manx" are rejected because they have only vague temporal reference and do not make reference to the fundamental nature of the dichotomy between the two varieties at all, and while appearing to be neutral, may in fact reflect a "Manx never died" ideology, as discussed above; moreover all attested periods of Manx may be classified as "Modern" Gaelic (in contrast to Old and Middle Irish). "Neo-Manx" was rejected because it seems to have a slightly negative or disparaging connotation, as if questioning the authenticity of the variety, even though I have not found widespread use of it in this way. (Williams (2006: x), on the other hand, in his defence of Revived Cornish, favours 'Neo-Cornish' as 'more neutral'.) I use the same terminology also for other languages referred to, such as 'Revived Hebrew', 'Revived Kaurna', etc., despite the fact that authors writing on these languages might use other terminology.

Zuckermann (2009: 41) claims that it is 'misleading' to use terms such as 'Modern Hebrew' or 'Revived Hebrew', because he believes that the revived language, which he calls 'Israeli', is a completely new hybrid variety just as much deriving from Yiddish and other European languages as from Hebrew, rather than straightforwardly being Hebrew 'revived'.

---

[7] Even though 'revival' in this context might be popularly perceived by members of the RM community more as revitalization and expansion, rather than resurrection of a dead language, as Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 48) notes.

Although Zuckermann's basic thesis on the 'multi-sourcedness' of revived languages is accepted here, i.e. that it is probably impossible to revive completely all components of an extinct language without change and influence from the revivalists' L1, his position on terminology perhaps goes too far. It is not problematic to refer to these languages as 'Revived X', so long as one bears in mind that complete revival without hybridization is unlikely; after all, all terms in all fields inevitably carry caveats restricting their precise reference which are not immediately obvious from the word itself. 'Israeli' moreover is problematic because Hebrew was revived several decades before the founding of the State of Israel.

Another consideration is that all classifications of what is one language or separate languages are subjective, arbitrary, contradictory to similar situations in other places, and based ultimately on the identities and politics of their speakers or the speakers of neighbouring languages (cf. the mutually unintelligible "dialects" of Chinese as opposed to the mutually intelligible mainland Scandinavian "languages"). Certainly, the process linking Biblical and Revived Hebrew is more complex and "unnatural" (i.e. atypical) than the direct intergenerational transmission linking different periods of other languages; however, it may be that it is better to see language revival merely as one of a number of less typical sociolinguistic processes, including various types of artificial "manipulation," which can divert a language from the expected path of its "natural" diachronic drift, such as sudden intense language contact (as with French and English after the Norman conquest), the adoption of writing or of a new orthographic system, or the spread of widespread literacy, sudden adoption of the language by large numbers of L2 speakers, far-reaching ideological authoritarian corpus planning (e.g. Turkish from the time of Atatürk onwards), etc. Zuckermann seems to recognize this to some extent, as he continues to use the term 'Israeli Hebrew' in contexts where his term 'Israeli' on its own might not be familiar (e.g. when noting in the bibliography on his website what language his papers are written in),[8] and the following passage concedes the complexity of the issue:

> the Hebrew revival cannot be considered a failure because without the zealous, obsessive, enthusiastic efforts of Ben-Yehuda and of teachers, writers, poets, journalists, intellectuals, social activists, political figures, linguists and others, Israelis would have spoken a language (such as English, German, Arabic or Yiddish) that could hardly be considered Hebrew. To call such a hypothetical language 'Hebrew' would have not only been misleading but also wrong. To call today's Israeli 'Hebrew' may be

---

[8] <http://www.zuckermann.org/articles.html>

puristic but not wrong: Hybridic Israeli is based on Hebrew as much as it is based on Yiddish. So, although the revivalists could not avoid the subconscious influence of their mother tongue(s), they did indeed manage at the same time to consciously revive important components of Hebrew.

(Zuckermann and Walsh 2011: 115)

6. Language death and the continuity of revived languages

The question of whether Revived Hebrew, or Revived Manx, should be regarded as in some respect new languages has implications for how the concept of language "death" is viewed. If revived languages are new languages, then it is possible to reconcile the idea that the traditional language is "dead" or "extinct," with the observation that the revived variety is very much "alive." Although this may rile many revival speakers themselves, at least on a first hearing, since they would prefer to say the language never "died" at all, it may be that this way of framing the issue is advantageous in the longer term not only for the purposes of a level-headed, objective academic analysis of the phenomenon of language revival, but also for the revival community itself, since it (a) recognizes the trauma and significance of the language death event to the community, (b) recognizes and gives dignity to the "last native speakers," but also (c) recognizes the legitimacy of the revived language as a valid means of expression, badge of identity and act of creativity of the new speaker community, and (d) allows for an appreciation of the unique needs and challenges of developing a revived language, thus helping to make corpus planning initiatives more effective.

Nevertheless, many authors have noted the widespread dislike of terms such as "dead" and "extinct" within language revitalization and especially revival movements,[9] and some argue that such preferences should be respected and followed by scholars.

> Many supporters of endangered languages dislike this finality, given the relative success of efforts to 'revive' 'dead' languages in recent years: e.g. in the British Isles (Cornish, Manx), the USA (Miami, Mohegan, Mutsun), Australia (Kaurna). Some fear that using the term may in itself have a causative effect, hastening a language's demise. Campaigners for the Manx language, for example, trace continuity via linguists and enthusiasts who learned the language from traditional native speakers in the 1950s, to a new language community of fluent adult speakers who are bringing up new young native (neo-) speakers; they oppose using the term 'language death' for Manx, although the last traditional speaker died in 1974.
>
> (Sallabank 2012: 101)

---

[9] The ideologies of the Manx revival community will be explored further in Ch. 3 §5.

Sallabank (2012: 102) recognizes that "death"-related terminology such as 'decline', 'obsolescence' and 'moribund' may 'imply negative attitudes', although they also have 'specific technical meanings'. The metaphorical nature of this terminology may be problematic, especially if agency is ascribed to languages as if they had a life of their own:

> Many of these terms (e.g. *death*, *moribund*, *revival*, *awakening*) utilize the metaphor of anthropomorphism, which is fairly common in the field of linguistics (e.g. language 'families', 'genetically related' languages, etc.). But as Denison (1977) points out, it is not languages which live and die, but those who speak them. The attribution of agency to languages is one of the fallacies which may obscure the causes of language endangerment, and hinder effective policies in support of diversity.
> (Sallabank 2012: 103)

Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 50) also critiques the ideological basis of metaphors such as 'living' and 'dead', which he claims derive from 'nineteenth century romanticism':

> Authenticity can be understood as an ideological construct that is an essential element in the practices of speakers and learners of languages and those who analyse them. It is part of the broader construction of language itself as a natural, living object, which has its roots in nineteenth century romanticism, a movement which also constructs a distinct nation or people, the *volk*, as having a distinct language of its own […] The metaphor of language as a living object has permeated popular as well as intellectual culture so that languages are described as 'in danger', 'dying', 'dead', 'on their last legs', 'revitalised' or 'revived' in a similar way that one might talk about a hospital patient or a family pet.
> (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 50)

Although Ó hIfearnáin is no doubt right to warn us to be wary of the influence of romanticism, and other ideologies, in modern popular conceptions of language (and many other social issues), it seems to me that the metaphors of "living," "death," "revival" etc. are an intuitive and obvious way of talking about the perpetuation, cessation and resumption of language use, not necessarily tied to any particular period or any ideology or cultural current so specific as 'nineteenth century romanticism'. If there is danger in their use, it is the same sort of danger as is found in any kind of abstract (i.e. metaphorical) terminology, and it is overcome by remaining alert to the differences between the literal and metaphorical meanings (e.g. in this case, the fact that languages, unlike living organisms, are usually immortal unless subject to catastrophic events; that they do not have life-stages such as youth and old age, except relatively, but rather are subject to perpetual aimless drift; and that, leaving aside the

details of the present discussion, it appears that a "dead" language can, unlike an organism, be in some form resurrected to "life").

One may employ alternative, and perhaps more "positive"-sounding metaphors, such as Zuckermann and Walsh's (2011) 'sleeping' or 'sleeping beauty' languages, which may be 'reawakened' and 'reclaimed' rather than 'revived', but such imagery is still anthropomorphic, and what is more, may lead to the mistaken idea that a 'sleeping' language can be 'reawakened' in its original form without change or hybridization. The following statement on the website of the New South Wales Government Department of Aboriginal Affairs (Sallabank 2012: 102) utilizes this metaphor to dress up a language death denial ideology as objective fact and what is more as morally compulsory, while misrepresenting 'linguists' as being unanimous in rejecting the terms 'extinction' and 'dead language', and stating without qualification that these languages 'are capable of being revived':

> The term 'extinction' or 'dead' language is no longer used among linguists because there are now techniques to revive languages. They are offensive to Aboriginal people. We refer to languages less regularly used as 'sleeping' languages, as they are capable of being revived.
> (New South Wales Government Department of Aboriginal Affairs, quoted in Sallabank 2012: 102)

When language revivalists, or academics taking their side, argue polemically that a particular revived language is "not dead," all one can say is that it is indeed dead according to whatever definition the writer of its obituary was using (assuming he or she was in fact cognizant of the relevant facts), but not dead according to the definition their opponent is using, a point made by Thomson (1986) in relation to Manx:

> Now I hope you will not carry away with you from this evening's lecture simply the misleading and emotive statement that Manx is a dead language, and blame me for making it. In the terms of the definition I have given it *is* true, but it did not become true on the death in December 1974 of Ned Maddrell, in whose memory this series of lectures was instituted, but much earlier, after the last child, whoever he or she was, learnt the language within the family and was able subsequently to live in a community in which it served as the ordinary means of communication, even if education and contacts with the wider world subsequently compelled that child to learn a second language.
> Let me stress again that 'dead' in this sense is not the same thing as 'lost', that the tradition may continue under favourable conditions with great vigour and be faithful to its origins, but for those who use it the language is now a second language,

consciously acquired; the significant difference is the absence of a community of speakers for whom it is the first and preferably the only language.

(Thomson 1986)

It is certainly the case that scholars and agencies documenting language endangerment and shift have sometimes struggled adequately to describe language revival situations (perhaps because cases of language revival have been infrequent in the past and the study of the phenomenon is in its infancy), but it is not clear that the indignant responses of language revivalists and their advocates, which blur ideologically motivated assertion and academic objectivity, help to clarify the situation.

A good example of this is the furore which erupted in 2009 when UNESCO classified Manx as 'extinct' in its *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. After letters of protest were sent from the Chief Minister of the Isle of Man, and from many speakers of Revived Manx, including children at the Manx immersion school (who wrote in Manx and said 'If our language is extinct then what language are we writing in?'), UNESCO changed its classification to 'critically endangered' (BBC News 2009). While the affront felt by the Revived Manx community may be understandable, it is not clear that classifications which aim to document language endangerment and extinction scientifically should be determined by popular and political protest. Language extinction is currently a worldwide epidemic (one felt by many stakeholders to be a tragedy), the scale of which needs to be properly recorded. While many extinct or moribund languages have some kind of L2 activist community or revival movement, the extinction of the traditional varieties of the languages as native community languages needs and deserves to be recorded, and not obscured or covered up for the sake of a PR victory. In any case, it is not clear that describing Revived Manx as 'critically endangered' accurately conveys its circumstances. Most of its speakers would regard Revived Manx as increasing in strength, and not tottering on the brink, about to disappear. 'Critically endangered' is more appropriate as a description of moribund traditional languages which are down to their last few elderly speakers. Perhaps a new description, such as 'Traditional variety extinct; undergoing revival' would clarify the situation. It seems that the UNESCO editors are indeed aware of the issue of revived languages, as they offer the following explanation of their position:

When we say that a language is extinct, we mean that it is no longer the first tongue that infants learn in their homes, and that the last speaker who did learn the language in that way has passed on within the last five decades. It may be possible to revive extinct languages, provided that there is adequate documentation and a strong motivation within the ethnic community. In many communities, revitalization efforts begin when

there are still elders alive who learned as infants, even if there is often a gap of several generations of non-speakers in between. There are more and more examples of languages being brought back to life, even if many linguists still wish to distinguish such revived languages from those that have been spoken continuously, without interruption.[10]

The fact that revived languages are in some sense new languages, rather than direct continuations of the traditional languages, need not necessarily be lamented, or seen as a mark of failure to be either derided or covered up. Rather the hybrid nature of these languages may be celebrated, as Zuckermann (2006: 67) advocates for Revived Hebrew:

> The language spoken in Israel today is a beautiful hybrid language, marvellously demonstrating multiple causation throughout its genetics and typology. Whatever we choose to call it – Israeli, Hebrew, Israeli Hebrew, Spoken Israeli Hebrew, Modern Hebrew, Contemporary Hebrew, Jewish – we should acknowledge, and celebrate, its complexity.
> (Zuckermann 2006: 67)

Zuckermann also notes the practical downsides of failing to recognize that the traditional and revived varieties are distinct language varieties, for example the failure of Israeli school students to master the reading of the Hebrew Bible because it is assumed they should be able to understand a text supposedly written in their 'mother tongue' (Zuckermann 2006: 64–6, Zuckermann and Holzman 2014), and the mismatches between forms and constructions promoted by Israeli prescriptive grammarians and language commentators (who base their assumptions on the norms of Biblical Hebrew) and the intuitions and natural usage of L1 speakers of Revived Hebrew (Zuckermann 2006: 66–7).

The realization that Traditional Cornish can never be fully revived is shared by Price (1984: 134) and Williams (2014: x–xv), but appraisal of the revived language is wholly negative whereas Williams' is more positive Price's and is similar to Zuckermann's attitude towards Revived Hebrew:

> The old Celtic speech of Cornwall died out two centuries ago. It is still dead, and will evermore remain so. It is true that the present century has seen the propagation by a small band of enthusiasts of a type of language that is partially derived from the old Celtic speech of Cornwall, but it is also partially invented and to claim that it represents a 'revival' of authentic Cornish is to misrepresent the situation […] In the past, the term

---

[10]   <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/faq-on-endangered-languages/> [accessed 18.12.2014]

'Cornish' has been used with reference both to the traditional and authentic language of Cornwall and to modern pseudo-Cornish, but I shall reserve the term for genuine Cornish and shall refer to pseudo-Cornish as 'Cornic'.

(Price 1984: 134)

Cornish cannot be revived. When the last native-speakers died at the end of the eighteenth century, they took with them their ability to speak the traditional Celtic language of Cornwall. The language that is now in the process of revival is different from the speech of the last native-speakers and indeed of any native-speakers of traditional Cornish of any period. The revived language is not Cornish in the way that the language of Dolly Pentreath and William Bodinar was Cornish […]

Neo-Cornish is not completely natural. Its phonology is to some degree conjectural, its lexicon is not entirely native and a very small part of its inflection is reconstructed. There are, however, several things that can be said in its favour. First, Neo-Cornish is based on traditional Cornish and is therefore closer to traditional Cornish than either Breton or Welsh is. However artificial its origins, Neo-Cornish belongs in and to Cornwall in a way that no other language does, dialectal English included. Secondly, traditional Cornish before 1780 must have been similar to Neo-Cornish today. A fluent speaker of Neo-Cornish and a speaker of traditional Cornish can never meet. If they could, they would probably experience a great degree of mutual comprehension. In which case, their respective idioms must be dialects of the same language.

(Williams 2014: x–xv)

Crystal (2000: 162) takes a realistic but positive view of the revival of Kaurna:

Can dead languages be revived […]? And, if such efforts are made, might not a Frankenstein's monster of a language be the result?

In fact, limited success has been achieved in several instances […] The revived language [Kaurna] is not the same as the original language, of course; most obviously, it lacks the breadth of functions which it originally had, and large amounts of old vocabulary are missing. But, as it continues in present-day use, it will develop new functions and new vocabulary, just as any other living language would, and as long as people value it as a true marker of their identity, and are prepared to keep using it, there is no reason to think of it as anything other than a valid system of communication.

(Crystal 2000: 162)

7. Aims and scope of the thesis

The central aim of this thesis is to provide a broad outline of the linguistic features of Revived Manx, comparing them with Traditional Manx and seeking to establish the continuities and discontinuities between the two varieties. The present chapter provides an overview of the history of the traditional and revived varieties of Manx, and a brief literature review of

scholarship on Manx and on language revival, with a summary of the theoretical assumptions and terminology used in the thesis.

The linguistic description itself is the focus of chapter 2, and is divided into sections on phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax, and lexis and idiom. The description does not seek to be comprehensive, nor to be a descriptive grammar of Revived Manx, but rather to explore and illustrate the more salient features of Revived Manx which differ from the traditional variety. Conclusions about distribution and frequency of occurrence are therefore to be regarded as approximate and provisional. Nevertheless, in most cases it has been possible, based on examination of the sources used and my own experience as a member of the RM community, to give an indication as to whether a feature is mostly restricted to speech or writing, whether it is widely regarded as substandard, acceptable or not noticed at all, and whether it occurs frequently across the majority of speakers, or infrequently only in certain speakers. It would no doubt be worthwhile doing more detailed quantitative, corpus-based studies of certain features, to study in greater depth the speech or writings of particular individuals, or to examine variation according to register, domain, background of speakers, etc.; however, each such study would be a thesis or a lengthy article in and of itself, and the purpose here has been to provide a basic (perhaps "potted") outline of a linguistic variety which has barely been described at all until now, in the hope that this may provide the foundation for further studies of the kind suggested here.

Chapter 3 attempts to address the question as how successful the revival of Manx, in objective linguistic terms, may be considered to be, i.e. how close is the revived language to the traditional language, and how might it develop in the future. I examine Revived Manx in the context of Zuckermann's (2009) model of 'hybridization', considering to what extent his analysis of Revived Hebrew may be applied to Manx, and where there are differences.

It may be that some will question the value of this work, especially with regard to its potential practical usefulness to the Revived Manx community. Most authors have observed that revival speakers tend to believe that their language is a legitimate continuation of Traditional Manx, whatever changes might have crept in, and that by and large they are happy with the language they speak and relatively unconcerned by changes and variation within it (Abley 2004: 113, Kewley Draskau 2005: 229, Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 48). To them, Manx has clearly been successfully revived, or continued as a living language without interruption; they are more interested in ensuring that the number of speakers increase, and the amount of Manx spoken by existing speakers increases, than in what kind of Manx they speak. What then, is the point of asking the technical linguistic question of how far Traditional Manx can be said to

have been revived with regards its formal structure, its phonology, syntax, idiom etc.? To begin with, we may quote Thomson, who raises a similar question in the conclusion of his 1986 Ned Maddrell lecture on 'change or decay' in the linguistic development of Manx (although I would be wary of his prescriptive notions of 'autonomy' and 'excellence'):

> Has this been a sterile discussion, 'academic' in the bad sense of having no bearing on anything beyond itself? Possibly so, and if that is the case I apologise for wasting your time this evening. But I think the realisation that Manx, as we are able to recapture it in its late nineteenth-century form, was already well advanced in decline, not just in the number of speakers or in the areas of life it was able to cope with, but in its degree of autonomy and excellence too—I think that that realisation is bound to raise for all of us who are concerned that it should not pass into the limbo of 'lost' languages, the question of just what form and standard of Manx it is that we wish to maintain and propagate for the future.
> (Thomson 1986)

It is worth pointing out firstly that even a purely 'academic' perspective is by no means of irrelevant or uninteresting to members of the RM community. Speas (2009: 24) notes that those interested in language for its own sake, and therefore at some level in linguistics, are found in every speech community. By the very nature of a language movement, it is surely true that many of those who choose to learn Manx are deeply interested in Manx in and of itself, and in language more generally, or develop such an interest as they acquire the language. Indeed, it would perhaps be somewhat patronizing to assume that RM speakers would be interested only in immediately "practical" issues, and would not want to find out more about the nature of the language they speak, in comparison with other languages in similar situations, irrespective of the utilitarian value of such knowledge.

Secondly, the *prima facie* majority ideological position may not necessarily be the same as the consensus conclusion the speaker community might come to upon further debate and discussion; cf. Kroskrity's (2009: 71) discussion of the 'need for "ideological clarification"' (after Fishman (1991: 17)) and 'the conflicts over the beliefs and feelings about languages and the importance of early-on resolving these conflicts at a local level to enhance language revitalization efforts'. It is therefore by no means clear that 'the question of just what form and standard of Manx it is that we wish to maintain and propagate for the future' (Thomson 1986) is or would be of little interest to the RM community, since adequate 'ideological clarification' has arguably not yet occurred. The pre-existing dominant views may be or have been beneficial in some way to the community, but might also have downsides.

Another issue to consider is a very practical one: those learning and using Revived Manx may feel the need for greater guidance on what forms to choose to use (which requires a conscious knowledge of what range of forms exists and in what varieties of the language), and perhaps on the extent to which choice in some areas may or may not be possible (i.e. the extent to which hybridization with English is inevitable). The relative lack of discussion of what 'form and standard' of Manx should be 'propagated' may in part reflect scarcity of time and resources, rather than simply a lack of interest in the topic, or a belief in its irrelevance. It is hoped, therefore, that the present work may be of some practical use for the preparation of learning resources etc. in the future.

The thesis is intended primarily as a contribution to the study of the phenomenon of language revival or reclamation, which like all aspects of language, may be of interest in and of itself, and may also shed light on wider linguistic and sociolinguistic processes and commonalities. It is also a field which is likely to be of more and more relevance over the coming decades as ever increasing numbers of languages become moribund or extinct in their traditional form, and more and more communities seek to reclaim and reconstruct their ancestral tongue, or the historical language of the place they have chosen to make their home. All research of this kind is potentially valuable to fledgling language revival communities across the globe as it can shed light on "what to expect" so far as the practicalities of revival and the likely results are concerned (cf. Zuckermann and Walsh 2011).

I am myself from the Isle of Man and a fluent speaker of Revived Manx. Although I now spend much of my time off the island, I speak Manx when I get the opportunity to certain friends and acquaintances, online, and from time to time at Manx events, and have contributed to the Manx scene in terms of creative writing, translation etc. In studying any community there are always advantages and disadvantages to being either an "outsider" or an "insider". I have tried to utilize my experience as a member of the Revived Manx community to guide my analysis in this study (while basing my work as far as possible on independent documentary sources). However, the potential for bias on my part, especially in the analysis of language ideologies, should always be borne in mind, although I have sought to be as balanced and objective as possible.

8. Acknowledgements

Chapter 2

Linguistic description of Revived Manx

1. Introduction

The following description of Revived Manx is based on texts written mainly from the 1970s onwards, as well as some from earlier periods of the revival, recordings and videos of RM speech in the public domain, and the personal experience of the author of interacting with RM speakers over several years. The treatment does not aim to be exhaustive, but to cover many of the most prominent features which differentiate Revived Manx from the traditional language. Phonetics and phonology are discussed first, followed by morphology and syntax, and finally lexicon and idiom. Certain aspects of the language have been largely left out of consideration due to space constraints and complexity; for example the initial consonant mutation system is not dealt with specifically although certain specific mutations (e.g. lenition marking gender) are considered in the relevant sections.[11]

Above and beyond the problematic nature of generalizing about the characteristics of any language variety, given that all varieties are a collection of subtly different idiolects, it is difficult to give a generalized account of the linguistic features of a revived language where most of the speakers are adult learners, because of the degree of variation in fluency, learning methods, metalinguistic awareness, exposure to different varieties of the language, differences of opinion as to how close the revived language should be to the traditional language, and what variety / varieties of the traditional language to draw on, as well as the lack of a community using the language on a daily basis in a range of domains, which would normally exercise a homogenizing influence and level idiolectal differences. Few, if any, of the features described below are found regularly in the speech or writing of all, or even most, users of Revived Manx. Some features are widely regarded as part of the target variety and propagated in Manx courses, whether because they have been consciously introduced, because of ignorance or

---

[11] Adherence to the mutation rules appears to be quite variable in both TM and RM, with certain triggers and consonants causing or undergoing mutation more consistently than others (Thomson 1969: 190); moreover the orthography may mark mutation less consistently than it was in fact pronounced in speech (e.g. the prefixation of *h-* to vowels, which according to Rhŷs (1894: 72) was generally observed in both reading and spontaneous speech although it is not usually written in texts such as the Bible). The mutation system in the terminal speakers shows extreme and apparently random variation (Broderick 1999: 94). This makes a comparison between TM and RM usage somewhat difficult. However, in general the mutation rules, especially the lexically triggered ones (e.g. that caused by possessive *my* 'my'), which do not depend on knowledge of gender etc., seem to be fairly widely observed in RM, and learning the rules forms a major part of introductory Manx courses. The mutation system is regarded as an emblematic part of the identity of Manx as a Celtic language. Occasional confusions of the more nuanced rules sometimes occur, however, as well as hyperarchaic over-adherence to aspects of the system often or usually ignored in TM.

misunderstanding of the relevant feature in Traditional Manx, or because they are considered to be the result of legitimate language change. Other features may be widely regarded as sub-standard, but are frequently encountered nonetheless, and found in the unguarded or hasty language use even of those who would consciously reject them. Still others are not widely noticed at all. Some features appear to be associated with particular periods of the revival, or with particular groups of speakers, such as older revivalists who were directly influenced by the last traditional speakers, children attending the Manx-medium primary school, immigrants from a non-Manx background, or more academically-minded revivalists. The speakers of Revived Manx from whom the examples are derived vary in proficiency, but all can express themselves fairly fluently and confidently and would generally be regarded within the community as 'speakers' rather than 'learners' (cf. Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 57–8).

The features which differentiate Revived Manx from the traditional language on which it is based may be divided into a number of categories according to their origins.

1.1. Substratal effects of English.

Where a feature of the traditional language is absent or significantly different from the structure of English, there is often a tendency to substitute forms more closely resembling those of English, the first language of most Revived Manx speakers. There may be an attempt to avoid these in careful speech or writing, but often they appear despite efforts to avoid them, or else they are not noticed at all. Examples include the diphthongization of long vowels (§3.1), intrusive and linking R (§3.3), realization of TM palatalized consonants as clusters (§3.6), the use of *my* 'if' to form indirect questions (§4.1.6), loss of grammatical gender in inanimate nouns (§4.2.1), replacement of the genitive by the preposition *jeh* 'of' (§4.2.2.4), use of stress rather than emphatic suffixes to show emphasis on pronouns (§4.2.3.1), confusion of singular and plural 2nd person pronouns (§4.2.4), realignment of the semantics of Manx lexis according to English semantic distinctions (§5.8), and the influence of English style, especially in translations and complex higher register texts (§5.10).

1.2. Hyper-Gaelicisms and hyper-archaisms

As a reaction against the real and perceived influence of English both on the traditional and revived language, there is a tendency to seek to replace forms and structures perceived as being of English origin with forms perceived as native and Gaelic. This may include:

- suppression of an English-derived form in favour of a native one, when both were in use, either interchangeably or with some semantic distinction, in the traditional

language, e.g. replacement of TM *back* adv. 'back' with *er ash*, G. *ar ais*, despite the fact that this has a different meaning in TM (§5.3);

- introduction or "restoration" of Gaelic (i.e. Irish or Scottish) forms which were non-existent, marginal or archaic in traditional Manx, e.g. "correction" of Manx noun genders (§4.2.1), introduction of genitives formed by internal vowel change and palatalization (§4.2.2.1), borrowing of Irish *rinceadh* 'dance' as *rinkey* for TM *daunsin* (§5.3), use of construction with *er* 'on' for 'hungry' and 'thirsty' (§5.4.3);

- introduction of structures and aidioms believed to be Gaelic, or at least to sound vaguely "Manx" or "Gaelic" or "idiomatic," and non-English, which in fact are not found in any Gaelic variety, e.g. *s'treisht lhiam* 'I hope' (§4.1.11.8);

- avoidance of structures which happen to resemble English, even when this resemblance may be a coincidence and a result of internal development, or a centuries-old borrowing, in favour of more distinctively "Gaelic" structures, e.g. favouring of the copula over the substantive verb with nominal predicates (§4.1.11.1);

- preference for the most conservative or archaic variants available in TM, e.g. the use of the inversion infinitive (§4.18), the past / conditional unaugmented copula *by* (§4.1.11.4), nasalization after the article in the genitive plural (§4.2.2.2);

- avoidance of forms considered to be grammatically or historically illogical, e.g. avoidance of the progressive with initial *g-* (G. *ag*) used as an infinitive, against consistent Classical and Late TM usage (§4.1.7).

1.3. Spelling pronunciations.

The ambiguous and irregular Manx orthography can lead to pronunciations based on guesswork which differ from the historical pronunciation. For some forms, their historical pronunciation may be difficult to determine, especially if they lack cognate forms, or there are variant cognate forms, in the other Gaelic dialects. In any case, only a minority of RM speakers are familiar with Irish and / or Scottish Gaelic, and fewer still with Gaelic historical linguistics, so even if the historically expected pronunciation can be determined with near certainty, this may not be the pronunciation in common use. Examples are given in §3.8–10.

1.4. Internal analogy, overgeneralization and simplification.

Some distinctions or irregularities in the traditional language may be levelled by analogical influence from other forms within the language, and forms which appear to be logically

possible may be introduced, which in fact are unattested in TM (e.g. extension of the zero copula to adjectival predicates §4.1.11.2, *cha nee agh* 'only' §4.1.11.6, overgeneralization of *as* 'as' in the equative construction §4.2.5.3). Forms restricted to fixed expressions in TM may be made more productive in RM, e.g. overgeneralization of the unaugmented copula *s'* (§4.1.11.3). Nuanced distinctions in TM may not be fully acquired by RM speakers and may be subject to reanalysis, e.g. the distinction between simple and emphatic pronouns (§4.2.3).

1.5. Erroneous or ambiguous information in dictionaries, grammars and language courses.

Some features have been derived from misinterpretation of information in reference works, or from ambiguities, errors or omissions in the reference works themselves. Examples include the introduction of a periphrastic comparative / superlative (§4.2.5.2), the use of a redundant possessive with *quail* 'meeting, towards' (§5.5.1), the extension of *eie* to cover all the meanings of English 'idea' (§5.8.4) based on an ambiguous definition in Cregeen's dictionary, and loss of synonymy due to the omission of forms in text-books (§5.11).

1.6. Neologisms.

Whereas in the traditional language novel phenomena were dealt with by paraphrase, liberal borrowing from English, and only occasionally by derivation from native roots, a wider range of neologizing techniques have been used in Revived Manx (cf. Lewin 2015, Broderick 2013a, b, 2015), the products of which have gained varying degrees of acceptance. These methods include semantic extension and compounding of TM lexis (§5.1), borrowing from Irish and Scottish Gaelic (§5.2), and borrowings from English phonologically modified as if they had entered the language centuries ago (§5.7).

1.7. Mixing of dialects, registers and historical periods of the language.

Forms from distinct varieties in TM are often mixed in RM. Forms from northern and southern Manx may be used by the same speaker, often without awareness of their dialectal provenance (§3.13). Conservative (usu. eighteenth-century) features may be used alongside later forms, e.g. the increased use of inflected verb tenses in RM in contrast to Late TM usage (§4.1.2).

2. Sources

2.1. Revived Manx sources

Spoken material:

[Unlabelled examples, usually of a very general nature, are remembered or constructed from my own experience of RM speech. However, I have endeavoured to use referenceable examples as far as possible.]

BJC   *Bernard and Joan Caine Interviews*. Manx Heritage Foundation.
          <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/video_collection_79769.html>

BS   *Brian Stowell Interviews*. Manx Heritage Foundation.
          <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/video_collection_82161.html>

JC   *Juan Crellin [interviews]*. Manx Heritage Foundation.
          <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/video_collection_31498.html>

The above are interviews on a variety of topics with prominent long-standing members of the RM community, most of whom had direct contact with some the last traditional speakers.

SJV   *Saase Jeeragh video files*. Manx Heritage Foundation.
          < http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/video_collection_74051.html>
          A series of videos to accompany the *Saase Jeeragh* course (see below). References are
          to the number of the lesson.

TCM   *Taggloo: Conversational Manx*. Culture Vannin. 2014.
<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLY5y-gRhKs8gmP0sMWYlmp25dl1b0Tweu>
          A series of thirteen videos comprising interviews with a number of RM speakers on a
          variety of topics relating to everyday life, as well learning and speaking Manx,
          produced and made available in the public domain for the benefit of learners of the
          language.

Written material:

DS   *Droghad ny Seihill*. Christopher Lewin. 2010 (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)
          An original fantasy novel.

ESE   *Ecstasy as Skeealyn Elley*. Ré Ó Laighléis (trans. by R. W. K. Teare). 2008 (St Judes: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

A collection of short stories on contemporary topics translated from Irish.

JK   'Shirveish Ashoonagh Keeill Vraddan Sharmane, liorish Juan y Kewley, Yn Ardjaghin. 1919 [Kirk Braddan National Service a Sermon, by John Kewley, the Archdeacon. 1919]'. Manx National Heritage Library MS 06161/51, pp. 3–9

John Kewley was a prominent clergyman and a learner of Manx and supporter of the early revival movement, who corresponded with Edward Faragher and collected much of the latter's manuscript material (cf. Broderick 1981b). He preached a number of sermons in Manx composed by himself at occasional Manx services between 1919 and 1933.

MC   *Manannan's Cloak: An Anthology of Manx Literature*. Robert Corteen Carswell. 2010 (London: Francis Bootle)

A chronological anthology of short extracts of Traditional and Revived Manx verse and prose.

LdT   *Lessoonyn da Toshiaghteyryn*. Manx Heritage Foundation / Culture Vannin. < http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/beginner_lesson_index.html>

A series of lessons for beginners. References are to the number of the lesson.

LM   *Lessoonyn Meanagh*. Manx Heritage Foundation / Culture Vannin. <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/inter_lesson_index.html>

A series of intermediate lessons. References are to the number of the lesson.

RLT 1966   *Gys y lhaihder* [To the reader] by R. L. Thomson in Edmund Goodwin and Robert L. Thomson. 1966. *First Lessons in Manx. Lessoonyn ayns Chengey ny Mayrey Ellan Vannin*, 3rd edn (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

RLT 1969   Preface by R. L. Thomson in Cregeen, Archibald. 1969. *A Dictionary of the Manks Language*, 3rd edn (Menston: Scolar Press)

RRVE *Chronicle of the Kings of Mann and the Isles. Recortys Reeaghyn Vannin as ny h Ellanyn*. George Broderick and Brian Stowell. 1973 (Edinburgh: George Broderick)

The translation from Latin into Manx of this mediaeval chronicle was part of a 'swing to creating secular texts in Manx' and 'inaugurated a period of the production of primarily original material in the language' (Broderick 2015: 38). The Manx translation is by Stowell, with advice from Robert L. Thomson.

SJ   *Saase Jeeragh*. Manx Heritage Foundation / Culture Vannin.
    < http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/audio_collection_71715.html>
    This course was developed in 2009 by the Manx Heritage Foundation / Culture Vannin, based loosely on the Ulpan method, as is currently in use in various classes across the island. References are to the number of the lesson.

Skeeal.   *Skeealaght*. Lewis y Crellin, Juan y Crellin, Colin y Jerree and Shorys y Creayrie. 1976 (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)
    A collection of short stories and anecdotes, including folktales translated from the other Gaelic languages.

WP   *Winnie-y-Pooh*.
    <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/media/Stories/Winnie-y-Pooh%201.pdf>
    A translation of the collection of children's stories *Winnie the Pooh* by A. A. Milne.

2.3. Traditional Manx sources

All examples of TM speech are taken from *HLSM* (Broderick 1984–86). Examples from the Bible are taken from the 1819 / 1979 edition as digitized online by the Manx Heritage Foundation.[12]

CS   *The Principles and Duties of Christianity* [*Coyrle Sodjeh Son leid as ter ny risagh* (*sic*) *yn Credjue Creestee*]. Thomas Wilson, 1707 (London: Motte)

FRC   *Yn Fer-raauee Creestee. Yn Fer-raauee Creestee (1763) The Christian Monitor (1686): A Bilingual Edition with Notes and Introduction*. Robert L. Thomson, 1998 (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

NBHR 'Manx Stories and Reminiscences of Ned Beg Hom Ruy'. George Broderick, 1981, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 38: 113–78.

---

[12] <http://mannin.info/MHF/index2.htm>

Original prose of Edward Faragher (Ned Beg Hom Ruy) (1831–1908), the last native writer of Manx.

PSD   *Plain and Short Directions and Prayers*. Thomas Wilson, 1707 (London: Motte) [printed in a single volume with CS]

SC   *A Short and Plain Instruction for the Better Understanding of the Lord's Supper* [*Aght Ghiare dy heet gys Toiggal firrinagh jeh Shibber y Chiarn*]. Thomas Wilson, 1777 (Whitehaven: Ware)

SW   *Sharmaneyn liorish Thomase Wilson, D. D.* Thomas Wilson, 1783 (Bath: Cruttwell) A selection of Bishop Wilson's sermons translated into Manx and published posthumously (cf. Lewin 2011a).

3. Phonetics and phonology

The transcriptions of TM speech are from *HLSM* (Broderick 1984–86), and reproduce his transcription system, with minor typographical adjustments. My transcriptions of RM speech are intended to conform closely to the norms of the IPA, the only modification being the use of superscript symbols in some instances to represent weakly articulated phones and diphthong glides (as in Broderick's system). Stress is only marked when it does not fall on the initial syllable. All transcriptions are fairly broadly phonetic, phonemic transcriptions (in // brackets) being used only when phonemes are specifically discussed. No attempt is made to determine a phonological system or inventory of phonemes for RM as the range of inter- and intraspeaker variation in an L2 revival community is likely to make this task futile, and moreover it is the intention of this chapter to give a broad sketch of the linguistic nature of RM, rather than to look in too much theoretical detail at particular aspects of the language.

3.1. Diphthongization of certain long vowels

The long monophthongs [eː] and [oː] may be diphthongized, as in many English dialects, to [ei] and [oʊ], [əʊ] or similar. In line with ongoing changes in many English dialects, the latter may have fronting of the second part of the diphthong, e.g. [əʏ] (cf. Przedlacka 2001). The following RM example (1) has both diphthongs.

(1)   [ʃei kouˈfɒbəl mai ʊnˈʃɔː]
       she co-phobble mie ayns shoh
       'it's a good community here' (TCM)

In TM monophthongs [ʃeː] 'is' (copula, G. *is é*) and [ko(ː)] *co-* (prefix, G. *comh-*) would be found (*co-phobble* is a neologism).

3.2. Confusion of diphthongs

It is somewhat unclear how many phonemic /i/ dipthongs there were in Traditional Manx. There seem to be at least /ei/ /ai/ /oi/ /ui/, though Thomson (1976: 263) adds /æi/ and /øi/, noting that some of the diphthongs may be allophones. These diphthongs have a variety of overlapping ambiguous spellings in the Manx orthography, and there is a tendency to confuse them in Revived Manx, especially realizing /ei/ as /oi/. In particular, there is a class of words which had /ei/ (sometimes realized as [əi] or [ai]) varying with /iː/, with /iː/ more common in southern Manx (*HLSM* II: 162), which are often realized as [oi] or [ɔːi] in Revived Manx, a realization never found in the traditional language. E.g. *ruy* 'red', TM [rei] [rai] [riː], RM often [ɹɔːi], *nuy* 'nine', southern TM [niː], northern [nei], RM [nɔːi]; *cloie* 'playing', TM [klei] [kliː], RM [klɔːi]. A notable exception seems to be *oie* 'night', northern TM [ei], southern [iː], where the pronunciation [iː] seems to have been firmly entrenched in the oral tradition of the revival as no other pronunciation is commonly found.

3.3. Loss of /r/, intrusive /r/

Under the influence of the non-rhotic varieties of English spoken by most revivalists, loss of /r/ (2), linking /r/ and intrusive /r/ (3) are all widespread in RM, and seem to go largely unnoticed.

Elision of /r/:

(2a)   [va mə ˈʃanˌɛː tʃit stʃax]
        va my shenn-ayr cheet stiagh
        'my grandfather would come in' (TCM)

(2b)   [pɜːt lə muɹə]
        Purt le Moirrey
        'Port St Mary' (TCM)

Intrusive /r/:

(3a)   [saiᵈn dau gɹɛː nax vel monə tɹɛː ɹeməs]
        shegin dou gra nagh vel monney traa /r/ aym's
        'I must say that I don't have much time' (TCM)

(3b) [va mi beə ɹuns duːliʃ]
va mee beaghey /r/ *ayns Doolish*
'I was living in Douglas' (TCM)

(3c) [foðə ɹeðə henə]
foddey /r/ *er-dy-henney*
'long ago' (TCM)

These phenomena are also attested in the Manx of the terminal traditional speakers (cf. Thomson 1992: 129, *HLSM* II: 169). In (4) there is intrusive /r/ between *eh* and *edyr*, and loss of final /r/ in *edyr*. This appears to be a late contact feature, perhaps restricted to the reduced speakers of the final generation, since articulation of postvocalic /r/ remains frequent in the terminal speaker material, and is consistently written in the orthography.[13]

(4) [ha ˈrau mi ˈruː eːvɪlʲ ˈlai ạ rəðə]
cha row mee rieau abyl lhaih eh /r/ *edyr*
'I was never able to read it [Manx] at all' (*HLSM* II: 267)

3.4. Vowels before /r/

There is a tendency towards centralization of vowels before preconsonantal and final /r/ in Late Spoken Manx (*HLSM* III: 44–5), i.e. historical /e(ː)/, /a(ː)/ and occasionally other vowels become [ö(ː)] in Broderick's transcription, representing [ø(ː)], [ɜ(ː)] or similar ('realised with a degree of retraction and lip-rounding' (ibid.)), and the /r/ may itself be dropped. This resembles similar changes in English words such as 'herd', 'third' etc., although is somewhat distinct since English historical /a/ is usually lengthened and retracted to /ɑː/ rather than being raised to /ɜː/ (e.g. 'hard').

In Revived Manx there are similar realizations but the distribution is more closely modelled on English. For example, most of the realizations of *cur* 'give, put, send' in *HLSM* (II: 112) preserve the vowel as [o] or [u] and sometimes the final /r/ is maintained, e.g. [ko] [kor] [kur], whereas for many RM speakers the vowel is centralized and lengthened and the consonant lost, as in English 'cur', i.e. [kɜː]. Similarly, historic /uː(r)/ or /uə(r)/ may be realized as [ɜː] in RM, e.g. TM [du(ː)t] *dooyrt* 'said' (G. *dubhairt*) (*HLSM* II: 127), but RM [dɜːt]. Cf.

---

[13] The only exception to this is that G. medial <rs> is consistently written as <s(s)> in Manx, with loss of /r⁽ʲ⁾/, although the /s/ may be retroflex (Jackson 1955: 125–6), e.g. *claasagh* 'harp' (G. *cláirseach*), *fesst* 'spindle' (G. *fearsad*), *essyn* 'door-jamb' (ScG. *ursainn*), *as* 'says, said' (ScG. *arsa*). Rhŷs (1894: 148) reports elision of /r/ before stops in words such as *jiarg* 'red' (G. *dearg*) and *ard* 'high' (G. *ard*), and in phrases such as *feer veg* 'very small' (G. *fíor bheag*). The transcriptions in *HLSM* (II: 10, 234–5) for *ard* and *jiarg* show both retention and loss of /r/.

English 'sure', in conservative Manx English (and conservative RP) [ʃuə] [ʃʊə], but now often [ʃɜː] or [ʃɔː] for many speakers.

3.5. Dental stops replaced by alveolars

Non-palatalized /t/ and /d/ in TM are dental or interdental, and /t/ is more strongly aspirated than in English (Jackson 1955: 80, *HLSM* III: 71). This feature is also found in traditional Manx English (Broderick 1997: 130), though less frequently heard today. In the contemporary English of the Isle of Man, alveolar [t] and [d] are usual, and are the most common realizations in Revived Manx also. Some speakers, however, make an effort to replicate the traditional sounds, influenced by contact with native speakers or recordings of them, or with those who acquired Manx from them. The dental realization may also arise from substrate influence if the speaker's L1 is a conservative form of Manx English, or from imitation of such pronunciation. Some speakers may also heed the following note in the preface of Kneen's (1990: iv) *English–Manx Pronouncing Dictionary*, which has been widely used by learners of the language since its initial publication in 1938:

> The only consonants which the student will find any difficulty in pronouncing are the following t, d, n, l, s and r. These are produced by pressing the tip of the tongue more firmly against the teeth or palate than is the case in English.
> (Kneen 1970: iv)

The difference between the traditional and anglicized pronunciations is particular noticeable in the clusters /dr/ and /(s)tr/, in which the stops in contemporary Manx English, in common with other English dialects, are typically heavily palatalized or affricated [dʲɹ] or [dʒɹ], [(s)tʲɹ] or [(s)tʃɹ] as opposed to TM and conservative Manx English [d̪ɹ] and [(s̪)t̪ʰɹ].

3.6. Palatalization

The palatalization of certain "slender" consonants found in TM, which is not a feature of English, is realized in a variety of ways in RM. The palatal feature may be segmentalized as a semivowel /j/, or even syllabified as a short vowel /i/, or dropped altogether (5):

(5)   TM [lʹo̞ːɹ] *lioar* 'book', G. *leabhar* > RM [ljɔː(ɹ)] [liˈɔː(ɹ)] [lɔː(ɹ)]
        TM [roː] [rʹoː] *rio* 'ice' G. *reo* > RM [ɹjoː] [ɹiˈoː] [ɹoː]
        TM [elʹə] *elley* 'other', G. *eile* > RM [eljə]

As in Late Spoken Manx, palatalization may appear where not historically expected (Broderick 1999: 90). Sometimes this may be in imitation of the terminal speakers, but often it seems to

arise from the ambiguity of the Manx orthography (see below). A similar weakening or loss of the "broad / slender" contrast in Shaw's Road Irish is noted by Maguire (1991: 199–200).

3.7. Velar and palatal fricatives /x/ /ç/ /ɣ/

In RM /x/ /ç/ and /ɣ/ may be confused, or replaced with corresponding stops /k/ and /g/ (6). The difference between velar /x/ and palatal /ç/ is not always clear in the orthography, and /ç/ and /ɣ/ are rarely attested in Late Spoken Manx owing to the breakdown of lenition (Broderick 1999: 87–8), which results in the substitution of stops for fricatives in initial position. In RM some speakers also substitute /k/ for /x/ in other positions, presumably because of the lack of this phone in English.

(6)   [g] for [x] or [ɣ]   [gɪnzəgə] *gynsaghey* 'learn' ScG. *ag ionnsachadh*
        [k] for [x]   [klʲaktə] *cliaghtey* 'custom' G. *cleachtadh*
                              [mak] *magh* 'out' G. *amach*
                              [giːstak] *geeastagh* 'fishing' G. *ag iascach*
                              [gɪlgak] *Gaelgagh* 'Manx-speaking' G. *Gaoidhilg + ach*
        [x] for [j] or [gʲ]   [uns ə xəmɛːn] *ayns y Ghermaan* 'in Germany' Ir. *insan Ghearmáin*
                              [rə xeðən] *ry-gheddyn* 'to be found' ScG. *ri fhaotainn*
        [x] for [ç]   [xeðən] *cheddin* 'same' G. *chéadna*
            (All examples from TCM)

Many speakers, however, have no difficulty with these fricatives, or produce stops only sporadically, or in certain situations such as before a pause or hesitation. Some speakers seem to have more difficulty with /ɣ/ and /ç/, perhaps because /x/ is familiar to some extent through widely known and used non-English words and names such as Scottish *loch* and German *Bach*, or because the distinction between initial <gh> i.e. /ɣ/ and medial or final <gh> i.e. /x/ is not fully acquired. In (7) the word internal /x/ is realized as /k/, but the initial /ɣ/ is devoiced to /x/:

(7)   [mə ˈlukˈtai wel ta mə xʷunʲə]
        my lught-thie well ta my ghooinney
        'my family, well there is my husband' (TCM)

Sometimes there is overgeneralization of [x], perhaps as a hypercorrection, or under influence from Liverpool English where /k/ may be realized as a fricative (Watson 2007: 353) (8):

(8)   [uns ə vɹɒˈx]
        ayns y vrock
        'in the mess' (TCM)

3.8. Pronunciations resulting from ambiguity of the orthography

3.8.1. <ay>

This digraph may represent /eː/ as in *cray* 'clay' (G. *cré*), /ɛː/ as in *ayr* 'father' (G. *athair*), /u/ /ə/ as in *ayns* 'in' (ScG. *anns*), /oː/ /uː/ as in *ayn* 'in him, it' (G. *ann*), /e/ as in *kayt* 'cat' (G. *cat*), or /aː/ as in *ayrn* 'part' (G. *earrann*), *tayrn* 'pull' (G. *tarraing*). Apparently by analogy with the latter, *maynrey* 'happy' and *maynrys* 'happiness' are often pronounced by revival speakers as [maːnɹə(s)] (LM 16), although TM pronunciations recorded are [mendrɒ̯] [mɛ̃ːndrəs] [meːndərəs] (*HLSM* II: 293), as G. *méanar*, *méanra* would suggest (with epenthetic consonant [d] and epenthetic vowel [ə] in the third example). The error may be traced to Kneen (1970: 38), who gives the pronunciation as (**mahn**ris, **mahn**ra).

3.8.2. <oy> <oi>

These digraphs may represent either short /o/ or long /oː/; e.g. *Moirrey* 'Mary' (G. *Moire*), *slayntoil* 'healthy' (G. *sláinteamhail > -óil*), *moyll* 'praise' (G. *mol*), *stoyl* 'stool' (G. *stól*). The short vowels tend to be identifiable by the doubling of following consonants (the <i> or <y> appears to signify the presence or absence respectively of palatalization in the following consonant). Nevertheless, many RM speakers pronounce these long in certain words when they are short in TM (9), presumably because of the orthographic ambiguity and lack of knowledge of the Gaelic cognates; although this could potentially reflect the secondary lengthening of short vowels sometimes found in TM (Jackson 1955: 9), and an example of *moylley* with long [oː] is attested (*HLSM* II: 308).

(9)   TM [molə] *moylley* 'praise', G. *moladh* > RM [moːlə]
        TM [solə] *soylley* 'enjoyment', G. *soladh* > RM [soːlə]
        TM [dolʲi] *doillee* 'difficult', G. *doiligh* > RM [doːlʲi]

3.8.3. <eu>

This digraph is ambiguous because it can signify either /uː/ /eu/ with a preceding palatalized consonant or glide /j/, or a diphthong /eu/ without any preceding palatalization or glide, e.g. [juːnəs] *eunys* 'joy', G. *éibhneas*, v. [e̯uləs] *eulys* 'anger', G. *aimhleas*. The prepositional pronoun [eu] *eu* 'at you', which is a reduced form of G. *agaibh*, is pronounced by some RM speakers as [juː] [jau] etc., although there is no historical basis for the glide, perhaps also by analogy with English 'feud', 'neuter', 'eunuch' etc.

3.8.4. <ei>

This digraph may represent /eː/ (e.g. *feill* [feːlʹ] 'meat, flesh', G. *feoil*), /ei/ (e.g. *eirey* [øirə] 'heir', G. *oighre*), or /e/ (e.g. *queig* [kweg] 'five', Ir. *cúig*). This ambiguity can lead to forms containing <ei> representing TM /eː/ being pronounced with [ei] or [ai]. This realization is commonly found in the following (10):

(10)   TM [dʹʒɑːrˈdeːⁱnʹ] *Jerdein* 'Thursday', G. *Déardaoin* > RM [dʒəˈdain] (TCM)

The German digraph <ei> as in *Einstein* might perhaps be an influence here. Another speaker in TCM has the historically expected vowel [dʒəˈdeːn]. The same realization of <ei> is often found in the 1sg. conditional / imperfect forms of the substantive verb (11):

(11)   TM [viːən] [viːN] [biːᵈn] *veign*, *beign* 'I would be', Ir. *bheinn*, *bhínn*, ScG. *bhithinn* > RM [baiᵈns] (BJC) (with emphatic suffix)

This pronunciation of *veign* (dependent *beign*) with [ai] arise perhaps from confusion with *begin* (sometimes spelled *beign*) 'had to' (the past of *shegin*), Ir. *b'éigean*, which in both TM and RM is usually pronounced [bai(ᵈ)n]. This pronunciation is also frequent with *beiyn* 'animals' (ScG. *beathaichean*) (12):

(12)   TM [beːinʹ] (palatalization probably erroneous?) *beiyn* 'animals', ScG. *beathaichean* > RM [bɑiən] (TCM)

3.8.5. <ia>

This digraph may be pronounced either [i(ə)] or [aiə], [aia], reflecting the ambiguity of <i> in the English orthography on which the Manx one is based, between the post-Great Vowel Shift pronunciation of /ai/ and the continental pronunciation /iː/ found in some French / latinate words (e.g. 'machine'). I have heard the homographs *Mian* 'Matthew' *[maian] (not attested in *HLSM*, but cf. Rhŷs 1894: 46–7) and *mian* 'desire' [miːn], G. *mian*, confused in RM speech. In TCM, one speaker realizes *grian* 'sun', G. *grian* (TM [griːn]) as [gɹaiən], although this particular departure from TM pronunciation is not usual in RM.

3.8.6. <gn>

The use of the digraph <gn> in French and Italian, and in borrowings from those languages in English, for the palatal nasal [ɲ] or cluster [nj], is apparently responsible for the common RM

pronunciation of *aigney* 'mind, will', G. *aigne* as [anʲə], [anjə]; e.g. [nə aɲəxən ek sla·i] *ny aignaghyn ec sleih* 'peoples' minds' (BS) (74a).[14] The TM pronunciation is [ag′n′ə].

3.8.7. Orthographic representation of palatalization

Palatalization is not consistently marked in Manx orthography (Broderick 2010: 307), with the result that consonants may be palatalized in RM which do not have palatalization in TM. For example, by analogy with [balʲə] *balley* 'town', G. *baile*, many RM speakers pronounce *halley* 'hall' as [halʲə] (or [haljə]). There happens to be no attestation of this word in *HLSM*, but there seems no reason to expect the English word 'hall' to develop a palatalized [lʲ], and the Ir. and ScG. forms are *halla* and *talla* respectively.

The lenited form of [gʲilʲə] *guilley* 'boy', ScG. *gille*, is often pronounced with 'broad' [ɣ] rather than [j], as in (13), apparently under the misconception that the <u> signifies a non-palatalized initial consonant, when in fact it seems to be based on the English orthographic convention of placing <u> after <g> in words like 'guile', the purpose of which is to prevent the reading of <g> as /dʒ/.

(13) [tɪɛː va miʃ mə ɣilʲə ɛːg]
     tra va mish my ghuilley aeg
     'when I was a young boy' (TCM)

An additional source of confusion is that while initial /j/ as lenition of /gʲ/ may be written either <y(i)> or <gh(i)> in Manx orthography, <gh(i)> seems to have been preferred in most texts in standardized orthography such as the Bible, making the distinction between /ɣ/ and /j/ less easily discernible in written Manx. Similarly, *gennal* 'cheerful, merry' represents G. *geanamhail*, but there is no indication of the palatalized initial consonant in the orthography, so RM speakers are liable to pronounce the lenited form *ghennal* (e.g. in the greeting *Nollick ghennal* 'Merry Christmas') with initial [g], [ɣ] or [x]. This confusion is not found with the noun from which this adjective is derived, *gien* 'cheer', G. *gean*, since the <i> makes clear the palatalized nature of the /gʲ/. Another case is *geddyn* 'getting, finding' and its lenited form *gheddyn*. It is not obvious from the spelling whether the <g> or <gh> in this form is "broad" or "slender". The two interchangeable forms *geddyn* and *feddyn* 'getting, finding' are found in all periods of Manx. *Feddyn* is presumably equivalent to ScG. *faotainn* (*HLSM* II: 161, 189) with the form in initial [g] deriving from the progressive *ag* (cf. *doll* > *goll* 'going') and / or

---

[14] The digraph <gn> is in fact used in Phillips to represent a palatal nasal in *gniart* 'strength', later *niart* (G. *neart*) (Thomson 1953: 10).

from interference from English 'get'. However, since forms in <ao> may vary with <é> across Goidelic dialects, cf. ScG. *aodann*, Ir. *éadan*, Manx *eddin* 'face', Ir./ScG. *aoibhneas*, ScG. *èibhneas*, Manx *eunys* 'joy' [juːnəs], *feddyn / geddyn* may represent **féatain / géatain* (cf. Ir. *féadaim* 'I can', from the prototonic stem of *ad-cota* 'gets, obtains' (*eDIL* s.v. *fétaid*)). In Phillips, the lenited form *gheddyn* is written with initial <j> which represents /j/, and several of the recorded realizations in native speech have initial palatalized [gʹ]. Nonetheless, in RM the lenited form tends to be pronounced with initial [g], [ɣ] or [x].

3.9. Archaic spelling pronunciations

In TM the plosive is usually dropped in the clusters /xt/ /st/ /ʃtʲ/ in final position (orthographic <ght> <s(h)t>) (Jackson 1955: 80–82, *HLSM* III: 86, 88). It seems that this tendency goes back as far as the seventeenth century (Rhŷs 1894: 98). In RM, however, many speakers consistently pronounce the orthographic <t> (14).

(14) [kɑˑʒiakt] *cosheeaght* 'walking' (TCM)
      [hɔʒaxt] *hoshiaght* 'first' (TCM) (cf. TM [hɔʒʹax])
      [naiaxt] *naight* 'news' (TCM)
      [ʃeʒəxt] *sheshaght* 'society' (cf. TM [ʃẹʒɑx])
      [taiˈoːst] *thie-oast* 'pub' (TCM) (cf. TM [taiˈoːs])

Some speakers, however, continue the TM practice of eliding the /t/ (15):

(15) [t̥ɔjax] *toshiaght* 'beginning' (TCM) (cf. TM [tɔʒʹax], [tɑ̈ːiax])
      [ɛˑʃ] *eisht* 'then' (BS) (cf. TM [ẹʃ], [ẹːʃ])

3.10. Spurious pronunciations based on unhistorical spellings

Some unhistorical spellings have become common in the revival, which have then affected pronunciation in RM. For example, the spelling *Jelune* 'Monday' (Ir. *Dé Luain*) has become widespread, leading to pronunciations such as [dʒəˈluːᵈn] (TCM), although in TM G. /uə/ is usually fronted to [iː] [eː] [yː] etc. (*HLSM* III: 139), and attested TM pronunciation of this item is [dʹʒẹˈliᵈnʹ], [dʹʒẹˈleːᵈnʹ] and similar. Cregeen has *Jelhein* as his main headword, with *Jelune* as an alternative spelling; he cites the Latin *dies Lunæ* and the explanation 'the day dedicated to the moon', so *Jelune* is presumably a learned etymological spelling, rather than a reflection of TM pronunciation. Kneen (1970: 49) has the semi-Gaelic spelling *Jyluain*, and gives the unclear pronunciation guide (je**l.uein**), which according to his crib would equate to something like *[dʒeˈlyːin]. Goodwin (1901: 44) gives *Jelhein* in his main list of days of the week, but

notes *Jyluain* and *Jelune* as alternative spellings. Fargher (1979: 501–02) gives *Jelune* first and in his examples, but also *Jelhein* as an alternative.

Another spurious spelling is *Rosien* for *Rushen* (Fargher 1979: 650), the sheading and parish in the south-west of the Isle of Man. This name represents G. *Roisean*, TM [rο̞ʒən] (Broderick 2006: 186). In TCM a speaker pronounces *Rosien* as [ˌruʃiˈen], a spelling pronunciation which also violates usual Gaelic stress placement. The spurious spelling is perhaps influenced by the G. form and may be an attempt to produce a distinctive Manx spelling, different from that used in English. However, this has apparently led the RM speaker to assume that the distinct spelling must represent a distinct pronunciation.

3.11. Maintenance of traditional pronunciation of certain forms not predictable from orthography

In certain common lexical items, idiosyncratic TM pronunciations which are not obvious from the spelling are usually or often preserved in RM, owing to the oral tradition of the revival whereby common forms remembered from the native speakers have been successfully passed down and have become established among revival speakers. In some cases, TM pronunciations may have also been revived from study of recordings and transcriptions of native speech.

neesht 'also'

This is generally pronounced [nʲis], [njis] in RM. This apparently reflects the southern TM pronunciation [nʹiːs], [nʹɪs] etc. The orthography better reflects the northern form [niːʃ] [niʃ] (*HLSM* II: 321).

shegin 'must'

This is generally pronounced [sain], [saiᵈn] in RM, reflecting the usual TM pronunciation (*HLSM* II: 395). This pronunciation diverges from the orthography in two respects: there is non-palatal initial [s] rather than the palatal [ʃ] implied by orthographic <sh>, and the historic [g] is consistently elided (cf. secondary lenition, §3.12.3), forming a monosyllable with optional preocclusion. Initial [ʃ] is also attested in TM, but seems to be unusual in RM.

ayns shoh 'here', *ayns shen* 'there', *myr shoh* 'like this', *myr shen* 'like that, so', *dys shoh* '[to] here', *dys shen* '[to] there'

In TM these are usually pronounced with 'broad' [s] rather than slender [ʃ], despite the orthography implying otherwise, e.g. [əˈsο̞ː], [usˈseᵈn], [məˈsο̞ː], [moˈseᵈn], [dəs ˈsο̞ː], (cf. Ir.

an so, *an soin*, *mar so*, *mar soin*) although realizations with [ʃ] are also found, e.g. [unˈʃo̞ː]. In addition, the <n> is usually elided in TM. Most speakers of RM follow the orthography and pronounce the [n] and [ʃ], but others produce forms similar to TM. The realizations [əˈsɔː] and [dəˈsen] have been noted in TCM.

3.12. Preservation of traditional pronunciation features

In addition to the maintenance of TM pronunciations of particular words, certain general features of Late Manx phonology, which are not represented in the orthography, are also retained. These include preocclusion, secondary lengthening, and secondary lenition.

3.12.1. Preocclusion

Preocclusion, i.e. the insertion of an unreleased stop before final nasals, and occasionally laterals (Rhŷs 1894: 142–4, Jackson 1955: 113–5, Broderick 1986: 28–34, Chaudhri 2007: 39–43), is a prominent feature of Late TM, and is often heard in RM speech also. The same speaker may produce preocclusion on some occasions, but not on others, even in the same word, e.g. in TCM one speaker says both [kiən] *keayn* 'sea', without preocclusion, and [eɹ ə xiᵈn] *er y cheayn* 'on the sea', with preocclusion. Further examples of RM preocclusion (16):

(16)　[gʲlʲɔᵈn] *glione* 'glen', G. *gleann* (TCM)
　　　[ʃeᵈn] *shen* 'that', G. *sin* (TCM)
　　　[hiːᵈn] *hene* 'self', ScG. *fhìn* (BC)
　　　[sleᵈn] *slane* 'fully', G. *slán* (JC)

3.12.2. Secondary lengthening of short vowels

A feature of Late Manx pronunciation is frequent, though inconsistent, secondary lengthening of historically short vowels (Rhŷs 1894: 3, 9–10, Jackson 1955: 9, *HLSM* III: 122), especially /a/ and /o/. This is continued in RM, especially in certain words where it seems to be almost universally observed, such as the following (17):

(17)　[faːgən] *fakin* 'see', ScG. *faicinn* (TCM)
　　　[lʲaːvi] *lhiabbee* 'bed', ScG. *leabaidh* (TCM)
　　　[fɔːðə] *foddey* 'far', Ir. *foda* (TCM)
　　　[kaːvan] *cappan* 'cup', Ir. *cupán*, ScG. *copan* (BJC)

In other words it is common, where it was found also in TM (18):

(18)　[nə haːðu] *ny hassoo* 'standing', G. *seasamh* (TCM)
　　　[bɒːx] *boght* 'poor', G. *bocht* (TCM)
　　　[taːgət] *taghyrt* 'happening', ScG. *tachairt* (BS)

3.12.3. Secondary lenition

Another feature of TM is secondary lenition, whereby medial voiced stops are liable to become voiced fricatives or in some cases be elided, medial voiceless stops become voiced, and may become fricatives or be elided, and voiceless fricatives are voiced or elided (Jackson 1955: 65, *HLSM* III: 71–72). This appears to have been less developed in the Classical Manx period, for it is marked only rarely in the orthography, and then only the most incipient stages (e.g. *cabbyl* 'horse', G. *capall*, often with fricative in late TM [kʹaːvəl]). In RM it seems to be fixed in certain lexical items, and variable in others (19). For example, *cappan* 'cup' seems to be universally pronounced with medial [v] in RM, although [b] is also found in TM. This fixed pronunciation is perhaps due to the stereotyped phrase *cappan dy hey* 'cup of tea', which is typically acquired in the early stages of learning the language.

(19)　　[lʲaːvi] *lhiabbee* 'bed', ScG. *leabaidh* (TCM)
　　　　[fɔːðə] *foddey* 'far', Ir. *foda* (TCM)
　　　　[nə haːðu] *ny hassoo* 'standing', G. *seasamh* (TCM)
　　　　[faːgən] *fakin* 'see', ScG. *faicinn* (TCM)
　　　　[flʲaː] *fliaghey* 'rain' OIr. *flechud* (TCM)
　　　　[maːɹən] *magheryn* 'fields' ScG. *machair* (TCM)
　　　　[sə vɛːdə] *'sy vaatey* 'in the boat' ScG. *bàta* (TCM)
　　　　[eɹ ə vɛːðə] *er y vaatey* 'on the boat' (TCM)
　　　　[kraːl] *credjal* 'believing' G. *creid + -eáil* (BC)
　　　　[laːl] *laccal* 'wanting' Eng. 'lack' + G. *-áil* (BS)

3.13. Mixing of dialects

Two main dialects of TM have been noted by scholars, north and south (Rhŷs 1894: 160–1, *HLSM* I: 160–6). There were probably more localized distinctions, although evidence for these is thin.[15] The differences between the two main dialects were not in any case great. The terminal speakers who survived into the mid-twentieth century and who interacted with the early revivalists represented both dialects (Broderick 1999: 65, 70, 178–9). RM speakers today tend to have features of both southern and northern Manx in their speech, although awareness of the traditional dialects seems to be low. A minority consciously model their speech on one dialect or the other.

　　　　Of the other distinguishing features of the dialects listed by Broderick (*HLSM* I: 160–166), the commonest RM forms sometimes agree with the southern, and sometimes with the northern form, and sometimes both forms are found. The deciding factor often seems to be

---

[15] Broderick (*HLSM* I: 166) discusses the possibility of a Peel sub-dialect, for example.

what agrees closest with the standard orthography, though not always, as the case of *neesht* above shows. The list of features below includes all those in Broderick's list which seem reasonably certain markers of the southern and northern dialects in TM, leaving out some of the more tentative ones.

3.13.1. Treatment of stressed G. *-ann*

A prominent phonological characteristic of the traditional dialects was their varying treatment of historic stressed G. final *-ann*, the vowel of which remained a monophthong in southern TM, with compensatory shortening in the presence of preocclusion, i.e. [oːn] [oᵈn], but was usually diphthongized in the north, i.e. [aun] [auᵈn] (*HLSM* I: 161). Both realizations are found interchangeably in RM (20):

(20)   diphthongal (i.e. 'northern') [məˈkjaun] [məˈçaun]
        monophthongal (i.e. 'southern') [məˈkjɔn] [məˈço:n] *mychione* 'about' (TCM)

Note that, apart from the speakers who make a conscious effort to adopt one dialect or the other, in which case the choice will generally coincide with the area in which they were brought up or reside, there seems to be no correlation between use of the diphthongal or monophthongal realization in RM with geography. On the whole, the diphthongal pronunciation seems to be commoner.

3.13.2. Raising of G. /aː/

Broderick (*HLSM* I: 160) notes that G. /aː/ is usually raised to [eː], [ɛː] in Manx, but may remain as [aː] in the north. The raised pronunciation is usual in RM, except in speakers consciously adopting a northern pronunciation, or imitating particular northern terminal speakers, e.g. [ɹaːd] *raad* 'where', also 'road, way', ScG. *rathad* (JC), where most RM speakers would say [ɹɛːd].

Laghyn 'days'

In contrast to the regular development, the plural of *laa* 'day', *laghyn* (cf. ScG. *làithean*) was usually realized with [aː] in southern Manx and with either [aː] or [eː], [ɛː] in the north, where the medial fricative was also more likely to be lost e.g. southern [laːxən], [laːɣən], northern [laːən], [leːən], [lɛːxən] (*HLSM* I: 257). In RM realizations with a raised vowel and no fricative seem to be usual. In TCM, realizations such as [leːən], [lɛːn] are produced by seven out of eight speakers who use this word. One speaker, however, says [laːxən]. This speaker has made a point of studying sources such as *HLSM* and models his speech on southern TM.

3.13.3. Treatment of stressed final G. *-án*

Broderick (*HLSM* I: 161) and Rhŷs (1894: 160) observe that in monosyllables ending in G. final stressed *-án*, such as *bane* 'white', G. *bán*, or *slane* 'whole', G. *slán*, there is a tendency in the south to maintain the quality and length of the vowel [ɛ(ː)], with less propensity for preocclusion to develop, whereas in the north the preocclusion is more consistent, and the vowel is usually shortened and its quality may be changed to [ø] or similar. In RM, the southern form seems to be usual, at least for *bane*, which in TCM is uttered by four speakers, all of whom produce [bɛːn] with a long vowel and no preocclusion. *Slane*, however (and its mutated form *clane*, G. *tslán*), is usually realized with a short vowel and preocclusion, although without the northern change of vowel quality, i.e. [sleᵈn], [kleᵈn],which is the realization produced by the four speakers who use this word in TCM. This lexical distribution may not simply be an artifact of the revival—all of the attestations of *slane* in *HLSM* from both northern and southern speakers have a short vowel, and usually preocclusion, whereas the description of the dialectal variation in vowel length and quality is true of *bane*.

3.13.4. Treatment of G. *ao* and *ua*

According to Broderick (*HLSM* I: 161) 'the tendency is for Gaelic *ua* and *ao* to fall together in Spoken Manx as one sound treated differently in the North as from the South. In the North it tends to be sounded as an unrounded high front vowel,' (i.e. [iː(ə)]) 'and in the South as a rounded or unrounded high back, or rounded high front vowel' (i.e. [uː], [ɯː], [yː]). Jackson's (1955: 47–53) descriptions of the realizations he heard do not include [ɯː], [yː]. From a recording of the southern terminal speaker Ned Maddrell on the LearnManx website (part 5),[16] in which the revivalist interviewers elicit a number of words with historic G. *ua* and *ao* from him, it is clear that Maddrell often had a distinctive vowel in these items, which to my ears sounds like a central to front-central vowel, generally rounded but sometimes less so, i.e. [ʉ], [ɨ], [ʏ].

   This sound, or approximations of it, are not generally found in RM, although it may be heard from those who model their Manx on southern TM (probably on Maddrell). For example, in TCM one speaker talks of [ə ʏːləs] *y Cheyllys* 'the Sound', G. *caolas*, cf. TM [ə xyːləs]. More typically, the 'northern' pronunciation with [iː] is adopted, perhaps because this sound

---

[16] <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/audio_collection_11918.html> [accessed 22.08.2015]

exists in English; [e:], [ei] may also be found. Three other speakers mention this placename in TCM, and their realizations are [ə xe:ləs], [ən kei:ləs], [ə ki:ləs].

An exception from this pattern is *feayr* 'cold', G. *fuar*, where a southern pronunciation with [uə] seems to be usual in RM, cf. southern TM [fu:ᵊr], northern [fi:ər]. In TCM all speakers have [fuə], [fuəɹ].

3.13.5. Treatment of vowel in *oie* 'night' and *nuy* 'nine'

The realization of the vowel in these words in RM has been discussed above. In southern TM there was usually a monophthong [i:] and in the north a diphthong [ɛi], [ai] (*HLSM* I: 162). In RM the monophthongal (southern) pronunciation [i:] of *oie* 'night' is near universal, although [ei] may be produced by those consciously adopting a northern pronunciation (21):

(21)   Interviewer: [kiɹəd te gɹɛ: son i: vai]
C'red t'ou (?) *gra son 'oie vie'?*
'What do you (?) say for *oie vie* (goodnight)?'

Interviewee: [ei vai eɹ ə tu:i]
'[ei vai] *oie vie' er y twoaie*
'[ei vai] in the north' (JC)

As discussed above, on the other hand, a diphthongal pronunciation is usual for *nuy* 'nine', G. *naoi*, but very often the English diphthong [ɔ(:)i] is substituted for TM [ɛi], [ai]. In the Taggloo interviews four speakers produce diphthongal realizations [nɒi], [nɔi], [nai], while two who model their Manx on the southern dialect produced a monophthongal realizations [ni:] (including an instance of the ordinal [ni:u] *nuyoo*, G. *naoimheadh*).

3.13.6. *Shenn* 'old'

This tended to be pronounced with a vowel [a] in the north and [e] in the south (*HLSM* I: 162). In RM the northern pronunciation with [a] seems to be usual, despite the orthography. This pronunciation is perhaps attractive to avoid confusion with the demonstrative *shen* 'that'.

3.13.7. Loss of medial fricatives

The fricative [x] or its secondarily lenited form [ɣ] were better preserved in southern TM than in the northern dialect, where the tendency was to elide the fricative altogether (*HLSM* I: 163–4). In RM this seems largely to be lexically determined; *magher* 'field' and *fliaghey* 'rain' usually lose the fricative and are monosyllabic (cf. *laghyn* above), whereas *jeeaghyn* 'look' usually preserves it.

3.13.8. Differences in vocabulary

Although not connected with phonology, dialectal differences in vocabulary will be mentioned here. According to Broderick (*HLSM* I: 165–6), they were not great in TM.

There was a difference between north and south with regard to the adverb used after adjectives with the meaning 'terribly'; *agglagh* was usual in the south, and *atçhimagh* in the north. There is only one instance of *agglagh* with this function and none of *atçhimagh* in this or any function in TCM, and from my wider experience of RM it seems that *agglagh* is usual.

The word for 'talking' was more commonly *taggloo* in the south and *pleadeil* or *preacheil* in the north. *Taggloo* (or *loayrt* 'to speak') is usual in RM, and *pleadeil* has not been noticed.

Baatey 'boat' was used in both areas, but *saagh* 'vessel' was common in the north. *Saagh* seems to be rarely used in RM in this sense.

The numeral 'one' was *unnane* or *'nane* [o̯ˈneːn], [neːn] in southern TM, and in the standard orthography, but sometimes *annan* in the north [anan], which is reflected in some non-standard written texts (Broderick 1990: 59, Lewin 2014a: 13). In the *HLSM* material *annan* seems to be restricted to *annan-jeig* 'eleven', as northern speakers have *'nane* otherwise (*HLSM* I: 165, II: 319, 469). *Nane* and *nane-jeig* are usual in RM.

The first person plural ending / pronoun (which was restricted to the future tense in Classical Manx but is found in other tenses in the speech of the terminal speakers) was *mayd* [məd] in southern TM (G. *-m(a)id*) and in the standard written language, and *main* [main] (cf. East Ulster Ir. *muinn*) in the north. *Mayd* is usual in RM.

3.14. The relationship between Manx English and RM

Many learners and speakers of RM place importance on authentic pronunciation and 'accent', i.e. pronunciation which is close to that of the old TM speakers. According to a survey of fluent RM speakers carried out by Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 56), 42.4% of respondents regarded 'a Good Gaelic Accent' as one of the '[e]ssential qualities in identifying "good" Manx'. Older speakers with direct contact with TM speakers, as well as other speakers regarded as having a good Manx accent, may be considered models to be imitated:

> Learners are strongly advised to attend a Manx class where the language is taught by competent speakers or to resort to a good Manx speaker for help with pronunciation.
> (Fargher 1979: vii)

So hooar mee yn chooid smoo jeh'n Gaelg aym's voish Dick y Radlagh ayns Colby as v'eh just—v'eh yindyssagh goll lesh shilley er yn dooinney er yn oyr dy row ram Gaelg echey as va blass yindyssagh ec yn dooinney, as v'eh yindyssagh.

So I got most of my Manx from Dick Radcliffe in Colby and it was just—it was great visiting the man because he had a lot of Manx and the man had a fantastic accent, and it was great.' (TCM)

JC: *…Stewart Bennett. T'eshyn dooinney elley ta feer vie, jeean er y Ghaelg nagh vel?*
AC: *As cre voish hooar Stewart Bennett yn Gaelg vel fys ayd?*
JC: *Cha nel mee slane shickyr. Cha noddym ginsh dhyt shen.*
AC: *Ta blass yindyssagh echey.*
JC: *Ta. Ta. T'eh blass Manninagh dy bollagh, nagh vel?*

JC: Maybe and maybe Stewart Bennett will be. He's another man who is very good, keen on Manx isn't he?
AC: And where did Stewart Bennett get Manx from, do you know?
JC: I'm not quite sure. I can't tell you that.
AC: He's got a wonderful accent.
JC: Yes. Yes. It's a completely Manx accent isn't it? (BJC)

It is certainly true that conservative Manx English phonology has a Manx Gaelic substrate (Broderick 2007), which is still evident in conservative (and usually older) speakers today, in features such as the dental stops, some vowel qualities, and to some extent intonation. Consequently, learners of Manx may be advised to model their 'accent' in Manx on that of conservative Manx English speakers, e.g. in the guide to pronunciation in *The First Thousand Words in Manx*, Amery et al. (1986: 56):

> If in addition you already have a Manx accent, or can imitate one, your pronunciation should be good.
>   (Amery et al. 1986: 56)

There may not be a full recognition of the ways in which the present-day phonology of Manx English (especially less conservative varieties) has moved away from that of earlier Manx English, not to mention TM. On the other hand, this drift away from traditional phonology may be acknowledged and accepted as inevitable, and any variety of Manx accent may be accepted as expressive of the speaker's identity and therefore a suitable basis of RM pronunciation; cf. the following passage from the preface of Fargher's dictionary:

> Owing to English influence the pronunciation of Manx is slowly changing but this should not be a matter of great concern to those with an earnest desire to see the language survive as a spoken tongue.
>   (Fargher 1979: vi)

4. Morphology and syntax

4.1. The verbal system

4.1.2. Inflected verb tenses

Broderick (*HLSM* I: 86) and Kewley Draskau (2005) note that the use of inflected tense forms of verbs, was usually replaced by the 'do'-periphrasis in terminal TM, although the inflected forms of the irregular verbs remained frequent. According to Kewley Draskau (2005: 230), 'Manx '21st century primers and courses have long encouraged a return to 'Classical Manx'' and Manx continues this tradition', with the result that '[m]odern writing in Manx displays renewed confidence in the deployment of syntactic elements' (ibid.: 237), including a reversal of the trend away from inflected tense forms. This does indeed seem to be borne out as far as written RM is concerned. In the RM prose texts in Carswell (2010) (MC), out of 202 occurrences of regular verbs in the simple past, future, conditional or imperative forms, the inflected form is found in 76.7% of cases, while the periphrastic form accounts for only 23.3% of cases. In spoken RM (represented by TCM), however, the situation seems much closer to that in Late TM; inflected forms represent only 24% of cases, with the periphrastic forms at 76%.

Inflected and periphrastic forms in RM prose texts in MC:

Inflected:
d'ansoor, eaishtagh, dreggyr, chiangl, chooinee, skyrr, cha scuirr, shirragh, inshyms, dinsh, roie, heid, vrish, huitt, cheau, hirr, dreggyr, choard, hass, chiare, chionnee, dinsh, haghyr, denee, smooinee, duirree, screeu, vrie, hayrn, chum, hooyll, vrie, inshyms, eeckyms, fuirree, jeeagh, dinsh, hoig, chionnee, lheim, immee, ynsee, vrie, dinsh, hrog, loayr, hyndaa, vrie, yeeagh, chrie, hyndaa, shirr jee, veeit, dinsh, hass, yeeagh, cum, duirree, eaisht jee, loayr, smooinee, vrie, chossyn, cha smooinee, dansoor, dinsh, vrie, hoie, yeeagh, smooinee, doshil, deayshil, deayshil, hoig, heill, woaill, yeeagh, hyndaa, raink, roie, chroym, scuirr, roie, scuirr, raink, roie, chum, yeeagh, dreggyr, smooinee, yeeagh, yeeagh, smooinee, smooinee, dreggyr, cum, bannee, smooinee, loayr, dyllee, deam, deie, woaill, screeagh, woaill, lhaih-jee, lhaih-jee, lhaih-jee, mannagh dayrn, heill, hoig, smooinee, huitt, insh, reih, smooinee, yeeagh, immee, jeeagh, immee, jeeagh, doshil, huitt, smooinee, smooinee, hrog, lhaih, docklee, yeeagh, chrie, deab, heid, huitt, hyndaa, yeeagh, vynghear, smooinee, hyndaa, lhie, smooinee, daghyragh, ymmyrkagh, hoie, yeeagh, chaddil, lheie, eiym, chloagagh, cheauagh, hyndaagh, hyndaa, hiauill, huitt, yiar, bannee (155)

Periphrastic:
ren gimraa, ren jeeaghyn, cha ren leih, yinnagh y phriseil, cha jinnagh creck, cha jean y hyndaa, dy jinnagh ad shottal, ren bwoalley, yinnagh shooyl, ren taggloo, yinnagh loayrt, ren gearey, ren jeeaghyn, ren jeeaghyn, ren crankal, ren jiargaghey, ren jeeaghyn, ren smooinaghtyn, ren loayrt, ren mongey, ren mongey, ren mongey, ren floutyraght, ren loagan, jean-jee y chionnaghey, jean-jee y lhaih, nee fosley, nee jiole, ren marroo, ren girree, ren coayl,

ren sauail, ren fosley, ren toiggal, ren jeeaghyn, ren jeeley, ren surlley, nee farraghtyn, ren gearey, ren gennaghtyn, ren deayrtey, ren gennaghtyn, ren moostey, ren croymmey, ren blakey, ren doostey, nee'm lhaih (47)

Inflected and periphrastic forms in RM speech (TCM):

Inflected:
Smooinnee, dynsee, eaisht, dynsee, chionnee, phrow, roie, chionnee, dy cheau, chloie, cha cosney [sic: *cha gossyn*], *haghyrys* (12)

Periphrastic:
ren toiggal, ren gynsaghey, ren toiggal, cha ren toiggal, ren caghlaa, ren failleil, ren cosney, ren gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, [ren] gynsaghey, ren meeteil, ren cloie, [ren] gynsaghey, [ren] gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, cha ren gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, ren meeiteil, cha ren toiggal, ren geearree, ren loayrt, ren gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, ren gynsaghey, ren geaishtagh, ren lhaih, ren gynsaghey, ren prowal, neeym gobbragh, ren gynsaghey, ren brishey, ren cosney, ren gyllagh, ren jeeaghyn, ren çhellvaney, cha nee [sic: *jean] gobbragh, ren gynsaghey* (38)

It seems that RM speakers have regarded the frequent use of inflected tense forms as a marker of the written language, although not necessarily a marker of high register only. Some RM writers have used a high proportion of inflected verbs even in colloquial style. For example, Carswell says of John Gell's writing:

> His own style is that of the late native speakers whom he knew personally, and this is similar to the nineteenth century work of Neddy Beg Hom Ruy – full of idiom, yet in many respects setting out clauses and sentences in a similar way to English and with rare use of the included object. Gell's gift was in teaching conversational Manx.
> (Carswell 2010: 174)

Despite the similarity between his style and the terminal TM speakers, in the extract from Gell's prose given in MC there are no instances of 'do'-periphrasis at all, only the inflected past tense verbs *dinsh* 'told', *roie* 'ran', *heid* 'blew', *vrish* 'broke', *huitt* 'fell, dropped', *cheau* 'threw'. Kewley Draskau suggests that increased use of the 'do'-periphrasis at the expense of the inflected forms was seen as a symptom of 'attrition' and 'reduction' in a 'fragmented' variety of the language which was 'felt not to be 'good Manx'' (Kewley Draskau 2005: 230); it is likely then that there was a deliberate effort to reestablish the inflected forms and use them more frequently. Cf. the approach of Fargher (1979: vi–vii) in seeking to 'restore' features of Manx which he believed had been weakened or lost in TM (see §4.2.1).

4.1.3. Confusion of tenses

Although in most cases RM speakers have a good command of the formation of the inflected tenses, the rules being relatively simple and exception-free, they do not always fully control the deployment of the semantically appropriate tense or sequence of tenses in spontaneous speech, and sometimes in writing. Although such errors would be found occasionally in L1 speech, they appear to be more frequent in RM, which would be a symptom of the fact that RM is a second language for almost all its speakers, and a dominant language for none (22).

(22a) [tʃɹe hiŋk miː dəs ən eljən ha ɹau mɒnə gilk gɒl ɛː lɔːt eg ən tʃɹeː ʃen əz ha nɒdəm dʒiːməl ɛː ə ˈvʊnˌskɔiˀl]
*Tra haink mee dys yn Ellan cha row monney Gaelg goll er loayrt ec yn traa shen, as cha **noddym** dreamal er y Vunscoill*
'When I came to the Island not much Manx was being spoken at that time, and I cannot [i.e. could not] dream of the *Bunscoill*' (TCM)
Expected: *cha noddin* (conditional / imperfect) or *cha dod* (preterite)

(22b) [ti fɔːðə fɔːðə ʃeː na fɒdəm ɹuː smʊnjən də ɒdəx eː veː tɹeː va miʃ ginzəxə gilk]
*T'eh foddey foddey share na **foddym** rieau smooinaghtyn dy oddagh eh ve tra va mish gynsaghey Gaelg*
'It's much better that I can [i.e. could] ever think it could be when I was learning Manx' (TCM)
Expected: *oddin* 'I could' (conditional), or *veign er smooinaghtyn* 'I would have thought' (conditional perfect)[17] (TCM)

(22c) [gaː də ɹau mi gɒːvɹəxə den gilk ɹiʃ imədi bleːntən ha ɹau mi ɹuː ˈsmʊnˌjaˑxtən də biː ljidʲ ən ˈbʊnˌskʊl kʊɹət əˈ bʊn]
*Ga dy row mee gobbraghey da'n Gaelg rish ymmodee bleeantyn cha row mee rieau smooinaghtyn **dy bee** lhied yn Bunscoill currit er bun*
Though I was working for Manx for many years I never thought that the like of the *Bunscoill* will [i.e. would] be set up (TCM)
Expected: *dy beagh* 'would be' (conditional)

(22d) *"Agh," dooyrt fer rish yn chenn dooinney, "Immee stiagh sy thie as fow yn garmin ass y choigee ayds" – son **she fidder eshyn** – as tra haink eh magh er y traid as yn garmin echey, chelleeragh va'n garmin chyndaait dys cabbyl mie as cabbyl aalin*
"But," said a fellow to the old man, "Go into the house and get the beam out of your loom" – for he is [i.e. was] a weaver–and when he came out on the street with the beam, immediately the beam was turned into a good horse and a beautiful horse (Skeeal.: 62–63)
Expected: *she fidder v'eshyn, v'eshyn (ny) (f)idder* (preterite)

---

[17] Also note the use of the independent *oddagh* after the conjunction *dy* for expected dependent *noddagh / voddagh* (cf. Ir. *go bhféadfadh*, ScG. *gum faodadh*). In fact in constructions of this type the rule in TM, as it is in other Goidelic dialects, seems to have been for both clauses to have relative verbs with no *dy* in the second clause, cf. *Dy nheign dou aggle y ghoail roish—ve agglagh dy yannoo nhee erbee ta mee credjal ver jummoose er* 'that I must fear to do anything that I believe will anger him' (SW: 90), not **dy der*.

4.1.4. Confusion of aspect

Aspect is not always expressed by equivalent tense forms in Manx and English, and English influence is sometimes apparent in RM (23):

(23)   *Ga nagh **dooyrt** eh monney, va Thom ny ghooinney creeney as schleioil*
       'Though he did not say much, Tom was a wise and skilled man' (Skeeal.: 23)
       Expected: *nagh row eh gra* (past progressive), *nagh beagh eh gra* (imperfect progressive), *nagh niarragh eh / nagh jinnagh eh gra* (conditional / imperfect)

Although the simple preterite forms in English may be used with habitual, durative or stative aspectual meaning, the preterite in Manx generally describes only discrete and individual instantaneous events, i.e. *ga nagh dooyrt eh monney* would normally be interpreted 'though he did not (on one particular occasion) say much', and progressive forms are used to express habitual actions, states and general truths.

Such confusions of tense and aspect are not systematic or frequent in RM and generally the tense and aspect system is the same as in TM.

4.1.5. Confusion of independent and dependent forms

Manx has a distinction in most tenses between independent and dependent verb forms. This distinction carries no semantic load in itself, but certain particles and constructions require one form or the other. Occasionally the forms are confused in RM (24). We have already seen an example of this above in the section on confusion of tenses with *dy oddagh*.

(24a)   *as aggle er **nagh oddagh** eh roshtyn yn thie-oast yn oie shen*
        'he being afraid that he could not reach the inn that night' (Skeeal.: 25)
        Expected: *nagh voddagh / noddagh* (alternate forms)

(24b)   [a niː ʃen ɡɒˈvrax]
        ***Cha nee** shen gobbragh*
        'that will not work' (TCM)
        Expected: *cha jean*

4.1.6. Indirect questions confused with conditionals

Indirect polar questions—i.e. those introduced in Standard English by 'whether' or 'if'—are in Manx identical to the corresponding direct questions; that is they are introduced by the dependent form of the verb, with elided historic interrogative particle **an*.

(25a)   Direct question: *jig Saul sheese myr ta dty harvaant er chlashtyn?*
'will Saul come down, as thy servant hath heard?' (1 Samuel 23:11)

(25b)   Indirect question: *hee mayd **jig** Elias dy hauail eh*
'let us see whether Elias will come to save him' (Matthew 27:49)

However, in RM the particle *my* 'if' and the relative form of the verbal noun is sometimes used instead, presumably owing to the fact that English 'if' may be used both as a marker of indirect relatives and as a conditional conjunctive (26):

(26)   *Er yn raad er-ash dy-valley vrie y ven **my oddin** goll trooid Purt ny h-Inshey*
'On the way back home the woman asked if I could go through Peel' (MC: 194)
Expected: *voddin / noddin*

Cf. the parallel use of *os* 'if' in spoken Welsh (King 2003: 312).

4.1.7. Vowel initial non-finite verbs with prefixed *g-*

The progressive particle (originally preposition) **ag* has been elided entirely in Manx apart from the survival of the consonant /g/ as a prefix on vowel-initial verbal nouns. By the eighteenth century it had become usual to prefix this *g-* to verbal nouns in all verbal constructions, including those in which the verbal noun is used as an infinitive and where it would not be historically expected (27):

(27a)   *cha ren ad **geaishtagh***
'they hearkened not' (Jeremiah 44:5)

(27b)   *dy vod mayd **gansoor***
'that we may say again [answer]' (Joshua 22:28)

This use of the *g-* form as infinitive is sanctioned by several RM text-books (e.g. Kneen 1973: 138–9, Kewley Draskau 2008: 131, Fargher 1979: xiv). Nevertheless, some RM speakers have used the bare verbal noun in these constructions as a hypercorrection:

(28a)   *ren adsyn va foast er mayrn guee as **eie** er Gorree lesh jeir gyn ad y varroo*
'those that were left begged Godred with pitiful cries to spare them their lives' (RRVE: 7)

(28b)   *Cha nodmayd **obbal** dy vel marranyn 'sy lioar shoh*
'We cannot deny that there are errors in this book' (RLT 1969)

(28c)   *cha jeanym **imraa** e ennym*
'I will not mention his name' (Skeeal.: 3)

61

4.1.8. The inversion infinitive

The construction in which a noun object precedes the verbal noun with an intervening leniting particle *y* (G. *do*, *a*) is common in eighteenth-century Manx. In Late Manx, however, it is largely replaced by the construction in which the noun object follows the verbal noun (which is also a frequent alternative in the earlier language) (Broderick 1982b: 181–2). The latter construction is usual in spoken RM; no examples of the inversion infinitive occur in TCM, where only instances of the verbal noun + noun object are found such as the following:

(29)   [ɹen mi kɔːznə piːeːtʃˈdiː]
        *ren mee **cosney PhD***
        'I gained a PhD' (TCM)

However, some authors choose to use the inversion infinitive extensively in written RM. Carswell (2010: 179) notes it as a 'distinctive feature of Robert Thomson's style' (30):

(30)   *Foddym **bee y gheddyn** dhyt*
        'I can get food for you' (MC: 180)

Occasionally there is overgeneralization of the inversion infinitive in RM, for example replacing the progressive, where inversion is never possible in TM (31):

(31)   *Adsyn ta nish **eshyn y hirveish** ayns annooinidys, ec y traa shen, nee ad eshyn y hirveish ayns pooar*
        'They who now serve him in weakness, at that time shall serve him in power'
        Expected: *Adsyn ta nish shirveish eshyn…* (JK)

Here the construction is used appropriately with periphrastic *jannoo* 'do' in the second clause, but the first clause with the progressive would be ungrammatical in TM. Kewley evidently knew a considerable amount of Manx (Gelling 1998: 184), and was familiar with spoken Late Manx through his contact with Edward Faragher and others; however, the inversion infinitive appears to have been rare in spoken Late Manx (Broderick 1982b: 181–2) and it would appear that Kewley in his sermons was trying to imitate the syntax of the Bible without having fully acquired the parameters of use of constructions such as this. This is not surprising given the underdeveloped nature of grammars and other resources at this time and later.

4.1.9. Pronominal object of the verbal noun

In Classical Manx, the pronominal object of the verbal noun may be expressed by means of a possessive particle, with or without an accompanying personal pronoun (Broderick 2010: 345–

6). In Late Manx the personal pronoun on its own is usual, as it is in RM. However, the more archaic construction may be encountered in written RM (32):

(32)   *cheayll eh veih Harry Boddagh ad as eshyn **nyn glashtyn** voish e yishag vooar*
         'he heard them from Harry Boyd and he heard them from his grandfather' (Skeeal.: 65)

(32) shows confusion between the infinitival construction and the progressive construction which would be expected here, i.e. *as eshyn dy nyn glashtyn* 'and he hearing them', unless *as ren eshyn nyn glashtyn* 'and he heard them' is intended.

Goodwin and Thomson's (1966: 12) widely-used primer *First Lessons in Manx*, as well as Kewley Draskau's (2008: 37–8) recent *Practical Manx*, both give paradigms of the pronominal object of the verbal noun including differentiated masculine and feminine third person singular forms without personal pronouns, e.g. *dy akin* 'seeing him' and *dy fakin* 'seeing her', even though in attested TM the masculine form seems to have been generalized and the personal pronouns are always found in the third person singular, i.e. *dy akin eh*, *dy akin ee* (Broderick 2010: 345, Lewin 2016: 163–4).

4.1.10. Omission of *ve* 'be' in perfective infinitive

In TM the verbal noun *(y) ve* 'to be' (often *v'* before perfective *er*) is necessary in the perfective infinitives of the kind *oddin ve er n'yannoo eh* 'I could have done it', lit. 'I could be after doing it' (ScG. *dh'fhaodainn a bhith air a dhèanamh*) (33):

(33)   *oddin **v'er ymmyrkey** eh*
         'I could have borne it' (Psalm 55:12)

However, *ve* is sometimes left out by RM speakers, perhaps because it has no counterpart in English and the *er* is interpreted as being equivalent to English 'have' (34):

(34)   *erreish da'n vwyllin **er scuirr***
         'after the mill had stopped' (MC: 169)

This omission of *ve* is occasionally found in TM also (35):

(35)   *dy voddagh my voir **er ve** my oaie*
         'that my mother might have been my grave' (Jeremiah 20:17)

Compare the omission of *fod* 'be' in analogous constructions in colloquial Welsh (King 2003: 207).

4.1.11. The copula and the substantive verb

Manx, like the other Gaelic languages, has two verbs 'to be', the copula *she* and the substantive verb *ta*. The rules governing which of these verbs is used in a given instance and the syntax of clauses involving them in TM is highly complex, and common usage in RM is not always in line with TM syntax. In particular, there is a tendency towards overgeneralization of the copula.

4.1.11.1. 'To be' with noun phrase predicate

In TM a number of constructions involving either the copula or the substantive verb may be used when the predicate is a noun phrase. For example, 'he is a man' may be translated as follows:

> Copula only:
> *She dooinney eh* (Ir. **Is é duine é*)
>
> Substantive verb only:
> *T'eh dooinney* (Ir. **Tá sé duine*)
>
> Copula + substantive verb:
> *She dooinney t'eh* (Ir. **Is é duine atá sé*)
>
> Substantive verb + preposition + possessive:
> *T'eh ny ghooinney* (Ir. *Tá sé ina dhuine*)

The copula only and prepositional possessive constructions are common to all the Gaelic languages, but the substantive verb only construction and its focused form are specific to Manx (or are found only in the language of semi-speakers and learners in Irish and Scottish Gaelic).[18] There has been an assumption in the scholarship that the substantive verb only construction is an innovation deriving from contact with English (Ó Sé 1991: 170, Williams 1994: 738–40); be that as it may,[19] it has been well-established in Manx since the earliest attestations.

All the constructions are found in RM, although there is sometimes an attempt to avoid the use of the substantive verb only construction and encourage the use of the copula in its place, presumably because the substantive verb only construction is regarded as an anglicism. For example, in Culture Vannin's series of Ulpan-based lessons *Saase Jeeragh*, the use of *ta* with nominal predicates is entirely proscribed, and the use of the copula insisted upon:

---

[18] Although according to Thurneysen occasional examples of the use of the substantive verb with a nominal predicate are found in Old Irish (*GOI*: 475).

[19] I have argued in a recent conference paper (Lewin 2015c) that there may in fact be internal motivations for this development.

We use *she* with nouns:

A) She dooinney mish   I am a man
B) She eirinagh mish   I am a farmer
C) She yn Aspick mish   I am the bishop

In all of these examples I am saying that I am a / the noun (i.e. 'man'; 'farmer'; 'bishop'). It would be incorrect to use *ta* here:

Ta mee dooinney   would be incorrect
Ta mee eirinagh   would be incorrect
Ta mee yn aspick   would be incorrect

The fact that 'dooinney'; 'farmer' [*sic*] & 'aspick' are nouns is given away by the words 'a' & 'the'. So, remember, if you want to say that you are 'a' or 'the' something in Manx, you must use *she*

Gow kiarail [Take care]:

1 He is good   = T'eh mie
Agh [but],
He is a good man = She dooinney mie eshyn
        (SJ 14)

The difference between *she* and *ta* is explained by stating that *she* is used with noun predicates and *ta* with adjectives. This is perhaps a pedagogical over-simplification, but also reflects the difficulty faced by L2 learners of Manx, which includes all the authors of RM courses, in fully assimilating a complex and nuanced grammatical system in the absence of immersion in a target variety spoken by a native speech community. It should also be noted that the lesson seems to assume that the emphatic pronouns are obligatory when the subject of a copula clause, whereas in TM the use of plain and emphatic pronouns depends on whether emphasis or contrast is intended or not (for the use of the emphatic pronouns see §4.2.3). In addition, the TM rule whereby the word order is copula-predicate-subject if the predicate is indefinite, but copula-subject-predicate if the predicate is definite and the subject is heavy (i.e. a noun or a non-emphatic pronoun), is violated by the example *she yn aspick mish*, for which in TM we would expect *she mish yn aspick* 'I am the bishop'.[20] Moreover, the option of substantive verb + prepositional possessive (*ta mee my eirinagh*) is not mentioned at all.

---

[20] For example, *She mish yn Chiarn yn Jee eu* 'I am the Lord your God' (Judges 6:10), but with a non-emphatic pronoun the predicate may precede the subject, which is otherwise generally only the case if the predicate is indefinite, e.g. *She mac Yee mee* 'I am the Son of God' (Matthew 27:43). If the predicate is indefinite, the subject if a pronoun follows the predicate regardless of whether it is emphatic or not, e.g. (non-emphatic) *dy re albynagh me* 'that I am a Scot' (Edward Fargher, Broderick 1981: 118), (emphatic) *she moddey elley us* 'you are another dog' (Edward Fargher, Broderick 1981: 126).

Despite prescriptions such as this, the substantive verb only construction is common in RM (36):

(36) [teː ɒbə jindəsak]
      t'eh obbyr yindyssagh
      'it is wonderful work' (TCM)

4.1.11.2. Deictic subject demonstratives with indefinite predicates

In Irish, contrary to usual copula word order, it is possible to have a demonstrative such as *seo* 'this' or *sin* 'that' as the subject and an indefinite noun phrase following as predicate, i.e. *sin fear* 'that is a man' may replace *is fear é sin* (cf. Mahon 1984, Breatnach 1976). This seems to be a contraction and reanalysis of earlier *ag so* etc., which may originally have been literally equivalent to French *voici*, *voilà* (i.e. 'see here, see there'). This construction seems to be rare in TM,[21] but is very common in RM (37), either owing to Irish influence or an overgeneralization of the zero copula construction to allow the deletion of *ta* as well as the copula, i.e. the substantive verb only construction *ta shen dooinney* might be shortened to *shen dooinney* (in TM in the copula construction the overt copula might be omitted, but the copula word order with indefinite predicate followed by the subject would be expected, i.e. *(she) dooinney shen*).

(37a) [tan gelk te ɹə geðən fɔːðə sɛː niʃ soː əs ʃen ɹəd fiːə vai]
       ta'n Ghaelg t'eh ry-gheddyn foddey share nish so **shen red feer vie**
       'Manx, it is available far better now so that is a very good thing' (TCM)

(37b) [smai lʲam tɹɒðənən tɹaui əs ʃen suətʃ də spoːᵊt]
       S'mie lhiam troddanyn traauee as **shen sorçh dy spoyrt**
       'I like ploughing matches and that is a sort of sport' (TCM)

The demonstrative *shen* 'that' may be used in this construction as a resumptive element or a quasi-copula with a heavy subject, like French *c'est* as in *L'état, c'est moi* 'I am the state' (the state, that's me). This usage is frequent in RM (37) and may be compared with the use of

---

[21] I have found a couple of instances in Classical Manx of a demonstrative-initial copula construction with an indefinite predicate coming second, but it may be that this is under the influence of the word of the order of the English original: *Agh ga dy nee shoh un ayrn vie jeh nyn gurrym, foast cha vel eh agh ayrn* 'But though this is one good part of our duty, yet it is but a part' (*Yn Fer-raauee Creestee*, Thomson 1998: 67), *Shoh boayl faasagh* 'This is a desert place' (Mark 6:35); but notice the usual order *She boayl faasagh shoh* to render the same passage in Matthew 14:15. If the demonstrative-initial construction was a feature of TM, it may have been largely found with a spatial deictic function in speech, explaining the dearth of examples in written Manx. A demonstrative initial construction with *er hoh* or *er shoh* is found from two speakers in *HLSM*, e.g. [ɑˈhoː röd ˈbɛg dötʲ sɑn ˈduːrɑx] *er-hoh red beg dhyt son dooraght* 'here is a little bit for you as a tip' (*HLSM* II:149–50), but this form is otherwise not widely attested.

resumptive pronouns in TM and RM, e.g. *Quoi-erbee ta dwoaie echey er e vraar, t'eh ny ghunver* 'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer', lit. '…he is a murderer' (1 John 3: 15).

(38)   [ən inɹəkən spɔːʔ tə miʃ dʒinu ʃen ʃuːəl]
        *Yn ynrican spoyrt ta mish jannoo **shen shooyl***
        'The only sport I do [that] is walking' (TCM)

Furthermore, this construction is frequently used with adjective predicates in RM (39), but not in TM where the substantive verb *ta* would be required:

(39a)   [ʃen skanˈʃoːl]
        shen scanshoil
        'that is important' (TCM)

(39b)   [ʃen jindəsax sɒn ən eljən]
        ***shen yindyssagh** son yn ellan*
        'that is wonderful for the island' (TCM)

4.1.11.3. Overgeneralization of the unaugmented copula

The unaugmented copula *s'* (G. *is*, as opposed to the augmented copula with fossilized third person masculine pronoun *she*, G. *is é*), past / conditional *by*, is of restricted occurrence in TM. It is found productively only in comparative-superlatives, and in clefting of adjectives and adverbs (where the augmented form *she* can also, but less frequently, occur). It is also found in a limited set of fixed idioms involving adjectives, nouns and in one case the preposition *lesh* 'with' (with the sense 'own, possess'). Examples of these constructions in TM are given below (40–41):

Productive use of *s'* (40):

(40a)   ***S'mie** ta goo yn Chiarn, t'ou uss er loayrt*
        'Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken' (2 Kings 20:19)

(40b)   *Dy yannoo cairys as briwnys kiart, te **ny s'taitnyssagh** da'n Chiarn na ourallyn costal*
        'To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice' (Proverbs 21:3)

Non-productive use of *s'* in specific idioms (40):

(41a)   *My **s'taittin lhiat** goll mârym gys Babylon*
        'If it seem good unto thee to come with me into Babylon' (Jeremiah 40:4)

(41b)   ***s'mooar lhiam** yn olk ta mee hannah er choyrt erriu*
        'I repent me of the evil that I have done unto you' (Jeremiah 42:10)

(41c) **sheeagh** *y magher kiare cheead shekel dy argid*
'the land is worth four hundred shekels of silver' (Genesis 23:15)

(41d) **s'feer eh**, *dy bee ellanyn ny marrey seaghnit ec dty hoyrt-mow*
'yea [it is true], the isles that are in the sea shall be troubled at thy departure' (Ezekiel 26:18)

In the latter example, *s'feer eh* (G. *is fíor é*) is a fixed idiom; with other adjectives, *s'* could not productively be used where there is no focus, and the adjective *feer* 'true' can be used only with *s'*; in other circumstances *firrinagh* is used. In the following RM example (42), an extended adjective phrase with modifier *dy-liooar* 'enough' (G. *go leor*) is focused, which would not be expected in TM as the construction is not productive and admits only of an unmodified adjective.

(42) *s'feer dy-liooar shen*
that is true enough (MC: 168)

In TM, the idiom *s'feer shen* 'that is true, true that' (e.g. Daniel 3:24) covers this meaning on its own; in order explicitly to include the element 'enough', the substantive verb would need to be used: *ta shen firrinagh dy liooar*.

The following example (43) shows the violation of the non-productiveness of the non-augmented copula by the creation of a new construction *s'cliaghtey ec X Y* 'Y is a custom or practice for X':

(43) **By chliaghtey ain** *son y chooid smoo lhaih ass y Lioar Chasherick*
'It was our practice for the most part to read from the Holy Book' (MC: 196)

To begin with, it is not usual for the preposition *ec* 'at' to be used to express the semantic subject in copula constructions (though *ec* is frequently used in this way in substantive verb constructions such as *ta fys aym er* 'I know it', lit. 'there is knowledge at me on it'); if this were a TM idiom, one would expect **s'cliaghtey da X* or **s'cliaghtey lesh X*, using *da* 'to' or *lesh* 'with'. Secondly, a number of constructions existed in TM to express this meaning (44):

(44a) *Boayl* **va shin cliaghtey** *gheddyn eeasteeyn mie*
'Where we used to get good fishings' (NBHR: 136)

(44b) *son shen myr* **va cliaghtey** *ny deiney aegey dy yannoo*
'for so used the young men to do' (Judges 14:10)

(44c) **boallagh** *Yeesey dy mennick taaghey yn voayl shen marish e ostyllyn*
Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples (John 18:2)

It is not possible to tell on formal grounds whether *cliaghtey* in (43a) represents the G. progressive participle *ag cleachtadh* or an old passive participle *cleachta* (cf. *cailjey* 'lost', G. *caillte*, alongside later and regular *caillit*, G. ? *-*ichte*). It is certainly a noun *cliaghtey* 'custom, habit' in (43b). *Boallagh* is historically a copula construction *b'oayllagh* (G. *b' eolach*) (Thomson 1981: 106) but had been reanalysed by the Classical Manx period as an imperfect verbal form with 1sg. *boallin* 'I used to' (Judges 16:20) (Kewley Draskau 2006: 87).[22] Using these constructions (43) would be rendered as *Va shin cliaghtey / V'eh yn cliaghtey ain / Boallagh shin son y chooid smoo lhaih ass y Lioar Chasherick*.

4.1.11.4. Hyper-archaic use of past tense copula *by*:

The past / conditional form of the unaugmented copula *by* (G. *ba*, *budh*) occurs only in fixed idioms and is not used productively in TM, except to a limited extent in superlatives in Classical Manx. However, some writers of RM have used *by* productively (45) where the present tense *s'* would be used in TM, in conjunction with a tensed form of the substantive verb if needed.

(45)   ***by-vie eh**, dy row ec Jac cleayshyn mooar dy liooar dy lhiettal yn edd veih goll harrish yn eddin echey*
        'it was good, that Jac had ears big enough to go prevent the hat from going over his face' (MC: 169)

In TM either the substative verb with unfocused adjective would be used here, i.e. *v'eh mie* 'it was good', or if focused the present copula *s'* would be used with a tensed form of the substantive verb, i.e. *s'mie v'eh*, as in (46):

(46)   ***s'mie veagh eh** son y dooinney shen mannagh row eh rieau er jeet er y theihll*
        'it had been good for that man if he had not been born' (Matthew 26:24)

4.1.11.5. Use of dependent form of the unaugmented copula

The G. form *gur* which combines the conjunction *go* 'that' with the present dependent unaugmented copula, does not come into Manx except in the subordinate form of the augmented copula *dy re* (G. *gur é*). Elsewhere it is replaced by the usual form of the conjunction *dy* (G. *go*), which causes nasalization and prefixes *n-* to vowels (cf. G. *gonadh*, McManus (1994: 417)). These forms are normally only found in non-productive fixed idiomatic uses of the unaugmented copula (47):

---

[22] Cf. ScG. *is urrainn mi*, *is urrainnear*, where a historical copula construction has in some varieties developed verbal forms, or Welsh *yr wyf eisiau, angen, ofn* etc. 'I want, need, fear', reanalysed from historical *y mae arnaf eisiau* 'there is want on me', etc.).

(47)   *hoiggal dy vel eh ny chadley, as **dy negin** y ghoostey eh*
        'peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked' (1 Kings 18:27)

In productive use, it seems that the dependent form of the augmented copula was generally used in TM, even though the unaugmented copula *s'* would be used when the independent form was required (cf. Lewin 2011a: 196) (48):

(48a)   *Er-yn-oyr **dy nee chion** ta'n giat*
        'Because strait [tight] is the gate' (Matthew 7:14)

(48b)   ***dy nee atchimagh** agglagh veagh nyn gerraghey*
        'that it is terrible fearful their punishment would be' (SW: 228)

In the following RM example (49), however, there is an apparent example[23] of the unaugmented dependent copula with a productive adjective, where on the TM pattern we would expect *dy nee / re atchimagh…*:

(49)   *surrys enn hannah **dy atchimagh** ta stayd y theihll*
        'it is well known that it is awful that the state of the world is' (MC: 233)

On the basis of *dy negin* etc., one might expect **dy n'atchimagh* here.[24] This is an example of the use in a RM of a logically possible construction, which, however, does not seem to have been usual in TM.

4.1.11.6. *Cha nee agh* 'it is only'

Another example of a construction which sometimes occurs in RM, presumably because it is assumed to be logically possible, but which does not seem to occur in TM, is the use of the copula in the *cha* 'not' + *agh* 'but' construction conveying the meaning of 'only' (50):

(50)   ***cha nee agh** eiyrtys y taghyrt vees ry akin roish shen*
        'it is only the effect of the event which will be visible before that' (DS: 2)

However, in TM this construction seems not to be used with the copula even when it might be expected if it were possible, as in the following examples (51):

---

[23] Carswell (2010: 234) does not interpret the sentence as I have done, but rather translates 'the state of the world is already awfully well known', taking *dy* to be the adverb-forming particle rather than the subordinate conjunction + copula. This interpretation does not, however, seem to make sense as it does not account for the presence of the substantive verb *ta*. Moreover, the use of more obscure Classical Manx structures is a hallmark of the writing of the quoted author, as shown by the use of the rarely attested idiom *surrys-enn*.

[24] But cf. *dy anvennick lesh 've fegooish obbyr* lit. 'so that it is infrequent with him to be without work' (FRC: 98).

(51a)   *cha vel ayn agh yn un vriwnys nyn gour*
         'there is but one decree for you' (Daniel 2:9)

(51b)   *Shee* [sic: *she*] *mee hene t'ayn, as **cha vel ayn agh mee***
         'I am, and none else beside me [There is I, and there is only I]' (Isaiah 47:10)

(51c)   *cha row eh agh ny scollag*
         'he was but a youth' (1 Samuel 17:42)

If the RM construction were possible in TM, one might expect the possibility in TM that the above could appear as **cha nee agh yn un vriwnys ta nyn gour* (parallel to *she yn un vriwnys ta nyn gour*), **cha nee agh mish t'ayn* (parallel to the actually occurring parallel clause *she mee hene t'ayn*) and **cha nee agh scollag v'eh* (parallel to *she scollag v'eh*), but no attestations of this kind have been noted, and it is probably ungrammatical, perhaps because it confounds two distinct focusing strategies. In the copula clefting construction, the focus position is at the beginning of the clause immediately following the copula, whereas in the *cha…agh* construction the focus position seems to be towards the end of the clause, after *agh*, and normal word order may be changed accordingly, as in the first two examples above.

4.1.11.7. Spurious *ad hoc* copula constructions

In spoken RM, *ad hoc* constructions with the copula used in various ways which violate TM grammar are found, reflecting lack of full acquisition of the details of copula syntax, or inability to stick to known structures in the full flow of speech (52).

(52a)   [ʃei kouˈfɒbəl mai ʊnˈʃɔː]
         she co-phobble mie ayns shoh
         'it's a good community here' (TCM)
         Expected: *she co-phobble mie t'ayns shoh*, *she co-phobble mie (t')eh ayns shoh*, *ta co-phobble mie ayns shoh*, *t'eh (ny) c(h)o-phobble mie ayns shoh*

(52b)   [ʃi fiː vai ʃedn]
         she feer vie shen
         'that's very good' (TCM)
         Expected: *s'mie shen*, *she feer vie ta shen*, *ta shen feer vie*

(52a) seems to stem from a one-to-one equation of *she* and English *it is*; while (52b) from a confusion of the augmented copula *she* (which when clefting an adjective would have to be accompanied by the substantive verb) and the unaugmented copula *s'* used to focus adjectives without the necessary involvement of the substantive verb (though a modified adjective such as *feer vie* would not be expected with it in any case).

71

4.1.11.8. *S'treisht lhiam* **'I hope'**

This is a spurious copula construction which has become a standard idiom in RM. 'I hope' seems to have generally been expressed by the verbal noun *treishteil* in TM, used in the progressive construction with the substantive verb *ta* in the same way as other verbal nouns (53):

(53)   ***ta mee treishteil*** *nagh jean lheid cheet orrym arragh ayns my vea*
       'I hope that I don't experience the like any more in my lifetime' (Broderick 1981b: 21)

However, most speakers of RM are more familiar with and regularly use a copula construction *s'treisht lhiam*, which appears to be unattested in TM (54a). An early occurrence, but without the prepositional pronoun, is found in Thomson's preface to his edition of Goodwin's *First Lessons in Manx* (54b):

(54a)   [sṯɹɛːʃ ljəm sə tɹɛː ɹə hit njim gʊl dəs njɛːɹin nə smeŋkə]
        S'treisht lhiam *'sy traa ry-heet neeym goll dys Nherin ny s'menkey*
        'I hope in the future I will go to Ireland more often' (TCM)

(54b)   *Ta mee er hirrey er-y-fa shen ny shenn varranyn y ghaartlian ass dy bollagh, gyn*
        *marranyn noa y chur lhiam stiagh—**s'treisht** ec y chooid sloo dy vel shen er jeet lhiam*
        'I have sought therefore to weed out the old errors completely, without introducing new
        errors—it is hoped at least that I have succeeded in that' (RLT 1966)

This construction is not found in Kneen's dictionary or grammar, or in Fargher's dictionary, and its origins are obscure. It was perhaps adopted in order to differentiate the sense 'hope' from the other sense of *treishteil*, 'trust'. The adoption of a copula construction also fits with the tendency to favour copula constructions as a perceived return to more Gaelic idiom.

4.1.11.9. Clefted substantive verb + prepositional possessive construction

(55) is another example from RM of a construction which might be considered logically possible, but which does not actually occur in TM:

(55)   *she ny ghuilley feer vitchooragh v'eh*
       'he was a very mischievous boy' (MC: 168)

Clefting of the predicate with the particle *ny* etc. (hisorically the preposition 'in' + possessive agreeing in person, number and gender with the subject) is not attested in TM; rather a plain predicate with no particle may be clefted, or a non-clefted construction used. We would

therefore expect *she guilley feer vitchooragh v'eh*, *v'eh ny ghuilley feer vitchooragh* or *v'eh guilley feer vitchooragh*.

4.1.11.10. Replacement of the copula with the substantive verb in fixed idioms

While overgeneralization of the copula is more common, replacement of the copula where its use is fixed in TM with the substantive verb is also found, as in (56) where TM *begin da* 'had to' with the unaugmented copula *by* is replaced by a form with the substantive verb *va*:

(56) *va egin da Thom as Illiam dy obbraghey er mullagh y wyllin*
      'Tom and William had to work on the roof of the mill' (Skeeal.: 25)

4.2. The nominal system

4.2.1. Gender

The marking of gender by lenition and pronoun replacement is variable in RM. It seems that many speakers pay little or no attention to gender, at least in speech (marking all inanimates as masculine), and those who do may be unsure of the gender of individual nouns. Such inconsistency and uncertainty about gender is also noted by Maguire (1991: 210–11) in Shaw's Road Irish.

(57) is an example of gender accord in spoken RM, with agreement between the feminine noun *Gaelg* 'the Manx language' and the feminine pronoun *ee*:

(57) [ta ɹam slai ɛːgə tʃit suːs niʃ as gilk də lʲuːɹ ɒk əs tad gʲiːɹi: lɔːɹt iː]
      *Ta ram sleih aegey çheet seose nish as **Gaelg** dy liooar oc, as t'ad geearee loayrt **ee***
      'A lot of young people are coming up now who have plenty of Manx, and they want to speak it' (TCM)

However, frequently an inanimate noun which is feminine in TM is marked as masculine in spoken RM (58):

(58) [ən bunskul ən fɜː ta miː ginzəkə ɹek niʃ]
      ***yn bunscoill yn fer** ta mee gynsaghey ec nish*
      'the primary school, the one I teach at now' (TCM)

In (58), the feminine noun *bunscoill* 'primary school' is left unlenited and is referred to with the masculine *fer* 'one' (lit. 'man', G. *fear*), which in TM seems to be restricted to referring to masculine nouns, *unnane* 'one' being used with feminines (Lewin 2014b: fn. 13). The [ek] could be interpreted as *eck* 'at her', which might be expected in TM, but it seems more likely that it is in fact the simple preposition *ec* 'at' on the pattern of English 'the school I teach at'.

In (59), *Gaelg* is left unlenited (which might be expected in late TM anyway, cf. Broderick 1999: 86–8), and is referred to by the masculine pronoun *eh*:

(59)   [ta mi faːɡən nə smuː slai ta praul ən ɡilɡ niʃ manax vel ad lɔːt eː də fleˈoːl]
   ta mee fakin ny smoo sleih ta prowal yn Gaelg nish mannagh vel ad loayrt eh dy flaaoil
   'I see more people who try Manx now if they don't speak it fluently' (TCM)

Occasionally, nouns which are masculine in TM are marked as feminine in RM, as in (60) in which *balley* 'town' is lenited and referred to with the feminine pronoun *ish*.

(60)   [ən vaˑljə ɹiʃ hiːn]
   yn valley ish hene
   'the town itself' (TCM)

In (61), *red* 'thing' (G. *rud*, *réad*), which is masculine in TM, is followed by a lenited adjective as if feminine:

(61)   [ta ʃen ɹud vai]
   ta shen red vie
   'that is a good thing' (TCM)

In RM writing, too, historically masculine nouns may appear to be marked as feminine and vice versa (62):

(62a) *rish thousane blein va nyn eeasteyryn goaill* **yn arrane** *shoh cheet, choud's v'ad goll magh er y cheayn. Eer gys lhing nyn ayraghyn v'ad jannoo ymmyd* **j'ee**
   'for a thousand years the fishermen used to sing this following song, whilst they were going out on the sea. Even down to our father's time they were using it' (MC: 235)
   [*Arrane* 'song' (G. *amhrán*) is masculine in TM, but is here referred to by the feminine pronoun *j'ee*.]

(62b) *ayrn mooar*
   'a large part' (RRVE: 9)
   [*Ayrn* 'part' (ScG. *earrann*, Ir. *urrann*) is probably feminine in TM,[25] but the adjective in this example is unlenited.]

(62c) *V'eh wheesh shen jeant magh lesh aalid* **yn Ellan** *dy ren eh reih* **eh** *myr ynnyd-vaghee*
   'He was so pleased with the beautiful prospect of the Island, that he chose it to be his residence' (RRVE: 11)

(62d) *ellan beg*
   'a small island' (Skeeal.: 60)

---

[25] Cregeen has it as masculine, but it is feminine in Irish and Scottish Gaelic, and is marked as feminine in *ayrn wooar* 'a great part'(CS: 49), *un ayrn vie* 'one good part' (FRC: 67), *yn ayrn vie shen* 'that good part' (Luke 10:42).

The final two examples (62c,d) may be a deliberate example of hypercorrection of gender. *Ellan* 'island' (Ir. *oileán*, ScG. *eilean*) is feminine in TM, according to Cregeen and examples such as *kiannoort ny hellan* 'the chief man of the island' (Acts 28:7), *ayns yn Ellan veg shoh* 'in this small island' (*Mona's Herald* 06.06.1834)[26] and *er ellan veg yn Noo Micael* 'on the little island of St Michael' (NBHR: 161), but masculine in other Gaelic dialects. However, it is prescribed as masculine in Fargher's (1979: 426) dictionary, though with the comment 'f. in late Mx.' Fargher implies that Manx gender had become confused by the Late Manx period, and sees it as his duty to 'restore' gender and other features and thereby reverse the alleged 'havoc wrought on the language by English', as he says in his preface (Fargher 1979: vi–vii):

> I make no apology whatsoever for attempting to restore to the Manx language mutations, genders and certain other characteristics of Gaelic which without doubt existed in pre-literary and classical Manx but which had already disappeared before the final demise of the native speakers, owing to the havoc wrought on the language by English.
> (Fargher 1979: vi–vii)

This attitude reflects an assumption in Manx scholarship of decay and confusion in the grammatical gender system, even as far back as the Classical Manx period, as the following quotations show:

> A simplification of the system of gender, number, and case marking was more or less complete by the Classical Manx period, if not before, resulting in only one gender (masculine), with some exceptions in the old feminine.
> (Broderick 1999: 165)

> It is hard to be certain whether the sense of gender was strong in early Manx; references to inanimate nouns by fem[inine] pronouns are not frequent and on the whole it looks as though they were referred to by masc[uline] pronouns perceived as neuter.
> (Thomson 1986)

> The *t* of the article has been eliminated before vowels (there is no trace of it even in Phillips), e.g. *yn eean* (Ir. *an t-éan*), *yn ommidan* (Ir. *an t-amadán*). In other ways, too, gender has been rather badly confused.
> (O'Rahilly 1972: 119)

In fact, the evidence suggests that the Manx grammatical gender system was intact and not subject to any major disruption down to the last generations of speakers with a full acquisition of the language, such as Edward Fargher (1831–1908). Only in the terminal speakers (those

---

[26] By the Classical and Late Manx period, adjectives did not usually lenite after masculine dative singular nouns, meaning that the lenition of *beg* here is a fairly certain marker of gender (Lewin 2014b: 5, Thomson 1998: 109).

born from c. 1850 onwards), whose dominant language was English, does grammatical gender in inanimate nouns seem to have broken down, probably owing to inadequate exposure to and socialization in the language in childhood, leading to incomplete acquisition (Lewin 2014b). The existence of a few nouns with genders different from those in the other Gaelic dialects, as with *ellan* here, as well as the existence of nouns with variable gender (many of them old neuters), does not necessarily imply general weakening of the gender system, as some degree of variation and transference between genders is likely to arise anyway.[27]

4.2.2. Genitive forms

Distinct genitive singular forms exist for some nouns in Classical Manx, especially feminines (Broderick 2010: 315), although they are interchangeable with the nominative forms and in many instances genitive case is shown only by genitive syntax and mutation, though the latter is also variable. Distinct genitive forms are infrequent in Late Manx, being largely restricted to attributive use in compound nouns. Genitive inflection is usually, and lenition of masculine singular nouns after the article sometimes, ignored in RM, particularly in speech. In written RM, hyperarchaic genitive forms may be found.

4.2.2.1. Hyper-archaic masculine singular genitives formed by palatalization / vowel alternation

Masculine nouns whose nominative plural and genitive singular are historically identical, being both formed by slenderization (palatalization of the final consonant, sometimes with vowel alternation), normally do not slenderize in the genitive singular in Classical and Late TM, although the slenderized form is frequently maintained as the plural. The only masculine noun that regularly forms a slenderized genitive is *baase* 'death', genitive *baaish* (G. *bá(i)s*). However, some writers of RM have sought to use what they would regard as the "correct" genitive form, regardless of actual TM usage (63):

(63a) *er dreeym y chabbil*
       'on the horse's back' (Skeeal.: 1)

(63b) *ec cass y chrink*
       'at the foot of the hill' (Skeeal.: 62)

---

[27] The feminine gender of *ellan* may perhaps arise by analogy with feminine *Mannin* '(Isle of) Man', with which it would frequently have been semantically associated, and perhaps *çheer* 'country' (G. *tír*), an old neuter which may be feminine or masculine.

Compare the following TM examples, in which the genitive noun is lenited after the article, but not inflected, along with examples of the plural form (64):

(64a)   *doghan y **chabbyl***
        'the plague of the horse' (Zechariah 14:15)

(64b)   *mullagh y **chronk***
        'the top of the hill' (Joshua 15: 9)

(64c)   *Ta mish myr t'ou uss, my phobble myr dty phobble's, my **chabbil** myr ny **cabbil** ayd's.*
        'I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses' (1 Kings 22:4)

(64d)   *lhig da ny **croink** clashtyn dty choraa*
        'let the hills hear thy voice' (Micah 6:1)

4.2.2.2. Genitive plural with nasalization after the article

The genitive plural normally has no specific marking in Classical and Late Manx. However, a few nouns in Classical Manx may show nasalization after the definite article *ny* (65). This nasalization is more widespread in Early Manx (Thomson 1953: 19).

(65a)   *giat ny **g**abbyl*
        'the horse gate [gate of the horses]' (Jeremiah 31:40) [G. *capu(i)ll*]

(65b)   *ard-vochilley ny **g**eyrragh*
        'that great shepherd of the sheep' (Hebrews 13:20) [G. *caora*, *caorach*]

In the following RM example, *bunney* 'sheaf' is nasalized after the article in the genitive plural, and left in its singular form, where no nasalization and the plural form *bunnaghyn* would be expected in TM, certainly in Late Manx:

(66)   *boandaghyn ny **m**unney*
        'the bindings of the sheaves' (Skeeal.: 25) [G. *punnann*?]

In (67), from the early days of the revival, the nominative plural form *paitchyn* 'children' (ScG. *pàistean*) is found, but with genitive plural nasalization:

(67)   *Corneil ny **b**aitchyn*
        'the children's corner' (*Isle of Man Examiner* 15.06.1901)

4.2.2.3. The feminine genitive singular article *ny*

The feminine genitive singular form of the article *ny* is fairly widespread in Classical Manx, and in fixed phrases in Late Manx, but is always interchangeable with the masculine / general

form *yn*, *y*, and tends to be found only with distinct genitive forms (Thomson 1992: 119) or with bisyllabic abstract nouns ending in -*ys* (68):

(68a)   *joan ny hooirrey*
        'the dust of the earth' (Genesis 28:14) [G. *úir*, *na húire*]

(68b)   *laa ny briwnys*
        'the day of judgment' (Mark 6:11) [G. *breitheamhnas*]

In RM, some writers use *ny* where it would not be expected in TM. In (69), *ny* is used with a morphologically non-distinct genitive and with a following periphrastic possessive with a form of *ec*, which is not usual in TM.[28]

(69)   *chiass ny lhiabbee echey*
        'the warmth of his bed' (MC: 201)

Lhiabbee (ScG. *leabaidh*) has a genitive form *lhiabbagh* (e.g. *ec kione ny lhiabbagh* 'upon the bed's head' (Genesis 47:31)), but this would not normally be expected with a following periphrastic possessive, and in any case is not used here.

In (70), *ny* is used with a monosyllabic feminine noun *ben* 'woman' which does not usually have an inflected genitive form in Classical and Late Manx, and which usually takes the nominative / masculine genitive singular article *y(n)* (e.g. *dooinney yn ven varroo* 'the husband of the dead woman' (Judges 20:4)).

(70)   *corp ny ben aeg waagh*
        'the body of the beautiful young woman' (MC: 199)

In the following RM example (71), the archaic genitive inflection of *ben* 'woman', *mrieh*, is used, although this does not seem to have been usual in Classical Manx, despite being cited in Kelly's (1870: 17) grammar and Cregeen's (1835: 117) dictionary (who has it as plural 'of women', however, suggesting its use was not familiar), and it is found in Phillips (*GEM* s.v. *ben*):

(71)   *eddin ny mrieh*
        'the woman's face' (TS: 32)

---

[28] Although examples are occasionally found, e.g. *cairysyn ny cheer ain* 'the rights of our country' (*Mona's Herald* 06.02.1835).

4.2.2.4. Replacement of the genitive by preposition *jeh* 'of' / *ec* 'at'

The genitive construction is sometimes replaced in RM by the use of the preposition *jeh* 'of',
or sometimes *ec* 'at', which is not usual in TM, where no preposition is used even in long
strings of genitives as in (72):

(72a) *kerraghey mee-chairys inneen my phobble*
         'the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people' (Lamentations 4:6)

(72b) *dorrys giat shiar thie yn Chiarn*
         'the door of the east gate of the Lord's house' (Ezek. 10:19)

The following examples illustrate the RM use of *jeh* (73):

(73a) [ən ʃiːᵊn dʒeː ən glɛːᵊɹ]
         yn sheean jeh yn ghlare
         'the sound of the language' (TCM)
         Expected in TM: *sheean yn ghlare*

(73b) [ekʲ bun dʒeː nɛːn dʒeː nə maːɹən]
         ec bun jeh nane jeh ny magheryn
         'at the bottom of one of the fields' (TCM)
         Expected in TM: *ec bun nane jeh ny magheryn*[29]

(73c) [ən bun dʒeː ən kuːʃ]
         yn bun jeh yn cooish
         'the meaning of the matter' (TCM)
         Expected in TM: *bun y chooish*

(73d) *ny chesh-veanyn jeh ny breneenyn shoh*
         'the nuclei of these atoms' (MC: 197)
         Expected in TM: *chesh-vean(yn)*[30] *ny breneenyn shoh*

The construction with *ec* (74) seems to be an overgeneralization of the periphrastic possessive
construction (e.g. *yn thie aym* 'my house' lit. 'the house at me', for *my hie* 'my house') which
in TM is found only with pronominal forms and not nouns:

(74a) [nə aɲəxən ek slaˑi]
         ny aignaghyn ec sleih
         'people's minds' (BS)
         Expected in TM: *aignaghyn / aigney sleih*

(74b) *yn eie ec Burgess*
         'Burgess's idea' (MC: 168)

---

[29] The second *jeh* is partitive and would be used in this way in TM.
[30] In TM it might be expected that *chesh-vean* (TM 'dead centre') would be singular here, as each atom has only
one nucleus (cf. Thomson 1998: 90); this could also apply to the next example (74a) with *aignaghyn* 'minds'.

4.2.3. Simple and emphatic pronouns

Like the other Gaelic dialects, the personal pronouns in Manx all have both simple and emphatic forms, as do all the prepositional pronouns. The paradigms below show the simple and emphatic forms of the personal pronouns and the pronominal forms of the preposition *ec*.

Personal Pronouns:

	Singular			Plural	
	Simple	Emphatic		Simple	Emphatic
1	*mee*	*mish*	1	*shin*	*shinyn*
2	*oo*	*uss*	2	*shiu*	*shiuish*
3m	*eh*	*eshyn*	3	*ad*	*adsyn*
3f	*ee*	*ish*			

	Singular			Plural	
	Simple	Emphatic		Simple	Emphatic
1	*aym*	*aym's*	1	*ain*	*ainyn*
2	*ayd*	*ayd's*	2	*eu*	*euish*
3m	*echey*	*echesyn*	3	*oc*	*ocsyn*
3f	*eck*	*ecksh*			

The simple and emphatic forms are both very common in both TM and RM, but in the speech and writings of many RM speakers their distribution is less consistent, and there seems to be a tendency to reanalyse the emphatic pronouns as disjunctive pronouns (cf. the use of the historically accusative pronouns *me*, *him* etc. as disjunctive pronouns in all contexts other than subject position directly preceding a verb in colloquial English, and the use of *moi*, *toi* etc. in French). In TM the emphatic forms are used whenever there is a sense of emphasis or contrast, and whenever the equivalent pronoun in spoken English would have heavier than usual stress to convey such a sense, while the simple forms are used elsewhere. In RM, however, there is a tendency to use the emphatic forms in a variety of circumstances where there is no particular emphasis or contrast in the meaning, and where the English translation would not have strong stress on the pronoun. On occasion the simple pronouns may be strongly stressed to convey emphasis or contrast, where in TM the emphatic forms would be used. Maguire (1991: 217) notes similar developments in Shaw's Road Irish. Cf. also Coppetiers' (1987: 555–7) observation that native and L2 speakers of French in his study appear to have divergent interpretations of the functions and distribution of the pronouns *ce* and *il* / *elle* (also Birdsong 1992: 731–2).

4.2.3.1. Use of simple for emphatic pronoun

In (75) two pronouns *oc* 'at them, by them') and *aym's* 'at me' (i.e. 'my') are strongly stressed, expressing contrast between 'the work that was done by *them*' and '*my* work'. However, only *aym's* is in the emphatic form; *oc*, even though the speaker actually stresses it more strongly, is left in the simple form, where we would expect emphatic *ocsyn* in TM. Emphatic *aym's* 'at me, my' is, however, used as expected.

(75)   [gin uljə ɹən ɒbə va dʒint ˈɒk jəˈnou jəˈnou ha bɛːəx ɒbə gɒɹiʃ ən ɒbəɹ ˈeməs ɔːn]
    *gyn ooilley yn obbyr va jeant **oc** you know you know cha beagh obbyr gollrish yn obbyr*
    ***aym's** ayn*
    'without all the work that was done by *them* you know you know there would not be work like *my* work' (TCM)

In some RM pedagogical material, it seems the simple form is used in emphatic situations because the emphatic forms have not yet been taught, as in the following exchange from a video accompanying the *Saase Jeeragh* course (76):

(76)   A: [vel u skiː dʒuː] *Vel oo skee jiu?* 'Are you tired today?'
    H: [ˈta mi skiː dʒuː] *Ta mee skee jiu.* 'I am tired today'
    […]
    A: [kwɔi ʃɔː] *Quoi shoh?* 'Who is this?'
    H: [ʃɔː məˈnanən] *Shoh Manannan.* 'This is Manannan'
    A: [vel ˈei skiː dʒuː] *Vel **eh** skee jiu?* 'Is *he* tired today?'
    H: [ha nel eː skiː] *Cha nel eh skee.* 'He is not tired'
        (SJV 2)

In TM, and usually in RM, the emphatic *eshyn* would be expected rather than the simple form *eh* here.

4.2.3.2. Use of emphatic for simple pronoun: the inverted object construction

In this construction, the object pronoun is placed before the verbal noun, with a leniting particle *y* (G. *do*, *a*) intervening. In TM the pronoun is usually the simple form, unless there is specific emphasis or contrast. Cf. the following TM examples (77):

(77a)   *Agh tra va Paul er scughey yn chooish gys clashtyn Augustus, doardee mee eh dy ve er*
    *ny reayll derrey oddin **eh y choyrt** gys Cesar*
    'But when Paul had appealed to be reserved unto the hearing of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept till I might send him to Caesar' (Acts 25:21)

(77b) *as nee ad **adsyn y ghoaill** son cappee, dauesyn v'ad hene roïe nyn gappee; as nee ad reill harrish nyn dranlaasee*
'and they shall take them captives, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors' (Isaiah 14:2)

In RM, however, many writers (the construction is rarely used in speech) consistently use the emphatic form in this position (78):

(78a) *Cha nodmayd obbal dy vel marranyn 'sy lioar shoh—marranyn yn er-prental y chooid smoo jeu (agh ta shin jerkal nagh jean ad shen **uss y heaghney** dy mooar), agh paart jeu neesht ta lesh yn er-screeuee*
'We cannot deny that there are errors in this book—most of them errors of the printer (but we expect that they will not trouble you greatly), but some of them too belonging to the author' (RLT 1969)

(78b) *By-lesh Mannanan lhongan, v'ee 'Skeeabeyder ny Tonn,' / Tra baillesh **ish y vooadaghey**, chelleeragh daase ee chionn*
'Manannan had a small boat, she was 'The Wavesweeper', / When he wished to enlarge her, immediately she grew fast' (MC: 166)

From the perspective of TM, the use of the emphatic pronouns in these examples could lead to odd interpretations. In (78a), the writer's use of the emphatic *uss* 'you' rather than the simple form *oo* may give the sense 'we hope that they will not trouble *you* personally (though they might trouble other people)', whereas what is presumably intended is that it is hoped that the printing errors will not trouble *anyone* who uses the book.

4.2.3.3. Use of emphatic for simple pronoun: the infinitival construction with included subject

This construction (Thomson's (1981: 134) 'nominalising construction') involves the subject + leniting particle *dy* (G. preposition *do*, *a*) + verbal noun. In TM, if a personal pronoun is the subject, it may be simple or emphatic depending on the context, as elsewhere. In RM, the emphatic form is frequently found regardless of context.

In the following TM example (79), the simple pronoun *oo* is used, because the whole passage is about the actor 'thou', who has already been introduced, and there is no contrast between 'thou' and other actors:

(79) *Ny share te, nagh jinnagh oo breearrey, na **oo dy vreearrey**, as dyn cooilleeney*
'Better is it that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay' (Ecclesiastes 5:5)

In (80), however, there is a contrast between two actors ('I' and 'ye'), both of whom are subjects in this construction, and in both instances the emphatic pronoun is used:

(80) *Son t'ad phadeyrys breg diuish, dy scughey shiu foddey veih'n cheer eu hene; as **mish dy eiyrt** shiu magh, as **shiuish dy herraghtyn***
'For they prophesy a lie unto you, to remove you far from your land; and that I should drive you out, and ye should perish' (Jeremiah 27:10)

In the following RM example (81), the emphatic *uss* 'you' is used in two parallel clauses involving the infinitival construction. However, the constrast is between the two possible courses of action that the actor 'you' could take, and not between 'you' and another actor, and therefore *oo* would be more likely in TM:

(81) *uss reih eddyr daa red: eddyr **uss dy choayl** dty vioys as dty reeriaght cheu-sthie jeh jeih laa as feed, ny **uss dy aagail** dy aagail Loghlyn gyn shilley 'chur urree dy bragh arragh*
'You have a choice of one of two things: either you lose your life and kingdom within thirty days, or you leave Norway, never to set eyes on it again' (RRVE: 11)

4.2.3.4. Use of emphatic for simple pronoun: circumstantial clauses introduced by *as* 'and'

This is another circumstance where speakers of RM often use only the emphatic pronouns, where the simple pronouns are usual in TM when the pronoun carries no special emphasis:

(82) *Cha beagh ee abyl jannoo lieh cho wheesh as veagh urree jannoo as **ish** jeeaghyn mysh y lhiannoo beg*
'She would not be able to do half as much as she would have to do when she was looking after the little baby' (ESE: 28)

In this example, the emphasis on *ish* would in TM imply contrast with an other actor, but no-one else is mentioned (the passage is about the effects of her having to look after a baby, not about whether she or someone else is looking after it). Cf. the following TM example (83) where the simple pronoun *eh* is used in the circumstantial clause:

(83) *Ny tra ta'n spyrryd dy eadaghey dy ghoaill eh, as **eh** geadaghey mysh e ven, as dy choyrt lesh y ven roish y Chiarn, nee'n saggyrt cooilleeney urree ooilley'n leigh shoh*
'Or when the spirit of jealousy cometh upon him, and he be jealous over his wife, and shall set the woman before the Lord, and the priest shall execute upon her all this law' (Numbers 5:30)

In the following TM example (84), on the other hand, the emphatic form *shiuish* 'you' is used in the circumstantial clause, because a contrast is made between what the child is doing (being ill) and what 'you' are doing (trying to comfort it with its toys):

(84) *Ta shiu er vakin paachey as mooarane taitnys echey er e ghaieaghyn, as goail feer olk rish scarrey roo: oor ny lurg, foddee, t'eh bwoailt lesh chingys, as **shiuish** streeu dy vrynneragh rish lesh ny eer gaieaghyn ve tammylt roish shen as wheesh dy haitnys echey ayndoo; agh ooilley ayns fardail: ta'n eer shilley jeu cur corree er*
'You have seen a child extremely fond of his playthings, and most impatient to part with them: an hour after, perhaps, he is taken ill, and you strive to divert him by the things he was just before so very fond of; but all in vain: the very sight of them offends him' (Wilson 1783: 160)

4.2.3.5. Use of emphatic for simple pronoun: subject of the copula

The subject of the copula clause follows the predicate if the predicate is indefinite, and if it is a pronoun, may be in its simple or emphatic form as in other environments. However, in RM there is a tendency to use the emphatic forms only, regardless of semantic and pragmatic context, and this may be taught as the only possibility in courses. For example, in the relevant part of the *Saase Jeeragh* course quoted in §4.1.11.1. above, only examples with the emphatic pronouns are given. The pertinent examples are repeated below (85):

(85) *She dooinney mish*
'I am a man'

She eirinagh mish
'I am a farmer'

She dooinney mie eshyn
'He is a good man'
        (SJ 14)

In practice, it is quite likely that these sentences would have the emphatic form in TM, since *she eirinagh mish* 'I am a farmer' might well be an answer to a question about occupation in a situation in which a number of people with different occupations are present (or at least there might be some idea of contrast with other jobs that other people might do, even if there is not an obvious and immediate contextual contrast); and *she dooinney mie eshyn* 'he is a good man' might well have deictic force (i.e. one might be literally or metaphorically pointing at a good man). However, in TM it would be odd to use the emphatic form in a situation such as the following: *Ta'n fer shoh cummal 'sy thie shen as she dooinney mie eh* 'This fellow lives in that house and he is a good man', since the man is identified in the first clause, and in the second clause 'he' is not new information, nor is there any contrast with other actors. The following TM examples from Edward Faragher well illustrate the difference (86):

(86a) *Ta ny joareeyn olbynagh jannoo magh dow dy re albynagh **me** as dy re Farquhar yn slenue aym*
'The Scottish strangers claim to me that I am a Scot and that Farquhar is my surname' (NBHR: 118)

(86b) *As dooyrt eh rym dy re joareeyn va ooilley yn cheshagh va marysh, agh Mannanee **shinyn** dooyrt eh*
'And he said to me that all the company that were with him were strangers, "but we are Manxmen" he said' (NBHR: 141)

In the first example the emphasis is on the thing that Faragher is being told he is, i.e. 'a Scot' rather than on 'me'. In the second example, however, the actor 'we' (*shinyn*) is emphasized because it is contrasted with the company of strangers; there is also an element of insistence and assertiveness: '*we* are Manxmen'.

In general, it seems that there has been some degree of reanalysis of the role of emphatic pronouns in RM. In non-emphatic contexts, the simple pronouns are generally used as the subject or object of a finite verb, but in other contexts, where the pronoun is felt perhaps to be in a less prototypical position, the emphatic form is preferred, with a distribution somewhat similar to the clitic pronouns (e.g. *je*, *me*) and disjunctive pronouns (e.g. *moi*) in French. On the other hand, in positions where the simple pronouns are usual, they may be retained even when the pronoun is heavily stressed and there is strong emphasis or contrast. This is presumably due to influence from the speakers' L1, since English does not have morphologically marked emphatic pronoun, instead relying on stress and intonation.

4.2.4. Confusion of T and V forms (*oo / shiu*)

Manx has a T/V distinction between the 2pl. pronoun *shiu*, which is also used to refer to individuals of higher social status or strangers, and the 2sg. *oo*, which is used to refer to close acquaintances and family members, and social inferiors. Modern English has no number or politeness distinctions in the second person, so it is not surprising that RM speakers sometimes use *oo* and *shiu* interchangeably, even in the same passage, as in the following examples (87):

(87a) *Hom! Cre'n aght ta fys ayd raad **t'ou** goll er sooree gyn eayst ayn as gyn fer erbee geiyrt **erriu**?*
'Tom! How do you [sg.] know where you [sg.] are going courting without any moon and without anyone following you [pl.]?' (Skeeal.: 23)

(87b) *Ta ourys orrin neesht dy darragh drogh smooinaghtyn stiagh ayns **dty** chione keayrt ennagh, as beemayd eeit **eu***
'We're also suspicious that a bad thought would come into your [sg.] head some time and we'd [we'll] be eaten by you [pl.] (MC: 186)

Confusion of 2sg. and 2pl. pronouns was also a feature of the Manx of the terminal traditional speakers (Broderick 1999: 125–6), and is found on one occasion in the writings of Edward Faragher (Lewin 2014a: 88). In RM speech plural marking in the imperative (suffix *-jee* or pronoun *shiu*) is often omitted, presumably under the influence of English which does not have a number distinction in the imperative; this development is also found in Belfast Irish (Maguire 1991: 204).

4.2.5. Adjectives

4.2.5.1. Retention of the particle *ny* in qualified comparatives in RM

In TM, the particle *ny* is generally needed before the comparative adjective or adverb (which is an inflected form of the adjective preceded permanently by the unaugmented copula *s'*, occasionally in the past / conditional *by*), except when it stands in initial position (88):

(88a)   *Va goan e veeal **ny s'buiggey** na eeym*
       'The words of his mouth were softer than butter' (Psalm 55:22)

(88b)   *Agh loayr eshyn **ny s'jeeanney***
       'But he spake the more vehemently' (Mark 14:31)

(88c)   ***Share** goll dy lhie fegooish shibber na girree ayns lhiastynys*
       'Better to go to bed without supper than to rise in debt' (Cregeen 1835 s.v. *lhiastynys*)

However, *ny* is generally omitted when a qualifier such as *foddey* 'far', *lane* 'much', *veg* 'any', *monney* 'much' precedes the comparative. This rule also applies with more complex phrases acting as adjectival qualifiers (89):

(89a)   *Nagh vel shiuish **foddey share** na adsyn?*
       'Are ye not much better than they?' (Matthew 6:26)

(89b)   *as nagh vel eh **veg s'diuney** na'n chrackan*
       'and it be no lower than the other skin' (Leviticus 13:26)

(89c)   *hooar eh ad **jeih keayrtyn share** na ooilley ny deiney-creeney as rollaageydee v'ayns ooilley e reeriaght*
       'he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm' (Daniel 1:20)

(89d)   *doyrt e dy jeanagh e cur **skillyn sy veash smoo** doin*
       'he said he would give us a shilling a measure more' (Edward Faragher, Broderick 1981b: 128)

In RM, the particle *ny* is more often than not retained with modifiers (90):

(90a)   [fədə nə ʃɛːˀ]
        foddey ny share
        'far better' (TCM)

(90b)   [fɔːðə nə stɹɔːʒə]
        foddey ny stroshey
        'far stronger' (TCM)

However, the TM pattern is also found (91):

(91)   [fɔːdə ʃɛː]
        foddey share
        'far better' (TCM)

4.2.5.2. The periphrastic comparative

A periphrastic comparative / superlative with *smoo* 'more, most' + adjective, parallel with the English construction, is noted in RM textbooks:

> All adjectives, except the irregulars below…, may also form their comparative-superlative with *smoo* 'more, most', as in English.
> (Goodwin and Thomson 1966: 51)

> The Relation of superiority is expressed by: ny s'…na, ny smoo…na, *more…than*, *-er than*.
> Examples: ny s'baney na, *whiter than*; ny smoo gloyroil na, *more glorious than*.
> (Kneen 1931: 64)

> The alternative periphrastic construction with *smoo* (greater, more) and *sloo* (less, least) may always be used, especially with longer adjectives, and those beginning with *s-*, except with irregulars.
> (Kewley Draskau 2008: 87)

In TM, however, it is almost universal to use the inflected comparative / superlative, even with longer adjectives, and those beginning with *s-* (92). Often the radical form of the adjective is used with *(ny) s'* (92c), rather than the distinct inflected comparative / superlative form (92b), but *smoo* is not found.

(92a)   *As bee dty vea **ny sollys** na'n vun-laa*
        'And thine age [life] shall be clearer than the noonday' (Job 11:17)

(92b)   *ta mee er scrieu **ny s'arryltee** hiu*
        'I have written the more boldly unto you' (Romans 15:15)

(92c)   *Dy yannoo cairys as briwnys kiart, te **ny s'taitnyssagh** da'n Chiarn na ourallyn costal*
'To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice' (Proverbs 21:3)

In the terminal speakers, too, the form with *(ny) s'* rather than *ny smoo* is usual, with or without intention of the distinct inflected form (*HLSM* I: 41–3), with only occasional examples of the periphrastic form. Kneen (1931: 126) does note that the periphrastic construction is 'not very common'. In Classical Manx, forms with *smoo* seem to have been limited to (a) use of *smoo* as an intensifier meaning roughly 'very', probably on the model of English 'the Lord most high' etc. (Thomson 1998: 90), and (b) with non-prototypical adjectives such as passive participles (Thomson 1981: 70). Nevertheless, RM usage of many speakers seems to be more in accordance with the pattern outlined in the textbooks, i.e. inflected forms with shorter and more common adjectives, and *smoo* with longer ones (i.e. a similar distribution to English *-er* / *-est* and *more* / *most*).

(93a)   [nə smuː fɑːgəs]
        ny smoo faggys
        'nearer' (TCM)
        (TM *ny s'niessey*)

(93b)   [nə smuː ɛːʒəx]
        ny smoo aashagh
        'easier' (TCM)
        (TM *ny sassey*)

The current *Saase Jeeragh* course, goes further, prescribing the periphrastic form as the preferred form for all adjectives, apart from common suppletives; this appears to be for pedagogical reasons, to make learning comparative / superlative forms easier:

Comparatives
[…]
Smoo… = most …   Sloo … = least …
Yn ven smoo aalin ayns Mannin   The most beautiful woman in Mann
Yn cabbyl smoo tappee ayns y teihll The fastest horse in the world
Yn baagh sloo aghtal ayns y valley The least intelligent animal in the town
Yn boayl sloo aalin ayns Mannin   The least beautiful place in Mannin
[…]
Ny smoo …. na = more … than   Ny sloo … Na = less … than
Ta mee ny smoo tarroogh na eshyn   I am busier (more busy) than him
Ta shin ny smoo fliugh na jea   We are wetter than yesterday
T'eh ny sloo çheh na Jemayrt   It's less hot than Tuesday
Ta mee ny sloo tarroogh na jea   I'm less busy than yesterday

Note: Comparative adjectives also have special forms:

T'ee ny smoo aalin na mish	T'ee ny s'aaley na mish
Ta'n gleashtan ny smoo moal nish	Ta'n gleashtan ny s'melley nish
T'eh ny smoo çheh jiu	T'eh ny s'çhoe jiu
T'eh ny smoo shenn na Jonee	T'eh ny shinney na Jonee

Special forms which it is *essential* to learn:
Ny share (better) & Ny smessey (worse)
          (SJ 17/18)

The diminutive comparative / superlative construction with *sloo* 'less, least' mentioned in the above sources (also Kneen 1931: 64) appears to be restricted to RM; none of the textbooks give any TM examples, and none have been noted. Moreover, the construction seems not to be found in Irish or Scottish Gaelic. A negative equative would be used instead, e.g. *cha vel mee cha tarroogh* 'I am not as busy' instead of **ta mee ny sloo tarroogh* 'I am less busy', or an antonym, e.g. *yn boayl s'graney* 'the ugliest place' instead of **yn boayl sloo aalin* 'the least beautiful place'.

4.2.5.3. Omission or retention of *as* in the equative construction

The usual pattern for the equative construction in Manx is *cha* + adjective + *as* 'as…as'. In TM, *as* is generally omitted when followed by the demonstratives (cf. English 'that big' = 'as big as that'). This also applies in the case of certain other items which take *as*, such as *lheid* 'such', and the irregular equatives *wheesh* 'as much', *whilleen* 'as many', *choud* 'as far' (94):

(94a)   *Agh v'eh **cha myghinagh shen** dy leih eh daue nyn voiljyn*
          'But he was so merciful, that he forgave their misdeeds' (Psalm 78:38)

(94b)   *As myr ny drogh figgyn, nagh vel son ee, t'ad **cha olk shen***
          'And as the evil figs, which cannot be eaten, they are so evil' (Jeremiah 24:8)

(94c)   *C'raad yiow mayd **y lheid shoh**, dooinney ayn ta spyrryd Yee?*
          'Can we find such a one as this is, a man in whom the Spirit of God is?' (Genesis 41:38)

(94d)   [ha ˈrau mi ɡ'iː hwiːʃ ˈʃeᵈn fiːə ˈmenɪk]
          *cha row mee gee **wheesh shen** feer mennick*
          'I wasn't eating that much very often' (*HLSM* II: 476)

In RM, however, this syntactic detail seems to have been generally overlooked, and *as* is usually retained with the demonstratives (95):

(95a)   [ho skiː əs ʃen]
          cho skee as shen
          'that tired, as tired as that' (TCM)

(95b)   [hɒ fleˈoːl əs ʃen]
        cho flaaoil as shen
        'that fluent, as fluent as that' (TCM)

(95c)   [ə lʲidʒ as ʃen]
        y lhied as shen
        'suchlike, the likes of that' (TCM)

4.2.5.4. *Cho wheesh, cho whilleen*

Manx has two suppletive equative forms which do not require *cha / cho*: *wheesh* 'as much', and *whilleen* 'as many' (G. *a choibhéis* and *a choimhlíon*, Thomson (1998: 87), *HLSM* II: 475–6) (96).

(96a)   *as ren eh jeeig mysh yn altar,* **wheesh** *as chummagh daa howse dy arroo*
        'he made a trench about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed' (1 Kings 18:32)

(96b)   **whilleen** *as venn rish, v'ad er nyn lheihys*
        'as many as touched him were made whole' (Mark 6:56)

However, *cho* is frequently placed before these forms in RM (97):

(97a)   [ta mi ɡəˈlʲ jindəs də vel ən ɡilk ɡɛːs hoː wiːʃ əs tiː]
        ta mee goaill yindys dy vel yn Gaelg gaase **cho wheesh** *as t'ee*
        'I am surprised that Manx is growing as much as it is' (TCM)

(97b)   *er yn oyr ynrican dy by vie lesh Christopher Robin* **cho wheesh**
        'only because he liked Christopher Robin so much' (WP)

The expected TM forms are sometimes found in RM (98):

(98)   [te mai də vel ʌulʲin brastələn əz ləˈzuːnən rə xeðən niʃ][31]
        t'eh mie dy vel **whilleen** *brastyllyn as lessoonyn ry-gheddyn nish*
        'it's good that there are so many classes and lessons available now' (TCM)

A further irregular equative in TM is *choud* 'as far', which is often replaced in RM by the regular formation *cha foddey* (99), which does not seem to occur in TM:

---

[31] Note that the speaker in this example also uses the pronunciation with initial stress noted by Cregeen and attested from the terminal speakers (*HLSM* II: 476), rather than the pronunciation with final stress indicated by the spelling and the etymology. However, the speaker does not follow TM syntax whereby a singular noun following *whilleen* would be expected (e.g. *whilleen sharvaant* 'as many servants' (1 Timothy 6:1), [hwilʹən ˈkiːʳt] *whilleen keayrt* 'so many times' (*HLSM* II: 476). In Late Manx *whilleen* seems to be often replaced by *wheesh*, as in the following examples: *ta wheesh dy s[h]elgeyryn gholl mygeayr[t] rish shatanse dy vleintyn* 'there have been so many hunters going around for a number of years' (NBHR: 156), [hwiːʃ ˈkʹiri] 'as many sheep' (*HLSM* II: 475), [hwiːʃ ðə slɛi] 'as many people' (*HLSM* II: 476).

(99)   *cho foddey as Mannin*
        'as far as Mann' (RRVE: 11)

Similarly, the composed form *roud* 'too far' may be replaced in RM by *ro foddey* (100):

(100)   [ɹɑː fɔːðə]
        ro foddey
        'too far' (TCM)

4.2.6. Numerals

There are a number of fine details in the system of numerals in TM in terms of agreement, word order etc. which are not consistently observed in RM. The rules may be consciously taught and known, but not fully controlled by speakers, especially in spontaneous speech.

4.2.6.1. Use of plural article *ny* with *daa* 'two':

The numeral *daa* 'two' in TM takes a singular definite article and a singular noun (but a plural adjective) (101):

(101a) *yn daa voalley*
        'the two walls' (Isaiah 22:11)

(101b) *daa chalmane aegey*
        'two young doves' (Luke 2:24)

In the following RM example (102), the plural article is found, although the noun is singular as expected:

(102)   [nə dɛː skɒl]
        ny daa scoill
        'the two schools' (TCM)

4.2.6.2. Plural nouns after multiples of 20 and 100

In TM, multiples of *feed* 20 and *keead* 100 are followed by singular nouns, or else by the partitive preposition *dy* and a plural noun (103).

(103a) *feed **bleïn** dy eash*
        'twenty years old' (1 Chronicles 27:23)

(103b) *three cheead **shynnagh***
        'three hundred foxes' (Judges 15:4)

(103c) *kiare cheead **dy gheiney** aegey*
        'four hundred young men' (1 Samuel 30:17)

In the following RM examples (104), however, a plural noun is used. In the second example, not only is the expected singular form *blein* 'year(s)' not used, but the special plural form *bleeaney* of this noun used after numerals which take the plural is replaced by the general plural form *bleeantyn*.

(104a) *tree cheead **deiney***
     'three hundred men' (RRVE: 7)

(104b) [da.id blɛːntən]
     *daeed **bleeantyn***
     'forty years' (TCM)

(104c) [dʒai əs da.id bliːnə]
     *jeih as daeed **bleeaney***
     'fifty years' (TCM)

In (105) the plural would be expected, but the non-numeral plural form of *blein* is used:

(105)   [ʃax bliːntən]
     *shiaght **bleeantyn***
     'seven years' (TCM)

Often, however, the expected TM forms are found in RM (107):

(106a) [ʃeː bliːnə]
     *shey **bleeaney***
     'six years' (TCM)

(106b) [kiːd blen]
     *keead **blein***
     'a hundred years' (TCM)

4.2.6.3. '*n* or *n*+1' + noun phrase

When two sequential numerals linked by *ny* 'or' are followed by a noun phrase in TM, the partitive *dy* (G. *de*) must be used, as in other Gaelic dialects (107):

(107a) *kair ny queig **dy veilaghyn***
     'four or five miles' (Edward Fargher, Broderick 1981b: 144)

(107b) *ghaa ny three **dy eanishyn***
     'two or three witnesses' (Hebrews 10:28)

Cf. also Welsh *dau neu dri o dystion* 'two or three "of" witnesses'. However, this rule is frequently disregarded (and may not be widely taught or known) in RM, and the unlenited plural noun is used with the preposition (108):

(108) [tɹiː nə kʲeᵊ maːɹən]
       *three ny kiare **magheryn***
       'three or four fields' (TCM)

5. Lexis, idiom and style

The most obvious differences between TM and RM lexis are in new vocabulary or usages which have been adopted to cover contemporary topics and concepts; this is primarily by semantic extension of TM material, or borrowing from English or the Gaelic languages. However, other changes to Manx lexis, idiom and style have emerged in RM owing the subconscious influence of English, and inadequate acquisition or misinterpretation of the TM lexis.

5.1. Reapplication of TM lexis

5.1.1. Semantic extension of TM lexis to fill lexical gaps

The commonest way of adapting the TM lexicon to cover contemporary concepts has been by extending the meaning of existing TM lexical items, sometimes with the addition of further explanatory elements (Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 40). This was already the practice in TM (109).

(109) TM *charbaa* 'wean, separate' (ScG. *tearbadh*) > TM *charbaa veih'n Agglish* 'excommunicate' (CS: 10)
       TM *scoillar* 'scholar, pupil' > TM 'disciple' (FRC: 19)

(110) TM *mooghey* 'extinguish, put out, quench' > RM 'abolish, repeal, annul'; *mooghey-poosee* 'annulment (of marriage)' (Thomson undated)
       TM *ronsaghey* 'search' (ScG. *rannsachadh*) > RM 'research' (Broderick 2015: 40). Fargher (1979: 431) has the calques *aa-hirrey* and *aa-ronsaghey* (*aa-* G. *ath-* 're-'), but *ronsaghey* is in general use today (cf. the same application of *rannsachadh* in contemporary ScG.)
       TM *chesh-vean* 'dead centre' (ScG. *teis meadhon*) > RM 'nucleus (of atom)' (Fargher 1979: 527, Carswell 2010: 197–8, cf. Broderick 2015: 40)

5.1.2. Compounding of TM lexical items

New compounds may be formed using TM lexis (112). Again, this strategy was already used in TM (111) (Broderick 2015: 41).

(111) TM *irree* 'rising' (G. *éirghe*), TM *seose* 'up' (G. *suas*), TM *reesht* 'again' (ScG. *a-rithist*) > TM *irree-seose-reesht* 'resurrection'
TM *giarey* 'cutting' (G. *gearradh*), TM *chymmylt* 'around' (G. *timcheall*) > *giarey-chymmylt* 'circumcision' (*chymmylt* later reanalysed as 'foreskin', cf. Thomson (1967))

(112) TM *sheshaght* 'company, society' (Early Ir. *seiseacht* < Norse *sessi*, *HLSM* II: 399), TM *dellal* 'dealing' > RM *sheshaght-ghellal* '(commercial) company'
TM *cowrey* 'mark, sign' (G. *comharra*), *feysht* 'question' (G. *faoiside*) > *cowrey-feysht* 'question mark' (Fargher 1979: 607)

Often in RM left-headed compound nouns are formed, against the usual pattern of TM, i.e. the clarificatory element is prefixed to the head noun, instead of following as a genitive. This would appear to be modelled on neologistic Irish; (113) is modelled on Irish *irisleabhar* 'magazine'. The elements *lioar* 'book' and *earish* 'time' are TM items, and the compound makes semantic sense, but **lioar-earish* would be expected if TM norms were followed.

(113) TM *earish* 'time, weather' (G. *iris*), TM *lioar* 'book' (G. *leabhar*) > RM *earishlioar* 'magazine' (Thomson 1970: 102, Fargher 1979: 473)

New lexical items may be formed by means of regular derivation using TM morphemes (114):

(114) TM *co* 'co-, con-, together, equal' (G. *cómh-*), *earroo* 'number' (G. *áireamh*), TM *-(ey)der* '-er, -or' (actor noun suffix) (G. *-(e)adóir*, ScG. *-(e)adair*) > RM *co-earrooder* 'computer' (Fargher 1979: 179)

5.2. Borrowing of Irish or Scottish forms to fill lexical gaps

A considerable number of Irish and Scottish forms have been borrowed into RM (Fargher 1979: vi, Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 42–3) (115), especially Irish neologisms for modern technology and concepts developed since the Irish Revival at the turn of the twentieth century, and especially the founding of the Irish Free State in 1922 (Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 42).

(115) *symoil* 'interesting' (Fargher 1979: 421) < Ir. *suimiúil*
gleashtan 'car' (Fargher 1979: 132) < Ir. *gluaisteán*
etlan 'aeroplane' (Fargher 1979: 14) < Ir. *eitleán*

Some of these have found greater currency in RM than in Irish; for example, *carr* is in wider use for 'car' in Irish, but *gleashtan* is in general use in RM, perhaps because *car* is a Manx word with other meanings ('tune'; 'turn' > 'throughout' as in *car ny bleeaney* 'the turn of the year' i.e. 'throughout the year'). *Symoil* has competition from an apparently Scottish-derived form *anaasagh* [əˈnɛːsax] (?<*annasach* 'remarkable, strange'), although as Broderick (2015:

43) notes, the long vowel in the second syllable and resulting stress-pattern are unexpected if this is the etymology.

5.3. Replacement of TM anglicisms with Gaelic forms

There has been a tendency to replace established English borrowings in TM with Gaelic forms in RM, whether outright borrowings from Irish or Scottish Gaelic (116a), neologisms based on Manx roots (116b), or extension of the use of TM forms which had less currency or restricted uses in TM (116c,d), apparently for reasons of purism (Lewin 2015: 25–6). Cf. Fargher's (1979: vi) views on replacing TM use of the English versions of Gaelic place-names with neologistic Manx forms:

> It always appalled me to hear the last few native speakers interspersing accounts of their travels in Manx with the anglicised renderings of Gaelic names. This unnecessary dependence upon English cannot be tolerated if the Manx language of the future is to survive in its own right, and has, therefore, been discouraged here.
> (Fargher 1979: vi)

(116a) TM *daunsin* 'to dance' > *rinkey* (Ir. *rinceadh*)

(116b) TM *smookal* 'to smoke (tobacco)' > *toghtaney* (Manx *toghtey*, G. *tochtadh* 'to choke'; Manx *to(a)ghtan* 'suffocation, hoarseness' (Kelly 1866: 182))
also > *jaaghey* (Manx *jaagh* 'smoke', G. *deat(h)ach*) (cf. Lewin 2015: 25, Broderick 2015: 47–8)

(116c) TM *question*, *cweshtan* 'question' > *feysht* (TM 'examining', occasionally n. 'question') (G. *faoiside*); *keisht* (Kelly 1866: 40), but otherwise unattested in TM and probably borrowed from G. *ceist*)

(116d) TM *back* 'back' (adv. 'to previous location') > *er ash* (other meanings in TM)
TM *s'laik lhiam* 'I like' > *s'mie lhiam* (less frequent idiom in TM)

Daunsin and *rinkey* are both in common use in RM (both are given in Fargher (1979: 215)), and both are found in TCM, the former in the variant [daunlən] with /l/ for /s/, reflecting a TM pronunciation variant (e.g. [døunlʹən], *HLSM* II: 118).

Smookal is also found in RM speech (Broderick 2015: 47–8), but the neologism *jaaghey* has been adopted on "No Smoking" signs (*Jaaghey mee-lowit* lit. 'smoking disallowed') which have been promoted by the Manx Heritage Foundation / Culture Vannin in recent years (Cain 2010: 1). The more cumbersome neologism *toghtaney* is the only translation given by Fargher

(1979: 704) for this sense,[32] but seems less used today. *Jaaghey* is in Cregeen (1835: 95) as 'smoking', and Fargher takes this to mean 'smoking fish' (cf. Ir. *deataigh*).

Question, *cweshtan* (Cregeen 1835: 52) is the commonly used TM word for 'question' in the Bible and elsewhere (*feysht* is found in this sense only in Luke 2:46 *cur feyshtyn orroo* 'asking them questions'). However, *question* is not generally used in RM, although *ansoor* 'answer' is found (Fargher 1979: 32) alongside native *freggyrt* (ScG. *freagairt*). Fargher (1979: 608) gives only *feysht* and *keisht*. *Ansoor* is presumably felt to be more acceptable because it is more assimilated to Manx phonology and orthography. Cf. Welsh *cwestiwn* 'question', the only commonly used term in all registers, but native *ateb* 'answer'.

Back is in general use in TM from at least the mid eighteenth century (it does not occur in Phillips or in CS / PSD (1707), where *reesht* 'again' is used),[33] and is well attested in the Bible (117a,b) and in the Manx of the terminal speakers (117c) (cf. Lewin 2015: 25, Broderick 2015: 46–7):

(117a) *kys te nagh vel shiu loayrt fockle mychione coyrt lhieu **back** y ree?*
'why speak ye not a word of bringing the king back?' (2 Samuel 19:10)

(117b) *As haink eh gy-kione, tra va Yeesey er jeet **back**, dy ghow yn pobble lane boggey jeh: son v'ad ooilley fieau er*
'And it came to pass, that, when Jesus was returned, the people gladly received him: for they were all waiting for him' (Luke 8:40)

(117c) [tad t′ʃɪt ˈbak ə̃sə ˈtau:rə]
*t'ad cheet **back** ayns y tourey*
'they come back in the summer' (*HLSM* II: 73)

The usual form meaning 'back' in the other Gaelic languages, Ir. *ar ais*, ScG. *air ais*, exists in TM *er ash*, but usually has a specialized sense, especially in the collocation *cheet er-ash* 'to spring forth, flourish, germinate', used especially of plants, as well as metaphorically (118a, b). *Cheet er-ash* may also have the sense 'come to light, be discovered, found out' (118c,d).

(118a) *ayns y voghrey ver oo er dty rass dy **heet er-ash***
'in the morning shalt thou make thy seed to flourish' (Isaiah 17: 11)

(118b) *Cur-my-ner, neem's red noa y yannoo: eer nish hene te **cheet er-ash**; nagh der shiu geill da?*
'Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it?' (Isaiah 43: 19)

---

[32] Apart from *ceau thombaacey* 'to consume tobacco' on the model of Ir. *caith tobac*.
[33] e.g. *leeid me reesht gys y raad cair liorish leid ny aghtyn as hee oo hene mie* 'bring me back [to the right way] by such means as to thee shall seem meet' (PSD: 1).

(118c) *Tra va mee kiarit dy laanaghey Israel, eisht **haink** peccah Ephraim **er-ash**, as olkys Samaria*
'When I would have healed Israel, then the iniquity of Ephraim was discovered, and the wickedness of Samaria' (Hosea 7:1)

(118d) *cha vel nhee erbee follit nagh jig gys soilshey: ny nhee erbee keillit, **nagh jig er-ash***
'there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known' (Matthew 10: 26)

Use of *er ash* to mean 'back' is occasionally attested in TM, however (119):

(119) *ta'n obbyr er churt yn rhumatism **er ash** dow*
'the work has brought the rheumatism back to me' (NBHR: 155)

In TM, *cheet er-ash* would normally be interpreted as 'spring forth, come to light' etc., whereas 'return, come back' would be *cheet back* or *cheet reesht* 'come again'. In RM, however, *cheet er ash* would be generally interpreted as 'come back' (120), and the TM senses seem not to be widely known (although *çheet er-ash* is given by Goodwin (1901: 64) alongside *çheet rish* for 'showing itself, appearing'). Fargher (1979: 55) gives only *er-ash* for 'back' and ignores *back* altogether. A useful semantic distinction has thus been lost in the name of purism. For the borrowing of 'back' in Irish, cf. Ó Curnáin (2007: 2039).

(120) [tʃɪɛː heŋk mi eˈɹaʃ ren mi miˈdʒɛːᵊl ɹiʃ filiː]
*tra haink mee **er ash** ren mee meeiteil rish Phillie*
'when I came back I met Phillie' (TCM)

In TM, various expressions exist for 'I like'. The most common is *s'liack lhiam* / *s'laik lhiam*, incorporating a borrowing of English 'like' into a Gaelic copula construction (121a,b,c); there is also *s'mie lhiam* (Ir. *is maith liom* 'is good with me') (121d) and *s'taittin lhiam* (Ir. *taitin* 'please') (121e), both of which appear occasionally in Classical Manx but are unattested in terminal speech, and *ta mee taitnyssagh er* 'I am pleased with, fond of [lit. on]' (121f).[34]

(121a) *Fow dou ee, son **s'laik lhiam** ee dy mie*
'Get her for me; for she pleaseth me well' (Judges 14:3)

(121b) *cha nhimmey Manninagh **nagh laik lesh** chengey ny mayrey*
'there are not many Manxmen who do not like the mother tongue' (*Mona's Herald* 22.12.1840)

---

[34] Also with English borrowing, *fond er* / *jeh* 'fond of' (*HLSM* II: 175).

(121c) [slak l'ẹm ə ˈboːl ʃọː]
       s'liack lhiam *y boayl shoh*
       'I like this place' (*HLSM* II: 415)

(121d) *Ta'n sleih cairal fakin shoh, as **s'mie lhieu** eh*
       'The righteous see it, and are glad [they like it]' (Job 22:19)

(121e) *vagh ny inneenyn fer **taitnysagh er** yn cheshagh ock*
       'the girls would be very fond of their company' (NBHR: 168)

In RM, however, *s'mie lhiam* is the only construction commonly taught to learners (cf. SJ: 15) and the most frequent construction encountered in speech and writing (although Faragher (1979: 458) includes *s'laik lhiam* and *s'taittin lhiam*) (122). The preference for *s'mie lhiam* appears to stem from a desire to avoid the use of an English-derived form, imitation of the Irish *is maith liom*, and perhaps the fact that the construction is easy to explain as 'X is good with me'. One might compare the situation in Welsh, where *licio*, *leicio* is the usual translation found in native usage, but native *hoffi* is taught to learners and in schools.

(122a) [ˈsmailjəm beːəxə əˈsɔː]
       s'mie lhiam *beaghey ayns shoh*
       'I like living here' (TCM)

(122b) [ha mai ljam laksə]
       cha mie lhiam *Laksaa*
       'I don't like Laxey' (TCM)

As Broderick (2015: 46) notes, the logically possible preterite / conditional form *by vie lhiam* 'I like / I would like' does not seem to be attested in TM. *Baillym* (G. *b' áil liom*) 'I wish, would like' seems to have been usual in TM, along with the present tense *saillym* 'I want to' (117):

(123a) *Nish mychione giootyn spyrrydoil, vraaraghyn, **cha baillym** shiu ve meehushtagh*
       'Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant' (1 Corinthians 12:1)

(123b) *Shickyr rish yn Ooilley-niartal **baillym's** loayrt*
       'Surely I would speak to the Almighty' (Job 13:3)

(123c) [bɛːlim ˈgɔl]
       baillym *goll*
       'I'd like to go' (*HLSM* II: 22)

Note that *saillym*, *baillym* is in TM usually followed by a clause, rather than a noun phrase as semantic object, although there are occasional exceptions (123).

(124)   *Hreisht eh ayns Jee; lhig da eh y livrey nish my **saillish eh**: son dooyrt eh, She mac Yee*
        mee
        'He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the
        Son of God' (Matthew 27:43)

By liack lhiam etc. seems to be restricted to preterite meaning in TM (119). It may be used in the conditional sense 'I would like' in RM, although not as frequently as *by vie lhiam* (Broderick 2015: 45–6).

(125)   *As **by-laik lesh** y ven aeg*
        'And the maiden pleased him' (Esther 2:9)

The use of *by vie lhiam* as a general-purpose polite way of expressing desire, especially for concrete objects (126), would seem to imitate polite English usage (cf. the discussion of Kneen's 'polite phrases' in Appendix §2). In TM, however, more direct expressions using e.g. *laccal* 'want' might be expected.

(126)   ***By vie lhiam** jough*
        'I would like a drink' (SJ: 16)

A renewed interest in the TM texts has sparked an increased desire for authenticity in some circles with the RM community, leading to the adoption of forms such as *back* and *s'liack lhiam* by some speakers (Lewin 2015: 26–7), although the purist hyper-Gaelic forms remain more widespread.

5.4. Other replacement of TM forms with borrowed Gaelic forms

5.4.1. 'Depend on'

The TM idiom for 'to depend on' in the sense of one circumstance or thing being contingent on another is *lhie er* lit. 'to lie on' (G. *luigh ar*) (127).

(127a) *kyndagh dy vel wheesh **lhie er** lheid y Chredjue 've ain*
        'because so very much depends upon our having such a faith' (SC: 39)

(127b) *Dy vel ooilley **lhie er** bannaght Yee*
        'that all depends on God's blessing' (SW: 118)

However, this idiom does not appear to be widely known or used in RM, and *croghey er* (lit. 'to hang on') is in general use (128):

(128)　[te kɪɔːxə ɛː nə ɒltʲɹən kɛːɹ əs fiːd]
　　　　*t'eh **croghey er** ny olteynyn Kiare as Feed*
　　　　'it depends on the members of the House of Keys' (TCM)

Croghey er is the principal translation given by Fargher (1979: 227), who does not include *lhie er* at all:

> **depend**, *v.i.* **1**. crogh (er) *v.n.* croghey (er). *It all depends on that,* T'eh ooilley croghey er shen. **2**. *It depends on you*, She er dty laue hene eh. **3**. *I can depend on him*, Foddym treishteil er. *The child depends on its mother,* Ta'n lhiannoo treishteil er e voir. *(Idiom) I depend on myself these days*, Ta mee shassoo er my chione hene ny laghyn shoh. **4**. *That all depends!* Bee shen rere myr huittys eh. *You may depend on it*, Foddee oo ve shickyr jeh.
> 　　　　(Fargher 1979: 227)

Croghey er, apparently based on Sc.G. *a bhith an crochadh air* 'to depend on, be dependent upon' (lit. 'be in hanging on'). Two of Fargher's other examples seem to be based on Irish idioms given by De Bhaldraithe, and do not originate in TM:

> It depends on you, *ar do láimh atá*. That depends, it all depends, *beidh sé sin de réir mar a thitfidh*.
> 　　　　(De Bhaldraithe 1959 s.v. 'depend')

Fargher's Manx version of the first of De Bhaldraithe's expressions is not only not a TM idiom, so far as is known, but is also ungrammatical, as the substantive verb would be required, as in the Ir., i.e. *she er dty laue hene t'eh* 'it is on your own hand that it is'. These expressions do not appear to have gained currency.

　　　　The fact that *lhie er* in this sense has not come down into widespread usage in RM may have to do with the fact that phrasal verbs are not well-covered by the dictionaries (Cregeen and Kelly), and the texts in which *lhie er* 'depend on' is frequent, such as SC and SW, have until recently been relatively inaccessible owing to scarceness of copies, and there has been little emphasis on the reading of TM religious literature in the language movement since the 1970s (Broderick 2015: 38). Scanned versions of these and other texts are now freely available online (Lewin 2015a: 29).

5.4.2. 'Alone'

In TM 'alone', 'on my own', 'by myself' is *my lomarcan* lit. 'in my lonely person' (G. *lomracán*) or *orrym pene* lit. 'on myself' (G. *orm féin*) (129):

(129a) *cha vel yn Ayr er my aagail **my lomarcan***
'the Father hath not left me alone' (John 8:29)

(129b) *Shass **ort hene**, ny tar my choair; son ta mee ny s'casherick na uss*
Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou (Isaiah 65:5)

(129c) *Son dy vel ad er n'gholl seose gys Assyria, assyl oaldey **er hene**: ta Ephraim er vailley caarjyn*
'For they are gone up to Assyria, a wild ass alone by himself: Ephraim hath hired lovers' (Hosea 8:9)

However, *lhiam pene* rather than *orrym pene* is common in RM (along with *my lomarcan*), apparently on the model of Ir. *liom féin*, ScG. *leam fhèin*. This is the form given in Kneen's (1931: 189) grammar and in Fargher (1979: 24), neither of which mention the construction with *er*.

5.4.3. 'Hungry', 'thirsty'

In TM, 'hungry' is usually expressed by using the noun *acc(y)rys* 'hunger' (ScG. *acras*) as a verbal noun with progressive *g-* (*HLSM* II: 183, no example sentence given) or a derived adjective *accryssagh* 'hungry' (130):

(130a) *haink fer jiu magh ayns yn baathey beg dy gheddyn beagey, son ve feer **eccrysagh***
'one of them came out in the little boat to get food, for he was very hungry' (NBHR: 128)

(130b) *Shen-y-fa my ta dty noid **accryssagh**, cur da bee*
'Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him' (Romans 12:20)

Similarly 'thirsty' is *paa* (G. *?ag pathadh*) (131a) or derived adjective *paagh* (131b):

(131a) [tɛː mi pɛː]
*ta mee **paa***
'I am thirsty' (*HLSM* II: 344)

(131b) *dagh unnane ta **paagh**, tar-jee gys ny ushtaghyn*
'every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters' (Isaiah 55:1)

In RM, however, these concepts are usually expressed with abstract nouns *accrys* 'hunger' and *paays* 'thirst' and the preposition *er* 'on' expressing the experiencer (LM: 16).

> Now we have Row accrys er? Was there hunger on him, was he hungry? We can reply that there was, Va, or a little more fully,
>
> Va, va accrys er. He was, he was hungry. Va, va accrys er.
> (LM: 16)

Under 'hungry', Fargher (1979: 398) first gives *Ta accrys orrym* lit. 'there is hunger on me', followed by *Ta mee gaccrys*, which is marked as 'P[opular; slang]'. Under 'thirsty' (ibid.: 774), he gives *paagh* and *paa*, but *Ta paays orrym* lit. 'there is thirst on me' as the only translation of 'I am thirsty'. There would appear to have been a deliberate attempt to promote a more distinctively Gaelic and non-English idiom at the expense of normal TM usage, on the model of Ir. *tá ocras orm*, ScG. *tha an t-acras orm*, as well as the model of the use of the construction with *er* with certain emotions in Manx such as *aggle* 'fear' and *farg* 'anger' (132):

(132a) *Ny-yeih, ga **dy vel aggle orrym** ny cheayrtyn: foast ta mee coyrt my hreishteil aynyds*
    'Nevertheless, though I am sometime afraid: yet put I my trust in thee' (Psalms 56:3)

(132b) *as **va farg er**, as hie eh seose gys thie e ayrey*
    'And his anger was kindled, and he went up to his father's house' (Judges 14:19)

Note also occasional usages with *cheet* 'come' (133):

(133) [hęŋk ˈpɛːs ˈmuːr ˈɑrəm]
    haink paays mooar orrym
    'a great thirst came on me' (*HLSM* II: 345)

Cf. Gell (1989: 24), '[m]any nouns are used colloquially as verbs, but 'ta accrys orrym' is a more literary form'.

5.4.4. 'To look (appear)'

This is generally expressed in Manx with *jeeaghyn* 'to look' (cf. ScG. *coimhead*, *amharc*, Ir. *féachaint*, *breathnú*, *amharc*, Welsh *edrych*) (134):

(134a) *Ta my chaarjyn er ghellal dy molteyragh myr awin, as myr ny strooanyn t'ad lheïe ersooyl; Ta **jeeaghyn** doo lesh y rio; as ayndoo ta'n sniaghtey follit*
    'My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook, and as the stream of brooks they pass away; Which are blackish [look black] by reason of the ice, and wherein the snow is hid' (Job 6:15–16)

(134b) *va yn ear **jeaghyn** quiagh, ginsh dy row gheay as fliaghey er gerrey*
    'the sky looked strange, telling that wind and rain were near' (NBHR: 135)

This usage of *jeeaghyn* is also frequent in RM. However, another construction, not attested in TM, is sometimes encountered, which is modelled on an Ir. use of *cuma* 'shape, form', Manx *cummey* (135). Fargher (1979: 466), gives both constructions, although the version with *cummey* comes first:

He looks happy, Ta cummey maynrey er. T'eh jeeaghyn maynrey.
(Fargher 1979: 466)

(135)   va cummey dreeys orroo
        'they looked bored', lit. 'there was a shape of boredom on them' (TS: 29)

Cf. Ir. tá cuma spéisiúil air 'it looks interesting' (<www.foclóir.ie> s.v. 'look').

Another example of a hyper-Gaelicism in the RM lexicon is the new copula construction s'treisht lhiam 'I hope' (§4.1.11.8) for TM ta mee treishteil.

5.5. New usages and idioms based on TM but differing in details

5.5.1. Quail 'meet'

In TM, 'to meet' is frequently expressed by the phrasal verbs cheet quail X or goll quail X in. 'to come / go in the meeting of X' (136). This involves the complex preposition quail (G. i gcómhdháil), which would have originally taken the genitive, and has pronominal forms 1sg. my whail, 2sg. dty whail, 3sg.m. ny whail, 3sg.f. ny quail, 3pl. nyn guail. Quaiyl (usually so spelt) also exists as an independent noun meaning 'court (of law)'.

(136a) As haink Judah gys Gilgal, dy **gholl quail y ree**, dy choyrt eh harrish Jordan
        'And Judah came to Gilgal, to go to meet the king, to conduct the king over Jordan' (2 Samuel 19:15)

(136b) As cur-my-ner myrgeddin, t'eh nish er e raad dy **heet dty whail**
        'And also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee' (Exodus 4:14)

(136c) cur-my-ner **haink Yeesey nyn guail**, gra, Dy vannee diu
        'behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail' (Matthew 28:9)

(136c) [hɪɡəm ðə ˈxwɛːl ęke rɛːd ˈtęzən]
        higgym dty whaiyl ec y raad tessen
        'I'll meet you at the crossroads' (HLSM II: 357)

In RM, however, the construction is often different. A common variation is the use of a redundant pronominal element ny with a following noun phrase; compare TM quail + noun phrase (136a) with RM use of ny whaiyl (137):

(137a) va caa da Thom **cheet ny whaiyl ymmodee sleih** gagh oie
        'Tom had an opportunity to meet many people each night' (Skeeal.: 23)

(137b) haink eh **ny whaiyl ny fir elley**
        'he met the others' (Skeeal. 26)

This usage is probably to be traced to inaccurate information in textbooks such as Kneen (1931: 188), Goodwin and Thomson (1966: 55), Kewley Draskau (2010: 184) and Fargher (1979: 488, see below) (cf. Lewin 2011b):

> The following lacks a simple preposition, 'towards, to meet':
> Sg. 1 my whaiyl, 2 dty whaiyl, 3m. ny whaiyl, 3f. ny quaiyl;
> Pl. nyn guaiyl.
> > (Goodwin and Thomson 1966: 55)

> *I met a man*. Haink mee ny whaiyl dooinney.
> > (Kneen 1931: 188)

As well as the verb *meeiteil*, 'meet' is usually translated by *goll/çheet ny whaiyl*, with the appropriate form of the possessive:

> *Haink mee ny whaiyl dooinney*   I met a man
> *Haink ee my whaiyl*   She met me
> *Higym dty whaiyl*   I shall meet you
> > (Kewley Draskau 2010: 184)

In fact, as (136a) shows, there was no lack of a citation form *quail*,[35] which is well attested in TM, and there is no reason to expect **Haink mee ny whaiyl dooinney* and similar; in TM this would be *Haink mee quail dooinney*.

Fargher (1979: 488) implies by his examples that the possessive should agree in number and gender with the following noun, although he gives 'tar quail *v.n.* çheet quail' as the citation form:

> *I met a man*, Haink mee ny whail dooinney. *I met a woman*, Haink mee ny quail ben.
> > (Fargher 1979: 488)

An alternative variant in RM involves adding the preposition *rish*, perhaps by analogy with the synonymous *meeiteil rish* (<English 'meet') (138):

(138)   [heŋk mi xweːl riʃ ən ɡau]
        *haink mee **quail rish** yn Gaaue*
        'I met the Gaaue'[36] (BC)

---

[35] Thomson also makes the same erroneous claim about a lack of a 'simple preposition form' about *my yei* 'after me' (G. *i mo dhiaidh*) (Goodwin and Thomson 1966: 54), despite the fact that Goodwin in the first edition of the *First Lessons* gives the example *jeeaghyn jei* 'looking after' (Goodwin 1901: 64), cf. *Creeaghyn deiney gannooinaghey lesh aggle, as lesh jeeaghyn **jei** ny reddyn ta ry heet er y thalloo* 'Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth' (Luke 21:26), *Bee yn Vriwnys sheign cheet **jeiy** shen fegooish peal* 'the judgment which must follow [come after that], will be without appeal' (SW: 73).

[36] 'The Blacksmith', i.e. John Kneen, one of the last native speakers.

There is also a variant using *rish* and the possessive, which is reflexive, agreeing with the subject (139):

(139)   *higmayd* **nyn guaiyl ry** *cheilley*
        'we will meet one another' (Skeeal.: 59)

The expected TM construction is sometimes found in RM (140):

(140)   [heŋk mi kweil iljəm ə ɹadlax]
        haink mee **quail** *Illiam y Radlagh*
        'I met William Radcliffe' (JC)

5.5.2. *Jannoo / goaill ymmyd jeh* 'to use'

'To use' in TM is usually *jannoo ymmyd jeh* 'to make use of' (*ymmyd* < G. *adhmad*) (141a,b) or the borrowing *(g)usal* (141c).

(141a)   *cha vel shin er* **n'yannoo ymmyd jeh***'n phooar shoh*
         'we have not used this power' (1 Corinthians 9:12)

(141b)   *Agh ta fys ain dy vel y leigh mie, my ta dooinney* **jannoo ymmyd lowal jeh**
         'But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully' (1 Timothy 1:8)

(141c)   *Tad* **gusal** *mennic eh, agh cha vel y cheeall my chione cre te meanal*
         'They often use it, but I haven't a clue what it means' (*Monas Herald* 27.12.1833)

However, a variant *goaill ymmyd jeh* lit. 'take use of' not attested in TM has become common in RM, perhaps because it corresponds less directly to English 'make use of' (142):

(142a)   *Shoh mess yn laboraght echey fey feed blein dy chooney lhieu ooilley (myr chiare eshyn) ta gynsaghey as* **goaill ymmyd jeh***'n Ghailck ain*
         'This is the fruit of his labour for twenty years to help all those (as he intended) who learn and use our Manx language' (RLT 1969)

(142b)   *er yn oyr dy row fys eck dy row potecareeyn* **goaill ymmyd jeh** *pennyn glassey*
         'because she knew that pharmacists used green pens' (MC: 228)

5.5.3. *Cur yn olk er*

A common idiom for 'annoy, upset, offend' in RM is *cur yn olk er* lit. 'put the evil on' (143).

(143)   [ha mai ljam taiən bwiː tə sɜːtʃ də ɹəd em məˈçoːn taiən bwiː tad kɔɹ ən ɔlk ɒɹəm]
        Cha mie lhiam thieyn bwee; ta sorçh dy red aym mychione thieyn bwee, t'ad **cur yn olk orrym**
        'I don't like yellow houses; I have a sort of thing about yellow houses, they annoy me' (TCM)

This does not seem to be attested in TM, where *cur sneih er* is used for 'annoy, vex' (144):

(144)   **ver ad sneih erriu**, *'sy cheer raad nee shiu cummal*
        '[they] shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell' (Numbers 33:55)

The origin of *cur yn olk er* is unclear. It is not found in Kneen (1938), but Fargher (1979: 719) has *cur olk er* (without the article) for 'to spite', with the example *Ren ee eh dy chur olk er* 'She did it to spite him'; this may be modelled on De Bhaldraithe (1959 s.v. 'spite') who has *cuirim olc, cancar, ar*. Gell (1989: 24) has *cur y drogh er* 'put the bad on, making one mad, vexing', and the example *ta'n taggloo echeysyn cur y drogh orryms* 'his talking annoys me'. *Drogh* (G. *droch*) is normally a prefixed adjective, and there appears to be no attestation of its use in TM or the other Gaelic dialects as a noun. Kelly (1866: 67) has *drog* as a noun 'evil, misfortune, mishap ill-luck' with the example *yn drog ort* 'ill betide you'; reference is made to Welsh *drwg* and Irish *droch*, and in view of the apparent final stop it is unclear whether this is in fact genuine TM or one of Kelly's inventions or borrowings (cf. Thomson 1990). If the RM usage is not a genuine TM idiom, it is perhaps modelled on ScG. *cuir dragh air* 'annoy, bother', with *dragh* being phonosemantically or orthographically associated with Manx *drogh*, with *olk* later substituted. Brian Stowell[37] recalls an occasion on which Robert L. Thomson "corrected" *cur y drogh er* to *cur yn olk er* on the basis that *drogh* is not a noun.

5.6. Confusion between TM items owing to phonological and semantic similarity: *ennagh* 'some' and *erbee* 'any'

Ennagh 'some, a certain' (G. *éigineach*, Early Manx *egnagh*) and *erbee* (G. *ar bith*) 'any' are often confused in RM, apparently because of the semantic and phonological similarity (145); context, however, usually makes clear what is meant. The phonological similarity is heightened by the fact that *ennagh* in both TM and RM may have final stress (*HLSM* II: 146), probably for rhythmic reasons and by analogy with *erbee*.

(145a) [va mi kuməl unˈʃen lesə leʃ mə pɛːɹəntən son fiːd fiːd bliːn nə ruð əˈbiː məˈʃen]
        *va mee cummal ayns shen lesh y… lesh my paarantyn son feed… feed blein ny **red erbee** myr shen*
        'I was living there with my parents for twenty years or something ["anything"] like that' (TCM)

(145b) [ha nel u boɹət məˈkjɔn ˈpasˌpɔːt nə ˈɹudəˌnax məˈʃen]
        *cha nel oo boirit mychione passport ny **red ennagh** myr shen*
        'you're not worried about a passport or anything ["something"] like that' (TCM)

---

[37] Personal communication 02.09.2015. I am grateful to Chris Sheard and Robert Carswell for pointing out the examples in Gell, Fargher and Kelly here.

5.7. Backdated borrowings

A few English / international lexical items have been borrowed into Manx and subjected to sound changes as if they had been borrowed at an earlier period (Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 41–2). This rather antiquarian process is adopted and described by Thomson (1970: ii) in his supplement to Kneen's dictionary:

> The supplement contains a number of new words (as Kneen's dictionary already did) made up on the following conservative principles: first, regular derivation and compounding of native elements (processes which have drawn extensively but critically on Kelly's English-Manx dictionary); second, figurative extension of the meanings of existing words; and third, and only under pressure, borrowing from other languages, and preferably with the borrowing assumed to be ancient and therefore affected by the sound-changes which have modified other Manx words in the course of time.
> (Thomson 1970: ii)

Two commonly-used examples of this process are *chellveeish* 'television' (cf. Ir. *teilifís*) and *chellvane* 'telephone' (Thomson 1970: 112, Thomson 1991: 136, Fargher 1979: 766), which replace Kneen's (1970: 72–3) suggested borrowing *telefon* and calque *foddey-reayrtys* lit. 'far vision'. Broderick (2015: 31) claims that 'television' and 'telephone' 'were put in an 18th century phonological setting'; however, the imagined period must be considerably earlier, as late borrowings (eighteenth century onwards) generally preserve the English form largely unchanged, and the change /oː/ > /ɛː/ in 'telephone' > [tʃelˈvɛːn] is early as a native development, cf. *airh* 'gold' (G. *ór*) (Phillips *ayr*, *aer* but also *aur*, Thomson (1953: 148)).

Other examples include the RM adaptation of English 'station' and 'million' as *stashoon* (Fargher 1979: 730) and *millioon*, on the pattern of the mediaeval borrowings from English / Anglo-Norman *lessoon* (< 'lesson', *leçon*), *resoon* (< 'reason', *raison*) and *ashoon* (< 'nation'), which preserve the original stress (cf. Thomson 1991: 132), whereas late native borrowings would have the modern English stress pattern (*million* is attested in TM) (Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 41).

5.8. Influence from English semantic categories

5.8.1. *reaghey*

In TM the verb *reaghey* (from *rea* 'flat, even', G. *réidh*) can mean 'rid, get rid of' (146a,b) (cf. the phrasal verb *geddyn rey rish* 'to get rid of' (146c), Ir. *faigh réidh le*, Arran ScG. 'fhuair e réidh 's e, réidh sa chùis, *he got clear or rid of it, rid of the business*' (Dwelly s.v. *réidh*)), or 'judge, settle, decide (a case, matter)') (146d,e).

(146a) *As nee shiu yn cheer y **reaghey** jeh e chummaltee, as baghey ayn*
'And ye shall dispossess the inhabitants of the land, and dwell therein' (Numbers 33:53)

(146b) *Eshyn ta goail shoh gys e chree, cha jean eh dy bragh coontey e hraa myr laad er e laue,—cha shir eh son saaseyn dy **reaghey** rish*
'He that lays this to heart, will never think his time a burthen; will never seek for ways to get it off his hands' (SW: 162)

(146c) ***hooar** ad **rea rish** ny doghanyn oc*
'the diseases departed from them [they got rid of their diseases]' (Acts 19:12)

(146d) *As haink ny ostyllyn as y chanstyr cooidjagh dy **reaghey** yn chooish shoh*
'And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter' (Acts 15:6)

(146e) *As ta mee er chlashtyn my-dty-chione dy vel oo son cur bun er ashlishyn, as **reaghey** cooishyn doillee*
'And I have heard of thee, that thou canst make interpretations, and dissolve doubts' (Daniel 5:16)

From this second sense, RM speakers have extended the meaning of *reaghey* to mean 'decide' in the sense of 'make up one's mind, resolve to do something' (147a,b), and also 'organize, arrange' (147c). The latter sense is perhaps influenced by Ir. *réitigh*, which as well as meanings such as 'solve, resolve, elucidate', which are similar to Manx *reaghey*, may mean 'adjust, arrange, put in order' (Ó Dónaill 1977 s.v. *réitigh*).

(147a) *Va gunney ec Thom as un 'astyr **reagh***[38] *eh dy gholl er ny conneeyn marish Illiam y Kennaugh*
'Tom had a gun and one afternoon he decided to go [hunting] rabbits with William Kennaugh' (Skeeal.: 23)

(147b) ***reagh** ad dy hannaghtyn rish tammylt beg*
'they decided to stay for a short while' (Skeeal.: 24)

(147c) ***Reagh** ad ad hene ayns daa chummey-chaggee*
'They formed [organized themselves] into two squadrons' (RRVE p. 47)

This semantic extension is partially a result of assuming a Manx lexical item which may correspond to one sense of an English lexical item (here 'decide') can be used for all of the English word's senses, as well as perceived lexical gaps as no other obvious translation for

---

[38] The use of *reagh* as the stem is unexpected as the verbal noun is etymologically *rea-aghey*, i.e. ScG. *rèidheachadh*, and the stem would be *reaee*, ScG. *rèidhich*. Kelly (1866: 156) gives *reaiee* as the 'imperative mood' (i.e. the stem), but *reaghit* as the passive participle 'decided, done, settled'; Cregeen (1835: 134) gives no stem or finite forms but gives *reait* 'decided, disentangled, unravelled, cleared, settled'. Cf. RM *aa-vioghit* 'revived' (< *aa-vioghey*, ScG, *ath-bheòthachadh*), but Cregeen (1835: 25) *bioit*.

'decide' and 'organize' existed. In TM, 'decide' in the sense 'make up one's mind' might be translated by a calque of the latter English idiom (cf. ScG. *dèan suas t' inntinn*), or perhaps by using *kiarail* 'intend, resolve' (148b).

(148a) *As ren shin **nyn aignaghyn** dy slane **y yannoo seose** dy choyrlaghey nyn sheshaghyn Creestee, ad dy yannoo ny oddagh ad ayns cooney lesh ny Methodeeyn Sostynagh*
'And we fully made up our minds to advise our fellow Christians to do what they could in helping the English Methodists' (*Mona's Herald* 07.08.1850)

(148b) *ve jeaghyn dy row ad er **yannoo seose ny aignaghyn** dy yannoo irree-magh as yn vainshteragh ad hene*
'it seemed they had made up their minds to rebel and to do the captaining themselves' (NBHR: 126)

(148c) *As **chiare** ny Hewnyn dy yannoo myr v'ad er n'ghoaill toshiaght, as myr va Mordecai er scrieu huc*
'And the Jews undertook to do as they had begun, and as Mordecai had written unto them' (Esther 9:23)

5.8.2. *reihys* 'election'

The RM form *reihys* 'election' (Fargher 1979: 49, Thomson 1970: 94) (also Fargher *ard-reihys* 'general election') adds an abstract noun forming suffix *-ys* to the verbal noun *reih* 'choosing, choice' (G. *rogha*). This reflects an English semantic distinction between 'choice' and 'election', which is not made e.g. in ScG. *taghadh* (Manx *teiy* 'to choose, pick'), in which the bare verbal noun is used without any further suffix (but cf. Ir. *toghchán* 'election' < *togha* 'choice'), or German *Wahl* 'choice, election' (Lewin 2015: 27, Broderick 2015: 49).

5.8.3. *preeu-valley* 'capital (city)'

In TM, and in RM until recently, no distinction has been made between 'city' and 'capital (city)', *ard-valley* (lit. 'high town') serving for both. However, the prefix *preeu* (G. *príomh*) 'primary' has recently been borrowed into RM to create *preeu-valley* 'capital (city)' to make the distinction explicit (Lewin 2015: 27, Broderick 2015: 48).

5.8.4. *eie*

TM *eie* (?Ir. *uídh*, *uidhe*, ScG. *ùidh*) is found in certain idioms, *cur eie er* 'to interfere with, meddle with', *ta eie aym er* 'I have to do with', *gyn eie er* 'besides, not to mention, let alone' (149).

(149a) *Faag-jee veue ny deiney shoh, as **ny cur-jee eie orroo***
'Refrain from these men, and let them alone' (Acts 5:38)

(149b) *As cur-my-ner deïe ad, gra, **Cre'n eie t'ayd orrin**, Yeesey Vac Yee? vel oo er jeet dy nyn dorchaghey roish y traa?*
'And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?' (Matthew 8:29)

(149b) *As va earroo cloan Venjamin er ny ghoaill ec y traa shen, ayns ny ard-valjyn shey thousaneyn as feed va tayrn y chliwe, **gyn eïe er** cummaltee Ghibeah, va'n earroo oc shiaght cheead reih deiney*
'And the children of Benjamin were numbered at that time out of the cities twenty and six thousand men that drew sword, beside the inhabitants of Gibeah, which were numbered seven hundred chosen men' (Judges 20:15)

Cregeen (1835: 60) translates *eie* as 'idea', giving the example sentence *cha row eie aym er* 'I had no idea of it', and in a separate entry as 'meddle' giving the example *cha dug mee eie er* 'I did not meddle with him or it', with the comment '[t]his word may seem strange as it has no substantive in English'. The first sense and example would appear to be an instance of the construction in (149b), rather than a separate lexeme with the range of meanings of English 'idea'. Nevertheless, in RM, *eie* has been used to mean 'idea' in the sense 'thought, concept, notion, proposal' etc. (150). Fargher (1979: 401) also gives *smooinaght* 'thought', which would probably be the natural TM rendering, but *eie* (pl. *ieeghyn*) is given as the primary translation.

(150a) *By vooar yn **eie** eh*
'It was a great idea' (Fargher 1979: 401)

(150b) *Cre mychione goll dys yn Thie Bane ayns Purt ny hInshey? Aye, shen **eie** mie*
'What about going to the White House in Peel? Aye, that's a good idea' (LdT: 5)

5.9. Influence from English syntax

Manx does not have a straightforward equivalent of English present participles used as adjectives, e.g. 'interesting', 'exciting', 'frightening' etc. Sometimes a non-verbal adjective may be used, e.g. TM/RM *agglagh* 'frightening, terrible', RM *symoil* 'interesting' (§5.1). For 'exciting', no straightforward TM equivalent existed. TM *greesaghey* 'kindle, stir' (G. *gríosaigh*) (151) from *greesagh* 'embers' (G. *gríosach*) has been semantically extended to mean 'excite' (Thomson 1970: 95, Fargher 1979: 289).

(151a) *Cur-jee my-ner, ooilley shiuish ta* **greesaghey** *aile, t'er nyn gruinnaghey mygeayrt lesh smarageyn; shooill-jee ayns soilshey yn aile eu hene, as ny smarageyn ta shiu hene er n'oaddey.*
'Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks: walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled' (Isaiah 50:11)

(151b) *Ta smooinaghtyn er olk ayns nyn greeaghyn: as dy kinjagh* **greesaghey** *seose anvea*
'Who imagine mischief in their hearts: and stir up strife all the day long' (Psalms 140:2)

(151c) [griːðɑ̯xə nə ˈkriːxən ˈĩŋən]
greesaghey *ny creeaghyn ainyn*
'stirring up our hearts' (*HLSM* II: 210)

Fargher (1979: 289) translates 'excited' logically enough with the passive participle *greesit*, but 'exciting' is given as *greesee*, which appears to be the genitive form of *greesaghey*. This could perhaps be used attributively with the meaning 'of excitement', but RM speakers have taken it as an adjective and it may be used predicatively, which is not possible for genitives in TM (152):

(152) *Ga dy row y slane cooish feer* **ghreesee***, cha row ee er n'insh veg my-e-chione da caarjyn ny da nabooyn*
'Though the whole matter was very exciting, she hadn't told friends or neighbours anything about it' (TS: 29)

5.10. Influence from English style

In RM texts, which are often translated from English, there is a tendency to render English phrasing literally, rather than in a paraphrase which would be more usual in TM (Lewin 2015: 27–8, Broderick 2015: 51–3); cf. the following TM renderings of English specialized lexis by paraphrases (153).

(153a) *jeh roshtyn vooar as fo ta ymmodee dy rheddyn er ny hoiggal*
'very large and comprehensive' lit. 'of great extent and under which many things are understood' (FRC: 57)

(153b) *geaishtagh rish sleih aegey ta gynsaghey nyn Gredjue*
'catechising' lit. 'listening to young people who are learning their faith' (FRC: 52)

The following statement is made at the beginning of each episode of the Manx Radio programme *Traa dy Liooar* ('Time Enough') (154):

(154) *She co-yannoo y CCG as Radio Vannin ta 'Traa dy Liooar'*
       '*Traa dy Liooar* is a BBC and Manx Radio co-production'[39]

This is a word-for-word translation of the English, with *co-yannoo*, a neologism meaning literally 'co-doing, co-making' for 'co-production'; TM tends to avoid abstract nouns of this nature. Lewin (2015: 52) suggests an alternative translation which uses the TM strategy of paraphrase and avoids abstract neologisms (155):

(155) *Ren y BBC as Radio Vannin gobbraghey ry-cheilley dy chroo 'Traa dy Liooar'*
       lit. 'The BBC and Manx Radio worked together to create *Traa dy Liooar*' (after Lewin 2015: 52)

Broderick (2015: 52), however, claims that this 'paraphrase is quite wordy and for "officialese" or "Government Manx" compact forms of the sort found today in Irish and Scottish Gaelic (and now Manx) are required to meet modern needs'. It is not entirely clear why conforming to English style is so necessary for 'Government Manx'; nor is (155) much more 'wordy' than the original.

Other examples of following the English preference for specialized lexical items in preference to paraphrases are shown in (156).

(156) *fo chrackanagh* 'subcutaneous' (MC: 226) (Fargher 1979: 746), rather than *fo'n chrackan* 'under the skin'
       erskyn dooghyssagh 'supernatural' (TS: 28), rather than *erskyn dooghys* 'above nature' (Fargher 1979: 751)
       Gaelgeyr 'Manx speaker' (<Ir. *Gaeilgeoir*) (Fargher 1979: 479), *Bretnisheyr* 'Welsh speaker' (<Ir. *Breatnaiseoir*), rather than *dooinney Gaelgagh* 'Manx-speaking man', etc., *sleih ta Bretnish oc* 'people who have Welsh', etc.

5.11. Loss of synonymy

Where more or less interchangeable synonyms exist in TM, often only one item is in common use in RM. For example, TM has three synonymous words for 'wait (for)', *farkiagh (son / er)*

---

[39] As discussed in Lewin (2015: 27) and Broderick (2015: 51), *CCG* is an acronym of *Co-chorp Creeley Goaldagh* 'British Broadcasting Corporation', all the elements of which are RM neologisms. *Co-chorp* is 'corporation' (Fargher 1979: 195) and *creeley* (Fargher 1979: 112) is from Ir. *craoladh* (orig. 'announce, proclaim' (Ó Dónaill 1977)). *Goaldagh* (G. *Gallda(ch)*) means 'foreign' generally in Gaelic and especially 'non-Gaelic', and is used in Scottish Gaelic for 'Lowland, English/Scots-speaking', in Ir. for 'Norman, English', etc. Kelly (1866: 98) glosses *Goaldagh* as 'Welsh, English, foreign, Gaulish', but there is no evidence that this sense was known in TM, and it is also the word in TM for 'guest', which introduces ambiguity. *Bretnagh* is the direct equivalent of 'British', but means 'Welsh' (as in Ir. *Breatnach*). In Scottish Gaelic, 'the BBC' is always left as *am BBC* (oblique *a' BhBC*), which if adopted in Manx would avoid the difficulties of translation and be more easily recognizable, cf. also Welsh *y BBC* /əbiːbiːˈsiː/, less commonly /əbiːbiːˈek/. However, Robert Carswell, the presenter of the programme, informs me (personal communication 04.09.2015) that the use of *CCG* was intended as a joke.

(Ir. *faircsin*), *fieau* (*son / er*) (G. *feitheamh*), *fuirraghtyn* (*rish*) (157c) (Lewin 2011c, Lewin 2015: Broderick 2015: 49–51).

(157a) *va troailtee Sheba **farkiaght orroo***
　　　'the companies of Sheba waited for them' (Job 6:19)

(158b) *As va'n pobble **fieau son** Zacharias, as yindys orroo dy row eh cumrail choud ayns y chiamble*
　　　'The people waited for Zacharias, and marvelled that he tarried so long in the temple' (Luke 1:21)

(157c) *cha jeanagh eh **furriagh rish** piagh erbee gys hooar eh gys y hie dy ghoaill ny shellanyn as y chroosyn*
　　　'He didn't wait for anybody till he got to his house to take the bees out of his trousers' (NBHR: 160)

Of these, *farkiagh* and *fieau* seem to have been the most commonly used (in the sense 'wait for'). Both are found in the Manx of the terminal speakers (*HLSM* II: 158, 166–7), but *fuirraghtyn* is not (in this sense). *Fuirraghtyn* is more commonly used in the sense of 'stay, tarry' in TM. In RM, however, *farkiagh* and *fieau* seem to be largely unknown, and *fuirraghtyn rish* is the form commonly used and taught for 'wait for'. This is probably because *fuirraghtyn rish* has appeared in several widely-used textbooks, in which synonyms are omitted (Goodwin 1901: 64, Goodwin and Thomson 1966: 17, Kneen 1970: 82, Gell 1989: 13, Ó Meara undated: 130). There is no obvious rationale for the choice of *fuirraghtyn* over the synonyms; however, where several interchangeable forms exist, it is probably easier to teach and learn just one. Thomson in his preface to his revised edition of Goodwin's *First Lessons in Manx* uses *fieau* to mean 'expect' (Thomson and Goodwin 1966: *Gys y Lhaihder*), for which *jerkal* (G. *dearc*) would be expected in TM.

5.12. Code-switching and code-mixing

Very little code-switching or code-mixing has been noticed in the spoken RM sources examined here (although note the instance of 'you know' in (75)). This may be because the videos, although relaxed and informal, were made as resources for Manx learners and speakers, and therefore the speakers would have been conscious of an expectation to speak Manx consistently. Nevertheless, in general levels of code-switching and mixing among fluent RM speakers seem low. This presumably has to do with negative or purist attitudes towards English, and perhaps a naïve assumption that when speaking one language (e.g. Manx), that is the language that one should speak for the whole interaction. This is different from the kinds of

assumptions made by those growing up in a native bilingual society, or in a language shift situation. There also seems to be a general aversion to using English words and phrases in Manx speech, although this happens sometimes (see below), when a Manx term is unknown or forgotten, or for effect, emphasis, humour, etc., as in other multilingual communities. In general, knowing and using appropriate Manx lexis is valued, and speakers will often use dictionaries or ask one another if they are unsure of a term.

5.12.1. Nonce borrowings

Occasionally, English words are spontaneously borrowed into Manx in informal speech, sometimes adapted to Manx morphology, e.g. by means of the verbal noun forming suffix *-al* (158).

(158)   [pɹaiˈɔɹəˌtaizəl]
        prioritisal
        'prioritize' (TCM)

This strategy was also widely used in TM; cf. Cregeen (1835: ix) who notes, rather disapprovingly:

> *AL*, added to a verb, has the same meaning as AIL, *ing*, in English, and may be termed the grand *Manksifier-general* of English verbs; as, *trying*, TRYAL; *fixing*, FIXAL, &c., &c.; but not to the credit or honour of those who so make use of it.
>   (Cregeen 1835: ix)

Chapter 3

Analysis and conclusions

1. Manx: a successful revival?

It is probably safe to say that no language revival will be entirely successful in the sense of the revived variety being indistinguishable from the traditional variety, as if no break in intergenerational transmission had occurred. Leaving aside changes introduced consciously for practical purposes (principally the coining of new terminology for concepts which did not exist or were not prominent in the experience of the TM speech community), the impossibility of complete revival is down to two main factors:

(a) Paucity of attested material in the traditional language.

Even the largest corpora of extinct languages will not fully illustrate every lexical item, grammatical item, or semantic nuance which existed in the grammars of living native speakers. Certain components of the language, such as pragmatics, or certain registers or domain-specific lexis may be particularly poorly attested.

(b) Incomplete acquisition by revivalists.

It will not generally be possible for even the most committed or gifted revivalists to absorb fully all of the linguistic data which could in theory be extracted from the existing corpus. Texts or recordings may be inaccessible or difficult to interpret; textbooks and grammars are generally less extensive than is the case with larger, living languages; and most revivalists will have many other calls on their time, mental resources and enthusiasm. Not everyone is a perfectionist, and some may be actively willing to embrace a new variety of the language which is not entirely consistent with the attested data from the traditional variety. Furthermore, a passive knowledge of traditional features does not necessarily mean that the speaker is able actively to produce them consistently. L2 speakers of any language tend to 'fossilize' (see below) at a stage of incomplete acquisition of certain components of the target language, such as phonology.

      In addition, it seems likely that most or all revival movements will have predominant language ideologies which differ significantly from the assumptions and preferences of the traditional speech community, which may for example lead to the active avoidance of forms from the traditional language (cf. Ch. 2 §5.3).

1.1. The 'success rate' of Revived Hebrew and Revived Manx

While recognizing that such a measure is approximate and to a significant degree subjective, Zuckermann and Walsh (2011: 114–5) attempt to quantify on a scale of 1 to 10 the 'success rate' of the Hebrew revival:

> The vernacularization of Hebrew was partially a success and partially a failure. It is hard to provide an exact quantification for such a multi-variable enterprise, but we would roughly estimate that on a 1–10 scale, 10 being a complete success and one being a complete failure, the Hebrew revival is at seven. More specifically, we propose the following continuum approximations for the extent to which Israeli can be considered Hebrew: mindset/spirit: 1 (i.e. European); discourse (communicative tools, speech acts): 1; sounds (phonetics and phonology): 2; semantics (meaning, associations, connotations, semantic networkings): 3; constituent/word order (syntax): 4; general vocabulary: 5; word formation: 7; verbal conjugations: 9; and basic vocabulary: 10 (i.e. Hebrew).
> (Zuckermann and Walsh 2011: 114–5)

Zuckermann (2009: 41) argues that '[g]enerally speaking, whereas most forms of Israeli are Semitic, many of its patterns are European'. 'Forms' here are basic morphology and basic lexis, while 'patterns' are how these basic elements are combined in syntax, compounding, idioms etc.

> It is proposed that (1) Whereas Hebrew was synthetic, Israeli—following Yiddish etc.— is much more analytic; (2) Israeli is a *habere* language (cf. Latin *habere* 'to have', taking the direct object), in stark contrast to Hebrew; (3) European languages sometimes dictate the gender of Israeli coinages; (4) The (hidden) productivity and semantics of the allegedly completely Hebrew system of Israeli verb-templates are, in fact, often European; (5) In Hebrew there was a polarity-of-gender agreement between nouns and numerals, e.g. *'éser banót* 'ten girls' versus *'asar-á baním* 'ten (feminine) boys'. In Israeli there is a simpler—European—system, e.g. *éser banót* 'ten girls', *éser baním* 'ten boys'; (6) Yiddish has shaped the semantics of the Israeli verbal system in the case of inchoativity; (7) Following 'Standard Average European', the Israeli proclitics *be-* 'in', *le-* 'to' and *mi-/me* 'from', as well as the coordinating conjunction *ve-* 'and', are phonologically less dependent than in Hebrew; (8) Word-formation in Israeli abounds with European mechanisms such as portmanteau blending.
> (Zuckermann 2009: 41)

Several of the differences between Biblical and Revived Hebrew listed by Zuckermann may be compared with features of Traditional and Revived Manx. Zuckermann (2009: 50) illustrates his point (1) that Revived Hebrew is more analytic than Biblical Hebrew by noting the replacement of the construct state construction (e.g. *'em ha-yéled* lit. 'mother the-child', 'the child's mother') with a construction involving a preposition meaning 'of' (e.g. *ha-íma shel ha-yéled* 'the mother of the child'). This is paralleled in RM by the (less consistent) replacement

of the genitive with a prepositional construction modelled on English use of 'of' (e.g. TM/RM *moir y phaitchey* lit. 'mother the child' > RM *y voir jeh'n phaitchey* lit. 'the mother of the child') (Ch. 2 §4.2.2.4). Zuckermann's point (3) that 'European languages sometimes dictate the gender of Israeli coinages' recalls the loss of grammatical gender in inanimate nouns in RM on the model of English (Ch. 2 §4.2.1). The simplification of gender and number agreement (5) in Revived Hebrew may be compared with the simplification of agreement rules in the numeral system in RM (Ch. 2 §4.2.6). The shaping of the 'semantics of the Israeli verbal system' by Yiddish may be compared with the (sporadic) influence of the English tense and aspect system on RM (Ch. 2 §4.1.3–4) (although this is not extensive because of the close similarity between the systems to begin with). The partial reanalysis of the Hebrew prepositional and conjunction clitics as phonologically independent units on the model of European prepositions and conjunctions (7) recalls the ability of TM unstressed or lightly stressed pronouns and possessives to carry stress in the RM of many speakers (Ch. 2 §4.2.3.1). European-based patterns of word-formation in Revived Hebrew (8) may be compared with patterns such as right-headed compounds in RM on the English and Irish model which are very rare in TM (Ch. 2 §5.1.2).

Some features in Manx which have analogues in Hebrew are notable for being maintained intact in RM: for example, both Biblical Hebrew and Manx are non-*habere* languages (i.e. one says 'the book is at / to me' rather than 'I have the book'), but while spoken Revived Hebrew has innovated by adding an accusative marker to the possessed (marking what is the subject in the Biblical Hebrew construction as object) (Zuckermann 2009: 51–2), this cannot occur in RM since there is no distinction between nominative and accusative case marking in Manx; also the possessed in the Manx construction is more obviously in a subject syntactic position directly following the verb *ta* 'to be', whereas in Hebrew it follows the possessor.

It is not entirely clear how Zuckermann and Walsh come to their estimate that Revived Hebrew overall has a success rate of 7 out of 10, since an average of their ratings for individual components of the language is 4.7. An attempt will be made to provide a similar approximation for RM, albeit with the same caveats as Zuckermann and Walsh give for their estimates. It would appear that Zuckermann and Walsh's ratings are largely impressionistic, and the same is true of the figures given here for Manx. Without a large-scale, detailed quantitive comparison of many variables between traditional and revived varieties, it is unclear how else the "success" of a language revival could be measured. It should also be borne in mind that I do not necessarily agree entirely with Zuckermann and Walsh's ratings for Hebrew, but given my lack

of expertise in Hebrew, no attempt is made to revise them here. For the above reasons, the following paragraphs are probably of greater interest for the discussion than the ratings themselves. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the impressionistic figures are of some value for the reader in weighing up the similarities and differences between the two language revivals. Furthermore, it is believed that the overall conclusion, that Revived Manx is more similar to Traditional Manx than Revived Hebrew is to Biblical Hebrew, is plausible, given the factors listed at the end of the present section.

Approximation of the success rate of the revival of Manx:

'Mindset/spirit': Hebrew 1, Manx 5

Zuckermann and Walsh do not make clear exactly what these vague terms mean. They are taken here to refer to style, idiom, and the way language ideologies interact with corpus planning choices. The language ideology of most RM speakers is quite different from that of TM speakers, for example in the RM preference for neologisms and borrowings from Irish and Scottish Gaelic as opposed to the TM preference for borrowing from English (Ch. 2 §5.3). On the other hand, there is clearly a significant strand of wishing to replicate the TM 'mindset' in the RM community, cf. preferences for the less apparently English form where there is more than one option, and the adoption of hyper-Gaelic forms, and spuriously idiomatic constructions having no counterpart in TM or other Gaelic dialects (e.g. *by chliaghtey ain*, Ch. 2 §4.1.11.3). However, given that the supposedly Gaelic idiom of RM speakers does not accurately replicate that of TM, even if that is the intention, and that there is significant influence from English style (Ch. 2 §5.10), the revival of TM style, idiom and ideology cannot be considered a full success, although it is probably more so than in the case of Hebrew.

'Discourse (communicative tools, speech acts)': Hebrew 1, Manx 5

Zuckermann (2009: 49–50) notes that some of the most common discourse markers in Revived Hebrew, such as the item *nu*, are from Yiddish. The nature of the Biblical Hebrew material means that little information about the pragmatics of spoken Hebrew is available. The existence of the TM data, including written dialogues reflecting spoken usage and recordings of conversations between terminal speakers, as well as the existence of closely related Gaelic dialects still in unbroken community use, mean that the situation is significantly better for Manx. Nevertheless, some TM discourse markers, even though attested in the corpus of TM texts, are not widely used in RM, and some English-based discourse markers have been

introduced into RM (e.g. the use of *gollrish* as a calque of the contemporary English discourse marker 'like', Clague (2004–5)).

'Sounds (phonetics and phonology)': Hebrew 2, Manx 4

The gulf between the phonology of TM and English is not as vast as that between Biblical Hebrew (and the more Semitic, Mizrahi varieties of liturgical Hebrew) and the European languages, such as Yiddish, spoken by most of the first generations of revivalists, i.e. while velar fricatives and palatalized consonants may cause some difficulty to English speakers, they are not as alien to English speakers as pharyngeal consonants are to speakers of European languages. Nor in the case of Manx is there a centuries-old tradition of pronouncing the target language in a prestige setting (religious services and studies in the case of Hebrew) in a way very different to the phonology of the original spoken language. Manx revivalists also have the advantage of having had the opportunity to speak to traditional speakers, or being able to listen to recordings of traditional speech. Nevertheless, it is clear that there is pervasive influence from English phonology in the speech of most RM speakers: the palatalized consonants are almost always realized as clusters, or depalatalized; most speakers show some English influence on the realization of long vowels and diphthongs; and replacement of velar fricatives by stops is quite widespread, although sporadic in many speakers.

'Semantics (meaning, associations, connotations, semantic networkings)': Hebrew 3, Manx 6

As noted in Ch. 2 §5.8., the English division of semantic space, combined with lack of clarity in TM sources, can result in a realignment of the semantics of Manx lexis in some cases. However, the semantic differences between TM and RM are probably not as great as those between Biblical and Revived Hebrew. Zuckermann and Holzman (2014) report that Israeli students have significant trouble accurately understanding the Hebrew Bible because of the semantic differences between Biblical usage and the semantics of Revived Hebrew, whereas fully competent RM speakers rarely have difficulty understanding the 18th century Manx translation of the Bible.

Constituent/word order (syntax): Hebrew 4, Manx 8

Very little syntactic influence from English has been noted in RM, although there are a few examples, such as substitution of the *jeh* periphrasis for the genitive (Ch. 2 §4.2.2.4), and

perhaps the absence of rightward shifting of object pronouns (cf. ScG. *chì mi a-màireach thu* 'I will see you tomorrow', usually *hee'm oo mairagh* in RM).

'General vocabulary': Hebrew 5, Manx 7

The gulf in terms of technology and concepts between the society Biblical Hebrew speakers lived in over two millennia ago and that of Revived Hebrew speakers from the end of the nineteenth century onwards is much greater than that between TM-speaking society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and the contemporary society in which RM is used. Nevertheless, significant amounts of vocabulary have been coined or borrowed in RM, often in ways contrary to the usual practice of TM (i.e. right-headed compounds, borrowings from Irish and Scottish Gaelic, philologically "back-dated" borrowings etc.), which make the wider vocabulary of RM rather different from that of TM, or from the vocabulary TM would have developed if it had survived as a living community language to the present day (in which it is likely semantic extensions etc. would have been more in line with the language ideologies and linguistic knowledge of earlier generations of TM speakers, and borrowing from English would have been freer). Spontaneous borrowing from English, found especially in colloquial RM speech, is in line with TM usage in a way that borrowing from modern European languages such as English into Revived Hebrew cannot agree with the norms of Biblical Hebrew, since both TM and RM have existed in close contact with Modern English whereas Biblical Hebrew had no contact with the languages most significant for borrowing in Revived Hebrew.

'Word formation': Hebrew 7, Manx 7

Morphological word derivation in RM generally reflects usage in TM, although some morphemes borrowed from Irish and not attested or not productive in TM are used in RM (such as the prefixes *so-* '-able', *do-* 'un-…-able', *ym-* 'many, poly-') and some TM elements are used in ways not found in TM (e.g. *Gaelgeyr* 'Manx speaker', Ch. 2 §5.10).

'Verbal conjugations': Hebrew 9, Manx 9

The verbal conjugations of the traditional varieties of both Hebrew and Manx are generally replicated accurately in the revived languages. These are fundamental components of the grammar which are taught rigorously to learners and which are indispensable. Nevertheless, occasional errors in inflection may be found in RM (Ch. 2 §4.1.3, 4.1.5), although it is likely the correct forms are passively known by the speakers.

'Basic vocabulary': Hebrew 10, Manx 10

Basic vocabulary (e.g. body parts, kinship terms, most common verbs) is generally well-attested in the sources for the traditional varieties, is learnt in the early stages of acquisition of the language, and frequently used.

The mean of the scores given here for Manx is 6.8 (i.e. almost the same as Zuckermann and Walsh's score of 7 for Hebrew, but higher than the mean of their individual scores which is 4.7). The subjective and imprecise nature of these scorings should be borne in mind; nevertheless, it is perhaps to be expected that the revival of Manx should be more 'successful' than that of Hebrew given the following factors:

(a) Manx and English are both Indo-European languages, whereas Hebrew and the European languages of the early revivalists belong to different language families (Afro-Asiatic and Indo-European).

(b) The traditional variety of Manx was already in close contact with Modern English, the L1 of the revivalists, and the two languages may share features due to areal contact. Biblical Hebrew two millennia ago had no contact with the European languages spoken by nineteenth and twentieth-century Jews (although there are complex patterns of contact between later varieties of learned and *lingua franca* Hebrew and these languages).

(c) Early Manx revivalists had direct contact with TM speech, and RM speakers today still have access to recordings and transcriptions of TM speech, as well as living Irish and Scottish Gaelic speech. No such resources are available for Biblical Hebrew.

(d) More terminology for contemporary and vernacular concepts exists in TM than in Biblical or mediaeval Hebrew.

2. Problems with Hebrew as a model

One problem with comparing contemporary Revived Hebrew with Revived Manx is that we are not comparing like with like in terms of the stage at which the two revivals are at present. Revived Hebrew has a large L1 community with stable intergenerational transmission, whereas RM has few L1 speakers, and no Manx-dominant L1 speakers. In other words, apart from its unusual origins, Revived Hebrew today is a fully "living" language like any other, subject to the ordinary forces of language change, while RM is a small predominantly L2 community where adult second language acquisition is far more significant than intergenerational transmission; to use Zuckermann's (2009) term, RM for the time being is stuck in a persistent

'founder generation' situation and has not yet fully got off the ground, instead remaining in a limbo zone between "death" and "life", or between "sleeping" and "waking".

If RM were to become the dominant L1 of a speech community with stable intergenerational transmission, the language then spoken by subsequent generations would be more comparable to contemporary Israeli Hebrew. However, it is unclear whether the non-TM features of RM would be more or less prominent in this next generation L1 variety of RM. On the one hand, the 'convergence principle' (Zuckermann 2009: 48) may mean that features present in both RM and English (including those not present in TM) are more likely to persist in the next generation variety than features not present in English, i.e. the future L1 variety of RM might have a lower "success" score in terms of representing a revival of the linguistic features of TM than the present heterogeneous variety taken as a whole.[40] On the other hand, the competencies, linguistic choices and ideologies of the parents of the next L1 generation (who may be a particular sub-group of the current or future L2 community), and future prescriptive standardization efforts might have an impact in preserving or restoring TM features. The evidence from Hebrew, however, suggests that prescriptivism has little impact; for example 90% of Israeli informants in one study do not follow the 'polarity of gender' agreement rules found in Biblical Hebrew and promoted by prescriptivists (Ravid 1995, Zuckermann 2009: 57).

Amery (2013b) makes the point that Zuckermann and Walsh's application of lessons from Revived Hebrew to revived languages in a more incipient stage may not be fully appropriate:

> Zuckermann & Walsh (2011: 119) caution against purism and urge us to embrace hybridity. But Zuckermann is far too hasty to embrace hybridity and the influence of English and to prejudge the outcome. In the examples cited of English influence on reclaimed Kaurna, Zuckermann & Walsh (2011: 120) fail to draw a distinction between the language of input (the language provided in Kaurna language resources, learning materials and used by teachers) compared with learner's attempts to produce Kaurna utterances […] Of course the pronunciation of learners of Kaurna is influenced by their English mother tongue, just as the pronunciation of English by adult ESL [English as a second language] learners is influenced by their mother tongues. But that does not necessarily mean that the pronunciation of future L1 speakers of Kaurna will be unduly

---

[40] This may have happened in the first L1 generation of Shaw's Road Irish speakers; for example, according to Maguire (1991: 214) the non-traditional English-like construction in which object pronouns follow the verbal noun (e.g. *ag glanadh iad* 'cleaning them') is usual in the speech of most of the children, while one or two children sometimes produce the traditional forms with preposed possessives (e.g. *dá nglanadh*). Little information is given about the parents' Irish (i.e. the founder generation and input for the first L1 generation), but it may be supposed that both variants exist in it side by side. The congruence principle, however, favours the long-term survival of the form more similar to English syntax, unless prescriptivism / standardization has a countervailing impact.

influenced by English spelling conventions. Their pronunciation will depend in large part on the quality of the oral input they receive.

        (Amery 2013b)

Amery goes on to point out that authenticity (i.e. adhering as closely to the forms of the traditional language) is ideologically important for the Kaurna people in terms of 'recognition and respect' of their heritage, and the credibility of their language in the eyes of other Aboriginal peoples. He concludes that '[i]t is important that errors are identified and corrected in the latter in order to ensure that a maximally authentic reclaimed language emerges'. Note the wording 'maximally authentic': it is not argued that the revived language can be entirely 'authentic', i.e. fully replicating the forms and patterns of the traditional language, but that decisions taken by revival speakers in the founder generation stage can have an impact on the future direction of the language's development. Zuckermann (2013b), in a reply to Amery's blog post, concedes that striving for authenticity, at least in some components of the language, may be possible, while insisting that 'hybridization' is inevitable:

> To date, there has never been a language reclamation eviscerated of hybridization between the language being revived and the revivalists' mother tongue(s) […]
> But this is NOT to say that a specific revival community should not be allowed to strive to be 'authentic' or at least more 'original'. It is obviously for the Indigenous people to decide.
> Moreover: The new trans-disciplinary field of enquiry called Revivalistics (including Revival Linguistics) demonstrates which components of language are more revivable than others. A community can take such perspicacious generalizations into account and decide, for example, to focus its revival efforts on specific, emblematic, components. In fact, emblematicity is more common than authenticity, and we ought to embrace it too.
>   (Zuckermann 2013b)

Zuckermann perhaps overstates his case when claiming that 'it is […] hard to imagine more successful revival attempts' than the Hebrew revival:

> given that the Hebrew revivalists, who wished to speak *pure Hebrew*, failed in their purism, it is simply hard to imagine more successful revival attempts. It would be hard to compete with the Hebrew revival for the following two components: (1) the remarkable strength of the revivalists' motivation, zealousness, Hebrew *consciousness*, and centuries of 'next year in Jerusalem' ideology, and (2) the extensive documentation of Hebrew (as opposed to, say, 'sleeping' (i.e. 'dead') Australian Aboriginal languages).
>   (Zuckermann 2009: 46)

It may be true that the 'the extensive documentation of Hebrew' provides a larger corpus on which to base a language revival than in the case of, say, Kaurna or Cornish, but it is not clear

that the documentation of Hebrew is superior to that of TM, especially in view of the predominantly religious and literary nature of attested written Hebrew and the lack of texts and dictionaries representing a spoken vernacular variety of the recent past. Zuckermann does not take into consideration the genetic and / or typological closeness of the revivalists' L1 and the target language; speakers of one Indo-European language trying to revive another may face fewer difficulties than Indo-European speakers acquiring a Semitic or an Australian Aboriginal language. The existence of closely related living languages (Irish and Scottish Gaelic) which are partially mutually intelligible may also provide an advantage not available to Hebrew (whose fellow Semitic languages such as Aramaic and Arabic are not so closely related). As for the revivalists' 'motivation' and 'zealousness', it is not clear that that this is less strong among revivalists of Manx (and other languages) than in the early communities of Hebrew revivalists, only that the RM community has a smaller population. The ideology of restoring a lost national heritage and reversing historical oppression is somewhat similar in any case, although lacking the religious element and the scale and severity of historical persecution. Zuckermann also does not consider the potential impact of the involvement of trained linguists in language revival. Modern linguistics did not exist at the time of the Revived Hebrew founder generation, whereas in contemporary language revivals, trained linguists are often heavily involved in research into the corpus of the traditional variety, creating language resources and teaching, e.g. the cases of Kaurna (Amery 2013a), Miami (Wesley 2007) and Wôpanâak (Fermino 2000). In some cases the linguists are members of the indigenous community itself.

3. Second language acquisition and interlanguage

A language such as Revived Manx which predominantly has only L2 speakers, in contrast to contemporary Revived Hebrew which now has a large L1 speaker community, must be seen in terms of the observed patterns or tendencies of second language acquisition. It has been widely observed that adult acquisition of a second language rarely results in fully native-like competence or performance. Selinker (1969, 1972) introduces the concept of 'interlanguage' to describe the learner's variety of the target language whose grammar differs from both the learner's L1 and that of the target language. The interlanguage is typically highly variable, with multiple rules co-existing for the same function (Song 2012), e.g. Ellis (1985) reports a learner of English using two variants for expressing negation in the same discourse: 'No look my card' and 'Don't look my card'. The learner's interlanguage gradually evolves to become closer and closer to the target language; however, most L2 speakers reach a point where interlanguage features are 'fossilized', and there is no further progress towards native-like performance. For

example, most L2 speakers have a persistent "foreign accent" even if they regularly use the L2 for decades. Selinker (1972) estimates that only 5% of L2 learners avoid fossilization. Why and how fossilization occurs, and the extent to which it is inevitable, have been matters of debate. Explanations include decreasing brain plasticity after puberty, linked to the concept of a 'critical period' for language learning (Scovel 1969, 2000); a lack of motivation to attain more native-like competence once the learner has reached a level at which effective communication is possible despite the persistence of interlanguage features in the learner's idiolect (Corder 1978: 83); and lack of cultural empathy towards L1 speakers (Guiora et al. 1972).

Revived Manx today, and other revived languages as spoken by their founder generations, are best seen as a collection of learner interlanguage idiolects, many or most of which are fossilized at various points on the continuum between the speakers' L1 (English) and the target language (Traditional Manx). Any generation of new L1 speakers would inevitably acquire some of the interlanguage features of the founder generation and regularize them in a creolization-like process, thus producing a mixed variety. This is the mechanism of Zuckermann's 'hybridization'. The situation is complicated by the fact that, unlike most second language acquisition situations, there is no L1 speaker community of the target language in existence, and furthermore, since some of the innovations of RM are considered by most learners and speakers to be legitimate developments of the language, it is unclear that Traditional Manx *per se* is the target language. It is, rather, an idealized or unspecified variety of the revived language, or in the words of one of Ó hIfearnáin's (2015: 57) informants, a 'moving target'.

4. Hybridization or language contact?

Zuckermann (2009: 46) proposes his 'hybridization' model of the genesis of Revived Hebrew (and other revived languages) as a 'synthesis' of two earlier opposing opinions; the 'thesis' that Semitic, Biblical Hebrew has been successfully revived, and the 'antithesis' that Revived Hebrew is in fact a relexified variety of Yiddish and thus an Indo-European language, in which Yiddish is the substrate and Hebrew the superstrate. He makes the claim that

> [u]nlike the traditionalist and revisionist views, my own hybridizational model acknowledges the historical and linguistic continuity of both Semitic and Indo-European languages within Israeli. Hybridic Israeli is based simultaneously on Hebrew and Yiddish (both being primary contributors), accompanied by a plethora of other contributors such as Russian, Polish, German, Judaeo-Spanish ('Ladino'), Arabic and English.

Zuckermann contrasts his analysis with 'the classical language contact analysis, according to which Israeli is (axiomatically) Hebrew (revived) with extensive influence from Yiddish, as well as other European languages spoken by its creators' (Zuckermann 2009: 46). He continues as follows:

> I hope that this article weakens the viability of such a hypothesis, which to me sounds implausible even if only from a historical sequence perspective. If the phonology, phonetics—and in fact all linguistic components—of Israeli were shaped by European languages in the revival process, I wonder why one should argue that Israeli is Hebrew influenced by Yiddish. Such a contact linguistic analysis may suit Modern Italian, influenced by American English but how can one expect it to suit the case here in which neither Israeli nor Hebrew were mother tongues between the second and the nineteenth centuries AD? In other words, Israeli is not a simple case of Hebrew with an 'imposition' (van Coetsem, 1988, 2000, as well as Winford, 2005).
> (Zuckermann 2009: 46)

It is not clear that Zuckermann's comparison with Italian is relevant, since the influence of American English on Italian is a case of 'borrowing' (Van Coetsem 1988) or 'R[ecipient] L[anguage] agency' (Winford 2005), i.e. Italian speakers (recipient language speakers) using English-derived forms or structures in their Italian). The situation of revived languages is more comparable to Van Coetsem's 'imposition', Winford's 'S[ource] L[anguage] agency', in cases of 'interference through shift' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 37ff.), in which speakers of an L1 adopt an L2, and may in time give up their L1 altogether, but impose substrate features from their L1 on their L2 which may persist in the long term in the language of future generations when active knowledge of the L1 is long forgotten. Good examples of this are the various Celtic Englishes (cf. Tristram 1997), such as Hiberno-English (Odlin 1997), Manx English (Broderick 1997) etc.

Under this analysis language revival is simply a sociologically specific form of language shift. There is thus no difference in principle between Hiberno-English and Shaw's Road Revived Irish, or between Manx English and Revived Manx; all are cases of the adoption by a community of an L2 which becomes an L1 for later generations, with continuing substrate influence from the L1, whether the substrate is Traditional Irish in the case of Hiberno-English, (Hiberno-)English in the case of Shaw's Road Irish, Traditional Manx in the case of Manx English, or (Manx) English in the case of Revived Manx. Revived languages are unusual primarily because the L2, the target language, does not have a living speaker community at the start of the language shift, but the resulting paucity of exposure to the target language (which

may be accessible only through written sources, recordings, and the interpretations and reconstructions of the revivalists themselves) is not after all too dissimilar in its effects to the paucity of exposure to L1 English by the first speakers of Hiberno-English who acquired English as a second language through seasonal migration, hedge schools etc.

Zuckermann is probably right to criticize Horvath and Wexler's (1997) 'relexification' model as going too far in classifying Revived Hebrew as a dialect of Yiddish with Hebrew vocabulary, since this hypothesis seems to be based on an underestimation of the ability of conscientious and motivated students to acquire an active (if imperfect) command of Hebrew grammar from the available texts (Horvath and Wexler 1997: 19–23), but it is surely valid to state that Yiddish is the substrate in the formation of Revived Hebrew. It is not clear that Zuckermann's insistence that Hebrew and Yiddish are both 'primary contributors' is anything but a statement of the obvious that is true of any situation of interference through shift, in which the new speakers' L1 and the target language are both contributors towards the resulting contact variety, but in different ways. Zuckermann does recognize that the nature of the respective contributions of Hebrew and Yiddish to 'Israeli' are different when he states that

> Israeli does include numerous Hebrew elements resulting from a conscious revival but also numerous pervasive linguistic features deriving from a subconscious survival of the revivalists' mother tongues, e.g. Yiddish.
> (Zuckermann 2009: 46)

This does not sound very different from eighteenth and nineteenth century Irish people making a 'conscious' effort to learn and speak English, alongside the 'subconscious survival' of their mother tongue, Irish. Zuckermann bases his use of the term 'Israeli', and his classification of the language as simultaneously Indo-European and Semitic, on his rejection of analyses which give 'the linguistically and historically wrong impression that Israeli is an organic evolution of Hebrew'. However, it is equally true to say that contemporary Irish English is, to a large extent, descended from a new language variety created in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, rather than being simply an organic evolution from earlier forms of English, because Irish English speakers are descended primarily from Gaelic speakers, rather than first millennium Anglo-Saxon speakers (i.e. the origins of Irish English are 'nongenetic' (Odlin 1997: 28)). Is Irish English (and perhaps English in general, if the authors in Filppula, Klemola and Pitkänen (2002) are correct about a Celtic substrate even in the English of England) therefore a 'hybrid language'? Or what of French, descended from a variety of Vulgar Latin most of whose first speakers were probably L1 speakers of Gaulish? Since language shift is a pervasive phenomenon in the history of the world, and languages are frequently adopted as an L2 (and

subsequently a substrate-influence L1) by populations which far outnumber the L1 speakers they are in contact with, most of the languages of the world were probably 'hybrid languages' at some point in their past. While Zuckermann's basic point about language revival, that it can never be entirely successful in the sense of eliminating the influence of the revivalists' L1 and resurrecting the target language exactly as it was in the past, is fully accepted here, his assertion that 'hybridization' is a unique process distinct from substratal imposition or influence during language shift seems somewhat misconceived. Nevertheless, language revival has certain specific characteristics or tendencies which differ from typical language shift:

(a) There is no living community of L1 speakers of the target language, or else the L1 community is small, inaccessible and endangered or moribund (as in the case of revived varieties of Breton and Irish whose speakers have little contact with and input from speakers of the traditional varieties).

(b) Language shift is usually from a minoritized low-prestige language to a dominant high-prestige one, whereas language revival involves shift from the dominant language to a formerly minoritized one, which is given a new prestige for reasons of nationalism, pride in an ancestral heritage, a sense of historical injustice etc. (Hebrew is unusual in already possessing high prestige because of its religious association).

(c) Shift to a revived language is usually not completed, i.e. the revival population becomes bilingual but does not abandon their L1 (again the Israeli abandonment of Yiddish and the other L1s of the early revivalists is unusual).

(d) Once the L2 has become an L1, but with a substrate, this contact variety may gradually become more like the standard variety of the language by further language (or rather dialect) contact, demographic mixing, etc. in a way similar to the assimilation of creoles to an acrolect (cf. Horvarth and Wexler 1997: 34). This is not possible with a revived language as the revival community are the only living speakers (except in cases such as Shaw's Road Irish, but speakers of such varieties are unlikely to assimilate to the traditional variety because of the factors outlined in (a) above). However, there may be attempts to bring the revived language closer to the traditional variety by prescriptive censure, probably with only limited success.

5. The ideologies of the Revived Manx speech community

The most common ideological response to the issues of the hybrid or interlingual nature of RM, and the English substrate in RM among the RM speaker community has been to embrace the reality and inevitability of 'change' or 'making mistakes'; speaking some form of Manx, even if it is somewhat different to the traditional variety, is considered better than letting the

language die. This view is seen in the following extracts:

> Persuade a friend or friends to learn Manx with you and TRY OUT YOUR MANX ON EVERY POSSIBLE OCCASION. Don't worry about making mistakes: speak Manx and let the language live!
> (Stowell 1970: i)

> I think that no one brought up in English can speak the mother tongue exactly like the old natives, but that does not matter, I would say to you all, do your best and take hold of it now that there are books and cassettes to help you, don't be shy, and don't be afraid of making mistakes, that is the way to learn. Remember this, 'He who never made a mistake, never made anything.'
> We are not like our ancestors, and our Manx will not be exactly like theirs. Remember, every language has changed over the years, therefore we must expect a change in the mother tongue of the Isle of Man, but – ON NO ACCOUNT MUST WE ALLOW IT TO DIE
> (Gell 1977: 27)

> The vocabulary of a living language is constantly changing and extending. It borrows extensively from other languages. In this dictionary I have tried to give new connotations to old Manx words and have borrowed unashamedly from our Gaelic cousins […]
> Owing to English influence the pronunciation of Manx is slowly changing but this should not be a matter of great concern to those with an earnest desire to see the language survive as a spoken tongue
> (Fargher 1979: vi–vii)

> "[…] by and large everyone is just getting on and doing it. People don't get passionately engaged about what's proper […] Sometimes two or three words are going round for about ten years, till one seems to emerge as the favorite"
> (Anne Kissack, quoted in Abley 2004: 113)

Fargher's (1979: vii) pragmatic acceptance of phonological change under English influence contrasts with his adamant desire to remove perceived English influence from other areas of the language:

> The use of a number of the Gaelic place-names is optional but the proper names to be found throughout Gaeldom should, in my view, always be used in their Manx form wherever possible. It always appalled me to hear the last few native speakers interspersing accounts of their travels in Manx with the anglicised renderings of Gaelic names. This unnecessary dependence upon English cannot be tolerated if the Manx language of the future is to survive in its own right, and has, therefore been discouraged here […]
> I make no apology whatsoever for attempting to restore to the Manx language mutations, genders and certain other characteristics of Gaelic which without doubt existed in pre-literary and classical Manx but which had already disappeared before the final demise of the native speakers, owing to the havoc wrought on the language by English.

This concentration on re-Gaelicizing (or hyper-Gaelicizing) certain components of the language, while being unaware of, indifferent or resigned to English influence in others recalls Zuckermann's (2013b) concept of 'emblematicity' cited above; cf. the Hebrew revivalists' indifference towards or unawareness of the non-Hebraicity of idioms calqued from Yiddish so long as they were composed entirely of Hebrew lexis (Zuckermann 2009: 48). On the other hand, the acceptance of "change" as inevitable seems to be linked to a popular and simplified version of the axiom of modern linguistics (against prescriptivism) that language change is natural and inevitable and that all language varieties are equal and should be described objectively. However, in the ideology of the RM community, the considerable differences between normal language change in a language in intergenerational transmission and changes arising from the process of language revival are ignored or downplayed, since the assertion that Manx is changing like 'every language' helps to present Manx rhetorically as a normal, living language like any other.[41]

The apparently contradictory co-existence in the predominant ideology of the RM community of hyper-Gaelicizing purism with a *laissez-faire* acceptance of "change" and therefore English influence in areas such as phonology may at first glance appear hard to explain. However, it is easier to understand when one considers that the purist tendencies are directed at perceived deficiencies of the traditional language such as 'anglicised renderings of Gaelic names' and grammatical 'characteristics of Gaelic' which are alleged to have 'disappeared […] owing to the havoc wrought on the language by English' (Fargher 1979: vi–vii), whereas the tolerance of anglicization is directed at the contemporary revived language, whose speakers are not to be criticized since they are doing their best to keep the language alive, and their efforts are better than nothing. In other words, the imperfections of the revivalists' Manx can be forgiven so long as they are doing their best to reverse the historical injustice of the anglicization of the Isle of Man, not only by reversing language shift through

---

[41] Cf. Roberts' (2013: 170–1) observation about linguistic liberalism in the context of Welsh that no descriptivist stance can be devoid of prescription, and that it is inevitable that popular reflexes of scholarly axioms will shape societal discourse beyond what is intended by the scholars themselves: 'Cyfeirir weithiau at y gwahaniaeth rhwng gramadeg disgrifiadol a gramadeg deddfol heb sylweddoli fod elfen ddeddfol yn ymhlyg yn y disgrifiadol yn y modd y mae'n dilysu'r hyn a ddisgrifir drwy anwybyddu'r amodau sy'n peri iddo ddigwydd, hynny yw cysylltiadau pŵer. Yn anochel mae niwtraliaeth ymddangosiadol ieithyddiaeth ddisgrifiadol, sy'n osgoi cwestiwn amodau cymdeithasol caffael iaith a hyfedredd ieithyddol, yn cynhyrchu cyfiawnhad effeithiol i bolisïau ieithyddol y gyfundrefn ryddfrydol, gan gyfrannu at sefydlu'r Gymraeg yn gyfrwng ansafonol a thanseilio'r ymdrechion i ymestyn cyd-destun ei defnydd. Oherwydd mae i ddatganiadau'r gwyddorau ddylanwad ac effeithiau gwleidyddol nad ydynt o reidrwydd yn adlewyrchu bwriadau'r awduron, ac nid oes gweithred sy'n llai niwtral wrth drafod y byd cymdeithasol na datgan yr hyn sy'n bod gydag awdurdod.'

restoring the use of Manx as a spoken language, but also by purifying it of perceived corruptions in the attested traditional variety. There is also perhaps a conscious or subconscious weighing up, even without the formal contribution of revival linguistics, of 'which components of language are more revivable than others' leading the community to 'take such perspicacious generalizations into account and decide, for example, to focus its revival efforts on specific, emblematic, components' (Zuckermann 2013b; see above). English loanwords and place-names in TM are very salient and easy to replace, whereas the persistence of an L1 accent in the L2 is widely considered more or less inevitable, while English influence at the level of syntax, pragmatics etc. may be barely noticed at all.

However, an alternative point of view has gained some ground in recent years, which I have called 'authenticism' (as opposed to 'purism') (Lewin 2015: 26):

> An alternative point of view which has become more common in recent years is a kind of reverse purism, which rejects the idea that one should make the language more Manx by stripping it of the forms which the Manx people actually used. Individuals with this point of view seek to make their usage as authentic as possible, even where this means using anglicisms such as *back* [cf. Ch. 2 §5.3] which have been rejected by other sections of the movement. This point of view might be called "authenticist". Individuals who lean towards this view will recognize the need for neologisms and adaptations, but would keep them to a minimum, regarding traditional forms as having primacy.
> They will also use some "non-authentic" forms, both out of force of habit and to make themselves more easily understood to other speakers: this spirit of compromise tends to be greater among authenticists who are more heavily involved with everyday practical use of the language, such as teachers at the Manx medium school. The authenticist point of view has developed in the wake of renewed interest in the classical Manx texts, after a period when contemporary (and secular) material, necessarily written by learners, was in vogue, and in conjunction with the greater accessibility of the classical texts in electronic format.
> (Lewin 2015: 26)

Besides the restoration of certain TM lexical items and constructions such as *back*, some holders of this ideology take an interest in using *HLSM* and other sources to adopt a more traditional pronunciation, and may cultivate certain dialect forms, as noted in Ch. 2 §3.13.2.

6. Future prospects

> Manx in its revived form can only go in one direction, namely upwards.
> (Broderick 2015: 55)

The following sections present my own thoughts and impressions on the future of Revived Manx, and are therefore more subjective and speculative than the rest of the thesis. The focus is on insights which can be drawn from the research not only in terms of deepening our

understanding of language revival, but also for the benefit of the RM community and other groups engaging in language revival around the world. Although some recommendations are given, and possible scenarios imagined, I have sought to maintain neutrality between ideological positions and emphasize that much depends on the choices and preferences of RM speakers, none of which are definitively "right" or "wrong".

There is a general sense of optimism in the RM community, and pride in achievements such as the Manx-medium primary school which would have seemed like impossible dreams to previous generations of revivalists (cf. the opinions expressed by speakers in the episode 'Manx Today' of the TCM video series). Recently the language movement has been cited in the international press as a rôle model for language revitalization:

> From a global perspective, what the Manx language warriors have achieved over the years is exemplary […] Manx revitalisation is a success story – it's one of the bright spots in an otherwise gloomy landscape of language extinction around the world. Its revival is a role model, I can feel the energy, the passion and the inspiration.
> (David Harrison, quoted in BBC News 05.12.2014)

It seems that a modest expansion of the community can be expected in the future, that is, a gradual expansion of the numbers of active speakers, primarily from adult language classes, but also from the ranks of *Bunscoill Ghaelgagh* pupils and a few children raised with RM as a home language, as well as an expansion in the number of social events where the language is used. Potential problems may include overstretching of resources and personnel (Mannette 2012: 79–80, 82–3). The age profile of L2 learners may be problematic, as at present many of the adult classes seem to have more older and retired people attending than younger people; the latter are crucial for transmitting the language and being able to work in and for the language. The fact that beginner-level and intermediate learners outnumber fluent speakers means that it is difficult to provide Manx-medium events which give fluent speakers the opportunity to use the language freely, while being inclusive of those with lower competencies.

It is perhaps in informal, non-institutional domains and relationships that the language is strongest and in which the revival can be said to be most successful in sociological terms. By this is meant the fact that the language is now an unmarked vernacular for certain speakers in certain relationships, especially for friends who have met through the RM community and have never spoken any other language but RM to one another. For these speakers, it feels more natural to speak Manx in these relationships than English. In view of the difficulty of establishing Manx-speaking homes and families, Manx-medium friendship groups and

informal social networks offer the best hope for the expanded use of RM as an unmarked vernacular in the future.

Complete revival, in the sense of Manx becoming once again the unmarked vernacular of the majority of the population of the Isle of Man, seems very unlikely and is not widely held as a goal of the language movement. Even the more limited goal of establishing Manx as the vernacular of a small geographically constrained community of L1 speakers with intergenerational transmission, as in Shaw's Road, does not seem realistic at present. However, if the language is used as a preferred vernacular, even if only by a small group of speakers who are English-dominant in their overall linguistic competence, it cannot be denied that Revived Manx is "living" in some sense and functions as an expressive and viable means of communication and social interaction. It is likely then, that the long-term future of Manx, and many other revived languages, lies in what Thomson (1986: 2) calls 'enduring second-language status':

> Let me stress again that 'dead' in this sense is not the same thing as 'lost', that the tradition may continue under favourable conditions with great vigour and be faithful to its origins, but for those who use it the language is now a second language, consciously acquired; the significant difference is the absence of a community of speakers for whom it is the first and preferably the only language […] enduring second-language status, as in the case of medieval Latin, requires particularly favourable circumstances to sustain it.
> (Thomson 1986: 2)

The long-term maintenance and modest expansion of RM, including limited use as an unmarked vernacular, seems assured. However, the question of whether and to what extent the RM of the future will be 'faithful to its origins', in closely reproducing the formal linguistic structure of TM, is less clear, as is the question of whether this matters. As discussed in Ch. 1, most previous scholarship on RM has heavily focused on the external, sociological aspects of the language revival, without analysing in any detail the linguistic structure of the revived language itself, or how this interacts with the external aspects. The silence of the scholars is matched by a *laissez-faire* reluctance within the community itself to discuss the relationship between the traditional and the revived language, and variation within the latter: any difficult or contentious questions are sidestepped by the invocation of platitudes such as "all languages change" and "Manx never died."[42]

---

[42] Cf. Broderick (2015: 54), 'the tendency in Man at present is to allow all and sundry forms of Manx free rein. Those idioms and expressions which find general favour tend to survive, i.e. matters are left to the forces of nature,

6.1. Practical effects of language ideologies

Although all language ideologies espoused by speakers in a community must be considered to be valid and legitimate, in the sense that an academic analysis cannot take sides on judgements of a subjective, aesthetic and cultural nature, the objective, practical consequences of different ideological positions can and should be scrutinized. It is likely that the dominant ideology of the RM community has in many ways been advantageous to the language movement. The emphasis on Manx as an ordinary living language like any other, and the legitimacy of revival speakers as successors of the traditional native speakers, may have the effect of boosting the self-confidence and self-esteem of members of the RM community, and their sense of ownership of the language. It has helped to neutralize the stigma of language death and of being a nation which has lost (or given up) such a significant part of its culture and identity, instead emphasizing the survival and resilience of the language and its speakers (as 'language warriors' etc.), and the Manx language movement as a success story. This "positive" presentation of the situation is also useful in legitimizing the place of RM in the eyes of the wider, mainly English-speaking Manx society, including the government which provides much of the funding for Manx initiatives, and in attracting attention and publicity for the language movement worldwide. The confidence engendered by this ideology has also allowed RM speakers to undertake bold initiatives such as establishing the Manx immersion school without fears about whether their Manx was "good enough". A more cautious or hesitant approach might never have got such things off the ground.

However, the dominant ideology has disadvantages as well. The texts and recordings of the traditional language are de-emphasized as a resource for acquiring the pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, idioms and styles of the language, since more contemporary material is considered to be just as good Manx, and furthermore more culturally relevant to the present day, or simply less dull (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 56–7, Broderick 2015: 38, 54). This results in a reliance on texts produced by speakers of Revived Manx, which contain a good deal of variation and uncertainty in forms and structures because they were produced by L2 speakers, and on grammars, dictionaries and other resources which sometimes offer an incomplete or unclear account of the language. New speakers of Manx are alienated from their own linguistic and cultural heritage by the lack of exposure to TM material during the learning process, which is then perceived as "difficult" and the preserve of a small group of scholars or experts, rather

---

so to speak, and no authority has so far asserted itself to prescribe what is acceptable and what is not. If matters are to be rigorously tied down, such as in a school situation, then a prescriptive grammar becomes necessary.'

than being the patrimony of the whole community; cf. the difficulties of Revived Hebrew speakers in understanding the Hebrew Bible (Zuckermann and Holzman 2014). The insistence that more fluent users of RM are unequivocally "speakers" (Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 46, 57–8) means that their needs as learners (who will always be English-dominant bilinguals) are ignored, and the development of the Manx language skills at more advanced levels (e.g. for those intending to teach in the Manx medium primary school) has no formal support.

6.2. Ideological clarification

The belief that Manx need not be thought of in terms different from other living languages also means that few resources have been put into discussing or researching the formal linguistic nature of contemporary Manx, or what members of the Revived Manx community believe it to be like, or want it to be like. Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 48) may be broadly right to observe that there is 'a group assumption' that 'an authentic target variety' exists, but as he also notes, it is 'something of a moving target'. This could be problematic for teaching and learning the language and codifying grammar, lexis, pronunciation etc. in teaching and reference materials. Anecdotal evidence suggests that learners are frequently frustrated by the lack of available guidance on recommended usage, and contradictions between dictionaries, grammars, coursebooks and texts. There is therefore a need for resources such as new prescriptive grammars and dictionaries etc. (cf. Broderick 2015: 54), during the creation of which the 'question of just what form and standard of Manx it is that we wish to maintain and propagate for the future' (Thomson 1986: 18) can hardly be avoided. The descriptivist axiom of linguistics, and the popular form of it which gives rise to the *laissez-faire* ideology of the RM community, cannot apply to the activity of language revival (only to the study of it), since the activity is a conscious, creative act of language planning, guided necessarily by the aesthetic, political and other subjective preferences and choices of the revivalists. At some point, e.g. in the writing of new grammars or dictionaries, in proof-reading new texts for publication, or in the deliberations of Coonceil ny Gaelgey, in answering the questions of students in class, the question of what standard of usage to recommend will inevitably arise. Should common (but sporadic) RM usages such as indirect interrogative *my* 'if', ungrammatical in TM, be accepted or discouraged? Should idioms and details of syntax, such as the complex rules surrounding the use of numerals, or the deletion of *ny* in comparative adjectives after quantifying adverbs, which seem to be little known or used by most RM speakers, be prescribed unequivocally as part of the language, because they are the rule in TM? Despite the widespread relaxed attitude towards "language change" and assertion of the legitimacy of RM, the TM sources such as the

Bible are nevertheless frequently resorted to (e.g. in discussions of Coonceil ny Gaelgey) as a "final word" on correct usage, and it is likely that even the most *laissez-faire* RM speakers would balk at deposing TM as the ultimate target variety, or declaring a TM usage definitively replaced by an RM form. In view of the contradiction between the belief in the equal legitimacy of RM and TM and the status of RM as a normal living language on the one hand, and the implicit recognition of the primacy of TM and the difficulty of establishing an RM target variety without reference to TM on the other, it is likely that it would be beneficial for the community as a whole for individuals with different shades of opinion (or taste) on these matters to come together for the task of 'ideological clarification' (cf. Fishman 1991: 17, Kroskrity 2009):

> Language ideological clarification is the process of identifying issues of language ideological contestation within a heritage language community, including both beliefs and feelings that are indigenous to that community and those introduced by outsiders (such as linguists and government officials), that can negatively impact community efforts to successfully engage in language maintenance and renewal. This process of identifying and raising consciousness about linguistic and discursive issues enables appropriate discourses to occur between community members, or between members and either linguists or government officials who have differing opinions. Ideally these discourses would promote actual resolution—a clarification achieved—or foster a tolerable level of disagreement that would not inhibit language renewal activities.
> (Kroskrity 2009: 73)

Such clarification would allow individuals to recognize and explore their own beliefs and choices (which they may not previously have consciously analysed) as well as those of others, allowing the development of a new consensus position, or at least a compromise of the kind encouraged by Dorian (1994: 479–80):

> I suggest that a common challenge for language revitalization and language revival is to limit the restrictive role which puristic attitudes are likely to play in the communities in question, or to channel such attitudes into forms which are useful rather than harmful.
> (Dorian 1994: 479–80)

One could substitute any language ideology for 'puristic attitudes' here. Ideological clarification could take place through a public meeting or forum, similar to those which have periodically been held in the past (cf. Ó hIfearnáin 2015: 54), or via online discussion groups. Although the choices and decisions would be for the community itself to make, one might suggest the following points which might be explored and debated in any process of ideological clarification:

- Recognize the particular properties and requirements of RM as a revived language, distinct from languages in unbroken intergenerational transmission, without this being taken as an attack on the validity and legitimacy of RM as a functioning means of communication and badge of identity in contemporary Manx society, which may be reaffirmed.

- Recognize that terms such as "dead" and "alive" with respect to languages are metaphors and simplifications; explore alternative conceptions such as "sleeping" and "awakening", "reclamation" etc.

- The recognition that Manx has indeed died, and subsequently been revived, instead of being considered an attack on the movement or the legitimacy of the contemporary language, may be framed positively as (a) sober and respectful recognition of the cultural trauma suffered by the Manx people and the marginalization and minoritization of the last generations of traditional speakers and (b) a matter of pride that the revival movement has succeeded to a significant degree in reclaiming and revernacularizing the language and making it into a viable means of communication and social interaction for a vibrant community of speakers.

- Discuss the issue of purism with regard to the removal of established TM anglicisms from RM. It may be recognized that language contact is a universal phenomenon, and that "healthy" contact between Manx and English occurred for centuries before the commencement of language shift. Items such as *back* and *s'laik lhiam* can be viewed as part of the richness of the language, rather than as "corruptions" or "decay". At the same time, neologisms which have come into common use may be accepted. Having two or more variants in use side by side is not necessarily problematic.

- Discuss the rôle of the traditional language as target language. In reference works TM forms could be given as the default recommended forms, but RM forms noted as such in non-judgemental terms where relevant. On the other hand, the most widely established RM forms could be given as the recommended form, but with a clear note stating that TM usage was different, and that both forms are acceptable.

- Discuss the concept of language revival as a creative act. Since the revived language is still in a 'founder generation' state, current speakers have considerable ability to shape the future direction of the language. This may be viewed as empowerment of the speaker community. At the same time, recognize that the English and interlingual substrate in RM cannot be fully obviated, but this need not be seen as failure; instead,

as suggested by Zuckermann and Walsh (2011), 'hybridity' can be celebrated as an expression of the mixed linguistic heritage of the revivalists and of their creativity. The degree of 'hybridity' or substrate influence, however, is not set in stone, and Amery's (2013b) warning not to 'prejudge the outcome' of language revival should be borne in mind.

- Consider carefully the rôle of prescription and error correction in the RM community. Can prescription, and revision of existing recommended forms if considered desirable, be presented as helpful and empowering rather than pedantic or off-putting? Who has the authority to determine standards of usage, and how should such standards be disseminated?

- Identify the shortcomings, as well as the strengths, of existing reference works, with the recognition that this is no slight on the authors of these works, who were committed and erudite individuals doing their best for the language. The strengths and weaknesses of these existing works, and the views and needs of current learners, may feed into the planning process for new resources.

- Even if elements of language ideology which have influenced the development of RM in the past are determined to be negative, unnecessary or in need of revision, the historical context and aims of earlier revivalists may be acknowledged and respected.

- Balance fears of "upsetting the apple-cart", "being like the Cornish"[43] etc. with the benefits of open discussion and explanation of differences of opinion, and the long-term risks of leaving contentious issues unaddressed.

Ideological clarification would serve, furthermore, to keep individuals and groups within the community (individually and in groups) as engaged as possible, making full use of their talents and strengths:

> [A minority language] cannot afford to lose any of those who are most committed to it and must attempt to expand its lexicon (or revise its orthography or engage in any other kind of corpus planning) gingerly and carefully, by means of judicious and relatively riskfree modifications or innovations.
> (Fishman 1991: 348)

---

[43] The outward lack of disagreements of factions and schisms in the Manx revival movement is sometimes contrasted by RM speakers with the divisions within the Revived Cornish community (cf. Dorian 1994, Williams 2014), and it is feared that any such disagreements in the RM community would be counter-productive to the success of the movement and damaging to the image of the language in the eyes of the public and potential learners.

6.3. How revivable (in principle) is Manx?

If the RM community, or a subsection thereof, were to come to the conclusion that RM should ideally be as close to TM as possible, i.e. that every effort should be made to revive the different linguistic components of TM to the highest degree possible, and reduce the influence of substrate and interlanguage features, and the effects of ignorance or misinterpretation of the TM data, i.e. to make the language 'maximally authentic' (Amery 2013b), what kinds of steps would need to be taken? Even if this aim is not judged realistic or desirable (and no suggestion is given here that it should be), the theoretical question or thought experiment is one which may be instructive and useful both for the field of revival linguistics and for members of the RM community who are weighing up what is feasible. It is suggested that the following steps would be important:

1) **Ideological clarification**

As discussed above, ideological clarification is needed as a first step to make sure the aims of the revival (or the new approach to the revival) and reasons for these aims are agreed and understood, and this needs to involve and include the community as a whole.

2) **Making the TM corpus more accessible**

The complete corpus of TM written texts and recordings would be made available in a free, accessible and searchable electronic format. Key texts would be edited with English translation and notes in a format accessible to RM speakers and learners who are not academics.

3) **Integration of TM material into the learning process**

The study of TM material would have a more central rôle in Manx courses, including recordings of the terminal TM speakers as guidance for pronunciation. Fluent speakers would also be encouraged to explore TM material more, perhaps through reading groups, or online apps etc. which give bitesize chunks of material.

4) **New dictionaries, grammars and other resources**

All Manx dictionaries and grammars are out-of-date, incomplete or inaccurate in various ways. The following especially would be needed:

(a) a comprehensive historical dictionary of TM based on the whole corpus;

(b) a comprehensive historical grammar of TM, and based on these;

(c) a prescriptive dictionary (both English–Manx and Manx–English) or dictionaries, including RM neologisms (but clearly marked) and providing a definitive guide to usage, rather than being a compendium of previous dictionaries and suggested translations, as current

dictionaries are, and with a pronunciation guide in IPA for each entry, together with audio recordings, based as closely as possible on TM phonology;

(d) a prescriptive grammar on the same basis;

(e) other guides to usage based on the above resources, such as a handbook explaining in clear terms how to avoid common pitfalls.

5) **Involvement of trained linguists and insights from linguistics**

Insights from research on revival linguistics, second language acquisition and other relevant fields should be taken into consideration. The guidance and involvement of trained linguists in the development of resources and teaching and learning strategies should be sought. Existing members of the RM community could also be encouraged and funded to study linguistics at tertiary level.

6) **Continued training of more fluent speakers**

It should be recognized that all RM speakers, whatever their level of fluency, are learners and part of an ongoing creative process of language acquisition and development. Resources should be developed for the advanced study of Manx and to help overcome, as far as possible, the effects of fossilization in those who have been reached a high degree of fluency or who have been speaking Manx for a long time. Continued training in Manx is especially important for those involved in teaching others, whether children or adults.

7) **Engagement with the other Gaelic languages**

RM speakers should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with Irish and/or Scottish Gaelic (if not learn them to fluency), in order to be exposed to varieties of Gaelic with living traditional native speakers, while recognizing the differences between Manx and other Gaelic varieties.

8) **Strategic placing of strongest speakers**

The most fluent and most TM-like speakers should be strategically placed in teaching, broadcasting, translation and writing, etc., in order to give other speakers and learners maximum exposure to maximally authentic Manx.

9) **Revision of existing RM material**

In light of the new standards, existing commonly-used RM texts and course books etc, should be revised and reissued.

Some of these steps are already being taken, at least in part, and some would be beneficial regardless of language ideology. A project to digitize the whole TM printed and MS corpus, with a view to producing a historical dictionary at a later stage, has been been proposed by a team led by George Broderick, but has not yet got off the ground. Important components of the

corpus, however, such as the Bible, are already available in one digital format or another. A new 'pocket dictionary' is also planned and is an aim of the current Culture Vannin Manx language plan, but has yet to come to fruition (see below). Even if all of these policies were fully implemented, it is not suggested that they would result in full replication or resurrection of all the forms and structures of TM; the effects of the revivalists' L1 and incomplete knowledge will still be apparent to some degree even in the "best" speakers. Even the intimate involvement of trained linguists in developing and transmitting the revived variety will not necessarily result in adherence to the prescribed norms of e.g. pronunciation, as the experience of the Baldwin family in reviving Miami shows (Wesley 2007: 56–7):

> All six family members are dominant in English and the potential for English interference in their Miami phonology is high. However, the effects of language contact differ between Daryl and the rest of his family. Likely because of the amount of work he does on the language and his training in linguistics, Daryl's Miami pronunciation is close to the reconstructed phonetics of the language. Karen and the children, conversely, exhibit some anglicization in their pronunciation, even though much of their Miami input comes from Daryl.
> (Wesley 2007: 56–7)

'Anglicization' of pronunciation includes loss of Traditional Miami vowel lengths, except when they carry important meaning distinctions, diphthongalization of certain vowels, and replacement of short vowels with schwa (Wesley 2007: 56–60) (cf. similar substrate influences in Traditional Manx vowels, Ch. 2 §3.1).

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to suppose that aiming high (i.e. aiming to replicate the traditional language as far as possible) will produce better results, even if not perfection, than not making much effort at all. Also, even if only a few speakers in the population achieve near-authentic TM-like competency and performance, they may serve as models for other speakers and learners and thereby increase the overall level of closeness of the revived language to the traditional variety. Both Williams (2013: xvi–xvii) for Cornish and Amery (2013b) for Kaurna support a strategy of aiming high when it comes to adhering to the forms of the traditional language, while recognizing that ultimately the revived language will be shaped by its speakers, especially if and when it becomes an L1:

> If the Cornish speaking community were large and contained many people for whom Cornish were a native language, the situation would be quite different. The language, including its lexicon, would be determined by the linguistic practice of its speakers. The words used by native speakers would be decisive. As it is, the number of people fluent in Cornish is pitifully small and does not at present appear able to perpetuate itself. Since there is no sizeable community speaking revived Cornish as a native language,

we are compelled to rely on the only native speakers available to us, namely the writers of the traditional texts. We must follow them as closely as we can. It is not legitimate for us at this stage in the revival to attempt to reshape the language according to our own preferences.

(Williams 2013: xvi–xvii)

Whilst I embrace language change, I reject an 'anything goes' approach. Until we see the emergence of first language speakers of reclaimed languages as occurred in the case of Israeli, and reportedly for other languages including Wampanoag, the historical record must remain the arbiter of what is correct.

When it comes to error correction, a clear distinction needs to be drawn between language learner attempts to use the language versus language that appears in language learning materials and resources that serve as a model for language learning. This includes language that appears in the public domain. It is important that errors are identified and corrected in the latter in order to ensure that a maximally authentic reclaimed language emerges.

(Amery 2013b)

Broderick (2015: 55), citing a personal conversation with Robert L. Thomson, advances the view that too much emphasis has been put on 'treat[ing] Manx on a par with, say, French or German', i.e. as if it were a 'living community language' which had never undergone a break in intergenerational transmission, and instead a more effective strategy is to 'teach it as one taught Latin (i.e. as a dead language)':

The question here is: given the aforementioned short-comings,[44] what sort of Manx do we wish to see flourish?

---

[44] Broderick (2015: 53–4) describes these 'shortcomings' as follows: 'The more one leaves behind the era of the native Manx speakers, the less is their influence to be discerned in the spoken Manx of today. Instead, the influence from English has proportionately increased, not only in the pronunciation of Manx but also in its grammar. This is perhaps to be expected, given the large influx into Man of outsiders, mainly from England, over the last thirty years or so. As a result, there is a tendency to think in English first, then to translate into Manx, at times Manx being merely used as a code for English. Leaving aside exceptions, this tendency seems now to be fairly general right across the board. Such a tendency involves *inter alia* obvious calques on English idioms, misunderstanding of aspects of Manx grammar, including separating the preposition from its pronoun in prepositional pronouns, e.g. *lesh mish* 'with me' for *lhiams* (Ir. *liomsa*, ScG. *leumsa* [*sic*]), etc., reminiscent of the last days of native Manx speech (cf. HLSM/I: 60–63). The list goes on, and children in the schools are seemingly on the receiving end of it [...] it was quite apparent to me that the spoken Manx of some of those I came across last summer sounded somewhat stilted and forced (as if derived from book-Manx), that is to say, without the ease and fluidity of a practised speaker with an adequate feel for the spoken language'. Although Broderick broadly identifies some of the features of RM described in Ch. 2 of the present thesis, it is not clear to me that 'the influence from English has proportionately increased' since the period when revivalists and terminal traditional speakers were in contact, except in pronunciation, as Broderick (here) and Fargher (1979: vii) note; in grammar, on the other hand, the kinds of solecisms (from the TM perspective) found in RM texts written by those who had close contact with the native speakers, and their pupils, such as Crellin et al. (1976), seem little different from those found in those written by younger speakers, and the same can be said of recordings of older and younger RM speakers. The example cited by Broderick of decomposition of prepositional pronouns does not seem to be particularly widespread in RM (although I have heard it on occasion). The comment on 'Manx being merely used as a code for English' (presumably implying relexification) seems somewhat exaggerated; it is not clear how Manx could be spoken at normal conversational speed with Manx lexis superimposed on English grammar, given VSO word order, the lack

Some years ago I discussed this matter in some detail with Manx Gaelic expert, the late Robert L. Thomson. His view was that it was quite misleading to treat Manx on a par with, say, French or German. Both French and German are living community languages, Manx is not. In such circumstances Manx had to be treated differently. The most effective way to deal with Manx, it was felt, was to pursue a dual strategy:

1. to teach it as one taught Latin (i.e. as a dead language), whereby a thorough grounding in the grammar, idiom and vocabulary of Traditional Manx was made, and
2. at the same time one would also be taught to speak good Manx on the basis of the available source-materials. Both strategies would run parallel, but with greater emphasis on the first.

What has happened in practice is that the second strategy has taken priority, but without any thorough grounding, that is to say, Manx in the schools has been, and is still being taught at a fairly superficial level.

However, it order to secure a sound and adequate knowledge of the language, with emphasis on the use of traditional Manx material (both oral and written), a systematic and thorough study of Manx, as outlined in the dual strategy above, is seen as the best and only way forward for the future.

(Broderick 2015: 55)

Broderick's (and Thomson's) prescription that Manx should be taught 'as one taught Latin' and as a 'dead language' is not explained in detail, and it is likely that framing the matter in these precise terms would be difficult to market to the RM community, given the widespread defensive attitudes to any suggestion that Manx is "dead". Nevertheless, the basic thrust of the argument made by Broderick here agrees with the conclusions of the present chapter, i.e. that the particular circumstances and needs of a revived language are distinct from those of 'living community languages' in unbroken intergenerational transmission, and it would on balance be advantageous to the revival movement to recognize this in corpus and acquisition planning for Manx. In addition, making more extensive use of the TM resources in a situation where all resources are scarce surely makes sense from any ideological perspective.

Note that Broderick makes an *a priori* ideological assumption that it is necessary and desirable that RM remain (or be made) close to TM. While I have argued that there may be practical (as well as aesthetic, political etc.) reasons why this view (or a partial version of it) has much to recommend it (§6.1), and have outlined as a thought experiment how the most radical version of it might be realized (§6.3), I do not claim that this is the only legitimate ideological position and I emphasize that the RM community would have to carry out a process

---

of a verb 'to have' etc., the frequent occurrence of prepositional constructions for emotional and physiological states, etc., and I have not come across any fluent RM speakers whose language could be meaningfully described as 'a code for English'. This is not to deny, however, the pervasive English substrate influence on RM of all periods.

of ideological clarification to work out what direction it actually wants to go in on this—after all, a highly anglicized form of Manx which is very dissimilar to TM could potentially be just as effective as a badge of identity and as a means of communication (cf. Ngarrindjeri, an Australian Aboriginal language and a neighbour of Kaurna, whose revivalists have chosen largely to relexify English grammar with Ngarrindjeri lexical items rather than attempt to revive the original morphology and syntax (Zuckermann and Walsh 2011: 120)).[45]

6.4. Current and future corpus planning and resource development

An important and urgent part of any future development of Manx will be a renewed focus on corpus planning. This has arguably been somewhat neglected in the past, as the focus in recent years has been on status planning, especially with regard to expanding domains of usage e.g. in education, and public relations activities such as persuading businesses to make tokenistic use of the language. It is probably easier to justify and explain expenditure of time and funds on such activities than on corpus planning. For example, the general public would immediately see the point of a Manx-medium school, even if they opposed it, as the concept is not hard to grasp; whereas it is more difficult to explain the purpose of, say, funding a team of researchers to investigate how neologisms should best be coined, which grammatical forms should be used, or how the orthography might be revised. At any rate, such activities are less likely to make headlines and be easily citable as examples of the success of the movement. In addition, individuals involved in a language revival will have their own interests and priorities and it is no surprise if status managers such as Culture Vannin's language development officer, the *Greinneyder* (who is the *de facto* co-ordinator of most new initiatives in the RM community) are more interested in status planning than other aspects of language planning; cf. the observation of Ó Maolalaigh et al. (2014: 202):

> From the perspective of Gaelic status planning managers, corpus development is often seen as a relatively uninteresting technical task. Language practitioners, on the other hand, are much more aware that corpus development involves making decisions which are more political than technical, and hence that everyone should have a voice in the process.
> (Ó Maolalaigh et al. 2014: 202)

---

[45] However, for the reasons given in §6.2 above, I suspect that the community would not in practice go down this road. The initial unreflective opinions of most RM speakers might be soft *laissez-faire*, but in practice the community's language practices follow a soft authenticist ideology and defer to the TM corpus as the ultimate linguistic model. A hard authenticist programme (§6.3) would be easier to argue for and implement than a hard *laissez-faire* one, since it would involve merely insisting on a closer adherence to the models already used.

Culture Vannin lists the following 'priority areas' for corpus planning in its language policy (Culture Vannin 2013: 10):

> a) Culture Vannin to continue to fund the work of a paid translator and administrator of Coonceil ny Gaelgey
> b) For specialised terminology word lists and dictionaries to be made available on www.learnmanx.com
> c) The publication of a Manx-English / English-Manx pocket dictionary for learners
> d) For Manx National Heritage to work towards making the recordings carried out by Yn Çheshaght Ghailckagh activists of native speakers in the 1950s widely available
> e) For Key Partners to support academic research into Manx Gaelic which will specifically improve the quality of language instruction on the Island
>   (Culture Vannin 2013: 10)

The document also includes a definition of corpus planning:

> Corpus planning centres around two areas:
> the need for linguistic standardisation and
> the need to develop a popular form of Manx
>   (Culture Vannin 2013: 10)

This definition is vague and it is unclear how exactly the 'two areas' relate to the listed priorities. It is not explained what kind of 'linguistic standardisation' is meant or how it is to be achieved; nor is it clear what is to be understood by 'a popular form of Manx'—does this mean a widely accepted form of Manx, or a vernacular and colloquial register? In addition, the space and level of detail devoted to 'corpus planning' is much less than the other aspects of language planning considered in the language policy, namely 'planning for language acquisition', 'planning for language use', and 'status planning'.

The most significant and largest-scale proposal in the list of specific 'priority areas' is the 'publication of a Manx-English / English-Manx pocket dictionary for learners'. The policy document is for 2010 to 2015, but as of late 2015 no progress towards beginning this project seems to have been made. No indication is given in the document of the ideological principles that would underlie the compilation of this dictionary, who would be involved in the project, and the scope and components of the dictionary (e.g. how extensive would be the exemplification, whether pronunciation would be shown and how). How far would the new dictionary go in revising suggested neologisms and usages in earlier dictionaries which can be shown to be mistaken or questionable from the point of view of TM, or would (some of) these be retained and regarded as a legitimate and integrated part of the language? It is likely that these complex issues and their full implications have not fully been considered. Mannette

(2012: 83) discusses the proposed learners' dictionary, but rather naïvely sees the demand and challenges only in terms of devising and standardizing neologisms, taking for granted the purist assumption that borrowing English forms is a 'tempting' fault to be avoided, and ignoring the other pressing reasons new dictionaries (and other resources) are needed:

> Creating a concise dictionary especially suited to learners is an immense task, one which many linguists and compilers find time-consuming and difficult. However, it is not an impossible task, and the benefits to the people who request such a volume are immediately apparent. Indeed, perhaps the most pressing need for a new dictionary is the need to address new and modern terminology which older books like Cregeen and Fargher's simply do not possess, or translate bilingually. As the language does borrow heavily from English, it is tempting for new speakers to manxify English terms without ever learning the correct, decided upon Manx term.
> (Mannette 2012: 83)

In my view, the primary weakness of the earlier dictionaries is not their lack of contemporary terms, but rather their lack of accurate coverage of the existing corpus of the language. The lack of a term for a new concept can be dealt with by spontaneous coinage, paraphrase, or *ad hoc* borrowing from English; it should not really be a major problem, and RM speakers are used to being creative in this regard anyway. The primary weaknesses of Cregeen's (1835) Manx–English dictionary are the lack of examples of usage for most entries, some ambiguous definitions, and a lack of multi-word idioms such as phrasal verbs and prepositional constructions. The primary weakness of Fargher's (1979) English–Manx dictionary are that it is essentially a compendium of all the material in previous dictionaries, and is not selective. Very often it gives no clear indication which items were or are in more common usage, and which are obscure and possibly invented forms taken especially from Kelly (1866) (cf. Thomson 1990). In the case of neologisms introduced by Fargher himself, very often various suggestions are given; in some cases, none of them are in general use in contemporary RM. In addition, there are a large amount of illustrative examples containing idioms apparently devised by Fargher himself, or modelled on the Irish examples in De Bhaldraithe's (1959) dictionary (cf. Ch. 2 §5.4.1), which are not in widespread use. On the other hand, common usages in both Manx and English are frequently omitted, and the dictionary inherits some flaws of organization from De Bhaldraithe, such as only giving numbers for sub-entries without indicating the meaning, and sometimes giving secondary senses before primary ones. None of this is to deny the importance of the previous dictionaries and the hard work and erudition of their compilers; but it is clear that new dictionaries are needed, and this is not merely a case of adding a few additional neologisms.

7. Concluding remarks

In the foregoing examination of Revived Manx we have seen that Zuckermann's assertion that 'hybridization' is inevitable in language revival is almost certainly true, in that no language can be revived exactly as it was in its traditional form, without substrate influence from the revivalists' L1 and the effects of second language acquisition, and the language ideology of the revivalists which will generally differ significantly from that of their traditional speaker forebears. However, we have questioned whether 'hybridization' is a phenomenon unique to language revival, or whether it would be better seen as a sub-type of interference through shift, the substrate influence from speakers' L1 which occurs whenever a group shifts to a new language which is initially an L2 for everyone in the community. In addition, it has been argued that Revived Hebrew is not necessarily the most successful revived language in terms of replication of the linguistic structure of the traditional variety, and more attention needs to be given to factors such as degree of genetic relatedness between the extinct / revived language and the dominant language, the length of time since the death of the last traditional speakers and the amount of exposure to traditional speech (in the form of recordings or in person) received by the first revivalists, and the rôle of trained linguists in the revival process. Zuckermann might be right to encourage revivalists ultimately to 'embrace hybridity', but this applies fully only to revived language which have developed a fully-fledged L1 variety with intergenerational transmission. Revivalists of the founder generation, or the indefinite founder generation situations typical of most language revivals, in which the language remains a consciously acquired L2 for generations of revivalists, should recognize the limitations of language revival but also be aware that the exact degree of closeness to the traditional variety is to a considerable degree in their hands. Hybridity may be inevitable, but the degree of hybridity is not, and the development of a revived language will equally inevitably be shaped by the choices, priorities, ideologies and creativity of the revival community.

For the future development of Revived Manx, I recommend a process of ideological clarification to identify and resolve contradictions in existing language ideologies in the community and move towards a new consensus (or compromise) position, which can provide a solid basis for the vital tasks of corpus planning and resource development. A central recommendation is that the specific character and needs of contemporary Manx as a revived language should be acknowledged, and simplistic and defensive platitudes ("Manx never died", "language change is normal") questioned, with the reassurance that this acknowledgement does not undermine the validity and legitimacy of Revived Manx as a symbol of Manx culture and

identity and as a viable means of communication and self-expression. Paradoxically, it may be that recognizing that Manx today is not quite an ordinary living language may be the most effective way of ensuring that the best shot is given at making it one.

References

Abley, Mark. 2004. *Spoken here: travels among threatened languages* (London: Heinemann)

Ager, Simon. 2009. 'A study of language death and revival with a particular focus on Manx Gaelic' (M.A. dissertation, University of Bangor)

Amery, Heather, Robert Thomson, Pat Burgess, Adrian Pilgrim and Audrey Ainsworth. 1986. *The First Thousand Words in Manx* (London: Usborne)

Amery, Rob. 2013a. 'A matter of interpretation: Language planning for a sleeping language, Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide Plains, South Australia', *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 37: 101–24

——— 2013b. 'Authenticity and the correction of errors in the context of language reclamation', *History and Philosophy of the Language Sciences* (blog post 28.08.2013) <http://hiphilangsci.net/2013/08/28/authenticity-and-the-correction-of-errors-in-the-context-of-language-reclamation/> [accessed 04.01.2015]

Basta, Munir. 1991. 'Iqladiyus Labib', in, *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, ed. by Aziz S. Atiya (New York: Macmillan), vol IV, p. 1302

BBC News. 2009. 'Manx Gaelic 'not extinct' says UN', 19.08.2009. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/isle_of_man/8210192.stm> [accessed 13.08.2015]

BBC News. 2014. 'Manx Gaelic 'warriors' praised for language revival', 05.12.2014. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-isle-of-man-30345741> [accessed 06.10.2015]

Bentahila, Abdelâli and Eirlys Davies. 1993. 'Language Revival: Restoration or Transformation?', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 14: 355–73

Breatnach, R. A. 1976. 'An gléas teaspáinteach', *Éigse*, 16: 215–20

Birdsong, David. 1992. 'Ultimate Attainment in Second Language Acquisition', *Language*, 68: 706–55

Broderick, George. 1980–2. 'Manx Traditional Songs and Song Fragments I: Manx Museum MS. 263A (Clucas Coll.)', *Béaloideas*, 48–9: 9–29.

——— 1981a. 'Baase Illiam Dhone', *Celtica*, 14: 105–23

——— 1981b. 'Manx Stories and Reminiscences of Ned Beg Hom Ruy', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 38: 113–78

——— 1982a. 'Manx Traditional Songs and Song Fragments II: Manx Museum MS. 450A', *Béaloideas*, 50: 1–41

——— 1982b. 'Manx Stories and Reminiscences of Ned Beg Hom Ruy Translation', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 39: 117–94

——— 1983. 'Boddagh Yn Cooat Laaghagh: A Manx Version of a Fenian Tale', *Béaloideas*, 51: 1–10

——— 1984a. 'Ny Kirree Fo Niaghtey', *Celtica*, 16: 157–68

——— 1984b. 'Berrey Dhone: A Manx Caillech Bérri?', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 40: 193–210

——— 1984c. 'Ec ny Fiddleryn', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 40: 211–27

——— 1984–6. *A Handbook of Late Spoken Manx*. 3 vols. (Tübingen: Niemeyer)

——— 1990. 'Fin as Oshin', *Celtica*, 21: 51–60

——— 1991. 'The decline and death of Manx Gaelic', in P. Sture Ureland and George Broderick (eds), *Language Contact in the British Isles. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1988* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)

——— 1997. 'Manx English an Overview', in *The Celtic Englishes*, ed. by Hildegard L. C. Tristram (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 123–34

——— 1999. *Language Death in the Isle of Man* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)

——— 2006. *A Dictionary of Manx Place-Names* (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society)

——— 2010. 'Manx'. In Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (eds): *The Celtic Languages* (London: Routledge), pp. 305–56

——— 2011. 'The imperfect and secondary future in Late Spoken Manx', *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, 28: 307–32

——— 2013a. 'Neologisms in revived Manx Gaelic', *Studia Celtica Fennica*, 10: 7–29

——— 2013b. 'The revival of Manx Gaelic in the Isle of Man', *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, 29: 132–71

——— 2015. 'The Revival of Manx Gaelic in the Isle of Man', in *Minority languages in Europe and beyond – results and prospects*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland (Berlin: Logos), pp. 33–58

Broderick, George and Robert L. Thomson. 1979. *Five stories from the Old Testament Apocrypha in Manx Gaelic From Manx Museum MS. 1236A in the William Sayle Collection* (Douglas: Yn Çheshaght Ghailckagh)

Brooks, Simon. 2015. *Pam na fu Cymru* (Cardiff: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru)

Cain, Adrian. 2009. *Gaelg Vio,* 13.
<http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/media/News/Gaelg%20vio%2013.pdf>
[accessed 04.08.2015]

——— 2010. *Gaelg Vio*, 18.
<http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/media/News/gaelg%20vio%2018.pdf>
[accessed 24.08.2015]

——— 2013. 'Pobble: supporting Manx Gaelic as a community asset'.
<http://isleofman.com/News/details/58451/pobble-supporting-manx-gaelic-as-a-
community-asset> [accessed 14.11.2015]

Carmody, Francis J. 1947. *Manx Gaelic Sentence Structure in the 1819 Bible and the 1625
Prayer Book* (Berkeley: University of California Publications)

——— 1953. 'Spoken Manx', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 24: 58–80

Chaudhri, Talat. 2007. 'Studies in the Consonantal System of Cornish' (Unpublished doctoral
dissertation, University of Wales, Aberystwyth)

Clague, Marie. 2004–5. 'Cross-Linguistic Discourse Markers in Manx Gaelic and English',
Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium, 24/25: 195–205

——— 2007. 'Narratives in Manx: strategies in immersion acquired language', *Journal of
Applied Linguistics* 4: 261–84

——— 2009. 'Manx Language Revitalization and Immersion Education', *e-Keltoi Journal of
Interdisciplinary Celtic Studies*, Vol. 2: *Cultural Survival*

Coppieters, René. 1987. 'Competence Differences between Native and Near-Native Speakers',
Language 63: 544–73

Corder, S. P. 1978. 'Language-learner language', in *Understanding Second & Foreign
Language Learning: Issues & Approaches*, ed. by Jack C. Richards (Rowley: Newbury
House), pp. 71–92

Craine, David. 1952. 'Manx clerical life 1600–1800', *Isle of Man Natural History and
Antiquarian Society Proceedings*, 5: 368–84

Crellin, Lewis y, Juan y Crellin, Colin y Jerree and Shorys y Creayrie. 1976. *Skeealaght*
(Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

Crystal, David. 2000. *Language Death* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Culture Vannin. 2013. *Jannoo Shickyr Traa Ry-heet y Ghaelg: A Strategic Review for 2010-
15 (revised 2013).*
<http://www.culturevannin.im/cms/media//PDF/CV%20Manx%20Gaelic%20Strategy
%202013%20update.pdf> [accessed 13.08.2015]

Cumming, J. G. (ed.). 1859. *An Account of the Isle of Man* (Douglas: Manx Society)

DASG: *Corpas na Gàidhlig, Digital Archive of Scottish Gaelic* (University of Glasgow) <http://dasg.ac.uk/corpus/>

Davies, A. S. B. 1948. 'Cyflwr Presennol Iaith Geltaidd Ynys Manaw', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 12: 89–91

De Bhaldraithe, Tomás. 1959. *English–Irish Dictionary* (Dublin: Oifig an tSoláthair)

Denison, Norman. 1977. 'Language Death or Language Suicide', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 12: 13–67

Dorian, Nancy. 1994. 'Purism vs. Compromise in Language Revitalization and Language Revival', *Language in Society*, 23, 479–94

Douglas, Mona. 1935. *Beginning Manx Gaelic. A Manx Primer* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

eDIL: Toner, Gregory et al. (eds). *Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language*. <http://edil.qub.ac.uk/dictionary/search.php>

Ellis, Rod. 1985. 'Sources of variability in interlanguage', *Applied Linguistics*, 6: 118–31

Fargher, Douglas C. 1979. *Fargher's English–Manx Dictionary* (Douglas: Shearwater Press)

Fermino, Jessie Little Doe. 2000. 'An Introduction to Wampanoag Grammar' (unpublished master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola and Heli Pitkänen (eds). 2002. *The Celtic Roots of English* (Joensuu: University of Joensuu)

Gell, John. 1977. *Cooinaghtyn my Aegid as Cooinaghtyn Elley* (Isle of Man: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

Gell, Juan. 1989. *Conversational Manx*. 2nd edn (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

Gelling, John. 1998. *A History of the Manx Church 1698–1911* (Douglas: Manx Heritage Foundation)

George, Ken and George Broderick. 2010. 'The revived languages – Cornish and Manx', in *The Celtic Languages*, ed. by Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (London: Routledge)

GEM: Thomson, Robert L. 1954–7

Gill, William. 1859. 'Editor's Introduction', in *A Practical Grammar of the Antient Gaelic, or Language of the Isle of Man, Usually Called Manks*, by John Kelly (Douglas: Manx Society)

Gill, W. H. 1896. *Manx National Songs with English words* (London: Boosey & Co)

GOI: Thurneysen, Rudolf. 2003. *A Grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies)

Goodwin, Edmund. 1901. *First Lessons in Manx. Lessoonyn ayns Chengey ny Mayrey Ellan Vannin* (Douglas: Broadbent). Reprinted in 1949 by Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh with foreword by J. D. Qualtrough

Goodwin, Edmund and Robert L. Thomson (rev.). 1966. *First Lessons in Manx. Lessoonyn ayns Chengey ny Mayrey Ellan Vannin*. 3rd edn (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

Guiora, Alexander Z. et al. 1972. 'The effects of experimentally induced changes in ego status on pronunciation ability in a second language: An exploratory study', *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 13: 421–8

Haramati, Shlomo. 1992. *ivrít khayá bimrutsát hadorót* [Living Hebrew throughout the Generations] (Israel: Masada)

Harrison, William. 1869. *Bibliotheca monensis: a bibliographical account of works relating to the Isle of Man* (Douglas: Manx Society)

Hindley, Reg. 1984. 'The Decline of the Manx Language: a Study in Linguistic Geography', *Bradford Occasional Papers*, 6: 15–39

Hinton, Leanne. 2002. *How to Keep Your Language Alive: A Commonsense Approach to One-on-One Language Learning* (Berkeley: Heydey Books)

——— 2003. 'Language Revitalization', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23: 44–57

Hornsby, Michael. 2005. '*Néo-breton* and questions of authenticity', *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 6: 191–218

Horvath, Julia and Paul Wexler (eds). 1997. *Relexification in Creole and Non-Creole Languages With Special Attention to Haitian Creole, Modern Hebrew, Romani, and Rumanian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)

HLSM: Broderick, George. 1984–6.

Ifans, Dafydd and Robert Thomson. 1979–80. 'Edward Lhuyd's Geirieu Manaweg'. *Studia Celtica*, 14–5: 129–67.

Jackson, Kenneth. 1953. *Language and History in Early Britain* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

——— 1955. *Contributions to the Study of Manx Phonology* (Edinburgh: Nelson)

Jenner, Henry. 1876. 'The Manx language: its grammar, literature and present state', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1875–6: 172–97

Jones, Mari C. 1998. 'Death of a Language, Birth of an Identity: Brittany and the Bretons', *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 22: 129–42

Kelly, John. 1866. *Fockleyr Manninagh as Baarlagh* ['Manx and English dictionary'] (Douglas Manx Society)

Kewley Draskau, Jennifer. 2005. '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*, 25: 229–46

——— 2006. 'Interlingual Contact: Some Modals with Variable Morphology in Manx Gaelic', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, 10: 85–120

——— 2008. *Practical Manx* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)

King, Gareth. 2003. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London: Routledge)

Kneen, J. J. 1911. *Yn Saase Jeeragh* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

——— 1925–8. *The Place-Names of the Isle of Man with their Origin and History*, 6 vols (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

——— 1931. *A Grammar of the Manx Language* (London: Oxford University Press)

——— 1937. *The Personal Names of the Isle of Man* (London: Oxford University Press)

——— 1938. *English–Manx Pronouncing Dictionary* (Douglas: Mona's Herald). Reprinted 1970 by Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh

——— 1940. *Manx Idioms and Phrases* (Douglas: Clucas and Fargher)

König, Claudia. 1996. 'The Manx Language—Past and Present: A Sociolinguistic Study' (unpublished dissertation, University of Mainz)

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2009. 'Language Renewal as Sites of Language Ideological Struggle The Need for "Ideological Clarification"', in *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance & Lessons Learned*, ed. by Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University), pp. 71–83

Lewin, Christopher. 2011a. 'A sermon in Manx translated from the work of Thomas Wilson: Text and Commentary', *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, 28, 175–210

——— 2011b. *Bun as Bree: A series of short articles on Manx Gaelic grammar, idiom, vocabulary and pronunciation*, 3 (Manx Heritage Foundation) <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/media/News/bun%20as%20bree%203.pdf> [accessed 04.09.2015]

——— 2011c. *Bun as Bree: A series of short articles on Manx Gaelic grammar, idiom, vocabulary and pronunciation*, 4 (Manx Heritage Foundation) <http://www.learnmanx.com/cms/media/News/bun%20as%20bree%204.pdf> [accessed 31.08.2015]

——— (ed.). 2014a. *Lioar-lhaih Ghaelgagh: Original Manx Gaelic Prose 1821–1907* (Douglas: Culture Vannin)

——— 2014b. 'The persistence of grammatical gender in Manx Gaelic' (unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University of Edinburgh)

——— 2015a. 'Classical Manx, Revived Manx and English: competing standards', in *Minority languages in Europe and beyond – results and prospects*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland (Berlin: Logos), pp. 23–31

——— 2015b. 'A Manx sermon from 1696', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 62, 45–96

——— 2015c. 'The distribution of the copula and the substantive verb with nominal predicates in Manx' (unpublished conference paper, Teangeolaíocht na Gaeilge / Gaelic Linguistics, Maynooth University)

——— 2016. 'The syntax of the verbal noun in Manx Gaelic', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*, 17, 147–239

Loch, Charles W. 1946. 'Some Notes on the Present State of the Manx Language – April 1946'. Manx National Heritage Library, MS 5134B

Maguire, Gabrielle. 1991. *Our Own Language: An Irish Initiative* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters)

Mahon, William J. 1984. 'Some Notes on the Demonstrative-initial Constructions', *Proceedings of Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, 4, 143–8

Mannette, Antonia. 2012. 'Language Learning in Pubs, Tea Rooms and other Non-Formal Settings' (M.A. dissertation, University of Alberta)

Marstrander, Carl J. S. 1932. 'Det Norske Landnåm på Man', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, 6: 40–386

——— 1934. 'Remarks on the Place-Names of the Isle of Man', *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, 7: 287–334

McManus, Damian. 1994. 'An Nua-Ghaeilge Chlasaiceach', in *Stair na Gaeilge*, ed. by Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó Hainle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach (Maynooth: National University of Ireland), pp. 335–4

Miller, Stephen. 2007. '"Here the Manx language lingers, and may linger some time longer": Manx and English in Cregneash in 1901', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 55: 108–21

Moore, Arthur W. 1891. *Carvallyn Gailckagh* (Isle of Man: John Christian Fargher)

——— 1896. *Manx Ballads and Music* (Douglas: G. & R. Johnson)

Moore, Arthur W. and John Rhŷs (eds). 1895. *The Book of Common Prayer in Manx Gaelic*. 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Odlin, Terence. 1997. 'Hiberno-English: Pidgin, Creole, or Neither?' (CLCS Occasional Paper No. 49, Trinity College Dublin)

Ó Broin, Brian. 2010. 'Schism fears for Gaeilgeoirí', *The Irish Times*, 16.01.2010

Ó Cuív, Brian. 1957. 'A Poem in Praise of Raghnall, King of Man', *Éigse*, 8: 283–301

Ó Curnáin, Brian. 2007. *The Irish of Iorras Aithneach County Galway*. 4 vols (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies)

Ó hIfearnáin, Tadhg. 2007. 'Manx orthography and language ideology in the Gaelic continuum', in *Langues proches–Langues collatérales / Near Languages–Collateral Languages*, ed. by Jean-Michel Eloy and Tadhg Ó hIfearnáin (Paris: Harmattan), pp. 159–70

——— 2015. 'Sociolinguistic vitality of Manx after extreme language shift: authenticity without traditional native speakers', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 231: 45–62

Ó Maolalaigh, Roibeard, Wilson McLeod, Mark McConville and Susan Bell. 2014. *Dlùth is Inneach – Final Project Report: Linguistic and Institutional Foundations for Gaelic Corpus Planning* (Bòrd na Gàidhlig)

Ó Meara, Jamys. *Saase-Jeeragh DirectMethod A Conversation Based Manx course. Lioar Nane Book One* (Manx Heritage Foundation)

Ó Sé, Diarmuid. 1991. 'Prosodic change in Manx and lexical diffusion', in *Language Contact in the British Isles. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1988*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland and George Broderick (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 159–80

Paton, Cyril Ingram. 1957. 'Chengey ny Mayrey: the Mother Tongue, A letter from the Rev. J. T. Clarke in 1872', *Journal of the Manx Museum*, 74: 28–32

Payton, Philip. 1997. 'Identity, Ideology and Language in modern Cornwall', in *The Celtic Englishes*, ed. by Hildegard L. C. Tristram (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 100–22

Price, Glanville. 1984. *The Languages of Britain* (London: Edward Arnold)

Przedlacka, Joanna. 2001. 'Estuary English and RP: Some Recent Findings', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 36: 35–50

Rabin, Chaim. 1974. 'halashón haivrít bat yaménu' [Contemporary Hebrew], in *haentsiklopédya haivrít* [Hebrew Encyclopedia], vol. XXVI, pp. 660–4

Ravid, Dorit. 1995. 'Neutralization of Gender Distinction in Modern Hebrew Numerals', *Language Variation and Change*, 7: 79–100

Reedy, Tamati. 2000. 'Te Reo Maori: The Past 20 Years and Looking Forward', *Oceanic Linguistics*, 39: 157–68

Reid, Nicholas. 2010. 'English influence on the pronunciation of re-awakened Aboriginal languages', in *Re-awakening languages: theory and practice in the revitalisation of Australia's Indigenous languages*, ed. by John Hobson, Kevin Lowe, Susan Poetsch and Michael Walsh (Sydney: Sydney University Press), pp. 293–306

Rhŷs, John. 1894. *The Outlines of the Phonology of Manx Gaelic* (Douglas: Manx Society)

Roberts, Richard Glyn. 2013. 'Cenedlaetholdeb: Gwireddu'r genedl ac atgynhyrchu gormes', in *Pa beth yr aethoch allan i'w achub? Ysgrifau i gynorthwyo'r gwrthsafiad yn erbyn dadfeiliad y Gymru Gymraeg*, ed. by Simon Brooks and Richard Glyn Roberts (Llanrwst: Gwasg Carreg Gwalch), pp. 160–83

Sallabank, Julia. 2012. 'Diversity and language policy for endangered languages', in *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*, ed. by Bernard Spolsky (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 100–23

Scovel, Thomas. 1969. 'Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance', *Language Learning*, 19: 245–53

——— 2000. 'A Critical Review of the Critical Period Research', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 213–23

Selinker, Larry. 1969. 'Language Transfer', *General Linguistics*, 9: 67–92

——— 1972. 'Interlanguage', *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10: 209–41

Song, Lichao. 2012. 'On the Variability of Interlanguage', *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2, 778–83

Speas, Margaret. 2009. 'Someone Else's Language On the Role of Linguists in Language Revitalization', in *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance & Lessons Learned*, ed. by Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University), pp. 23–36

Stowell, Brian. 1970. *Bunneydys: A Course in Spoken Manx* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

——— 2005. 'The case of Manx Gaelic', in *Rebuilding the Celtic Languages: Reversing Language Shift in the Celtic Countries*, ed. by Diarmuid Ó Néill (Talybont: Y Lolfa), pp. 383–416

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

Thomas, Graham and Nicholas Williams (eds). 2007. *Bewnans Ke: The Life of St Ke* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press)

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Thomson, Robert L. 1952. 'The syntax of the verb in Manx Gaelic', *Études celtiques*, 5: 260–92

——— 1953. 'Early Manx: A Contribution to the Historical Study of Manx Gaelic arranged as a supplementary volume to the Moore-Rhys edition of the Phillips Prayer Book (1610)' (unpublished B.Litt. dissertation, University of Glasgow)

——— 1954–57. 'A Glossary of Early Manx', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, 24, 272–307; 25, 100–40, 264–308; 27: 79–160

——— 1960. 'Svarabhakti and some associated changes in Manx', *Celtica*, 5, 116–26

——— 1960–2. 'The Manx Traditionary Ballad', *Études Celtiques*, 9: 512–48, 10: 60–87

——— 1961–2. 'Jeelym Gailckagh: Edward Lhuyd's Manx vocabulary of 1707', *Journal of the Manx Museum*, 6, 78: 149–51

——— 1963. 'Norse Loanwords in Manx', *Scottish Gaelic Studies*, 10: 65–8

——— 1967. 'Notes on Some Manx Words', *Journal of the Manx Museum*, 7, 83: 62–4

——— 1969. 'The Study of Manx Gaelic. Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 55: 177–210

——— 1970. 'Preface' and 'Supplement', in *An English–Manx Pronouncing Dictionary*, by J. J. Kneen (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

——— 1976. 'The stressed vowel phonemes of a Manx idiolect', *Celtica*, 11, 255–263

——— 1981. *Lessoonyn Sodjey 'sy Ghailck Vanninagh* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

——— 1984. 'Aspects on the Gaelic-Norse Controversy: Manx Personal Names and General Vocabulary', *Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 9: 145–55

——— 1986. 'Ned Maddrell Memorial Lecture, 1986. Change or Decay?' (unpublished typescript, MNHL MS 13047)

——— 1988. 'Manx-Latin *gilbogus* again', *Celtica*, 20: 141–44

——— 1990. 'The Revd Dr John Kelly as a Lexicographer', *Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 9: 443–58

———— 1991. 'Foreign elements in the Manx vocabulary', in *Language Contact in the British Isles. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1988*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland and George Broderick (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 127–40

———— 1992. 'The Manx language', in Donald MacAulay (ed.), *The Celtic Languages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 100–36

———— 1995. *Pargys Caillit. An abridgement of John Milton's* Paradise Lost *By Thomas Christian with the anonymous translation of Thomas Parnell's* The Hermit (Douglas: Centre for Manx Studies)

———— 1997. *Paart dy homileeyn ny sharmaneyn oikoil Agglish Hostyn* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

———— 1998. *Yn Fer-raauee Creestee (1763) The Christian Monitor (1686): A Bilingual Edition with Notes and Introduction* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

———— 2000. 'Manx', in Glanville Price (ed.), *Languages in Britain & Ireland* (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 58–89

———— Notes on coining neologisms in Manx (unpublished typescript, MNHL MS 13047)

Thomson, Robert L., and Adrian J. Pilgrim. 1988. *An Outline of Manx Language and Literature* (Douglas: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh)

Tristram, Hildegard L. C. (ed.). 1997. *The Celtic Englishes* (Heidelberg: Winter)

Van Coetsem, Frans. 1988. *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact* (Dordrecht: Foris Publications)

Wagner, Heinrich. 1958–69. *Linguistic Atlas and Survey of Irish Dialects* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies)

Watson, Kevin. 2007. 'Illustrations of the IPA: Liverpool English', *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*, 37: 351–60

Wesley, Leonard Y. 2007. 'Miami Language Reclamation in the Home: A Case Study' (doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley)

Williams, Nicholas. 1994. 'An Mhanainnis', in *Stair na Gaeilge*, ed. by Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó Hainle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach (Maynooth: National University of Ireland), pp. 703–44

———— 2014. *Cornish Today: An examination of the revived language*. 3rd edn (Cathair na Mart: Evertype)

Winford, Donald. 2005. 'Contact-induced changes Classification and processes', *Diachronica*, 22: 373–427

Zuckermann, Ghil'ad. 2009. 'Hybridity versus revivability: multiple causation, forms and patterns', *Journal of Language Contact*, 2: 40–67

———— 2013a. 'Historical and moral arguments for language reclamation' (blog post 26.06.2013) http://hiphilangsci.net/2013/06/26/historical-and-moral-arguments-for-language-reclamation/ [accessed 10.08.2015]

———— 2013b. Comment on Amery (2013b)

Zuckermann, Ghil'ad and Gitit Holzman. 2014. 'Let my people know!: towards a revolution in the teaching of the Hebrew Bible', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 226: 57–82

Zuckermann, Ghil'ad and Michael Walsh. 2011. 'Stop, Revive, Survive: Lessons from the Hebrew Revival Applicable to the Reclamation, Maintenance and Empowerment of Aboriginal Languages and Cultures', *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 31: 111–27

Appendix

History of Traditional and Revived Manx

1. Traditional Manx

Manx or Manx Gaelic (*Gaelg* or *Gailck*) was the vernacular speech of the population of the Isle of Man between at least the middle of the first millennium CE and the mid nineteenth century, the last native speakers to acquire the language in the home and community passing away in the second half of the twentieth century. Manx is an Indo-European language belonging to the Gaelic or Goidelic branch of the Celtic family, and is thus closely related to Irish and Scottish Gaelic, with which it is mutually intelligible to a limited degree. It is more distantly related to the Brythonic Celtic languages Welsh, Cornish and Breton, and more distantly still to most of the languages of Europe, Persia and northern India. Typologically, it is a verb-subject-object language, although in many clauses the main verb is a non-finite historical verbal noun resulting in auxiliary-subject-verb-object order. As far as inflectional morphology is concerned, the language is fairly strongly analytical, and increasingly so during its recorded written history as the last traces of inflectional case marking disappear. The lexicon has been described as 'impoverished' (Thomson 1992: 101) owing to the absence of higher literary registers as a result of the lack of a Gaelic-speaking aristocracy. A large number of concepts which in English would be expressed by single verbs are in Manx expressed by means of phrasal verbs or prepositional constructions. The lexicon is predominantly Gaelic at all periods, although there are significant numbers of mediaeval borrowings from Latin, Norse and Anglo-Norman, and later a considerable amount of borrowing from English (Broderick 2010: 353–4).

The early history of Gaelic in the Isle of Man is obscure, although it is generally believed that the language spread to the island, perhaps at the expense of a pre-existing Brythonic language, during the period of Irish expansion into neighbouring parts of Britain c. AD 500 (Broderick 1999: 13, 2010: 305, Thomson 1992: 100, Jackson 1953: 173). A few Ogham inscriptions in Primitive Irish from this period are the first attestations of Gaelic writing in the island. The island came under Norse control between the early tenth and the mid thirteenth century, and a mixed Gaelic and Norse culture seems to have flourished during this period, as attested in the Classical Irish praise poem to the Norse-Gaelic king Reginald or Raghnall (Ó Cuív 1953). A large number of Norse place-names survive in the Isle of Man; however they are not found as densely as in the northern Hebrides and Gaelic names are in the

majority. A few Norse borrowings are found in the Manx lexicon, but in general the Norse influence on the language is slight (Price 1984: 72, *pace* Williams 1994). It is unclear to what extent, if at all, Gaelic literacy was found in the Isle of Man in the mediaeval period. Under the Scottish and English administrations that followed the collapse of the Norse Manx polity, Gaelic seems not to have been written down at all in the island apart from personal and place-names which are written in English-based orthography.

After a period of instability in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in which the island was contested between Scotland and England, and then held by a series of Anglo-Norman barons, the island came for several centuries (1405–1736) under the control of the English Stanley family, who ruled the island as an autonomous fiefdom, although under the ultimate suzerainty of the English or British crown (Price 1984: 72). Much of the time the Stanleys took little direct interest in the island, and day to day administration was by a governor, his officials, and an oligarchy of native gentry who comprised the quasi-parliamentary institution of the House of Keys. Much power over the everyday life of the population was held by the Church in the form of the Bishops of Sodor and Man or their representatives, whose extensive and often-exercised power lasted into the mid-eighteenth century, long after the system of ecclesiastical courts to enforce public morality had waned in the Anglican church in England.

Although English was used by a small elite associated with the Stanley administration, and a somewhat wider subsection of the population was bilingual, Manx was the sole or primary language of the vast majority of the people of the Isle of Man until the end of the eighteenth century, and remained strong in many communities well into the nineteenth (Broderick 1999: 14). In the early eighteenth century Bishop Wilson estimated that two thirds of the population could not understand English (ibid.: 16) The first (ineffectual) measures to promote English at the expense of Manx were taken in the second half of the seventeenth century by Bishop Barrow who set up an English-medium parish school system and a grammar school (ibid.: 15–16). The earliest extant continuous text in Manx was Bishop Phillips' translation of the Book of Common Prayer, completed c. 1610 though not published until 1895 (Moore & Rhŷs 1895). This does not seem to have been met with enthusiasm by the rest of the clergy, apparently on account of its orthography (Moore & Rhŷs 1895 I: xii), which although largely English-based has vowels based on Welsh and continental models, and it was not found practicable to print it at the time (Thomson 1969: 182). The usual practice in religious services in the seventeenth century seems to have been extemporaneous translation into Manx of the

services in the Prayer Book and scripture readings (cf. Cumming 1859: 15, Thomson 1953: 9, Craine 1952: 379).

A single example of a Manx sermon from 1696 (Lewin 2015b), partially using Phillips' orthography, is the only other known attempt at Manx literacy in the seventeenth century. Writing in Manx was put on a more secure footing in 1707 with the publication of a bilingual catechism by Bishop Thomas Wilson, using a different English-based orthography with the vowel symbols based on Early Modern English norms. This system, with some modification and standardization, was used for the Bible translation later in the eighteenth century, and in all other Manx publications ever since, including in the revival. Less standardized varieties were often used in carval (see below) and folksong manuscripts, and in the writings of Edward Fargher (1831–1907).

Bishop Wilson was ultimately in favour of the replacement of Manx by English, but recognized the practical need for the Scriptures and other religious books in Manx (Broderick 1999: 16). Under his reign the translation of the Gospels was begun, and the Gospel of Matthew was published in 1748. During this period, it appears that the practice of writing sermons in Manx became more common among the clergy, since a few examples survive from the 1720s, and many more from the middle of the century onwards. Under Wilson's successor, Bishop Hildesley, Manx was used as a medium of instruction in parish schools for the first time (Broderick 1999: 17), and the translation of the scriptures was completed with the publication of the last part of the Old Testament in 1773. A new translation of the Prayer Book had been published in 1765. Hildesley's episcopate marked the high point of the public use of Manx. After his time, religious and secular authorities were increasingly uninterested in Manx, if not openly hostile to it, and from the late eighteenth century onwards various socioeconomic forces contributed to the beginnings of language shift.

Nevertheless, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries also saw a modest flowering of vernacular literacy in Manx. Carvals (long religious songs or 'carols' composed especially for the custom of the *Oie'll Verree* on Christmas Eve, cf. Jenner (1876: 182)) and hymns were composed by ordinary people, with large numbers being preserved in manuscript carval books. The arrival of Methodism in the 1770s led to the composition of hymns in Manx and the publication of several editions of a hymn book from 1795 onwards, although this more austere and evangelical form of religion also had the effect of suppressing native Manx song, folklore and traditional entertainments (Stowell and Ó Bréasláin 1996: 10). According to Thomson and Pilgrim (1988: 16), '[t]he end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth saw an increase in the number but a diminution in the scale of Manx publications'.

These included the hymn books, and also numerous temperance and other religious tracts. From the 1820s to the 1850s, occasional articles, letters and verse in Manx appeared in the island's newspapers, with topics including debate on the usefulness or otherwise of maintaining the language, and the movements for political reform which were gathering steam at the time. These uses of the language apparently reflect increased literacy in Manx following the publication of the Bible and other devotional works and the introduction of Manx-medium education in the preceding decades. Nevertheless, there were no significant efforts to cultivate the language for wider literary or public use, apart, perhaps, from Thomas Christian's translation of *Paradise Lost*, published in c. 1796 (Thomson 1995). Manx was used in the courts into the nineteenth century (Gill 1859), some official proclamations and notices were translated into Manx until the 1860s (König 1996: 10, Loch 1946), and new laws were promulgated in both Manx and English at the Tynwald ceremony, as they still are. The use of Manx in the courts, as in the churches, seems never to have been suppressed or abolished, but simply to have faded away as the population gradually became bilingual and then predominantly English-speaking, and as Manx-speaking personnel became scarcer.

The Manx and their language remained largely insulated from the outside world until the middle of the eighteenth century. Hindley (1984: 18) and Broderick (1999: 23) point to the growth of the "running trade" ("smuggling" to the English authorities) whereby Manx seamen exploited the island's autonomous status and low customs rate to import wines, spirits, tea and tobacco (legally) into the island and then illegally export them to Britain. This trade made the Isle of Man more prosperous, but also increased the exposure of Manx speakers to English. In 1765, the British parliament passed the Act of Revestment which provided for the compulsory purchase of the Lord of Man's manorial rights by the British Crown, allowing for the suppression of the running trade. The ensuing depression and the imposition of more direct British rule led to significant levels of emigration of Manx speakers from the island, and increased prestige for the English language (Broderick 1999: 24).

Broderick (1999: 24–26) notes a number of factors militating against Manx from the Revestment period onwards, including immigration from northern England and Scotland; further waves of emigration to Britain and America owing to various economic depressions associated with the Napoleonic Wars, depression of the fishing industry (1830s), potato famine (1840s), and commonland reorganization (1860s); increase in communications with the outside world, especially the beginning of regular steamer services from the 1830s; the development of mass tourism from the 1830s onwards, but especially in the latter half of the century; improved roads and rail transport around the island reducing the isolation of remote, rural and

Manx-speaking communities, and exposing them to visitors; and utilitarian ideas about "getting on in the world," for which English was seen as indispensable and Manx as redundant.

Even those who espoused the study or use of Manx, such as John Kelly (1750–1809), a proofreader of the Bible translation and author of the first grammar and dictionary of the language, often presented the use of Manx as a temporary, utilitarian strategy which would eventually lead to the replacement of Manx by English: Manx might be of some historical or antiquarian interest, but it was not practical for the modern age (Thomson 1969: 208–9). There was some debate on the future of Manx in the island's newspapers. Letters (including one in Manx) urging its abandonment and emphasizing its uselessness were printed (Broderick 1999: 27–31), while others were more measured, pointing to the vibrancy of the Welsh language (Lewin 2014a: ii–iii) or the language's continuing importance for pastoral work in the Church (Broderick 1999: 30–1). Nevertheless, and notwithstanding different degrees of enthusiasm or reluctance towards the loss of the language, language shift seems to have been widely seen as inevitable by the middle of the first half of the nineteenth century. Cregeen (1835), in the preface of his dictionary, describes Manx as 'a decaying language'. Not until the 1870s does the point seem to be made that bilingualism is in principle feasible, and that the adoption of English does not necessarily necessitate the abandonment of Manx. In a speech the Manx clergyman and tract-writer J. T. Clarke points out that:

> *oddagh Gailck ve oc chammagh as y vaarl, fegooish yn derrey yeh cheet ayns raad y jeh elley. Te yn fardalys smoo 'sy theihll dy chredjal dy jinnagh tushtey jeh taggloo as lhaih yn Ghailck dy bragh cheet 'sy raad oc ayns gynsagh yn vaarl*
> 'they could have Manx as well as English, without the one getting in the way of the other. It is the biggest stupidity in the world to believe that knowledge of speaking and reading Manx would ever get in their way in learning English'
> (J. T. Clarke, *Mona's Herald* 21.02.1872, cf. Lewin 2014a: iii)

Nevertheless, by the 1870s, the process of language shift was hastening to completion and Clarke saw no hope of the language's survival, or any practical use in maintaining its use, except for the spiritual benefit of the existing generations of speakers.

Language shift appears to have been fairly rapid, with largely Manx-speaking older generations, bilingual middle generations and largely English-speaking children co-existing in the same households (Jenner 1875: 24). The ceasing of intergenerational transmission seems to have occurred between 1840 and 1880 (Broderick 1999: 164). The language disappeared fairly uniformly across the whole island during this period, although it seems to have lingered longer in the more remote areas, such as Cregneash (cf. Miller 2007, Broderick 1999: 43),

where J. T. Clarke found monoglot Manx-speaking children in the late 1840s (Paton 1957, Lewin 2014a: 28–9). Most of the terminal speakers recorded in the twentieth century were raised in these more remote areas, including upland areas of the southern parishes of Rushen and Arbory such as Cregneash and Ronague, and the rural areas of the northern plain. In 1871, the first year a census was taken which included a question about the language, there were 13,530 speakers of Manx out of a total population of 54,042 (25.04%), of whom 190 were monolingual (Broderick 1999: 41). By 1901, the next time this question was asked, the total number of speakers had dropped to 4657 (8.51%), with only 59 monoglots.[46] It may be assumed that most of these remaining speakers were elderly, and numbers dropped off rapidly with every census, halving to 2351 in 1911 (4.58%), and dropping further to 896 in 1920 (1.52%) (in which year there were 19 monoglots, the last time any were recorded), and 529 in 1930 (1.07%). Many of these people would no longer have been habitual speakers of Manx.

In the mid and late nineteenth century parents who could themselves speak Manx would often choose to speak only English with their children, sometimes retaining Manx as a secret language among themselves (Broderick 1999: 35). English was used as a status symbol, and Manx was associated with the old and backward (ibid.: 36). Those children who still had Manx as a home language were often taunted by their monolingual English-speaking peers at school, and might be punished by their teachers (ibid.: 36–37). As the language passed into desuetude, its use was increasingly restricted to certain conservative work domains (Rhŷs 1895: ix), or conversation with elderly members of the community or household. The terminal speakers who were later befriended and recorded by academics and revivalists all acquired Manx under less than ideal circumstances at a period when much socialization both within the home and outside would have been increasingly in English, resulting in inadequate acquisition of certain linguistic features and a larger than usual degree of variation, compounded by decades of little or no use of the language (Broderick 1999: 5–7). Ned Maddrell, the last traditional speaker, for example, acquired English before Manx and learned Manx from an elderly aunt from the age of two and a half at the earliest (*HLSM* I: 463, 467–8, Broderick 1999: 75). This final generation of speakers lived into the mid twentieth century; twenty speakers were identified in the 1940s (Davies 1948), but by the 1960s only two were left, and Maddrell himself died in 1974 at the age of 97. With his death, Traditional Manx acquired naturally in the home became a thing of the past.

---

[46] Owing to the age profiles of some of these reported monoglots, it seems that the figures for monolingual speakers may be too high (Broderick 1999: 43, König 1996: 28).

2. Revived Manx

The roots of the antiquarian interest in the Manx language and its associated customs and folklore, which eventually led to revival efforts, can be traced back as far as Edward Lhuyd's investigations at the beginning of the eighteenth century (Thomson 1961–2), the interest in Manx Fenian and other folksongs prompted by the publication of MacPherson's *Ossian* in the 1760s (Broderick 1990), and John Kelly's efforts to enrich the language through borrowing from dictionaries of Irish and Scottish Gaelic (Thomson 1990). However, the shift away from the use of Manx as the native vernacular of the Manx peasantry and working class towards a bourgeois interest in preservation and "revival," broadly understood, of the language and its culture can be seen in the shift in the use of the language in the island's newspapers. Until about the 1850s, occasional letters, dialogues and essays appear which make use of the language as a medium of communication by and for native speakers to discuss topics beyond the language itself, such as politics and religion, whereas later material appears as antiquarian curiosity:

> At this time [before c. 1850] writings in Manx were still aimed at the needs of the general public; the language was a means of communication, not an object of interest in itself. This stands in contrast to the many later Manx pieces in newspapers which begin to appear in the second half of [the] nineteenth century, which tend to have an antiquarian, nostalgic or preservationist purpose, and were often composed or translated by learners and revivalists.
> (Lewin 2014a: i)

Interest in the island's history and heritage led in 1858 to the establishment of the Manx Society for Publication of National Documents of the Isle of Man. Although history rather than language was the society's primary concern, the founding documents mention among the points of interest of the island that it is '[i]nhabited by an aboriginal tribe of the great Celtic family, with language, institutions, and laws peculiar to itself' (Harrison 1869: 276–86); moreover, the second volume in the society's series of publications in 1859 was a new edition of Kelly's grammar. Other publications concerned with the language followed, namely a new edition of Kelly's dictionary with additions from Cregeen and Mosley in 1864, and the Manx translation of *Paradise Lost* and another Manx poem in 1871, and Bishop Phillips' translation of the Book of Common Prayer, together with Rhŷs's *Outlines of Manx Phonology*, in 1895. That the aim of the (re)publication of Manx language books was antiquarian and academic, rather than revivalist *per se*, is shown by Gill's resignation to the demise of Manx in his introduction to the reprint of Kelly's grammar:

The object of this reprint is not to uphold the Manx as a spoken language,—that were a hopeless attempt, were the end ever so desirable; but to afford some assistance to the student of this interesting branch of the ancient Celtic, and to obtain for it, when its lifetime is gone by, a place among the records of the dead languages of Europe. The decline of the spoken Manx, within the memory of the present generation, has been marked… It is rarely now heard in conversation, except among the peasantry. It is a doomed language,—an iceberg floating into southern latitudes.
(Gill 1859)

By the early 1870s, interest in revitalizing the language led to the holding of 'Manx readings' in Peel and Douglas which, according to lengthy newspaper reports proved popular and were the talk of the towns. William Dawson, an ironmonger in Peel, was instrumental in setting up the first of these events. Dawson would later be an important Manx-speaking informant for John Rhŷs. The remaining Manx-speaking middle class, including businessmen such as Dawson and members of the clergy, played a central role in these events, reading addresses, dialogues, passages from the Bible, poems and songs. The event in Peel was held in a hall owned by Charles Morrison, a successful merchant and owner of a fleet of fishing boats, and the father of Sophia Morrison, a key figure in the early revival and a collector of folklore. The genesis of the idea is described as follows:

Our readers will recollect that some years ago when penny readings were first introduced, considerable *furore* was excited, and the readings were most attractive. They were patronised by all classes of the community, and were in many cases highly successful in a pecuniary view. Perhaps in no part of the Island were these readings conducted with more spirit than in Peel.… Some weeks ago, it occurred to Mr John Dawson, ironmonger, Peel, that a series of readings in the vernacular might be successfully introduced. Upon communicating his idea to a number of parties, he was laughed at by many, told by others that the matter would most assuredly prove a failure, and it was even insinuated that if he persisted in and clung to his extravagant notions, he would become a fit subject for the Asylum at the Strang. Although Mr Dawson met with much discouragement, he resolved to *try* at all events. He was not to be so easily beaten. Upon earnest solicitation, several parties volunteered their aid, and after the issuing of a preliminary notice, the matter began to be more talked of, and now many of those who had at first condemned the idea as a most visionary one, advocated it.
(*Mona's Herald* 10.01.1872)

According to the report, the audience 'evinced by their smiling countenances that they enjoyed immensely the rude though able performances of a few of the remnants of the old Celtic' and 'upwards of a thousand people were assembled, and we understand that hundreds were turned

back at the entrance'. The ensuing event in Douglas was similarly successful. However, this movement came too late to have any effect on reversing the language shift which was already largely complete in most areas by the 1870s, and the main motivation seems to have been nostalgia, and pride in the language as a national symbol, but not a serious hope that it could be revived for everyday usage. This focus on nostalgia, language preservation and antiquarianism, as a bourgeois pastime, would characterize the language movement in the remaining decades of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth.

By the 1890s, interest in Manx tradition led to the publication of two collections of Manx songs, *Manx National Songs, with English words* arranged by W. H. Gill (1896), and *Manx Ballads and Music* by A. W. Moore (1896), a member and from 1808 Speaker of the House of Keys. As Stowell and Ó Bréasláin (1996: 18) observe, Gill's book, with English lyrics and 'drawing room arrangements with dashes of sentimentality' was highly popular with the anglicized Victorian bourgeoisie, whereas Moore's volume which presented the songs as they had been collected with the Manx lyrics was a much more modest seller. This is perhaps in part because adopting Manx music in anglicized form was simply easier than learning a language which was rapidly dying out, primarily spoken by those of low socioeconomic class, and for which there were few resources beyond the Bible. As Broderick (1999: 180) notes, a similar situation has prevailed in more recent times:

> At present Manx music and dance enjoys considerable popular support in Man (more so than that for the language, primarily due to easier acquisition).
> (Broderick 1999: 180)

In March 1899, interest in the language led to the founding of Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh or 'The Manx Language Society' (YCG). The first president of the society was A. W. Moore. The primary aims of the organization according to its constitution were, firstly, 'the preservation of Manx as the national language of the Isle of Man', and secondly, 'the study and publication of existing Gaelic literature and the cultivation of a modern literature in Manx' (Kneen 1931: 20–21). There was some difference of opinion within the society as to the degree to which the practical use of Manx was feasible; the first of the above aims is perhaps deliberately vague in that it could mean the preservation of the vernacular use of the language, or its restriction to use as a symbolic, ceremonial and literary tongue. Although there seems to have been regret over the passing of Manx as a spoken vernacular, this was nevertheless seen as inevitable by Moore, who said at the first AGM in November 1899:

The question is: is it desirable to endeavour to revive the spoken Manx by teaching it to the young, or is it not? I venture to think that it is not, and, as I know that several respected members of our society differ with me on the point, I will ask your indulgence while I state my views. We have, on the one side, the incontrovertible fact that a common tongue is a stimulus to the feeling of a common nationality, and, on the other, the equally incontrovertible fact that the capability of speaking a language which is only shared by a very limited number of people is of no value for the purpose of gaining a livelihood. Manxmen are a very practical folk… I think, then, that when we come to consider how much better our children would be equipped for the battle of life by learning to speak (say) French or German rather than Manx, we can hardly hesitate as to what our verdict will be. Much as I regret to think of the day when the grand and sonorous language of Ellan Vannin will be no more heard, yet I feel that I must prefer the practical to the sentimental and acquiesce in its disappearance.

(*Isle of Man Examiner* 18.11.1899)

This is a reflection of the utilitarian ideas of the nineteenth century which had led to the belief that the language had to be given up in the name of 'progress' in the first place (cf. similar attitudes towards Welsh in the same period, discussed by Brooks (2015)). Not all members were of the same opinion, as Moore notes; Canon E. B. Savage, another Manx enthusiast who in the 1880s had undertaken to track down remaining monoglot speakers, had urged the present 'patriotic Manxmen and women' at the inaugural meeting in March to try not only to preserve Manx, but 'to make it an active living language' (*Isle of Man Examiner* 25.03.1899). At the same meeting, Mr E. E. Fournier, secretary of the Pan-Celtic Congress in Dublin, noted that bilingual individuals 'acquire a mental vigour and alertness which not only improves their intellectual faculties all round, but enables them to acquire an additional language with facility. From a practical and commercial point of view the maintenance of the Celtic languages thus becomes a desideratum of the national economy'. Fournier goes on to outline a vision for extending the teaching of Manx, and ends his speech with the optimistic prognosis 'we may look forward to a time when the great majority of the people in this happy Island will speak the sweet-sounding language of their Celtic ancestors' (ibid.). However, a reporter for the Gaelic League in Ireland commented in the League's journal that with stances such as that of Moore, YCG could not be taken seriously (Stowell 2005: 400).

Despite the somewhat ambiguous approach of the Society, there were significant levels of enthusiasm and activity in the first few years of its existence. Manx classes were established in various parts of the island, most notably one in Peel which in 1899 had 75 pupils (*Isle of Man Examiner* 25.03.1899). Edmund Goodwin's *First Lessons in Manx*, the first primer for the language, originally designed for blackboard use in the Manx classes, was published in

1901; in the same year, a selection of Aesop's fables, translated by Edward Faragher, were published, and further publications of texts and coursebooks followed, with a journal *Mannin* being published between 1913 and 1917 (König 1996: 37). Competitions in Manx were established in the Manx Music Festival ("the Guild") which attracted large numbers of entries in the first few years (König 1996: 36–7). Initially there was a campaign to have Manx taught in the island's schools, but this met with very little success and was not fully achieved until the 1990s (Broderick 1999: 174–5).

Although there were still approximately 4,000 native speakers at the turn of the century, it is unclear to what extent they were utilized for the purposes of revival. Some native speakers had a rôle in the early classes, but as König (1996: 38) notes, 'the great majority of the c. 4,000 native speakers were not able to teach the language systematically to students'. Moreover, there was little emphasis on conversation in the early classes; rather the main aim was to read the Manx Bible, as evidenced by the preface to Goodwin's lessons:

> The pleasure to be had from reading the wonderfully beautiful and idiomatic Manx version of the Scriptures would amply compensate for a year's labour in the study of the language.
> (Goodwin 1901: preface)

Very little attempt seems to have been made to gather linguistic material such as pronunciation, dialectal differences, idioms, traditional vocabulary, reminiscences etc. from the remaining native speakers.[47] In part this may reflect some antipathy towards the native speech of the time, which may have been regarded as somewhat decayed in comparison with the 'beautiful and idiomatic' Manx of the Bible—cf. Kneen's (1931: 14) remark that the language in the nineteenth century had fallen into 'decadence' and Cregeen's comment already in the 1830s that 'numerous corruptions have crept into the dialect in general use' (Cregeen 1835: iii). However, it may also be a result of optimistic complacency, such as that expressed by Fournier (above), and by William Cubbon, the acting editor of the *Isle of Man Examiner* and a supporter of the revival, in response to the 1901 census:

---

[47] The need for such work was not entirely overlooked. Goodwin (1901) in the preface to his *First Lessons* states '[i]t is hoped that some other Manxman may write a more extensive grammar, detailing all the facts of the language. It would be well, too, if the actual pronunciation of the native speakers in the various parts of the Island were taken down accurately in some such notation as that of the "Association Phonétique Internationale"'. Similarly Rhŷs had written in 1894 'in ten or fifteen years the speakers of Manx Gaelic may come to be counted on the fingers of one hand. In the meantime it is my sincere wish that some trained phonologist, who speaks Irish or Scotch Gaelic as his mother tongue, may go carefully over the ground which I have tried to survey—and that soon—in order to correct the errors which may be found to disfigure the following outlines' (Rhŷs 1894: ix–x).

Doubtless during the last two years many Manx people have set themselves to learn to read and speak Manx, and it is more than probable that many adults, able to converse in Manx, have gone to some trouble to impart their knowledge of the language to young children. Anyhow, Manx is far from being a dead language—it is not even moribund—and if the Manx people but respond as they ought to the appeals of the leaders of the Pan-Celtic movement, Manx will be spoken for centuries to come.

(William Cubbon, quoted in Kneen 1931: 24)

Class divisions may also have played a rôle; there was a large gap in socioeconomic and educational terms between the middle class pillars of the community such as Moore who led YCG and the mainly rural, poor and marginalized native speakers. Efforts to make Manx respectable for bourgeois consumption are evident in Kneen's *Manx Idioms and Phrases*, which includes a section of 'polite phrases' (Kneen 1940: 49–50) such as *Te traa foddey neayr's va'n onnor aym dy akin yn chuyr eu* 'It is a long time since I had the honour of seeing your sister', *yn sharvaant s'imlee eu* 'your most humble servant' and *Cur m'arrym da nyn naunt* 'Give my respects to your aunt', drawing-room expressions which would surely have sounded stilted and unfamiliar to native Manx-speaking fishermen or cotters.

Nevertheless, it does seem that that major figures in the early revival such as Goodwin and Kneen had significant exposure to native Manx speech. Kneen (1931: 16) makes reference, for example, to soliciting the opinion on a linguistic question of 'five Manxmen of the lower class…three fishermen, a farm-labourer, and a carpenter (i.e. a boatbuilder), all of them men of fair intelligence, though unlearned', which suggests he was fairly familiar with such people. Kneen also writes in a letter of growing up in modest circumstances in Douglas in a house where a number of Manx speakers resided, including some who were 'not at home' in English (*Révue Celtique* 44: 467). Of Goodwin we are told by Joseph D. Qualtrough that he had 'constant conversation with Manx speakers' and that '[h]e wore the mantle of scholarship with utmost modesty and he made a host of friends, particularly among those fishermen who could converse with him in Manx' (Goodwin 1947: foreword).

Between the native written texts such as the Bible and the native speech which was still relatively readily available, the early revivalists had a fairly solid grounding in Traditional Manx in which to base their own language use. However, differences of approach with regard to how the language might be developed, which would influence the future direction of the revival, are already apparent. Goodwin's *First Lessons* are based exclusively on written texts such as the Bible and on the vernacular language of everyday life, such as words for food, farming practices, etc., and make no attempt to introduce neologisms for new concepts; it is

taken for granted that such things will be borrowed from English, as in natural Traditional Manx usage:

> [t]he loan-words coffee, mustard, etc., are as in English.
> (Goodwin 1901: 64)

He suggests that such loan-words should be used 'sparingly', but does not suggest alternatives:

> Loan-words from English are sometimes met with, such as drawer, dresser, &c. They should be used as sparingly as possible.
> (Goodwin 1901: 19)

Kneen, on the other hand, while having a good knowledge of Traditional Manx, is more willing to push the boundaries in terms both of domains of usage (cf. the 'polite phrases' referenced above) and developing neologisms for modern concepts such as *foddey-reayrtys* 'television' (Kneen 1938: 73).[48]

After the initial enthusiasm of the first decade or so, the activities and energy of YCG and the wider movement waned around the time of the First World War (Broderick 1999: 175). Peaks and troughs of enthusiasm have been a feature of the Manx language movement ever since. As Kneen (1931: 20) observes, 'Celtic enthusiasm, always of a fugitive nature, sadly waned again during the last twenty years'.

The movement received a boost from the visits of Marstrander in 1929, 1931 and 1933, who came to seek out remaining native speakers and study Manx phonology and place-names. This encouraged a small group of activists to carry out their own search for remaining native speakers. Approximately twenty such speakers were found and the activists, members of YCG who already had a good knowledge of Biblical Manx, took the opportunity to improve their knowledge of spoken Manx by direct interaction with these remaining traditional speakers (König 1996: 39–40). Manx classes were revived and the publication of lessons and other materials resumed (e.g. Douglas 1935). Two leading figures in this period were Mona Douglas and J. J. Kneen (Broderick 1999: 176–7). Mona Douglas in particular was motivated by romantic nationalism and by the example of the Irish independence movement and its associated cultural and linguistic revival (Broderick 1999: 177). During this decade, Kneen published a series of important works, including his *Grammar* (Kneen 1931), *The Personal Names of the Isle of Man* (Kneen 1937), and his *English–Manx Pronouncing Dictionary*

---

[48] This term did not catch on and was later replaced by another neologism *çhellveeish* on the model of Irish *teilifís* (Lewin 2015: 24, Broderick 2015: 41–2) (cf. Ch. 2 §5.7).

(1938). In the 1920s he had already published his six-volume *Place-Names of the Isle of Man* (Kneen: 1925–8). Kneen was not a professional scholar and these works display imperfections arising from his own academic limitations and (in the case of the grammar) the Irish model on which it was based (cf. Thomson 1969: 189, Jackson 1955: 4–5, Marstrander 1934); they have nevertheless proved valuable for learners of the language (Thomson 1970).

The activities of the revival continued in a similar vein into the 1940s and 50s. When Charles Loch visited the island in 1946 he was impressed by the fluency of the Manx of the c. twenty enthusiasts who had learnt Manx partially from the native speakers (Loch 1946, König 1996: 41) and who spoke it among themselves. In this period, approximately fifty people were attending Manx classes in Peel, Douglas and Port St. Mary (König 1996: 41). Church services in the language were also revived, and four a year were organized by YCG in the 1940s (König 1996: 42).

The late 1940s and early 50s saw renewed interest in recording and studying the remaining native speakers. A visit to the island by the *taoiseach* of the Irish Free State, Éamon de Valera, in 1947 during which he met Ned Maddrell, led to the dispatching of the Irish Folklore Commission to the island in April 1948 for the purpose of making recordings of the native speakers (König 1996: 43). Further recordings were made by various scholars and enthusiasts from the 1950s to early 70s (Broderick 1999: 62–6), transcripts of most of which can be found in Broderick (1984 I). The late 1940s and 50s saw a modest increase in scholarly interest in Manx. Francis J. Carmody published a monograph and an article (1947 and 1953) on Manx syntax, the deficiencies of the former of which prompted Robert L. Thomson to make his first contribution to Manx linguistics, a paper on the syntax of the Manx verb (Thomson 1952). Thomson then completed a thesis on the grammar and lexicon of Phillips' Prayer Book (Thomson 1953), and continued to make important contributions to Manx scholarship until shortly before his death in 2005. In 1950 Heinrich Wagner visited the island to interview Manx native speakers for his *Linguistic Atlas and Survey of Irish Dialects* (Wagner 1958–69, point 88). Six months later, Kenneth Jackson made a similar visit to investigate Manx phonology, the results of which were published in a short volume in 1955.

The movement during this period was dominated by a core of committed enthusiasts such as Leslie Quirk, Charles Craine, William Radcliffe, Mark and Tom Braide, Walter Clarke, Douglas Fargher and John Gell (Stowell 2005: 402), who had built up relationships with the remaining native speakers and who made efforts to put their Manx into practice in their everyday lives. For example, in the 1950s, Fargher and Quirk ran a wholesale fruiterer's business in Douglas and apparently conducted all their business together in Manx (Broderick

1999: 179). Fargher, who served as secretary of YCG in the early 1950s, was particularly instrumental in reawakening enthusiasm for the language, organizing classes, publishing booklets and being an effective publicist at a time when most people were hostile, apathetic or ignorant towards Manx (Stowell 2005: 402, Broderick 1999: 178–9). In 1952, Fargher and Joe Woods, the secretary of the Manx branch of the Celtic Congress, published an appeal in the *Mona's Herald* in which they encouraged 'members of this legion of Manx people to come forward with a practical demonstration of their nationality by enrolling in a Manx language class' (*Mona's Herald* 30.09.1952). Among the younger students of Manx inspired by this appeal were Brian Stowell, who read the appeal when he was only sixteen, and Bernard Caine, both of whom would go on to have prominent rôles in the movement for decades to come. Fargher's enthusiasm was evidently infectious, as the following reminiscence of Stowell's shows:

> "It just struck an absolutely magic chord in me. It was like a religious conversion—I just knew I had to learn Manx. It was amazing!… I literally discovered my Manx identity!"
> (Brian Stowell, interviewed in König 1996: 45–6)

From 1956 to 1962 Fargher was away from the island working in Africa, which was a great loss to YCG, the activities of which waned for a few years (Broderick 1999: 179, Fargher 1979: xii). However, on his return, the movement was revitalized and entered a new phase of development. Under the direction of Fargher, elements of the Manx language movement became more overtly nationalistic and radical. In 1964 Fargher and others founded the first Manx nationalist party Mec Vannin ('Sons of Man'), and the language was considered to be an important part of preserving the Manx national identity, especially in the face of increasing demographic change (König 1996: 46, 53). New links were also made with Ireland; in 1985, the body *Caomhnóirí an tSuaicheantais* ('keepers of the badge') awarded the *Fáinne*, or gold ring badge in recognition of fluency in Gaelic, to Fargher and Quirk, and later gave permission for a badge-awarding committee to be established in the Isle of Man (Broderick 1999: 179, König 1996: 47–8). This scheme proved an important motivator for people to increase their proficiency in Manx.

By the beginning of the 1970s, the movement was in a very vibrant phase, with well-attended evening classes being funded by the Isle of Man Board of Education, and *oieghyn Gaelgagh* 'Manx evenings' in pubs providing a new social setting for learners to become fluent in a relaxed environment (König 1996: 47, Broderick 1999: 180). This went along with a

revival of interest in Manx folk music. This period saw a series of new publications, including efforts to make available new modern, secular literature (e.g. Lewis et al. 1976), since it was felt that the earlier emphasis on the Manx Bible and other religious literature 'would not attract younger people to learn Manx' (Broderick 2015: 38), as well as the advent of radio programmes in Manx (Broderick 1999: 179; 2015: 36–7). The growth of nationalist radicalism during this period with the emergence of organizations such as *Fo Halloo* ('Underground') meant that the language movement was sometimes viewed with suspicion, and Manx speakers were even expelled from public houses for speaking the language (König 1996: 53).

In 1979, the Millennium Committee of Tynwald gave financial support towards the publication of Fargher's 900-page *English–Manx Dictionary*, which he had been working on since the early 1950s (Fargher 1979: xii). The dictionary was partially based on De Bhaldraithe's (1959) *English–Irish Dictionary*, and is essentially a compendium of all the material in Cregeen and Kelly's dictionaries, quotations from the Bible and other Classical Manx sources, a certain amount of material recorded directly from the last native speakers, especially Ned Maddrell, and a large number of neologisms, some based on native Manx roots, and many others adapted from Irish, Scottish Gaelic and English.

The dictionary has proved to be an important resource for the Revived Manx community, although it is not without its weaknesses (cf. Ch. 3 §6.4). Fargher intended it to be 'a largely prescriptive work', in that 'it does not aim to be a record pure and simple of the language as it was spoken at any time during its history, but tries to provide some sort of basic standard upon which to build the modern Manx language of today and tomorrow, in order that those who feel the need to express themselves in Manx may here find the necessary means to do so' (Fargher 1979: vi). The main weakness of the book is that it is in essence a volume of suggestions and options, so far as neologisms and new usages of existing words are concerned, and yet being such a weighty tome, invested with the authority of one of the most revered figures of the revival movement in recent decades, and in the absence of other reference works, it has in practice often been taken without question to be authoritative, even though many of its entries are ambiguous as they do not differentiate between different senses, or between commonly used lexical items and more obscure or doubtful ones. In addition, Fargher's views on the historical development of the language were coloured by an exaggerated perception of the 'havoc' that had been 'wrought on the language by English' (Fargher 1979: vi–vii),[49]

---

[49] Cf. O'Rahilly's (1972: 121) comment on Manx that '[f]rom the beginning of its career as a written language English influence played havoc with its syntax'.

leading him to 'a certain attempt at antiquarian restoration of the case system, whose loss can be shown to be an internal development' (Broderick 1999: 48); compare also Fargher's attempts to "correct" Traditional Manx noun genders (Ch. 2 §4.2.1).

The 1980s saw a number of small but significant victories concerning the use of Manx in public and official life. Manx was taught as an extra-curricular activity in certain schools where there were enthusiastic teachers in the 1970s, but the 1980s saw renewed pressure from YCG on the government to introduce and fund an official programme of Manx lessons in the school system. An important advance was the introduction of a Manx O-level course and examination offered through the Isle of Man College of Further Education (König 1996: 54–5). The course was taught and the examination set by Robert L. Thomson, and involved a rigorous introduction to Classical Manx. However, the O-level was discontinued after 1986 because of falling numbers of students and because of the introduction of the GCSE system, with the proposed examination being rejected by the examination board for being 'out of line with other (modern) languages' (König 1996: 55).

Another important advance was the passing by Tynwald in 1985 of the *Report of the Select Committee on the Greater Use of Manx Gaelic*, recognizing the importance of Manx and offering limited official recognition and use. This move came as something of a surprise even to the language movement itself, since although limited in its scope and practical consequences, the report represented a major change from the previous indifference of the government (König 1996: 60), and came about owing to the enthusiastic backing of a number of members of the House of Keys, most notably Charles Cain, who argued for increased provision for the language in order 'to enable a Manxman to use his own language with pride and to express his own nationality without being made to feel second-rate' (König 1996: 58). Initial proposals by Cain included extensive use of Manx in official paperwork; although this was watered down for perceived practical reasons in the final version of the report, the recommendations adopted did support the use of bilingual signs by government departments on offices, vehicles, and stationery, as well as recommending that street and district boundary signs should be bilingual, allow the use of ceremonial oaths in Manx, and support the use of bilingual documentation 'provided such use does not deleteriously affect commercial activity or the expeditious administration of justice'. These recommendations were implemented and bilingual signage and stationery in the contexts mentioned are now well-established as the norm.

The most important practical effect of the report was the establishment in 1985 of a 'Manx Language Advisory Council', Coonceil ny Gaelgey, under the auspices of the recently set up Manx Heritage Foundation (König 1996: 60, 80–1, Stowell 2005: 404–6, Broderick

2015: 36). The main function of Coonceil ny Gaelgey was and is to provide official translations for government signs etc., as well as providing translations upon request for private individuals, businesses and other organizations. The Council also took on the job of translating summaries of new laws for promulgation in the annual Tynwald ceremony. The Council initially consisted of three members, Robert L. Thomson, Adrian Pilgrim, and Douglas Fargher. Following Fargher's death in 1986, Thomson and Pilgrim carried out the function of the Council on their own until the mid 1990s (König 1996: 80). Thomson, and by extension Coonceil ny Gaelgey in its early days, took a more philologically conservative approach to coining neologisms than Fargher in his dictionary; cf. for example Thomson's preface to the 1970 reprint of Kneen's dictionary, and a note found among his papers apparently for a meeting of Coonceil ny Gaelgey:

> The supplement contains a number of new words (as Kneen's dictionary already did) made up on the following conservative principles: first, regular derivation and compounding of native elements (processes which have drawn extensively but critically on Kelly's English-Manx dictionary); second, figurative extension of the meanings of existing words; and third, and only under pressure, borrowing from other languages, and preferably with the borrowing assumed to be ancient and therefore affected by the sound-changes which have modified other Manx words in the course of time.
> (Thomson 1970: ii)

> On the whole it is wise to stick to genuine, native, words as far as possible, which avoids the difficulty of making adjustments to cognates, and preserves the character of the language. In the Laws I think very few cognate terms have been admitted: e.g. kiarrooghys 'gaming' < Ir. cearrbhach 'gambler', cearrbhachas 'gambling'; charmaanit 'limited' < OIr. termon (terminus, the limit of a sacred site), about which I have some doubts now; cronghyr 'lottery' < Ir. cronchor 'lot' (not oxytone as D[ouglas] F[argher]); feeshag 'video' < OIr. fis < visio; someone asked the other day about feeal for 'chess' or the like < OIr. fidchell, cog. W. gwyddbwyll, > fidhcheall > *fiall (difficulty is that fiodhall 'fiddle' gives the same result in Manx) […]
> Safer is (metaphorical) extension of existing words.
> (Thomson, unpublished note, Manx National Heritage Library MS 13047)

This may be compared with Fargher's (1979: vi) more relaxed approach to updating the language:

> The vocabulary of a living language is constantly changing and extending. It borrows extensively from other languages. In this dictionary I have tried to give new connotations to old Manx words and have borrowed unashamedly from our Gaelic cousins. Loan words are not easily recognised except by the expert and hundreds of

Irishisms and Scotticisms are now part of the living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century.

(Fargher 1979: vi)

An example of this difference of approach is that the Manx law summaries produced by Coonceil ny Gaelgey use *sheshaght-ghellal* for '(trading) company' (lit. 'dealing society / company', cf. TM *sheshaght-chaggee* 'army', lit. 'fighting company'), a coinage made from existing Manx words (Thomson undated), whereas Fargher (1979: 177) has *colught*, from Irish *comhlacht*. The word in common use is *colught*, but *sheshaght-ghellal* is still used in the laws. Such differences of approach in the Manx movement have never led to serious public rows or schisms, perhaps because the unity of the movement and practical matters of language use have been considered more important. Nevertheless, a hint at such issues under the surface may be detected in the conclusion of Thomson's Ned Maddrell lecture delivered in 1986, the year after Coonceil ny Gaelgey was founded and the year the O-level was discontinued:

> But I think the realisation that Manx, as we are able to recapture it in its late nineteenth-century form, was already well advanced in decline, not just in the number of speakers or in the areas of life it was able to cope with, but in its degree of autonomy and excellence too—I think that that realisation is bound to raise for all of us who are concerned that it should not pass into the limbo of 'lost' languages, the question of just what form and standard of Manx it is that we wish to maintain and propagate for the future.
>
> (Thomson 1986)

Other important developments in the 1980s included the first entirely Manx-medium film *Ny Kirree fo Niaghtey* ('The Sheep under the Snow') produced in 1983 by George Broderick and Peter Maggs of Foillan Films; the acceptance of cheques written in Manx by Isle of Man Bank in 1984; conferences on the future of Manx held in 1983 and 1986; and the founding of the annual Ned Maddrell memorial lecture in 1985.

In 1990 the Government commissioned an opinion poll which showed that 36% of respondents wanted Manx taught as an optional subject in schools (Stowell and Ó Bréasláin 1996: 24). In response to this demand, which though rather modest was far higher than expected, a Manx Language Officer (*Oaseir Gaelgagh*), Brian Stowell, and two peripatetic teachers were appointed by the Department of Education to create a course for use in primary schools (Broderick 1999: 182). Teaching of Manx began in 1992. Initial uptake was far higher than expected, with c. 40% of parents of primary school children opting for Manx lessons for their children. A total of 1949 potential pupils for Manx were registered by summer 1992 (1482

179

primary and 467 secondary), almost 20% of the school population (König 1996: 66). Even on the basis of 30 minutes a week of Manx only, it was not possible to cater for all of these children immediately, and some had to wait one or two years to begin the course. The success of the scheme was somewhat mixed, especially in the secondary schools, where timetable pressures and unenthusiastic head teachers have sometimes hindered its progress (König 1996: 67–8).

By the early 1990s a few families who were active within the language movement had decided to try raising their children in Manx. This was greeted with a good deal of optimism at the time (cf. König 1996: 56–7, 71–3, Stowell and Ó Bréasláin 1996: 26), although the long-term results have been mixed, since the lack of socialization in the language in a wider community coupled with the personal preferences of the children has meant that some of them have not retained an active command of the language into adolescence and adulthood. Nevertheless, the existence of a new generation of native speakers was used as an argument to push for education through the medium of Manx (König 1996: 73). The first Manx-medium nursery group had been established in the mid 1980s, but it was not until 1993 that Manx preschool provision was put on a firmer footing with the group Chied Chesmad ('First Step'), which began with ten to twelve children, including some who were being raised with Manx as a first language (König 1996: 72).

In 2001, the foundations were laid for Manx-medium primary education with the inauguration of a Manx unit with nine reception (age four to five) and year one (age five to six) pupils within Ballacottier School in Douglas (Broderick 2015: 35). In 2003 the unit moved to its own premises in the recently vacated old school building in St John's in the centre of the island, becoming known as Bunscoill Ghaelgagh ('Manx-speaking primary school'). In 2006 the school gained two additional full-time teachers in addition to the headteacher, Julie Matthews, and became a separate school in its own right. The language policy in the school is one of total immersion, with all subjects except English being taught entirely through Manx. By the time they leave the school aged 11, children can express themselves fluently in Manx and understand spoken and written Manx; however, English is still their dominant language and Manx is rarely heard in the playground. Limited provision for the continuance of Manx-medium delivery of certain subjects is made at the Queen Elizabeth II High School in Peel.

In 1995 the first Manx Language Festival or Feailley Ghaelgagh was organized by YCG, and was widely publicized in the local print and broadcast media. There was a general feeling of momentum in the movement at this time, as Manx was beginning to be seen as a mainstream part of the cultural life of the island rather than as an eccentric, antiquarian or pointless pursuit. The negative attitudes of earlier generations who had seen learning Manx as

'unacceptable' (Stowell 2005: 21) were beginning to pass away, as older people who might recall the final stages of language shift and the ridiculing of the Manx of their own grandparents, died, and younger generations, including some not originally from the island, adopted the language as part of their own identity:

> Putting it in fairly grim terms, a lot of the attitude change possibly is because some of the older Manx people have died off […] because the hostility to the language was, I'm sure, something psychological, and it is significant, that one or two very old people I've come across, their attitude that I knew years and years ago, their attitude was deeply against Manx, has actually softened an awful lot, and I think a lot of this hostility was a sort of defence mechanism, it wasn't actually true hostility, it was sort of defence and a feeling, almost a guilt, really […] but that's largely gone.
> (Brian Stowell, interviewed by Adrian Cain)[50]

1995 also saw the establishment of the post of Manx Language Development Officer or *Greinneyder* ('Encourager') within the Manx Heritage Foundation 'with a view to raising the profile of Manx both within Man and internationally and to assist organisations both private and public who work to support Manx' (Broderick 2013: 137). In the late 1990s, the functions of Chied Chesmad were taken over by a new charity, Mooinjer Veggey ('Little People'), which now runs four nurseries around the island as well as being involved in the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh. Another important organization, Caarjyn ny Gaelgey ('Friends of Manx') was established in the late 1980s by Peter Karran, a member of the House of Keys and prominent supporter of the language. The organization holds a number of Manx classes and events such as coffee mornings at its headquarters in St John's, and is also involved in encouraging and publishing Manx literature (Stowell 2005: 407). In 1997, a GCSE-equivalent course, the *Teisht Chadjin Ghaelgagh* ('General Manx Certificate') was established, based on the modern foreign languages GCSEs of the English curriculum, and an A-level equivalent, the *Ard Teisht Ghaelgagh* ('Higher Manx Certificate') followed (Broderick 2015: 34–5). Neither of these qualifications are formally recognized outside of the island, unlike the short-lived Manx O-level of the 1980s.

---

[50] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q1urD2CH37U&index=7&list=PLY5y-gRhKs8iT_3P5m__tG48T2KZB2Puj>