

Preformatted version of Review in *Anglia* 126/2, 2008, 409-11

*The Celtic Englishes IV. The Interface between English and the Celtic Languages*. Ed. Hildegard L. C. Tristram. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 2006, 350 pp. € 18.00.

The Volume *The Celtic Englishes IV* contains the proceedings of the fourth international colloquium on Celtic Englishes organised by Hildegard L. C. Tristram at the University of Potsdam in September 2004. This fourth, and final, meeting in the series followed earlier events in 1995 (*The Celtic Englishes*, published in 1997), 1999 (*The Celtic Englishes II*, published 2000), and 2001 (*The Celtic Englishes III*, published 2003). The specific theme of the fourth colloquium was “Exploring the ‘Celticity’ of the Celtic Englishes”.

Like the previous colloquia, the fourth colloquium provided pre-publications of the contributors’ articles, which were supplemented by responses of pre-appointed respondents at the meeting. The articles in the present volume are versions of the majority of the papers delivered at the colloquium. While some authors have integrated a number of comments by the respondents, two responses have been added to the volume separately.

*The Celtic Englishes IV* starts with the editor’s introduction, which comprises short summaries of the papers found in the volume. Further, she adds background information on the conference series and on the previous proceedings.

The first three papers deal with markers of ‘Celtic’ ethnicity. Alan Kent’s paper “‘Bringin’ the Dunkey down from the Carn.” Cornu-English in Context 1549-2005 – A Provisional Analysis’ is a comprehensive and innovative study describing Cornu-English and its position as an identity marker in Cornwall.

Gary German discusses the system and the importance of ‘Celtic’ forms of names in Cornish, Welsh and Breton and also puts forward the suggestion that warlike names born by early Brythonic settlers in Brittany may mirror imperial intentions of the settlers.

Liam Mac Mathúna’s contribution ‘What’s in an Irish Name?’ describes the different naming systems used in Irish and asserts the importance of the social and cultural anchoring function, particularly of patronymic expressions, in traditional Irish society.

The next two papers deal with the use of Standard English in Ireland. Jeffrey Kallen and John Kirk introduce the ICE-Ireland corpus. They argue on its basis that the Standard English varieties used in Ireland display specific lexical and grammatical traits showing the influence of the Irish language. Séamus Mac Mathúna, in his response to their paper, points out that in considering Standard Irish English, regional variation is neglected and asserts that the back-ground of the speakers would be a valuable addition to the data.

The following two papers by Kevin McCafferty and Ailbhe Ó Corráin deal with a salient feature of Irish English (IrE), the *after*-perfect. McCafferty contradicts the assumption that the *after*-perfect is exclusively used for ‘hot-news’ senses, and argues that in addition to previously described resultative uses it is, and has been, extending towards preterite uses, and in this respect it follows cross-linguistic tendencies of perfect markers. The author offers many examples of this phenomenon.

Some of the examples mentioned appear to be taken from earlier studies cited in the bibliography (thus example (19) from Ronan 2005). There, reference to the earlier studies, rather than to the primary sources would seem to suggest itself.

Ó Corráin examines the history of the *after*-perfect in Irish language history. He shows that in 17<sup>th</sup> century Irish a corresponding construction was frequently used with future and subjunctive verbal forms, and that this construction is likely to have formed a model for similar uses in early IrE. When the corresponding Irish construction was finally superseded by different formations in Irish, he argues, the Irish construction underwent a functional shift and became limited to

recency. He argues that this development is the basis for the developments of *after + -ing* in Irish English.

The next contribution is by Elvira Veselinović, who investigates multi-word verbs in English and in Irish. She points out that both languages are increasingly substituting morphologically complex, compounded verbal forms with multi-word forms such as phrasal verbs, prepositional verbs or support verb constructions. She suggests that similar developments in Irish and English may, on the one hand, be due to borrowing, possibly in two directions, but on the other hand, independent typologically parallel developments that led to similar outcomes may have taken place. She argues that while both languages gave up preverbal composition, English increasingly lost suffixation and used simple verbs whereas in Irish petrified preverbs remained as inseparable parts of the verb.

The question of whether there was ‘Celtic Influence on English Relative Clauses?’ is asked by Erich Poppe, with particular reference to the use of relative pronouns and to preposition stranding, which are sometimes attributed to Celtic substrate influence. He argues that relative clauses without initial relative pronouns are common in many Germanic languages, also at early stages, and therefore do not need to be attributed to the influence of Celtic constructions, which may lack relative pronouns due to the presence of special relative verbal forms. Likewise, preposition stranding exists in Celtic languages, but also in earlier and modern varieties of different Germanic languages, which furthermore display different syntactic structures. He suggests that preposition stranding in both English and Celtic languages may be independent and due to basic word order rules in the languages. In his reply to this paper, Malcolm Williams basically agrees with Poppe’s assessment, but points out that even if stranded prepositions at the end of relative clauses are different structurally, they might still appear similar to language users in the sense that they sound like preposition stranding in spoken speech.

The final group of papers deals with topics connected to the evolution of contact languages. The article ‘Irish Presence in Colonial Cameroon’ by Augustin Simo Bobda illustrates that the presence of Irish missionaries was highly important for the educational sector in Cameroon between the 1920ies and the early 1960ies. He argues that IrE left notable traces in the lexicon, grammar and pronunciation of Cameroon English and illustrates this by the realisations of the vowels in NURSE, STRUT, and SQUARE, as well as /hw/ and <th> as compared to other varieties of English spoken in West Africa. In his conclusion he points out, though, that it would be desirable to have more information on the actual dialects of the speakers who came from Ireland and on what further factors influenced the genesis of Cameroon English. In this context, it seems that the influence of local languages would also need to be considered. It is hoped that this article will increase due interest in this rather under-researched field of study.

Raymond Hickey’s contribution ‘Contact, Shift and Language Change Irish English and South African English’ compares features of Irish English and South African Indian English. Hickey argues that these two have in common that their genesis took place in an environment of imperfect language learning by adult learners in a large scale language shift. This type of language acquisition is identified as being the cause of many characteristics of these varieties. Hickey gives examples of typical features of simplified registers and he argues that the importance of morphological marking of aspect systems, as indicated by the use of *do + be* or *bees* to mark habitual aspect in IrE, can be connected to this. He does, however, caution that some problems in explaining the genesis of this feature remain. He concludes that the features discussed overall point to little influence being exercised by the retention of archaic features of the superstrate language, except for in the lexicon. Rather, simplification and the influence of substrate structures play a large role, the latter particularly in the genesis of Irish English syntax. Regarding the problems with the genesis of habitual *do* or *bees*, Hickey draws attention to the fact that Hebridean English, in contrast to IrE, seems to lack the feature of habitual marking by *do* in spite of similar substrate influence. There may, however, be an explanation in the substrate situation as well, as Scots Gaelic in fact differs in its use of the present tense from the typically

adduced Irish situation. Where Irish differentiates between the synthetic present, used for habitual events, and analytic structures used for actions in progress, Scots Gaelic can use the analytic present both for the habitual and for events in progress, whereas the synthetic present may be used for the habitual, but is also employed as a future marker (compare e.g. Gillies 1993). As there is no single clearly distinguished habitual marker in Gaelic, there would be less substrate pressure from Scots Gaelic to distinguish between habitual and non-habitual aspect in its contact variety of English. Furthermore it might be noted that in the example *Is go Gaillimhe a chuaigh sí inné* 'It's to Galway she went yesterday' (p.246) the form *Gaillimh* 'Galway' should be used rather than *Gaillimhe*.

Claudia Lange's paper investigates the interaction of 'Reflexives and Intensification in Irish English and other new Englishes'. She points out that, apart from Finnish, these categories are formally and functionally similar within Europe only in Celtic and English. She points out that, particularly where forms consisting of pronoun+*self* are used in subject position, Celtic influence could be assumed. She illustrates, however, that similar structures are found in Asian varieties of English. She argues for structures consisting of pronoun+*self* to develop as alternative emphasis markers in contact situations where the languages that came in contact with English lack intonational emphasis.

Peter Siemund's contribution considers the viability of purely attributing specific characteristics of IrE either to retention of earlier British English features or to transfer from the Irish language. He points out that by being interested in the outcome of language contact, these approaches neglect the mechanisms at work and do not address features not obviously derived from either of these sources. Against the background of two IrE case studies he introduces the universalist approach, arguing for giving more regard to the influence of typological universals, (contact-induced) grammaticalisation and parameters of second language acquisition. He states his case convincingly and draws attention to approaches that have hitherto not received enough attention in the field. For two topics mentioned *passim*, more regard could have been given to the possibility of Celtic influence, however. One is the assessment that VSO order in Irish had no effect on English. In this respect the often mentioned penchant of IrE for cleft sentences should not be neglected. Secondly for the use of infinitives instead of *-ing* forms, Irish language influence cannot be ruled out *a priori* as Irish has only one nominalised verbal form, the verbal noun. As this is used in contexts where both the English infinitive and the *-ing* form are used, this may lead to errors in bilingual or language-acquisition contexts.

Finally, David White argues that the number of features distinguishing English from the other Germanic languages can be explained in terms of the cultural adaptation of the conquered British to the Anglo-Saxons both culturally and linguistically. This would have led to assimilation of the British and thus to an introduction of linguistic features from British into the emerging English language.

This publication should be of great interest to scholars interested in dialectology, language history, sociolinguistics, and in language contact in general, as well as in the emergence of contact varieties of English in particular. The overall topic index is very helpful. The common bibliography found in *The Celtic Englishes III* was convenient and might have been profitably kept in *The Celtic Englishes IV*.

#### References:

- Gillies, William. 1993. "Scottish Gaelic". *The Celtic Languages*. Ed. Martin J. Ball with James Fife. London: Routledge. 145-227.
- Ronan, Patricia. 2005. "The Hiberno-English *after*-perfect and its Contexts". *Dialects Across Borders*. Ed. Markku Filppula, Juhanni Klemola, Marjatta Palander & Esa Penttilä. (*Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 273), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 253-270.