

How Scottish is Irish Standard English?

John M. Kirk and Jeffrey L. Kallen

1. Introduction

In this paper, we will identify ‘standardisation’ and ‘Scottishness’ empirically on the basis of the evidence provided by the Irish component of the International Corpus of English (henceforth, ICE-Ireland). With this approach, ‘Scottishness’ can be measured by those features of lexis and morphosyntax which appear in the ICE-Ireland corpus and for which there exists a plausible case of transfer from Scots or which reflect areal features shared by Ireland and Scotland but not found elsewhere. We will show that such features, by appearing across a range of texts from both Northern Ireland (the ICE-NI subcorpus) and the Republic of Ireland (the ICE-ROI subcorpus) demonstrate a certain, albeit limited, Scottishness. Given the focus of the international ICE project on standard English, as discussed below, we should not be surprised that the amount of observable Scottishness in ICE-Ireland is relatively small. Nevertheless, the very existence of distinctly Scottish features in this corpus raise important questions for the relationship between dialectal or vernacular features of language and the development of national standard Englishes.

Our basic hypothesis regarding Scottishness is based on the well-documented history of Scottish settlement in the seventeenth century (Perceval-Maxwell 1973, Robinson 1984, Bardon, 2001, Montgomery and Gregg 1997, among others) and on the equally well-documented descriptions of present-day Scottish English or Modern Scots.¹ We hypothesise that, if Scottish features have survived in Ireland, they are more likely to have survived in the nine historical counties of Ulster than in the rest of Ireland, and that, therefore, if they have been absorbed into the standardised

¹ The distinction between these terms is often based on ideological, rather than systemic or structural, considerations. We note, for example, that Miller (2003), the same article as Miller (2004, 2008), is written as a description of (modern) Scots. In the former paper, the title refers directly to ‘Modern Scots’, whereas in the latter two it refers to ‘Scottish English’. The editors of those latter volumes clearly regard the material as nothing other than Scottish English. Each label is thus commensurate with an editorial stance which reflects a conceptual difference rather than a difference in the materials under consideration.

language, they are more likely to be evident in ICE-NI than in ICE-ROI. Given that the Republic of Ireland includes three of the nine counties of Ulster, our expectation is that this hypothesis is more likely to be confirmed in relative rather than absolute terms.

First, however, we feel it necessary briefly to describe the ICE methodology upon which our results and conclusions are based. For the study of Irish English, ICE methodology offers several innovations.² ICE does not depend on introspection, casual observation or questionnaire elicitation. It is based on a collection of texts (each of 2,000 words) in 15 different situational categories of the spoken language and in 17 functional types or domains of the written language. Together, these categories generate 300 spoken texts and 200 written texts.³ The categories and the number of texts in each are identical across national components, so that each text category may be directly and systematically compared across corpora.⁴ The reader should note that, whereas all our analyses are based on the spoken component of the corpus, depending on the topic, we have sometimes used the entire spoken component and on other occasions used only certain registers, which we have clearly indicated. Nevertheless, we believe that whatever data are used, we will be careful with the extrapolations we will make and qualify appropriately.

Given that there is no ICE corpus for Scotland, it will be our approach in addressing 'the Scottishness question' to compare equivalent categories of spoken texts in ICE-NI and ICE-ROI with the scholarly literature on Scottish English (modern Scots) or, in some instances, with comparable data from ICE-GB. We will be asking, to what extent are features shared across the same category in each corpus?

² Funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Board (later Council) and from the Royal Irish Academy and the British Council Social Sciences Committee have been essential to the development of this project and is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks go to the host of speakers, writers, and broadcasters who have kindly given permission for their contributions to be included in ICE-Ireland.

³ A discussion of ICE principles follows in the next section; for further information about ICE-Ireland, see Kallen and Kirk (2008).

⁴ For the record, of the Ulster speakers in ICE-ROI about whom we know the particular details, there are 3 speakers from Co. Cavan (S1A-070\$A, S1A-086\$A, and S1B-041\$B), 10 from Co. Monaghan (S1A-061\$B, S1A-062\$C, S1A-065\$B, S1A-069\$C, S1A-070\$B, S1A-086\$B, S1B-038\$B, S1B-057\$G, S1B-058\$E and \$F, and S1B-080\$C), and 8 from Co. Donegal (S1A-026\$I, S1A-043\$C, S1A-044\$D, S1A-098\$A and \$B).

The Scottishness question lends itself to numerous interrogations. Northern Irish accents, especially, have many features in common with Scotland, as numerous studies have shown. (e.g. Wells 1980, Milroy 1981, Harris 1985, Kingsmore 1995, McCafferty 1999, 2007). Since the ICE project is not concerned with phonology, this approach to Scottishness is not a central concern of the present paper. As an indication of what is possible in this regard, however, we start with a discussion of some findings from the *SPICE-Ireland Corpus* (Kirk et al. 2009), which is an annotated version of the spoken texts in ICE-Ireland, designed to highlight features of discourse structure, the expression of speech acts, and prosody.⁵ We will return to discourse features later in the paper, but as an illustration of prosodic features that may help to delimit Ulster speech, let us consider here the analysis of tone direction as annotated in *SPICE-Ireland*.

Table 1 shows the total number of the four main pitch movements identified in the spoken component of ICE-Ireland.⁶ As seen in the table, the frequency of tone groups with falling movements is considerably lower in ICE-NI (36.6%) than in ICE-ROI (63.4%). Conversely, the proportion of rising movements – though considerably less common in both subcorpora – is far more common in ICE-NI (73.1%) than in ICE-ROI (26.9%). As the table shows, the tendency for ICE-NI and ICE-ROI to be nearly inverse to each other continues with the minor patterns of the Rise-fall and the Fall-rise. We know of no research on Scottish English with which these results may be compared, although our results may be indicative of close affinities between Northern Ireland and Scotland.⁷

⁵ The *SPICE-Ireland Corpus* was supported by the AHRB Research Grant Project on ‘Integrating Prosody, Pragmatics and Syntax in a Corpus-based Description of Irish Standard English’, December 2003–November 2005, for which receipt of funding is gratefully acknowledged. See Kirk (2010) for an overview and Kallen and Kirk (in press) for further detail.

⁶ Tables 1 and 2 are constructed on the basis of the 98.5 texts in the spoken component of *SPICE-Ireland* which have been annotated for prosody.

⁷ We also realise that, from the prevalence and development of the Scottish vowel-length rule in all areas of Northern Ireland (see Kirk 1998, especially Map 6; also Corrigan 2010), except in what Harris (1984, 1985) identified as the South Ulster dialect, no inference may be drawn about the nature and distribution of intonation features until more research comes to establish, among others, just such a connection, if at all.

Tone		NI		ROI		IRL	
		n.	%	n.	%		
1	Fall	18126	36.6	30110	63.4	48236	
2	Rise	8251	73.1	3030	26.9	11281	
3	Rise-fall	1533	89.1	187	10.9	1720	
5	Fall-rise	267	25.4	784	74.6	1051	
		28177	45.2	34111	54.8	62288	

Table 1: SPICE-IRL: Results by Tone Pattern

Apart from questions of phonology, then, Scottishness could be interpreted as a question of vocabulary, including the entire range of lexical expression, as discussed in Kirk & Kallen (in press), to which the reader is referred. Moreover, Scottishness could be interpreted as a question of morphosyntax, features of which have become, as Falconer (2007) shows, asymmetrically converged with and dialectalised into a shared system with English, occasionally involving some syntactic or semantic refunctionalisation.

Scottishness could also be a question of pragmatics. Using a taxonomy adopted from Searle (1965), the *SPICE-Ireland Corpus* also allows for investigations of the speech act status of each utterance in our spoken texts, with a view to establishing an initial picture of how speakers map syntactic structures and prosody onto their communicative – and often situationally based – needs. Space and time prevent us from reporting on pragmatic features here, although early results may be seen in Kirk, Kallen, and Rooney (2005), Kallen (2006), Kirk (2010), Kallen and Kirk (in press) and Vulpius (2010).

To those structural levels of language need to be added the various factors which may account for the Scottishness factor: is Scottishness simply a question of transfer from the substratal source dialect, or are there other explanations such as dialect convergence involved? To what degree do cultural and content-related, as opposed to structural, features figure in a determination of Scottishness?

As the present investigation is based on corpus evidence, two more factors are central to our methodology – frequencies (both absolute and relativised numbers of occurrences) and salience (where particular expressions stand out). It is in the interplay of frequency and salience that both our interpretation and calibration of Scottishness will be formed.

2. ICE and ICE-Ireland: Background and methodology⁸

The proposal to compile an International Corpus of English (ICE) was first published in a brief note by Greenbaum (1988). In a later discussion of the ICE project, Greenbaum (1996b: 3) explained that

its principle aim is to provide the resources for comparative studies of the English used in countries where it is either a majority first language (for example, Canada and Australia) or an official additional language (for example, India and Nigeria). In both language situations, English serves as a means of communication between those who live in these countries. The resources that ICE is providing for comparative studies are computer corpora, collections of samples of written and spoken English from each of the countries that are participating in the project.

Nelson (1996: 28) further elaborates the ICE concept in describing the social characteristics of the contributors to ICE corpora:

The authors and speakers of the texts are aged 18 or over, and have been educated through the medium of English to at least the end of secondary schooling. We use these two criteria because they are quantifiable. We do not attempt an evaluation of the language in a text as a criterion for inclusion or exclusion. Age and education can be accurately measured, and they can be applied in the same way in every country. The project, then, is not based on any prior notion of what 'educated' or 'standard' English is.

As we discuss below, there are a number of features of ICE-Ireland that reflect the specific historical and political forces that have shaped the linguistic ecology of Ireland. In order to appreciate these particularities, though, we start with an examination of the salient features of ICE as an investigation of English as a world language. First, although it is true that all the countries in Greenbaum's national categories contain within them elements of dialect variation, urban vernacular speech, non-native or learner English, linguistic change in progress, and a host of other sources of linguistic variation, ICE is not designed as a study of variation, but as a study of 'standard' national Englishes. Taken to extremes, it could appear that this focus on the standard language would make international comparisons re-

⁸ This section is based on an earlier text in Kallen and Kirk (2007).

dundant: if 'standard' English is truly standardised, then all national standards should be linguistically identical and comparisons would be unrevealing. Yet built into Greenbaum's aim of 'comparative studies' is the recognition that national standard Englishes do differ in important ways: in other words, that there is diversity within English even when the English which is being studied is ostensibly that which suppresses variation. Secondly, we recognise that Nelson's succinct definition of the contributors to the ICE corpus also anticipates the inclusion of linguistic diversity within ICE. Second-level education, especially in those English-speaking countries where it is widely available, is not necessarily a linguistically unifying experience, i.e., one which determines a focused linguistic norm for all participants. Thus it may be that considerable variety will be found among speakers and writers who meet the simple educational criterion used in ICE. Thirdly, we point out that Nelson's reference to 'texts' indicates the essential unit of the ICE corpus: the corpus text, consisting of approximately 2000 words of speech or writing, taken from a specified context as defined in ICE protocols (see Nelson 1996: 28-33, Nelson, Wallis, and Aarts 2002: 309-31). Each ICE corpus includes 300 texts of spoken language and 200 texts of written language, yielding a total of 1 million words, orthographically transcribed and marked up using a standard ICE markup system (see Greenbaum 1996 for various discussions of ICE annotation; the ICE markup system is available from the ICE website).

In theory, then, the ICE project lays down simple rules which determine each national corpus based on a combination of textual and language-user definitions. This system is general enough to be applicable across a wide range of English-speaking countries, yet specific enough to ensure comparability of text type and social considerations among the different corpora. In practice, however, we have found that many decisions had to be made in implementing the ICE-Ireland corpus that could not have been determined by general ICE guidelines, but which, instead, required elaborations or modifications to the ICE procedures in order to retain the goal that ICE-Ireland should be a credible representation of standard English usage in Ireland. For details on this point, see Kallen and Kirk (2007, 2008).

To give a sense of what is involved in the ICE-Ireland corpus, Table 2 gives the distribution of text types and approximate word counts for the spoken text categories of ICE-Ireland. The number of texts in each category is split evenly between ICE-NI and ICE-ROI, so that the total number of words per category in each zone is roughly equal. Titles of text categories in the table reflect usage within the ICE-Ireland project and sometimes differ in small

but self-explanatory ways from the original ICE labels. All results reported in this paper are from ICE-Ireland's spoken component.

ICE-Ireland text category	Abbreviation	Word count
Broadcast discussion	BRD	42,632
Broadcast interview	BRI	20,931
Broadcast news	BRN	40,579
Broadcast talks	BRT	40,964
Business transactions	BUT	21,447
Classroom discussion	CLD	43,345
Demonstrations	DEM	22,069
Face to face conversation	FTF	210,540
Legal cross-examination	LEC	20,013
Legal presentations	LEP	21,110
Parliamentary debate	PAD	22,390
Scripted speeches	SCS	20,468
Spontaneous commentary	SPC	43,028
Telephone conversation	TEC	20,673
Unscripted speeches	UNS	62,777
Total spoken ICE-Ireland		652,966

Table 2: Spoken text types and word counts, ICE-Ireland

Morphosyntax

The thrust of our case about Scottishness is based on the following selection of morpho-syntactic features and one discourse features. We may not claim to completeness of coverage – many other possible features could no doubt be examined. However, our selection has been motivated partly by our awareness of their saliency, and partly by the attention which they have attracted in the recent scholarly literature. Our approach to Scottishness is also conditioned by insights from the world-wide survey of variation in English morphosyntactic features carried out by Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004). That investigation, which compares some 76 features across 46 ‘non-standard varieties of English’ (p. 1144) helps us to see many features of Scottish and Irish English in the context of world English more generally. For instance, accounts of Irish English regularly draw attention to the use of reflexive pronoun forms as subject or other non-reflexive pronouns, as in

Mum and myself are still hoping a separation will not take place from ICE-Ireland (see Kirk and Kallen 2006: 104). Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004: 1158), however, show that such uses with first person reflexives are found in 30 of the varieties surveyed, including both first-language and second-language Englishes. On the other hand, the *after*-perfect construction, exemplified in ICE-Ireland by *A new fella is **after** taking over* (see Kirk and Kallen 2006: 96), is shown to be truly limited in its distribution: it arises in the Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004) survey only in Ireland, Newfoundland (where historical links to Irish English based on settlement are well-documented, e.g. by Clarke 1997), and Cameroon. As we shall see below, the use of *never* as a punctual negative particle (or ‘preverbal past tense negator’ in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi’s terms), which is sometimes thought to be particularly associated with Irish English, is actually among the most widespread variable features of English, occurring in 40 of the varieties surveyed (p. 1158). The challenge for the study of dialect syntax identified in Kirk (1985), in which it is pointed out that the study of a single place or area dialectologically tells little about where else any given feature might occur (see also Kallen 1981), has at least a partial answer from the Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004) survey: future comparative work of this kind may shed further light on the nature of Scottishness in world English.

2.1 Particles of Negation⁹

According to Miller (2003: 87), ‘In Scots verbs are negated by the independent words *no* or *not*’, shown here in (2), or ‘by the suffixes *-nae* and *-n’t*, as seen in (3) below.

- (1) She’s **no** leaving
She’s **not** leaving
- (2) She **isnae** leaving
She **isn’t** leaving

Moreover, Miller states that ‘*is*, *have* and *will* attach to the preceding pronoun and become reduced’, as in *she’s no phoned yet*, *she’ll no be coming*

⁹ Although there are accounts of negation in most studies of Scottish English (or Modern Scots) syntax, these accounts tend to be descriptive rather than quantitative: see, for example, Beal (1997), Bergs (2005: §3.1.4), Görlach (2002: §6.2.5), Johnson (2007), Macafee (1980), Macaulay (1991, 2005), and Miller (1993, 2003, 2004, 2008).

to the party, and *I've no seen him the day*, and that *-nae* is added to DO as in *he doesnae help in the house* or to modal verbs as in *she cannae knit*, where the negation applies to the modal verb (cf. *You can no come to the party if ye dinnae want tae*).¹⁰

These features occur in ICE-Ireland, albeit extremely rarely. The suffixal *-nae* form occurs with DO and modals, as in:

- (3) a. <S1A-045\$A FTF-N> <#> And they break the head off for the tail and that 's why they call it tailing <#> They **dinnae** call it heading <#> <{2> <[2> <,> They call it tailing yeah </[2> <#> And that 's separating <#> And then you get the head-onners <#> They 're the bigger dearer ones <#> They they **dinnae** touch them and they like working with them <,> so they do
- b. <S1A-026\$A FTF-N> <#> But <,> I **cannae** talk to her <#> Do you ever just find a person like that
- c. <S1A-045\$A FTF-N> <#> <[2> No they </[2> </{2> **wouldnae** <#> They **wouldnae** know <{> <[> but uh </[>.

The negator *nae* also occurs as an isolate form:

- (4) <S1A-045\$A> <#> <[> Aye whenever </[> </{> you were saying there earlier on people think they can eat raw prawns like <#> That 's it they **have nae** a clue

The last three examples are from the same speaker, a fisherwife from Portavogie, in one of the traditional heartlands of Scottish settlements in the Ards peninsula.

2.2 Contracted Negative Forms

It is well-documented that English shows alternations between negative contraction and non-contraction on the main verb, as in:

¹⁰ Purves (2002) spells the negative clitic with *-na* e.g. *canna*, *isna* and extends it to *wesna*, and the negative isolate as *no*, as in *a'm no that fou*.

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

(5) <S1A-030\$C FTF-N> <#> What 's wrong <{> <[> if the
</[> branch **is not** in Derry

(6) <S1A-022\$B FTF -N> <#> That pizza **isn't** as nice when
it 's cooked on a plate.

At the same time, a further alternation concerns contraction in negative sentences whereby contraction takes place with the auxiliary becoming attached to the subject, leaving *not* in full form, as in (7a), or contraction takes place between the auxiliary and *n't*, leaving the subject unaffected, as in (7b):

- (7) a. <S1A-049\$A> <#> <[> Elaine '**s not** going to go </[>
</{> I 'd say cos she has some golf thing on first
of all <,> up in Sligo
b. <S1B-023\$D> <#> Well I would take the opinion that
Dennis Haughey **isn't** the only one outside this

Table 3 presents the data for contracted and uncontracted negated auxiliaries in the Face-to-face Conversation data in ICE-Ireland.

Negative Contracted (forms in <i>-n't</i>)			Negative Uncontracted (forms in <i>not</i>)	
NORTH	SOUTH		NORTH	SOUTH
1	2	3	4	5
		<i>(zero) not</i>	2	0
0	0	<i>am</i>	44	36
11	16	<i>are</i>	46	50
90	105	<i>can</i>	3	0
75	47	<i>Could</i>	3	0
0	1	<i>Dare</i>		
183	218	<i>Did</i>	19	9
74	55	<i>Does</i>	13	5
435	441	<i>Do</i>	2	0
15	14	<i>Had</i>	0	1
9	10	<i>has</i>	0	2
55	80	<i>have</i>	4	6
56	84	<i>is</i>	157	79
0	0	<i>May</i>	1	0
7	2	<i>Might</i>	3	3
3	0	<i>Must</i>	0	0
1	2	<i>Need</i>	0	0
9	13	<i>Should</i>	2	0
0	4	<i>Use(d) (to)</i>	0	0
93	110	<i>Was</i>	5	9
20	25	<i>Were</i>	4	1
0	59	<i>Will (won't)</i>	7	2
107	138	<i>Would</i>	5	3
0	3	<i>Others</i>	0	0
1243	1427	Total	320	195
46.6%	53.4%		62.1%	37.9%
2670 (100.0%)		3005	515 (100.0%)	

Table 3: Contracted and Uncontracted Negatives in ICE-NI and ICE-ROI (FTF Data)

Table 3 shows that ICE-ROI has a higher proportion of negated auxiliaries with the negative particle contracted to the auxiliary (53.4%) and ICE-NI has a higher proportion of negated auxiliaries where the negative remains isolate (62.1%). Whereas the reality is that both options occur in each of components of ICE-Ireland, it is the northern component whose distribution more closely resembles the Scottish situation, which, as Miller (2003, 2004, 2008) after all acknowledges, is also variable.

Here are some further examples. Sentence (8) shows a contrast between the contracted Auxiliary and uncontracted negative in (8a) and the opposite pattern in (8b); the question form using contracted *n't* in (9) contrasts with the uncontracted negative in (11); and (10) shows the contrast between declaratives with a contracted Auxiliary (10a) and a contracted negative (10b).

- (8) a. <S1A-019\$B FTF-N> <#> Enjoy his wine <#> He 'll be
<,> I know <#> And **he 'll not** have me there annoy-
ing him so he 'll be grand
- b. <S1A-040\$B FTF-N> <#> It 's really as simple as
that <#> If you don't how to feed them then **I won't**
have to give it to the poor dog
- (9) <S1A-002\$D FTF-N > <#> I was actually looking for
blonde streaks
<S1A-002\$B> <#> **Aren't they** a bit ridiculous
<S1A-002\$D> <#> No I like them
- (10) a. <S1A-049\$A FTF-S> <#> <[> Elaine '**s not** going to
go </[> </{> I 'd say cos she has some golf thing
on first of all <,> up in Sligo
- b. <S1A-010\$D FTF-N> <#> It 's nice to eat something
that **isn't** chips
- (11) <S1A-052\$A FTF-S> <#> **Are you not** going to La Stampa
today
<1A-052\$C> <#> What <#> No uh I 'm going to you know
<,> your a-la-cartes Cameron 's you know <#> I I
thought about having you know <,> cat food <{> <[>
but </[>

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

<S1A-052\$B> <#> <[> It 's not it 's not </[> </{}> a
bad place actually <#> I 'd dinner there on Friday

A further pattern concerns what is generally referred to as *no*-negation and *not*-negation, defined on the basis of the negation of a following NP either by the use of a negative determiner (*he's got no money*) or by a negative particle and *any* as the determiner (*he's not got any money*). In what we refer to as Type 1 negation in Table 4, the negative particle may be contracted to the auxiliary verb as in (12). Alternatively, the auxiliary verb may be contracted to the subject as in (13), or to neither, as shown in (14).

- (12) a. <S1B-034\$G BRD-S > <#> Well uh I I 'm not sure if I
'd go as far as uh Mary Harney uh went uh when she
said it would only last a couple of weeks but then
I suppose uh given the events of the last couple of
weeks <,> uh it **mightn't be any surprise** if uh per-
haps in the early in the new year it falls
- b. <S1A-006\$A FTF-N> <#> And he said yeah <#> I said
that 's okay as long as you know cos I **haven't** hoo-
vered **or anything** yet <#> So he came in and that
was grand <#> And uhm <,> why did I start to tell
you this
- (13) a. <S1A-021\$A FTF-N> <#> **I 'm** not superstitious but I
would not want to live in <,> or I would not want
to have as a bedroom a room where someone had been
brutally murdered
- b. <S1A-049\$A FTF-S> <#> <[> Elaine 's not going to go
I 'd say cos she has some golf thing on first of
all <,> up in Sligo
- c. <S1A-085\$A FTF-S> <#> I I really don't have a fig-
ure in my mind <#> You see obviously she 's not go-
ing to make one big enough
- d. <S2A-033\$A UNS-N> <#> And it 's not going any fur-
ther than the group that 's here and the people who
'll be actually working on the OPs so uhm what you
say is between ourselves and nobody will necessar-
ily be identified by anybody else
- e. <S1A-050\$A FTF-S> <#> Maybe it 's not a firework

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

<S1A-050\$C> <#> It is of course <#> What else goes
neeee

(14) <S1B-030\$C BRD-N> <#> Not in the least <#> <{> <[> It
's very important </[> that we **do not have any risk**
to the public who use the Eurotunnel

In Type 2 negation, the auxiliary verb may or may not be contracted to the subject, as shown in (15) and (16) respectively.

(15) <S1B-021\$A BRD-N> <#> <[> But </[> </{> somebody
would have to pay for the unification of Ireland
<#> There **'s no** question about that <#> <{1> <[1>
<.> Ei </.> either Britain </[1> continues its sub-
vention or somebody makes it up <{2> <[2> <,> or we
</[2> all get very poor

(16) <S1B-032\$D BRD-S> <#> Uh I regret the way now the
position that we 're in and by the way I certainly
won no personal satisfaction in saying that I 've
been proven right in anything <#> I don't want that
<#> I wish that weren't so <#> I wouldn't <{> <[>
want it to be so </[>

Table 4 shows the contrast in the use of these two types of negation for the verbs BE and HAVE in the Face to face conversations in ICE-Ireland (for further discussion of this feature, and comparison with other English varieties, see also Kirk and Kallen 2009b):

		ICE-NI	ICE-ROI
Type 1	Neg V <i>any</i> NP/ <i>any</i> PRO	67 (39.4%)	82 (50.0%)
Type 2	V** <i>no</i> NP / neg PRO	103 (60.6%)	82 (50.0%)
Total		170 (100.0%)	164 (100.0%)

Table 4: NOT-Negation vs. NO-Negation (or *any*-Negation vs. *no*-Negation) with BE and HAVE, ICE-NI and ICE-ROI, FTF data

This table shows, yet again, that the Scottish preference (in this case, for *no*-negation) is reflected in a higher distribution in ICE-NI Face to face conver-

sations (60.6%).¹¹ With the use of data as seen in Tables 3 and 4 regarding negation in Face to face conversations, which show both the Scottish and English forms to be widespread throughout Ireland, we are able to confirm the Scottish hypothesis on the basis of distributional preponderances, but only rather weakly so.

2.3 Punctual *never*

It is plausible to think that the use of punctual *never* is a Scottish feature that should be much more robust in Northern Ireland than in the Republic. Miller (2003, 2004, 2008), for example, states that ‘in Scots the normal negative with past tense verbs is *never*’, i.e. with reference to a single occasion; Beal (1997: 372) states that ‘the use of *never* as a non-emphatic negator is certainly common in Scots today’. Macaulay (1991: 55-6) also records that the use of this punctual negator was more frequent in working-class speech and was synonymous with *not*. As we shall see, however, the evidence as a whole does not support an assumption that Irish English punctual *never* is a Scottish feature.

Turning first to Face to face conversations in ICE, the Scottish hypothesis appears to receive support. In ICE-ROI Face to face conversations, only one out of 84 occurrences of *never* is a punctual negator. In ICE-NI, on the other hand, there are 7 examples of the punctual negator out of 136 occurrences of *never*. Two examples from ICE-NI are:

(17) <S1A-026\$A FTF-N> <#> Must ‘ve been on about an hour
and a half <#> <{2> <[2> You know </[2> and she was
really brilliant you know <#> Like I mean she sang
so many songs but her voice **never** went <#> <{3>
<[3> You know </[3> she ‘s got a really good voice
really strong you know

(18) <S1A-045\$A FTF-N> <#> So me Da came in with a bag of
them you see and the head was still on them <#>
They were still living <#> And didn’t this here
took <&> laughter </&> but she **never** gave a flinch
<#> She was ready to catch it <#>

¹¹ Görlach (2002: §6.2.5) offers the view that Scottish negatives are ‘more distinct from English than other features’.

The one example from ICE-ROI is clearly punctual in its reference, as it refers to the setting-off of a firework:

(19) <S1A-050\$C FTF-N> <#> Can you imagine <,> the chair
 you and me would go down right down to the lads <&>
 squeal </&> <#> Fireworks <#> Happy Halloween <,>
 <#> My God what 's on top of the <,> oh
 <S1A-050\$B> <#> She missed it
 <S1A-050\$C> <#> It **never** burst <#> It just went neeee
 <S1A-050\$A> <#> Maybe it 's not a firework
 <S1A-050\$C> <#> It is of course <#> What else goes
 neeee

From this sample, there would appear to be support for the view that the prevalence of punctual *never* ('on the one occasion that') – as opposed to its durative ('lasting continuously over time') or habitual ('recurrent over and over again') senses – in ICE-NI is indicative of Scottish influence.

When we consider punctual *never* in other registers, however, a different picture emerges. Tables 5 and 6 present the results for Business Transactions (BUT), Classroom Discussions (CLD), Parliamentary Debates (PAD), and Broadcast Discussions (BRD) in the two subcorpora, ICE-ROI and ICE-NI.

	ICE-NI				ICE-ROI				total
	BUT	CLD	BRD	PAD	BUT	CLD	BRD	PAD	
punctual	1	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	8
durative	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	6
habitual	4	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	10
total	7	3	6	2	0	2	3	1	24

Table 5: Function of *Never* – Raw Figures

	ICE-NI		ICE-ROI	
punctual	4	22.2	4	66.7
durative/habitual	14	77.8	2	33.3
total	18	100.0	6	100.0

Table 6: Function of *Never* - Percentages

Table 6 shows that, whereas there are only four occurrences of punctual *never*, as a percentage of the occurrences of *never*, punctual *never* in these four registers is three times more frequent in ICE-ROI than ICE-NI, rather defeating the Scottish hypothesis.

Miller's claim about the Scottishness of punctual *never* and Görlach's reinforcement (2002: §6.2.5) of Beal's (1997: 372) tentative suggestion that punctual *never* may be a fairly recent importation into Scotland from Northern Ireland notwithstanding,¹² Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004) show that, of all 76 features included in their world-wide survey, punctual *never* is one of the most prevalent, widespread and frequent of all. This example demonstrates that whereas standard English forms may become semantically re-functionalised in Scottish and Irish English to an extent that they are associated with local dialects, and if there is no other factor anchoring the feature locally (such as substratal influence for Celtic features or a strong documentary record in Middle Scots), we need to be open to the possibility that a feature may have more universal distribution. As a result of Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi's survey, punctual *never* is not the only feature now in need of redesignation from being a marker of Scottishness (or Irishness) to one of widespread vernacular English.

2.4 Punctual *whenever*

In contrast to *never*, a more plausible argument may be made that punctual *whenever* is a salient marker of Ulster English. For Montgomery (1997: 218–9), punctual *whenever*, a subordinating conjunction which refers to a one-time event rather than to a periodic or durative event, constitutes one of two key instances of 'features unmistakably traceable to Scotland'. Mont-

¹² Beal bases her suggestion on Mitchell (1799), a book of Scotticisms, who remarked that 'in the north of Ireland' *never* is in common usage for *not*, and that it was not regarded as a Scotticism. However, she also notes that '*never* as a negator is not a distinctively Scottish feature'.

gomery and Kirk (2001) reinforce this derivation by reference to the *Oxford English Dictionary* ('now only Scottish and Irish usage'), the *English Dialect Dictionary* (*I came whenever I heard you call* – an undated example from Inverness), and the *Scottish National Dictionary*, which includes the following:

- (20) 1845 Ayrshire Wreath I've heard say, that he spoke a sentence o' Greek, **whenever** he cam into the world.

Robinson (2007: 125) further observes the use of *whenever* 'when a single occasion is referred to' and cites *a cudnae tak it onie lang'r whaniver he cum in bloothert last nicht*.

In the four categories of Business Transactions, Classroom Discussions, Parliamentary Debates, and Broadcast Discussions in ICE-Ireland, of the 11 examples of *whenever*, two express a punctual sense, both from ICE-NI:

- (21) <S1B-074\$A BUT-N> there from uh July two thousand and two till uh <,> towards the end of September two thousand and two **whenever Mr Martin intervened** <#> The developer <,> uh intervened and uh <,> pulled the application uh on the basis that a decision hadn't <,> happened
- (22) <S1B-072\$A BUT-N> I I think you must 've uh <,> pulled one of the hamstring 's muscles <#> Uhm <,,> what 's happened is **whenever you heard the snap** it was probably a few fibres uhm uh <,,> <unclear> 3 syll </unclear> <#> You haven't actually broken the whole hamstring

Although standard uses of *whenever* remain high in our small sample at 81.9%, those two examples of punctual *whenever* are sufficient to suggest salience for ICE-NI.

To put punctual *whenever* into context, we refer to Montgomery and Kirk's (2001) discussion of both punctual *whenever* as we discuss here and 'extended time' *whenever*, which can be paraphrased as 'at the time that' or 'during the time that': cf. the Ulster example *You don't seem to be as sleepy*

as you do *whenever* you're in your teens (p. 241). This discussion shows that these punctual and extended-time uses of *whenever* are features of vernacular Ulster English and English in parts of Appalachia and the American South; in a similar vein, Corrigan (2010: 67) cites the example *just whenever my dad came up to Belfast* from a context which stresses how and when the speaker's parents first met. In the *Dictionary of Smoky Mountain English* (Montgomery and Hall, 2004), the first sense of *whenever* is glossed, with reference to a single event, as 'at the moment or point that' (with reference to the past). The sharing of these meanings between Ulster and parts of the United States, together with the Scottish evidence cited earlier, suggests links that follow from earlier population movements and settlement, but also leave the door open for further investigations as to the direction of diffusion for this innovation and the extent to which it may be shared by other English varieties.¹³

Thus while we do not regard punctual *never* as a Scotticism or a Celticism, the evidence for punctual *whenever* is more suggestive of Scottish links. The point of discussing such features is to show that what appear to be strikingly salient features of vernacular Irish English, which occasionally surface in ICE-Ireland, are not necessarily evidence of Scottish or Celtic origin. Some are based on standard English forms which have become semantically refunctionalised in Irish English. Our results for *whenever* and *never* show that those local uses are in the minority within the corpus of Irish standard English. We expect this pattern to be repeated with regard to similar shared forms in other national varieties contained in ICE.

2.5 *if*-clause protases

A first instance of this feature is what Aitken (1979: 110) calls 'the reduced form of infinitive *have* as a ['] after *had*' (giving the example of *if ye had a said, we wid a kent and we could a went*). Kirk (1986: 235-238) refers to this form as the *have* + double past participle construction in *if*-clause protases (thus creating a verb-phrase construction identical to the main clause apodosis). As Greenbaum and Nelson (1996) show, on the basis of a sample of ICE-GB, *if*-protases generally precede their apodoses, as indeed we find here:

¹³ Häcker (1998: 241, 259) suggests that Irish English *whenever* corresponds to its Dutch cognate *wanneer* on the grounds that the latter does not refer to repeated actions.

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

- (23) <S1A-027\$C FTF-N> <#> **If I had 've thought** what I could 've done was was sent it to uhm got me mate to get them for me in Derry and then just get them <unclear> 4 sylls </unclear> <,> or me da sorry
- (24) <S1A-032\$A FTF-N> <#> **If he had 've got in for longer**
- (25) <S1A-041\$B FTF-N> <#> But I 've already I 've got a Switch card as well so it shouldn't <,> **if they had 've took it** I 'd 've been snookered
- (26) <S1A-041\$D FTF-N> <#> Brilliant <#> See the whole film it 's brilliant up until you find out that he 's a frigging half bat creature <{1> <[1> thing </[1> <#> **If it had 've been an ordinary serial killer** <{2> <[2> it </[2> would have been far better
- (27) <S1B-072\$B BUT-N> <#> **If I had 've been exercising for a while** and I was sitting I would feel it for a few weeks after exercising
- (28) <S1B-073\$B BUT-N> <#> And **if I had 've knew it was there** when I was studying like <{3> <[3> I would 've definitely came up you know </[3> <,> <#> It was a bit unfortunate like <,> <#> But uh
- (29) <S2A-003\$E SPC-N> <#> Now that was uh an unfortunate uh miss there from Conor O'Shea <#> **If he had 've got that** there 'd only be seven points separating the sides <#> As it is <,> Ireland will now need to score twice

However, some *if*-protases follow the apodosis, as in:

- (30) <S1B-055\$A PAD-N> <#> Now in saying that <,> I would 've been here **if I had 've stood in North Belfast where I should 've stood** <#> But <,> but I decided

- (31) <S1A-095\$B TEC-N> <#> I know <#> It would 've been better **if he had 've just buggered off back to Belfast,**

although in (32) the *if*-clause could just as well be analysed as a complement clause, as it is in:

- (32) <S1B-008\$A CLD-N> <#> **I wish I had 've taped her** because she was a wonderful example of <,> she explained it so well <,> this nine under extreme stress.

All the realisations of this feature in the ICE-Ireland material we consider here come from ICE-NI, except for (33), which comes from a speaker from Cork City:

- (33) <S1A-057\$B FTF-S> <#> <[> Yeah you </[> </{> won't though <#> You know what I mean <#> I mean **if we had 've <,> if we had 've studied from Christmas onwards <,> <{> <[> last year </[> we would have got As in everything <#> You know you would 've.**

What is distinctive about this feature is the inclusion of a non-finite perfective auxiliary in the form of a past participle between the operator and the lexical verb. It is realised in speech as a weak form or as an enclitic /'v/ and consequently often rendered in literary texts as <of>, as in:

- (34) Ah wouldnae **of** come **if Ah had of knew** (Helen W. Pryde, *The First Book of the MacFlannels*).

Kirk (1986) finds this feature in dramatic texts in contemporary Scots:

- (35) **If I'd'a been at masell** (Bill Bryden, *Benny Lynch*)

- (36) He would have told me **if he'd'a known**. (Bill Bryden, *Benny Lynch*)

Purves (2002: 25) provides the example:

(37) **Gin it haed a been me**, A wad a taen hir bi the neb.

Miller (2003: 96) analyses the construction as pluperfect replacement in *if*-clauses and *wish*-complements, citing the following examples:

(38) I reckon I wouldnae have been able to dae it **if I had-nae've been able to read music**.

(39) I wish **he'd've complimented me**, Roger.

Adams (1948), in considering this feature as typical of Ulster speech, suggests that it might be a survival of the Old English *ge-* past participle prefix (see also Hogan 1934). According to Aitken (1979), it is “one of the shibboleths of Central Scots urban working-class speech”. At present, it is hard to decide whether the construction is a Scots construction in Ulster or an import into Scotland from Hiberno-English into Glaswegian English in the nineteenth-century. If the former, in view of the predominance of the Scottish population in Ulster over the centuries (by 1680, Scots had outnumbered the English 4 to 1) and the Scottish role in the establishment of towns, industry and commerce, as well as in the medical profession and religion, it should hardly be surprising that Scottish constructions survive in standardised speech Irish English to the present day. The picture, however, is complicated by what we might call the ‘archaic survivals’ hypothesis of Hogan and Adams: further research on this point is needed.

2.6 Epistemic *mustn't*

According to Miller (2003: 89) *must* is only epistemic in Scots, and that consequently *mustn't* expresses ‘I conclude that not’. For Görlach (2002: 107), ‘negated *must* does not – as in St.E. – necessarily express ‘prohibition’, but may have epistemic meanings’. This gloss certainly applies to the three examples of epistemic *mustn't* in ICE-NI:¹⁴

¹⁴ Although we are concerned with spoken component of ICE-Ireland here, we cannot help noting that, whereas there are no examples of epistemic *mustn't* in the spoken component of ICE-ROI, there is one example in a written text:

(42) <W1B-012\$A> <#> I 've already written you a letter but according to your last letter to Aoife you **mustn't** have got it.

(40) <S1A-009\$B FTF-N> <#> Well Esther Dunne **mustn't** have
been there at it then <#> I said our Rosie says she
's related to him

(41) <S1A-022\$A FTF-N > <#> Was she not working
<S1A-022\$B> <#> **Mustn't be**
<S1A-022\$C> <#> Are they not open today
<S2A-022\$A> <#> Say I 'm owe an awful lot of people
money <#> And she **mustn't** of¹⁵ thought it was so
much money that I owed a few quid here you know or
there

Thus while Hickey (2007: 191–2) rightly claims epistemic *mustn't* as a feature shared with Scotland, the small amount of evidence from ICE-Ireland is certainly indicative of a provenance only in Ulster. The Ulster association can only be viewed as relative, however, since anecdotal evidence in the Republic certainly confirms its existence, and epistemic *mustn't* is one of the 76 global features in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004): their example is *this mustn't be true*. Kortmann (2008: 481) shows epistemic *mustn't* in only the three northernmost UK varieties.

2.7 Progressive Verbs Forms

Although progressive aspect is a central feature of standard English, it has been claimed repeatedly that progressive aspect occurs with greater frequency in Irish and Scottish English because of its occurrence with certain classes of verbs with which the progressive supposedly does not occur in the standard. Such claims about a wider functional range for the progressive are echoed for Scottish English by Macafee (1980), Beal 1997, Purves (2002: 52–3), Miller (2003: 92–3), Bergs (2005: 33) and Dossena (2005), who cite, as examples of a greater use with the progressive than occurs in standard English, the following verbs: *doubt, forget, hear, hope, intend, know, learn, like, mind, recognise, remember, want*. For the same verbs in Irish English,

(42) occurs in an ICE text called 'Donegal letters', indicating the provenance of the writer in Ulster.

¹⁵ The use of *of* for contracted 've is a rare occurrence in ICE-Ireland, which has slipped through the transcription protocols urging 'standard' conventions.

similar claims of greater frequency of use are made by, for instance, Filppula (2001, 2003), Mittendorf and Poppe (2000), Poppe (2003), Ó Corráin (1997), and Ronan (2001), each with their own methodologies. In our analysis (see, for example, Kirk, Kallen, and Filppula 2008), we adopt the classification of types of verb classes and subclasses according to semantic domains presented in the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Biber et al 1999: §6.3.3.1). This approach includes those semantic domains which are supposedly rare in the progressive aspect, but for which it has been suggested that progressive aspect is used in Irish English. When we compare each set of verbs with respect to the two categories of Broadcast Discussions (BRD) and Business Transactions (BUT) in ICE (NI), ICE (ROI) and ICE-GB, we see that, overall, progressive aspect occurs in ICE-NI and ICE-ROI only marginally more frequently than in ICE-GB. All three percentages are consistently high relative to expectations: usage of the progressive may seem high at 18.6% for ICE-NI and 19.5% in ICE-ROI, but it is very close to the 17.3% found in the comparable data of ICE-GB. These figures relate to those very semantic domains where, in standard British English, progressive aspect is claimed not to occur; thus what is surprising is not the frequencies for ICE-Ireland but that for ICE-GB. We know of few studies which are so systematically comparable on this point. According to Greenbaum (personal communication in 1987), all aspects of the behaviour of progressive aspect can – and do – occur in standard British English, now confirmed by the present ICE-GB results. Findings of this kind cast doubt on suggestions that extended uses of the progressive aspect are a marker either of Scottishness or Celticity, and reinforce the suggestions of, for example, Miller (1993, 2003, 2004, 2008), Beal (1997), and Smith (2005) that the progressive appears to be on the increase in general. The worldwide distribution of progressive uses found in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi's (2004) survey, and Kortmann's (2008: 480) view of the progressive as indicative of a north-south divide, provide further evidence for the progressive as a global, rather than a regional, feature.

2.8 Discourse Marker *but*

According to Aitken (1979: 109), a further 'shibboleth of Central Scots urban working-class speech' is the 'adverbial tag use of *but*', as in *you meant it, but and* comparable with *though (you meant it, though)*. The DSL, for its part, describes *but* as an 'idiomatic use at the end of a phr. or sentence, sometimes as an intensifier', and includes nine examples, including statements and questions, as in:

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

(43) towards that pig with a knife stuck down his sock.
Kilt suited him, **but**. Unlike ma da (Liz Lochhead
Bagpipe Muzak 36: 1991)

(44) 'Oh, Fergie, you're a real braw wee kiltie!' 'Whaur's
your sporran **but**?' (Robin Jenkins *Fergus Lamont* 8,
1979)¹⁶

Despite these possible associations of clause-final *but* with Scotland, we find that of the 11 occurrences of this feature in ICE-Ireland, only three are from ICE-NI:

(45) <S1A-011\$C FTF-N> <#> <[2> Did she </[2> </[2> do that
while she was in her prime <,> with The Prime of
Miss Jean Brody <&> laughter </&>
<S1A-011\$B> <#> <{> <[> Anyway it was </[> just so
<S1A-011\$C> <#> <[> Her and her girls </[> </[>
<S1A-011\$C> <#> My girls would never do that on me
<S1A-011\$B> <#> My only <,> encounter with people that
were **but**

(46) <S1A-038\$A FTF-N> <#> As long they all fitted around
your table then it 's fine
<S1A-038\$B> <#> No the most well I suppose you
could probably get eight round my table if you bor-
rowed another two and put the <.> m </.> middle bit
in
<S1A-038\$A> <#> Yeah <#> <{> <[> Yes I wouldn't
have </[> that **but**

(47) <S1B-030\$A BRD-N> <#> <{1> <[1> Well there are Greeks
and Germans in other terrorist organisations **but**.

The other eight are from ICE-ROI:

¹⁶ Neither Beal, Görlach nor Miller, quoted above, record clause-final *but*.

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

- (48) (<S1A-053\$A FTF-S> <#> It 's <,> all that it is Janie
it 's muscular spasm **but**
- (49) <S1A-055\$B> <#> She rang McDaid anyway **but**
- (50) <S1A-059\$A> <#> Yeah she 's young and cute **but**
- (51) <S1A-065\$C> <#> It 's very <,> I don't know <,> I
shouldn't really say <{> <[> that cos my relatives
</[> lived there **but**
- (52) <S1A-100\$A TEC-S> <#> Yeah I know <#> It seems to have
paid off as well considering how well you can see a
pool table
<S1A-100\$B> <#> Yeah <#> It 's great <& > laughter </&>
<S1A-100\$A> <#> Pool hustler
<S1A-100\$B> <#> No **but**
- (53) <S1B-034\$G BRD-S> <#> <[2> So perhaps </[2> </{2> per-
haps on Questions and Answers we 'll have the the
agenda of the Cabinet and the minutes of the Cabi-
net in the future **but**
- (54) <S1B-036\$F BRD-S> <#> But I I mean you 're asking the
others what they would do **but**

Given that Aitken (1979: 110) regards this feature as stigmatised in Central Scotland, that other commentators on Scots do not mention it at all, and that, on the evidence of ICE-Ireland, the distribution of this feature is not predominantly skewed towards Ulster, it might be conjectured that clause-final *but* may not be an import from Scotland to Ireland. It may have come the other way around, from Ireland to Scotland, through nineteenth-century migration. Further global evidence, of the type exemplified by Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004), may, of course, suggest that it is neither Scottish nor Irish, but arises from a different dynamic of innovation or convergence.

3. Conclusion

Whereas distinctive features of Scottish English have been discussed and analysed for some time, what is only now coming to light is the extent to which at least some of those features can be considered universal in the senses explored by, e.g., Chambers (2004), Mair (2003), and Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann (2009). Our treatment of punctual *never* shows that since it is the second most widespread feature of the 76 features surveyed by Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004), Kortmann (2008), and Szmrecsanyi and Kortmann (2009), occurring in 40 out of 46 varieties of English, Scottish ‘ownership’ of the feature is not sustainable. Similarly, whereas it may be apparent that progressive aspect occurs more often in Scottish and Irish English, there appears no functional reason why this should be the case, as all possible uses of the progressive are potentially available to all speakers of English. The inclusion of many features in the literature on Scottish and Irish English as somehow characteristic of the one or other region, or which have migrated from the one to the other, is now re-opened by the very thorough survey by Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004, 2009). Regional features are redesignated vernacular features and appear to occur in very different varieties of English – and no doubt because of their functionality. Because the range of spoken registers in an ICE corpus comprises some 15 different discourse situations, it is striking that the above examples come from across the range of texts in ICE-Ireland and are not simply restricted to informal conversation. Whereas we have argued that in the standardised spoken language in ICE-Ireland there are Celtic linguistic features which make ICE-Ireland uniquely Irish (Kirk and Kallen 2006, 2007), we cannot do so to the same extent for Scottishness. In the attempt to do so in this paper, and in the absence of phonological evidence on the Scottish side for a valid comparison, and whereas Scottish lexical material in ICE-Ireland is very limited, the more we try to build a case for Scottishness on morphosyntactic grounds, the more we establish through observing shared vernacular features that the spoken language of the ICE-Ireland corpus is nothing less than a world English, a variety of world Englishes.

We have not entertained the possibility of demonstrating Scottishness on the basis of content, although we recognise that treatments of Scottish topics – whether traditional folk culture or current political affairs – depend on the appropriate vocabulary no matter where the speaker or writer may be from. Nor have we done so on the basis of style or pragmatics, although we expect that ongoing research will enable us to show in pragmatic terms, specifically in the operation of speech acts, ways in which discourse in

Northern Ireland differs from that in the Republic. As we have discussed above, further ongoing research might yet demonstrate that the distinctive patterns of tone direction, may also be attributable to Scots or specifically Scottish influence.

Although our analyses have demonstrated low frequencies of Scotticisms, we do not believe that frequencies or other quantitative answers are decisive here. Tempting though it might be for some to write off Scottishness on the grounds of such high percentages of standardisation, and shared universal features of vernacular speech, we believe that Scottishness manifests accumulatively at more than one level. The growing group of recently self-styled 'Ulster-Scots' speakers use expressions or constructions associated with traditional Scots to create bonding and solidarity as if participants in a common cultural enterprise. Such Scottish features have the function of reinforcing that the speakers belong to the same family, that "you're one of us", no matter whether the speaker is on the radio or talking to a single addressee. On the other hand, one feature may be sufficient for the conveyance of Scottishness or the new Ulster-Scottishness, such as *aye* as a response marker instead of *yes*. Some impact of certain features maybe also be deepened by the accompanying accent or intonation, so that no matter what is said or how it is expressed, Scottishness is implicit through the signal being heard. A central issue concerning the linguistic identity of Ulster-Scots is that what many Ulster-Scots (as well as others from the same areas, though not sharing that ethnic self-designation) can hear as distinctive about their speech is simply the accent.

If the standard language is that variety which most strongly suppresses variation, then we have shown both how strong that pressure towards standardisation in Ireland is and yet also how resistance to that pressure persists. Superstratal pressure may be due to education, the influence of the standardised written form on individuals represented in those categories under investigation, or the prescriptivising ideology of an invariant standard language. Our present results for ICE-Ireland show that, in all instances, standardisation is almost never quite fully achieved and residual vernacular elements persevere in standard contexts.

Our investigation, although wide-ranging, has been far from exhaustive. We have confirmed our hypothesis that, in view of historical demography, with large numbers of Scots speakers settling in Ulster in the seventeenth century, and with the known longevity of Scots, particularly in oral currency, those speech patterns continue even today to be reflected in Irish standard English, and that they show up more in the spoken transcriptions of

ICE-NI than of ICE-ROI. By its associations with education, and all the professional domains which arise from education, standard English is not the locus for an investigation of traditional vocabulary which is inherently bound up with folkways and folk customs. That there is evidence at all of features of traditional dialect in ICE-Ireland is more due to the chance inclusion of particular speakers, such as the Portavogie fisherwife, than anything more institutional or systematic. However, the amount of such material is very low, and we are having to assess the status of several features as Scottish. Although our results show low occurrences of features or few differences in the frequencies of occurrence of features vis-à-vis standard British English, we believe that it is the presence *at all* of such features – not their absolute or relative quantity – which in the formal contexts under investigation, and in the accumulation of harmonious features at other levels, mark at least part of the speech out as Scottish.

In testing our hypothesis, however, three further distinctions may be made:

- the Scottish hypothesis is confirmed only in some instances – for instance, contraction in negative sentences in Scotland and Northern Ireland is, on distributional balance, more likely to be by the operator to the (usually pronominalised) subject than by the negative participle to the operator. The double past participle construction appears more robustly in Scotland and Northern Ireland, though here it is also possible that the feature is more vernacularised in the Republic – and hence less likely to be used in ICE – than it is in Northern Ireland.
- the Scottish hypothesis is in some cases, as with punctual *whenever*, nuanced by the observation of similarities of usage in Scotland, Ulster, and historically relevant parts of the United States, but not clearly confirmed or rejected in the absence of more linguistic information from more sources of data.
- in some instances, the Scottish hypothesis is wrong because global perspectives (as shown by Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi, Chambers, and others) demonstrate that it cannot be right. Punctual *never*, epistemic *mustn't*, and increased use of the progressive, all appear to be of this type.

Two final points remain. Although we have focussed intentionally on Scottish influences, we are aware that many Scots features are shared with Northern English, whose speakers also settled in Ireland in the seventeenth

century (cf. Braidwood 1964). For instance, Kirk 1999 calculates that of the material attributed to Scots in the *Concise Ulster Dictionary*, about half of it is also recorded as being shared with northern dialectal English. The marking of third person plural present tense verbs with an inflectional *-s* is as much referred to as the Northern Subject Rule as simply subject-verb concord (cf. Pietsch 2005 for a full critical overview). Just as the Irish immigrants took their speech ways to Glasgow in the wake of the Famine, so they did too to cities in the North of England, Liverpool and Newcastle prominently amongst them (cf. Wales 2001, Beal 2004a, 2004b, republished as 2008a, 2008b). Thus whereas there is much common ground between the notion of Scottishness in Irish English, there is in fact just as valid a case an investigation in to the Northern-ness of Irish English, to deal with which, however, is beyond our present concerns. At the same time, Northern English is also one of the varieties of English featured in Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi (2004), so that caveats about a more global distribution, similar to those discussed here, also need attention.

Our second point concerns the methodology of corpus linguistics in the context of ICE-Ireland. In Kirk et al. (2004a), we acknowledge that the end product of a corpus project under-represents the decisions used to make the corpus. Every corpus raises problems and questions — and we recognise that corpora are not absolutes in any given sense. ICE-Ireland is not standard Irish English, but is merely representative of standard Irish English to the extent that the problem of representativity has been addressed and critically answered before inferences may be drawn. ICE-Ireland acts as mediator between the reality of language usage and the demands of corpus analysis — in the present case to test for Scottishness. We acknowledge that the presentation of large amounts of data in a corpus might well create a much more objective picture of language usage than is possible using more traditional methods — yet even a large corpus such as ICE-Ireland can never purport to represent language usage in any ‘objective’ sense. It will always represent the compiler’s answer to the kinds of questions such as sampling and representativeness addressed in the compilation (and discussed in Kirk et al. 2004), and, as presented here, the analysis of the corpus. In obliging ourselves to be accountable to the facts of usage, and against the ideology of an invariant standard language, we have shown that the ICE-Ireland corpus displays inescapable diversity — including the display of Scottish features within standardisation.

References

- Aitken, A.J. 1979. 'Scottish Speech: A Historical View, with special reference to the Standard English of Scotland'. In Aitken, A.J. and T. McArthur (eds.) 1979. *Languages of Scotland*. Edinburgh: W & R Chambers, 85–118.
- Bardon, Jonathan. 1992. *A History of Ulster*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press.
- Beal, Joan C. 1997. 'Syntax and Morphology'. In Jones, Charles (ed.) 1997. *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 335–77.
- Beal, Joan C. 2004a. 'English dialects in the North of England: Phonology'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Edgar Schneider (eds) 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 113–33.
- Beal, Joan C. 2004b. 'English dialects in the North of England: Morphology and Syntax'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Edgar Schneider (eds) 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. Vol. 2: *Morphology, Syntax*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 114–41.
- Beal, Joan C. 2008a. 'English dialects in the North of England: Phonology'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Clive Upton (eds.) 2008. *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 122–44.
- Beal, Joan C. 2008b. 'English dialects in the North of England: Morphology and Syntax'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Clive Upton (eds.) 2008. *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 373–403.
- Bergs, Alexander. 2005. *Modern Scots*. 2nd edn. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Braidwood, John. 1964. 'Ulster and Elizabethan English'. In Adams, G.B. et al. (eds.) 1964. *Ulster Dialects*. Holywood: Ulster Folk Museum, 5–109.
- Chambers, Jack. 2004. 'Dynamic typology and vernacular universals'. In Kortmann, B. (ed.) 2004. *Dialectology meets Typology*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 127–45.
- Clarke, Sandra. 1997. 'The role of Irish English in the formation of New World Englishes: The case from Newfoundland'. In Kallen, J. (ed.) 1997. *Focus on Ireland*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 207–25.
- Corrigan, Karen P. 2010. *Dialects of English: Irish English, vol. 1: Northern Ireland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Falconer, Gavin. 2007. *Scots: Decline, Revival and Divergence*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Queen's University Belfast.

- Filppula, Markku. 2001. 'Irish influence in Hiberno-English: some problems of argumentation'. In Kirk, John M. and Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.) 2001. *Language Links: The Languages of Scotland and Ireland*. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona, 23–42.
- 2003. 'More on the English Progressive and the Celtic Connection'. In Tristram, H.L.C. (ed.) 2003. *The Celtic Englishes III*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 129–49.
- Greenbaum, Sidney (ed.) 1996. *Comparing English Worldwide: The International Corpus of English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Greenbaum, Sidney and Gerald Nelson. 1996. 'Positions of adverbial clauses in British English'. *World Englishes* 15: 69–81.
- Häcker, Martina. 1998. *Adverbial Clauses in Scots: A Semantic-Syntactic Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Harris, John. 1984. 'English in the North of Ireland'. In Trudgill, P. (ed.) 1984. *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 115–34.
- 1985. *Phonological Variation and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hickey, Raymond. 2007. *Irish English: History and Present-day Forms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogan, J.J. 1934. *An Outline of English Philology Chiefly for Irish Students*. Dublin: The Educational Company of Ireland.
- Johnson, Paul. A., Jr. 2007. 'Scottish English and Scots'. In Britain D. (ed.) 2007. *Languages of the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 105–21.
- Kallen, Jeffrey L. 1981 [1985]. 'A global view of the English language in Ireland'. *Teanga* 2: 32-43. Reprinted in Ó Baoill, D. (ed.) 1985. *Papers on Irish English*. Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics, 63–78..
- 2006. *Arrah, like, you know: The dynamics of discourse marking in ICE-Ireland*. Plenary address, Sociolinguistics Symposium 16, Limerick.
- Kallen, Jeffrey L. and John M. Kirk. 2007. 'ICE-Ireland: Local Variations on Global Standards'. In Beal, Joan C., Corrigan Karen P. and Hermann L. Moisl (eds.) 2007. *Creating and Digitizing Language Corpora*, vol. 1: *Synchronic Databases*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 121–62.
- 2008. *ICE-Ireland: A User's Guide*. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona.

Kirk and Kallen, *How Scottish is Irish Standard English?*

- In press. *SPICE-Ireland: A User's Guide*. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona.
- Kingsmore, Rona. 1995. *Ulster-Scots Speech*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Kirk, John M. 1985. 'Linguistic Atlases and Grammar: The Investigation and Description of Regional Variation in English Syntax'. In Kirk John M. Stewart Sanderson and John D.A. Widdowson (eds.). 1985. *Studies in Linguistic Geography: The Dialects of English in Britain and Ireland*. London: Croom Helm, 130–56.
- 1987. Aspects of the Grammar in a Corpus of Dramatic Texts in Scots. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Sheffield.
- 1998. 'Ulster Scots: Realities and Myths'. *Ulster Folklife* 44: 69–93.
- 2010. 'Introducing the SPICE-Ireland Corpus', Paper presented at the *5th Inter-Varietal Applied Corpus Studies (IVACS) Group International Conference on Connecting Corpus Linguistics*, University of Edinburgh, 18–19 June 2010.
- Kirk, John M. and Jeffrey L. Kallen. 2006. 'Irish Standard English: How Celticised? How Standardised?'. In Tristram, Hildegard L.C. (ed.) 2006. *The Celtic Englishes IV: The Interface between English and the Celtic Languages*. Potsdam: Potsdamer Universitätsverlag, 88–113.
- 2007. 'Assessing Celticity in a Corpus of Irish Standard English'. In Tristram, Hildegard L.C. (ed.), *The Celtic Languages in Contact*. Potsdam: Potsdam University Press, 270–88.
- 2009a. 'Just in Irish Standard English'. In Bowen Rhonwen, Mats Mobärg and Sölve Ohlander. (eds.) 2009. *Corpora and Discourse – and Stuff. Papers in Honour of Karin Aijmer*. Gothenburg Studies in English. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 149–58.
- 2009b. 'Negation in Irish Standard English: Comparative Perspectives'. In Penttilä, Esa and Heli Paulasto. (eds.) 2009. *Language Contacts Meet English Dialects: Studies in Honour of Markku Filppula*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 277–296.
- In press. 'The Cultural Context of ICE-Ireland'. In Hickey, Raymond (ed.) *Researching the Languages of Ireland*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, *Seria Celtica Upsaliensis*.
- Kirk, John M., Jeffrey L. Kallen and Markku Filppula. 2008. 'The progressive in British and Irish Standard English'. Paper given at the International Conference on Methods in Dialectology 13, Leeds.

- Kirk, J. M., Jeffrey L. Kallen, Orla Lowry and Anne Rooney. 2004. 'Issues arising from the compilation of ICE-Ireland'. *Belfast Papers in Language and Linguistics* 16: 23–41.
- Kirk, John M., Jeffrey L. Kallen and Anne Rooney. 2005. 'Corpus linguistic analyses of pragmatics and prosody'. Guest presentation on the pragmatic annotation of linguistic corpora, University of Lancaster.
- Kirk, John M., Jeffrey L. Kallen, Orla Lowry, Anne Rooney and Margaret Mannion. 2007. *International Corpus of English: Ireland Component. The ICE-Ireland Corpus: Version 1.2*. Belfast: Queen's University Belfast and Dublin: Trinity College Dublin. [version 1.2.1 released December 2009]
- Kirk, John M., Jeffrey L. Kallen, Orla Lowry, Anne Rooney and Margaret Mannion. 2009. *The SPICE-Ireland Corpus: Systems of pragmatic annotation for the spoken component of ICE-Ireland. Version 1.2.1*. Belfast: Queen's University Belfast and Dublin: Trinity College Dublin.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 2008. 'Synopsis: Morphological and syntactic Variation in the British Isles'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Clive Upton (eds.) 2008. *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 478–95.
- Kortmann, Bernd and Szmrecsanyi, Benedikt. 2004. 'Global Synopsis: Morphological and Syntactic Variation in English'. In Kortmann, Bernd and Edgar Schneider (eds.) 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English. Vol. 2: Morphology, Syntax*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1142–202.
- Macafee, Caroline. 1980. 'Characteristics of Non-standard Grammar in Scotland'. Unpublished typescript.
- Macaulay, R.K.S. 1991. *Locating Dialect in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2005. *Talk That Counts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mair, Christian, 2003. 'Kreolismen und verbales Identitätsmanagement im geschriebenen jamaikanischen englisch'. In Vogel, Elisabeth, Antonia Napp and Wolfgang Kutterer (eds.) 2003. *Zwischen Ausgrenzung und Hybridisierung*. Würzburg: Ergon. 79–96.
- McCafferty, Kevin. 1999. '(London)Derry: between Ulster and local speech — class, ethnicity and language change'. In Foulkes, P. and G. Docherty (eds.) 1999. *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*, London, 246–64.

- 2007. ‘English in the North of Ireland’. In Britain D. (ed.) 2007. *Languages of the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 122–34
- Miller, Jim. 1993. ‘The Grammar of Scottish English’. In Milroy J. and L. Milroy (eds.) 1993. *The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles*. Harlow: Longman. 99–138.
- 2003. ‘Syntax and Discourse in Modern Scots’. In Corbett, J., McClure, J.D. and J. Stuart-Smith (eds.) *The Edinburgh Companion to Scots*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 72–109.
- 2004. ‘Scottish English’. In Kortmann, Bernd and Edgar Schneider. (eds.) 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. Vol. 2: *Morphology, Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 54–72.
- 2008. ‘Scottish English: Morphology and Syntax’. In Kortmann, Bernd and Clive Upton (eds.) 2008. *Varieties of English*, vol. 1: *The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 299–327.
- Milroy, James. 1981. *Accents of English: Belfast*. Belfast: The Blackstaff Press.
- Mitchell, H. 1799. *Scotticisms, Vulgar Anglicisms and Grammatical Improprieties Corrected*. Glasgow.
- Mittendorf, Ingo and Erich Poppe. 2000. ‘Celtic Contacts of the English Progressive?’. In Tristram, H.L.C. (ed.) 2000. *The Celtic Englishes II. The Celtic Englishes III*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 117–45.
- Montgomery, Michael B. and R.J. Gregg. 1997. ‘The Scots Language in Ulster’. In Jones, Charles (ed.) 1997. *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 569–622.
- Montgomery, Michael B. and Joseph S. Hall. 2004. *Dictionary of Smoky Mountain English*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Montgomery, Michael B. and John M. Kirk. 2001. ‘“My Mother, Whenever She Passed Away, She Had Pneumonia”: The History and Functions of *whenever*’. *Journal of English Linguistics* 29: 234–49.
- Nelson, Gerald. 1996. ‘The design of the corpus’. In Greenbaum, Sidney (ed.) 1996. *Comparing English Worldwide: The International Corpus of English*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 27–35.
- Nelson, Gerald, Sean Wallis and Bas Aarts. 2002. *Exploring Natural Language: Working with the British Component of the International Corpus of English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ó Corráin, Ailbhe. 1997. ‘On Verbal Aspect in Irish with Particular Reference to the Progressive’. In Seamus Mac Mathuna and Ailbhe Ó Cor-

- ráin (eds.) 1997. *Miscellanea Celtica in Memoriam Heinrich Wagner*. Uppsala: Studia Celtica Uppsaliensis, 159–73.
- Perceval-Maxwell, Michael. 1973. *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. [repr. Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1990]
- Pietsch, Lukas. 2005. *Variable Grammars: Verbal Agreement in Northern Dialects of English*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Poppe, Erich, 2003. ‘Progress on the Progressive? A Report’. In Tristram, H.L.C. (ed.) 2003. *The Celtic Englishes III. The Celtic Englishes III*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 65–84.
- Purves, David. 2002. *A Scots Grammar: Scots Grammar and Usage*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Edinburgh: The Saltire Society.
- Robinson, Philip. 1984. *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600–1670*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan. [repr. Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1994]
- Ronan, Patricia. 2001. ‘Observations on the Progressive in Hiberno-English’. In Kirk, J.M. and D.P. Ó Baoill (eds.) 2001. *Language Links: The Languages of Scotland and Ireland*. Belfast: Cló Ollscoil na Banríona. 45–58.
- Searle, John. 1976. ‘A Classification of Illocutionary Acts’. *Language in Society* 5: 1–23.
- Smith, Nicholas. 2002. ‘Ever moving on: changes in the progressive in recent British English’. In Peters, Pam, Peter Collins and Adam Smith (eds.) 2002. *New Frontiers of Corpus Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 317–30.
- 2005. *Recent Changes in the English Progressive*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Lancaster.
- Szmrecsanyi, Benedikt and Bernd Kortmann. 2009. ‘Vernacular universals and angloversals in a typological perspective’. In Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola and Heli Paulasto (eds.) 2009. *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts: Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. London/New York: Routledge, 33–53.
- Vulpius, Daniel. 2010. ‘*Shut up, I’m telling a story: An Analysis of Politeness in Formal vs. Informal Contexts*’. Unpublished Magisterarbeit, Technische Universität Chemnitz.
- Wales, Katie. 2006. *Northern English: A Social and Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, John C. 1980. *Accents of English*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.