SCHOLARSHIP AND LANGUAGE REVIVAL: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN CORPUS DEVELOPMENT FOR REVIVED MANX

CHRISTOPHER LEWIN

University of Edinburgh

ABSTRACT

In this article the role of different ideological viewpoints concerning corpus development within the Manx revival movement in the second half of the twentieth century is explored. In particular, the work of two prominent figures is examined: the Celtic scholar Robert L. Thomson, who published extensively especially on Manx language and literature, and also contributed to the revival, particularly as editor of several pedagogical resources and as a member of the translation committee *Coonceil ny Gaelgey*, and Douglas Fargher, a tireless activist and compiler of an *English-Manx Dictionary* (1979).

Broadly speaking, Thomson was of a more preservationist bent, cautious in adapting the native resources of the language and wary of straying too far from attested usage of the traditional language, while Fargher was more radical and open especially to borrowing from Irish and Scottish sources. Both were concerned, in somewhat different ways, to remove perceived impurities or corruptions from the language, and were influenced by the assumptions of existing scholarship. A close reading of the work of these scholar-activists sheds light on the tensions within the revival movement regarding its response to the trauma of language death and the questions of legitimacy and authenticity in the revived variety. Particular space is devoted to an analysis of the preface of Fargher's dictionary, as well as certain features of the body of the work itself, since this volume is probably the most widely consulted guide to the use of the language today.

Finally, it is argued that the Manx language movement today would benefit from a reassessment and discussion of the ideological currents of the past and present, and a judicious evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of existing reference works.

Keywords: language revival, Manx, corpus planning, language ideology, authenticity

1. Introduction

This article builds on a presentation delivered at the International Congress of Celtic Studies in 2015[1] on the implicit ideologies underpinning academic work on Manx Gaelic over the past century or so. There it was argued that there has been tension between a position which sees Manx as a Gaelic dialect like any other, interpreting changes primarily as internal developments (cf. Rhŷs 1894: x) and one which views it as decayed and anglicized, assuming English (or Norse) influence wherever Manx diverges from Irish and Scottish Gaelic. The latter stance was most famously articulated in O'Rahilly's (1932: 121) declaration that Manx "hardly deserved to live", and echoed in Ó Sé's (1991) assertion of the "creolized" or "creoloid" nature of the language and Williams' (1994) description of Manx as a "béarlagair Lochlannaithe" (Norsified patois / creole). In the present article, a similar ideological tension within the activist community of Manx revivalists in the twentieth century is explored, as well as the implications of this for the Revived Manx-speaking community today. The focus is on two prominent figures in the movement, both of whom were involved in lexicography and corpus planning, but who took decidely different ideological positions.

2. Language ideology

The relatively new field of language ideology in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology has given rise to many definitions of what the term 'ideology' means in a linguistic context. Broadly speaking, 'language ideology' may be understand as "cultural conceptions of language-its nature, structure, and use", and "what people think, or take for granted, about language and communication" (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994: 55-56). Two further useful definitions, cited and discussed by Kroskrity (2000: 5), regard language ideology as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979: 193) and "the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (Irvine 1989: 255).

A particular ambiguity in the concept of language ideology concerns where such beliefs or ideas are sited, i.e. the degree to which they are consciously articulated in metalinguistic discourse or whether they are unconscious and implicit, and revealed only in language practice:

---

[1]   Lewin (forthcoming).

> While metalinguistic discourse, as Silverstein [1979] suggested, is a sufficient condition for identifying ideology, Rumsey's [1990] "commonsense notions" and Heath's [1977] "self-evident ideas" may well be unstated assumptions of cultural orthodoxy, difficult to elicit directly. Although ideology in general is often taken as explicitly discursive, influential theorists have seen it as behavioral, pre-reflective, or structural, that is, an organization of signifying practices not in consciousness but in lived relations.
>
> (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 57-58)

In this paper, a broad conception of language ideology is adopted, focusing both on what is implicitly revealed by the two figures' own use of the language, and on their explicitly stated opinions and prescriptions. Of course, given this focus on elite figures within the movement, it must be borne in mind that their ideas and beliefs were and are not necessarily shared by the wider Revived Manx community. Nevertheless, an analysis of the work of these influential writers sheds useful light on the ideological currents within the Manx language movement, and it appears that Fargher's views at any rate are broadly in line with the dominant ideologies of Revived Manx speakers in recent decades (Lewin 2015, 2016a: 128-131).

3. Revived Manx

In this article I assume, following Dorian (1994: 481) and Nahir (1998: 339), a distinction between language revitalization or maintenance (i.e. efforts to slow and reverse the decline in usage and status of a minoritized language which retains a native speech community) and language revival (i.e. efforts to revernacularize a language with no remaining native speakers). The two may overlap: there are many situations where some native speakers still exist, simultaneously with the revernacularization of a language as an L2 of a largely autonomous revivalist speech community (e.g. Breton and Irish to a significant extent, and Manx formerly). This article follows Lewin (2015, 2016a) and Broderick (2015) in using the term 'Traditional Manx' to refer to the now extinct native variety deriving directly by intergenerational transmission from earlier forms of Gaelic, and 'Revived Manx' for the variety spoken today, predominantly as an L2.[2]

The Manx language, as it is spoken and written today, is the product of a revival, and not simply a process of revitalization. No native speakers of the traditional variety are now alive, and those who have had limited, direct

---

[2]   For an explanation and defence of these admittedly (and inevitably) problematic terms, and an evaluation of alternatives, see Lewin (2016a: 20-23).

contact with native speech can probably be counted on the fingers of one hand. As far as is known, the last speaker who acquired traditional Manx in childhood, Ned Maddrell, died in 1974, and the last Manx-dominant speakers who grew up in largely Manx-speaking communities must have died in the early twentieth century. Revived Manx, while having many continuities with the traditional variety, is arguably a new language, and the typical speaker will have a heavy English substrate in their phonology and grammar, and also a significant amount of neologistic lexis of a kind alien to the linguistic ideologies of traditional L1 Gaelic-speaking communities, as described for example by Ó Maolalaigh et al. (2014) for Scottish Gaelic and Ní Ghearáin (2011) for Irish.

The revival began as a middle-class antiquarian pursuit in the late nineteenth century, when the emphasis was more on the preservation of Manx literature than the practical use of the language (cf. Broderick 1999: 173-176, Stowell 2005: 400). More radical currents emerged around 1900, but efforts to revive the spoken language were hampered by inadequacy of teaching methods, which focused on learning to read the Manx Bible rather than the colloquial language, and by the fickleness of public and institutional enthusiasm. The modern period of the revival can be said to have begun in the 1930s, when enthusiasts began seeking out the remaining native speakers and acquiring the spoken language from them, supplementing this acquisition with continued study of the Bible.

Later, and especially from the 1970s onwards, attempts to modernize and radicalize the revival movement led to a renewed emphasis on colloquial speech and modern writing by second-language speakers, and the sidelining of the study of religious texts, which was perceived as dry and off-putting (Broderick 2015: 38). However, the death of the last native speakers and the sidelining of the religious texts, which were translated by native speakers before the decline of Manx began, meant that revival speakers were increasingly detached from the sources for the traditional language. Consequently, the major figures of the revival movement, and textbooks, dictionaries and literature produced by them, became proxy authorities (cf. Ó hIfearnáin 2015).

We shall examine the work of two of these prominent individuals: firstly, the Celtic scholar Robert L. Thomson (1927-2006), who published extensively, especially on Manx language and literature, and also contributed to the revival, particularly as editor of several pedagogical resources and as a member of the translation committee Coonceil ny Gaelgey; and secondly, Douglas Fargher (1926-1987), a tireless activist and compiler of an *English-Manx Dictionary* (1979). Broadly speaking, Thomson was of a more preservationist bent, cautious in adapting the native resources of the language and wary of straying too far from attested usage of the traditional language, while Fargher was more

radical and open especially to borrowing from Irish and Scottish sources. Both were concerned, in somewhat different ways, with the removal of perceived impurities or corruptions from the language.

4. Robert L. Thomson

Thomson's cautious and philologically informed approach is revealed in his description of the principles he takes in the devising of neologisms in his preface to the revised edition of Kneen's English-Manx dictionary (originally published in 1938):

> 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.
>
> Though still far from providing a complete guide to Manx for modern life, the dictionary and supplement, it is hoped, will serve, as the dictionary has so well served in the past thirty years, as a useful aid to the acquisition and use of chengey-ny-mayrey Ellan Vannin [the mother tongue of the Isle of Man].
>
> (Thomson 1970: ii)

Note that although Thomson's ideology here is "conservative", in that it takes the traditional language as its primary model, seeks to use the least innovating processes in creating neologisms, and eschews as far as possible borrowing from other languages, it is still a revivalist ideology since the publication is intended as "a useful aid to the acquisition and *use* of chengey-ny-mayrey Ellan Vannin" (my emphasis) in the context of "modern life".

More is revealed about Thomson's ideological position in unpublished typewritten notes found in his papers (Manx National Heritage Library MS 13047), which seem to be intended for an address, perhaps at a Coonceil ny Gaelgey meeting, on the principles of coining neologisms:

> First port of call the dictionary – remember to check with Mx-Eng – pitfalls in dictionaries…
> Second line of inquiry is one of the cognate languages, or indeed any other language you know: the result is either a) a word that has a Manx

cognate; b) a word that doesn't; in (a) the Manx cognate may provide a suitable solution, or it may have a meaning so removed from the Manx meaning as to be quite unsuitable; if (b) it may be capable of adaptive borrowing, but equally likely it will not, because it would clash with an existing word or lack body. The adaptation of cognates from Ir[ish] or S[cottish] G[aelic] involves some knowledge of the history of Manx sounds from the O[ld] Ir[ish] period onwards. There is also the problem of choosing a Manx spelling for them, choosing the right analogy with other words of the same source…

… abstractions should be shunned…

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[3] I think very few cognate terms have been admitted: e.g. kiarrooghys 'gaming'[4] < 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's dictionary]); feeshag 'video' < OIr. fis < visio; someone asked the other day about feeal for 'chess' or the like < OIr. fidchell, cog. W[elsh] gwyddbwyll, > fidhcheall > *fiall (difficulty is that fiodhall 'fiddle' gives the same result in Manx)…

Safer is (metaphorical) extension of existing words…

(Thomson undated)

There is a marked emphasis here on the traditional language as the primary source of legitimacy—"genuine, native words" are to be preferred, presumably in contrast to neologisms which would be perceived as artificial or foreign. Caution is the primary consideration in rendering modern concepts into Manx: caution in using dictionaries, which may mislead; caution and philological rigour in considering etymologies, with "some knowledge of the history of

---

[3]   Thomson is referring here to the promulgation of summaries of all new acts passed by the Manx parliament, Tynwald, at the annual open-air sitting at St John's on 5th July, in both English and Manx. This was originally done so that everyone in the island, including those who did not speak English, would be aware of the law, and is one of the few uses of Manx, albeit now ceremonial, to have survived without interruption. The technical translations needed for this have been, and continue to be, an important catalyst for the development of neologisms.

[4]   John Kelly (1750-1809), a native Manx scholar, has *carrooagh* in his dictionary (Kelly 1866), but this is probably one of the many Scottish and Irish words Kelly Manxified without fully understanding Gaelic orthography and the correspondences between Manx and its sister languages (cf. Thomson 1990), since the initial palatalized consonant of *cearrbhach* is not indicated, and a development to final stressed *-oogh* /ˈuːx/ would be expected, as in *tarbhach > tarroogh*. Kneen (1938 [1970]) and Fargher (1979) both reproduce this *carrooagh*, while Thomson's form here seems to be a correction to the expected Manx form if it had been attested. Thomson and his contemporaries seem to be unaware of the word *gamstyragh* 'gaming', found in a nineteenth-century catechism (Clague 1814: 10). This is clearly from English 'gamester', but the form suggests it was well established in Manx.

Manx sounds from the O[ld] Ir[ish] period onwards" seen as an essential qualification; and caution in ensuring neologisms do not "clash with an existing word", and that the "character of the language" is preserved. The process of coining or adapting neologisms is framed as one in which scholarly gatekeepers should carefully guard the language and only reluctantly 'admit' innovations when necessary. Aesthetic and scholarly considerations seem to take precedence over any practical constraints which might arise, such as the need for terms to be translated quickly, a shortage of academic expertise, the need for consistency with terminology already in use (even if 'wrong' from a philological perspective), and the potential for alienating users of the language if they are told that a term they have used for a long time is 'incorrect'.

Although Thomson is concerned to "preserve the character of the language", his philological predilections seem to take precedence, since the peculiar practice of backdating loans as if they had been borrowed centuries ago (such as *çhellveeish* for 'television') would probably not be welcomed by Scottish Gaelic speakers, for example, who use *telebhisean* (Ó Maolalaigh et al. 2014: 107, 116-117). It should be remembered that Thomson was primarily a scholar of the written, religious literature of Manx and may not have been particularly concerned with what kind of neologisms would have seemed natural to vernacular speakers of traditional Manx. In this respect, Thomson's ideology aligns with the preservationist tendency of an earlier period of the Manx language movement (see above). 'Antiquarian' might be an apt designation for this approach.

5. Douglas Fargher

It is worth comparing Thomson's approach with some extracts from Fargher's preface to his dictionary, in which quite different ideological assumptions and priorities can be discerned:

> 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 a vital part of the living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century, or 'Neo-Manx' as the scholars would have it, our last native speaker, my cousin Ned Maddrell, having died in 1974.
>
> The aim of this dictionary is purely practical. It is largely a prescriptive work and not a descriptive one, that is to say, 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.

…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 unncessary 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.

The orthography used throughout is a mixture of the variants found in Kelly's, Cregeen's and Kneen's works. My own view, also shared by many respected and authoritative speakers of the language, is that this system is a historic abomination, separating, as it does, Manx from the rest of Gaeldom, and thus destroying the linguistic unity of the Gaels, without replacing it with anything better in the way of a truly phonetic orthography.

…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.

…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.

In spite of the enforced anglicisation of the Manx people since the 1872 Education Act, the anglo-americanisation of the Island in our own times and the present day influx of thousands of new residents, there has been a great revival in Manx national consciousness over the last fifteen years since the formation of the first nationalist political movement, which has led to a much greater interest in and use of the native tongue, especially among the younger people of the Island. It is to them, *yn feallagh aegey*, that I leave this dictionary in the hope that Manx will survive as a living language into the next century and beyond. I also hope that the book will serve as a memorial to the wonderful old Manx men and women who taught me *Chengey ny Mayrey Ellan Vannin* when I was a young man and who transformed me from being culturally a West Briton into a Manxman.

(Fargher 1979: vi-vii)

Fargher's dictionary is modelled on de Bhaldraithe's English-Irish dictionary, and it appears that the wording of Fargher's preface is partly based on de Bhaldraithe's:

The vocabulary of a living language is, of course, always changing and extending. The usual ways of adding to the vocabulary are by giving new connotations to old words, by borrowing foreign words, or by coining

new words. In Irish these three processes have been general for centuries. Many loan-words are no longer recognized as such except by the expert.
(de Bhaldraithe 1992 [1959]: v).

Many of the entries are also modelled on de Bhaldraithe's, and Fargher's dictionary inherits some flaws of organization from de Bhaldraithe, such as only giving numbers for sub-entries without indicating the meaning, giving secondary senses before primary ones, and failure to provide exemplification of the most straightforward rendering of the English headword, while giving copious examples of less common idioms. An example of de Bhaldraithe's influence may be seen in the entry for 'depend' (Lewin 2016a: 99-100). In Traditional Manx 'depend' in the sense of one circumstance being contingent on another is *lhie er* (Gaelic *luigh ar*), literally 'lie on'. This is absent from Fargher's entry, but two near translations of de Bhaldraithe's example sentences are given, "*It depends on you*, She er dty laue hene eh" and "*That all depends!* Bee shen rere myr huittys eh." There is no evidence that either of these are Traditional Manx idioms, and moreover, the first is ungrammatical since the substantive verb *ta* is omitted in the clefting construction. De Bhaldraithe has, "It depends on you, *ar do láimh atá. That depends, it all depends, beidh sé sin de réir mar a thitfidh*." Fargher gives no indication that these are modelled on Irish. He also gives *croghey er*, apparently modelled on Scottish Gaelic *an crochadh air* 'depending on', literally 'hanging on'. It is clear from these examples that Fargher's "Irishisms and Scotticisms" go far beyond individual loanwords for modern concepts, and that he favoured the wholesale, unacknowledged importation of Irish and Scottish idioms into Manx, while often omitting attested Manx constructions and forms.

Fargher's preface clearly, if stridently, defends the legitimacy of revivalist efforts to expand and remodel the language as they saw necessary and desirable, without being so constrained by the norms of the traditional language, or the kind of philological caution espoused by Thomson. The emphasis is on the practical use of Manx by ordinary people, rather than scholars, and is tied explicitly to a strongly nationalist (and pan-Gaelicist) outlook which aims to undo the perceived historic injustice of "Anglicisation". The reversal of this injustice involves not only substituting the use of the Manx language for that of English, but also an attempt to reverse some of the perceived influence of English on the structure of the language, which is characterized as "havoc" allegedly "wrought on the language by English." This seems to be based on O'Rahilly's exaggerated, inaccurate[5] portrayal of contact features in Manx:

---

[5]   There is in fact little evidence of English influence on Manx syntax, certainly not to the extent suggested by the word 'havoc'. As an example of a feature which appear at first glance to represent clear English interference we may take the use of the personal pronoun as direct object of the verbal noun rather than the possessive. It has been argued briefly by Thomson (1986) and

> 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.
>
> (O'Rahilly 1932: 121)

Fargher's purging of alleged English influence extends to the introduction of features seen as "Gaelic" on the grounds that they "without doubt" existed at some point in the past, regardless of whether they are attested in traditional Manx, and an insistence on the use of invented Manx forms of Gaelic place-names, the use of English forms of such names being portrayed, rather improbably, as an existential threat to the language. An imagined "Gaelic" purity thus takes priority over attested usage in the traditional language. The dictionary is openly stated to be "prescriptive" and sets out how the language should be, according to the author's nationalist ideology, rather than describing it "as it was spoken at any time during its history."

A high degree of reverence is expressed for the native speakers, who are credited with inspiring Fargher's nationalist awakening, but the continuity of the traditional language and the "living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century" is paramount, and the legitimacy and authority of the revivalists as the heirs of the traditional native speakers is emphasized: note that Fargher is keen to remind the reader that the last native speaker is "my cousin Ned Maddrell", and that reference is made to fellow revivalists as "respected and authoritative speakers of the language" (rather than 'learners', 'students', etc.).

Fargher's approach to coining neologisms is not, in outline, very different from that advocated by Thomson: "I have tried to give new connotations to old Manx words and have borrowed unashamedly from our Gaelic cousins". However, Thomson's emphasis on caution and scholarly rigour, and on only admitting Gaelic loanwords reluctantly, is replaced by what might be described as a fairly gung-ho attitude. Far from borrowing reluctantly and cautiously, Fargher introduces Irishisms and Scotticisms "unashamedly". A similar tone is detectable in the passage on re-Gaelicizing Manx grammar: "I make no apology

---

Broderick (2009: 345-346), and in more detail by the present author (Lewin 2016b, 2016c), that there are clear internal motivations for this change, which can be seen in progress in the texts from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, even if the example of the English construction may have been a contributing factor. As for O'Rahilly's claim that "some of the Manx that has been printed is merely English disguised in a Manx vocabulary", it is true that some of the translated texts, and certain passages of particular texts, are more slavish than others, but for the most part the translations are skilful and idiomatic (cf. Thomson 1979, 1998: iv-vi). The Manx Bible in particular is generally such a loose translation (compared for example with the Scottish Gaelic or Welsh versions) that it has been described as "Bowdlerised" (Wood 1896). For a more detailed discussion of O'Rahilly and his influence on later Manx scholarship, see Lewin (forthcoming).

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…".[6]

This ideological approach is justified with reference to assertions presented as general, indisputable facts: "The vocabulary of a living language is constantly changing and extending. It borrows extensively from other languages". While these statements may be true in a general sense, they are used here to evoke a vague concept of 'language change' as a positive, or at least inevitable, phenomenon, which in practice serves as legitimization for whatever changes and innovations the author sees fit to make. No consideration is given to the fact that 'language change' (usually unplanned, unconscious change) in a 'living language' (which would normally be understood as a community language with healthy rates of intergenerational transmission) may be a very different phenomenon from conscious lexicographical and corpus planning practices in the context of the revival of a language with no L1 speakers.

While in Thomson's vision of corpus planning the scholar is central to the process and philological considerations take precedence over all others, Fargher's references to "experts" and "scholars" seem to be calculated to relegate them to the sidelines. "Loan words are not easily recognised except by the expert", he says, the implication seeming to be that any quibbles such experts might have with any such adaptations are not of importance since these loans "are a vital part of the living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century" (i.e. like it or not). Fargher acknowledges that "the scholars would have it" that Revived Manx is "Neo-Manx" (i.e. in some way artificial or lacking authenticity), but Fargher's business is not with them, but with those nationalist-minded revivalists who agree with him in regarding the language presented in

---

[6] For example, Fargher gives the gender of *ellan* 'island' as masculine, although with the note "f. in late Mx.", despite the fact that all the known evidence points to it having been feminine in both Classical and Late Manx (Lewin 2016a: 75). Fargher here prefers to follow the Irish and Scottish Gaelic gender, presumably on the assumption that the Manx gender system was subject to decay and confusion (cf. Broderick 1999: 165, Thomson 1986: 9-11, O'Rahilly 1932: 119). One might also note Fargher's (1979: vi) claim without evidence that the orthographic unit <ch> (or <çh>) 'sounded in late Manx like English *cherry*, *church* and in classical Manx like the *t* in *tulip*', which suggests a belief that the affricate value of Gaelic palatalized *t* in Manx was less pronounced in the eighteenth century, presumably on the grounds that the affricate value must be English influence. This ignores the fact that the phonetically natural development of affrication in /tʲ/ is found in several parts of the Gaelic world, and there is no particular reason to think it is from English. Moreover, the fact that Classical Manx orthography writes historical /tʲ/ as <ch> in initial position, but <it(t)> in final position in items such as *aitt*, Gaelic *ait*, and the past participle suffix *-it*, strongly suggests that the affricated pronunciation was well established in Classical Manx in initial position. The terminal native speakers also preserve final [tʲ] alongside initial [tʃ] (Jackson 1955: 80-82, Broderick 1986: 5-11), and it is possible that /tʲ/ and /tʃ/ (the latter in loanwords) were contrastive in final position.

the dictionary as, without qualification, "*the* living Manx Gaelic of the late twentieth century" (my emphasis).

Co-existing with the purist strand of Fargher's ideology (and not without a degree of contradiction) is an emphasis on pragmatism, on making concessions with purity and/or authenticity for the sake of the higher goal of the survival of the language. Thus anglicized pronunciation is accepted, and it is declared that "this should not be a matter of great concern to those with an earnest desire to see the language survive as a spoken tongue". The implication here appears to be that if anyone complains too much about non-traditional pronunciation, the earnestness of their commitment to the revival is to be questioned. It is not entirely clear why Fargher accepts the influence of English on Manx pronunciation so nonchalantly, while declaring that "unnatural dependence on English" when it comes to place-names in the Gaelic world "cannot be tolerated". Perhaps he simply felt that anglicization of pronunciation was inevitable, while choice of lexis could be more easily controlled and mandated, e.g. by means of a dictionary perceived as authoritative.

Similar positions to those taken by Fargher are well attested in other minority language revitalization situations. One might compare a similar ideology in the Breton revival movement:

> Pour ses inventeurs et ses promoteurs, le N[éo-]B[reton] est au-dessus des dialectes, mais également au-dessus du breton lettré hérité de la tradition, pratiqué notamment par l'Eglise. Car il ne s'agit pas simplement d'un breton soigné (qui au besoin emprunterait au français les termes qui lui feraient défaut, comme les écrivants l'avaient toujours fait). Il est vu comme un breton *restauré*, rétabli dans une pureté originelle, *reconstitué tel qu'il aurait dû être s'il n'avait subi le contact inégalitaire avec le français*. Le breton doit donc désormais exister sans le recours au français, mais même dans la négation de ce dernier: chaque mot emprunté au français usurpe un mot breton, que la paresse ou la vanité a fait tomber dans l'oubli et pour y remédier, des néologismes sont systématiquement créés pour les remplacer.
>
> [For its inventors and promoters, Neo-Breton is above the dialects, but equally above the literate Breton inherited from the tradition, used notably by the Church. For it is not merely a question of a cultivated Breton (which would out of necessity borrow from French those terms which it lacked, as writers had always done). It is seen as a *restored* Breton, reestablished in an original purity, *reconstituted as it should have been if it had not suffered unequal contact with French*. Breton should therefore exist henceforth without recourse to French, but even in negation of the latter: every word borrowed from French usurps a Breton word, which has been forgotten through laziness or vanity, and to remedy this, neologisms are systematically created to replace them.]
>
> (Le Pipec 2013: 106) (original emphasis; my translation)

Williams (2013: xvi) describes a similar situation with regard to revived Cornish:

> The more Celtic appearance [of] the vocabulary of both Welsh and Breton has been a source of envy to some Cornish revivalists. From Nance onwards such purists have believed that English borrowings disfigured Cornish and in some sense did not belong in the language. They considered that revived Cornish would be more authentic, if as many borrowings as possible were replaced by native or Celtic words. Such a perception is perhaps understandable in the context of the Cornish language as a badge of ethnic identity. From a historical and linguistic perspective, however, it is misplaced. Cornish, unlike its sister languages, has always adopted words from English. Indeed it is these English borrowings which give the mature language of the Middle Cornish period its distinctive flavour. Cornish without the English element is quite simply not Cornish.
>
> (Williams 2013: xvi)

6. Thomson and Fargher compared

It should be noted that the ideological underpinnings of Thomson and Fargher's approaches to the revival of Manx share much in common. Both regret the shift from Manx to English and see the anglicization of the Isle of Man as a historical injustice. If Thomson does not express this sentiment so forcefully as Fargher it is nonetheless apparent in his reaction, in his Rhŷs lecture to the British Academy (1969), to the fawning "*Prydeindod*"[7] of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century Manx scholar John Kelly:

> Kelly…in later life suffered from, or thought it prudent to assume, an excess of the quality conveniently termed *Prydeindod* in modern Welsh…the linguist and the patriot must alike be affronted by his attitude. It makes me angry every time I read it.
>
> (Thomson 1969: 208-209)

Both Thomson and Fargher look to a purer Gaelic past for inspiration and source material for rebuilding the language, but whereas Thomson looks predominantly to the eighteenth-century Manx of the Bible, Fargher is more enamoured of the twentieth-century Irish revival.

That Thomson felt strongly both that Manx should be revived, but also that care and caution should be exercised in pursuing this aim, is clear in the

---

[7]   'Britishness (esp. as opposed to Welshness)' (*Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*).

following quotation, from a lecture given in the Isle of Man to an audience largely made up of Manx revivalists. The passage seems to suggest an awareness of potential differences and disagreements concerning language ideologies, and to hint at the importance for the future of the language of discussing and resolving them:

> 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: 17-18)

Thomson's defence of the eighteenth-century texts as a source for the revival is in my view justified, since the aversion to their study from the 1970s onwards would seem to be a case of throwing the baby out with the bathwater: it is possible to view the study of these texts as an integral part of reviving the language, while welcoming modern methods of teaching and promoting Manx, and expansions of domain for the language. Thomson's implication that later stages of the language showed decay in their "degree of autonomy and excellence" is less defensible,[8] and is akin to Fargher's implicit assertion that the language of the native speakers – and even that of earlier periods – is not Gaelic enough and needs to be altered by revivalists such as himself.

7. Revivalists and native speakers

Although there is no doubt that the revivalists consciously treated the native speakers with the utmost respect and indeed reverence, the power dynamic between younger and better educated language activists and students on the one hand and elderly, less educated rural native speakers of a marginalized and often despised language should be borne in mind. Consider the following quotations:

---

[8]   Thomson's judgment is subjective, and he does not give evidence for his claim. In his lecture Thomson also fails to differentiate clearly between 'decay' as a result of language shift and incomplete acquisition among the very last (semi-)speakers, and that allegedly found in earlier generations. There is an assumption of gradual 'decline' of the language "in the areas of life it was able to cope with" and "in its degree of autonomy and excellence", but Thomson does not provide evidence for this or a mechanism as to why it should have occurred. See Lewin (forthcoming) for further discussion.

it was said of Doug [Fargher] (and I have heard it from Ned Maddrell himself) that he spoke the old tongue far better than did the native speakers, who, when they heard him, were reminded of the purer Manx of their grandparents around the middle of the last [19th] century.

(Pilgrim 1979: xi)

Ymmodee keayrtyn neayr's yn laa shen ta Ned as mee hene er ve garaghtee mychione yn chied laa hie mee dy akin eh ayns Creneash, as ny s'anmey tra va Gaelg flaaoil aym yiarragh eh rhym "Ta'n Ghaelg ayds ny share na'n Ghaelg v'ec dty Yishag Vooar nish," as va mee gollrish moddey as daa amman echey tra va mee clashtyn Ned gra shen rhym. [Many times since that day have Ned and myself been laughing about the first day I went to see him in Cregneish, and later when I had fluent Manx he would say to me, "Your Manx is better than the Manx that your grandfather had now," and I was like a dog with two tails when I heard Ned say that to me.]

(Fargher 1977, quoted and translated in Carswell 2010: 190)

While Fargher and his colleagues no doubt politely laughed off such praise, their hunger for legitimacy should be borne in mind and it may be that the compliments and approval of the native speakers led to a greater confidence in their own knowledge and intuitions about the language than was altogether warranted (as evidenced by the omissions and ungrammatical and idiomatic constructions in Fargher's dictionary, as in the entry for 'depend' discussed above).

The insecurity of the native speaker in the presence of 'scholars' is also evident in the following following exchange between Ned Maddrell and two revivalists, Fargher and Bernard Caine:

NM: If any of you find that I make a mistake, don't hesitate in correcting me, because I'm as liable to make mistakes as you are. You are scholars and I am not…
DF: *Cha nel, cha nel, cha nel* [No, no, no]
BC: *Cha b'lhoys dou shen, cha b'lhoys dou shen* (*sic*) [I wouldn't dare [do] that]

(recording made by Brian Stowell, www.learnmanx.com, transcribed by me)

Similar conscious or unconscious tensions and power imbalances are reported in similar situations involving metropolitan educated L2 speakers and traditional rural native speakers, as in Ireland (Ní Ghearáin 2011: 306) and Brittany (Hornsby 2005: 198). It can be argued that Manx revivalists have indeed dared to 'correct' the Native Manx of their ancestors, to the extent that some Revived Manx texts might be difficult to understand to a traditional speaker, even if we allow for neologisms and concepts which were not part of

traditional Manx society.[9] A Traditional Manx speaker would not understand common Revived Manx expressions such as *s'treisht lhiam* 'I hope' or *s'cosoylagh* 'it is likely', which are used by many speakers in preference to traditional *ta mee treishteil* and *s'licklee / t'eh laik.*

As far as neologisms for modern technology and so on are concerned, these may be considered a necessary adaptation to modernity and the needs of contemporary speakers, but where attested traditional forms for everyday, timeless concepts are replaced without good cause, the approach promoted by Fargher may be seen as a distraction from the task of breathing life once more into the rich corpus of Manx lexis, idiom and grammar inherited from the traditional speakers and texts, and an unnecessary source of potential conflict and confusion when there is in any case plenty that inevitably must be discussed and negotiated in all aspects of the revival movement.

8. Conclusion

Speakers of Revived and Traditional Manx can of course no longer meet, but it is perhaps nevertheless problematic if the native Manx of the past is implicitly (or explicitly) rejected as being not Manx enough. Efforts to purge Manx of grammatical and lexical influence from English arguably constitute a purism of a simplistic and unnecessarily xenophobic kind, which disregards the lived experience of centuries of Manx speakers, for whom some contact with English and borrowing of English forms was an inherent part of their linguistic world, and reflects a discourse which comes close to blaming the traditional speakers for letting their language become 'impure'.[10] It also makes the native Manx

---

[9]   Although an overly purist approach which avoids all recourse to borrowing from English or international vocabulary can produce language that is difficult to decode even for many revivalists. Everyday terms which are given natively-derived forms may gain widespread acceptance (such as the Scottish Gaelic *eadar-lìon* 'internet', *làrach-lìn* 'website' and *post-dealain* 'email'), whereas less frequently occurring items are likely to fail to gain recognition or be understood (Ó Maolalaigh et al. 2014: 109). The defenders of the many hundreds of neologisms created by Fargher and since by Coonceil ny Gaelgey and other bodies and individuals should perhaps consider whether most of them are ever likely to be used, or understood, even by audiences favourably inclined to such neologisms.

[10]   Cf. Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 52-53), "While it is true that later spoken and revitalised Manx display a range of linguistic features which are classically only associated with dialects in terminal decline in Ireland and Scotland, they seem to have been acceptable in Manx at least as far back as the translations of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the 17th century… That Manx had these contact features while there were still many monolinguals does not undermine its intrinsic authenticity as a named variety of a defined speech community, any more than would be the case of any other contemporary language that reveals evidence of language contact and mixing in its idiom, vocabulary and syntax."

texts of the past less accessible to new speakers. On a more subjective level one could paraphrase Williams' (2013: xvi) words on Cornish and say that Manx without the English element is quite simply not Manx.

Although in principle a revived form of a language which departs substantially from the traditional language on which is modelled can meet the needs of its users,[11] the role of the Classical Manx texts, as well as the native speaker transcriptions and recordings, as the final authority and basis of the revived language, has never been seriously questioned. That large proportions of the revival speakers surveyed by Ó hIfearnáin (2015: 56) regard "use native idiom in speech", "grammatical accuracy" and "a good Gaelic accent" as "essential qualities in identifying 'good' Manx" suggests that an aspiration to model revival usage on Traditional Manx (though not necessary specifically on the terminal native speakers) is widespread.[12] In the deliberations of Coonceil ny Gaelgey, as well as open forums such as the 'Ynsee Gaelg' Facebook page,[13] run by Culture Vannin's Manx language development officer, participants frequently refer to the Bible and other Traditional Manx sources when discussing grammar and usage. The appearance of a searchable online version of the Manx Bible with parallel English, as well as online digital versions of other texts, and the release on CD of remastered versions of recordings of the native speakers with accompanying transcriptions (Manx National Heritage 2003), have led to a small upsurge of interest in these resources, and their potential for enriching the revived language (cf. Lewin 2015: 26, 29, Broderick 2015: 54). Even if some (or most) revivalists do not study these resources in depth themselves, there are enough who do who are in positions of influence in education, creative writing, on Coonceil ny Gaelgey, etc., to ensure that the corpus of Traditional Manx will continue to inform usage and shape the development of the language in the future, and cannot be ignored or considered redundant.

Since there will inevitably be disagreements on approach and priorities in any language revival, there is an argument to be made that it would be best to avoid disagreement on what should be uncontroversial, that is, the corpus of the traditional language which does not change (except for the discovery of material previously unknown or overlooked).[14] It is probably too late to take this

---

[11]   For example Ngarrindjeri is an Australian Aboriginal language 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).

[12]   Although these sentiments could perhaps also be interpreted as favouring the pan-Gaelic Irish-leaning approach of Fargher.

[13]   https://www.facebook.com/groups/252051161535121/ (accessed 27 June 2017).

[14]   In theory there is potential for disagreement over which time period of the traditional language to use as a basis for the revival. (This has been a large part of the disputes over Cornish.) In practice, however, there is little difference between eighteenth-century (Classical) and nineteenth-century (Late) Manx, in that there while minor changes in phonology and syntax can

approach systematically in the case of Manx, but those embarking on the early stages of revival of other 'sleeping' languages, as well as languages which are endangered in their traditional L1 variety and likely to survive in the future predominantly as an L2 among new speakers (such as the four 'living' Celtic languages), would do well to give careful consideration to these issues.[15] In this approach, English-derived forms, where the Traditional Manx testimony is clear that they were the usual, unmarked form in a particular use or sense, would be left alone, and accepted for general use in Revived Manx. Thomson's philological caution may be considered extreme or impractical, for the reasons mentioned above, but it is perhaps fair to say that a greater degree of caution and deference to the 'character' of the traditional language is desirable than that shown in Fargher's approach (if only to keep everyone on board in the centre ground and ward off future disagreements).[16]

An additional factor in determining how these issues are playing out today is the establishment since 2001 of the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, the Manx-medium primary school in St John's in the centre of the island. Anecdotally the author is aware of some frustration on the part of teachers and other involved with the school over the slow and academic process of coining new terms, especially when this involves replacing or revising terms already in use. The teachers have had to develop their own terms independently of Coonceil ny Gaelgey in some areas, and may not have the time to do any deeper research than looking in Fargher's dictionary. In their view, questioning or revising terms in Fargher and other items in use in the curriculum risks confusing or alienating children and parents, or undermining their confidence in the language and in pedagogical resources such as dictionaries. Similar concerns are sometimes raised by those involved in teaching Manx to adults, who may seek to avoid discussing or

---

be discerned, there are few forms which can definitively be said to belong to one century or the next, and both conservative and innovating variants are found side by side in the Classical Manx texts such as the Bible. The Early Manx of Phillips' prayer book translation of c. 1610 has rather more archaic forms not found later, but no-one has ever suggested using Phillips as a primary basis for the revived language (apart from the resurrection of a few lexical items attested only in Phillips, such as *barel* 'opinion', Irish *baramhail*, now in common use in Revived Manx).

[15]   This is essentially the aim of Ó Maolalaigh et al. (2014), who are concerned to ensure that corpus planning in Scottish Gaelic should develop in a way that does not contradict the dominant language ideology of Gaelic speakers, and has maximum popular, scientific and political legitimacy, in order to avoid the emergence of too wide a divergence between the majority of the Gaelic-speaking community and those involved in producing grammatical and lexical resources.

[16]   Cf. Fishman (1991: 348), "[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 risk-free modifications or innovations."

acknowledging disagreements over variant forms, terms, constructions or spellings to maintain a front of unity before newer members of the movement, and avoid confusion and 'awkward questions'. I recognize these concerns, but would argue that there is a need to balance them against the realization that this approach may store up trouble for the future, and frustrate the more curious students. In teaching both children and adults, openness about all aspects of the linguistic situation, including the existence of variation and different viewpoints concerning this variation, can be a way of engaging and including new speakers in the development of the language, if handled sensitively.

All of this is not to discount the enormous amount of labour Fargher put into his dictionary and the boon it has been to students and language activists over the years. Given the apparently bleak outlook for Manx at the time of its publication, when the small band of Manx enthusiasts was largely marginalized in Manx society and constantly had to defend the value of their movement and of the language itself, the confident and combative tone of Fargher's remarks is understandable, and was perhaps necessary. In an era when the authority of prescriptive grammar in English (and Latin and other languages), rote-learned in the classroom, was unquestioned in the popular mind, Fargher perhaps felt he had to present his vision of Manx in a similarly authoritative and uncompromising way in order to set Manx on an equal footing with English and claim for it the same kind of authority and prestige enjoyed by the dominant language.[17] This does not mean that today's Manx speakers need be constrained by this framework. Fargher (1979: vii) left his dictionary to "the younger people of the island… in the hope that Manx will survive as a living language into the next century and beyond". To this end, his dictionary will surely prove most useful if it is regarded as a flexible resource, a compendium of previous usage and suggestions for new forms, rather than as a monolithic authority setting in stone what Manx is and should be.

REFERENCES

Broderick, George. 1986. *A Handbook of Late Spoken Manx Vol. 3 Phonology*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Broderick, George. 1999. *Language Death in the Isle of Man*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Broderick, George. 2009. "Manx," in: Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (eds), *The Celtic Languages*. London: Routledge, 305-356.

---

[17]   In Jaffe's (1999: 23) terms this constitutes a "resistance of reversal", whereby the outcomes of language domination and shift are resisted but not its 'structures of value' concerning what a standardized prestige language is or should be. "Radical models of resistance" which challenge dominant assumptions are also possible, but come with their own costs (Jaffe 1999: 29-30).

Broderick, George. 2015. "The Revival of Manx Gaelic in the Isle of Man," in: P. Sture Ureland (ed.) *Minority languages in Europe and beyond – results and prospects*. Berlin: Logos, 33-58.

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

Clague, J. 1814. *Aght Giare Dy heet gys Tushtey as Toiggal jeh'n Chredjue Creestee*. Douglas: Beaton and Copeland.

de Bhaldraithe, Tomás. 1959. *English-Irish Dictionary*. Dublin: Oifig an tSoláthair.

Dorian, Nancy C. 1994. Purism vs. Compromise in Language Revitalization and Language Revival. *Language in Society* (23). 479-494.

Fargher, Douglas C. 1979. *Fargher's English-Manx Dictionary*. Douglas: Shearwater Press.

Heath, Shirley Brice. 1977. Social history. In L. Leann Parker and Shirley Brice Heath, *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives*, 53-72. Arlington: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Hornsby, Michael. 2005. *Néo-breton* and questions of authenticity. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* (6). 191-218.

Irvine, Judith. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* (16). 248-267.

Jackson, Kenneth. 1955. *Contributions to the Study of Manx Phonology*. Edinburgh: Nelson.

Jaffe, Alexandra. 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kelly, John. 1866. *Fockleyr Manninagh as Baarlagh* ['Manx and English dictionary']. Douglas: Manx Society.

Kneen, J. J. 1970. *English-Manx Pronouncing Dictionary*. (2nd edition). St. Judes: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2000. Regimenting Languages: Language Ideological Perspectives. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language*, 1-34. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Le Pipec, Erwan. 2013. Les trois ruptures sociolinguistiques du breton. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (223). 103-116.

Lewin, Christopher. 2015. Classical Manx, Revived Manx and English: competing standards. In P. Sture Ureland (ed.), *Minority languages in Europe and beyond – results and prospects*, 23-31. Berlin: Logos.

Lewin, Christopher. 2016a. *The revivability of Manx Gaelic: a linguistic description and discussion of Revived Manx*. Unpublished MPhil thesis, Aberystwyth University.

Lewin, Christopher, 2016b. The syntax of the verbal noun in Manx Gaelic. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* (17). 147-239.

Lewin, Christopher, 2016c. Syntactic innovation in Manx and Sutherland Gaelic. In Wilson McLeod, Anja Gunderloch and Rob Dunbar (eds), *Rannsachadh na Gàidhlig 8,* 237-249. Edinburgh: Dunedin.

Lewin, Christopher. Forthcoming. 'Manx hardly deserved to live': Perspectives on language contact and language shift. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* (64).

Manx National Heritage. 2003. *Skeealyn Vannin Stories of Mann. The complete collection of Manx Language archive recordings made by the Irish Folklore Commission in 1948*. Douglas: Manx National Heritage. Audio tracks now available at https://www.youtube.com/user/ManxNationalHeritage (accessed 11 May 2017).

Nahir, Moshe. 1998. Micro language planning and the revival of Hebrew: A schematic framework. *Language in Society* (27). 335-357.

Ní Ghearáin, Helena. 2011. The problematic relationship between institutionalised Irish terminology development and the Gaeltacht speech community: dynamics of acceptance and estrangement. *Language Policy* (10). 305-323.

Ó hIfearnáin, Tadhg. 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, Mark McConville, Wilson McLeod and Susan Bell. 2014. *Dlùth is Inneach – Final Project Report: Linguistic and Institutional Foundations for Gaelic Corpus Planning*. Bòrd na Gàidhlig. Available at: http://www.gaidhlig.org.uk/bord/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/%C3%93-Maolalaigh-et-al.-2014-Planadh-corpais-CR12-03-Corpus-planning.pdf (accessed 21 November 2016).

O'Rahilly, T. F. 1932. *Irish Dialects Past and Present*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Ó Sé, Diarmuid. 1991. Prosodic change in Manx and lexical diffusion. 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*, 159-180. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pilgrim, Adrian J. 1979. Introduction. In Douglas C. Fargher, *Fargher's English-Manx Dictionary*, viii-xiv. Douglas: Shearwater Press.

Rhŷs, John. 1894. *The Outlines of the Phonology of Manx Gaelic*. Douglas: Manx Society.

Rumsey, Alan. 1990. Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* (92). 346-361.

Williams, Nicholas. 1994. An Mhanainnis. In Kim McCone et al. (eds), *Stair na Gaeilge*, 703-744. Magh Nuad: Roinn na Sean-Ghaeilge,

Williams, Nicholas. 2013. *Geryow Gwir: The lexicon of revived Cornish*. Cathair na Mart: Evertype.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds), *The elements: a parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193-247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Stowell, Brian. 1964. Recordings of Ned Maddrell. Available at: http://learnmanx.com/cms/audio_collection_11918.html (accessed 21 November 2016)

Stowell, Brian. 2005. The case of Manx Gaelic. In Diarmuid Ó Néill (ed.) *Rebuilding the Celtic Languages: Reversing Language Shift in the Celtic Countries*, 383-416. Talybont: Y Lolfa,

Thomson, Robert L. 1969. The Study of Manx Gaelic. Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture. *Proceedings of the British Academy* (55). 177-210.

Thomson, Robert L. 1970. Preface and Supplement. In J. J. Kneen *English-Manx Pronouncing Dictionary*. (2nd edition), 87-113. St. Judes: Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh, ii.

Thomson, Robert L. 1979. Introduction. In *Bible Casherick yn Lught-thie*. Douglas: Shearwater Press.

Thomson, Robert L. 1986. Ned Maddrell Memorial Lecture, 1986. Change or Decay? Unpublished typescript, Manx National Heritage Library MS 13047.

Thomson, Robert L. 1990. The Revd Dr John Kelly as a Lexicographer. *Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society* (9). 443-458.

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

Thomson, Robert L. Undated. Notes on coining neologisms in Manx. Unpublished typescript, Manx National Heritage Library MS 13047.

Wood, G. W. 1896. An account of the translation and editions of the Holy Scriptures in the Manx language. *The Manx Church Magazine*, 6. Available at: http://www.isle-of-man.com/manxnotebook/history/manks/script.htm (accessed 27 June 2017).

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* (23). 55-82.

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). 111-127.