

SIR JOHN RHÛS MEMORIAL LECTURE
THE STUDY OF MANX GAELIC
By R. L. THOMSON

Read 22 October 1969

IT is, perhaps, too much to expect that Manx, that Cinderella of Gaelic tongues, should ever attract many students'—so in 1931 wrote T. F. O'Rahilly,¹ himself a student of Manx, and one who never neglected the contribution, however small, that it could bring to the point he was dealing with. While I can give no convincing imitation of Prince Charming yet I must confess that I have long been captivated by this Cinderella amongst the Gaelic tongues. Indeed she is a Cinderella among the Celtic ones as a whole, for Cornish, her counterpart in the British group, has, by reason of possessing some generally rather late medieval remains, appeared more glamorous in the eyes of historically minded students of Celtic than Manx, which can boast of nothing of more certain antiquity than the sixteenth century.² Yet in being a student of Manx I find myself in excellent company, from Edward Lhuyd, the father of Celtic philology,³ down through Sir John RhÛs whose interest in the subject, aroused in 1886 when he visited the Island to examine its Ogam inscriptions, and issuing in his *Outlines of the Phonology of Manx Gaelic*⁴ in 1894, provides me with one excuse for talking about Manx today in this series of memorial lectures. In the next generation came Carl Marstrand, who published regrettably little on the subject apart from the introduction to his study of Manx place-names,⁵ but who left a substantial body of notes dating from the 1920s. In our own time both Professor Jackson

¹ T. F. O'Rahilly, *Irish Dialects Past and Present* (1932), ix.

² The 'Traditionary Ballad', though its earliest manuscript and printed forms are from the eighteenth century, must be dated to this much earlier period; see *Journal of the Manx Museum* vi, no. 75 (1958), 53-4, and *Études celtiques* ix (1962), 521-48, x (1963), 60-87.

³ For Lhuyd's Manx material see *Journal of the Manx Museum* vi, no. 78 (1961), 149-51, and J. Carney and D. Greene, *Celtic Studies, Essays in memory of Angus Matheson* (1968), 170-82.

⁴ In the second volume of A. W. Moore and John RhÛs, *The Book of Common Prayer in Manx Gaelic* (1893-4), and separately. RhÛs hoped that others might follow him in the study of Manx (p. xii), but the only Celtic scholar born in the Island was E. C. Quiggin (cf. *Journal of the Manx Museum* vi, no. 74 (1957), 19-21).

⁵ *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* vi (1933), 52-79.

and Professor Wagner have shown an interest in the subject, the one as a preliminary,¹ the other as an appendix,² to their greater works on the Gaelic dialects of Scotland and Ireland.

But it is not about these distinguished students of Manx from outside the Island that I propose to speak for the most part to-day, much less to attempt any sort of defence of the study itself (fully defensible though I believe it to be),³ but rather to turn your attention to the Manx scholars to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of the language as it has been in the past. If it did not sound too much like plagiarism I might have entitled this lecture 'The Native Manx Grammarians'; and if I may stretch 'native' to include 'long resident', and 'grammarian' to include 'lexicographer', I shall have given you a fair idea of the scope of my subject.

Right at the beginning I propose to cheat by including one who was certainly long resident, but neither grammarian nor lexicographer in any explicit way. Yet if the invention of an orthography for a hitherto unwritten language is one of the basic linguistic tasks, John Phillips may have a claim to be considered the founder of Manx linguistic studies. Probably a native of North Wales he was an Oxford graduate (M.A. 1584) and held livings in Yorkshire as well as being rector of Andreas (1587) and Archdeacon of Man. The key to his future, however, lay in his appointment in 1590 as chaplain to Henry, Earl of Derby, Lord of Man. Accordingly, on the translation of Dr. Lloyd to Chester, he was consecrated in 1605 as Bishop of Sodor and Man, an office which he held till his death in August 1633. Unlike many of his successors he took the Manx language seriously, and according to an account written twenty-five years after his death he 'out of zeal to the propagating of the Gospel attained the knowledge [of Manx] so exactly that he did ordinarily preach in it'. His preaching has left no trace, but in a uniformly Anglican diocese he had also to make provision for the conduct of the services of the Church according to set forms.

¹ *Contributions to the Study of Manx Phonology* (1955).

² *Linguistic Atlas and Survey of Irish Dialects* (1958-69), point 88.

³ Apart from the intrinsic interest of the development of an isolated branch of East Gaelic, the non-traditional orthography allows us to observe sound-changes which are masked by conventional Gaelic spelling (cf. *Celtica* v (1961), 116-26), and with regard to grammar and meaning early Manx can shed light on that early period of Scottish Gaelic when writers of the language still felt bound to the standards of literary Irish (cf. Carswell's *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh* (1969), Scottish Gaelic Texts Society xi, introduction and notes).

We have no figures relative to the proportion of the population which was Manx-speaking only, but it seems likely to have been a very large majority, excluding only the more substantial land-owners and farmers, clergy, merchants, and some other towns-people and a few incomers in the Lord's service. What was needed in Man, as in all the areas where English was not the first language of the people, was a translation of the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible. The former at least of these Bishop Phillips set himself to provide; there was also a tradition later in the seventeenth century that he had translated the Bible, a tradition known to Lhuyd who on the strength of it requested a copy of Leviticus 11 from that version,¹ but no trace of such a translation survives. The Prayer Book was presumably written between 1605 and 1610 for early in 1611 we find Phillips referring to the 'Mannish Book of Common Prayer by me translated' which he had proposed to submit to the revision of his convocation in preparation for having it printed. The phrase 'by me translated' is probably a slight exaggeration, for although the bishop was no doubt the moving spirit in the enterprise, there is some evidence in the text that there were at least two hands at work. The division lies between the Psalter and the rest of the book, and the main point is that in the Psalms the 2nd pers. sg. pronoun, normally *ú*, takes the form *tú* after the future, relative, and conditional forms of all verbs, whereas in the rest of the book this feature is restricted to the substantive verb.²

The point of immediate linguistic interest here is the orthography, which is similar throughout the book. Bishop Barrow in 1663 regarded Manx as an unwritten language: 'there is nothing either written or printed in their language, which is peculiar to themselves; neither can they who speak it best write one to another in it, having no character or letter of it among them.'³ The existence of Phillip's translation, apparently unknown to him, proves him wrong in fact, but no doubt his impression was generally correct, that most Manxmen were illiterate in their own language and that even those who could write did not write in Manx. The long absence of any native

¹ R. T. Gunther, *Life and Letters of Edward Lhuyd* (1945), 495.

² This description puts the matter in historical terms. Phillips actually leaves the pronoun unchanged and adds the *-t* to the verb. By a similar false analysis he often writes the augens of the 2 sg., when syllabic, in the same way as the emphatic pronoun of which he no doubt thought it was an unstressed form. Other differences are the preference of the Psalter for inflected over periphrastic tenses and its use of the grave accent.

³ Moore and Rhys, *op. cit.* (note 4), xii.

rulers, native aristocracy, or any native learned class, arising latterly from the English and Stanley connection, and earlier from the vicissitudes which the Island underwent during the period from the end of Norse rule till it finally became the secure possession of the English crown, meant that the sequence of the native Gaelic tradition was irreparably broken, and such Manx words as could not be avoided, place-names and personal names, were written down in Latin and English documents according to alien conventions of orthography. There took place also an impoverishment of the vocabulary in comparison with that of Irish or Scottish Gaelic, by the loss of those elements that might be vaguely termed 'literary'—a process very similar, it seems to me, both in its causes and its effects, to that which English underwent in the centuries following the Norman Conquest, though in the case of Manx there was no large-scale redevelopment of the language through loan-words such as occurred in the second half of the Middle English period.

In so far as Manxmen were literate they were literate in English in this and the following century, and indeed all attempts at elementary education took it for granted that a knowledge of English reading and writing was the goal to be aimed at, and more advanced study concentrated on the classical languages just as in England, so it was natural and even inevitable (given the great disparity between the English and Gaelic systems of spelling, which makes the understanding of one no great help to the comprehension of the other), that if Manxmen were to be literate in Manx it could only be through an English-based orthography. It would be wrong, of course, to give the impression of any debate or any deliberate choice in this matter, for there was no one who knew or would recommend the Gaelic system. We may doubt whether in any case it would have been a great advantage to Manxmen to have a traditional Gaelic orthography for their language, for the more perfectly the system was adjusted to the facts of Manx pronunciation the less help it would be to Manxmen in reading Scottish or Irish Gaelic because of the numerous sound-changes that have overtaken Manx, and that reading would in any case have been complicated by the impoverishment of vocabulary already referred to.

John Phillips and his assistant, probably Hugh Cannell,¹

¹ A. W. Moore, *Manx Worthies* (1901), 20. 'He was one of the first preachers in this Isle, and the first that taught the Manks to read the Scriptures in the Manks tongue, and assistant to the late Reverend Father in God, John Phillips, Bishop of this Isle in the translating of the Bible.'

vicar of Kirk Michael and his nearest neighbour at Bishops-court, would be unlikely to know anything of Gaelic orthography, though it is not unreasonable to suppose that the bishop knew the Welsh system, but however that may be they adopted for the consonants a system fairly close to that of English, one which marks the distinctions that English can mark (because they are phonemic in English) such as that between the palatal and non-palatal consonant pairs *ch* and *t*, *j* and *d*, *sh* and *s* (this last not very consistently), and which ignores those distinctions that English has no need to make, as between different sorts of *l* and *r*, or between [g] and [ɣ] (both written *g*). This orthography generalizes *k* in all positions (also *-ck* finally) at the expense of *c*, and for [x], still a living sound in English in Phillips's time, it has the contemporary spelling *gh*.

For the vowels he seems to have turned to another model, whether it was Welsh, or the reformed pronunciation of Latin, or a continental language like Italian or Spanish, or the scheme of one of the English spelling reformers, but certainly not the English of his contemporaries.

I have been speaking as if it were quite certain that Phillips was the inventor of the orthography of his Prayer Book translation but this is not really certain at all, and it is possible that there already existed an orthographic system in which such little as needed to be written in Manx was written and which he simply adopted. The evidence for its being a new invention consists chiefly in the testimony of the vicars-general:¹ one of them declared he could not read it at all, the other that it was some time before he could puzzle it out because the vowels were unfamiliar. Both these men, it is true, may be thought to have had some motive for seeking to discredit the bishop's enterprise, but I do not see why they should have told a direct lie on this point. The evidence for Phillips's orthography being a traditional one depends on supposed anachronisms in his spelling, that is, on spellings implying pronunciations obsolete in his time and which, therefore, in the absence of written documents, could not have been known to him. The cases that concern us here are the initial groups *kn-*, *gn-*, and *tn-*, in all of which later Manx has *r* in place of *n*, and possibly the medial-final group *sk*, which later generally becomes *st*.² While *n*-spellings continue in proper names in other

¹ Moore and Rhŷs, *op. cit.* xii.

² There are some exceptions, as *askaid* (possibly because of the position of the stress); *maskey* is frequent in the eighteenth century beside *mastey*, and *myskid* is invariable.

documents well after Phillips's time there are a certain number of *r*-spellings in these words already in the sixteenth century. This evidence does not, I think, go beyond suggesting that in Phillips's time the pronunciations with *n* and *r* were in competitive coexistence and that he chose, or was advised to choose, to adopt the more conservative type.¹ I ought to add, on this occasion particularly, that Professor Rhÿs was attached to the opposite view,² that Phillips was using a traditional orthography, belonging to the same family as the spelling of the Dean of Lismore's Book. One cannot deny that Phillips's spelling may represent a parallel to the Dean's Book in the borrowing—it would have to be in the fifteenth century and might plausibly be associated with the beginning of the Stanley lordship—of the spelling conventions of one language to express another, but I think Phillips's spelling can be recognized as having distinctly Middle English features in opposition to the equally distinct Middle Scots features of the Dean's Book, and that there is no probability of their belonging in any sense to the same school or having a common origin.

The translation of the Prayer Book never reached print in Phillips's lifetime. We do not know what happened to it in 1611, and a single manuscript copy written about twenty years later is all that survives. Whether this is a copy for use, one of a score or so to be supplied to the parishes (like the Synod of Argyll's *Shorter Catechism*), or whether, as I am inclined to believe in view of its varied scripts and sizes of writing, running titles, and so forth, it was a fair copy made for the press near the end of the bishop's life, and this time frustrated by his death, we do not know. In view of the smallness of the edition required—there were then only seventeen parishes in the Island, and few laymen could have been expected to have afforded a personal copy—the cost of so large a book³ would have been very high indeed, and it may have taken the bishop, whose annual income from the bishopric was probably between £100 and £140 per annum, a considerable time to raise the necessary funds. Again the finan-

¹ There appears to be only one 'inverted' spelling with Manx *gn-* in a loanword that had *gr-*, i.e. *gnau* from (en)grave, but if the diphthong had a nasal quality from the vocalization of *-v-*, this nasality may have been mistaken for that imparted to a following vowel by *cn-*, *gn-*, a nasality strong enough to have given rise to an *-n-* in the orthography in later times, e.g. *knock* 'hill' gives *cronk*.

² *Outlines*, 165–79.

³ The Welsh edition of 1567 contains 490 pages; the Irish of 1608, in smaller print and lacking the Psalter, has 266.

cial struggles of the Synod of Argyll with the Catechism and the first fifty Metrical Psalms later in the same century are an instructive parallel. Justice was not done to Phillips's work until the edition of the manuscript by A. W. Moore and John Rhys in 1893-4.

The rest of the seventeenth century is a complete blank so far as Manx literary¹ and linguistic activity is concerned, but toward the end of it there comes on the scene the only bishop of Man to have attained to more than local celebrity, Thomas Wilson. A Cheshire man and a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, he occupied the see for an exceptionally long period (1698-1755), in his later years refusing offers of translation to more lucrative positions. It was during his episcopate that the first effective design of translating the Book of Common Prayer and the Bible into Manx began to take shape. Also about the beginning of the eighteenth century Manx is first brought to the notice of the learned world by its brief mention in Lhuyd's *Archaeologia Britannica*. Lhuyd unfortunately did not visit the Island in person or we might have had much fuller information about the language of his time, but seems to have had correspondents, either directly or at second hand. In the same year as his *Archaeologia* there appeared the first Manx printed book, a bilingual version of Bishop Wilson's *Principles and Duties of Christianity*, the Manx version usually known as *Coyrle Sodjeh*, a much expanded version of the Prayer Book Catechism. The work included a separately paginated little book of *Plain and Short Directions and Prayers* for private and family use. In his preface addressed to the clergy of the Island the bishop, who was a stout defender of a rigorous ecclesiastical discipline, which elsewhere had fallen or was falling into desuetude, reminds his brethren that it had lately been agreed 'that all Persons intending to Marry, should first . . . fit themselves for Confirmation and the Lord's-Supper' which in effect meant, as he observes later, 'if People are hindered from the Lord's Supper, and from Marriage, until they can give some Account, according to their Capacities, of God, of Themselves, and of their Duty, all Sorts of People will strive to learn more or less, and Parents will for very Shame send their Children to be instructed, that they may be Confirmed, and qualified for a Married and a

¹ The ballad-elegy on Illiam Dhone, executed January 1662, revived and printed 1781, must belong to this century, though the references to the fate of his enemies show that it must be some way removed from the date of his death.

Christian Life'. He also noted that 'Persons under the Censures of the Church, under Afflictions, in Poverty, asking either your Favour or your Charity, will lend an Ear to that Advice, which at other Times they would little regard'.

In this work the spelling of the Manx text, though not fully developed into the near uniformity of the second half of the century, is already clearly the same system as that in use later and as clearly marks a break with the Phillipsian type except in that both are non-Gaelic. The bishop's introduction is half apologetic about the spelling: 'They that have had the Trouble of Translating it, are very Sensible that the Liberty which every Man takes of *Writing after his own Way*, will expose them to some censure'; and hopes no one will fail to use the book on that account, 'since this would have been the Case, whoever should have undertaken it'. There was in fact no agreed orthography, and Lhuyd, in a letter written after seeing the book, shows that he regarded the spelling as peculiar, especially in the matter of word-division.¹ The translation is quite a free and idiomatic one, especially rich in copula constructions, which in later usage tend to become infrequent. The names of the translators are unknown; one of them may have been William Walker, afterwards rector of Ballaugh, and very much in Bishop Wilson's confidence.

The next step forward was taken in 1722 when the bishop and his two vicars-general, John Curghey, vicar of Braddan, and William Walker, were imprisoned, after a brush with the civil power, in Castle Rushen for nine weeks and spent part of their enforced leisure in translating part of the New Testament into Manx, though nothing was published until the first edition of St. Matthew in 1748.² Thereafter under pressure from Wilson's successor, Mark Hildesley (1755-73), the work went on very quickly: the Gospels and Acts in 1763, the Book of Common Prayer in 1765, the Epistles and Revelation in 1767, and the Old Testament in two volumes (the second including Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus from the Apocrypha) in 1771 and 1773. In addition to these Bible translations other works were produced, a translation of the *Christian Monitor* under the title *Yn Fer-raauee*

¹ Gunther, *op. cit.* (note 9), 281.

² This gospel was revised for the edition of the Gospels and Acts and again for subsequent editions of the Bible, and the changes made are some indication of changing usage as well of changing ideals of translation. Some may perhaps be useful for dating other undated works like the carvals; e.g. the abandonment of the long forms *eishtagh* and *reeshtagh* in 1763 may mean that they had passed out of currency by this date.

Creestee by Paul Crebbin, vicar of Santon,¹ in 1763, written in my opinion in the best Manx of the century; a new bilingual version of Wilson's *Short and Plain Instruction for the Better Understanding of the Lord's Supper* in 1777, the Manx revised by Philip Moore;² and a translation of a selection of Wilson's sermons in 1783, published at the expense of his son. Finally in a rather different vein Thomas Christian, vicar of Marown, published in the last decade of the century his abridgement of Milton's *Paradise Lost* in some 4,000 lines of rhymed verse, telling the story in chronological order.

Biblical translation, though not obviously within the scope of my subject, was an important contributory feature to the work and career of our next grammarian, John Kelly. Born in 1750 at Algare in the Baldwin valley he was educated first at Douglas Grammar School under the Revd. Philip Moore, chaplain of St. Matthew's, and being a good scholar in general and especially so in Manx (not that this implies that the language was studied as part of the curriculum, but Moore was himself regarded as an expert on the subject, though he modestly denied it),³ Kelly was drawn about 1766 into the Bible-translating machinery as a copyist. The various books had been assigned to different members of the clergy and came in in draft; some of these drafts still survive in a rather moth-eaten state.⁴ The drafts were then corrected by Moore and others and the revised text copied fair by Kelly for the press, in some cases possibly more than once.⁵ The corrections include supplying omissions, deleting the translator's version of any passage that

¹ He died in 1764 and his name does not appear among the translators of the Bible, though he seems to have had a share in the Liturgy (Butler, see note 23, p. 254). His only other work is an unpublished tract against frequenting alehouses.

² For a memoir of the Revd. Philip Moore see W. Butler, *Memoirs of Mark Hildesley, D.D.* (1799), 186 ff.

³ Butler, op. cit. 467: 'I do not pretend to a profundity of skill in our language, being only a plain Manks-man. My brethren, some of them, would persuade me to think otherwise,—*at non sum credulus illis.*'

⁴ Manx Museum manuscript 5690; the names of the translators, so far as known, are given in Butler, op. cit. 252–6.

⁵ Philip Moore pays tribute to his assistance in a letter of 1 May 1772: 'Since the death of my learned friend and fellow-labourer, the Rev. Mr. Curphey, the whole of this second volume has devolved on myself. Let me not, however, arrogate the whole merit of this performance; which I could not so readily have accomplished . . . , without the assistance of Mr. Kelly, a very ingenious young man, trained up for this service, and a candidate for holy orders; who has been from the first my adjutant in revising, and

had already appeared in the Prayer Book of 1765, imposing a regular terminology of technical terms, and a certain amount of change of grammar and idiom. Some translators, for example, are unduly fond of periphrastic verb-forms with *jannoo*, and these are intermittently replaced by inflected forms; but generally interference with the translator's own grammar and idiom is not extensive,¹ though idioms such as the copula construction which are at variance with the corresponding English expression are fairly frequently altered, and in this respect the finished product may be less representative of the language of the period than were the drafts. The editors' aim in revising was, of course, to make the version as accurate as possible, though it should be remembered also that they did not shrink from radical alterations in places where contemporary opinion regarded the Authorized Version as incorrect,² but since they were writing for an increasingly bilingual audience it was important that the Manx and English versions should not diverge without good reason.

Kelly was the author of a grammar and two dictionaries. The grammar³ was printed in 1804, but both dictionaries came to grief: the Manx-English one was not printed at all in his life-

correcting, and now transcribing a fair copy of the whole Bible, as well as of the Apostolical Epistles. He was also corrector of the press, at Whitehaven, for all that has been printed there: and is now ready to embark for that place, to attend the printing of this second volume, so soon as my lord bishop shall have heard from the Society how his finances hold out' (Butler, *op. cit.* 635-6). On his way to Whitehaven with the second half of the first volume of the Old Testament Kelly had been shipwrecked, as he tells us: 'On our next return from the island to Whitehaven, the 19th of March, 1771, charged with another portion, from Deuteronomy to Job inclusive, we were shipwrecked in a storm. With no small difficulty and danger the manuscript was preserved, by holding it above the water for the space of five hours; and this was almost the only article saved. His lordship, and the Rev. Philip Moore, whenever the subject afterwards came into conversation, were jocularly pleased to compare the corrector to Cæsar; who, during the seafight at Alexandria, is said to have saved his Commentaries by holding them in one hand, and swimming with the other.' (Butler, 231.)

¹ This is apparent alike from a comparison of the drafts with the published version, and from the considerable fluctuation in mutational usage from one book to another which will be discovered below.

² Butler, *op. cit.* 187-8, refers to the advice of Bishop Lowth and Dr. Kennicott; Philip Moore, in a letter to the Revd. J. Stuart of Luss, dated 6 June 1780, gives an account of the methods of translation and mentions some changes from the Authorized Version, *ibid.* 666-9.

³ *A Practical Grammar of the Antient Gaelic; or, Language of the Isle of Mann, usually called Manks* (1804); more conveniently referred to by its running title, *A Grammar of the Manks Language*.

time, and the more ambitious *Triglott* of English with Manx, Irish, and Scottish Gaelic (here, as was usual at that time, called Erse) began printing in 1808 but before it was finished a fire at the printing-house destroyed the whole stock of sheets. The Manx-English dictionary and the grammar were both begun long before 1804. Kelly tells us in the preface to the grammar that they were begun in 1766 'for the instruction of that great and pious prelate, the Rev. Dr. Hildesley, Lord Bishop of Sodor and Mann; and were likewise intended to assist and direct my fellow-labourers and myself in that arduous and important work, the translation of the Manks Bible'.¹ The two works seem to have started life within the covers of one book, now Manx Museum manuscript 1477. The finished version of the grammar and dictionary were sent, presumably with a request for his patronage, to the Duke of Atholl 'many years' before 1804, but the duke apparently returned neither a favourable reply nor yet the manuscripts. Kelly, after his work on the Bible, was enabled to proceed to St. John's College, Cambridge,² from which he moved to become minister of the episcopalian congregation in Ayr in 1776, then tutor to the Marquis of Huntly in 1779, and then vicar of Ardleigh and later rector of Copford near Colchester in 1791. After a period of poor health he died of typhus in November 1809. It is to his former pupil the Marquis that the grammar is dedicated, with the hope that the time was not far distant when it would be followed by the 'Dictionary of a people, who alone, in the great revolutions of ages have preserved the government, the laws, the monuments, and the language, of the antient Druids'.

The *Grammar of the Manks Language* is an interesting production, but to judge it fairly we need to go back behind the Manx Society's reprint of 1859 and even beyond the 1804 edition to the original manuscript draft. Kelly began his work before either of

¹ The suggestion may have come from the bishop. On 3 February 1764 he wrote to Philip Moore: 'We have some curious thoughts here, you must know, of attempting an English and Manks Dictionary; and thereby of recovering some of the many words that seem to have been lost in the latter tongue. The word *chumhach* [*sic*], for power, is one; *pooar* is manifestly English' (Butler, *op. cit.* 477). Moore in 1773 conveyed the same impression to the SPCK: 'the late good bishop had engaged him [Kelly] in forming a *Vocabulary* or *Dictionary* of the language, with a promise of ten guineas, when finished' (*ibid.* 234).

² He received some recompense from the SPCK for the years devoted to the publishing of the Bible, though the amount is not clear (Butler, *op. cit.* 234, 239, 245-6).

the first two grammars of Scottish Gaelic had appeared (though both were published before his), Shaw's *Analysis* in 1778 and Stewart's *Elements* in 1801. It was begun even before the first edition of Vallancey's Irish grammar in 1773, but it appears from the draft that Kelly had Vallancey by him when that draft (not necessarily the first) was written, for there are a few verbal echoes. Vallancey's influence appears chiefly in the printed edition where there is a considerable amount of direct, though unacknowledged, quotation. In the second chapter, on pronunciation, for example, the references to 'ancient manuscripts', to 'broad' and 'small' vowels, to 'labial', 'light', 'weak', and 'heavy' consonants, the comparisons with Greek sounds (with one exception),¹ and the references to the unlenited pronunciation of *l*, *n*, and *r* as a 'doubling' are all taken from Vallancey. His example seems to be responsible for Kelly's having moved the article, ch. 12 in the draft, up to the first place in the accidence (ch. IV), and for introducing a paradigm of it declined through six cases. When we read in ch. V of the printed version that 'In Manks there are six Cases, though originally we seem to have used but three, viz. the Nom. Gen. and Dat.', we may suppose that for Kelly fact is breaking through the mists of grammatical phantasy, for these three cases are the maximum that can be justified in Manx (apart from some early vocatives),² but all that is happening is that he has reworded Vallancey's even more improbable statement: 'The ancients used but three cases, viz. nom. gen. and dat. The moderns have introduced six, as in the Latin, &c.' The whole idea of five declensions of nouns in Manx is presumably adopted as conformable to Latin and enforced by Vallancey's example, though there is no similarity in the membership of the proposed declensions.³ The striking thing about Kelly's draft here is that it explicitly denied the existence of case distinctions and logically therefore had no need for declensions; the whole of chs. V and IX is new material in the printed edition. The original treatment of case, added to the end of ch. IV, read: 'As to the Cases, there is but one Termination throughout the Singular Number, and another in the

¹ Greek χ . Kelly asserts that *Ch* has 'the soft guttural sound of the Greek χ rightly pronounced' and gives as examples in the draft *chyrrys*, *chiassagh*, *chiollagh*. Vallancey also refers to Greek χ , but with respect to Irish lenited *c*.

² Phillips has the two distinct vocatives singular *gharrid* 'friend' (nom. *karry*), and *veck* 'son' (nom. *mack*).

³ It is interesting to note by way of contrast that both Shaw and Stewart adopted for Scottish Gaelic a two-declensional system.

Plural; so that they are only distinguished by Prepositions or Articles set before them or in their Construction; varying their Initial Letters, if mutable, answerable to their Dependence on the preceding Words; as Thie an House, Stoo my hie, the Furniture of my house, Gys e hie to his house, Chionnee eh thie; he bought a house; O hie, O House; ass e thie, Out of her House.' His examples carry us through the gamut of cases, nom., gen., dat., acc., voc., and abl. Here he undoubtedly represents the truth about the majority of Manx nouns, but by denying the possibility of case distinctions he leaves himself with no means of placing the surviving genitive and rarer dative singular forms. While adding a long section on declension (pp. 17-23) to which we shall return in a moment, he did not abandon the shorter ch. VII (originally 6) on the formation of plurals. Although he did not originally adopt declension as a feature of nouns Kelly did include it as characteristic of pronouns, where as far as Manx is concerned it is less defensible than in nouns, and so like Vallancey and Shaw (but not Stewart) he declines them, though like Shaw he jibs at assigning them a vocative. The draft also shows that Kelly did not originally work out the full paradigms of the irregular verbs which bulk so large in the printed version (pp. 47-57). In one respect, however, and that not the least important he was able to strike out on his own; the syntaxes of Vallancey and Shaw, reduced as they are to twelve and fourteen general rules respectively, are far less comprehensive than Kelly's (pp. 66-75), though his division of it under parts of speech inevitably makes it less comprehensive than it might have been.

Kelly's introduction of paradigms of declension presents us with a certain amount of evidence of mutation, and as this is a subject he does not deal with at all comprehensively, indeed one on which he presents conflicting evidence, it may be worth while to go into the matter more fully. It would be simple if we could turn up some authoritative statement on the position in Manx. J. J. Kneen's *Grammar of the Manx Language* on this point, as on so many others, is merely a transcript of the Christian Brothers' Irish grammar.¹ It will be obvious to any Gaelic

¹ This may seem a harsh dismissal of the work of one who did so much in Manx studies, notably on place-names and personal names, and whom Marstrander thought so highly of, but the fact is as stated. Kneen's description of the language should not be relied upon except where it is independent of its source or other evidence confirms it. By way of extenuation it can properly be urged that the writing of a grammar without a model is a difficult

reader that Manx has much less in the way of mutation than its sister languages, and that according to the text examined what there is may seem to be in some disorder. There is, of course, nothing at all abnormal in the reduction or simplification of the mutational system. Even the most extensive type is a simplification of what would have occurred if the results of phonetic changes had been left without analogical rearrangement. For example, the tying of mutation in the adjective to the gender (and case) of the noun rather than to its stem-formation is already a simplification. At the same time, the inhibition of mutation for phonetic reasons introduces irregularities into the system. Then again the reduction or loss of the case-system introduces a further simplification so that in Manx the incidence of mutation becomes more like that in Welsh than in Gaelic. Finally there is the distinction between such mutations as bear some functional load of meaning and such as may be regarded as redundant in this respect and therefore expendable.¹ Furthermore, mutation and gender are mutually supporting systems and the reduction of one will necessarily involve the other.

Manx makes very consistently the distinction between significant and non-significant mutation: the mutations which are permanent, i.e. of which the radical does not occur, as adverbs like *hannah* and irregular verbs like *honnick*, and also those which have some morphological value, e.g. those in the future relative and conditional and preterite of regular verbs, in verbs generally after preverbal particles, and in nouns after the possessive particles. At the other end of the scale Manx has abandoned lenition after simple prepositions, with the general exception of *dy* and with occasional exceptions after *gyn* and in particularly close or traditional combination with *fo* in a few cases. The more debatable middle ground includes groups like article + noun and noun + adjective in various cases.

task, that the model is that of a cognate language, and that the work was done early in Kneen's career, left in manuscript for a long period, and then published in haste without revision. His work on place-names has been sufficiently criticized by Marstrander (see p. 177, note 5). The lack of early records and the range of languages involved make this a peculiarly difficult subject even for the professional scholar, and it is often easier to say Kneen was wrong than to correct him. The foregoing will explain why, with real regret, I have not been able to include in this survey of the native Manx grammarians any mention of one whose reputation stands so high amongst his fellow Manxmen.

¹ The point about redundancy has been made by Professor Borgström, with regard to Scottish Gaelic, in *Celtic Studies* (see p. 177, note 3), 13.

In his paradigms Kelly declines his nouns for the most part with the article (in the abl. with the preposition *gyn* alone), and regularly shows the lenition he prescribes (p. 12) in the nom. fem. sg. (a passage not in the draft, and quoted from Vallancey) as *yn ven*, *y(n) tooill* p. 17, *yn vannish* p. 18, *yn ghloyr* p. 19, *yn voir*, *yn eill*, *yn chloan* p. 20. The gen. masc. sg., according to a rule similar to that of Vallancey but not quoted exactly (p. 12), should also have lenition after the article, and this duly appears in the paradigms *yn ghuilley*, *yn choo* p. 12, *yn er* p. 17, *yn vaaish* (but homorganically inhibited in *yn thie* p. 18), *yn chaggey*, *yn touree* p. 19, *y vraarey*, *y gheuree*, *yn chagliagh* p. 20, *yn chliwe* p. 21, *y chruin*, *y ching*, *yn vac*, *yn er*, *yn volg*, *y chellee* p. 22, *y voddee* p. 23. The fem. gen. sg. should have the article *ny* and no mutation but *h* prefixed to a vowel (p. 13, again quoted from Vallancey); examples given are *ny mrieh*, *ny baa*, *ny coshey*, *ny hawin* p. 13, *ny sooilley*, *ny coshey* p. 17, *ny banshey*, *ny hooigey*, *ny creggey* p. 18, *ny toaney*, *ny marrey*, *ny muigey*, *ny cruinney* p. 19, *ny mayrey*, *ny shayrey*, *ny cheerey*, *ny foalley* p. 20, *ny hanmey*, *ny killagh*, *ny bleeaney*, *ny duirn* p. 21, *ny baa* p. 22, *ny guoee* p. 23. For some reason he does not explain, however, Kelly gives also some cases of nasalization, e.g., *ny giark* p. 18, *ny groshey* p. 19, *ny glienney* p. 20, *ny geyrragh* pp. 23, 25. There may be something in the fact that these all begin with [k], though *ny cruinney* p. 19 has not been included among them. *Ny giark* and *ny geyrragh* are certainly gen. pl. At the same time we find in this context lenition in *ny ghloyr* p. 19, and this too is probably in origin a gen. pl.¹ Kelly marks the ablative with the preposition *gyn* without article, and the rather peculiar arrangement is that after first leniting both singular and plural (apart from dentals) it gradually comes to lenite in the singular but not in the plural; e.g., *gyn hooill* but *gyn sooillyn* p. 17, *gyn chass*, *gyn chassyn* p. 18, *gyn chaggey*, *gyn chaggaghyn* p. 19, *gyn voir*, *gyn*

¹ Manx orthography has some difficulty with the nasalization of *d* and *g* (non-palatal; the palatal sounds become *y*- and combine with the preceding *-n* to give a reasonably accurate rendering). Writers generally shrink from replacing *d*- by *n*- and *g*- by *-ng*, though these expected changes are found intermittently, e.g., in *Coyrle Sodjeh* and *Yn Fer-raauee Creestee*. Instead the tendency is to use *gh*-, exactly as in lenition, though there is no reason to think the nature of the mutation has changed. A similar orthographic interference with the natural representation of the sounds occurs in lenition with palatal *g*- (often *gi*-); the earlier and natural usage is to turn *gi*- into *y(i)*-, but the parallel of the velar *g*- becoming *gh*- gradually extends to the palatal also. By a converse development in some manuscripts *y* comes to be used as the lenited form of *g*, whether palatal or velar, and even before consonants.

voiraghyn p. 20, *gyn chagliagh*, *gyn cagleeyn* p. 21, *gyn chron*, *gyn chruin*, *gyn chellagh*, *gyn kellee* p. 22, *gyn cheyrrey*, *gyn kirree* p. 23. Vallancey shows a similar apparent lack of system and this, coupled with normal loss of lenition after *gyn* in Manx, may explain Kelly's paradigms.

On the group preposition + singular article + noun Kelly initially gives no ruling and we have to deduce what we can from his paradigms. His 'dative' regularly takes the form of *da'n*+noun, and the examples are *da'n tooill* p. 17, *da'n chass*, *da'n thie*, *da'n baase*, *da'n vannish* p. 18, *da'n caggey*, *da'n ghloyr*, *da'n tourey* p. 19, *da'n voir*, *da'n eill*, *da'n chloan*, *da'n cagliagh* p. 20, *da'n doarn* p. 21, *da'n chron*, *da'n kellagh* p. 22, *da'n cheyrrey* p. 23, *da'n fer* p. 25, and also *veih'n dooinney*, *jeh'n dooinney*, *veih'n marchan* p. 72, *marish y ghuilley*, *rish y ven*, *lesh y ghrian* p. 74. The paradigmatic examples suggest that, leaving aside dentals, lenition goes with the feminine gender. This would account for all the examples up to p. 25 except *da'n tourey*. When he drew up these paradigms Kelly seems to have forgotten that he had written in draft ch. 23 (printed XXVI) that the combination preposition + singular article lenited all nouns except those initialled by *d*, *j*, and *t* [and presumably *ch*].

In the plural the only mutation that occurs in the paradigms is in the genitive, where he says (p. 13) that 'the initial of the Genitive Case plural suffers always, when the genitive article *ny* is used, as if the possessive *ny*n were put in apposition'; examples are *ny moghtyn*, *ny dhielyn* p. 13, *ny gassyn* p. 17, *ny maaseyn*, *ny manshyn*, *ny giarkyn* p. 18, *ny gaggaghyn* p. 19, *ny mraaraghyn*, *ny gagleeyn* p. 20, *ny gliwenyn*, *ny gialteenyn*, *ny mleeantyn* p. 21, *ny gruin*, *ny ging*, *ny maa*, *ny vir*, *ny muilg*, *ny gellee* p. 22, *ny girree* p. 23. We may note the exception *ny creggyn* p. 18, probably a slip, and the lenition in *ny ghloyraghyn* p. 19, *ny ghuirn* p. 21, *ny ghuoee* p. 23.¹ It is also notable that there is no prefixing of *n-* to a vowel but that *h-* is normally found instead: e.g. *ayns diunid ny hushtaghyn* p. 11 (the reference there in 1804 to the 'genitive article' read 'Article plural' in the draft), *ny hooigyn* p. 18 (but nom. *ny ooigyn*!), and *ny hanmeenyn* p. 21. There is no trace here of the genitive plural with the same form as the nominative singular.

Kelly wrote, he tells his patron, 'to assist and direct' the translators of the Manx Bible. How far do his prescriptions accord with his and their practice? There are no grounds for thinking that Kelly's share in the copying and proof-reading of the translation was meant to include any form of grammatical,

¹ See note 1, page 191.

as distinct from orthographical, standardization, and so we can use the translation, with other works in which he had no hand, to determine what the facts of usage were in his time. We shall find that there are considerable, sometimes great, differences in this respect between different parts of the Bible, and we must remember that nothing of all this translation work could be produced by monoglot Manxmen; indeed in all Manx printed and manuscript literature only the carvals,¹ the religious verse of the eighteenth and earlier nineteenth centuries, and some secular verse, can be composed by monoglots and some at least were pretty certainly not so. The clergy who undertook this translation work were locally educated, it is true, but through English and in the classics,² only informally and occasionally through or in Manx, and for some of them, depending on their upbringing, it must have been a second rather than a first language in terms of status if not always in terms of order of acquisition. They were not in contact with any other form of Gaelic,³ and the absence

¹ A collection of these religious poems was published by A. W. Moore, *Carvallyn Gailckagh* (1891), containing 85 poems with translations (cf. *Journal of the Manx Museum* vi, no. 77 (1961), 102-3). A similar collection, published in the *Examiner* during the Great War by the late Philip W. Caine, failed by a series of accidents to reach book form. On the basis of my own cataloguing of the Manx Museum's carval manuscripts I reckon there are at least 90 unpublished poems, and that the total bulk, published and unpublished, is about 20,000 lines. Many of Moore's versions could now be improved in the light of a larger range of evidence for the text than was available to him. Secular verse is collected by the same editor in his *Manx Ballads* (1896).

² In a letter to the Revd. Dr. Walker of Moffatt, dated 14 November 1768, Philip Moore gives this account of their education: 'in the reign of Charles II, bp. Barrow established an academy at Castletown, for the education of young men to serve the church; who receive their instruction from an academical professor, who is a Master of Arts from one of the Universities. There is a competent salary for the teacher, and a handsome exhibition for the three or four youths on the establishment. There is also, at Douglas, a benefaction from a gentleman lately deceased, for the education of two candidates for the ministry. Our last academic master was the Rev. Mr. Ross, a gentleman of your country, from Musselborough: so that, you see, from these seminaries we have the blessing and benefit of a competent share of classical, theological, and other learning in the arts and sciences, to qualify us for the ministry' (Butler, *op. cit.* 570-1). He modestly omits to mention his own share in the educational system.

³ There is some evidence of casual contact with persons or through books. Cf. Kelly's dictionary, s.v. *Gaelck*, for a reference to the Revd. Mr. McLagan, then chaplain to the 42nd Regiment, stationed in Man about 1770, who assisted them 'in the recovery or the application of obsolete words', with a probable example (though not a happy one) s.v. *Muc-awin*. (For what McLagan gained in these exchanges, see *Scottish Gaelic Studies* ix (1961),

of a local literary tradition left them without standards of correctness other than their own, not necessarily representative, usage.

The group of mutations I propose to examine here comprises (a) article + nom. fem. sg., (b) article + gen. fem. sg., (c) article + gen. masc. sg., (d) preposition + article + singular noun, (e) all cases of adjectives. In each case I have taken a piece yielding approximately the same number of examples from each of the eighteenth-century texts 1707, 1748, 1763F, 1763L, 1767R, 1767H, 1771E, 1771B, 1773I, 1773H, 1777, 1783, 1796,¹ and collected the evidence bearing on these points. On some it is more cogent than on others: in (a) for example, since mutation of one kind or another is the only evidence for the noun being feminine, or being so regarded by that writer, we should merely be going in a circle if we said he had a hundred per cent record of mutation in this class. The question arises whether some may not have more than a hundred per cent, i.e. that some masculine nouns are mutated in this position too. Two particular cases ought first to be discounted, viz. nouns preceded by *veg y* and *lheid y*, for although they would no doubt have been explained by the writers as containing the article (and indeed *lheid ny* is the plural form), they must have been originally *a bheag do* and *a*

9-22.) In a letter to Philip Moore, dated 3 February 1764, Hildesley wrote: 'The Manks is a very ancient language, beyond doubt; and could we but get such a thing as an Erse Dictionary we should be capable of improving, or rather restoring it. We have been able, with a little study and attention, clearly to make out the sense of every word in the Erse Lord's Prayer, bating two or three at the most' (Butler, op. cit. 477). Hildesley had a copy of Borlase's *History of Cornwall*, which Philip Moore had seen, for he writes in 1769 of an Anglo-Cornish glossary at the end of it: 'on perusing which, I was astonished at the surprising similarity of the two languages; every sixth or seventh word almost the same, or with very little variation, but clearly from the same root' (Butler 477, 599). And writing on 1 May 1772, Philip Moore informs the SPCK: 'I have finished the revisions of the last tome of our Manks Bible. I say revisions, because it has had two, *litteratim, et verbatim*: first, the several portions, as translated by the clergy; next, the fair copy, to prepare it for the press,—with all the severity and attention of a critical reviewer: comparing and collating every sentence with other translations, including the Irish, as well as the Gaelick; and with the help of several commentators, ancient and modern' (Butler, 635).

¹ These texts are: 1707, *Coyrle Sodjeh*, pp. 1-15, 67-81; 1748, St. Matthew, chh. 9-12; 1763F, *Yn Fer-raauee Creestee*, pp. 3-20; 1763L, St. Luke, chh. 17-20; 1767R, Romans, chh. 1-16; 1767H, Hebrews, chh. 1-9; 1771E, Exodus, chh. 3-12; 1771B, Judges, chh. 1-7; 1773I, Isaiah, chh. 1-7; 1773H, Hosea, chh. 1-12; 1777, *Aght Ghiare*, pp. 1-23; 1783, Wilson's Sermons, pp. 173-95; 1796, *Phargys Callyt*, pp. 5-17, 60-77.

leithid do, and lenited accordingly. This disposes of one masc. in 1707, two in 1763F, one in 1771B, two in 1773H, one in 1777, and one in 1796. Those that remain are: 1763F *cre'n cheint* 19, 1767R *yn chairys* 9. 30, 1773H *yn chagliagh* 5. 10 (which Kelly uses as a paradigm of a masculine noun, but, as it is a modification of *coigríoch* and so originally feminine, the translator may be quite right), 1777 *yn Vie* 6, 1783 *yn vie* 180 and *yn volteyrys* 182, 1796 *y viallys* 433. Our only authority for describing these as masculine is Cregeen's dictionary, and certainly *chairys* and *mie* are elsewhere used as feminines. There is no evidence here for assuming that mutation is being wrongly used.

The sequence article + gen. fem. sg. (*b*) is rather a different case. A distinctive gen. sg. form is a rarity in Manx nouns, possessed by almost no masculines and only a small part of the feminines. Consequently it seems an irregularity in the system and tends not to be used even where it exists, except in traditional contexts, set phrases, usually with article or possessive, and indefinitely as a sort of adjective. So far has the sense of the genitive as a general grammatical category gone from the language that Cregeen in his dictionary gives genitive singular forms as separate entries with the definition *a. d.*, i.e. adjective derivative. So, for example, *clagh* has gen. *cloaie*, but the latter will be found only in collocations like *syn cloaie* and not in ones like *trimmid ny cloaie*; *feeyn* has genitive *feeyney*, but it occurs only in phrases like *garey-feeyney* or *saagh feeyney*. Consequently examples of (*b*) are rare and repetitive; here separate words only are given, without variations or repetitions in any one text: 1707, *Noid ny hanmey* 9, *Briwnys ny Haglish* 11, *Thie ny Bondiaght* 67; 1748, *laa ny briwnys* 10. 15; 1763F, *Noid ny Hanmey* 16, *Eunys-syn ny Foalley* 19; 1767R, *leigh ny foalley* 4. 1; 1767H, *mean ny hagglish* 2. 12, *achyr ny hanmey* 6. 19; 1771E, *ushtey ny hawin* 4. 9, *joan ny hooirrey* 8. 17; 1771B, *oirr ny marrey* 5. 17, *thie ny bondiaght* 6. 8; 1773I, *boyn ny coshey* 1. 6, *foays ny cheerey* 1. 19, *ooigyn ny hooirrey* 2. 19, *freaney ny marrey* 5. 30; 1773H, *genniagh ny marrey* 1. 10, *cummaltee ny cheerey* 4. 1, ? *laghyn [n]y feailley* 12. 9; 1777, *Ashoonyn ny Hooirrey* 10, *Baase ny Croshey* 12; 1783, *Noid ny anmey* 175; 1796, *stoyl ny glovr* 209, *er feih ny maynrays* 192.

When the genitive singular of a masculine noun is preceded by the article (*c*) there should be lenition of the noun. Since masculine nouns, other than verb-nouns, rarely have a distinct genitive this mutation is normally the sole mark of the genitive case. Examples are: 1707, *jerrey'n Teihl* (x5) 10, *mooads y pheccah shoh* 71; 1748, *dooinney'n phoosee* (x 3) 9. 15, *cree'n tallooin* 12. 40, but

not *f*-, as *thie yn fer-reil* 9. 23, *Chiarn y fouyr* 9. 38, *cowrey yn phadeyr*¹ 12. 39; 1763F, *cleynyn y Theihll* (x 2) 5, *maase y vagheragh* 8; 1763L, *mess y gharey-feeyney* (x 3) 20. 10, *reill y chiannoort* 20. 20, *cloan y theihll* 20. 34, but not in *laghyn yn Mac dooinney* (x 2) 17. 22, *leeideilee yn pobble*² 19. 47; 1767R, *kesmady n y chredjue* (x 3) 4. 12, *corp y vaase* (not gen. *vaaish*) 7. 24, *leigh yn chairys* (if masc.) 9. 31, *berchys y theihll* (x 3) 11. 12, *eilley'n toilshey* 13. 12, but not in *cairy s y credjue* 4. 11, *jercal . . . yn cretoor* 8. 19, *cloan yn gialdyns* 9. 8; 1767H, *undin y thalloon* 1. 10, *pooar y vaase* (x 2, not *vaaish*) 2. 14, *laa yn violagh* 3. 8, *er dy hoshiaght y theihll* (x 2) 4. 3, *bun y taualtys* 5. 9, *ree'n chairys* (if masc.) 7. 2, *oik y taggyrtys* 7. 5, *cooyl y churtan* (gender?) 9. 3, *arg y chonaant* (x 3) 9. 4, but not in *peccaghyn y pobble* (x 3) 2. 17, *cooilleen yn gialldyn* 6. 15, *baase yn fer* 9. 16; 1771E, *cooyl yn aasagh* 3. 1, *joan y thalloon* (x 4) 8. 16, *leoie yn choirrey* 9. 8, *lossreeyn y vagher* 9. 22, *biljyn y vagheragh*³ (x 2) 9. 25, but not in *shilley'n pobble* 4. 30; 1771B, *foyr y chliwe* (x 4) 1. 8, *cummaltee'n choan* 1. 19, *laghyn y vriw* 2. 18, *dorrys y chabbane* (x 4) 4. 20, *yrjid y vagher-caggee* 5. 18, *messyn y thalloon* 6. 4, but not *clashtyn y pobble* 7. 3; 1773I, *fer-reill y phobble* 3. 7, *mess y thalloon* 4. 2, *cree yn phobble* 6. 10, *magher y ghialleyder* 7. 3, *folt y ching* (gen. of *kione*) 7. 20; 1773H, *maase y vagheragh* (x 4) 2. 12, *reddyn y thalloon* 2. 18, *maase y vagher* 4. 3, *aalid y voghrey* 6. 3, *oghe yn winneyder* 7. 4, *laghyn yn cherraghey* 9. 7, *laghyn y chooilleeney* 9. 7, *mess . . . yn villey-figgagh* 9. 10, *laa yn chaggey* (not gen. *chaggee*) 10. 14; 1777, *Miolaghyn y Theihll* (x 3) 2, *Mooadys y Pheccah . . . y Cherraghey* 5, *baase y Pheccagh* 8, *Baase y Chretoor* 8, *Bannaght yn Er-kionnee* 9, *er graih yn Voggey* 12, but not in *er coontey yn Sluight* 6; 1783, *ard imnea yn Chreestee* 177, *kiarailyn y theihl* (x 2) 179, *Shirveish yn Ghoo* 180, *raad yn vaase* (not *vaaish*) 180, *eiraghyn y choaylanmey* 185, *kiarail yn Chredjue* (x 2) 189, but not in *stayd yn Sushtal* (x 4) 173; 1796, *foays y valley* 19, *ooashley'n theihll* (x 2) 30, *leigh yn chrootagh* 109, *mooads y viol* 268. It will be noticed that five

¹ The *ph*- spelling for *f*- is standard in *phadeyr*; in early Manx it was a little more widespread. See the spellings under *Faase*, *Fainney*, *Faishnagh*, *Feeyn*, *Flaaoil*, *Foldeyr* in 'A Glossary of Early Manx', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* xxv (1955-6), 139-40, 264-79.

² See below, pp. 197, for 198, discussions of this word. Other examples show that non-lenition here is not due to reluctance to lenite *p*-, but is peculiar to this word.

³ The two genitives, *y vagher* and *y vagheragh*, are divided in the Bible as a whole in the proportion 3:4, and most books show both indifferently, though there is sometimes a preference, as in Genesis and Psalms for the first, and in Ezekiel and Daniel for the second. The fem. *ny magheragh* is rare and in Mt. 6. 28 is a correction for an earlier *y vagher*.

of these collections (1707, 1763F, 1773I, 1773H, and 1796) exhibit no exceptions to this mutation in the material examined, and when allowance is made for cases of *pobble*, and a reluctance to lenite *f*- out of existence, it becomes clear that lenition in this situation can be regarded as the norm. With regard to *pobble* we have been fortunate in our sample to dredge up the two examples of lenition in Isaiah; a more comprehensive survey in the Bible texts shows that while the lenition of this word in the gen. sg. is normal in Leviticus, Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, Matthew, Luke, John, Acts and Hebrews, it is not so in Exodus (except 13. 22, 19. 7) or in Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 1 Chronicles (except 21. 2), and Esther.

It has been noted that in some of these examples, although lenition marks the genitival status of the noun, the distinctive genitive inflection is not used, and also that there are few and limited examples of the feminine genitive singular. It should be added that there are far more feminine nouns in genitival construction than this short list implies. For examples: 1748, *boayrd y cheesh* 9. 9, *stoyr y chree* (x 2) 12. 34; 1763F, *nhee'ghyn mie y vea shoh* 6; 1767R, *laa'n chorree* 2. 5, *raad y chee* (x 2) 3. 17, *diunid y verchys* 11. 33; 1767H, *lorg-reill yn reeriaght* 1. 8, *kiarailyn y chree* 4. 12, *stoyl-reeoil y ghraysee* 4. 16, *ree'n chairys* 7. 2, *glenney yn eill* (not *ny foalley*) 9. 13, *siyn y chirveish* 9. 21; 1771E, *ushtey yn awin* 7. 20, *glassyraght y cheer* (not *ny cheerey*) 10. 12; 1771B, *cummaltee yn cheer* (x 2) 1. 33, *dorryssyn y chamyr* (x 3) 3. 23, *mullagh yn chreg* 6. 26; 1773I, *cooish y ven-treoghe* 1. 17, *biljyn y cheyll* (not *ny keylley*) 7. 2; 1777, *sluight y Ven* 6, *Billey yn Vea* 18; 1783, *raad y vea* 180; 1796, *skell y ghrian* (not *ny greiney*) 63, *towse y phooar* (not *ny pooaragh* (x 2)) 75, *billey'n vea* (x 4), *cree'n cheshaght* 455—all of which are the ordinary nominative with appropriate mutation, used as genitive. Kelly does not mention this possibility in the printed version, but in the draft he was clearly nearer the facts of the situation when he wrote (ch. 16) 'When two substantives come together belonging to divers things, the latter, be it masculine or feminine, if the Article *y* or *yn* precede it, shall change into its soft; as *Bun y chooish*, *mac y ven*, *Baare yn olt'* (giving two feminine and one masculine example!), rather than in his later version (ch. XVIII) restricting this mutation to masculine nouns and adding a separate paragraph for the feminines, directing the use of *ny*, and no lenition. It will be seen, therefore, that observing a noun in the genitive singular with the article is no guide to its gender unless it is accompanied by the feminine article *ny*, which will not normally be the case.

For (*d*), preposition + singular article + noun, the evidence is too abundant even from this modest sample to be presented in full. We may take first the crude figures for mutation versus non-mutation in this position without regard to gender or any other factors: 1707, 22:8; 1748, 16:7; 1763F, 26:2; 1763L, 20:8; 1767R, 5:21; 1767H, 25:14; 1771E, 31:18; 1771B, 25:9; 1773I, 23:3; 1773H, 19:1; 1777, 24:20; 1783, 24:11; 1796, 20:3. The non-mutation figures for 1771E and 1771B can be reduced to 3 in each case if we note that 15 examples in Exodus and 6 in Judges are of *pobble*. A more comprehensive survey of this word shows that non-lenition is normal in this position, and I have been able to find only one example of mutation (Genesis 26. 10). However much the proportions vary in different texts it is noteworthy that only one, 1767 Romans, actually reverses the normal preponderance of mutation over non-mutation, and this clearly is the reflection of the usage of that particular translator. Furthermore, in subsequent editions it seems that the revisers found his neglect of this mutation rather extreme, for sporadic corrections bring the figure up to 11 mutations against 15 non-mutations.

The unstated implication of Kelly's paradigms is that lenition is not required here with masculine nouns. If we apply this test of gender to the non-mutated forms in our collection we shall find that most of them can be accounted for by the immutability of *pobble*, the reluctance to lenite *f*⁻¹ (especially in the passage in 1767H), and this immutability of masculines. This combination of circumstances will account for all the exceptions in 1707, 1748, 1763F, 1763L, 1767H, 1773I, 1773H, 1777, and 1783. There remain a few cases where feminines seem not to be mutated in this position, e.g., 1767R (19 masc. +) *cree* 2. 29, *folliaght* 11. 25; 1771E (3 masc. +) *bondiaght* 6. 6; 1771B *fainagh* 4. 15; 1796 (2 masc. +) *grian* 25. It must also be noted that even within the same text examples of the mutation will occur side by side with non-mutation; there are two points to note here; (i) that the non-mutation of masculine nouns is only facultative, not a regular rule (except perhaps in 1767R, 1777, and 1783), and (ii) that where the non-mutation is only a very small minority of the total occurrences of the grammatical construction and even then not consistent, we must make allowance for the possibility of scribal and typographical error. The general

¹ This appears in Kelly's grammar; we find in the draft of the table in ch. X, p. 24, the lenited adjective *ben irrinagh* marked with a query, and absent from the printed version altogether.

rule, however, is that with the exception of a few of the later texts, the practice is, as Kelly originally stated it, to lenite nouns after the combination preposition + singular article.

The last situation to be examined is (*e*) that of the adjective (following its noun) according to the various cases, genders, and numbers of the noun, and particularly to inquire how far lenition in the adjective follows that of the noun. From the examples collected the following pattern emerges. As we should expect, the nom.-acc. sg. of feminine nouns is followed by lenition of the adjective, the number of examples varying greatly from text to text. I have noted only two exceptions: 1767R, *caslys feill peccoil* (nom. = gen.) 8. 3, and 1783 *yn verchys mooar* 180. There are, however, some examples of lenition here after nouns given as masculine by Cregeen, e.g., 1707, *y Chiarn cheddyn* 81 (but this is merely an early example of *cheddin* (= *ceudna*) with permanent lenition, a state of affairs which becomes normal during the century); 1763F, *cooinaghtyn vie* 4, *tastey vie* 6, *e chenjallys ghraihagh* 11, *Noid vooar nyn anmey* 16, (of which *tastey vie* is found as fem. in *Carvallyn Gailckagh* 85, supported by one manuscript while four others have *nish*; *kenjallys* in this phrase is invariably fem. in the Bible translation; *cooinaghtyn* may have acquired the gender of *cooin* (= *cuimhne*) which survives only as a predicative in *s'cooin lhiam* 'I remember'; and *noid* is occasionally fem. in Carswell and Desiderius);¹ 1771E, *grunt chasherick* 3. 5; 1773I, *yn slught chrauee* 6. 13; 1777, *y Stayd pheccoil* 3, *cre'n Stayd hrimshagh* 5, *yn Stayd hreih* 6, *e Chenjallys ghraihagh* 9, *Ainjys chinjagh* 19 (of which *stayd* is fem. in Irish and Scottish Gaelic, and *ainjys vooar* occurs in the first line of an unpublished carval in Manx Museum manuscripts 160, 447, and 2141); 1783, *baght vie* 174, *fys vie* 179, *oyr vooar* 181; 1796, *eaynagh ghowin* 92, *kiaull ving flaunysagh* 112, *flaunys villish* 130, *yn eanish wooar* 159, *diunid wooar* 447 (of which *feanish* (= *fiadhnaise*) is historically fem., and *diunid* is usually so, e.g. Ps. 36. 6, Is. 51. 10, Amos 7. 4). In addition to adjectives, mutation of an indefinite genitive singular noun occurs in this position, e.g. 1773I, *geay-chassee* 5. 28, *skeaig-ghrine* 7. 19; 1773H, *y gheay-chassee* 8. 7; 1796, *sheshaght-chaggee* 106. In the plural a wider search will turn up *cloan gheiney* regularly, and exceptionally *slatt gheiney* in 2 Sam. 7. 14.

Examples of the vocative, singular and plural, are not numerous but mutation is usual in the adjective after nouns of both genders; exceptions are 1773I, *ashoon peccoil* 1. 4, and 1796, *O vraar gloyroil* 242.

¹ *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, xxiv; *Desiderius*, glossary s.v. *námha*.

After a genitive singular masculine noun the adjective might be expected to be lenited, especially if the article precedes and the noun is lenited, but the evidence, such as it is, is almost entirely against it and in favour of non-lenition, i.e. the mutation of the nominative. I have noted only two exceptions: 1783, *kiarail yn Chredjue Chreestee* 189 (which is probably an example of the tendency of scribes and compositors to use *Chr-* in this word instead of *Cr-*, irrespective of mutation, under the influence of English spelling), and 1796, *foays y valley verchagh* 19 (but cf. *'sy valley wooar* 114, which, as we shall see, implies that *balley* is treated as feminine).

For the prepositional case, which we can conveniently call 'dative', we might expect mutation in adjectives after singular nouns of both genders, but here, as with the genitive singular masculine, there is distinction by gender, with the mutation of the nominative singular again setting the pattern. Some exceptions, to the fairly numerous examples that form the basis of this rule are: 1707, (m.) *jeh my Chredjue Chreestee* 13, *er y laa cheddyn* 75 (on both of which see above), (f.) *veih'n Agglish firrinagh* 10 (immutable *f-*); 1748, (m.) *jeh'n credjue Chreestee* 10. 18 footnote, (f.) *ayns yn oor keddyn* 10. 19; 1763L, (m.) *lesh stayd chronnal* 17. 20 (but see evidence for fem. gender above), (f.) *gys cheer foddey* 19. 12, 20. 9 (immutable *f-*); 1767H, (f.) *gys nearey foshlit* 6. 6 (immutable *f-*); 1771E, (f.) *dy ghlare floaoil* 4. 10 (immutable *f-*), *dy chlagh gyere* 4. 25, *trooid y vondiaght dewil* 6. 9. (homorganic inhibition?); 1773I, (m.) *er y raad-wooar* 7. 3 (but the translators are divided on the gender of *raad*; it is masc. in Deuteronomy, Numbers, Judges, 1 Samuel, Proverbs, and often in Isaiah, fem. in 2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Jeremiah, and sometimes in Isaiah); 1773H, (m.) *ayns kenjallys-ghraithagh* 2. 19 (see above for fem. gender); 1777, (m.) *gys y Stayd varvaanagh* 3, *ayns y Stayd hreih* 3, *liorish Prowal hrimshagh* 5, *ayns y Stayd ghiare* 13, *jeh'n Stayd hrimshagh* 22 (but see above for fem. gender), (f.) *lesh Cree booisal* 22 (but while Cregeen gives *cree* f., his attached proverb shows it m.); 1783, (m.) *'syn aght Chreestee* 186 (possibly fem., otherwise see above for *Chr-* spellings); 1796, (m.) *veih'n vroid wooar* 53, *'sy valley wooar* 114, *'syn eanish hollys* 214 (but may be fem.), *veih'n eiraght wooar* 238, 423 (which could be expected to be fem., cf. Scottish Gaelic), *jeh'n diunid wooar* 361 (see above for fem. gender), (f.) *trooid y ghless shliawin* 63 (but *sl-*, *sn-* are not consistently mutable), *jeh'n phooar gloyroil* 120.

After attenuated plurals lenition of adjectives or dependent genitives may be expected; Kelly¹ quaintly describes this as

¹ *Grammar*, ch. VIII, p. 16; this is the implication of his statement, apropos

some plural nouns taking a feminine adjective. Examples are not numerous; exceptions are 1748, *kirree cailjey* 10. 6; 1773I *goair-fyrryn* 1. 11, *fir-faishnee* 2. 6 (both immutable *f*-); 1777, *ny Peccee mee-vaynrey* 5.¹

For comparison with the seventeenth century we can turn to three sections extracted from Phillips's Prayer Book.² We find (a) that the nominative singular feminine after the article is generally lenited, with only occasional failure as in *yn shessaght* Ps. 75. 3; (b, c) in the genitive singular after the article, lenition is normal in masc. nouns and in fem. nouns where the nominative is used as genitive, with some exceptions as *fer ghiani rüst yn syyl* 21, *klaun yn shilógh* Ps. 78. 4, *érick yn beagh* Ps. 92. 9, *ordyghy yn padjer moghrey* 20; the genitive singular feminine article is rather more frequent than in later texts, and there is more evidence for the genitive after the verb-noun and certain prepositions, as *kur ny bríi* 20, *tryid magh ny bleyney* 20, *erksyn ny káyrys* 239; (d) the group preposition + singular article + noun shows lenition of the noun, both masculine and feminine and including *pobble*, and failure of mutation is rare, e.g. *liorish y kighlá shoh* 37, *masky yn slyei* Ps. 77. 14, *ayns yn shillee ainiyn* Ps. 79. 11, *rish yn flúyr* Ps. 81. 17, *er y kruitt* Ps. 92. 2; the genitive plural is frequently nasalized after the article; (e) as regards adjectives the position is similar to later usage, i.e. lenition after the nominative feminine singular, the vocative singular of both genders, usually not lenited after the genitive singular masculine (though examples can be found elsewhere in this text, e.g. *bunn yn tšyl ghruin* Ps. 18. 15), and about equally divided between lenition and

of gender, that nouns in *-ee* [joined to an adjective feminine whether of the singular or plural number] are feminine. The words in brackets are added to the draft version, but the sense is clear from the example *peccee*.

¹ In addition to these examples of the presence and absence of expected mutation there are some instances of unexpected mutation. Those that fall within the limits of the present survey are: (a) cases of lenition of a masc. nominative singular after the article; all, strangely enough in view of the general reluctance to lenite that sound, are cases with *f*-, e.g. 1771B, *yn er cheddin* 7. 4; 1773I, *yn er* 1. 3, *yn er coyrlee* 3. 3, *yn er-lhee* 3. 7, *yn er-boggyssagh* 5. 14; 1773H, *yn er-casherick* 11. 9; (b) lenition of the adjective after a masculine nominative singular, e.g. 1748, *my er-ghraihagh* 12. 18, and of a genitive singular not only after a feminine singular noun, as 1767R, *sharvaant ghooiney elley* 14. 4, 1771E *shanstyr chloan Israel* 4. 29, *ollagh chloan Israel* 9. 6, 1771B *laue chloan Israel* 4. 24, 1796 *gloyr vac Yee* 293, but also after masculines and plurals, and in the genitive plural, as 1767R *folliaghtyn gheiney* 2. 16, 1771E *stuirtyyn chloan Israel* 5. 14 (x 3), *osnaghyn chloan Israel* 6. 5, 1771B *sluight chloan Israel* 3. 2, 1783 *drogh vea Chreesteenyn* 179, *son ymmyrkey-bea Chreesteenyn* 182.

² These are pp. 17-40, 223-47, 566-94.

non-lenition after dative singular masculines, but normal after feminines, i.e. with gender coming to be the dominant factor.

The only other Manx grammarian¹ before J. J. Kneen was Archibald Cregeen, who prefixed to his dictionary some remarks on grammar (pp. vi–xv). The section ‘Of the Letters and their Sounds’ follows closely on Kelly’s first three chapters. In dealing with nouns Cregeen by implication rejects Kelly’s declensions, and contents himself with a section on the formation of the plural, making no mention of the formation of the genitive singular at all. He presents no paradigms of the verbs, regular or irregular, but merely lists the suffixes of the verb-noun and the various tenses and persons, and enumerates the stems of the irregulars. His general comments are placed under the title ‘Of Peculiarities’, i.e. the plural article, the position and plural of the adjective, derivative adjectives (distinguished because some of them, though Cregeen does not acknowledge this, are genitive singular nouns), the singular after *daa*, the emphatic suffixes, gender, inflection of verbs by suffixes, comparison of adjectives, and mutation. Each of these is mentioned because it involves a total or substantial difference from English usage. For mutation he refers only to lenition after a feminine singular noun, in the preterite of verbs, in the vocative, after the article (except *ch*, *d*, *j*, *t*, but without mentioning gender), after possessives, in the verb-noun after *er*,² and in adjectives after *feer*. He concludes with three pages of illustration of the mutations. The grammar is not intended to be any sort of comprehensive treatment but merely a series of notes for the guidance of users of the dictionary, particularly with respect to the mutated forms.

We come finally to the dictionaries. Cregeen’s was the first of these to be published, in 1835 or a year or two later. It is a work of sober scholarship³ which took its author some twenty years to

¹ The scope of the present lecture fortunately relieves me of the necessity of saying anything about Heinrich Leo, *Grammatik des auf der Insel Man gesprochenen Dialektes der gaelischen Sprache oder des Manxischen* (1847).

² Mutation of the verb-noun after *er* (i.e. *iar*) is the only case in Manx of fluctuation between nasalization and lenition. The former is, of course, the historically correct mutation, and in the seventeenth century it is the rule. Lenition gradually gains ground at its expense (non-mutation, as in Scottish Gaelic, is extremely rare and probably always a mistake), but it is difficult to see the pattern. Retention of the old mutation seems to be tied to particular words, e.g. *er jeet*, and to particular consonants, especially the voiceless ones.

³ Rhŷs commented approvingly on the ‘sobriety and acumen’ of the author

compile. His primary source is the Bible, to which references are generously supplied, and he also added a large number of proverbial sayings by way of illustration. On the grammatical side he marks the stress (which is an essential point in Manx where the general Gaelic rule of initial stress has been overridden by a variety of other factors),¹ indicates the formation of the plural either in full or by reference to the grammar, and generally also gives the gender, the importance of which for mutation he points out in the grammar. We have seen that there is reason to query some of Cregeen's genders, but this does not mean that his information is wrong. First, he did not allow for some nouns being of either gender, and secondly, when in doubt about gender he tended to turn to the evidence of pronouns, which, as Stewart recognized,² is not always reliable, particularly where personification is concerned. He tells us in his Introduction (p. v) that 'to place the present publication within the reach of the peasantry of the Isle of Man, it has been greatly abridged from what was at first purposed by the author'. Even so a great deal of space is taken up with mutated forms which are then referred to their radicals, a procedure helpful to the beginner but irritating to the scholar who fears something now irrecoverable may have been sacrificed to it.

Cregeen seems to have known little about any other Gaelic or Celtic dialect and thus simply recorded what he found. He did, indeed, include some etymological conjectures in his dictionary, all quite worthless though often interesting in themselves, because he took it for granted that words could be explained by reference to contemporary forms of the language.³ Sometimes these explanations may not be his own but the fruit of popular speculation. He adheres generally to the spelling of the Bible and comments at times on its inconsistencies. At others he spells as he thinks the pronunciation demands while acknowledging that the usual spelling is otherwise; he also lets slip a valuable clue to the variety of spelling of a single sound in Manx when he takes note of the necessity not only to represent pronunciation but to distinguish homophones. Yet he allows tradition its place

adding that 'in fact the work contrasts very favourably in these respects with Dr. Kelly's Manx-English Dictionary, which is diversified by etymological extravagances of a quaint nature' (*Outlines*, p. vii).

¹ Cf. *Celtica* v (1961), 116-26.

² *Elements*, part III, ch. I, section III (p. 148 of the 1801 edn.).

³ For example, *Baroole* is explained as *baare ooyl*, though the Anglo-Norse name Wardfell shows that a Gaelic etymology is out of the question.

in orthography and stops short of altering spelling to conform with supposed etymology. I need say no more in description of the details of this work as it has just been reproduced by Yn Cheshaght Ghailckagh from the original edition.

Kelly, as we noticed earlier, was unlucky in his lexicographical enterprises. His dictionary of Manx, prepared, like the grammar, for Bishop Hildesley and the translators, was intended to follow the grammar to the press, but never appeared until the Manx Society took it in hand and produced a version, edited by the Revd. William Gill, vicar of Malew, in 1866, from a manuscript copy. In addition to Manx Museum manuscript 1477 already mentioned, three of the four volumes of a later copy transcribed from it in 1795 survive in MSS. 1045-7, and this seems to be the basis of the printed edition. As far as I can see it reproduces Kelly's manuscript quite closely in the main; in the section of the letter *L* that I examined I found only one serious error—the strange entry 'Lheecagh-er-cabbyl, s. a farrier', which originally and intelligibly read 'Lhee-âgh *or* cabbyl'. The printed edition omits some of his etymological material, which is not necessarily a loss, and the occasional indications of the form of plurals and genitives are generally suppressed. Although Kelly wrote in the grammar (p. 16) that he had been 'very exact in setting down the gender of every noun in my Dictionary' this is not true of either of the manuscript versions that have come down to us or of the printed edition. In all these respects, and in the extreme scarcity and imprecision of references, Kelly's dictionary is inferior to Cregeen's, except in containing more words. From a point early in the letter *B* the editor added 'all such *good* Manx words as occur in Cregeen's Dictionary', i.e. words not obviously of alien origin, which Cregeen, while deploring them, had nevertheless faithfully recorded as part of the language.

Unlike Cregeen, Kelly is prone to invention, or perhaps he would have called it deduction. Assuming that words are made of prefixes, roots, and suffixes, he takes it that each of these elements can have an independent existence and a fixed semantic content, and accordingly enters them as words. The type of entry to be on one's guard against here is that which contains 'as'; in the '*x*, as *y*' formula, *y* is genuine but *x* is an unfounded deduction from it. For example, under *An* we have [quite correctly] 'a privative particle used in composition' and 'sometimes intensive'; then a substantive 'order, regularity' hence *anney* 'commandment' [!]; also 'desire' as *meean* 'monthly

desire' [an etymological spelling for the usual *mian* which occurs in its proper place]; a conjunction interrogative [apparently obsolete in Kelly's time, and rare even in Phillips]; another substantive 'an old word for water' as *farrane* 'a spring, cold water' [a lucky hit?]; and yet another substantive 'island' instead of *in* [equally ghostly], as *man-an-agh*; and then under *An*, *ain* 'an orb, circle, planet', as *gri-an* 'sun' the hot orb from *gree* [itself a deduction] or *greesagh*; *dialuan* 'Monday' [Irish spelling] from *lu* or *sloo* 'lesser' and *an* a planet; *bli-an* or *baal-ian* 'the year or circle of Baal [Kelly was obsessed by Baal; see entries on pp. 13-16] or the sun'; *slong-an* 'a chaplet, circle, or roll used by milkmaids to steady the pail on their heads.' Further examples will be found s. vv. *ar* (twice), *id* (thrice), and on a smaller scale *passim*.

In the terms of Professor T. J. Morgan's sympathetic lecture on the eighteenth-century Welsh lexicographers,¹ while Cregeen belongs to the 'naïve' school of popular etymology and is innocent of any intention to deceive, Kelly can be intermittently misleading (though by no means on the scale of William Owen Pughe) in that he mixes up the 'creative' with the 'objective' type of lexicography. Alike in his grammar and his dictionary his learning and the learning of his age have proved to be a dangerous thing for him, an *ignis fatuus* luring him away from the solid ground of fact to the quagmires of fancy.

Something has already been said of Kelly's *Triglott*. For this, too, we have manuscript evidence in an original, Manx Museum manuscript 2045, and a fair copy for the press, manuscript 51. Like the other dictionary, after the fiery grave of the original edition, it reappeared, shedding the Irish and Scottish Gaelic columns (the Manx Society having decided against printing the *Triglott* entire), as the second half of the Society's dictionary of 1866, edited by the Revd. William Gill, and the Revd. J. T. Clarke, chaplain of St. Mark's, but chiefly by the latter.² Examination of a portion of this work in relation to the manuscript evidence gives less ground for confidence; the editing is much more far-reaching and only a selection of Kelly's renderings of a given English word is reproduced. The editor seems to have held the view that in any pair of terms, whatever their grammatical status or relation, the second element ought to be

¹ *Llên Cymru* ix (1968), 3-18.

² William Cubbon, *A Bibliographical Account of Works relating to the Isle of Man* (1933-9), 820, however, draws attention to the share of the work undertaken by John Ivon Mosley.

lenited, and accordingly in the section of *B* that I have examined we find *immyr vane* for *bane* (s. v. Balk) and *dooinnev vrisht* for *brisht* (s. v. Bankrupt); there are miscopyings, as *poibvollagh* for *-vollag* (s. v. Bagpipe), *stangrane* for *-vane* (s. v. Balk), and the serious misrepresentation of *Cooylley cheu-chooylloo* (s. v. Back-door) as *cooylloo*. Presumably it is the editor who is responsible for the foolish practice of inserting *dy* before every verbnoun and so making it more difficult for the inexperienced reader to find the radical form of the word. The need to render a large English vocabulary in the *Triglott*¹ means that many of the Manx words are intolerably wrested from their usual sense. This came out clearly for me recently when I was going through the material for *L* in a pilot project for a new Manx dictionary, working from slips which included matter from this English-Manx dictionary. Ideally any material from this source requires to be checked with Kelly's manuscript as to its form, and with other evidence as to its meaning.

Despite these criticisms we are, of course, immensely indebted to the lexicographers. There is abundant material to enable us to write a much better descriptive and historical grammar of Manx than Kelly could contrive, and I hope to do it some day, but the same material that suffices for the grammar fails by reason of its very homogeneity to give a comprehensive view of the lexicon—Cregeen estimated that 'little more than two-thirds of the language' was preserved in such printed sources, and we may add that the principal unpublished sources, carvals and sermons, belong to the same field of interest—and accordingly we are grateful for every crumb of information from other aspects of life that the lexicographers can provide, however inadequate their definitions and however vague or misleading their grammatical labels may sometimes be.

The lexicographers have also another interest for the present day. Each in his prefatory matter expresses an attitude to the language.² We have already touched on Bishop Phillips's and

¹ The same method was followed elsewhere; cf. *Scottish Gaelic Studies* xi (1968), 231: 'I proceed "pari passu" with my translation of Johnston's English Dictionary now brought down to the Letter O, & arrange under their several Initials . . . the words of the translation, to be entered, into their respective places in the Gaelic Dictionary.'

² Similarly with Shaw and Stewart. The opening of the latter's Introduction is quoted almost word for word by Cregeen in his. Stewart had also studied the Manx New Testament and occasionally commends its renderings in his footnotes. He seems to have made more progress with the language than

Bishop Wilson's views on this matter, but the existence of as much printed Manx as there is we undoubtedly owe to the interest of Bishop Hildesley. He was quite aware of opposition and apathy. Bishop Barrow in the seventeenth century had already concluded that the cure for Manx ignorance and slackness in religious matters was to teach the inhabitants English, and he had his followers in succeeding centuries, whereas Hildesley accepted the fact of the language (it would probably be too much to expect that anyone in that rational century or in the materialist one following should regard the existence of Manx as a positive good), and proceeded to make provision for the majority for whom it was the only effective means of communication. English schools had done their best within their limitations, but what the results were Hildesley describes in a letter of 1762 to the Archbishop of York: 'The Manks people, in general, are naturally shrewd, of quick apprehension, and very apt to learn: and they would be, I am confident, extremely fond of perusing the Scriptures, if they had them, and were taught to read them, in their own tongue, as they are the *English Bibles*; which latter, numbers can do very roundly, whilst they scarce understand the meaning of a single sentence; nay, I might say, I believe, of some, a *single word*!' (Butler, op. cit. 422). And indeed to such the Manx version made a great difference, as he observed to Philip Moore in 1764: 'My whole heart is upon Manks translations: *Hic labor, hoc opus est*. A poor woman in this parish, upon her son's reading a chapter to her, cried out, with great exultation, "We have *sit* in darkness till now!"' (Butler 499-500). The archbishop approved his plans in a letter of 14 August 1762 (Butler 425-9), but one criticism is cited by Hildesley in a letter to the Revd. James Wilkes, his Registrar: 'I think it would not be amiss, if Mr. Register were to be at the trouble of taking a copy of the Archbishop's letter, and have it in his pocket, to obviate objections, as occasion may offer; such, as an evil spirit may suggest, which is never wanting to oppose and misrepresent good designs: such, for example, as it seems begin to be raised, against what I, and my super-excellent predecessor, judged would be a blessing to this country;—as if *I* were about to *ruin* it, by introducing *Scotchmen* to our *best livings*, by means of the Liturgy and Scriptures being printed in the Manks tongue!' (Butler 429). And a Vallancey whose oft-quoted praise 'here the beautiful expression of the Manx over the Irish translation, is visible to every Celtic scholar' refers to a passage which he clearly misunderstood.

little later in one to Philip Moore about his assistant he shows that some of the clergy lacked enthusiasm for using the language: 'I presume your Douglas assistant will be disposed to breathe a little northern air among his relations on this side, at the ensuing holidays [Christmas, 1763], and then he will be at hand to try his voice at Lezayre. Has he made a Manks sermon yet? if he has not, 'tis fit he should; unless he is one of those geniuses of the South, who think the cultivation of that language *unnecessary*. If I were not fraught with full conviction of its utility, and with resolution to pursue my undertaking, what with the coolness of its reception by some, and the actual disapprobation of it by others, I should be so discouraged as to give it up. This, I believe, is the only country in the world, that is ashamed of, and even inclined to extirpate, if it could, its own native tongue' (Butler 449–50); and that some laymen were opposed to it also: 'I have to observe, that I know of no Manksman, who has shewn any dislike, as you seem to suppose, to the Society's [the SPCK] printed Proposals; but, to the scheme of the poor wrong-headed bishop, for introducing Manks printed Gospels and Liturgy, several are disapprovers, both North and South, in this *Ellan-shaint*: as if he were intending to ruin the country, by extending the light of our holy religion to them who sit in darkness, for want of a Manks book, whereby to see, with their own eyes, the wonderful dispensation of God's revealing goodness to the sons of men. . . . When they come to have four Manks Gospels, and Acts of the Apostles, which are just now finished, let the *native* railers against Manks-printing vent their remarks with as much wit and acrimony as they please; whilst our *foreign* friends go on zealously to promote it with their truly Christian contributions.' (Butler 457–8.)

Like some of Hildesley's critics Kelly, too, in later life suffered from, or thought it prudent to assume, an excess of the quality conveniently termed *Prydeindod* in modern Welsh. In the proposals for the *Triglott*, reproduced in the English-Manx dictionary, he wrote of his predecessors who had dwelt on the great antiquity of the Gaelic, commended the vast energy of its phraseology, and displayed the etymological purity of its words. 'On all these accounts it is highly worthy the attention of the scholar and the antiquary. But these are confined objects, embracing words and neglecting men.' Bishops Wilson and Hildesley had 'studied it with a higher view,—to render it by publication instrumental in removing ignorance, communicating truth, and obtaining a knowledge of English. Their

motives were religious and moral; but the present state of the empire holds out to government and individuals another motive at this time [1805] not less imperious, that unity of language is the surest cement of civil as well as of religious establishments.' And later he makes the point even more explicitly: 'When there shall be one national language, then only will the union of the empire be completely established.' 'It is true', he acknowledges, 'that in process of time this cultivation of the Gaelic language will destroy the language itself, as a living language; but it will have produced the knowledge of a better, and will descend to posterity by means of the press in a more perfect state, than if it should be found only in the conversation of unlettered individuals. There would be no more cause for regret, then, that it was not a living language, than there is at present, that the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin are no longer such.' If the study of the Celtic languages enjoyed at the present day in Britain as a whole even a fraction of the prestige attaching to Hebrew, Greek and Latin in Kelly's time, there might be just a grain of truth in his last sentence. As for the rest, the linguist and the patriot must alike be affronted by his attitude. It makes me angry every time I read it.

With Cregeen one can more readily sympathize today. He knew some who shared Kelly's attitude: 'I am well aware that the utility of the following work will be variously appreciated by my brother Manksmen. Some will be disposed to deride the endeavour to restore vigour to a decaying language. Those who reckon the extirpation of the Manks a necessary step towards that general extension of the English, which they deem essential to the interest of the Isle of Man, will condemn every effort which seems likely to retard its extinction.' But Cregeen remained attached to it: 'That a language so venerable for its antiquity¹ and so estimable on many accounts should be so generally neglected, is much to be lamented. The consequence

¹ What they meant by Manx being 'an ancient language' is clarified by Philip Moore's letter of 11 April 1769: [Manx] 'which I verily believe to be one of the most antient this day in the world,—being manifestly a dialect of the antient Celtick, the language of all Asia-Minor, and of Europe for many centuries, before ever Greece or Rome existed. . . . That a vast number of Greek and Latin words are deduced from the old Celtick, is not to be disputed, and these we can trace very plainly in the Manks' (Butler, 599–600). Similarly Kelly, on irregular comparison of adjectives (*Grammar*, ch. XI) adds: 'Which variations run through all the European languages, as depending on the Celtic; and not from the caprice of custom, as Mr. Louth imagines.'

of this neglect has been, that numerous corruptions have crept into the dialect in general use, and so many anglicisms been adopted, that the Manks is now seldom spoken or written in its original purity. Despised and neglected, however, as the language appears to be at present, it is susceptible of high improvement, and justly entitled to the attention of the scholar. The sublime strains of Ossian¹ mark the capabilities of the language, and commend it to the regard of the philologist as a subject of curious enquiry, and deserving accurate investigation.' Later he writes of the language: 'It appears like a piece of exquisite network, interwoven together in a masterly manner, and framed by the hand of a most skilful workman, equal to the composition of the most learned, and not the production of chance.' And, unlike Kelly, he has some hope for its future: 'At the present period, then this interesting little Island promises to become once more the abode of science and literature, it is hoped that Gaelic learning will revive, and that every facility will be afforded for the acquisition of a language so essentially necessary within the precincts of Mona to the students of Divinity, and the students of Law. . . . Amongst the numerous literary advantages which "King William's College"² is expected to afford the sons of Mona, it is devoutly to be wished that the cultivation of the *vernacular tongue* be not overlooked. The establishment of a *professorship* for that specific object would be highly desirable.' Unfortunately the college did not turn out to be quite that kind of institution, and the establishment of an insular university, first projected in the seventeenth century,³ has not yet, even in the full flood of post-war creations, materialized in Man; but we may go on hoping that its evident advantages to the Island and its neighbours will some day be realized and that when it happens, Cregeen's 'highly desirable' professorship of Manx will not be forgotten.

¹ Cregeen is here apparently not distinguishing Manx from Gaelic as a whole. There is one Ossianic fragment in Manx, and some grounds for thinking there were once others (cf. Moore, *Manx Ballads*, 2 ff.), but the term 'sublime strain' is hardly applicable to this sort of ballad poetry, and Cregeen is obviously echoing conventional praise of Macpherson's versions.

² Opened 1833; cf. A. W. Moore, *A History of the Isle of Man* (1900), 672.

³ Ibid. 366; James, seventh Earl of Derby noted: 'I had a design, and God may enable me, to set up an university, without much charge (as I have contrived it), which may much oblige the nations round about us. It may get friends into the country, and enrich this land.'