

The Scotch-Irish Element in Appalachian English:

How Broad? How Deep?

Michael Montgomery, University of South Carolina

Within recent years the idea of tracing different dialects of American English back to regions of the British Isles has aroused renewed interest, starting particularly with the broadcast of the immensely popular PBS series "The Story of English" in 1986-87. An early episode of that program, "A Muse of Fire," featured a New Englander visiting an East Anglian pub, purportedly in search of the speech patterns of his Puritan ancestors. A subsequent episode, "The Guid Scots Tongue," began by examining the English of Scotland, exemplified by a Scotsman reading from William Lorimer's 1983 version of the New Testament (a translation, host Robert MacNeil tells us, made entirely into Scots except for the statements made by the Devil, which are rendered in "London English").¹ In the course of an hour this show argued that the English of seventeenth-century Lowland Scotland, as portrayed from a Scottish pulpit, and eighteenth-century Ulster, as epitomized at a modern-day sheep auction in the County Antrim town of Ballymena, has evolved into the English of latter-day American descendants of hardy "Scotch-Irish" frontier folk—not only North Carolina's denizen mountaineers like the renowned storyteller Ray Hicks, but even long-distance truck drivers using Citizens Band Radio slang along Western interstate highways.

In one form or another the idea of tracing American dialects back to the old country or to earlier times has been around for quite a while.² Since the late-nineteenth century popular writers have pointed out similarities between the speech of Appalachia and Elizabethan English (e.g., *afeard*, *holp* as the past tense of *help*) and Chaucerian English (e.g., the pronoun *hit*).³ This has led to the frequent claim that Appalachian speech is "Shakespearean" or preserves the "Queen's English"; the latter label has recently been applied to the speech of North Carolina as a whole in a tourist booklet distributed by the Tar Heel

State's Department of Tourism.⁴ A minority of students of Appalachian culture like Cratis Williams have maintained that the region's speech preserves a lode of features with a different source, traceable to settlers not from Southern Britain but from the opposite end of the British Isles, i.e., Ulster and Scotland.⁵ This case was taken up by "The Guid Scots Tongue," but not made very convincingly. Ray Hicks sounds just too unlike Ballymena farmers. However enticing a language connection between Appalachia and Ulster/Scotland might be to establish and however probable it might in fact be (given what is known of settlement history), the program made it seem far-fetched and not very likely because it cited little direct evidence. (In this paper "Ulster" is used rather than "Northern Ireland" because the language patterns associated with Scottish settlers in Ireland spanned the nine-county historical province rather than the six-county modern political entity. Some of the strongest settlements of Ulster Scots were in County Donegal, now part of the Republic of Ireland.)

Writers have applied many labels to the culture of Appalachia, not only "Shakespearean," "Elizabethan," and "Scotch-Irish," but also "British," "English," "Anglo-Saxon," even "*pure* Anglo-Saxon." In addition to being stimulated by the American yen for finding historical roots, those attempting to connect Appalachian culture to the British Isles have been motivated to provide a specific cultural identity for the people of Appalachia—one linked directly to Old World forebears, perhaps even to famous literary and historical figures—in order to counter a prevailing national perception of Appalachia as a deprived region having little culture and an unflattering, often violent history.

Validating Appalachian culture by identifying its sources was clearly one objective of many commentators who wrote about the region from within, such as John C. Campbell, Josiah Combs, and Cratis Williams.⁶ All three men, the last two Appalachian natives, devoted much energy to untangling the early settlement patterns to determine the collective genealogy of the region's inhabitants and to assess the relative proportions of Scotch-Irish, English, and German population groups. Campbell and Combs examined patterns of surnames, Campbell of 1200 old families from mountain areas of Kentucky,

Tennessee, and North Carolina, and Combs of his Eastern Kentucky schoolchildren. Campbell found equal portions of English and Scotch-Irish, while Combs' smaller sample included predominantly English names. (Although surnames are used to calculate ancestry and place of origin more often than any other trait and represent one of the very few tools available, assessments based on surnames are never definitive and their limitations are often not recognized—in the present case one is that many English-derived names have been used in Ireland and Scotland for centuries.) Combs and Campbell had another objective in calculating the national stocks in Appalachia: to temper extravagant, often unqualified statements of popular historians around the turn of the century about how the early Scotch-Irish almost single-handedly settled and subdued the frontier, the best-known of which were made by Theodore Roosevelt in *The Winning of the West* (1889-96).

Of course, cultural validation has also been the goal of many outsiders, like ballad-collectors and folklorists who have written about Appalachia. For decades, hosts of researchers have visited the hills of Southern Appalachia to record the natives and to try to capture the echoes of American immigrants in song, in story, and in voice and to document the survival of Scottish, Irish, and English musical traditions and verbal lore. An early and perhaps the best-known of these was the Englishman Cecil Sharp, who with his assistant Maud Karpeles found versions of Francis James Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads in Eastern Kentucky in 1916 and 1917, when ballad-singing was supposed to be "a lost art."⁷ There have been many others. But whatever specific agenda they may have had, it is well known that scholars in fields other than language, particularly folklorists like Henry Glassie, have made far greater progress in describing how cultural patterns and phenomena spread into Appalachia.⁸ It is striking that, with the exception of three brief studies to be discussed below, researchers on Appalachian English have added little to our knowledge of how the region's speech relates to areas of Britain and Ireland and have generated little concrete research into the question.

Outside Appalachia, the result has been the same. American linguistic scholars have from time to

time been interested in the Old World roots of the country's speech, most notably in the early days of the well-known Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada project in the nineteen thirties and forties.⁹ Preparatory to identifying these roots, the atlas decided to undertake a nationwide effort to map American dialects into regions by interviewing older, less traveled, and less educated speakers. This survey began work in New England in 1931 but has never been completed for the entire country, and the publication of its findings has been slowed for a variety of reasons. In recent decades Linguistic Atlas researchers have said little about making trans-Atlantic linguistic connections, as it has become apparent that these are much more complicated and difficult to posit than was originally foreseen.¹⁰

Accounting for the Lack of Research

Thus, there is a general impression (and a fair number of myths) that Appalachian speech preserves relics from a former age and population, but there is also a conspicuous lack of concrete information about this, despite the long-standing interest in comparing cultural and language patterns. How do we explain this situation? Is it the case that the research *has not* been done or is it that it *cannot* be done?

On the one hand, it might simply be the case that linguists have never sat down to investigate the Scotland/Ulster/Appalachian language connection in a systematic manner. As suggested above, researchers have severely underestimated the complexities involved in exploring this question. Perhaps they have given up too quickly or haven't employed a methodology that can guide them through the pitfalls of comparing speech patterns an ocean and several centuries apart. Perhaps they haven't looked for evidence in the right places. On the other hand, perhaps the connections are no longer discernible, much less significant, between the language patterns of Ulster and Appalachia. Perhaps too much time has passed to compare the speech of Appalachia and Ulster/Scotland directly using twentieth-century evidence.

Stubborn realities argue against a detectible connection. Speakers on the two sides of the ocean sound so dissimilar today (although this may largely reflect differences in intonation, the pitch and rhythm of the voice, which could mask similar grammar and vocabulary). The Ulster element in Colonial American English, brought by the influx of 150,000 or more immigrants in the six decades before the Revolution, may well have faded with the early interaction of the Scotch-Irish with English, German, and other groups. If so, the leveling or disappearance of distinctive language patterns would have accompanied the purported loss of Scotch-Irish cultural identity quite early on (cf. James Leyburn's well-known statement that this had occurred by the time of the American Revolution¹¹). Also arguing for few surviving traces of Ulster English and Scots in Appalachia is the fact that all varieties of a language, even isolated ones, change constantly. These difficulties, among others, in comparing twentieth-century Appalachian English with what will henceforth be called Scotch-Irish English¹² represent concerns and difficulties that are real, but perhaps not insuperable to overcome. The present paper not only traces a range of Appalachian grammatical features to varieties of British and Irish English, but it also outlines the linguistic processes that may have accounted for their maintenance in mountain speech. Identifying how features of Scotch-Irish English have evolved into Appalachian English provides a much richer view of the continuing dynamics of Appalachian culture and speech; it also provides important directions for how to compare American English to British and Irish English more generally.

Five earlier studies have commented on, or made assessments of, the influence of Ulster and Scottish speech patterns on Appalachian English.¹³ In a 1931 Josiah Combs cited seven "words of more or less Scottish tincture," including *bonnie*, *cadgy*, *ferment*, *gin* (= "if"), and *needcessity*, but claimed that mountain speech had far more numerous Elizabethan elements. Most recently historian David Hackett Fischer has argued for considerable similarities between "backcountry [which includes Appalachia] speech ways" and those of the "borders" of the British Isles (Northern England, as well as Scotland and Ulster). Three other more in-depth studies, by Wylene Dial, Alan Crozier, and Michael Ellis require

closer attention; it will be instructive to examine their objectives, approaches, and findings as a preliminary to the research presented here.

From among the many more that Dial discusses as relics preserved in West Virginia speech, Table 1 lists seventeen words and phrases which she identifies as having Scottish counterparts. In making her connections, she relies on published sources like the *English Dialect Dictionary* for Scottish and English items and draws from personal observation for Appalachian items.¹⁴ Since she does not list separately the items she considers Scottish in ancestry, not all of those listed in the table are clearly identified by her as Scottish. The point of her essay is a familiar one: to assert, by citing many common Appalachian terms having bona fide Scottish and earlier English sources, that mountain speech has a rich, underrecognized, and undervalued heritage.

Table 1: Scottish Contributions to Appalachian English

(according to Dial 1969)

Key: G = Grammar; P = Pronunciation; V = Vocabulary

- V *backset*—n., setback (in health)
- V *blinked* (milk)—adj. sour
- V *clever*—adj., neighborly, accommodating
- G *done*—v. have, as in "I *done* finished my lessons."
- G *don't care to*—phrase, would like to
- P *fixin*—n., she-fox (i.e., *vixen*)
- G *fornenst*—prep., next to
- V *haet*—n., the smallest thing that can be conceived
- G *hoove*—v., heaved (past participle of *heave*)

- G *how soon*—conj., that, as in "I hope *how soon* we get some rain."
- V *ill*—adj., bad-tempered
- P *ingerns*—n., onions
- V *pooch*—v., protrude
- V *redd up*—phrase, set in order, clean up
- G -s suffix on verbs with plural subjects, as in "Moonshiners needs to be treated right."
- G several—adj., many
- V skift—n., light covering, as of snow

2 Pronunciation; 7 Grammar; 8 Vocabulary; 17 Items Total

Crozier's study deals only with items for which there is good evidence of being brought by immigrants from Ulster. Table 2 lists the thirty-six items that he discusses. Unlike earlier, more anecdotal commentators like Cratis Williams, Crozier explicitly identifies the sources he uses, lays out his methodology, and is more systematic than previous scholars. Using four published dictionaries and glossaries on Ulster English and one on Scots, several comprehensive British and American dictionaries, and reference works from British and American dialect atlas projects, he searches for items which are similar in meaning and form in the speech of both Ulster and Pennsylvania, the colony which in the eighteenth century attracted more Scotch-Irish immigrants than any other. Crozier's careful approach, governed by prudent caveats against leaping to the conclusion that a term derives from Ulster because it is found both there and in the United States, is as follows: "[t]o make a case for Scotch-Irish influence one must demonstrate that features common to Ulster and America are recorded in those areas of the United States where the Scotch-Irish are known to have settled in large numbers, and preferably *only* in those areas. Even then, the case may not be conclusive."¹⁵ His findings, based on published sources, are considerably more informative and valid than earlier studies.

Crozier concludes that, with varying degrees of certainty, four pronunciations, ten grammatical forms, and twenty-three vocabulary items used in Pennsylvania probably derive from Ulster. For example, he cautiously includes "*agin, again*--conj., by the time that"; the present study, as will be seen in Table 3, classifies this as having a General British source. Some items (like *diamond*, for a type of town square) are found today only in Pennsylvania, while others have much wider currency, like "positive" *anymore* (i.e., used in an affirmative sentence, as in "When I go to New York, I always stay in a hotel *anymore*.") His general conclusion suggests that further research would be fruitful: "It is clear therefore that a few characteristics—mainly lexical [i.e. vocabulary]—of Ulster English survived the assimilation of the Scotch-Irish into the American people, and it is very possible that more traces of Ulster speech remain to be discovered in the dialects of the Midland region."¹⁶ (The Midland region, according to cultural and linguistic geographers, is an area spreading westward and opening in a fan-like shape from the Eastern Pennsylvania/Delaware Valley cultural hearth from which it developed. It includes all of Appalachia, as well as the Lower Midwest and the Upper South. Linguistically it is marked by a folk vocabulary setting it off from the North and the South.)

Table 2: Ulster Contributions to American English

(According to Crozier 1984)

Key: G = Grammar; P = Pronunciation; V = Vocabulary

- G *agin, again*--conj., by the time that
- G *all the (one)*--noun phrase, the only (one)
- G *anymore*--adv., nowadays (in positive sentences)
- P *becaise*--conj., (pronunciation of *because*)
- G/P *boilt*--v., past tense of *boiled*

- V *bonny-clabber--n.*, curdled sour milk
- V *bottom(s)--n.*, low-lying land
- V *bucket--n.*, pail
- V *cabin--n.*, rude log house of the American frontier
- V *cruddled milk--n.*, curdled sour milk
- V *diamond--n.*, town square
- V *dornick--n.*, roundish stone
- G *driv, druv--v.*, past tense forms of *drive*
- P *drooth--n.*, (pronunciation of *drouth, drought*)
- V *evening--n.*, latter part of the day (includes the afternoon)
- V *fireboard--n.*, mantelpiece
- V *flannel cake--n.*, type of cornbread
- V *granny--n.*, midwife
- V *hap--n.*, quilt
- V *hull--v.*, shell
- V *muley--n.*, hornless cow
- V *nicker--n.*, whinny
- P *nothing--*(pronunciation with low central vowel)
- V *piece--n.*, short distance
- V *poke--n.*, bag
- V *singletree--n.*, pivoted crossbar to either end of which the traces are fastened when yoking a horse to a plow.
- V *slut--n.*, light made from a grease-soaked rag in a dish or bottle
- V *sook--interj.* (a call to livestock)

- V *spouting*--n., gutter
- G *till*--prep., to
- G *want out*--same as *want to get out*
- V *wattle*--stout stick with a lash used for driving oxen
- G *you-all*--second person plural pronoun
- G *you'ns*--second person plural pronoun
- G *yous*--second person plural pronoun

4 Pronunciation; 10 Grammar; 23 Vocabulary;

36 Items Total (*boilt* considered both a pronunciation and a grammatical form)

In an extended critique of historian Fischer's work, Michael Ellis has compared aspects of Appalachian speech, particularly vocabulary, with that of five regions in the British Isles.¹⁷ He takes twenty traditional terms collected in East Tennessee and seeks their distribution according to English and Scottish dictionaries and linguistic atlases. Only three of these (*galluses*, "suspenders"; *palings* (of a fence); and *stake*, "fence post") were found to be exclusively Scotch-Irish or Northern English, while only two of the twenty (*counterpane*, "quilt"; and *rank*, "foul-smelling") were not found there. Sixteen terms were found in the English West Midlands. Ellis suggests that "a more extensive comparison of Appalachian and British regional vocabulary might result in a better understanding of the ancestry of Appalachian vocabulary."¹⁸

As interesting as the findings of Dial, Crozier, and Ellis are, these three studies are quite limited in scope. They take for comparison between Scotch-Irish and Appalachian/American English a small, mixed group of terms. While the results may tell us about individual forms, it is difficult to calculate with precision or state with generality the extent of influence from Scotch-Irish English. Can they provide any *relative* assessment of the Scotch-Irish contribution to Appalachian English, as opposed to some other

contribution such as that from speakers originating from Southern England? Can they answer the questions in the title of this paper about the breadth and depth of the Scotch-Irish influence? The answer, except to some extent for Ellis' study, is no. A methodology that involves identifying individual, highly selective, correspondences, whether done by romanticizers pointing out "Elizabethanisms" and "Chaucerianisms" or by more recent writers like Dial and Crozier, who tally common vocabulary items, pronunciations, and grammatical usages, can ultimately reveal little. No matter how striking, or actually how numerous, the resemblances may be, they constitute little more than curiosities without a valid perspective. An approach that searches for and tallies only resemblances cannot tell us what part of the whole they represent. In short, previously published studies cannot grant us the larger perspective or permit us to address important, general questions because they are based on unsystematic comparisons of Appalachian English with varieties of British English.

This paper argues that research into the connection between Scotch-Irish and Appalachian English can overcome the stubborn realities cited earlier and tell us much more than previous studies have done. It concludes that a thorough comparison provides surprising answers about the breadth and depth of the Scotch-Irish influence. Perhaps the most important keys to this effort are the use of local and unpublished sources that are available only in the British Isles and adherence to a systematic, objective methodology having three specific steps:

First, it systematically isolates a wide range of grammatical features, forty in all, that have been noted in the literature as typical of Appalachian speech.¹⁹ In other words, it begins by characterizing the variety in its own terms. This procedure avoids the problem of haphazardly and impressionistically choosing items to compare and establishes a principled approach for drawing comparative conclusions.

Second, it determines, where possible, the most likely British source (i.e., Scotch-Irish, Southern British, or General British) for each of the forty features.²⁰

Third, it counts and interprets the number of features attributable to different regions of the

British Isles, in order to assess their relative contributions to Appalachian English. The result of this approach is to plot the ancestry of each feature more reliably and to achieve the most general comparative view possible.

The Scope of the Challenge

Why is it that research has until the present study made no truly general assessment of the Scotch-Irish and English elements in Appalachian speech, especially given the keen interest for a century in tracing the ancestry of Appalachian people? Beyond the lack of an accurate methodology, there is the problem of knowledge and sources. American researchers tend to know little about the earlier speech of Scotland and Ireland. The general familiarity with the writings of Shakespeare and his contemporaries has no doubt has led many to "recognize" older elements in Appalachian English and to believe that it is more "Elizabethan" than is actually the case. Few, if any, of those writing on Appalachian speech have apparently known that there is not one, but two multi-volume historical dictionaries of Scots, the *Scottish National Dictionary* and the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*.²¹ Questions about Scotch-Irish influence cannot be addressed by using the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the best-known and most comprehensive historical dictionary of the language, because its coverage of non-literary and regional varieties, particularly from Ireland, is quite limited. Like all dictionaries, it is only as good and complete as its citation files, and these were heavily biased toward literary language and offer little direct evidence on the speech patterns of the common people. Also, they suffer from the problem of negative evidence; that is, the entry of a word in a dictionary indicates something about when, where, and how that word has been used, but we cannot necessarily conclude from the absence of a word that it did not exist, or from the absence of a citation that a word was not used at a certain time and place. Even the best dictionaries fall considerably short of being based on a complete documentary record.

Thus, it is necessary to go beyond dictionaries and consult other types of material—local

glossaries, linguistic studies, and original sources themselves. An extensive literature on Scots does exist, though it is largely tucked away in major British libraries and there is as yet no good bibliography for it. The literature on the English language of Ulster is also largely inaccessible to Americans,²² and some of the larger studies and sources of data are unpublished.²³

The present paper draws on an extended research effort to detail the roots of Appalachian English based on reference works on American and British English²⁴ and three other types of sources: 1) primary, archival material, such as letters from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Scots in Ulster and early Ulster emigrants to America; 2) secondary, such as local glossaries and studies of Scots and Ulster English consulted in Scotland and Ireland; and 3) the author's consultations with local authorities in both Ireland and Scotland and first-hand observation of contemporary speech. It thus relies on a wide variety of sources not used heretofore by American linguists.

The research reported in this paper focuses on grammatical features rather than vocabulary or pronunciation. Grammar has been shown by linguists to be "deeper" in a language and more resistant to change, at least rapid change, than the other two areas of language. Grammatical features and forms often exist in relation to one another (for example, singularity to plurality for nouns) and participate in certain systems like the expression of verb tense or noun plurality, or they are certain classes of words like conjunctions and prepositions, which connect words to one another. For both of these reasons, and others that will be discussed, grammatical features are more likely to preserve traceable elements. By comparison, vocabulary is more easily and quickly borrowed across languages and dialects (for example, English has borrowed thousands of nouns from French but almost no grammar). Pronunciation is also less stable; even in isolated communities it continually evolves according to the social dynamics of the speakers, much more so than grammar. Grammatical features have two further advantages for the language historian wishing to compare them across dialects. They can be unambiguously identified from earlier written documents (whereas spelling can easily disguise pronunciation), and they can be counted

and sometimes quantified by a percentage (the latter are especially useful for comparative purposes), unlike vocabulary.

Calculating the Scotch-Irish Contribution

We turn now to the first step of the methodology outlined—identifying a comprehensive list of forty grammatical features that are characteristic of Appalachian English and that comprise the basis for our comparison to varieties of British English. These are listed by part of speech in Table 3. A grammatical feature that is "characteristic of Appalachian English" is a structure or category whose occurrence, so far as can be determined, is more or less limited to Appalachia or to the Midland territory or which occurs to a significantly higher degree in these regions than elsewhere in the United States. Most features in Table 3 are not confined to the region, being either still found in scattered distribution in older-fashioned American English (such as *blowed* and *growed* as past-tense forms) or prevalent in rural areas outside Appalachia until a generation or two ago. Nor can it be argued that all forty are used by all Appalachian speakers or are found throughout Appalachia. Some of them are quite rare, others definitely recessive, but all have been identified in the literature by several sources as occurring in the Southern mountain region. While these assessments reflect the fullest information available from reference works (dictionaries, historical grammars, etc.), original documents, and other sources, they are only as reliable as the sources on which they are based and cannot be claimed to be absolutely definitive. As stated earlier, reference works never give us the negative information of whether a certain form did *not* occur at a particular time and place. While the number and range of sources from which information is drawn enhances the reliability of the assignment of features to categories according to origin, for some forms (such as *get to* and *go to* meaning "begin to") no information has been found on the regional demarcations either in Britain or in America. These are included in this assessment because they are quite common in Appalachian speech, are discussed in studies of Appalachian speech, and are apparently not found widely

in rural and old-fashioned speech elsewhere in the country. In some cases the classification of grammatical features is subjective to a degree, but grammatical forms used widely throughout the U.S. are excluded even if common in Appalachia. These include *ain't*, the combination of objective pronouns (e.g., *me and him*) used as a subject, the use of *was* with plural subjects (*they was*, etc.), and a number of others.

Relying on as many sources as could be found for each features, the researcher took the second step, which was to determine, when sources permitted this, whether the historical currency of each of the forty features was general in Britain or was limited to a region of the British Isles. The result of this investigation into the origin and history of each feature is shown in Table 3 by the abbreviation in the left-hand column. Thus, a feature like *-s* suffix on third-person-plural present-tense verbs is classified as Scotch-Irish since its distribution in the British Isles has historically been and continues to be in Scotland/Northern Britain and Ireland, its distribution in the United States is most strongly associated with Appalachia, and the suffix has the same meaning and use in the two regions.

Table 3: List of Appalachian Grammatical Features

(SI = Scotch-Irish; SB = Southern British;

Un = Unclear; GB = General British)

A. Verbs:

1. SI Suffix *-s* (and Linking Verb *is*) in the Present Tense with Plural Noun Subjects but not with Plural Pronoun Subjects: "People *knows*" vs. "They *know*"; "People *is*" vs. "They *are*."
2. BB Regular Past Tense Suffix *-ed* in *blowed*, *throwed*, etc.: "Who *blowed* up the church house?"
3. Un *get to/go to* (= "begin to"): "Just after he left, the roof *went to* leaking again"; "We *got to* laughing and giggling."

4. SI Multiple Modal Verbs: "We *might should* break the bad news to him."
5. GB *liked to* (= "almost"): "I got lost and *liked to* never found my way out."
6. SB *a-* Prefix: "All of a sudden that bear come *a-runnin'* at me."
7. SI Completive or Emphatic *done*: "They have *done* landed in jail again."
8. Un Preposed *used to*: "*Used to* Pa wouldn't have done a thing like that."
9. SI *used to* + *would, could*: "I can't do it now but I *used to could*."
10. SI *need* + Past Participle of Verb: "That boy *needs taught* a lesson."

B. Pronouns:

1. SI *y'all/you all*: "Can *y'all/you all* give me a hand with this load?"
2. SI *you'uns/we'uns*, etc.: "*You'uns* come down with me."
3. SI *ye* (= "you"): "I told *ye* to keep away from there."
4. SI Combinations with *all* (*we-all, us-all, they-all, you-all, who-all, what-all, where-all, why-all*, etc.):
"*Who-all* is going?"
5. SB *-n* Suffix on *hisn/hern/theirn/ourn/yourn*: "I didn't like that look of *hern*"; "Is this a book of *yourn*?"
6. GB *hisselself/theirselves*: "You can meet Mister Jones *hisselself*."
7. GB Personal or Ethical Dative (as *me* = "myself"): "I bought *me* a dog."
8. SI *they* Existential (= "there"): "*They's* about five people in that house."
9. GB *it* Existential (= "there"): "*It's* many people that think so."
10. GB Deletion of Subject Relative Pronoun: "They's about five people \emptyset could have done it."
11. GB *hit* (= "it"): "*Hit's* a long time since I tasted it."
12. Un *everwhat/everwhich/everwho* (= "whatever," etc.): "*Everwho* was here sure left in a hurry."

C. Nouns:

1. GB No Suffix *-s* on Noun after Quantifying Adjective: "Five *bushel*"; "Many *mile*"
2. SB *-es* Plural Suffix after *-sp*, *-st*, *-sk*: *waspes*, *postes*, *deskes*

D. Prepositions:

1. Un Compounding of Prepositions: "Come *out from up under* the table"; "Cal, ain't you a-going *across down over to* Rose's?"
2. GB *anent* (= "opposite, nearby"): "He was layin' on the road *anent* the spring-house."
3. SI *forment/fernenst* (= "against, next to"): "It's over *fernenst* the wall."
4. SI *till* (= "to"): "It's quarter *till* five."
5. SI *wait on* (= "wait for"): "Would you mind *waiting on* me?"
6. GB *again/against* (= "before, by the time that"): "She'll be back *again* five o'clock."

E. Conjunctions:

1. GB *again/against* (= "before, by the time that"): "I'll be ready *again* you are."
2. SI *whenever* (= "at the time that" or "as soon as"): "*Whenever* I was young, people didn't do that"; "*Whenever* I heard about them, I bought one right away."
3. Un *till* (= "so that"): "They . . . got 'em in a good jail there *till* the mob can't get 'em." (Jesse Stuart)
4. SI *and* in Absolute Phrases: "They all wore mother hubbard dresses, *and* them loose."
5. GB *nor* (= "than"): "He's better *nor* you."

F. Adverbs:

1. SI Positive/Affirmative *anymore*: "It's a pretty skilled job *anymore*."
2. SI *all the far* (= "as far as"): "That's *all the far* I want to go."

3. GB *right* (= "very, quite"): "It's *right* airish this morning."
4. GB *yonder*: "That's my field down *yonder*."
5. SI *yan* (= "yon, over there"): "Snakes was everywhere going here and *yan*."

Table 4 divides the forty Appalachian features into groups based on the British ancestry assigned to them.

Table 4: Categorization of Features by Ancestry

- 1) Eighteen (45%) are Scotch-Irish: A1, A4, A7, A9, A10, B1-B4, B8, D3-5, E2, E4, F1, F2, F5.
- 2) Three (7.5%) are Southern British: A6, B5, C2.
- 3) Fourteen (35%) are General British: A2, A5, B6, B7, B9-B11, C1, D2, D6, E1, E5, F3, F4.
- 4) Five (12.5%) are of uncertain origin (i.e., dictionaries and other reference works provide no clear information): A3, A8, B12, D1, E3.

The results of this type of comparison, which provides the most direct, broadest view to date, suggests two things: 1) the exclusively Scotch-Irish contributions to the grammar of Appalachian English significantly outnumber exclusively Southern British ones and appear to be largely responsible for the distinctive grammar of Appalachian English today; 2) a third of the forty grammatical features, the fourteen classified as General British, were shared by more than one immigrant group whose descendants settled in Appalachia.

While Table 4 views each of the forty grammatical features as equivalent in significance and level of structure, another way to classify them is according to their type of grammatical structure, described as follows and presented in Table 5:

- 1) Five are suffixes added to verbs, pronouns, or nouns: A1, A2, B5, C1, C2. In origin two are

Scotch-Irish, two Southern British, and one General British.

2) Ten involve word order patterns (the combination of two or more words in a distinct way): A4, A8, A9, A10, B4, B10, D1, E4, F1, F2. Seven of these are Scotch-Irish, none Southern British, one General British, and two uncertain in origin.

3) Seven involve categorical differences (involving a grammatical category not found in other dialects; often a familiar form such as *done* is employed in a way unfamiliar to other dialects): A3, A5, A6, A7, B1, B2, B7. Three of these are Scotch-Irish, one Southern British, two General British, and one uncertain in origin.

4) Five are pronouns that vary from other dialects: B3, B6, B8, B11, B12. In origin two of these are Scotch-Irish, none Southern British, two General British, and one uncertain.

5) Thirteen are function words (prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions whose function is to relate words or elements in a clause to one another): B9, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, E1, E2, E3, E5, F3, F4, F5. Five of these are Scotch-Irish, none Southern British, seven General British, and one of uncertain origin.

Table 5: Types of Grammatical Features by Source

Feature Type/Distribution	Source				
	SC/IR	Sou BRIT	Gen BRIT	Uncertain	
Suffixes	1	2	2	0	
Word Order Patterns		7	0	1	2
Categorical Differences		3	1	2	1
Differences in Forms of Pronouns		2	0	2	1
Function Words		5	0	7	1

Total 17 4 13 6

Scotch-Irish English has contributed all six types of grammatical features to Appalachian English. This is particularly true for word order patterns (like A4, "We *might should* go on", and A10, "That boy *needs taught* a lesson") and function words (like D4, *till*, and D5, "wait *on*"). Only three items (A6, *a*-prefix, and two suffixes—the long plural of an additional syllable in nouns like *postes* and *waspes* (C2) and *-n* on possessive pronouns like *hern* and *yourn* (B5), can be traced back specifically to Southern Britain. These have not been current, so far as sources indicate, in Ireland, Scotland, or Northern Britain over the past five centuries. Although this suggests a minimal Southern British contribution, we must remember that the English of Southern Britain and Scotland/Ulster shared fourteen grammatical features that are now identified as Appalachian, including the auxiliary verb *liked to* (A5) and the ethical dative use of pronouns (B7).²⁵ Moreover, there are hundreds of grammatical features not in our tables that are shared as the common core of English everywhere.

Explaining the Scotch-Irish Contribution

The preceding comparison strongly suggests that the Scotch-Irish influence on Appalachian English, at least on its grammar, was broad in terms of the variety and deep in terms of the number of patterns. It indicates as well that many Appalachian features contributed by Ulster emigrants continue to thrive in modern-day speech, that they were not leveled away. Why might the latter be so? Explanations that rely on demographic factors alone, citing the numerical dominance of the Scotch-Irish and their descendants in Southern Appalachia, are much too simple. They ignore the fact that settlers from various areas of England predominated in some parts of the region. Isolation cannot account for this either. Appalachian residents have had continuing contact with speakers of more mainstream and prestigious varieties of American English since the settlement period. Nor does the use of Scotch-Irish features as

markers of identity with an ethnic group provide a very plausible explanation, given the statement of James Leyburn quoted earlier and the lack of popular awareness of Irish or Scotch-Irish ancestry in the mountains today, unless Scotch-Irish features have come to symbolize Appalachian cultural identity. Why did descendants of the Scotch-Irish in Appalachia not abandon their distinctive usages more often and shift to a more general variety of English, or at least one with fewer distinctive usages, as did the speakers of so many other dialect and language groups? This is how the North American melting pot is supposed to have worked, at least for immigrants from the British Isles.

Were grammatical features brought from Ulster simply retained as they were in the speech of immigrants and their descendants? One would think that in this case they would probably contrast most directly with Southern British forms. Or did they evolve in America, undergoing changes in meaning and/or form that can explain their preservation?

Further insight into these questions and work toward a reasonable linguistic explanation (not a social one, which is still a long way from formulation) of *how* and *why* the Scotch-Irish influence has been preserved comes by approaching the eighteen Appalachian grammatical features traceable to the Scotch-Irish in a third way. This involves formulating a typology for connections between Scotch-Irish and Appalachian English in terms of the evolutionary processes which account for their present-day patterning.

In studying these connections, we draw on concepts from the study of creole languages that carefully distinguish between the form of a grammatical feature and its meaning or function. Linguists have shown that in a creole language (e.g., in Gullah, the English creole spoken on the Sea Islands of South Carolina and Georgia) a form that sounds like and looks like one in the dominant language may continue to be used, but its meaning and function may differ, often subtly so. The effect is to camouflage some parts of the language, making speakers of both the dominant language and the creole believe that they use the same words in the same way, when they do not. For instance, the English verb form *been* has

been adapted in Gullah to refer to an action that took place long ago (*He been go* thus means "He left a long time ago"). This same tendency applies to newly formed varieties like Appalachian English and may well account for the retention of a number of grammatical features. Although it's not yet clear how all of the eighteen features determined earlier to be of Scotch-Irish origin can be classified, three types of processes characterizing trans-Atlantic linguistic connections can be proposed: straight retentions, disguised retentions, and reinterpretations. The eighteen grammatical features are grouped under these three processes in Table 6.

Table 6: Types of Grammatical Feature by Process

I. Straight Retentions (5)

A9. *used to + would, could*

B2. *you'uns/we'uns*, etc.

B3. *ye* (= you)

D3. *fornent/fernenst* (= against, next to)

F5. *yan* (= yon)

II. Disguised Retentions (8)

A1. 3rd Plural Present-Tense *-s* (and *is*) with Noun Subjects but not Pronoun Subjects

A10. *need* + Past Participle of Verb

B4. Combinations with *all* (*what-all, where-all*, etc.)

B8. *they* Existential (= there)

D4. *till* (= to)

D5. *wait on* (= wait for)

E2. *whenever* (= at the time that, as soon as)

E4. *and* in Absolute Phrases

III. Reinterpretations (4)

A4. Multiple Modal Verbs

A7. Completive/Emphatic *done*

B1. *y'all/you all*

F1. Positive *anymore*

The first type of process, straight retentions, involve items whose form and meaning/function are the same or very similar in Appalachia and Ulster/Scotland. However, while their form in Appalachian English is different from American English generally, their meaning/function is equivalent to other forms in American English. This is represented in Table 7.

Table 7: Straight Retention Relationships

Appalachian English		American English Generally
Form	=	Form
Meaning/Function	=	Meaning/Function

An example of this is the preposition *forment*. While quite distinct in form, it means the same "against" or "next to." It is such Scotch-Irish forms which we would expect to have competed most directly with those having a source in British English (like *against*), and in fact these straight retentions tend to be recessive in modern-day Appalachia, probably because of their salience, and are more common among older speakers than younger ones. These straight retentions include the following: the pronoun *you'uns*

(B2), equivalent to *y'all, you*, or other plural pronouns; the pronoun *ye* (B3), equivalent to *you*²⁶; and the adverb *yan* (F5), equivalent to *yon, yonder, or over there* for other speakers.

The second type is disguised retentions, items whose form and whose meaning and function are the same or very similar in Appalachia and Ulster. But while their form in Appalachian English is identical to that in American English generally, their meaning or function is at least partially different. This is represented in Table 8.

Table 8: Disguised Retention Relationships

Appalachian English	=	American English Generally
Form	=	Form
Meaning/Function	□	Meaning/Function

These retentions are camouflaged in Appalachian English because the form of an item is usually more salient than its meaning or function. An example that has the same form and might appear to have the same meaning in Appalachian English as elsewhere is the conjunction *whenever*. In American English generally it has several meanings. In referring to an intermittent event it is equal to "as often as" (as in "*Whenever* I work late, I order a pizza."); in referring to a hypothetical event it is equal to "at whatever time" or "at the moment that" ("I will be there *whenever* he arrives".) But in Appalachian and Ulster English it can be used in the past tense to mean "at the moment that" or in both the present and past tense to mean "as soon as." As a result, speakers of other varieties of American English interpret sentences like *Whenever I heard about the course, I signed up for it right away* and those listed below in Table 9 as referring to intermittent occurrences, which of course does not actually make sense.

Table 9: Sentences with *whenever*

(Collected in Tennessee and South Carolina)

- 1) *whenever* we were going out, I said to him . . .
- 2) *whenever* his Daddy died, he took over the farm.
- 3) I was home on Wednesday and *whenever* I got on the interstate on Thursday my car broke down and I was stuck three four or five hours.
- 4) As my school years continued, I inevitably expanded my knowledge of vocabulary. However, there seemed to be a change [in] my language *whenever* I reached my senior year in high school.

Thus, an Appalachian speaker in stating "I'll come *whenever* I can" may be using the word to mean "as soon as" and is expressing urgency, but may be understood to say "I'll come *at whatever time* I can" by outsiders. A friend of this writer who moved to South Carolina from Michigan recently had to call a plumber about a desperate situation one morning. When the plumber said that he would be over "*whenever* he could," she angrily told him not to come, thinking that he was going to take his time. He was actually going to come at his very next free moment.

Other Ulster grammatical features retained in Appalachian English also disguise their distinctiveness in their function, i.e., they are identical with forms found elsewhere in American English, but in Appalachian speech they are used in different grammatical contexts. Examples are third-person-plural *-s* (A1), as in "the men knows", which is camouflaged by its likeness to third-person-singular *-s*, as in "the man knows"; *need* + past participle (A10), as in *needs taught*, disguised by its similarity to *need* + infinitive + past participle (*needs to be taught*); and *till* (D4), which many speakers of American English believe is a clipped form of *until*. The preposition/conjunction *till* originally came from Norse; it has long been a variant of the preposition *to* in Scots and still is in some places in North America, especially in phrases to tell time (e.g., *quarter till ten*).

Sometimes these disguised retentions have both different meanings and different contextual

distributions, as with the form *they* when used to introduce a sentence that states the existence of something (B8), and *wait on* (D5) as equivalent to *wait for*. Because they are disguised and Appalachian speakers are often unaware of how these grammatical features differ from other kinds of American English, they continue to flourish in mountain speech.

A third process, "reinterpretation," has affected some Appalachian features that come from Scotch-Irish English. Their meaning and function has been thoroughly or completely expanded or shifted since arriving from Ulster in the eighteenth century. While originally brought to the Midland region by the Scotch-Irish, today they are prevalent in both Appalachia and beyond. Three are common in the Lower South (multiple modal verbs (A4), perfective *done* (A7), and *y'all/you all* (B1)), while the positive use of *anymore* (F1) has spread through much of the Middle West. The reinterpreted Scotch-Irish features that spread to the Lower South are now used by both whites and blacks throughout the region.

Reinterpreted features contrast with other varieties of American English in form, as straight retentions do, but also in meaning and function. This is represented in Table 10.

Table 10: Reinterpretation Relationships

Appalachian English	□	American English Generally
Form	□	Form
Meaning/Function	□	Meaning/Function

These grammatical features survived and expanded because they have developed specific functions in Appalachian English and derivative varieties that have given them a niche in the face of their lack of equivalence.

The two best examples of these reinterpretations are combinations of modal verbs like *might could* and *might should* (A4) and the pronouns *y'all* and *you all* (B1). While modal combinations are

attested in Scotland, Ulster, and Northern England and the most common combinations on both sides of the Atlantic have some similarity, the range of combinations found in Appalachian and Southern American English appears to be open-ended, and it is apparently much broader than the range of permissible combinations in the British Isles.²⁷ *Y'all* is still used to a limited extent in Scotland today, but equivalent only to the phrase *all of you*. Apparently after migrating to North America it developed its semantic qualities (for example, as an "associative plural" used in addressing one person but referring to others connected with the addressee). For many speakers, *y'all* has been reanalyzed as a contraction of *you all*, which it may not have been originally.²⁸

In recent years linguistic scholars elsewhere have examined the elements of colonial varieties of European languages (sometimes called "extraterritorial" or "exported" varieties) and have pointed out that the competition of dialects in colonial territories often led to the formation of new dialects—not just a new inventory of forms selected from the dialects of the mother country, but sometimes entirely new patterns.²⁹ The reinterpretations discussed here are further evidence of the dynamic nature of such varieties, in this case Appalachian English. This typology outlines ways in which we may explore the evolution of grammatical patterns of Old World English into New World English. The three processes sketched bring us much closer to an account of how distinctive Old World patterns, in this case from Scotch-Irish English, have been preserved in New World English. This typology, in addition to helping us understand how individual forms have or have not evolved over the past three hundred years, provides (particularly for disguised forms) an explanation of why the Scotch-Irish impact on Appalachian English has been underestimated in the past.

In attempting to assess this impact, this paper has offered the broader dimensions of a case that still requires much to be filled in. Much more data, particularly from original documents, needs to be gathered. Each of the disguised and reinterpreted grammatical forms deserves full-length description of its history and an account that will enable us to develop specific hypotheses that account for its

development. Little more than their classification can be presented here. The same type of analysis should be undertaken for vocabulary and pronunciation.³⁰

This paper has focused on tracing connections in grammatical patterns between Appalachian English and varieties of British English. Such an effort, even at a relatively shallow time depth of less than three hundred years, faces analytical and documentary challenges that the current investigation has sought to meet by consulting an unprecedented range of published and unpublished sources. By comparison, previous attempts to make connections can be seen to have been small-scale, unsystematic, and tentative. If we assume some degree of homogeneity in the varieties that we have been calling Scotch-Irish English and Appalachian English, and if we assume the correct identification and comparison of grammatical forms from our work with dictionaries and grammars, local linguistic literature, original documents, and consultation with local observers, we can posit a strong link in the grammatical systems of Scotch-Irish English and Appalachian English. This link is both broad and deep and extends across many types of grammatical features. As a result, we are much closer to saying just how "Scotch-Irish" Appalachian English is.

Notes

1. This representation was apparently contemplated by Lorimer in doing his translation, but was abandoned. The devil speaks in Scots in the version that reached publication, but one can hardly blame the PBS program for using the line. The research on which this paper is based was supported in part by travel grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Southern Regional Education Board and by a Research and Productive Scholarship grant from the University of South Carolina. The author would especially like to thank A. J. Aitken, John Kirk, Caroline Macafee, and Philip Robinson for their advice and observations on Scottish and Ulster English. Any errors of interpretation or any overstatements, however, are strictly those of the author of this paper.

2. For a comprehensive survey of the literature on this subject, see Michael Montgomery, "British and Irish Antecedents," *Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 6: English in North America*, ed. by John Algeo (Cambridge, 2000), 86-153.
3. The first concerted effort in this regard was apparently undertaken by Calvin S. Brown in a series of four short studies: "Dialectal Survivals in Tennessee," *Modern Language Notes* 4 (1889): 205-209; "Other Dialectal Forms in Tennessee," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 6 (1891): 171-175; "Dialectal Survivals from Spenser," *Dial* 16 (1894): 40; "Dialectal Survivals from Chaucer," *Dial* 22 (1897): 139-41.
4. *A Dictionary of the Queen's English* (Raleigh: North Carolina Travel and Promotion Division, c1965).
5. Cratis Williams, "Who are the Southern Mountaineers?" *Appalachian Journal* 1 (1972): 48-55; the earliest effort in this regard was perhaps H. P. Burt, "The Dialects of Our Country," *Appleton's Journal* 5 (1878): 411-17.
6. John C. Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland* (New York: Russell Sage, 1921); Josiah Combs, *The Kentucky Highlands from a Native Mountaineer's Viewpoint* (Lexington, 1943); Williams, *op. cit.*
7. Helen Child Sargent and George Lyman Kittredge, eds., "Introduction," *English and Scottish Popular Ballads Edited from the Collection of Francis James Child* (Boston, 1904), xiii; Cecil J. Sharp, *English Folk Songs from the Southern Appalachians*, edited by Maud Karpeles. 2 vols. (London, 1932).
8. Henry Glassie, *Patterns in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States* (Philadelphia, 1968).
9. For a discussion of the goals of atlas work, see Hans Kurath, "The Conference on a Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada," *Bulletin of the Linguistic Society of America* 4 (1929), 20-47. Three branches of the atlas cover territory within Appalachia: the Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States interviewed speakers in North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia in the 1930s, the

Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States surveyed Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama in the late 1960s and 1970s, and the Linguistic Atlas of the North Central States covered Kentucky and southeastern Ohio in the 1950s. For an overview of these projects, see Raven I. McDavid, Jr. "The Dialects of American English," *The Structure of American English* by W. Nelson Francis (New York, 1958), 480-543.

10. One might compare Kurath's *Word Geography of the Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor, 1949), whose first chapter, "The English of the Eastern States: a Perspective" (pp. 1-10), focuses in detail on British and Continental European sources of American vocabulary with Craig Carver's *American Regional Dialects: A Word Geography* (Ann Arbor, 1987), a work comparable in scope written a generation later. Carver says almost nothing about such sources.

11. James G. Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History* (Chapel Hill, 1962), vi.

12. In the present study "Scotch-Irish English" refers to the general variety of English brought to North America in the eighteenth century by Ulster emigrants, the overwhelming majority of whom were ultimately of Scottish ancestry, according to Leyburn, *op cit.*, and R. J. Dickson, *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America, 1718-1775* 2nd edition, with a new introduction by Graeme Kirkham (Belfast, 1988). While seventeenth-century Lowland Scots and eighteenth-century Ulster English overlap considerably, Scotch-Irish English includes some features of Scots for which there is not yet evidence in Ulster (in part due to the scant earlier documentary record), and it contains some features that apparently derive from Ulster contact with Irish Gaelic (like positive *anymore*, F1) but are unattested in Scotland.

13. Josiah Combs, "Language of the Southern Highlander," *PMLA* 46 (1931) 1302-22; David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in North America* (New York, 1989), 652-55; Wylene Dial, "The Dialect of the Appalachian People" *West Virginia History* 30 (1969), 463-71; Alan Crozier, "The Scotch-Irish Influence on American English," *American Speech* 59 (1984), 310-31; Michael Ellis, "On the Use of Dialect as Evidence: Albion's Seed in Appalachia," *Appalachian Journal* 19 (1992), 278-97.

14. Joseph Wright, *The English Dialect Dictionary*, 6 volumes (Oxford, 1898-1905).

15. Crozier, 311.
16. Crozier, 328.
17. Ellis, *op. cit.*
18. Ellis, 286.
19. These forty features have been culled from the published research on Appalachian speech as identified in an exhaustive bibliography covering this literature, James B. McMillan and Michael B. Montgomery, *Annotated Bibliography of Southern American English* (Tuscaloosa, 1989).
20. "Southern British" is an inclusive term for patterns whose origin and distribution have been limited to one or more regions of England.
21. William Grant and David Murison, eds., *The Scottish National Dictionary*, 10 vols. (Edinburgh, 1931-84); William Craigie and A. J. Aitken, eds. *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue: From the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth* (Chicago/Aberdeen/Oxford, 1933-2002).
22. For example, William Hugh Patterson, *The Glossary of Words in Use in the Counties of Antrim and Down* (London, 1880); John J. Marshall, "The Dialect of Ulster: Glossary of Words in the Ulster Dialect, Chiefly Used in the Midland and North-eastern Counties," *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 10 (1904), 121-30; 11 (1905), 64-70, 122-25, 175-79; 12 (1906), 18-22; Michael Traynor, *The English Dialect of Donegal: A Glossary* (Dublin, 1953).
23. A trove of these is on deposit at the Ulster Folk and Transport Museum at Cultra Manor, Holywood, County Down, Northern Ireland, e.g., Sir John Byers, "Dictionary of Ulster English," a 1000-page typescript.
24. Carver, *op. cit.*; Frederic G. Cassidy et al. *Dictionary of American Regional English* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985-); Craigie and Aitken, *op. cit.*; Crawford Feagin, *Variation and Change in Alabama English: A Sociolinguistic Study of the White Community* (Washington, 1979); Grant and Murison, *op. cit.*, Edwin R. Hunter, "The American Colloquial Idiom, 1830-1860" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Chicago, 1925); Otto

Jespersen, *A Modern Grammar on Historical Principles*, 7 volumes (London, 1954); McDavid, *op cit.*; F. Th. Visser, *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, 2 volumes (Leiden, 1970); Harold Wentworth, ed., *American Dialect Dictionary* (New York, 1944); George P. Wilson, "Folk Speech," *The Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore* (Durham, 1952), 505-618; Walt Wolfram and Donna Christian, *Appalachian Speech* (Arlington, 1976).

25. This influence may in fact be broader than it appears to be, since Southern British forms may well have come through Ulster. Many settlers from England, including from the Southwest, participated in the seventeenth-century plantation of Ulster (Robinson 1984). Twentieth-century novels in Ulster English (e.g., *Mrs. Murphy Buries the Hatchet* by Agnes Romily White) employ *a*-prefixing and regularized past form *blowed*. Much of the North American contact between Scotch-Irish and Southern British people and their varieties of English was mirrored three centuries ago in Ulster. This is the subject of another paper: Michael Montgomery and Philip S. Robinson, "Ulster English as Janus: Language Contact Across the Irish Sea and Across the North Atlantic," *Language Contact Across the North Atlantic*, ed. by Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, 411-26. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

26. Although no formal analysis has yet been pursued by this or any other writer, *ye* appears to be a phonological variant of *you* in unstressed contexts, particularly as the direct object of a verb or the object of a preposition. This form of *ye* is used as both singular and plural and has no connection to the Middle English and Renaissance *ye* which was a nominative plural form.

27. See Margaret Mishoe and Michael Montgomery, "The Pragmatics of Multiple Modals in North and South Carolina," *American Speech* 69 (1994), 3-29. The authors identify two dozen combinations based on their observations in South and North Carolina, including the following previously unattested ones:

- 1) It's a long way and he *might will can't*, but I'm going to ask.
- 2) They're saying we *may shall* get some rain.
- 3) We *would might* run maybe ten hams a week. The author has developed the cross-Atlantic

comparison of modal combinations further in a longer paper: Michael Montgomery, "Exploring the Roots of Appalachian English," *English World-Wide* 10 (1989), 227-78.

28. For many modern-day Southern American speakers, *y'all* and *you all* are apparently unrelated forms. *Y'all* most likely derives from *ye all*, the Scotch-Irish phonological form of *you all*, and not from *you all* directly (Michael Montgomery, "The Etymology of *Y'all*," *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honor of Frederic G. Cassidy*, ed. by Joan H. Hall, et al. (New York: 1992), 356-69). This is supported by the fact that many Southerners today who use *y'all* either do not also use *you all* (the "supposed" form, according to dictionaries, from which it is contracted) or spell the form as *ya'll*, which means they do not associate its derivation with *you + all*; see Michael Montgomery, "The Reanalysis of *y'all*," *American Speech* 55 (1990), 137-39. The contention here is that the contracted form *y'all* was brought by Ulster emigrants, contrary to Crozier's supposition (1984:326).

29. Peter Trudgill, *Dialects in Contact* (London, 1986).

30. A first effort has been made by Michael Montgomery, "The Diversity of Appalachian English," Paper read at Appalachian Studies Association meeting, Asheville, 1992.