

Title	Why resumption? Resumptive pronouns in prepositional relative clauses [in Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish]
Creators	Hoyne, Mícheál
Date	2017
Citation	Hoyne, Mícheál (2017) Why resumption? Resumptive pronouns in prepositional relative clauses [in Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish]. In: Referential properties and their impact on insular Celtic syntax. Studien und Texte zur Keltologie (14). Nodus Publikationen, Muenster, pp. 69-100. ISBN 9783893236244
URL	https://dair.dias.ie/id/eprint/1037/

**WHY RESUMPTION?:
RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS IN PREPOSITIONAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN IRISH**

A prepositional relative clause (PRC) can be defined as a relative clause (RC) in which the antecedent is in a prepositional relationship to the verb in the RC. In broad terms, Old, Middle and Modern Irish have two methods of forming PRCs. In one, the RC does not contain any lexical element corresponding to the antecedent: this is the gapped strategy, so called because the RC can be said to contain a gap where the head is processed again (or re-activated). The other strategy involves the use of a resumptive pronoun (RP): in this strategy, the head is repeated as a prepositional pronoun (generally agreeing in number and, in the singular, also in gender, with the head) within the RC itself.

The first strategy is the usual one in Old Irish (c. 600 – c. 900) (see Example 1), though occasional examples of the second strategy are met with (see Example 2).¹

(1) *ní lat in cách forsa mmitter _*

'is-not' 'with-you' 'everyone' 'on + REL. PARTICLE' 'you-judge'

'not yours is everyone on whom you pass judgement'

(Wb. 6 b 22; cited in Ó hUiginn 2013: 164)

(2) *hua duemar nech suidigther loc daingen dō inna āgathar ní*

'since' 'is-protected (SING. PASSIVE)' 'anyone' 'is-established (SING. PASSIVE)' 'a strong place'

'for-him' 'in + NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE' 'he-fears' 'something'

'since anyone is protected to whom is established a strong place in which he fears nothing'

1 I am very grateful to Liam Breatnach, Damian McManus and Erich Poppe for their comments and corrections on an earlier version of this paper. I alone am responsible for the deficiencies that remain.

When citing examples, I give the Irish text in italics, except the headword. The RC itself is underlined. RPs are marked in bold. '_' signifies the gap site in a RC, that is, the point at which we can imagine the head must be re-processed. Where any text intervenes between the headword and the relevant RC, this text is given superscript. The primary focus of the present paper is PRCs with RPs; to distinguish the periods of the language from which the various examples discussed are sourced, I prefix 'A' to the Old Irish examples, 'B' to Middle Irish and 'C' to Early Modern Irish. This procedure is only followed for examples with RPs. On the occasion of the first citation, I give the text as it was printed, though for reasons of clarity I do not reproduce italics to indicate expansions of manuscript contractions and, where necessary, I introduce punctuation in square brackets and also macrons. In subsequent citations or in theoretical examples, I employ the standardised orthography commonly used in critical editions for each period of the language. -[verbal form] in the body of the paper indicates that this is a dependent form. * indicates an example of my own invention; it does not necessarily indicate that the example is ungrammatical. Superscript *N* indicates following nasalisation. The following abbreviations are used:

COND. = conditional mood

NEG. = negative

NP = noun phrase

PL. = plural

PAST = past tense

PP = prepositional phrase

PRC = prepositional relative clause

PRES. = present tense

RC = relative clause

REL. = relative

SING. = singular

SUB = subject

SUBJ. = subjunctive mood

VP = verb phrase

(Ml. 87 d 15; Example A1 below)

In clauses of the type exemplified in (1), the head (*in cách* 'everyone') is followed by a preposition (the fact that the preposition occurs at the beginning of the RC rather than in approximately the position where it would occur in a non-RC means that this is an example of 'pied-piping') and the relative particle *a^N*. The verb (*-mmitter* 'you judge') has its dependent form. In clauses of the type illustrated by Example 2, the head (*nech* 'anyone') is followed immediately by the verb of the RC (*suidigther* 'is-situated'), which presumably takes the standard relative form.² The head is re-activated in the RC by a prepositional pronoun (*dó* 'to him'). The RC thus has a structure like a non-RC (V, S, PP).

In Early Modern Irish (c. 1200 – c. 1650), the pied-piping approach with a gap continues to be the norm (see Example 3). In addition to this strategy for PRC formation, however, we also find a RP strategy (see Example 4). The relative particle (*a*)*ga^N* / (*a*)*gá^N* (< the preposition *ag* + relative particle *a^N*) comes to be used to introduce a PRC which also contains a prepositional pronoun that refers back to the head.³

(3) *ainm an inaidh ina tucadh an cath[-]sin* _
'the name of the place' 'in + REL. PARTICLE' 'was-given (PAST PASSIVE)' 'that battle'
'the name of the place where that battle was fought'
(Walsh 1920: 24-5)

(4) *an t-ógán agá mbí drochfhuadar faoi*
'the youth' *AGÁ* 'is (HABITUAL)' 'bad-activity' 'under-him'
'the youth who is bent on ill'
(Bergin 1931: l. 5315)

The origin of the *agá* PRC construction would appear to lie in the doubling of the preposition, that is, that a preposition would occur once in pied-piping and the same preposition would occur combined with a RP referring back to the head in the RC itself. There is at least one (late) example from Middle Irish (c. 900 – c. 1200) of this phenomenon (Example 5) and it is also found in Early Modern Irish with copular PRCs (Example 6).

(5) *duine fora tá omun báis fair*
'a man' 'on + REL. PARTICLE' 'is (3 SING.)' 'fear of death' 'on-him'
'a man who fears death'
(Hughes 1991: l. 165)

2 The relative and dependent forms of singular passive deponents are identical. In the other examples of this construction known to me (A2-4 cited below), the verb must have its dependent form as it is preceded by a negative verbal particle. But cf. the use of the relative form of the verb in some possessive relatives and Thurneysen's remarks (1946: 322) on their relevance to PRCs with RPs in Old Irish.

3 The long vowel in *agá* is curious. I know of no phonological reason why the relative particle *a* (which, so far as I know, is short in all stages of the language) should be lengthened when combined with a preposition ending on a consonant. Perhaps we have to do here with analogical lengthening influenced by *dá* (< Old Irish *día*), the combination of *do* 'to' + the relative particle (and also *do* + the possessive pronoun *a*). Note that *agá* in RCs is represented by *go* (Munster) and *a* (other dialects) in Modern Irish, while in contrast the combination of *ag* + possessive pronoun *a* (as opposed to *ag* + relative particle *a*) is now realized as *á*. (*'na*, originally the preposition *i* + the relative particle and used as a relative particle in some Munster dialects, is a separate development.) The shortening of the vowel in relative *agá* in Modern Irish, if that vowel was indeed realized long in Early Modern Irish, might have been due to the influence of other verbal particles in Modern Irish, such as the leniting relative particle *a* (used in subject and object RCs) and the conjunction *go* 'that'. For convenience, when referring to the combination of *ag* + the relative particle, I use the form *agá* throughout this paper.

(6) *do neamhthoil an té lérab leis é*
 'by the non-will' 'he' 'with + PRES. COPULA' 'with-him' 'it'
 'without the consent of him who owned it/to whom it belonged'
 (Mac Raghnaill 1979: l. 2257)

It seems likely that in time, *ag* + *a*^N, perhaps because of its high frequency in PRCs, was grammaticalised as a relative particle introducing PRCs with RPs, and came to be used in the course of the Early Modern Irish period to introduce (non-copular) possessive relatives and even some object relatives with RPs (see Examples 7 and 8 for possessive and object relatives respectively).

(7) *ar an íomháigh ^{do-chonnairc an rí.} agá raibhe a ceann d'ór [...]*
 'on the image' 'the king saw' AGÁ 'was (3 SING.)' 'its head' 'of gold'
 'on the image that the king saw whose head was of gold'
 (Bergin 1931, l. 4035)

(8) *ar lucht Sodoma *7 Gomarra, agar chuirsead na hós dóire[-]se i gcarcair uathbhásaigh ifrinn iad*
 'on the people of Sodom and Gomorrah', AGÁ + PAST VERBAL PARTICLE 'put (3 PL.)' 'these inn-keepers' 'in the horrible prison of hell' 'them'
 'on the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, whom these inn-keepers put in the horrible prison of Hell'
 (Bergin 1931, l. 3622)

In the course of the Modern Irish period (c. 1650 –), *agá* is reduced to *go*^N (in Munster Irish) and *a*^N (in other dialects). The pied-piping strategy is now marginal, the RP strategy being the norm.⁴

The question that I wish to attempt to answer in this paper is: why does the RP strategy occur at all? McCone (1985: 96) argues that the RP construction of PRCs is a dialect feature in Old Irish:

The standard Old Irish method of forming a prepositional relative was by means of a preposition plus *-(s)a* followed by nasalisation ([Thurneysen 1946: 312-13]), a type that has dominated in the literature until quite recently and is still the norm in present-day Scots Gaelic speech. However, a construction with a conjugated preposition in the relative clause is the rule in today's spoken Irish in Ireland itself and seems to be at least as old as the following two isolated examples from the Glosses, *nech suidigther loc daingen do* (Ml. 87d15) and *ní fail ní nád-tái mo dligeth-sa fair* (Sg. 26b7: see [Thurneysen 1946: 322]) [...] [W]e may envisage two approaches to creating an unambiguous prepositional relative in the very late prehistory of Irish, one by shifting demonstrative *(s)a*, formally identical with the originally demonstrative Old Irish article, to relative function (cf. Watkins, *Celtica* 6, 24-5) in a manner for which English, German and the Ionic dialects of ancient Greek offer good

4 A detailed diachronic account of all of these Early Modern Irish developments is a desideratum.

Note also a peculiar development in South-East Ulster and almost certainly confined to writing in which a prepositional pronoun corresponding to the head in number and, in the 3 singular, in gender, takes the place of the fronted preposition of the pied-piping construction:

mise, oram a bhfuil d'fhiachaibh do sheirbhís a dhéanamh
 'I 'on-me' 'is (3 SING.) of obligations' 'your service' 'to do'
 'I who am under an obligation to do your service'
 (Ó Buachalla 1983, 70).

For an explanation of how this construction arose, see Ó Buachalla 1983.

typological parallels, and the other by simply inserting the appropriate prepositional pronoun into the relative clause as in the two examples just given. I suspect that this may be one of the few cases where variant usages in the Glosses probably have a base in different dialects, the preposition plus *-(s)a* type of apparently northern origins being rapidly absorbed into the literate register whereas the 'conjugated' preposition type of broadly southern origins was apparently confined to colloquial usage for centuries and only cropped up occasionally in the literature. The fact remains that this could happen as early as the eighth century.

McCone's analysis presupposes that the Modern Irish RP construction for PRCs is a direct descendant of the Old Irish RP construction. His analysis does not address the significant morphological differences between the two: in the Old Irish RP construction, the verb has its relative form rather than its dependent form; grammaticalised *agá* (Modern Irish *go/a*) is also unexplained. (One could perhaps imagine a fusing of the two PRC constructions of Old Irish discussed so far to create the Modern Irish PRC with a RP.) In any event, McCone's remarks do not explain (nor were they intended to) why a RP structure should have developed at all. Was this development arbitrary or is there an explanation for why a gapped structure should be preferred in certain circumstances and a RP structure in others?

Ó hUiginn (2013: 166) gives the following account of the RP structure in Old Irish:

This would appear to be a marginal type that represents a further development of the old dative, or prepositionless relative [discussed in Ó hUiginn 2013: 164-5]. Given that the dative relative can cover a wide semantic range (e.g. by whom/which, to whom/which, with whom/which, etc.), it would appear that the resumptive prepositional pronoun has been added to define more clearly the nature of the relationship between antecedent and relative verb. Although [this construction] does not appear to have been productive – the prepositional relative being by far the dominant construction – the syntactic strategy of using a resumptive prepositional pronoun is one we again encounter at a later period in Irish [...]

As an example of the kind of semantic ambiguity he has in mind and which the use of the RP rather than a prepositionless RC resolves, Ó hUiginn writes, referring to Example 2:

Without the resumptive prepositional pronoun,⁵ [Example 2], for instance, could be translated as 'as [sic] person by whom a strong place is established'.

Discussing the RP structure in Early Modern Irish, he suggests the double-use of the preposition and the use of *agá* as a relative particle introducing PRCs with prepositions other than *ag* represent “a degree of semantic weakening in the combination of preposition and relative particle” (Ó hUiginn 2013: 168).

This development seems to have started with the prepositional relative with *ag*, which had a wide semantic range, and then spread to other prepositions [...]

He also cites Bergin's remarks (1931: 361) on the semantic bleaching of *agá*

[*ag*] with rel. pron[oun] often in a weakened sense 'concerning, with regard to', sinking to a mere introductory particle.

Bergin does not address the use of RPs in RCs where *agá* is 'a mere introductory particle'. One

5 That is, if the RC was formulated as a prepositionless RC **nech suidigther loc daingen*.

might assume from the remarks above that the wide semantic range of *ag* resulted in semantic bleaching and its grammaticalisation when combined with a relative particle, resulting in *agá* becoming an introductory particle to relative clauses, the prepositional relationship between the head of the RC and the verb being expressed by a conjugated prepositional RP in the RC itself. The use of grammaticalised *agá*, however, is not obligatory in forming PRCs in Early Modern Irish. Why is there variation within a single text, some PRCs being formed with the gap and the others with the *agá* construction?

Modern Irish has two ways of forming direct object RCs – one with a gap, the other with a RP. In Hoyne 2016, I argued that the Modern Irish direct object relative construction with a RP ultimately descends from an *agá* RC construction with a RP (cf. Example 8).⁶ When the gapped structure is used, a direct object RC can often be formally ambiguous: that is, it is often formally unclear whether the head of the RC is the subject or direct object of the RC.⁷ Though it is often claimed that the RP type of direct object relative is employed to avoid ambiguity, this is not borne out by real examples: RPs are not always used when the resulting object RC is ambiguous and are often used when no serious ambiguity could result with a gap structure.⁸ I argued, drawing on cross-linguistic research on the use of RPs, that the RP structure of Modern Irish object relatives is employed in cases where the RC is difficult to process; specifically, the claim is that the more difficult it is to re-activate the head at the point in the RC where it must be processed as an argument within that clause, the greater is the likelihood that a RP will be employed in the RC to facilitate processing. For example, if a large number of processing costly words intervene between the head and the point in the RC where it must be re-activated, the strain on working memory may be such that a RP is employed in the RC. Similarly, if the head itself is not very accessible, that is, if it is difficult to activate a mental representation of the head, a RP may be used to ease its re-activation in the RC.⁹ Non-restrictive RCs (such as 'Eleanor Knott, whom Binchy respected'), in which the RC provides additional information concerning the head but is not necessary to identify it, are structurally more difficult to process than restrictive RCs (such as 'the scholar whom Binchy respected'); the latter are said to be more integrated with their heads.

There is significant cross-linguistic evidence to suggest that some types of RCs are more difficult to process than others. Keenan and Comrie (1977) proposed an accessibility hierarchy of relativisation, a simplified version of which, sufficient for our purposes, I present below:

Subject > Direct Object > Prepositional Object > Genitive

If a language can relativise a position lower on the hierarchy, it can relativise all positions higher on that hierarchy. For example, if a language allows prepositional object relatives, it allows direct

6 At the time of writing Hoyne 2016 I did not have any examples of a direct object RC with the *agá* RP construction.

7 For example, *Bonnaí Dubha Ó Dubhthaigh a cheangail a' Bás agus Aingeal a' Bháis* could be translated 'Bonnaí Dubha Ó Dubhthaigh, who tied up Death and the Angel of Death' or 'Bonnaí Dubha Ó Dubhthaigh, whom Death and the Angel of Death tied up'. No grammatical or syntactical information clarifies the role played by the antecedent in the RC.

8 For example, *an t-oifigeach sgannruighthe [...] a tharrtháil mé an oidhche roimhe sin* is formally ambiguous, admitting two possible translations – 'the frightened officer that had saved me the night before' or 'the frightened officer that I had saved the night before'. The latter is the correct interpretation in the context and could have been unambiguously formulated using a RP as **an t-oifigeach sgannruighthe ar tharrtháil mé é an oidhche roimhe sin*. This is an example where the disambiguating potential of the RP relative construction was not availed of. Similarly, *na tithe seo nár fhág aon duine fós iad*, 'these houses that no-one has yet left', is an example of the use of the RP relative where the gap-strategy equivalent **na tithe seo nár fhág aon duine fós* could hardly be semantically ambiguous, though formally the translation 'the houses that have not yet left anyone' would also be possible.

9 For the accessibility of referring expressions, see Ariel 1988, 1991 and 2008. For a brief summary of the issue, see Hoyne 2016, 56-7, 67.

object relatives and subject relatives. If a language does not allow prepositional object relatives, it does not allow genitive relatives. Interestingly, the likelihood that RPs will be employed increases further down the hierarchy. For example, while Modern Irish allows RPs in direct object relatives (albeit rarely), these are not normally grammatical in subject relatives. RPs are, however, normal in prepositional and possessive relatives. There is significant empirical evidence that this hierarchy of relativisation reflects processing difficulty: the further to the right on the hierarchy the position, the more difficult it is to relativise; for all the positions that a language can relativise, the further right on the hierarchy the position the greater the likelihood that RPs will be employed in RCs on that position. Within those RC positions that allow both RPs and gaps, it follows that more complex, difficult to process RCs will have RPs, while less complex, easier to process RCs will not; this is the claim I have made for Modern Irish direct object relatives. The situation can be envisaged as one of competing demands: RPs are not processing free – they too incur a certain processing cost – and so are avoided whenever the RC is sufficiently easy to process that they are not required; when a RC becomes too processing costly with a gap, a RP is used to ease the processing burden, the processing cost incurred by the RP being less than the processing burden that would have resulted using the gapped structure.¹⁰

In the present paper, I will argue that processing difficulty holds the key to understanding the distribution of RPs in PRCs in Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish.¹¹ In order to do this, I have analysed texts in which both PRC strategies are attested – the gapped strategy and the RP strategy.¹² This should allow a comparison between the accessibility conditions in both types of PRC. It should, of course, be borne in mind that an investigation of Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish is complicated by the nature of the evidence. Few texts are found in manuscripts contemporary with the time of their composition; fewer still are in an authorial hand. The beginnings of printing of Irish-language material in the late sixteenth century resolve some of these difficulties. As far as manuscript material is concerned, however, we are often dealing with texts which may have been composed by one person or many or composed by one person and redacted at a later point. As such, we may have a mix of PRC usage in a single text that is due to variation in individual usage or that reflects diachronic developments. By describing the texts and where they are to be found below, I mean to draw the reader's attention to these difficulties. In addition, it should be borne in mind that we are dealing here with texts composed in literary standards. Some usages common in speech were deliberately avoided in writing.¹³ This may complicate the evidence: an example of a PRC with a RP may represent a slip on the part of the author/scribe or a later modernisation and not, in fact, allow a proper comparison with PRCs employing the gapped strategy in the same text. Despite these difficulties, I believe the procedure employed below is the most practical method for comparing the two PRC strategies which concern us here in the hope of understanding their distribution.

OLD IRISH (c. 600 – c. 900)

To investigate resumption in PRCs in Old Irish, I will focus first on the four examples

10 See Ariel 1990, Hawkins 1999, Hofmeister and Norcliffe 2013 for processing difficulty and RPs. For a good summary of the issues involved, see Moravcsik 2006: 169-72.

11 Modern Irish, in which the gapped structure is marginal, is not investigated on this occasion.

12 I analysed all unique PRCs in a given text which had a nominal or pronominal head (excluding interrogative pronouns). In prosy-metric texts, RCs occurring in poems were not analysed, as metrical factors may have contributed to syntactical choices on the part of the poet. Where I give the total number of PRCs examined in a text this number can be taken to refer to unique PRCs (in prose).

13 Compare, for example, the attitude of the author of the seventeenth-century *Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae* to the relative particle *neoch*, which he declares to be a Munster feature which the learned (*periti*) do not use (Mac Aogáin 1968: ll 1096-9; see McManus 1994: 425).

presented by Ó hUiginn (2013: 166):

A1 *hua duemar* nech *suidigther loc daingen* **dō** inna āgathar ní

'anyone' 'is-established (SING. PASSIVE)' 'a strong place' 'for-him' 'in + NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE' 'he-fears' 'something'

'since anyone is protected to whom is established a strong place in which he fears nothing' (Ml. 87 d 15)

A2 ní fail ní *nád taí mo dligeth-sa* **fair**

'there is not' 'anything' NEG. PARTICLE 'touches (3 SING)' 'my law' 'on-it'

'there is nothing on which my law does not touch'

(Sg. 26 b 7)

A3 *noco ririub rī[g] nĒrenn ar fer nā fedar clainn nā cenēl* **dó**

'I will not barter' 'the king of Ireland' 'for a man' NEG. PARTICLE 'I-know' 'family' 'nor' 'kindred' 'of-him'

'I will not barter the king of Ireland for a man whose kindred or race I know not'¹⁴

(Bergin and Best 1938: 170)

A4 tír fosad *a mbī maith cach maith* [...] *nā bīat glāma* **ann**

'level land' [...] NEG. PARTICLE 'is (HABITUAL 3 PL.)' 'thorny weeds' 'in-it'

'a level land in which every good thing (?) flourishes [...] in which there are no *glāma* [thorny weeds]'

(Mac Niocaill 1971: 82)

In all of these examples, the head is followed directly by the RC and a prepositional pronoun within the RC refers back to the head. The first two examples cited by Ó hUiginn are derived from the Glosses, that is, from contemporary manuscripts of the Old Irish period. The first is from the 'Milan Glosses' on a Latin commentary on the Psalms (early ninth century), the second from the 'St Gall Glosses' on Priscian's Grammar (mid-ninth century). These examples are particularly valuable as evidence that resumption was grammatical in Old Irish and that examples of resumption in PRCs from Old Irish texts preserved in later manuscripts need not necessarily be due to later corruption. A drawback of the Glosses for my present purposes is that by their nature, the Glosses represent (for the most part) short, unconnected passages. Comparing PRCs in the Glosses is complicated by the fact that the various corpora of Glosses are found in manuscripts of different dates and that even within a single body of Glosses we may have to do with several layers of glossing carried out by different individuals at different times. Of course, these difficulties are not necessarily circumvented in their entirety when dealing with a single continuous passage in the Glosses, as it too may have been subject to deliberate or inadvertent scribal redaction or have arisen through the combination of originally separate glosses. I suspect that a study of all of the PRCs in the Glosses would, despite the reservations expressed above, prove illuminating, but such a study cannot be attempted here.

The other two examples given by Ó hUiginn do derive from longer, continuous passages of prose (the tale "Tochmarc Étaíne" and an Old Irish law tract, respectively) and so provide an opportunity to compare PRCs within a single text. Of course, as these texts survive in manuscripts considerably younger than the language of the texts themselves, the influence of scribes and redactors cannot be ruled out. Be that as it may, I assume, on the basis of an example of the PRC construction with resumption, that resumption was grammatical and therefore an option in constructing a PRC at the time of composition/redaction of the text.

14 A more literal translation would be 'a man that I do not know a family or kindred of his'.

Turning first to Example A1 from the Milan Glosses, I will now suggest that accessibility theory offers a reasonable explanation as to why the PRC was formulated with a RP rather than with the pied-piping more commonly used in PRCs in Old Irish; in other words, why was

A1a **nech día suidigther loc daingen* _

'anyone' 'to + REL. PARTICLE' 'is-established (SING. PASSIVE)' 'a strong place'

dis-preferred in this instance? In the hypothetical PRC A1a, the gap in the RC does not, at first sight, appear to be characterised by low accessibility. Only two content words (*loc* 'place' and *daingen* 'strong') intervene between the verb and the re-activation site. More significantly here, I suspect that it is important to bear in mind that the RC in question is an argument within a larger sentence. The NP *loc daingen* is itself the head of another PRC:

loc daingen inna āgathar ní _

'in + NEG. PARTICLE' 'he-fears' 'a thing'

'in which he fears nothing'

As such, in assessing the on-line processing demands of A1, we should perhaps imagine the following hypothetical re-formulation:

A1b **nech día suidigther loc daingen inna āgathar ní* _

'anyone' 'to-whom' 'is situated' 'a strong place in which he fears nothing'

In representing the gap in this theoretical example, I assume that the filler-gap domain (the distance between the head and the point in the RC where it is re-activated) includes the obligatory arguments of the PRC. Here the obligatory argument of the present passive *suidigther* (rel. *suidigther*) is its subject, *loc daingen inna āgathar ní* 'a strong place in which he fears nothing', which is quite a complex NP. In order to process the PRC A1, the hearer/reader must process the head, the verb governing the PRC, an indefinite NP and a further PRC qualifying that NP. Taking cognisance of this heavy processing load, the use of a RP to refer back to the antecedent *nech* becomes less mysterious: the RP facilitates the successful on-line processing of the PRC with *nech* as its head before a further PRC (this time with the head *loc daingen*) must be processed. The very low accessibility of the head *nech* 'anyone' may also be a contributing factor here in giving rise to conditions where a RP was felt necessary to re-activate the head at the gap site.

A similar explanation can account for A2.

A2a **ní forná taí mo dligeth-sa* _

'something' 'upon' NEG. PARTICLE 'touches (3 SING. PRES. SUBJ.)' 'my law'

Like *nech*, *ní* is characterised by low accessibility, being an indefinite pronoun. Note too that *ní* refers to something unreal here, the semantic subject (and grammatical object) of the negative existential VP *ní fail* 'is not'. The verb in the PRC itself is present subjunctive (*-taí* from *do-tét*). Cf. Thurneysen's remarks on the use of the subjunctive in indefinite relative clauses ('whoever, whatever, whenever', etc.): 'Here the indeterminate nature of the subject, object, etc., invests the entire action with a measure of uncertainty to which Old Irish is extremely sensitive' (1946: 330). Though the distance between the head and the point in the RC where it must be re-activated is not particularly great, the low accessibility of the head, the difficulty with which a mental representation of an unreal indefinite entity is re-activated, itself may be sufficient to trigger the use

of a RP here.

A3 is the sole occurrence of a RP in a PRC in the Old Irish tale “Tochmarc Étaíne (II)” (Bergin and Best 1938: 162-72). There are two other PRCs in the same text, both of which employ pied-piping and a gap to relativise the head:

(9) an tech a mbíth Ailill a ngalar _
'the house' 'in' 'was (3 SING. PAST HABITUAL)' 'in sickness'
'the house wherein Ailill lay sick'
(Bergin and Best 1938: 166-7)

(10) lā n-and a mbātar ina tigh _
'one day' 'in' 'were (3 PL.)' 'in her house'
'one day as they were together in her house'
(166-7)

The following is a reformulation of A3 as a pied-piping PRC:

A3a *fer díaná fedar clainn ná cenél _

Of significance here is the low accessibility of the head itself which is an indefinite noun. In addition to this processing burden, a further two indefinite NPs must be processed before the re-activation site in the RC. Contrast Example 9, in which the head is a definite NP and the subject of the verb in the RC (the substantive verb and its predicate, *-bíth [...] i ngalar* 'was [...] in sickness') is a proper name (*Ailill*), and Example 10, where the head is an indefinite NP but the RC consists only of the substantive verb and its predicate (a definite NP, *a tigh* '(dat.) her house').¹⁵

The fourth example cited by Ó hUiginn occurs in an Old Irish law text ('Text I', Mac Niocaill 1971). For purposes of comparison there is only a single other PRC in this passage:

(11) tīr inbēla ^{sōn} i mbi maith cach clann _
'land clearable with an axe' 'that' 'in' 'is (PRES. HABITUAL COPULA)' 'good' 'every plant'
'[that is] land clearable with an axe, in which every plant flourishes'

The comparison with A4 in its full context is illuminating.

A4 tīr fosad a mbi maith cach maith itir ith & mlicht & lín & glaisīne & mil & rú & cumrad, nāch ēicin do frichnam tuair na slige, nā bīat glāma ann
'level land in which every good thing (?) flourishes, both corn and pasture and flax and woad and honey and madder and sweet fruit, which requires no application of manure or clearing, in which there are no *glāma*'¹⁶

15 Interestingly, a similar phrase to A3 occurs in an EModIr text but without a RP:

don [to]chuirthe *7 don tuilidhe, dā nach feas clann nō ceinéul _
'for the foundling' 'and' 'for the orphan' 'of + REL. PARTICLE' NEG. PARTICLE + PRES. COPULA 'known'
'family' 'or' 'kindred'
'to that foundling [...] whose family and kindred are unknown [lit. 'that no family or kindred of his are known']'
(O'Rahilly 1949: ll 2309-10)

Note that in this example the antecedent, being definite, is more accessible than the antecedent in A3.

16 *Ná* in the underlined RC might also be translated 'and [...] not' (see Thurneysen 1946: 540-1). For the meaning of

Comparing the other PRC in this text, which had only a single content word (*cach clann*) after the substantive verb and its predicate, it is clear that distance from the head to the activation site in the RC can reasonably be proposed here as a reason for resumption in the PRC. Between the head *tír fosad* 'level land' (an indefinite NP and therefore relatively low on the accessibility hierarchy) and the PRC which concerns us (*ná bíat gláma ann* 'in which there are no *gláma*') the hearer/reader must process two quite complex RCs; the first of which (*i mbi maith cach maith* 'in which every good thing is good') is followed by a long adjunct phrase (*itir ith [...] & cumrad* 'including corn [...] and sweet fruit') and contains in total some eight content words after the substantive verb and its predicate; and the second of which contains a further three content words (*do frichnam tuair na slige*) after the copula and its predicate (*nách éicin*). Processing difficulty provides a likely explanation for the use of a RP here at the point of re-activation in the third RC of which *tír fosad* is the head.

Before turning to a discussion of the Middle Irish evidence, I will deal briefly with two further examples of the RP construction of PRC in Old Irish texts kindly brought to my attention by Liam Breatnach. The first example occurs in a legal gloss of the Old Irish period preserved in a sixteenth-century manuscript (see Breatnach 2005: 338-46).

A5 *c[ét]muinte[r] do[-]lcuirter saeth fuirri do galur*
 'a wife' 'is put' 'affliction' 'on-her' 'of disease'
 'a wife who experiences the affliction of a disease'
 (Binchy 1978: 893)

Note that the head and the NP following the verb of the RC are indefinite (*cétmuinte[r]* 'a wife', *saeth do galur* 'an affliction of a disease') and (in the context of the legal text) hypothetical. *Saeth do galur* is a particularly processing costly NP and it is to be noted that the RP is interposed between the two nouns that make up this phrase.

The second additional example is from a passage of the ninth-century text *Cáin Domnaig* and was first noted by Pokorny in his Old Irish grammar (1925: 116).¹⁷

A6 *Oc timciul relci dō dīa domnaig fuceird mberridi [sic] mbeg cona bachuill din conair boī fuirri*
 'At going around a graveyard' 'to-him' 'on Sunday' 'throws (3 SING.)' 'chip-of-wood' 'small' 'with his staff' 'from the path' 'was (3 SING.)' 'on-it'
 'While going around a graveyard on Sunday, he [a saintly man] threw a little wooden chip with his staff from the road on which he [or 'it'] was'
 (Meyer 1901: 228)

In A6, it is notable that there are no words intervening between the definite head of the RC (dat. *conair* 'path') and the re-activation site in the RC except the verb of the RC itself. It is difficult to explain then why the RP structure was preferred in this instance. Here we may have to do not with the low accessibility of the head itself but rather with the difficulty of re-activating the subject of the RC. If the referent of the zero subject in the RC is the cleric who is going around the graveyard, he has been referred to by means of a prepositional pronoun (*dó*), a zero subject (*fo-ceird* Ø) and a possessive pronoun (*cona*) in the lead-up to this RC and has not been referred to by an explicit NP since the beginning of the anecdote (two sentences prior to the citation). Perhaps the processing cost

gláma, see Kelly 2000: 394.

17 For discussion of *Cáin Domnaig* see Breatnach 2005: 209-12. The relevant example is from Section B of the (composite?) text. It was edited by Meyer from the early sixteenth-century MS, British Library Harleian 5280.

of activating the zero subject in this circumstance is so high that the accessibility of the head of the RC at the re-activation site is lower than might initially appear.¹⁸ If the zero subject in the RC is the small chip of wood itself, it should be noted that this is expressed by an indefinite NP and that several content words intervene between this less accessible NP and the re-activation site within the RC.

In the above discussion of a small number of Old Irish PRCs, I have argued that RPs are motivated by low accessibility at the gap site in the PRC where the head is re-activated. It will be clear that I do not believe that the variation in PRC construction constitutes evidence for dialects in Old Irish. The use of RPs in PRCs does not, I believe, point to regional variation in PRC construction, but rather to particularly complex, processing costly PRCs. Even if we assume that PRCs with RPs were confined to a particular dialect or group of dialects, the question as to why and how such a construction would develop in preference to pied-piping with a gap would remain to be answered. It seems to me that accessibility theory provides the best account of the variation in PRC construction in Old Irish and that a fuller investigation of the corpus of Old Irish along these lines would be a fruitful enterprise.¹⁹

MIDDLE IRISH (c. 900 – c. 1200)

McManus (1994: 425) draws attention to the following example of a PRC with a RP in a Middle Irish text, “Gesta Pilati” (Hughes 1991: 80-93), dated by its editor to the twelfth century but preserved in the fifteenth-century *Leabhar Breac* (RIA MS 23 P 16). Note the doubling of the preposition *for*: it occurs first before the relative particle *a* and the verb in the RC; the second occurrence is a prepositional pronoun within the RC referring back to the head.

B duine *fora tá omun báis fair*

'a man' 'on' REL. PARTICLE 'is (3 SING.)' 'fear of death' 'on-him'

'a man who fears death'

(Hughes 1991: l. 165)

Once again, it may be worth providing the full context for this phrase:

18 We can compare this example with another PRC in the same passage, in which the gapped-strategy is employed, as expected:

Alaili cēli Dē and fechtus dīe domnaig co n-aco nī: an gilli mbec docum in luic i rabī

'Another *cēile Dé* 'there' 'once' 'on Sunday' 'and' 'saw (3 SING.)' 'something' 'the young lad' 'towards' 'the place' 'in' 'was (3 SING.)'

'and he saw something, a young lad [going towards] the place in which he [the *cēile Dé*] was'

(Meyer 1901: 228)

19 We may have an example of the doubling of a preposition in a PRC, on the second occasion as a prepositional pronoun, in a metrical passage in *Brislech Mór Maige Muirthemni*, an Old Irish tale which is extant in the twelfth-century Book of Leinster and has undergone some re-working in the Middle Irish period. (I am indebted to Liam Breatnach for this example.)

Is trúag in bith a táthar and

PRES. COPULA 3 SING. 'pity' 'the world' 'in + REL. PARTICLE' 'is (PASSIVE)' 'in-it'

(Kimpton 2009: 34).

The editor translates this as 'Wretched is the ailing world', but there is no note to justify this translation. I suggest translating it as 'Wretched is the world, in which people are [but *Cú Chulainn* (the object of the lament) is not]'. I would interpret the RC as being non-restrictive. The syntax of a metrical text is, of course, not necessarily representative of prose usage.

Cindus didiu conanacair duine fora tá omun báis fair tidecht i n-agaid do chumachta-su?
'How then can a man who fears death go against your power?'

It will be noted that *duine* 'a man' is indefinite. Like *nech* and *ní* in A1 and A2 respectively, *duine* here does not refer to a specific individual or entity and as such is relatively more difficult to activate. There are nine PRCs in “Gesta Pilati” excluding B. All but one have definite heads, as in

(12) *asin carcair i roibe _*
'from the prison' 'in' 'he-was'
'from the prison where he had been'
(l. 61)

(13) *Cia duine ocá tá in mór-chumachta[-]sa _?*
'Who-is' '[the] person' 'at + REL. PARTICLE' 'is (3 SING.)' 'this great power'
'Who is the man who has this great power?'²⁰
(l. 163)

(14) *Cia sō fria n-abair rí na glóire _?*
'Who-is' 'this' 'to + REL. PARTICLE' 'you-say' 'the king of glory'
'Who is this that you call King of Glory?'²¹
(ll 221-2)

The only other example of an indefinite head besides B is in apposition to a definite NP:

(15) *i flaith in athar - flaith ^{side} i tá betha cen bás _ , óice cen shentaid _ *7 cetera*
'in the kingdom of the father' 'a kingdom' 'the aforementioned' 'in' 'is (3 SING.)' 'life without death'
'youth without age' 'etc.'
'in the Kingdom of the Father – a kingdom in which there is life without death, youth without age et cetera'
(ll 269-70)²²

The head of B, therefore, is the least definite antecedent of a PRC in “Gesta Pilati”, the most difficult to activate, and it is, I suggest, significant that it is this head which is re-activated in the RC by means of a RP. Note too that the RP also serves to signal the end of the embedded clause, easing the processing of the rest of the sentence.

EARLY MODERN IRISH (c. 1200 – c. 1650)

For the purposes of the present paper, I examined in detail the PRCs in four texts in Early

20 The editor translates 'What man has this great power [...]?' The definite article can be omitted before a restrictive RC, but is to be understood here (see Uhlich 2013).

21 The editor translates 'Who is this that is called the King of Glory?', taking *-abair* as 3 sing. impersonal.

22 Cf. also

doc[h]um nime baile i taitnemand amal gréin,
'to' 'Heaven' 'where' 'in' 'he-shines' 'like the sun'
(Hughes 1991, 92, ll 269-70)

I have not included this PRC in the discussion as *baile*, originally a noun 'place', can be used as a conjunction (see *DIL*, s.v. 1 *baile* (e)) and, as such, we may not have to do with an indefinite head here. In any event, *baile* here is coreferential with *Nem* 'Heaven'.

Modern Irish. In addition, I will have occasion in the discussion below to make some references to PRCs encountered in other texts which were not subject to systematic investigation for the purposes of this paper. The four texts examined in detail were:

(i) “Smaointe Beatha Chríosa” (henceforth *SBC*) (Ó Maonaigh 1944): a translation of the *Meditationes vitae Christi* from Latin. The earliest MS witness was written in 1461. A scribal colophon provides the following details regarding its composition: *Tomās Gruamdha Ó Bruacháin .i. canánach coradh a Cill Eala, is ē do chuir an leabur[-]so a nGaeigheilig, ocus Domnall Ó Conaill do gabh, ocus Diarmuid Ó Conuill do sgrībh ann so hī*, ‘Tomás Gruamdha Ó Bruacháin, that is, a canon of the chapter [or ‘choir’] in Killala, it was he who translated this book into Irish, and Domhnall Ó Conaill who read it aloud, and Diarmaid Ó Conaill who wrote it down here’ (Ó Maonaigh 1944: xvi). A Tomás Ó Bruacháin matching this description flourished between 1447 and 1469. It would appear that the earliest witness of “Smaointe Beatha Chríosa” was very likely written soon after the translation was carried out. Given the length of the text, only PRCs in ll 1 – 3405 were extracted for use in this paper.

(ii) “Craobhsgaoileadh Chloinne Suibhne” (henceforth *CCS*) (Walsh 1920: 1-75): a history of the Mac Suibhne family written by Tadhg son of Fítheal not earlier than 1532 and not later than 1544 (see Walsh 1920: lviii). With regard to the authorship note the scribal colophon: *nā tucadh fer a lēighte guth ar in ngraibneōir oīr mā tā fudha ann nī ciontach an graibneōir riss acht an leabhar gan chur re chēile roime *7 gurab as chenn is mō do ghabh sé dhe*, ‘And let not him who reads it cast any blame on the writer. For if there be a mistake in it, the writer is not responsible for it, but the fact that he did not compose the book beforehand, and that it was mainly out of his head that he set it down’ (Walsh 1920: 74-5). This would suggest that “Craobhsgaoileadh Chloinne Suibhne” represents something of a rarity: an Early Modern Irish text with a known author/redactor in a manuscript written by that individual.

(iii) “Eachtra Uilliam” (henceforth *EU*) (O’Rahilly 1949): a translation of “William of Palerne” from an early sixteenth-century English version of the tale. Dunn (1957) would narrow the *terminus ad quem* to 1520/29. The earliest MS witness is apparently mid-seventeenth century in date.

(iv) “An Teagasg Críosaíde” (henceforth *TC*) (Mac Raghnaill 1976): a printed catechism composed by Bonaventura Ó hEóidhasa (d. 1614), which was first published during the author’s lifetime (1611). As with (ii), a great advantage of this text is the certainty that all examples are authorial and that no (conscious or unconscious) scribal interventions complicate the evidence.

In describing prose texts, McManus (1994: 335-6) makes a useful distinction between what he calls ‘Type A’ (texts written in a register which better reflects Early Modern Irish linguistic developments, relatively free from pseudo-archaism) and ‘Type B’ (texts written in a deliberately archaising style drawing heavily on Middle Irish). All of the texts (i) to (iv) can be described as belonging to Type A.²³

23 This should not be taken to mean that there are absolutely no pseudo-archaic features in these texts, merely that a pronounced pseudo-archaising tendency is not encountered in these texts. *SBC*, for example, despite being written in Irish quite close in many respects to modern-day Irish, shows evidence of features which were almost certainly no longer part of the Irish of the fifteenth century, such as the *nota augens* -*siomh* (see McManus 1994: 431) or the occasional use of the past-tense verbal particle *ro* for *do* (e.g. Ó Maonaigh 1944, ll 1776 and 2944). Similarly, it is hard to imagine that the conjunction *nó* ‘nor’ ever had a plural form *nóid* in spoken Early Modern Irish (see l. 388). (*Nóid* presumably arose through analogy with (*io*)*náid* ‘than’, a form of (*io*)*ná* used before a plural NP, and confusion of (*io*)*ná* ‘than’ and *ná* ‘nor’. I have no other example of *nóid*.)

75 PRCs were examined from *SBC*. Two of these contained RPs.²⁴

C1 in *tī, ler leis gach aen-nī ocus an talamh co n-a ceathraib ocus co n-a maithisaibh*
'one' 'with+REL. PARTICLE+PAST COPULA' 'with-him' 'every single thing' 'and the earth with its
animals and goods'
'he to whom everything and the earth with its animals and goods belonged'
(ll 1025-6)

C2 don mbanntigherna *nach āil lē dealughadh re n-a Mac* [...] *le*
'to the lady' NEG. PARTICLE + PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'with-her' 'parting with her son'
'to the lady, who does not wish to part from her son'
(ll 2896-7)

In both C1 and C2 the verb in the RC is the copula. C1 involves a repetition of the preposition within the RC, the second occurrence being a resumptive prepositional pronoun. In C2, a negative RC, the preposition only occurs once, combined with the RP in the RC.²⁵

There are five other examples of the construction *is āil le X Y* 'X wishes Y' in *SBC* with which we can compare C2 in the hope of motivating the use of the construction with the double-use of the preposition and a RP in preference to a pied-piping construction C2a.

C2a *don mbaintighearna *le(is) nach āil dealughadh rena mac*
'to the lady' 'with' NEG. PARTICLE + PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'to part from her son'

As I have no other example of the construction *is le X Y* 'Y belongs to X' in a PRC in the portion of *SBC* examined for this paper, I will discuss C2 first. The five other examples of the construction are:

(16) i n-a Tigherna mōr i n-a shuighi i n-a cathaīr aird rīghamhail fēin co ndreich athardha
caínbarraigh trōcairigh *lerb āil _ co toileamhail in cinidh daena do shlánughadh*
'as a great lord seated in his own tall, royal chair with a fatherly, kind, merciful countenance' 'with+
PRES. COPULA' 'wish' 'lovingly' 'the human race to save'
'as a great lord seated in his own tall, royal chair with a fatherly, kind, merciful countenance who
desires lovingly to save the human race'
(ll 203-6)

(17) gibē *le n-ab āil _ Dia do lenmuin*
'whoever' 'with' PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'God to follow'
'whoever wishes to follow God'
(ll 1162-3)

(18) gibē *le n-ab āil _ betha spiradālda do beth air*
'whoever' 'with' PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'spiritual life to be on-him'
'whoever wishes to have a spiritual life'

24 In addition, I note a single instance in the section examined of a resumptive possessive pronoun in a genitival RC:

A-tā biadh agam-sa aga caitheamh nach bhfuil a fis agaib-si
'is (3 SING.)' 'food' 'at-me' 'at its eating' NEG. PARTICLE 'is (3 SING.)' 'its knowledge' 'at-you (PL.)'
'I have food [that I am] eating that you do not know about [lit. 'that you do not have its knowledge']'

25 In the RP structure of PRCs, neither the preposition nor the relative pronoun *agá* normally occurs before the negative verbal particle.

(l. 1166)

(19) *dā gach aennduine leib áil _ beth aga bhrúd*

'to every single person' 'with' PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'to be at his breaking'

'to every person who wishes to break him [Christ]'

(l. 1775)

(20) *gach nech leis nach áil _ do thrial spiradálta do coimhlínadh duit [...]*

'everybody' 'with' NEG PARTICLE + PRES. COPULA 'wish' 'your spiritual journey to fulfil by-you'

'everybody who does not wish that you should fulfil your spiritual journey'

(ll 2358-9)

One difficulty with these examples is establishing where we should represent the gap site in the RC. Grammatically, *is áil le X Y* 'X wishes/desires Y' can be analysed *is áil* [prepositional predicate] [subject], and this is the word-order we expect with this and similar constructions (e.g. *is maith le X Y* 'X likes Y'). Given that this is the expected word-order with this construction it seems likely that the antecedent is processed not after the subject but directly after the copula; that is, rather than assuming that the reader/hearer re-activates the head of C2 after the subject of the RC (*dealughadh rena mac* 'to part from her son'), it seems likely that this process occurs earlier, as reflected in the placement of RPs when RPs do occur in RCs of this type (the RP *lé* 'with-her' occurs after the copula in the RC and not after the subject of the same clause). If this is so, distance between the head and the point of re-activation in the RC will not be factor in PRCs where the head is the prepositional predicate of the construction *is áil le X Y* and similar phrases: the distance between the head and the activation site will always be the same. If the gap site is imagined as occurring after the subject of the *is áil* construction, then there is a greater distance between the complex head of Example 16 and the point of re-activation in the RC than between the less complex head of C2a and the same point in that RC: in Example 16 four content words (the adverb *go toileamhail*, the NP *an cineadh daonna*, and the verbal noun *slánughadh*) intervene before this point is reached; a mere two intervene in C2a (the verbal noun *dealughadh* and the NP *a mac*). If, as I believe we should, the gap site in a pied-piping construction of this type is imagined as following the copula in the RC directly, the distance between the head and the re-activation site in both clauses is identical.

If distance from the head to the re-activation site is not a factor, the motivation for the use of the RP construction in preference to a gap structure probably lies in the accessibility of the head itself. The punctuation of my translation of C2 should have made clear that I take it to be a non-restrictive RC. The lady here is the Virgin Mary. In contrast, the five other examples of relativised prepositional predicates of *is áil* sentences are restrictive RCs. As mentioned earlier, it appears that non-restrictive RCs involve a heavier processing load than their restrictive counterparts. This distinction, I suggest, accounts for the distribution of RPs in the *is áil* PRCs discussed here.²⁶

26 RPs are not obligatory in all non-restrictive PRCs. This is of relevance in considering C2, where a non-restrictive RC has a RP. Contrast

Pedur, *dā tuc an Tigherna na dīnite mōra[-]so _*

'Peter' 'to + REL. PARTICLE' 'gave (3 SING.)' 'the Lord' 'these great dignities'

'Peter, to whom the Lord gave these great dignities'

(ll 2353-4)

It may be that copular RCs behave somewhat differently from non-copular RCs and have a lower threshold for the use of RPs. Cf. McCloskey's remarks (1990: 258 n. 41) on RPs in Modern Irish copular RCs. For non-restrictive direct object relatives in Modern Irish, see Hoyne 2016, 76-8.

For the same reasons as those advanced above with regard to *is áil* PRCs, I regard the re-activation site of RCs where the prepositional predicate of the phrases of the type *is le X Y* 'X owns Y/Y belongs to X' as occurring directly after the copula in the RC. For this reason again, distance from the head to the re-activation site could hardly motivate the use of a RP like that in C1. If so, then the accessibility of the head itself offers the most likely explanation for why the gap construction in C1a was dis-preferred.

C1a **an tí ler _ gach aoinní agus an talamh gona ceathraibh agus gona maitheasaibh*
'one' 'with + PAST COPULA' 'every single thing and the earth with its animals and its goods'

An tí 'he, whosoever, one' is an indefinite personal pronoun, characterised by very low accessibility.²⁷ One might wonder whether prosodic factors also played a role here, given that all forms of the copula and all simple prepositions are unstressed in Early Modern Irish. The unstressed combination *ler* in C1a would have to indicate the relationship of the RC to the head and the verb within the RC. In this instance, perhaps a RP is necessary for successful processing of the clause because too much semantic information would be encoded in an unstressed element. In this regard, it is worth noting here that RPs are not obligatory in all PRCs with the head *an tí*. There are two non-copular PRCs in *SBC* with the head *an tí* and these do not have RPs.

(21) *toil in tī ō tānac _*
'the will of him' 'from' 'I-came'
'the will of the one from whom I came'
(l. 2066)

(22) *don tī tre tionnluicther mē _*
'for him' 'through' 'is handed over (PASSIVE PRES.)' 'I/me'
'for the one through whom I am handed over'
(l. 3247)

EU has two examples of *an tí* functioning as the head of a copular PRC, neither of which contain a RP:

(23) *an tí dār chóir _ a bheith urramach dhó*
'one' 'to + COND. COPULA' 'proper' 'to be obedient to-him'
'one who owed him [the Emperor] obeisance'
(O'Rahilly 1949, ll 959-60)

(24) *an tí dār chóir _ mh'onōrughadh*
'one' 'to + COND. COPULA' 'proper' 'my honouring'
'him who ought to pay me obeisance'
(l. 1014)

In both of these the head is the prepositional predicate not of the copula alone but of the copula phrase *is cóir* 'is proper, should' (*is cóir do X Y* 'X should do Y'). Perhaps pied-piping with a gap is only possible when the VP following the head contains a stressed element.

Turning to CCS, 25 PRCs were identified, only one of which had a RP.²⁸

27 See Hoyne 2016, 70-2 for the low accessibility of *an té* (< earlier *an tī*) in Modern Irish direct object RCs.

28 No examples of possessive relatives with RPs were noted. The three examples of possessive RCs that occurred

C3 fer séghuinn sochinēlach ^{an Ruaidhrí[-]sin} *do imigh mōrān do thīrthuib an domain *7 ga robattar na tēngthacha coittchenna uile do meabair aicce*

'an excellent, high-born man' 'that Ruaidhrí' 'travelled many of the countries of the world' 'and' 'at + REL. PARTICLE' 'were (3 PL.)' 'all the common languages' 'of mind' 'at-him'

'that Ruaidhrí was an excellent, high-born man who travelled many of the countries of the world and who knew all the common languages [more literally, 'who had all the common languages learnt']²⁹

(Walsh 1920: 68-9)

The PRC in C3 could be analysed as an example of the double-use of a preposition (in this case *ag*) in a PRC (with the second instance being a prepositional pronoun referring back to the head) or as an instance of grammaticalised *agá* used as a relative particle introducing a RC with a RP.

What motivated the use of a RP in C3? The head of the PRC is the indefinite NP *fear séaghainn soichinéalach* 'an excellent, high-born man'. It is followed by the definite NP *an Ruaidhrí-sin* 'that Ruairí' (a single content word). Then begins the first RC of which *fear séaghainn soichinéalach* is the head, the subject RC *do imthigh mórán do thíorthaibh an domhain* 'who travelled many of the countries of the world'. This RC has a relatively complex NP (an indefinite NP made up of three content words) as its object. The head is re-activated as a gap in this RC. Then follows the RC which is of interest for the purposes of this paper. The subject of the PRC C3, *na teangthacha coitcheanna uile* 'all the common languages', is also a quite complex NP (a definite NP consisting of three content words). Between the head, then, and the point of re-activation within the PRC, twelve content words are processed, the greatest number of content words between a head and its re-activation site in a PRC in this text.³⁰ This in itself, of course, is only one measure of the processing load incurred between the head and the point in the PRC at which it is re-activated: of importance also is the fact that two RCs (one a subject RC, the other a PRC) must be processed between these points also.

In *EU*, 130 PRCs occur. Five of these have RPs.³¹

were all copular. E.g.

an t[-]ēnchonnasabal *as mō ainm* **7 orrdercas* *_*
 'the one constable' COPULA 'greatest' 'name' 'and' 'fame'
 'the [one] constable of greatest name and fame'
 (Walsh 1920, 66-7)

29 The editor translates this 'a noble, princely man was he; he travelled many of the countries of the world, and could speak all the common languages'.

30 Note that I am counting *-robhadar* [...] *do mheabhair*, i.e. the substantive verb and its prepositional predicate, as a single content word.

31 I note the following possessive relatives with RPs, the first of which is also a PRC:

tar aonmhac an impire Ghrēugaigh, *neoch ag a raibhe ar a chumas* *críocha *7 cineadhacha na cruinne go coimhiomlán do mhilleadh nó do mhóirleasughadh*
 'the one son of the Greek emperor' REL. PARTICLE 'at' REL. PARTICLE 'was (3 SING.)' 'on' 'his ability' 'lands and races of the earth' 'completely' 'to destroy' 'or' 'to greatly assist'
 'except the only son of the Greek Emperor, in whose power it was to destroy all the lands and races of the earth or to do them great good'
 (Il 1509-11)

an tí *agá bhfuil cloidheamh na heuccla ós cionn na cruinne go coimhiomlán ar iomchur aige, & nach bhfeudann tréun a thraothadh nó calmacht a chlaoidh nó cosgar a chomach*
 'one' [...] NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'can (3 SING.)' 'strength' 'his overthrowing' 'or' 'courage' 'his defeating' 'or' 'victory' 'his breaking'

C4 *7 *nách bhfuil* rí nā roithighearna nā diūice nā deughimpir ^{isin domhan} *nách lánéudáil leis a faghāil mar mhnaoi nó mar bhainchéile dhó fén*

'and that there is not' 'a king' 'nor' 'a great lord' 'nor' 'a duke' 'nor' 'a noble emperor' 'in the world'
NEG. PARTICLE + PRES. COPULA 'full-profit' 'with-him' 'to get her' 'as a woman' 'or' 'as a wife' 'for-himself'

'since there is no king or prince, no duke or emperor in the world but would deem it great profit to get her as wife'

(O'Rahilly 1949: ll 505-8)

C5 *go nach raibhe* fear freasdail nó friothōilmhe, feadhmantach nó fíorsgúille, *nār choisg cuid dá obair* *7 *dá fheadmantus de*

'until there was not' 'a man of waiting or attending' 'a steward' 'or' 'true-scullion' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'she-restrained' 'part of his work and of his stewardship' 'from-him'

'so that there was no waiter or servingman, no steward or scullion whom she did not relieve of part of his work'

(ll 1899-1901)

C6 *ní fhuil* críoch nō ceannadhach ^{inar ccomhghar} *nách bhfuil a fhios aca* an t-aithearrach deilbhe ina ndeachamar

'there is not' 'land' 'or' 'province' 'near us' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'is (3 SING.)' 'its knowledge' 'at-them' 'the change of shape in which we have gone'

'there is no land or province near us which does not know of our disguise [more literally, 'which does not know it, the change of shape into which we have gone']'

(ll 2715-17)

C7 an tí *agā bhfuil cloidheamh na heuccla ós cionn na cruinne go coimhiomlán ar iomchur aige*

'one' AGÁ 'is (3 SING.)' 'the sword of terror' 'over the world' 'completely' 'carried' 'by-him'

'he who carries the sword of terror suspended over the whole world'

(ll 4594-6)

C8 *ní raibhe* ceinél ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan ^{isin uile dhomhan} *nách raibhe dream ēigin isin ccathraigh* [-] *isin lé gach aoncheard díobh* [...]

'a type of music or performance or art' 'in the whole world' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'was (3 sing.)', 'some group' 'in that city' 'with every single trade of them'

'there was no kind of melody or music or minstrelsy in the whole world but there was in that city a band of its devotees [more lit. 'there was no kind of music or performance or art in the whole world that there wasn't some group in that city pursuing every single trade of them']'

(ll 4692-4)

C4 (copular PRC), C5 and C6 are negative PRCs in which the preposition occurs only once, combined with a RP in the RC itself. C7 could be analysed as an example of the double-preposition construction (the preposition *ag*) or as an example of grammaticalised *agá* as an introductory particle to the PRC with a RP in the RC itself. C8 will be discussed in more detail below.

'he who carries the sword of terror suspended above the whole world, he whom strength cannot overthrow, nor courage defeat, nor victory break'

(ll 4594-7)

C4, C5 and C6 all have indefinite heads and these heads are the semantic subject of negative existential sentences; in other words, these are things which do not exist. For the reasons outlined above with regard to *is áil* constructions, distance between the head and the re-activation site is unlikely to be a major motivating factor for the use of a RP in C4 (but note that the *éadail* 'profit' is compounded with *lán-* 'full' here); similarly, the distance between the gap and re-activation site in C6 is not great. Distance could be a contributing factor in C5 (three content words: *cuid* 'bit', *obair* 'work', *feadhmantas* 'stewardship'), but is by itself insufficient to explain why a RP was felt necessary to re-activate the head. Compare, for example,

(25) *ar na slighthibh sainreadhacha i n-ar lāindeimhin leó an t-impir *7 ardmhaithe na Gréige do ghabháil* _

'the main streets' 'in' PAST COPULA 'fully-certain' 'by-them' 'the emperor' 'and' 'the high-nobles of Greece' 'to go'

'the main streets on which they were quite sure that the Emperor and the nobles of Greece would pass'

(ll 1761-2)

in which there are seven content words (*lán-* 'full', *deimhin* 'certain', *an t-impir* 'the emperor', *ard-* 'high', *maithe* 'nobles', *Gréig* 'Greece', *gabháil* 'go') between the head and the gap site. Even the indefiniteness of the head is itself not the only factor contributing to low accessibility conditions at the re-activation site. Compare

(26) *slighthi *7 sainróid inar ccomhghoire ar a ttathaighit lucht margaidh *7 móircheannagheachta ōn chathraigh* _

'roads' 'and' 'highways' 'near us' 'on' REL. PARTICLE 'frequents (3 PL.)' 'people of market and great-commerce from the city'

'highways and roads frequented by merchants and market people from the city'

(ll 2067-8)

Like C4, C5 and C6 the head of Example 26 is an indefinite NP. Six content words intervene between the head and the gap site (*tathaighid* 'frequents (3 PL.)', *lucht* 'people', *margadh* 'market/buying and selling', *mór-* 'great', *ceannagheacht* 'commerce', *an chathair* 'the city'). I suggest that the fact that the heads of C4, C5 and C6 occur in negative existential clauses may be significant here: because they are said not to exist, they are less accessible than other indefinite PRC heads. Cf. A2 above. There is only one indefinite head in a negative existential sentence qualified by a PRC in *EU* which is not accompanied by a RP:

(27) *nách raibhe sa chruinne go comhlán rí nó roithighearna agar bh'fhearr dhi a beith* _ *inās*

'king' 'or' 'great-lord' 'at + COND. COPULA' 'better' 'for-her' 'her being' 'than him'

'that in the whole world there was no king or prince it would be better for her to wed ['to be with him, to be had by him'] than Partinotas'

(ll 1496-7)

This is similar to C4, though here the gap site is in a verbal noun phrase and not the prepositional predicate of a copular phrase. This difference in structure may be a factor (cf. footnote 26). Note also that the head of Example 27 is slightly less complex.

Reference has already been made to the low accessibility of *an tí* '(the) one, he, whosoever' (see C1 above). In *EU*, *an tí* alone is not sufficient to sanction a RP in a PRC. Two of the relevant counter-examples have already been cited (23 and 24 above). Note also

(28) an tī ar ar thréigios gach aoinneach don Ádhamhchloinn _
 'one' 'on' REL. PARTICLE + PAST VERBAL PARTICLE 'I-have-forsaken' 'every single person of
 the human race'
 'he for whom I have forsaken all others'
 (ll 1629-31)

(29) an tí dār dhlighis umhla *7 urraim do thabhairt _
 'one' 'to + PAST VERBAL PARTICLE' 'you-have-been-obliged' 'obedience' 'and' 'respect' 'to give'
 'one to whom thou owedst obedience'
 (l. 3767)

While the low accessibility of the head in C8 may contribute to the use of a RP, distance between the head and the re-activation site is also a factor. The head is the agent of the VP *aga bhfuil* [...] *ar iomchar* 'is... being carried'. Before the re-activation point in the RC is reached, six content words must be processed (*a-tá ... ar iomchar* 'is being carried', *cloidheamh* 'sword', *eagla* 'terror', *an chruinne* 'world', the intensifier *comh-* and *iomlán* 'total'). I suggest these factors contribute in combination to low accessibility at the point of re-activation in the RC.

C8 also features a RP: the prepositional pronoun *díobh* 'of them' refers back to the indefinite head (*ceinéal ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan* 'a type of music or performance or art'), itself the subject of a negative existential sentence. The phrase *gach aoinceard díobh* 'every single trade of them' in the RC itself is a nominal partitive referring back to the head. Unlike in the other PRCs we have examined so far, there is a mismatch between the head and the argument that re-activates it in the PRC. Consider the following two hypothetical examples, the first formulated as a gapped PRC, the second as a PRC with a RP:

C8a *ní raibhe ceinéal ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan ^{isin uile dhomhan} leis nach raibhe dream éigin isin gcathraigh-sin _
 'a type of music or performance or art' 'in the whole world' 'with' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'was (3 SING.)' 'some group' 'in that city'

C8b *ní raibhe ceinéal ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan ^{isin uile dhomhan} nach raibhe dream éigin isin gcathraigh-sin leó
 'a type of music or performance or art' 'in the whole world' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'was (3 SING.)' 'some group' 'in that city' 'with-them'

Both of these could be translated, 'there was not a type of music or performance or art in the whole world that some group in that city did not practice'. The re-activation site in the PRC is occupied by a gap in C8a and by a RP in C8b. Both the gap and the RP correspond perfectly with the head; they are co-referential with it. In contrast, in a partitive relative like C8 the relationship of the head to the RC requires both that the syntactic role of the head with regard to the verb in the RC (in this case, the head is a prepositional object governed by the preposition *le* 'with') must be identified and also a partitive relationship to the head must be established. This means that in a partitive PRC the head can never be represented by a gap: a partitive nominal phrase + *de* 'of' is required. In the present instance, a pied-piping construction with the preposition *le* (C8c) is impossible because of the non-identity of the head and the prepositional object of the RC. The fronting of the partitive preposition *de* (C8d) is presumably too complex to process successfully in a timely fashion, though a case could be made for ambiguity being a decisive factor.

C8c *ní raibhe ceinéal ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan ^{isin uile dhomhan} leis nach raibhe dream éigin isin gcathraigh-sin le gach aoinceard díobh

'a type of music or performance or art' 'in the whole world' 'with' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'was (3 SING.)' 'some group in that city' 'every single trade of them'

C8d *ní raibhe ceinéal ciúil nó oirfididh nó ealadhan ^{isin uile dhomhan} dá nach raibhe dream éigin isin gcathraigh-sin le gach aoinceard

'a type of music or performance or art' 'in the whole world' 'of + REL. PARTICLE' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'was (3 SING.)' 'some group in that city' 'with every single trade'

C8 is the only example of a partitive PRC in *EU*, but I have noted the following examples in the Early Modern Irish translation of an English-language version of the Book of Maundeville made in 1475 by Fíngín Ó Mathghamhna (Stokes 1899), a text of Type B:

(30) *Atatt .u. oilēin .x. & dā .xx. ara fuil rí ar cach oilén díb*

'is (3 PL.)' 'fifteen islands' 'and' 'two twenties' 'on' REL. PARTICLE 'is (3 SING.)' 'king' 'on' 'every island of-them'

'There are two score and fifteen islands, over each of which is a king'

(pp 256-7)

(31) *Ataat dā tír .x. & trī fichit ^{fa rí na h-Innía}, ara fuil rí ar cach tír díb*

'is (3 PL.)' 'twelve countries' 'and' 'three twenties' 'under the king of India' 'on' REL. PARTICLE 'king' 'on' 'every country of-them'

'over each of which is a king'

(pp 286-7)

Note the double-use of the preposition *ar* 'on' in both examples from the Maundeville translation. In C8, the preposition *le* 'with' only occurs once. If C8 were not negative, one would expect either *le* or the relative marker *aga* to occur after the head of the PRC, but these can be omitted when the head is followed by a negative verbal particle.

Three PRCs with RPs occur in *TC* from a total of 168 PRCs examined.³²

32 The relative particle *agá* is used to introduce all non-copular possessive RCs in this text. See, for example

aonchorp cumaisgthe *agá bhfoil Críosa* 'na chionn

'a single composite body' AGÁ 'is (3 SING.)' 'Christ' 'in its head'

'a single composite body of which Christ is the head'

(ll 419-20)

For other examples, see ll 1210-11, 1677-8, 2460-1, 2463-4, 2660, 2670-1, 2973-4. Note also the following so-called 'double relative', in which the head is re-activated within the complement clause of a verb in the RC:

dochum an uile neitheadh do chreideamh agá bhfoillseócha an Eaglas gurab cóir a chreideamh

'in order to believe all the things' AGÁ 'will reveal' 'the Church' 'that + PRES. COPULA' 'proper' 'its believing'

'in order to believe everything that the Church reveals that it is proper to believe'

(ll 1006-7).

Note the variation in the (non-)use of possessive RPs in the two following clauses. In the first, a possessive pronoun in the non-finite VP *ag léaghadh* 'reading' refers back to the head, in the second there is a gap in the non-finite VP *do chur i bhfaoisidin* 'to put into confession'.

an ní *agá ccaiththear aimsear fhada agā léghadh*

'the thing' AGÁ 'is spent (PASSIVE)' 'a long time' 'at its reading'

C10 *iarrmaoid ar Dhia ar n-arán díleas féin, .i. ní agá mbia ceart againn chuige, gan chuid duine oile do leigean go hégcórach chugaind*
 'we-ask' 'of God' 'our own proper bread' 'i.e.' 'something' AGÁ 'is (3 SING.)' 'a right' 'at-us' 'to-it'
 'without yielding to us another person's portion unjustly'
 'we ask God for our own proper bread, i.e. something that we have a right to, without allowing us to have unjustly that which belongs to someone else'
 (Mac Raghnaill 1979, ll 1372-3)

C11 *do neamhthoil an té lérab leis é*
 'by the non-will' 'he' 'with + PRES. COPULA' 'with-him' 'it'
 'without the consent of him to who owned it/to whom it belonged'
 (l. 2257)

C12 *peacadh agā bhfaicthea dhó maith éigin do bheith ann*
 'a sin' AGÁ 'is-seen (PASSIVE PRES.)' 'to-him' 'some good' 'to be' 'in-it'
 'a sin in which there appears to him to be some good'
 (l. 2351)

The distance between the head and the re-activation site in C10 is not particularly great and it would appear likely that it is the low accessibility of the head itself (*ní* 'something') which is key to the use of the RP here. There are, however, three other examples of indefinite *ní* functioning as the head of a PRC without a RP in the RC:

(32) *más ní é ar nách biadh breith _ uair oile*
 'if-is (PRES. COPULA)' 'something' 'it' 'on' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'would-be (3 SING.)'
 'catching' 'another time'
 'if it is something that could not be gotten another time'
 (l. 1396)

(33) *gealladh do thabhairt do Dhia fá ní mhaith ar a mbia buidheachas ag Dia _ do dhēnamh*
 'to give a promise to God' 'about a good thing' 'on' REL. PARTICLE 'will (3 SING.)' 'gratitude' 'at God' 'to do'
 'to give a promise to God about doing a good thing because of which God will be grateful'

(not *an ní *caiththea aimsear fhada ag léaghadh* _)
 'the thing that a lot of time is spent reading'
 (ll 1869-70)

na peacaidh *ar nár chuimhnigh neach do chor* _ a bhfaoisidin
 (not *na peacaidh *nár chuimhnigh neach ar a gcor i bhfaoisidin*)
 'the sins' 'on' NEG. VERBAL PARTICLE 'remembered' 'anyone' 'to put' 'into confession'
 'the sins which anyone did not remember to confess'

In the former, *ag léaghadh* 'reading' is adverbial to *caiththea aimsear fhada* 'a long time is spent'. The head is the object of the verbal noun *léaghadh*. In the latter, *peacaidh* is the object of the non-finite VP *do chur i bhfaoisidin* 'to put into confession' and a prepositional object of the verb in the RC *cuidhnighidh*.

I only note one non-copular possessive RC:

nach foil daoine as measa fortúin _
 'that there are not' 'people' COPULA 'worse' 'fortune'
 'that there are not people whose fortune is worse'
 (ll 2973-4).

(ll 1981-3)

(34) *a ngioll ar ní éigin oile ina mbiadh tarbha _ nó aoibhneas _*
'on account of' 'something else' 'in + REL. PARTICLE' 'would be (3 SING.)' 'benefit' 'or' 'joy'
'because of something which would give benefit or joy'
(ll 2356-7)

It is difficult to detect any great difference in the accessibility of the head at the re-activation point in the RC between these three clauses and C10a

C10a *ní *dochum a mbia ceart againn _*

It is possible that we are dealing with very subtle differences of accessibility. One might note that the PRC in C10 is followed by a long non-finite VP and that the use of a RP in the PRC may have been motivated by a perceived need to resolve this clause in a timely fashion before beginning the processing of the following VP; in contrast to C10, little or nothing needs to be processed before the end of the sentence in Examples 32, 33 and 34. Alternatively, perhaps we should bear in mind that we do not have to do here with fixed grammatical rules. A certain amount of variation in the (non-)usage of RPs is perhaps to be expected. A RP is motivated by low accessibility in C10, but is not necessarily obligatory: the accessibility is not so low that C10a would be impossible. The claim made in the present paper is merely that RPs will be found in low-accessibility contexts. I do not claim that the usage of RPs in all such contexts is governed by strict rules. Certain RCs may produce conditions in which the accessibility of the head at the re-activation site is so low that a RP is mandatory for successful processing of the RC. In other less complex relativised structures, we may expect some variation and overlap between the gap and RP strategies.

For C11, see the discussion of C1 above.

The head of C12 is an indefinite NP (low on the accessibility hierarchy), but more noticeable here is the structural complexity.

C12a *peacadh *ina bhfaicthear dhó maith éigin do bheith _*
'a sin' 'in + REL. PARTICLE' 'is seen (PASSIVE)' 'to-him' 'some good to be'

Maith éigin do bheith ann 'some good to be in it' can be analysed grammatically as the subject of the passive verb *-faicthear* 'is seen' and also as a non-finite complement clause to the passive verb, that is, as the non-finite equivalent of

C12b *peacadh *agá bhfaicthear dhó go bhfuil maith éigin ann*
'a sin' AGÁ 'is seen' 'to-him' 'that' 'is (3 SING.)' 'some good' 'in-it'
'in which he sees that there is some good'

Both C12a and C12b are more structurally complex than a PRC like

C12c *peacadh *ina bhfuil maith éigin _*
'a sin' 'in + REL. PARTICLE' 'is (3 SING.)' 'some good'
'a sin in which there is some good'

C12a and C12b require relativisation across a verb of the class of *verba dicendi et sentiendi* into the complement clause of that verb. In other words, the re-activation site is more deeply embedded

syntactically in C12 than in C12c. I would like to suggest that the structural complexity caused by the complement clause structure in C12 makes the RC more costly in terms of processing and that this greater processing load motivates the use of a RP in C12.³³

CONCLUSION

In the present paper, I have argued, based on a small corpus of examples from Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish, that RPs are employed in PRCs that are difficult to process. The more difficult it is to re-activate the head at the point in the RC where it must be processed again, the more likely it is that a RP will occur. Conversely, we would not expect to encounter a RP in a RC which is easy to process; if the head is easily re-activated at the point in the RC where it must be processed again, a RP should not occur. If this explanation of RP distribution in PRCs in Irish is accepted, the evidence of PRCs in Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish can be added to the evidence gleaned from other languages that RPs are used cross-linguistically as an aid to the timely processing of PRCs that would otherwise be too costly in terms of processing. I am aware that many issues regarding resumption in Irish have been explored only superficially in the present paper. In particular, the diachronic picture is wanting. It remains to be determined, for example, when *agá* became grammaticalised, and how the pied-piping strategy with a gap became marginal in Modern Irish.³⁴ More ambitious studies with large corpora will be required to answer these questions. Nonetheless, it is my hope that I have sketched the general lines along which a satisfying account of resumption in RCs in Irish might be formulated. While I do not rule out the possibility that other factors besides accessibility may play a secondary role in PRC formation, I do believe that accessibility factors rather than ambiguity lie behind the distribution of RPs and gaps in RCs.

REFERENCES

- Ariel, Mira (1988): "Referring and Accessibility". *Journal of Linguistics*. 24: 65–87.
- Ariel, Mira (1991): "The Function of Accessibility in a Theory of Grammar". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 16: 443–63.
- Ariel, Mira (1999): "Cognitive universals and linguistic conventions: the case of resumptive pronouns". *Studies in Language*. 23: 217–69.
- Ariel, Mira (2008): *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.

³³ Cf. the following direct object RC with a RP in a complement clause:

na neithe *agár cóir dhúinn dóthchas do bheith againn go bhfoigheam iad*
 'the things' AGÁ + PAST COPULA 'proper' 'for-us' 'to have hope' 'at-us' 'that' 'we-will-get' 'them'
 'the things that we should hope that we will have them'
 (ll 183–4)

Another example occurs at ll 11554–6. Cf. the possessive 'double relative' in footnote 32.

The issues posed by relativisation into a subordinate clause could be analysed in terms of syntactic islands. See McCloskey 1985 for a very clear and readable analysis of Modern Irish 'double relatives' in these terms. In the present paper, I am advocating a psycholinguistic perspective on the issues involved in RP usage, but there is nothing in this approach that necessarily contradicts the insights gleaned by, for example, the generative grammatical approach to these issues. The focus and terminology differs, but the evidence derived by both approaches with regard to, for example, island constraints, can overlap. For discussion, see Phillips and Wagers 2007.

³⁴ I presume we have to do here with patterns of usage gradually becoming grammaticalised over time. See Ariel 2008 and Hawkins 2004.

- Bergin, Osborn (1931): *Trí Bior-ghaoithe an Bháis*. 2nd edition. Dublin: RIA.
- Bergin, Osborn, Best, R.I. (1938): “Tochmarc Étaíne”. *Ériu*. 12: 137-96.
- Binchy, Daniel (1978): *Corpus Iuris Hibernici*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Breatnach, Liam (2005): *A Companion to the Corpus Iuris Hibernici*. Dublin: DIAS.
- DIL = Dictionary of the Irish Language based mainly on Old and Middle Irish materials* (1913-75). Ed. by E.G. Quin et al. Dublin: RIA.
- Dunn, Charles W. (1957): Review of O’Rahilly 1949. *Speculum*. 32: 849-52.
- Hawkins, John A. (1999): “Processing complexity and filler-gap dependencies across grammars”. *Language*. 75: 244-85.
- Hawkins, John A. (2004): *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hofmeister, Philip and Norcliffe, Elisabeth (2013): “Does resumption facilitate sentence comprehension?”. *The Core and the Periphery: data-driven perspectives on syntax inspired by Ivan A. Sag*. Ed. by Philip Hofmeister and Elisabeth Norcliffe. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 225-46.
- Hoyne, Mícheál (2016): “Structural ambiguity and resumptive pronouns: the pragmatics of the transitive 'direct' and 'indirect' relatives in Modern Irish”. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics*. 17: 31-95.
- Hughes, Ian (1991): *Stair Nicoméid: the Irish Gospel of Nicodemus*. London: Irish Texts Society.
- Keenan, Edward and Comrie, Bernard (1977). “Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar”. *Linguistic enquiry*. 8: 63-99.
- Kelly, Fergus (2000): *Early Irish Farming*. Revised edition. Dublin: DIAS.
- Kimpton, Bettina (2009): *The Death of Cú Chulainn: a critical edition of the earliest version of Brislech Mór Maige Muirthemni with introduction, translation, notes, bibliography and vocabulary*. Maynooth: School of Celtic Studies, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- Mac Aogáin, Parthalán (1968): *Graiméir Ghaeilge na mBráthar Mionúr*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid (1971): “Tír cumaile”. *Ériu*. 22: 81-6.
- Mac Raghnaill, Fearghal (1976). *An Teagasg Críosdaidhe*. Dublin: DIAS.
- McCloskey, James (1985): “The Modern Irish double relative and syntactic binding”. *Ériu*. 36: 45-84.
- McCloskey, James (1990): “Resumptive pronouns, Ā-binding and levels of representation in Irish”. *The Syntax of the Modern Celtic Languages*. Ed. by Randall Hendrick. San Diego: Academic Press, 199-248.

- McCone, Kim (1985): “The Würzburg and Milan Glosses: our earliest sources of 'Middle Irish'”. *Ériu*. 36: 85-106.
- McManus, Damian (1994): “An Nua-Ghaeilge Chlasaiceach”. *Stair na Gaeilge in ómós do P[h]ádraig Ó Fiannachta*. Ed. by Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó Háinle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach. Maigh Nuad: Roinn na Sea-Ghaeilge, Coláiste Phádraig, 335-446.
- Meyer, Kuno (1901): “Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften”. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*. 3: 226-63.
- Moravcsik, Edith (2006): *An Introduction to Syntactic Theory*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Ó Buachalla, Breandán (1983): “The prepositional relative clause in SE-Ulster Irish”. *Celtica*. 15: 69-77.
- Ó Maonaigh, Cainneach (1944): *Smaointe Beatha Chríost*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Ó hUiginn, Ruairí (2013): “A note on relative marking in Irish”. *The Land beneath the Sea*. Ed. by Pamela O'Neill. Sydney: the University of Sydney, 163-9.
- O'Rahilly, Cecile (1949): *Eachtra Uilliam: an Irish version of William of Palerne*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Phillips, Colin and Wagers, Matthew (2007): “Relating structure and time in linguistics and psycholinguistics”. *Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. Ed. by M. Gareth Gaskell. Oxford: OUP.
- Pokorny, Julius (1925): *Altirische Grammatik*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Stokes, Whitley (1899): 'The Gaelic Maundeville'. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*. 2: 1-63, 226-301.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf (1946): *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: DIAS.
- Uhlich, Jürgen (2013): “Zum Artikelgebrauch beim Bezugswort eines Relativsatzes im frühen Irischen”. *Saltair saíochta, sanasaíochta agus seanchais: a festschrift for Gearóid Mac Eoin*. Dublin: Four Courts, 429-62.
- Walsh, Paul (1920): *Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne: an account of the Mac Sweeney families in Ireland, with pedigress*. Dublin: Dollard, Printinghouse.

Mícheál Hoyne
Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies