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**Abstract:** Middle Breton presents a singular anomaly of pronominal argument coding. Objects are accusative m(eso)/proclitics save in two constructions where coding is split by person, 3rd unique enclitics ~ 1st/2nd accusative m/proclitics. The constructions are HAVE, deriving from Insular Celtic *mihi est*, where the new coding replaces nominatives coded by verbal inflection (Lat. *mihi est* ~ *sunt* type); and imperatives, where it replaces accusatives coded by V1-sensitive clisis (Fr. *aide-moi* ~ *ne m'aide pas* type). Innovative varieties of Breton extend accusatives throughout. This work traces the evolution of *mihi est* and imperative constructions in light of a crosslinguistic construction type that reveals the underlying nature of the anomalous coding: noncanonical subject + 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative object. It proceeds through: (1) Decomposition of HAVE as dative clitic + BE *mihi est* from Brythonic throughout "conservative" varieties of Breton. (2) Breton-Cornish innovation of nonclitic datives for *mihi est* and their subjecthood. (3) Breton-Cornish loss of agreement with nominative objects, leading to replacement of inflected forms of BE by independent and then encliticised pronouns, converging with accusatives objects of the V1 imperative. (4) Middle Breton alignment of imperatives with *mihi est* in 3rd person nominative objects. (5) Middle Breton emergence of latent 1st/2nd person accusatives upon shift from meso- to proclisis shift and grammaticalisation of the HAVE-perfect. (6) Transition to accusative coding of all objects in innovative varieties, whereby dative-nominative *mihi est* shifts to dative-accusative and rarely nominative-accusative *habeo*, speaking to conditions on nominative-accusative interactions in theories of case.

1 **Introduction**

This work traces the development of HAVE from its origin in the *mihi est* construction of Brythonic to its reanalysis as *habeo* in Modern Breton, along with that of imperatives insofar as they bear on it. It is organised around the singularly anomalous argument coding of these two constructions in Middle Breton (MB) and later "conservative" varieties:

(1) Pronominal subject and object coding in MB (using 1SG, 2PL, 3PL)

---

* Comments very welcome: milan_rezac@yahoo.ca.

1 Sources and their codes are given in the Appendix. Leipzig glossing is used save as follows: (i) First line respects source orthography in standard transcription, with ¶ verse or line-break and § strophe-break when relevant. (ii) In the gloss line, affixes (usually united in the first line) are attached by ., while clitics (usually separated in the first line) by =. (iii) The following conventions identify the dependent pronouns of interest: (a) verb.suffix, preposition.suffix; (b) meso/proclitic=, but meso/proclitic= when accusative, dative (syncretic throughout), or genitive (syncretic in Breton save 3SGM when genitive is glossed GEN); (c) host=enclitic, but =enclitic when coding objects. (iv) With finite verbs, 3SG/default, present, and indicative are usually not glossed; otherwise abbreviations distinct from Leipzig are † imperative or jussive, CNS consuetudinal, COND conditional, D- the de-prefix of HAVE, PST past, PT preterit, R preverbal particle; (v) underline signals features of interest, here nominative suffixes. Clarified below are elements of the verbal complex (*R*=:, section 3.2, (=),section 5.5) and HAVE (*be* and D-, section 3.3-4, here only dubbed *have* for clarity). Reference are deferred to later detailed discussion, e.g. the *habeo* analysis of HAVE in MB in sections 5, 8.
By and large, coding of weak-pronoun arguments in Breton is familiar from its Brythonic cognates, only more categorical: subjects are nominative suffixes to the finite verb, objects are accusative clitics infixed in or prefixed to the verbal complex, and both are in complementarity distribution with independent (pro)nominals. However, in MB, HAVE and imperative constructions are idiosyncratic. The coding of their objects is striking from the historical-comparative perspective: it is split by person, 1st/2nd by accusative clitics and 3rd by enclitics that do not otherwise code arguments. This object coding goes hand-in-hand with a more familiar but likewise unique coding of subjects in these constructions. With HAVE, it is by what seem to be accusative clitics, but doubling rather than complementary with independent subjects. With imperatives, it is by verbal suffixes only, in close contrast to jussives which allow independent subjects and code objects regularly. The typological-comparative perspective offers useful parallels built on below, but at first sight, the system is surprising as well: alternations in clisis directionality are usually conditioned by factors that do not figure here at all (finiteness, tense, mood, verb-initiality), or do so in an unexpected fashion (1st/2nd person pronouns in higher clausal positions than 3rd).

Several aspects of these anomalies are fairly understood historically. One is use of accusative clitics to code the subjects of HAVE across Brythonic: the forms of HAVE go back the *mihi est* syntagm 'Y (dative) is X (nominative)', and dative clitics were syncretic with accusative ones in Brythonic – though it is usually thought that by MB, *mihi est* had become *habeo*, 'Y (nominative) has X (accusative)'. Another is coding of pronominal objects as enclitics in positive imperatives, because they lacked a leftward host for the accusative mesoclitics of Brythonic – though by MB, this coding had spread to negative imperatives which had the needed host, and mesoclistis had mostly given way to proclisis.

Only partly described, and not yet traced in development, is the use of these selfsame object enclitics for the possessum of *mihi est* in Middle Breton and Cornish, rather than of inflected forms of BE as in Middle Welsh; their restriction to 3rd person with *mihi est*, and extension of this restriction to imperatives in MB alone; and the MB recruitment of accusative clitics to code 1st/2nd person objects of both constructions. What we expect historically for MB is HAVE constructions like *-m biont* =1SG=be.PT.3PL 'they were to me, I had them', ≈ Middle Welsh *-m buant*, but we get rather *-m boa-y*; and imperative
constructions like *goloit-ny/y 'cover!2PL=1PL/3PL', as in Middle Cornish and in certain varieties of Breton, while we get MB *hon goloit ~ goloit-y.

The key to these developments lies in nominative objects of systems where nominative is the case not only of canonical subjects, but also of objects in constructions with noncanonical subjects, centrally oblique-subject unaccusatives like *mihi est. These objects reveal the case-based nature of the split-person coding, as 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative, and the parameters behind its development, such as loss of agreement with nominative objects and their extension to imperatives. Taking this parallelism as point of departure, this work traces the development of *mihi est and imperative constructions.

It is organised into four parts. This introductory part continues in section 2 with an overview of nominative objects, and section 3 with a sketch of Breton morphosyntax.

The second part focuses on dative subjects of *mihi est. Section 4 traces the development of the remnant dative clitics of Brythonic, establishing that old *mihi est forms continue to be decomposed into clitic + BE throughout conservative varieties of Breton, and may have even remarked dative case through the de-prefix characteristic of Breton-Cornish. Section 5 follows the innovation of independent counterparts to dative clitics in Breton-Cornish from their origin as clause-external nominals linked to dative resumptives. Their grammaticalisation as oblique subjects derives their unique "agreement" in both finite and nonfinite clauses as clitic doubling, and it in turn explains new V1 forms of *mihi est.

The third part turns to the objects of *mihi est. Section 6 derives the Breton-Cornish replacement of inflected forms of BE by enclitics from nonagreement with nominative objects, "unblocking" independent pronouns that then encliticised, and converged with accusatives "unblocked" in imperatives due to the absence of a clitic host in V1. In Middle Breton, the two object types collapsed in nominative objects with their 3rd person restriction and adopted distinctive forms. They were complemented by accusative clitics for 1st/2nd person, latent in the system but awaiting means to realise them: replacement of meso- by proclitics and grammaticalisation of the HAVE-perfect, studied in section 7.

The last part in sections 8 and 9 completes the history of *mihi est with its evolution to habeo. Most innovative varieties turn out only to transition from dative-nominative to dative-accusative and few continue to nominative-accusative. Both these latter stages shed light on the theory of case through the interaction of nominative → accusative object case with nominative characteristics of the subject in morphology and syntax.

2 *Mihi est and nominative objects

Breton HAVE descends from the *mihi est construction, combining BE with oblique possessor and nominative possessum (Benveniste 1966, Heine 1997, Bauer 2000). We will be concerned with the subtype where the oblique is the subject and the nominative object, i.e. an oblique-nominative unaccusative. Such unaccusatives offer analogues to the Breton 3rd person restriction on object-coding enclitics, of their alternation with 1st/2nd person accusatives, and of the extension of this coding to other anomalous-subject constructions. The closest to Breton is Finnish for both *mihi est and imperative (Rezac 2019).

Finnish mostly has a typical nominative-accusative system. The nominative subject can be in the canonical subject position high in the clause, and then must control person and

---

2 Henceforth, dative-nominative etc. is to be read as dative-subject – nominative-object, while dative+nominative etc. makes no assertions about subject/objecthood.
number agreement. It can also be in lower positions, and then controls agreement if 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} but not 3\textsuperscript{rd} person. Certain unaccusatives take oblique subjects, including the allative possessor with BE. A lower nonoblique is then nominative but has objecthood properties: a nominative object. Nominative objects cannot control agreement if 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, and are not licensed at all if 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person; in their stead, there appear 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person accusatives.\(^3\)

(2) Nominative vs. oblique subject in Finnish (neutral word order)

\textit{Transitive with agreeing nominative subject and accusative object}

Minä näen \{sen | ne | sinut\}

1SG.NOM see.1SG 3SG.ACC 3PL.NOM/ACC 2SG.ACC

I see it | them | you. [≈ MB: …\{en | o | -z\} guelan]

\textit{BE with agreeing nominative subject and lower allative}

\{Sinä olet heillä | Ne ovat heillä\}

2SG.NOM be.2SG 3PL.ANIM.ALL 3PL.NOM be.3PL 3PL.ANIM.ALL

You | They are with them. [≈ MB: …\{out | int\} gante]

\textit{HAVE qua BE with 3\textsuperscript{rd} person possessum object = nonagreeing nominative}

Heillä on \{se | ne | kirjat\}

3PL.ANIM.ALL be.3SG \{3SG.NOM | 3PL.NOM/ACC books.NOM\}

They have \{it | these books\}. [≈ MB: …o deus \{eff | y\}]

\textit{HAVE qua BE with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person possessum object = *nominative → accusative}

*Heillä olet (sinä) → Heillä on sinut

3PL.ANIM.ALL be.2SG 2SG.NOM be.3SG 2SG.ACC

She has you. [≈ MB: *…o deus-te → …o deus da if followed by participle]

True or addressee-directed imperatives, whose subjects have certain syntactically unusual properties, also code the objects of transitives in this way, while by contrast 3\textsuperscript{rd}-person-directed jussives have regular subject and object morphosyntax:

(3) Imperative versus jussive argument coding in Finnish

\textit{True imperative (NOM + 3.NOM~1/2.ACC, subject syntax special)}

(*Te) tuokaa \{se | minut\}

\(^3\) The analysis of Finnish closely follows Kiparsky (2001), notably for the nominative vs. accusative nature of the object case (transparent but debated), the subjecthood of the oblique with HAVE (transparent and agreed-on, save that Finnish belongs to systems where empty categories resist obliques, limiting test), and the link of split-person object coding with anomalous subject coding also in imperatives but not jussives (as well as in the arbitrary impersonal and 1PL use but not generic impersonal; the Breton impersonal syntactically behaves as the latter and is not relevant here, Rezac and Jouitteau 2015). Holmberg (2005) supplements the familiar nonagreement of low 3\textsuperscript{rd} person nominative subjects with agreement of low 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person ones (on such position or movement-dependent agreement for 3\textsuperscript{rd} but not 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person, see Brandi and Cordin 1989, and cf. D’Alessandro and Roberts 2010). Systems similar to Finnish are discussed in Timberlake (1979). The "PCC" analysis and link with Breton follows Rezac (2004a: ch. 5, 2011: ch. 5, 2019), Jouitteau and Rezac (2008), discussing elements omitted here, such as 3\textsuperscript{rd} person animate/logophoric pronouns in Finnish.
(2PL.NOM) bring!2PL {3SG.NOM | 1SG.ACC}  
(You) bring {it | me}. [= MB: {digasit eff | ma digasit}]

Jussive (NOM-ACC, subject syntax as elsewhere)  
(He) tuokoot {sen | minut}  
(3PL.NOM) bring!3PL {3SG.ACC | 1SG.ACC}  
Let them bring {it | me}. [= MB: {e | ma} digasent]

The person and number restrictions on nominative objects are familiar from other systems. These reveal the extent of variation in constructions, agreement, and codability of 1st/2nd person, all illustrated by Icelandic. Icelandic is also largely a nominative-accusative system. The nominative subject of simple unaccusatives may appear high and low. Beside such simple unaccusatives, there are oblique-nominaive unaccusatives, where the oblique has subjecthood and the nominative objecthood properties. As in Finnish, 1st/2nd person nominative objects cannot control agreement, but unlike in Finnish, they are unavailable (with agreement) or degraded (otherwise). 3rd person nominative objects control agreement in some varieties, "A", but not others, "C". Imperatives have accusative objects.4

(4) Dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic "A"

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dative subject + 3rd person nominative object} \\
\text{Henni \{leiddust | ??leiddist\} þeir} \\
3SGF \text{ bore.PST.3PL|3SG} \text{ 3SG.NOM} \\
\text{They bored her.} \quad \text{(Taraldsen 1995: 307-9; \`leiddist in "C")}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dative subject + 1st/2nd person nominative object} \\
\text{Henni \{*leiddumst | ??leiddust | ??leiddist\} við} \\
3SGF \text{ bore.PST.1PL|3PL|3SG} \text{ 1PL.NOM} \\
\text{We bored her.} \quad \text{(Taraldsen 1995: 307-9)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ditto in a control infinitive} \\
\text{Við \text{vönumst til að leiddast \{hún \ | \*hið\} ekki} \\
1PL.NOM \text{ hope.1PL for to bore.INF 3SGF.NOM | 2PL.NOM not} \\
\text{We hope not to be bored with you.} \quad \text{(Bobaljik 2008: 319n27, \* is ? for some, cf. Holmberg and Sigurðsson 2008: 271)}
\end{align*}
\]

The specification of the person restrictions to nominative objects is brought out by: its absence with nominative subjects even when low (in Icelandic "A" and "C" both); with oblique-subject unaccusatives that have oblique or PP coarguments (the object of \text{lika 'DAT like NOM' cannot be 1st/2nd person, but that of its synonym \text{lika við 'DAT like against ACC'})

can, Maling and Jónsson 1995); with oblique-subject unaccusatives that take accusative objects (the next developmental stage of *ília*, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012, cf. section 8 here); and with similar nominative + dative unaccusatives in systems where the nominative is the subject (German *gefallen* 'like', Zaenen et al. 1983).

Not all *mihi est* constructions have a person restriction on the possessum. Contrasts like that between Icelandic and German and among Icelandic verbs suggest that the restriction is absent for nominatives that can be subjects in a certain relevant sense. However, this remains to be established for systems such as Latin (see Baldi and Nutti 2001, cf. Baðdal et al. 2012 for uncertainty about subjecthood, and Fedriani 2014: 4.2 for available tests):

(5)  *Mihi est* in Latin

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. ut tu mihi es} & \quad \text{b. tibi sunt gemini} \\
\text{as 2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT be.2SG} & \quad \text{2SG.DAT be.3PL twins.NOM.PL} \\
\text{as you are mine} & \quad \text{you have twins} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Plautus, early Latin)

The current state of research indicates that there is a widespread restriction to 3rd person nominative and absolutive objects in certain constructions with anomalous, especially oblique, subjects (Kiparsky 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2017b, Rezac 2011, 2019). This restriction will be called the Person-Case Constraint or PCC here, using a term introduced in Bonet (1991) for superficially different phenomena, but sometimes applied to Icelandic and Finnish. Here, it is a convenient term, not a commitment to unification with other phenomena called the PCC. There is variation in (i) the agreement of 3rd person nominative objects in such structures (Icelandic "A" vs. "C", Finnish); the availability of accusative for 1st/2nd person objects (Icelandic vs. Finnish); which anomalous-subjects constructions are characterised by this object coding (Finnish vs. Latin for *mihi est*, Finnish vs. Icelandic for imperatives). We will see all of this variation play out in the diachrony of Breton, deriving such contrasts as object coding by nominative suffixes in MW and by enclitics in MB-MC from the (un)availability of object agreement.

3 Relevant elements of Breton

3.1 History and dialects

This section sketches the relevant elements of Breton, with details and references left to when they become relevant. The common ancestor of the Brythonic languages is Proto-British (≈ -7C), branching into Old South-West Brythonic and Old Welsh (OSWB, phrases, OW, brief texts, ≈ 8-11C). The term Brythonic is used here for these stages. OW continues to Middle Welsh (MW, extensive texts mid-13C-), OSWB to Middle Cornish (verse late 14C-), and Middle Breton (MB, brief/extensive texts 14C-/16C-). Middle Breton texts show limited dialectal differentiation. It surfaces upon transitions to early Modern Breton (eNB, mid-17C-, following an orthographical reform). Traditional classification of eNB varieties follows bishoprics: Kerne (K), Leon (L), Treger (T), often patterning together (KLT), against the distinctive varieties of Gwened (W; it is further convenient to use clW for the language of 18-19C texts and grammars based on south-eastern varieties, and prefix
compass points as needed, e.g. w(est)/c(entral)W). During 18-19C eNB, regular accusative object coding changed in KLT; its loss by late 19C is here the starting point for Modern Breton (NB; usually from early 19C). Here, varieties with the split-person coding for objects of *mihi est* are called conservative, and these always have the old coding of accusative objects as well; those that align objects of *mihi est* with accusative objects are innovative; some are both. It is the conservative varieties that are of chief interest: MB, earlier eNB-KLT, and W of all periods. 

3.2 Clausal morphosyntax

The verbal complex and periphrastic constructions of MB are summarised below. They mostly remain in conservative varieties. MC is similar, somewhat less so MW.

(6) Verbal complex in MB (synthetic)

\[(C=) (R=) (NEG=) ((=)pron\text{ACC}/\text{GEN}=) (em-) V_{\text{FIN:suffix,NOM}} / V_{\text{INF}} (=\text{pronDBL,NOM})\]

*C=:* certain complementisers attached to the verbal complex, such as *pa(n)*L 'when', and in early MB also *ha* 'and'.

*NEG=:* high negation *ne*\(^L\), *na(c)*\(^L\) with finite verbs.

*\(R=:* verbal particle: finite: *ra*\(^L\)/*da*\(^L\) (optative); *a*\(^L\) (preverbal or relativised nominal argument); *e(z)*\(^M\) (elsewhere, but also \(\emptyset\) between predicate and BE); \(R\) is excluded by NEG (always), \(C\) (varies), and proclitics (always, alongside *e(z) → en*).

*\(R=:* verbal particle: infinitive: \(\emptyset\) or *da*\(^L\) = preposition 'to'.

*\(=\text{pron}=\): pronominal object clitics, proclitic (*pron*) or mesoclitic (*=\text{pron}=*).

*\(=\text{pron}\):* pronominal object enclitics and doubling enclitics.

*em=:* reflexive prefix

(7) MB periphrastic constructions: auxiliary \(V_{\text{FIN}} / V_{\text{INF}}\) of the verbal complex + nonfinite lexical verb, and pronominal clitics and reflexive attach to it.

passive periphrasis: BE + V\text{PARTICIPLE}

perfect periphrasis: BE/HAVE + V\text{PARTICIPLE}

progressive periphrasis: BE + \(’oc’h/ouzh=V_{\text{INF}}\)

do-periphrasis DO + \(V_{\text{INF}}\)

Of clausal syntax, finite verb placement and the preverbal position are relevant, here described for MB/eNB prose (save jussives, section 9). The term \(V1\) is used for verbal complexes where the verb is initial; it is then initial in the clause, modulo certain adjuncts

---

5 Recent surveys of the relevant systems include: Brythonic, OSWB (Schrijver 2011b, whose nomenclature is followed here; cf. Fleuriot 1964), OW (Falileyev 2008), MW (Borsley et al. 2007, Willis 2010, Schumacher 2011), MC (George 2010, Williams 2011), MB-eNB (Schrijver 2011a; cf. Le Berre 2001 on the making of MB), NB (Heinecke 2002, Press 2010, Ternes 2011). The extinct and poorly documented (e)NB variety of Batz/Gwenrann with its remarkably different morphosyntax is set aside here save when directly pertinent (Ernault 1883, Mathélier 2017). The domain of the empirical study of Breton and Cornish here is set out in the Appendix; other discussion draws mostly on secondary literature.
and coordinating conjunctions. V1 characterises positive imperatives and positive bare-verb responsives, both root clauses. All other finite clauses are nonV1 and the complex begins with a complementiser, negation, or particle. These nonV1 clauses are differentiated by the presence of the unique preverbal position preceding the complex. It hosts exactly one argument, predicate, adjunct, or "expletive"; only adjuncts can precede the complex independently of it. This position is distributed as follows: obligatory in root clauses if positive and not optative, with the exception of particle e(z) + forms of 'be', 'come', 'go'; optional in root clauses if negative or optative; unavailable in embedded clauses, save some that are root-like in this respect. The preverbal position determines the identity of the a, e(z) particles when overt: a for nominal arguments, e(z) otherwise. In nonfinite clauses certain complementisers license a preverbal position but only for subjects. MC is close to MB, MW differs esp. in greater range of particles, more extensive complexes with initial (particle +) V, preverbal position without particles, and different morphosyntax of preverbal topic and focus (the details will appear in section 5).

3.3 Morphosyntax of (pro)nominal arguments

The chief relevant elements of nominal morphosyntax are case-distinctions among bound or dependent pronouns and them alone, their blocking of free or independent pronouns, and their Complementarity with independent (pro)nominals. The case distinctions are: nominative suffixes to finite verbs, accusative meso/proclitics to finite verbs and to infinitives (after MB), genitive meso/proclitics to nouns and to infinitives (in MB), and several series of suffixes to prepositions. The dependent pronouns may be doubled by doubling enclitics for reasons such as focus. The forms in conservative varieties are:6

Table 1: Pronouns in key conservative varieties of Breton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>eNB-clW</th>
<th>NB-swW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indep.</td>
<td>ACCcl</td>
<td>GENcl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>'m-ma</td>
<td>mé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>te,=de</td>
<td>'z-da</td>
<td>té</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>huy,=hu</td>
<td>hoz</td>
<td>hui,=hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3GM</td>
<td>eff</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>eñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGF</td>
<td>hy</td>
<td>he,=y</td>
<td>hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols: x~y (contextual variants); x,y (other variants); 'x (infixed clitic); =x (enclitic not independent; =SU only subject doubling); ·x (independent not enclitic); -x (suffix); † (relic).

---

6 Here and below the consonant mutations are superscripted to the trigger as L(enition), N(asalisation), P(rovection), S(pirantisation), K(-spirantisation) of k only, M(ixed mutation) = lenition of voiced stops save provection of d; they are mostly not reflected in orthography until eNB. R abbreviates allomorphic n(l/)r(<n) in the coda of proclitics; H abbreviates allomorphic h/q/j/i just in this table.
Note: suffixes only illustrated for 3rd person, pres. kar- 'love' and evit 'for'; doubling enclitics have the same form as independent pronouns, modulo = and § symbols.

Sources: MB HMSB: close to early eNB-KLT, save for orthography, with later loss of infixed forms; eNB-clW – Le Bayon (1878), close to Guillewie and Le Goff (1902), Guillaume (1836); NB-swW – Cheveau (2007), near-isomorphic to NB-w/cW Crahé (2014).

The MB system differs from MC and MW by the marginality of the mesoclitic or "infixed" forms of the object clitics, ceding wholly to proclitics in eNB, and consequently by a more thorough-going accusative-genitive syncretism (section 6).

Two interactions involving pronouns will be relevant (see seminally McCloskey and Hale 1983 for NIr, Anderson 1982, Stump 1983 for NB). One is blocking: dependent pronouns block independent pronouns, which are unblocked when a dependent pronoun is unavailable. Blocking is widespread and all Brythonic systems have it, with differences of strength and detail (section 6). The other interaction is Complementarity between dependent pronouns and independent (pro)nominals, save that subjects combine with nominative suffixes across the negation ne and often na(c). Complementarity and its negation-exception hold in MC and MW but again details differ (section 6). Historically, Complementarity reflects two types of development: nominative suffixes go back to agreement that shifted to 3SG with independent nominatives (still agreeing in OIr, partly in Brythonic and MW but never MB, section 6), while other dependent pronouns were at that point pronouns complementary with other nominals (accusatives and genitives were early clitics and occasionally violate Complementarity; suffixes to prepositions attached later and do not). The two chief approaches to Complementarity align with these origins. On the Agreement Hypothesis, dependent "pronouns" are rather agreement with silent controllers (perhaps overt in "doubling" enclitics). On the Incorporation Hypothesis, agreement if any is undetectable, and dependent pronouns do realise pronouns (doubtable by enclitics).

4 Mihi est HAVE from Celtic to Breton: dative clitics + BE

4.1 Dative clitics

In Brythonic, earlier dative nominals were mostly replaced by PPs, but there is a residue: clitics syncretic with accusatives but continuing the uses and syntax of datives. They survive chiefly yet only sporadically in MW, as goals, benefactives, experiencers with a variety of transitives and unaccusatives, and as possessors in mihi est (Morris-Jones 1913: §160, Lloyd-Jones 1928: sec. 2, CG: §467, cf. 279, 340, GMW: §61, 162, cf. 138b, Fleuriot 2002: 23-4, Borsley et al. 2007: 323).

(8) MW transitive, unaccusative + dative

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{y gwr} & \quad \text{a'm rodes} & \quad \text{y gwin} \\
\text{the=man} & \quad \text{R=1SG=give.PT} & \quad \text{the=wine} \\
\text{the man who gave me the wine [cf. Fr.: l'homme qui m'a donné le vin]} & & \text{(BT, e14C MW)} \\
\text{nym dawe} & \quad \text{kingid} \\
\text{NEG=1SG=come=1SG} & \quad \text{thought} \\
\text{there comes not thought to me [cf. Fr: il ne me vient pas d'idée].}
\end{align*}
\]
ny’m tawr
NEG=1SG=matter
It does not matter to me [cf. French: ça ne m’importe pas].

Matasovic (2004) argues from the analogous situation in OIr that it motivates dative case on the clitics, despite its syncretism with the accusative. This is so for MW as well. One motivation is paradigmatic: accusative clitics alternate with independent nominals, but dative clitics do not, having either no independent analogues at all (experiencer of 'matter'), or only PPs (e.g. goal of 'give', expressed by *to* with its own dependent-pronoun forms). The other motivation is syntagmatic: dative clitics combine with accusative and nominative internal arguments, as above with 'give', 'come' (e.g. the counterpart of *A thought came me*). Both lines of evidence have motivated dative on 1st/2nd person clitics in French to explain analogous contrasts with English, though only 3rd person is not syncretic (cf. Kayne 1975, Pesetsky 1995). The evidence only motivates an oblique case on the remnants of dative clitics in MW and OIr, and that would do here. It may nevertheless be called dative, under the conventional use of the term for oblique case coding goal, recipient, experiencer, and possessor arguments of verbs (distinct in OIr from the quite different morphosyntax and use of the prepositional case called "dative", Stifter 2010).

4.2 *Mihi est* HAVE in Insular Celtic and Brythonic

In MB-MC, dative clitics are restricted chiefly to *mihi est*, but there productive. The *mihi est* construction can be reconstructed for Insular Celtic. In MW, it remains mostly transparent, as it also is in OIr: BE + dative clitic + nominative possessum (exemplaries in Loth 1910: 496-501, Lloyd-Jones 1928: sec. 2):

9) *Mihi est* HAVE in MW cf. OIr

Gueisson *am buyint.*
servants R=1SG=be.CNS.PST.3PL
Servants were to me, i.e. I had servants.

(BBC, m13C MW)

cf. *rót-biat limm áinige*
PV=2SG=be.FUT.3PL with.1SG guarantees
Thou shalt have honours with me.

(Stokes 1887: 234, Ernault 1888b: 258, OIr)

The possessor is coded by a dative clitic, syncretic with accusatives in form, but without an independent counterpart. The possessum is clearly nominative: when preverbal it controls a phi-matching suffix on the verb, as otherwise only nominatives do. These are generally subjects, but with *mihi est* and a few other unaccusatives they might be objects; that they are objects will be clear in MB-MC (section 5).7

7 In MW, preverbal nominative subjects tend to be crossreferenced by nominative suffixes as topic but not focus, with exceptions (Plein and Poppe 2014). The few cases with a plural possessum occur chiefly in CLhH,
In the MW *mihi est* constructions, possessums only seem to be 3rd person, and so are the few other candidates for nominative objects of unaccusatives that take arguments coded by dative clitics. This is consistent with analysing these constructions as dative-subject – nominative-object unaccusatives constrained by the PCC. They contrast with a striking example where 2SG BE combines with a dative clitic that codes the argument not of BE but of a predicate adjective, and leaves the nominative to be the subject, unconstrained by the PCC (on this contrast elsewhere, see Rezac 2016: sec. 4 on Basque, cf. Sigurðsson 1996: 2.5 on Icelandic, Postal 1984: 153-8, 1990: 177, Rezac 2011: 162-3 on French).

(10) a

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ar bwyr} \quad \text{gwar} \\
\text{R=1PL=be.SUBJ.2SG gentle} \\
\text{mayest thou be gentle to us}
\end{array}
\]

(BT, e14C MW; cf. CG: §467, GMW: §138b)

In all the Insular Celtic languages, the *mihi est* construction stands beside BE + 'to', 'with' PPs to express various uses of have, and in MW was replaced by it, as also in OIr. These BE + PP constructions are also productive in MC-MB, but there so is *mihi est*.

(11) MW BE + PP as HAVE

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Esi} \quad \text{ym} \quad \text{arglwyt} \\
\text{be} \quad \text{to.1SG lord} \\
\text{I have a lord.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Yssydyn} \quad \text{genhyf} \\
\text{be.3PL with.1SG} \\
\text{[Hast thou news from the gate?] I have them.}
\end{array}
\]

(CLhH, t14C MW) (WM, 14C MW)

4.3 **HAVE as *mihi est* clitic + BE in conservative varieties**

In MB, two verbs continue to use dative clitics. Our chief concern is with the descendants of *mihi est*. It is often given out as changed to *habeo* by MB, but we will see here that it remains *mihi est* there and in later conservative varieties. The other verb is *deur- (+ BE)* 'wish', with a dative experiencer and a clausal argument; it is common but restricted, and the experiencer is early recoded as nominative (*HMSB*: §151; ditto the MW cognate *tawr-* 'matter', Morris Jones 1913: §196, GMW: §162). In MC it is also these two verbs that continue dative clitics (Lewis and Zimmer 1990: 59ff., Toorians 2014: 8.14).\(^8\)

\(^8\) Other descendants of dative clitics in MB are found in idioms, at least *am haual 'R=1SG=seem', *"meseems"* (Pm, e16C MB; see *DEVRI*: hañvalout). For late eNB, sporadic dative uses of accusative clitics have been attributed to French influence, e.g. *Ma laret quer splan-ze er uirionne '1SG=say.INF so clear=this the truth'* (19C eNB-W, Ernault 1883: 22). In MC, a dative clitic also occurs in *numdarfa, numdarfe 'NEG=1SG=happen.IMPF* (BK, e16C MC), of which little can be made (no clitics with the barely attested Breton cognate, *HMSB*: §147, and the productive MW one, *GMW*: §154). A BE + oblique + nominative construction survives frozen in MB *piaou- 'own', with only 3rd person possessums in examples that continue its original structure (MB-eNB *HMSB*: §153, and still Le Bayon 1878: 34, *pace* Lewis and Piette 1990: §55.6; later 'own', *DEVRI*: s.v.; often defective, Guillec and Le Goff 1902; cognate MW *pieu* in *GMW*: §88-9, MC *pew*, cf. on OW Zimmer 1999; Fleuriot 2002: 28, Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.3). The originally dative argument of 'woe' (*Barbal et al. 2011*), is independent when pronominal in MB (*DEVRI*: s.v., Ernault 1888a: s.v.) and MW (*GPC*: s.v.) but enclitic in MC (section 6 below). There are rare "double object" examples in Breton like *è
In the earliest MB examples of *mihi est* are morphologically transparent as clitic + BE:

(12) Early MB HAVE vs. transitive

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Panesen ha suruguen hambezou dameren} \\
\text{parsnip and ashbread R=1SG=be.FUT to=lunch} \\
\text{I will have parsnip and ashbread for lunch.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{cf. An guen heguen amlouenas} \\
\text{the=white smiling R=1SG=gladden.PT} \\
\text{The smiling white (i.e. white-checked, blond, blessed) one gladdened me}
\]

(Io, m14C MB; h silent)

Not all MB forms are this transparent, but they are close, apart from a de-element after 3rd person clitics. Otherwise, instances of opacity reflect changes in consonant clusters at the clitic-BE boundary, chiefly in the 2nd person (*HMSB*: §140n4). However, such opacities are well within the scope of allomorphy, and found elsewhere in clitic-host combination in Breton. To illustrate, in 2SG -z/θ/ + b-forms of BE can show up as -s/∅ + p-, as with other 2SG -z + b-initial stems, but also retain the historically regular development > -f- (Schrijver 2011a: 394). This is no more exceptional than retention of nasal mutation in an 'the' + dor 'door' > an nor beside its general absence, and no more evidence against clitic + BE decomposition than against 'the' + 'door' (further examples in *HMSB*: §11-17). (Clitic + deur- (+ BE) 'want' combinations are transparent.)

There is, on the other hand, a great deal of evidence from diachronic change that in conservative though not innovative varieties, descendants of *mihi est* forms continued to be perceived as comprised of clitics and BE. This may be illustrated most fully in eNB-clW. Two features of the paradigm are deferred: the de-element after 3rd person clitics (next subsection), and the choice ofès among other copula forms in the present (section 6).

Table 2: *mihi est* in 19C eNB-clW (partial; Le Bayon 1878, Le Goff 1927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>da’ ‘to’ + ACC + inf. in b-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>em ès ~</td>
<td>em bès</td>
<td>ha pès</td>
<td>em/mem bout</td>
<td>d'ém/da mem b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>eh ès ~</td>
<td>ha pou</td>
<td>ha poè</td>
<td>ha pout</td>
<td>d'ha p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>en dès</td>
<td>en (dv)ou</td>
<td>en (dv)öé</td>
<td>en (dv)out</td>
<td>d'er b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGF</td>
<td>hi dès</td>
<td>hi (dv)ou</td>
<td>hi (dv)öé</td>
<td>hi (dv)out</td>
<td>d'hé [hi] b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>hun nè~</td>
<td>hur bès</td>
<td>hur boè</td>
<td>hur bout</td>
<td>d'hur b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>e huè ~</td>
<td>hou pès</td>
<td>hou poè</td>
<td>hou pout</td>
<td>d'hou p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ou dè~</td>
<td>ou (dv)ou</td>
<td>ou (dv)öé</td>
<td>ou (dv)out</td>
<td>d'ou b-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shaded forms are not transparent as accusative clitic + BE.3SG/DFLT

\[
paea an heulelep soum '[For this I promise] 3SGM.GEN=pay.INF the=like=sum' (Qu, e17C MB), likely with an inherent second accusative (cf. Jónsson 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2001, Maling 2001).\]
The strongest evidence for decomposition is innovation of infinitives and in clitics:

**Infinitive:** The forms of BE in *mihi est* reflect the full range of tense-mood distinctions of plain BE, even the consuetudinal tenses specific to BE and by MB lost in older derivatives of BE (*HMSB*: §139ff., 167). However, *mihi est* was restricted to finite forms, because infinitives developed from nominals and nominals could not host object clitics (section 5). At some point, infinitival forms were innovated; they appear chiefly in 18-19C eNB-clW and some NB-W varieties (Ernault 1888b: 265-6, *LVB*: 198-9, *HMSB*: §140.10, Châtelier 2016a, Ternes 1970: 16.3.3, Favereau 1997: §418). These infinitives were not formed as for other new verbs, by tacking a productive infinitival ending onto the 3SG/default form taken as stem, e.g. *en-dev-eign*. Rather, they were built using the infinitive of BE, *bout*, itself idiosyncratic, and thereby revealing the BE in *mihi est* (Le Bayon 1878: 72-3, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 41-2; see section 5 on other formations).9

**Clitics:** In the development of W, the forms of the accusative clitics changed, and the dative clitics in *mihi est* ended up mostly changing with them, reflecting the continuing perception of their identity:

- **2SG (2PL is similar):** The accusative is MB mesoclitic -\(^p-L^v P\) /θ/ ~ proclitic *da*\(^L\). Through sound change and analogy, eNB-clW ended up with *ha(s)*\(^P\) alongside other forms (ha(s))\(^L\), le\(^L\), Le Bayon 1878, Le Goff 1927, *HMSB*: §54, Schrijver 2011b: 394). This *ha(s)*\(^P\) was seamlessly integrated into *mihi est* forms, replacing expected *-h- + vowel-, *-∅ + f/p-*. The integration is complete by eNB-clW, e.g. fut. *ha pou*, save pres. with both ha pès and older eh ēs = MB -z eux (Le Goff 1927: 203; cf. Le Bayon 1878: 28). A similar process had taken place earlier in MB, when 2SG *da-\(^L\) was innovated as the proclitic counterpart of earlier mesoclitic -\(^p-L^v P\) (section 7) and introduced into V1 jussives of *mihi est* (section 9, *da vezet* in ex. (66)).

- **1PL:** Older hon > clW hun along with several other \(n\)-final proclitics split into hun before t, d, n, h and vowels, hul before l, hur elsewhere; this too spread to *mihi est*.

- **1SG:** MB accusative-genitive 1SG mesoclitic -\(^m\)\(^v\) ~ proclitic *ma*\(^L\) became clW proclitic em\(^S\) ~ me\(^S\), but with the addition of the allomorph me\(^N\) before voiced stops, originally genitive (Le Bayon 1878: 50n, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 32; cf. Schrijver 2011b: 34-

---

9 Weaker evidence for BE in *mihi est* comes from *b*-contamination. The forms of BE are built on two roots: *es- in pres. and impf. ind., and *bheu- elsewhere. The descendants of *es- began with a vowel, but the imperfect was early contaminated with *b-\(^v\)- from the *bheu- forms, e.g. MB impf. 3SG *oa → \(^v\)oa* cf. fut. 3SG \(^v\)ezo (*HMSB*: §139n2, Schrijver 2011a: 405). In eNB-clW, *b-\(^v\)- appears with the imperfect after a consonant-final element of the verbal complex, *mar boe* 'if=BE.IMPF.3SG' beside *oe* elsewhere (Le Bayon 1878: 27, cf. 73). The same contamination takes place with BE in *mihi est*, e.g. MB impf. -m *oa → -m boa '1SG=BE.IMPF' cf. fut. -m *bezo* '1SG=BE.FUT' (*HMSB*: §140n4, Schrijver 2011a: 407). In clW it affects all forms in Table 2, because all 1\(^st\)/2\(^nd\) person clitics end with a consonant (including underlying 2SG *ha*\(^P\), reflected inprovection). In clW it moreover comes to optionally affect pres. forms of *mihi est*, again because all 1\(^st\)/2\(^nd\) person clitics end in a consonant, though not the form of plain BE, ēs, because with this form preceding elements of the verbal complex retained special forms, e.g. *mar d- rather than plain *mar* (cf. Le Bayon 1878: 35). While the contamination runs from *b*-forms to vowel-initial forms within the paradigms of plain BE and BE in *mihi est*, the parallelism of the contamination suggests the continued synchronic perception of the same BE in both. In MC, the parallelism breaks down in contaminated pres. 1SG. -m *bus*, beside uncontaminated 2SG *-th us*, plain BE *us* (= MB eus).
5, 50; \( N = \) homorganic nasal). In some eNB-clW texts, meN spreads to mihi est when its conditions are satisfied, i.e. before b-initial forms (obligatorily Guillome 1836; optionally MG, e18C eNB-clW; cf. Le Goff 1927: 203).

- **3SGM**: No change takes place in W, but similar evidence comes from an MB text that optionally changes en to an both as accusative and in mihi est (Gk, late 16C MB; the distribution of neither follows that of particles = e'n, a'n, pace Hemon 1954c: 232n2, see rather Ernault 1928: 220n6 as an early T characteristic).

Apart from forms of mihi est, there is syntagmatic evidence for the continued perception of clitics in mihi est forms. In MB, the verbal particle e(z) is either absent or replaced by en before proclitics, i.e. all but the mesoclitic 1SG -m, 2SG -z (HMSB: §177). In later varieties, en remains chiefly in W, and extends to the new proclitics that replace the mesoclitics, 1SG em< < particle + -m<, 2SG clitic ha(s)l-p, but not to e.g. vowel-initial verbs. The initial portions of mihi est forms are treated like clitics by en (Le Bayon 1878: 3, 28n2). Thus we get a systematic but partly noninherited parallelism between accusative clitics and clitics in mihi est:

(13)  
\[ \text{en particle in eNB-clW} \]

\[ \ldots \text{en em lausquou} \quad \text{cf.} \quad \ldots \text{en em boai} \quad \]
\[ R=1SG=\text{let.FUT} \quad R=1SG=\text{BE.IMPF} \]
\[ \ldots \text{that he will let me} \quad \ldots \text{that I had} \]
\[ \text{(MG, e18C eNB-W)} \]

\[ \ldots \text{en hou pé} \quad \text{cf.} \quad \ldots \text{en hou kleuán} \quad \]
\[ R=2PL=\text{be.CNS} \quad R=2PL=\text{hear.1SG} \]
\[ \ldots \text{that you have (que vous avez)} \quad \ldots \text{that I hear you (que je vous entends)} \]
\[ \text{(Le Bayon 1878: 29, 51, t18C eNB-clW)} \]

More broadly, in conservative varieties, the morphosyntax of the verbal complex containing mihi est and that containing accusative clitics is the same when it comes to particle choice before the clitic, such as a vs. e(z) in ex. (45) (Rezac 2019).10

All this evidence for the decomposition of mihi est forms into clitic + BE is limited to conservative varieties of Breton. Innovative varieties lose it (section 8; cf. Press 1986: 9.3.1). MC presents a similar situation, but the opacity is greater (see note 9), and earlier than in MB there appear forms doubling clitics by nominative suffixes (section 8).

(14)  
Dative 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person clitics in MC

| Accusative | Dative in mihi est | Dative in duer-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG, unchanged</td>
<td>nym gref peyn</td>
<td>nym byth creys nym dur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG=1SG=bother pain</td>
<td>NEG=1SG=be peace</td>
<td>NEG=1SG=concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 ARBRES: kaout 'avoir' suggests that mihi est in eNB-clW does not distinguishing the preverbal particles eNB-clW é – e = MB e – a before 1SG, but again the same goes for accusative 1SG: with both we find en em in é-contexts (Le Bayon op.cit., save after nag 'how'), em otherwise (e.g. mar em 'if=1SG), while ém is only 'in=1SG= + noun (so across Guillôme, Pourchasse, Marion, Seveno, Olierieu, Buleon, Laboulette).
1PL. (a)g-element innovated in both accusative and mihi est
neb agan pernas gwyn agan bys
who 1PL=redeem.PT joy 1PL=be

2SG. mihi est alone retaining-θ+/p + b- > -f-
ret flamyas/-0v-/~/-0f/- te afyth/f/
R=2SG=blame.PT 2SG R=2SG=be

4.4 The de-prefixed 3rd person forms

So far forms with 3rd person clitics in Table 2 have been left aside. These are the most significant island of opacity relative to clitic + BE: in Breton and Cornish these and only these forms contain what seems to be BE prefixed with de-. This prefix can be analysed as an applicative marker originally, but may have become a dative marker in MB-MC.

The most widespread etymology of the de-forms is as reflexes of BE with the preverb(s) *do- (OSWB, OW de-, MW dy-, di-, MB-MC de-), related to the preposition *do- 'to' (OW di, MW (dj), (do), MB da, MC the) (Fleuriot 1964: §148, 2002: 27-9, cf. Ernault 1890: 458-460, Loth 1886: 320n, followed by HMSB: §140n1; on MW di-, dy- + BE = MB de- + BE, Loth 1900: 508-9, CG: Suppl. to 213 l. 20). On this view, both BE and *do+BE were used to build mihi est in Brythonic. In MW, bare BE is usual, but continuations of *do+BE are found with both 1st/2nd and 3rd person clitics. In MC and MB, bare BE combines with 1st/2nd-person clitics, *do+BE with 3rd person.11

(15) *do+BE in MW

a. Kanweis am dioed
   Hundred.men R=1SGM=be.IMPF
   NEG=3PL=be country
   (BT, e14C MW)

Preverbs like *do-'to' have been analysed as adposition-like elements that introduce an argument and incorporate into the verb, often alternating with free adpositions on related meanings (Baker 1988, Petersen 2007 crosslinguistically, Miller 1993, Acedo-Matellán

11 Fleuriot’s (1964, 2002) form *do-of the preverb and preposition is employed here for convenience (cf. CG: §431.27); current views favour etymologically unrelated preverb *tuo- and/or *to- and preposition *dū in Insular Celtic (Schrijver 1995: 17n2, 2011b: 51, Eska 2007, Matasovic 2009: s.v. *do, *to-, Stifter 2014). The OSWB impf. subj. debei, impers. pres. cns. debider, and OW pres. cns. dibid, pst. dibu forms are not found with clitics and mean 'be (at), come', possibly giving parts of the paradigm of MW dyuot 'come' in interaction with *do-ag-'come' > deu-, dy- + BE (Fleuriot 1964: §148, Falileyev 2000, 2008, GMW: §143); inversely, MW forms attributed to deuot with a dative clitic may often be forms of *do+BE qua mihi est (cf. already Ernault, Loth op.cit.). MW candidates for dy+BE include the archaic morphosyntax where the preverb hosts clitics, e.g. Adef nef dimbi 'dwelling heaven di-1SG-be.CNS' (BT, e14C MW) (Lloyd-Jones 1928: 93, also cf. Loth 1910: 479-480). It is possible that the extinct ENB variety of Batz had 3rd person forms with and without the de-prefix, but more likely they reflect leveling of a phi-less form as with other verbs (Ernault 1883: 26-30). The chief alternative approach to MB-MC de-, not discussing other forms, is Schrijver (1997: ch. 7, 2011b: 69-70), here in section 6; the dative-case analysis of the restriction of de- to after 3rd person clitics can be profitably applied to it. Other views: Ernault (1883: 28-29), LVB: 185-6.
2016 in Indo-European; cf. Adger 2006, Newton 2006 on incorporation of preverbs in OIr). Overt or covert elements of this sort, applicatives, have been argued to introduce all "high" oblique arguments of unaccusatives (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Pylkänen 2008). An applicative is then expected in the syntax dative-nominative mihi est, and might alternate with an adpositional counterpart. The reflexes of *do-BE and BE + *do 'to' do stand in such an alternation in all the Brythonic languages, though this is not generally the case preverbs: thus MW pres. (-s) dioes "he has" above (productive as MB en deus, MC -s teve) beside MW oes idaw 'is to him' (productive, as is MB eux dezaff, MC us dethy).

In MB-MC unlike in MW, the distribution of BE and *do-BE depends on the person of the dative clitic in the complex.12 This would not be unique crosslinguistically, but may be rare (Comrie 2003). However, because MB de-, MC ge- is contiguous with the clitic, it may rather have been reanalysed as an exponent of its dative case. Then its restriction to 3rd person fits a widespread pattern whereby only 3rd person clitics are distinctively dative (Adger and Harbour 2007, as in French).

4.5 The HAVE-perfect

In Breton as in other Celtic languages, mihi est HAVE serves as a lexical verb with a typical range of have-meanings (cf. Belvin 1996, modulated by a division of labour with BE + PP, Favereau 1997: 432-5 for NB). Alone of the Celtic languages, Breton recruited mihi est as the perfect auxiliary in combination with the et-participle of the lexical verb, alongside the more restricted BE auxiliary, illustrated later on (e.g. (17); typical distribution: transitive She has seen it, unaccusative and reflexive She *has/*is come, perfect of passive She is been seen). It is frequently illustrated below, e.g. ex (17). It is fully formed by the earliest extensive texts of early 16C. The lack of cognates and near-identity with the Romance-Germanic HAVE-perfect have suggested a calque (HMSB: §155). In parallel with French, the perfect gradually replaces the simple past (HMSB: §169).

Crosslinguistically, when a new perfect formation recruits lexical HAVE as auxiliary, it can adopt the latter's argument coding. In a nominative-accusative system with a mihi est HAVE, the subject of transitives and intransitives is then coded in the same way as the oblique possessor, while the object of transitives is coded like the nominative possessor (Latin, Heine 1997: 4.3; Karelian, close to Finnish, Seržant 2012: 358; Georgian, B.G. Hewitt 1995: 501-2 on the new perfect, 369-373 on mihi est HAVE; compared to Breton in S. Hewitt 2016). This is so also in Breton: the forms of lexical HAVE and its arguments in a given variety are always shared with the HAVE-perfect (modulo the unrealisability of 1st/2nd person accusative clitics on mihi est forms, section 7).

5 Rise, development, and implications of independent datives

5.1 Independent datives

It is usually supposed that by MB-MC, dative+nominative mihi est had become nominative-accusative habeo, in large part because of the morphosyntax of innovated independent possessors (CG, Heine 1997, Stassen 2009, Schrijver 2011a). This innovation

12 The 1PL hon (b)eus ~ hon deus (EKG, t19C eNB-L) type of late, innovative eNB-KLT varieties is to be attributed to the extension of 3SG(M) stems in them (HMSB: §140n2; cf. section 8).
is of the greatest interest, but by their systematic differences from nominative subjects, they
cannot point to a *habeo* analysis, and rather support a *mihi est* one (Jouitteau and Rezac
2008). Their rise and nature is the matter of this section.

In MW as in OIr, the vestigial datives are limited to pronominal clitics with finite verbs,
and they cede to PPs over time. In MB-MC, independent (pro)nominal counterparts
developed to the surviving dative clitics of *mihi est*, and in MB also of *deur-*. The earliest
examples have independent pronouns in the preverbal position:

(16) Independent datives (underlined) in MB-MC

...me ambezo auantur mat ha quarzr
  1SG R=1SG=be.FUT adventure good and fair
[Henri Bossec says: if God wants] I will have a good and fair adventure.
  (Bo, e14C MB)

Me amous vnamoric ioliuic
1SG R=1SG=be a=lover pretty
I have a pretty lover
  (Io, m14C MB)

ha ty a vyʒ hy
and 2SG R=2SG=be=3SGF
and you will have her
  (CE, t14C MC)

A huy ouz deu[r] quet he guelet hy
Q 2PL 2PL=want not 3SGF=see.INF=3SGF
Do you not want to see her?
  (B, m16C MB)

Later but still early they appear as postverbal nominals:

(17) Postverbal independent dative (underlined) + nominative in MB

pan ho deffoe lauaret an oratoret ez oa ...
when=3PL=D-be.PT said the=speakers R=be.IMPF
when the speakers had said that it was ...
  (Ca, t16C MB)

goudé ma en deueux an beleg legitim consacret an bara
after as=3SGM=D-be the=priest legitimate consecrated the=bread
after the legitimate priest has consecrated the bread
  (Gk, t16C MB)

pa nendueues an dut argant
when=NEG=3SGM=D-be.CNS the=people money
when people have money
  (Qu, e17C MB)

pe en hini nen deua medecin er bet aznaudeguez
which in=one NEG=3SGM=D-be.IMPF doctor in=the=world knowledge
[disease] about which no doctor in the world had knowledge

17
We have already seen one innovation in *mihi est* clearly common to MB-MC, the de-prefix to after 3rd person clitics, and independent counterparts to dative clitic are another. It seems likely that these innovations took place in common between Breton and Cornish, though the OSWB corpus affords no evidence bearing on the matter.

The new independent possessors of *mihi est* likely arose through an ambiguity of the preverbal position, and this is taken up in the next subsection. It is the postverbal position, however, that affords the clearest window on their syntax in MB-MC: the possessors behave as subjects, possessums as objects. In MB prose, possessors precede possessums when both are independent (17), just as subjects do objects of transitives (modulo rightward shift due chiefly to heaviness). This is also true of MC, (18) (though the corpus is verse). In the MB HAVE-perfect (17), again the possessor-coded subjects precede objects when independent, and moreover subjects alone can precede the participle, as can subjects of the BE-passive and BE-perfect. These positional properties are as expected from systems like Icelandic, where subject/objecthood but not obliqueness determine what derived position a nominal may occupy (and its interpretation there, discussed below).13

In form, the new independent counterparts of dative clitics are bare NPs/DPs, just as the independent counterparts of nominative and accusative clitics, as seen above. This form is expected in a system where clitics of various cases alternate with independent NPs/DPs ("nominals") invariant for case and both stand in opposition to PPs. The absence of inflectional case on the independent nominals is no more evidence that they are not dative

---

13 The subject > participle order is facilitated by a postparticipial object, so it is more frequent in the HAVE-perfect than the BE-perfect and BE-passive, but not limited to it (e.g. ...ma vezo ma hol eurou gret en ho feiz 'that=be.FUT my all works done in=2PL=faith', Mc, e17C MB). There is no simple pure objecthood test, though partitive *a*-marking does tell us the possessum behaves like postverbal subjects of unaccusatives and objects of transitives (cf. Schapansky 1996: 3.2 on NB, Widmer and Starke 2016 on MB).
than it is evidence that others are not nominative, accusative, genitive, and when corresponding to dative clitics they might as well be called independent datives. Nonoblique status is also not to be inferred from their control of the particle $a$ rather than $e(z)$ in the above examples, for that proves to be a property of nominals whether linking to oblique or nonoblique arguments (subsection 2). There is one anomalous aspect of their morphosyntax, systematic doubling by phi-matching clitics, and this not only distinguishes them from nonoblique arguments, but is expected for oblique subjects (subsection 3). These various aspects of independent datives come together and are further clarified in the innovated infinitives of $mihi$ est (subsection 4). Finally, we will look at a further development of independent pronouns when preverbal subjects, shared by $mihi$ est with other verbs; it sheds light on certain striking characteristics distinguishing (e)NB-W: use of independent pronouns when other varieties require nominative suffixes, and appearance of $mihi$ est forms in new V1 constructions (subsection 5).

5.2 Origin and ambiguity of independent datives in the preverbal position

The preverbal position is where independent datives have been argued to originate (as nominativus pendens, Mac Cana 1973: 118, 1991: 57), and where evidence for a habeo analysis has been seen in form and position (CG: §352, Stassen 2009: 233 for MC) and in control of the particle $a$ (Schrijver 2011a: 407 for MB). The preverbal position is indeed a plausible point of origin and offers a historical explanation of nominal form and particle control, but this is precisely as expected for $mihi$ est without any reanalysis.


**Hanging topic or nominativus pendens: $XP + root$ clause.** If $XP$ was a nominal, it originally bore nominative, and later was bare. It linked to an overt resumptive in the main clause, including in the "highest subject position", or nothing.

**Copular cleft: copula + $XP$ predicate + direct or indirect relative clause.** If $XP$ was a nominal, it was again nominative, later bare. It linked to: (i) nominative and accusative gaps in the direct relatives marked a.o. by relativisers and conjunct morphology; (ii) overt resumptive or nothing in root-like indirect relatives marked a.o. by absolute morphology (cf. CG: ch. 29, GMW: §64ff. for an overview of the various subtypes).

(19) OW preverbal nominals (texts, analysis Falileyev 2008, Schrijver 2011b)

*Hanging topic (including topic-internal direct relative clause)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ir pimp het eterin diguormechis</td>
<td>Lucas hegit hunnoid the fifth bird PV-REL-PV-V.PT.3SG.CONJ Lucas go.3SG.ABS that one the fifth bird that Lucas added, that one goes…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MP, e9C OW; cf. McCana 1973: 96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copular cleft (adverbial gap in root-like indirect relative)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is cihun argant agit eterin illúd be so.much money go.3SG.ABS bird that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MP, e9C OW; cf. McCana 1973: 96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it's for so much money that that bird goes

(Copular cleft (accusative gap in direct relative)
is did ciman ha ci
be day whole REL get.FUT.2SG
it's the whole day that you will get

(Comp, e10C OW)

These two constructions interacted in the formation of the preverbal position in MB-MC-MW. The outcome was still two distinct constructions, with different properties, here described in the form that they are took in Breton, from MB onwards. Both are also found in MW with certain differences.14

Nominal + gap (movement): XP in the preverbal position links to a gap. If XP is nominal, it links to nominative and accusative gaps. It controls the particle a and the form so of the copula. These formal properties derive from the copular cleft + direct relative, though the focus interpretation has been lost (see subsection 4).

Nominal + resumptive ("broad", "double", or "false" subject construction): a nominal in the preverbal position links to a resumptive dependent pronoun anywhere but the matrix subject (on NB, Urien 1987, 1989, Rezac 2010, 2013). It is can be found with the particle e(z) and non-so copula, but it too typically takes a, so (on NB-L, op.cit.; cf. Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 138, Le Bayon 1878: 62-3 on eNB-clW). These properties are consistent with origin in copular cleft + indirect relative, maybe with influence of the hanging topic:

(20)  Nominal+resumptive + a/so + dependent pronoun resumptive in MB and MW

an tirant cesar a falle dezaff laquat dan marou cals a chistenyen
the=tyrant Caesar R=like.IMPF to.3SGM put.INF to=the death lots of=Christians
the tyrant Caesar wanted to put to death lots of Christians

(Ca, t16C MB)

darn auez ho spered euel en vr balanç
some R=be.CNS 3PL=spirit as in=a=scale
some are such that their spirit is as on scales

(Beach, m17C MB)

---

14 The relevance of the resumptive construction in Breton to the independent possessor is discussed esp. in McCana (1991: 57; the choice of examples with e, eo there can be misleading). In MW, the mixed sentence continues the copular cleft: positive (later omitted) or negated copula + focus XP (including subject) + 3SG/default verb, in its relative form when available. The abnormal sentence looks as if continuing aspects of the hanging topic construction: topic (including subject) + positive or negated verb with nominative suffix phi-matching the topic if subject (on movement + agreement versus base-generation + resumptive analysis, see Tallerman 1996, Willis 1998, Meelen 2016). In both MB and MW, across negation subjects control a nominative suffix (in MB ne, only sometimes na), objects to gaps (usual in MB) or resumptives (usual in MW). Relatives show the same pattern in both systems of movement gaps (direct) and resumptives (indirect), with parallel choice of particles and copula (cf. comparatively LVB: 391-3, 426-8, 435; CG: §394ff.; MB details in HMSB: §§175ff., §§188ff., MW, GMW: §64ff.). MC is closer to MB than to MW (e.g. no abnormal sentence, different behavior of ne vs. na). MW also has preverbal arguments without particles (esp. poetry: GMW: §199n; cf. for importance, Schrijver 1997: ch. 7, Willis 2010: 146-7).
The only way to differentiate the gap and the resumptive constructions when the latter uses the particle *a* is by gap versus resumptive. However, this distinction cannot be made for the possessor of *mihi est*: the resumptive construction has a dative clitic as resumptive, but the gap construction also has the dative clitic due because it always doubles any possessor of *mihi est*. It is also with *mihi est* that the choice of particle is unhelpful, because *a* is the rule for grammatical roles such as experiencer and possessor (see Manning 2001: ch. 5 on MW; MB seems similar). It follows that preverbal nominals linked to dative clitics were and remained ambiguous in Breton (modulo tools like scope reconstruction).\(^\text{15}\)

This formal identity of the gap and resumptive constructions for *mihi est* in Breton goes back to the point of origin for independent dative. Prior to this point, datives of *mihi est* were only clitics clause-internally, but these could be resumptive to preverbal nominals in the whatever form(s) the resumptive construction took at that point: in Brythonic, it would be hanging topic (+ dative resumptive), and likely copular cleft (+ dative resumptive if relatives limited gaps to nonobliques, cf. Keenan and Comrie 1977, Joseph 1983, Salzmann 2009). Essentially this stage is retained in MW, though the gap and resumptive constructions have partly changed in character. The dative clitics of MW have no clause-internal independent counterparts, but independent nominals in the preverbal position can link to dative clitics as resumptives:

\begin{equation}
(21) \quad \text{Auacdu } a \text{e deubu } y \text{ gymeint}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Avacdu } R=3SG=\text{come-be.PT the=}as.much}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Avacdu had as great [an experience]}
\end{equation}

(BT, e14C MW)

This state of affairs is a natural point for the innovation of the independent dative (cf. MacCana op.cit.): nominals linked to dative clitics as resumptives in the preverbal position were generalised to all subject argument positions, on analogy to nominals linked to other resumptives (here *pron* is a dependent pronoun and *NP* an independent (pro)nominal):

\begin{equation}
\text{Pre-V + resumpt. } \sim \text{Postverbal } :: \text{Pre-V + resumpt. } \sim \text{Postverbal}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{NP } + \text{pron } \sim \text{pron or NP } \sim \text{NP } + \text{pronDAT } \sim \text{pronDAT only } \rightarrow \text{pronDAT or NP (doubled!)}
\end{equation}

This origin derives the bare nominal form of independent datives when preverbal; from there it was generalised to lower positions, consistently with the alternation of all other dependent pronouns with bare nominals. It also derives their control of the particle *a*, consistently with control of *a* by all other nominal arguments linking to a gap or

---

\(^{15}\) To complete the picture of *mihi est*, the possessum-object when preverbal usually links to a gap from MB-MC on, but resumptives can be found (*Honnezh am hoe bi descr et er skol* 'this R=1SG=be.IMPF=3SGF learned in school, Crahé 2014, cf. ARBRES), as they do can with the ordinary accusative object of transitives (q.v. Press 1986: 203, 207, Rezac 2011: 262n3; Manning 2001: 242 on MC).
nonlocative resumptive. There is one puzzle: the innovated independent nominal is doubled by a dative clitic, not just in the preverbal position where it originated as a resumptive, but in its new postverbal position(s) – in violation of Complementarity that constrains all other postverbal nominals on the lefthand side of the analogy.  

5.3 Clitic doubling of datives

The new independent datives of *mihi est* in both preverbal and postverbal positions are doubled by phi-matching clitics in MB-MC, and likewise for the few MB examples of *deur-* with preverbal subjects. The doubling remains in later conservative varieties of Breton, save that nonpron nominals are doubled by 3SGM in W (cf. *HMSB*: §174.2; rarely general 3SGM, Ernault 1888b: 261). In both Breton and Cornish, the doubling is a unique subsystem of anti-Complementarity. It speaks against a *mihi est* to *habeo* reanalysis, since not only is a nominative subject expected to obey Complementarity, it does so when the transition to *habeo* finally takes place (section 8; cf. Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: sec. 4-5, *pace CG*: §352, Stassen 2009: 6.4)).

If we approach the doubling as pronominal clitic-doubling rather than agreement, it turns out to fit a well-studied pattern, whereby doubling occurs with applicative obliques even when not with other arguments (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). Thus we get systems where applicative obliques allow and require clitic doubling, either across the board (Greek, Spanish) or when pronouns (French), but nonobliques, nonapplicative or low obliques, and PPs do not allow it even on similar interpretations (Anagnostopoulou 2017a, Landau 2010).

(22) Clitic doubling with independent pronouns in Modern French

**Dative:**

Tu *(lui)* plais  
2SG.NOM=(3SG.DAT=)please.2SG to=3SGF  
You please her.

**Accusative:**

Tu *(la)* satisfais  
2SG.NOM=(3SG.ACC=)satisfy.2SG 3SGF  
You satisfy her.

**Locative:**

Tu *(y)* pense  
2SG.NOM=(LOC=)think.2SG  on=3SGF

---

16 There should have been no problem, upon innovation of postverbal independent datives, in combining them with a form of the verbal complex lacking the dative clitic, i.e. bare BE, since a bare BE is used as a form of *mihi est* in various contexts, e.g. infinitives in certain (e)NB-W varieties (section 5.4). The same goes for an alternative route to the innovation of independent datives, generalisation from dative-accusative clitic + doubling enclitic identical in form to independent pronoun → dative clitic + independent nominal (perhaps suggested by Fleuriot 2002: 19): again, the doubling is found only for the innovated independent datives, not for independent accusatives though formally identical. Yet even the occasional "prolepsis" of MW of accusative/genitive clitic + following independent nominal (*GMW*: §56n4, 60, 198, Fleuriot 2002: 23 point 3) is absent in MB (or nearly so: Lewis and Piette 1990: §25).
You think about her.

That fits MB-MC and later conservative varieties of Breton perfectly. There is no doubling with nominative subjects and accusative objects, because they are nonoblique. There is no doubling of PPs. Doubling is allowed with and required of the possessor of *mihi est* and experiencer of 'want'. These are dative subjects of intransitives, and as such applicative obliques on the above-cited theories. Since the tendency of applicative obliques to uniquely allow or prefer doubling holds across systems where doubling arose independently, it is unsurprising to see it appear in Breton.

5.4 Tying it together in an innovation: Infinitives

The *mihi est* construction was originally restricted to finite BE, because nonfinite forms were nominalisations, and datives-accusatives were not licensed in these, nor could their genitives represent datives (cf. French, Kayne 1975, partly Latin, Spevak 2014). Possession in infinitives is expressed by BE + 'to', 'with' PP in MB-MC-MW. MB-MC also recruited *caffout-caffos* 'find, get'; as infinitive, this kept its regular object coding (genitive originally, accusative in (e)NB), but became suppletive to *mihi est* in allowing uses that only *mihi est* had in finite clauses (e.g. *caffout-caffaff couf* 'get.INF/*1SG memory' as "remember"). In W, however, *mihi est* developed infinitival forms (section 4).

These infinitives are found in all and only environments where infinitives of other verbs are. Thereby they make available the most stringent of subjecthood diagnostics for *mihi est*: restrictions on the subject of infinitives, as the silent element under control or raising, or as the overt element licensed by prepositional complementisers (Stephens 1990, Rezac 2011). Thesy show that the subject is the possessor of lexical HAVE and the subject of (in)transitives of the HAVE-perfect, never the other argument (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008):

(23) Subjects of infinitival *mihi est* HAVE

*Controlled complement:*

ne garehoh quet *hou* pout *ind*

NEG=like.COND.2PL not 2PL=be.INF=3PL

would you not like to have them

(EOVD, 19C eNB-clW)

*Controlled adjunct:*

ne laret quet ... eit *ou* pout-*ean* guélet

NEG=say!2PL not for=2PL=be.INF=3SGM seen'

do not say … despite having seen him"

(EOVD, 19C eNB-clW)

*Arbitrary:*

ret-ê *en* devout-*ind* leinet

necessary=be 3SGM=D-be.INF=3PL read

it is necessary to have read them

(EOVD, 19C eNB-clW)
Specified.\(^{17}\)

Deustu d’ein  em bout  baléet
despite to.1SG 1SG=be.INF  walked
Despite me having walked …

(RNDL, e20C NB-wW)

The infinitives of *mihi est* support the dative-nominative analysis by their argument coding (Rezac 2019). Their subject-coding proclitics cannot be analysed as the nominative subjects of *habeo*, even in disguise, because Breton infinitives belong to the type that excludes nominative dependent pronouns as *subjects* (section 6.2). Their object-coding enclitics can be analysed as nominative, as below, because infinitives of this sort license nominative *objects* in the same way as finite clauses (Icelandic, Freidin and Sprouse 1991: sec. 6, Schütze 1997: 4.1.1.2; Finnish, Vainikka 1989, 2003).\(^{18}\)

5.5 Neutral preverbal subjects, pronoun fusion, and V1 *mihi est*

The oblique subjects of Icelandic not only appear in the same derived positions as nominative subjects, but also have the same interpretations there. In Breton, interpretation can be examined in the preverbal position, and presents an asymmetry between subjects and nonsubjects. It has been studied in NB, but will be seen to hold of MB/eNB prose, and a similar asymmetry has been established for MW prose (Meelen 2016: ch. 5, 2017), as well as hinted at by MC verse (in fusion of its subject pronouns, below).

\(^{17}\) In this example, the subject incorporates into the prepositional complementiser (see Stephens 1990) from the preverbal position (*HMSB*: §175n1 for evidence from the particle *a* in finite analogues).

\(^{18}\) The full range of nonfinite forms of BE corresponding to finite *mihi est* is intricate but is derivable: they should be available for *mihi est* precisely to the extent that its dative subject is licensible. This is always so when *mihi est* is put into the perfect in a finite clause, where the mechanics is as with any other verb: the nonfinite portion of the clause, lexical BE with its arguments, is realised by the participle of BE, and combines with the finite-clause architecture of the HAVE-perfect, licensing the highest argument as dative subject (see ex. (36), *HMSB*: §140n5; ditto with deur- (+ BE) 'want', e.g. n’en deuxaux deuruzet 'NEG=3SGM=D-be want-been' Qu, e17C MB). In infinitives, the crosslinguistic situation indicates two points of variation: the availability of empty categories like PRO in oblique cases; and whatever forces clitic-doubling of oblique subjects. In systems like Icelandic, doubling is absent or covert (Anagnostopoulou 2003). This leads to the expectation of W varieties that use plain bout 'be.INF' as the infinitive of *mihi est*, both as auxiliary (e.g. goude bout ind lennent 'after be.INF=3PL read' "after having read them", DHKN, m20C NB-W), less commonly as lexical (Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 20; kabout prepered; Le Goff 1927: 203; Le Besco 1992: 111: avoir, Favereau 1997: §418; DICO: PYKLC-56094-MAM-0224); there may be traces in MB (bezaiff fez anezy 'be.INF faith of.3SGF' "[the cross signifies … that it is necessary] to have faith in it", N, MB). eNB-clW develops the morphology to realise the doubling (with subvarieties allowing non-phi-matching with 3SGM en d(e)vout, Ernault 1887: 43); it too may have traces in MB (*LVB*: 102-9). Usually, failure to license oblique PRO and/or its clitic-doubling leaves MB with nothing for lexical *mihi est*, and quite a different if superficially similar counterpart to perfect *mihi est* (*LVB*: 371-6). This is the BE-perfect, where the auxiliary is the infinitive of BE, and the object transitives and subject of intransitives are genitive clitics to it. This is the usual "ergative" pattern of argument coding in MB-MW infinitives (Manning 1995; e.g. hon bezaff ... douar '1PL=be.INF earth', only plain BE "us to be earth", not *mihi est* "us to have earth", M, 16C MB). The result is ambiguous with the passive if available (e bout ganet '3SGM.GEN=be.INF born' "him to be born", N, MB; dam bezaf nouet hoz pedaf 'to=1SG=be.INF annointed 2PL=ask' "I ask you to have annointed me" or "…for me to be annointed", N, MB; perfect Ernault 1888a: 266, 1888b: bezaff; passive *LVB*: 356, 371, Hemon 1981: §138n; during eNB-KLT, the proclitic shifts to the participle, *HMSB*: §155n1, where the reflexive prefix *em* is found always).

Here we will only look pronouns, because the neutral reading lent itself to destressing and attachment and so ended up revealed in orthography. Pronouns are governed by an additional constraint: Blocking of independent by dependent pronouns when available. The Gk example below illustrates: (i) an independent pronoun shifts topic, with no other markedness; (ii) a dependent pronoun continues the topic; (iii) the preverbal position then has the sole filler without focus other than the subject, long head movement in periphrastic contructions. This is typical of MB and eNB prose. However, occasionally independent pronouns do appear in the preverbal position. By contrast, the rare preverbal object pronouns are new or contrastive focus (cf. HlMSB: §51.7c vs. 51.5).

Neutral pronominal subjects vs focused objects in MB

---

Switch topic subject
Te à caro da Autrou ... Caret à ry da Nessafu ...
2SG R=love.FUT 2SG=lord ... love.INF R=do.FUT.2SG 2SG=next

[How many commandments are of Love? There are two chief, which are proposed to us by our lord and our god, through the words that are below.] You will love your Lord your god, [with all your ... That is the first, and the Greatest Commandment. The second is similar to this,] You will love your Neighbour like yourself.

(Gk, t16C MB)  

Continuing topic subject
Na graff quet sur, me a careff en mat ez graen
NEG=do.1SG not sure 1SG R=love well R=do.1SG

---

19 Thetic sentences are all-new. Continuing (given, familiar) topics pick up the current topic, and so tend to be dependent pronouns, but if independent are usually subjects (esp. Timm 1991 for NB). Plain switch topics usually involve an accessible referent and then are subjects. The focus-related readings of nonsubjects include new information focus, contrastive focus (topic), and wh-words, but there are marked fronting of nonsubjects outside these categories (best studied for MW: Watkins 1993: 126-7, Meelen 2017: 159, 183 and cf. 2016: 6.5.1, 6.6.1, Harlos et al. 2014: 136). The optional preverbal position of negative clauses shows the subject-based asymmetry in NB (Kennard 2014). Exceptional in the texts studied here are light-verb constructions: these can neutrally front objects, e.g. Esper hé dueux en pep tra "Hope it has in every thing" (Gk, t16C MB) (cf. Wmffre 1998: 3.2, Timm 1989: 366-7 vs. 375-6), but also neutrally let objects precede subjects postverbally, e.g. ...endeues couff an penitant "[of which] has memory the penitent" (Cnf², ml7C MB) (cf. neutral fronting as local, Rezac 2004, Joutitteau 2005, perhaps as predicate-based, Hewitt 2002).  

20 The exceptional appearance of independent nominative pronouns for pro is well-known from pro-drop systems, even if the reasons are still not fully understood, and in this pro-drop differs strikingly from clitic-independent alternations of systems like French (Spanish, Filiaci et al. 2013 with literature; Italian, cf. Frascarelli 2007: 712-3; Czech, Mathesius 1947, Zimová 1988; Ariel 1990). Some exceptions in Breton are systematic, e.g. interrogative ha(c), pe clauses in early prose (e.g. Cath, Qu, IN); but even these do not require subject pronouns, e.g. ha seuell à greomp ny Q rise.INF R=do.1PL=1PL "And shall we get up?" (Qu, e17C MB) (cf. HlMSB: §51.5n, 85, 192, Guilleivic and Le Goff 1902: 102, 115).
[What are you saying? You speak (sc. French) as well as I, yeah, and better. --] I surely do not, I would like to do so [though it cost me twenty ecus.]

(Qu, e17C MB)

**Continuing topic subject (construction-favoured)**

Piu so é barz, hac y so calz? -- Na ynt-quet, tri pe peuar who be inside and 3PL be many NEG=be.3PL not three or=four Who is inside, and are they many? They are not, three or four.

(Qu, e17C MB)

**Contrastive focus object**


generant orateur az eux assamblé […] ha me a contrainez […]
fifty orators R=2SG=be assembled and 1SG R=contrain.2SG

[Here is a fair sentence and judgment for an emperor:] fifty orators you have assembled [against a maiden: and promised them great goods and honours … :] and me you constrain [without any hope to go forth to combat against them]

(Cath, t16C MB)

The W varieties of Breton differ by allowing preverbal independent pronouns as neutral subjects when dependent ones are required in KLT. This contrast is known for 20C NB (Favereau 1997: §505, 2000, though for current NB cf. Kennard 2018). However, it goes back at least to eNB (as revealed by parallel translations).

(26) **Continuing topic subjects in KLT + liminal W vs. rest of W (underlined)**

**Translations of The Prodigal Child**

[... e laraz: [...] Zeevel e ri̅ngn, hag e lari̅ngn [...] R=say.PT rise.INF R=do.FUT.1SG and R=go.FUT.1SG to 1SG=father and R=say.FUT.1SG

[But after having come back to himself,] he said: [...] I will rise and I will go to my father, and I will say [to him]

(MP, 19C eNB-wW Guémené-sur-Scorff, border of KLT)

[... yon e laras: [...] Sewé a l e hrign, ha me yei dad me zâd, ha me lari̅ngn [...] 3SGM R=say.PT rise.INF R=do.FUT.1SG and TSG go.FUT to 1SG=father and TSG say.FUT

[But when it came to him to return to himself,] he said: [...] I will rise and I will go to my father, and I will say [to him]

(MP, 19C eNB-wW Groix)

**Translations of The Introduction to Devout Life**

proposi a reont ne bec'hint mui, mæs n'er greont propose R=do.3PL NEG=sin.FUT.3PL more but NEG=3SGM=do.3PL

[In this manner also there are penitents who do leave the state of sin, but … : that is to say,] they propose that they will not sin any more, but do not do it [except against their will …]

(IN, e18C eNB-L)

ind e gueméré er résolution ne bêheint quet mui, mæs ind hé hemère 3PL R=take.IMPF the resolution NEG=ne.sin.3PL not more but 3PL 3SGF=take.IMPF

[In this manner there also there is lots of people who leave the state of sin; but …; that is to say,] they took the resolution that they wil not sin anymore, but they took it [with a certain regret …]

(EOVD, e19C eNB-eW)

The *mihi est* construction of conservative varieties conforms to the exceptional neutrality of preverbal subjects. However, it is less hampered by the blocking of independent by dependent pronouns, because *mihi est* lacks infinitival forms, and so the *do*
+ infinitive periphrasis, often leaving independent pronouns as the sole neutral preverbal element. Other arguments are focused (including the rare object pronouns, see ex. (53)).

(27) Typical contexts of preverbal possessor (neutral) versus possesum (focus)

Continuing topic subject
mar emmeus bet an moyen […] me am bezo iuez […]
if=R=1SG=be been the means 1SG R=1SG=be.FUT also
[Certainly you will not pay …] if I had the means [to give you to eat], I will have also to give you to drink.

Switch and continuing topic subject
Antreit, me meus aman mezer mat, […] me ameus ivez […]
enter 1SG 1SG=be here cloth good 1SG R=have also
Enter, I have here good cloth, [good canvas of all sorts, …]. I also have […]

New information focus object
Pemp pe huech acces terzyen ammeus bet …
five or six attack fever R=1SG=be been
[Explaining one's pallor:] I have had five or six attacks of fever

(Qu, e17C MB)

The unmarked interpretation of preverbal subject pronouns has a consequence that can be detected in orthography all the way back to MB: destressing and attachment. It is revealed by phenomena that treat the pronoun as the initial element of the verbal complex (for MB examples, see Ernault 1888a, Loth 1890, s.v. me, te, ni/ny, hui/huy, en, hui, ho, a; cf. also George 1991: 229, HMSB: §51-4):22

- union of pronoun + verbal complex (rare and idiomatic, e.g. medest '1SG=R=be' attest')
- union of pronoun + mesoclitic (1SG/2SG), which attaches to subject pronouns alone as it does to complex-internal material like negation (e.g. mez pet '1SG=R=2SG ask')
- union of pronoun + proclitic, with elision of final e of the pronoun as otherwise only with complex-internal material like negation (moz ped '1SG=2SG ask').

21 In W mihi est did develop infinitives, see below, and so allows the do + infinitive periphrasis (q.v. Ernault 1888b: 265, 1890: 473, HMSB: §140.10, Chatelier 2016a: 147-166) – without effect here since in W independent preverbal pronouns are not blocked by dependent ones.

22 Orthographic union in MB manuscripts is strongly correlated with what are clitics on independent grounds; it is more prevalent in earlier texts (e.g. Pez aqunemery anomen 'what R=take=3SGF of=nomen', Donoet, e16C MB), but crops up later in interesting ways later (e.g. C/R + BE, 'go', 'come', 'owe' in Beach, m17C MB). Several phenomena must be kept distinct from fusions. One is absence of a between predicate and lenited copula, shared across MB-MC-MW (cf. LVB: 432ff., with diverse later evolutions, e.g. Le Bayon 1876: 26); there is no fusion in me eo '1SG (R)=be' "it's me" vs. me ez eo (GBI, 19C eNB-KLT). Another is hyphen-attachment of the copula eo in esp. W varieties to any preceding predicate, e.g. Pihue-è? … Mé-è 'who=be … me-be' (MG, t18C eNB-eIW; cf. Ternes 1970: 14.1). Lastly, elision of the verbal particle a seems to be a different phenomenon and in need of a study of its own (cf. HMSB: §175.4, LVB: 431).
These fusions are never categorical in writing, being commonest with 1SG *me*, less so with 2SG *te*, rare or absent with other pronouns (with different phonological structure). Only subject pronouns undergo fusion, and only those plausibly neutral, such as plain switch-topics; focused subjects and nonsubjects do not. The *mihi est* construction behaves exactly as others (further MB examples in Ernault 1888a s.v. *eux*, Stokes 1887).

(28) Fusion of unfocused subject pronoun, regular verb and HAVE

\[ \text{men gray ioa} \text{yasmant} \]
\[ 1SG=3SGM=do,FUT \text{ joyously} \]

[Thank you my friend, when you have to do with anything, come to me, I will make you a good bargain. – Well, madam.] I will do it willingly.

Ha *membezo ě*

\[ Q \]
\[ 1SG=be,FUT=3SGM \]

[I will give seventeen *sous* in a word.] Will I have it?

(Qu, e17C MB; in French source *I* is clitic *je*)

The fusions differentiate (e)NB varieties. They seem to be the least continued in L. They are uncommon in eNB orthographies (e.g. *me ho* '1SG 2PL', not *m'ho*, in IN, e18C L, COL, m18C L), and by the first morphophonological study, pronominal subjects tend to be unstressed but not fused (Sommerfelt 1920, e20C eNB-L, e.g. *me o*). In contrast, they become more robust in W. In eNB-clW orthographies, the sporadic fusions of MB are often systematic (e.g. in the 19C standard, 1SG *mē*, 2SG *tē* + e.g. 2PL *hou(č) → m'hou(č); mē, tē + R=1SG/2SG= in *mihi est → m'em ..., t'ha ..., partly already IS, t18C eNB-clW). By the time of linguistic studies of NB-W, the morphophonology underlying the fusions is clearly described: neutral subject pronouns are destressed and prefixed to the verbal complex, with accompanying vowel reduction or elision, e.g. 1SG independent *maj* versus prefixed *m>-, m*- (Ternes 1970: 16.2.1.1, 14.1, m20C wW, henceforth *W-Grx*; inferable from Crahé 2014: 5.3.1, 3.3 and passim, e21C c/wW, henceforth *W-Lan*).

The result is that preverbal independent pronouns become morphologically bound when neutral subjects. This explains the aforementioned anomaly of W: preverbal pronouns alternate with the nominative suffixes as continuing topics in W because both are dependent pronouns in W but not KLT. Nevertheless, they continue to fill the preverbal position, in contrast to their apparent further development in MC (George 1991 on MC vs. MB, perhaps also the extinct eNB variety of Batz, Ernault 1883; the filling of the preverbal position by a form fused to the complex may have its parallel in long-head-movement, see Borsley et al. 1996, Jouitteau 2007, 2011, forth, and for fusion, Urien 1999).23

23 It is not clear whether fusion is possible for preverbal nominals linked to resumptives (subsection 2). These nominals – "broad", "false", "double" subjects – do show all other aspects of subject behavior, including neutral interpretation (Rezae 2011, 2013). A clear example of the reduction of a broad subject to a prefix occurs in *jadfo te daxon* 3SGM=need.IMPF to.3SGM "he wanted" (Ternes 1970: 16.5; the independent 3SGM pronoun is *jyn*); but we are looking for a paradigmatic reduction rather than what may be a fixed expression (cf. Ternes 1970: 260n1). Enclitic doubling bears on this matter. In Breton as in other Brythonic languages, only dependent pronouns may be doubled by enclitics (Stump 1983, 1989 on NB, Widmer 2017: sec. 4 on MB; counterexamples are arguably idiomatic, e.g. NB *me oar-me* '1SG know=1SG' "what do I know", "etc."). However, W frequently doubles apparent independent preverbal pronouns when unfocused subjects, (ia). This
The same reduction and attachment takes place with *mihi est*, but with further consequences. Some fusions are transparent, e.g. 1SG in W-Grx 1SG *mә* + 1SG pres. *әmәbes* → *mәmәbes*, W-Lan 1SG *mә* + 1SG pres. *me(s)* → *mәme(s)*. Others are opaque, e.g. 1PL W-Grx 1PL *ni* + 1PL pres. *xurbes* → *nibes*, W-Lan 1PL *ni* + 1PL pres. *nibes(s)* → *nibes(s)*. The W-Lan 1PL *nibes(s)* is ambiguous between realising *mihi est* alone and pronoun + *mihi est*, the latter filling the preverbal position, while the W-Grx 1PL *nibes* only reflects the former. However, certain forms that were originally forms of *mihi est* alone have become ambiguous like W-Lan 1PL *nibes(s)*: e.g. W-Lan 1SG *me(s)*, W-Grx 1PL *nibes* but not 1SG *әmәbes* (Ternes 1970: 16.3, Crahé 2014: 5.1.8). The reason why only certain forms were so reanalysed, such as W-Grx *xurbes* but not *әmәbes*, may be their consonantal onset, which it seems elsewhere preferred in V1 forms (cf. positive bare responsiveness such as on ’*be.1SG’ > *bon, gon*, Favereau 1997: §436, cf. *HMSB*: §180).

The ambiguous forms of *mihi est*, whether resulting from pronoun + *mihi est* fusion (nibes-type) or reanalysis of *mihi est* forms (*xurbes*-type), explain an important anomaly of W with respect to KLT: in early/mid-20C NB, certain *mihi est* forms with 1st/2nd person subjects become available as V1 (*LVB*: 186–7, Favereau 1997: §440, §539). This is the historically expected behavior of forms like *nibes* as fusions of pronoun + *mihi est*, and new for forms like *xurbes* due to reanalysis on the model of *nibes*. Only *mihi est* underwent this development is because only with *mihi est* are preverbal pronouns doubled by phi-matching proclitics. A reanalysis of *zou ’be’* would leave it ambiguous between ’I am’, ’you are’, etc.

Let us take stock of this rich phenomenon. Fusion of independent pronouns with the following verbal complex can only take place when they are unstressed, and so gives us a ready tool to study whether neutral readings of the preverbal position are limited to subjects in older stages of Breton, as they are in NB. They are, and the subject of *mihi est* patterns with regular subject, whether the possessor of lexical HAVE or the subject of the HAVE-perfect. The fusion is found in MB, seems to peter out in eNB-KLT, but gains force in eNB-W, where it underlies two characteristics of W: preverbal pronoun subjects when other dialects require dependent ones, because they have become dependent; and V1 with certain 1st/2nd person forms of *mihi est*, because they realise pronoun + *mihi est*.

### 6 Nominative objects and the rise of enclitics

#### 6.1 The puzzles

Follows from and supports their reduction to dependent pronouns (Rezac 2019: Appendix A). Nevertheless, similarly frequent broad subjects never seem to be doubled, (ib). That is unexpected if they too have become dependent, unless derivable (cf. Willis 2007: 2.2, Meelen 2016: 218 on MW absence of doubling enclitics with preverbal subjects of the abnormal sentence, there despite crossreferencing by nominative suffixes). Doubling is common with preverbal independent pronouns doubled by dative clitics in *mihi est* (me *mәs-me ‘1SG 1SG=be=1SG’ like e *mәs-me ‘R=1SG=be=1SG’, MG, e19C eNB-clW).

(i) Doubling enclitic with preverbal pronoun moved but not broad subject

| a. ha me zou-mә caus? and 1SG be-1SG cause | b. Me faut d’eign […] |
| (MG, t18C eNB-clW) | (EOVD, e19C eNB-clW, same author as MG) |


In MW as in OIr, the possessum of \textit{mihi est} is coded in the same way as other nominative dependent pronouns, by suffixes to \textit{BE} (though perhaps not always present when expected, see note 7). In MB-MC, \textit{BE} in \textit{mihi est} is invariant, and the possessum is coded in a unique fashion: by postverbal pronouns, at first identical to doubling enclitics. In light of the transparency of \textit{BE} in \textit{mihi est}, the absence of forms with nominative suffixes is striking, e.g. MB *\textit{m biont} '1SG=be.PT.3PL' "I have them", like MW \textit{m buant} (note 7).

\textbf{(29)} \begin{itemize}
\item[3\textsuperscript{rd} person objects of \textit{mihi est} HAVE in MW and MB-MC (see further (33))]
\end{itemize}

\begin{verbatim}
a. nyth vi _ _
   NEG=2SG=be,FUT.3SG/DFLT
   It will not be to thee.

b. noz boe y
   2PL=be,PT=3PL
   [that] you did not have them
\end{verbatim}

(BT, 14C MW) (N, MB)

MB presents another anomaly: when \textit{BE} has several forms, namely in pres. and impf. 3SG/DFLT, \textit{mihi est} uses only one, e.g. MB pres. \textit{eus} '1SG=be' (using the \textit{BE}-form \textit{eus} for indefinite subjects), never MB *\textit{m eo} '1SG=be', (the \textit{BE}-form for definite subjects, even with a definite possessum), or MB *\textit{m zo} '1SG=be', (the \textit{BE}-form for relativised and fronted subjects, even when the possessum is relativised or fronted).

These are the puzzles of nonagreement and \textit{BE}-forms taken up in this section. Both turn out to be expected from nonagreement with nominatives when objects, a crosslinguistically common option, though a specific trigger for it will be suggested in the history of \textit{mihi est}. Once \textit{BE} in \textit{mihi est} stopped agreeing with nominative objects, their realisation as postverbal pronouns follows from independent principles of the pronominal system, and has a parallel in the V1 positive imperative. However, the subsequent developments of these new pronouns in MB are not reducible to these principles, and result in a distinctive coding of nominative objects. The analysis leads to the expectation that 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person objects are missing; that is the matter of section 7.

\textbf{6.2 Nonagreement}

Nominative objects of oblique-subject constructions can agree or fail to even if nominative subjects agree in high and low positions (section 2, Icelandic "A" vs. "C", Finnish). If Breton-Cornish unlike Welsh have the nonagreement option, nominatives will control nominative suffixes (verbal inflection) subjects but not as objects, deriving the difference.

This is all that needs saying on one of two approaches to Complementarity, the \textit{Agreement Hypothesis}, where suffixes realises phi-agreement with dependent pronouns. Only a little more is needed on the \textit{Incorporation Hypothesis}, where they realise the dependent pronouns themselves, and there is no overt expression of agreement. The extra element is the postulate that dependent-pronoun nominatives must be licensed by phi-agreement, independently of the licensing requirements of independent nominatives. This has been established for systems where both elements can be seen together, as in French: independent nominative subjects are licensed in agreeing finite and some nonagreeing nonfinite clauses, but clitic nominative subject are only licensed in the former (Kayne 2000: ch. 9; cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017 on other systems). It follows that if verbal inflection realises nominative dependent pronouns, they need silent phi-agreement in Breton-Cornish,
and will not be licensed as nonagreeing nominative objects, just as they are not licensed as subjects of of infinitives (Rezac 2019).

The difference between MB-MC and MW in whether nominatives agree as objects may relate to a broader difference between the two in the status of nominative suffixes. In MB-MC, the suffixes are in strict Complementarity with independent nominals when clause-internal, preverbal or postverbal (cf. HMSB: §174.1n, 176n1). MW has robust exceptions even with clearly clause-internal, postverbal nominals. In OW-OSWB such exceptions may have been the norm (on MB, HMSB: §174.1n, 176n1; on MW, GMW: §198-200, Borsley et al. 2007: 9.3; on OW-OSWB, Fleuriot 1964, LVB, Koch 1991, Schumacher 2011).24

(30) Agreement with postverbal independent nominatives in MW and OW

\[
\text{ac ual ydoethant y llygot idaw yr grofd and as R=come.PT.3PL the=mice to.3SGM in=the=croft}
\]

(WM, 14C MW)

\[
\text{imguodant ir degion REFL=besought PT.3PL the nobles}
\]

(Chad2, OW; cf. Falileyev 2000: s.v. imguodant)

This state of affairs suggests that MW had available a grammar where nominative suffixes still realised agreement: (i) needed by dependent pronouns, as in MB-MC; (ii) typical with preverbal nominatives in the abnormal sentence, whether subjects or objects; (iii) available with postverbal nominatives (at least when subjects). It may have coexisted with, and evolved to, the Complementarity grammar of MB-MC, where nominative suffixes code dependent pronouns, and so only "agree" when resumptive (with prenegation subjects, Stump 1983, Schäfer 1995, Jouitteau 2005), plus in the abnormal sentence (also resumptive in Tallerman 1996, Meelen 2016, but not Willis 1998). The development of Complementarity in this domain still remains unclear (cf. Roma 2000 for MIr).

6.3 BE-forms

Nonagreement with nominative objects also helps explain why of the several 3SG/default forms of BE in pres. and impf., mihi est in MB has only one. Most of these BE-forms may be absent from mihi est simply because their Brythonic antecedents offered no host to the dative mesoclitics, including relative so that seems to go back to a form of BE initial in its

---

24 HMSB is strict about the lack of exceptions in Breton, up to one (HMSB: 174.1n to get rhyme); apparent counterexamples always involve something else filling the preverbal position, whether linearly (cf. the ex. in Widmer 2017: 233n17) or by particle control (HMSB: §176n1). That is essentially confirmed in this study; the very few counterexamples having the character of errors induced by e.g. complexity in (i). The few plural postverbal nominative objects of MW do not agree, e.g. (ii).

(i) Bezaff ezynt eues ho natur pechedou veniel an ré pere …
be.INF R=be 3PL from=3PL=nature sins venial the=ones which…
those which … are also due to their nature venial sins

(Cnf², m17C MB)

(ii) Ac ým oed y ereu, § Ac ým oed i ieitheu
and R=1SG=be.IMP=1SG words, and R=1SG=be.IMP=1SG languages

(BT, e14C MW)
verbal complex + relativiser. This is inadequate in one key case: MB eo, the form when the subject is a 3SG dependent pronoun or a postverbal independent definite, versus MB eus, with a postverbal independent indefinite (MC yw : us /øs/, MW yw : oes). We should expect ‘is not to me, I have not’ as MB ne’m eus + indefinite possessum ~ *ne’m eo + definite possessum, just as we get ‘is not’ MB ned eus + indefinite postverbal subject ~ *ned eo + definite. However, only the eus form is found in mihi est in MB (relevant evidence seems absent from the small corpora of MC and MW).

Here too nonagreement with nominative objects may suffice as explanation. We need some way to distribute eus : eo forms according to the definiteness of the following but not necessarily adjacent subject. This dependency can be treated as agreement. If we suppose that eo is the form that agrees with a definite, and eus the elsewhere form, then nonagreement with nominative object leaves only the eus form.

The very form MB-MC-MW-OW/OSWB eus-us-oes-(h)ois of the copula presents a puzzle, but it is not specific to mihi est. The expected descendant of pres. 3SG *esti of BE is absent in MB-MC, but found as ys beside oes in MW, with functional specialisation (GMW: §147-8). Both ys and oes occur in MW forms of mihi est (Fleuriot 2002: 27):

(31) MW ys ~ oes in mihi est

a. am ys gwin
   R=1SG=be wine
   (BT, e14C MW)

b. am oes naut
   Q=1SG=be protection
   (BBC, m13C MW)

25 The other forms of the copula are the present and imperfect indicative prefixed with ed-, em-ed- in MB (= MW yd-, cf. MC asyw, usi, vgy); the present indicative 3SG ema, 3PL emaint in MB (= MC yma, mons, MW (y) mae, (y) maent); and relative forms, MB so (cf. MW yssid) (see MB HMSB: §139, §166, Schrijver 2011a: 6.3.4; MC Toorians 2014: 8.9, 8.39; MW GMW: §147-9; Brythonic CG: §478, Fleuriot 1964: §147.2, Failileyev 2000: Appendix 2, Schrijver 2011b: 4.9.7.1). Apart from the relative form the etymologies are opaque. The MB (em-)ed-prefixed forms unlike ema- allow though do not need the preverbal particles (ex. in HMSB: 159, 166, 175-6, cf. Hemon 1954b; as in MW), and so added a over the course of MB (Widmer 2012), leaving more to be said (e.g. so for relativised subjects but not objects derives *a’m so; whatever underlies the specialisations of the (em-)ed-forms as "positional" might derive *a/e’m edy).

26 There is the slim possibility that no explanation is needed. HAVE is subject to definiteness restriction in English, French, and Breton, but only on certain uses (They have a/the/every ship, where only a allows the 'own' reading, while a, the, every allow readings paraphraseable by e.g. They have taken a/the/every ship, They have a/the/every ship on the screen, in front of them, with them, ready, in their possession ...; alongside 'own' They still have the ship, The ship they have is in the dock). This restriction has been related to one in existential-BE constructions (e.g. Heim 1987, Belvin and den Dikken 1997), but the details are not well understood (cf. There is a/*the/*every ship in front of them etc.). In MB-MC-MW, pronominal possessums are found with lexical mihi est (examples are found throughout this section, including with the eus form in Breton), and MB also has other definites of the sort available with HAVE in English or French (in MB: e.g. ar re ho deueux an vsaig à raison 'the ones 3PL=D-be the usage of reason' Gk, t16C MB; nep en deueux an calon net 'whoever 3SGM=D-be the=heart pure', Gk, t16C MB; ma n'on eus an feiz ... perë ... 'if NEG=1PL=be the faith ... which...', Cnf2, m17C MB). It seems unlikely that these can all be reduced to cases where existential-BE allows definites, but not impossible (e.g. pan eus an moyan 'when be the=means', Mc, e17C MB; not repertoried in HMSB: §168, but cf. GMW: §149 on MW and OW cognates). The HAVE-perfect has no definiteness restriction on its objects but yet still only the eus-form, while the BE-perfect of certain intransitives and passives also has no definiteness restriction but the proper eus, eo form according to the definiteness of its subject, so that adds to the puzzle.
It is in place here to resume a recent solution to this longstanding puzzle, because it links the rise of the eus-us-oes form to the mihi est construction: Schrijver (1997: ch. 7, 2011b: 4.9.7.1, below S). S starts from two bases: (i) oes as the nonV1 counterpart of V1 yssit 'there is, exists', a derivative of ys; (ii) yssit as a relic forms of mihi est that use enclitics rather than mesoclitics to code datives in V1, along with yssyn(-i) 'be=1SG(=1SG)', yssyn(-ni) 'be=1PL(=1PL)'. Behind these ys-forms, S reconstructs an absolute ~ conjunct alternation: absolute: V1 3SG *esti (> ys) + second-position clitic root-clause particle *eti + enclitic pronoun 3SGN *ed > yssit ~ conjunct: preverbal element such as *ne 'NEG' + *eti + *ed + *esti > *nêd-e-is > *nïd-oiis > nyt oes. This 'there is (not) to it' developed along the lines French il y a '3SGM.NOM=there=have.3SG' > "there is". Enclitic pronouns other 3SGN *e(d) gave rise to the yssym, yssyn forms. The conjunct survives directly in MW nyt oes, MB ne deus 'there is not'. The form eus-us-oes was extracted and generalised to the nonV1 form of BE with an indefinite subject. This form was also extended to mihi est in place of MB-MC *es, MW ys.27

This proposal for the rise of the eus-us-oes form suggests a trigger for the use of the nonagreement option with nominative objects in MB-MC. It entails a stage where the mihi est construction in positive root clauses was V1 BE + *eti + dative-accusative enclitics. However, while Insular Celtic is reconstructed with object enclitics in V1 constructions versus mesoclitics elsewhere, the enclitics are severely restricted by the time we meet them: in Brythonic, essentially to the MW yssym, yssyn, yssit forms of ys above (GMW: §147, Koch 1987: 152n12, Fleuriot 2002, but CG: §478b sceptical; cf. Zimmer 1999 on OW); in OIr, mostly to after 3SG absolute endings (Thurneysen 1946: §429-431, also cf. 427; cf. Newton 2006: 2.3). Yet the positive root clause may have a disproportionate effect on acquisition and change (Lightfoot’s 1991 "degree-0" learnability; cf. Kroch 2001). The restriction in this clause type of the possessor-coding enclitics to after 3SG forms of BE may then have provided the fulcrum for generalising 3SG forms of BE throughout mihi est, i.e. the nonagreement of MB-MC.

6.4 Blocking and unblocking

Once it is given that MB-MC cannot code nominative objects by suffixes, it is expected that independent pronouns in the postverbal position become "unblocked". Generally, nominative suffixes as dependent pronouns block postverbal independent pronouns, e.g. Breton lavaran ‘say.1SG’, *lavar me ‘say 1SG’. However, when dependent pronouns are

---

27 This the fully developed account of eus-us-oes (cf. Stokes 1887: 51, Ernault 1890: 460, Morris-Jones 1913: §189.3 cf. Zimmer 1999, Fleuriot 2002: 27). Issues for it include: (i) The extension of mihi est with 3SGN *ed to ‘there is’ only occurred with *esti, e.g. no *[n] + *eti + *ed + forms of *bw- > MB **(d)evo for bo ‘there will be’. (ii) The puzzle of other (n)d related in other work to ned eux &c, often unexpected for root-clause *eti (e.g. MB pan(d) eo, mar(d) a: CG: §478.2, LVB: 185-6, McCone 2006; in fine for MB HMSB: §181, 198-199; the it-, ed- forms of the copula do seem reliable to the 3SGN in yssit phonologically and as "positional"); (iii) The unique development of (*e is > *ê ê > *ois > MB-MC /ês/, since the W form wes added in S has w rather than 2PL (cf. maps adjacent to Le Roux 1927: map. 83, and cfW 2PL e huës = MB hoës eus but not e.g. 2SG eh é = 2SG -z eus). Issue (i) relates to S’s account of the de-prefix of mihi est forms in MB-MC (MW is not discussed); all of *eti + *ed + *esti > *d-e-iss > *ois was imported in the place of *is into mihi est constructions with 3rd person clitics, giving e.g. *-in-oiis for -*en-is ‘3SGM-be’, and only later was *ois imported into forms with 1st/2nd person clitics; and this development was not restricted to *esti, giving e.g. *[n] + *eti + *ed + forms of *bw- > *[n] (ed)/devo- imported into mihi est *[n(e)] in devo- > e.g. MB en devo (then influencing the pres. to give MB en devex beside en deex, cf. LVB: 185-6 with literature).
unavailable, independent pronouns are unblocked and appear in the same positions as independent nominals. The unavailability can be syntactic (XP-fronting to the preverbal position; the "strong-pronoun environments" of coordination and modification), or morphological (Breton ha(g) 'as' has no inflected forms, hence ha me, until forms like hag-on develop to block them, Fave 1998, 20C NB-L). All the Brythonic languages show such blocking and unblocking, though it varies in details and strength.

To introduce the unblocking with nominative objects, let us first look at unblocking with accusative objects, because it is more familiar and they will presently collapse with nominative objects. Brythonic can be reconstructed with a blocking of independent pronouns by mesoclitics for accusative objects. However, there was no blocking of objects in V1 positive imperatives, because mesoclitics needed a preverbal host in the verbal complex, and had none in V1 constructions. Instead, independent pronouns appear in the position of independent nominal objects. In contrast, in negative imperatives the negation na supplied host (CG: §348ff.).

(32) Clitic – independent alternation for objects of imperatives (underlined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive imperative</th>
<th>Negative imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>digwch ūi odyma</td>
<td>nam ellug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring!2PL 1SG from.here</td>
<td>NĒG=1SG=release!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holyough ve</td>
<td>na vlamyough yy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow!2PL=1SG</td>
<td>NĒG=blame!2PL=1SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrig ef</td>
<td>n'en recevet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correct=3SGM</td>
<td>quet NĒG=3SGM=receive.IPV.2PL not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(WM, 14C MW) (BBC, m13C MW) (PA, e15C MC) (Gk, t16C MB)

With nominative subjects, MB-MC-MW all have strong blocking of postverbal independent pronouns. The exception is precisely where expected, in uninflectable forms:

---

28 On the interaction of the V1 imperative with Vendryes' restriction of Wackernernagel clitics to a host in the verbal complex across Insular Celtic, see esp. Sims-Williams (1984: 171). The unblocking occurred in Brythonic, whereas OIr inserts the particle no (neither allows the old enclitic pronouns or infixation after a preverb). Middle-stage Brythonic system have undergone further developments. MB has strong blocking of postverbal pronouns by accusatives clitics, MC nearly as strong (but see Toorians 2014: 7.6), MW far weaker (GMW: §55, perhaps due to its more extensive V1; incipient clitic loss, Borsley et al. 2007: 9.8; but also interesting morphophonological and syntactic conditions, Morris-Jones 1913: §160, 1931: §77, Watkins 1977: 152, the latter witnessed in OSWB though not MB-MC, cf. Fleuriot 1964: §116-7, Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1). In MW, the unblocked postverbal pronouns are independent, in MB-MC encliticised, as discussed below. In MW, the negative imperative also uses postverbal pronoun owing to their weak blocking; but in MC and some MB texts, with strong blocking, they have become grammaticalised here from the positive imperative, also discussed below (OW has a clitic in na-m erek mi 'NEG=1SG=ask!2PL/3SG=1SG', OW, discussed in Falileyev 2008, Schrijver 2011b). There are no traces of the old dative-accusative enclitics (see above), nor do initial a, y appear as props for or syllabic forms of clitic (q.v. in other V1 constructions for MW GMW: §58, 61, Schrijver 1997: 166; not in MB). The locution "V1 (positive) imperative" is needed because in MB ha 'and' could attach to the verbal and nominal complexes and host mesoclitics, giving non-V1 ham 'and=1SG' + positive imperative (HMSB: §53; not with proclitics, 1PL *ha hon, see the next subsection, but also with 2SG + reflexive en-, Hemon 1954a: 250, and in the jussive, see section 9).
in MB, this is *eme* 'quoth', with postverbal independent pronoun, *eme-vê* 'said-1SG' like *eme Zouê* 'said God' (de Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *dis-je*), until it develops inflected forms that block them, e.g. *emez*, *un* 'quoth.1SG' (Sommerfelt 1920, e20C NB-L) (LVB: 205-6, HMSB: §152; cf. MW *heb(yr)* 'quoth', *GPC: eb* ³, *GMW*: §170).

Nominative objects in MB-MC should behave in the same way, since they could not be expressed by suffixes when pronominal. This is so, save that unlike with *eme* and with imperatives, they are restricted to 3rd person (section 7).

(33) 3rd person nominative objects of *mihi est* (underlined) (cf. ex. (33))

```
  nac eruyn ti    hedw   nyth vi __
  NEG=pray!2SG=2SG peace   NEG=2SG=be.FUT
  Pray not for peace – it will not be to thee.
```


```
  ha   ty   a vy 3   hy
  and 2SG  R=2SG=be=3SGF
  and you will have her

  hac oz bezo ef
  and 2PL=be.FUT=3SGM
  'and you will have it'

  Gant queuz bras   emeux ef   clasquet
  with regret great  R=1SG=be=3SGM  sought
  I have sought him with great regret

  (J, e16C MB)

  nep   en   deus-hy
  whoever  3SGM=D=be=3SGF
  [after the death of] whoever has it [sc. a royal charge]
```

(de Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *survivance*)

---

29 A sample from early to m16C MB verse (later MB prose in sections 6.5 and 7.1): *na he deffe hy"nor would have it"; Da quer map doe en dewoe hy"your dear son of God had it* (Pm, e16C MB); *Ivez cafet entren bedis onmeux ef"Also we have found him among the people"; houis eux y lamet"you have freed them"; *hac oz bezo ef"and you will have it"; A te zeux hy santitiat?"And did you sanctify her"; Gant queuz bras emeux ef clasquet"I have sought him with great regret"; *Me meux ef guel et"I have seen him"; em be ef guerzet"I have sold him* (J, e16C MB); *memeux eff rez bezet"I have legitimately had it"; *Mar az vez y ... gourmet"If you have ... kept them"; *Mar nez vez eff ... amanet"If you have not expiated it* (M, e16C MB); *Na lauar quet es te hy neb quentel guel et"Do not say that you have not seen her" (B, m16C); *noz boe y'[and would you swear that] you did not have them?"; *a huy ox eux eff euez nezet"whether you have also spun it* (N, MB). Other MC examples are rare: *me am byth ef"I shall have it"; ha te a with ef"and thou shalt have it* (BK, e16C MC). The MW example is one of only a couple, and counterparts of it do occur in MB through object-drop; what does not exist in MB-MC is nominative suffix counterparts to 3PL -nt in MW (9), and in MW counterparts to postverbal pronouns such as 3PL *wy/nt* after 3SG/default BE. There is one exception to default BE-forms in *mihi est*, but little can be made of it: *me an heny am crucifiat 1SG the=one R=1SG=crucify.PT.IMPERS* has a variant where *am* is replaced by *ameur*, as if *R=1SG=be.IMPERS*, without replacing *crucifiat* by participle *crucifiet* (J, e16C MB) (Ernault 1888b: *ameur*; LVB; Rezac and Jouitteau 2015).
The result in MB-MC is a contrast between general coding of core arguments by dependent pronouns on the verb, accusative clitics and nominative suffixes, and two environments where pronouns appear instead after the verb, accusative objects of imperatives and nominative objects of *mihi est*. These constructional contrasts are categorical in MB and nearly so in MC – a situation that is striking from the perspective of MW, where weaker blocking in the accusative system results in frequent postverbal pronouns outside imperatives, and pronominal objects of *mihi est* are nearly absent.

The postverbal pronouns of V1 imperatives and *mihi est* look the same, because both are objects (same position) and independent (invariant for case); but they were at first distinct in morphosyntax (abstract nominative vs. accusative case) and reasons for unblocking (V1 vs. PCC). Matters did not remain so. By the time we meet them in MB-MC, they have become enclitics and spread to negative imperatives, and can no longer be derived through unblocking. Then in MB alone, they become unified by extension of the 3rd person restriction and new forms, calling for a new analysis.

6.5 Encliticisation and change of form in MB

In MB-MC the postverbal pronoun objects of imperatives and *mihi est* became *argumental enclitics*, at first identical in form and position to *doubling enclitics*.30

In *position*, the enclitic character of argumental and doubling enclitics alike is revealed by their placement immediately after the verbal complex. In negative clauses, this puts them between the verbal complex and the low negation *quet*. Here neither other arguments, nor any adjuncts, can appear. This is the situation in MB and eNB-KLT. In W, both doubling and argumental enclitics follow *ket* from the first texts of 18C eNB-clW on.31 In the HAVE-perfect, the enclitics moreover precede the participle, while independent nominal objects follow it, and later-developed accusative objects procliticise to it. Argumental and doubling enclitics occasionally combine, in both orders.32

30 The MB/eNB evidence is set out in detail here because it is only very partially given elsewhere. Work on NB-W is clear on the enclitic status of objects of *mihi est* and imperatives (Ternes 1970: 10.6; Favereau 1997: §247), and already grammars of eNB-clW highlight their distinctive position (Guillôme 1836: 115, Guillevie and Le Goff 1902: 30-1). However, in MB they have been grouped with independent against affixal (doubling) pronouns (*HMSB*: §51-52, though rich in relevant examples), or with affixal pronouns not all of which are such (*CG*: §348 including objects of imperatives in MW), or not addressed (Lewis and Piette 1990).

31 The pre/post-*ket* placement of enclitics relates to the degree of attachment of *ket* to the verb. In NB-KLT penult-accent systems, Sommerfelt (1920: 117-9, 149; eNB-L) entails that both the low negation *ket* and enclitics group with the verb for word-level stress, while Jackson (1961: 329; eNB-T) entails that *ket* does not though it attaches and destresses at the phrase-level (cf. occasional hyphenation from MB on, as in *Na ynt-quet* ‘NEG=be.3PL not’ (Qu, e17C MB). Correspondingly, NB-T but not NB-L permit some post-*ket* placement of enclitics (cf. Borsley and Stephens 1989, Stump 1989). In W ultimate-accent systems, the two domains are harder to tell apart, but Ternes (1970) analyses *ket* as part of the same morphophonological word as the verb, and enclitics must follow it.

32 By 19C eNB, doubling (rarely) and argumental (very rarely) enclitics can float to the participle of periphrastic constructions (e.g. BSLsse m19C eNB-L, MBJJ e20C eNB-T, DHKN m20C NB wW, TDPB m20T, OFBH l20C eNB-L, and other doubling examples in NB in Rezac 2013, *ARBRES*: Les pronoms écho; cf. perhaps in MW, Morris-Jones 1931: §73, *GMW*: §62n2).

(i) Floating in NB W
(34) Enclitic position of the object of imperatives in MB (cf. (38))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na dibrit y quet oll} \\
\text{NEG=eat!2PL=3PL not all} \\
\text{Eat them not all!}
\end{align*}
\]

(Qu, e17C MB; HMSB)

(35) Enclitic position of the object of \textit{mihi est} in MB

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oll e meuxy dispriset} \\
\text{all R=1SG=be=3PL despised}
\end{align*}
\]

(Cath, t16C MB)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{no pe euff quet à bianoch…} \\
\text{NEG=2PL=be.COND=3SGM not for=less} \\
\text{you would not have it for less (tr. French: \textit{vous ne l'auriez pas à moins})}
\end{align*}
\]

(Qu, e17C MB)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ha ne meus me y quet effet oll?} \\
\text{Q=NEG=1SG=be=1SG=3PL not for\textless} \\
\text{Have I not all drunk (tr. French: \textit{Ne l'ay ie pas tout beu?})}
\end{align*}
\]

(Qu, e17C MB)

(36) Enclitic placement of the object of \textit{mihi est} in eNB-KLT

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n'oc'h eus-hu-ën quet karet} \\
\text{NEG=3PL=be=2PL=3SGM loved} \\
\text{have you not loved him [sc. your neighbour]}
\end{align*}
\]

(IN, e18C eNB-L)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{digand pe hiny oc'h eus-hu ê bet} \\
\text{from=which=one 2PL=be=2PL=3SGM had} \\
\text{From which one have you had it?}
\end{align*}
\]

(de Rostrenen 1732: s.v. \textit{lequel}, e18C eNB)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ma n'oc'h euz hi ket} \\
\text{if=NEG=2PL=be=3SGF not} \\
\text{if you do not have them [sc. one hundred crowns]}
\end{align*}
\]

(BD, t18C eNB-T; HMSB)

(37) Enclitic placement of the object of \textit{mihi est} in (e)NB-W

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mæs pet güéh en e hoës-ind-hui méritet?} \\
\text{but how.many times R=2PL=be=3PL=2PL deserved}
\end{align*}
\]

EOVD, e18C eNB-elW)

\[
\text{a. ma 'më pet ie bahateit b. men e hues on lakeit-hui} \\
\text{that 1SG=be been=3SGM beaten} \\
\text{where R=2PL=be=3SGM put=2PL}
\]

(DICO, 21C NB-W)

(Loth 1886: 185, 19C eNB-eW)
Some of the above examples of argumental enclitics involve the negative imperative. Here originally the negation na(c) was a clitic host, and so remained in W, but elsewhere from MB on argumental enclitics are allowed (Gk, t16C-MB) or general (IN, e18C eNB-L; so also MC). The negation na(c) itself did not cease to be an obligatory host of accusative clitics in other finite clauses, and indeed in imperatives for 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person (section 7.2). Moreover, by 16C MB, 3\textsuperscript{rd} person clitics had become proclitic and no longer needed a leftward host (ibid). It follows that postverbal pronouns can no longer be derived from unblocking due to the absence of a mesoclitic host.

(38) Variable innovation of enclitics in negative imperative

\begin{align*}
\text{na} & \quad \text{credet} & \quad \text{ef} & \quad \text{quet} & \quad \ldots & \quad \text{n'en} & \quad \text{receuet} & \quad \text{quet} & \quad \text{en} & \quad \text{ho} & \quad \text{ty} \\
\text{NEG}= & \quad \text{believe!} & \quad \text{2PL} & \quad \text{3SGM} & \quad \text{not} & \quad \text{NEG}= & \quad \text{3SGM}= & \quad \text{receive!} & \quad \text{2PL} & \quad \text{not} & \quad \text{in}= & \quad \text{your}= & \quad \text{house} \\
\text{(Gk, t16C MB)}
\end{align*}

Enclitic status can also be indicated by form. Argumental and doubling enclitics alike at first had the same form as independent pronouns. This started changing at the end of MB, e.g. 3PL MB \(y/\i/>\text{eNB varieties int, ind} >\text{eNB-KLT varieties int-}y\) as independent, but often a step or two behind as enclitic. We may thus contrast argumental and doubling enclitics with independent pronouns unblocked elsewhere, here with \textit{chetu ‘lo}.\textsuperscript{33}

(39) Text with 3PL independent \textit{y, int, indy}, enclitic only \textit{y}

\textit{Independent postverbal indy} \sim \textit{y}

\begin{align*}
\text{chetu-} & \quad \text{indy} & \quad \text{a} & \quad \text{se} & \sim & \quad \text{chetu} & \quad \text{y} & \quad \text{breman} \\
\text{lo} & \quad \text{3PL} & \quad \text{there} & \quad \text{lo} & \quad \text{3PL} & \quad \text{now}
\end{align*}

\textit{Doubling and argumental y}

\begin{align*}
\text{pe en lech} & \quad \text{ém'haindy?} & \quad \text{digacist} & \quad \text{y} & \quad \text{me} & \quad \text{meus} & \quad \text{y} & \quad \text{gounezet} \\
\text{where} & \quad \text{be.} & \quad \text{3PL} & \quad \text{send!} & \quad \text{2PL} & \quad \text{3PL} & \quad \text{for} & \quad \text{1SG} & \quad \text{ISG}= & \quad \text{be}= & \quad \text{3PL} & \quad \text{earned}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{33} Later on, \textit{int} (not, it seems \textit{inty}) extended to argumental enclitics, regularly in eNB-clW as \textit{ind} (Le Bayon 1878), but rarely also elsewhere (BM, t18C T copy, both \textit{hint} and \textit{i}). Other changes include gain of onset in 3SGM \(o\tilde{n} > \text{yo\tilde{n}}\) (MP, t19C eNB-neK), and denasalisation in 3SGM \(e > e\) (IN, COL \(e,m18C\) eNB-L, cf. for IN Châtelier 2016b: 408). MB already had enclitic forms for 2SG -\textit{te} \sim -\textit{de} and 2PL -\textit{hui} \sim -\textit{hu}. Later various enclitic forms can be found only in certain environments (e.g. -\textit{de}, -\textit{hu}, -i subject doubling in questions for clW, Le Bayon 1878: 50n; cf. Hingant 1868: 174, Ernault 1897: §41.1, Moal 1909: 84).
Orthography gives evidence about form. In MB orthography, full unification is an excellent guide to clisis, though always sporadic (see note 22). It can be found with argumental and doubling enclitics (e.g. (39), (40), (45), (46), (47)). Hyphenation is also frequent, but so it is between elements of what seem to be minimal prosodic phrases where clisis never developed by any criteria (thus chetu-inty above).

Finally, there is syntactic evidence from coordinated hosts. When independent nominal subjects and objects can be shared across sisters, clitics vary. In French, sharing is allowed for nominative subject proclitics but not accusative object pro- and enclitics (e.g. Kayne 1975: 97, Rowlett 2007: 136). From MB on, it is the rule to repeat any type of clitic on each coordinated host, indicating a tight coupling: 34

(40) Coordinate host vs. nonhost in HAVE-constructions

Enclitic on auxiliary host shared across coord. participles
ma en deveus-ii revoquet ha reprenet
as 3SGM=D-be=3PL revoked and retaken

Proclitics distributed across coordinated participle hosts
...em eus o tennet hac ho sachet
...R=1SG=be 2PL=drawn and 2PL=brought

Proclitics distributed across coordinated finite hosts
evellen hoc'h anavan hac hoc'h ador'an
like=this 2PL=know.1SG and 2PL=adore.1SG

Enclitics distributed across coordinated imperative host
detestit-y ha regretit-y
detest!2PL=3SGF and regret!2PL=3SGF

(IN, e18C eNB-L)

Thus at some point prior to 16C MB, the unblocked independent pronouns coding objects of imperative and mihi est had encliticised. The same took place in MC (clearly with imperatives, Toorians 2014: 7.6; the handful of pronominal objects with mihi est is ambiguous). The outcome was identical in form and position to doubling enclitics, up to ambiguity, e.g. o deus-i’3PL=D.is-3PL', both "they themselves have" and "they have them" (IN, e18C eNB-L). MW retains the earlier state of affairs where independent objects of

34 Counterexamples exist but generally are as in French, involving factors such as close parallelism. More research is needed to see whether argumental enclitics can ever occur in the strong pronoun environments of coordination and modification, as also with accusative, genitive clitics and nominative suffixes, though available in some varieties with suffixes to prepositions (e.g. suffixal ire-d'ai hac er ré... 'between.3PL and the ones...', though precisely in this environment blocking seems to be absent, ire' ean ha hui 'between 3SGM and 2PL', both IS, t18C eNB-clW; cf. Joutteau and Rezac 2006 on NB). Doubling enclitics can occur in these environments provided that the dependent pronoun they double can, again only prepositional suffixes in some varieties Breton (see Willis 2007 on the situation in MW, adding that doubling there is not required, e.g. there is both y rof (i) a Duw 'between.1SG(=1SG) and God', WM 14C MW).
imperatives contrast with doubling enclitics (*GMW*: §55, 62, Borsley et al. 2007: 9.8; cf. Morris-Jones 1913: §160.iii, 1931: §77). Doubling pronouns had presumably encliticised in Brythonic but the details are unclear (on OSWB-OW forms, see Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1).

Comparison of MB and MC suggests certain details about the enclitisation. It attached independent pronouns to the preceding verb when object but not predicate. It is unclear whether the subject was encliticised; the only evidence would come from MB *eme*² 'quoth' discussed above and it is ambiguous (e.g. both *eme-vê* with lenited *me* '1SG' like an independent nominal *eme Zouë* 'said God' but also *eme-me* like the never-leniting 1SG enclitic, de Rostrenen 1932: *dis-jê*). The enclitisation may originally have taken place only when verb and argument were adjacent; by MB the low negation *quet* and participle of the HAVE-perfect intervene between independent and enclitic positions, but both are MB innovations. At the shared MB-MC stage the enclitisation did not affect arguments of other governors, leaving them independent after MB *ha(c)* 'than' (uninflectable), *ched*, *chetu* 'lo' (< c² *sell-de* 'look!2SG=2SG', *sellit-hu* 'look!2PL=2PL', opaque in MB, *HMSB*: §51; but MC *otta* 'lo' encliticised its argument), *gwa* 'woe' (but MC *goe* + enclitic) (cf. *HMSB*: §51, Toorians 2014: 7.6, 12.2). Similar enclitisation is common, for instance in French in enclitic coding of only pronominal objects with V1 positive imperatives – or indeed the enclitic dative-accusative series of Insular Celtic (above, though limited as described, e.g. *bithom-sa* 'be!3SG=1SG', Thurneysen 1946: §430).

6.6 Adoption of prepositional morphology and new status

In eNB, many conservative varieties undergo a further development: the argumental but not doubling enclitics adopt the forms of prepositional suffixes. This has important analytical consequences, because it singles out and unifies object coding across imperative and *mihi est* constructions.

In MB, the (3rd-person only) argumental enclitics have the same form as doubling enclitics (3SGM /eṽ/, 3SGF /(h)i/, 3PL /i/). In the change, argumental enclitics adopted the forms of suffixes to preposition. This choice is natural. Among dependent pronouns left-attached to their hosts like enclitics, verbal suffixes to verbs go back to agreement morphology distinct from pronominal forms in Proto-Indo-European, but prepositional suffixes go back to pronouns attached in the history of Celtic and partly made of the same elements as independent/encliticised pronouns (cf. Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1). The result by MB is that prepositional suffixes have a weaker attachment to their host, like enclitics (to go by orthography, which frequently separates them), make the same phi-distinctions as enclitics (gender in 3SG), and even have forms similar to the enclitics (prepositional suffixes MB 3SGM /(h)aṽ/, /(h)ã/, 3SGF /(h)i/, 3PL /(h)e/, /(h)o/, verbal suffixes, 3SGM/F ∅, 3PL /nt/; so throughout eNB, Table 2).

The change took place across the spectrum conservative varieties, though not in all and not always obligatorily (see *HMSB*: §54n2 on MB and eNB L, T; but already fairly fully de Rostrenen 1738: 1.1.2.1-3, grammarian from T drawing much on L, and esp. Le Bayon 1878: 51, grammarian of cL describing varieties around Vannes, also partly Le Clerc 1908: §139, grammarian of T not actually using enclitics in his own writings).³⁵

³⁵ *HMSB*: §54n gives an MB example but along with others like (45) it involves 3SGM *añ* for *eñ* that is found independently for all enclitics (e.g. m19C eNB-L, Hingant 1868: §445). In NB-wW, the change is masked: all 3SGM and 3PL pronouns collapse to the old prepositional suffixes (Ternes 1970: 3SGM /jɔŋ/ 3SGF /xi/ 3PL /nt/; so throughout eNB, Table 2).
(41) Differentiation of argumental and doubling enclitics in an eNB-L variety

Independent: \text{3PL} \quad \text{Doubling: 3PL}

\begin{align*}
\text{chêtu-int} & \quad \text{pelec'h emaint-y}\\ 
\text{lo 3PL here} & \quad \text{where be.3PL=3PL}
\end{align*}

Imperative: \text{3PL} \quad \text{mihi est: 3PL}

\begin{align*}
\text{grit-he} & \quad \text{er=c'his}\\ 
\text{make!2PL=3PL in.the=manner} & \quad \text{be.INF2PL=be.FUT=3PL}
\end{align*}

(COL, t18C eNB-L/T)

(42) Differentiation of argumental and doubling enclitics in an eNB-clW variety

\text{Doubling: 3SGM} \quad \text{3PL}

\begin{align*}
\text{piw ć-eañ} & \quad \text{ou hani-\text{ind}}\\ 
\text{who be.3SG=3SGM} & \quad \text{3PL=one=3PL}
\end{align*}

Imperative: \text{3SGM} \quad \text{3PL}

\begin{align*}
\text{kâret-eañ/hoñ} & \quad \text{kasset-hai}\\ 
\text{love!2PL=3SGM} & \quad \text{send!2PL=3PL}
\end{align*}

\text{mihi est: 3SGM} \quad \text{3PL}

\begin{align*}
\text{hag e mes eañ/hoñ reit} & \quad \text{hag e mès ind/hai goarnet}\\ 
\text{and R=1SG=be=3SGM given} & \quad \text{and R=1SG=be=3PL kept}\\ 
\text{and I have given it [to a poor person]} & \quad \text{and I have kept them [with me]}
\end{align*}

(Le Bayon 1878, t19C eNB-clW)

(43) Differentiation of argumental and doubling enclitics in an eNB-T variety

\text{o deus-Ê} \quad \text{etabilisset … voant ii} \quad \text{o unan etabilisset 3PL=D-is=3PL established … be.IMPF.3PL=3PL 3PL=\text{self established}}

"[who] have established them [to govern the Church, even as] they were \underline{\text{themselves established [by J.C.]}}"

\begin{align*}
\text{na lest Ê} & \quad \text{quet d'o conit}\\ 
\text{NEG=let!2SG=3PL not to=3PL=deceive.INF} & \quad \text{do not let them deceive them}
\end{align*}

(CMT, e19C eNB-T)

The change suggests a novel morphosyntactic category constituted of objects of imperatives and \text{mihi est} and them alone. It has its parallel in Finnish, where objects in these two environments are nominative, while objects of transitives in other moods are accusative, as in Breton (section 2). The parallel is strengthened by the restriction of the nominative-enclitic objects to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person and their alternation with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person accusatives

\(\text{xaj}/;\) Cheveau 2007: \text{3SGM/}(h)jɔ/ 3SGF/\text{h}i/ 3PL/\text{(h)j}u/; in 3SGM already in t19C MP).
in both constructions across both languages (section 7). Adopting the parallel yields the followings picture of argument coding for dependent pronouns (Rezac 2019, with analysis):

Table 3: Dependent pronoun form-syntax in MB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent pronoun</th>
<th>Case and position/GR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doubling enclitic</td>
<td>doubles all dependent pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffix to finite verb</td>
<td>nominative subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(infix/)proclitic to verb</td>
<td>accusative object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(infix/)proclitic to nominals</td>
<td>genitive object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffix to preposition</td>
<td>prepositional object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(infix/)proclitic to BE</td>
<td>dative subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

argumen slal enclitic (3rd person only) object of *mihi est*, nominative object of imperative, nominative

On this view, argumental enclitics code nominative objects. They are then rare in doing so by their own form, rather than by sharing the form of nominative subjects and differing in agreement. Breton indicates one diachronic pathway to this outcome: (i) dependent pronouns coding nominative subjects need agreement, and agreement becomes limited to subjects; (ii) absence of dependent pronouns for nominative objects unblocks independent pronouns; (iii) independent pronouns cliticise in only environments where the clitics may be analysed as nominative objects. Elements (i, ii) are common. It is in (iii) that MB is distinctive, even from MC where enclitics code arguments across a variety of grammatical functions, such as the argument of *goe* 'woc'. In MB, they only code objects of anomalous-subject constructions, compatible with a nominative object analysis.

7 Nominative objects and the PCC

7.1 The Person Case Constraint on nominatives and the accusative repair

In conservative varieties of Breton, where pronominal objects of *mihi est* are richly attested and described, thanks to a large corpus, living varieties, and the HAVE-perfect, they are restricted to 3rd person when enclitics. This is also true of their few counterparts in MC. The restriction extends to pronominal objects of the imperative when enclitic in MB and eNB-KLT but not in (e)NB-W, and it is absent from MC. This affords minimal contrasts that underscore the puzzle of the restriction: it is not due to lack of 1st/2nd person forms, since doubling enclitics have these, and so do enclitic objects of imperatives in W and MC. Something more abstract must explain in both of its forms:

(44) 3rd person restrictions on argumental enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>loved!2PL=3PL/1PL</th>
<th>3SGM=D-be=3PL/*1PL (loved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB (= eNB-KLT)</td>
<td>caret y/*ny</td>
<td>...en deus y/*ny (caret)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNB-clW (= MC)</td>
<td>câret-ind/ni</td>
<td>...en dès-ind/*ni (câret)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead of the expected enclitics, we find in both *mihi est* and imperative constructions accusative proclitics for 1st/2nd person. The result is a coding split by person, unique in Brythonic: 3rd person argumental enclitic (originally identical with doubling enclitics, later special, as discussed above) ~ 1st/2nd person accusative proclitic (originally partly novel but inherent in the system, as discussed below). The first example contrasts anomalous and regular object coding from a contiguous passage, the others more synoptically.

(45) Object coding in *mihi est* and transitives

nep *en-deuesaff* graet […] vn cleuffet *en* saesiz […] who ever 3SGM=D-be=3SGM done an=illness 3SGM=seize pe en heny *emeus* da enguentaet […] n’az lessen […] which=in=one R=1SG=be 2SG=engendered NEG=2SG=leave.IMPF.2SG pe en heny ez euz *ma* enguentaet, té az heus *ma* disquet […] which=in=one R=2SG=be 1SG=engendered 2SG R=2SG=be 1SG=taught (Cnf², within a single paragraph, m17C MB)

(46) *Mihi est*: 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitic alternation MB, eNB-KLT, NB-W

oll e *meuxy* dispriset en deueux *ma* digaczet all R=1SG=be=3PL despised 3SGM=d-be=1SG=sent I have despised them all [who] has sent me (Cath, t16C MB) ne *meus é* quet cleuffet *Nem meus quet ho cleuet* NEG=1SG=be=3SGM not heard NEG=1SG=be not 2PL=heard I have not heard him I have not heard you (Gk, t16C MB)

…en *deveus-èn* tennet …en *deveus* *va=*zennet 3SGM=D-be=3SGM drawn 3SGM=D-be 1SG=drawn …has drawn it …has drawn me (IN, e18C eNB-L)

N’em eus ket *eñv/höñ* gwelet N’em boe ket ho kwelet NEG=1SG=be=not=3SGM seen NEG=1SG=be.IMPF=not 2PL=seen I have not seen him. I had not seen you. (Crahé 2014, 21C NB-cwW)

(47) Imperatives: 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitic in MB, eNB-KLT but not NB-W

aduertisyd ma sicour(et) quezcomp *hy* warn!2PL-3PL 1SG=help!(2PL) send!1PL=3SGF (N, MB)

listy da redec *ma* excusit musuromp *eff* let!2PL=3PL to run 1SG=excuse!2PL measure!1PL=3SGM (Qu, e17C MB)

tennit-*èn* va zennit rentomp-*èn* draw!2PL=3SGM 1SG=drawing!2PL return!1PL=3SGM
In light of section 2, the limitation of argumental enclitics to 3rd person as objects of *mihi est* reflects the PCC on nominative objects of oblique-subject unaccusatives (Icelandic, Finnish) and imperatives (Finnish); in some systems 1st/2nd person is expressible by accusative (Finnish but not Icelandic). With *mihi est*, the restriction to 3rd person possessums is robust in MB but compatible with MC-MW and may go back to Brythonic. With the imperative, the 3rd person restriction is a development of MB alone and continued in eNB-KLT but not (e)NB-W. Only in Breton do 1st/2nd person accusative proclitics appear with imperative and *mihi est*. It seems then that an antecedent of MB(-MC-MW) restricted the nominative objects *mihi est* to 3rd person (Icelandic-type), while MB aligned imperatives with *mihi est* and added 1st/2nd person accusatives (Finnish-type). These developments are discussed next.

7.2 The rise and limits of proclitics

Table 4 resumes the accusative and genitive pronominal clitics of the Brythonic languages. In Brythonic the accusative clitics were "infixed", attaching leftward to the initial element of the verbal complex, as well as rightward (e.g. 2SG.ACC *=twe > *=θ^P+L=, syllabified by the leftward host, mutating the rightward one). Genitive clitics were proclitics, but developed infixed forms after prepositions (e.g. 2SG.GEN *tewe= > *dow^L=, after preposition > *=θ^P+L=). Because the two case-series were built of similar pronominal materials, some infixed forms of genitives and accusatives ended up syncretic, and this became systematic in 1st/2nd though not 3rd person in MB-MC-MW.

Table 4: Accusative and genitive clitics in MB-MC-MW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MB ACC</th>
<th>MC ACC</th>
<th>MW ACC</th>
<th>Bryth ACC</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>GEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-m^S?</td>
<td>-m^S?</td>
<td>-m^S?</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>v^N</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m~mi</td>
<td>?mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-z^P(L), -z^P(L)</td>
<td>-m~ow^s</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
<td>-m<del>m</del>o~v^N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>(h)on</td>
<td>-gan/^n</td>
<td>-gan-agan</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n<del>n</del>y</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>on, an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>(h)o(z)</td>
<td>-gas</td>
<td>-gas-(ag) as</td>
<td>-ch</td>
<td>-ch-ych</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>e^L</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-y^L</td>
<td>-e^h~s</td>
<td>-e^h~y^L</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGF</td>
<td>he^ss, +s</td>
<td>he^ss</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-y^s(h)y^s</td>
<td>-e^h~s</td>
<td>-e^h~y^s</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>(h)o^s</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-ga~aga^s</td>
<td>-e^h~s</td>
<td>-e~eu</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>(h)ou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols: -x (infixed), x~y (infixed-proclitic), x,y (other variants); † marginal; (x) limited
Sources: MB (HMSB, Schrijver 2011a); MC (Toorians 2014; th, dh /ð/); MW (GMW, Borsley et al. 2007: ch. 9); Bryth = OW, OSWB (Schrijver 2011b)

MB is distinctive in two ways (cf. HMSB: §51-4, Pedersen 1909: §498, CG: §354, Lewis and Piette 1990: §27, Schrijver 2011a). One, the accusative-genitive syncretism went so far that only 3SGM kept the difference. This mostly remained so in later conservative varieties, though partly reversed in W (details follow). Two, in MB only 1/2SG have
productive infixed forms, while all the others are proclitics. The latter are identifiable as such even within the verbal complex, because they suppress the vowel of their earstwhile hosts, rather than the reverse: thus NE¬G=1PL MB n’hon vs. MC-MW ny’n, or R=1PL MB ◁ hon vs. MC-MW a’n ~ y’n, OW a’n. By eNB, the infixed forms were lost or syllabified to proclitics, such as eLW 1SG me\textsuperscript{\textforall} ~ em\textsuperscript{\textforall}, 2SG te\textsuperscript{L/P} \sim ha\textsuperscript{L/P}, and the mesoclitic category vanished (HMBS: §53-4 and e.g. Le Bayon 1878: 51).\textsuperscript{36}

A learner faced with the MB system would see a single series of accusative-genitive clitics in all but 3SGM, motivating a syncretism at least in 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person over accidental homophony. The syncretism entails that the sole mesoclitics, 1SG =m=, 2SG =z=, have proclitic alternants ma=, da=. These were originally genitives, alternating according to whether or not there is a leftward host (= MC, MW). Accusatives in the verbal complex were originally only mesoclitics (= MC, MW); but as soon as the syncretism was in force, the proclitics should be available in any finite forms without a leftward host (in MB alone). These are imperative and mihi est constructions.

With imperatives, the earliest extensive MB texts of early 16C already have both the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person argumental enclitics, shared with MC, and 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person accusative proclitics of old 1PL hon and new 1SG ma types. The likely path from the earlier system shared with MC to the later system of MB may be sketched as follows:

- **Brythonic:** In V1 imperatives, the accusative clitics were unavailable because infixed, independent pronouns were unblocked, and enclitised by MB-MC (section 6).
- **Generalisation of PCC:** In MB, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person restriction of argumental enclitics in mihi est spread to imperatives, the only other construction to use them; the extension reflects reanalysis of imperative objects from accusative to 3\textsuperscript{rd} nominative (argumental enclitics) ~ 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} accusative (accusative proclitics when available) (Finnish type).
- **Rise of proclitics:** The originally infixed accusative clitics, unavailable in V1, had become replaced by proclitics, 1PL hon-, or acquired proclitic allomorphs, 1SG ma-; these were immediately available in the V1 imperative (1\textsuperscript{st} person, reflexive 2\textsuperscript{nd} person, Hemon 1954a) and jussive (see ex. (66), section 9).
- **Negative imperative:** At some indeterminate point in KLT but not W, negative imperatives optionally or obligatorily adopted the objet case of positive imperatives: 3\textsuperscript{rd} nominative (argumental enclitics) ~ 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} accusative clitic (but because negation was a clitic host, the mesoclitic allomorphs of 1/2SG were used). Such dual-syntax negative imperatives have a close parallel in French (Rowlett 2014).

(48) Imperatives typical of MB and early eNB-KLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd}</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>independent→enclitic</td>
<td>liquit-ēn</td>
<td>na zilezit-ēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let!2PL=3SGM</td>
<td>extension of enclitic</td>
<td>quet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{36} In MB-MC-MW, the nonsyllabic accusative infixed clitics developed syllabic forms when needed, e.g. MW pan ym ‘when=1SG’ (beside unblocking independent pronoun). In MB, these were reanalysed as particle e(z) + regular infixed clitic, giving e.g. MB pa(z)\textsuperscript{L/P} = pa e(z)\textsuperscript{L/P} beside paini\textsuperscript{L/P} (HMBS: §53, 198-199, 202; for the mutation, Le Roux 1927: map 347 point 56). There is in MB no analogue of MW clause-initial a, y + infixed clitic (q.v. GMW: §58-61, 192-3, Schrijver 1997: ch. 7, Meelen 2018).
With *mihi est*, the restriction of nominative objects to 3rd person is part of its inheritance as an oblique-nominative construction, along with the parametrisable potential for 1st/2nd person accusative objects. However, accusative clitics could not appear on forms of *mihi est* itself because of dative clitics, since there appears to have been a constraint against sequences of meso/proclitics (cf. *LVB*: 202). The constraint may be of ancient date, since even in MW dative clitic only combine with independent direct objects (ex. (8)). It holds throughout the history of Breton, barring 1st/2nd person accusative clitics on *mihi est* forms in conservative varieties, and encompassing 3rd person accusative clitics when these become available in *mihi est* in innovative varieties (section 8). The constraint is not unexpected: learners without input to indicate what a dative + accusative clitic cluster looked like may have failed to innovate it or innovated a ban (with parallels such as English *stridden, *forwent, *amn't gaps: Baerman et al. 2010, Yang 2016).37

It follows that with *mihi est* 1st/2nd person accusatives had to await the rise of the HAVE-perfect and its alternative host in the participle. However, the proclitic + participle combination is novel to the perfect. In comparable constructions there is variation in whether accusative clitics attach to the perfect auxiliary or the participle (Benucci 1993 on central Romance, cf. note 18 on the perfect infinitive of Breton). There ought therefore to be a grammaticalisation that renders the participle available as accusative clitic host (e.g. its lexicalisation of v ACC+V rather than just V, Rezac 2019). The state of affairs in MB suggests that the grammaticalisation belongs to 16-7C. One hint to this effect is a gap between the first attestation of 3rd person enclitics on *mihi est* both lexical and auxiliary, e16C, and 1st/2nd person proclitics on the participle, the latter 16C. The other is the grammar of an early 17C MB author who has the 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd accusative proclitic coding in imperatives, but seems not to allow accusative clitics in the HAVE-perfect; this grammar is discussed in the next subsection.

---

37 As with gaps elsewhere, there are occasional violations; they are found in the rich textual attestation of eNB-KLT (*LVB*: 202) and in NB (Trépos 2002: 217, §382, cited in *ARBRES*: Pronoms objet proclitiques).

(i) Proclitic cluster ban violations in dative-accusative innovative varieties

```
HAVE-perfect
le'ch m'hen po laket n'ho'm euz ket pedet
place that=3SGM=2PL=be.FUT placed NEG=2PL=1SG=be not asked
where you will have put it I have not invited you

Lexical HAVE
n'er pou ket n'am po ket ho'm eus
NEG=3SGM=2SG=be.FUT not NEG=1SG=2SG=be.FUT not 3PL=1SG=be
you will not have him you will not have me I have them
```

(GBI, m19C KLT, cited in *LVB*: 202)

(SBI II, m19C KLT, cited in *DEVRI*: bezañ)

(e20C eW, Brangili 1910)
The participle offers a remarkable opportunity to see how closely the split-person object coding is tied to constructions with an anomalous subject. It is used in two other constructions based on transitives: the BE-passive and the BE-perfect. In the BE + participle passive, the object promotes to subject and is coded as nominative. The BE + participle perfect is used alongside or instead of the HAVE-perfect for certain intransitives, and is regular with reflexives (HMSB: §173, Hemon 1954a). In MB as in MC and MW, reflexives are formed with the prefix *en*, but uniquely in MB, *en* is usually accompanied by an object clitic. The participle in the BE-perfect prefers bare *en*, perhaps again reflecting its later grammaticalisation as clitic host. However, when object clitics are present, they are accusative proclitics to *em*=participle even in 3rd person, not enclitics to BE. The coding is expected because the argumental enclitics code nominative objects and only appear in anomalous-subject constructions, i.e. dative-subject *mihi est* BE in the HAVE-perfect, not nominative-subject constructions, i.e. nominative-subject plain BE in the BE-perfect. We need the HAVE vs. BE perfect to see this contrast, since plain BE does not itself take objects to contrast with the split-coded objects of *mihi est* BE.

(49) BE-perfect of reflexive verbs in MB (on the form *en* see note below)

\[
\begin{align*}
1SG be & \rightarrow 1SG=REFL=given \\
I have & \text{ given myself} \\
& \text{as he had offered himself [for me]} \\
& \text{(Cath, t16C MB)}
\end{align*}
\]

It remains open whether the perfect or imperative were influenced by the sole other periphrastic construction with objects, *do* + infinitive. It is found in similar forms across MB-MC-MW and so antedates the perfect of MB (LVB: 48, 408-13, HMSB: §158). Pronominal objects are genitive clitics on the infinitive, possibly influencing their form and placement in the perfect, but there is person split, unlike in the HAVE-perfect.

(50) *do* + infinitive periphrasis (pronominal object genitive in 3SGM)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nonimperative: obligatory fronting of infinitive or infinitival VP} \\
2PL=\text{ask.INF R=do to} & : 3SGM.GEN=rec've.INF \quad \text{for} \quad 3SGM.GEN=\text{send.INF R=do to.2PL} \\
\text{He asks you to receive it [with good will] for he sends it to you} \\
& \text{(Qu, e17C MB)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Imperative: infinitive/infinitival VP fronted or in-situ} \\
3SGF=\text{desire.INF NEG=do!2SG not} & : \text{do!2PL … 1SG=obey} \\
\text{do not desire her!} & : \text{obey me!} \\
& \text{(Gk, t16C MB)} \quad \text{(B, e16 MB)}
\end{align*}
\]

An important assumption as been set aside until now: that the 1st/2nd person proclitics of the imperative and HAVE-perfect are accusative, rather than genitive as in the *do* + infinitive periphrasis in MB. This can be established as soon as we can examine the matter. In (e)NB-W, the genitive-accusative syncretism of 1st/2nd person is partly broken, and it is accusative forms that are used in the imperative and HAVE-perfect: most clearly in 1PL
(the genitive proclitic is replaced by a definite article in certain NB-W varieties, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014, cf. Noyer 2019); fairly clearly in 2SG (there is a complex specialisation of the te and ha forms across (e)NB-W varieties and some of it follows accusative-genitive lines, Le Goff 1927: 198-9, 202); and perhaps for 1SG (Le Bayon 1878: 51 entails that eNB-clW em ~ me alternate freely as accusative but not genitive, but cf. Guilleivic and Le Goff 1902: 31, Châtelier 2016b: 429-36). Moreover, there is independent syntagmatic evidence: certain (e)NB-W varieties replace doubling enclitics by inflected forms of da 'to' when the antecedent is an accusative but not genitive clitic (Loth 1895), and it is da that doubles the 1st/2nd person clitic in the HAVE-perfect (Ternes 1970: 307).38

7.3 Exceptions to the PCC

The 3rd person restriction on argumental enclitics for objects of imperative and mihi est constructions has been uncovered by textual studies of MB and eNB-KLT (HMSB: §51; cf. Kervella 1947: §425-9; Vallée 1923, 1926: 91-2), but it is already fairly clear in grammars of eNB-KLT (de Rostrenen 1738: I.1.2.1, I.5.1.3, I.5.1.5, II.4; Le Clerc 1908: §139), explicit for mihi est in contrast to the imperative in grammars of eNB-clW (Guillième 1836: 30-34, 115, Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guilleivic and Le Goff 1902: 30-2), and comprehensively so described in linguistic studies of NB-W (e.g. Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014; description is inadequate for the variety in Le Besco 1992, while that in McKenna 1988 is innovative). The present study essentially confirms it across conservative varieties (MB prose in detail and broadly verse, selected eNB prose and NB-W corpora, see Appendix).

Nevertheless, a handful of striking exceptions have also been found here in two early 17C MB authors, G. Quiquer (MB-L, Roscoff) and T. Gueguen (MB-L, Morlaix):

(51) Exceptions to the PCC: 1st/2nd person argumental enclitics

a. nep en deues ny offanset vs. nep an deueux hon offanset whoever 3SGM=D-be=1PL offended whoever 3SGM=D-be 1PL=offended who ever has offended us
   (Do, e17C MB; Qu, e17C MB)       (Gk, t16C MB)

b. dan hiny en deues huy ¶ digacçet davido
to=the=one 3SGM=D-be=2PL sent to.1SG to the one who has sent you to me (tr. of de celuy qui vous ¶ a enuoyé vers moy)
   (Qu, e17C MB)

c. He deues ny à anuy redimet
   3SGF=D-be=1PL of=pain redeemed
   [to Mary /] who has redeemed us from pain
   (NI+, m17C MB)

38 It may be that even on infinitives, objects were accusative already by 16C MB. The form of the 3SGM clitic alone is genitive e in MB, and only becomes accusative later such as eNB-clW en, er, el (HMSB: §§53-4). However, when 3SGM is attached to reflexive em, it is more often accusative en than genitive e (on the participle in (49); on infinitives e.g. e nem meuly '3SGM=RX=praise.INF', Cath, t16C MB) (Hemon 1954a: 250). The combination of object clitics with em is an MB innovation, and so the use of en here may be giving away reanalysis of the accusative as genitive by 16C MB. If so, the strict use of e when 3SGM is attached directly to infinitives may reflect reanalysis of it as allomorph of the accusative in this environment.

39 Caveat: of MB prose, T. Gueguen's Be could not be included in this study, only Do and Mc.
One exception, in the Lord's Prayer, is shared by both authors, (51)a; in other versions the accusative proclitic hon replaces the enclitic ny (including the earlier Gk, t16C MB, the cotemporaneous Prôn, e17C MB/W, and all the versions in Nédélec 1978). Quiquer otherwise regularly uses the 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitic alternation in the HAVE-perfect, save for (51)b, which may be an artifact of line-by-line translation. Gueguen's works suggest a different story. Only the imperative has the 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitics alternation. The HAVE-perfect uses the expected 3rd person enclitics, but 1st/2nd person are not coded as accusative proclitics; rather once as enclitic (51)c, and several times as early a-forms, used at this period as "last resort" (section 8).

These exceptions recall a much-discussed aspect of Icelandic oblique-subject constructions, where all means to express 1st/2nd person counterparts to 3rd person nominative objects incur some degree of deviance, yet may be used nevertheless (see references in note 4). In T. Gueguen's grammar, 1st/2nd person accusatives objects are available in anomalous-subject constructions, but the participle of the perfect may not yet have grammaticalised as their host, leaving only perhaps not wholly grammatical enclitics and a-forms. An early version of the Lord's Prayer may date to such a grammar as well.40

Otherwise, conservative varieties avoid the PCC with pronominal objects of lexical mihi est by paraphrase—occasionally in direct contrast with innovative varieties, where mihi est has been reanalysed with new accusative objects immune to the PCC (section 8):

(52)  Lexical HAVE + 1st/2nd person possessum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mé ne vein</td>
<td>quet attau guet-n-oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG NEG=be.FUT.1SG not always with.2PL</td>
<td>NEG=2PL=be.FUT not always 1SG:ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will not always be with you</td>
<td>you will not always have me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matthew 26:11: [For ye have the poor always with you;] but me ye have not always. (AVImaheu, m19C eNB-W) (BSLss, e19C eNB-L)

There is no person restriction found with independent pronoun objects in the "strong-pronoun environments" of focus fronting (only mihi est, very rare), coordination, and modification (theoretically with both, but very rare). None is expected, since there is no

40 One verb never seems to have grammaticalised its participle as an accusative clitic host: BE, whose participle be(ze)t is used in the HAVE-perfect of mihi est (cf. note 18). Here 3rd person enclitics to the auxiliary turn up early, e.g. (37). 1st/2nd person proclitics should look like (ia), from prescriptive guidelines by a nonnative grammarian, but this seems otherwise untested, and is explicitly given out as ungrammatical in NB-W (Le Goff 1927: 203). The gap is not surprising: the participle of BE might resist lexicalising accusative v with V, and/or may resist clitics because of potential mutations. Instead, conservative varieties resort to paraphrases, and innovative varieties use postverbal a-forms (section 8; the codification of Standard Breton in Kervella 1947: §425-9 limits a-forms to such ineffable objects but this is a novel prescriptive limitation). Exceptionally, an independent pronoun is found in the conservative (ib), with no means to ascertain its case or nature (cf. proclitic-independent alternations in NIr, McCloskey and Hale 1983, Andrews 1990).

(ia) hén en deus ho pet (ib) jɔ̄ nas pa ni
| 3SGM | 3SGM=V-be 2PL=been |
| He has had you | He has had us |

(Vallée 1923; bet > pet via 2PL ho') (Cheveau 2007; pa = bet)
way to tell whether they are accusative (and so not restricted) or nominative (restricted, but crosslinguistically strong-pronoun environments offer exceptions to the PCC, Rezac 2019).

(53) Preverbal independent pronoun object of HAVE-constructions

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{huy am eus galuet an sarmant me eo an guiznyen} \\
2\text{PL R}=1\text{SG}=\text{be called the}=\text{shoot} \quad 1\text{SG be the}=\text{vine} \\
\text{[You in sacred place who serve me:]} \text{you I have called the branch, it is I the vine.} \\
\text{(Cnf², m17C MB; the copula eo rather than so = 'it is I …')} \\
\text{Tì em es guèl} \\
2\text{SG R}=1\text{SG}=\text{be seen} \\
\text{Translating: C'est toi que j'ai vu [hier soir] It's you that I saw yesterday} \\
\text{(DICO: 20C NB-W Plumergat)}
\end{align*}
\]

8 Onto the road to \textit{habeo}

8.1 The dative-accusative stage

The conservative split-person coding of the objects of imperative and \textit{mihi est} characterises MB and early eNB-KLT (with extensions to the negative imperative), eNB-clW (with an additional accusative object option for both constructions, see below), and most NB-W varieties (save that objects of the imperative are likely accusative, below). From 18C on, the object coding of both constructions comes to align with those of regular transitives. This innovation has been viewed as evidence for the transition from dative-nominative \textit{mihi est} to dative-accusative \textit{habeo}, yet for the most part it turns out to indicate rather an intermediate and only recently well-studied dative-accusative stage. The stage is important for theories of case, because some of them relate the availability of nominative objects to nonnominative subjects, and of accusative objects to nominative subjects.

In KLT, the regularisation of imperative and \textit{mihi est} interacts with a new system of coding accusative pronouns, but in W it may be examined by itself. It is transparent for \textit{mihi est} in eNB-clW: it keeps the conservative 3\textsuperscript{rd} person enclitics, but adds 3\textsuperscript{rd} person accusative proclitics. The result may be analysed as the availability of both the conservative split-person 3\textsuperscript{rd} nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative system, and the innovative accusative-only system for objects. The coding of the subject remains distinctively dative, with proclitic forms (section 4) and immunity to Complementarity (section 5). The better-studied varieties of NB-W only have the older conservative system.\textsuperscript{41}

(54) 3\textsuperscript{rd} person enclitic & proclitic in eNB-clW

\[
\begin{align*}
m' & \quad \text{em es ean} & \text{perpet} & \text{karet} \\
m' & \quad \text{em es} & \text{perpet} & \text{er haret}
\end{align*}
\]

\textsuperscript{41} This development is not found in earliest W texts of 17C (Prôn, e17C MB-W; NG, t17C eNB-W) and rarely in 18C (not in Guillôme 1836; rare in IS, t18C eNB-clW), but comes into its own in 19C (Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guilevic and Le Goff 1902: 30-1; MG, EOVD, e19C eNB-clW); it is however absent from most of the best-studied 20-21C varieties (Termes 1970, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014, but found in McKenna 1980, where the accusative proclitics surviving in W are augmented by the \textit{a}-forms of KLT).
1SG \( R=1SG=\text{be}(=3SGM) \)  always \( (3SGM=)\text{loved} \)
I have always loved him.

(Guillevic and Le Gof 1902: 30-1)

The positive imperative in eNB-clW also retains its conservative coding and gains an innovative one. However, the innovative coding is by enclitics for all persons, and moreover the enclitics become differentiated from those coding the object of \( \text{mihi est} \). Only this innovative coding is continued in well-studied NB-W varieties. It is susceptible to analysis as an accusative object system realised by enclitics in the positive imperative and proclitic elsewhere, i.e. precisely the same system as French (Rezac 2019).

8.2 The KLT system: dative-accusative through the rise of \( a \)-forms

eNB-KLT also regularised the coding of imperative and \( \text{mihi est} \) constructions, but perhaps not at first by extending accusative proclitics, rather through an innovation in regular object coding: \( a \)-forms.

\( a \)-forms are in origin pronominal forms of the preposition \( a \) 'of' (+ doubling enclitic). In MB, \( a \)-PPs regularly code partitive counterparts to accusative objects, pronominal or not (cf. Schapansky 1996: 3.3 on NB). From late 16C MB, pronominal forms of \( a \) sporadically code pronominal objects under negation even without a partitive meaning (\( \text{HMSB: §69} \), Stark and Widmer forth; cf. Borsley et al. 2007: 9.5.3 on MW).

(55) Earliest \( a \)-forms for objects under negation

\begin{align*}
\text{palamour na ezneuez may anezi} & \\
\text{because NEG=recognise.2SG more of.3SGF} & \\
\text{because you do not recognise her anymore} & \\
\text{n'en receuet quet en ho ty, ha na saludet quet à Nezafu} & \\
\text{NEG=3SGM=V!2PL not in 2PL=house and NEG=V!2PL not of.3SGM} & \\
\text{do not receive him in your house, and do not greet him} & \\
\text{na casset quet âhenamp en tantation. Mais hon delivret ac en drouc.} & \\
\text{NEG=send!2PL not of.1PL in=temptation but 1PL=deliver!2PL from=the=evil} &
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(Cath, t16C MB)} & \\
\text{(Gk, t16C MB)} &
\end{align*}

42 With more detail: The earliest distinctively W texts have the MB system, though imperative forms are few (1\textsuperscript{st} person proclitics in Prôn, e17C MB-W; 3\textsuperscript{rd} person enclitics in NG, t17C eNB-W). The positive imperatives of 18-19C eNB-clW are like eNB-KLT in (i) split-person 3\textsuperscript{rd} enclitics ~ 1\textsuperscript{st} proclitics, (ii) variable adoption of prepositional forms for the enclitics. However, eNB-clW also: (iii) adds 1\textsuperscript{st} person enclitics; (iv) develops distinctive imperative forms of 3\textsuperscript{rd} person enclitics through reanalysis of the 2PL imperative ending (Le Bayon 1878: 51-2; Guillaume 1836 and Guillevic and Le Goff 1902 omit (ii) and (iv)). In NB-w/cW moreover, (v) 1\textsuperscript{st} person proclitics are absent, leaving only imperative enclitics (Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014 on NB-w/cW; Le Goff 1927: 202n5 indicates the same for NB-eW). Negative imperatives always have accusative clitics in W (modulo \( a \)-forms in Ternes 1970, see below).

43 One NB-W dialect continues or echoes this system: object-coding is conservative, but for 3\textsuperscript{rd} person objects under negation, \( a \)-forms are an alternative to accusative clitics, and required with \( \text{mihi est} \) and imperative (Ternes 1970: 16.6) – i.e. precisely where MB had its 3\textsuperscript{rd} person argumental enclitics, though as a W variety the dialect also codes 1\textsuperscript{st} person by enclitic in the imperative. Nearby NB-wW varieties do not use \( a \)-forms (Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014, Le Besco 1992) or have them with the KLT distribution (McKenna 1980).
[And] do not send us into temptation. But deliver us from evil.

(Prôn, e17C MB/W)

From early 17C, a-forms occasionally crop up as pronominal objects elsewhere, mostly in environments where other coding is difficult. This is clearest for 1st/2nd person objects of mihi est, barred as nominative enclitics, and as accusative pro/mesoclixics when there is no participle to host them (lexical mihi est) or has not yet grammaticalised as host (in T. Gueguen's grammar, section 7). The use of a-forms here fits well their origin as prepositional objects, since these are immune to the PCC (section 2).44

(56) 1st/2nd person objects of mihi est → a-forms

a. en deues deliuret ahanomp vez an poaniou
   3SGM=be delivered of.1PL from the=pains
   [How …] has he delivered us from pains

   (Do, e17C MB)

b. ma en deues preseruet à ha noch
   that=3SGM=be preserved of.2PL
   that he has preserved you [from this sort of sins]

   (Mc, e17C MB)

c. ho pezo ac’hanon da viana evit ho Parner
   2PL=be.FUT of.1SG at=least for 2PL=judge
   you will have me at least as your Judge.

   (RP, e18C eNB-L)

We may broadly track the ensuing development by looking at works in eNB-L. In the early 18C eNB-L works of C. Le Bris, a-forms are mostly restricted to such difficult pronominal objects (including RP, IS above), but not entirely (cf. HMSB: §69). By the mid-18C COL, a-forms are common alternatives to accusative clitics everywhere, and to the 3rd person argumental enclitics of mihi est but not imperative constructions, while accusative clitics have not yet spread to either.

(57) Near-minimal pairs of conservative and a-form object coding:

a. n’e m eus ket an honor {d’he anaout | d’anaout anezi}
   NEG=1SG=be not the=honour to=3SGF=know.INF to=know.INF of.3SGF

44 Another environment that may have presented a coding difficulty is the left conjunct of plain coordinations as objects. This is an environment that tends to require strong pronouns crosslinguistically, and the expected independent pronouns are occasionally are found here in Breton (HMSB: §51.12), but may not have been optimal (a puzzle best studied for French, Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 103, Kayne 1975: 2.17, 2000: 9.7, 180 note 29, Rezac 2011: 145). Here too we get early a-forms:

(i) guelet anezàn pe anezi o vervel
   see.INF of.3SGM or of.3SGF to=die.INF
   to see him or her dying

   (IN, e18C eNB-L)
b. alies {en er guèlan | e velàn anezi}  
   often R=3SGM=see.1SG R=see.1SG of.3SGF

c. casset oe‘heus-ê dan dour  
   sent 2PL=be=3SGM to=the=water known R=1SG=be of.1SG

d. anavezet em eus anezàn  
   known R=1SG=be=3SGM

e. biscoaz n‘em eus-ën  
   never NEG=1SG=be=3SGM

f. ne anavezàn quet anezàn  
   NEG=known not of.1SG

(COL, m18C eNB-L)

However, the earlier 18C grammar of de Rostrenen (1738), born in T near W but explicitly drawing much on L, already has both accusative clitics and a-forms as objects of regular transitives and mihi est constructions, alongside the older 3rd person enclitics in the latter; again the imperative keeps only the conservative coding.45

(58) 3PL pronominal objects of HAVE in de Rostrenen46

a. me am eus {y bevet | o bevet | bevet anézho} ~ o bevet am eus  
   1SG R=1SG=be=3PL drunk 3PL=drunk of.3PL

b. cavet am eus-ê/-han̂ o tibri  
   found R=1SG=be=3SGM at=eat.INF

c. livirid ê  
   say!2PL=3SGM
   (de Rostrenen 1738: I.1.2.1, I.5, II.4, m18C eNB-K)

The different argument do not codings combine. Apparent counterexamples involve proclitics to the participle + doubling enclitics. These attach to the participle if postverbal, but to the auxiliary when it fronts by long head movement (supporting the view that the result is a participle + auxiliary morphological complex, Urien 1999). Dual coding by argumental enclitic + proclitic is unattested: *...hou poé ind ou roet.

(59) Fronted clitic+participle + doubling enclitic on auxiliary

\[
\begin{align*}
E & \text{ententet} \quad \text{oe‘heus-y} & Ou & \text{reit} \quad \text{hou poé ind} \quad \text{d‘ein} \\
3SGF & = \text{heard} & \text{2PL} & = \text{be=3PL} & \text{3PL} & = \text{given} \quad \text{2PL} & = \text{be.IMPF=3PL} & \text{to.1SG} \\
\text{have you heard her} & \text{You have given them to me}
\end{align*}
\]

45 An example may occur as early as an MB text at the threshold of eNB: object coding is conservative, (i-a), but (i-b) is ambiguous between an innovative proclitic and a conservative enclitic in prepositional-suffix form.

(i) a. …en deua y goall trettet  
   3SGM=D-be/IMPF=3PL badly treated
b. …en deua ho sauuettéet  
   3SGM=D-be=3PL=saved
   (Beach, m16C-MB)

46 Long-head-movement of the participle in o bevet am eus singles out the accusative clitic.
By 19C eNB-L both accusative proclitics and \( a \)-forms are regular for all objects, and argumental enclitics are rare, lasting longer with imperatives (cf. HMSB: §53-4). By early 20C, \( a \)-forms have ousted accusative proclitics in most of NB-KLT, becoming the sole productive coding of all weak and strong pronominal objects, outside the preverbal focus position where independent pronouns remain (Le Roux 1927).

The outcome of these developments is regularisation of object coding for both \textit{mihi est} and imperative constructions in eNB-KLT. However, there is no reason to think that it was accompanied by loss of the dative character of the subject in eNB-KLT any more than in eNB-clW. In early-mid 18C eNB-KLT texts like (57)-(58), subjects of \textit{mihi est} remain coded by forms still as close to accusative clitics as in eNB-clW (section 4). In later 18C and 19C texts accusative clitics undergo changes never reflected in \textit{mihi est} before their loss (e.g. replacement of 1/2SG mesoclitics by proclitics, syncretism in 3SGM: HMSB: §54), while former clitics in \textit{mihi est} can become deformed (e.g. 1PL \textit{hon bV-} \( \rightarrow \textit{mV-} \) or via \textit{hon d-} \( \rightarrow n- \)). Even then, however, they remain immune to Complementarity, indicating they still reflect oblique and not nominative subjects (the NB-L variety of Sommerfelt 1920: §269 is a late witness of such systems).

8.3 Dative-accusative and nominative-like agreement

In many (e)NB-KLT varieties at the dative-accusative stage, the older \textit{mihi est} forms add nominative suffixes, either as doubles of prefixes continuing the dative clitics, or as sole phi-exponents. This striking phenomenon has been a key piece of evidence for the \textit{mihi est} to \textit{habeo} reanalysis (CG: §352-6, Heine 1997: 2.4-5, Stassen 2009: 6.4, Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: sec. 4-5). However, it can now be better situated at the dative-accusative stage in the transition oblique-nominative \( \rightarrow \) oblique-accusative \( \rightarrow \) nominative-accusative (Hrafnbjargarsson 2004: ch. 2). Recent work on this stage in Insular Scandinavian reveals that while the subject keeps dative case, it may gain aspects of nominative behavior, including control of agreement (Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012):

(60) Subvariety of Icelandic "C" with dative subject controlling nominative agreement

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Kennurunum} \\
\text{teachers.DAT}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{likuðu} \\
\text{like.PST.3PL}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ekki} \\
\text{not}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{þessi} \\
\text{this}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{hegðun} \\
\text{behaviour.NOM}
\end{array}
\]

(Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013: 131)

Doubling nominative suffixes in \textit{mihi est} appear in all the Brythonic languages: sporadically in 14C MW and 15C MC and more robustly in early 16C MC; in the jussive

---

\footnote{The loss of conservative coding with \textit{mihi est} and at a delay with imperatives may be traced across 19C eNB-L texts (e.g. BSLss e19C-L, EKG m19C-L, MBR t19C eNB-L); Hingan's (1868) grammar of eNB-L omits it, but there is an isolated survival with imperatives in an NB-K variety (Humphreys 1985: 318-320, Favereau 1997: §247; analysis in Rezac 2019). The variants of MP across 19C varieties witness the replacement of accusative clitics with \( a \)-forms; Favereau (1984: III.1.h) describes on their register-specific use in an NB-K variety. Hewitt (2001) documents the spread of \( a \)-forms to preverbal objects when doublable by enclitics in an NB-T variety (out in Urien and Denez 1977, Stephens 1982, Timm 1987, Schapansky 1996 across NB varieties), and Timm (1987) the rise of new weak-strong distinction among them.}
only in 16-17C MB and conservative eNB; and outside the jussive mostly in innovative 19C eNB-KLT and Batz but usually not conservative W.

(61) Nominative suffixes attached to *mihi est*

a. *am bwfy* gan grist
   \[ R=1SG=be,\text{SUBJ.1SG}=1SG \] with Christ
   that there may be to me with Christ, that I may be with Christ
   \[ (\text{BT, e14C MW; cf. Loth 1910: 499, LLloyd-Jones 1928: 92}) \]

b. *an tekter asbetheugh why*
   the=enjoyment \[ R=2PL=be,\text{2PL}=2PL \]
   the enjoyment [that] you will have
   \[ (\text{PC, e15C MC}) \]

c. *â ny hon bemp*
   O 1PL 1PL=be,\text{COND.1PL}
   O if we had
   \[ (1690\text{ ed. of Qu, eNB, }apud\text{ Ernault 1888b: 262, vs. }ny\text{ hon be in 1626, MB}) \]

d. *Ma fotred defint sonj ouz hoc'h.* § Evel-d-oun-me hi *ho karo*
   my=boys 3PL=be,\text{FUT.3PL} thought to.2PL as.1SG=1SG 3PL 2PL=love,FUT
   My boys will think of you. § Like me they will love you.
   \[ (\text{BBZ I, m19C eNB-K}) \]

e. *Ni moamb bet eul lestr caër, c'hui ac'h eus hi freuzet*
   1PL 1PL=be,\text{IMPF.1PL} been a=boat fair 2PL R=2PL=be 3SGF=destroyed
   We had a fair boat, you destroyed it
   \[ (\text{SBI I, t19C eNB-T}) \]

These phenomena need not all have the same analysis, and one is advanced in the next section for the jussive that is specific to it. Here the last (e)NB-KLT phenomenon is discussed. Usually, it involves a nominative suffix doubling a distinctive prefix for the same phi-features, but the prefix is also found neutralised to the 3SGM/DFLT form. All person-number and tense-mood combinations can be affected, but within any given variety, only a subset of phi-features is, most commonly 1PL and/or 3PL, in certain tenses/moods (Ernault 1883: 29, 1888b: 258-64, 1890: 472-4, *LVB*: 200ff., *HMSB*: §140n6, 151, 174n2).

The suffixes of eNB-KLT HAVE presents characteristics of the dative-accusative stage(s) studied in Insular Scandinavian (IS, Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012). One, in IS datives with nominative behavior retain dative case morphology, and in eNB they have the next best thing, immunity to Complementarity (section 5). Two, the nominative behavior of datives in IS can depend on their phi-features, unlike that of plain nominatives, and the same goes for Breton; such modulation may rely on dative case (Rezac 2008). Three, nominative behavior of datives in IS appears at the dative-accusative and not dative-nominative stage, and likewise suffixes in Breton HAVE outside the jussive mostly occurs only in systems that use innovative accusative objects (to be nuanced next).

Upon a full transition to *habeo*, we should expect, above all, Complementarity between dependent pronouns and independent nominals as with clearly nominative subjects (a syntactic property, tempered by residue in idiomatic constructions of the *me thinks* sort); and less so, dependent-pronoun subject coding by nominative suffixes only (a
morphological property, tempered by residue in allomorphy of the geese sort). These expectations seem at first sight to be met in certain NB systems at the K/T boundary (Favereau 1997: §420ff., Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: sec. 4-5):

(62) Fully nominative-like coding of the subject of HAVE

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{ni neus} & \text{poan} & \text{meump} / \text{neusomp} \\
\text{1PL HAVE.3SG/DFLT} & \text{pain} & \text{HAVE.1PL}
\end{array}
\]

(Favereau 1997: 216, I20C K)

However, a closer look at such systems suggests that they are not truly habeo systems with Complementarity. It is common for only 3rd person to be affected (type i neus '3PL HAVE' – ... neusont, neunt 'HAVE.3PL', Timm 1985, Trevidig 1987, Wmffre 1998: 2.24, likely Noyer 2009: 4.2.7.3). This may reflect as a crosslinguistically common restriction of clitic doubling to 1st/2nd person. Sometimes 1PL joins 3PL but 1SG and 2SG/2PL do not (as illustrated, Noyer and Favereau but not Timm and Trevidig, op.cit.). There is an historical reason for this, collapse of the old 1PL clitic alone with the 3SGM clitic (1PL (h)on + BE and 3SG en + de-BE > (ә)n-), and it may be continued as allomorphy (1PL= > DFLT= // 1PL __BE, especially when it applies to subjects of negative sentences which require dependent pronouns otherwise, Noyer 2019: op.cit.). Clearer evidence of Complementarity comes rather from far rarer systems taken up next.48

8.4 Fully nominative-like subjects: nominative suffixes and Complementarity

Both nominative-like suffixes and Complementarity in descendents of mihi est are of importance to two hypotheses in theories of case (e.g. Yip, Maling and Jackedoff 1987, Marantz 1991, Bittner and Hale 1996, Chomsky 2000, cf. Baker 2015: chapter 2; see Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012 for application to Insular Scandinavian):

(63) Case constraints: In a case domain, (i) *NN: only one argument can be nominative; (ii) NA: accusative entails nominative (here nominative, accusative may refer to particular properties such as case or finite-verb agreement).

The appearance of nominative properties on datives at the dative-accusative stage has been seen as support for the NA constraint. It predicts that they should be absent at the dative-nominative stage, but not that they need be manifested overtly or easily discoverable at the dative-accusative stage. The eNB suffix of HAVE surveyed so far supports the NA constraint insofar as it only appears in innovative systems where HAVE allows accusative objects. The *NN constraint prevents the object from being nominative if, or in the same way that, the subject is. In Breton, it predicts that nominative objects of the mihi est stage, as detectable through enclitics restricted to 3rd person, are incompatible with nominative subjects of the habeo stage, as detectable by Complementarity. More weakly, the enclitics

48 Suggestive of an oblique-subject analysis of the present systems is absence of an imperative of mihi est (Wmffre 1998: 2.26, unlike plain BE, contrast Ternes 1970 on BE plain and mihi est alike), recalling its unavailability with oblique-nominative unaccusatives in Icelandic (Barðdal 2006: 54, see section 9).
might resist the nominative-like morphology of doubling, but only insofar as it betrays synchronic nominative syntax – a weak prediction given the vicissitudes of morphology.

One variety studied here has sufficiently robust Complementarity to speak to these expectations: EN, 18C eNB-T (cf. points 22–4 in Le Roux 1927: maps 82ff.: see Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). The coding of subjects of HAVE when dependent pronouns is mostly conservative, but doubling occurs in a 1PL form. However, Complementarity characterises independent subjects, as if they had become nominative, though 1SG pres. escapes it (a common locus of residues, as in am, me thinks, etc.).

Table 5: Dependent-pronoun and independent subjects of \textit{mihi est} in EN (partial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>EN dep. (* Doubling)</th>
<th>EN indep. (* Complementarity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres. 1SG</td>
<td>-m eus</td>
<td>meus</td>
<td>me (a) meus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 1PL</td>
<td>(h)on eus</td>
<td>on eus</td>
<td>te neus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 2SG</td>
<td>-z eus</td>
<td></td>
<td>huy (a) neus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 2PL</td>
<td>(h)oc'h eus</td>
<td>(o) heus</td>
<td>ma hamarad 'my friend' a neus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 3SGM</td>
<td>en deus</td>
<td>en deus, (a/e) neus</td>
<td>eur gos hast 'an old whore' ... a neus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 3SGF</td>
<td>he deus</td>
<td>(e)deus</td>
<td>ar friponed 'the rogues' a neus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres. 3PL</td>
<td>(h)o deus</td>
<td>(o) deus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. 1SG</td>
<td>-m bo</td>
<td>mou</td>
<td>me nefou*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf. 1SG</td>
<td>-m oa</td>
<td>(a/e) moay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf. 1PL</td>
<td>hon oa</td>
<td>mo(a)mb*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two nominative tendencies interact with object coding that is still mostly conservative, both for regular objects (accusative clitics, beside some \textit{a}-forms, Stark and Widmer forth), and for objects of HAVE (split 3rd argumental enclitics ~ 1st/2nd accusative clitics). The interaction makes it clear that the conservative 3rd person argumental enclitics, by hypothesis nominative objects, can combine with HAVE-forms that are nominative-like in suffix doubling, (64)a. However, they are not found with independent subjects that are nominative in Complementarity, only 1SG pres. that escapes it, (64)b. There is no way to tell whether this limitation is accidental or not.

(64) HAVE independent subject + dependent-pronoun object in an eNB-T variety

a. nin ne moamb \textbf{an} nached
   1PL NEG=1PL=be.1MPF.1PL=3SG denied

b. me meus\textbf{an} invanted
   1SG 1SG=be=3SG invented

(EN, 18C eNB-T)

This pattern fits the *NN constraint by preventing subjects and objects from combining when both show evidence of nominative syntax. It does weaken the generalisation that the suffixes of eNB \textit{mihi est} are incompatible with nominative objects. The prevalent limitation of suffixes to innovative varieties still suggests that the typical path to them lies through nominative properties added to the dative subject and incompatible with nominative
objects. However, in EN moamb the suffix seems to be a morphological exponent of phi-features derived from clitic doubling of a purely oblique/dative subject, though the form might derive from a subsystem with a dative+nominative subject in the same or another variety. The next section looks at still another path to the suffixes.49

9 Note on the jussive of mihi est

Like the other Brythonic languages, Breton has imperative verbal forms for 2SG, 2PL, and 1PL, whose subject includes the addressee, and MB/eNB also have jussive verbal forms for 3SG and 3PL; both clause types are root only (cf. HMSB: §134, 165, Lewis and Piette 1990: §27, Kervella 1947: §190, LVB: 296f., Favereau 1997: §335, 388, 440, 461, 535). Jussives differ in morphosyntax from imperatives and from other constructions, and thereby interact uniquely with mihi est (cf. HMSB: §140n5, LVB: 192). One of these interactions is widespread appearance of suffixes to code phi-features of the subject of mihi est even in varieties where the subject shows no other signs of nominative behavior, starting with MB.

(65) Jussives in MB/eNB

hac hon ca lounnou  bezent eleuet
and our hearts be!3PL raised
and let our hearts be raised [in your love]

Presantent  adversourien hor silvidiguez eta quement …
present!3PL enemies 1PL=salvation then as.much
Let the enemies of our salvation present then as much [as they like]

Pe eff  ozech pe yuez groec ¶ He miret lounen
or 3SGM husband or also wife 3SGF=guard!3SG glad
[Be he husband or also wife,] let him/her keep it gladly

The jussive flouts two generalisations about Breton morphosyntax in section 2. One is coupling of the preverbal position and particles a, e(z) (when not excluded by other elements of the verbal complex). In the imperative there is no preverbal position or particles, as also in bare responsives, while other root finite clauses have both. The positive jussive has the preverbal position optionally (like ra/da-optative and negative root clauses) but no particle (bare or negated verb). The other is Complementarity of verbal suffixes and independent (pro)nominals as subjects. Complementarity is the basis for the Incorporation Hypothesis, whereby verbal suffixes reflect dependent pronouns rather than agreement. The imperative and bare verb responsive are merely compatible with Complementarity, because they only allow suffixes (+ doubling enclitics), while other root finite clauses show Complementarity, because they allow independent (pro)nominals only with the 3SG/DFLT verbal form. In the jussive, independent preverbal or postverbal (pro)nominals can though

---

49 EN seems isolated in this respect. Closest to it come a couple of suffixed forms in the 1690 eNB-L but not 1626 MB edition of Qu like (61)c, but they do not combine with object clitics and appear when mihi est in eNB-KLT is on the cusp of innovative object coding, (56)-(58).
need not combine with phi-matching suffixes. This is anti-Complementarity and thereby evidence that the jussive 3SG/3PL suffixes realise agreement, not pronouns. These two anomalous properties are unique to jussives in Breton (cf. Ernault 1888b: sec. 2), though more general in early MW and OSWB-OW (sections 5, 6). Object coding in the jussive is throughout by regular accusative proclitics, though it is rare (cf. Le Goff 1927: 202 for NB-W, and Finnish in section 2 for such a jussive-imperative contrast).  

When it comes to *mihi est*, there are no forms with the 2SG-2PL-1PL imperative forms of BE nor forms with some imperative of BE + 2SG-2PL-1PL argumental enclitics. These are familiar restrictions due to nominative object nonagreement and the PCC. What functions as the imperative of *mihi est* is formally the 3SG/DFLT jussive of BE plus the dative clitic (*HMSB* §140, 165n; ditto for *deur*, *HMSB* §151):

(66) Straightforward jussives of *mihi est*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ham bezet} & \quad \ldots \text{heern kalet} \\
\text{and=1SG=be!3SG} & \quad \ldots \text{irons hard}
\end{align*}
\]

(B, m16C MB)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(te) da vezet} & \quad \text{(conf)} \\
\text{2SG 2SG=be!3SG memory}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{hon conscientou ho deuezet} \quad \ldots \text{ho repos}
\]

\[\text{our consciences 3PL=D-BE!3SG have } \ldots \text{3PL=repose}
\]

\[\text{let our consciences have their repose}
\]

(Qu, e17C MB, text)

This construction is not expected to impose any constrain on the phi-features of the dative subject, and does not. Likewise, the dative subject should in principle be clitic or independent doubled by clitic, and both are available (grammatical appendix to Qu, e17C MB), though the former is rule (including the texts of Qu). Most importantly, the 3SG/3PL suffix of jussives is not expected to agree with the nominative of *mihi est* because it is the object rather than subject, and that is also so. The coding of nominative objects of *mihi est* is expected to be by enclitics, in contrast to accusative with transitives, and so it is:

(67) Racse a pret ham bezet hy

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{therefore on-time R=1SG=be!3SG=3SGF}
\end{align*}
\]

(J, m16C MB)

---

50 Examples with both proclitic and enclitic in the standard NB codification of Kervella (1947: §429) are explicitly constructed long after the jussive had vanished.

51 There is resistance to imperatives of oblique-subject unaccusatives (Barðdal 2006: 54 on Icelandic). These pose the problem of combining imperative forms, where the 2nd person phi-inflection codes nominatives that here are objects and barred by the PCC, with imperative syntax, which requires the addressee-inclusive argument to be the subject, here oblique (see Barnes 1986: 25 on rare Faeroese examples: silent the addressee-inclusive subject + bare stem, the usual 2SG imperative form but arguably default; cf. note 18 on structurally similar infinitival nonfinite formations of *mihi est*).
The ban on agreement with nominative objects has in the jussive a consequence unique in the system. In all finite forms save the jussive, there is a tense/mood stem that is linearly segmentable from phi-bearing suffixes, though it also doubles as the form for 3SG dependent pronoun for most verbs including BE: thus fut. 3SG/DFLT bezot, 3PL bezont. In the jussive, 3SG bezet and 3PL bezent, the 3SG suffix is not a substring the 3PL suffix, and so both are portmanteaus for jussive and phi-features; There is no phi-neutral jussive form. Yet the 3SG phi-features of bezet are inert with mihi est. Moreover, they realise merely phi-features, i.e. agreement with a controller, not dependent pronouns, as everywhere else (save perhaps the imperative). These two properties may underlie an anomalous of jussives of mihi est: they often double dative clitics from the earliest texts, long before the later more generally doubling of late eNB (esp. Ernault 1888b, LV B).52

(68) Double of dative clitic by nominative suffix in jussives in MB

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ham bezif} & \quad \text{az gracc} \\
\text{and}=1\text{SG}=\text{be.FUT}^7,1\text{SG} & \quad \text{of}=2\text{SG}=\text{grace} \\
\text{hazuez} & \quad \text{trugarez} \quad \text{da vez} \quad \text{conf} \\
\text{and}=2\text{SG}=\text{be}!2\text{SG}^2 & \quad \text{pity} \\
\text{y ho deuezent} & \quad \text{3PL}=\text{D-be}!3\text{PL} \\
\text{3PL} & \quad \text{3PL}=\text{be}!3\text{PL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(J, e16C MB; cf. ham bezet above)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{y ho deuezent} & \quad \text{3PL} \quad \text{3PL}=\text{D-be}!3\text{PL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Gk, t16C MB, beside da vezet above)

This early doubling may be analysed as recruiting inert phi-agreement suffixes to crosscode phi-features of the dative clitic as a part of morphological exponence, independently of the case of the subject unlike the more general doubling of eNB (see Arregi and Nevins 2012, 2018 for parallels and theories).

10 Overview

Let us take stock by listing the chief findings (using constructed forms to illustrate):

\textit{Split-person coding:} MB and other conservative varieties of Breton have an anomalous split-person coding by 3rd person enclitic \(\sim\) 1st/2nd person accusative clitics for objects of HAVE (MB \textit{hoz boe y guelet} \(\sim\) \textit{hoz boe hon guelet} \(2\text{PL}=\text{be}\).PT=3PL seen \(\sim\) 2PL=be.PT 1PL=seen', not the historically expected nominative suffixes \(\textit{*hoz biont ...\), nor the later accusative clitics \textit{hoz poe ho/hon guelet}, and MB also for objects of the imperative (\textit{guelit-}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{52} The doubling is especially striking in grammars which give extensive lists of both jussive and nonjussive forms, the latter lacking doubling, the former prevalently showing it: e.g. 3PL \textit{y ho deuezent} but not 2SG \textit{te da bezet}, 1PL \textit{ny hon bet}, undecidable in 2PL \textit{huy ho bet}, 3SGM \textit{ef en deuezt} (grammatical appendix to Qu, e17C MB); 2SG \textit{d’az pez, éz péz, da pé}, 3PL \textit{ho bezénd, oz bezeand}, \textit{ho deffénd}, perhaps 2PL \textit{ho pézéd}, \textit{ho pézid}, \textit{ho pobid}, \textit{ho píed}, not 1PL \textit{hon beiez, hor béziéd}, and undecidable in 3SG \textit{én devéd, én deféd} (De Rostrenen 1738, eNB); 2SG \textit{ha péés, 2PL hou péét, 1PL hun béemb, 3PL ou déent}, undecidable in 3SG \textit{en déet} (Guillôme 1836, eNB-clW) (some emendation of \textit{hop ysy} is often given alongside these forms but little can be made of it: Loth 1879, Ernault 1895). In innovative varieties, the descendant forms can end up using suffixes alone beside clitics in the rest of the paradigm (e.g. Hingant 1868: 57 on eNB-L; cf. HMSB: §140n5).]
Both the form and distribution of the coding have parallels elsewhere in the split-person case-marking of objects in constructions with anomalous, especially oblique subjects, as 3rd person nominative ~ 1st/2nd person accusative or ineffable. This parallelism requires that HAVE retain its dative-nominal mihi est structure in conservative varieties, and needs an explanation of innovations: independent nominals doubled by dative clitics, enclitics coding for pronominal nominative object, and proclitic versus infixed forms of accusative clitics.

**Dative clitic + BE in mihi est:** Conservative varieties of Breton offer rich evidence that descendants of mihi est forms remain dative-accusative clitic + BE, most strikingly in innovated forms (e.g. 19C mem bout '1SG=be.INF' using the infinitive of BE and a new allomorph of the 1SG acc. clitic). The distinctive de-prefix required after 3rd person clitics in MB-MC (*en OA → en doa 3SGM=D-be.IMPF*) and sporadic in MW (*-m dioed '1SG=D-be.IMPF*) may have become a dative case-marker from an earlier applicative preverb (building on the *do-prefix analysis of Fleuriot 1964 a.o.).

**Independent datives:** MB-MC innovate independent nominal counterparts to the surviving dative clitics. They can be traced to a preverbal nominal + resumptive construction available at all stages in all the Brythonic languages, explaining various elements of their morphosyntax, whence they generalised in MB-MC to clause-internal subject argument positions (building on the nominativus pendens hypothesis of Mac Cana 1973). The unique doubling of these independent nominals by dative clitics reflects their structure as applicative obliques (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). Innovated infinitives of mihi est add novel evidence for the subjecthood and clitic doubling of obliques. In common with other subject pronouns, that of mihi est attaches to the verbal complex in W and gives rise to novel V1.

**Nominative objects:** Insular Celtic mihi est may already have been an oblique-subject -nominative-object construction restricted to 3rd person nominatives, and was so by MB-MC. MB-MC innovate nonagreement even with 3rd person nominative objects (no MW type *-m buant '1SG=be.PT.3PL'), also resulting in restriction on copula forms (no *-*m eo), possibly traceable to constraints on mihi est in positive root clauses as Brythonic V1.3SG+enclitic (MW type *yss-ym 'be.3SG=1SG*'). This entails "unblocking" of postverbal independent pronouns to express nominative objects (*-*m biont → -m boe y with 3PL y), just they are unblocked to express accusative objects in V1 imperatives without an accusative clitic host (*-s guelit → guelit y). In both environments, the independent pronouns encliticise in MB-MC (e.g. guelit-y). In MB the imperative adopts the 3rd person restriction of mihi est, and later the 3rd person enclitic of just these two constructions assume new forms, unique to them as nominative objects (e.g. 3PL -y → -e/-o).

**Accusative objects:** Crosslinguistically, 1st/2nd person in the split-person object coding may be ineffable or accusative. In MB-MC, the accusative was not realisable until accusative clitics acquired proclitic forms in MB (no host in *-*n guelit, clitic cluster ban in *-*n hoz boe), whereupon they appear in the imperative (hon guelit), and in mihi est once the participle of the perfect grammaticalises as clitic host (hoz boe hon guelit).
Renalysis to dative-accusative: During early Modern Breton, objects of *mihi est* (first) and imperative (later), align with regular transitive objects as accusative in most varieties, at first optionally. The realignment can occur by itself, or through the rise of a new coding of accusatives by "*a*-forms" (originally for negated and ineffable objects). Throughout this development, the subject of *mihi est* constructions remains dative, resulting in a dative-accusative structure intermediate between dative-nominative and nominative-accusative. In conformity with the behavior of this stage elsewhere, the dative can gain nominative characteristics, notably doubling by suffixes (type *ni hon oa* → *ni hon oo* → *ni noamp, ni moamp*). Only rarely is there evidence for a full reanalysis to *habeo* with nominative subjects (paradigmatic *ni a noa* → *ni a noa, moamp*). Consonant with theories of case, the new nominative subjects are incompatible with nominative objects when this can be examined (types *moamp-añ* but not *ni a noa-añ*).

11 Appendix: Sources

**Breton:** MB is most fully studied in *HMSB* (Lewis and Piette 1990, Pennaod 1966 are limited regarding the anomalous object coding studied here), here supplemented by studies of MB prose (syntax and morphology) and verse (chiefly morphology). By eNB, also studied in *HMSB*, the first grammars appear (Maunoir 1659, De Rostrenen 1738, Le Brigant 1779, Dumoulin 1800, Le Gonidec 1807, Troude 1842, Hingant 1868, most L), some with comprehensive descriptions of the anomalous object coding by native-speaker-grammarians (eNB-clW, esp. Le Bayon 1878, also Guillaume 1836, Guillévic and Le Goff 1902; but already de Rostrenen 1738, eNB-K/L, anachronistically Le Clerc 1908, eNB-T), complemented by didactic texts (esp. COL, m18C L, and partly Qu, e17C MB); these have been supplemented here by selected prose (chiefly works of C. Le Bris for early 18C L; L. Pochasse and J. Marion for 18-19C W; EN, CFS, CMT for 18-19C T). For the conservative varieties of NB-W, there are extensive studies (esp. Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007ab, Crahé 2014), partial descriptions (e.g. Ernault 1876-8, Loth 1886, 1895, 1897-8, Le Dibéder 1912, McKenna 1988, Le Besco 1998, Le Pécé 2008, Le Bozec 2018), corpora (many preceding citations, and Corne 1991, Diéberder 2000; DICO, BANQUE, KAN), and extensive literature (here chiefly works of L. Herrieu, e20C). Grammars of Standard Breton draw on diverse literary traditions and are to be used with care (by native speakers of K, Kervella 1947, Trépos 1996; nonnative, Ernault 1897, Vallée 1923). A wealth of sourced native-speaker usage is organised in Favereau (1997) and *ARBRES*.

**Cornish:** MC is described in Lewis and Zimmer (1990); Toorians (2014) is more detailed regarding forms as far as its coverage goes; they are supplemented here by a survey of the MC verse for forms of *mihi est*, up to and including early-16C BM.

Textual citations: Texts are cited by title, approximate ms. date as e(early), m(id), (la)t(e) + century C, language, period, and variety. Titles for MW follow *GMW*, for MC Toorians

---

53 Of MB prose, all known brief texts of 14-16C have been included in this study, and the majority of the longer texts (Cath, Gk, Cnf in 2nd ed., Do, Mc, Qu, Prôn, Beach, but not Be, Bel, or 1st ed. of Cnf, inaccessible to me at present). These are chiefly translations, most idiomatic in their clausal morphosyntax, to go by comparison with later works illustrating idiomatic native-speaker usage of the same varieties such as MBR for L, as well as with the originals in French (Cnf being more odd in this respect).
(2014), for Breton DEVRI, ARBRES, with the following additions (and the understanding that the 1st edition of works such as Qu, HB is used unless noted by 2):


**CFS**: Catechis (imprimet dre urs an autro meurbet illustr ha reverand Yan-Augustin de Frétat de Sarra, escop ha cont à Dreguer). 2nd ed. 1775. Pierre Guyon: Montroulles.


**MP**: 19C dialectal variants of the Parable of the Prodigal Child in CHB + Ernault (1876-8), Bureau (1876-8).

**Nl+**: Nl with the additional material in Pineault (1969).

**BANQUE**: Banque Sonore des Dialectes Bretons: banque.sonore breton.free.fr

**DICOS**: Dictionnaires Bretons Parlants: dico parlant breton.free.fr

**KAN**: Chansons de tradition orale en langue bretonne: to.kan.bzh
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