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Abstract: This work analyses an apparent constructional idiosyncrasy in the coding of pronominal arguments in Breton as an effect of the Person Case Constraint (PCC), and applies it to central questions in theories of the constraint and its repairs, and of the relationship between agreement, case, and licensing. The anomaly affects objects of the imperative, the HAVE-perfect, and lexical HAVE: 3rd person has a unique coding, 1st/2nd person is ineffable or accusative, the case of all other objects. The coding is derived historically and synchronically from nominative objects constrained by the PCC, originating in lexical HAVE as the sole oblique-subject unaccusative, and extended to the remaining constructions despite thematic transitivity, with crosslinguistic analogues studied through Finnish. The findings support two distinctive aspects of Anagnostopoulou's (2003) theory of the PCC. One is a partial intervention analysis of the 3rd person restriction in the PCC, where the effect of an intervening applicative oblique on phi-Agree is attributed to its specification for person but not number; this predicts the same effect for other interveners specified only for person but neither applicative nor oblique, including imperative subjects in Breton. The other is a Case-theoretic analysis of the failure to license 1st/2nd person in the PCC, which derives it from failure of person phi-Agree needed for Case-licensing; this predicts repairs that surface as 'dependent' case, including accusative in Breton (Rezac 2011). A third more widely shared hypothesis is considerable independence of the thematic and agreement-case systems, and attribution of the PCC to the latter; it is supported by the study and explored to model intra- and crosslinguistic variation in the constraint. A theory of the PCC is developed, building on these elements, and addressing current challenges from superficially nonagreeing nominals.
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1 Introduction

This work analyses an idiosyncracy in the coding of pronominal arguments in Breton as an effect of the Person Case Constraint, and explores through it central questions in theories of the constraint and of the relationship between agreement, case, and licensing. In Breton, pronominal objects in finite clauses are generally accusative proclitics. In three constructions, however, they have a unique split-person coding: 1st/2nd person by accusative proclitics or ineffable, 3rd person by enclitics not otherwise used for coding arguments. The constructions involved make up two or three superficially unrelated groups: the imperative of active transitives, the HAVE-perfect of active transitives, and lexical HAVE:

(1) Pronominal object coding in Breton

Regular coding: accusative proclitic e, ho, nominative suffix -∅

…e zenn …ho tennas
3SGF=draw 2PL=draw.PST
…draws her …drew you

Anomalous coding in imperative: 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitic

Comments welcome (milan_rezac@yahoo.ca).

1 "Breton" alone refers to the relevant conservative varieties (section 2). Leipzig glossing rules are used modulo the following: (i) First line respects source orthography. (ii) In the gloss line, affixes (usually united in the first line) are attached by ., while relevant clitics (usually separated in the first line) by =. (iii) The bound pronouns of interest (section 2) are indicated by typography in both first and gloss line: (a) host=suffix (nominative with verb, oblique with preposition), (b) proclitic=host (accusative unless otherwise specified; note frequent allomorphy like zenn < tenn in (1)); (c) host=enclitic (argumental enclitics, double enclitics introduced later). (iv) With finite verbs, -exponent present tense, indicative mood, and 3SG/default suffix are not glossed. (v) HAVE is not analysed as proclitic=BE until section 4, so en deveus 'has' in (1) is later '3SGM=D.be'; (v) additional glosses: I MPR impersonal, SIMP surrogate imperative, and D (q.v. section 4). Texts are cited by abbreviation, dialect, and manuscript period, see Appendix 4.
The usual description of this exceptional coding is as unrelated idiosyncracies of imperative and HAVE-constructions; the description could be theoretically reified through constructional idioms whose shared and unique properties have explanations outside synchronic syntax. In the known history of Breton morphosyntax, there does prove to be a partial explanation for why pronominal arguments are enclitics in these three constructions. However, it sheds no light on their restriction to 3rd person; their alternation with 1st/2nd person accusative proclitics; their shared evolution across the three constructions; and crosslinguistic analogues to such a split-person coding in such a construction group, studied here through Finnish.

That is where the Person Case Constraint (PCC) comes in. Breton HAVE originated as and in the relevant varieties remains the sole oblique-subject – nominative-object unaccusative. As such, it is expected to be restricted by the PCC to 3rd person nominatives, while 1st/2nd person objects are ineffable or "repaired" to accusative. The theory of the PCC adopted and extended here is the defective-intervention approach of Anagnostopoulou (2003). It is characterised by two distinctive and one more widely shared ingredients that are supported and developed here:

- **Partial intervention**: The 3rd person restriction in the PCC is due to defective intervention in phi-dependencies by nominals specified for person but not number; such a specification is given to applicative obliques (cf. Taraldsen 1995). The hypothesis predicts the same intervention by nonapplicative nonobliques specified only for person, and is borne out by interveners including imperative subjects in Breton.

- **Case Theory**: In the PCC, interveners prevent person phi-Agree with 1st/2nd person, and thereby their licensing if licensing requires Case and Case requires full phi-Agree (cf. Chomsky 2000). Such a Case-theoretic link of phi-dependencies with both licensing and case permits an understanding of why unexpected accusative case with unaccusatives licenses 1st/2nd person barred by the PCC, as a repair by dependent Case (Rezac 2011). Challenges to Case Theories have come from nonagreeing nominals in PCC contexts and are addressed here, though restricting Case Theory to only person-bearers is also possible (cf. Béjar and Rezac 2009; Preminger 2014, 2018; Kalin 2018, 2019).

- **Parameters**: Theories that attribute the PCC to the syntax underlying the agreement-case system can be neutral about thematic properties, and so capture parallelism among, for instance, applicative dative, agentive dative, agentive ergative interveners; this is so here. The approach is explored to model intra- and crosslinguistic variation in constructions subject to the PCC through the featural content of lexical items.

This study is organised into two parts: one for the analysis of Breton (sections 2-5), the other for the theory of the Person Case Constraint (section 6). The first part begins with relevant aspects of the syntax and morphology of Breton in section 2. Section 3 discusses the imperative: it offers a clear view of the rise of the anomalous object coding and what it should have given without the PCC. Section 4 turns to HAVE; its analysis as a dative-subject – nominative-object unaccusative explains the person restriction and case alternations from the constraint and its repairs. Section 5 sketches how the anomalous coding disappeared with the PCC when HAVE and imperative constructions became reanalysed with accusative objects.

---

2 The historical core of the PCC comprises active transitives with combinations of dative-accusative/absolutive clitics, later extended to unaccusatives/passes with nonclitic dative subjects and nominative/absolute objects, of which the paragon is in Icelandic (section 6). Not all work adopts the unification. It is the latter, Icelandic-type PCC that is almost exclusively relevant here, though the theory of section 6 belongs to those that unify the two phenomena. All here may be read by substituting an alternative like "person restriction" for the PCC (save for aspects of subsection 6.8).
The second part, section 6, is the theoretical study resumed above, relating the three constructions in Breton as "casual" unaccusatives subject to the PCC, linking them to crosslinguistic analogues, and developing a theory of the constraint and its repairs.

2 Breton morphosyntax

2.1 Linguistic and theoretical background

This section sets out relevant aspects of Breton morphosyntax. Breton is a Celtic language spoken in Brittany. It is closest akin to Cornish, next to Welsh; the three form the Brythonic branch, sister to Goidelic, of the Insular Celtic languages. The varieties relevant here may be organized as follows (Press 2010, Ternes 1992, 2011, Humphreys 1992, Stephens 1992, Le Berre 2001, Heinecke 2002, Schrijver 2011a,b; Appendix 4 gives the sources used here):

- Brythonic: The 6/7C common ancestor, and here also used for shared developments in differentiating Old Welsh and Old Breton-Cornish (brief texts).
- Middle Breton (MB): 12C – mid-17C, esp. 14C- (phrases) and early 16C- (substantial mostly religious texts with little dialectal differentiation); cognate with Middle Cornish (MC, George 2010, texts late 14C-), Middle Welsh (MW, Willis 2010, texts mid-13C-).
- Early Modern Breton (eNB): mid-17C – 19C (texts and grammars, both reflecting dialects).
- Modern Breton (NB) (texts, spoken-language corpora, linguistic studies).
- Dialects: Traditional divisions for eNB reflect the bishoprics of Gwened (W, southeast), Kerne (K, southwest), Leon (L, northwest), Treger (T, northeast). Together KLT is strikingly different from W. W is here divided into clW (18-19C W Vannes area), Wo (21C Lorient area), and Wg (20C Groix) (see Appendix 4). NB presents rich microdialectal variation, augmented by growing isolation, alongside convergences in contact zones.

The varieties of Breton chiefly relevant here are MB, earliest eNB-KLT, and most W varieties of all periods. These varieties are conservative in their object coding, which changed in eNB-KLT to an innovative system (section 5).

The theoretical frame used in sections 2-5 is partly expository, but chosen so as to built on it in section 6. The relevant assumptions about the morphosyntax of case, agreement, and associated movement are those in the background of recent work in generative syntax (e.g. Chomsky 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Baker 2008, 2015, Roberts 2010, Preminger 2014, Kalin 2019). A D-NP architecture is assumed for nominal arguments, C-T-v-VP for clauses. Arguments are called oblique if their case is c/s-selectional. Nonoblique arguments have structural Case through phi-Agree with clausal Agree/Case loci, T NOM and v ACC. Several shorthands are useful for typical groupings of properties. For arguments, these are: A, the external argument of active transitives, including unergatives; O, the internal argument of active transitives; S, the internal argument of unaccusatives and passives; subject, object, referring to structural subjecthood, objecthood properties. For verbal constructions, they are: (thematic) transitive, intransitive, i.e. with and without the external argument respectively; and casual transitive, intransitive, i.e. with and without accusative (ergative) case/agreement; so They were seen by us is a thematic transitive but casual intransitive.\(^3\)

2.2 Clausal syntax


---

\(^3\) The dual use of transitive, intransitive here is unusual, but simplifies exposition when reckoning with noncanonical constructions, such as active thematic transitives in oblique – nominative case frames. The use of casual here extends one of its older uses (cf. French casuel): ‘pertaining to case and [by extension here:] agreement’.

\(^4\) The description is limited to relevant aspects of the prose of conservative varieties. The literature cited mostly studies innovative varieties of NB, but the relevant findings about clausal syntax, argument asymmetries, and free/bound
In finite clauses, any and all arguments can appear postverbally, with neutral order A/S > O > PP. Certain finite clauses have a unique preverbal position for displaced arguments. It has been analysed as specifiers of one or more left-peripheral heads from T up, adjacent to the verb in the manner of V2 systems. It may be filled by A-movement of the subject on a neutral reading (Spec,T); by A'-movements of any argument (Spec,Cfoc,wh,…); and in other ways such as long head movement. The position is mostly a root phenomenon, obligatory in positive and optional in negative clauses, but absent in imperatives. It is mostly absent in infinitives (raising, controlled, and arbitrary PRO, save wh in wh-infinitives); however, certain complementisers license the subject and it only before the verb (specified-subject Spec,T, i.e. for-to type).

(2) Transitive clause (constructed, NB orthography)

Nonroot, no preverbal position
Peogwir/Hag e prof ar merch'ed ar wareg da Iona.
Because/whether R=offer the=girls the=bow to=Iona
Because/Whether the girls offer the bow to Iona…

Root, preverbal subject A/A'-movement (neutral/focus)
Ar merch'ed a brof ar wareg da Iona
The girls/GIRLS offer the bow to Iona.

Root, preverbal nonsubject A'-movement only (focus)
Ar wareg a brof ar merch'ed __ da Iona.
The girls offer the BOW to Iona.

Infinitive, specified subject vs. PRO
(D’ar merch'ed) da brofañ __ ar wareg da Iona
to=the=girls R=offer.INF
(For the girls) to offer the bow to Iona...

Pronominalisation in root clause with focus fronting
Dezhi he frofont
to.3SGF 3SGF=offer.3PL
They offer it to HER. [it = ar wareg, feminine]

The preverbal position follows heads of the C-system if present, such as interrogative hag. It precedes heads of the T/Fin-system: the preverbal particle (R) of most verbal clauses, and the high negation (NEG) of all negated verbal clauses. These heads, and certain complementisers if adjacent, form a morphophonological unit with the verb, the verbal complex. Within the complex the verb is flanked by bound pronouns, set out next.5

(3) Verbal complex (synthetic constructions; periphrastic in section 4)

(C) (R) (NEG) (procliticACC) (em/reflexive) Vfin/suffixNOM / Vinf (enclitics)
R: Finite clauses: optative ra/da, else a if a DP argument fills the preverbal position, else e(2)/en; R but not NEG is absent in imperatives and responsives. Nonfinite da (= preposition 'to') or ∅; negation is usually unavailable.

2.3 Core argument syntax and morphology

5 The morphophonological unity of the complex is detectable in various ways, such as initial consonant mutation (e prof-, a/da brof-, a prof-). Certain nuances are omitted, such as interactions of a, e(2) with NEG and proclitics.
The core arguments A, S, and O have a nominative-accusative alignment: A, S are nominative and O accusative, as discussed below; A, S but not O are raising trace, controlled PRO, arbitrary PRO, and the specified subject of infinitives; A, S but not O are subjects of imperatives; A e-commands O for local anaphora; in the postverbal field, A precedes O, and A, S but not O can occur between the auxiliary and participle; A, S but not O allow a neutral reading in the preverbal position. When these core arguments are morphophonologically independent, including free or independent pronouns, they are bare DPs invariant for case. Other arguments such as goals are PPs containing bare DPs. Case is distinguished on bound or dependent pronouns:6

- Nominative: one set suffixes to the finite verb for A/S.
- Accusative: one set of proclitics to the finite verb, the participle (in the HAVE-perfect, section 4), and the infinitive (only after early eNB) for O.
- Genitive: one set of proclitics, mostly syncretic with the accusative, to the noun for the possessor, and the infinitive for O/S (only in MB and early eNB).
- P-argument: several sets of suffixes for arguments of preposition and subjects of infinitives with prepositional complementisers.

Table 1: Independent and dependent pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Indep.</th>
<th>ACCcl</th>
<th>GENcl</th>
<th>cIW</th>
<th>Indep.</th>
<th>ACCcl</th>
<th>GENcl</th>
<th>Wo</th>
<th>Indep.</th>
<th>ACCcl</th>
<th>GENcl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>m~ma</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>→ 2PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>te, -de</td>
<td>z~da</td>
<td>té</td>
<td>ha(s)/-te</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>huRk</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>3k</td>
<td>sRk+ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>hu, -hu*</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>huy, -hu</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>hui, -hu</td>
<td>3GM</td>
<td>eñ</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>4GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3GM</td>
<td>eff</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>cañ</td>
<td>eRk</td>
<td>cañ</td>
<td>eRk</td>
<td>3SGF</td>
<td>hy</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>3SGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>P-pl</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-ont</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3GM</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>-ont</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>3GM</td>
<td>hy</td>
<td>-ont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>hy</td>
<td>-ont</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>houy</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>hy</td>
<td>-ont</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table: suffixes only illustrated for 3rd person, for the present indicative of kar-‘love’ and the preposition evit ‘for’.

Conventions in Table:
Double enclitics (q.v. below) have same forms as independent pronouns, save x- (not enclitic), -x (only enclitic), -x* (ditto, further restricted)
~ separates leftward-conditioned allomorphs in 1SG/2SG (q.v. section 3-4)
L, S, SN, P, SP, R, K consonant mutation types (only in post-MB orthography).
H abbreviates allomorphic h/c/j/i, Rk allomorphic n/(l)jk

Sources:
MB – Hemon (1975); close to early eNB, save for orthography
cIW – Le Bayon (1878), close to Guillevic and Le Goff (1902)
Wo – Cheveau (2007ab); almost isomorphic to Crahé (2014)

Our concern is with the case and agreement of the core arguments. The syntax assumed for the nominative-accusative system of Breton has two clausal Agree/Case loci, TNOM and in transitives vACC, each Agreeing for phi-features with the closest phi-bearing argument and assigning Case to it, A/S and O respectively. As independent DPs, nominatives subjects may A-

---

6 Here clitic, affix are used only of morphophonologically status, and weak, strong of syntactic structure. The terminological distinction “suffix” versus “(pro/en)clitic” is used as standard for Breton, but of limited foundation. In NB orthographies, suffixes are written with their host, proclitics are separated by space, and enclitics by hyphen. In earlier orthographies, suffixes to prepositions though not verbs are frequently separated from their hosts, occasionally doubling enclitics and proclitics are written with them, and the hyphen is only sometimes used with enclitics, but frequently indicates prosodic groupings without the close attachment of clitics with its characteristics like allomorphy.

5
move to Spec,T, while accusatives objects do not show detectable A-movement. As dependent pronouns, the core arguments are nominative suffixes and accusative proclitics. Two properties guide their analysis: Complementarity and Blocking.

(4) Complementarity: Dependent pronoun clitics/suffixes are in complementary distribution with independent DPs, except: (i) subjects preceding high negation; (ii) subjects of HAVE.


Complementarity has suggested that dependent pronoun clitics/suffixes realise "incorporated" pronominal arguments (Anderson 1981; the analysis assumes absence of pronominal doubling, q.v. below). They are thus analogous to the clitics of French, which are in complementary distribution with independent nominals, and not to the agreement of French, which reflects Agree-valued phi-features controlled by independent as well as clitic nominatives. The negation exception to Complementarity has been analysed as a resumptive pronoun for subjects crossing negation (Schafer 1995, Jouitteau 2005); the HAVE exception is central here later (section 4).

Blocking comes in two types. With core arguments, Blocking is close to its analogue in French, and may be analysed in the same way (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). Dependent pronouns reflect syntactically more deficient nominals than independent pronouns, weak versus strong. Strong pronouns are required in certain environments, including coordination, modification, and focus. Elsewhere, weak pronoun syntax is possible, and preferred; this preference is Blocking. This essentially yields the distribution of dependent and independent pronouns as core arguments in Breton (see Appendix 1). With objects of prepositions, Blocking does not work this way and has no parallel in French; it will not concern us here (see Jouitteau and Rezac 2006 on Breton).

(5) Blocking: Independent pronouns are licensed only if dependent pronouns are unavailable, that is in:

- Coordination and modification (save with prepositions).
- Nonclausal environments: response fragments, vocatives, appositions.
- Predicates in any position.
- Preverbal position: focus, wh, etc. subjects and objects, and neutral subjects in finite clauses, subjects in nonfinite/nonverbal clauses.
- Arguments of a certain items, with variation: equative hag 'as'; eme 'quoth'; gwa 'woe'; sed, setu 'ecce'.

(6) Illustration of Blocking with core arguments

Heñ an neus {ma havet | kavet Pêr ha me}.
3SGM has 1SG=found | found Per and 1SG
English: He has {found me | found Per and me}.
French: Il {m'a trouvé | trouvé Pierre et moi}.

(eNB T, Le Clerc 1908: §139, §76, slightly adapted)

Blocking then indicates that core argument dependent pronouns are weak pronouns, like French clitics. In Breton, they surface on the verb. This fits theories where weak pronouns move and attach to their Agree/Case loci, nominative T_NOM and accusative V_ACC (with varied mechanics: Cardinaletti and Starke 1999, Matushansky 2006, Roberts 2010, Mavrogiorgos 2013; in periphrastic constructions T_NOM is part of the auxiliary and V_ACC of the nonfinite lexical verb, see section 4).

(7) Synthetic finite transitives o frofint 'they will offer them'

Structure: O_{ACC}+V_{V}+V_{A}+A_{ANOM} [A + [V \emptyset]]
Unlike in French, there is no realization of phi-Agree between T_NOM and the nominative subject: the "agreement" suffix of the finite verb reflects the nominative weak pronoun in Breton, while in French the suffix reflects phi-Agree and the nominative weak pronoun is a proclitic. However, there is evidence for a covert analogue of French agreement. In French, subject clitics are not found wherever subjects are licensed, but only in agreeing finite clauses, indicating that they depend on agreement, here analysed as phi-Agree (Kayne 2000: ch. 9; cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017, with evidence that agreement, not finiteness matters). Likewise in Breton, the nominative suffixes that correspond to French subject clitics are limited to finite clauses, indicating dependence on phi-Agree: they are agreement-licensed nominals (see further section 6 on such nominals, and Appendix 1 on Breton pronouns).

2.4 Doublee enclitics

By Complementarity, dependent pronouns do not double independent nominals. However, they do double pronominal enclitics, typically for contrast or clarity:

(8) Doublee enclitics (doubling dependent pronouns underlined)

```
what hour R.1SG=console.2PL=2PL=1PL
\[
\text{[\text{my God ...} \text{when will you console me?]}
\]
```

(IN, early 18C L)

Doublee enclitics are chiefly important here because they help identify argumental enclitics. Of doubling itself, only the briefest sketch can be given (see further Appendix 1). It is restricted to dependent + enclitic pronoun combinations (Stump 1983, 1989). Similar doubling is common; in French, it is clitic + independent pronoun under focus (Zribi-Hertz 2008). A common analysis is the "big DP" hypothesis (Uriagereka 1995, Belletti 1999, 2005, Cechetto 2000, van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen 2005). The doubler and doublee originate in the same DP, e.g. [D_doubler D_Pdoublee]; possible combinations and subsequent movements reflect licensing requirements, such as the need of weak pronouns move to Agree/Case loci. Many details remain open about Breton (case of doublee, if any; strength of doublee, given typical use for contrast; does the doublee stay in or move as part of the remnant big-DP).

Let us turn to the evidence for encliticisation. Although doublee enclitics are chiefly used for contrast and clarity, morphophonologically they are enclitics, and distinct from independent pronouns in apposition (see esp. Stump 1983, 1989; so invariably in descriptive studies addressing the issue, e.g. Favereau 1997: §247, Kervella 1947: §424, Schrijver 2011a: 5.6.1):7

- Enclitics are right-adjacent to the morphological complex containing the dependent pronoun doubling them. This can put them far from corresponding independent DPs and in a unique position: in conservative varieties save W, enclitic doublees of dependent pronouns attached to the finite verb split the verb from the otherwise strictly adjacent low negation ket 'not' (Stump 1983, 1989; in W they attach to ket).
- The forms of enclitics and independent pronouns are similar, but enclitics may reflect earlier independent forms (e.g. as independent 3PL developed i > int > inti, enclitics often lag behind), or their reductions (e.g. 2PL independent hui [xhi], enclitic hu [hy]).
- Enclitic and host fall into the same domain for word-level prosody, leaving enclitics unstressed in other than ultima-accented systems (e.g. Sommerfelt 1920: 149, early 20C L;

---

7 The diagnostics of weak/strong status, coordination and modification, are not useful, because whether an enclitic can occur in these environments depends on whether the doubling dependent pronoun can (so not with core arguments, only arguments of prepositions).

- Enclitic and host can condition each other's allomorphy (Hingant 1868: 174, Moal 1890: 84; Cheveau 2007b: 5.3.1, 21C Wo; Goyat 2012: 9.3.1, 21C K; for theoretical consequences, see Bennett et al. 2019: 3.2 with literature).

The host of doublee enclitics is generally the morphophonological word containing the doubling dependent pronoun, with some evidence that enclitic attachment is freer and looser than that of dependent pronouns. The concrete mechanism of enclitisation remains to be studied, and we return to it only as relevant for argumental enclitics (sec. 4.4).8

2.5 The puzzle of argumental enclitics

We now come to the puzzle introduced through (1). In conservative varieties, the pronominal objects of active imperatives, of the active HAVE-auxiliary + participle perfect, and of lexical HAVE, are not coded by accusative proclitics or other pronominal forms described so far. Rather, they are enclitics, originally identical with doublee enclitics in form and position though not doubling anything and without focus, later acquiring forms unique to them and shared across all three constructions. These argumental enclitics are restricted to 3rd person, while in 1st/2nd person regular accusative proclitics appear. Their study begins with the imperative, where their origin is clearest.

3 Imperative

3.1 Imperatives: V1 and O-coding

The imperative is a good starting point, because the history of argumental enclitics in it is clear: as a verb-first (V1) construction, the imperative lacked a host for accusative clitics, licensing independent pronouns in their stead, which became enclitics by MB. This story underscores the puzzle of the restriction of enclitics to 3rd person, their alternation with 1st/2nd person accusatives, and their subsequent shared evolution in imperative and HAVE – not least because these features are absent in cognate languages, and some varieties of Breton.

All the Brythonic languages and their reconstructible antecedent have dependent and independent pronouns, and Blocking of the latter by the former. Accusative clitics were enclitic to a preverbal X° in the left periphery, such as negation. In V1 constructions, these enclitics were unavailable, and did not Block independent pronouns. The expected outcome is found in MW and MC: in the V1 positive imperative, O is coded by independent pronouns, distinct from counterparts of Breton doublee enclitics in these languages; in the non-V1 negative imperative, accusative clitics are the rule (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §348ff; Morris-Jones 1913: §160, 1931: §77; Evans 1964: §55; Toorians 2014: ch. 7).9

---

8 Syntactic evidence of looser attachment comes from anomalies of placement, mostly still to be studied. One is a "float" of doublee enclitics from the auxiliary to the participle in compound tenses, widespread after early eNB, though often rare (e.g. BSLs mid-18C L, MBJJ early 19C T, DHKN mid-20C W, TDPB mid-20 T, OFBH late 20C L; cf. Rezac 2013, ARBRES s.v. Les pronoms écho; cf. in MW Morris Jones 1931: §74, Evans 1964: §62); like other positional properties, it is shared with argumental enclitics, ma 'mé pet te bahateit 'that 1SG=be been=3SGM beaten' "that I had beaten him" (DICO, 21C W-Guern).

9 This exposition strips a complex situation to what is relevant (see Koch 1991, Russel 1995, Schrijver 1997, 2011b, Fleuriot 2002, Meelen forth, with differences not relevant here). The comparison of MB, MW, and MC, indicates an "infixed" accusative-dative clitics series, enclitic to preverbal X°s including negation and proclitic to the following verb. In strict V1 with no such preverbal X°, there are traces of enclitics to the verb, but these were lost early (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §478, Evans 1964: §147, Koch 1987: 152n12, Fleuriot 2002; cf. Newton 2006 on Old Irish). In constructions with a missing preverbal X° host, including V1, or a morphophonologically difficult one, such as pan 'when', independent pronouns were licensed (so still in MW, Morris-Jones 1913: §160, 1931: §77, giving weaker Blocking than in Breton or than for non-accusatives in MW, Evans 1964: §55, Willis 2007: 9.8; in MB, the morphophonological effect is absent due to emancipation of clitic forms discussed below, and V1 is limited to imperatives and responsives). The reconstruction fits the very limited evidence of Brythonic: host for the clitic, na-m errcit mi 'NEG=1SG=ask.IMPR.2PL/3SG=1SG; V1(?) + independent, aruoart hun '[who] enchant.PST 2PL'; unsuitable host, pan galuher hi 'when call.IMPR 3SGF' (see for sources and analyses Fleuriot 1964, Schrijver 2011b).
In Breton, the positive imperative is the sole surviving V1 environment other than bare-verb positive responsives. The morphosyntax of imperatives apart from the coding of pronominal O is straightforward and like that of French (Hemon 1975: §165, §173, Favereau 1997: §388, §440, §461, §535, Lewis and Piette 1990: §27, Kervella 1947: §190): the subject is coded only by dependent pronouns, regular 2PL and 1PL nominative suffixes but for 2SG the bare verb (+ doublee enclitics); the positive imperative is verb-initial, the negative follows the high negation *na*. Historically, we would expect that the V1 positive imperative codes pronominal O by postverbal independent pronouns, and the negative imperative by accusative clitics, with no person restrictions.

That is almost what we find in certain NB varieties of W such as Wo (Cheveau 2007ab, Crahé 2014). The chief development is the replacement of independent pronouns by enclitics. These are identical to independent pronouns and doublee enclitics in 1st person. In 3rd person, they are unique to the imperative, containing an initial *t* rebracketed from the 2PL ending -*it*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperatives in Wo and Fr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wo: Gortozit*-ni*hoñ!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr: Attendez-<em>nous</em>le!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Await us/him!        Let us await him!    Don’t await us/him!

(21C Wo, Crahé 2014: 289-294; *-t-hoñ* [tõ])

This NB Wo system is a familiar one of clisis-directionality determined by verbal properties. It has an exact parallel in and may be given the same analysis as French (e.g. through verb raising, Kayne 1991; see also Roberts 2010, Mavrogiorgos 2013, Rowlett 2014, Pescarini 2018); it may have even been modelled on French (see below). Our focus now is the system of conservative varieties other than W and of early W itself as well.

3.2 MB/eNB-KLT: The rise of enclitics

Conservative varieties of Breton other than W, and earliest W, present a radical transformation of the Brythonic system (Hemon 1975: §51). The independent pronouns coding the object of V1 imperatives have become enclitics, but only in 3rd person. Their 1st/2nd person counterparts are absent, enclitic or independent. Instead, new 1st/2nd person accusative proclitics appear. The resulting split-person coding often extends to negative imperatives, losing its link to V1. The same developments also take place with HAVE, where V1 will not be a factor, and later the enclitics of both constructions adopt new, unique forms. Here these developments are traced in the imperative.

While MW and MC code the object of the V1 positive imperative by postverbal independent pronouns, in MB it is coded by enclitics with the form and position of doublee enclitics. Evidence of position is available in varieties where the positive imperative pattern generalises to the negative: pronominal O must precede the low negation *ket* ‘not’, as also do doublee enclitics and argumental enclitics with HAVE, but nothing else.

10 Forms called imperatives in Breton fall in two groups: imperative, concerned here (only 2SG, 2PL, 1PL forms), and jussive (only 3SG, 3PL forms) (cf. also section 6). They do not exclusively share any morphology and have a radically different syntax. In imperatives, the verbal complex is initial: positive V.IMP ~ negative NEG=(acc.clitic)=V.IMP (MB also has an alternative positive with *ha* ‘and’=(acc.clitic)=V.IMP). The subject is the 2SG, 2PL, 1PL suffix, apart from a separate vocative (as in French; no English type *Nobody move!*). The subject includes the addressee, so pronominal objects are either disjoint 1SG/PL and 3SG/3PL, or reflexive, which in MB are 1PL and 2SG/2PL accusative clitics + verbal prefix *em* (after MB, the pronominal part is lost or invariant). 3rd person directives, lost in ENB, have a remarkable syntax: the preverbal position is available but optional; the verbal complex lacks the preverbal particles; phrasal subjects are available in the preverbal position or postverbally, but foot Complementarity (Ernault 1888: 249f., Le Roux 1957: 297, Hemon 1975, Favereau 1997: §335). The very few examples of pronominal objects are proclitic (e.g. *He miret* ‘3SGF=guard.SIMP.3SG’ ‘let him keep it’, Pm, early 16C MB, and later forms cited in Le Goff 1927: 202; the examples in Kervella 1947: §429 are explicitly artificial).

11 While enclitic status is known (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §38), Hemon (1975) does not discuss it, so relevant tests are given here for MB; the placement tests are explicit in grammars and studies of HAVE in W, cited in section 4.

12 It may be noted that argumental enclitics do not occur in the strong-pronoun environments of coordination, modification, focus; but this generalisation is not robust in the corpus here, as the imperative offers few contrasts with independent pronouns in these environments.
Enclitic position of O of IMP

na credet ef quet
NEG=believe.IMP.2PL=3SGM not
do not believe him!

(Gk, late 16C MB)

In form, enclitics were originally identical to independent pronouns, but differences appear as they change under absence of stress or fail to undergo expansions of independent pronouns (pre- and postpreverbal).

Enclitic O of imperative versus independent pronoun after chetu

[3PL y, int, indy when independent, only y as enclitic]
digacsit y all chetu-indy a se
send.IMP.2PL=3PL all look 3PL there

(Qu, early 17C MB; independent also y)

[3PL i > independent i, int, inty, argumental enclitic he < P-suffix]
grit-he
do.IMP.2PL=3PL

look 3PL here

(COL, late 18C L/T)

Starting in late MB, many varieties undergo a further development: the argumental enclitics adopt the forms of prepositional suffixes, both in imperatives and in HAVE-constructions (Hemon 1975: §54n2 on MB and eNB L, T; Le Clerc 1908: §139 on T). The result is a differentiation of doubling and argumental enclitics (e.g. 3PL argumental (h)je, doubling i, examples above and below), though they had been identical earlier (and so ambiguous: en deveus-èn '3SG=D.is-3SGM' as "HE has" and "he has him", IN, early 18C L). The cause may have been precisely the surface differentiation of a distinction made in the grammar. Prepositional suffixes are the natural choice to make it, since among argumental dependent pronouns, they are closest to enclitics in form (post-host, usually not written with it in eNB orthography, making gender distinctions, and even similar in phonology: see Table 1).

Differentiation of argumental (3PL ê) and doublec enclitics (3PL ii) (underlined)

o deus-ê etablisset … voant ii o unan etablisset
3PL=D.is-3PL established … was 3PL=3PL their=Self established
"[who] have established them [to govern the Church, even as] they were themselves established [by J.C.]

na lest ê quet d’o conit
NEG=let.IMP.2SG=3PL not to=3PL=deceive
do not let them deceive them

(CMT, early 19C T)

Thus at some point prior to MB, independent pronouns coding the O in V1 imperatives had encliticised. This encliticisation was but the lastest in a series that had earlier given the other dependent pronouns (cf. Griffiths 2015a,b). It attached core arguments to a preceding verb; independent pronouns as predicates or as arguments of nonverbal hosts were unaffected. It skipped intervening elements, notably the low negation ket ‘not’ and the participle of the HAVE-perfect, possibly not yet present when it took place (on ket, Willis 2012; on the HAVE-perfect, section 4). Similar encliticisation is common, resulting among others in the French system of O coding by enclitics in the V1 imperative. Why it only yielded 3rd person enclitics and what happened to 1st/2nd person is to be explained.
3.3 MB/eNB-KLT: Proclitics

For 1st/2nd person O of V1 imperatives, we should expect in MB independent pronouns, as in MW and MC, or enclitics, as in Wo. Neither is found in MB/eNB-KLT. Instead, 1st/2nd person objects of V1 imperatives are coded by accusative proclitics; the same will be true of HAVE.

These proclitics are an innovation. In Brythonic, accusative clitics were both proclitic to the following finite verb, and enclitic to a preverbal X° such as negation; they were thus in the V1 positive imperative. Their MB descendants still allow attachment to a leftward host, and there are forms that need it, 1SG 'm, 2SG 'z, while also depending rightward on the finite verb. Thus MB negation na + 3SGF he (triggering elision) or 1SG 'm (in need of a syllabic host) + kar 'love.IMP.2SG' (with consonant mutation triggered by proclitics) > n'he c'har, na'm c'har.

By MB, three relevant developments had changed the Brythonic system. (i) Accusative clitics save 1SG, 2SG have invariant forms that do not need to be syllabified by a leftward host. (ii) Accusative and originally distinct genitive clitics had become syncretic, save 3SGM. (iii) In 1SG, 2SG, genitive clitics originally had forms independent of a leftward host, ma, da, as well as post-vocalic 'm, 'z syncretic with accusatives; at some point the syncretism was completed with accusative ma, da. By MB, these had become available when there was no leftward host – the V1 imperative, and the HAVE-perfect below. In eNB, even 1SG, 2SG lose forms conditioned by the leftward host (Table 1; see Hemon 1975: §51-4, Pedersen 1909: §498, Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §354, Lewis and Piette 1990: §27; cf. Schrijver 1997, 201a,b).13

This story accounts for the forms of 1st/2nd person proclitics in the imperative, but not for why they replaced 1st/2nd person independent or enclitic pronouns (found in cognate MW and MC), nor why 3rd person was unaffected (replacing or alternating with enclitics – as in innovative varieties, section 5). The resulting split-person coding characterises MB (15-17C), early eNB KLT (17-18C), earliest W (Prôn, early 17C MB/W; NG, late 17C W), and is an option in clW (18-19C), though not Wo (20-21C) with the above-described French-like system of person-insensitive imperative enclitics.14

3.4 MB/eNB-KLT: Independence of V1

Historically, the enclitic coding of the O of imperatives was limited to the positive imperative as V1; in the negative imperative, accusative clitics had a host in the negation. This is so in W, most MB texts, and occasionally in eNB-KLT (e.g. KAS, mid-19C T). Elsewhere in eNB-KLT, 3rd person enclitics are often extended to the negative imperative, optionally (e.g. Gk, late 16C MB) or obligatorily (e.g. Qu, early 17C MB; IN, early 18C L) (cf. Hemon 1975: §53-4).

(13) Imperatives in an eNB-KLT variety (IN, early 18C L)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent=enclitic</td>
<td>extension of enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquit-ën</td>
<td>na zilez-ën</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let.IMP.2PL=3SGM</td>
<td>NEG=leave.IMP.2PL=3SGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new proclitic</td>
<td>old proclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va galvit Maria</td>
<td>n'am galvit mui Noëmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG=call.IMP.2PL Maria</td>
<td>NEG=1SG=call.IMP.2PL anymore Noemi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Breton, the significance of the extension is the decoupling of argumental enclitics and the split-person coding from V1. Certain varieties must allow two structures for negative imperatives, a situation familiar from a similar extension in French (q.v. Rowlett 2014).

---

13 When we turn in section 4 to the rise of the same split-person coding in the HAVE perfect, there will be evidence that the proclitics are accusative, and discussion of ways that the genitive may have influenced their rise other than by supplying allomorphs.

14 For completeness, the V1 imperatives of 18-19C clW can be succinctly described as (i) the split-person system of MB, 3rd enclitics ~ 1st proclitics, (ii) along with optional or dialectal adoption of P-forms for the enclitics, plus two developments that lead to Wo, (iii) development of 1st person enclitics, (iv) partial remodelling of the 3rd person enclitics with initial t, but not (v) the step that gives Wo, loss of 1st person proclitics, where also syncretism of all 3rd person pronouns with P-suffixes obscures (ii) (Le Bayon 1878: 51-2).
3.5 From imperative to HAVE and back

The anomalous coding of pronominal objects in the Breton imperative has a clear history. In Brythonic, O was coded generally by accusative clitics but in V1 constructions by independent pronouns. In Breton, the latter encliticised. The result should have been the alternation of non-V1 accusative proclitic – V1 enclitic, as in French and late Wo Breton. Earlier conservative varieties however offer the following puzzles:

- The enclitics deriving from independent pronouns are restricted to 3rd person, and non-3rd person independent pronouns are not continued.
- Accusative proclitics appear for and only for 1st/2nd person.
- This split-person coding is decoupled from V1 in the negative imperative.
- The same split-person coding appears for the object of HAVE, and the enclitics of both undergo shared distinctive adoption of P-suffix forms.

Thus the question arises of what underlies the coding of objects, such that it gave rise to a split-person 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd accusative proclitic coding for the object of imperatives and lexical/auxiliary HAVE and them alone. One part of the answer comes from the following study of HAVE, where the split-person coding is seen to be the expected effect of the Person Case Constraint on an oblique-subject + nominative-object unaccusative. The other part is extension of this structure and constraint to transitives with another sort of anomalous subject, that of the imperative; that is the matter of section 6.

4 HAVE

4.1 Overview

Beside the imperative, the split-person coding by 3rd argumental enclitics ~ 1st/2nd accusative proclitics characterises the pronominal object of HAVE-constructions, namely of lexical HAVE and of transitive verbs in the HAVE-perfect. The history of HAVE is intricate but rewarding, because it explains the split-person coding through the Person Case Constraint. The story may be sketched thus: Breton HAVE originated as a "mihi-est" HAVE, that is BE with a dative possessor subject and nominative object. This structure is expected to bar 1st/2nd person nominatives by the PCC, deriving the 3rd person restriction on enclitics as pronominal nominative objects. The 1st/2nd nominatives barred by the PCC can be repaired to accusatives, resulting in the 1st/2nd person accusative proclitics. The rest of this section goes through the details. In innovative varieties, HAVE underwent a common change to a transitive "habeo" HAVE, and the split-person coding was lost; this is reviewed in section 5.15

4.2 Brythonic background

In the Celtic languages, English lexical have is usually expressed by BE + nominative S + 'to, with' PP, and so also in Breton (here gante, din):

\[(14)\] Daou wareg o deus (prenet) ar merch’hed, met houna’h zo gante bremañ zo din.
\[\text{two bows have (bought) the=girls but this.one be with.3PL now be to.1SG}\]
\[\text{The girls have (bought) two bows, but the one that they have now is mine.}\]
\[\text{(NB; adapted from Jouitteau and Rezac 2008)}\]

However, conservative Breton also expresses lexical have by mihi est HAVE: BE + oblique possessor + nominative possessum (q.v. Benveniste 1966, Heine 1997, Bauer 2000; o deus above is its NB descendant). It is found in the oldest stages of both Brythonic and Goidelic languages, and outside Breton and Cornish its ingredients are transparent, including in the MW sister of MB (q.v. esp. Loth 1910, Lloyd-Jones 1928, Le Roux 1957):

\[\text{15 The analysis here develops and revises Rezac (2004: ch. 4), Jouitteau and Rezac (2008).}\]
The possessum has the behavior of the S argument of BE: it is a bare DP when independent, as all core arguments, and it controls a phi-matching nominative suffix when preverbal, as A/S does in MW (unlike in Breton). The possessor is an object clitic. These mostly code O in MW, continuing earlier accusatives. Sporadically, however, they continue earlier datives, otherwise replaced by PPs: recipients (with 'give', 'grant'), experiencers ('come', 'matter'), benefactives ('be gentle to'), and possessors (*mihi est HAVE) (Morris-Jones 1913: §160, Lloyd-Jones 1928: sec. 2, Evans 1964: §61, §162, cf. §138b, Fleuriot 2002, Willis 2007: 323; for case collapse in clitics, Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §279, §340). These latter uses of object clitics motivate a residual dative case (so Matasović 2004 for the parallel and cognate situation in Old Irish). The dative is syncretic with the accusative, but distinctive in distribution: it is the case of clitics which do not have nonclitic DP counterparts, as accusative clitics do (rather, 'to', 'with' PP or no counterparts); and which can combine with O or S, unlike accusative clitics (arguably for Case-theoretic reasons). The distribution of the dative in MW may be modelled through applicative head(s), of restricted availability, and limited to introducing weak pronoun arguments.

In MW, only traces remain of *mihi est HAVE that eventually vanish. In MB and MC, it is productive as lexical have, and in MB the perfect auxiliary. Their argument coding is identical save for 1st/2nd person objects; lexical HAVE is taken up first (though when needed an example uses auxiliary HAVE).

4.3 HAVE in MB: General morphosyntax

4.3.1 HAVE as dative proclitic + BE
In MB, productive descendants of dative clitics are limited to two verbs. One is *deur- 'want', with an obligatory "accusative" clitic experiencer and a clausal argument; in eNB the experiencer is recoded as nominative (Hemon 1975: §151; likewise for its MW cognate *dawr-, Morris Jones 1913: §196, Evans 1964: §162). The other is the continuation of *mihi est HAVE. In conservative varieties, it is a *mihi est HAVE, as will be seen (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008; Le Bayon 1878: 72-3, Gilliévrec and Le Gof 1902: 42, Favereau 1997: §418). Moreover, subjecthood falls strictly to the dative possessor, which is not always true of *mihi est HAVE crosslinguistically. The result is the sole dative-subject unaccusative beside *deur-.

This subsection establishes the morphosyntax of HAVE apart from the object.

MB HAVE may be introduced by its earliest example: *hambezou "I will have" is transparently the preverbal particle *a + 1SG proclitic *m + future 3SG of BE, cf. *hamguorant is *a + 1SG proclitic *m + 3SG transitive:

(17) Panesen ha suruguen *hambezou dameren parsnip and ash.bread R=1SG=be,FUT to=lunch
I will have parsnip and ash-bread for lunch.

Mar=hamguorant va karantit [...] if=R=1SG=guarantee my=beloved
If my beloved guarantees me [...] (Io, mid-14C MB [marginalia])

In conservative varieties, HAVE continues to be BE with object proclitics. This is brought out nicely by innovations in 18-19C clW:

Table 2: HAVE in 19C clW (partial; Le Bayon 1878, Le Goff 1927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>cf. da' 'to' + acc. clitic + infinitive in b-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>*em bou</td>
<td>*em boé</td>
<td>*em/mem bout</td>
<td>d'/em/da mem b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ha pou</td>
<td>ha poé</td>
<td>ha pout</td>
<td>d'ha p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGM</td>
<td>en d(ev)ou</td>
<td>en d(ev)oé</td>
<td>en d(ev)out</td>
<td>d'er b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGF</td>
<td>*hi d(ev)ou</td>
<td>*hi d(ev)oé</td>
<td>*hi d(ev)out</td>
<td>d'hé [hi] b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>hur bou</td>
<td>hur boé</td>
<td>hur bout</td>
<td>d'hur b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>hou pou</td>
<td>hou poé</td>
<td>hou pout</td>
<td>d'hou p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ou d(ev)ou</td>
<td>ou d(ev)oé</td>
<td>ou d(ev)out</td>
<td>d'ou b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf</td>
<td>*bou (3SG)</td>
<td>*boé (3SG)</td>
<td>bout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The forms of HAVE in conservative varieties like CIW close to proclitics + BE, but more importantly, diachronic changes indicate the synchronic reality of this decomposition. One striking line of evidence comes from the innovation of infinitival forms in CIW, Table 2 (q.v. Le Roux 1957: 198-9, Hemon 1975: §140, Châtelier 2016a). This was not done in the usual way of innovating infinitives, using the 3SG/default form of a verb with or without the productive infinitival suffix -*ein*. Rather, the infinitive of HAVE was built on the opaque infinitive of BE (*bout*). This was prefixed with proclitics abstracted in the main from the finite forms of HAVE, but also using the by now partly divergent accusative proclitics (1SG *em*, mem-, cf. Le Goff 1927: 203). Similar evidence for the decomposition of HAVE into proclitic + BE can be found across conservative varieties (e.g. regularisation of 2SG *ha* in both HAVE and accusative proclitics in W, Hemon 1975: §53-4; introduction of b/p from BE into imperfect forms of HAVE across eNB, Hemon 1975: §139n2, §140n4, Schrijver 2011a: 407).

There is also opacity in the proclitic + BE combinations of HAVE. Its most interesting aspect is the *de*-element with 3rd person proclitics in Table 2. These forms descend from a derivative of BE with the prefix 'to' (Hemon 1975: §140n1, Fleuriot 1964, 2002: sec. 5, Lewis and Pedersen 1961: Suppl. to 213 l. 20, differently Schrijver 2011b: 69-70). Originally, *mihi est*
HAVE may have used both bare BE and de+BE; the de-prefix may be the realisation of the incorporated preposition or applicative introducing the dative possessor (cf. Baker 1988, O’Herin 2001; Miller 1993; ch. 5 for cognate prefixes). In Breton and Cornish, BE and de+BE fused into a single paradigm where de follows 3rd person proclitics; this distribution suggests that de was reanalysed as dative case, given the crosslinguistic pattern where only 3rd person distinguishes dative and accusative (as in French; Adger and Harbour 2007).

4.3.2 Possessor coding: dative doubling

In MW, remnants of datives are only clitic. In MB and MC, the dative arguments of HAVE and deur- can also be independent DPs doubled by phi-matching proclitics. The innovation of a bare DP to code datives is unsurprising, since all other arguments coded by clitic/suffix dependent pronouns alternate with independent bare DPs. Clitic doubling of the DP is unexpected, since it flaunts Complementarity, which bars precisely such doubling for other arguments (including for the argument regularly coded by proclitics, O).

(18) DP + clitic possessor with HAVE and deur-

... me ambezo avantur mat ha quarrz 1SG R=1SG=BE.FUT adventure good and fair [Henri Bossec says: if God wants] I will have a good and fair adventure. (Bo, early 14C MB)

The restriction of clitic doubling to the possessor of HAVE and experiencer of deur- ‘want' clarifies their analysis (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). Its distribution fits the generalisation that applicative obliques in systems like Greek, Spanish and French are distinctive in their licensing of clitic doubling, by allowing and requiring it with nominals that otherwise do not allow or require it, in contrast to nonapplicative obliques including datives, to nonoblique accusatives including direct objects, and to PPs expressing the same thematic roles as the doubled obliques with the same verbs like experiencers (Anagnostopoulou 2017a, Landau 2010, with literature). In MB then, the following properties distinguish the applicative dative of HAVE and deur-:

unique dative and/or applicative morphology on 3rd person clitics, esp. in the de-element;
combinability with nominative S; paraphrase with ‘to', ‘with' PPs for HAVE and nothing with deur-; clitic doubling. The limitation of applicative datives to BE and deur- reflects narrow selectional constraints on applicative constructions.

4.3.3 Subjecthood: possessor/A/S

In MB, the possessor of mihi est HAVE is always the subject, and likewise for the experiencer of deur-; the possesum of HAVE is thus the object. The subjecthood diagnostic most relevant to the PCC is furnished by infinitives, discussed below. All other correlates of subjecthood concur. One is order in the postverbal field: generally, A precedes O and A/S but not O may precede the participle; likewise for the possessor and possesum of lexical HAVE, and the A/S and O of the HAVE-perfect. Another correlate is neutral reading in the preverbal position: generally it is limited to A/S; with HAVE it is limited to the possessor of lexical HAVE and A/S of the HAVE-perfect.

(19) Postverbal order with HAVE

pe en hini nen deua medecin er bet aznaudeguez

18 Other cases of opacity in HAVE are to be analysed as allomorphy, arising from sound change such as proclitic + BE consonant cluster reductions in 2SG/2PL, analogues of which are found in proclitic + host combinations generally (cf. Hemon 1975: §14, §16). Proclitic + deur- combinations remain transparent so long as they survive (MB, earliest eNB).

19 This contrast with O retains its force whether the introduction of independent DP datives started on analogy with double enclitics (cf. Fleuriot 2002: 19) or through topic + resumptive structures (Mac Cana 1973, 1991).

20 The exposition here adopts the position of Landau (2010) and other literature that the accusative experiencer of the preoccupare class of psych-verbs is an inherent accusative, at least when doubled in Spanish and Greek – in the terms here, oblique. As mentioned above, nothing here changes of dative is really another inherent case.
which in one NEG=3SGM=be.PST doctor in=the=world knowledge [disease] about which no doctor in the world had knowledge

(Beach, mid 17C MB)

goudé ma en deueux an beleg legitim consacret an bara after as 3SGM=be the=priest legitimate consecrated the=bread after the legitimate priest has consecrated the bread

(Gk, late 16C MB)

(20)  Preverbal neutral possessor versus focal object

Ha  membezo é
Q  1SG 1SG=be.FUT=3SGM
Will I have it? [translating French et l'auray-je with clitic 1SG je]
[Context: two people negotiate a price; “I will give 17 sous.” ]

(Qu, early 17C MB)

Pemp pe huech acçes terzyen ammeus bet …
five or six attack fever R=1SG=be been
I have had five or six attacks of fever
[Context: one person notes the other's pallor; the other explains.]

(Qu, early 17C MB)

4.3.4 Clausal syntax

HAVE has the same clausal syntax as other verbs, set out in section 2. The following example illustrates. Clauses with HAVE have the preverbal position between C and T/Fin when other verbs do, such as in root indicatives; the position is filled in the same way, the subject on a neutral reading and any argument on a marked reading like focus; and proclitic + BE is prefixed by heads of the T/Fin system as with other verbs, including the particle a when the preverbal position is filled by a DP argument and e(z) when filled by otherwise.21

(21)  eNB preverbal particles with HAVE

me  am eus ho caret … abalamour da-ze  em eus ho tennet
1SG R=1SG=be 2PL=loved because of=this R=1SG=be 2PL=drawn
I have loved you … because of this have I drawn you …

(IN, early 18C L)

4.3.5 Agreeing infinitives

Both subjecthood and clausal syntax are clarified by infinitives. Outside W, mihi est HAVE only has finite forms; nonfinite clauses resort to different constructions (esp. kaout ‘get’ as lexical have, BE as perfect auxiliary). In W, mihi est HAVE developed infinitives with the same distinctive argument coding as finite clauses. They are built on the infinitive of BE, which is in clW/Wg prefixed with dative proclitics (discussed above, Table 2).

(22)  Agreeing infinitive of HAVE (RNDL, early 20C Wg22)

21 The argumental DP controlling a is not only A, S, O, but also the “broad subject” linked to a resumptive (on NB, see Urien 1989, Rezac 2010): e.g. ny a fell deomp ‘1PL R=like to.1PL’ “we like” (Qu, early 17C MB). Thus a is expected after the possessor of HAVE whether or not it reanalysed to habeo (pace Schrijver 2011a: 407). In MB and later, a few intransitives may occur without the preverbal position, i.e. root-initial particle e(z) + verb: mostly copulas, modals, and basic motion verbs, but not HAVE until NB W with 1st/2nd person possessors (Le Roux 1957: 186-7, Favereau 1997: §440, §539, Crahé 2014: 5.1.8.2; on this distinctive aspect of W, see Appendix 1).

22 This example has a specified subject pronoun in the preverbal position, incorporated into the prepositional complementiser (Stephens 1990 for such specified subjects, Hemon 1975: §175p1 for particles showing them to be in the preverbal position even when incorporated, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006 on the incorporation). The distribution of the infinitives of mihi est HAVE, both lexical and auxiliary, with the characteristic split-person coding of objects, is precisely the same as that of other infinitives. To illustrate: controled complement, lexical: ne garehoh quet hou pout ind “would you not like to have them”; controled adjunct, auxiliary: ne laret quet … eit ou pout- gun gielet for=2PL=be.INF=3SGM seen “do not say … despite having seen him”; arbitrary-PRO subject, auxiliary: ret-ë
Deustu d’eín em bout baléet
despite to.1SG=be.INF walked
Despite me having walked …

Infinitives confirm the subjecthood of the possessor of lexical HAVE and the A/S of the HAVE-perfect: these alone are specified subject, arbitrary PRO, controlled PRO, raising trace, according to environment. Infinitives also complete the evidence that mihi est HAVE has the same clausal syntax as other verbs: the sole preverbal argument is the subject in the same environments that license specified subject infinitives for other verbs. Lastly, infinitives reveal an additional aspect of dativehood. In Breton as in French, infinitives do not license nominative weak-pronoun subjects, Breton suffixes and French clitics, even when they license other specified subjects (sections 2, 6). The infinitives of HAVE in W obey this restriction if their proclitics are dative weak pronouns rather than anomalous realisations of nominative ones.

This long subsection may be resumed briefly: in conservative varieties of Breton, HAVE remains a mihi est BE, that is BE with a dative possessor, and the dative is the subject by all tests. We may now turn to the reason why this is of interest here: the coding of the object.

4.4 Possessum coding by 3rd enclitic: lexical HAVE

Given the mihi est nature of HAVE in conservative varieties of Breton, the possessum might be expected to be coded as the S of BE is in general: by nominative suffixes as a weak pronoun in finite clauses, by bare DPs otherwise. Instead, pronominal possessums use the split-person coding familiar from the imperative: 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd ineffable or accusative proclitic. For HAVE, this split-person coding follows from the Person Case Constraint expected in oblique-subject – nominative-object intransitives.

The theory and empirical basis of the PCC are set out in section 6. Here, its consequences are described and schematically illustrated:

(23) PCC(+) in intransitives

Typical state of affairs outside PCC contexts: Nominatives control full agreement in the canonical subjecthood position (Spec,T), and at least as 1st/2nd person when lower (e.g. as low focus or in equatives).

PCC context: In oblique-subject – nominative-object intransitives whose finite verb agreement reflects phi-Agree:

PCC: finite verb agreement with the nominative is impossible for person, usually also barring the licensing of 1st/2nd person nominatives (setting aside the strong-pronoun environments of coordination, modification, focus, which can ameliorate licensing but not agreement);
PCC repair: in some systems, the 1st/2nd person nominative unlicensed by the PCC appears as a nonagreeing accusative;
PCC+: in some systems, finite verb number agreement with a 3rd person nominative is also barred, but without an effect on licensing, except when the nominative is a type of pronoun that needs agreement (i.e. agreement-licensed type of pro/clitic).

Clause type: Nonfinite-nonagreeing clauses vary in whether 1st/2nd person nominatives are licensed in PCC contexts.

en devout-ind leinet [___ 3SGM=D.be.INF=3PL.read] “it is necessary to have read them” (all EOVD, 19C cfW).
PCC(+) and repair for a dative-subject – nominative subject system

Low 1/2.NOM subj.: agr.  αVFIN.AGRi 1/2i.NOM
NOM – DAT obj.: agr.  @NOM VFIN.AGRi DAT

PCC DAT – 3.NOM: "agr.  DAT VFIN.AGRi 3SG/PLi.NOM
PCC+ 3.NOM: %agr.  *DAT VFIN.AGRDFLT 3SG/PLi.NOM

PCC repair  %→ 1st/2nd ACC

Notes: or; % = variation across grammars; subject position underlined

Let us apply the PCC to mihi est HAVE as BE with a dative possessor – nominative possessum in Breton. We derive the following expectations about pronominal nominative possessums (outside strong-pronoun environments):

(25) PCC predictions for mihi est HAVE in Breton:
(i) By the PCC, the possessum should be barred as 1st/2nd person, these being either ineffable or repairable to 1st/2nd person accusative.
(ii) By the PCC+ if present, agreement reflecting phi-Agree with 3rd person should be unavailable. In Breton:
(a) lack of phi-Agree should rule out 3SG/PL weak pronoun nominative suffixes, since these are agreement-licensed weak pronouns (section 2);
(b) instead, independent pronouns should be un-Blocked (section 2);
(c) these postverbal independent pronouns should have encliticised by the historical change reconstructed from the imperative (section 3).

=> 1st/2nd person * or accusative, √3rd person enclitics.

That is what we find in MB for lexical HAVE. 3rd person pronouns outside are always enclitics rather than accusative proclitics, identical in form and position with doubling enclitics (the diagnostics are in section 3, some already illustrated there for HAVE). 1st/2nd person possessums are not available with lexical HAVE at all, either as enclitics or as independent pronouns, despite the availability of the expected forms through 1st/2nd person doubling enclitics (explicitly native-speaker grammars, in clW contrasting HAVE with the imperative where 1st person is available, Guillôme 1836: 30-34, 115, Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 30-2, in eNB/NB T grouping HAVE and imperative, Le Clerc 1908: §139; linguistic studies of NB W, e.g. Ternes 1970; textual studies of MB/eNB, Hemon 1975: §51; see further Appendix 2).

(26) Enclitic objects of HAVE an in MB variety: precede ket, participle; 3PL y only beside independent int, inty, y (also shows 1SG doubling enclitic)

no pe eff y quet à bianoch…
NEG=2PL=be.COND=3SGM not for=less
you would not have it for less (tr. French: vous ne l’auriez pas à moins)

ha ne meus me y quet effet oll?
Q=NEG=1SG=be=1SG=3PL not drunk all
Have I not all drunk (tr. French: Ne l’ay ie pas tout beu?)

(Qu, early 17C MB)

This generalisation sets aside the strong-pronoun environments of coordination, modification, and preverbal focus. These environments are generally unhelpful in studying the PCC when agreement is invisible, because they can ameliorate 1st/2nd person licensing by properties of their own like phi-feature projection, and doubly unrevealing in Breton because
the independent pronouns that these environments require do not distinguish nominative and accusative (cf. Appendix 2).

Thus, given a pre-MB system where lexical HAVE is an oblique-subject – nominative-object BE, and the retention of this structure in conservative varieties, the PCC predicts that nominative object pronouns are ineffable when 1\ST/2\ND person, and the PCC+ that they are independent-turned-enclitics when 3\RD (outside strong-pronoun environments, where 3\RD person encliticisation is blocked and 1\ST/2\ND person unclear). It remains to complete the story with a synchronic analysis of how nominative-object weak pronouns are realised as argumental enclitics, sharing their position only with doublee enclitics, and at first but not later also their form. The analytical possibilities can be compactly presented by specifying what other dependent pronouns realise, and underlining the conditions that link and distinguish them (section 2).

Nominative suffixes: nominative weak pronouns, A-moved to Agree/Case locus (T) + spec-to-head attachment, if agreeing (= French nominative clitics).

Accusative proclitics: accusative weak pronouns, A-moved to Agree/Case locus (v) + spec-to-head attachment (= French accusative clitics).

Doublee enclitics: attach by a distinct mechanism which result in a looser and outermost placement in the verbal complex, but arguably are not simply weak pronouns (as focus-bearers) or have case (as doublees).

The nominative-object weak pronouns of HAVE do not A-move to their Agree/Case locus, the subjecthood position Spec,T_NOM, and do not satisfy the conditions on nominative suffixes (agreement) and accusative proclitics (case). They attach to the verbal complex from a lower position, arguably Spec,v, where nominative object weak pronouns A-move in Icelandic. Their attachment mechanism is the same as for doublee enclitics, resulting in the same position (see Bennett et al. 2019: sec. 3 on a similar phenomenon with discussion of mechanisms). Their form was originally shared with doublee enclitics, but later differentiated, reflecting their weak-pronoun status and/or nominative case (section 6.8 elaborates on case).

The theory of the PCC in section 6 has two relevant points of variation. One is whether 3\RD person nominative objects control agreement, i.e. plain PCC, or not, PCC+. For Breton, PCC+ explains why 3\RD person pronominal objects are not nominative suffixes but independent-turned-enclitic pronouns. The same goes for Cornish: its productive lexical HAVE has the same morphosyntax and the same limitation to 3\RD person objects, indicating the same history. The very limited evidence of the vestigial HAVE of Welsh hints at the plain PCC (given the nominative suffix in (15)). The other point of variation is whether the nonlicensed 1\ST/2\ND person nominatives are repairable to accusatives; this is studied next. Finally, the theory predicts, and crosslinguistic counterparts confirm, that the PCC should disappear if ever mihi est HAVE were reanalysed with accusative or oblique objects; this will be seen in section 5.23

4.5 Possessum coding by 1\ST/2\ND proclitics: auxiliary HAVE

4.5.1 The HAVE-perfect

---

23 It is worth delving deeper into the inferable history of Celtic mihi est HAVE to bring out the role of the PCC and its PCC+ variant. In Old Irish and arguably Brythonic, the verb complex is clause-initial in neutral word-order. Object pronouns, already syncretic accusative-dative, are ordinarily enclitics to a preverbal X° in the complex: X°p…V. This includes HAVE as X°p…BE.3SG/PL (with clear 3PL agreement in Orf and MW). There seem to be no 1\ST/2\ND possessums in any ancient Celtic language, consistent with the PCC for a dative- rather than nominative-subject mihi est HAVE. Old Irish and MW allow the plain PCC, or not, PCC+. For Breton, PCC+ explains why 3\RD person pronominal objects are not nominative suffixes but independent-turned-enclitic pronouns. The same goes for Cornish: its productive lexical HAVE has the same morphosyntax and the same limitation to 3\RD person objects, indicating the same history. The very limited evidence of the vestigial HAVE of Welsh hints at the plain PCC (given the nominative suffix in (15)). The other point of variation is whether the nonlicensed 1\ST/2\ND person nominatives are repairable to accusatives; this is studied next. Finally, the theory predicts, and crosslinguistic counterparts confirm, that the PCC should disappear if ever mihi est HAVE were reanalysed with accusative or oblique objects; this will be seen in section 5.
Auxiliary HAVE clarifies the PCC in Breton. There is a 3rd enclitic - 1st/2nd split in object coding, but the latter are accusative proclitics rather than ineffable. This is the expected consequence of PCC repair; it proves unavailable with lexical HAVE because of an independent ban on clitic clusters. Auxiliary HAVE also show how the intransitive casual structure of lexical HAVE extends to thematic transitives, a stepping stone to unifying object coding across HAVE and imperative constructions.

The periphrastic perfect with auxiliary HAVE is present from the earliest MB texts. It has no antecedent or cognate, but is similar to and may be calqued on the Romance-Germanic have killed/died perfect. It combines an auxiliary, usually HAVE but with certain intransitives also BE, and a participle, otherwise used to build the BE-passive. The combination is monoclusal with arguments selected selected by the participle, I have done the work, rather than biclausal, I have the work done. In parallel with developments in French, the perfect gradually replaces the simple past (Hemon 1975: §169).

The coding of the A/S and O of the HAVE-perfect is identical to that of the possessor and possessum of lexical HAVE. There is one apparent exception: 1st/2nd person possessums are absent with lexical HAVE, but 1st/2nd person O's in the HAVE-perfect are accusative proclitics on the participle (see references under lexical HAVE). The result is an alternation between 3rd person enclitics to auxiliary HAVE and 1st/2nd person proclitics to the participle. Let us look next at how this coding arose and how it is to be analysed.

(27) penaus en deveus great Doue traou bras en he andret
    how 3SGM=be done God things great in=3SGF.GEN=regard
...how God has done great things in her regard

(IN, early 18C L)

The coding of the A/S and O of the HAVE-perfect is identical to that of the possessor and possessum of lexical HAVE. There is one apparent exception: 1st/2nd person possessums are absent with lexical HAVE, but 1st/2nd person O's in the HAVE-perfect are accusative proclitics on the participle (see references under lexical HAVE). The result is an alternation between 3rd person enclitics to auxiliary HAVE and 1st/2nd person proclitics to the participle. Let us look next at how this coding arose and how it is to be analysed.

(28) 3rd enclitic ~ 1st/2nd proclitic alternation

ne meus é quet cleuffet
NEG=1SG=be=3SGM not heard
I have not heard him

Nom meus quet ho cleuet
NEG=1SG=be not 2PL=heard
I have not heard you

(Qu, early 17C MB)

4.5.2 Rise of the HAVE-perfect

When the HAVE-perfect arose in Breton, the arguments of the participial main verb adopted the coding of the arguments of lexical HAVE: A/S as dative subject (dative proclitic when pronoun) – O as nominative object (independent or enclitic when 3rd person pronoun, depending on when the perfect arose). This identity of argument coding across lexical and perfect-auxiliary HAVE is characteristic of both habeo HAVE systems, like that of French, and mihi est HAVE systems, discussed below. It holds all Breton varieties, save for 1st/2nd person objects in conservative varieties.

Crosslinguistically, the 1st/2nd person nominatives banned by the PCC are sometimes ineffable (Icelandic), and sometimes "repaired" to accusatives (Finnish). With lexical HAVE, a ban on 1st/2nd person possessums imposes but a slight burden on expressiveness, for they are rare even in innovative varieties where there is no PCC. In the HAVE-perfect, it would eliminate about a third of the pronominal objects actually attested in a typical eNB text (Appendix 2). Instead, Breton had availed itself of the repair-by-accusative.

The forms of the 1st/2nd person proclitics are as for the imperative in section 3: the allomorphs expected of accusative proclitics, once extended outside their original environment after a leftward host (e.g. 1SG -m), via syncretism with genitive proclitics (gen. 1SG ~ ma). The new proclitics attach to the participle, not the auxiliary, unlike in French. It is possible that both the new accusative allomorphs and their participial attachment were influenced by the
coding of O in infinitives, which is genitive (de receu in (29)), including in the infinitive of the periphrastic auxiliary DO + infinitive construction (é digas à gra). If so, the PCC explains the limitation of this influence on the HAVE perfect to 1*/2*, not 3rd person (contrast object coding (28)-(29)).

(29)  de receu … rac é digas         á gra dech
     to=3SGM.GEN receive.INF for 3SGM.GEN send.INF R=do to.2PL
     [He asks you] to receive it … for he sends it to you

(Qu, early 17C MB)

Aside from any such influence, proclitics could attach only to the participle and not to the auxiliary in the HAVE perfect because of a ban against proclitic clusters (Le Roux 1957: 202). In the Brythonic languages, pronominal clitic clusters could originally have arisen only if the residual dative clitics combined with accusative clitics, but they never do so (cf. ex. (16)). The rise of the HAVE-perfect presented a new opportunity, if the new 1*/2* person accusative proclitics coding O had attached to the auxiliary HAVE with its dative proclitic coding A. Instead, the proclitics appear on the participle, both in conservative systems where they are only 1*/2* person, and in innovative systems where they include 3rd (section 5). The ban rules out any accusative proclitics if HAVE is the only potential host, namely with lexical HAVE, so there is no need to parameterise PCC repair to be available in the HAVE-perfect but not with lexical HAVE (see further Appendix 2).

The ban only prevents accusative proclitics from attaching to the HAVE-auxiliary. Grammaticalisation may have been needed to turn the participle into a host, perhaps by analysing it as realising enough structure to include v with the accusative proclitic (section 2). The result is in place by the first extensive 15-16C MB texts – though perhaps not for all writers, leaving them without an easy way of expressing 1*/2* person O in the HAVE-perfect (Appendix 2).

4.5.3 Casually intransitive perfects of thematic transitives

The account of the split-person object coding with lexical HAVE relies on the PCC barring a 1*/2* person nominative object below an oblique subject. Its extension to the HAVE-perfect includes that thematic transitives have a parallel casual architecture: A as dative subject – O as nominative object.

Such casually intransitive architectures for thematic transitives are familiar crosslinguistically (section 6), including in HAVE-perfects (Heine 1997: 4.3). A good example is Georgian (Hewitt 1995: 368-373, 501-2), because the morphosyntax has been well studied (esp. Harris 1981, 1985), and its relevance to Breton has already been observed (Hewitt 2016).

24 The 1*/2* person proclitics of the imperative and the HAVE-perfect are here spoken of as accusative. This is not crucial here (cf. Jouitteau 2005, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006 on genitive as object case in NB). However, despite the genitive-dative syncretism in 1*/2* person, it can actually be demonstrated in certain conservative varieties. First, Wo varieties break the syncretism in 1PL, and proclitics of the HAVE-perfect can then be seen to be accusative (Cheveau 2007ab, Crahé 2014); ditto for 2SG in cW (explicitly Le Goff 1927: 198-9, 202). Second, in some W varieties, enclitics doubled by and only by accusative proclitics are replaced by forms of da to + dependent pronoun suffix (Loth 1895), including when the doubling proclitic is the 1*/2* person proclitic on the participle of the HAVE perfect (Wg, Ternes 1970: 307). When it comes to the influence of the periphrastic DO construction (Stephens 1982, Borsley et al. 1996, Rezac 2005, Jouitteau 2005, 2011), it is uncertain that it was grammaticalised early enough to influence the HAVE perfect (for absence of later constraints on it in early MB, see Le Roux 1957: 48, 408-13, Hemon 1975: §158; see the latter citation for another candidate genitive-accusative influence, in imperatives). In nonfinite HAVE-perfects, O is coded by a genitive proclitics to BE.INF + participle, perhaps underscoring the role of the cluster ban in finite perfects (cf. Hemon 1975: 155n1, cf. Le Roux 1957: 371-6).

25 The rich textual record of innovative varieties includes rare exceptions that illustrate the work done by the ban, with both lexical (below) and auxiliary HAVE (Le Roux 1957: 202).

(a) n'am po ket NEG=1SG=2SG=be.FUT not
    you will not have me
(b) ho/m eus 3PL=1SG=be
    I have them [children]

(SBI II, mid-19C KLT, cited in DEVRI s.v. bezañ3)
Table 3: Georgian argument coding

Core arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Tense/Mood</th>
<th>Also</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Series I (e.g. present)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ABS (=NOM)</td>
<td>Series II (e.g. aorist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>---NOM-</td>
<td>---NOM---</td>
<td>Series III (e.g. perfect)</td>
<td>psych-unaccusatives; <em>mihi est</em> HAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>- NOM</td>
<td>HAVE + participle perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Georgian, the active voice of thematic transitives mostly employs the casual systems canonical for it, in the present nominative-accusative. In the synthetic perfect and the more recent HAVE + participle periphrastic perfect, however, active thematic transitives assume the dative-nominative case-pattern canonical for thematic applicative unaccusatives and passives in the language, including *mihi est* HAVE. In the framework adopted here, thematic transitives usually have nonoblique A, O, with case from $T_{NOM}$, $V_{ACC}$, but when the C-T system has certain tense/mood features, A is introduced as a dative oblique, $V_{ACC}$ is absent, and O gets case from $T_{NOM}$ (cf. Skopeteas et al. 2013; further section 6, including the PCC in Georgian). The same analysis may be given to Breton. The PCC then constrains the casually intransitive dative-subject – nominative-object HAVE-perfect, just as it does lexical HAVE.26

(30) Case/Agreement of thematic transitives in Breton and Georgian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_{NOM}$</th>
<th>$A_{NOM}$</th>
<th>$V_{AG,ACC}$</th>
<th>$O_{NOM}\ominus$</th>
<th>Regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{NOM}$</td>
<td>$A_{DAT}$</td>
<td>$V_{AG}$</td>
<td>$O_{NOM}\ominus$</td>
<td>HAVE perfect: PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{NOM}$</td>
<td>$A_{DAT}$</td>
<td>$V_{AG,ACC}$</td>
<td>$O_{NOM}\ominus$</td>
<td>HAVE perfect: PCC repair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 From HAVE to imperative

The HAVE-constructions of conservative varieties have the same anomalous split-person coding of their objects as imperative, 3rd enclitics ~ 1st/2nd person accusative proclitics. As with the imperative, the enclitics originated from independent pronouns licensed by the unavailability of dependent pronouns. Unlike in the imperative, where V1 should have caused the unavailability without any person restrictions, in HAVE-constructions the cause of the unavailability also predicts the split-coding coding through the PCC+:

- Lexical HAVE was and in conservative varieties remains a dative-subject – nominative-object unaccusative, and this casual architecture is adopted by active transitives in the HAVE + participle perfect.
- Nominative objects were restricted to nonagreeing 3rd persons by the PCC+, as pronouns at first independent and then encliticised; synchronically, argumental enclitics realise nominative object weak pronouns.
- 1st/2nd person nominative objects are barred by the PCC, but a repair to accusative was innovated and grammaticalised as accusative proclitics, modulated by a ban on proclitic clusters.

It remains to see how this approach extends to the imperative. One part of the answer is an intransitive casual architecture for active thematic transitives, as in the HAVE-perfect. The other part is its extension to just the imperative; it relates to the unusual properties of imperative subjects through the theory of how oblique subjects give rise to the PCC. These are the topics of section 6.

In this account, the diachronic steps lead to several different grammars where a dative-nominative casual structure has to be acquired for HAVE, and ultimately for the imperative. At all points, the split-person coding is one robust cue, along with the evident decomposition of

26 Object case is not linked to argumenthood on this system, and indeed potential ECM objects are accusative generally but nominative as 3rd person with HAVE and the HAVE-perfect (e.g. ".ho pe-ên cafet oc’h ober un action iffam ".…you have-him found doing a vile deed”; ".em eus-èn cafet rapportet gant ur Scrivagner ".…I have-it found reported by a writer”; ".ho pezo-ii evit compagnunezet ".…you will.have-them as companions", IN, early 18C L).
HAVE into unaccusative BE and with a dative subject, witnessed for instance in the innovated infinitives of clW. In the next section, we will briefly look at how dative-nominative HAVE was nevertheless reanalysed in innovative varieties and the PCC lost, before turning to the theory of the PCC itself and unification of the imperative with HAVE.27

5 The end of the system

The conservative split-person coding of the objects of HAVE-constructions and the positive imperative characterises MB, early eNB (optionally or obligatorily extended to the negative imperative), and most W varieties up to present (HAVE optionally innovative in post-18C clW; positive imperative innovative with French-like enclisis optionally in clW, obligatorily in Wo and Wg).

Outside W, the conservative system disappeared during eNB: all objects assumed accusative coding, and argumental enclitics vanished. Also during eNB, new accusative pronouns were innovated. These are the a-forms, so called because they repurposed pronoun-suffixed forms of the preposition a 'of' as independent pronouns in both weak- and strong-pronoun environments, at first alongside and then replacing accusative proclitics. The roughly concurrent rise of a-forms and regularisation of all object appear to be related.

(31) Earliest a-forms (all texts regularly use proclitics/enclitics)

For expected accusative under negation, esp. imperative:

\[
\begin{align*}
na \text{ credet } & \text{ of } \quad \text{ na credet of } \\
\text{ NEG=V.IMP.2PL=3SGM} & \quad \text{ NEG=V.IMP.2PL=3SGM}\text{ not } \\
\text{ do not believe } & \quad \text{ do not believe }
\end{align*}
\]

(Gk, late 16C MB; a-form O unique)

For ineffable accusative in coordination:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{guelet anezàn } & \text{ pe anezi } \quad \text{ see.INF of.3SGM or of.3SGF to=die.INF} \\
\text{to see him or her dying } & \text{ (IN, early 18C L, a-form O sporadic)}
\end{align*}
\]

For ineffable 1st/2nd person object of HAVE:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ho pezo } & \text{ ac'hanon } \text{ da viana } \text{ evit ho Parner} \\
\text{2PL=be.FUT of.1SG } & \text{ at=least } \text{ for } \text{ 2PL.GEN=judge} \\
\text{you will have me at least as your Judge. } & \text{ (RP, early 18C L, same writer as IN; Hemon 1975)}
\end{align*}
\]

Originally, the preposition a 'of' was available for partitive objects, pronominal or not (cf. taste it ~ taste of it). Perhaps through this use, the first sporadic a-forms appear in late-15C MB for nonpartitive pronominal objects under negation, instead of accusative proclitics (Hemon 1975: §69, Schapansky 1996: 3.3; cf. Willis 2007: 9.5.3 on Welsh). Among the examples are negative imperatives, where a-forms thus alternate with both the original accusative proclitics, and the 3rd person argumental enclitics adopted from the positive imperative (first example above). In earliest eNB-KLT, a-forms sporadically appear for objects independently of negation, chiefly those where the expected coding is problematic. One example is left conjuncts, a strong-pronoun environment where independent pronouns may have been deviant (a conundrum noted for French, and found in other clitic systems: Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 103, Kayne 1975: 2.17, 2000: 9.7, 180 note 29, Rezac 2011: 145). Another example is 1st/2nd person objects of lexical HAVE, ineffable by the PCC as argumental enclitics, and by the proclitic cluster ban as repaired accusative proclitics (third example; also Appendix 2). A-forms may have been used in these environments because of their oblique origin, since neither restriction affects obliquities (French coordinations, op.cit.; Icelandic PCC, Maling and Jónsson 1995). These occasional a-forms in early 18C eNB-KLT had given onto general availability of a-forms for all objects by 19C. Accusative proclitics appear to have kept them company, and 3rd

27 Of alternative explanations for the clisis directionality, verb-height has been eliminated as a factor. That leaves a direct role of person, which either makes the wrong predictions (high 1st/2nd ~ low 3rd, Wilschko 2006; Bianchi 2006) or is an approach to the PCC (again, not readily suitable here; see Anagnostopoulou 2017b discussing Bianchi 2006).
person argumental enclitics were gradually given up. The result was a reanalysis of objects of HAVE and imperative constructions as ordinary accusative objects. There is a separate diachronic pathway by which HAVE-constructions regularised their object coding. It has been well studied for oblique-nominative unaccusatives in Germanic: these first adopt accusative for the object, then the oblique subject gains some nominative behavior, and finally becomes nominative (Hrafnjargarsson 2004: ch. 2, Arnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012). The endpoints of this route have been observed for HAVE as *mihi est to habeo* change (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §352-6, Heine 1997: 2.4-5, Jouitteau and Rezac 2008, Stassen 2009: 6.4). However, all stages are found in Breton, sometimes in the same variety. Varieties that transition from conservative coding innovate in object coding not by losing the person restriction on argumental enclitics of HAVE, but by adding 3rd person accusative proclitics (Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 30-1), and in KLT also as *a*-forms for all persons (e.g. e.g. COL mid-18C L; McKenna 1988: §430 for a W variety on the border of K).28 This separate route to accusative objects may be discernible in the longer survival of the conservative split-person coding with imperatives than with HAVE in eNB-KLT, exceptionally into NB (Humphreys 1995: 318-320, Favereau 1997: §247).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Object:</th>
<th>HAVE</th>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>late MB &amp; early eNB</td>
<td>proclitic all</td>
<td>non3</td>
<td>non3</td>
<td>Qu, early 17C MB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enclitic --</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IN, early 18C L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-eNB 1</td>
<td><em>a</em>-form</td>
<td>exceptional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-eNB 2</td>
<td><em>ditto save regular object a-forms common</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFS, late 18C T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late eNB</td>
<td><em>ditto save object of HAVE and/or imperative also or dominantly like regular object</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COL, mid 19C L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>proclitic recessive</em></td>
<td>non3, rare 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>EKG, late 19C L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enclitic --</td>
<td>rare 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBR, late 19C L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>a-form dominant</em></td>
<td>dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td>MP, 19C KLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 The Person Case Constraint

#### 6.1 History and mystery

Our starting point was an unusual constellation of constructions in Breton – imperatives of active transitives, all active transitives in the HAVE-auxiliary perfect, and lexical HAVE – that differ from the usual accusative coding of objects by a unique split-person coding 3rd enclitics ~ 1st/2nd accusative proclitic or nothing. The imperative revealed the historical processes that gave rise to object enclitics in these constructions, but left mysterious the 3rd person restriction and the behavior of 1st/2nd person. HAVE eliminated this mystery for itself: the split-person coding is the expected outcome in Breton of the Person Case Constraint and its repair is in oblique-

---

28 Two varieties illustrate innovation in particular interesting ways. One is ciW, where adding dative-accusative to dative-nominative results in an enclitic-proclitic alternation in 3rd person, (i-a) (in 19C grammars and texts, Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 30-1, MG and EOVD, early 19CL ciW, BSPD early 20C ciW, but not Guillômé 1836, NG late 17C, IS mid 18C save exception, nor in Wo, Wg). (i-b) illustrates the new proclitic in a rare violation of the ban on clusters in a related east-W variety. The other is the 18C T text EN. It is the earliest system where subjects of HAVE respect Complementarity, combining with an invariant form of HAVE when it requires so, otherwise retaining old dative proclitic coding, partly doubled by nominative suffixes (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008 discuss similar systems). The detail of interest is that conservative object coding occurs only with subjects coded by dative proclitics by Complementarity regularly when silent or pre-negation (simple, *meus an ‘R=ISG=be=3SG’, doubled by nominative suffix, *nin ne maugh an ‘1PL NEG=1PL=be:IMPF 1PL=3SG’), and when Complementarity requires a form without the proclitic (cf. *le a neus ‘2SG R=have’, with neus the invariant form), it is suspended (*meus an ‘ISG 1SG=be=3SG’).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>m’ em es ean</th>
<th>perpet</th>
<th>karet</th>
<th>karet</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>n’er pou</th>
<th>karet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG R=ISG=be=3SGM</td>
<td>always</td>
<td><em>SGM=loved</em></td>
<td>NEG=ISGM=be:FUT not</td>
<td>you will not have him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have always loved him. (19C ciW, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 30-1)</td>
<td>(early 20C east W, Brangili 1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subject – nominative-object constructions. In order to extend the PCC to the imperative of active transitives, a theory is needed of what makes the PCC apply where it does. In turn, this manifestation of the PCC in Breton and its counterparts illustrated by Finnish shed light on the theory, notably on the interference of certain “defective” nominals like obliques with structural Agree/Case dependencies, and on the links between agreement, case, and licensing.

6.2 The PCC(+)

The term "Person-Case Constraint" PCC has since its introduction in Bonet (1991) been used for different constellations of phenomena under a wide variety of analyses (surveyed in Anagnostopoulou 2017b, complemented by e.g. Walkow 2012, Stegovec 2018, Coon et al. 2018). An important fault-line is whether the core empirical domain contains person restrictions on oblique-subject – nominative/absolutive-object constructions, such as psych-unaccusatives in Icelandic and Basque. These are our starting point, for it is among them that Breton *mihi est HAVE belongs.

This domain of the PCC gives rise to two theoretical issues that do not necessarily arise outside it. One is the quirkiness of the oblique, the term used here to refer to how an argument (the oblique) that does not itself control a given type of phi-agreement affects control of it by another argument (the nominative or absolutive). The other is relationships between restrictions on the agreement of an argument and its case and licensing. It is also to these two theoretical issues that Breton has the most to contribute: regarding quirkiness, in grouping obliques with certain other distinctive nominals like imperative subjects; regarding case and licensing, in evidence from repairs of the PCC that they are related to agreement, at least to agreement in person.

Theories of the PCC covering our core domain also often include others, notably Bonet's (1991) original restrictions on dative – accusative/absolutive clitics in transitives. This is so here, building on Anagnostopoulou (2003) (similar unifications: e.g. Albizu 1997, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Nevins 2007, Baker 2008, Rezac 2008b, 2011, Walkow 2012, 2013, Preminger 2014, 2018, Sheehan 2018; versus: e.g. Schütze 2003, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008 on Icelandic nominative objects, Stegovec 2018 on clitic clusters). With view to this generality, the PCC is here characterised as follows.29

(32) PCC(+): given a syntactic structure with a phi-probe, a phi-bearer G in its domain, and a quirky element X closer to the probe than G:

PCC(+) agreement: the person feature and in + systems the number feature of G cannot match the probe (reflected in lack of overt person agreement and unavailability of agreement-licensed pronouns).

PCC licensing (apart from agreement-licensed pronouns): nonoblique G with a person feature is not licensed under certain circumstances, roughly: if G's person would match the probe were X absent.

PCC repairs: in some systems, nonlicensing of a person-bearing G licenses an alternative structure or PCC repair.

where a quirky element differs in ways explored below both from an element with person and number visible to the probe (which fully matches the probe and prevents any match with G) and from a phi-less element (which does not interfere with the probe).

Theories of syntactic features and dependencies define the remaining theoretical terms: domain of (e.g. c-commanded by), closer to A than B (e.g. c-commanding modulo equidistance), element (e.g. term/label); phi-probe (e.g. set of unvalued phi-feature); person and number (Appendix 3; briefly: number includes gender and is never unspecified; person is unspecified when plain "3rd" at least on internal arguments). The

29 As noted in the introduction, what follows save aspects of the last subsection can be developed as a theory of quirky-intervener + nominative/absolutive-object constructions – that is, excluding for instance accusative objects transitives in Breton, Finnish, Icelandic, or French.
The notion of agreement-licensed pronouns (e.g., Italian nominative pro or French nominative elítes) is discussed at the end of this section.

The domain that principally concerns us is structures where $G$ is nominative and the phi-probe is on the Agree/Case locus $T$. These include unaccusatives with their core argument $S$ as $G$ and an applicative oblique as $X$:

\[(33) \ T[\text{[phi, Case=NOM]} \cdots X \text{[phi, Case= Acc]} \cdots G[(1/2)\ell]\{SG/PL]\{u\text{Case}\}]\]

The paragon of the PCC in this domain is psych-verbs and applicative-dative passives in Icelandic (Taraldsen 1995, Sigurðsson 1996, Schütze 2003, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; as PCC, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003). Here their Finnish counterpart is used, because it shares the restriction of Icelandic, yet allows a repair like Breton (Rezac 2011: 5.6). Finnish has a nominative-accusative system of case and agreement. The finite verb agrees for person and number with the nominative subject in the canonical subjecthood position, and with 1st/2nd person nominative subjects and predicates in lower positions (as in Icelandic):

(34) **Agreement with nominative subjects**

**BE with low agreeing 1st/2nd person nominative subject**

Sitä olen minäkin käynyt Pariisissa.

EXPL be.1SG 1SG.NOM.also gone Paris.ADES

I have been to Paris, too (actually). (Holmberg 2005: 544)

**BE with low agreeing 1st/2nd person nominative predicate**

…että se olen ollut minä

…that 3SG.NOM was.1SG been 1SG.NOM

…that it has been me

There are unaccusative verbs with oblique subjects such as experiencers. Only one also allows an animate nominative object: HAVE as BE with an allative possessor. Its nominative possessum is restricted to "3rd person, i.e. nonperson (as in Icelandic) and cannot control number agreement (as in "Icelandic C"): the PCC and PCC+ respectively. 1st/2nd persons are not ineffable (unlike in Icelandic); they turn up in accusative case by PCC repair:

(35) **PCC in Finnish intransitives**

**HAVE qua BE with 3rd person nonagreeing nominative / *accusative**

Heillä on {se | ne (kirjat)}

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

They have {it | them / these books}. (neutral word order)

**HAVE qua BE with 1st/2nd person, *nominative → accusative (repair)**

*Heillä olet (sinä) → √Heillä on sinut

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

She has you. (Possessive, neutral word order; contrast nominative-subject + allative, neutral Sinä olet heillä, "You are with them")

Other oblique-subject unaccusatives combine with infinitives, in which the same 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative alternation may be witnessed on $O$ across a raised, controlled, or

---

30 The distribution of the PCC in Finnish, i.e. of 3rd person nominative – 1st/2nd person accusative alternation on objects with unaccusatives and certain transitives, has areal parallels studied in Timberlake (1974) (cf. also Seržant 2016). For Finnish, Kiparsky (2001) reviews the literature and argues for key generalizations about case, subjecthood, and distribution of the alternation, against alternatives passed here over in silence such as nominative objects qua accusatives-in-disguise when they alternate with accusative pronouns; the work also advances an analysis where the person restriction depends on both objecthood and a higher syntactically anomalous subject, and is thus avant la lettre close to the PCC analysis linking it to Icelandic in Rezac (2006, 2011: 5.6). The description of Finnish simplifies by ignoring animate / logophoric 3rd person: it behaves as 1st/2nd person in the PCC (Appendix 3).
oblique A. This environment works as above, save for the transparency of certain nonfinite clauses to the upstairs Agree/Case system in Finnish, which has no counterpart in Breton. The simplest subtype may be illustrated with raising 'must' (Koskinen 1998: 4.2.1.3; generally, Vainikka 1989, 2003, Vainikka and Brattico 2014, Brattico 2014):

\[(36) \text{Heillä täytyy nähdä se } / \text{sinut.} \]

\[3PL.ANIM.ALL must.3SG see.INF 3SG.NOM 2SG.ACC\]

They must see it / you. (It behooves them to see it/you.)

The parallelism between Breton and Finnish is plain: in both, the subject is ordinarily nominative A/S and object accusative O, but oblique-subject unaccusatives have a split-person coding of the object, notably \textit{mihi est} HAVE: nominative restricted by the PCC to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, and 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person accusative by PCC repair. The PCC in oblique-subject intransitives, and partly its repair, is familiar from better-studied systems such as Icelandic and Basque. In both Finnish and Breton, however, the same split-person coding is found in active thematic transitives with certain special subjects, such as the imperative. Before turning to them, let us introduce a theory of how obliques give rise to the PCC that allows and predicts the same behavior for certain nonobliques.

6.3 Quirkiness in oblique-subject intransitives

The theory to the PCC explored here belongs to defective intervention analyses, where a quirky element blocks phi-dependencies across itself for person but not necessarily number, while a typical nonoblique blocks them fully. Icelandic illustrates: its datives are quirky because they cannot control finite verb agreement yet prevent a lower nominal from doing so for person (PCC), and in some varieties for number (PCC+). Such quirky obliques are also visible to A-movement and subjecthood phenomena typical of nonobliques (this is the origin of the term quirky). Beside quirky obliques, there are obliques invisible to all these phenomena, and transparent obliques which like nonobliques control agreement to the exclusion of a lower nominal. The oblique of \textit{mihi est} HAVE in Finnish and Breton is quirky: an oblique subject that does not control agreement and gives rise to the PCC\textsuperscript{+} for the nominative object.\textsuperscript{31}

In Anagnostopoulou's (2003) partial intervention analysis of defective intervention in the PCC, quirky obliques give rise to the PCC because they have person but not number phi-features visible to the relevant clausal phi-probe phi-Agree. There are different ways of relating this partial specification and oblique case (Appendix 3), and closely related alternatives that capitalise on other aspects of quirky obliques, such as obliqueness directly (Preminger 2014) or applicativity (Adger and Harbour 2007). Anagnostopoulou's partial intervention makes the distinctive prediction explored here: other arguments specified for person but not number give rise to the PCC in the same way as quirky obliques without being oblique or applicative or dative. Rather, their "surface" correlate should be anomalous interaction with the relevant phi-probe, whether revealed in the PCC itself as with quirky obliques, or also by controlling deficient agreement analysable as matching them for person but not number.\textsuperscript{32}

It is a consequence of the partial-intervener analysis that in the configuration (33), the quirky oblique X matches the higher phi-probe for person, and prevents the lower goal G from doing so (if match obeys feature-relativised locality). The quirky person match surfaces as default "3\textsuperscript{rd} person in finite verb agreement (Appendix 3). The impossibility of person match with the lower goal surfaces as absence of person agreement with it, but also as failure of its licensing if it bears person (1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd}, not underspecified "3\textsuperscript{rd}", ibid.). The failure is absolute in Icelandic, but repairable in Breton and Finnish. The nature of licensing and repairs are addressed below under Case.

\textsuperscript{31} Minimal contrasts among oblique types are illustrated by dative experiencers of psych-verbs, quirky in Icelandic versus invisible German (Zaenen et al. 1985), and quirky or transparent across varieties of Icelandic and Faeroese (Jonsson 2009, Arnadottir and Sigurðsson 2012) and of Basque (Rezac 2008a, Fernández and Rezac 2012).

\textsuperscript{32} Among other approaches to defective intervention, certain seem ultimately compatible with partial intervention even if the specific mechanics here would have to be modified (e.g. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008); others are unavailable for independent reasons (e.g. Baker 2008, given the robust evidence for person agreement with low 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person nominatives in Icelandic and Finnish, cf. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Preminger 2011).
Insofar as a quirky oblique lacks number, it is not necessarily expected to affect number match. In simple PCC systems, the more distant goal can control number agreement (Icelandic "A"). In PCC systems, default number agreement appears instead (Icelandic "C", Finnish, and Breton). In both types of system, the lower goal is licensed if specified only for number, i.e. "3rd" person. The nature of the PCC-PCC+ difference is likewise taken up below under Case.

The partial-specification approach to defective-intervention has several points of parametric variation. They may be illustrated relative to how they affect the PCC in unaccusatives with applicative obliques in (33): (i) whether the oblique is quirky (PCC), invisible (no constraint), or transparent (no lower nominative, or a separate Agree/Case locus for it, Rezac 2008b); (ii) whether the lower goal raises above the oblique to feed phi-Agree with T_{NOM} (and so avoids the PCC: general in German, restricted in Icelandic, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008); (iii) whether the casual architecture of thematic intransitives has v_{ACC} (as in dative-accusative psych-unaccusatives in certain varieties of Insular Scandinavian, unaffected by the PCC as all accusatives in these systems, beside dative-nominative psych-unaccusatives restricted by the PCC in other varieties; this too is discussed below under Case).

### 6.4 Quirkiness in oblique-subject transitives

The partial-intervention approach in itself makes no reference to thematic properties such as applicativity or unaccusativity. It is expected to give rise to the PCC with thematic transitive if they have the casual architecture of intransitives, and this is so.

Canonically, thematic transitive appear *casually transitive* structures when not passive: nominative/ergative-A – accusative/absolutive-O, via the Agree/Case locus T_{NOM/ERG} for A and v_{ACC/ABS} for O. However, they can appear in *casually intransitive* structures canonically associated with thematic intransitives, resembling but distinct from passives: one Agree/Case locus, T_{NOM} or v_{ABS}, to which O relates in the same way S does, plus an oblique A. Such a structure has been described above for Georgian, where some tenses/moods have the canonical casual structures, but others dative-A – nominative/absolute-O. Certain types of ergativity have been given such casually intransitive analyses, with the ergative of A as oblique and nominative or absolute on O (e.g. Woolford 1997, 2006, Anand and Nevis 2006, Bhatt 2006, Legate 2008, Bjorkman 2008; cf. for English-type passives Collins 2005, 2018); so have nonfinite nominative-object subsystems of generally accusative languages (Lavine 2000: ch. 5, Franks and Lavin 2006).33

The partial-intervention approach to the PCC predicts that these casually intransitive thematic transscripts should be constrained by the PCC under the same conditions as thematic unaccusatives and passives: if A is a quirky oblique (not an invisible ergative, Anand and Nevis 2006, Shklovsky 2012), phi-Agree with O crosses A (e.g. the locus is T rather than v, Legate 2008); and O has not raised past A to feed phi-Agree. When these conditions are met, the PCC does indeed restrict O (for simple ergative systems, Rezac 2008a, Doron and Khan 2012, Kalin and van Urk 2015, more complex Albizu 1997, Rezac 2011: 5.9; for nominative-object nonfinite clauses, cf. Timberlake 1974).

In Breton, there is one casually intransitive thematically transitive structure, and it is subject to the PCC: the Georgian-like HAVE-perfect (section 4). In it, the argument coding of the lexical *mihi est* HAVE is extended to transitive in the auxiliary HAVE + participle perfect, with dative A and 3rd person nominative ~ 1st/2nd person accusative O. A parallel development is found not in Finnish itself, but in the closely related Karelian (Seržant 2012: 358).34

---

33 Issues that arise include sensitivity to properties of the C/T system such as tense sensitivity (in ergative systems, see Bjorkman 2018 vs. Coon and Preminger 2017; see Marlett 1986 for perhaps the most extreme case); and irrelevance of vP-phasehood to agreement and case (esp. Keine 2017 for agreement and Brattico 2014 for case).

34 Here it is relevant to raise the putative absence of the PCC in Georgian dative-nominative constructions (cf. Béjar 2003: 3.3-10, Rezac 2011: 248n54). The morphology in fact suggests that the PCC is present. In casual transitive, there is a unique person agreement prefix; it is obligatorily controlled by the applicative dative of any person and by the 1st/2nd person absolute (accusative) if present, e.g. T_{DAT/ABL}-V-. If there is both a dative and a 1st/2nd person absolute (accusative), the PCC is repaired by changing the structure of one of the arguments. In casual intransitive, there is the same prefix with the same dative and absolute control, e.g. T_{DAT/ABL}-V-. If there is both a dative and a 1st/2nd person absolute (nominative), the PCC is expected, and appears not to arise, with the prefix controlled by dative if 1st/2nd and otherwise absolute (nominative) if 1st/2nd. However, just in the expected PCC contexts and not otherwise, there appears additional suffixed morphology, formally identical to a suffixed copula, with its own prefix controlled by the absolute (nominative), e.g. T_{ABL-V}-T_{ABL-BE-} (Hewitt 1995). This looks like a PCC repair activating an otherwise
6.5 Quirkiness in impersonals

On the partial intervention approach to defective intervention, quirky obliques give rise to the PCC because they interfere with person but not number match of the higher phi-probe – unlike phi-less invisible obliques that are inert, and phi-complete nobliques that absorb the probe. This proposal predicts that other person-only bearers should have the same effect even if not oblique. A person-only phi-specification has independently been advanced for certain human impersonals – and they do indeed appear as the subject of casually intransitive "mediopassives" of thematic transitives, whose object has the now familiar split-person coding: 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative. The Romance incarnation, the "nominative se" construction, has already been analysed as an instance of the PCC (D'Alessandro 2004, 2007: ch. 4, Rezac 2004, Medová 2009: ch. 7; on the "nominativity" of se, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017). Here this analysis is sketched for its Finnish counterpart (Rezac 2011: 5.6.4). It is one of the two environments in Finnish where thematic transitives show the same PCC as oblique-subject unaccusatives, and will bring us to the other, the imperative.

(37) **Finnish generic impersonal**

| jos tuo sen / minut. |
| if bring.3SG 3SG.ACC / 1SG.ACC |
| if one brings it/me |

**Finnish arbitrary impersonal**

| jos tuodaan se / minut. |
| if bring.IMPR 3SG.NOM / 1SG.ACC |
| if one brings it/me (IMPR glosses the arbitrary impersonal) |

Finnish has two human impersonal pronouns (Vilkuna 1999: ch. 4; Helasvu and Vilkuna 2008). One is **generic impersonal pro**. This is essentially a silent counterpart of English one, available in various cases and grammatical functions, with the same phi-features as any other 3SG argument (Holmberg 2009). When it is the A of a transitive, O is accusative.

Our interest lies in the **arbitrary impersonal pro**. Intepretively, it is close to German *man*, French *on*, Italian nominative *se*, and Irish "autonomous" inflection (Egerland 2003, McCloskey 2007). Like them, it is limited to environments that license agreeing nominatives (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017; Egerland 2003 – an agreement-licensed pronoun type discussed later). There, it is coded through "fourth person" or "unipersonal" agreement morphology. Though it has been analysed as a passive (Manninen and Nelson 2004), syntactic tests like antecedence of local anaphora (Vilkuna 1999: 4.1.4; Kaiser and Vihman 2006: 6.1, Rezac and Jouitteau 2016: ch. 8) indicate a rich nominal structure (full DP for Landau 2010, Legate 2014). When it comes to phi-features, as an impersonal with human reference, arbitrary pro is specified for person (Malamud 2012; e.g. [\*] in Appendix 3). However, concording nonfinite predicates indicate that there is no number: with the 3SG generic impersonal concord must be singular, but with the arbitrary impersonal it can also be plural (Vilkuna 1999: 140, Kaiser and Vihman 2006: sec. 3; cf. Egerland 2003). The arbitrary impersonal then quirkily has a person but not number specification.35

### Notes

35 Various matters are left open here: what other featural content arbitrary pro may have and its 4th person morphology reflect, such as [arb] (Malamud 2012); whether the 4th person morphology reflects featural agreement with pro or pro itself or both (see note 37 on the analogous question for imperative pronouns); interaction of the impersonal pros with the EPP (neither satisfies the "phrasal" EPP, unlike unlike 1st/2nd person pro, Holmberg 2005, allowing other arguments to do so and so gain some subjecthood properties, Kiparsky 2001; cf. Wood 2017); how to derive noncategorial pragmatic contrasts between the two impersonals (Rezac and Jouitteau 2016: ch. 8); and the analysis of the 1PL use of the arbitrary impersonal (ibid: a complex DP where the impersonal doubles a 1PL restrictor, like French *on-nous*, with morphosyntax suggesting that the DP gets nominative). The description simplifies the realisation of the arbitrary impersonal: the agreement-position -\*\(Vn\) is accompanied by a lower -\*\(TA-\*TU\). The latter allows intriguing syntactic
Partial intervention predicts that if this person-only pro is the subject of casually intransitive thematic transitive, the object is nominative restricted to 3rd person by the PCC, and accusative 1st/2nd person by PCC repair. That is so. Arbitrary PRO appears to behave likewise (cf. Taraldsen 1986; Hakulinen et al. 2004: §939; for the PCC in infinitives, see under Case below). Somewhat more open is whether the person-only match with the arbitrary pro assigns nominative or not, satisfying any Case-licensing requirements it may have. The mechanics of Case below are compatible with this.

This analysis of "mediopassives" relies on a partially phi-specified argument, and a casually intransitive structure for thematic transitives, lacking $V_{\text{ACC}}$ (up to repair). The former arguably permits the latter, since only if A is not fully phi-specified can $T_{\text{Nom}}$ Agree past it with O and thus Case-license it. However, it remains open whether a partially phi-specified A entails absence of $V_{\text{ACC}}$, in view of casual alternations that seem to reflect a parameter forcing $V_{\text{ACC}}$, like dative-nominative vs. -accusative psych-verbs in insular Scandinavian. These matters are taken up below under Case. Independently, it seems clear from diagnostics like number concord that number specification is a point of variation in human impersonals, whether generic (Finnish), or arbitrary (including Breton: Rezac and Jouitteau 2015, 2016).

6.6 Quirkiness in imperatives

We have now reached the sole remaining structure with the intransitive PCC in Breton and Finnish, the imperative of active transitives. Crosslinguistically, subjects of imperatives are more restricted than elsewhere in form and interpretation, and such deficiencies have been linked to occasional coding of their objects by nominative (Timberlake 1974: ch. 8, Munro 1979, Shopen 1985:1:175, Dixon 1994: 3.4.2, Kiparsky 2001). So it is here, but the deficiency is novel: restriction of the subject to addressee-inclusive pronouns, which eliminates certain categories of nominals and their phi-features, allowing the rest an analysis eschewing number. This general idea is worked out concretely within Zanuttini's (2008) analysis of imperatives, with focus on Breton and Finnish in contrast to French (together B-F-Fr).

The relevant imperative type is the "true" imperative, which differs from "surrogate" imperatives and other moods in the morphosyntax of the left periphery and core arguments (cf. Isaac 2015). The difference to be explained is object coding. In B-F-Fr, the object is generally accusative, including in surrogate imperatives; but in the true imperative, it is accusative only in French, while in Breton and Finnish it has the familiar split-person coding 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative, like objects of oblique-subject intransitives in both languages, and of arbitrary-impersonal subject transitives in Finnish.\(^{36}\)

\[(38)\] **Surrogate imperative (NOM-ACC, subject syntax as elsewhere)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(He) tuo-koot -</th>
<th>(he) sen /</th>
<th>minut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3PL.NOM) bring-SIMP-PL</td>
<td>3SG.ACC / 1SG.ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let them bring it/me.

**True imperative (NOM-3.NOM~1/2.ACC, subject syntax special)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(*Te) tuo-kaa -</th>
<th>(te) se /</th>
<th>minut.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2PL.NOM) bring-IMP</td>
<td>3SG.NOM / 1SG.ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(You) bring it/me.

It is a defining property of true imperatives that their subject include the addressee; hence Finnish, Breton, and French have true imperative forms only for 2SG, 2PL, and 1PL analyses, and may be especially related to the BE rather than HAVE auxiliary selection in the nominative $se$ mediopassive of Italian. However, it may be extended exonce, as synchronic residue of the impersonal's origin: in synthetic forms the reflexive/middle (-\textit{Fn}) of a causative (-\textit{TA-}) (Lehtinen 1984, 2007); plus periphrastic forms deploying the resultative (-\textit{TU}) participle, not itself passive, through external influence (cf. de Smit 2006) – perhaps supported by the "double passive" option where periphrastic forms pile up these morphemes. \(^{36}\) The term "surrogate" is proper for uses of moods like the indicative with directive force, as in French; here it is also used also sloppily used for distinctive 3SG/3PL forms in Breton and Finnish that have been called imperative, optative, jussive, but have a morphology and syntax of their own, though in Finnish historically related to true imperative forms.

Imperative pronouns have a distinctive morphosyntax (again like PRO, cf. esp. Potsdam 1998). In B-F-Fr, they are coded by "classical pro-drop", i.e. forms of the imperative verb with 2SG, 2PL, 1PL suffixes. In Breton and Finnish, this is like other pronominal subjects of other finite clauses, but in French it is unique. In French and Breton, no other subject is possible. In Finnish, the imperative pronoun can be doubled by a subset of regular nominals, not necessarily referential (You/Nobody leave! type; the case is nominative, uncertain as to assigned or default). The doubling may be analysed through complex DPs, of which the imperative pronoun is the highest element and theone visible to clausal phi-Agree (Zanuttini 2008, cf. Höhn 2016 outside imperatives, and big-DP doubling in section 3). Surrogate imperatives allow the same nominal expressions as subjects as other moods do.37

The phi-content of imperative pronouns so far consists of person features from the imperative head, distinguishing 2SG/2PL from 1PL. We still need to differentiate 2SG and 2PL. This can be done with singular-plural number phi-features, but also by other means. To be concrete, let us adopt one traditional analysis of [singular]-[plural] number phi-features, as operators on NP predicates. Whether NPs combine with number, and which morphosyntactic types of them do, varies. In B-F-Fr, NPs generally do so, and thus so also do DPs built on them; this includes personal pronouns (Elbourne 2013: ch. 10).

However, there are other means than number phi-features of mapping certain nominals to pluralities or atoms (Corbett 2004). Among them are associatives, which map a certain "high-animacy" subset of referential nominals to a plurality that adds salient associates, alone or in combination with number; possibly, they are always a part of 1st/2nd person "pluralities" (Corbett 2004: 4.3, Kratzer 2009: sec. 5). Certain systems with associatives look and have been analysed as what we are looking for: number is absent and 1st/2nd person pronouns have atomic reference when bare but plural reference with an associative (Cantonese is one language where the pronominal system has been so characterised, Cysouw 2009: 4.3.5, and indeed the nominal system, cf. Cheng and Sybesma 1999). In B-F-Fr then, imperative pronouns are susceptible to two analyses, by dint of being high-animacy referential expressions: one like other personal pronouns that includes number; and one without number, so that a pronoun with the [2nd] person phi-features refers to the atomic addressee without an associative and to a plurality containing the addressee with an associative (cf. [2nd] and [group] in Kratzer 2009: sec. 5).38

It is not straightforward to determine whether a given plurality is formed by an associative: associatives result in a semantic plurality (hence plural "semantic agreement", cf. e.g. Ackema and Neelman 2018: 292n23), and morphology need not reveal the associative or syncretise it with number (hence the view that all 1st/2nd plurals involve associativity, Corbett 2004: 4.3, Kratzer 2009: sec. 5; for the range of ways in which content like honorifics can be syncretised with number, see Corbett 2004: 6.4, 7.1). However, in B-F-Fr the very morphology of imperative forms is suggestive about the content of the imperative pronouns. French is simplest:

37 In Breton, ordinary agreement suffixes realise (agreement ÷) incorporated pronouns, since they are in complementary distribution with other nominals (section 2). In Finnish, they realise agreement, even under pro-drop (Holmberg 2005). However, the analysis of imperative subjects as necessarily pronouns (alone, or doubled by a DP) makes them always complementary with other nominals, inviting the Breton analysis for B-F-Fr, so henceforth imperative verbal forms are spoken of as realising (features of) imperative pronouns rather than agreement with them.
38 The analysis sketches essentials, not committing to one among the currently very divergent approaches to person and its combination with number (e.g. Heim 2008, Kratzer 2009, Harbour 2016, Ackema and Neelman 2018); to the content of local anaphora with transmitted phi-features (if NP is present, then impersonal pronouns are additionally distinctive in not combining number with NP); and to a full theory of associative constructions (Corbett 2004). The analysis of the 1PL imperative pronoun illustrates certain choice points: if 1st/2nd person features are directly referential (Kratzer 2009, but assuming that speaker and addressee are atomic, Harbour 2016: 4.2.1), then pro with only [2nd][1st] denotes the minimal inclusive duality, and an associative is needed to add others, a distinction not reflected in morphology; if person features are operators on predicates (Harbour 2016), then pro with (the closest equivalent of) [2nd][1st] denotes the nonminimal inclusive, as does one with the associative added, while pro with only [2nd] likewise includes associates and is limited to addressee-only reference by competition with its associative counterpart through a "maximise feature" principle (Harbour 2016: 80).
true imperatives use the same fusional person+number suffixes as other moods, suggesting the same featural content (cf. Rowlett 2007: 2.2.1.4). Finnish goes in the opposite direction. Outside true imperatives, phi-agreement reflects person and number (PL $t$ in 3rd person, gemination in 1st/2nd person, e.g. 2SG/PL $ttu$; for 1PL the arbitrary impersonal is common). True imperatives use different morphology (eschewing literary forms, 2SG is stem + a silent consonant, elsewhere a stem-formant, 2PL is stem + $kaa$, historically the imperative suffix; 1PL uses the arbitrary impersonal form; see Sebeok 1944, Thomas 2012, Hakulinen et al. 2004, and for history Laanest 1982, Lehtinen 2007). In Breton also the imperative is distinctive, though less so (the verbal stem for 2SG; 2PL and 1PL are fused person+number, 1PL found outside the imperative, but 2PL only in some varieties; Hemon 1975: §134). Morphology thus hints that Finnish and Breton but not French make the 2SG-2PL-1PL distinctions with different features in imperative pronouns than elsewhere – though it is only a hint, since phi-features need not have the same exponence across categories.

Under the partial intervention approach to the PCC, the split-person coding of the object in the imperative of Breton and Finnish follows from the a distinctive featural content of imperative pronouns, namely specification for person but not number, precisely as in the arbitrary impersonal. The Agree/Case mechanics of transitives are identical in all respects. The accusative-only coding of the object in French suggests that impersonal pronouns have number as well as person, again modulo the same uncertainty as in the imperative.

Thus the partial intervention approach to the PCC permits unification of the anomalous split-person object coding in Breton and Finnish across unaccusatives with quirky oblique subjects, "mediopassives" with a clearly numberless impersonal pronoun subject, and imperatives with imperative pronoun subjects that can be analysed as numberless, with some support in morphology. Changing perspective from that of the analyst studying partial intervention to the speaker guided by knowledge of its mechanics, the split-person object coding as nominative is evidence for acquiring a casually intransitive structure for thematic transitives in mediopassives and imperatives, and the 3rd person restriction is evidence for acquiring subjects with person but not number phi-features visible to clausal phi-Agree.

We are now also in a position to say something about the rise of this constellation of PCC constructions in Breton. At some point, the coding of core arguments by independent-turned-enclitic pronouns was limited to the objects of positive imperative and HAVE. With HAVE, they were only 3rd person by the PCC, later accompanied by regular 1st/2nd person accusatives by PCC repair (sections 3-4). Through the shared 3rd person object coding, the imperative adopted the restriction of HAVE, motivating reanalysis of its structure as one where the restriction is created by the PCC. Although this development took place before the earliest extensive MB texts that witness it (15C), it must have occurred during the separate development of Breton (after 8C), and so is fairly recoverable – unlike the rise of the Finnish construction group, of far more remote and especially syntactically obscure history (cf. Laanest 1982, Lehtinen 2007, Havas 2008 with literature, and the preceding subsection on the mediopassive).

6.7 Parameters

We have followed the PCC in casual intransitives of nominative-accusative languages, from its core domain of unaccusatives/passives with oblique subjects to thematic transitives with oblique, impersonal, and imperative subjects. All exhibit the two coding anomalies that the partial intervention approach correlates: split-person object case, 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd ineffable or accusative; and subjects impinging on but defective in agreement (with respect to nominatives). Languages differ in the set of constructions with this profile, and the differences are amenable to classical parametrisation through syntactic features of lexical items. They may be illustrated with reference to the structure (33) of the specific constructions under study (repeated below):

\[
(33) \quad T_{\phi}, \Case=NOM \ldots X_{\text{quirky}} \ldots G_{[1/2/\emptyset][SG/PL][\text{uCase}]}
\]

Given the structure (33) at the point where the phi-probe of T Agrees, parametric differences lie in the phi-features of the intervener X. If it were not quirky, it would fully match phi-features of the probe and prevent any relationship with G (typical nonoblique; transparent
oblique), or else not interact with the probe at all and let G match it (typical, i.e. invisible, oblique; any phi-less nominal). Quirky interveners with person but not number phi-specification are created by the lexical specification of certain morphosyntactically distinctive nominal classes, here human impersonal pronouns and imperative pronouns, or by certain oblique-case structures (q.v. Appendix 3, along with number-only interveners). Other parameters whether the phi-probe of T Agrees in the structure (33) or some other structure: for instance, whether unaccusatives take an applicative argument, whether it is base-generated above the core argument, and whether the core argument undergoes A-movement past it within the complement of T. One potential parameter has come up with each PCC construction discussed: parametrisation of casual intransitivity by specifying that \( v_{\text{ACC}} \) is present in addition to \( T_{\text{NOM}} \). It is left to the following discussion of Case.

6.8 Case

6.8.1 Case, licensing and PCC

A central issue in work on the PCC has been the relationship between its two manifestations, (restrictions on) agreement and nominal licensing. It may be illustrated by two nearly-opposed proposals. Anagnostopoulou (2003) situates her analysis in what may be called the phi-Case hypothesis: phi-Agree assigns structural Case, which is the syntactic aspect of both nominal case morphology and nominal licensing (Chomsky 2000, 2001; cf. esp. Schütze 1997: ch. 4, Frampton and Gutmahn 1999). On the basis of the PCC, Anagnostopoulou argues that a phi-probe assigns Case to a goal only if it matches each of the person and the number phi-features that is present on it. Failure to match person is what goes away in PCC contexts with the licensing of person-bearing nominals. Preminger (2014) adopts a syntactic version of the configurational case hypothesis, where case is not related to nominal licensing and not fed by phi-Agree (Marantz 1991, Bobaljik 2008; Bittner and Hale 1996). Instead, the PCC affects licensing through the requirement that person-bearers value a phi-probe under certain conditions (Béjar and Rezac 2003, 2009; cf. Nichols 2001, Baker 2008, Kalin 2018, 2019, Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2018).

The general defective intervention approach to the PCC, and its specific construal as partial intervention, do not depend on the phi-Case hypothesis. It is nevertheless this hypothesis that will be explored here, because the Breton-Finnish type of system makes important contributions to it. One is fairly clear support from PCC repairs for some link between nominal licensing and case morphology with 1st/2nd person nominals. The other is a hint of a link between phi-Agree and case with 3rd person nominals. This will bring us to the last topic, the challenge that PCC contexts offer to the phi-Case hypothesis: dissociation between agreement, case, and licensing for nonagreeing nominals.

6.8.2 PCC repairs

When the PCC prevents person agreement with a person-bearing nonoblique nominal, such as the nominative objects here, the nominal also often fails to be licensed, even with number-only or default agreement. In systems like Icelandic "A", such a 1st/2nd person would-be-nominative can be ineffable (see Appendix 2). In Finnish, a repair turns the unlicensed nominative to accusative, as if the intransitive casual architecture were transitivised (Rezac 2011: 5.6). Analogous repairs of the PCC by transitivisation have been best studied for ergative-absolutive systems, where they turn absolutes to ergatives just when the PCC blocks their person agreement (Rezac 2008b, 2011; Arregi and Nevins 2012; Tyler 2018). Breton corroborates the

---

39 Throughout, parametrisation by syntactic features of lexical items can be rephrased as their realisability, e.g. of agentive \( v \) with and without a phi-probe. It is left open whether the parameters here fully reduce variation in the PCC to the structure (33) across our core domain, casual intransitives with an applicative oblique. In some apparent exceptions, the PCC proved to be present (Basque, Rezac 2008b, Arregi and Nevins 2012; cf. note 34 on Georgian). In others, the relevant structure is not (33) because of raising past the applicative (French, Béjar and Rezac 2003; “Stylistic Fronting” in Icelandic, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; elsewhere doubt turns chiefly on what different subjecthood tests diagnose and how it relates to (33), and has motivates other parameters: see Anagnostopoulou 2003: 5.6.1 on Greek). In still other exceptions, obliques are not interveners despite superficial appearance (Abaza, Rezac 2008a). The matter of the ‘weak’ PCC may be quite different (see note 44 with references).
Finnish repair by accusative, which is important because Finnish is otherwise the sole accusative system where a repair of the PCC in intransitives has been studied, and the relative isolation of its split-person coding for certain objects has been a factor in assays at alternative explanations (see note 30). Breton also controls for various alternative analyses of repairs, notably through the strong-pronoun character of the relevant pronouns of Finnish, since their counterparts in Breton are weak-pronoun clitics. Lastly, the development of the Breton split-person coding is fairly recoverable and indicates one diachronic pathways to the grammaticalisation of repairs: from genitives in related nominalisations that lack the PCC through a genitive-accusative syncretism (section 4; the Finnish system has far more remote origins, with syntactic details especially difficult to recover, cf. Havas 2008 with literature).

PCC repairs by ergative and accusative evidence relationships between the three phenomena linked by the phi-Case hypothesis, and so are important evidence for it: phi-Agree for person, blocked by the PCC; licensing of person-bearing nominals, unavailable without this Agree; and morphological case, which rescues these nominals in PCC repairs. Within the phi-Case hypothesis, the repairs favour theories that relate the ergative and accusative, and make them available as needed to fix certain licensing problems.

Let us make this concrete by sketching one possible mechanics for the repairs within Anagnostopoulou's (2003) modification of Chomsky's (2000) phi-Case hypothesis. In intransitives, there is canonically only one Agree/Case locus, $T_{NOM} \sim v_{ABS}$. In PCC contexts, it fails to fully match a person-bearing object, and thereby Case-license it as nominative ~ absolutive. The repairs take the form of accusative ~ ergative on this argument and default agreement on $T_{NOM} \sim v_{ABS}$, as if the failure of Case-licensing enriched intransitives with the extra Agree/Case locus of transitives, $v_{ACC} \sim T_{ERG}$. It is possible to view ordinary accusative ~ ergative in transitives as the reflex of just such an enrichment in response to Case-licensing failure, this time due to there being two nominals, only one of which can be fully phi-Agreed with and so Case-licensed by $T_{NOM} \sim v_{ABS}$. The parallel behavior of ergative and accusative suggests a theory where both are dependent c/Case, against absolutive and nominative obligatory c/Case (Baker and Bobaljik 2018). However, the theory of dependent Case must make it available for Case-licensing not just when there are two nonobligates, but also when there is only one and it fails to Agree for its person feature in PCC contexts (Rezac 2011):

(40) **Case Theory (as relevant here)**

- **Case licensing**: Nominal arguments need Case for licensing (an aspect of Full Interpretation, Chomsky 2000), and can be Case-licensed through match for each of their person and number phi-features present on it with a phi-probe on an Agree/Case locus (Anagnostopoulou 2003).

- **Agree/Case loci**: In a minimal CP, the obligatory or default locus $T_{NOM} \sim v_{ABS}$ must have a phi-probe, and the dependent locus $v_{ABS} \sim T_{ERG}$ has one only if needed for Case-licensing (Rezac 2011: ch. 5).

In the nominative-accusative systems studied here, the mechanics are simple. A nonoblique DP argument fails to get Case from the obligatory locus $T_{NOM}$ when it is the object of a transitive whose external argument blocks the phi-probe of $T_{NOM}$, and when it is the person-bearing object of an intransitive whose oblique subject blocks the person feature of the phi-probe of $T_{NOM}$. The minimal containing CP fails to converge under these conditions unless it also contains $v_{ACC}$, thus licensing the presence of $v_{ACC}$ (a globalist formulation that has a localist alternative, Rezac 2011: 5.9 building on Laka 2000).

Among issues in theories of dependent c/Case, one has arisen in our discussion: dependent case without an obvious obligatory case, as in (dative-)accusative beside (dative-)nominative unaccusatives and passives in insular Scandinavian. These are apparent exceptions to various approaches to Burzio's Generalisation. There is evidence for many of them that there is in fact an argument relating to the obligatory locus, either a silent nominal (Bittner and Hale 1996, Laka 2000, Haider 2001, Platzack 2006, Wurmbrand 2006, Szucsch 2007, Schäfer 2008, 2012, Wood 2017), or a transparent oblique (Jónsson 2009, Árnasdóttir and Sigurðsson 2012). PCC repairs yield the inverse problem, when they fail: since dependent case repairs unlicensed 1st/2nd
For person-bearing nominals, the PCC in intransitive agreeing clauses supports a relationship between person agreement (which it blocks strictly), licensing (which it blocks under certain conditions), and case (in repairs). For nonperson-bearers, i.e. standard *3rd* person, plain PCC says nothing about these relationships, and PCC+ cautions against them because suspension of number agreement does not seem to affect case or licensing. Even for person-bearers, the link between agreement and case or licensing turns out to be challenged by nominals that systematically do not control agreement, such as accusatives in the systems here. This subsection and the next explore how these challenges can be met under the general phi-Case hypothesis, leaving open alternatives such as restricting the phi-Case hypothesis to person-bears (Kalin 2018, 2019).

Let us begin with the first challenge, lack of number agreement with with nominals just in PCC contexts of PCC+ systems. Parametric context absence of number agreement without effect on licensing has always been a part of theories exploring the phi-Case hypothesis: according to clause type (case without agreement in infinitives, Schütze 1997: ch. 4); movement (agreement only upon movement or in spec-head configurations, D'Alessandro and Roberts 2010); or linear order (agreement with coordinate structures, Bhatt and Walkow 2013). Following much of this work, let us adopt a distinction between two *match* and *valuation*. Match is the syntactic aspect of phi-Agree, relating an unvalued feature on a target to a value on a goal. Valuation is part of the transfer to PF and allows the matched value to be realised on the target under certain conditions (Bhatt and Walkow 2013, Marušič et al. 2015). Valuation may still be distinct from other featural manipulations in realisation (cf. Kalin to appear; for such manipulations, see e.g. Bonet 1991, Arregi and Nevins 2012, 2018).

This match-value distinction may be used to approach the PCC-PCC+ split under the phi-Case hypothesis. Consider two Icelandic varieties, "A" and "C". In both, high and low *3rd* person" nominations control number agreement, save that in "C" they fail to do so in a PCC context. Under the phi-Case hypothesis, in both "A" and "C" there is number match between T NOM and 3rd person DPs in a PCC context, but only in "C" does it lead to valuation. To differentiate "A" and "C", we may use the distinctiveness of T NOM in a PCC context: only here do T's person and number features match different goals (locally represented on T in a feature-sharing construal of match, Pesetsy and Torrego 2007, Haug and Nikitina 2016). "C" can then be distinguished from "A" by having no spell-out for phi-features matching different goals.40

Under certain approaches to Case, case as well could be affected by this distinction. On the phi-Case hypothesis, Case reflects properties of the assigning locus (Chomsky 2000). A locus like T is complex of features, so the Case assigned by it is invariant only if it reflects an invariant property of T (its category, Pesetsky 2013: 9.1), not if it reflects more of the locus, for

---

40 The defective- and partial-intervention approaches to the PCC are compatible with other takes on the PCC-PCC+ split, such as a lower locus for number than person agreement (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008). The suggestion here to rely on the distinctiveness of T (phrased representationally as feature sharing with different goals, but derivationally reflecting a stage where T's person has a match and number does not) can be related to discussions of splitting/bundling of person and number probes on the one hand (Béjar 2003 and much related work) and of (in)compatibility of person and number features (Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003; cf. Schütze 2003). The PCC-PCC+ contrast has been best studied in Icelandic (key discussions relevant here: Sigurðsson 1996, Jónsson 1996: ch 3-4, 2016; Schütze 1997 [S], Anagnostopoulou 2003: 4.7, 2018 [A], Holmberg and Htoarstdóttir 2004 [H&H], Hiraisha 2004, Nomura 2005 [N], Bobaljik 2008: sec. 6 [B], Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008 [S&H], Ussery 2013, 2017 [U], Kučerová 2016 [K], Wood and Sigurðsson 2017 [W&S]). In all varieties, a nominative controls finite verb agreement, save when there is a dative intervener; then "A" has obligatory, "B" optional, and "C" no number agreement, restricted by the PCC [S&H]. In "A", number agreement is possible with a moved or in-situ nominative aross an dative, by some favoured, and degraded even when avoiding problems like the PCC. "A" suggests that quirky datives do not intervene for number agreement at all (so [S], [B], [A]; but see [N]). "C" may be modelled as "A" without valuation. Variety "B" could be integrated here mechanically essentially following [K] with v-to-T number transmission or in various other ways.
instance if it is a copy or occurrence of the locus on the nominal (Rezac 2003, 2004: ch. 4, building on K-binding, Bittner and Hale 1996; so in fact also Pesetsky 2013: 9.1, but with the copy stripped to invariant features). There are few pertinent differences among T's, especially if tense is not differentiated in syntax (Pesetsky and Torrego 2007: 297n34; cf. Pesetsky 2013: 3.2). PCC contexts have just been seen to give rise to such a difference. It is reflected by agreeing (PCC) versus nonagreeing (PCC+) 3rd person. It could also be reflected by case of this "3rd" person, i.e. a different nominative for the nonagreeing "3rd" person in PCC contexts than the one "3rd" person has elsewhere (cf. Chomsky 2000: 149n90).

Usually, the case of "3rd" nominals is not affected by being in a PCC context or controlling agreement there. However, this is a possible analysis Breton. Outside PCC contexts, nominative weak pronouns are suffixes to the finite verb, licensed by valuing the phi-probe, i.e. agreement-licensed pronouns discussed below. In PCC contexts, they fail to value the phi-probe, and are otherwise unique enclitics. This suffix-enclitic difference can be analysed as a realisation of the same difference in the feature content of T in versus outside PCC context as the difference responsible for agreement/nonagreement. It is not the sole analysis (section 4.4). Whether it is right or not, Breton does bring to the fore the very possibility of a casual difference associated with PCC/PCC+, and hints at trajectories that can give rise to it: unblocking of independent pronouns when agreement-licensed ones are unavailable by the PCC, followed by a reanalysis as agreeing versus nonagreeing nominatives. This is of value whether systems with similar trajectories end up making a casual distinction or resist it.

6.8.4 Nonagreeing nominals in PCC context 2: Nonagreeing clauses and cases

The other challenge for the phi-Case hypothesis is the observation that even for person-bearers, the PCC does not always lead to failure of licensing:

(41) Agreement-licensing correlation (approximation): the PCC bars licensing of person-bearing nominals only if they would control overt person agreement were the quirky intervener absent, or if they belong to a certain clitic/weak pronoun type (Bonet 1991: ch. 4, Albizu 1997, Rezac 2011: 5.2.3, Preminger 2018).41

This generalisation pools two environments of nonagreement, neither addressed here so far: nonagreeing clauses, and nonagreeing cases. Nonagreeing clauses are nicely illustrated by Basque: 1st/2nd person absolutives are not licensed in a PCC context, whether strong or pro, if they would control agreement without the intervener (= in a finite clause), but are fine otherwise (= in a nonfinite clause) (Laka 1993). This sensitivity of licensing to context can be modelled by modifying Anagnostopoulou's (2003) condition that Case requires a complete match by relativising completeness to the probe:

(42) Match Condition on Case: a nominal is assigned Case by Agree with an Agree/Case locus [only] if each of the person, number phi-feature of the nominal, if present, is matched by the corresponding phi-feature of the locus, if present.42

Goals of Agree/Case loci whose overt morphology makes it clear that there is a person probe will not be Case-licensed in PCC context; that includes all the systems we have looked at. However, they will get Case from a locus whose phi-probe lacks person (so a probe for number, or the root φ node of person and number; see Appendix 3). Whether superficially nonagreeing infinitives are to be so analysed seems to vary. It is a reasonable analysis for Basque; however,

---

41 Even when the licensing of a potentially agreeing argument should fail due to lack of person match in a PCC context, ameliorations exist, with great variation across speakers and often a remnant of deviance: e.g. by number-only agreement (on Icelandic, with variation, Sigurðsson 1996, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; on Basque, rarely acceptable, Rezac 2008b); default agreement (on Icelandic, Appendix 2); focus, coordination, modification (in French, ibid). These may all reflect some way of suspending person match, and some are found independently of the PCC (e.g. Chomsky 2000: 149n90, Schütze 1997: 4.1.5-6, Sobin 1997, Rezac 2004: 5.3).

42 Here person, number are as in Appendix 3; the formulation allows the two features to be part of a single probe or distinct probes of the same locus, but can be changed to require the former; and [only] allows for additional conditions.
the likewise superficially nonagreeing infinitives of the systems under study here, Breton, Finnish, and best known Icelandic, all seem to show the PCC.\footnote{Icelandic is the best described problem. At first sight, it suggests that the PCC is absent in infinitives, namely in: (i) $V_{\text{INF}}$ ... $\text{DAT}^{...}$ ... $\text{NOM}^{\text{BAD}}$ $V_{\text{INF}}$/$\text{PRED}_{\text{BAD}}$ (e.g. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 271, Preminger 2011: 932; superscripts indicate selection). However, the PCC reappears for nominative objects: (ii) $\text{DAT}^{...}$ / $\text{PRO}_{\text{DAT}}$ $V_{\text{INF}}$ ... $\text{NOM}^{\text{BAD}}$: although some have no person contrast here (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 271; key to e.g. Keine 2010, Preminger 2018), others do, albeit weaker than with agreeing verbs, and do so across different verbs, ECM and control infinitives, and speakers (e.g. Bobaljik 2008: 319n27; Nomura 2005: 79-80; Boeckx 2008: 51; and indeed Sigurðsson 2004: 155n14). This suggests the same phi-Agree mechanics for finite and infinitival clauses, with failure to realise agreement in the latter (Schütze 1997: ch. 4). The exceptional configuration is then (i), and seems to involve an opaque infinitive internally licensing its specified subject nominative with no dative to interfere (so already Sigurðsson 1996: sec. 2.4, 3). This can be seen as be a PCC repair "strengthening" infinitives, ordinarily obligatorily transparent to phi-Agree, by adding an Agree/Case locus in the C/T system, so that they become of a type independently known to be opaque to phi-Agree (q.v. Schütze op. cit.; Nomura 2005: ch. 3, Bobaljik 2008: 320; Wood and Sigurðsson 2017).}

The other nonagreement environment is apparent in languages where nominatives but not accusatives control overt agreement. In these languages, we may contrast these two cases in parallel PCC contexts: for instance, nominative S versus accusative O of an active versus passive transitive with an applicative dative. The nominative is subject to the PCC; the accusative varies. In one type of system, usually with "strong" but also sometimes "weak" pronoun accusatives, the accusative is fine in the PCC context (Icelandic, Finnish). This is expected from the Match Condition on Case, if $V_{\text{ACC}}$ has no person probe. In the other type of system, usually with "clitic" but also sometimes "weak" pronoun accusatives, the accusative is out in the PCC context (French). The latter type of system comes out right if its accusative pronouns independently need licensing by phi-Agree for their person and number, and so a probe with person on $v$ (Rezac 2011: 5.2.3; Preminger 2018).

Such a pronominal type is familiar: it is the class of "deficient" pronouns licensed only as subjects of agreeing, not nonagreeing clauses, including nominative clitics in French (Kayne 2000: ch. 10, in contrast to nonclitic subjects) and nominative pro in Italian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017, showing that agreement matters rather than finiteness). It is not necessary here to decide how this agreement-licensed pronoun type works. Here it suffices that its licensing requires that any and all of person, number phi-features present on the pronoun value a phi-probe (cf. Roberts and Holmberg 2010 on related approaches to classical pro).

This sketch assumes that in a system like French, the PCC with accusative clitics guides the acquisition of an agreement-licensed pronoun type, and through it of a $v$ with a person-containing probe, whereas a person-less probe suffices in Icelandic whose accusative nonclitics are fine in a PCC context. The result is a neat split between agreement-sensitive, "true" clitic accusatives of the French sort, and agreement-insensitive, weak/strong accusatives of the Icelandic sort. However, nothing said here prevents there to be also a personless $v$ in French, and also a person-bearing $v$ in Icelandic: any such limitations are external to syntax Preminger (2018) develops such a proposal.\footnote{The postulation of agreement-licensed pronouns here unites two lines of evidence: PCC with accusative clitics in French indicates that this type matches for person if present; exclusion of nominative suffixes in Breton PPC+ requires that this type values for number if present. Often the status of a pronoun cannot be ascertained, as with accusative proclitics in Breton, since there is no reason to posit structures where they would be affected by the PCC (to datives of other languages there correspond low/invisible PPs; section 4). Moreover, the immunity/susceptibility of accusatives to the PCC is one of the aspects of the PPC least understood in detail. It does not reduce to usual distinctions like clitic versus weak, with microvariation across otherwise very similar varieties and stages in Romance, Slavic, Basque, though hints have often been noticed that stricter PCC does might correlate with stricter positional and clustering restrictions (Garca 2001: 412-4, Nicol 2005, Anagnostopoulou 2008, 2017b, Rezac 2011: 160-5). It is also in chiefly in the domain of weak pronouns that there is evidence of the "weak" PPC (Anagnostopoulou 2017b with references; for caveats, Ormazabal and Romero 2007: 2.3.3.2, Rezac 2011: 4.6.8, Walkow 2014).}

\section{Conclusion}

This study started with a coding anomaly in Breton that is a recognisable manifestation of the Person Case Constraint in the unique oblique-subject unaccusative HAVE, extended to an unusual constellation of constructions which can be understood through the recruitment of HAVE to build perfects, and through an independent convergence of its object coding with that of positive imperatives. Breton was then compared to Finnish, where a similar situation presents itself, with more remote and unclear history, more transparent in some respects, more opaque or ambiguous in others. On the comparison a theory of the PCC was set out, extending the
One finding is support from a novel domain for Anagnostopoulou's (2003) partial intervention: quirky obliques interfere with person but not number phi-dependencies by their specification for person but not number. The hypothesis predicts parallel interference by nominals specified likewise but neither applicative nor oblique. Yet corroboration of the prediction does not entail the hypothesis. Alternatives could adopt partial intervention, and still model the superficially identical effect of quirky obliques differently (e.g. through the interaction of c/Case-modulated phi-invisibility, probe order, and displacement: Béjar and Rezac 2003, Preminger 2014, resumed in Appendix 3). The challenge for a partial intervention analysis of quirky obliques is the transformation of the phi-features of the nominal within by the supranominal oblique case (Appendix 3). We do know that phi-features of nominals can be transformed in a similar way by other supranominal architecture (e.g. Serbo-Croatian gospoda 'gentlemen', nominal SG.FEM for modifiers, transformed to PL.NEUT for the clause, despite pragmatic PL.MASC, Wechsler and Zlatic 2003, Corbett 2006: ch. 5, 7; Landau 2016; for 1PL pronouns with 3SG for the clause, Rezac 2011: 6.3 with literature).

A second finding is support for Anagnostopoulou's (2003) Case-theoretic derivation of the unavailability of person-bearers in PCC contexts from their failure to control person phi-dependencies: phi-Agree assigns Case and Case underlies both licensing and case morphology (Chomsky 2000). The support comes from PCC repairs, because they supply the missing Case-theoretic link between the addition of person licensing and of dependent case. All thus turns on the proper analysis of PCC repairs. There is remarkable superficial diversity in constructions that repair the PCC, but no less striking are their limitations, when compared to paraphrases available to circumvent to PCC on the one hand, and to problems superficially resembling the PCC that they cannot repair. Any argument from a theory of repairs for a Case Theory depends on whether the Case Theory derives this diversity and limitations, for all or some coherent subset of PCC repairs. It fails if effects on case are incidental to the mechanics of repairs, just as a theory of person phi-features is not informed by the incidental person restriction of the idiom I/you/*she betcha. This remains a matter of inquiry (Rezac 2011: ch. 5, 2016, Walkow 2013, 2014, Kalin 2018, 2019, Stegovec 2018, Foley et al. 2018). Current Case-theoretic analyses of PCC repairs say little about and so are compatible with many challenges to particular theories of Case: Caseless nominals (perhaps even nonperson bearers); other nominal licensing (focus, incorporation); other factors in "case" morphology (many-to-many syntax-morphology mapping); (non)relationships of Case to position and movement types (improper movement).

The force of the third finding may be brought out by its effect on the domain of the PCC in intransitives, a.k.a. the "person restriction" on nominative (and absolutive) objects. The historical core of this domain is unaccusatives and passives with oblique subjects (united with transitive PCC, e.g. Boeckx 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Baker 2008, Rezac 2008b; or not, e.g. Schütze 2003, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008). Here the domain is extended to thematic transitives whose object is nevertheless a nominative restricted to 3rd/default person, and whose subject, though not a nonagreeing oblique, still controls deficient agreement (D'Alessandro 2007, Rezac 2007, 2011). A unification needs the mechanics of both nominative agreement-case and the PCC to span very different thematic structures. This is so in many theories (references in section 6.4), but not all (e.g. Adger and Harbour 2007). Here the comparison of Breton with systems like Finnish and Icelandic has contributed to one of the tasks of such a cross-thematic approach: to modulate which constructions in a system have intransitive casual architecture, and which are subject to the PCC, ideally through independently justifiable means, such as the effect of no versus selectional case of the external argument on the availability of dependent Case/case for the object.

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1: Pronominal system of conservative varieties

The coding of pronominal core arguments in Breton follows largely from section 2, i.e. the distribution of the T, v Agree/Case loci, Blocking of strong by weak pronouns, and big-DP
doubling of enclitics by dependent pronouns. However, intriguing conundrums remain, as in most previous approaches: failure of focus to license independent pronouns postverbally, as coordination and modification do; failure of nominative suffixes to block independent pronouns as preverbal neutral subjects; availability of doublee enclitics to such preverbal subjects. A more complete analysis is sketched here.45

Independent pronouns: These are restricted to coordination and modification, the preverbal position under a nonneutral reading (henceforth "focus"), and the preverbal position as neutral for the subject A/S. This is largely derived from Blocking of independent pronouns qua strong by dependent ones qua weak.

Not so derived is failure of focus to license independent/strong pronouns postverbally (e.g. ma oan/*oa me bras 'if was.1SG/*3SG 1SG big', contrast predicate ma oo me "if it was me"), but it is parallel to wh-limitations in English (e.g. If anyone/*who were here, would you leave?), and analysable analogously: in Breton the sort of focus that licenses independent pronouns is restricted to a criterial left-peripheral position.

Also not so derived is availability of neutral independent pronouns in the preverbal position. This follows if derivations/structures with neutral strong-pronoun subjects in the preverbal position are those where there is no other means to satisfy the preverbal position requirement, e.g. no focus in the left periphery; there is no competitor that differs only by having a weak-pronoun subject, since there would be no filling the preverbal position.

Doublee enclitics: These must be doubled by dependent pronouns, with one exception discussed below, and then encliticised to the host of the dependent pronoun, modulo "float" to certain lower positions. Doubling may be given the big-DP analysis. The big-DP is restricted to [weak enclitic], in part perhaps by Kayne's Generalisation: the doubling weak pronoun takes up Case-licensing, so something else must license the doublee, and encliticisation is the sole mechanism in Breton (many later varieties develop diverse further restrictions on doubling, e.g. Kervella 1947: §424, Trépos 2002: §442-3; Stephens 1982; Ternes 1970; Goyat 2012). It is unclear if doubling always involves focus (it seems grammaticalisable in certain environments, Hemon 1975: §52).

Exception: Doublee enclitics are also licensed by independent subject pronouns in the preverbal position in W (me zou-me koh 'me is me old', eit PRO bout-me koh 'despite PRO be me old'; cf. Hemon 1975: §51); this is rare elsewhere, not early, perhaps idiomatic (me oar-me 'me knows me' "what do I know"). There is evidence that in W, neutral preverbal "independent" pronouns can attach to the following verbal complex (Ternes 1970, Le Besco 1992, also evolution of HAVE in Cheveau 2007b, Crahé 2014). Even when they do so, they still satisfy the preverbal position requirement, i.e. they do not permit OSV (contrast this further development in MC, George 1991, and perhaps in Guérandais, Mathieu 2017a); satisfaction of the preverbal position by an attached element also occurs in long head movement (Borsley et al. 1994, Urien 1999, Jouitteau 2007, 2011). Thus W adds a proclitic to the suffixal weak pronoun nominative. It may be observed that in French nominative but not accusative/dative weak pronouns satisfy the EPP, so the development brings W closer to French, although nominative suffixes remain weak pronouns rather than agreement. The development may have been general in MB.46

8.2 Appendix 2: Objects of HAVE

The earliest sizeable MB text robustly witness the split-person coding with HAVE, 3rd person argumental enclitics (lexical, auxiliary HAVE, imperative) -- 1st/2nd person proclitics (auxiliary

---


46 Briefly, MB has at least optional elision final e in independent preverbal pronouns (so 1SG me, 2SG te) if followed by a (h+)-word-initial verbal complex, but only for neutral subjects (not focused arguments, nor predicates), sometimes accompanied by orthographic union with a following proclitic (esp. 1SG), rarely also the rest of the verbal complex (esp. 1SG of HAVE, e.g. (20)). Outside W, the situation is unclear; the environment would have been affected by the total loss of proclitics, and by the collapse of the preverbal particles a', e' > s'.
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HAVE, imperative). By late MB and eNB, larger texts have dozens of instantiations of this split (e.g. Qu, CA, IN, EOVD) and essentially no counterexamples (see below). Textual studies only give these generalisations (esp. Hemon 1975: §51-2). The text IN has been partially quantified here. The expected split coding is frequent and categorical. Detailed surveys here of MB prose texts, and briefer surveys of MB verse, of early eNB-KLT prose, including the fourteen other texts by the author of IN (q.v. Châtelier 2016b), and of W prose written and spoken, offer the same picture (sources in Appendix 4).

Table: Pronominal arguments to HAVE and imperative in IN, early 18C L  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enclitic (3rd)</th>
<th>Proclitic (1st/2nd)</th>
<th>of which both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical HAVE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE + participle</td>
<td>57 (38 lexemes)</td>
<td>29 (21 lexemes)</td>
<td>1 (2 lexemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL imperative</td>
<td>51 (33 lexemes)</td>
<td>6 (6 lexemes)</td>
<td>1 (1 lexeme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which both</td>
<td>15 (4 lexemes)*</td>
<td>1 (1 lexeme)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 8/15 are imperatives of the lexeme 'receive'

Eventually native-speaker grammars of cLW explicitly describe the split-person coding (Guillôme 1836: 30-34, 115, Le Bayon 1878: 51, Guillec and Le Goff 1902: 30-2); also late eNB-T (Le Clerc 1908: §139 – variants of MP show that in T unlike L conservative coding remained a living option into 19C T). It is likewise described by 20-21C linguistic studies of NB W that draw on texts and elicitations (Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007ab, Crahé 2014; of other extensive studies of W, description is inadequate for the variety in Le Besco 1992, while the variety in McKenna 1988 is innovative). It is part of some codifications of standard Breton (Kervella 1947: §425-9; Vallée 1923, 1926: 91-2).

Exceptions to the split-person coding are nearly absent with HAVE in conservative varieties; indeed, studies do not recognise any (including Hemon 1975: §51). Here they have nevertheless been found with two MB authors: Quiquer (L, Roscoff) and Gueguen (L, Morlaix). One occurs in an early version of the Pater Noster with both authors, (1a); in all other MB versions proclitic hon replaces enclitic ny (including the earlier Gk, late 16C MB, and the cotemporeaneous Prôn, early 17C MB/W, as well as later versions of Qu, and all versions surveyed in Nédélec 1978). Quiquer in the same text otherwise regularly uses 1st/2nd person proclitics beside 3rd person enclitics in the HAVE-perfect; the one exception (1b) may be an artifact of lineation. Gueguen is remarkable, because 3rd person enclitics are regular, yet 1st/2nd person proclitics absent: 1st/2nd person objects of the HAVE-perfect seem to be avoided, but there is one other enclitic (1c), and a couple of the earliest a-forms (1d) (q.v. section 5). With imperatives, 1st/2nd person is proclitic and 3rd person enclitic in these as in other MB and early eNB-KLT texts (e.g. Gueguen's ma pardonit '1SG pardon.IMP.2PL', Mc, early 17C MB).

(1a) nep en deues ny offanset whoever 3SGM=R=be=1PL offended whoever has offended us (Do, early 17C MB; Qu, early 17C MB)

(1b) dan hiny en deues huy // digacçet davido

---

47 IN and other texts by C. Le Bris are on the cusp of innovation; a-forms are sporadic and mostly as repairs, but half a century later in L varieties, they are frequent for all objects, beside the older coding (section 5). At a cursory examination, the other 13 works by Le Bris do not change the categorial distribution of the split-person coding, but multiply lexemes found in several cells (as in ex. (1) of the main text). There is one datum in IN not counted, an apparent counterexample that by its distinctiveness underscores the generalisation: (i). It is likely that the participial second conjunct does not entail an elided syntax with HAVE, perhaps reflecting the frequent Breton counterpart of the small clauses discussed for Irish in Chung and McCloskey (1987), either directly or as an amalgam (cf. English none ... could have gone to Dunkirk or the North Sea and us not know about it, https://tinyurl.com/y4qlqkkks):

(i) ... me am bise da lazet-te, hae e reservet-hi e buez ... 1SG R=1SG=be.COND.IMPF 2SG=killed=2SG and 3SGF=kept.3SGF in-life
I would have killed YOU, and kept HER alive.

(IN, early 18C L)
to=the=one to=the=one 3SGM=be=2PL sent to=1SG

(Qu, early 17C MB)

(1c) He deues ny à anuy redimet 3SGF=be=1PL of=pain redeemed [to Mary /] who has redeemed us from pain

(Nl+, mid 17C MB)

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

(Do, early 17C MB)

These exceptions recall poorly-understood analogues in systems with otherwise very robust PCC (e.g. Baker 1996: 638n2 on Mohawk). Of interest for Breton may be oblique-subject – nominative-object unaccusatives in two systems. One is Finnish, where the PCC has a fully grammaticalised repair, so 1st/2nd person objects are accusative. The other is Icelandic, where there is no repair, so 1st/2nd person objects should be ineffable, and to some extent are. However, to some extent they are also available as nonagreeing nominatives, with lesser or greater degradation, worse for speakers that require agreement of 3rd person nominative objects, but throughout in contrast to agreement required of other 1st/2nd nominatives even when low.48

In Breton, Gueguen's grammar may be analysed beginning with the observation that the PCC is present, clearly with the imperative but arguably also with HAVE, where it is suggested by the nonce use of *a-forms just for 1st/2nd person objects (cf. section 5). The repair is also present with the imperative; with HAVE, it is unavailable with lexical HAVE by the ban on proclitics generally, and it was also unavailable with auxiliary HAVE before the participle had grammaticalised as proclitic host. When the repair was unavailable with HAVE, the equivalent of nonagreeing nominatives in Icelandic were independent pronouns (earlier) or (later) their enclitic descendants – with the same variability and liminality as in Icelandic. This is what Gueguen's two enclitics may reflect.

One verb never seems to have grammaticalised its participle as a proclitic host: HAVE, whose participle *be(ze)t* is syncretic with that of BE. A proclitic on it should look as in (2a), from prescriptive guidelines by a nonnative grammarian focusing on KLT when accusative proclitics had become archaic. However, this is unattested in MB or eNB, and ungrammatical in NB W (Le Goff 1927: 203). The gap may be morphophonological (q.v. Yang 2016) and caused by failure to innovate forms of the participle with initial consonant mutations (in (2a) pet < bet due to ho; in (2b) *p* is the basic form). Instead, conservative varieties resort to paraphrases such as 'be with' for 1st/2nd person possessums, in contrast to enclitic 3rd person possessums which are available; innovative varieties use postverbal *a*-forms (cf. Kervella 1947: §425-9). Exceptionally, an independent pronoun – analytically ambiguous between nominative and accusative as all independent forms – is found in conservative (2b). It is analysable as a stopgap (as in inflectional gaps of Irish, McCloskey and Hale 1984, Andrews 1990) or amelioration of licensing without agreement (as above for Gueguen).49

(2a) hén en deus ho pet 3SGL 3SGM=be 2PL=been
He has had you

(Valée 1923; bet > pet by mutation due to 2PL ho)

---

48 Considerable degradation is reported in "A" and some "B" varieties (Sigurðsson 1996, Schütze 1997: 4.1.1.5, Nomura 2005, Thráinsson 2007: 4.2.5.2), less in other "B" and "C" varieties (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012: 4.3), though even then unavailable in passives (where there is also participle agreement; Sigurðsson op.cit., Jónsson 1996: 4.6.3, Ussery 2012); in contrast to perfect nonagreement if the nominative is the subject of a nonfinite clause (note 43), and to a distinct amelioration by 1st/2nd - 3rd syncretism (Sigurðsson, op.cit., Sigurðsson and Holmberg, op.cit.; cf. Basque, Rezac 2008b: 101).

49 A typical contrast of innovative and conservative variety is translations of Matthew 26:11: *n’ho pézô két bépréd* ac’hannou *you will not always have me* (BSLss, mid 19C L) – *mé ne vein quet attiu guet-n-oh* *I will not always be with you* (AVImaheu, mid 19C W, the native Wo author gives this W translation side-by-side with the foregoing L translation).
To close this survey, let us turn to the strong pronoun environments of preverbal focus, coordination, and modification. The amelioration of the PCC in strong pronoun environments by focus and nonprojection of person features has analogues in systems with robust PCC (cf. Rezac 2011: 4.3 on French). In Breton, there are rare examples here of 1st/2nd person objects of HAVE as independent pronoun in these environments, but because independent pronouns are case-invariant, we cannot tell whether they are nominative or accusative (independently, attested examples are ambiguous with other structures as well).50

8.3 Appendix 3: Elements of the defective-intervention approach to the PCC

The partial specification analysis of Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2018) belongs to the general class of defective intervention analyses of the PCC. In defective intervention, quirky obliques interact with clausal phi-Agree defectively relative to fully phi-specified nominals. There are approaches to defectiveness other than partial specification, for instance directly through oblique case/Case; some require displacement of the intervener for number Agree. These variants are generally compatible with the discussion in the text, save that they do not unify quirky obliques with other quirky interveners. Partial specification may be spelled out and related to certain alternatives as follows:

**Locality:** Locality restricts match to closest goal; a simple interpretation of the partial specification approach relativises locality to person and number as distinct features, so that a person-only bearer does not intervene in number dependencies. This view faces the challenges of underspecified person and/or number on nominals that need to fully intervene, e.g. 3SG external argument of transitives. The desired result may be opted in different ways:

**Number:** It is assumed that nominals are always specified for “number” understood as number-gender-class, i.e. the node [individuation] of Harley and Ritter (2002) or [ɣ] of Kalin (2019). It may be left open whether singular and plural are both morphosyntactically present and how they are interpreted, provided gender-class picks up any slack left by underspecification.

**Person:** The minimum assumed here is that 1st/2nd person features count as person, plain “3rd” person does not at least on internal arguments, but other, “marked” 3rd person does and then behave as 1st/2nd person for the PCC (including grammaticalised animates, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Adger and Harbour 2007, Harbour 2013, Kalin 2019; logophora, Charnavel and Mateu 2014).51 A typical feature-geometric interpretation may be [π [participant [author]]], where π is marked 3rd person (see Harbour 2016 for a recent review of such proposals). On other than internal arguments, it seems reasonable that [π] is present through selection by v and Appl (cf. Adger and Harbour 2007). However, it is also possible to allow personless external arguments, and derive their obligatory intervention in person match as consequence of their number specification (either through Case, since person match past a number-specified nominal could Case-license number-bearers; or through any interaction of Agree and person-number such that match for number entails intervention for person, see references in the next point).52

---

50 To illustrate analogues, consider French je me rapelle... ‘I remember…’, where the inherent reflexive dative clitic me bars the usual repair of the PCC by a nonclitic dative in French transitives. When a 1st/2nd person accusative incurs the PCC, it is out as a bare unfocused strong pronoun, but much improved by modification; coordination; and focus, especially with fronting: *Je me rapelle toi ‘I remember you’; Je me rapelle toi dans un beau costume de bain “I remember you in a beautiful bathing suit”; Je me rapelle toi et tes amis sans problème “YOU I remember” (M.J., p.c.; cf. Rezac 2011: 4.3 with references).

51 Finnish contrasts general 3rd person (SG se, PL ne) with marked 3rd person (SG hän, PL he) which is originally animate but increasingly logophoric (Priikki 2017); a distinction is also made in the relative-interrogative general joka, animate kuka (Timberlake 1974: 7.9). The marked 3rd persons behave exactly like 1st/2nd person in split-person coding environments. Holmberg and Nikanne (2008) propose that se/ne differs from hän/he as personless.

Agree and displacement: Displacement of the quirky person-intervener is not necessary for number match across it if it does not have number though it may displace for other reasons (thus Anagnostopoulou 2003: 4.4, 5.1, 2018; Nomura 2005 analyses the Icelandic "A" data key there using displacement). In other approaches to defective intervention, the quirky person-intervener must displace. This is needed on partial intervention approaches if person intervention entails number intervention, for instance if locality is relativised to phi-sets. It is also needed on other approaches to defective intervention, for instance if quirky obliques are fully phi-specified and intervene defectively because of their case/Case.53

Phi-specification of quirky obliques and their person Agree: Evidence about the phi-specification of quirky obliques allows multiple interpretations. Key findings include: agreement/clitic morphology indexing 1st/2nd person applicative datives, even inanimate, suggests a person feature shared with 1st/2nd but not 3rd person nonobliques (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 4.2, Adger and Harbour 2007); quirky datives can be systematically invisible for clausal number-gender agreement (e.g. Taraldsen 1995); there is microparametric variation in transparency of obliques and control of a feature by a dative prevents its control by a lower element (Rezac 2008a; Atlamaz and Baker 2018; Tuite 1998; Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012). That leaves space for a variety of theories of quirkiness (e.g. Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003: 5.4; Schütze 1997: 109, Frampton and Gutmann 1999, Chomsky 2000; Collins 2005; Adger and Harbour 2007; Boeckx 2000, 2008; Bobaljik 2008, Preminger 2014; ch. 8; Rezac 2008a, Alexiadou et al. 2014, Anagnostopoulou and Sevdali 2015; Sigurðsson 2017; Atlamaz and Baker 2018). In partial intervention approaches, person-only match with a quirky oblique gives rise to 3rd/default person agreement regardless of phi-features within the oblique. Analyses have attributed the invisibility of number to the oblique case layer (Anagnostopoulou 2003 building on Taraldsen 1995; Rezac 2008a), and the "reduction" of person to mechanics of Agree matching for person but not number (ibid) or the same mechanics that hide number (Rezac 2008a, cf. also Boeckx 2000).

8.4 Appendix 4: Sources

The chief sources for conservative varieties are briefly described here (* is prefixed to material usefully discussing argumental enclitics).

For MB, standard references are Lewis and Piette (1990), very partial for the constructions here, and *Hemon (1975), invaluable but with occasional lacunae (Appendix 2). Most MB texts have been surveyed here, but detailed study has been reserved for prose.

For eNB varieties, the chief linguistic study is again Hemon (1975), rarely supplemented by studies of aspects of the grammars of individual writers (Châtelier 2016b). In eNB, the first grammars appear (Maunoir 1659, De Rostrenen 1738, Le Brigrant 1779, Dumoulin 1800, Le Gonidec 1807, Troude 1842, Hingant 1868, most focusing on L). These eventually include comprehensive descriptions of the distribution of argumental enclitics by native-speaker-grammarians (esp. cW, *Guilôme 1836, *Le Bayon 1878, *Guillevic and Le Goff 1902; also T, *Le Clerc 1908). The other aforementioned grammars omit explicit description of enclitics but reveal their distribution by examples, sometimes in minimal pairs, as do didactical materials (esp. COL, mid-18C L, and partly its antecedent Qu, mid-17C MB). Pros of conservative varieties of all periods of eNB has been surveyed.

For NB, relevant are esp. studies of W establishing the full system of pronominal argument coding (*Ternes 1970 for Wg; *Cheveau 2007ab and *Crahé 2014 for Wo, distinct varieties close in their pronominal system). Also of use are partial descriptions often with corpora (e.g.

without underspecification do have ways to model partial intervention correctly (Nevins 2007, Anagnostopoulou 2008), while other approaches that allow but do not require partial intervention make nuanced predictions (Harbour 2016). Foley et al. (2017) present intriguing evidence for a more nuanced scale of person in the PCC, but at present the repairs there fit the profile of synthetic- analytic alternations due to morphophonological gaps known to be distinct from PCC repairs (Rezac 2011: 2.3, 4.4). Foley et al. (2017) present intriguing evidence for a more nuanced scale of person in the PCC, but at present the repairs there fit the profile of synthetic-analytic alternations due to morphophonological gaps known to be distinct from PCC repairs (Rezac 2011: 2.3, 4.4).

53 To illustrate concretely: case/Case on a nominal allows match but not valuation; person and number probe separately in that order; the person probe matches but is not valued from the oblique, and only if it displaces it to be equidistant to the number probe can the latter match a lower argument (Béjar and Rezac 2003, with quirkiness as the lack of Case of Chomsky 2000; Preminger 2009, 2014: ch. 8, with quirkiness as the Case discrimination of Bobaljik 2008).
Ernault 1878, Loth 1886, 1895, 1897-8, Le Diberder 1912, McKenna 1988, Le Besco 1998, Le Pipec 2008, Le Bozec 2018), and additional corpora (e.g. DICO, BANQUE, KAN).

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; others, *Ernault 1897, *Vallée 1923). A wealth of sourced materials illustrating native-speaker usage is assembled in *Favereau (1997) and *ARBRES.

Textual abbreviations are those of Hemon (1975), DEVRI, ARBRES, which give relevant details, with the following additions or departures:


HB: First edition of 1712 is used.

MP: 19C dialect versions of the parable of the prodigal child in CHB.

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


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

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