

The Breton Double Subject Construction*

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER

Introduction

The following Breton sentences are in the *double subject construction*. In bold is the *narrow subject*, which corresponds to the subject of English or French. To the left of it the underlined *broad subject* appears, obligatorily linked to an underlined *resumptive pronoun* through which it receives its thematic interpretation.

- (1) An tamm-douar-se a zeu **gwinizh kaer** ennañ.
this bit of land R comes wheat fair in.it
Fair wheat grows on this bit of land.

(also: the bit of land that there grows fair wheat in)

(Trépos 2001: 245)

- (2) Pèr a zo kouezet **e zi**.
Per R is fallen his house
Per's house has fallen.

(Fave 1998: 51)

This widespread construction has its place in most grammars of the language; it has been studied in depth by Urien (1989ab) and Hendrick (1988). There is an analogue in Irish, McCloskey and Sells (1988), Ó Baoill and Maki (2007), and others perhaps farther afield, Doron and Heycock (1999). If it is truly a double *subject* construction rather than a more commonplace one such as dislocation, it corresponds to nothing in English or French, and theories of their syntax are designed to block it - whence its linguistic interest.

In languages like English and French, there is a subjecthood position inside the TP (IP, FinP). Only displaced arguments or expletives may occur in it. Left-peripheral DPs linked to pronouns are outside the TP; in consequence, unlike subjects in the TP, they are invisible to TP-internal phenomena such as the Extended Projection Principle or reflexive pronoun and floating quantifier antecedence, nor can they occur in structures missing nonthematic positions outside the TP, such as ECM infinitives:

- (3) a Ces arbres, ***(il)** tombe **(*tous)** **de la neige** sur leurs branches.
These trees, ***(there)** falls **(*all)** **snow** on their branches.
b On voit [**(*ces arbres)** tomber **de la neige** sur leurs branches].
We expect (for) [**(*these trees)** ***(there)** fall **snow** on their branches].

* This work is given here as completed in 2009; it complements Rezac (2011). I am grateful to participants of the Resumptives Workshop (Paris VII, June 2007) and the Fifth Celtic Linguistics Conference (Gregynog, September 2007) for comments, to M. Jouitteau for field-work, and to Denise L. for sharing her judgments. The research was partly funded by a postdoctoral grant 2006-7 to the Laboratoire de Linguistique de Nantes, and I thank H. Demirdache for her support. Thank you finally to J.-P. Angoujard, who founded the lab's interest in the languages spoken in Brittany.

In the Breton double subject construction, the broad subject does appear to be in the TP. A first reason to distinguish it from dislocation is its visibility for the V2/EPP requirement that something precede the finite verb. In Breton finite clauses, all arguments are licensed below the tensed verb. In root clauses, something must appear before the finite verb. This element is linked to the finite verb through a preverbal particle or *rannig*, glossed R, which takes different forms according to what satisfies V2/EPP: in the Leoneg dialect, a^L if it is a nominal argument and e^M otherwise (superscripts refer to an effect on the consonant of the verb). The broad subject of the double subject construction counts for V2/EPP and the form of the *rannig*, (5)e:

(4) Breton root clauses: __ R AUX/V (SU) (V.PARTICIPLE) (SU) DO PP

- (5)
- | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------|-------------|----------|---------------------------------|
| a | Warc'hoazh | e welo | Naig | ur vag | er porzh. |
| | tomorrow | R will.see | Naig | a boat | in.the port |
| b | Naig | a welo | | ur vag | er porzh |
| | | | | | warc'hoazh. |
| c | Ur vag | a welo | Naig | er porzh | warc'hoazh. |
| d | Er porzh | e welo | Naig | ur vag | warc'hoazh. |
| e | <u>Ar porzh</u> | a welo | Naig | ur vag | <u>enni</u> 'in.it' warc'hoazh. |

However, *rannig* control and V2/EPP might belong to a domain larger than the TP, and the broad subject could be analysed as a resumptive topic/focus in the left periphery of the clause (Jouitteau 2005: 5.1.2), or as the focus of a cleft like (6) where the bracketed telltale markers of clefts are all omissible.

- (6) me (an hini eo hag) a zo deuet ma zro da baeñ
 me the one it.is that R is come my turn to pay
 It's me whose turn it is to pay (lit. that it's my turn to pay)

(BY-AG: 402)

However, there is evidence in Breton that the broad subject is truly a subject, grouping it with the narrow subject against all other nonthematic elements. Four are considered here: being the subject of an infinitive (robust if rare), being the highest postverbal nominal (less clear), controlling agreement (uncertain), and determining the forms of *be* (possibly robust and certain common). The first is enough to make the broad subject out to be a subject, in agreement with Hendrick (1988) who puts it in Spec,T, yet also to show that it relates to a true resumptive rather than to a movement gap, in agreement rather with Urien (1989a). The theoretical consequences are drawn out in Rezac (2011).

The evidence is mostly drawn from a corpus. Hamstrung though a corpus is by the absence of negative evidence, the coherent narratives comprising it have the advantage of contextualization essential for some of the constructions under study, and the written form of its bulk monitors for grammaticality. It affords a look at the lie of the land and its boundaries, for those who would explore further.

A first look at broad subjects

Before turning to structures with true broad *subjects*, first a brief look at finite clauses where a preverbal DP links to a resumptive pronoun. Some might be resumptive topics or foci, some covert clefts, and some or all true double subject constructions.

Breton is a language with *resumption*. The head of a relative clause may relate to a gap in subject or object positions, but otherwise it links to a pronoun, typically signalled by verb or preposition agreement, or by possessor or object proclitic. The constraints on resumption in relative clauses and apparent double subject structures seem to be the same. In dialects that resemble most closely the Irish pattern of McCloskey (2005), the resumptive may be pretty much at any distance from its antecedent:

- (7) Ar ganevedenn, [...], a deu en eun taol-kont **kement liou** [_{RC} **a zo warni**] da veza flamm kenañ
 the rainbow R comes suddenly every colour R is on.it to be bright very
 Every colour that is on the rainbow ... becomes suddenly very bright
 (MY-OF: 28)

A common reading of clause-initial resumed DPs is that of a discourse topic. However, other readings are available:

Discourse-new indefinites and quantifiers:

- (8) rak nep piv bennak a lazhe ur bleiz a veze roet dezhañ un tamm arc'hant
 for any who some R killed a wolf R was given to.him a bit money
 for whoever killed a wolf was given a bit of money
 (GY-ST: 23-4)

- (9) Ur gêr all a zo dezhi an hevelep anv en hanternoz:
 a town another R is to.it the same name in.the north
 [The name of Caer Llion comes from Castra Legionum. Here Caer Llion ar Wisg is spoken of.] There is another town with the same name in the north:
 (AF-M: 103 note 6)

- (10) rag, gouzoud a ouzoh, eur marh [pa ne da ket] a vez kresket **ar herh dezhañ** [a goude ez a].
 a horse R is increased the oats to.him
 for, you know, a horse when it doesn't walk is given more eats and after it goes
 (MM-M 1:29)

Quantifiers over context-established domains, weak and strong:

- (11) Gwazed, merhed ha bugale vraz, pep hini a vo gantañ eur falz dioutañ:
 men, women, and children big each one R will.be with.him a sickle from.him
 Men, women, and older children, each one_i will have a_i scythe of his_i own.
 (SV-MR: 92)

Quantifiers scoping under negation (here *hani* is perhaps a negative polarity item, ARBRES s.v. *La négation*):

- (12) Hani ag an ofiserion arall ... ne ra **vad** dezhoñ er gwelet.
 any of the officers other NEG does good to.him him see
 It does no good to any of the other officers of the regiment to see him.
 (*Kammdro an Ankou*, Loeiz Herrieu, 1994 [1933, Gwenedeg])

Wh-words over both presupposed and nonpresupposed domains:

- (13) [Eas a-walc'h ... e oa d'am filhor entent] peseurt gwezenn e oa **va c'hoant warni**.
 what.kind tree R was my desire on.her
 [Easy enough ... was it for my godson to understand] what kind of a tree I desired
 (KI-ZM:16)

Many of the above examples are with intransitives. Some lack narrow subjects entirely: impersonal passives, unaccusatives with only a prepositional argument, or *be*-predications of the type *she is a baker*, expressed in Breton as *is a baker from.her* to which a broad subject may be added. Thus:

- (14) Ar yez [ma ra ganti un den] a zo anezi eur bed
 the tongue R is of.her a world
 Le langage [qu'on homme parle] est un monde [dans lequel il vit et agit].
 (HJ-ML II: 117)

However, similar transitives are perfectly possible:

- (15) Va breur a **brenin** eur gontell dezañ
 my brother R will.buy.I a knife to.him
 I will buy my brother a knife.
 (Fave 1998: 50)

The resumptive-linked DPs in these examples are nonthematic and receive their thematic interpretation through the resumptive. This makes for contrasts with thematic DPs in parallel positions on diagnostics sensitive to argumenthood or origin in the thematic domain. Consider the transitive/anticausative verb *terriñ* 'break'. The string *Nolwenn a dorro he bazh* 'Nolwenn R will.break her staff' has two analyses: a simple transitive with *Nolwenn* as narrow subject, '**Nolwenn** will break her staff', or anticausative with *Nolwenn* as a resumptive-linked DP, 'Nolwenn, **her staff** will break'. The passive *Bez e vo torret he bazh* 'EXPL R will.be broken her staff' means 'Her staff will be broken', but a resumptive-linked DP may replace the expletive, *Nolwenn a vo torret he bazh* 'Nolwenn, **her staff** will be broken'. The resumptive-linked DP in these examples is in the preverbal position, satisfies V2/EPP, and controls the rannig, just like a displaced transitive subject, but contrasts with such a displaced argument in two ways. First, transitive subjects trigger the perfect auxiliary *have* (ARBRES, s.v. *Sélection de l'auxiliaire*), while adding a resumptive-linked DP to a passive or intransitive keeps *be*. Second, transitive subjects require that linked pronouns in Condition A domains assume reflexive/emphatic forms similar to English/French *-self/-même* (ARBRES, s.v. *Pronom réfléchi*), while a resumptive-linked DP even in Condition A domains links to an ordinary pronoun as its resumptive (Hendrick 1988: 98-101). Thus resumptive-linked DPs unlike transitive subjects do not count for the *have/be* alternation and reflexive antecedence.

Nonfinite structures

Infinitives of the specified subject, control, and raising/ECM type in Germanic and Romance have a left-peripheral position where only the narrow subject or an expletive can occur: Spec,T. Thus the following contrasts between finite and infinitival clauses:

- (16) a Two books were placed on the shelf. (neutral order)

- b There were two books placed on the shelf. (expletive, postverbal subject)
 c On the shelf were placed two books. (locative inversion)
 d On the shelf, two books were placed. (topicalization)
- (17) a The shelf has enough room [for two books to be placed on it.]
 b The shelf has enough room [for there to be two books placed on it.]
 c The shelf has enough room [*for on it to be placed two books.]
 d The shelf has enough room [*for on it two books to be placed.]

Breton infinitives are similar. Specified subject infinitives occur as subordinate clauses headed by various prepositional complementizers, and as independent narrative infinitives optionally headed by *hag* (Stephens 1990).

- (18) a Prepositional infinitives: P°/C° (+ da₁) + ___ (+ da₂) + infinitival VP.
 b Narrative infinitives: (hag) + ___ (+ da/hag) + infinitival VP

The ___ position can host but a single argument, the narrow subject (Stephens 1990: 154, Favereau 1997: §698; Hendrick 1988: 142). The object and prepositional phrases must follow. The narrow subject may do so as well, at least for intransitives.¹

- (19) a Daoust da **loened cheptel** da greskiñ *t* er vro-mañ, ...
 despite to cattle to grow.INF in.the land-this
 b Daoust da greskiñ loened cheptel er vro-mañ.
 c *Daoust da er vro-mañ_i da greskiñ loened cheptel
 (D.L.)

When a pronominal narrow subject follows the prepositional complementizer, it is realized as agreement on it, in the manner of pronouns after prepositions generally:

- (20) Daoust da Yann / (daoust) dezhañ / evitañ da vezañ kozh e oa serzh bepred.
 despite to Yann despite to.him for.him to be old R was fit always
 Despite Y./him being old, he was still fit.
 (Stephens 1990: 162, Kervella 1995: §278)

The less-studied narrative infinitive seems to be much the same:

- (21) (Hag) Yann/eñ da lenn al lizher.
 HAG Yann/he to read.INF the letter
 Yann/he read the letter.
 (Stephens 1990:163)

- (22) ha mond Yann diouzhtu ha ...
 HAG go.INF Yann immediately and
 Yann went immediately and ...
 (TA-LW: 73)

One element other than the narrow subject may appear in the pre-infinitival position: the broad subject of a double subject construction. Though unmentioned in grammars, the corpus instances are robust. All are built on intransitives like *bezañ* 'be', *mont* 'go', *treiñ*

¹ D.L. is a speaker of Kerneveg (Quimperlé), p.c. to M. Joutteau.

'turn'; these are all verbs that also allow a post-infinitival narrow subject, the availability of which elsewhere remains to be ascertained.

First, the prepositional-complementizer adjunct infinitives:²

- (23) Daoust d'ar vro-mañ da greskiñ **loened cheptel enni/e-barzh**
 despite to the land-this to grow.INF cattle in.it/within(.it)
 'Despite cattle growing in this land'
 (D.L.)³
- (24) daoust d'an tevinier beza enno **kalz a frankiz.**
 despite to the dunes be.INF in.them lots of freedom
 [So many horse-drawn carriages! It was difficult to find place for them,] despite
 there being lots of space in the dunes.
 (SV-MR: 30)
- (25) daoust d'ezan beza hir **e ziouskouarn!**
 despite to.him be.INF long his ears
 [for he was a man of living faith,] despite having heard a lot of racy things!
 (KI-ZM: 131; D.L.)
- (26) Daoust dezhañ bezañ lemm **e lagad** [n'en devoa ket taolet evezh e...]
 despite to.him be.INF sharp his eyes
 Despite his eyes being sharp, [he had not paid attention that...]
 (KF-DG: 130)
- (27) Evit-han da redek **he wad.**
 despite-him to run.INF his blood
 [Il ne cesse pas de faire son devoir] quoique son sang coule.
 (*Kanaouenn al levier, Barzaz Breizh*, H. de la Villemarqué, 1963: 359)
- (28) [Yannig ha Jobig, gwiv hag ampart c'hoazh,]
 daousto dez-**he** bout é redek **o nav vlez ha pevar-ugent**
 despite to-them be.INF PROG run their nine years and eighty
 [Yannig et Jobig, deux bonshommes enjoués et encore vaillants,] bien que dans
 leur quatre-vingt-neuvième année,
 (ML-BV: 176)
- (29) [Du-hont ... e vez gwelet tud gwisket kran ... ha teltennoù savet war ar sabl]
 evit d'ar re a ya da neuial bezañ diwallet **o c'hroc'hen** deus an heol berv.
 for to the ones that go to swim be guarded their skin from the sun burning
 [There ... are seen finely clothed folks ... and tents raised on the sand] in order
 for those who go swimming to be their skins guarded from the burning sun.
 (BY-AG: 357)

² In these examples in Breton *rede* 'run', *mont* 'go', *don't* 'come', *kreskiñ* 'grow', *sevel* 'rise' are intransitive, as is *treiñ* 'turn', cf. *Treiñ a reaz eur frouden enn he benn* 'turn did an idea in his head' = 'Il lui passa dans la tête une idée bizarre', Troude 1886 s.v. *passer*). *Beza(ñ)/bout* is likewise intransitive 'be' here. In the lexical use of 'be', 'have', *bezañ* is the infinitive of 'be' and in some dialects of 'have' (distinct in finite forms), but not for SV and KI who use *kaout* 'have', and it cannot be used to express the analogue of English *The dunes have lots of space in them* where Breton must use 'be' (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). In their auxiliary use, *bezañ* is the infinitive of passive 'be' as in (29) and perfect 'have/be' everywhere.

³ *Enni* is more literary than *ebarzh*. The latter is glossed 'within.it' despite not showing overt agreement, since as Urien (1989a: 212) shows it is the sole adverb that behaves as if it had a resumptive *pro*.

Next narrative infinitives:

- (30) Ha me mond **eur zahad droug ennon**.
 HA me go.INF a bag-ful anger in.me
 I became angry.
 (MM-M 1: 36; D.L.)
- (31) Hag ar jeant ha dont da soñj dezhañ ez edo atav e zaou breizh war e choug
 HA the giant HA come to thought to.him that was still his two preys on his back
 And the giant realized that his two victims were still on his back.
 (TA-LW: 76)
- (32) (Setu) hag hen a trei **eur froudenn** enn he benn.
 thus HA he HA turn a current en his head
 (Voilà qu') il lui passa par la tête un idée. / Une idée bizarre lui passa par la tête.
 (Troude 1886, sv. *bizarre, style, idée*)

Both are found with nonnative but expert authors, having remained through re-editions:

- (33) [Kent din bezañ kromm **va c'hein**], e oan eskuit hag helavar
 before to.me be.INF curved my back
 Before my back was bowed, [I was prompt and eloquent]
 (*Canu llywarch hen, Hor Yezh* 1938: 19, M. Klerg)
- (34) Hag ar mab hena mont **droug enhan**
 and the son oldest to.go evil in.him
 And the oldest son became angry.
 (*Sarmoniou an Aotrou Quéré, J. Quéré, ed. K. Jézégou, 1906*)

Obligatory control infinitives also have broad subjects, as their silent controlled element. The examples are rather intricate:

- (35) beza ma teu kentoh d'ar re-man_x [PRO_x sevel **c'hoant ganto** da zrailla galleg genen]
 although comes rather to these rise.INF desire with.them to cut French with.me
 although these ones happen rather to want to speak in French with me
 (MY-OH: 3)
- (36) Me, neuze, o klevet anezañ a zo tost din_x [PRO_x mond **droug ennon**;_i] hag ...
 me, then, hearing him R is near to.me to.go anger in.me and
 I, then, hearing him, almost get angry and (say to him).
 (MY-OH: 113)
- (37) ha tost e oa dezhañ_x [PRO_x da vezañ graet **tro ar bed** gantañ;_i]
 and near R was to.him to have done turn the world by.him
 and he had nearly done the turn of the world
 (TA-LW: 96)
- (38) emaoun-me_x, PRO_x en eur ober neuz PRO_x da veza lorc'h ennoun
 making appearance to be pride in.me
 [Le chat!] dis-je, en faisant semblant d'être fier
 (KJ-RT: 38)
- (39) Douarneneziz_x o deus anv PRO_x da vezañ distag-meurbet **o c'halon** ouz ar baourentez
 D 3PL have name to be unattached-very their heart to the poverty
 Douarnenezians have a reputation of their hearts being very liberal to poverty.
 (DY-DI: 15)

(40) eo bet brudet ar Vro-Vagan_X PRO_X da veza pinvidig he douar.
 is been renowned the Bagan Country to be rich her land
 [over time] the land of the Bagan Country has been renowned as rich

(SV-PI: 204)

The matrix clauses selecting the infinitives are locutions such as *dont da X V-INF* lit. 'come to X V-INF', meaning 'X happens to V-INF', and *bezañ tost da X V-INF*, lit. 'be close to X V-INF', meaning 'X almost Vs'. The matrix argument *X* normally must control the silent narrow subject of the infinitive, not any other empty position. This restriction is one reason for positing the special element PRO reserved to subject positions, or its theoretical equivalents. In these examples however, the narrow subject is overt and postverbal, and the matrix *X* argument controls rather a pronoun inside the infinitive – arguably by the mediation of a broad subject PRO (cf. McCloskey and Sells 1988). That is, the infinitives correspond to finite double subject constructions like the following:

(41) Neuze ar mezhvier a yae **droug ennan**:
 then the drunkard R went anger in.him
 Alors l'ivrogne se mettait en colère:

(KJ-RT: 90, cf. MY-OH: 113, UF-KB 2: 204)

The striking and telling character of such control through a broad subject is best brought out by trying out parallel structures in English or French: **he was about PRO to be finished a turn of the world by him* for *he was about PRO to finish a turn of the world*.⁴

One construction presently ambiguous between control and prepositional infinitive is the negative imperative, composed of frozen *arabat* 'forbidden' + *be* + *da* + *X* + *INF*. *Da* + *X* is either an argument of *arabat*, or a prepositional complementizer of the infinitive.

(42) Met arabat deoc'h bezān **re a vall** warnoc'h.
 but forbidden to.you to.be too.much of haste on.you
 But don't be too much in haste.

(BY-AG: 205)

The foregoing infinitives indicate that broad and narrow subjects form an exclusive group, the *subjects* to which refer the constraints on specified subject and control infinitives. In them, the resumptive-linked DP cannot be in an A'-position of the type *The dunes(,) there's lots of freedom in (them)*, since infinitives do not license this position. Nor can it reflect a cleft of the type *Despite me being *(the one) whose blood runs* for (27): it is impossible to drop nonfinite *bezañ* 'be', transform finite *red* 'runs' to an infinitive, omit *an hini* 'the one', and code the focus *me* as complementizer agreement.

Another nonfinite structure seems to single out the broad and narrow subjects: small clauses. They are not as well understood as infinitives, but have the virtue of being attested in grammars in the double subject construction. Breton small clauses have the format in (43) and are exemplified in (44) (cf. Chung and McCloskey 1987 for Irish). They are built on a variety of predicates (types *Kate – strong / to the city / his friend /*

⁴ Rather than control, the foregoing constructions might involve 'raising of the object of a preposition', where *X* raises from the subject position of the infinitive to the matrix prepositional object (see McCloskey 1983 for Irish). Their significance remains the same, for just as PRO can only be a subject, so can a raisee.

arrived late), and occur as independent clauses in narration, as concessive adjuncts, and without *hag* under perception verbs and prepositional complementizers.

(43) Small clause format: (HAG) (SUBJ) (HAG) PRED (SUBJ)
(NB: *hag* is independently 'and' and a relative complementizer; **hag hag*)

(44) Labourat a ra c'hoazh, ha **hi** kozh.
work R does still HAG she old
She is still working, although she is old.

(Kervella 1995: §813)

(45) Ha laouen **Bilzig**.
HAG happy B.
Bilzig was happy.

(LF-B: 57)

They are common with the double subject construction (the predicate is in italics here):

(46) Ne oa ket evit hen ober, hag eñ nerzh dezhañ kouskoude.
HAG he strength to.him nevertheless
He was not able to do it, despite him being strong.

(Kervella 1995: §813)

(47) ar zelaouerien, hag int ken digor o diou-skouarn...
the listeners, HAG (=despite) they so open their ears
The listeners, despite their ears [being] so open, ...

(Trépos 2001: §626)

(48) Ha hi he dorn ouzh al lamp petrol ... [Ha hi gaoliata ar bank,]
And she her hand to a petrol lamp ... [and straddled the bench,]

(BY-AG: 136)

(49) Hag ar Brusianed kemeret Pariz ganto.
and the Prussians taken Paris by.them

(BY-AG: 248)

There is an interesting parallelism between double subject constructions and resumptive modification structures. For finite clauses, the modification analogue is a finite resumptive relative, as in the alternative translation of (1) (Urien 1989a, Fave 1998; the relative reading is forced by a complementizer like *hag* before the rannig). For small clauses, the analogue is a resumptive AP, unavailable in English or French (Hingat 1868: §211, Le Clerc 1986 [1911]: §128b.1° rem, §129c, §147d rem, Hemon 1995: §23, §41):⁵

⁵ Mittendorf and Sadler (2008) study such APs in Welsh, where they occur as both modifiers and after *be* + the predicative particle *yn* in independent clauses, the latter being perhaps the only instance of something like double subject construction in Welsh (as opposed to resumptive focus, Borsley et al 2007: 123, 207). They observe that adjectives that change their stem vowel in concord agree with neither of the DPs involved, though earlier they could agree with either, and in Arabic they agree with the narrow subject. Thus cf. the concord of the simple modifier *bachgen byr* 'boy(MSG) short(MSG)', *merch fer* 'girl(FSG) short(FSG)', versus the resumptive modifier *merch fyr ei thymor* 'girl(FSG) short(MSG) her temper(FSG)'. These examples also show that the resumptive like the simplex modifier does undergo initial consonant lenition after FSG but not MSG nouns, *byr/ber* > *fyr/fer*, and so also as predicate in *Mae Siân yn fyr/*fer (ei thymor)* 'is Siân(FSG) PRED short (her temper)'.
In Breton, there is no concord save modifier lenition: *ur stêr vras/*bras* 'a river big' from adjective

- (50) pa voe gwelet [ur vagig [he goueliou digor]] o tont eus tu an enezenn
 when was seen a little.boat her sails open a-coming from side the island
 When there was seen a little *boat with her sails unfurled* (*boat its/whose sails unfurled) coming from the direction of the island

(RJ-GW: 107)

These constructions offer clues for analyzing the double subject construction in general. An adjective phrase with a free pronoun and a narrow subject for the adjective gives rise to a modifier if adjoined in a DP, and to a small clause if predicated of the DP. In the same way, a verb phrase (or rather T'/Fin' with its *rannig*) with a free pronoun and its narrow subject can modify an NP as a relative or be predicated of a DP to create the double subject construction (cf. Doron and Heycock 1999).

Postverbal placement

Broad subjects always occur to the left of all the arguments of a predicate: there are no instances of a resumed DP between the subject and the object, for example. However, perhaps they do not always occur at the left periphery of finite clauses, before the verb. Postverbal broad subjects are expected if the verb can sometimes raise past the usual position of a broad subject (e.g. Spec,T), or if they can occur in one of the variety of postverbal positions that are known to be available to narrow subjects:

- (51) N' en deus ket (Yann) seblantet (Yann) karout ar vugale.
 NEG 3SGM has not Yann seemed Yann to.love the children

(Jouitteau 2005: 146, cf. Hendrick 1988: 106 note 8, 157)

However, postverbal subjects have been claimed to be impossible. Urien (1989a: 209-210) states that one does not have beside *Yun a ziver ar gwad diouzh e zorn* 'Yun R flows the blood from his hand' an internal version **Pa ziver Yun ar gwad diouzh e zorn* 'When flows Yun the blood from his hand', beside the ordinary *Pa ziver ar gwad diouzh dorn Yun* 'When flows the blood from (the) hand (of) Yun'. Hendrick (1988: 106 notes 6, 8) likewise finds that Breton speakers do not accept postverbal broad subjects. He expects them to be available at least when there is no narrow subject, and proposes they are not because of discourse conditions on them, beyond the pale of sentential syntax.

A large and varied corpus such as Urien's or the one here comes in useful, because it provides opportunities for meeting even difficult contextual requirements. Indeed, Urien (1989a: 210) finds a couple of exceptions to his statement, and there are more here.

The examples can be put into two groups, ones where the putative broad subject is adjacent to the constituent hosting its resumptive, and rarer ones where it is not. The latter

bras, and transitive *ur stêr vihan c'hlas* 'a river small (*bihan*) blue (*glas*)'. For resumptive modifiers, lenition is possible: *ur stêr bras/vras he genou* 'a river(FSG) big her mouth' with adjective *bras* 'big' (Hemon 1995: §20). It suggests that they do not derive from a relative clause *ur stêr a zo bras/*he he genou* 'a river R is big her mouth', as predicate adjectives do not lenite; independently, *zo* cannot be dropped (unlike *eo* with a post-copular subject). The optionality of lenition is regular for complex modifiers, e.g. *ur stêr vras/*bras* 'a river big' but *ur stêr bras/vras-meurbet* 'a river big-very', *stêr bras/vras ar Faouët* '[the] river big of.the Faouët'. The reverse order *ur stêr he genou bras* is also possible and then lenition is (probably) not.

involve either the *be* auxiliary of passives or the *be* copula. The passives are interesting because changing the *be*-auxiliary to *have* and omitting the *by*-phrase yields a nearly synonymous transitives with a transitive narrow subject for the the broad subject: *Pa he do an arme noar treuzet ar ganol* 'when the black army will have crossed the channel'.

- (52) Pa vezo an arme noar treuzet **ar ganol** ganti, ... e skoimp a-unan
 when will.be the army black crossed the channel by it
 When the black army well have traversed the channel, we will strike all together.
 (LI-EK I: 147, cf. Urien 1989a: 210)
- (53) ... peogwir e oa hemañ troet **e gein** gantañ
 ... because R was this.one turned his back by.him
 ... because this one had turned his back
 (BY-AG: 125)

The rest involve the *be*-copula. The first is of interest because if *lod all* were preverbal, the auxiliary would probably be *zo* as discussed later on.⁶ So *lod all* either is never in the right configuration to condition *zo*, or the choice of *zo* applies after the verb raises higher.

- (54) [Mar deus tud hag a zo inouus, ...]
 ez eus lod all eur blijadur tremen ganto eun eur pe ziou.
 is some others a pleasure pass.INF with.them an hour or two
 [If there are people that are annoying, ...] there are others that it is a pleasure to spend an hour or two with them.
 (AF-HG: 110, see Urien 1989a: 210)
- (55) [Ha m'en dije gouzet mestr ar Vari Vorgan]
 e oa an den dianav-se **eur harr gamm** outañ!
 R was the man unknown-this a leg game to.him
 [And if the master of the M.M. knew] that this unknown man had a game leg!
 (BY-TM: 46)
- (56) poltred diouti hec'h-unan [a zo Mari lorc'h enni gantañ]
 picture of herself R is Mari pride in.her with.it
 a picture of herself that Mary is proud of
 (Guilliot 2006: 1894, data by M. Jouitteau from a native speaker from Carhaix)
- (57) Eur wech e oa, pe ne oa ket, ... hag e oa eun den **e hano** Mizerig.
 once there was, or was not ... there WAS a man his name M
 (KI-ZM: 77)
- (58) Erruout a reaz gant eur manac'h **he hano Romen**, hag ar manac'h-ma...
 he fell in with a monk his name Romen, and this monk...
 (MG-BZ: 21 March)

One can imagine alternative analyses of these examples.⁷ It is worth noting that a common naming-construction is like the last example save with the broad subject preverbal: *Me a zo Pèr Toullgoad va ano* 'I R is Pèr Toullgoad my name' (BY-TV: 48).

⁶ M. Jouitteau p.c.

⁷ One might take the broad subject of the passives as narrow subject predicated of an adjectival participle phrase containing the narrow subject as the Ancient Greek accusative of respect, *troet e gein* 'turned [in respect to] his back' like *tuphlòs tòn noûn* 'blind [in] mind' (and so also some instances above, *hir e ziskouarn* 'long (of) his ears'. But there is no warrant for an accusative of respect, because unlike in Greek,

The second group has the broad subject at the edge of the narrow subject containing the resumptive:

- (59) ma teufe ar c'haor **he bronnou** da ehana bera!
 so.that should.come the goat her teats to pause.INF drip.INF
 so that the goat's teats should ceasing dripping.
 (KI-ZM: 103)
- (60) [... e oa aet Naig da bardon Itron Vari ar Joa;
 hag a zo houmañ **he chapel** savet du-hont
 who R is this.one_i her_i chapel raised over-there
 [N. had gone to the Pardon of Lady M. of Joy] whose chapel is raised over there
 (BY-AG: 366)
- (61) ... stag deus kumun Triagad hag a zo houmañ **hec'h iliz-parrez** ... diazezet war an uhel
 next to commune T. that R is this.one her church-parish set on the hill
 ... next to the commune of Triagat whose parish church is ... set on high
 (BY-AG: 9)
- (62) ... d'ar mare ma oa c'hoazh Napoleon III **e vazh impalaer** gantañ
 at a time that was still Napoleon III his sceptre imperial with.him
 at a time when Napoleon III still had his imperial sceptre
 (BY-AG: 28)

Here some broad subjects fitting this description are particularly low. In one (albeit oral) example, it follows the participle:

- (63) [Pa veze digoret klas, ober tro d'ar park tout, e ben]
 e peze troc'het da bark **an hanter de outañ** gant ar falz vihan
 R you.have cut your field a half from of.it with the sickle small
 [Quand tu avais ouvert la coupe, fait le tour du champ,] eh ben tu avais coupé la
 moitié de ton champ avec la faucille
 (MP-BD: 34)

In others, it co-occurs with so-called long head movement of an infinitive and a participle before the verb, which seems to raise the highest postverbal element (Rezac 2004, Jouitteau 2005). The broad subject then ought to start out structurally lower than they:

- (64) Koueza 'reaz Loeiza **he meud** en he dorn.
 fall did Loeiza her thumb in her hand
 Loeiza became disillusioned (*thumb fall in hand* 'become disillusioned')
 (BY-TM: 132)
- (65) Kouezet e vije bet, sur-awalc'h, Jul Ferry **e veud** en e zorn...
 fallen R would.be been sure enough J. F. his thumb in his hand
 Jules Ferry would have been disillusioned...
 (BY-AG: 95)

These examples might be analysed quite differently, as [_{DP} [_{DP} broad subject] [_{DP} narrow subject]], thinking of early Modern English *Pallas her glass* for *Pallas's glass* (Lass 1999: 146, Allen 2008: 6.5), Norwegian *Per sin bok* 'Per his book', German *dem Hans*

the participle / adjectival phrases always contain a pronoun resumptive to a preceding DP in the clause.

sein Buch 'the Hans.DAT his book', or Alsatian French *Prends ça pour Pierre son chien* 'Take that as Pierre's dog' (Grevisse-Goosse 2008: §354.R3). But such DPs should have a general distribution, while *war ar c'haor he bronnoù* 'on the goat's teats' is never found.

To end on a particularly fascinating potverbal broad subjects, the following two versions of the same sentence have a variety of analytical possibilities, depending on where the clausal boundaries are put and how the structure of the complement clause is analyzed.

- (66) a Santout 'ran Mamm-gozh he gwazhiennoù o virviñ gant ar c'hoant flapiñ.
 feel I.do grandma her veins a-boiling with the desire to.chat
 I have a feeling that grandma's veins are boiling with the desire to chat.
 b Santout 'ran Mamm-gozh o virviñ he gwazhiennoù gant ar c'hoant flapiñ.
 (EM-H: 46, published vs. PDF)

Agreement

Agreement in Breton is of three kinds with different properties and underlying mechanisms (Stump 1984, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006). In most contexts, both pre/post-verbal overt subjects co-occur with a 3SG verb, and only silent pronouns control other agreement suffixes. However, a negated verb agrees with a *preverbal* subject, by the same suffixes as elsewhere reflects a silent pronoun. The verb *have* is special: it always agrees with a subjects anywhere, at least in the Leoneg dialect. For all three scenarios, it may be asked whether broad subjects behave like narrow subjects.

Consider first broad subjects as silent pronouns coded by agreement suffixes. They do very rarely occur, but mostly for *have*, whose evidence is suspect as will be seen.

- (67) Hag a forz da chom da zelled outañ em-oa savet c'hoant ganin e brena.
 I-have risen desire with.me him buy
 And by staying to look at him, I came to want to buy it. (MM-M 2: 31)
- (68) N' he doa ket faotet dezi gwiska he botou-lèr o zalonou uhel-pik.
 NEG she-had not liked to.her put.on her boots-leather their heels high-very
 She did not want to to put on her leather boots with extra-high heels. (BY-TV: 121)
- (69) met biskoazh n' d-eus fellet dezhi mont war-gil
 but never NEG she-have liked to.her go a-back (EM-H: 52)

There are apparent counter-examples where an agreeing verb is shared by two conjuncts, its agreement acting as the narrow subject of the first but the broad subject of the second:

- (70) ne vijent ket bet adreñket ha lakaet an doenn warno!
 NEG would.be.3SG not been restored and put the roof on.them
 [What a pity] they have not been restored and a roof put over them!
 (SV-PI: 262)

However, these need not imply that the string combining the agreeing verb and the second conjunct is grammatical, *ne vijent ket bet lakaet an doenn warno*, any more than the English translation implies the grammaticality of **they have not been a roof put over them*. Rather, the full form of the second conjunct might correspond only indirectly to the first via an ellipsis that ignores agreement, e.g. *ne-vije-ket-bet lakaet an doenn warno* 'they NEG would.be.3SGS not been put the roof on them', just as the full form of the second conjunct in the English translation would be *a roof has not been put over them*.

Perhaps quite different is the following 3SG verb followed by the 'echoic' pronoun, *hi*. In the Leoneg dialect and standard Breton, echoic pronouns are emphatic in meaning but enclitic to an agreeing verb or preposition, and a noun or participle with a possessor or object proclitic (Stump 1984, Timm 1994). However, in Kerneveg including BY, they need not be emphatic, not so closely dependent on agreement, and potentially at quite a distance from the verb (German 2007). Their historical antecedents did not depend on agreement and such uses remain, e.g. *ha lennet hi al leor* 'and [having] read she the book' (ME) (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). So *hi* is a postverbal broad subject, but since it is 3SG it cannot be seen whether it is an agreeing one.

- (71) ... peogwir e oa-hi dija, heb gouzout dezhi, **he** c'halon o vont
 because R was-she already without knowing her heart a-going
 ... because her heart, without her knowing, was already going
 (BY-AG: 193)

The next agreement scenario is a broad subject before a negated verb other than *have*. Narrow subjects in this position agree, as if the negation forced pick-up by a pronoun to repair a movement violation, though one that does not seem to impose any interpretative restrictions (cf. Stump 1984, Schafer 1995, Jouitteau 2005).

- (72) a ar vugale [a lenn/*lennont] b ar vugale na [lennont/*lenn] ket
 the children R read/*read.they the children NEG read.they/*read not

Urien (1989a: 205) claims that this agreement cannot be controlled by a broad subject (or the head of a relative clause, the same configuration for him). The claim seems solid. The couple of exceptions below against scores of confirmations in the corpus again involve *have*. This contrast between broad and narrow subjects might bespeak a difference in their origin. If broad subjects originate within the TP but high enough not to move past negation, they would trigger no rescuing pronoun.

- (73) [Ar re n'o doa ket fuzuilhoù] ne deue/*deue-nt ket ganto **filc'hier**
 those who did not have guns NEG come/*come-they not with.them scythes
 Those who did not have guns brought scythes.
 (Urien 1989a: 205)
- (74) ar hasted a zizaillo-ze n' o doa ket fellet dezo troha eeun
 the bitches of scissors NEG 3PL had not wanted to.them cut straight
 those bitches of scissors did not want to cut straight
 (EM-M: 16)
- (75) Hi, [hag he-doa karet kemend-all,] n'he doa ket fellet dezhi leuskel he relegou ganto
 she NEG 3SGF had not liked to.her leave her remains with.them

She, [who had loved so much,] did not want to leave her remains with them [to honor].'

(HJ-MB: 132)

The final scenario involves the verb *have*. *Have* is the only Breton verb to agree with both a preverbal and postverbal overt subject as well as a silent one. Hendrick (1988) claims that it also obligatorily agrees with a preceding broad subject:

- (76) a Plijet en/*o deus d'ar vugale sellout ouzh ar tele.
 pleased 3SG/*PL have to the children look at the TV
 b Ar vugale o deus plijet dezho/*da Ø sellout ouzh an tele
 the children 3PL have pleased to.them/*to look at the TV

(Hendrick 1988: 79, 81, 90)

However, in investigating the agreement of *have*, one must proceed with the utmost care. Consider the following apparent counter-example to Hendrick's generalization:

- (77) Neoazh ar soudarded n'en deus ket faotet dezhe ober netra [enep d'ar bobl]
 Still the soldiers NEG 3SGM-have not want to.them do anything
 Yet the soldiers did not want to do anything [against the people].

(Loeiz Herrieu, letter, 6/6/1917)

The example is irrelevant because in the Gwenedeg dialect, where *have* fails to agree with overt 3rd person *narrow* subjects. This is true of much Tregereg and Kerneveg as well, optionally or obligatorily (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008), and Hendrick's data are from Kerneveg speakers. By contrast, in Leoneg and the literary standards based on it, *have* must agree. So the status of *have* agreement above is difficult to evaluate: it might be comparable to the prescriptive *whom* in *Whom does it seem is the best candidate?*, probably not part of core grammar (Lasnik and Sobin 2000). The same qualms apply to examples in the corpus where *have* agrees with a *pro*-dropped or pre-negation broad subject, as HJ, BY, and EM are all Kerneveg writers (and MM-M is an oral text).

A salient property of all these examples (save the one from MM-M) is that there is no narrow subject: the broad subject is added to the psych-unaccusatives *fellout*, *faotañ*, *plijout* 'like', with a clausal argument and prepositional phrase experiencer linked to the broad subject. This is an extremely common broad subject context. Rarer are configurations where the verb *have* has both a narrow and broad subject. For the majority of them, the narrow subject is a silent pronoun which must and does agree, pre-empting the broad subject. In the remaining few, sometimes there is no conflict, and once it is the broad subject that controls agreement:

- (78) Va hoar-kaer Maragrid he-doa **he c'hoar** dimezet gand eul labourer er porz
 my sister-in-law M 3SGF-had her sister married with a labourer in.the port
 My sister in law's Margarid's sister had married with a labourer in the part

(BC-SD: 189)

- (79) Martinika he deus **an dud** enni ar memez rikouriou
 Martinique(F) 3SGF have the people(MPL) in.her the same resources
 In Martinique people have the same resources [...]

(FV-RM)

FV/Fave is a Leoneg writer, for whom the agreement of *have* should be robust, and for whom the narrow subject controls agreement in object fronting and resumptive relatives.

There are no sure conclusions to draw from such meager data, only questions that are now more clearly formulated.

Forms of *be*

The last diagnostics grouping broad and narrow subjects against all else are the forms of *be* (Hendrick 1988; on *be*, see Kervella 1995: §206, Fave 1998: 63ff., Hewitt 1988, Favereau 1997: §441-3, German 2007). Of interest here are the forms of the present indicative *be* with an overt subject in Leoneg, which depend on the subject's position, definiteness, and the presence of a locative argument in the preverbal position:

- | | | | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (80) | a | Ar/ur vag the/a boat | (A) ZO (R) is | er porzh / gwenn. outside / white | [SU ___] |
| | b | Er porzh / gwenn | EZ EUS | ur vag | [___ SU _{-def}] |
| | c | Gwenn | EO | ar vag. | [___ SU _{+def}] |
| | d | Er porzh | EMANÑ | ar vag | [___ SU _{+def} + LOC] |

Urien (1989b) investigates whether in sentences with a preverbal broad subject and a postverbal narrow subject, there appears *ez eus / emañ / eo* as when the narrow subject is postverbal otherwise, or whether (*a*) *zo* is also possible because the broad subject that precedes is akin to a narrow subject in that position. Grammars report vacillation, *Pêr a zo / ez eus klask warnañ* 'Pêr is search on.him' (Trépos 2001: 45). Urien finds that virtually only (*a*) *zo* is possible in Leoneg, and Fave (1998: 51) confirms.

- | | | | | | |
|------|--|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| (81) | <u>Mari</u> | A ZO / EMANÑ | ar vilin-gafe | en <u>he</u> dorn. | → A ZO in Leoneg |
| | Mari | | the mill-coffee | in her hand | |
| | Mari has her coffee-grinder in her hand. | | | | |

(Urien 1989b:119)

Urien relates the dominance of (*a*) *zo* to the rannig *a* which optionally appears before *zo*. As mentioned in the introduction, any preverbal nominal argument triggers the rannig *a*, whether narrow subject, broad subject, or moved object. Urien posits that *a* morphologically only compatible with *zo*, not *emañ/eo*, so *zo* is forced by a broad subject simply in virtue of its being a nominal (cf. Hendrick 1996: 86).

However, *a* is also triggered by a moved object, and in that context it is possible to see whether the copula depends, like the rannig, only on there preceding a nominal argument, or whether it differentiates broad/narrow subjects from moved objects. It seems that a moved object triggers *emañ/eo*, not (*a*) *zo* (Hendrick 1988: 105-6 note 2).

- | | | | | | |
|------|---|-----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|
| (82) | a | Moved object: | DP ₁ BE [... __ _i ...] | → <i>eo/emañ</i> | / <i>a</i> rannig |
| | b | Narrow subject: | DP ₁ BE [... __ _i ...] | → (<i>a</i>) <i>zo</i> | / <i>a</i> rannig |
| | c | Broad subject: | DP ₁ BE [... pronoun _i ...] | → (<i>a</i>) <i>zo</i> | / <i>a</i> rannig |
- (Leoneg)

Thus extracted objects take *emañ*, unlike broad subjects:

- (83) Petra EMA en e zoñj [ober ___]?
 what is(it) in his thought do.INF
 What is it in his thought to do?

(Fave 1998: 141)

- (84) Ar steriou... a zo mantruz [pegement a vuhez a vez enno]
 the rivers R is stunning how.much of life R is in.them
 It is stunning how much life is in the rivers.

(MY-OF: 95, cf. MY-MI: 122)

These examples come from Leoneg, but Hendrick's observation is made on the basis of Kerneveg, where the relevant contrast also exists. Narrow subjects use *zo*, extracted objects must use *emañ/eo*, and broad subjects allow both:

- (85) **Per** A ZO o klask Mona er c'hoad
 Per R is PRG seek Mona in.the wood
 Per is looking for Mona in the woods.

(Hendrick 1988: 105-6 note 2)

- (86) Per EMANÑ / *A ZO **Mona** o klask ___ er c'hoad.
 Per is R is Mona PRG seek in.the wood
 Mona is looking for Per in the woods.

(Hendrick 1988: 105-6 note 2)

- (87) Yann a zo / eo bet sentet outañ / komzet anezhañ gant ar vugale
 Yann R is / is been obeyed to.him spoken of.him by the children
 Yann was obeyed / talked about by the children

(Hendrick 1988: 84, 102 note 12)

- (88) Peogwir ar re-ze a zo [**moyen [da lakaad anezo]] (...)
 because these R is means to put them
 Because these ones can be worn (no matter what the weather is).**

(MM-M 11: 20)

If these contrasts hold true, broad and narrow subjects form an exclusive group for the *be*-alternation, and that makes for another property that identifies them both subjects: for example, Spec,T (cf. Hendrick 1988: 74-5, 85). Two consequences may be mentioned. First, whilst broad subjects in infinitives are rare, those followed by *a zo* are legion, and leave no doubt that a broad subject can be indefinite as in (9) or link to a deeply embedded resumptive as in (88). Second, broad subjects and heads of resumptive relatives pattern alike for *be* and contrast with moved objects and heads of object-gap relatives, suggesting that resumptive relatives always involve (a copy of) the relative head in the double subject configuration, bearing out the parallelism of the two constructions emphasized by Urien (1989ab: 108-9), Fave (1998: 51).

Much investigation remains ahead to confirm the reality of the broad subject – moved object contrast. For instance, *zo* sometimes occur after moved objects, but apparently in analogues of English *tough* and purpose infinitives, which involve a silent pronoun:

- (89) Amañ **an traou** a zo diêz (OP) da zirouestla *pro*
 here the things R is difficult to untangle
 Here things are difficult to untangle.

(AF-M)

After broad subjects, even in the core Leoneg area, there is some rare vacillation in forms of *be* not attributable to the factors enumerated by Urien (1989b), for example *Ar voulladenn-ze ez eus enni 30 barzoneg* 'the printing-this is in.it 30 poems' (MY-YK), *Te ez eus arhant ganez, Jobig?* 'You is money with.you, J?' (MM-M 3: 31), *An iliz-parrez a welom bremañ eo bet savet he zour gand ar houarnamant saoz* 'The parish church we see now is(=has) been raised her tower with the British government' (SV-PI: 255). *Eo/emañ* rather than *zo* is well-noted for Tregereg-Kerneveg (Le Clerc 1986 [1911]: §87.1° note 1, §147d, §162c rem, §205, Gros 1984: 294-6, 301, Fave 1998: 51, Favereau 1997: §442, Trépos 2001: 214, Plourin 2000, Hendricks above).⁸ It may be that only a *zo* marks the double subject construction, and *ez eus / eo / emañ* indicate an alternative such as a cleft or a dislocation (cf. Stephens: 1982: 27-31).

Conclusion

It seems likely that there exists in Breton a double subject construction, whose broad subject has the subjecthood properties otherwise reserved to the narrow subject and due to occupying a nonthematic position in the TP. Beyond this, only a scaffold for further inquiry has been sketched – what verbs occur in the construction in infinitives, what readings are available to a broad subject postverbally, how agreement treats it.

There remain other potential correlates of subjecthood to explore. It may be that overt narrow and broad subjects pattern together in licensing echoic pronouns in the absence of agreement (Jouitteau and Rezac 2006: 1941, ARBRES s.v. *Les pronoms echo*). The echoic *ni* can certainly pick up the narrow subject in a sentence like *ni zo-ni laouen* 'we are-we happy' or *ni yae-ni da welout ar saout* 'we went-we to see the cows', at least in Gwenedeg, and probably not the fronted object, *ni yaent(*-ni) da welout* 'us(obj) went.they(*-us) to see'. As for broad subjects, the corpus seems not to have a single instance of *ni zo-ni laouen hor c'hoar* 'we is-we happy our sister', but nothing can be concluded from silence. Floating quantifiers might provide a similar diagnostic, licensed by the broad subject in *An aotrou person a grie abalamour ar merhed a veze toud sakochou ganto en overenn* 'The lord priest R cried because the girls R were all bags with.them at the mass.' (MM-M 3: 6)

Finally, there may be dialectal variation in the double subject construction. Most broad subjects in infinitives come from Leoneg and postverbal ones from Kerneveg. Breton dialects differ on other respects that might be related. Tregereg frequently uses *eo/emañ* after broad subjects where Leoneg requires *zo*, as mentioned in the last section. For Gwenedeg, Guillevic and Le Goff (1986: 138) observe that the double subject construction *Pièr e zou milén é vlèu* 'Peter R is yellow his hair' is avoided for pronouns, *me zou milén mem blèu* 'I is yellow my hair', which is common elsewhere; this contrast has many potential correlates, including the unemphatic character of overt pronouns in SVO and the prevalence of neutral SVO in Gwenedeg. As time runs out on the old richness of Breton dialects, there is a "Last Chance to See".

⁸ Le Clerc contrasts (*ac'h*) *eo* for broad subjects with (*ec'h*) *eo*, but perhaps only orthographically (§205)?

References

- ARBRES: Vers un Atlas numérique des variations dialectales du breton en syntaxe.
<http://arbres.iker.univ-pau.fr/index.php/Accueil>.
- Allen, Cynthia. 2008. *Genitives in early English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borsley, Robert D., Maggie Tallerman, and David Willis. 2007. *The syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chung, Sandra, and James McCloskey. 1987. Government, barriers, and small clauses in Modern Irish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 173-237.
- Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 1999. Filling and licensing multiple specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist approaches*, ed. by David Adger, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett, and George Tsoulas, 69-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fave, Visant. 1998. *Notennou yezadur*. Emgleo Breiz. [= FV in corpus]
- Favereau, Frances. 1997. *Grammaire du breton contemporain*. Morlaix: Conseil Général du Finistère.
- German, Gary. 2007. Language shift, diglossia, and dialect variation in Western Brittany: The case of Southern Cornouaille. In *The Celtic languages in contact*, ed. by Hildegard L. C. Tristram, 146-192. Potsdam: Potsdam University Press.
- Grevisse, Maurice, and André Goosse. 2008. *Le bon usage: Grammaire française*. 14th edition. Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier.
- Gros, Jules. 1984. *Le trésor du breton parlé*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz – Brud Nevez.
- Guilliot, Nicolas. 2006. A top-down analysis for reconstruction. *Lingua* 116: 1888-1914.
- Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff. 1986 [1902] *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Brest: Ar Skol Vrezoneg - Emgleo Breiz.
- Hemon, Roparz. 1995. *Breton grammar*. Translated, adapted, and revised by Michael Everson. Dublin: Everson Gunn Teoranta.
- Hendrick, Randall. 1988. *Anaphora in Celtic and Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hewitt, Steve. 1988. Un cadre pour la description de la syntaxe verbale du breton. *La Bretagne Linguistique* 4: 203-11.
- Hingat, Jean. 1868. *Éléments de la grammaire bretonne*. Tréguier: A. Le Flem.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2005. La syntaxe comparée du breton. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Nantes.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac. 2006. Deriving the Complementarity Effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement. *Lingua* 116: 1915-1945.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac. 2008. From *mihi est* to *have* across Breton dialects. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa [Selected proceedings of the 34th Incontro di Grammatica Generativa]*, ed. by Paola Benincà, Federico Damonte, and Nicoletta Penello] 33: 161-178.
- Kervella, Frances. 1995 [1945]. *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*. La Baule: Skridoù Breizh.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Nicolas Sobin. 2000. The *who-whom* puzzle: On the preservation of an archaic feature. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 343-371.
- Lass, Roger. 1999. Phonology and morphology. In *The Cambridge history of the English language III: 1476-1776*, ed. by Roger Lass, 56-186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McCloskey, James. 1983. Raising, Subcategorization and Selection in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 441–485.
- McCloskey, James, and Peter Sells. 1988. Control and A-chains in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 143-189.
- McCloskey, James. 2001. The distribution of subject properties in Irish. Ms.
- McCloskey, James. 2005. Resumption. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 4, case 55. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mittendorf, Ingo, and Louisa Sadler. 2008. NP would like to meet GF: A Welsh adjectival construction. In *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. Stanford: CSLI.
- Ó Baoill, Dónall, and Hideki Maki. 2007. A Paradox in Interaction of A and A' Chain Formation in Modern Irish. Paper presented at the Fifth Celtic Linguistic Conference, Plas Gregynog, September 7-9, 2007.
- Plourin, Jean-Yves. 2000. *Initiation au breton familier et argotique*. Crozon: Armeline.
- Rezac, Milan. 2004. The EPP in Breton: An uninterpretable categorial feature. In *Triggers*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk and Anne Breitbarth, 451-492. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rezac, Milan. 2011. Building and interpreting nonthematic A-positions: A-resumption in English and Breton. In *Resumptive pronouns at the interfaces*, ed. by Alain Rouveret, 241-286. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.
- Schafer, Robin. 1995. Negation and verb second in Breton. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 135-172.
- Stephens, Janig. 1982. Word order in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.
- Stephens, Janig. 1990. Non-finite clauses in Breton. In *Celtic linguistics*, ed. by Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe and Jenny Rowland, 151-165. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1984. Agreement vs. incorporation in Breton. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 289-348.
- Timm, Lenora A. 1994. Pronominal *a*-forms in Breton: a discourse-based analysis. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 4: 1-34.
- Trépos, Pierre. 2001. *Grammaire bretonne*. Brest: Brud Nevez.
- Troude, Amable. 1886. *Nouveau dictionnaire pratique français et breton*. Brest: Lefournier. [= TA in corpus]
- Urien, Jean-Yves. 1989a. *La trame d'une langue, le Breton: Présentation d'une théorie de la syntaxe et application*. Lesneven: Mouladurioù Hor Yezh.
- Urien, Jean-Yves. 1989b. Le verbe "bezañ" et la relation médiante. *Klask* 1: 101-128.

Corpus

Systematically investigated corpus (native speakers), annotated by hand, in intention exhaustively (* marks incomplete). More details about individual writers are to be found on the site ARBRES. Marked as such are transcripts of oral performances or interviews. Abbreviations: L Leoneg, K Kerneveg (b Bigouden, k Kap), T Tregereg, G Gwenedeg.

| Code | Author | Title | Year | Author's origin |
|------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| AF-M | Abeozen, F. | <i>Ar mabinogion</i> | 1991 ['25-] | [L (Dre Nevez)] |

| | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| AF-M | Abeozen, F. | <i>Hervelina Geraouel*</i> | 1943 | [L (Dre Nevez)] |
| BY-TV | Bijer, Y. | <i>Trêz ar Vari-Vorgan</i> | 2003 | [Kb (Lec'hiagad)] |
| BY-AG | Bijer, Y. | <i>Avel Gornôg</i> | 2007 | [Kb (Lec'hiagad)] |
| BC-SD | Briant-Cadiou, Y. | <i>E skeud daou dour ar barrez</i> | | |
| DA-EP | Dizuet, A. | <i>Eñvorennou ur prizoniad</i> | 1980 | [T (Roche-Derrien)] |
| DBL-AP | Dastum, ed. | <i>Amañ 'z eus plijadur</i> | 2003 | [L, oral] |
| DY-DI | Drezen, Y. | <i>An dour en-dro d'an inizi</i> | 1972 ['31] | [Kb (Pont L'Abbé)] |
| DY-SBA | Drezen, Y. | <i>Sizhun ar breur Arturo</i> | 1990 ['49] | [Kb (Pont L'Abbé)] |
| EM-DM | Ewen, M. | <i>Danevellou merhed-bihan Ana</i> | 1987 | [K (Scaer)] |
| EM-H | Ewen, M. | <i>Hañvezhioù</i> | 2004 | [K (Scaer)] |
| EM-MM | Ewen, M. | <i>Ar mor, a-dreñv ar menez...</i> | 1993 | [K (Scaer)] |
| FV-RM | Fave, V. | <i>War roudou or misionerien*</i> | 1989 | [L (Cléder)] |
| GY-SK | ar Gow, Y. | <i>E skeud tour bras Sant Jermen</i> | 1978 ['55] | [T (Pleiben)] |
| GP-EE | Gouedig, P., ed. | <i>Eñvoriou tud Enez Eusa</i> | 1984 | [L (Eusa), oral/ed.] |
| HJ-ML | Helias, J. | <i>Marh al lorh 1, 2*</i> | 2002 ['75] | [Kb (Pouldreuzic)] |
| HJ-MB | Helias, J. | <i>Mojennou Breizh</i> | 2001 | [Kb (Pouldreuzic)] |
| JK-KO | Jezegou, K. | <i>E korn an oaled</i> | 1992 ['23] | [K (Gwineventer)] |
| KF-DG | Kervella, F. | <i>Dindan gouriz ar bed*</i> | 1985 | [K (Dirinon)] |
| KI-ZM | Krog, I. | <i>Ur zac'had marvailhou</i> | 1924 | [Kk] |
| KJ-RT | Kerrien, J. | <i>Ar Roc'h Toull</i> | 2000 ['24] | [L (St. Thégonnec)] |
| KY-D | Kalloc'h, Y.-B. | <i>Ar en deulin</i> | 1935 | [G (Groix)] |
| LF-B | al Lay, F. | <i>Bilzig</i> | 1925 | [T (Locquirec)] |
| LL-BJ | Leclerc, L. | <i>Ma beaj Jeruzalem*</i> | 1997 ['03] | [T] |
| LI-EK | Lan, I. | <i>Emgann Kergidu</i> | 1977 ['77] | [L (Plounevez-Loch.)] |
| MG-BZ | Morvan, Gabriel | <i>Buzer ar Sent</i> | 1894 | [L (Plabenneg)] |
| ML-BV | Loeiza ar Meliner | <i>Àr bont ar velin</i> | 2009 | [G (Hembont)] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 1</i> | 1990 | [L (Gorre), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 2</i> | 1990 | [L (Bro Bagan), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 3</i> | 1998 | [L (Goueled), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 5</i> | 1998 | [L (Cléder), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 8</i> | 1993 | [L, oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 11</i> | | [K (Traoñ), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 13</i> | 1994 | [K (Meneziou), oral] |
| MP-BD | Mellouet, P. | <i>Blaz an douar</i> | 2001 | [L, oral] |
| MY-OH | Miossec, Y. | <i>O haloupad war henchou</i> | 1987 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-DM | Miossec, Y. | <i>Dreist ar mor bras</i> | 1981 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-FB | Miossec, Y. | <i>O foeta bro er hanada</i> | 1981 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-MI | Miossec, Y. | <i>Mond da Izrael</i> | 1991 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-TE | Miossec, Y. | <i>Tammou eñvorennou</i> | 1994 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-YK | Miossec, Y. | <i>Yann-Ber Kalloh</i> | | [L (Guiclan)] |
| ME-PG | le Moal, E. | <i>Pipi gonto</i> | 2002 [1902-] | [T (Coadout)] |
| PJ-ZB | Priel, J. | <i>Va zammig buhez</i> | 1975 ['55] | [T (Priel)] |
| RY-EB | Riou, Y. | <i>Envoriou eur beizantez</i> | 1995 | [L (Milizac), oral/ed.] |
| RJ-GW | Riou, J. | <i>Geotenn ar Werc'hez</i> | 1957 ['28] | [T (Lothey)] |
| RN-M | Rozmor, N. | <i>Ar mestr</i> | 1988 | [L (Rosco)] |
| SV-MR | Seite, V. | <i>Ar marh reiz</i> | 1985 | [L (Cléder)] |
| SV-PI | Seite, V. | <i>O pourmen dre Vreizh-Izel 2</i> | 1998 | [L (Cléder)] |
| SJ-BK | Skragn, J.-M. | <i>Ma buhez e ker ar Vinaoued</i> | 2002 | [Ku (Huelgoat)] |
| TP-LA | Trépos, P. | <i>Lod all a varv...</i> | 2001 [c. '60] | [Kb (Plozévet)] |
| TA-LW | Troude, A., Milin, G. | <i>Labous ar wirionez</i> | 1950 ['70] | [L (Brest)] |
| UF-KB | Uhel, F. | <i>Kontadennou ar bobl 1, 2</i> | 1984- [19C] | [T (Plouaret)] |