



***Mihi est* from Brythonic to Breton II: The nominative object**

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER

Abstract: Middle Breton (MB) presents a singular anomaly of pronominal argument coding. Objects are accusative proclitics save in two constructions, where coding is split by person: 3rd unique enclitics ~ 1st/2nd accusative proclitics. The constructions are HAVE, from Insular Celtic *mihi est*, where the new coding replaces inflectional nominatives (cf. Latin *mihi est ~ sunt*); and imperatives, where it replaces accusative enclitics in V1 (cf. French *aide-moi ~ ne m'aide pas*). Part I followed HAVE as dative clitic subject + BE from (1) Brythonic through (2) Breton-Cornish and the HAVE-perfect of Breton. Part II traces the history of object coding: (3) Independent > enclitic coding originates in unavailability of accusative object mesoclitics in V1 imperatives by Vendryes' Restriction in Brythonic, and nonagreement with nominative objects of *mihi est* in Breton-Cornish. (4) Restriction of enclitics to 3rd person originates with *mihi est* in typically nonhuman nominative object possessa in Brythonic or Breton-Cornish; it spreads to imperatives through shared enclitic coding in MB, and is circumvented by the MB innovation of accusative proclitics for mesoclitics that allows 1st/2nd person even in V1, as well as the participle in the new HAVE-perfect later in MB. (5) "Innovative" varieties of Breton transition to regular accusative objects with or without losing dative subjects of *mihi est*. The developments are constrained to familiar patterns of nominative/anomalous subject + accusative/nominative object case combinations, giving rise to the imperative + HAVE construction grouping of Finnish within the history of Breton.

Keywords: *mihi est*, oblique subjects, nominative objects, person restrictions, case theory, proclisis-enclisis alternations, Breton, Cornish, Brythonic

1 The pronominal system and the puzzle of *mihi est*

Part II turns to the origin and evolution of object coding of the *mihi est* construction within the pronominal system of Breton, illustrated in Table 1 for Middle Breton (MB):¹

Table 1: Subject–object coding in finite clauses in MB (constructed; *HMSB*: §51–3)

Object:	3SGM	1SG	Translation
Present	<i>en=les-et</i>	<i>=m=les-et</i>	You leave him/me

¹ Leipzig glossing is used, modified as follows: source interpunction is kept, with n-dash – for source hyphens, and enriched with affix juncture -, ~ if unifying source words, and clisis juncture =, ≈ if breaking up source word. Not glossed are: with finite verbs, 3SG or default, present, indicative; with pronominal proclitics, accusative-genitive when syncretic or in *mihi est*, unless relevant. Abbreviations distinct from Leipzig are ! imperative-jussive, *CNS* consuetudinal, *COND* conditional, *D* the *de*-prefix of HAVE (I.4.4), *IMP* impersonal, *IPF* imperfect, *PT* preterit, *R* verbal particle, *RX* reflexive. Object-coding clitics are italic for proclitics, bold for enclitics. Sources are cited by abbreviation († verse); ms. century (e early, m mid, t late); variety (compass points, c central), and line, verse, or page (as source allows). Language abbreviations are OSWB, OW Old South-West British, Welsh, MB, MC, MW Middle Breton, Cornish, Welsh, (e)NB (early) Modern Breton, varieties KLTW of Kerne, Leon, Treger, Gwened. References to part I are by section.

	3SGM.ACC=leave-2PL	=1SG=leave-2PL	
Imperat.	les-(e)t= ef	<i>ma</i> =les-(e)t	Leave him/me!
	leave-!2PL=3SGM	1SG=leave-!2PL	
<i>mihi est</i>	hoz=eus= ef	<i>N/A</i>	You have him
	2PL=be=3SGM		
HAVE-	hoz=eus= ef leset	hoz=eus <i>ma</i> =leset	You have left him/me
perfect	2PL=be=3SGM left	2PL=be 1SG=left	
BE-	eu <i>en</i> =em-leset	o-ff <i>ma</i> =em-leset	He has left himself
perfect	be 3SGM.ACC=RX-left	be-1SG 1SG=RX-left	I have left myself

In MB finite clauses, dependent pronouns are usually accusative-aligned proclitics as objects and nominative-aligned suffixes as subjects. These are illustrated with the synthetic present and the periphrastic BE-perfect. Proclitics and suffixes can be doubled by concurring enclitics, but these do not alone code arguments. Independent (pro)nominals are in complementary distribution with the clitics and suffixes.

Three constructions are each anomalous in both their subject and object coding, all only found in finite clauses in MB: lexical *mihi est* ‘have’, the periphrastic HAVE-perfect using *mihi est* BE as auxiliary, and the imperative. They share a single anomaly in object coding: it is split by person into 1st/2nd person proclitics, syncretic with accusative proclitics, and 3rd person enclitics, which only here code arguments of the verb. Their subject coding is also anomalous, but in different ways. *Mihi est* and the HAVE-perfect use accusative-syncretic proclitics, and in concord rather than complementarity with independent (pro)nominals (I.4-5). The imperative uses nominative-aligned suffixes, but these do not have clause-internal (in)dependent counterparts (5.2). A last construction, the jussive, is rarely attested, but it has both canonical and anomalous codings of both subjects and objects.²

Part I focused on the subject-coding anomaly of *mihi est*, (1). Historically, *mihi est* combined finite forms of BE with an originally dative, later accusative-syncretic proclitics coding the possessor. The proclitics came to double independent (pro)nominals when these grammaticalised, giving rise to exceptional concord characteristic elsewhere of dative or other inherent-case clitic doubling. A *de*-element grammaticalised after 3rd but not 1st/2nd person proclitics, creating a split typical of other systems with extensive dative-accusative syncretisms. In MB and later varieties conservative about this, these distinctive features of *mihi est* are kept and extended (I.4-5).

(1) Argument coding in MB BE + ‘to’ vs. *mihi est* vs. ‘keep’

- a. pez voe di≈de / Ma=lesell
what be.PT/IPF to.2SG=2SG 1SG=leave
what cause hadst thou / to leave me, lit.: was to-thee
- b. Da=quer map doe en=de-uo=**hy**
2SG=dear son God 3SGM.ACC=D-be.PT/IPF=3SGF
Thy dear son of God had it [sc. martyrdom], lit.: him-(to-)was-it
- c. nep *he*=mirhe

² The term imperative is used here for 2SG, 2PL, 1PL forms, jussive for 3SG, 3PL forms, see 5.2.

whoever 3SGF=keep.COND
 whoever would observe it [sc. the Assumption]

(Pm[†], e16C MB)

From the original *mihi est* syntagm will also be derived here its anomalous object coding. The starting point is imperative-jussive constructions, revealing the origin of argument-coding enclitics, and the unexpectedness of person restrictions (section 2). The objects of *mihi est* BE will be among the arguments that should end up as enclitics, but for them a restrictions to 3rd person is expected (section 3). Cue to transfer of the restriction across constructions and its extension to ban 3rd person proclitics will be taken from similar coding splits in the circum-Baltic languages, above all Finnish (Timberlake 1974). The partial correspondence of MB and Finnish is resumed in Table 2: usually nominative-subject – accusative-object coding, against partly anomalous-subject – 1st/2nd person accusative object ~ 3rd person nominative or enclitic object (see I.2):³

Table 2: Argument coding in Breton and in Finnish finite clauses

	Breton			Object	Finnish		
	Subject	Dependent	Independent		Subject	Dep.	Indep.
Canonical	V-NOM	V-∅	N	ACC=	V-NOM	+NOM	ACC
BE-perfect	V-NOM	V-∅	N	ACC=	V-NOM	+NOM	ACC
<i>Mihi est</i>	ACC=D-V	+N		=3	N/A	OBLIQ.	3.NOM~1/2.ACC
HAVE-pf.	ACC=D-V	+N		=3~1/2.ACC=	—————N/A—————		
Imperative	V-NOM	N/A		=3~1/2.ACC=	V-NOM	+NOM*	3.NOM~1/2.ACC
Jussive	V-NOM	V-∅/NOM	N	ACC=, =3	V-NOM	+NOM	ACC
Arb. subj.	—————N/A—————				V-NOM	N/A	3.NOM~1/2.ACC

Notes: - affix, = clitic, +N dependent-marking + (pro)nominal, * restrictions

Analyses of the Finnish system have explored its anomalous object coding and its relationship to anomalies in subject coding across the functionalist-innatist spectrum (a.o. Hakulinen and Karlsson 1975, Timberlake 1975, Taraldsen 1985, Dixon 1994: 3.2.4, 7.2, Vainikka 1993, Maling 1993, Toivainen 1993, Nelson 1995: ch. 4, 1998, Kiparsky 2001, Rezac 2011: 5.5, Vainikka and Brattico 2014). Breton lends itself to them as well, and the recency of its object coding anomaly sheds light on ways in which such construction groupings can arise.

In innovative varieties, codings *mihi est* and imperatives partly or wholly regularise (section 4). These regularisations do not proceed in lockstep for *mihi est* and imperatives, dissolving their grouping. They are also largely independent for subjects and objects in *mihi est*, which changes from *mihi est* towards but never reaching *habeo* through transitional stages familiar from Germanic, always limiting split-person object coding to systems where subject coding has not fully regularised (section 5).

³ NOM and ACC gloss S/A- and O/S-aligned distinctions made by nominal suffixes in Finnish, finite verb suffixes in Finnish and Breton, and proclitics in Breton (I.3). Like *mihi est* in both systems are certain intransitives with infinitival complements (I.4.3). Finnish but not Breton has object case transmission into infinitives, and distinguishes grammatically animate or logophoric 3rd person that behaves as 1st/2nd (I.2).

2 The development of object coding in imperatives

2.1 Mesocclisis and enclisis in Brythonic systems

In Brythonic systems, pronoun coding prefers or requires dependent forms. If these are unavailable, independent ones can be used: due to structure or meaning, notably in the preverbal position, as predicate, often in coordination and modification; when there is no host, as in fragments and ellipses; and when there is a potential host but not all attachment requirements can be met (see *HMSB*: §51 for MB). In this last case, independent pronouns can themselves develop into enclitics by attaching to the host.

The system may be introduced with prepositions in Table 3. Prepositions typically have pronominal inflection, illustrated by MB *daued* ‘towards’ (*HMSB*: §62ff.). In MB it fairly strictly preempts independent pronouns unless coordinated or modified. Independent pronouns are found when inflected forms are missing through borrowing, *à propos*, *quitte à* from French, and reanalysis, *(h)a(c)* ‘as’ if recruited from ‘and’. These may acquire inflection, or the pronoun can encliticise. Elements without dependent-pronoun forms for arguments are few in MB and largely shared with MC-MW: *ha(c)* ‘as’, *goa* ‘woe’, the presentationals *sed(e)*, *setu* ‘lo, voici, voilà’, partly *eme* ‘say’ (*HMSB*: §51).⁴

Table 3: Prepositional inflections and gaps in Breton

	3SGM	2PL
Inflected	dauet-aff (B [†] , m16C)	daued-och (B [†] , m16C)
Gap → Independent	à propos ef (Gk, t16C)	a huy (Qu, e17C)
Innovated inflection	quit—oh (CS.bar [†] , e18C W)	hag-oh (Fave 1998, 20C L)
Independent → enclitic	hag≈eñ (Fave 1998, 20C L)	

Accusative dependent pronouns can be reconstructed as “infixe” or mesoclitic for Brythonic: they attach rightward to the finite verb, inducing allomorphy, but they also need a particle, conjunction, or separable preverb in the verbal complex as leftward host. Their clisis reflects their origin as second-position or Wackernagel clitics in Proto-Indo-European. Their mesocclisis reflects Vendryes’ Restriction in Insular Celtic, whereby the second-position requirement must be satisfied within the verbal complex (Eska 1994, Newton 2006: 4.2). Genitive dependent pronouns have both pure proclitic forms, initial to the nominal complex, and mesoclitic forms, which developed after proclitic prepositions. Accusatives and genitives could but needed not collapse by regular phonological developments, 2SG acc. $*=t(w)e=$, gen. $*=tewe=$ > $*\theta^{LP}$ vs. 3SGM acc. $*=em=$ > $(e)n$, gen. $*=esjo=$ > $*e^L$ (Schrijver 1997: ch. 1, 2, 7, 2011b: 4.7.1, Hamp 1959, Lindeman 1989, *CG*: §357–8, *GVB*: ch. 18).⁵

⁴ On *ha(c)*, see Lambert 1975, 1977, 1998: 827. The presentationals may be fossilised imperatives of ‘look’, *HMSB*: §51, not Ernault 1899: §71. On *eme* as nominal or fossilised deponent, Ernault 1890: §73, 1899: §72, cf. *WG*: §198f., *GMW*: §170. *Goa* goes back to an experiencer dative + ‘be woe’, with usually silent verb, Barðal et al. 2011, so no host for the dative, leaving independent and usually adjacent (pro)nominal in MB-MC-MW, but more study is needed of rare cases where BE is overt, followed by 3SGM as independent or enclitic in MB (B[†] 264, m16C), preceded by mesoclitic in *mihi est* in MC (PC[†] 963, e15C).

⁵ In Table 4: for MB see *HMSB*, Schrijver 2011a, 3SGF Le Bihan 2020, 3PL Buchman 2011, leniprovection

Table 4: Accusative and genitive clitics in earlier Brythonic systems

	MB	MC	MW	OSWB ^B and OW ^W
	ACC-GEN	ACC GEN	ACC GEN	ACC GEN
1SG	x= m ^S =x= ma ^S , va ^S	m m	m ^h m ^h	w _m ^{BW} m w _{mi} , ^B mo
2SG	x= z/s/∅/h ^{LP} =x= da ^L	th ^{LP} th ^{LP}	th ^L th ^L	w _n w _{ti} , ^B to
1PL	x= ▲ =x= (h)on	(ga)n gan	n ^h n ^h	w _n w _{an} , ^B on
2PL	x= ▲ =x= (h)o(u)(z/s/∅/h) ^P	(ga)s gas	ch (w)ch	w _s a(w)ch
3PL	x= ▲ =x= (h)o[z] ^S	s ga ^S	y ^h ,s,[t] ▲	w _s eu ^h
3SGF	x= ▲, [ACC s/z] =x= (h)e ^{sh}	s y ^S	y ^h ,s y ^{sh}	^{BW} s w _i ^B hi
3SGM	x= ▲ =x= ACC en, GEN e ^L	n ▲ y ^L	y ^h ,s,[n,t] ▲ y ^L	^B n, ^W s,t ^{BW} i ^{BW} (h)i

Note: [...] marginal, – no form available, ▲ pure proclitic used.

This situation is essentially kept in MC-MW. MB undergoes two relevant innovations: loss of mesoclisism and accusative-genitive syncretism (cf. *VGKS.II*: §498, *CG*: §354, *HMSB*: §53, Hamp 1959, Schrijver 2011a: 5.6.1).

Mesoclisism remains for 1SG =*m*=, 2SG =*z*= in MB and is lost over the course of eNB. Other dependent pronouns are pure proclitics from the first texts, and can elide final *a*, *e* of erstwhile hosts, Table 5 (cf. I.5.5). The vocalic particles *a*=, *e(z)*= are thereby suppressed, and proclitic + verb comes to be initial in the verbal complex (*HMSB*: §175f.). This undoes Vendryes’s Restriction on object clitics, though not its consequences for placement of the verbal complex in the clause (I.3.2, I.5.4n42; Schrijver 1997: ch. 7, Meelen 2020).⁶

Table 5: Mesoclisism in MC-MW vs. pure proclisis in MB (constructed)

	MB	MC-MW
<i>na</i> vs. <i>ne</i> negations	+ 1SG + ‘see’ + 1PL + ‘see’	na/ne=m=guel na/ny=n=gwel
<i>a</i> vs. <i>e(z)</i> particles	+ 1SG + ‘see’	a/e=m=guel a/y=m=gwel

in 2SG Le Roux 1896, /θ/ of 2SG and 2PL > /θ/, /s/, /h/ Schrijver 2011a: 5.6.1, *HMSB*: §12, §53–5, Hemon 1954c: 249f., 251f., *LVB*: 254, doubling with reflexive *em*- omitted, Hemon 1954c: 249f., 250f., *LVB*: 253–5; MC *LCC*, *CG*, *TGMC*; MW *GMW*, *SW*, Schumacher 2011; OW Falileyev 2008; OSWB *GVB*, Schrijver 2011b. Here and below: ^Llenition, ^Pprovection, ^Sspirantisation, ^Nnasalisation, ^{LP}leniprovection, ^haspiration.

⁶ In MB unlike MC-MW, mesoclisism coincides with nonsyllabicity. Anaptyxis repaired syllabification. In MB the outcome largely looks like *ez*-particle insertion before mesoclitics, *pan=ez=pedaff* ‘when=2SG=ask1SG’ (J[†] 1322) → *e=z=* cf. particles conditioned by pure proclitics, MB *en=*, I.4.3; L *ouzh=*, W *doh=*, *HMSB*: §171. See for MB *CG*: §354n, *HMSB*: §53.1n1, §53.2n1, §198–9; MC, *CG*: §351n, *LCC*: §27, *TGMC*: 5.5; MW, *WG*: §160.ii.3, *CG*: §349n, §351n, §354n, *GMW*: §59, Schumacher 2011: 5.5.1.2. Non *ez*-particle with pure proclitics is perhaps for *en* (N[†] 392).

+ 1PL + ‘see’ hon=guel a/y=n=gwel

The 1SG =m=, 2SG =z= mesoclitics of MB have cognates syncretic for genitive-accusative across Brythonic. The new pure proclitics of MB are systematically syncretic as well, save 3SGM. If this syncretism led to underspecification of case outside 3SGM, or facilitated analogy, then the originally genitive-only pure proclitics 1SG ma=, 2SG da= should have become available for objects of finite verbs when mesoclitics were not. This proves to be so next in V1 (cf. CG: §354).

2.2 V1 and innovated proclisis in Breton

There is one environment where mesoclitisis should have been unavailable in Brythonic: V1 constructions, where the first element of the verbal complex is the verb (with its inseparable preverbs). By Wackernagel’s Law and Vendryes’s Restriction, accusative dependent pronouns should have encliticised to the verb. These enclitics are found in Old Irish, but essentially absent in Brythonic (3.1). In MB-MC-MW, V1 is characteristic of imperatives-jussives. They are V1 or (h)a=V! when positive, where (h)a= is ‘and’ or particle, and na=V! when negative. Otherwise V1 is found only in responsives in MB, which lack objects; outside MB, it is also found but rare in MC verse, less rare in MW verse (LCC: §46, George 1990, 1991; GMW: §199, Meelen 2020).

The object coding of MB imperatives and jussives is as expected for 1st/2nd person objects (HMSB: §53). 1PL, 2PL are pure proclitics, 1SG, 2SG alternate between proclitic and mesoclitic according to V1. The system remains in eNB of 17C and earliest 18C. In jussives, pronominal objects are nearly absent, but one hints that proclisis had been available even in 3rd person.⁷

(2) MB imperatives-jussives with pro/mesoclitic objects

Imperatives-jussives: pro/mesoclitics required in 1st/2nd person

- a. ha ma=difenn-et / Na≈m=ancouffh-et ... / Ha≈m=delch-et ...
 and 1SG=defend-!2PL NEG=1SG=forget-!2PL and=1SG=keep-!2PL
 and defend me / forget me not [when I pray you] / and keep me [firm] (B[†], m16C MB)

- b. renonc-et dezàn–e=hunan ... ha va=heuly-et
 renounce-!3SG to.3SGM 3SGM.GEN=self and 1SG=follow-!3SG
 let him renounce himself and bear his cross and follow me (PI, e18C eNB-L)

Jussives: pro/mesoclitic allowed in 3rd person

- c. Pe eff ozech pe yuez groec / He=mir-et louen
 or 3SGM husband or also wife 3SGF=guard-!3SG glad
 Whether he be husband or also wife, / let them keep it gladly

⁷ The analysis of *he miret* follows Hemon 1962, Le Berre 2011, “qu’il la garde”, unexpected for HMSB: §51.7a; La Villemarqué’s 1879 “il sera gardé” fits the context but not the form. The form could be infinitive, but command infinitives have subject reference and pragmatics unsuitable here, e.g. J[†] 1494, 2230, HMSB: §170.5, Le Gléau 1999: I: §13, and cf. French, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §407. Cf. Le Goff 1927: 27, Rezac 2021.

The restriction of proclitics to 1st/2nd person in MB imperatives is surprising. In V1, 3rd person pure proclitics should have been available as much as 1PL/2PL in MB, and earlier, 3rd person mesoclitics should have been available as much as 1SG/2SG. Yet the restriction is categorical for MB and earliest eNB for imperatives (2SG, 2PL, 1PL).

2.3 Unblocking of independent pronouns and V1

Until pure proclitics undid Vendryes' Restriction in MB, it would only have allowed enclitic objects in the V1 of positive imperative-jussives, but their expected forms do not appear in Brythonic, and almost do not appear due to independent limitations in Old Irish (*GOI*: §430f.). V1 could be evaded by particles or conjunctions like (*h*)*a*= in (2), but these did not grammaticalise to yield a regular alternation of V1 and particle + mesoclitic + V in Brythonic, as did *no*= in Old Irish (Sims-Williams 1984, McCone 1997, Newton 2006).⁸

The unavailability of object clitics in V1 should have licensed independent pronouns in the same position as independent nominals (*WG*: §160.iii). Evidence is weak in MW, better in MB-MC. In MW, mesoclitisis to positive *a*= and negative *na*= in imperatives-jussives is attested in verse, and goes back to OW. Otherwise, independent pronouns are the rule regardless of polarity and person. However, they are only weakly dispreferred to accusative mesoclitics outside imperatives-jussives (*GMW*: §55, *SW*: 9.8), perhaps generalising from phonological and syntactic difficulties with mesoclitics other than V1 (*WG*: §160, *WS*: §77, partly shared with OSWB, cf. *GVB*: §116f., Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1).⁹

In MB-MC, MC mesoclitics regularly and MB proclitics categorically block independent pronouns as objects, outside environments like fronting and coordination where clitics are unavailable (*TGMC*: 5.6, *HMSB*: §51, §53).¹⁰ The exception is imperatives-jussives, Tables 6, 7, and HAVE-constructions, section 3. In MC, objects of imperatives are postverbal independent pronouns or enclitic descendants of them, regardless of polarity or person (*LCC*: §28, §46, *TGMC*: 5.1, 5.6–7, George 1990, 1991). The rare objects of jussives are mesoclitics supported by particle *a*= or conjunction *ha*= 'and', again for all persons (cf. Zeuss and Ebel 1871: 516–8). In MB, objects are also independent-enclitic in positive imperatives, at least optionally in negative imperatives, and maybe optionally in positive imperatives – but all only when 3rd person (*HMSB*: §51, 53).¹¹

⁸ On MB (*h*)*a*=, see *HMSB*: §53.1n,2n; there may be evidence for (*h*)*a*= particle distinct from (*h*)*a*= 'and' yet not limited to supporting mesoclitics, expected from Schumacher 2017: 6.1.2 for MW (B[†]404, Ernault 1988b: s.v. *l bezaff*= B.1647 102). MB *e(z)*=, cf. I.5.5n42, is perhaps not quite absent with imperatives (G[†] 1153). In MW, both *a*= and *y*= support mesoclitics in various V1, *WG*: §131.5, *CG*: §433n; *LCC*: §46, *GMW*: §58, §192, Schrijver 1997: 7.1.4.1, Schumacher 2011: 5.5.1.2, 6.3.

⁹ MW imperatives-jussives are described with "enclitics" in *VGKS.II*: §492, *CG*: §348, and "independent pronouns" in *GMW*: §55a; but for MW [†]*a*=1SG=V!2SG, see Lloyd-Jones 1928: 90, [†]*na*=1SG=V!2SG, *ibid.*: 93, Strachan 1909: §50g, Sims-Williams 2010: 43, [†]*na*=1SG=V!3SG, Williams 1935: 103, OW [†]*na*=1SG=V!2PL/3SG, Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1, 4.9.5.

¹⁰ *HMSB*: §53 is categorical about accusative blocking. Apparent exceptions noted here involve orthographic ambiguity, see Ernault 1897: 201 via the fusion I.5.5, but also *ez* 'R' and *e=z* 'R=3SGF' (J.1622[†] 2834), cf. *HMSB*: §53.4n2, §53.7n, Le Bihan 2020; and contexts where dependent pronouns are unavailable, see 3.2.

¹¹ *HMSB* gives 3rd person enclitics in positive-negative imperatives-jussives, proclitics in negative ones. 3rd person proclitics have been found here in positive commands, but not in imperatives unambiguous by form or root-initial placement, rather in what may be command future, q.v. *HMSB*: §131; command infinitive, q.v.

Table 6: MC object coding in imperatives-jussives

Object	Positive	Negative	
Imperative			
1SG	holy-ough= ve follow-!2PL=1SG	na=vlamy-ough= vy NEG=blame-!2PL=1SG	(PA [†] , e15C MC)
3PL	gorr≈ y put!2SG=3PL	na=byhgh= y NEG=mistake!2SG=3PL	(OM [†] , 15C MC)
Jussive			
2SG	ha= <i>th</i> =weres-es and=2PL=help-!3SG		(OM [†] , 15C MC)
3PL	a=s=kemmer-es R=3PL.ACC=take-!3SG		(PC [†] , 15C MC)

Table 7: MB and earliest eNB object coding in imperatives-jussives

Object	Positive	Negative	
Imperative			
1SG	<i>ma</i> =confirm 1SG=confirm!2SG	na≈ <i>m</i> =ancoufha NEG=1SG=forget!2SG	
3SGF	les= ef leave!2SG=3SGF	na=blasfem= ef NEG=blaspheme!2SG=3SGM	J [†] , e16C
1PL	<i>hon</i> =diliur-et 1PL=deliver-!2PL	n'=on=les-et NEG=1PL=let-!2PL	
3SGM	corrig= ef [†] correct!2SG=3SGM	na=cred-et= ef NEG=believe-!2PL= 3SGM n'=en=receu-et NEG=3SGM.ACC=receive-!2PL	Gk, t16C
Jussive			
1SG	<i>va</i> =heuly-et 1SG=follow-!3SG		PI, e18C L
3SGM	<i>he</i> =mir-et 3SGF=keep-!3SG ro-ent= [?] ef give-!3PL=3SGM		Pm [†] , e16C J [†] , m16C

The imperative of MB thus has a systematic alternation of 3rd person enclitic and 1st/2nd person pro/mesoclitic in imperatives, including the same verb, verse, or sentence, (3).

(3) 1st proclitic ~ 3rd enclitic alternation in MB

a. Na≈*m*=diuisquet quet leset=**hy** ... *Ma*=leset

HMSB: §170.5 (so J[†] 1494); conjunctive infinitive, q.v. Ernault 1890: 97–9, Dottin 1911: 96f., *LVB*: 361–4, *HMSB*: §170.3 (so B[†] 550, N[†] 1322–7). In MB they also seem attested only with such ambiguous forms even in negative commands.

NEG=1SG=unrobe!2PL not leave!2PI=3SGF 1SG=leave!2PL
 Unrobe me not, leave it [sc. the robe] ... Let me

(J[†] 2170 ... 2743, e16C MB)

- b. *Da*=em- douc d≈an=crouc ha douc=**hy**
 2SG=RX-carry!2SG to=the=gallows and carry!2SG=3SGF
 Carry thyself to the gallows, and carry it [sc. the rope]

(J[†], e16C MB)

The gaps in this split-person coding are unexpected. The missing 3rd person proclitics do regularly code objects outside imperatives, perhaps even in jussives in MB, and their mesoclitic counterparts do so in MC. The missing 1st/2nd person enclitics are available for doubling rather than coding in MB, including doubling of proclitic objects of imperatives, *ma=cred-et=me* ‘1SG=believe-!2PL=1SG’ “believe me” (J[†], e16C MB), and do code objects of imperatives in MC. In MC, person plays no role, and clisis directionality is rather sensitive to the imperative-jussive split. Outside imperatives-jussives, MB-MC share object coding by accusative pro/mesoclitics to the finite verb, apart from one construction that will suggest the origin of person sensitivity in MB: *mihi est* (section 3).

None of MB-MC-MW fully retain the correlation of independent objects with V1 derivable from Vendryes’s Restriction. The deviations can be seen as secondary: V1 of transitives is severely limited outside imperatives-jussives; in MW, independent pronouns are taking over for accusative mesoclitics; in MB-MC, negative imperatives can have adopted the pattern of positive ones as in French (Grevisse and Goose 2008: 682a, Rowlett 2014). However, it would do here if something other than V1 blocked mesoclitics in imperatives-jussives, notably an illocutionary force element when realised without segmental content rather than as *a=*, and as such relatable to the distinctiveness of imperatives in Old Irish (cf. Newton 2006: 4.4.2).

2.4 Encliticisation

The Brythonic systems share a series of pronominal enclitics doubling dependent pronouns, deriving from encliticisation of independent pronouns (Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1). In MW, the pronominal objects of imperatives-jussives seem to be independent, in contrast to doubling enclitics (so *GMW*: §55, *SW*: 9.8, *WG*: §160, *WS*: §77; cf. Willis 2007: 2.2). In MC, they can be enclitic outside coordination, and that seems the rule when form is unambiguous (cf. *LCC*: §28, *TGMC*: 5.1, 5.6–7).

In MB, pronominal objects of imperatives have been given out both as enclitic, along with doubling pronouns (*LCC*: §28), and as independent, unlike doubling pronouns (*HMSB*: §51–2). Their descendants are enclitic or suffixal in NB (Ternes 1970, Crahé 2004; Favereau 1997: §247). Earlier, when there is clear evidence of form or position, they are enclitic, outside structures like coordination. Illustration is given here for imperative and HAVE-constructions alike, the latter anticipating section 3.

Table 8: MB independent, suffixal, and enclitic pronouns (*LCC*, *HMSB*, Schrijver 2011a)

	V-suffix	P-suffix	Enclitic	Indep.
1SG	-aff, -nn	-o(u)ff, -iff	=me	me
2SG	-Ø, -s	-o(u)t, -it	=te, =de	te
1PL	-omp, -mp	-omp, -imp	=ny	ny
2PL	-e/it, -ch	-o(u)ch, -e/ich	=huy, =hu	huy
3SGM	-Ø	-(h)aff	=eff	eff
3SGF	-Ø	-(h)y	=(h)y	(h)y
3PL	-ont, -nt	-(h)e, -(h)o, -(h)eu	=y	y

Note: *-(h)*, *=(h)* devoices; *y* /i/; *ou* /u/; *o* /o/, /a/ in V-omp, V-ont; *ff#* /v/

Evidence of form is limited early on. In MB, independent and enclitic pronouns usually have the same forms in 3rd person, Table 8. However, in several texts, 3SGM is sporadically or frequently *e* /e/ only when clitic. This can be combined with orthographic union, (4)a, and occasionally union alone suggests enclitic status, (4)b, since when union is regular, it is with what are clitics or affixes by allomorphy.¹²

(4) Enclitic form in MB

Object enclitic to imperative

- a. neuse azeul≈e ha glorifi≈e
 then adore=3SGM and glorify=3SGM

Object enclitic to mihi est

- b. oll e=m≈eux≈y dispriset
 all R=1SG=be=3PL despised

(Cath, t16C MB)

Evidence of position is clear. In MB, the element *quet* is grammaticalising as the low element of bipartite negation *ne ... quet* close to French *ne ... pas* (Willis 2013). As such, it is right-adjacent to the finite verb in prose, unlike similar adverbial elements, a.o. *(h)oll* ‘all’, *quen* ‘anymore’. This suggests a close morphophonological connection, consonant with rare orthographic union in MB and eNB (Gk II.116, t16C MB), and effects on allomorphy and stress in NB (Sommerfelt 1920: 117–9, 149 for L; Quiggin 1910, Jackson 1961: 329 for T; Ternes 1970, McKenna 1976 for W). The one exception is object and doubling enclitics. These precede *quet* in MB and 17–18C KLT, immediately follow in W. In either type of position, doubling and object enclitics can form clusters, and then with some freedom of ordering, suggesting clitics rather than suffixes.¹³

¹² MB 3SGM =*e* seems unstudied; it is early in MB (e16C J[†] 1224, 2112 imperative beside =*ef*), and continues to eNB (Châtelier 2016: 407 IN imperative, usual =*èn*; also expletive; ditto PI 2-3 et passim). Unrevealing seems new 17–18C 3PL *int*, =*int*, confining =*i* to doubling verbal-inflection 3PL *-nt*, Anon. 1795: 3, Guillome 1836: 32, Le Bayon 1878: 50n; Châtelier 2016: 407 gives IN *int*, =*ii*, but it is *ii*, =*ii* in the exemplar here. 3PL *indy*, independent in *LLC*: §24, *HMSB*: §51n3 from a nonce attestation in MB, is rather 18C– eNB-L, op.cit, *ALBB*: map 75, perhaps Rostrenen 1738: 62f.; it seems rather to be innovated 3PL inflection + doubling enclitic in MB and 18C T, W, Rezac 2021 (MB *ema* ‘be’, Donoet; *chetu* ‘lo’, Qu, *eme* ‘say’, NI[†]; 18C W Anon. 1975, T in texts in 4.3).

¹³ By late eNB, enclitic rather than suffix status is also supported by float of object and doubling enclitics to

(5) Enclitic position before low negation *quet* in MB

Object of imperative

- a. na=dibrit=y quet oll
NEG=eat!2PL=3PL not all
Do not eat them all

Object of lexical mihi est

- b. n≈o=pe=euff quet à=bianoch...
NEG=2PL=be.COND=3SGM not for=less
you would not have it for less

Object of HAVE-perfect in cluster

- c. ha ne=m≈eus=me=y quet effet oll?
Q NEG=1SG=be=1SG=3PL not drunk all
Have I not all drunk?

(Qu, e17C MB)

The outcome of MB, MC encliticisation(s) of independent pronoun objects recalls the earlier encliticisation in Old Irish V1. The earlier and later enclitic forms are not readily relatable, and it may even be that the new encliticisation took place separately in MB nad MC. Placement after *quet* in eNB-W suggests lateness, but the evidence only appears in 18C, and might reflect reanalysis in W.¹⁴ Other evidence comes from independent pronouns other than objects. The equative seems to take only independent-syncretic forms, MB-MC *ha te* ‘as 2SG’, not MC **ha≈ta*, MB **ha≈de* (PA, e15C; Qu, e17C). With the noun *goa* ‘woe’, early evidence is enclitic 2SG =*de* (HMSB: §51.9, Ernault 1895: s.v. *goadyza*, DEVRI: s.v. *eza*; cf. Favereau 1997: §244), and enclisis is regular in MC (TGMC: 5.6). With presentationals, in both MB-MC pronouns unlike nominals must be adjacent; the form is independent-syncretic in MB (on B[†] 164, see Ernault 1895: s.v. *Arriu*), but enclitic in the noncognate presentationals of MC (TGMC: 5.6–7). The evidence of MB *eme*, MC *yn meth* ‘say’ needs more study (CG: §590.6n; MB-eNB Ernault 1890: §60, §74, 1899: §72, LVB: 205–7, HMSB: §152, MC TGMC: 5.6, 6.19). Earliness may be hinted at by nuanced correlations of form and distribution in variants of 3SGM and 2SG (a.o. 3SGM =*e(f)* imperative object beside =[?]*ef* with ‘woe’ in MB-MC), to be weighed against striking mismatch in lenition of 1SG *=*me* (e.g. MB *goa*=[?]*me* vs. MC *go≈vy* ‘woe me’).¹⁵

auxiliary + participle, object (20C W in BSDB-Guern: AMLC-56076-JLC-0001) or doubling (19C W in Loth 1886: 185). Enclitic clusters are rare but well attested in pre-*quet* varieties (HAVE-perfect MB Qu I.37, 75, eNB IN 135, PM 55, Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *lequel*, cf. HMSB: §52b; imperative, eNB-L DAB 251), but post-*quet* varieties show more clearly freedom of ordering (Guillome 1836: 115; Cheveau 2007: 243, Crahé 2014: 294; EOv: 39, BDS-D-Inguiniel). Early grammars already highlight the weaker diagnostic of order object-participle order, Guillome 1836: 114f. on W, cf. Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 30–1.

¹⁴ An isolated earlier example, along with union of *quet*, is Maunoir 1659: I: 63, cf. I.4.1n11.

¹⁵ In Breton, 1SG lenites only with *eme* ‘say’, 1SG *eme-vê*, *eme-ven* beside *eme-me* (De Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *dire*), but *eme* like prepositions lenites independent arguments, *eme*=[?]*Zoue* ‘said God’ (De Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *nid*), and *-ven* is an eNB-T development (Dottin 1911: 86); MC and eNB-L use verbal inflections.

2.5 New morphology

During 18C, a new development took place, “chiefly in Treguier, but also in Leon” (*HMSB*: §54n2), yet found as well by 19C in south-central W and by 20C in northeastern K, and so perhaps an innovation of their central interaction zone. The 3rd person object enclitics differentiated from doubling enclitics by borrowing forms indirectly or indirectly from prepositional suffixes. The new forms are of interest because they group just those enclitics that code objects and are restricted to 3rd person in MB. The background of the borrowed forms is closeness of enclitics to prepositional suffixes in 3SGM and 3PL, and usual identity in 3SGF, Table 8. It derives from the origin of enclitics and prepositional suffixes alike in pronouns attached in Brythonic, and greater interaction of prepositional with verbal suffixes in 1st/2nd person (Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1, 4.9).¹⁶

An early description is found in the grammar of Rostrenen 1738, and its system appears to be witnessed in the 1756 K/L text BS. The decisive new form is L object-only 3PL =*ho*, beside older =*y* for as object and doubling. New 3SGM =*han* beside older =*ê*, =*en* is found for both object and doubling across varieties, but within BS it may consistently differentiate object =*ân* from object and doubling =*èn*, at a brief examination.¹⁷

Table 9: Enclitics in Rostrenen 1738, early NB-L(KT)

	3SGM		3PL
Doubling	ro=—han [∧] , give=3SGM	ra=—ê [*] do=3SGM	reont/roont=—y do/give.3PL=3PL
P-obj.	dez-â [*] , to-3SGM	oud—hâ [*] , to-3SGM	dez-o, nemed~ho to-3PL except-3PL
IPV-obj.	pilid [*] =han [∧] strike-!2PL=3SGM	nemed~hâ [*] except-3SGM	grid [*] =y/ho do!2PL=3PL
HAVE-obj.	me am=eus=—en [∧] /han [∧] 1SG R.1SG=be=3SGM	bevet fed	me am=eus=y/= [?] o bevet 1SG R.1SG=be=3PL fed

Note: * form attributed or attributable to L; $Vn^{\wedge}/\tilde{V}/$.

A mid-18C L textbook illustrates the new system in a different form. Here the prepositional suffix recruited is 3PL *-he*, characteristic of neighbouring KTW varieties, not 3PL *-ho* of the L variety itself, *eguett-o* ‘than-3PL’. This makes 3PL object enclitics distinct

¹⁶ It may be relevant that in MB-eNB, verbal suffixes are usually written unified, object and doubling enclitics usually separated but also unified, and prepositional suffixes frequently either, even when clearly inducing allomorphy, e.g. *gant* ‘with’, 1SG *guen ef*, *guenef*, 3PL *gant e*, *gante* (J[†], e16C MB).

¹⁷ See esp. Rostrenen 1738: 13f., 22, 62–4, 159, 182, cf. 1732: s.v. *laisser*, *ensevellir*. For BS, see Gibson 2002; the 1824 reprint of 1756 is drawn on here, the author is K, the forms also L. In Rostrenen and BS, the rare unambiguous 3PL *o* in the HAVE-perfect are not =*o* but *o*^S, q.v. 4.4. The new enclitics usually devoice the final of their host, see below, but not here: cf. Iosad 2017: 7.2.1, 7.3.2 with literature, and MPC 22–23 across varieties in 19C. *HMSB*: §54n2 sees the first hint of the new system in 3SGM ≈*aff*, M[†] 489, t16C print of e16C text with T features, but in T both object and doubling are /ã/, cf. Ernault 1914: 64n1; there is ambiguous =[?]o=[?] in Veach 86 vs. =y 88, m16C MB.

from both doubling enclitics and prepositional suffixes. 3SGM retains the old form =*en*, against suffix -*an*, -*â*.¹⁸

(6) 3PL object *ho*=, object =*he*, doubling =*y*, independent *int* m18C L

a. abars peur *ho*=ranquit=-hu? ... bezâ o=pezo=-**he** ...
 in when 3PL=need.2PL=2PL be.INF 2PL=be.FUT=**3PL**
 For when do you need them [sc. boots]? ... You will have them. ...

pelec'h emaint=-y ... grit=-**he** e≈r=c'his ... chetu-int amâ
 where be.3PL=3PL make!2PL=**3PL** in=the=manner lo 3PL here
 Where are they? ... Make them *à la mode*. ... Here they are.

b. ûr=c'harros caër o=deus=-hy?
 a=carriage fair 3PL=D.be=3PL
 Do they have a nice carriage?

(COL, m18C eNB-L, single dialogue)

In neighbouring T by late 18C, the verse text EN[†] shows full syncretism of 3rd person with prepositional suffixes, in both segmental form and devoicing of the preceding consonant (q.v. Dottin 1911: 75, 87–9, Favereau 1997: §247).

Table 10: Enclitics in EN[†], late 18C eNB-T

	3SGM new only	3PL old	3PL new
Indep.	hac enf as 3SGM	a jnd hoais en bue and 3PL still alive	
P-obj.	gant-an with-3SGM		gant-e with-3PL
IPV-obj.	diges≈ an send!2SG=3SGM	digesed= ind send!2PL=3PL	queset≈e send!2PL=3PL
HAVE-obj.	em≈eus= an diuisqued 1SG≈be≈3PL unclothed	em≈eus≈ ind gonned 1SG≈be≈3PL won	em≈eus≈e tennet 1SG≈be≈3PL drawn

EN[†] does not witness doubling enclitics in 3rd person directly, but they can be inferred to be 3SGM =(h)*an*, 3PL =*ind*, =*i*, and the contrast is witnessed slightly later for 3PL (CAT.1817, e18C T; cf. also Hingant 1868: §II.114, Ernault 1897: 203f.).¹⁹

¹⁸ There is no MB 3PL (h)e=: B[†] 1557 in *DEVRI* s.v. *e'* 'les' is sg.fem. *hoz art*; nor MB 3PL (=)he: J[†] 2794 in Favereau 2016 s.v. *hè* is the conditional.

¹⁹ The relevant forms of CAT.1817 are doubling *voant*=-*ii* 'be.IPF.3PL=3PL, imperative object *na=lest*=*ê* 'NEG=let!2PL=3PL', HAVE-perfect object *o=deus*=-*ê* *etablisset* '3PL=D.be=3PL established'. The grammar of Le Clerc 1909: §139, §75f. gives full contrasts, but it is not clear how far it reflects usage of a given variety: imperative and HAVE object enclitics same as prepositional suffixes, 3SGM =*han*, 3PL =*ê*, doubling enclitics same as independent pronouns in form, 3SGM =*heñ*, 3PL =*i*/=*int*.

A similar system is inferrable for adjacent northeastern K from evidence in late 20C. The system has almost entirely regularised with new independent pronouns or “*a*-forms” across all constructions (4.3–4), but keeps the new forms of object enclitics as 3rd person pronominal objects of the positive imperative, and extends the object-doubling contrast to 3SGF (Humphreys 1995: 320–2; cf. Favereau 1997: §245).²⁰

Table 11: Enclitics in late 20C NB-neK (Humphreys 1995)

	3SGM	3SGF	3PL
P-x(=x)	gānt-ã(=‘hjã)	gānt-ɛj(=‘hi)	gānt-æ(=hjæ:)
V!2PL=x	‘tapət=a	st’a:get=ej	‘de:bət=æ

Note: *gānt-* ‘with’, *tapət* ‘strike’, *sta:gət* ‘attach’, *de:bət* ‘eat’

In W, the phenomenon has not been noted for the southeastern varieties of early literature and grammars, with their characteristic *-hou* 3SGM prepositional suffix, against *-hon* in the rest of W. However, it is described in the grammar of Le Bayon 1878 of both *-hou* and *-hon* varieties, the latter native to the author (Auray; cf. Ernault 1897: 203f.):

Table 12: Enclitics in Le Bayon 1878, late 19C eNB-scW

	3SGM	3PL
Indep.	ean̄	ind
Doubling	é=ean̄ be=3SGM	ou=hani=ind 3PL=one=3PL
P-obj.	get=hon̄ with-3SGM	get=hai with-3PL
IPV-obj.	kâret= ean̄/hon̄ love!2PL=3SGM	kasset= hai send!2PL=3PL
HAVE-obj.	em≈es= ean̄/hon̄ reit 1SG=be=3SGM given	em≈ès= ind/hai goarnet 1SG=be=3PL kept

Le Bayon’s system is witnessed in an early 18C work in a variety geographically close to his, HJC (Merlevenez). 3rd person pronouns are independent and doubling 3SGM *ion*, 3PL (*h*)*int* in all contexts. As objects of imperative and HAVE constructions alone, they also allow the prepositional suffix forms of the variety, 3SGM *hon*, 3PL *he*.²¹

(7) 3SGM object enclitics in e19C csW

- a. mar d’e hui en=dès=**hon** queméret, [...] imen e hu≈ès=**ion** laquet
 if=be 2PL 3SGM=D.be=3SGM taken where 2PL=be=3SGM put
 if it is you who have taken him, [tell me] where you have put him

²⁰ Verbal form + doubling enclitic is in *pe=‘tã:sa=‘hi*: ‘when=dance=3SGF’, Humphreys 1995: 359.

²¹ Doubling includes that of the subject of HAVE-constructions, *en=dès=ion* ‘3SGM=d.BE=3SGM’ “[What] has he done”. The one gap is absence of old 3PL as object of HAVE, and it is also rare with imperatives, though it is the one probable object enclitics attested with a jussive, Rezac 2021.

- b. Queméret=**ion** hui–memb ac juget=**hon** revé hou=Lézen
 take!2PL=3SGM yourself and judge!2PL=3SGM according 2PL=Law
 Take him yourselves and judge him according to your Law
 (HJC, e18C csW)

W offers the most complete set of contrasts for object and doubling enclitics across constructions, but it comes with a caveat. In W, imperatives and jussives start out with the split-person object coding of MB in 17C, but switch to enclitics in positive and proclitics in negative for all persons over the course of 18C (Rezac 2021), and the enclitics can assume forms specific to imperative-jussive in the 19C varieties of interest, through reanalysis of *-t* in *-et* ‘!2PL’ (Le Bayon 1878: 52; cf. Cheveau 2007: 3.5.1.2, 4.4.1.4, Crahé 2014: 5.1.5.2.4, 5.3.4.2, not Ternes 1970). These changes bring W closer to French (Rowlett 2014; Morin 1978: 3.3, 1979: 2.2, 2.6). The outcome is an alternation between two accusative-aligned codings with no role of person: partly unique enclitics in positive imperative-jussive, proclitics elsewhere, including negative present-form “surrogate” imperative and negative jussive, beside split-person coding in HAVE-constructions. The relative timing of these changes remains unclear. The best-studied and documented varieties of 20C neutralise all distinctions in 3rd person pronouns, suffix, enclitic, and independent (Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2006, Crahé 2014, and corpora like BDS-D-Inguiniel; cf. Favereau 1997: §241).

2.6 The person restriction

In MB, objects of imperatives are 3rd person enclitics and 1st/2nd person proclitics. The person restrictions are shared with HAVE constructions and underscored by the rise of new forms for their object enclitics but not for doubling enclitics. The outcomes are resumed in Table 13. The restrictions, unexpected from conditions on forms and from cognate systems, are traced to HAVE-constructions in section 3.

Table 13: Changes in clitic sets and restrictions for object coding in finite clauses

	MB, 17C L	18C central KLT	18C-19C scW	18–19C seW
Doubling	=x	=x	=x	=x
HAVE	=x ₃	=x ₃ → =y ₃	=x ₃ → =y ₃	=x ₃
	x _{1/2} =	x _{1/2} = → x=	x _{1/2} = → x=	x _{1/2} = → x=
V!1/2	=x ₃	=x ₃ → =y ₃	=x ₃ → =t-y ₃	
	x _{1/2} =	x _{1/2} = → x=	=x ₃ → =x	=x ₃ → =x
V!3	x=, =x ₃			same as V!1/2
V other	x=	x=	x=	x=

Note: *x* original, *y* new, *t-y* imperative-reanalysis forms; → transitions over time; changes in italics discussed in 4.3–4; infinitival clauses same once developed, 4.5.

There is an important limitation to correlating new object enclitic forms with the 3rd person restriction. In no variety here can it be straightforwardly determined what happened to any argument-coding enclitics other than objects of verbs (2.4). To illustrate with HJC,

equative *ha(c)* ‘as’ is replaced by inflected *el* ‘like’; argument of presentationals can be analysed as independent pronouns, *chetu ion* ‘lo 3SGM’; and *é-mé* ‘say’ with 3rd person pronominal arguments has verbal inflection and enclitics doubling it (Rezac 2021).²²

3 The development of split-person object-coding with *mihi est*

3.1 Agreement and nominative objects of BE in *mihi est*

In MW, the possessum of *mihi est* has the same morphosyntax as the subject of plain BE. Preverbal (pro)nominals are found with and without the nominative-aligned concord of the person-number inflections of the verb, (8)a. Postverbal nominals lack concord, (8)b. Dependent pronouns are rare, and ambiguous between inflection and object drop, (8)c.²³

(8) 3rd person objects of *mihi est* HAVE in MW

- a. Pedwar-pwenn broder a \approx m=bu ... Pedwar-pwenn broder a \approx m=bu-ant ...
 four-chief² brother R=1SG=be.PT four-chief² brother R=1SG=be.PT-3PL
 Four noble brothers I had ... For noble brothers I had ...
 (PRBH[†], t14C MW)
- b. Ac y \approx m=oed=i ieitheu
 and R=1SG=be.IMPF=1SG languages
 I had languages
 (BT[†], e14C MW)
- c. nac=eruyn=ti hedwch ny \approx th=vi
 NEG=pray!2SG=2SG peace NEG=2SG=be.CNS
 Pray not for peace – it will not be to thee.
 (BT[†], 14C MW; following Lloyd-Jones 1928: 94)

In MB-MC, independent nominals give no evidence, because they never concord. However, pronominal possessa contrast with subjects of regular (in)transitives. They are never coded by the nominative-aligned finite-verb inflections, like the subjects of plain BE, but by enclitics, like the objects of the imperative-jussive. Attestation is restricted to 3SG in MC, as in (9)a, and such cases are ambiguous with 3SG inflection plus doubling enclitic. MB adds 3PL, (9)b, and here the absent **=m=bi-ont(=y)* type corresponding MW *=m=bu-ant* of (8)a contrasts with the well attested *=m=boe=y* type absent as MW **=m=bu wy*. This becomes still more striking in eNB, where the missing type can be created to calque the pro-predicate use of 3rd person accusative clitics in French, (9)c. The one other dative-subject verb, *deur-* I.4.3, is rare with objects and they are nominal (J[†] 1966, 2439, 3456).²⁴

²² There is potential in 18C *W eme=he* ‘they say’, but in Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *dire* it is ambiguous between verb with 3PL enclitic, cf. *W eme=ind < *eme=i*, and preposition with 3PL suffix, cf. KLT *emez-o/e/eu*.

²³ Generalisations about MW here are extrapolated from corpus searches for forms, concordances, and secondary literature, see esp. Loth 1910: 496–501, Lloyd-Jones 1928: sec. 2, Fleuriot 2001.

²⁴ The calque is observed in *DEVRI*: s.v. *en*; IN builds the *nen dint/douc’h* calque by adding its 3SGM *en=* to its *ne d \approx int/ouc’h* ‘NEG=be.2PL/3PL’, where *ned=* is an allomorph of negation *ne=* whose *d* may or may not be related to the *de*-element of *mihi est* and had an *nend=* alternative in MB, see CG: §478.2, *LVB*: 185f., Schrijver 1997: 6.3, 7.2, and Schumacher 2004: 104–114 cited in Lambert 2011: 209.

(9) 3rd person objects of *mihi est* HAVE in MB-MC

- a. ha ty a=vy3=hy
and 2SG R.2SG=be.CNS=3SGF
and you will have her
(CE[†], t14C MC)
- b. a huy a=toehe n≈oz=boe=y
Q 2PL R=swear.COND NEG=2PL=be.PT=3PL
and would you swear that you have not had them
(N[†], 15/16C MB)
- c. n'=en=d-int/ouc'h
NEG=3SGM.ACC=D-be.3PL/2PL
ils ne le sont, vous ne l'êtes
(IN, e18C eNB-L)

Inflectional concord and coding of the possessum in MW is earlier, and converges with Old Irish (Stokes 1887: 234, Ernault 1888b: 258, Tonner 2013–: s.v. *attá* I.c). Coding by independent or enclitic pronouns in MB-MC is then innovative, whether or not it was also available but is unattested in MW. It can be derived by starting with the *mihi est* construction, crosslinguistic variation in agreement with nominative objects, the realisation of agreement in Brythonic, and the dependent-independent alternations traced for V1.

In Middle Brythonic systems, person-number suffixes to the verb are required to express nominative subjects as dependent pronouns, but tend not to concord with them as independent (pro)nominals. In MB-MC, concord is absent unless the subject precedes negation (*HMSB*: §174.1, *TGMC*: 5.27, 5.31), but may have been possible in OSWB (*GVB*: §187). In MW, concord is regular with preverbal (pro)nominals under certain conditions, and though it is exceptional with postverbal nominals, it is common in OW (*GMW*: §198–200, *SW*: 9.3, Schumacher 2011: 6.1, Plein and Poppe 2014). Concord is the rule in Old Irish (Roma 2000). At some point then, Brythonic had a system where person-number inflection to the finite verb realised agreement, and control of it had nominative alignment: subjects of canonical transitives and intransitives always or variably, objects of oblique-subject intransitives at least sometimes. Later, concord was lost, more extensively in MB-MC than MW (further a.o. Koch 1991: §21, Schrijver 1997: 7.1.4.2).²⁵

(10) Concord with postverbal independent nominatives in MW and OW

- a. amkeud-ant y=gedymdeithon
say-3PL the=companions
(WM, e14C MW)
- b. im≈guod-ant ir=degon
REFL=beseek².PT-3PL the=nobles
(Chad2, 8–10C OW; cf. Falileyev 2000: s.vv., Schrijver 2011b: 49.4)

²⁵ OSWB examples have plural subjects in Latin, or collective singular subjects, or are candidates for predicate concord, cf. *GOI*: 539. There seem to be no hints of concord in MB, once factors like apposition are taken into account, *HMSB*: §174.1n, §176n1, Ernault 1888b: 251–6, apart from constructions of exceptional complexity (Cnf² 44, m16 MB). It is found in late NB, Jouitteau 2009–: s.v. Accord.

Crosslinguistically, nominatives can have diminished agreement as objects compared to subjects. Icelandic and Finnish are such systems. Broadly, agreement is required with subjects of canonical (in)transitives in high and low clausal positions, but with nominative objects of oblique-subject intransitives, mostly in low clausal positions, it is unavailable (Finnish and Icelandic), optional, or required (other varieties of Icelandic) (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; Kiparsky 2001, Holmberg 2005, Vilkuna 1996: 3.5; Rezac 2020).

In this light, it is not unexpected that agreement was less available for nominative objects than subjects in Brythonic. MW type (8) derives from agreement, leaving open whether the possessum was or was not already the subject, as it is by MB. MB-MC type (9) derives from a stage where person-number inflection reflected agreement with nominatives, but it was unavailable to objects. Nominative object pronouns then could not be coded by inflection, and independent pronouns were unblocked and encliticised, as with accusative object pronouns uncodable by mesoclitics in imperatives, Table 14 (Rezac 2020). This stage of development remains in the jussive of MB (5.2). Later, full loss of concord led to reanalysis of inflection in MB-MC as attached pronouns or agreement restricted to silent pronouns (Anderson 1982; Stump 1984), perhaps unlike in MW (Willis 1998).²⁶

Table 14: Development of suffix vs. enclitic object in *mihi est*

Agr. with nom. obj.	*=m=bu-ont	‘=1SG=be.PT-3PL’
> MW	=m=bu=ant	
Nonagr. with nom. obj.	*=m=bu/boi i	‘=1SG=be.PT.3SG 3PL’
> MB	=m=boe=y	

Agreement can also derive an aspect of *mihi est* left aside in I.4. The *mihi est* forms of conservative varieties of Breton transparently contain BE, including forms unique to it (consuetudinal and imperfect subjunctive in MB, Schrijver 2011a, and their evolving usage in W, Le Bayon 1892: 60, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 39, 91). Apparent exceptions are distinctions in 3rd person present and imperfect forms MB-eNB (*HMSB*: §139, §168) and their cognates in MC-MW (cf. *CG*: §478). Only the forms pres. *eus*, ipf. *oa* are found in *mihi est*, to the exclusion of pres. *so*, *eu*, *ema*, (*em*)*edy*, ipf. (*em*)*edoa*.

The form *so* is mostly reserved to after subjects; its absence in *mihi est* is expected because it did not combine with any mesoclitic host until late (cf. *HMSB*: §168, Widmer 2012), and once established, gaps in host-clitic combinations can persist (Yang 2017, as in Romance, Miller and Monachesi 2003: 3.3). This may extend to the (*em*)*ed-* forms, originally with consonant-final particle that would have resisted mesoclitics (cf. *WG*: §160, *WS*: §77). The origin of *ema* is unclear, its usage varies, and incompatibility with mesoclitics might extend to it (cf. incompatibility with negation, Favereau 1997: §416, Ternes 1970: 16.2.2, 16.2.5, going back to 17-18C W), but it can also be independently incompatible with possession (Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 90, 1931: 88, vs. Le Bayon

²⁶ For 3SG objects, it is possible that ambiguity of the type (9)a between pronominal inflection + doubling enclitic and default + object enclitic favoured the recoding. It would also lend itself to object omission as alternative, but at a cursory examination, silent objects do not seem more favoured with *mihi est* than other verbs at least in prose (e.g. Qu I.105, 137, 197 vs. 203, e17C). Only later when HAVE-objects became accusative can any role have been played by the resistance to proclitic clusters in 3.3, cf. Lambert 1998: 823.

1878: 64, Ternes 1970: 16.2.2, 16.2.5). These approaches will not work for *eu* vs. *eus*, but here concord comes in. The form *eu* is restricted to definite subjects, while *eus* is rare with them and typical with indefinite subjects, partitive *a* ‘of’ subjects, and no subjects at all (*HMSB*: §168; cf. *GMW*: §148 for MW). The form *eu* is then a definite-concord form, and if definiteness like person-number concord was lost with nominative objects by MB-MC-MW, it would have left *eus* in *mihi est* in all systems.

The very form MB *eus*, MC *us*, MW *oes*, OW/OSWB (*h*)*ois* of BE presents a puzzle. The expected descendant of **es-ti* ‘be-3SG’ is absent in MB-MC, but found as *ys* beside *oes* in MW (*GMW*: §147–8), including in *mihi est*, *a≈m=ys/oes* ‘R=1SG=be’ ‘I have [wine, protection]’ (Fleuriot 2001: 27 from BT[†], e14C MW, BBC[†], m13C MW). Schrijver’s (1997: ch. 7, 2011b: 4.9.7.1) solution in Table 15 links the rise of *eus* to *mihi est*, and suggests one trigger for the grammaticalisation of nonagreement with nominative objects.

Table 15: The development of **esti* in Schrijver 1997

	V1 (absolute)	V1=R=3SGN (absolute)	NEG=V (conjunct)
	<i>*esti=eti</i>	<i>*esti=eti=ed</i>	<i>*ne=eti=ed=esti</i>
MW, MB	<i>ys</i> , - ‘it is’, ‘there is’	<i>yssit</i> , - ‘there is’	<i>nyt oes</i> , <i>ne deus</i> ‘there is not’

On the proposal, root clauses V1 **esti* + particle **eti* > MW *ys*, V1 **esti* + **eti* + 3SGN dative-accusative clitic **ed* > MW *yssit* ‘there is’, and **ne* + **eti* + *ys* > MW, *nyt oes*, MB *ne deus* ‘there is not’, with *eus* then generalised. The change ‘there is (not) to it’ > ‘there is (not)’ is compared to French *il y a*. The position of **ed* obeys Vendryes’ Restriction (2.3). In V1, it should have encliticised the dative-accusative possessor to V1. That is robust with *mihi est* in Old Irish (*GOI*: §430, *CG*: §343), and only attested with *mihi est* in Brythonic, not only MW *yssit* ‘there is’, but also MW *yss≈ym/yn* ‘be=1SG/1PL’ ‘I/we have’ (*GMW*: §147, Koch 1987: 152n12, Fleuriot 2001: 27 vs. *CG*: §478b; cf. Zimmer 1999).²⁷

The proposal suggests a trigger for the use of the nonagreement option with nominative objects in MB-MC. It entails a stage where the *mihi est* construction in positive root clauses was V1 BE + **eti* + dative-accusative enclitics. However, even in Old Irish, these enclitics are severely restricted, mostly to after 3SG verbal forms, and so in MW *yssym*, *yssyn* (*GOI*: §§429–431, 427; Newton 2006: 2.3). Root clauses have been proposed to play a disproportionate role in acquisition and change (Lightfoot 2006, Roberts 2007). If at some point *mihi est* favoured 3SG BE, it may have led to generalisation of 3SG throughout *mihi est* to give its nonagreement with the nominative object, evident in MB-MC.

3.2 Nominative objects and 3rd person restriction

In MB-MC-MW, possessa of *mihi est* are only found in 3rd person. In part, this is attributable to the greater frequency of inanimate pronominal possessa in the corpus, though human ones are well attested early, MC (9)a, MB (12)a. With the far larger corpus of eNB, there is rich attestations of *mihi est* on a broad range of ‘have’ uses that lend

²⁷ Schrijver op.cit. does not refer to MW *am ys*, *yssym*, *yssyn*, and derives the *de*-prefix of MB-MC differently from *GVB* and MW *de*-prefixed forms in I.4.4; cf. Ernault 1928–1930: II: 138.

themselves to pronominal human possessa. Then an asymmetry is clear: enclitic coding is available for 3rd but not 1st/2nd person possessa.²⁸

The situation can be illustrated with the widely translated (11). eNB-W has no alternative to enclitics, and paraphrases, with ‘find’ (HJC) or ‘be with’ (HJC, AVImaheu, EAVI). So too can eNB-KLT (HTC). However, eNB-KLT has also innovated object coding by independent “*a*-forms” (4.3–4), and these are common here (TJK; cf. (21)b).

(11) Matthew 26:11 in eNB-W

- a. [hui hou pou berpet peurizon guenoh;] mæs aveit deign-mé,
 ne=*me*=havehet quet berpet
 NEG=1SG=find.FUT.2PL not always
 [You will always have poor with you;] but as for me, you will not always find me.
- b. [hui e huès berpet peurizon guenoh ...; mæs aveit deign-mé,]
 me ne=üeign quet berpet guenoh
 1SG NEG=be.FUT.1SG not always with you
 [You have always poor with you ...; but as for me,] I will not always be with you.
 (HJC, e18C eNB-scW)

Across all varieties, there is available but rare and marked fronting of pronominal objects to the preverbal position, and here all persons are attested with *mihi est*:

(12) Independent pronoun possessa of *mihi est*

- a. Ef oar nep tro n≈on=bezo quet
 3SGM on no turn NEG=1PL=be.FUT not
 Him in no wise will we have [for Barrabas have we chosen]
 (J[†], e16C MB)
- b. Mi hou=pou doh en=nouz
 1SG 2PL=be.FUT from the=night
 You will have me by night [or by day].
 (ALLS, e20C NB-swW)

The restriction of enclitics to 3rd person is derivable from their origin as replacements of agreeing nominative possessum objects of BE. Functionalist approaches to similar person restrictions would derive it from the rarity of human definites as possessa, through grammaticalisation of proclitic subject + BE + enclitic object only for 3rd person (Haspelmath 2004, 2020). Extended possession uses found in MB-MC like (9) need not have overturned the gap (Yang 2016, 2017). Innatist approaches would derive it from constraints on nominative objects of anomalous-subject structures. These operate

²⁸ On possession types and their relationship to ‘have’, ‘be’ verbs, see Heine 1997, and esp. Myler 2016, Brugman 1988 for those allowing definite human possessa, (9), (11), (12), (21); for NB see Favereau 1997: §432–5, analysed in Stolz et al. 2008: 306–310, but not for uses relevant here. Apart from the examples given, early enclitic objects of *mihi est* are inanimate, MC 3SGM (BK[†], e16C), MB 3SGM (J[†] 3262), 3SGF (Pm[†] 174, 218 in (1)b, J[†] 999, 2728), but early in MB are humans in the HAVE-perfect (J[†] below).

independently of frequency, differentiating nominative subjects from objects with oblique-experiencer intransitives such as ‘like’ across Germanic (Anagnostopoulou 2003: ch. 5).

The approaches are not incompatible. Both derive why the person restriction affects enclitic object possessa of BE in *mihi est* but not inflectional subject possessa of BE + ‘to, with, at’ (I.3, I.5). They differ in how readily they handle unusability of dative + inflected BE for possession (eNB (9)c, MW I.4.1 ex. (7)c, cf. Sigurðsson 1996: 2.5, Postal 1984: 153–8, 1990: 177, Rezac 2016: sec. 4); and absence of evidence for nominativity of object possessa in MB-MC without the concord of MW, (8)-(9) (Rezac 2020).

In Finnish, the possessum of oblique-subject BE in *mihi est* alternates as 3rd person nominative ~ 1st/2nd person accusative, Table 2. In Breton, objects of the HAVE-perfect in the next subsection are coded like the possessum of *mihi est*, and they alternate as 3rd person enclitic ~ 1st/2nd person accusative proclitic. We might thus expect accusative proclitics with lexical *mihi est*, but they are absent: there is (12) *hou=pou* ‘2PL=be.FUT’ ‘you will have’, and *em=bou* ‘1SG=be.FUT’ ‘I will have’, but no *em=hou=pou* ‘you will have me’. Only in 19C are such forms sporadically attested in innovative varieties, where objects of *mihi est* are all codable by accusative proclitics, and subjects of *mihi est* are coded by transformed descendants of proclitics (4.1, 4.4, 5.1) (Ernault 1890: §70, *DEVRI: bezañ*¹, *LVB*: 202 suggesting influence of French). Then we do get *n'=am=po ket* ‘you will not have [po] me [am]’ (SBI.II, m19C KLT), as well as *n'=er=pou ket* ‘you will not have [pou] him [er, productive accusative 3SGM]’ (JSES, e20C wW).

Explanation for the absence of these combinations in conservative varieties lies in their very combination of two proclitics accusative in form, one coding the object and one the subject of *mihi est*. In the history of Brythonic, these clusters are expected but absent not only for *mihi est* in MB, but also for ditransitives like ‘give’ in MW (I.4.1, ex. 7). Clitic clusters often have syncretism-related gaps (Rezac 2010) or repairs (Bonet 1995), and rarity of dative clitics (I.4.1) and 1st/2nd person possessa (above) would not have favoured innovation (cf. Yang 2016).

3.3 The HAVE-perfect and 1st/2nd person objects

MB-MC innovate periphrasis of plain BE + resultative participle for the passive of transitives and the perfect of intransitives (*LVB*: 120f.). These code the nominative subject on the BE-auxiliary like the nominative subject of lexical BE, (13)a, and likewise for the subject and object of lexical *mihi est*, (13)b.²⁹

(13) BE-perfect of plain and *mihi est* BE in MB

- a. pebez ez=ynt bezet
 what R=be.3PL been
 what they had been
- b. me≈m≈eux=eff rez bezet
 1SG=1SG=be=3SGM rightly been
 I had legitimately had it

²⁹ In MB, *deur-* ‘want’, I.4.3, is compounded with BE to form perfects like *mihi est* here (Gk II.124, t16C MB, Qu I.247, Mc 47, e17C MB); in MC perfects of BE are unattested (*LLC*: §54f., *TGMC*: 7.9–14).

(M[†], t16C, composed e16C MB)

MB extends the BE-perfect to transitives in two ways (*HMSB*: §155f., §173, *LVB*: 120–3, 250f., 259f.). Transitives reflexivised with the *em*-prefix form perfects with plain BE as auxiliarily + *em*-prefixed participle. The BE-auxiliary codes the subject as with intransitives. The object is usually absent, but when coded, it is in the same manner as with finite synthetic forms: by accusative proclitic to the *em*-prefix, here on the participle, with no restrictions of person, (14)a-b (Hemon 1954c: 252f., *LVB*: 253–5):³⁰

(14) Object coding in BE- and HAVE-perfect of transitives in MB

BE-perfect of em-reflexivised transitives

- a. me so *ma=em-* roet
1SG be 1SG=RX-given
I have given myself
- b. *ma≈z=eo* bezet *e n≈em-* offret
as=R=be been 3SGM.ACC=RX-offered
as he had offered himself [for me]

(Cath, t16C MB)

HAVE-perfect of transitives

- c. Gant queuz bras *e≈m≈eux=ef* clasquet
with regret great R=1SG=be=3SG sought
In great sorrow I have sought him

(J[†], e16C MB)

Other transitives use *mihi est* BE as auxiliarily, and code their subject and object in the same way as subject-possessor and object-possessum of lexical *mihi est*, (14)c. This is here called the HAVE-perfect. In MB, the HAVE-perfect is also found with some intransitives, and later spreads onto the domain of the BE-perfect, up to all lexical verbs in eNB-W. In dative-subject verbs, BE and HAVE perfects are indistinguishable, (13)b like (14)c. MB usage and distribution of the HAVE-perfect are similar to French (but see *LVB*: 120ff. against a calque), its subsequent trajectory partly converges in replacing the preterite (*LVB*: 306ff.), partly diverge in distribution (W to lexical but not auxiliary BE, to all intransitives and reflexivised transitives, Guillome 1836, Le Bayon 1878, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902).

Objects of transitives are frequently speech-act participants, and appear as proclitics to the participle by late 16C MB. The result is alternation between 3rd person enclitic to the auxiliary and 1st/2nd person proclitic to the participle (*HMSB*: §51, 53, cf. Ernault 1890:

³⁰ Accusative here is revealing; in eNB regularisation, it will be matched by accusative in W but not LT, 4.1–4. In 16C MB, even verbal nouns show accusative beside genitive when *em*-reflexivised, Hemon 1954c: 250. If proclitic to *em-* is an MB innovation, *LVB*: 252–5, Lambert 2010: 177, cf. Irslinger 2014, 2016, Dedio and Widmer 2017, it reveals early the general change of object case of infinitives to accusative of late 17C–, *HMSB*: §54. The genitive may then have been early reanalysed as allomorph of accusative with nonfinite forms. Counterexamples to accusative with finite forms are only apparent: *DEVRI*: s.v. e¹ Ab[†] ‘le’, referent is fem. *materi*, and Pm[†] 188 e ‘le’ in Hemon 1962, referent is likely fem. *tremenuan* 177 as in 186.

I.6). It remains in varieties conservative about clitic coding like 20C wW (Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014, Ternes 1970; cf. Guillome 1836: 30–34, 115, Le Clerc 1908: §139).³¹

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

nep en=deues≈**aff** graet [...] vn=cleuffet en=saesiz [...]
 whoever 3SGM=D.be=3SGM done an=illness 3SGM=seize
 pé=en=heny e=m=eus da=enguentaet [...] n'a≈z=lessen [...]
 which=in=one R=1SG=be 2SG=engendered NEG=2SG=leave.IMPF.1SG
 Whoever has done it [...] an illness seized him [...] in which I have engendered thee
 [...] lest I left thee [...]

(single paragraph, Cnf e17C, Cnf² m17C MB)

The 1st/2nd person enclitics missing on the auxiliary for object-coding are available for doubling, e.g. *Guelet onn≈eux=ny* ‘seen 1PL=be=1PL’ (J[†] e16C). The 3rd person proclitics missing for object-coding are found at least by eNB even in strictly conservative systems, when the participle is stranded without an auxiliary:³²

(16) 3rd person proclitics on stranded participles in conservative eNB

Stranded participle

a. me a≈m=bise da=lazet=te, hac e=reservet=hi e=buez
 1SG R=1SG=be.COND.PT 2SG=killed=2SG and 3SGF=kept=3SGF in=life
 I would have killed thee, and kept it alive.

Otherwise

b. ... e=m=bise=hi quemeret
 R=1SG=be=3SGF taken
 I would have taken it

(IN, e18C eNB-L)

In MB, 1st/2nd person proclitics are syncretic in accusative-genitive, and there is no determining case, unless there is a hint in distinctively accusative 3SGM in the BE-perfect of *em*-reflexivised transitives (14). However, the accusative-genitive syncretism is broken later in W. Then strictly conservative varieties reveal that the 1st/2nd proclitics of the HAVE-perfect are accusative: in 1PL, when the genitive proclitic is replaced by the definite article (q.v. Noyer 2019, *DEVRI* s.v. *ni*; thus NB-wW in Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014); in

³¹ The generalisation is categorial in the cited studies of NB-wW, inferrable from guidelines and omissions in earlier descriptive grammars, and derived from textual studies for MB-eNB, esp. *HMSB*. The latter is mostly confirmed here; 3rd is always enclitic, attested in most texts with both animate and inanimate referents (freq. a.o. in J[†], Qu, Cnf², Veach); 1st/2nd is proclitic save as in the next subsection, attested from late 16C texts (freq. a.o. in Gk, Qu, Cnf²); contrasts between the two are clear within texts like Cnf in MB, and reach high numbers right after (IN, e18C eNB-L, approximate numbers for the HAVE-perfect 57 3rd enclitics over 38 lexemes, 29 1st/2nd proclitics over 21 lexemes, plus (16)a, Rezac 2020).

³² Contra *HMSB*: §53; cf. RP 266. The example is analysable as coordinated participles sharing an auxiliary, and as coordinate clauses with absent or elided auxiliary in the latter, cf. *penaos heruez raison ez=dleez beza saludet ha groeat enor dit* lit. “how by right shouldst be greeted and done honour to.thee” (Cath, t16C MB).

2SG and/or 1SG, when allomorphs specialise on genitive-accusative lines (q.v. Le Goff 1927: 198f., 202, Rezac 2021; cf. NB-seW in Le Goff 1927: 202). The same is also given away in W varieties that replace doubling enclitics by inflected forms of *da* ‘to’ when the doublee is accusative but not genitive (q.v. Loth 1895, Ernault 1890; thus NB-wW in Ternes 1970: 307). As with lexical *mihi est* (12), 1st/2nd person objects can also surface as independent pronouns, case-invariant but in alternation with proclitics (e.g. Cnf² 194).

3.4 Grammaticalisation

In MB, 1st/2nd person proclitics to participles seem only attested from later 16C (Gk, t16C, Cnf, Qu, e17C), and later present anomalies in earliest W (NG[†], t17C, Hemon 1956: §70; CS.bar[†], e18C Rezac 2021). Otherwise the split-person coding is attested from the oldest extensive texts: 3rd person enclitics in lexical *mihi est* and HAVE-perfect (3.3), they and 1st/2nd person proclitics in imperatives-jussives (2.4) (Pm[†], J[†], e16C MB, N[†], 15C–).³³

There is one early 1st/2nd person object in the perfect of transitives, but the formation is unique: 1SG mesoclitic attached to plain BE rather than *mihi est* BE as auxiliary (Ernault 1888a: s.v. *ameur*, 1898: §23, *LVB*: 202f., Lambert 2010: 193f.).³⁴

(17) 3rd enclitic to *mihi est* BE and 1st proclitic to plain BE perfect

- a. Cazr ha flam, houz≈eux=y lamet
 fair and bright 2PL=be=3PL removed
 Fair and bright you have removed them [sc. Adam’s progeny]
- b. Me en=heny a≈m≈eur cruciffiat
 1SG the=one R=1SG=be.IMP crucified
 I am the one such that one has crucified me

(J[†], e16C MB)

Later, one author appears to lack proclitics on participles, and in their place innovates three remarkable strategies: T. Gueguen (†1632, Le Menn 2000). One is omission, perhaps absent elsewhere for 1st/2nd person, (18)a. Another are inflected forms of *a* ‘of’ or *a*-forms, (18)b, otherwise incipiently used only for objects of negative clauses and with no restriction of person and tense/mood (see 4.2). Finally, there are enclitics, (18)c, nearly unique to his works for 1st/2nd person objects of the HAVE-perfect, and absent for other object coding until imperatives realign in 18C W (see 2.5, 4.1). Otherwise his object coding is regular, not only for 3rd person enclitics in HAVE-perfects and imperatives, but also for accusative-

³³ Caveats: Human pronominal objects of HAVE-perfects are well represented in J[†], not Pm[†], B[†], M[†], N[†] (J[†] human 2101, 3522, 3836, 4085, 4353, inanimate 1564); M[†], t16C print of e16C composition, was searched by candidate forms; Jer[†], 18C extracts of possibly 15C ms, is available to me only through citations in *DEVRI*.

³⁴ The 1530 text of J[†] was republished “corrected and amended” in 1622 by T. Gueguen, and substitutes preterite *a≈m=cruciffiat* ‘R=1SG=crucify.PT.IMP’. The resumptive use of 1SG is less anomalous than seems for MB verse, cf. Ernault 1890: §70bis, Lambert 2010: 188, but also for *mihi est* generally, Crahé 2014: 240, Jouitteau 2009–: s.c. Objects d’*avoir*. The present proposal adds to the cited ones the nature of 1SG =m=, but keep their influence of *am cruciffiat*, and of the impersonal as the one category codable only by inflection, though not Ernault’s link to *rymawyr*, cf. Schrijver 1991: 47. However, one earlier text hints that BE-perfects of plain transitives might in fact have been available more generally (Donoet 15:10 vs. 18.10, e16C MB).

genitive 1st/2nd person proclitics in imperatives, (18)c, and infinitival BE-periphrases (18)d (see 4.5). An indication of the robustness and diversity of these uses is given in Table 16.

(18) T. Gueguen counterparts to 1st/2nd person proclitic

Omission in HAVE-perfect

- a. An Roué en=deues gret antren en é=celyerou
 the=king 3SGM=D.be made enter in 3SGM=cellars
 The king made me enter in his cellars. (tr.: Le Roy m'a fait entrer en ses celiers.)
 (Be, m17C MB)

A-form in HAVE-perfect

- b. hac en=deues anuironet à hanoff gand an=acoutramant à=iusticc
 and 3SG=D.be surrounded of.1SG with the=accoutrement of=justice
 and who has surrounded me with the accoutrement of justice
 (Be, m17C MB)

Enclitic in HAVE-perfect

- c. nep en=deues=**ny** offanset ... Hogen hon=deliuret à=pechet
 whoever 3SGM=D.be=**1PL** offended but 1PL=deliver!2PL of=sin
 whoever has offended us ... but deliver us from sin
 (Do, e17C MB)

Genitive proclitic on verbal noun of BE

- d. euit hon=bezaff miret
 for 1PL=be.INF kept
 for our being kept
 (Mc, e17C MB)

Table 16: Pronominal object coding in T. Gueguen

Context and coding	Attestations
V!2=3	3SGF Do 19 3PL Do 30 (not exhaustive)
1=V!2	1SG Mc 3, 1PL Do 20 (not exhaustive)
AUX PRT __	1SG Be 366 (not exhaustive)
HAVE _{fin.} =3 PRT	3SGM Do 48, Mc 12, 30, 33, 3SGF Do 19, 3PL Be 42, Do 40 Mc 7, 8, 81 (not exhaustive)
HAVE _{fin.} =1/2 PRT	1SG Be 236, 2SG Be 316, 1PL Do 20, NI [†] 109
HAVE _{fin.} PRT <i>a</i> -form	1SG Be 159, 1PL Do 17, 2PL Mc 78
NEG <i>a</i> -form	3SGM Mc 23 (perf.), 3SGF Mc 24 (past cond.) (not exhaustive)

T. Gueguen's systematic enclitics are joined by two instances in Qu e17C MB of G. Quiquer, but these are anomalous against regular proclitics (1SG Qu I.25, 49, 135, II.27, 2PL Qu I.63, 247). One may be an artifact of lineation (2PL, Qu I.209). The other is same as T. Gueguen's (18)c (Qu II.17). Both are in the same version of the Lord's Prayer, and a third closely similar version also has the enclitic (Tolan 1747: 223; Le Bihan 2010 dates the orthography to early 17C). Other versions have proclitic 1PL *hon*= (G. de Keranpuil's Gk, t16C; E. Gueguen's Bel, e17C; CS.bar[†], e18C; later, Nédélec 1978, Le Bihan 2010).³⁵

³⁵ I am grateful to H. Le Bihan for the version in Bel, a text unavailable to me at the time of writing, as

The evidence suggests that 1st/2nd person proclitics to the participle required a period of grammaticalisation still incomplete in some varieties by 16C. That there was need for it is unsurprising. Upon innovation of the HAVE-perfect prior to 16C, there would have been two potential host sites for object-coding proclitics, the auxiliary that already had a proclitic in *mihi est* forms, and the participle that had no proclitics in any construction. In Romance, both can host proclitics, but varieties and constructions differ on which (Miller and Monachesi 2003, Benucci 1993, Grevisse and Goosse 2008: §662b4°). Distribution may hint at central innovation (late 16C G. de Keranpuil, northeastern K; early 17C E. Gueguen, K, mostly G. Quiquer *1605? but not yet T. Gueguen †1632, northeastern L; anomalies in W even to early 18C). Proclitics to *em*-reflexivised participles in the BE-perfect would have for host reflexive *em*- + participle, where *em*- also reflexivises finite verbs; the few instances like (14) also seem to appear in late 16C (Hemon 1954c: 262f.).

At least one verb might not have grammaticalised its participle as proclitic host, BE itself in the perfect of *mihi est* (Le Goff 1927: 203). It is tempting to look to its unique coincidence of BE and HAVE-perfects, (13), and the rarity of 1st/2nd person possessa.³⁶

In varieties that had not grammaticalised the participle as proclitic host, several alternatives are found. One is independent pronouns licensed under their usual conditions, preverbal focus (12), or exceptionally unblocked (note 36). Another is resort to the plain BE-perfect, (17). Finally, there are T. Gueguen's omission, *a*-forms, and enclitics in (18). Analogues to are familiar crosslinguistically for similar person restrictions, and can grammaticalise (Rezac 2011: ch. 5, 2020), or give rise to usages that are exceptional like his enclitics (Azkue 1923: II.572–3/§808, Lafon 1980: 397–99; Baker 1996: 638n2; Smit 2006: 4.6) and attributed degrees of deviance by speakers (Sigurðsson 1996).

3.5 Extensions of person restrictions

In the *mihi est* construction, object-coding enclitics were originally 3rd person due to the rarity of animate possessa, or as nominative objects, or both (3.3). The restriction was extended to the HAVE-perfect along with all aspects of subject and object coding, with crosslinguistic analogues (Hewitt 2006, Rezac 2020). Earlier or later, the restriction appears to have been imported into imperatives-jussives, where it is absent in cognate systems and unexpected from the development of MB (2.4). There is one obvious fulcrum for the transfer: enclitics coding objects, (19)a. They are exclusive to HAVE and imperative-jussive constructions, originating as independent pronouns with HAVE due to unavailability of agreeing objects (2.3) and with imperatives due to unavailability of mesoclitic objects in V1 (3.2), with both then enclitised and adopting new morphology (2.4-5). The same fulcrum may have helped transfer later-developed pure accusative proclitics in V1 imperatives to the HAVE-perfect, (19)b, specifically to its participle because of the proclitic cluster ban (3.3). Here role may have been played by frequent homophony of the participle, stem + *-et*, and the 2PL imperative, stem with variable vowel affection + *-(e/i)t*.

remains G. Quiquer's Nom, studied here only through citations in DEVRI and GMB.

³⁶ Exceptions to Le Goff's claim found here are: eNB-W cases where 3SGF *hé=/(h)i/* can also reflect *=hi/(h)i/* in W, and so plausibly orthographic, Rezac 2021; and prescriptive guidelines for literary usage based chiefly on KLT at a point where spoken KLT had mostly lost object proclitics, Vallé 1923. In one otherwise conservative variety, postverbal independent pronoun objects specifically here have been highlighted: *jɔ n≈əs pə ni* '3SGM 3SGM=D.be been 1PL' 'He has had us' (Cheveau 2007: 5.4.2, e21C NB-swW).

(19) Transfers of person coding conditions (* reconstructed, ungrammatical)

- a. HAVE=3 : V!=3 :: ~~HAVE=1/2~~ : *V!=1/2 → V!=1/2
 b. V!=3 : HAVE=3 PRT :: 1/2/*3=V! : ___ → ~~1/2=HAVE PRT~~, HAVE 1/2(/3)=PRT

Left unexplained by this is the absence of 3rd person proclitics to alternate with enclitics. They expected in historically in V1 imperatives-jussives (2.2, perhaps attested in jussives), and they are attested in the perfect on stranded participles (3.3, 4.3). This absence is derived in theories that relate the 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative object coding to subject properties in Finnish (sec. 1). Any such role for subjects leads to certain expectations (explored in Rezac 2020): about the directionality of transfers between imperatives-jussives and *mihi est* (adopted in (19)); about the role of person in argument-coding enclitics other than verbal objects (2.6); about the nature of stranded participles (3.4); and about the interaction of the rise of enclisis, pure proclisis, and polarity-transfer in imperatives (2.4) and jussives (2.2, 5.2).

4 Regularisation of object coding

4.1 The addition of 3rd person proclitics in W

Over the course of 18C, most varieties added to the split-person coding of the objects of HAVE-constructions the accusative-aligned coding of other objects. This took place in two ways: by extension of 3rd person proclitics to the participle across much of KLT and W, and extension of novel independent accusative pronouns or *a*-forms in KLT and adjacent W. The imperative underwent similar developments, but separately.

The innovation is simplest to set out for W. In HAVE-constructions, 3rd person proclitics appeared as alternative to enclitics, usually and early on the participle in HAVE-perfects, sporadically and late on lexical or auxiliary *mihi est* itself (see 3.3). The change occurred in systems where the older genitive + verbal noun construction had already been replaced by accusative + infinitive, and the accusative form appears on the participle.

(20) Conservative-innovative object clitics in e18C W

- a. Mé am≈es=**hi**, quent evit~on guelet
 1SG 1SG=be=3SGF before for-3SGM seen
 I have seen it before him
- b. Ag é=pehe ar=hentan é=guelet
 though 2SG=be.COND the=first 3SGF=seen
 Though thou hadst seen it first
- c. Eun an=des ar=sicouret
 3SGM 3SGM=D.be 3SGM.ACC=helped
 He has helped him

(CS.bar[†], e18C eNB-cnww)

Only the enclitic coding is found in the oldest extensive, likely southeastern text of late 17C (NG[†]), and literature, grammars and corpora from that area only use or prefer it. From the northwest or northeast comes an early 18C witness to the innovation (CS.bar[†], Rezac 2021), and it wins out in the northwest by 20C (McKenna 1976). It is attested in the center-south by 19C (HJC, e18C, rare, Le Bayon 1878: 51; cf. Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 31), but absent from the southwest in 20–21C (Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014).³⁷

Imperative-jussive constructions took a separate route after the earliest texts (17C Pr, PR, NG[†], e18C CS.bar[†]): simple accusative-aligned coding by special enclitics in positive imperatives-jussives, present tense and its object coding for negative commands (2.5).³⁸

4.2 The rise of *a*-forms in KLT

In KLT, HAVE-constructions underwent the same innovation as in W, but KLT also recruited inflected forms of the preposition *a* ‘of’ or *a*-forms for all pronominal objects.

The origin of *a*-forms has been seen in *a* ‘of’ phrases coding partitive objects and subjects, often close to total ones, (21)a. By late 16C, they occur sporadically for total pronominal objects under negation as alternatives to proclitics, including for the same referent in the same sentence (Gk II.116, t16C MB), while *a* + nominal remains only partitive (Ernault 1890, *HMSB*: §69, Stark and Widmer 2020; cf. *SW*: 9.5.3 on MW). Examples occur with *mihi est* and imperatives but are not limited to them.³⁹

(21) Early *a*-forms

Partitive – total object ambiguity in MB

- a. Ne≈m=boe=quet [...] aneze [...] n=oz=boe=y?
 NEG=1SG=be.PT.not of.3PL NEG=2PL=be.PT=3PL
 [A: Have they not gone off with thee?] B: I have not [by my faith] received any. [...] C:
 [... and would you swear that] you have not received them?
 (N[†], 15C– MB, cf. Ernault 1890: 199)

Total object as last-resort in eNB-L

- b. ho=pezo ac’hanon da=viana evit ho=Parner
 2PL=be.FUT of.1SG at=least for 2PL=judge
 you will have me at least as your Judge.
 (RP, e18C eNB-L)

³⁷ Examples in McKenna 1976: §§317, 430, 434 hint at enclitics; cf. Jouitteau 2009–: s.v. Objects d’avoir.

³⁸ 18C W texts do rarely have 3rd person proclitics in positive commands, as in 19C KLT, but only when ambiguous with presents, Rezac 2021, presumably underlying their absence in Anon. 1795, Guillome 1836, Le Bayon 1878, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902, *HMSB*: §51–4.

³⁹ W mostly lacks *a*-forms at all periods, save nwW with KLT pattern, McKenna 1976, BSDB; but in 17–18C W, there are isolated *a*-form objects in negative imperatives, *HMSB*: §69, Rezac 2021, and in NB-swW of Groix, Ternes 1970: 16.6, proclitics alternate with 3rd person *a*-forms, and enclitics must be replaced by them in negative clauses, recalling MB. Other uses are distinct: in southern varieties *a*-forms double subjects, 18C–19C W in Le Gléau 1973: §14, Ernault 1878: 233, later code them, e.g. Ternes 1970: 16.2.5; more widely, *a*-forms code of subjects of equative and existential BE, Le Gléau 1973: §14, as quasiarguments already MB, Stark and Widmer 2019: 753.

From early 17C, *a*-forms occasionally turn up as pronominal objects elsewhere, perhaps chiefly in environments where other coding is difficult, as in the MB of T. Gueguen. This use characterises IN of C. Ar Bris, t17-e18C eNB-L: *a*-forms are rare, and several if not all appear when there no alternative, (21)b. Ar Bris’s object coding is otherwise that of MB, and the starting point which following systems modify: 3rd person enclitics ~ 1st/2nd person proclitics for objects of all imperatives and HAVE-perfects, accusative proclitics for objects of other finite forms, proclitics for objects of infinitives, genitive in 3SGM.⁴⁰

4.3 Generalisation of *a*-forms in eNB-T

Full extension of *a*-forms to alternate with proclitic and enclitic objects, without extension of proclitics for enclitics, is found in late 18C T SP[†], CT[†], CC[†], EN[†] (q.v. Le Menn 1983; cf. Dottin 1911: 87f., Stark and Widmer 2020: 751f. for object pronouns in EN[†]).⁴¹

Table 17: Pronominal object coding in late 18C eNB-T verse

		Proclitic		A-form		Source
Finite	3	me <i>o</i> =rento 1SG 3PL=will.make		me darde 1SG shot	anese of.3PL	CC [†]
	1/2	me <i>es</i> =tuanquou 1SG 2SG=will.“unmiss”		me a=vourefou 1SG R=will.torture	anoud a.2PL	EN [†]
Infinit.	3	<i>d</i> ≈ <i>o</i> =lacat to=3PL=put		da=lacat to=put	anese of.3PL	CC [†]
	1/2	<i>d</i> ≈ <i>o</i> =pisittan to=2PL=visit		<i>d</i> ≈anaout to=know	ahanoch of.2PL	CC [†]
Imperat. (pos.)	3	delchett≈ int hold!2PL=3PL		queset send!2PL	ane of.3PL	CC [†]
	1/2	<i>on</i> =delchet 1PL=keep!2PL		sicouret help!2PL	ahanomp of.1PL	CC [†]
Perfect	3	e teus≈ int bet thou.hast=3PL been/had		o cheus bet you.have been/had	anese of.3PL	CC [†]
	1/2	<i>o</i> =cleuet ameus oll 2PL=heard I.have all		beued a meus fed I.have	anoch of.2PL	CC [†] , EN [†]
HAVE (lex.)	3	<i>o</i> po≈ ynt /≈ y you.will.have=3PL		anou he.will.have	anesy of.3SGF	CC [†] , CT [†]

A-forms are found in the postverbal position of independent nominal objects, contrasting with finite-attached enclitics and finite- and participle-attached proclitics. There

⁴⁰ In IN, there are two clear *a*-forms against >100 object clitics: [*e cherisse*] *re anezi* ‘[loved] too.much her’, syncretic with partitive [*hor=be*] *re anezi* ‘[we have] too.much of.it’, and *gulet anezàn pe anezi o=vervel*, left conjunct object, the one environment that unexpectedly resists both clitic and independent coding in French, Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 103, Kayne 1975: 2.17. The situation is similar in RP, with one unmotivated *a*-form; on other works see *HMSB*: §69.

⁴¹ Finite forms here are glossed holistically; on *mih i est* forms in these texts see 5.1. Examples keep to one text save as needed. Poor but clear attestation includes objects of the DO-periphrasis and 3rd person inanimates as well as animates. Enclitics use the new enclitic in 3SGM (*h*)an, and in EN[†] 3PL (*h*)e, 2.6.

is no differentiation of old and new codings by register, to go by frequent their combinations even within the same sentence (EN[†] 2369f., 3109f., 2375 + 2440).⁴²

(22) Alternation of clitics and *a*-forms in EN

- a. mar=*en*=tapomb ... nin exersou a nean
 if=3SGM=seize.1PL 1PL exercise.FUT of.3SGM
 If we seize him [there, ...] we will make him exercise [without much rest].
 (EN[†], t18C eNB-T, same sentence)
- b. eun=dour a neus ma=rasasied / a discuised a hanon
 a=water have 1SG=filled and rested of.1SG
 a water that has filled me / and rested me
 (EN[†], t18C eNB-T)
- c. lenet≈e ... lened a né
 read!2PL=3PL read!2PL a.3PL
 read them ... read them
 (EN[†], t18C eNB-T, separated, same referent and context)

There is almost no extension of proclitics to imperatives or to participles of the HAVE-perfect in these texts, apart from stranded participles like (16)a (SP[†] 784). An exception (23) in EN[†] uses the genitive form of 3SGM, though the texts already allows the accusative form of 3SGM on infinitives (Dottin 1911: 87). The slightly later AJC[†] by the same author-copyist has more examples, though enclitics dominate (cf. Favereau 1997: §247).⁴³

(23) Proclitic on participle vs. infinitive in t18C eNB-T

- e*≈imited a meus ... tachomb d≈*en*=jmitan
 3SG.GEN=imitated I.have try!1PL to=3SGM.ACC=imitate.INF
 I have imitated him [...] let us try to imitate him.
 (EN[†], t18C eNB-T)

4.4 Full innovation: proclitics and *a*-forms in KLT

By 1738, G. de Rostrenen describes full generalisation of *a*-forms and proclitics, save perhaps in the imperative. Rostrenen's system is used soon after in the mid-18C L French-Breton colloquies COL (q.v. Le Goaziou 1950; cf. 2.5). The chief difference is in 3SGM: in Rostrenen, 3SGM is genitive on infinitives, and not witnessed on participles; in COL, it is both genitive and accusative on infinitives, but genitive on participles, and it is also genitive in mid-18C K/L BS, which has the object coding described by Rostrenen (2.5).⁴⁴

⁴² In NB, object *a*-forms been given out as available only in postverbal positions, Urien and Denez 1977: 280 on KLT, Stephens 1982: 2.6.3 on T, Timm 1987: 8.1 on K, Schapansky 1996: 3.2 along with partitives on W, but not Hewitt 2001 on T if the *a*-forms are enclitic-doubled; in the texts here *a*-forms are postverbal.

⁴³ Imperatives with proclitics are ambiguous with infinitives (positive SP[†] 959) or future (positive SP[†] 699f., negative CC[†] 487, cf. clearly future commands SP[†] 786f., CT[†] 84f.).

⁴⁴ All categories of Table 18 attested in COL are also in Rostrenen 1738: esp. I.1.2.1, I.5.1–3, I.5.1.5, II.4.

Table 18: Pronominal object coding in COL, mid-18C eNB-L

		Proclitic	A-form	Enclitic
Finite	3	<i>er</i> =guelàn 3SGM=I.see	ec'hanavezàn anezàn I.know a.3SGM	-
	1/2	<i>em</i> =ene R.1SG=knows	mar goulëner ac'hanon if one.asks a.1SG	-
Inf.	3	<i>d'</i> = <i>he</i> =anaout to=3SGF=know	d'anaout anezi to.know a.3SGF	-
	1/2	<i>va</i> =c'haret 1SG=love	[attested in Rostrenen]	-
Infin. + 'do'	3	<i>e</i> =anaout a ràn 3SGF=know I.do	anaout a rit-hu anezi know do.you a.3SGF	-
	1/2	<i>va</i> =anaout a rit-hu 1SG=know do.you	?	-
Impv. (pos.)	3	-	-	digassit= èn send!2PL=3SGM
	1/2	<i>va</i> =guisquit 1SG=clothe!2PL	divisquit ac'hanon unclothe!2PL a.1SG	-
Perf.	3	<i>e</i> =lavaret en deus 3SGM.GEN=said he has	anavezet em-eus anezàn known I.have a.3SGM	lavaret en deus= èn said he.has=3SGM
	1/2	<i>oc'h</i> =anout a ra 2PL=know he does	?	-

The rich range of examples of object coding and doubling in COL bring out the consequences of its innovations for 3rd person the HAVE-perfect, Table 19:

Table 19: 3rd person object coding in the HAVE-perfect of MB-eNB

Object coding		MB	COL
PRT AUX= <u>3PL</u>	gulet hon=eus= <u>y</u>	√	√
AUX= <u>3PL</u> PRT	hon=eus= <u>y</u> gulet	√	√
AUX <u>3PL</u> =PRT(= <u>3PL</u>)	hon=eus <u>o</u> =gulet(= <u>y</u>)	N/A	√
<u>3PL</u> =PRT AUX(= <u>3PL</u>)	<u>o</u> =gulet hon=eus(= <u>y</u>)	N/A	√
AUX= <u>3PL</u> PRT	hon=eus= <u>he</u> gulet	N/A	√
PRT AUX= <u>3PL</u>	gulet hon=eus= <u>he</u>	N/A	√

Elements: *gulet* 'seen', *hon=eus* '1PL=be' "we have", *o*=, =*o*, =*y* '3PL'

The first two rows continue the sole possibilities in MB, enclitics ambiguous for object and doubling, 3PL =*y*. One innovation is new forms for object enclitics, 3PL =*he*, the other is extension of 3rd object proclitics, 3PL *o*^S= . The result distinguishes object coding, =*he* or *o*^S=, from doubling, =*y*. There are two gaps. One is enclitic-doubling of object-coding enclitics, perhaps not to be excluded (cf. Ernault 1897: I.5). The other is doubling of

proclitics on fronted participles by enclitics to it, rather than enclitics to the auxiliary, perhaps because participle+auxiliary come to form a unit (q.v. Urien 1999).⁴⁵

Further evolution of KLT in 19C is sketched in *HMSB*: §54. Typically, the 3SGM accusative-genitive distinction is given up in favour of syncretic *e=*, but *en=* is repurposed for a new accusative-only category, 3SG inanimate. The object codings of HAVE and imperative constructions regularise fully to proclitics or *a*-forms, and by early 20C *a*-forms mostly replace object-coding proclitics (*ALLB*: map. 288), though these can be available in certain registers (Favereau 1984: III.1.h). There is one exception, 3rd person enclitics in positive imperatives, where they long remain available (EKG, m19C-L, MBR, t19C eNB-L, MPC 22-3 vs. 19, 19C eNB-KLT), or even obligatory (t20C northeast K, Humphreys 1995: 318–320, Favereau 1997: §§245, 247, see 2.6, but not Timm 1987: 8.1).

4.5 Infinitives of HAVE and HAVE-perfects

In MB-MC-MW, the dependent pronouns of verbal nouns are genitive in ergative alignment, coding S and O but not A (I.5.4). This extends to periphrases formed with plain BE in MB-MC, (24). *Mihi est* BE is confined to finite clauses in MB-MC (*ibid.*), and so seems to be the active perfect periphrasis formed with it in finite clauses in MB, Table 20 (so *LVB*: 353, 356–9, *HMSB*: §155n1, *pace* Ernault 1888a: s.v. *bezaff*).⁴⁶

(24) Passive periphrasis with verbal noun of BE in MB-MC

- a. *y=vos* *scryfys yn=lyffrow*
 3SGM.GEN=be.INF written in=books
 [Jesus Christ said] that it was written in books
(PA[†], 14C MC)
- b. *e=bout* *ganet e=bro breton*
 3SGM.GEN=be.INF born in=country Breton
 [and I have also learned] that he was born in Breton country
(N[†], 15C– MB)

Table 20: MB argument coding for finite clauses vs. verbal nouns

	Synthetic	Perfect	Passive
intransitive	V _{FIN-S}	BE _{FIN-S} V _{PRT}	
incl. plain BE	S=V _{VN}	S=BE _{VN} V _{PRT}	
<i>mihi est</i> BE	R=D=BE _{FIN} =S ₃	R=D=BE _{FIN} =S ₃ V _{PRT}	
	–	–	
transitive	O=V _{FIN-A}	A=D=BE _{FIN} =O ₃ O _{1/2} =V _{PRT}	BE _{FIN-O} →S V _{PRT} (by-A)
	O=V _{VN}	–	O→S=BE _{VN} V _{PRT} (by-A)

⁴⁵ In Table 19, MB has AUX *x=PRT(=x)*, *x=PRT* AUX with 1st/2nd person objects, immediately subsequent eNB witnesses 3rd person on stranded participles, (16); COL has AUX *x=PRT(=x)* only without =*x*, and lacks directly PRT AUX=*y* but cf. (6); *x=PRT* AUX=*x* may be unattested in MB, but is not isolated in eNB: *e=ententet oc'h≈eus=-y* ‘3SGF=heard 2PL=be=3SGF’ “You have heard her” (COL), *Ou=reit hou=poé=ind d'ein* ‘3PL=given 2PL=be.IPF=3PL to.1SG’ “You have given them to me” (BSPD, e20C eNB-W).

⁴⁶ Not included in Table 20 are *em*-reflexivised transitives; they are like intransitives with A/O for S, plus early when synthetic usual O_{ACC}=em-V_{FIN-S}, rare O_{ACC/GEN}=em-V_{VN}, see 3.3.

NOTE: V_{FIN} finite, V_{VN} verbal noun, V_{PRT} participle; 1/2/3 person; S, A, O, R argument roles; D dative element; -x suffix, x= proclitic, accusative to V_{FIN}, genitive to V_{VN}.

At some point, verbal nouns grammaticalised as infinitives. This becomes clear upon loss of the genitive O/S coding of verbal nouns, and use of the same O/S-codings as in finite clauses. It is shown for O in (25) from W, where it took place earliest. The examples also shows use of the infinitive of *mihi est* innovated in W (I.5.4) as perfect auxiliary (so already partly NG[†], t17C, Hemon 1956: §63, §80, fully CS.bar[†], e18C, Rezac 2021).

(25) Infinitives of HAVE-perfects with fully finite-like argument coding

- a. glahar sincèr *hur*=bout=**ean** commettét
 regret sincere 1PL=be.INF=3SGM committed
 sincere regret of our having committed it
- b. hac *en*=doud *er*=chervijét
 and 3SGM=D.be.INF 3SGM.ACC=served
 and (for one) to have served him

(MG, t18C eNB-W)

In KLT, the MB system remains in place formally in the earliest 18C L of C. Ar Bris. Clitics with verbal nouns are ergative-aligned and genitive, and even when the natural translation is the perfect active, the passive can be given away by *by*-phrase agents (*LVB*: 356–9). This mostly continues in the late 18C– T texts CC[†], CT[†], EN[†], SP[†], AJC[†], (26)a-b. However, there also appear signs of assimilation to finite clauses: objects of transitives can be accusative as well as genitive, see (23) above for EN[†], and appear on the participle rather than BE in periphrases, exceptionally in EN[†] (26)c, cf. (25)b, frequently in AJC[†].

(26) Evolution of infinitival HAVE-perfects in t18 eNB-T

Intransitive subject coded by proclitic

- a. ous *o*=besan *en*=quer
 PROG 3PL=be.INF in=town
 with their being in town

(CC[†], t18C eNB-T)

Passive of transitive revealed by-phrase

- b. Rentet graç da=Doue d≈*o*=pout choazet gantan
 give!2PL grace to=God to=2PL=be.INF chosen by.3SGM
 lit. Give thanks to God for your being chosen by him

(SP[†], t18C eNB-T)

Active perfect of transitive suggested by proclitic on participle

- c. darbead a=voay dean bean *ma*=etrangled
 nearly R=be.IMP to.3SGM be.INF 1SG=strangled
 he nearly strangled me

(EN[†], t18C eNB-T)

By mid-19C L texts, the shift is complete (cf. *HMSB*: 54n1; so AHS, EKG, HTC). The only difference from W is the use of the infinitive of bare BE as auxiliary, and this also an option in W (I.5.4; even in varieties with infinitives of *mihi est*, Ternes 1970: 16.3.3).

(27) Infinitives of HAVE-perfects with finite-like object coding in eNB-KLT

- a. d'=en=instrui
to=3SGM.ACC=instruct.INF
to instruct him
- b. goude beza en=instruet
after BE.INF 3SGM.ACC=instructed
after having instructed him

(AHS, m18C eNB-L)

The consequences for argument coding may be encapsulated by considering possible BE-based periphrases of transitives (cf. Le Goff 1927: 202, *LVB*: 356f.). In MB, the sole option is the passive *hoz/e=bout tennet* '2PL/3SGM.GEN=be.INF drawn' "your/his being drawn". 19C eNB KLTW would express this by silent-subject *bout tennet*, and adds active *bout ho/en=tennet* "having drawn you/him" with 2PL/3SG.ACC. 17C– W continues what looks like the earlier formation in *hou=bout tennet*, but *hou=bout* is the new infinitive of *mihi est*, so it is the active "our having drawn", beside the entirely novel *hou=bout en=tennet* "your having drawn him", *en=de-vout hou=tennet* "his having drawn you".

4.6 Overview

The main lines of changes to dependent-pronoun object coding are resumed in Tables 21, 22, setting aside nuances of negative clauses and jussives.

Table 21: Dependent-pronoun objects in KLT (bold: stepwise innovations)

	FIN	INF	IPV	HAVE-PF FIN	PF INF
e16C MB [†]	1/2/3A=	1/2/3G=	=3, 1=	=3	N/A
e17C MB	1/2/3A=	1/2/3G=	=3, 1/2=	=3, 1/2= [=3/1/2 ^{a1°/2°}]	N/A
e18C L (IN)	1/2/3A= ^{a°}	1/2/3G= ^{a°}	=3, 1= ^{a°}	=3, 1/2= ^{a°}	N/A
t18C T (EN [†])	1/2/3A= ^a	1/2/3G~ A = ^a	=3 ^(x) , 1= ^a	=3 ^(x) , 1/2/ 3G [°] = ^a	= FIN [°]
18C L (COL)	1/2/3A= ^a	1/2/3G~ A = ^a	=3 ^(x) , 1= ^a	=3 ^(x) , 1/2/ 3G = ^a	
19C KLT	1/2/3A= ^a	1/2/3A= ^a	=3, 1/ 3A = ^a	1/2/ 3A = ^a	= FIN
m20C KLT	^a	^a	^a [=3 ^{a1}]	^a	= FIN

Table 22: Dependent-pronoun objects in W (bold: stepwise innovation)

	FIN	INF	IPV	HAVE-PF FIN	PF INF
e16C MB [†]	1/2/3A=	1/2/3G=	=3, 1=	=3	N/A
t17C se ³ W NG	1/2/3A=	1/2/3G~ A =	=3, 1=	=3, 1*/2=	
e18C ncwW (CS.bar [†])	1/2/3A=	1/2/3G [°] ~ A =	=3, 1=	=3, 1*/2/ 3A =	= FIN

t18C seW (IS.mar)	1/2/3A=	1/2/3A=	=3/1	=3, 1/2/3A=	= FIN
18C scwW (HJC)	1/2/3A=	1/2/3A=	=3 ^(x) /1	=3 ^{x°} , 1/2~3A°=	= FIN
m20C swW-Groix	1/2/3A=	1/2/3A=	=3/1	=3, 1/2=	
e21C cwW-Languidic	1/2/3A=	1/2/3A=	=3 ^(l) /1	=3, 1/2=	

Notes: A/G acc./gen.; ^x object-form; ^l imperative-form; ^a a-form; * anomalies; ° exceptional; [...] restricted varieties

KLT moves towards simple accusative alignment of all object coding over 18–19C, replacing the split-person coding first in HAVE and then in imperative constructions. In the regularisation, *a*-forms can precede proclitics, and proclitics first use genitive, switching to accusative after infinitives had done so. W differs. Accusative alignment arises by mid-18C in the imperative, but in a form unique to it. In HAVE-constructions, accusative alignment is dialectal and dispreferred, but earlier than in KLT, and from the outset uses accusative proclitics, which are by then also the rule in infinitives. Central KLT and W systems develop distinctive forms of 3rd person enclitics for coding objects, shared by imperative and HAVE-constructions so long as these retain split-person coding.

5 Regularisation of subject coding

5.1 Dative-accusative and nominative-like agreement

The 18C realignments of object coding partly transition *mihi est* to *habeo*. The subject coding of *mihi est* as well can partially regularise to nominative, by doubling or replacing the old proclitics of *mihi est* with the nominative-aligned suffixes of other verbs:

(28) Nominative suffixes attached to *mihi est* in MB-MC

a. an=teker a≈s≈beth-eugh=why
the= enjoyment R=2PL=be.CONNS-2PL=2PL
the enjoyment [that] you will have
(PC[†], e15C MC)

b. en cas m'=en=deffe-nt
in=case as=3SGM=D.be.COND-3PL
in case they have, tr. *en cas qu'ils ayent*
(Qu.1690, eNB, cited in Ernault 1888b: 262)

The suffixes are attested across MB-MC-MW, but at different stages and frequencies. In MW, examples are isolated, even relative to its restricted use of *mihi est* forms (Loth 1910: 498f., Lloyd-Jones 1928: 92). In MC, they are sporadic, but span most person-number combinations across a range of tenses and moods already by early 15C (*LLC*: §56, *CG*: §352). In MB-eNB, there are two groups (Ernault 1888b: 258–64, 1890: §70, *LVB*: 200ff., *HMSB*: §140n6, 151, 174n2). In jussives, suffixes go back to earliest MB, appear in all varieties of eNB, and are frequent or regular for all person-number combinations; they are left to the next subsection. Elsewhere, suffixes are robust by late 18C across KLT, though attested early in an 1690 revision of an MB text, (28)b, and sporadically in 20C W.

They are usually restricted to 1PL and/or 3PL and rarely regular even then. These are addressed here, focusing on their relationship to innovations in object coding.

The suffixal coding of the subjects of *mihi est* has been viewed as transition to plain transitive *habeo* in MB-MC (CG: §352–6, Heine 1997: 2.4–5, Stassen 2009: 6.4), along with regularisation of object coding in (e)NB (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: sec. 3–5). However, the picture is more nuanced. The expected and attested points of development are clarified by work on the development of verbs like ‘like’ in Germanic: dative-subject – nominative-object to nominative-subject – accusative-object, through intermediate dative-subject – accusative-object (Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013, with literature):

Table 23: Germanic transition of ‘like’

DAT V _{AGR=NOM} NOM	Old Icelandic, Swedish, English, Modern Icelandic
DAT-NOM V _{AGR=DFLT/DAT}	Modern Icelandic, Middle English
DAT-ACC V _{AGR=DFLT/DAT}	Modern Faeroese, Middle English
NOM-ACC V _{AGR=NOM}	Modern English, Faeroese, Swedish

Stages transitional between the endpoints can have characteristics apparently at odds with two generalisations about case across a range of frameworks (Yip, Maling and Jackendoff 1987; papers in Reuland 2000). One is dependence of accusative on nominative. It is superficially counterexemplified at the dative-subject – accusative-object stage, though the stage often also reveals nominative behavior on the part of the dative; modifiers of the dative in nominative case, or control by the dative of nominative-aligned verb agreement, (29)a. The other is uniqueness of the nominative in the minimal clause. It is partly counterexemplified by combinations of nominative objects and dative subjects with nominative properties, (29)b (see further Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013).⁴⁷

(29) Dative-accusative with nominative properties of dative

- a. Liðunum mangla venjara.
 teams.the.DAT lack.3PL trainer.ACC
 The teams lack a trainer.
 (Faeroese, Jónsson 2009: ex. 23b)
- b. Kennurunum líkaði/líkuðu ekki þessi hegðun ...
 teachers.the.DAT like.PT.3SG/3PL not this.NOM behaviour.NOM
 The teachers did not like this behaviour [of the students].
 (Icelandic, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013: 131)

All stages of this evolution have analogues in the development of *mihi est*. The simple dative-nominative stage is continued in MW, and modified by nonagreeing nominative in the evolution of the conservative coding of MB (3.1). Transition to dative-accusative is found when object coding is regularised to accusative in early 18C L (Table 24, subject *Me am eus*) and 18–19C W (30). Subject coding remains that of *mihi est* in all respects (I.4–5).

⁴⁷ Multiple-nominativity has also been highlighted in the evolution of one of the Finnish constructions with 3rd nominative ~ 1st/2nd accusative objects not found in Breton, when arbitrary impersonals are recruited for 1PL and double nominative 1PL; see further Timberlake 1975: 215, Kiparsky 2001: 334.

(30) Conservative subject with conservative (a) and innovative (b) object

- a. Me m≈ès=**ean** deja larèt
 b. Me m≈ès el=larèt
 1SG 1SG=be=3SGM already 3SGM.ACC=said
 I have (already) said it

(MG, t18C eNB-W)

Table 24: Transparency and opacity of *mihi est* (morphological innovations underlied)

	‘we will have’	1PL= object	BE.FUT
MB prior to 14C	*=n=bo	*=n=	*bo
MB 15–17C	<u>hon=bezo</u>	<u>hon=</u>	<u>bezo</u>
L e18C, W 18–19C	<u>hor=bezo</u> , <u>hur=bou</u>	<u>hor=</u> , <u>hur=</u>	bezo, bou
LK e19C	hon= <u>d</u> (ez)o	hon=	b(ez)o
T t18C	<u>m-o-mb</u>	on=	bou

By late 18C KLT there appear analogues of the nominative-accusative stage. *Mihi est* forms loose their connection with accusative clitics and BE: innovative forms of accusative clitics like 1SG =m= → ma=, va= are no longer imported (cf. *HMSB*: §54), clitic + BE can undergo morphological innovations that obscure its parts esp. in 1PL (*HMSB*: §140n2, contrast 18C W, I.4.3, and imperatives, Hingant 1868: I.75 vs. 77, cf. Wmffre 1998: 2.26, contrast 18C W, Guillome 1836: ch. 5), and can suffixes appear to double or replace the old proclitic esp. in 1PL and/or 3PL (*LVB*: 183–201, Ernault 1890). Independently of these innovations of form, the unique concord of *mihi est* with its subject can be replaced by the nonconcord of other verbs, most clearly in 2SG/2PL (postverbal nominals, CC[†], CT[†], EN[†], SP[†]; postverbal nominals, CC[†], CT[†]; partly certain pronouns in certain tenses-moods, EN[†], CT[†]). In NB KLT all these innovations end up combining with innovative, accusative-aligned object coding, but in late 18C T they could combine with the conservative, split-person object coding in systems where it remains an option, (31), perhaps even in systems where it is the sole option (Qu.1690, t18C L; BSDB-Plumergat, e21C W).

(31) *Object enclitic with suffixed and nonconcord HAVE-forms*

- a. nin ne=moamb=**an** nached
 1PL NEG=we.had=3SGM denied
 We had not denied him
 (EN[†], t18C eNB-T; moamb ← on=boa ‘1PL=be.IPF’ + -mb ‘1PL’)
- b. chui an duss≈**int** ol dixpriset
 2PL have.3SGM=3PL all scorned
 You have scorned them all
 (CT[†], t18C eNB-T; beside *chui och≈eux* ‘2PL=be’)

However, across all these eNB systems, the regularisation of subject coding is only partial, indeed unusual: concord remains typical with preverbal pronouns in all texts and is found even with 2SG/2PL in texts like CT[†] of (31)b, and suffixal coding is not ubiquitous

even when it is common for a given person-number combinations like 1PL in EN[†] of (31)a. In each system, enclitics continuing nominative objects combine with subjects that as a class are not regularly nominative in alignment of form or of concord.

This remains true in 20C NB. These systems have simple accusative-aligned object coding by *a*-forms across constructions. The forms of *mihi est* can no longer be related to object clitics, since these are lost, or possessor clitics, because opacity has gone too far (Sommerfelt 1920: §269 on e20C eNB-L; Wmffre 1998: 2.24 t20C eNB-KLT central; cf. *ALBB* maps 82–92 vs. a.o. 41, 169, 325, 372–3, 383, 584). The subject coding of *mihi est* can be fully regular in form and concord (Favereau 1997: §420ff., Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: sec. 4–5). However, this is limited to 3rd person, when levelled to 3SGM, and/or to 1PL, which collapses phonologically with 3SGM, and the collapse calls bring about in such systems new unique nonconcord of these forms with prenegation subjects (3PL Timm 1987, Trevidig 1987, Wmffre 1998: 2.24, 2.26; 3PL and 1PL Favereau op.cit., Noyer 2019: 4.2.7.3). Full transition of *mihi est* to *habeo* does not appear to be attested.

5.2 The jussive and the jussive of of *mihi est*

The Brythonic languages have “imperative” or “jussive” verbal forms for subjects including addressees, 2SG, 2PL, 1PL, here called imperatives, and excluding them, 3SG and 3PL, here jussive. These two types are both united and differentiated by their morphosyntax, here described for MB-eNB.

(32) Subject reference and concord in jussives

Nonreferential subject

- a. Na=lavar-et den din
 NEG=say-!3SG person to.1SG
 Let none say to me [that he does not think about this]

Concording subject of plain BE

- b. Present-ent adversourien hor=silvidiguez eta quement
 present-!3PL adversaries 1PL=salvation then as.much
 Let then adversaries of our salvation present as much [as they like]

*Nonconcording object of *mihi est* BE*

- c. Hor=bez-et ato hon=daoulagat
 1PL=be-!3SG always 1PL=eyes
 Let us always have our eyes [on Jesus-Christ crucified]

(IN, e18C eNB-L)

*Pronominal object of *mihi est* BE*

- d. Rac=se a=pret ha≈m=bez-et=**hy**
 for=this on=time R=1SG=be-!3SG=**3SGF**
 Therefore quickly let me have it [sc. the cross]

(J[†], e16C MB)

Both imperatives and jussives can be initial in their verbal complex or V1, (32)b, and apart from responsives are alone so. Jussives but not imperatives have independent subjects that must be analysed as clause-internal, (32)a, and there is no limitation on their referent – definite, quantificational, or quasireferential with verbs like ‘please’. Uniquely in the system, jussives have number concord with their subjects by 3SG *-et*, 3PL *-ent*, (32)b; it is regular, optional, or absent in a given variety. Early in eNB-W, negated imperatives but not jussives were replaced by presents, save for plain and *mihi est* BE, which developed novel forms shared by both polarities (Rezac 2021). By NB, the jussive but not imperative is lost (*HMSB*: §165, save idioms, Hewitt 2010: 304, Favereau 1997: §388). The properties of the MB jussive are shared by MC, save that concord cannot be inspected because MC *-ens* is 3SG/PL, and in both MB-MC, object coding has unique elements in the jussive (2.2-3).⁴⁸

The interaction of *mihi est* with imperative-jussive is straightforward for object coding. In the development of MB-MC, the person-number suffixes of BE continued to code pronominal subjects of plain BE, but were replaced by enclitics for objects of *mihi est* BE, and the switch has been derived here from a stage where verbs concorded with nominative subjects but not objects (3.1). This very stage appears to be witnessed in varieties where the jussive concords, contrasting concurring subject, (32)b, never object of *mihi est*, (32)c, with the rare pronominal objects as enclitics, (32)d (J[†] 999, 2728).

Subject coding of *mihi est* in the imperative-jussive is partly regular, by dative proclitics to 3SG jussive of BE. This evades difficulties that commands of oblique-subject verbs face in systems with only imperatives (Barnes 1986: 25, Barðdal 2006: 54). Yet from the earliest texts, the 3SG jussive suffix of BE in *mihi est* BE is frequently replaced by person-number suffixes of the imperative, doubling the proclitic (Ernault 1888b: sec. 4, *LVB*: 192, *HMSB*: §140, 165n). It is illustrated in Table 25 for varieties that lack doubling otherwise.⁴⁹

Table 25: Jussive doubling in *mihi est* in grammar of Qu, e17C MB

	Qu, e17C MB, grammar [text]	Guillome 1836, W
3SG	en=deuez-et [?]	en=dé-et [?]
3PL	ho=deuez-ent ⁺ [ho=deuez-et ⁻]	ou=dé-ent ⁺
2SG	da=bez-et ⁻	ha=pé-ès ⁺
1PL	hon=b-et ⁻ [=on-bez-et ⁻]	hun=bé-emb ⁺
2PL	ho=b-et [?] [ho=bez-et [?]]	hou=pé-et ⁻

Note: ^{+/-/?} jussive suffix is doubling/nondoubling/indeterminable in the variety

⁴⁸ For subjects of commands, cf. Aikhenvald 2010: MB-eNB lacks the imperative type of English *Nobody eat your food!*, Zanuttini 2008, along with French, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §407f., Rowlett 2007: 2.2.1.4, and apparent exceptions are also shared with French, Ernault 1890: 100f. Internal and quasireferential subjects are richly attested from MB (N[†] 643, J[†] 99, B[†] 23, Qu I.5; J[†] 439, Qu II.29). Concord is the rule and well attested the e18C eNB-L of C. ar Bris in (32)b, and includes BE with subject (PM 111), but otherwise (e)NB typically lacks concord, Ernault 1890: 100f., Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 89, Rezac 2021; MB has concord of type (32)b (Qu I.31), alongside nonconcord (N[†] 704 vs. 1768), nonconcord in type (32)c (B[†] 395). Object coding in grammars of NB is explicitly inferred, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 76, Kervella 1947: §429.4n4.

⁴⁹ An MB example distinctive in doubling with future 1SG, Ernault 1888b: 259, with MW-MC counterparts, Loth 1910: 499, Lloyd-Jones 1928: 92, *CG*: §211, may be a misreading (J[†] 4044 in Le Berre 2011).

This unique proclitic-suffix doubling in the jussive of *mihi est* can be seen as extension of the unique independent-subject – suffix concord of the jussive in early systems to proclitic-subject – suffix concord. Outside *mihi est*, jussive suffixes are unavailable for such an extension, because they code pronominal subjects; but in *mihi est*, they cannot code the erstwhile nominative since it is the object, and are inert. The phenomenon may be compared to that of complex inversion in French (33): in simple complex inversion, the verb and nominative enclitic concord with the preverbal subject, but in “hypercomplex” inversion, subjects that would control 3SG/default suffix permit the 3PL suffix in concord with accusative object clitics (Kayne and Pollock 2014: 42f.).

(33) Complex (a) and Hypercomplex (b) inversion in French

- a. Cela les gênera–t–il?
- b. Cela les gêneront–ils?

6 Overview

The Breton *mihi est* construction can be reconstructed as BE with dative possessor and nominative possessum prior to the loss of case inflections in Brythonic. The possessor coding survived as accusative-syncretic clitic in finite clauses, along with marginal coding of other old dative goals, recipients, and experiencers. The possessum continued as case-invariant (pro)nominal controlling finite-verb agreement at least optionally, alongside optional or obligatory agreement by subjects of regular (in)transitives. The uses of *mihi est* were rare with human definite possessa, and at whatever point the possessum became the structural subject if it was not always one, it may have been ungrammatical in 1st/2nd person. At this stage, the argument coding of dative-nominative *mihi est* mirrored that of regular transitives, and such ditransitives as retained old datives, Table 26.

Table 26: Pre-MB-MC argument coding of transitive vs. *mihi est*, pres. ind.

<p>‘give’ =_{S3PL}=V-om_{1PL} (ni_{1PL}) ‘we give (to) them’ =_{n1PL}=V-ont_{3PL} (ni_{1PL}) ‘they give (to) us’</p>	<p>‘be’ (consuetudinal) =_{n1PL}=V-ont_{3PL} (i_{3PL}) ‘we have them’ [=_{S3PL}=V-om_{1PL} (ni_{1PL}) ‘they have us’]’</p>
--	--

Part I argued that *mihi est* remains based on BE and retains dative-like coding of its possessor-subject in conservative varieties of Breton. Accusative-syncretic clitics continue to code dependent pronouns, renewed as new accusative clitic forms arise from MB to W varieties of NB. A *de*-element has grammaticalised with them to distinguish 3rd person in MB-MC, as in other systems with extensive dative-accusative syncretisms. Nonclitic possessors were innovated in MB-MC and the clitics concord with them, as in other systems where exceptional concord reflects dative and other inherent-case clitic doubling.

Part II traces the development of object coding for lexical *mihi est* and its recruitment as the auxiliary of the HAVE-perfect, and relates it to that for imperatives, which unexpectedly from a historical perspective have the same coding in MB. It focuses on the

rise, fall, and correlates of their person restrictions, 3rd person for enclitics and 1st/2nd person for proclitics in Middle Breton. The main developments are outlined in Table 27:⁵⁰

Table 27: Argument coding development of *gwel-* ‘see’ and *bið-* ‘be’ in *mihi est*

	present ‘you see them/us’	imperative V1 ‘see them/us!’	present ‘we have them/you’
*B	=s _{3PL} /n _{1PL} =gwel-et _{2PL}	gwel-et _{2PL} i _{3PL} /ni _{1PL}	=n _{1PL} =bið-ont _{3PL} ~ -?
*MB-MC	>	gwelet=i _{3PL} /ni _{1PL}	> =n=bið=i _{3PL} ~ -?
*MB	> ho _{3PL} /hon _{1PL} =gwelet	+ ho _{3PL} /hon _{1PL} =gwelet	> hon _{1PL} =bez=i _{3PL} ~ -?
MB e16C		> gwelet=i _{3PL} ~ hon _{1PL} =gwelet	+ ... gwel-et _{PARTICIPLE}
MB t17C			+ ... ho _{2PL} =kwelet
eNBa		+ gwelet=he _{3PL} (KLTW)	+ hon _{1PL} =bez=he _{3PL} ... (KLTW)
eNBb		+ ho _{3PL} =gwelet (KLT)	+ ... ho _{3PL} =gwelet (KLTW)
eNBc		> gwelet=ni _{1PL} (W)	> hon _{1PL} =de..., m-e-mb _{1PL} ... (KLT)
eNBd	+ gwelet		
	> hon=bez, hon=de, memb (gwelet)		} anez-ho _{3PL} ~achan-omp _{1PL} /och _{2PL} (KLT)

For Brythonic, V1 imperatives could not host accusative mesoclitics, and would instead have used independent pronouns, case-syncretic upon loss of case inflections. These would also have replaced suffixes in *mihi est* upon loss of concord with nominative objects, but prior to general loss of concord in MB-MC. In MB-MC, independent pronoun objects encliticised, reinforcing the restriction of possessa to 3rd person. By 15C MB, unlike in MC, the restriction has transferred from *mihi est* to imperatives, limiting the enclitic object that these constructions alone shared.

In the development of MB, accusative pure proclitics developed, and should have been available in V1 imperatives, just as mesoclitics were in nonV1 imperatives. Yet in the transfer of the 3rd person restriction on enclitics, the pure proclitics were restricted to the complementary 1st/2nd person, and typically or always so were the mesoclitics, by principles explored for similar split-person codings for the circum-Baltic languages.

Also at this stage, participles of transitives grammaticalised with *mihi est* BE and its argument coding in the HAVE-perfect, including object coding by 3rd person enclitics to *mihi est* forms. In later MB, the HAVE-perfect innovates object-coding proclitics for 1st/2nd person on participles, as in imperatives, and perhaps through their influence.

From late 17C, central dialects of eNB differentiate the shared 3rd-restricted enclitic objects of imperative and HAVE-constructions from doubling uses of enclitics, through forms directly or indirectly recruited from prepositional suffixes (eNBa). In 18–19C, eNB mostly regularises the anomalous object coding of imperative and HAVE constructions. In KLT and in part in W, proclitics on participles lose the 1st/2nd person restriction, and so do later imperatives in KLT. In W, it is the 3rd person restriction on enclitics that is lost in imperatives, and there develop imperative-specific enclitic forms. Both constructions end up with plain accusative-aligned clitic coding (eNBb). In KLT moreover, inflected forms of *a* ‘of’ are generalised for objects and ultimately mostly replace clitics (eNBd). Also during this period, KLT partly regularises subject coding by adopting suffixes, deforming proclitics, and losing clitic doubling, always only in part (eNBc). All combinations of

⁵⁰ Analogical rather than phonologically regular forms of Brythonic are used to illustrate the continuation to MB-MC, and Breton orthography is normalised to Standard Breton.

conservative and innovative subject and object codings are attested, taking dative-nominative *mihi est* to dative-nominative or -accusative coding where the old dative can have nominative morphosyntax in part, but nominative-accusative *habeo* is never reached.

Acknowledgments

In addition to the acknowledgments of part I, I am grateful to M. Jouitteau, H. Le Bihan, M. Meelen, L. Toorians, D. Willis for helpful exchanges or comments, to S. Schumacher and H. Le Bihan for sharing works and text passages, and to R. Bideau and M. Jouitteau for scanning in a considerable portion of the sources used. Errors and omissions are mine. Parts I and II have been partially supported by ANR-18-FRAL-0006 UV2 (ANR) and FFI2014-51878-P (MINECO).

Corrigenda

References in part I to part II: II.1-2 to II.2 for changes to proclitics and imperative constructions and II.3 for agreement and HAVE constructions, II.3 to II.4, II.4 to II.5.

7 Bibliography

Texts

- Ab In: Joseph Loth (1887). “La célèbre inscription bretonne”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 2: 259–260.
- AHS [Guy] Marrec (1846). *Abrege eus an Histor santel hac eus a Histor an Ilis*. Sant-Briec: Prud’homme.
- AJC Jean Conan. *Avanturio ar citoien Jean Conan a Voengamp*. Ed in: Yann-Ber Piriou, Francis Favereau & Joël Cornette (1990). *Avanturio ar citoien Jean Conan a Voengamb*. Morlaix: Skol Vreizh.
- ALLS In: Yves Le Diberder, Michel Oiry & Donatien Laurent (2000). *A liù el loér hag er stered*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Ang477A In: Bernhard Bauer (2008). *Studien zu den Altbretonischen Glossen*. MA thesis, University of Vienna, 9–64.
- AVImaheu Christoll Terrien (1857). *Aviel revé St. Maheu*. Lundayn.
- B “Aman ez dezrou buhez sâte Barba dre rym” (1557). Paris: Benard de Leau. In: Émile Ernault (1888a). *Le mystère de Sainte Barbe*. Paris: Thorin, 1–187.
- B.1647 “Amant ez dezraov bvhez santes Barba dre rym” (1647). Montrovlez: Ian Hardovyn.
- BBC In: J. Gwenogvryn Evans (1906). *The Black Book of Carmarthen*. Llanbedrog.
- Be Tanguy Gueguen (1623). *Bvhez, marv, miraclov, ha canonisation an Autraou Sant Euzen*. Mon[trovl]les: George All[ienne]. In: Gwennole Le Menn (2000). *Vie de saint Yves – Buhez sant Euzen*. Vol. 1. Saint-Brieuc: Skol.
- Bel Euzen Gueguen (1625). *Declaration abvdant eves an catechism*. Montrovilles: George Allienne.
- BK Bewnans Ke. In: Graham Thomas & Nicholas Williams, eds. (2007). *Bewnans Ke*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- BM Beunans Meriasek. In: Whitley Stokes (1872). *Beunans Meriasek*. London: Trübner.
- BSDB Adrien Desseigne et al. (2013–). *Banque sonore des dialectes bretons*. url: <http://banque.sonore.breton.free.fr>.
- BSPD J. Larboulet (1907). *Buhé er Sent eit pep dé ag er blé*. Guéned: Galles.
- BS Claoda-Guillou Marigo (1824). *Buez ar Sænt*. Sant-Briec: Prud’homme.
- BT In: J. Gwenogvryn Evans (1910). *The Book of Taliesin*. Llanbedrog.
- CAT.1817 *Catechis imprimet dre urz an Autrou Augustin-René-Louis le Mintier* (1817). Sant-Briec: Prud’homme.

- CC In: Victor Tourneur (1906). *Le mystère breton de saint Crépin et de saint Crépinien*. Paris: Champion.
- Cath “Aman ez dezraov bvhez an itron sanctes Cathell gverhes ha merzeres en Brezonec neuez Imprimet” (1576). Montrollles.
- CE In: Lauran Toorians (1991). *The Middle Cornish Charter Endorsement*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Cnf Evzen Gvegvn (1612). *Confessional dastvmet eves an doctoret catholic apostolic ha romain*. Naffnet.
- Cnf² Evzen Gvegvn (1646). *Confessional d’astvmet eves an doctoret catholic apostolic ha romain*. Qvemperc Avrintin: Georges Allienne.
- COL *Nouveau dictionnaire ou colloque François et breton* (1773). 5th ed. Quimper: Marin Blot.
- Comp In: Alexandre I. Falileyev (2008). *Le vieux-gallois*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 97-104.
- CS.anon *Cantikeu spirituel* (1760). Guénett: Galles.
- CS.bar Per Barisy (1710). *Cantiqueu spirituel*. url: <http://mediatheques.quimper-communaute.fr>
- CT “Cognomerus ha Santes Trefina”. In: Anatole Le Braz (1904). “Cognomerus et Sainte Tréfine”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 20, 1–38, 146–187, 356–381, 472–499; 21, 54–89, 208–221, 436–473.
- Do Tanguy Gueguen (1622). *Doctrin an christenien*. Montrovlles: Geroge Allienne.
- Donoet In: Gwenäel Le Duc (1975). “Le Donoet, grammaire latine en moyen-breton”. In: *Études Celtiques* 14, 525–565.
- DAB “Divizou ar Basion”. In: Théodore Hersart de La Villemarque (1865). *Le grand mystère de Jésus*. Paris: Didier.
- EAVI J.–B. Olierou (1913). *En Aviél*. Guéned: Lafoyle.
- EKG Lan Inisan (1888). *Emgann Kergidu*. Brest: Le Fournier.
- EN Buez Louis Eunius. In: Georges Dottin (1911). *Louis Eunius ou le Purgatoire de Saint Patrice*. Paris: Champion.
- EOV [Jean Marion] (1838). *En or hag ar vuhé devot*. Guéned: Galles.
- G “An buhez Sant Gwenolê abat” (1580). In: Émile Ernault (1932–4). “L’Ancien mystère de saint Gwenole”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 40, 2–35; 413, 104–141, 318–379.
- Gk Gilles de Keranpuil (1576). In: Émile Ernault (1928–1930). “Le breton de Gilles de Keranpuil”. In: *Revue Celtique* 45, 202–271, 47, 72–159.
- HJC J[acques] Géguelleu (1818). *Histoer a vuhe Jesus-Chrouist*. Lorient: Le Coat Sant-Haouen.
- HTC [Gabriel] Morvan (1886). *Histor an testamant coz hag an testamant nevez*. Kemper: J. Salaun & Brest: Lefournier.
- IN [Charles ar Bris] (1710). *Introduction dar vuez devot*. Quemper: Derrien.
- ISmar [Jean Marion] (1790a). *Instructioneu santel ar er gurionnéeu principal ag er religion*. Guéned: Galles.
- ISpour [Louis Pourchasse] (1785). *Instructioneu santell éit derhell chonge ha profitein ag er retraite*. Guénett: Galles.
- J “Aman ez dezrou an Passion ha he goude an Resurrection, gant Tremenuan an ytron Maria ha he Pempzec leuenez hac en diuez ezedy Buhez mab den” (1530). Paris: Eozen Quilleure. In: Yves Le Berre. 2011. *La Passion et la Résurrection bretonnes de 1530*. Brest: CRBC–UBO.
- J.1622 “Aman ez dezrou an passion, ha hegoude an resurrection, An oll corriget hac amantet gand Tanguy Gueguen, bælec hac Organist, natiff a Leon” (1622). Montrouilles: George Allienne. In: Yves Le Berre. 2011. *La Passion et la Résurrection bretonnes de 1530*. Brest: CRBC–UBO. In: Théodore Hersart de La Villemarque (1865). *Le grand mystère de Jésus*. Paris: Didier.
- Jer In: Roparz Hemon & Gwenole Le Menn (1969). *Les fragments de La Destruction de Jerusalem et des Amours du Vieillard*. Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- JSES In: J.C. Brangili (1910). “Julian sellet èl ur Sant”. In: *Dihunamb* 6, 91–95.
- M Iehan an Archer Coz (1575). *Le Mirover de la mort, en Breton*. S François Cuburien.
- MBR Amable Troude & Gabriel Milin (1870). *Ar Marvailler Brezounek*. Brest: J.B. hag A. Lefournier.
- Mc Tanguy Gueguen (1621). *An Mirover a confession*. Montrouilles: Allienne.
- MG [Jean Marion] (1790b). *Magasin spirituel*. Guéned: Galles.
- MP In: Alexandre I. Falileyev (2008). *Le Vieux-Gallois*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 82–88.
- MPC In: Joseph Loth (1890). *Chrestomathie bretonne*. Paris: Bouillon, 360–380.

- NG In: Roparz Hemon (1956). Christmas hymns in the dialect of Vannes. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies.
- N “Aman ez desraou buez san[tes] // Nonn hac ez map Deuy dre ry[m]”. In: Yves Le Berre, Bernard Tanguy & Yves-Pascal Castel (1999). *Buez Santez Nonn*. Brest: C.R.B.C.
- NI Tanguy Gueguen (1650). *An novelov ancien, ha devot, an oll amantet, corriget hac augmentet ... gant Tanguy Gueguen Belec, natif à Leon*. Qvemper Cavrentin: George Allienne.
- Nom Guillaume Quiquier de Roscoff (1633). *Nomenclator communium rerum propria nomina gallico idiomate indicans...* Morlaix: G. Allienne.
- OM “Ordinale de Origine Mundi”. In: Edwin Norris (1859). *The Ancient Cornish drama*. Vol. 1. Oxford, 1–217.
- PA “Pascon agan Arluth”. In: Whitley Stokes (1860–1). “Poem of Mount Calvary”. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1–100.
- PC “Passio domini nostri Jhesu Christi”. In: Edwin Norris (1859). *The Ancient Cornish drama*. Vol. 1. Oxford, 222–477.
- PI [Charles Ar Bris] (1712). *Pedennou hac Instructionou Christen*. Brest: R. Malassis.
- Pm “Aman ez dezrou an Passion ha he goude an Resurrection, gant Tremenuan an ytron Maria ha he Penzec leuenez hac en diuez ezedy Buhez mab den” (1530). Paris: Eozen Quilleure. In: Roparz Hemon (1962). *Trois poèmes en moyen-breton*. Baile Átha Cliath: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- PRBH In: J. Gwenogvryn Evans (1911). *Poetry in the Red Book of Hergest*. Llanbedrog.
- Pr “An Form da obér an Pron e Brezonec” (1631). In: Joseph-Marie Loth (1905). “Le plus ancien texte suivi en breton de Vannes”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 20, 341–350.
- PM Charles ar B[ris] (1722). *Preparationou d ar maro*. Leon: ar Sieur.
- PR “Er forme ag er pron, é brehonnec Guennet” (1693). In: Joseph Loth (1890). *Chrestomathie bretonne*. Paris: Bouillon, 326–332.
- Qu Guillaume Quiquier de Roscoff (1626). *Dictionnaire et colloques françois et breton*. Lédan: Allienne.
- Qu.1690 Guillaume Quiquier de Roscoff (1690). *Dictionnaire et colloque françois et breton*. Morlaix: Ploesquellec.
- RD “Ordinale de Resurrexione Domini Nostri Jhesu Christi”. In: Edwin Norris (1859). *The Ancient Cornish drama*. Vol. 2. Oxford, 1–199.
- RP [Charles Ar Bris] (1722). *Reflexiou profitabl var ar finvezou diveza*. Castel-Paul: ar Sieur.
- SBI.II In: François-Marie Luzel (1890). Vol. 2. *Soniou Breiz-Izel*. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose.
- SP “Buez Sant Patrice”. In: Joseph Dunn (1909). *La vie de Saint Patrice*. Paris: Champion.
- TJK Jean-François Le Gonidec (1827). *Testamant Nevez hon Aotrou Jézuz-Krist*. Angoulem: F. Trémeau.
- Veach Bernard ar Speret Santel (1656). *Ar Veac’h Devot hac Agreabl evs a Perc’herinet Santes Anna e Gvenet*. Montrovez: Brayet.
- WM In: J. Gwenogvryn Evans (1907). *The White Book Mabinogion*. Pwllheli.
- General
- ALBB Le Roux, Pierre (1927). *Atlas linguistique de la Basse-Bretagne*. Paris: Droz.
- CG Henry Lewis & Holger Pedersen (1989). *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. Third edition, second impression with a supplement of 1961 by Henry Lewis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- DEVRI Menard, Martial, and Herve Le Bihan (2020). *Devri: le dictionnaire diachronique du breton*. url: <http://www.devri.bzh>.
- GMW Daniel Simon Evans (1964). *A Grammar of Middle Welsh*. Baile Átha Cliath: Dublin
- GOI Rudolf Thurneysen (1946). *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Trans. by Daniel A. Binchy & Osborn Bergin. Revised and enlarged edition with supplement. Baile Átha Cliath: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- GVB Fleuriot, Léon (1964). *Le vieux-breton*. Genève: Slatkine.
- HMSB Hemon, Roparz (1975). *Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

- LVB Pierre Le Roux (1957). *Le verbe breton. Morphologie, syntaxe*. Deuxième édition revue et augmenté avec un index et une carte. Rennes & Paris: Plihon & Champion.
- LCC Henry Lewis (1946). *Llawlyfr cernyweg canol*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- SW Borsley, Robert D., Maggie Tallerman, and David Willis (2007). *The Syntax Of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TGMC Toorians, Laurant (2014). *Towards a Grammar of Middle Cornish*. url: http://laurantoorians.com/?page_id=128.
- VGKS.II Holger Pedersen (1913). *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. Zweiter Band. Bedeutungslehre. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- WG John Morris-Jones (1913). *A Welsh Grammar, Historical and Comparative*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- WS John Morris-Jones (1931). *Welsh Syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2010). *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003). *The Syntax of Ditransitives*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Anderson, Stephen R. (1982). “Where’s morphology?” *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 571–612.
- Anon. (c. 1795). “Addition au vocabulaire français-breton”. In: *Vocabulaire nouveau* [Ed. unknown]. Vannes: J.M. Galles, 1–32 [separate pagination].
- Árnadóttir, Hlíf, and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson (2012). “Case in disguise”. In: *Variation in Datives*. Ed. by Beatriz Fernández and Ricardo Etxepare. Oxford University Press, 96–143.
- Azkue, Resurrección Maria de (1923). *Morfología vasca*. Bilba: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.
- Baker, Mark C (1996). *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna (2006). “Predicting the productivity of argument structure constructions”. In: *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 32, 39–106.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna et al. (2011). “‘Woe to the rich and the sordid fellows’: The syntax, semantics, and information structure of ‘woe’ in Indo-European”. Ms., University of Bergen.
- Barnes, Michael (1986). “Subject, nominative and oblique case in Faroese”. In: *Scripta Islandica* 37, 13–46.
- Benucci, Franco (1993). “Temporal periphrasis and clitics in Central Romance languages”. In: *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, 51–83.
- Bittner, Maria, and Ken Hale (1996). “The structural determination of case and agreement”. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 1–68.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (1975). *Recherches en vue d’une théorie de la grammaire françaises*. Paris: Champion.
- Bonet, M. Eulàlia (1995). “Feature structure of Romance clitics”. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 607–647.
- Brugman, Claudia. 1988. The syntax and semantics of HAVE and its complements. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Buchmann, Jürgen (2011). “(H)oz: Eine Ergänzung zur Flexion des mittelbretonischen Personalpronomens”. In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 58, 19–22.
- Châtelier, Antoine (2016). Traductions et variabilité en langue bretonne : l’exemple des traductions bretonnes de « l’Introduction à la vie dévote » (XVIIIe – XXe). Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
- Cheveau, Loïc (2007). Approche phonologique, morphologique et syntaxique du breton du Grand Lorient (bas-vannetais). Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
- Crahé, Maxime-Morvan (2014). Le breton de Languidic. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
- Dedio, Stefan, and Paul Widmer (2017). “S, A, and P argument demotion with preverbal imm-(a-n) in Old and Middle Irish”. In: *Études Celtiques* 43, 187–206.
- Dixon, Robert M. W (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dottin, Georges (1911). *Louis Eunius*. Paris: Champion.
- Ernault, Emile (1887). “Études bretonnes V”. In: *Revue Celtique* 8, 31–46.
- Ernault, Emile (1888a). *Le Mystère de Sainte Barbe, tragédie bretonne, et dictionnaire etymologique du moyen breton*. Paris: Ernest Thorin.
- Ernault, Emile (1888b). “Études bretonnes VI”. In: *Revue Celtique* 9, 245–66.
- Ernault, Emile (1890). “Études bretonnes VII”. In: *Revue Celtique* 11, 458–87.
- Ernault, Emile (1895). *Glossaire moyen breton*. 2nd edition. Paris: E. Bouillon.
- Ernault, Emile (1897). “Études bretonnes X”. In: *Revue Celtique* 18, 199–211.
- Ernault, Emile (1898). “Études bretonnes XI”. In: *Revue Celtique* 19, 181–211.

- Ernault, Emile (1899). “Les formes de l’infinif breton”. In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 2, 382–402, 494–522.
- Ernault, Emile (1914). *Le mirouer de la mort*. Paris: Champion.
- Ernault, Emile (1928–30). “Le breton de Gilles de Keranpuil”. In: *Revue Celtique* 45, 201–71, 47, 72–159.
- Eska, Joseph. (1994). “On the crossroads of phonology and syntax: remarks on the origin of Vendryes’ Restriction and related matters”. In: *Studia Celtica* 28, 39–62.
- Falileyev, Alexandre (2000). *Etymological dictionary of Old Welsh*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Falileyev, Alexandre (2008). *Le vieux-gallois*. Potsdam: Editions de l’Université de Potsdam.
- Fave, Visant (1998). *Notennou yezadur*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz.
- Favereau, Francis (1984). Langue quotidienne, langue technique et langue littéraire dans le parler et la tradition orale de Poullaouen. Doctoral dissertation, University of Rennes 2.
- Favereau, Francis (1997). *Grammaire du breton contemporain*. Morlaix: Skol Vreizh.
- Favereau, Francis (2016). *Geriadur bras*. url: <https://geriadurbrasfavereau.monsite-orange.fr>
- Fleuriot, Léon (2001). “Skoueroù emdroadurioù e morfologiezh hag e readur ar brezhoneg”. In: *Hor Yezh* 228, 14–34.
- George, Ken. (1990). “A comparison of word-order in Middle Breton and Middle Cornish”. In: *Celtic Linguistics*. Ed. by Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe, and Jenny Rowlands. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205–50.
- George, Ken. (1991). “Notes on word order in *Beunans Meriasek*”. In: *Studies in Brythonic Word Order*. Ed. by James Fife and Erich Poppe. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205–50.
- Gibson, Jacqueline. (2002). “Soñjomp ervat: ur sell ouzh embannadurioù Buhez ar Sent”. In: *Al Liam* 335, 68–82.
- Grevisse, Maurice, and André Goosse (2008). *Le bon usage*. 14th edition. Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier.
- Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff (1902). *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoyle.
- Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff (1931). *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*, 3rd ed. Vannes: Lafoyle.
- Guillome, Joachim (1836). *Grammaire française-bretonne*. Vannes: J.-M. Galles.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Karlsson (1975). “Suomen akkusatiivi: funtionaalinen näkökulma”. In: *Virittaja* 79, 339–363.
- Hamp, Eric P. (1959). “Middle Welsh, Cornish and Breton personal pronominal forms”. In: *Études Celtiques* 8, 394–401.
- Haspelmath, Martin (2004). “Explaining the Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint: a usage-based account.” In: *Constructions* 2.
- Haspelmath, Martin (2020). “Role-reference associations and the explanation of argument coding splits”. In *Linguistics* 59: 123-174.
- Heine, Bernd (1997). *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hemon, Roparz (1954). “Le verbe réfléchi en Breton”. In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 24, 248–263.
- Hemon, Roparz (1956). *Christmas Hymns in the Vannes Dialect of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Hemon, Roparz (1962). *Trois poèmes en moyen-breton*. Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Hewitt, Steve (2001). Notes sur le breton du Tregor. url: <http://www.academia.edu>.
- Hewitt, Steve (2010). “Mood in Breton”. In: *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Ed. by: Björn Rothstein & Rolf Thieroff. Amster: John Benjamins, 292–308.
- Hewitt, Steve (2016). The Georgian perfect tense series and the Western European BE/HAVE auxiliary split. url: <http://www.academia.edu>.
- Hingant, Jean (1868). *Éléments de la grammaire bretonne*. Tréguier: Le Flem.
- Holmberg, Anders (2005). “Is there a little pro? Evidence from Finnish”. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 533–64.
- Humphreys, Humphrey Lloyd (1995). *Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du parler breton de Bothoa*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz.
- Irslinger, Britta (2014). “Intensifiers and reflexives in SAE, Insular Celtic and English”. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119, 159–163.
- Irslinger, Britta (2016). “Detransitive strategies in Middle Welsh: The preverbal marker ym-”. In: *Referential Properties and Their Impact on the Syntax of Insular Celtic languages*. Ed. by Erich Poppe, Karin Stüber, and Paul Widmer. Münster: Nodus, 91–134.
- Jackson, Kenneth Hurlstone (1961). “The phonology of the Breton dialect of Plougrescant”. In: *Études Celtiques* 9, 327–404.

- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gíslí (2009). “Covert nominative and dative subjects in Faroese”. In: *Nordlyd* 36, 142–164.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie (2007). “The Brythonic reconciliation, from V1 to generalized V2”. In: *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7, 163–200.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie (2009–). *Arbres: le site de grammaire du breton*. url: <http://arbres.iker.cnrs.fr>.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac (2008). “From *mihi est* to have across Breton dialects”. In: *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33, 161–78.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1975). *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S., and Jean-Yves Pollock. 2014. “Toward an Analysis of French Hyper-Complex Inversion”. In: *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* 7. Ed. by Laura Brugè et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 150–167.
- Kervella, Frañcez (1947). *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*. La Baule: Skridoù Breizh.
- Kiparsky, Paul (2001). “Structural case in Finnish”. In: *Lingua* 111, 315–76.
- Koch, John T. (1987). “Prosody and the Old Celtic verbal complex”. In: *Ériu* 38, 143–76.
- Koch, John T. (1991). “On the prehistory of Brittonic syntax”. In: *Studies in Brythonic Word Order*. Ed. by James Fife and Erich Poppe. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–44.
- Lafon, René (1980 [1943]). *Le system du verbe Basque au XVIe siècle*. Baiona: Elkar.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (1975). “Emplois dissymétriques de la coordination”. In: *Études Celtiques* 14, 479–502.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (1977). “Emplois dissymétriques de la coordination II”. In: *Études Celtiques* 15, 523–531.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (1998). “L’actance dans les langues celtiques”. In: *Actance et valence dans les langues d’Europe*. Ed by Jack Feuillet. Berlin: De Gruyter, 295–345.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (2010). “Le passif impersonnel du breton moyen”. In: *L’impersonnel*. Ed. by Françoise Daviet-Taylor & Didier Bottineau. Paris: PUR, 177–196.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves (2011). “Stefan Schumacher. Die keltischen Primärverben”. In: *Études Celtiques* 37: 208–213.
- La Villemarqué, Théodore Hersart de (1865). *Le grand mystère de Jésus*. Paris: Didier.
- La Villemarqué, Théodore Hersart de (1879). *Poèmes bretons du moyen âge*. Paris: Didier.
- Le Bayon, A.-M. (1878). *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoye.
- Le Berre, Yves (2011). *La Passion et la Résurrection bretonnes de 1530 suivies de trois poèmes*. Brest: CRBC-UBO.
- Le Bihan, Hervé. (2020). “Ar skridoù krennvrezhoneg en oberenn Seán Ó Tuathalláin (John Toland), 1670–1722”. In: *Hor Yezh* 262: 39–48.
- Le Bihan, Hervé. (2020). “Le pronom infixe -s en moyen breton”. In: *Études Celtiques* 46: 87–72.
- Le Berre, Yves (2009). “A propos du *Stabat Mater* breton de Tanguy Gueguen (1622) : le « moyen breton » existe-t-il ?” In: *La Bretagne Linguistique* 14, 13–24.
- Le Gléau, René (1973). *Syntaxe du breton moderne*. La Baule: Editions La Baule.
- Le Gléau, René (1999). *Etudes syntaxiques bretonnes*. Brest: René Le Gléau.
- Le Goaziou, Adolphe (1950). *La longue vie de deux colloques françois et breton (1626–1915)*. Quimper: Le Goaziou.
- Le Goff, Pierre (1927). “Du tutoiement en breton de Vannes”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 37, 198–203.
- Le Menn, Gwennole (1983). *Histoire du théâtre populaire breton*. Saint-Brieuc: Skol.
- Le Menn, Gwennole (2000). *Vie de saint Yves – Buhez sant Euzen*, vol. 1. Saint-Brieuc: Skol.
- Le Roux, Pierre (1896). “Mutations et assimilations de consonnes dans le dialecte armoricain de Pleubian (Côtes-du-Nord)”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 12, 3–31.
- Lightfoot, David (2006). *How new languages emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindeman, Frederik Otto (1989). “Varia”. In: *Études Celtiques* 26, 73–79.
- Lloyd-Jones, John (1928). “Some features of Middle Welsh syntax”. In: *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 17, 81–101.
- Loth, Joseph-Marie (1886). “Remarques sur le bas-vannetais: Chansons en bas-vannetais”. In: *Revue Celtique* 7, 171–199, 451.
- Loth, Joseph-Marie (1895). “Le breton de Quiberon”. In: *Revue Celtique* 16, 323–36.
- Loth, Joseph-Marie (1910). “Remarques et additions à l’Introduction to Early Welsh de John Strachan”. In: *Revue Celtique* 31, 129–81, 312–32, 472–511.
- Maling, Joan. (1993). “Of nominative and accusative: the hierarchical assignment of grammatical cases in Finnish”. In: *Case and Other Functional Categories in Finnish Syntax*. Ed. by Urpo Nikanne and Anders Holmberg. Berlin: de Gruyter, 49–74.

- Marantz, Alec (1991). "Case and licensing". In: *Proceedings of ESCOL* 8, 234–53.
- Maunoir, Julien (1659). *Le sacré college de Iesus*. Quimper: Jean Hardouyn.
- McCone, Kim (1997). *The Early Irish Verbal Complex*. Maynooth: An Sagart.
- McKenna, Malachy (1976–). "The Breton of Guémené-sur-Scorff (Bas-Vannetais)." In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 35, 1–101; 36, 199–247; 37, 249–277; 38, 29–112; 41, 116–158.
- Meelen, Marieke (2020). "Reconstructing the rise of verb second in Welsh". In: *Rethinking Verb Second*. Ed. by Rebecca Woods and Sam Wolfe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 426–454.
- Miller, Philip, and Paola Monachesi (2003). "Les pronoms clitiques dans les langues romanes". In: *Langues Romanes, problèmes de la phrase simple*. Ed. by Danièle Godard. Paris: CNRS Editions, 67–123.
- Moal, Jean (1890). *Supplément lexico-grammatical au dictionnaire pratique français-breton du colonel A. Troude en dialecte de Léon*. Landerneau: Desmoulins.
- Morin, Yves-Charles (1978). "More remarks on French clitic order". In: *Linguistic Analysis* 5, 293–312.
- Morin, Yves-Charles (1979). "La morphophonologie des pronoms clitiques en français populaire". In: *Cahier de linguistique* 9, 1–36.
- Myler, Neil (2016). *Building and Interpreting Possession Sentences*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Nédélec, Pierre-Jean (1978). "Le Pater en breton, 4 siècles de variation". In: *Kaierou kenvreuriez ar brezoneg* 47, 13–21.
- Nelson, Diane (1995). *Grammatical Case Assignment in Finnish*. New York: Garland.
- Nelson, Diane (1998). "Case competition in Finnish". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 21: 145–178.
- Newton, Glenda Elizabeth (2006). The development and loss of the Old Irish double system of verbal inflection. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Noyer, Pierre (2019). The Breton of the canton of Briec. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sidney.
- Plein, Kerstin, and Erich Poppe (2014). "Patterns of verbal agreement in "Historia Gruffud vab Kenan": norm and variation". In: *Études Celtiques* 40, 145–60.
- Postal, Paul M. (1984). "French indirect object cliticisation and SSC/BT". In: *Linguistic Analysis* 14, 111–172.
- Postal, Paul M. (1990). "French indirect object demotion". In: *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*. Ed. by Paul M. Postal and Brian D. Joseph. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 104–200.
- Quiggin, E.C. (1910). "A case of stress-shifting in the dialect of Tréguier". In: *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 7, 354–356.
- Reuland, Eric, ed. (2000). *Arguments and Case*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rezac, Milan (2010). "Ineffability through modularity: Gaps in French clitic clusters." In: *Defective paradigms*. Ed. by: Matthew Baerman, Greville G. Corbett, and Dunstan Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 151–180.
- Rezac, Milan (2011). *Phi-Features and the Modular Architecture of Language*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rezac, Milan (2016). "Gaps and stopgaps in Basque finite verb agreement". In: *Microparameters in the grammar of Basque*. Ed. by: Beatriz Fernández and Jon Ortiz de Urbina. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 139–192.
- Rezac, Milan (2020). The Person Case Constraint in Breton and its consequences. Ms., CNRS-IKER. url: <http://www.iker.cnrs.fr/rezac-milan-cnrs>.
- Rezac, Milan (2021). The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg. Ms., CNRS-IKER. url: <http://www.iker.cnrs.fr/rezac-milan-cnrs>.
- Roberts, Ian (2007). *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roma, Elisa (2000). "How subject pronouns spread in Irish". In: *Eriu* 51, 107–57.
- Rostrenen, Grégoire de (1732). *Dictionnaire françois-celtique ou françois-breton*. Rennes: Vatar.
- Rostrenen, Grégoire de (1738). *Grammaire françoise-celtique ou françoise-bretonne*. Rennes: Vatar.
- Rowlett, Paul (2014). "French imperatives, negative *ne*, and non-subject clitics". In: *Journal of French Language Studies* 24, 29–47.
- Schapansky, Nathalie (1996). Negation, referentiality and boundedness in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Schrijver, Peter (1991). *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Astermdam: Rodopi.
- Schrijver, Peter (1997). *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland.
- Schrijver, Peter (2011a). "Middle and Early Modern Breton." In *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch*. Ed. by Elmar Ternes. Bremen: Hemen, 359–429.

- Schrijver, Peter (2011b). "Old British." In *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch*. Ed. by Elmar Ternes. Bremen: Hempen, 1–84.
- Schumacher, Stefan (2004). *Die keltischen Primärverben*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schumacher, Stefan (2011). "Mittel- und Frühneukymrisch". In: *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch*. Ed. by Elmar Ternes. Bremen: Hempen, 85–235.
- Schumacher, Stefan (2017). "An edition and analysis of Book of Aneirin B.39". In: *Zeitschrift für keltische Philologie* 64: 299–420.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann (1996). "Icelandic finite verb agreement". In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57, 1–46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Anders Holmberg (2008). "Icelandic dative intervention: person and number are separate probes". In: *Agreement Restrictions*. Ed. by Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. Berlin: de Gruyter, 251–80.
- Sims-Williams, Patrick (1984). "The double system of verbal inflexion in Old Irish". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82, 138–201.
- Sims-Williams, Patrick (2010). "The spread of 'sandhi h-' in thirteenth-century Welsh". In *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108: 41–52.
- Smit, Merlijn de (2006). *Language contact and structural change*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Sommerfelt, Alf (1920). *Le breton parlé à Saint-Pol-de-Léon*. Paris: Champion.
- Stark, Elisabeth, and Paul Widmer (2020). "Breton a-marking of (internal) verbal arguments". In: *Linguistics* 58, 745–766.
- Stassen, Leon (2009). *Predicative Possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stephens, Janig (1982). Word order in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Stokes, Whitley (1867). "The middle-breton irregular verbs." In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 12, 114–166.
- Stokes, Whitley (1868). "Die mittelbretonischen unregelmässigen verba". In: *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der arischen, celtischen und slawischen Sprachen* 5, 306–362.
- Stokes, Whitley (1887). "The Neo-Celtic verb substantive". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 20, 202–59.
- Stolz, Thomas et al. (2008). *Split Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Strachan, John (1909). *An Introduction to Early Welsh*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Stump, Gregory (1984). "Agreement vs. incorporation in Breton." In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 2, 289–348.
- Taraldsen, Tarald (1985). "On the distribution of nominative objects in Finnish". In *Features and projections*. Ed. by: Pieter Muysken and Henk van Riemsdijk. Dordrecht: Foris, 139–161.
- Ternes, Elmar (1970). *Grammaire structurale du Breton de l'île de Groix (dialecte occidental)*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH.
- Timberlake, Alan (1974). *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. München: Sagner.
- Timberlake, Alan (1975). "The nominative object in Finnish". In: *Lingua* 35, 201–230.
- Timm, Lenora (1987). "The verb morphology of Carhaisien Breton". In: *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 42, 242–92.
- Toivainen, Jorma (1993). The nature of the accusative in Finnish. In: *Case and Other Functional Categories in Finnish syntax*. Ed. by: Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 111–128.
- Toland, John (1747). *The Miscellaneous Works of Mr. John Toland*. London: J. Whiston, S. Baker, J. Robinson.
- Toner, Gregory ed. (2013). Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language. Revised edition 2013. Queen's University Belfast. url: <http://edil.qub.ac.uk/>.
- Trevidig, Alberzh (1987). "Dibarderioù rannyezh ar Poc'hêr". In: *Hor Yezh* 171–2, 71–79.
- Urien, Jean-Yves & Per Denez (1977–9). "Essai d'analyse semiologique du mot verbal et du syntagme verbal en breton contemporain". *Studia Celtica* 12/13: 150–200, 14/15: 290–312.
- Urien, Jean-Yves (1999). "Statut morphologique de la particule verbale". In: *Breizh ha pobloù Europa*. Ed. by Hervé Le Bihan. Lesneven: Hor Yezh, 645–76.
- Vainikka, Anne (1993). "The three structural cases in Finnish". In: *Case and Other Functional Categories in Finnish syntax*. Ed. by: Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 129–159.
- Vainikka, Anne, and Pauli Brattico (2014). The Finnish accusative. In *Linguistics* 52, 73–124.

- Vallée, Frañcez (1923). “Conseils de l’Academie Bretonne aux écrivains bretons”. In: *Buhez Breizh* 27, 496–99.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1996). *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Watkins, T. Arwyn (1977). “The Welsh personal pronoun”. In: *Word* 28, 146–65.
- Widmer, Paul (2012). “*A so* and *so* in Middle and Early Modern Breton”. In: *Hor Yezh* 270, 31–40.
- Williams, Ifor (1935). *Canu llywarch hen*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru.
- Willis, David (1998). *Syntactic Change in Welsh*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, David (2007). “Specifier-to-head reanalyses in the complementizer domain: evidence from Welsh”. In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 105, 432–80.
- Willis, David (2013). “Negation in the history of the Brythonic Celtic languages”. In: *The history of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Ed. by David Willis, Christopher Lucas, and Anne Breitbarth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 239–98.
- Wmffre, Iwan (1998). *Central Breton*. München: Lincom.
- Yang, Charles (2016). *The Prince of Linguistic Productivity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Yang, Charles (2017). “How to wake up irregular and speechless”. In: *On Looking into Words (and Beyond)*. Ed. by Claire Bower, Laurence Horn, and Rafaella Zanuttini. Berlin: Language Science Press, 211–233.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling, and Ray Jackendoff (1987). “Case in tiers”. In: *Language* 63, 217–50.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (2008). “Encoding the addressee in the syntax: evidence from English imperative subjects”. In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26, 185–218.
- Zeuss, Johann Kaspar, and Hermann Ebel (1871). *Grammatica Celtica*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Zimmer, Stefan (1999). “The verb “to be” in Old Welsh”. In: *Archaeolingua* 10, 547–57.