Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton III: Supplementary materials

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER
milan_rezac@yahoo.ca

1   Introduction

This is a work document DME.III supplementing DME.I-II and related work:[1]

DME.I-II:
Rezac, Milan. 2022. *Mihi est* from Brythonic to Breton II: The nominative object. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126: 325-385. DOI : 10.1515/if-2021-014
Rezac, Milan. 2021. *Mihi est* from Brythonic to Breton I: The dative subject. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125: 313-362. DOI : 10.1515/if-2020-013

Rezac, Milan. 2021. The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg through Barisy's 1710 Cantiqueu Spirituel. Ms, CNRS. DOI : 10.5281/zenodo.5823615
Rezac, Milan. 2022. The rise and fall of the Person-Case Constraint in Breton. Zenodo.

One major source of the supplementatry material is the text Bel, to which I had not had access for DME. It completes the data at several points, but above all, reveals an MB origin for the infinitives of *mihi est*, perhaps undocumented until now. Other supplements are details on constructions discussed in DME, such as certain usages of *have-* and *be-* constructions. The supplement also contains statistics referred to in DME as being in earlier drafts of Rezac 2022. The document is a work in progress and revised periodically. Comments, corrections, works, sources all very welcome.[2]

Note on transcription, translation, citations: Transcription likely has some errors so sources should be checked; a likely type of error that has been partially corrected is *deues ~ deueus*. Translations are given when they would seem to be useful, e.g. not in developments of *mihi est* infinitives, but for usage of *mihi est*. They ail to be literal since glosses are not given, and occasionally take some liberties to mirror the source as closely as possible. References are mostly in the bibliographies of the above works.

2   Datives: infinitives of *mihi est*; *de* and *deur*; *de*

2.1   Infinitive of *mihi est*

The development of the infinitive of *mihi est* -- adding to finite *am eux eñ* nonfinite *am bout eñ* -- is among the most significant changes for the study of *mihi est* (DME.I: 5.4, DME.II: 4.5). It is usually thought to appear in 17C Gwenedeg, be confined to it apart from a perhaps fixed form cited by de Rostrenen, and there specifically to coastal varieties, where it disappears by 20C (Châtelier 2016 with lit., esp. *LVB* and *HMSB*). It now seems reasonable that within Gwened it was a development shared by the interior

---

[1] Works referred to in DME as being on my website are now with its unforeseen demise rather on Zenodo primarily, and secondarily on ResearchGate.
[2] For the MB period, the major primary source not available to me is now Jer[†], as are several editions rather than originals of the texts. Among secondary sources, gaps only available to me through very partial notes that may lead to significant revisions are the are articles of P. Le Goff in *Revue Morbihannaise* and the 1995 thesis of P. Rolland on literary Gwenedeg, and much relevant work on cognate systems like Schumacher 2011.

(CS.bar[†], Rezac 2021, resumed below), and that outside Gwened, it took place in Kerne by one of the MB authors at the classical-late MB boundary, Y. Gueguen (Bel, documented here).[3]

Background on infinitives (DME.I: 5.4, DME.II: 4.5): MB shares with MC and MW verbal nouns as nominalisations rather than infinitives, revealed as such by the use of genitive pro/mesoclitics coding S/O in ergative alignment: *e vout bras, ganet* 'his being great, born', *e welet* 'his seeing = seeing of him'.

By 19C in all varieties, these forms have clearly become infinitives, revealed as such by the use of accusative pro/mesoclitics coding O, while genitive pro/mesoclitics for O/S are gone, *er gwelet* 'seeing him', **e vout*, outside those verbal nouns that have lexicalised as nominalisations like *e welet* 'sight, seeing of him' (Stephens 1982), a phenomenon particularly rare in Gwenedeg (Rezac 2021 with lit.).

The earliest robust, systematic evidence of the new system is the late 17C Gwenedeg texts NG[†], where it coexists with the old (Hemon 1956), and by the 1810 text CS.bar[†], the old system survives only in particular constructions and then disappears from Gwenedeg (Rezac 2021), while other varieties do keep often show only the old system until 19C (DME.II: 4.1-4).

The rise of infinitives may have been needed to extend *mihi est* beyond finite forms. The sort of "high" or "applicative" dative used in *mihi est* is typically excluded from nouns and nominalisations though available in gerunds and infinitives, i.e. it needs a sufficiently finite-like clause structure (see lit. DME.I: 5.4; cf. English, if slightly misleading because secundative: *We gave people choices*, *Our/us giving people choices*, *Our gift of *(people, *of people) choices (to people)*, *Their gift = gift of them* not *gift to them*). The generalisation explains why the Brythonic languages keep *mihi est* confinited to finite clauses until infinitives develop in Breton though they have and use the verbal noun of *be* in what would seem to be a suitable contruction, including the *apud me est* type *e vout din* 'his being to me' (see below for an example), but something like **da'm bout ef* 'my having him' beside *am bez ef* (MC **dhem bos ef*, MW **ym bot ef*).

Background on infinitive of *mihi est* (Châtelier 2016, Rezac 2021): The earliest nonce attestations is the MB-date but distinctively and uniquely Gwenedeg 1632 Pr[†], 1692 PR[†], 1680 NG[†], and then rich uses of varied formations in the earliest 18C texts like 1810 CS.bar[†]. These textual attestations of 18-19C occur in authors known to be from the southeast of Gwened, or in texts characteristic by hallmarks of the area (*dehou* rather than *dehoñ*). In 20C the one robust attestation of productive use is from the distinctive island variety of Groix in the southwest of Gwenedeg (Ternes 1970 for later 20C, and earlier in the usage of J.-P. Calloc'h, q.v. Le Pipec 2018). This has suggested the forms are coastal (Châtelier 2016).

---

[3] Y. Gueguen's forms are clear and rich in Bel. They have presumably not been noted in *HMSB, LVB*, Châtelier 2016 because the text has not yet been edited and the original difficult of access, and even its existence and authorship seem to have been established fairly late (Dujardin 1956). There is one clear form in Cnf, but its significance had passed me by without the confirming forms in Bel. My access to editions of MB texts remains very partial, so it seems entirely possible that the forms have been discussed in the literature, but if so, not in works drawn on in the above-cited studies.

However among the earliest robust attestations is P. Barisy's 1810 CS.bar[†], from Noyal-Pontivy at the inland eastern boundary of Gwened, but the parson of Inguiniel and aiming to write in its variety, near the inland western boundary with Kerne. The forms are distinctive, so whatever entered into their formation, they were not simply borrowed wholesale from any variety attested in southeastern authors (Rezac 2021). This extends the forms in Gwenedeg from the coast to the interior.

For earlier and outside Gweneg, the forms have been missing so far, apart from whatever might be infered from the way de Rostrenen 1732 presents his data: "There is no trace of this conjugated infinitive in Middle Breton" (*HMSB*: §140.10); "There is no trace of this conjugated infinitive in Middle Breton"; "La forme *en devout* se trouve chez Grég., vraisemblablement sous l'influence du. Van; il y a ajouté *en devezout*, d'après le rapport *en devo*, *en devezo* … Mais, chez les auteurs et grammairiens autres que ceux de Van. dev(ez)out ne se trouve pas" (*LVB*: 199).[4]

Verbal noun of *mihi est* in MB: The usual situation in MB well illustrated in all texts. For usages where finite clauses typically have *mihi est*, the nonfinite recourse is to *caffout*, itself only as transitive 'find, get' in finite clauses, and it is the only recourse when finite clauses can only use *mihi est*, but if they can also use *apud me est*, this too can be used in nonfinite clauses. Thus the usage of T. Gueguen of early 17C (native of Leon):[5]

A quement **ha me oz bezaff** bet <u>diff</u> an Lecteur ves an leur ancien Latin / peheny **am boa** bet en prest digant an Autrau Person à Penros, / **em boa** songiet en em contantiff à quement se / hep **caffout** sourcy de communiquaff ouz re all, "And what with me **having had** [*apud me est*, lit. with me being been to me] the lecture of the ancient Latin book / which I **have had** [*mihi est*] on loan from the Lord Parson of Penros, / I had thought to content myself with this / without **having** [*caffout*, note suppletion since *have worry* in finite clauses is only *mihi est*] worry to communicate it to others." (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17 MB)

Back to infinitives: It is not clear just when nominalisations became infinitives; only a terminus *ante quem* is given by the appearance of accusative pro/mesoclitics in 1680 NG[†].

All the Brythonic languages can use the verbal noun of *be* in various predications-equations, e.g. *e vout bras* 'his being big', and MC shares with MB its use in the perfect of intransitives and passive of transitives, *e vout ganet* 'his being born', *e vout skrivet* 'his being writen' (DME.II: 4.5). These are of course unavailable to full nominalisations in English or French, **his existence big, born*, though available to Poss-ing gerunds, *their being big, written*.

MB hints that a fully infinitival structure had become available by late 16C, in an innovative reflexive formation (DME.II: 350n30). Originally, all verbal forms

---

[4] *LVB*: 198 gives as the unique MLB candidate for the infinitive or verbal noun of *mihi est* the construction in M[†] 3350, citing Ernault 1914: 277n8. It seems as uncertain as it did to Ernault: it might be "their having", but it is perhaps even better taken as "their being".

[5] The examples given by Ernault, D.Etym. p. 230, are the distinct formation of infinitive of genitive S + nominalisation of BE + participle in the nominaliation of the passive (DME: 4.5). Le Roux refers to a candidate for the infinitive of *mihi est* Ernault's discussion of M that is far more convincingly explained by Ernault as not such.

reflexivised only by the inherited prefix *em-*. To this O-coding pro/mesoclitics had been attached sometime prior to 16C Breton. These are as expected accusative with finite verbs, but with verbal nouns they are not only the expected genitive, but also accusative, from the outset (Hemon 1954): e16C M† *d-e em cuzet* but *d-en em diffenn*. There are enough anomalies in these reflexivised formations to make any conclusions tentative, but a hint for evolution to infinitives it is.

In the author that will be of interest, Y. Gueguen, this evidence is no longer available, since by 17C clitic + *em-* had become fixed to an invariable reflexive marker *en em* grammaticalisaing the 3SGM form of the clitic in all formations. However, Y. Gueguen does have a unique morphosyntax with old verbal nouns that hints at their development to infinitives: he extending to them the negation of finite clauses. The negations *ne, na* were originally confinited to finite clauses, while verbal nouns resorted to the preposition *heb* 'without'. This remained typical even when verbal nouns had become infinitives, with sporadic extension of *ne, na*. Y. Gueguen however has fully extended *ne, na* to the old verbal nouns early by e17C: frequent type *n'oz adioutty, nac oz diminiuy* "not adding, nor diminishing" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C).

Infinitives of *mihi est*: This brings us to the infinitive of *mihi est* in Y. Gueguen. There are about a dozen forms, all but one in his 1625, Bel, the other in 1612/1646 Cnf, most but not all in translated passages.

A full study of these forms remains to be done, but a rough sketch can be given here. The forms are used mostly for the *have*-perfect, but also for lexical *have*. Like finite formations, they use 3SGM, 3PL, 1PL pro/mesoclitics, distinctively accusative *en* rather than genitive *e* with 3SGM, in concord with postverbal and preverbal subjects when attested with 3PL, and followed by *de* for and only for 3rd person. The rest is in part transparently the infinitive of *be*, in part not, discussed more fully below.

Illutrative examples:

3SGM *en dezout*, Bel:
pennaus vn croeadur en oat à pemp bloæz, ouz en-|dezout desquet da blasphemiff an hanuo à Doué
3SGM *en deuezaff*, Bel:
hac en em aduisæ econtinant, quent euit endeuezaff an holl consantet gant an volontez
3PL *hoz deuezout*, Bel:
pennaus heuelep tut-se so bezet meurbet diot ha foll, ouz hoz deue-|zout collet an mat souueran
3PL *ò dezuout*, Bel:
guinuidic an re, pere oz ò dezuout iontet ouz an contemplation an Charité parfet
1PL *hon bezaff*, Bel, Cnf:
hac euelse hoz hon bezaff dis-|carguetoch, ez grahimp ęssoch à se hõ beaig.
goudé ma hon bezaff lauaret (misericors)

The following passage may be quoted in full Bel, since it is not a translation like the others, but an original composition of the author's rather; all forms of *have* are in bold:

Ouzpen, pennaus bizhuic-|quen ne dléont esperiff da **caffet** dispancc, / mar **oz deueus** bet an hardizder / nequet hep muy quen oz vezaff eureudet, hoguen yuez græt com-|pagnunez charnel, / (autramant consomet an priedelæz neant) / oz **ò dezuout** an aznaoude-|guez deueus an ampeschamant à yoe entrezo da gallout bezaff priedou, / ya memes ma ne gouz-|uient ez voe etrezo ampeschamant, / **n'oz de-|ueus** græt cas "Moreover, [the Council says] how they must never hope to **have** dispensation, / if they **have had** the hardihood, not only to have been married, but also to have made carnal companionship / (in other words consumed the void marriage) / while **having** knowledge of the impedance that was between them to be able to be spouses, / yea even if they did not know that there was between them impedance, / they have not paid attention" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C MB)

Forms of the infinitive: The infinitive of *be* here is regular in *hon bezaff, en deuezaff, en deuezout*, with both *b/vezout* and *b/vezaff* used independently as the infinitive of *be* in the text, while the other form of the period *bout* is lacking. Very tentatively (on my part), *bezaff* is not Gwenedeg, being typical of Leoneg-Tregereg as soon as can be told (e.g. T. Gueguen's 1650 ed. of NI[†]; cf. *LVB*: 179f.). *Bezout bezout* is found in e16C MB J[†] (*HMSB* §139), later perhaps not in Leon-Treger (again tentatively), but close to Gwendeg NG's 1680 *bezouet, besouet* (Hemon 1956: §78-9). The historically earliest *bout* is common in MB, and later typical of Gwenedeg and Kerneveg, but does not seem to be found Y. Gueguen (based a search of about 50% of the text).

That leaves 3rd proclitic + *dez(u)out* forms where *d(e)* is the dative *de* prefix. Y. Gueguen does use *z*-forms of finite *mihi est* like 3SGM jussive *en deuezet*, future 3SGM *en deuezo*. Later, these *z*-forms are found with loss of *ue* in *en dezo*, including in the first grammar focusing on Kerneveg forms because the author was native to the dialect, Dumoulin's 1800 grammar (cf. *LVB*: 150ff, *HMSB*: §139). Thus *en dezout* corresponds well to *en devezout* with the usually drop of *ve* known attested stightly later in *en dezo*, though the *ve*-drop might be absent in forms of plain *be* in Y. Gueguen.

There remains *u* of *en dezuout*, also *deruout* (q.v.). The obvious candidate in the latter is compound with *bout*, but Y. Gueguen does not use it. He does use finite forms like *en dezuoe* that look like abstraction of *dez* as stem compounded with BE, so these are a direct analogue to *en dezuout*. A confound throughout is purely orthographic *z* in his texts like *dezez = deze*.

All these forms need fully study in relationship to the finite forms in and beyond the text. It seems fairly clear however that we are dealing with unique formations not borrowed from any attested Gwenedeg system, and attested in a Kerne writer of early 17C.

Dative clitic and *de*: A particularly striking feature of Y. Gueguen's grammar is the use of the accusative-syncretic clitic *en + de + BE* in forming the infinitive of *mihi est*.

This is characteristic of all early infinitives of *mihi est*, but by the time we meet them with 3SGM in 18C Gwenedeg, we are dialing with varieties where infinitives of transitives already use the accusative form *en, er, el* for O, and coding of S has switched to PRO.

In contrast, in Y. Gueguen's grammar, we still have the MB pattern where O and S alike are coded by the genitive form *e*, including with BE, e.g. *ouzpen é bezaff diuin* "in

addition to his being divine", *ouz é bezaff, an pen deueux an holl tadou arall* "with him being the head of all oth other fathers", *rac ouz e bezaff bet barnet* "for with him having been judged" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C). Thus it is striking that we find beside his accusative-genitive syncretic *hon bezaff* the distinctively accusative *en deuezaff* and not *e b/uezaff* for *mihi est* thus revealing at this point in a way it would not be later. It is a matter of analysis whether it is revealing of a dative clitic as the analysis is in DME, or paradigmatic influence of finite clauses, or both. Ditto for *en deruout* rather than *e deruout* (see below, more tentative since not clear that it is not fixed).

Similarly the presence of *de* is significant in the type *en dez(u)out*, and in later Gwenedeg Vannes-area and Groix reduction of *en devout* to *en dout*. These suggest the close association of *de* with the proclitic independently of the infinitive of BE, which is here deformed or reduced. Later this association is underscored by extension of *de* to 3SGF and 3PL in Groix (Ternes 1970: 16.3, cf. DME.I: 4.4). Again different analyses are available, but probably should share the conclusion that *de-* has been reanalysed from prefix to *be* where may have originated, and become associated with the pro/mesoclitic, as would be a dative marker (DME.I: 4.4).

Infinitive of *have* and accusative proclitic: There is one form of Y. Gueguen's that does not conform to earlier and later patterns at all: *Ouz vezaff r'hoet domp é map propr, ha dre an moien à nezaff,* **ouz hon deuezout adoptet** *euit é bugale, ha promettet domp an heritaig* "… **[his] having adopted us as** his children". It seems readily explicable in a way that may be encapsulated by *ouz hon ~~en~~ deuezout adopted* as being at the crossroads of two formations.

One formation is the regular MB passive of transitives with genitive proclitic coding of O→S on the verbal noun of passivising BE, *ouz hon bezout adopted* 'our being adopted'. These passives functionally corresponds to the usage of both passives of transitives and actives of transitives in nonfinite formations of French, though there is good reason historically and still MB and even in early 18C to analyse them only as passives, *LVB* (see lit. in DME.II: 4.5, notably *LVB's* passive against Ernault's Dict.Etym active for the type *dam bezaf nouet hoz pedaf*).

The other formation is the new perfect that should be theoreticall available to Y. Gueguen by combining his new, Gwenedeg-like infinitives, *en deuezout adopted*, and placement of proclitics on the participle in his finite clauses, *en deus hon adopted*, to *en devezout hon adopted*, the regular formation in Gwenedeg from later 17C, and close to the regular *bezaff hon adopted* of Leon in 18C (see lit. in DME.II: 4.5).

What Y. Gueguen has not otherwise attempted is to take his new active perfect infinitive and put the proclitic on the participle where he uses it in the active perfect finite. Already once earlier an author seems to have attemted to get around this unfamiliarity by sticking the clitic on the auxiliary (see DME.II: 3.4 on the *am eur cruciffiat* hapax of J[†]). Here that would have come out to *ouz hon en deuezout adopted*. Haplology of the clitics gives the attested result.

Alternatives need exploration, though they seem difficult at various points. One notable possibility is *de-* with 1PL *hon-*, unprecedented early, but appearing in 19C outside Gwenedeg (*HMSB*: §140n2, cf. DME.II: 368 with further lit).

7

2.2 _Deur-_ and dative _de-_

DME does not adequately address certain aspects of _deur-_, notably the apparent failure of MB-MC to recruit the dative marker _de_ after and only after 3rd person proclitics, as it did with _mihi est_, though the two verbs share the innovation of free preverbal and postverbal subjects concording with accusative-syncretic pro/mesolitics, at least in MB. It seems that the innovation may have been shared across the two verbs.

History: The MW cognate _dawr_ 'matter to, interest, like' (see further on what follows GPC, WG: §196). Pre-14C and mostly 14C examples in GPC use mesoclitics, like MB-MC (_ny'm dawr_ type); by 14C suffixes are attested (_ny ddoraf_ type); by 15C a mixture of both (_ny'm doraf_ type). Usage of the older type is with clauses, abstracts, absolute (cf. WG: §196). The prefixed type _didawr_ occurs in the same usages including early mesoclitics. The other argument can be absent in absolute usage, clause including _i_ 'to' infinitive but also finite, abstract (pro)nominals that are not personal pronouns, dropped with anaphoric reference rather than personal pronoun (i.e. no type _ny'm dawr ef_ seems attested). There are some _t_-forms (type _ny'm tawr_).

The OIr cognate is _dáthair,_ relative _daas_ 'ail', with both _d-_ and _t-_, and in part conflated with _at-tá_ 'be' substantive. This does have fully inflecting forms + prepositions early of the sort 'you.ail to.me' (see Thurneyssen §776ff, e.g. 777.2; eDil s.v. _attá_ I.a, _daas_, 1 _do_ II.5).

The traditional etymology related these forms to BE through *_stā-, steH_$_2$- 'stand' that specialised as a form of BE in Celtic, OIr _at-tá_ for the substantive verb '*stands' > 'finds oneself, be', MW _-tau_ 'is', OB _to_, perhaps MC presentative _otte_ (Matasovic 2009). Of this, MB-MC-MW _dawr-_ were attributed to mediopassive _(s)tā-ro_, perhaps with an evolution comparable to _mihi stat_ 'I am resolved' (VGKS II: 433). This does not fit MB-MC-MW, where the result should be MW **_ny'm tawr,_ MB **_ne'm zeur_ -- but cf. not only OIr but also MW _t_-forms like _ni'm tawr_ (WG: §196). The usual etymology now is to *_dā-yo-_ 'ail, trouble' and further perhaps to _deH_$_1$- 'bind', though the issue of _t_-forms remains (Schumacher 2004, cited in Matasovic 2009). Thus OIr, MW 'it does not ail me' > 'it pleases me' and further MB-MC 'to matters to me'.

_de_: DME.I passes over in silence the extensions of *_di-_ > _de-_ to _deur-_ cognates. MW appears to present the same picture for _dawr_ as for _mihi est_: _di-, dy-_ prefixed counterparts do exist (though unlike with _mihi est_, the sources cited here only give a 1st person example, _odit amdidawr or byt_ 'scarely anything interests me out of the world', so WG §196).

MB _deur-_ has not been given out with any _de_-prefixed form, but phonology would obscure it in part, and when it would not, it does in fact seem to appear in a couple of forms until now treated as anomalous.

Phonologically, we would expect two outcomes (cf. Schrijver 2011a: 370, 383). In roughly western varieties which most influence the MB _koiné, de-zeur-_ /deðør/ or with assimilation _deuzeur_ /døðør/. This directly explains the otherwise anomalous _nedeuzeur_ /døðør/ with 'NEG=3SGF=' (B[†] 231, m16C) [Hemon 1954: 212 "strange", Ernault 1896: 153, cf. 1914: 280n4 "pour _ne deuruez_ ?"].

In the southeast, and to a considerable extent elsewhere, ð is lost, fully documented only by the time of the *ALBB*, but attested by later 16C (rhyming *hente* in B[†] 759 cited in Schrijver 2011a: 383) and 17C (pertinently Gk, spellings like *bugale*, but also *guirionez* /e/ by rhyme, see Ernault's 1928 II:138). The result would have led to *de-eur, deueur, deur* /d(e/ø)ør/. That directly explains *Ma n'o de-ueur distreifu* with 'NEG=3PL=' (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C) [Ernault: "Lire deurue?"].

Both these forms are consistent with *de-* fixated after 3rd person proclitics in the prehistory of MB *deur-*, as with *mihi est*. I do not now of relevant MC forms, but *duer-* is rare in the text and perhaps incorrectly described as productive rather than idiomatic in DME.

By the time of texts in the 16C MB *koine*, *de* is not prefixed to *deur* when expected in the northwest-based standard, and for this must be involed the eastern collapse *deeur* > *deur*. What we do find, however, is frequent spelling *deuzr-* (a.o. Jer, Bel, Cnf). These have been taken as "hypercorrect" (Schrijver 2011a: 409; due to ðr > r), but it is not clear that this hypercorrection matches that found elsewhere (in my glossed excerpts of Bel, Cnf, about 50% of the texts, it is not; Jer is inaccessible to me; in Bel, Cnf, *deuzr* is request but not exclusive for *deur*). It may be that the *zr* forms are better explained by phonological development directly (haplology of the assimilated vowels of *døðør-*) or indirectly (eastern *deur* under influence of wester *deuzeur*). However, the *zr* forms are found in all formations of *deur*, i.e. not restricted to 3rd person proclitics (Bel *hac euelse em deuzr da ober*) or to finite forms (Bel *Iesus Christ endeues deuzruezet anduriff*).[6]

Usage: A full inventory of all usages remains to be given here, but some preliminary findings for MB may be given: dative clitic + *deur* is used exclusively with finite clause, nominalisation and later infinitive, rare abstract nominal, and rare silent anaphor referring to these, i.e. object drop under conditions that fit object drop elsewhere. There is no enclitic, but none is expected under this usage and the independent usage of object drop. When *deur* is regularised, object proclitics do appear (see below)

Argument coding: There also remains to be given a full inventory of the distribution of the formations of *deur-* across texts. Here follow some examples from Y. Gueguen's (K) e17C Bel, a useful text because it has a number of formations richly attested (the examples are only representative, chosen to illustrate diversity of bound pronouns and their doubling or nondoubling of free subjects):[7]

dative pro/mesoclitic + deur: the historically expected situation:
1SG Me am deur quelen | hac euelse em deuzr da ober |
1PL n'hon deur quet lauaret |
2SG pennaus ez deur te ez vsen à truez ouzyt |
3SGM dan hiny en deuzr techet |

---

[6] The developments do not explain what seems to be the one remaining anomalous form, B[†] *A huy ouz deux q̃t he guelet hy* (as *deur* 'do you not want to see her' rather than *mihi est* 'have you hot seen her'; clear: there is no precedent of *d-* after 2PL *ouz* with *mihi est* in this or other texts). It highlights the usual worry that errors did occur and it is hard to draw conclusions from a handful of unexpected forms.
[7] The other work of Y. Gueguen, Cnf², similarly usually has *deur* with proclitics, but not always: pe-ré traezou né deuzrueas è nep manyer ho ober "which things he [sic] could in no wise do".

3SGF ha rac se en he deuzr é salutemp an Itron Maria | oll quement hez deur |
3PL pere oz deuzr hac à fell dezo chom eréet | ha hoaz oz deuruffue bezaff domp æz-
|reuent

dative pro/mesoclitic + deur + be: perhaps historically expected given MW parallels; the
3SGM *en* might also be fixed when found, but there is no evidence, i.e. e.g. *endeur* with
1SG, and it is clearly unfixed in 3PL; not in the 3PL example concord with an internal
free R:
3SGM ma endeuruoe Doué |
3PL dre quement lech ma oz deuruoe é cacc | pehiny n'oz deuruez quet, ha ne gallont
euffry neptra ‖deueux an pez oz deuruez | Hac rac noz deuruoe quet an sant merzheryen
en nep moyen ober an memes tra

dative + regularised: not clear; 2PL proclitic plus jussive would look like doubling, as
with *mihi est*, DME.II: 5.2:
!2PL ha <u>noz deuruet</u> quet pechiff

deur regularised: presumably innovative, apparently only 3SG:
3SGM hac à gall ober oll quement <u>à deuzr</u>, hac à car

deur + be: presumably innovative:
3SGM rac maz <u>deuzruoe</u> Doué | Iesus Christ <u>maz </u>deuzruiffe | pennaus ez <u>g</u>all<u>o</u> hac ez
<u>deuruezo</u> **é sicour** en pep necessité |
3PL ha <u>da galloud</u> ober quement à <u>deuruezynt</u>

intrasentential mixes:
3SGM <u>Rac ma deurye</u> descuez, pennaus ez voe é guiryone maro euelse <u>en deuruoe</u> chom
en bez

Participle: frequent, always *deur* + BE:
3SGM pe euit heny Iesus Christ <u>endeues deuzruezet</u> anduriff

Infinitive: several formations:

deur + BE
<u>euit deuzrueout</u> quent meruel
é pro-|testaff <u>deuzruezout</u> beuaff ha meruel
map Doué oz <u>deuruezout</u> en em ober den

deur + BE? (as source of *u*)
ha <u>deuruout</u> oboissaff dan re
ha <u>n'hoz deuruout</u> reiff an su-|perflu dan paourien (note that this is 'not wanting', not
2PL)

dative clitic in 3SGM (fixed or not?) + deur + BE? (as source of *u*)
Da quen-|taff en <u>deuruout</u> ober vengeancc

Howerver, it is not absolute: e̱n oz clasq boedou re resquis, // en <u>deuruout</u> boedou diffennet | Da quen-|taff en <u>deuruout</u> ober vengeancc à enep an hiny

This last formation is of course that of infinitives of *mihi est*, and it is found in the text alongside infinitives of *mihi est*, q.v. There is no clear sign that the clitic can vary beyond 3SGM, but not evidence against it. There is no formation that attaches the infinitival suffix directly to *deur* with or without the proclitic, i.e. *(en) deu(z)rout*. Infinitives of *mihi est* and *deur* with dative proclitics are unique to Y. Gueguen in MB (Kerne).

The contemporary T. Gueguen (Leon) offers an infinitive of *deur* in its regularised usage with what appears to be an accusative-genitive object proclitic in Mc: *Doutancc am eux bet en Traou ves an feiz / dre n'am deurye quet. / Mar deux bet negligancc ves hõ costez, / hoguẽ é deur-|uout à propos deliberet* 'but wishing it (doubt, fem.) deliberately'. This appears to be the unique usage of deur with such a proclitic coding its subject-matter or theme. The author otherwise has both dative proclitics, *dre n'am deurye quet*, *nem deur quet* (2x) *no deurfé*, as in this example, and regularisation, e.g. in this very text: *ouz é pidiff / ez deurue-|zo hõ miret* 'asking him that he be willing to keep us'. (Other examples in Mc are *n'on be deuruezet*, *hep deuruout ez choaruise*).

2.3   <u>Notes on *am eur*</u>

There is an issue shared by all analyses of the *am eur cruciffiet* hapax of J[†] including that in DME.II: 3.4 which is based on these antecedents. The impersonal form of *be* is indeed well attested as *eur* (*LVB, HMSG*). However, it might be attested only by eNB. For MB I seem to be only able to very *oar*: e.g. *Goudé ma oar em habillet souden eo ret stoeoff d'an dou glin ha lauaret gant deuotion* (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C MB).

Ernault's attempts to connect *am eur* to *rymawyr* had not been cited in DME; this traditional seem to have been entirely left behind by subsequent work on the Welsh form (e.g. Schumacher 2011).

3   Imperative and jussive

3.1   <u>Jussive</u>

DME.II gives or early 16C 3 proclitic *en=miret*, 3 enclitic *roent=ef*, but no 1/2 coding had been found in the study until e18C. Bel[†] now offers a clear MB example (the 3SGM anaphora to *pivbennac* suggest that this is not the 2PL imperative, but 3SG jussive):

pivbennac eta, da ober é siluidiguez à viz, |Ha da brihatta an vertuzyou, dan trase requis,| Ha da chacçeal diouthaff an pechet,en pep quis,|Euit moien certen, **ma lennet** alieux hep co-|uardis.
"whoever then, to accomlish his salvation from vice, |and to embrace the virtues necessary to this thing, |and to chase from him sin in every manner, |as certain means, let him **read!3SG me** often."
(Y. Gueguen: Bel[†]; e17C MB)

11

An earlier instance might be B[†] 257, *An draman **ma disouzanet***. The context, the usage of *disouzanañ*, and *ag an > an* at this period allows several interpretations. It could be jussive "let this thing [the fountain under discussion and named] give me relief", or imperative "[Lord,] relieve me of this thing [thirst, which must be contextually inferred, or the fountain's having dried up, which is under discussion" (the latter is Ernault's interpretation, save that his translation takes *ma* as dative and *an draman* not as *ag an* but as the direct object, while *ag* with *disouzanañ* is supported elsewhere in the text).

Of interest is 3rd person human subject of the jussive of *apud me est* : *Bezet diff a crēn dispēnet* "Let her be beheaded for me", "Let me have her beheaded" (B[†], m16C).

3.2   <u>Imperative ambiguities</u>

DME.II: 2.3 mentions the absence of clear imperative forms with 3rd person proclitics after a particle, either in the distinctive !2SG forms, or the occasional distinctive !2PL like *list* 'let' (as far as I can tell, imperative only in MB). Such clear imperative forms always use enclitics in early verse, where they are frequent, and in their rare occurrences in prose. It is only for imperative forms ambiguous with present or future in command uses that there occur proclitics as well as enclitics for 3rd person, including in the same text: *Neusé mar lauar ni̠ch̠un deoch. ...* **na credet ef quet** and *Mar deuy nichun dauedouch, ha na dioug an doctrin_man,* **n'en receuet quet** *en ho ty,* **ha na saludet quet à Nezafu.** (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C MB).

   The availability of the missig proclitics would be trivially overturned by a single imperative forms like *en receu!*, and the argument set at naught by *hag alies ez studi an dra-man!*, *hac an dra-man a gred!*, or more fully by *hac alies en ho studi!* Their absence is surprising in light of usual descriptions, and it is far too early to assert that they are absent in MB, still less eNB. The matter needs further detailed study (undertaken for the 1810 W text CS.bar[†] in Rezac 2021, with uncertatin conclusions).

   Conversely, the analysability of forms like Gk's above as present or future must not be neglected. The present with its proclitic coding specialised in W as surrogate to the imperative in negative commands, and future is common on command uses from the earliest texts, along with the infinitive, though with different nuances.

   Bel[†] offers a good example where the rannig favours such present and/or future use in a commnd in what would otherwise taken to be an imperative. Clear imperative forms occur with fronted objects, but never linked by *a*, and fronted nonnomials, but never linked by *ez/en*. It is rather the peculiarity of the imperative-jussive that these rannigs can be absent, and always are when verbal inflection makes the imperative unambiguous.

An doudec articl-man **à credet**,
D'an Baradoes mar mennet monet;
Ha da pep vnan **ò quelennet**,
Hac alieux **en ò studiet**.
'These twelve articles **R=believe.2PL**,
To Paradise if you mean to go;
And to each one **them=teach.2PL**,

And often **R=them=study.2PL**'
(Y. Gueguen, K: Bel[†]; e17C MB).

3.3 Cornish

DME.II: 2.3 gives mesoclitics only in the jussive, while the imperative takes enclitics even when negated, as with 3rd person in MB. That stands. There is an emendation to BM that yields such a mesoclitic (Stokes 1872) but it has been challenged (Cuillandre 1931-2): *Ty falge horsen [n]am brag vy, Ty horsen agen (nagen?) brag ny* (BM[†]; e16C MC) "thou false whore's son who insults me" by emendation to "insult me not!".

4 Participles and proclitics

4.1 Participles and voice

Breton uses its resultative *et* participles as moidifer adnominal, *Un ti savet ganti* "a house raised by her", and adverbial, *Savet ganti un ti, Anna ...* "a house raised by her, Anna…"; root clauses, *Ha savet ganti un ti* "And raised by her a house"; and what may be called a conjunctive usage where the participle is conjoined with a preceding clause of various types, *[Anna zo aet, Hag Anna mond] ha savet ganti un ti* '[Anna has gone, And Anna go] and raised by her a house'. Infinitive usage can be put into the same groups.

Typically when the voice of participles in any usage can be detected, they are passive. This is given away by *by*-phrases, or by promoting their O to S as PRO or specified subject of the nonfinite clause. These are both early. The *by*-phrase type is well recognised (cf. Le Gleau 1999: III: §77). The promotion to subject may be illustrated as more rare and less obvious:

Duet out da pēn **hac eff tennet** / En dampnacion "Thou art come to end [sc. hast succeeded] **and he drawn** / Into damnation" (B[†], m16C MB)
He disober à predero, / Pan guelo chenchet he credēn, / **Ha hy badezet** mēn cret_hēn, / Neuse ten eff he dipenno. "To undo her he will think, / When he sees changed her belief, / **And her baptised** I would believe it, / Then hard he will behead her." (B[†], m16C MB) I would believe it, / Then hard he will behead her." (B[†], m16C MB)
Ouz hars an Croas maz foue gloaset / hon Roue ny crucifiet / Ez edoa e mam estlamet / **Ha hy e dyffout hyruoudet**. "At the foot of the cross where was injured / God our King to us crucified / was his mother astonished / **and she about him anguished**." (T. Gueguen, L: Do; e17C MB)

Often, there is no formal demontration of voi ce, and only translations that favour oe or the other (which is a poor guide, cf. DME.II: 4.5).

Euel ortolan / Goude **guelet** glan / An mam hen ganas / An sul dan myntin / Dan Magdalen din / En iardin dinoas. // En em discuezas "As gardener, / after having [being?] seen clearly / the mother that bore him / Sunday at morning / To the worthy Magdalen / harmless in the garden // He showed himself" (J[†]; e16 MB)

4.2   Active participles with any-person proclitics

In MB, there seem to be no instances of 3rd person proclitics on participles at all outside the *be*-perfect of reflexives, and no occasion to use them, i.e. no auxiliary-less participial clauses. Two crop up the works of 17/18C C. ar Bris (Leon), IN and RP (among many not examied here; see Châtelier 2016). He has quite robustly the MB coding, including systematic use of enclitics for 3rd person to the auxiliary, with two exceptions in the works studied here in detail, IN and RP (see statistics).

In IN, the example clearly involves a participle that has no auxiliary of its own, and cannot make use of the preceding one to code its own clitic object: *me am bise da lazet-te, hac e reservet-hi e buez*, source: "Si elle ne se fût détournée de devant moi, je t'eusse tué, et je l'eusse épargnée." (C. ar Bris, L: IN, e18C).

In RP, the same is true, *Da nep en devezo e garet hac e servichet fidelamant* "To whoever will have loved him and served him faithfully" (C. ar Bris, L: RP 266, e18C). However, this seems to influence to coding of the preceding participle, which could have made use of its auxiliary, giving what may have been the marked mixed-coding ... *en devezo-èn garet hac e servichet* (though note the C. ar Bris does in fact use *e* as the 3SGM enclitic, very rarely, but allowing an enclitic parse here, cf. DME.I: 366n12). The expected alternative is proclitic distribution across hosts, ... *en devezo e garet hac servichet*. This is avoided by C. ar Bris as in French, though it is well attested with other writiers (on French, Kayne 1975, Miller 1992). Thus C. ar Bris distributes an enclitic across coordinated participles because they already share the auxiliary to which it attaches as host, *ma en deveus-ii revoquet ha reprenet* "so that he has revoked and retaken thelm", but repeats both proclitics and enclitics on each host otherwise, participle *em eus o tennet hac ho sachet* "I have drawn them and pulled them", finite verb *evellen hoc'h anavàn hac hoc'h adoràn* "Thus I recognise you and adore you", imperatives *detestit-y ha regretit-y* "Detest thelm and regret them" (all IN).

[There is one more apparent instance of a 3rd person proclitic to the participle at an early period, in Bel, also an outlier, see statistics: *Tat, breur, pe nessaffuael arall dan moues goallet, à quemer an goas **endeueus he goallet*** "Father, brother, or another kinsperson to the woman injured, who takes the man **who has injured her**" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C MB). The 3SGF proclitic was /(h)e/, enclitic /(h)i/ in MB, but these collapsed early in Gwenedeg and Kerne to /i/, with comments already found in some of the earliest grammars of 18C (Rezac 2021). Y. Gueguen keeps the disinction, but this may anticipate the change.]

The coordinated participles above are an instance where an *active* participle is deployed without an auxiliary of its own and revealed as active by an accusative proclitic. Clear examples of such active participles are always rare for any of the uses of participles in Breton: adverbial, adjectival, root clause or narrative, and coordinated with another verb form include any of the preceding in what may be called the conjunctive use.

Such active participles are finally given attested clearly and independently in Gwenedeg, probably because of the great usage made in its literary language of root and conjunctive participles (important enough to be mentioned in the earliest grammar of the variety, Anon 1795, and later in Guillevic and Le Goff 1902). Here, to typical usages that

do not demonstrate active transitives, we may add reflexives that do not ordinarily participate in passivisation, and even accusative proclitics that are demonstrably active.[8]

Conjunctive participle usage of Gwenedeg

Typical but unrevealing:
oueit Pierre ha sailled arnon "Pierre ~~has~~ gone and jumped on me" (Anon 1795; t18C eNB-W)

Reflexivised transitive:
hag ind oeit hag um lakeit, én ur gerhet, de gemér tuézad "and they had gone and set themselves, while walking, to gather gleanings" [cf. Mark 2:23] (J. Oliero, W: AVIE; e20C eNB-W)

With accusative proclitic:
Hag ean oeit ha stouiet hag **en adoret** "And he ~~was~~ gone and bowed and adored him" [cf. John 9:38 : 37"You have already seen Him," Jesus answered. "He is the One speaking with you." 38 "Lord, I believe," he said. And he worshipped Jesus.] (J. Oliero, W: AVIE; e20C eNB-W)

Earlier on, there are attested at least the reflexivised participles:

Adverbial modifier
hac euelse **en em humiliet**‖ ez goulennet da retorn, source: "et que ainsi humiliez ils demandent de retourner" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C MB)
Adnominal modifier
Tut autentic **em apliquet** "authentic people ~~who have~~ applied themselves" (B[†], m16C MB)
Conjunctive (note that this is not simple coordination of participles, as the auxiliary would have to switch from *have* of plain perfects to *be* of reflexivised perfects; q.v.)[9]
pennaus n'endeus euff quet læset, na quenebut **en em astennet** rac maz eo endi-|uisibl, source: "il est certain qu'elle ne l'a point laissé, & ne s'est estenduë, car elle est indiuisible" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C MB)

4.3 Conjunctive participles

The examples of participles with 3rd person proclitics in C. ar Bris illustrate as it were a construction switch in coordination, where the left-conjunct clause would demand one structure, enclitic to the auxiliary, but the right-conjunct clause has a different one, proclitic to the participle bercause there is no auxiliary.

---

[8] Evidence from reflexivisation needs to be nunaced by the obsevation that inherently reflexive verbs can passivise in some systems and need to be studied for Breton (cf. Schäfer 2012).
[9] Contrast minimally *Hac an bro oll aue collet / Hac en drouc credēn **em tennet*** (B[†], m16C MB), where such an analysis is possible, though the different auxiliary facts of English do not allow the corresponding translatio: "And all the land would be lost / And in evil belief ~~have~~ drawn itself".

The conjunctive use of participles often involves other mismatches from the earliest texts, for instance different form of the *be*-passive auxiliary, or active *have*-perfect vs *be*-passive auxiliaries, or even simply different subject which prevents a simple analysis by coordinatio of participles. Some early examples are given here becaused alluded to in DME, leaving open their analysis.

Probably the clearest type: equative *be* corresponds to silent perfect-auxiliary *be*, ~~*en deus*~~ and or passive-auxiliary *be*, which would take a different, nonpostsubject form, ~~*ez eux*~~

Notet <u>piou pẽnac so bet occasion</u>, / <u>pe___roet moyen</u> da re all / da pechiff maruella-|mant, / so ret dezaff coffess. "Note <u>whoever has been occasion</u>, / or ~~has/was~~ given means to others / to sin mortally / must confess" (T. Gueguen: Mc; e17C MB)

Less drastic, switch from active *have*-perfect *am eux* 'I.have' to *be*-passive ~~*int*~~ 'they.were':

Suspiciõ <u>am eux bet</u> a re all, / <u>ha___barnet gueneuff</u> re prontamant. "Suspicion <u>have.I had</u> of others, / and ~~they.were~~ judged by me too quickly" (T. Gueguen: Mc; e17C MB)

Still less drastic, switch of *be* auxiliary use from *be*-perfect if intransitive to *be*-passive of transitive, but also drop of its agreement and change to postsubject form, *out > so*

<u>Duet out</u> da pēn **hac eff __ tennet** / En dampnacion "Thou art come to end [sc. hast succeeded] **and he ~~is~~ drawn** / Into damnation" (B[†], m16C MB)

Still less drastic, different pre/postsubject form of *be*, here passive-auxiliary *so* would need to become ~~*eo*~~:

Pennaus ezeo possibl, é retourne é buhez an hiny, <u>pehiny à so bet losquet</u>, <u>ha___guentet an ludu à nezo</u> en auel, pe taulet // oar an dour? "How is it possible that there returned to life <u>the one who has been burned</u>, <u>and scattered</u> ~~have been~~ the ashes of them [sic] in the wind, or through on the earth?" (Y. Gueguen: Bel; e17C MB) [Here the auxiliary form *so* can only be used after a subject, so the silent form needed would be *eo*]

Or one and the same finite form, but dropping its agreement suffix *vizif* to *vezo*, *oump* to *eo / ez eux*, or the next higher verb would need to drop it, *dleez* to *dle*

Aman a certen ez minif / Ha da bianhaf pan clafuif / Ha pan miruif maz <u>vizif</u> plen / Berr <u>enterret</u> en e metou / <u>Ha sebelyet___ma costou</u> / Tost ouz bez ma autrou louen "Here certainly I will remain / And at least when I take ill / And when I die, <u>I.will.be</u> / Quickly <u>burried</u> by his side / <u>And interred</u> ~~will.be~~ my ribs / Near to the grave of my glad lord." (J[†]; e16C MB)

hac ez spe-/cial deueus an pez pehiny maz <u>oump</u>, <u>preseruet ha miret</u> gantaff en sizun tremenet à pep drouc, <u>conseruet</u> en yechet ha prosperitez, <u>pe___r'hoet domp couraig, consolation, hac esperancc</u> "[to thank God for …] and especially for that <u>which we.are preserved and guarded</u> by it/him in the past week from every evil [sic], <u>kept</u> in heath and property, <u>or given</u> ~~is~~ to us courage, consolation, and hope" (Y. Gueguen: Bel; e17C MB)

penaos heruez raison ez <u>dleez beza saludet</u> <u>ha___groeat enor dit</u> "how with reason <u>you.ought be greeted</u> ~~and ought be~~ done honour to you" (Ca; t16C MB)

Finally just different subjects of the same construction, or siwtch to a nonreferential subject:

Pe dre occasion <u>ez eu bleczet an charantez Christen</u>, / <u>hac ___ an Nessafu deceuet ha tromphet</u> "[What is forbidden …? Every usage …] through <u>which occasion has been injured Christian love</u> / <u>and one's neighbour</u> <s>is</s> <u>deceived</u>" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C MB)

This last type can be illustrated with modifier participles that lack the auxiliary:

Sant Antonin à gra rapor es an vn Vsu-|ryer, / <u>pe heny arriuet en articl an maro</u>, / <u>exortet gant è Person</u> neusé presant, dré lieux exemplou mat ha saluter da ober restitution, / <u>ha roet dezaff da gouzout pennaus né gallé quet è absolf</u> "Sant Anonin makes report of a usurer, / <u>who arrived at the hour of death</u>, / <u>exhorted by his parson</u> then present, through many examples good and salutory to make restitution, / and <u>given to him to know that he could not absolve him</u>" (Y. Gueguen: Bel; e17C MB)

pennaus n'en em con-|tante quet an pecher hep muy quen deueus an Contrition, / hoguen æt d'en em teureull dirac treid an Bællec, euel à <u>geure</u> an Mag-|dalen dirac treid Iesus Christ, <u>ha confessæt é pechedou</u> gant guiryonez, / n'oz adioutty, nac oz diminiuy, nac oz quemesq nep gaou: "how the sinner did not content himself merely with contrition / but <u>gone</u> to throw himself before the feet of the priest, as did the Magdalen before the feet of Jesus Christ, and <s>having/being</s> confessed his sins truthfully, / not adding, nor dimishing, nor mixing any lie:" (T. Gueguen: Mc; e17C MB)

5   Lexical *have*

5.1   Usage of *mihi est* and *apud me est*

There is no inventory of the uses of *mihi est* or *apud me est* for older stages of Breton, and descriptions of later stages do not fit at least MB and its immediate continuations in eNB, not only for the largely translated prose of 16-18C, but also for adapted or original verse of 16C.

Usage at this period in both types of literature has certain outlines common with later usage (for lit. on that, see DME.II: 348n28). It is thus typical to make use of *mihi est* for say mental states, *have thirst*, or obtention of possession, *get the money*, *apud me est* for permanent possession, *have the kingdom of heaven*, or nominal predication, *be a father to me*. These are features of the following passages

An ré à ra heuelep traezou, *n'o deuezo* bizhuicquen **an roeantelez à doué**. …… Eurux meurbet eu an ré paour à speret, Rac **an roeantelez an efu** *so dezé*. § Eurux meurbet eu an ré debonnær, Rac y a *possedo* **an douar**. … Eurux meurbet eu an ré *ho deueux* **nafn, ha sechet a Iusticz**, … Eurux meurbet eu an ré so trugarezus, pé [v°]misericordius, Rac ma *ho deuezo* iuez **an trugarez**. § Eurux meurbet eu, nep *en deueux* **an calon** <u>net</u>, Rac y a guelo doué. "Those who do such things, *they.will.no. have* ever **the kingdom of god**. …… Happy are the poor of spirit, For **the kingdom of heaven** *is to them*. § ery happy are the meek, for they will *possess* **the earth**. … Very happy are the ones *who.have* hunger, and thirst of Justice, … Very happy are the ones who are merciful, or pitiful, For *they.will.have* also mercy. § Very happy is whoever *has* **the heart** <u>pure</u>, For they will see god." (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

17

Rac a certen **da guelet** plen en placc / *So diff* <u>soulacc</u> a hir spacc pep faczon / Na *nemeux* quet **tra en bet nemet huy**[10]. "For certainly **to see thee** plainly in place / *Is to me* solace of long space in every fashion / Nor *have.I* a thing but you / Thing I would live and trust in it (B[†]; m16C)

However, early literature also departs radically from later expectations in such usages as *I have this thing necessary*, *I have him father*, and frequently without obvious motivation in translation.

Of these uses, focus here is on the anomalous ones of *mihi est*, and on those that would admit human pronouns in it, as well as minimal comparison or contrast with *apud me est* on these matters, the matters relevant to DME.I-II. There is no attempt at completeness in anything.

The following conventions are used: *mihi est*, *apud me est* terminology, to which is added *kaout* for the suppletive use of 'find, get' in the place of *mihi est* in verbal nouns and infinitives (DME.I: 5.4, e.g. *kaout naon* 'have hunger' for finite *am eus naon*), but *kavout* on its independent use (*kaout naon* 'find, get hunger', normally not used).

The S/possessum is in bold, any "codas" like predicate adjectives are underlined, and when needed the other elements like *mihi est* in italics.

The order of examples is chronological, save when minimal contrasts are useful.

5.1.1   Core possession

Here are grouped relationships with concrete referents that can be described by 'own', 'posses', and changes in these relationship, describable by 'get'.

Of these, the permanent 'own', 'possess' relationship tend to resist definites:, *I don't know who has a sailboat. But I see that this sailboat would be ideal for my purpose. So let's find out who owns/#has it/this sailboat.* However, change 'get' does not: *I must have it. -- You can have it.* There are are other leeways, say by temporal bounds, *My family has had it for at least a century. Even if I lose everything, I will still have this sailboat; I don't know how long I have had it.* Here it is enough to note that *mihi est* has all these uses, and definites including are well attested with it on the 'get' uses, with early examples in DME. The use of *mihi est* as 'keep', is grouped here with 'own', though clearly divorcable as it is nown only archaic for *own*. (On definiteness here, including examples similar to these, and literature, see Myler 2016: 5.3)

Beside *mihi est* and sometimes rephrasing there stands *kavout* 'find, get', which has specialised as suppletive verbal nouna and later infinitive of *mihi est*, as can be told by usages where only *mihi est* is available like *avoir faim* (DME.I: 5.4). There are also other transitives, inherited *piaouañ* 'own', borrowed a.o. *possediñ* 'possess', and borrowied intransitives, a.o. *apparchant* 'appartain, belong'.

The permanent possession usage of *mihi est* is very common use of *apud me est* with *da* 'to', and stands alongside other prepositions expresing other relationship like *gant* 'with' of accompaniment and transitory possession, or *en* 'in' of various inclusions, all here grouped descriptively under *apud me est* for convenience, against *be* on other uses

---

[10] {01-066}Roparz (1984) *ne-m-eux quen tra e-n bet nemet huy* 'I have nothing but you in the world' S. 74

such as plain existence or equation. There might not be at least early uses of *apud me est* for 'get', unlike *mihi est*. No usage of *apud me est* from the earliest sources seems to have any restrictions on humans or pronouns or both.

MIHI EST 'get': definite (focusing on early ex. of pronouns additional to DME)
hon bezet **hy**. "let us have **it** [napcloth]" (J[†]; e16C)
hac oz bezo **ef** "and you will have **it** [sc. get the nail out]" (J[†]; e16C)
Ma nem bez **e pris** "If I have not **his price**" (J[†]; e16C)
A moneiz fin **tregont digner** … Az vezo "Of fine money **thirty dinars** … though.shalt.have" (J[†]; e16C)
hac an re, pere n'oz ennorynt quet, ò de-|uezo entre an poenyou arall **homan parti-|culier**, ne vezo quet ò buhez hir hoazlus. "and those who do not honour them will have among the other pains **this particular one**, that their life will not be long attractive" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

MIHI EST 'get': idiomatic taboo drop
Pe oz bezo __ oar ho crochenn "Or you'll get [it] on your skin" (J[†]; e16C)

MIHI EST: 'get' or 'own'
Bizhuyquen guenef me **queffrann** / Pan y ahanann **na rann cuyt** / Nez vezo quet "never with me **a part** / When thou goest hence **nor freehold** / shalt.thou have [get?]" (J[†]; e16C)
n'o deuezo bizhuicquen **an roeantelez à doué**. "They.will.have never the kingdom of god" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)
Rac euel n'o deuezo quet an Infidelet, heretiquet, ha schismatiquet, **an roeantelez an Nefuou**, Iuez pareillamant n'**en** *possedo* an catoliquet, à vezô maru é pechet maruel. "For as will not have the Infidels, heretics, and schismatics, **the kingdom of the Heavens**, Also likewise will not possess **it** the catholics, who will be dead in mortal sin" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)
Pa neved-hañ èm bezé bet **anezañ** tr. "Sans lui j'aurois eu" (Rostrenen 1832 sv lui).

MIHI EST: 'keep'
Nep en deueux **ma gourchemennou** "Whoever keeps **my commandments**" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

MIHI EST: 'have' of kinship
Rac noheux **car**… A ve hardiz da comps dihuy "for you do not have **kin** … who would be daring to speak to you" (J[†]; e16C)
neuse nep tro nez vezo **car** "then never wilt thou have **[a] friend**" (N[†]; 16C)

MIHI EST: 'have' of body-part
Quein / coff / beguel / hac ysily / Ha quement ameux nedeux sy / A roaf dihuy manifest quement ameux "Back / belly / nombril / and limbs / and whatever I have there is no doubt / I give to you clearly" (J[†]; e16C)

APUD ME EST + da 'to' 'own', focusing on examples with humans

Rac Roeantelez an efu *so dezé*. "The kingdolm of Gid is to them [sc. theirs]" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

me en em ro hiuizi-|quen deoch, ha ne fell diff muy *bezaff diff ma hunan* rac se autraou ma miret, "I give myself henceforth to you, and **I** do not want *to be to myself* therefore the lord keep me" (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)

pa na desiraff mui *bezaff diff ma hunã* ho-|guen*deochuy* "when **I** do not desire anymore *to be to myself* but *to you*" (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)

en vn lauaret, **te** *à so deompny*, rac da mã en deues te roet demp, "in saying, **thou** *art to us*, for thy mother has given thee to us" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

Deoh hemp quin **on**, deoh hemp quin **vein** perpet "*To you only* **I**.*am*, *to you only* **I**.*will be always*" (L. Pourchasse, W: CGS, 18C, ed. of 19C)

me fal deign *bout teoh*, **mé** *zou deoh*, **mé** *zou tout deoh* "**I** want to be *to you* [sc. yours], **I** *am to you*, **I** *am all to you*" (L. Pourchasse, W: CSR, 18C, ed. of 19C)

APUD ME EST + other prepositions, focusing on humans

Er membe hoant da **bout** *ganty* "For **I** would have desire *to be with her*" (B[†]; m16C)

Ouziff bout **digracc discascun** / a soingis de ia dre ma hun "*To me to be* **disagreeable disgrace** / I dreamed presently in my sleep" (N[†]; 16C)

an ré-man *n'a edynt quet en ho gallout*, hoguen didan galloud ré arall "**these ones** *are not in your power*, but under the power of others" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

Ma **vein** *én oh* é jouissein "that **I** *be in you* rejoicing" (L. Pourchasse, W: CGS, 18C, ed. of 19C)

Note: S of *be* as such show no resistance to humans of any person, nor do (O→)S of intransitives and passives with 'to' or other prepositions, in finite or other constructions :

Te a dle certen me en goar / Bezaff cuff vffuel euel car / Ha bout clouar ha hegarat "**You** must certainly I know it / Be affable humble as kin / And be gentle and kind" (B[†]; m16C)

Ouzist astriff **ezouch** dimat '**you** are quickly ungood to me' (B[†]; m16C)

Pan **ouch** roet diff "When **you** are given to me" (B[†]; m16C)

OTHER: possession verbs

Rac y a *possedo* **an douar**. "For they *will.possess* **the earth**" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C) [see above for another ex.]

Deut, *possedet* **an Rou-|antelæz** dreczet ha preparet deoch "Come, *possess* **the kingdom raised and prepared unto you**" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

an træzou **pere** *à apparchante dezo* "the things **which** *belonged to them*." (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

En huechuet lech, *en em appropriaff* **deues an træzou**, pere à so commun, à so vn specc deues à lazron-|ci, pe eueus à rapinerez, rac piu bennac *en[11]|| em appropri dezaff* **an træzou commun**, "In sixths place, to *appropriate oneself* **of things**, which are common, is a sort of theft, or rapine, for whoever *appropriates oneself to him* **the common things**," (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

5.1.2   Codas - Predication

---

[11] bottom right margin anticiating next page: em ap-|

A wide range of uses of *have* can be formally grouped because they have no resistance to definites, even as pronouns with concrete reference, yet do not involve the change dynamics of 'get' uses. They typically involve a "coda", prepositional, adjectival, participial, nominal: *I have it on my right, in my heart, in my hand, with me, beside me, on me, ready, built, sent to me*. They do not resist human referents insofar their relationship to the subject of *have* is not one describable by 'own', 'possess', unless the coda is *da* 'to' of possession, though they may still resist contingently, say by dint of the physicality of having a human *within my hand* or *on me*.

Analysis of the coda differs, though traditionally the adjectival, participial and nominal codas would be predicate complements. The prepositional codas can be treated as such, though might well have distinctive properties not studied here, of the sort *I have it on my/the/#your right; I have it with/on/beside me/#you*. Descriptively, they confuse the exposition: what is here called the <u>coda</u> of *habeo*: *I have* **them** <u>with me</u>, *mihi est, Me are* **they** <u>with me</u>, *apud me est*, does not correspond to the core prepositonal argument of *apud me est*, **They** *are with me*, which corresponds rather to the dative *me* of *mihi est*, nominative *I* of *habeo*, though in literature on existentials the prepositional argument of *apud me est* would be described as coda. Thus we get a.o. *apud me est + mihi est …ez ve* **Doué an Tat** *en tu cleiz da Doué an map*, … hac *en deuffue* **é map** <u>en tu dehou</u> "that *would.be* **God the Father** *on the left side to God the son* … nor *that.he.would.have* **his son** <u>on the right side</u>", or *mihi est + da* 'to' of possession coda where *apud me est* with *da* is the regular way of expression possession and *da* corresponds to the dative of *mihi est*: pa *n'o deueus* <u>dé zé ho vnan</u> **archant** "when *they.have.not* <u>to them selves</u> **money**", lit. 'when not=*them=there.is* <u>to them their=selves</u> **money**" cf. constructed typical *apud me est*, pa n'*eus dé zé ho vnan* archant "when not=*there.is to them their=selves* **money**" (see below for fuller examples). This prepositional coda type is taken up first.

(For literature and theory, see Myler 2016 generally, for English, Brugman 1988, and for distinctive properties of prepositional codas in English, Belvin and den Dikken 1997; for existentials with focus on *have-be* relationships and codas, Bentley et al. 2013, Cruschina 2015, and in Celtic, McCloskey 2015).

5.1.2.1 Prepositional

Prepositional codas are well attested with *mihi est* in MB and eNB, though I am not familiar with any description for NB. The same prepositions occur on similar usage as the core argument of *apud me est* and more usually, and that seems to be the normal modern construction.

MIHI EST + APUD ME EST: including human definites
N'ozheus quet da imaginaff ez *ve* **Doué an Tat** *en tu cleiz da Doué an map*, na queneubeut ez *vez* **Doué an Tat**, *é creis*, hac *en deuffue* **é map** <u>en tu dehou</u>, hac **an Speret glan**, <u>en tu cleiz</u> ez corporal rac couls an Tat, euel an map, hac an Speret glan equement hac an Diuinité, à so é pep lech, ha ne galher quet lauaret, pennaus ez *ve* **unan** *en tu dehaou, pe en tu cleiz d'e-|guille*, oz comps propr, hoguen ***Bezaff*** *en tu dehaou*, à signify en articl-man, bezaf egal en brasder ha galloud, gloar, ha ma-|iestez. "I do not have to imagine that **God the Father** *would.be on the left side to God the son*, nor neither that **God the Father**, *in the middle*, and *would.have* **his son** <u>on the right side</u>, and **the**

Holy Spririt, *on the left* corporally for the Father, like the son, and the holy Spirit in as much as Divinity, are everywhere, and one cannot say, that **one** *would.be on the right side, or on the left side to the other*, properly speaking, but *to be on the right side*, means in this article, to be equal in greatnes and power, glore, and majesty (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

hac euel maz credomp *ezeus en Doué* **vn Diuinité, ha try person** ; deme-|mes ez credomp en Ilys, pennaus n'endeus nemet vn Ilys hep muy quen, ha pennaus *ez deueus* enhy **try mat principal** "and just as we believe *there.is in God* **a Divinity**, and three persons; likewise we believe in the Church, that there is not but one Church, and how *she has* in her **three principal goods**" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

MIHI EST: human definites and pronouns
rac euel ma endeuoe sant Paul Iesus **Christ** en é galon, en deuo**auff** yuez en é guenou. "for as Saint Paul had **Jesus Christ** in his heart, he had **him** also in his mouth" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

rac piou bennâc en deveus **Jesus-Christ** en e galon, en deveus-**èn** souden goudese en e oll actionou exterieur "for whoever has **Jesus-Christ** in his heart, he has **him** soon thereafter in all his exterior actions" (C. ar Bris, L: IN; e18C)

an hini a zroug-prezec, hac an hini a gleo droug-prezec o deveus o daou **an Diaoul** ganto, mæs unan en deveus-**èn** en e deaud, hac un all en e scouarn. "the one who ill-speaks, and the one who listens ill-speech have both **the Devil** with them, but one has **him** in his tongue, and another in his ear."(C. ar Bris, L: IN; e18C)

MIHI EST: human other
Aman en hon eux **vn merch iouanc** "Hehre we have a young maiden" (Cath)

MIHI EST: inanimate definites and pronouns
ar Pried sacr eus a Gantic ar C'hanticou ne deveus quet hepquen **ar mel** var he diveus hac ouz bec he zeaud, mæs c'hoaz e deus-**èn** dindan he zeaud, da lavaret eo en he feutrin, ha ne de quet **mel hepquen** eo e deus ennâ, mæs ivez **leaz** "the spouse of the Canticle has not only **the tongue** on her lips and on the tip of her tongue, but moreover she has **it** under her tongue, that is to say in her breast, and it is not only **honey** that she has in it, but also **milk**", cf. source: "[vous ressouvenant que] l'épouse du Cantique n'a pas seulement le miel sur les lèvres et au bout de la langue, mais encore sous la langue, c'est-à-dire, dans la poitrine; et non-seulement du miel, mais encore du lait" (C. ar Bris, L: IN; e18C)

m'ou devou **ean** a glei pé a ziheu "that they have it on their left or on their right" (J. Marion, W: MG; t18C)

MIHI EST: inanimate other
Me ameux ouz ma clun **vnan** ./ … / Memeux **vn arall** eualdaff "I have **a hammer** against my thigh / I have **another** like it" (B[†]; m16C)

me meus aman **mezer mat** "I have here [a] good sheet" (Qu)

peheny en def-|foa teir sizun à ioa pe voar an tro **vn dr'en hir quehit ha bis vn den**, ez quichen ibil e troat, "who had three weeks ago or thereabout **a thorn so long as the finger of a person**, beside the ankle of his foot" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

en deffoué en spacc a pempbloaz voar'nu'guent pe voar an tro, **vn couezu bras** <u>en chot dehaou</u>, "[Guimarch] had during five years and twenty or thereabouts, **a great swelling** <u>in the right cheek</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

nemet ma en deu-|fuoa <u>didan vn neubet</u>‖ <u>colo</u> **vn clouedẽ gret a guial bras**. "save that he had <u>beneath a little straw</u> **a frame made of great twigs**" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

nemet ma en defuoa **vn neubet colo** <u>dindannaff</u> "save that he had **a little straw** <u>underneath him</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

reit diff an buhez **pe-heny** oz hues <u>enoch ò hunan</u>, "gie me the life which you have in yourself" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

MIHI EST: as above but note coordination with participial coda
Pé en lech pennac ez vise, en defuoa **vn croas** be-|pret <u>oz hars è guelé</u>, hac **vn imaig don Saluer Bini-|guet** <u>atachet</u> "Whatever place he were, he had **a cross** always <u>beside his bed</u>, and **an image of our Blessed Saviour** <u>attached</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

MIHI EST, perhaps KAOUT: second coda with *gant* 'with' of accompaniment:
rac ma endeueus <u>gantaff</u> <u>en è ty</u> **an concubinerez** "and if he has **the concubine** <u>with him in his house</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

hac oz deueus **guisty, ha concu-‖binereset**, <u>ganto</u> <u>en ho tyer</u>, "and/who have **whores, and concubines**, <u>with them in their houses</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

pe-heny en deues <u>gantaff</u> <u>en è ty</u> vn gast "who has <u>with him in his house</u> **a whore**" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

Rac Attrition drezy é hunan n'an deo quet suffissant, eguit *caffout* <u>dimp</u> <u>digant an Autrou Dove'</u>, **Remission eueus hon pechedou** "For contrition by itself is not sufficient, in order to have <u>to us</u> <u>from the Lord God</u>, **Remission from our sins**" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C) [alternatively *kavout* 'find, get']

MIHI EST, perhaps KAOUT: *da* 'to' of possession as coda does give 'own', 'possess', though the usual expression is *apud me est* with *da* 'to':
pa n'o deueus <u>dé zé ho vnan</u> **archant pé traezou arall** eguit gal-|out dispos à nezo : rac à huizyou an seruiger, hac an ré arall ho deueus archant à nezo ho hunan, "when they do not have to themselves money or other things in order to be able to dispose of them : for sometimes servants and others have money of themselves [sc. they do own it] (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C) [note coordination with pure ownership *mihi est*]

MIHI EST: perhaps omitted coda, focusing on examples with humans
Oll onneux ny **hon binhuyou** "All we have our tools [sc. on/with us]." (J[†]; e16C)

Ha non bezo **hon priso** muy "And we will not have [any] who will value us anymore" (J[†]; e16C)

Na nemeux quet **tra en bet nemet huy** "Nor have I [**a] thing in the world except you**" (B[†]; m16C)

penaus va c'hoar em les amàn va unan, ha ne deus **nemedon** evit labourat "how my sister leaves me here myself, and has but me to work" (BS 478)
.

5.1.2.2 Adjectival

Adjectival predicates of *have/avoir* in English or French tend to be the same as in the existential construction and so stage-level or temporary, relating them to locative and participle predicates, though there is no definiteness restriciton: *I have the door open, opened, ready, ajar, in front of me*, but not **I have the door green, agreeable, four feet wide*, cf. *There is a door open/*green*, with some exceptions, *Whoever has the heart pure/*red*. With other all adjcetives, *be* can be used, and what would correspond to the subject of *I have the door open* is coded prepositionally if at all, e.g. *This door is green to me*, which could here be described as *apud me est*, but sometimes it can clearly be the argument of the predicate itself, *proper, kind, agreeable to me*, and so not fit that description.

MB and eNB have a surprising range of adjectival codas here with *mihi est*, including some that are clearly individual-level or permanent ones like *agreeable, necessary, proper*, alongside *apud me est* or more generally *be*, and with *mihi est* these are generally departures from translation sources when this can be checked. A rare alternative is prepositional coding *have it as recommended*. I am not familiar with a detailed description of modern usage, but *be* seems to be the regular construction for all adjectives and certainly for the individual-level ones.

With over verbs, adjectival predicates are common to both subject and object in MB, though they remain to be studied
. They are specifically found as object complement to verbs sharing some of the usage of *mihi est* like 'keep', as in English and French: dan ré pe·ré à desir der-|chel <u>net</u> **ho eneffou** dré an sacramant à pinigien. "to those who desire to *keep* <u>clean</u> **their souls** through the sacrament of punishment" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

MIHI EST + BE (APUD ME EST?): adjectival predicate
ha dan re paour ez roe da dibry ha da euffa, ha **quement tra** a gouise *ho deuie* <u>necesser</u>. Mont a gre lies a guez da Hospital Lantreguer, hac oz caffout nigun maru en hoz laquæ en licelyou guẽ, **pere** *a veze dezaff* <u>prop</u>, "and to the poor he gave to eat and to drink, and **every thing that** he knew *they.had* <u>necessary</u>. We went often to the Hositæl of Lantreguer, and on finding any dead he put them in white sheets, **which** *were to him* <u>proper</u> [sc. which were his own]", source "…toutes autres choses qu'il sçauoit leur estre necessaire … en des suaires blancs, qui estoyent siens" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C) [note *mihi est* not due to translation]

MIHI EST and KAOUT: adjectival predicate
Na **pez** ameux <u>prob</u> da ober "[I do not know why I weep not, nor what passing I arrange, nor what particular counsel,] Nor **what** I have [as] <u>proper</u> to do" (J†; e16C)
hoguen an laz-|ronci en deueus **an trase** <u>propr</u>, maz con-|duz ha maz tẽn da droucgou bras meurbet "for theft has **this thing** [as] <u>proper</u>, that it leads and that it draws to far greater evils", source "mais le larcin a cela de propre" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C) [note that original uses *avoir* but with a prepositional predicate]
Hy oa ent seder **ma aeres** / Am oa <u>principal</u> em pales "She was certainly my heiress / **whom** I had [as] <u>principal</u> in my palace" (B†; m16C)
nep en deueux **an calon** <u>net</u> "Whoever has **the heart** <u>clean</u>" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

24

an re, pere oz deueus **an calon** <u>pur</u>, "those, who have **the heart** <u>pure</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

pa dleomp caffet **hon consciazou** <u>pur ha net</u>, ha <u>goullo</u> à pep faut "when we ought to have **our consciences** <u>pure and clean</u>, and <u>empty</u> of all fault" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

peheny hez deffoa <u>he oll chatal</u> **claff**, ho gouestlaff a geure da S. Euzen, "[Agace …] who had **all her livestock** <u>ill</u>, devoted them to S. Yves" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

quent se en deffoua **é bisaig** brepret <u>ioaieux</u>, "rather he had **his face** always <u>joyous</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

BEzaff en deffuoa **é da-|oulagat** <u>chast</u>, "he.had **his eyes** <u>chaste</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

he deffoa **he daou la-|guat** <u>chuezet ha clos</u>, [Tephan …] had her two eyes swollen nd closed, [so that she could not see]" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

hon renhy oz deueus **ò si-|gnification** <u>quen sclær</u>, maz gall pep vnan ò compreniff. "[Thirdly, these ~~sacraments~~ were darker, and thus there were few of those who understood … whereas on the contrary], ours have **their signfication** <u>so clear</u>, that everyone can understand them" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

pa en deues **an oat à vn bloez var vguent** <u>complet</u>, "whe he has **the age of one year and twenty** <u>completed</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C) [cf. similar examples under participles]

An heny […] à debr dauantaig, eguit dez an Iun caffout <u>scaffhoc</u> **an Iun**, à pech maruelamant "The one […] who eats more, for on the day of the fast to have <u>lighter</u> **the fast**, sins mortally" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

BE (APUD ME EST?): adjectival predicate

dan fin maz *ve-|zo deoch* <u>agreabl</u>, **an obla-|tion han sacrificc**, agraff deoch am corff … ha d'ren moyen se rentaff deoch an enor peheny so dleet deoch perpetualamant, ha ***bezaff|| deoch* agreable** d'ren moyen se: "So that be <u>agreeable</u> to you **the oblation and sacrifice** that I make to you of my body … and through this means [for **me**?] to give you the honour that is owed to you permetually, and *be* <u>agreeable</u> *to you* through this means." (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)

As with nominal predicates, *evit* 'for, as' is attested with *mihi est*, but rare:

en f
çon se hoz bezet **ma corff, ha ma eneuff** <u>euit recommandet</u>. "in this fashion have **my body, and my soul** <u>for commended</u> [sc. unto you]" (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)

5.1.2.3 Participial

The resultative participle in *-et* should behave like the adjective, specifically stage-level adjectives, plus any special restrictions, *I have had it killed/*died*. The result is of particular interest when it is possible to distinguish thiys predication from the periphrastic perfect and passive. Usually, in early verse this must go by meaning, as in *He had a child born (to him)* vs. *#He had born a child (to himself/*him)*, though sometimes this is ambiguous with a modifier since these are postnominal, *She had a newly made grave = She had a grave newly made*. Later that is by word order, since free objects follow the periphrastic participle, as in English, or in nonfinite clauses, where *kaout* is suppletive only with lexical *mihi est*, not the perfect auxiliary.

Like adjectives, participles can be subject and object complements with other verbs: oz chom bepret **an effect à nezy** grauet, hac imprimet en eneff. "remaining always **the effect of it [baptism]** graven, and imprinted in the soul" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C); En placc man **me guel** diouganet / **dou men** en he luz de cuzet **"**Je vois, en ce lieu prédestiné, / Deux pierres pour la cacher dans sa confusion;" "In this place I see foresung / **two stones** in her confusion to hide her" (B[†]; m16C)

MIHI EST, KAOUT: participial predicate
Me≠ ameux **vn bez** neuez graet "I have a grave new made" (J[†]; e16C) [ambigous with perfect and and maybe modifier]
Me≠ ameux **aczecc lyen** prenet "I have enough linen bought" (J[†]; e16C) [ambiguous with perfect]
Guelet affet nendeueux quet detry / **Buguel** ganet oar an bet nemet_hy "seeing that he does not have **a child** born in the world except her' (clearly not he had borne) (B[†]; m16C)
Nouz eux en bet **ear** ganet nemet_hy "I have not in the world **an heir** born except her" (B[†]; m16C)
ha goudé que-|ment sé, en deffoa **é bisaig** quen couls liuet euel pa en|| deuise|| debret bouedou mat bemdez. "And after this, he had **his face** so coloured as if he had eaten good dishes daily." (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)
oz caf-|fout **an oat à vn bloaz voar-|nuguent** achiuzet, (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)
hep caffout **ma speret** appliquet dan pez a gren: "and prayed without having **my spirit** applied to what I did" (T. Gueguen, L: Mc; e17C)

MIHI EST: as above but coordinated with other codas
he deffoa **he daou la-|guat** chuezet ha clos, [Tephan …] had **her two eyes** swollen and closed, [so that she could not see]" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)
Pé en lech pennac ez vise, en defuoa **vn croas** be-|pret oz hars è guelé, hac **vn imaig don Saluer Bini-|guet** atachet "Whatever place he were, he had **a cross** always beside his bed, and **an image of our Blessed Saviour** attached" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

MIHI EST: as above but coordinated with participle in the periphrastic perfect
Bezaf eo escuset eues an Iun, quement n'o deues **vn bloaz var vguent** accomplisset: ha nep en deues tremenet an oat à triuguent bloaz "Is excused from the fast, whoever has not **one year and twenty** accomplished, and whoever has passed the age of thirty years" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

APUD ME EST?: participlal predicate
Bezet diff a crēn dispēnet "*Be* **she** *be* beheaded *for me*" (B[†]; m16C) [or perhaps 'to' dative of interest, independently attested, cf. under mental states]

5.1.2.4 Nominal

In MB and eNB, the typical way of expressing nominal predicates with *be* is through as unmarked nominal predicate of *be* in constructions that could be taken as *apud me est* in some instances, *This is an aid to me*, or *mihi est* with prepositional coding, *I have it as as aid*, much as in English or French. These two strategies are available in NB. However, in

other systems unmarked nominal is familiar with both *mihi est* and *habeo*, including Latin *mihi es amicus*, *te amicum habeo*, and these are also found early in MB, and without precedent in translation. I am not familiar any description of this strategy in NB.

MIHI EST: unmarked nominal predicate
na cuf na car nemeux <u>goarant</u> "**Neither friend nor kin** have.I [as] <u>garant</u> " (J[†]; e16C)

MIHI EST: unmarked nominal predicate coordinated with prepositional one
hac en defuoa <u>euit oroiller</u> **vn men**, en fæçõ se ez cousque pan veze en Kmartin, nemet ma en defuoa vn neubet colo dindannaff, hac <u>oroiller</u> en defuoa à gue-|ziou **vn leur pe daou**. "and he had <u>for pillow</u> **a stone**, in this manner he slept when was at Kermartin, save if he had a little straw underneath him, and [as] <u>pillow</u> he had at times **a book or two**", source: "et que pour oreiller il avoit quelquefois vn liure ou deux" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C) [note the rephrasing of the source]

APUD ME EST?: unmarked nominal predicate

pez voe dide / Ma=lesell "what ~~eause~~ was to thee / to leave me" (Pm[†]; e16C) [common type, perhaps idiomatic]
yuez ne dalchaff quet cret pur / Ef+**fes** diff <u>tat</u> dre neb statur "Also I do not hold, believe it clearly / That **thou**.art to me <u>father</u> in any way" (B[†]; m16C)
Bezaff vé diff <u>confort</u>, **m'em bé** vn esperancc bennac. "It.would be confort to me, **if** I had some hope" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
Rac a certen **da guelet** plen en placc / So diff <u>soulacc</u> a hir spacc pep faczon "For certainly **to see thee** plain in the place / Is to me <u>solace</u> of long space in every way" (B[†]; m16C)
Presentemant, doh imp e man **IESUS**, / <u>Un Doüé douç'</u> "At the moment, to us is **Jesus** / <u>A kind God</u>" (P. Barisy, W: CS.bar[†]; e18C)

MIHI EST + *evit* 'for, as', including suppletive KAOUT
Rac an autrou, nen deuezo quet <u>eguit innoczant</u>, **an heny** en deuezo quemeret en vaen an hanu an Autrou doué. "For the lord, will not have <u>as innocent</u>, **the one** who will have taken in vain the name of the Lord god*" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)
hac en defuoa <u>euit oroiller</u> **vn men** (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C) [see above]
rac piu bennac n'ende-|ueus quet **an Ilys** <u>euit mam</u>, ne gall quet caffout **Doué** <u>euit Tat</u>. "for whover has not **the Church** for mother, cannot have **God** <u>for father</u>" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)
Nep n'en deuruezo cafet **an Ilys** <u>eguit mam</u> "Whowever does not want to have **the Church** <u>for mother</u>" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

The use of *evit* is not confined to *mihi est*:
ma dalchemp <u>eguit tadou ha mamou, hac euit pen</u>, **an Magistradet** à iustiçc quen ecclesiastic, ha ciuil: "that we hold <u>as fathers and mothers, and as chief</u>, **the Magistrates of justice both ecclesiastic, and civil**" (G. Keranpuil: Gk; t16C)

5.1.3   Mental and physical states, abstracts, clauses

These are all grouped here and given very short shrift, since they are irrelevant to human pronouns. For mental and physical states like *hunger, regret, mihi est* has always been and remained the rule in Breton, as in French: thus there is the equivalent of *j'ai faim*, but not it seems *il y a du faim à moi*, though presumably *il y a du faim en moi* could have have used *apud me est*, and *il y a du faim* plain *be*. With abstracts like *power*, these various expressions to seem to be attested early, though not specially studied here. At least *mihi est* is also early common with infinitives in usage similar to *I have to go*.

MIHI EST: mental state
queux flam ameux "bright regret I.have" (J[†]; e16C)

MIHI EST: abstracts
em be **moean** "that I have **means**"(J[†]; e16C)
nameux **lech** da nechif "I have not **space** to worry" (J[†]; e16C)
vn bech ponnher Ameux anezy "**a heavy burden** I have of her" (J[†]; e16C)

Ha pan voa Rector en parros Louhanec, en defuoa **vn mesmes fæçon** da cous-|quet, "and when he was Rector in the parish of Louhanec, he had **one [and the] same fashion** to sleep" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

MIHI EST: same, with prepositional arguments that are not codas
Goude **ann angoes hann esmae / queuz hep diffrae** ouzoae dif "After **the anguish and the turmoil / regret without haste** you had for me" (J[†]; e16C) [dative of interest]
pere ho deues deoch **affection hac oz enor**, "which have to you affection and honour you" (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C) [dative of interest or displaced argument of *affection*]
ha graet mat en deuezo an trasé enoff **an efficacité** peheny à so conuenable, "and do well that this thing has in me the efficacity which is convenable" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C) [location or displaced argument of *efficacité* with marked position]

MIHI EST + 'on' ~ APUD ME EST?: abstract
Gallout en se oarnoufme *nez ve* quet / Nemet e grat digant ma tat mat net / *Ez ve* affet *dit* bezet en credit "**Power** in this on me thee will.be not [cf. thou shall not have] / Save by accord of my good father clear / were.it to.thee in credit [sc. though hadst it delegated]" or uniquely *mihi est* + 'to' and object drop "…/ thou hadst to.thee in credit" (J[†]; e16C)

MIHI EST: infinitive
Memeux dre raeson da monet "I have by reason to go" (J[†]; e16C MB)
Memeux da monet "I have to go" (B[†]; m16C MB)

MIHI EST: here may be included idiomatic adjectives
nez vezo guell 'tu n'en sera / n'auras pas mieux' (B[†]; m16C)
pequement bennac autramant Iehan-Mary, oz deueus accustum da bezaff dou hanuo "although otherwise Iean-Mary have accustomed to be two names" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C) [perhaps *akustum* as noun, see DEVRI, late]

5.2   Inanimate possessors

From the outset, *mihi est, kaout* is found with inanimate as well as typical animate "possessors", like *have* and *avoir*. This appears to be well attested for *mihi est* elsewhere, for instance Finnish: *Pythagoraan lauseella on koulumatematiikassa … tärkeä merkitys* "Pythagoras's sentence has in school mathematics … an important significance."

Pet amser endeues an optatiff? "How many tenses has the optative?" (Donoet; e16C)
pere odeues « a » berre "which have short 'a'" (Donoet; e16C)
peheny chadenn pe scheul he deues peder pasen "which chain or scale has four steps" (Cath; t16C)
pequement bennac autramant Iehan-Mary, oz deueus accustum da bezaff dou hanuo "although otherwise Iean-Mary have custom to be two names" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
hoguen an laz-|ronci en deueus an trase propr "for theft has this thing ~~as its~~ own, [that it leads …]"
hon renhy oz deueus ò si-|gnification quen sclær, maz gall pep vnan ò compreniff. "ours ~~sacraments~~ have their signfication so clear, that each can understand them" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
deueus à anchantamantou ha compsou superstitieus pere dreizo ò hunan noz deueus nep vertuz da yachat an cleffetgiou "of enchantments and supersiticious words which through thmesleves do nhot have any virtue to heal illnesses" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Pa en deues an tra pe-heny à impliger, nerz Dia-|bolic aznauezet pé doutet, eo pechet maruel. "When the thing which one employes has Diabloc strength recognised or suspected, it is a mortal sin" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
hac an pez so scaff ha leger en vnan bennac ha din da caffout pardon "and that which is light and unimportant in someone and worthy to have partdon (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C) [could be nonsuppletive 'find, get']
En dangérussan branq en dès er gourmandiss e zou en ivraignereah. "The most dangerous branch that gourmanise has is drunkenness." (J. Marion, W: IS.mar; t18C)

Inanimate subjects are also, rarely, found with the dative clitic of *deur-*
Rac ez caffer pennaus *en deurfe* **an trase** la-uaret "For one finds that **this thing** *would.want* to say, [how god is accostumed to lead folk into temptation…]" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Petra *en deur* da lauaret **an compsou-se**, pere aia à rauc an gourchemennou? "What do *want* to say *these words*, which go beforehand in the commandments?" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Ha houman eo an vrz ordrenet gant Doué, **pehiny** *en deur* m'en em salue an pinuizien dre an hent deueus à trugarez, "for this is the order ordered by God, **which** *wants* that the rich greet each other on the road from gratitude" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

As in English and French, while A of transitives is typically animate, it can be inanimate, and so can of course A in the *have*-perfect coded like the R of *mihi est*:
Glachar parfont am confont beo "**Deep grief** consumes me alive" (J[†]; e16C)

Pridiry bout en ho souten / Am groa cuit franc a pep ancquen "[The] **thought** of being in your support / makes me frankly free of all anxiety" (B[†]; m16C)

deus an Sabbat, pe da hiny endeueus **an Sul** succedet. "of the Sabbath, to which **Sunday** has succeeded" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

More unusual in comparison to French seems to be the availability of inanimate *da* 'to' causees, which goes well with their generality for all overbs, not just transitives and unergatives:

[… ez finis an Confessional-man.] Pliget gant an Autrou Doué ober **dez‖aff** fructifiaff en è enor, hac è Siluidiguez d'an eneffou "[… finishes this Confessional.] May it please the Lord God to make **it** fructify in his honour" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

5.3   Pronominal S in the *have*-perfect of *be*

There are no truly convincing attestations of any proclitis to the participle of *be* in the *have*-perfect of *mihi est*, i.e. the type *Me meux ho pet, he bet*, and Le Goff 1927 has asserted that it is exceptional as a participle that cannot occur with proclitics in the *have*-perfect.

Still, there are hints of such proclitics in some work see DME.II: 355n36, Rezac 2021, 2022. It seems possible varieties unknown to Le Goff 1927 had developed them. Relative to the perfect of transitives, they had faced the extra hurdle of not having a model in synthetic forms for attaching accusative clitics coding O to the verbal stem and the confound in the same forms of accusative clitic (+ dative *de*) rather coding R when attached to *be*.

As soon as *a*-forms grammaticalised in KLT, and before, they are usual for expressing pronominal S of lexical *mihi est* (DME II: 3.4, 4.2-4). To these may be added from this earliest period an example of S in the *have*-perfect of lexical *mihi est*: *Pa neved-hañ èm bezé bet anezañ* tr. "Sans lui j'aurois eu" (Rostrenen 1832 sv lui).

6   Complementarity in agreement

Concord by clitic doubling between *have* and clausemate R/A subject varies in early texts in ways that need a detailed study. One variable is the use of 3SGM clitics for 3PL nominal subjects typical of Gwenedeg and highly variably even within the same MB text like Be. Another is the use of 3PL with what are at first sight 3SG subjects but may really be floating quantifiers like *pep unan* 'each one'.

Addressed here is rather the "Complementarity Principle" CP, whereby verbs other than *have* use their 3SG form with clausemate subjects, preverbal or postverbal, save when in "Negation Bag", where they precede negation, regularly *ne* and more variably *na* in MB (for terminology, literature, and the modern situation, see Jouitteau 2009--, cf. DME.II).

CP as such has appeared to have essentially no violations in MB and eNB, as highlighted in HMSB: §174.1n, 176n1, Ernault 1888b: 251, cf. DME.II 345n24. DME notes that there are rare, complex exceptions in Cnf². That has remained largely true on reexamination of the MB literature, Bel has been added to Cnf². The author of both, Y. Gueguen, K, largely conforms to CP in both works, along with the negation bag, but Bel

adds to Cnf² a consideragbly greater number of CP violations, and both works have negation bag violations (on the latter in eNB, see Rezac 2021).

Examples here are translated only in instances that establish a pattern, the rest is left untranslated.

Even for Y. Gueguen, regular patterns are typical in both Cnf² and Bel. The following show CP with subjects of all types and position, negation bag, pro-drop, and absence of CP with HAVE, in the two texts.

N'endeux douet en Beth na **resuscito** <u>an memes corffou-man</u>, "There is not doubt in the World that **will.resuscitate.SG** <u>these same bodies</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
<u>An Confessoret ignorant</u> (euel ma ouff ma-hunan syouaz gant ma calon) **ne greont quet** bihanoch faut, euit à **gra** <u>an pœnitantet</u>: "The ignorant Confessors (…) **do not do.PL** lesser fault, than **do.SG** <u>the penitents</u>" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
Rac maz **en em assamblez** <u>an fidelet</u> pere eo an guir Ilys, ebarz en fabricqou ha tem-|plou euit ober an exercissou "For as **assemble.SG** <u>the faithful</u> who are the true Church, in the fabrics and temples to do exercises" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
pennaus **ezeo** obliget <u>an holl Christenion</u> de gouzout "as **is.SG** obliged <u>all the Christians</u> to know" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Aman ez **vezo** aduertisset <u>an mezyeryen</u>, peré à **euff** hep reol na raeson, pennaus ez <u>edynt</u> bepret en stat à pechet maruel. Rac sè <u>nemetto</u> à **prometté** d'an Confessor dilesell ha quittat à fet do mezyuynti é dléer quet ho obsoluiff, muguet na dléer absolff an pecheryen arall obstinet, Rac ma **ho deueus** <u>an mezyeryen</u> constituet eguit ho Doué ho coff, (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
Rac greffusoch ez **pech** <u>an ré</u> à **cann**, à **detroc**, à **iniur**, hac à **car** [sic] drouc do tat, do mam, do mestr, ha do mat obereuryen, euit na <u>grahent</u> oz ober an trasé da tut arall : <u>An ré pe-ré</u> à **can** hac à **laz**, à **pech** greffussoch eguit <u>an ré pe-ré</u> n'a **græont** nemet iniurou bihan, hac à ro bochadou, <u>an ré</u> â **laz** dioar goust an paour, eguit n'a gra nep à dirob an pinuizic; … Brassoch ez **pech** <u>an ré pe-ré</u> à **priff** an guir|| possessor eues à vn tra bennac à pris bras, eguit n'a <u>grahent</u>, ouz è priuaff ves à vn tra à pris bihan : Greffussoch ez offancc nep à viol vn guerches eguit n'a grahé marbé corronpet. (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

Negation bag can be absent despite respect for all other constraints in, again in both texts; note that it does hold in these texts elsehwere specifically with the relative *na* involved here, as shown above.

Allas petra à **gall** da esperiff vn guez, <u>an ré pe-ré</u> na **lauar** quet|| ho breuier, pé mar hé **leueront n'o deueus** nep intention, deuotion, n'ac attention, ouz he lauaret. (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
d'em absteniff deues an œuffriou seruill, <u>pere</u> **eo** an re-se, pere **eo** accustum da ober <u>an seruigeryen, hac an arttisanet</u>, <u>pere</u> na **trauaill** nemet gant an corff : (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

Cnf² very occasionally violates plain CP. Bel has a far greater number of these violations with postverbal subjects, sometimes in the same passage where CP is respected. There is

no consistent cause: examples show regular - irreglar - suppletive plural, coordination or not, animate or not, "expletive" *eff* with *hac* and *pe* or not, synthetic constructions and periphrastic passives, tarnsitive and unaccusative, adjacency and distance.

Hac en traman é **pechent** dre anciandet <u>an Gentilet</u>, pere dre noz deuoe quet an aznaudæguez an guir Doué … pe en tra ez **pechent** <u>an Gen-|tilet</u>, pere à yoa quen dallet, ma græhent Idolou, "And in this thing **sinned.PL** through antiquity <u>the Gentiles</u>, who did not have the knowledge of the true God … in which thing **sinned.PL** <u>the Gentiles</u>, who were.SG so blinded, that they.made Idols" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
hac asamble ez **ynt** douguet <u>an torchou coar alumet, hac an essancc</u>, "and together **are.PL** carried the ignited was torches, and the essence" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
maz **vezynt** punisset <u>an drouc oberou-|ryen</u>, ha pa en meritont laquæt dan maro, dar fin maz **vezynt** <u>an tut mat</u> assuret, ha maz beuffhynt é peuch. "that **be.PL** punished <u>the evil doers</u>, and when they.merit it put to death, to the end that **be.PL** <u>good people</u> assured, and that they.live in peace" (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
ez cas ha <u>maz</u> **vehent** <u>negligant an Tat, hac an Mam</u> da ober an trase. (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Ha goude pan deu an buguel da cresquiff, ez **ynt** <u>obliget an Compazr, hac an Comhazr</u> da caffet carg ha soing da ober é instruiff en pez (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Me care gouzout pe <u>eff</u> à **resuscito** <u>an corffou-man memes</u>, pere honeus breman (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)
Bezaff **ezynt** eues ho natur <u>pechedou veniel an ré pere</u> n'a **dynt** quet à enep an carantez à‖ Doué, n'ac an nessaff "Are also by their nature venial sins those that are not against the love of God, nor one's neighbour" (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)
Pechiff à **gra** maruelamant <u>an Noteret</u> … oz ober contradou faux en oll pe vn queffren, pa ha **eo** <u>an acta</u> reprouuet, hac illecit, euel dré exempl, bezaff **ynt** <u>an oll contradou usuryer</u>, hac eguit sé en ho <u>tremenont</u>, hac ho <u>signont</u>, … Dememes é **pechont** <u>an artizanet ha mar-|chadouryen</u> oz falsifiaff ho marchadourez, (Y. Gueguen, K: Cnf²; e17C)

Not as CP violations count those where the subject is extraclausal, as seen by the rannig *ez*:
hac vn re à vezho hoaz tut yaouancc, pe bugale munut, <u>pere</u> pequement bennac ez **vezynt** é buhez ebarz en dezse diuezaff, nac euitse ez **marueynt** holl en vn instant, hac ez **dazcorcheynt** sou-den, dar fin maz paezynt an deuer deues an ‖maro (Y. Gueguen, K: Bel; e17C)

Elsewhere, in early verse, apparent CP violations are mostly impossible to determine. Even the closest lend themselves to dislocations:
Bede ma speret ez **redont** / <u>Poan ha hyrder quen diuergont</u> "Up to my spirit (they.)run / Pain and longing so shapemess!" (J[†]; e16C) (Le Berre translates with *they* and dislocation)
Ef≠ pur morchedus / Ha nichodemus / Nep enn= excusas / Gant trauaill ha poan / En= **disquennsont** glan / Emaes an langroas "He pure grieved / And Nichodemus / Who excused him / With travail and pain / (they.)descended him pure / From the cross." (J[†]; e16C)

In prose, there are essentially no violations of CP with most authors. The extremely rare ones are good candidates for dislocation:

voar que-|mẽtsé ez arriuas vn gruecic bihan euel cornõdones pe-|heny à <u>dicaças</u> try bara d'a-|stumet en vn seruiet, hac en istant sé ez disparuas na ne **viont** guelet pelhoch <u>na hy‖</u> <u>na hé seruiet</u>. (T. Gueguen, L: Be; e17C)

7   BE and object-position S

In Modern Breton, S is coded as follows:

Bound pronoun: suffix to the finite verb, silent with nonfinite predicates, doublable by enclitic (type *...ez in(-me), ha PRO mond-me, aet-me*)
Free pronoun: only in the preverbal position of root-like clauses (*me a yelo, ha me da vond, ha me aet*)
Nominal: preverbal or postverbal (like free pronoun, but also *ez yelo Anna, ha mond Anna, ha aet Anna*).

Unavailable are thus:
Free pronoun: postverbal (**ez yelo me*; with predicates other than finite verbs, more study is needed of the esp. Gwenedeg types *ha PRO mond-me, aet-me* to ensure that these are always bound); contrast postverbal free pronouns as predicates at least with with BE (*ez oa me* 'it was me').
A-forms: in any position (**ez yelo ac'hanon*); contrast partitive (*ne yelo ket anezo*), doubling (*ned aint ket anezho*); save 20-1C Kerne varieties that come to replace inflections by *a*-forms (German 2009).

BE is in part special. Prevebal S is coded as S elsewhere, i.e. free (pro)nominal, and in pres. ind. there is a special BE form here across construction, *zo* (*me, Anna zo…*). Postverbal S is also generally coded as S elsewhere, i.e. suffix to finite verb, doubling of it or PRO, and free postverbal nominal but not prooun, though the pronouns is available as predicate (*ez eo me* 'it is me', * as 'I am …').

Exceptional is nominal predication, i.e. binominal structures or equatives, with postverbal free S. In Middle Breton, these can be frequent in texts like Be. At some later point before early 18C, coding by *a* 'of' prepositions became innovated for S with nominal predicates, at least on certain usages in certain dialects, for all (pro)nominals though earlier attested with pronouns and more frequently with them afterwards. The construction recalls the Finnish *tulosrakenne* 'result construction' and its Czech analogue: *What became/came of Kate? Became/came/is of.her fisherman/*skilled at fishing. Life make of some people fishermen.* However, I have not found the construction other than with BE.

Within Breton, the construction is independent structurally, diachronically and dialectally from:

33

(i) *a*-forms as doublee of S/A under certain conditions, 19/20C- with dialectal variation (a.o. Stephens 1982, Timm 1995, Schapansky 1996, Fave 1998, Jouitteau 2009– with further literature);

(ii-a) coding of certain S/A in late 20C southwest (late German 2009);

(ii-b) coding of 3SG.F quasiargumental subjects going back to Middle Breton (op.cit., Widmer and Stark 2019);

(iii) general uses of *a, eus* 'of' for which *a*-forms are just pronoun-inflected forms for partitive O, S in object position going back to Middle Breton (op.cit.).

Clear description of the new coding of S is rare even for Modern Breton, though they are widely noted or illustrated.

Fave 1998 may be the best explicit description, in a variety where Middle Breton *a* and *eus* both 'of, from' have given a suppletive paradigm. Fave gives BE + *euz* 'from' for both equatives, *Ar yehed a zo anezañ eun teñzor*; and existence, *Eur paotrig dister, n'eus ket anezañ kaer (pe koulz lavared)* "Un garçon petit, il n'existe pas (pour ainsi dire)", and notes that it is needed to express existence with definites *Ar hiz-se a vo anezi c'hoaz a-benn deg vloaz amañ | An ti-ze a oa anezañ warlene - pe - ne oa ket anezañ warlene | Doue a zo anezañ* "God exists", where an indefinite would also allow *Eun Doue a zo* "Il y a un Dieu". These examples use pronouns in a resumptive construction to a preverbal subject-topic, but neither is a characteristic of the construction. Fave's writings use constructions without the preverbal nominals, *Ne vo ket implijet nemed evid an amzer-vremañ pe amdremenet euz doare-diskleria peogwir n'eus ket anezañ* "[ema] is not used except in the present or imperfect of the indicative because it does not exist" (Fave 1998) | *Bremañ e vez lavaret êz a-walh e lod kosteziou a zo: "Deg vloaz e-neus" e-leh DEG VLOAZ EO, ha koulskoude an oad, an deg vloaz, n'eus ket anezo eun dra perhennet med eur perz* (Fave 1998) | *N'hellan ket lavaret e vef stank ar Vretoned e Bombay, med bez ' ez eus anezo* (WRHM) | *N'eus anezo nemed folkloraj ar vro* (WRMH) | *N'eus anezo nemed mein berniet diskempenn* (WRMH). They also use them with nominals, *endra ma 'z eus euz an deltenn genta* 'while the first tabernacle exists' (Fave et al. 1988). Similar examples are widely found across dialects in 19-20C, e.g. *abaoue ma'z euz euz ar bed* (JKS), *bez' ez eus eus an troioù-lavar tenzor ar brezhoneg komzet* (Morvanou 1980: 617n3), along with pronouns of all persons, *soñjal a ran hag ez eus ac'hanon enta* 'je pense donc je suis' (Favereau 1991: s.v. *être*); examples with pronouns are in Timm 1997: 5 and Ledunois 2002: s.v. A (both focusing on uses of different uses of inflected *a* 'of').[12]

Both constructions go back at least to Rostrenen 1732 and are noted to be used across varieties, and so very shortly after the Middle Breton period, they they are not known to me from the copious and influential texts of Ar Bris slightly earlier: thus rare existential *pa ne deo qet ac'hanon* "since I do not exist" (s.v. rien); frequent equative, both involving

---

[12] Favereau gives no source; Gleau 1973: 75 cites as example of good usage a nonnative speaker's *Me va-unan ne ouien ket ha bez' e oa ac'hanon*; a Wikipedia contributer translates the Arcadia sentence as *Betek en Arkadia ez eus ac'hanon*; but John 8:58 is consistently translated by the older type: Oliereu: Kent ma oé Abraham e on me; Gonidec: abarz ma oa Abrabam, édoun. Fave: a-raog ma oa Abraham anezañ, «Ez On-me»; HJC i hraug ma hoai deit Abraham i hexisten. (FI33/38 ennenkuin Aabraham syntyi, olen minä ollut"; UT1548 & later: Ennenkuin Abraham olikaan/olen minä.)

change state, north-and-west *evel ma ez eus dèn anezañ*, southeast *el me hes deen anehouñ*, beside *evel ma ez eo dèn*, *el meide deen* "comme il est homme" (s.v. comme) | *Aba zeus dèn ac'hanoun* "depuis que j'ai mémoire" (s.v. memoire) *Ur pautr gentil och, ur pautr gentil so ac'hanoc'h* "vous êtes un gentil personnage" (s.v. gentil), and individual-level, *louarnicq so anezañ* beside *ul louarnicq eo* (s.v. finet).[13]

The only precursor to the new existential construction seems to be the partitive S in existentials, common in Middle Breton: *Nedeux a nep re a ve glan* (J[†]; e16C) | *A nen deux quet à differancz* (K) | *A n'en deux quet, à gourchemennou aral dauantag*; these would come close to definites e.. when denying that there is more than one unique entity, cf. *n'eus Doue all ebet nemetân, / n'eus a Zoue nemet an Aotrou.* (Fave 1977.)

For equatives, there are several constructions that may serve as precursors, richly attested from 18C on and either attested or expected to have been available in Middle Breton, as they are in English and French for the most part:

-Partitive S when paraphraseable by total S (*Evit ar c'hlèvejou corporel, ne deus quet anezo ivez a guement a ve un ampechamant ligitim da gommunia, nemet bomissa a raet alies*, IN | *Deustou ma hès a nehai a bep bro* "[I have now half a hundred priests … though they are of each country = {il y en a, ils sont} de tous les pays", LZBg; these do not have nominal predicts, but the situation is the same in the later *tud a bep seurt e zo anehe* KMDR).

-Partitive predicates when close to total predicates (*en indulgencou-man, péré e zou ag er ré caëran ha pourfitaplan* "these indulgences, which are ~~some~~ of the fairest and most profitable", BESquil | *Dessàu bugalé gueih dilezet e zou ag er vrassan alézon rah e fehé bout groeit* 'Raising abandoned poor children is ~~one~~ of the greatest alms of all that could be done' GRB | *Mæs é-mésq er beurerion guæd e zou a ré fal* "[I know that poverty is not an evil.] But among the poor how many are there of evil ones (lit. with ~~what~~ there.is of …)! [More often one sees them in front of the Church than within]." | *Elsen er rumadeu tud, a zrebi Abraham betag David, e zou anéhé rah pearzek rumad* 'Thus the generations of people, from Abraham to David, are of them all fourteen generations; cf. Fave 1998 giving along with nonpartitive S of equatives also *Deg a oa anezo = Deg e oant*, but using also in the same text a similar example that must have a nonpartitive S, *Bremañ e vez lavaret êz a-walh e lod kosteziou a zo: "Deg vloaz e-neus" e-leh DEG VLOAZ EO, ha koulskoude an oad, an deg vloaz, n'eus ket anezo eun dra perhennet med eur perz*).

-Apparently partitive predicates with quantificational S which might also or rather reflect split-NP existential S, when to equatives (*Bout zou a nehai hueh principal* 'there are of them six chief ones [that we are required to learn]', COSp | *hag un troh e zou a nehai* "[if we set aside the soliders in the town,] and there is a bunch of them", LZBg; *Peguement e zou a nehai ol? - Bout e zou seih* "How many are there of them all? - There are seven", *Hueh gourhemen e zou a nehai* "There are six commandments" Dréano, *Catechim historik en abad Fleuri*, 1851 | *cals zo anèzo = cals int* (Rostrenen 1732, frequent: s.v. beaucoup, nombre, nombreux, combien).

---

[13] The use of *a*-forms in equatives without BE in the type *NP a-α* 'What an NP α is' seems no earlier; q.v. DEVRI s.v. a / ag 1; nominals seem to be fine here, but it is to be confirmed; ditto such reduced equatives as complements of presentatonals, *chetu NP a-α*, are to be confirmed.

-Superficially *a* 'of' PP predicates analysable with silent 'one', 'some, someone, something', when close to equatives (*en hébrus a caldaïq, péré e zou ag ur secour bras aveit comprenein erhat ha parfœlemant el livreu sacret*, BESquil) | *muyoh a sourci ag un affœr a zou ag ur gonséquance quer bras-cé*, CNG).

-Of-PP predicates with change of state, when close to equatives (*petra e vou ag er bren hag ag er horzenneu* "what will be [become] the bran and the chaff?", GRD | *petra-vou ag en amitéeu didalvé* ? "what will become of useless friendships?" EOV; close to "result clauses" of Finnish or Czech, but limited to BE.

This result-like construction appears to be the sole clear anomalous coding of S in Breton outside *mihi est*. There is no anomaly found with analogues of *There were still we in the boat, There stood she all alone, Still unconvinced have remained you who….*, all of which use regularly coded S, including suffix to finite verb when pronominal and not preverbal – save for however are to be analysed presentatives like *Chetu me amañ* and its many dialectal cognates, *Chetu-me amañ, Chemadon ama*.

8   ECM and dative

In Breton texts, there exists a superficial analogue of what may in French be exceptional case marking or ECM. It involves perception and propositional-attitude verbs + infinitive. When these infinitives embed *have*-constructions, they would permit study of the treatment of the putative dative subject of these constructions under active and passive ECM. A preliminary caveat is that there is no direct evidence available that this is ECM for Breton, and that there would be the limitations familiar for ECM in French (Rowlett 2007: 5.2, Jones 1996: 9.2.2, 9.3, Labelle 1997, Sheehan 2020), where the best evidence for ECM is availability of idiom chunks as sobjects (Jones 1996: 9.3.4), but there are no overt expletives to test and generally control is hard to exclude as an alternative (Abeillé, Godard and Miller 1997, Burzio 1986). Depictives are available from the first major texts of Breton, including the *have*-type *We have them on the right*, but these are plausibly not ECM (Bruening 2018).

The following paradigm is then of interest. A/S subjects of active transitives and intransitives are matrix accusative clitic in the active, nominative suffix in the passive, as in French. The R subjects of *mihi est* have the same coding in the matrix clause, but link to the accusative syncretic clitic doubling or coding R + dative-like *de* element:[14]

ECM of direct A/S and dative R
active
er hleuèt … doh he expliquein dehai
[they wanted still] to hear him [another day] explaining it do them (BSK)
pegourz hun nès ni hou cüélet doh hou pout nean
when we have seen you have hunger or thirst (HJC)
passive

---

[14] Evidence is limited to 18-19C Gwenedeg, where all the relevant infinitives are present; there is a number of examples, but not enough to give a whole paradigm from a single author or to have minimal pairs.

ne oaih quet guélet doh hum hlorifiein (IUG)
you were not seen glorying yourself
guélet vezent nezé doh ou dout er santimanteu caërran
then they were seen having the fairest feelings (BSK)

If this is ECM, dative R has a dual behavior: in the embedded clause, R remains dative, like dative R under ECM in Icelandic; but in the matrix clause, it promotes to structural case, unlike in Icelandic. Given the nature of Breton dative coding, there is a near trivial way to get the right results: the sole datives of the system always have unique and obligatory clitic doubling in the system, so always involve whatever underlies such doubling like a big-DP structure; the clitic involved is dative; but the doublee is case-licensed inside the big-DP as usual in clitic doubling, say as argument of silent linker/P; unless it extracts to the matrix in putative ECM, which breaks whatever mechanism licenses it in the big DP. Still, the pattern is intriguing in light of theoretetical approaches to quirky case as inherent + structural (Andrews 1982, Chomsky 1986, 2000), and to datives that relate them to accusatives in various ways (Starke 2017).

Unfortunately, there is a confound and it renders the evidence irrelevant: the "broad subject" construction in Breton. Whenever there is licensed subject + predicate with gap for the subject, there is also broad subject + predicate with resumptive for the broad subject. This includes clauses of all sizes, including infinitives, e.g. finite *Kate came with no guests ~ No guests came Kate with them*, control infinitive *Kate wanted to come with no guests ~ Kate wanted no guests PRO to come with them*, perception complement infinitive *Isabel saw Kate come with no guests ~ Isabel saw no guests come Kate with them*. One factor that modulates the availability of subject and broad subject structures is the availability of gaps, only nominative and accusative, and resumptive pronouns, barred as direct-case matrix subject, perhaps dispreferred as direct-case matrix object, free direct-case remote subject or object, obligatory elsewhere, setting aside dative R of *mihi est* where the same surface form should reflect clitic doubling of subject and resumptive of broad subjects (DMEI: 5.2; Rezac 2010; Urien 1987).

It follows that in *Isabell her=saw __ her=DAT=be regret*, matrix *her=DE=* can be not only clitic doubling subject R of the infinitive raised into the matrix, but also clitic resumptive to broad subject R. Broad subjects do not case-match their resumptives, so no conclusions can be drawn about dative that becomes accusative/nominative + dative upon raising to matrix clause in ECM.

9 Distribution free pronouns and doubling enclitics

Theoretical note: The restriction of free pronouns to strong-pronoun environments and to weak-pronoun ones if bound pronouns are unavailable leaves unaccounted-for the absence of strong free pronouns outside the preverbal position of root clauses, i.e. the absence *ma=oa me bras* 'if=be.IPF 1SG big' for "if I$_{FOC}$ were big", expressed rather using dependent pronoun + doubling enclitic *ma=oan=me bras* 'if=be.IPF.1SG=1SG big', despite the availability of postverbal independent pronouns as predicates, including in clefts, *ma=oa me (oa bras)* 'if=be.IPF 1SG (be.IPF big)' "if it were me (who was big)".

One simple parallel is that of undisplaced *wh*-words of systems like English, *If anyone/*who were here, would you leave?*

Alternatively, it may be that marked readings like focus always require the big-DP doubling construction, whose syntax and realisation gives weak dependent pronoun + doubling enclitic ordinarily, but which may be displaced as a big-DP to the preverbal position, and then surfaces as an independent pronoun. Doubling may be given one of its common analyses: the two elements originate in the same "big" DP and possible combinations and displacements reflect licensing requirements. In Breton, the big DP is restricted to *[weak-pronoun doubling-enclitic]*. The weak pronoun is licensed as when undoubled, the doubling enclitic by encliticisation. It is left open why other independent pronouns and nonpronouns cannot substitute for the weak pronoun, a common situation (e.g. French, limiting doubling to dependent + independent focused pronoun, Zribi-Hertz 2008). There is considerable dialectal variation in doubling morphosyntax (varieties can come to resist doubling 3rd person, possessors, direct objects, e.g. Ternes 1970: 14.1, 14.4, 16.6.4; cf. Jouitteau 2009–: s.v. Les pronoms écho) and uses (focus and disambiguation, but sometimes near-grammaticalised in structures like questions, attributed to French influence, cf. Hemon 1975: §52).

10   Statistics

10.1   Caveats

These are added or completed as I get to them. They are also preliminary and susceptible to error.

Error estimates: The texts are expected to have errors of various sorts, including the author's competence (e.g. anacolutha where the author lost the train of thought), influence of the translation (e.g. constructions not present in the target grammar), and editorial (e.g. errors in typesetting). The variable of interest here is in the first place the use of pro/meso- vs. enclitics, and in the second clitics vs. other codings of pronouns in weak-pronoun contexts or generally. For these variables, error estimates can be obtained simply by looking beyond the target constructions of *have*-perfect, lexical *mihi est*, and the imperative-jussive, for instance at use of pro/mesoclisis vs. enclisis vs. other with synthetic finite verbs other than the imperative-jussive in general, or in specific usages such as preterite to compare with the *have*-perfect. This has occasionally been done – incompletely – and the data is then given; the numbers are high and the distribution is categorial with no deviation from pro/mesoclisis.

Clitichood: Pro/mesoclitics are unambiguous in form in general, with a handful of exceptions, notably some of the more interesting orthographical meanderings of Qu. Enclitic and free forms can only be distinguished by position when there are various separations between auxiliary and participle, so these are usually indicated.

10.2   1630 J[†]+R[†]

Pronominal objects of selected constructions in 1630 J[†]+R[†] (preliminary manual count)

x=   =x

38

mihi est	0	=3M.INAN hac <u>oz bezo</u> =ef
HAVE-perfect	0	=3M.ANIM clasquet, caffet[LHM], guelet, guerzet =3F.INAN santiffiet =3P.ANIM lamet (=3 6 of which 5 human, 1 inanimate)
imperative	1S= 20 ancoufha⁻, cleuet, conferm, cret, 4[1] credet, cusulyet, diuisquet⁻, ententet, leset, leset⁻, lest, lest⁻, paet, quemeret, quecet, sco⁻, sentet 1P= 2 leset (1S/P= 22) [reflexivised: 2S/P=em- 21]	=3M.INAN 7 (6): cret, credet, debr, 2 douc, les, reit =3M.ANIM 6: blasfem⁻, gra, quemeret[(inan?)], quesyt, quisit, reyt =3F.INAN 8: astennet, douc, douguet, diuis, lequet, leset, lisit, *staguet* =3F.ANIM 2: tretet, leset =3P.INAN 2: quemer, cont =3P.ANIM 1: list (=3 27 of which 9 human, 17 inaniman, 1 ambig.)
jussive	0	=3M.ANIM 1
V.FIN-V!	1S= 85-22 i.e. 63 1P= 18-2 i.e. 16 2S= 39 2P= 97 (1/2= 239-24 i.e. 215) 3M= 234 3F= 16 3P= 20 (3= 270)	0

Note: # doubling (not counted for V.FIN), ⁻ negation *na/ne* (not counted for V.FIN); *staguet* from lacuna in 1630 version.

Other pronouns: *mihi* est occurs with one free fronted 3M human S (or so it can be parsed, alternatively fragment); other free pronouns if any to be added to count

The count is manual and preliminary.

Note on the nature of the text: Plays like J[†]+R[†] though in verse consist mostly of dialogues and as such may be a better guide to native spoken usage than the largely didactic and exegetic prose.

10.3 <u>Y. Gueguen, K: Bel, 1625</u>

Pronominal O as 3SGM and 1PL with V.FIN in several environments as proxy for expected error in pro/enclisis (manual count, approximate):

3SGM= *en*		1PL= *hon*	
(HAC) EN V.FIN	42[1] (36)	(HAC) HON V.FIN	24 (19)
(HAC) EN EN V.FIN	3	(HAC) EN HON V.FIN	4
(HA) N EN V.FIN	14 (10)	(HA) N HON V.FIN	2
MA EN V.FIN	2	M HON V.FIN	5 (2)
PA EN V.FIN	5 (3)	M HON V.FIN	0
MAR (N[†]; 16C) EN V.FIN	3	MAR (N[†]; 16C) HON V.FIN	1

Note: (#)verbs if different from occurrences, [#] enclitic doubled
Gloss: *hac* 'and', *en* 'R', *ma* 'as', *mar* 'if', *n* 'NEG', *pa* 'when'

Other (e.g. *a*-forms): none

Pronominal O of *have*-perfect (manual parse):

Clitic	#	Participle (+ is distributed coordination)
1S=	1	poulset
1P=	13	caret, 2 crouet, diliuuret[sep:subj], exhortet, lamet, 5 offançet, tennet; adoptet*
2S=	2	2 tennet
2P=	1	curunet
=3M.INAN	2	graet[LHM], læset⁻
=3F.INAN	8/9	carguet, 2 composet, heuliet, lamet, obtenet, quelennet⁻, yunet[sep:adv]; goallet**
=3P.ANIM	2	enguentet, græt+colloquet
=3P.INAN	6	caffet+instituet, conduet, instituet, 3 quelennet

Note: ⁻ negation *quet*, superscripted various AUX-PRT separations

Pronominal S with lexical *mihi est* (manual parse)

=3M.ANIM (depersonfied?)	1	en deuoeauff yuez en é guenou
=3F.INAN (personified?)	2	nep endeueus-hy … nep n'en deueus-hy quet
=3M.INAN	1	en deuffue eoff

Pronominal O in imperative (manual parse):

1PL=	6+2⁻+1?	3+1? diliuret, diliur, conduz⁻, conduzet⁻, excuset, leset⁻
=3F.INAN	2	disquet, leueret
=3P.INAN	3	dalchet, colloquet, paez

Note: forms are 2S save 2P -et, and the latter are and not unambiguously imperative when negated -, or when embedded nonV1 indicated by ?

Other pronominal O/S of these constructions (e.g. *a*-forms): none

Typical examples (translation by pseudogloss):

have-perfect and imperative:
Ha pardonnet dimp hon offancçou euel maz pardonomp da nep **en deueux hon offancçet**. Ha **n'on leset** da cœzo en temptation. Hoguen hon diliuret à pep drouc. "And forgive us our offences just as we pardon to whoever **has offended us**. And **lead us not** to fall in temptation. But **deliver us** from every evil."

Lexical *mihi est*, inanimate S:
Ha hy à so vn vertuz bras an Charan-|tez … nep **endeueus-hy** ne gall quet coll é siluidiguæz … nep **n'en deueus-hy quet** : ne gall quet é nep moien ober é siluidiguæz "And she is a great virtue Charity … whoever **has her** cannot lose his salvation … whoever **has her not** : cannot by any means achieve his salvation."

Lexical *mihi est*, animate S: rac euel ma endeuoe sant Paul Iesus Christ en é galon, en deuoeauff yuez en é guenou. "for just as had Saint Paul Jesus Christ in his heart, **he.had him** also in his mouth."

Anomalies of *have*-perfect compared with regularities, see text for discussion:
* ouz <u>hon deuezout</u> adoptet **euit é bugale**; cf. e.g. pehiny <u>endeueus</u> quement-se **hon caret**.
** à quemer an goas **<u>endeueus</u> he goallet**; cf. e.g. **<u>n'endeueushy</u> quet que-lennet** domp **dre é guenou propr** | an AEbestel santel <u>oz deueus hy</u> heuliet

10.4 G. Quiquer, L: Qu; 1626

General and caveats: See on Bel.

Pronominal S of Lexical *mihi est*: =3M.INAN 4 (of which 1 with low negation *quet*)

Pronominal O of *have*-perfect:

=2P	1	*
=1P	1	*
1S=	4	dibilitet, digacçet[1], digacçet⁻, goulennet⁻,
2P=	2	cleuet⁻, refuset⁻
=3M.INAN	7	caffet, coummeret⁻, couinnet, displeguet, guelet, lauaret[LHM], priset
=3M.ANIM	5 (4)	cleffuet⁻, dizibræt, frottet+scriffellet, 2 tretet
=3P.INAN	2	forget+rouinnet, gounezet
=3F.ANIM	1	digaczet[cluster,]
=3F.INAN	1	effet[cluster,-]

Note: [#] doubled; - once per low negation *quet*

* Anomalies discussed in DME.II: 3.4

Additional caveat: This text independently has several elements of orthography that elsewhere do not combine to obscure the present study but do here: any orthgraphic indication of nasality with $/\tilde{e}(\tilde{v})/$ can be omitted, giving *e, é,* or it can be spelled, *eff, euff,* and inversely, *eff, euff* can be extendeded to /e/ along with other *ff*-orthographies for vowels. This neutralises much usual evidence about 3SGM, because proclitic genitive *e* can be spelled *euff,* and enclitic *eñ* not only *e(u)ff* but also *e, é,* though accusative proclitic *en* is kept intact: Euff [e] ecoummeret / à dleuisach, / … / no pe euff [eñ] quet / à bianoch … Na displeguit é [eñ] quet oll. / memeus / eff [eñ] guelet. / C. Nen deus quet a cas, / Nep en deues é [eñ] displeguet / en [en] en plego adarre …. In counts, when orthography is compatible with genitive proclitic or with enclitic and that is expected, it is counted as such.

Pronominal O of imperative: none

10.5 C. ar Bris, L: IN; 1710

Pronominal objects (automated parse for clitics, manual for *a*-forms)

	=3	=1/2	3=	1/2=
Lexical HAVE	5	-	-	-
HAVE + participle	57 (38)	-	1*	29^1 (21)
2PL imperative	51 (33)	-	-	6 (6)
cf. 3SG preterite	-	-	19^1 (18)	2 (2)
2PL future	-	-	7^0 (7)	-

Conventions: =*x* enclitic, *x*=proclitic, # of occurrences[#of which is enclitic-doubled] (# of lexemes)

* Coordinated participle that lacks its own auxiliary, see discussion.

Nonclitic: none in these constructions; on *a*-forms, cf. DME.II: 358n40.