

ϕ -Feature agreement: the distribution of the Breton Bare and Prepositional

Infinitives with the preposition *da*

MELANIE JOUITTEAU

IKER, CNRS UMR 5478

Château neuf, 15 place Paul Bert, 64100 Bayonne

melanie.jouitteau@iker.cnrs.fr

A shorter version of this article is forthcoming in Carrilho and Fernandez (eds.).

Abstract

This article investigates the hypothesis that infinitives clauses in Breton are Case-filtered. This hypothesis makes a straightforward prediction for the distribution of infinitive clauses: Bare infinitives appear in positions where direct Case is available to them. Prepositional infinitives appear as a last resort, in positions where no Case is available. In these environments, ‘da’, homophonous with a preposition, appears at the left-edge of the infinitive clause. I propose that ‘da’ realizes Inherent Case. I show that once the paradigms of semantically motivated preposition insertion are set apart, the hypothesis shows correct for control and ECM structures, with both intervening subjects and objects, purpose clauses and their alternation paradigms, including some preposition tripling paradigms. Larger infinitive structures in narrative matrix infinitives and concessive clauses are not Case-filtered. This makes Breton similar to English, where only perception and causative structures are Case-filtered, whereas other infinitive structures are not (Hornstein, Martins and Nunes 2008).

Keywords: Prepositional infinitives, Bare infinitives, Inherent Case, Celtic, Last Resort.

1. Introduction

The literature reports a strange paradigm of preposition insertion at the left-edge of small-clauses in Breton, as in the purpose clause in (1).

(1) Reit din ur bluenn vat **da** Yann **da** skrivañ aesoc'h a se.

give to.me a quill good P Yann to write easily.more of it

‘Give me a good quill, for Yann to write more easily.’

Treger, Tallerman (1997), cited from Stephens (1990)

Hendrick (1988) proposes that the higher *da* in (1) is a prepositional complementizer. Stump (1989:448ff), Stephens (1990), Borsley and Roberts (1996:32), and Jouitteau (2005/2010:chap4) consider that *da* is a Case assigner for the subject of infinitives, similar to English *for* in *For Yann to write*. Tallerman (1997) introduces a variant and proposes instead that the higher *da* is the head of an AgrS projection responsible for agreement in the infinitival clause. For the sake of this article, it is sufficient for me to note that the higher *da* in (1) is semantically motivated: it marks the following clause as a purpose clause. *Da* can be shown to independently assume the canonical goal/attribution/purpose semantic role in (2), including for infinitives as in (2)c.

(2) a. **Dit** eo?

P.you is

‘Is it for you?’, ‘Is it yours?’

Standard

b. Bremañ e vez anoiou ken drol **d'an** dud.

now prt is names so funny P the people

‘People have such weird names nowadays.’ *Treger, Gros (1970:149)*

c. Ur mekanig **da** [PRO_{arb} skriva].

a machine to write

‘a writing machine.’

Treger, Gros (1970:150)

It will turn relevant in this article that Breton prepositions have an ‘inflectional’ paradigm as in (2)a. I follow Joutteau and Rezac (2006, 2008, 2009) in considering that these paradigms result from incorporation of a weak pronoun into the prepositional host.

The issue addressed in this article is the identification of the motivation for the lowest preposition *da* in (1). Hendrick (1988) and Tallerman (1997) both noticed that *da* can realize two different entities, and that the lower occurrence of *da* in (1) does not plausibly assign Case to the subject of the infinitive. Stephens (1990:154), as a side note, remarks: “the *da* immediately preceding the verb resembles English infinitival *to* which has been shown by Pullum (1982) to be neither a preposition nor a complementizer.” Tallerman (1997) considers *da* an infinitival marker “which is not always overt”, located in a Tense projection inside the infinitive. In previous work (Joutteau 2005/2010, 2005b), I have proposed a first attempt to account for the distribution of the lower *da*. I have proposed that *da* is a preposition whose insertion motivation is last-resort Case-assignment to the infinitive itself. Joutteau (2005b, 2005/2010:chap 4), and Joutteau and Rezac (2006, 2008, 2009) have proposed that Breton extended verbal projections are nominal in the sense that they have interpretable 3SG ϕ -features, and hence serve as a goal for Agree, triggering complementarity effects in the verbal agreement system. In accordance, and like DPs, they need to pass the Case filter. If this line of research is correct, in terms of Chomsky (2000, 2001), the second *da* in (1) is a morphological realisation of an inherent Case marker for the infinitive structure.

In this paper, I wish to evaluate the *Case Filtered Infinitive* hypothesis in light of the broadest possible set of data. In a first section, I will present the core of the paradigms presented so far in favour of the *Case Filtered Infinitives hypothesis*, and discuss the predictions it makes. In section 2, I will provide a map of the various semantically motivated uses of *da*. The aim of this section is to be able to set apart last-resort uses of

da that are concerned with the *Case Filtered Infinitives* Hypothesis, with paradigms that are simply not concerned. In the remainder of the article, I will investigate all semantically vacuous uses of *da* found in a large literature corpus. In section 3, I will discuss in detail ECM causatives and purpose clauses. I will conclude that the *Case Filtered Infinitives* Hypothesis can account for their paradigms of *da* insertion, even in face of some intriguing dialectal variations. In section 4, I present and discuss the hard cases where *da* seems truly optional: Narrative matrix infinitives and Concessives. Section 5 briefly summarizes and concludes with a typological view.

2. Typology of the non-Case related uses of *da*

Investigation on the lower *da* in (1) requires to carefully set apart the other uses of this widely used preposition. As seen in the introduction, *da* can mark goals in a broad sense. This core meaning leads to different meaning extensions: *da* is the canonical introducer for indirect arguments. It also marks direction with verbs of movements (3)a, and attribution or destination as in (3)b. It is likely that the deontic use of *da* as in (3)c derives from its primary ‘goal’ semantic import.

- (3) a. Sevel a ra **da** zont **d’ar** prenestr.

stand.up prt does P go P the window

‘He stands up in order to go to the window.’ *Standard*, Drezen (1990:12)

- b. Ur marh koad en-oa fardet **da** bep hini.

A horse wood he-had built for each one

‘He had made a wooden horse for everyone.’ *Kerne*, Trépos (2001:§594)

- c. Neuze e soñjas he-doa **da** walc’hiñ warhoaz.

Leon,

then prt thought she-had to wash tomorrow Fave (1998:140)

‘Then she thought she had some washing to do the next day.’

Da also canonically marks the experiencer, a role which favours its apparition before the subjects of infinitives as in (4)a. Some experiencer uses recall the prototypical

contexts for benefactives/malefactives as in (4)b. The experiencer reading is also the source for an evidential reading as in (4)c.

(4) a. Gwellaad a ra **dezañ**. / ma teufe **dezhañ** mervel.

go.better prt does P.him if came P.him die

‘He is getting better.’ ‘If he happened to die.’ *Leon, Fave (1998:140,135)*

b. Louiz a zo marvet unan bennag **dezañ** ive.

Louiz prt is dead one some P.him too

‘Some relative of Louiz died too (on him).’ *Treger, Gros (1970:155)*

c. Penegwir me a veze mezo **dezo** ordinal.

because I prt was drunk P.the ordinarily

‘Because in their mind, I was drunk all the time.’ *Treger, Gros (1970:157)*

Some uses of *da* clearly result from lexical selection, for example the adjective *tost* (*da*), ‘next (to)’ as in (5). Some uses of *da* seem perfectly idiosyncratic. Some nominal locutions like *c’hoant*, ‘desire (to)’ optionally select *da*. This optionality seems perfectly idiosyncratic, and amounts to the availability of a genitive construction.¹

(5) Deuit *tostoc’h* **d’an** tan hag e tommo deoc’h.

come closer.more P the fire and prt warm you

‘Come closer to the fire and you will feel warmer.’ *Léon, Fave (1998:136)*

(6) a. *C’hoant* a-walh e-neus **da** vond da zañsal.

desire enough he-has P go to dance

‘He wants to dance.’ *Treger, Gros (1970:158)*

¹ Kervella (1995:§274) proposes that infinitives selected by *c’hoant*, ‘desire (to)’, and introduced by *da* appear when *c’hoant* and its infinitive can be separated. Another hypothesis is that *c’hoant* without *da* is semantically restricted to physical needs. Both hypotheses are contradicted by (6)b.

b. *C'hoant* en doa, eñ e-unan, _ mont da redek.

desire he had he his-one go to run

‘He himself wanted to go for a run.’ *Standard, Drezen (1990:34)*

Some verbs alternate in taking an argument introduced by *da* (Leclerc 1986:167). When the verb ‘to speak’ has two arguments (‘to speak to someone about something’), if the first argument is introduced by *da*, the second one will be introduced by *eus*, ‘from’. If however the first argument is introduced by *gant* ‘with’, the second one will be introduced by *diwar-benn*, ‘about’ (Kervella 1995:§629.II). Finally, the nominal expression *kaout keuz*, literally ‘to have regret’ selects the preposition *eus* for abstract actions, and the preposition *da* for people or objects (Leclerc 1986:167).

(i) respont **d'** ean / **hen** respont

answer to him/ him answer

‘answer him, answer to him.’ *Treger, Leclerc (1986:167)*

(ii) Komz **dezhan eus** e vignoned / Komz **gant** **diwar-benn** an dra-se.

speak to.him from his friends to.speak with.him about the thing-here

‘to speak to him about his friends’ / ‘to speak to him about that.’

Standard (Dirinon), Kervella (1995:§629.II)

(iii) Kaout keu **eus** eur pec'hed / kaout keu **da** X

have regret P a sin / have regret P X

‘to regret a sin, a person, a thing.’ *Treger, Leclerc (1986:167)*

2.1. Modals dialectally selecting indirect arguments

The modals *gallout*, ‘can’ and *rankout*, ‘must’, vary in transitivity across the dialects. Seite, from Kleder, of the Leon dialect, uses the modal *gallout*, ‘can’, with a *da* infinitive (7). Fave, from the same village, acknowledges such uses by recommending

not to use *da* in these structures, as in most other dialects as in (8)a. Seite himself sometimes makes use of this modal without *da* as in (8)b.

(7) Pesked_i a *heller* ive **da** [baka ø_i], braoged dreist-oll.

fishes prt can.IMP also to catch sea bass above all

‘One can also catch fish, above all sea bass.’ *Leon (Kleder)*, Seite (1998:9)

(8) a. Dezho da *c'hell* _ ober o zro foar ganin.

for.them P can do their round fair with.me *Kerne (bigouden)*

‘For them to be able to go around the fair with me.’ Bijer (2007:197)

b. ... e *heller* _ [taoler eur zell war ar Vro-Bagan]...

prt can.IMP throw a glance on the country Pagan

‘One can look at the Pagan country.’ *Leon (Kleder)*, Seite (1998:200)

All occurrences of *da* after the modal *gallout* are not to be disregarded as falling under this dialectal variation. In (9), Seite produces an example where the modal ‘can’ is itself infinitive and selects as its internal argument an infinitive with a realized subject (*ar batimañchoù*). As pointed out by Rezac (p.c.), the inflected version of (9), as illustrated in (10), could not survive preposition insertion. Until sentences like (10) are attested, (9) is a real case of *da* insertion at the left-edge of the infinitive.

(9) eun all a zo nevez beza bet savet dezo ... da **helloud d'***ar batimañchou* dont ennañ.

a other prt is new to.be been built for.3PL P be.able P the vessels come in.it

‘Another one has been built for them recently, for the vessels to be able to

come in it.’ *Leon (Kleder)*, Seite (1998:33), cited in Rezac (2009)

(10) Gellout a ra (?***d'**) *ar batimañchoù* dont ennañ.

be.able prt does P the vessels come in.it

‘The vessels can come in it.’ *unattested*

Dialectal alternations are also to be found with the modal *rankout*, ‘must’. Fave (1998:141) from the Leon dialect follows most usages and recommends bare uses, but

prepositional examples are to be found in standard and even in the same Leon dialect, again with *Seite* (see also Kervella 1933:62 and Inizan 1977:205).

(11) Ar Pont, gwir eo, a *rankomp* **da** weled.

Ar Pont true is prt must.1PL P see

‘It is true, we must see *Ar pont*.’

Léon (Kleder), *Seite* (1998:63)

I consider that these dialectal variations resort to lexical selection of the deontic *da* by the deontic modal *rankout*, ‘must’, and to lexical selection of the destination *da* by the modal *gallout*, ‘can’.

2.2. Da after interrogative words

Kervella (1995:§761) reports cases of occurrences of *da* in environments where interrogative words like *piv*, ‘who’; *petra*, ‘what’ or *pegement*, ‘how much’ precede an infinitive structure. This generalization is confirmed in the Treger dialect of Gros for almost every type of interrogative word.

(12) a. N' onn ket *piou* **da** houlen _ .

NEG know.1SG NEG who P ask

‘I don’t know (for) who to ask.’

b. Me am-oa gouezet *petra* **d'**ober _ dezo goude ive.

I prt-1SG-had known what P do to.them after also

‘I also had known what to do to them after.’ *Treger, Gros* (1970:157, 158)

It looks at first sight as if *wh* extraction is the trigger for *da* insertion, which could suggest that *da* simply marks movement. It is however likely that the above structures evolved from a semantically required *da* marking purpose. Breton makes extensive use of ellipsis. In (13), the structure has originated as *mat da ober*, ‘good to do’, with further movement of the prepositional constituent to the left, probably for focus. Ellipsis of *a zo mat*, ‘is good’ at the end of the sentence would just produce the same word order as

above, with a purpose *da*. If this analysis is on the right track, examples in (12) would just represent cases of ellipsis of *a zo mat*, ‘is good’.²

(13) Ne welan ket *petra* [_{CP} [_{SC} **da** PRO ober] a zo mad _].

NEG see.I not what to do R is good

‘I don’t know what is good to do.’ Leon, Fave (1998:141)

We are now well equipped to screen the empirical domain where the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis makes predictions.

3. The hypothesis of Case Filtered Infinitives and semantically vacuous ‘da’

In this section, I present the paradigmss that support the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis: (i) Control verbs, intervening subjects in ECM structures including causatives, (ii) intervening objects, (iii) purpose clauses and their ‘alternation paradigms’, including (iv) some intriguing tripling paradigms.

3.1. Control, ECM and intervening subjects

The hypothesis of *Case Filtered Infinitives* predicts that *da* should appear in Breton ECM structures when realized subjects of infinitives compete for Case with the infinitive clause they originate from. Intervention effects should vanish with PRO subjects as those fail to compete for Case. Indeed, Control clauses, when the *da* preposition is neither semantically motivated nor independently selected by the matrix verb, always show bare infinitives. This is illustrated in (14), proposed by Tallerman (1997:207) as an example of subject control verb, and in (15) with an indirect object control verb. The infinitive structure plausibly receives prototypical object Case from the matrix verb.³

² For a survey of Breton ellipsis, see ARBRES/index.php/Ellipse.

³ The control verbs usually proposed in the literature, like *pediñ da*, ‘ask to’ or *mirout da*, ‘prevent from’, do lexically impose a *da* preposition, rendering them improper for the test.

(14) N' he_x deus **klasket** zoken _PRO_x gwalc'hiñ he belo.

NEG she has searched even wash her bike

‘She didn’t even try to wash her bike.’ *Standard*, Press (1986:183)

(15) **Lavaret** en deus Lomig d' e vreur_x _PRO_x kemer ar garrigell.

told he has Lomig to his brother take the wheelbarrow

‘Lomig told his brother to take the wheelbarrow.’ *Treger*, Stephens (1982:149)

In (16), the ECM verb *gortoz*, ‘to wait’, selects a small clause whose subject is assigned the prototypical case of the object by the matrix verb. As predicted, *da* appears at the left-edge of the infinitival domain.

(16) a. *Gortoz anezhañ da zont.*

wait him P come

‘wait for his venue.’ *Treger*, Leclerc (1986:161)

b. o c’hortoz *an nor da* zigeriñ

at to.wait the door P open

‘at waiting for the door to open’ *Standard*, Fleuriot (2001:23)

3.1 ECM causatives

ECM causative structures deserve particular attention. The causative verbs ‘to put’ or ‘to let’ assign the prototypical case of the object to the subject of the infinitive (Stephens 1990:158, Tallerman 1997, Jouitteau 2005/2010). *Da* appears before infinitives in the three types of causative structures schematised in (17).

(17) a. to put [(subject *da*) VP] *ECM*

b. to let [(subject *da*) VP] *ECM*

c. to do *da* subject VP

Lexical DPs are unmarked for Case in Breton, but pronouns show morphological evidence that the subject of the infinitive indeed receives the Case that is prototypically assigned to objects. Breton pronominal objects canonically do not receive direct Case.

They appear instead as incorporated pronouns into a hosting preposition *a/eus* as in (18) or (19), or alternatively as oblique proclitics as in (20).⁴

- (18) Dec'h m' eus lakaet *eñ / **anezhañ** da sevel un ti.
 yesterday 1SG have put *he / P.3SGM P build a house
 'I had him build a house yesterday.' *Standard*, Jouitteau (2005:339)

- (19) Lakaat a ra Yann **anezho/ar baotred** da lenn al lizher.
 Make prt does Yann them the boys to read the letter
 'Yann makes them/the boys read the letter.' *Treger*, Stephens (1990:154)

- (20) Gouarnamant Pariz ne glask nemed eun dra, **o** lakaat **da** [_ gaout méz eus o yez]
 government P. NEG searches only a thing 3PL put P have shame of 3PL language
 'Government Paris searches only one thing: make them be ashamed
 of their language.' *Leon, (Kleder)*, Seite (1998:37)

When a matrix clause subject corefers with the pronominal subject of the infinitive, the latter shows up as a reflexive proclitic as in (21), with a Gwened morphological *te* variant of *da*. The subject of the infinitive can be a weather expletive (22).

- (21) Hi **hum** lak **te** greinein.
 she reflex put P shake
 'She started shaking.' *Gwened*, Le Bayon (1878:69)
- (22) Ezhomm a zo ur bannac'h glav! Laka **anezhi/anezhañ** d'ober 'ta neuze!
 need prt is a little rain make it.F/it.M to-do so then
 'We need some rain. Make it rain then if you can!' *Treger*, Stephens (1990:161)

⁴ In (20), the 3PL proclitic object is identical to a 3PL possessive pronoun (see also Le Gléau 2000:§80). Proclitic objects and possessive pronouns share most of their morphological paradigm. They are however not completely identical.

In the causative ECM structure in *lakaat*, ‘put’, the presence of *da* depends on the realization of the subject of the infinitive. In (23), the context ensures disjunction of reference between the matrix subject and the subject of the infinitive, suggesting a structure with PRO. *Da* is illicit. In (24), when the subject is realized and receives the prototypical Case of the object assigned by the causative verb, *da* appears before the infinitive. When the subject is null however, no *da* appears (see also Le Gléau 2000:§93).

(23) Ne *likin* ket c’hoazh [PRO lammout va c’hazeg].

NEG will.put not yet jump my mare

‘I won’t put my mare out to be covered yet.’ Le Gonidec (1921:724)

(24) Lakaet em eus (*anezhañ da*) [ober ur re votoù nevez].

put I have P.him P do a pair shoes new

‘I made him do a pair of new shoes.’ *Standard*, Kervella (1995:§253^{bis})

The second type of causative structure makes use of the verb *leskel*, ‘to let’, that also distributes the canonical Case of the object to the subject of its infinitive (25), that can be a weather expletive (26).

(25) *Lezel* a ra Lenaig **anezho/ar vugale** da lenn al lizher.

allow prt does Lenaig them the children to read the letter

‘Lenaig allows them to read the letter.’ *Treger*, Stephens (1990:154-9)⁵

(26) Fall an amzer! Netra d’ ober met *lezel* **anezhi/anezhañ** d’ ober.

bad the weather nothing to-do but allow it.F / it.M to-do

‘The weather is bad, but what can you do?’ *Treger*, Stephens (1990:161)

⁵ I have corrected the data reported here by the drop of a determiner, probably resulting from a partial copy/paste operation.

Presence of the *da* preposition is tied to the presence of a realized subject. In (27), the subject of the infinitive is PRO. Argument for this analysis comes from the form of the inanimate pronoun *hen*. If there was here no subject in the infinitive structure, *hen* would be bound in its local domain by the subject of the matrix sentence *ar pehed*, and should appear as a reflexive. Grammaticality of the non-reflexive form suggests there is another subject in the infinitive, that fails to bind the object pronoun (arbitrary PRO).

(27) *Ar pehed a lez [PRO_{arb} hen ober].*

the sin prt allow 3SG do

‘The sin is easy to do.’

Treger, Gros (1984:207)

In (28), the causative verb shows imperative morphology, a mood which allows for a special paradigm of object pronouns. Direct Case is assigned to the pronominal subject of the infinitive by the imperative causative verb. Again *da* appears.

(28) *Aotrou, laoskit-me da vonet àr ho komz.*

mister let-me P go on your speech

‘Mister, let me cut your words.’

Gwened, Ar Meliner (2009:180)

The third causative structure in (17) makes use of the verb ‘to do’, a verb that takes an agent DP subject and an intransitive VP internal argument. An experiencer is introduced by *da* (for further examples, see Kervella 1995:§253^{bis} or Bijer 2007:144).

(29) a. *Evit ober dezho [diskenn] e lonkas Yann meur a skudellad laezh.*

for to.do to.them go.down prt drank Yann lot of plate milk

‘Yann drank a lot of milk to make them go down.’ *Kerne, ar Gow (1999:51)*

b. *Ki ebet n' helle ober d'ezan [dont ac'hane].*

dog no NEG could do P.him come from.there

Central Breton,

‘No dog could make him leave from there.’

Perrot (1912:139)

As illustrated in section 2, the use of *da* as introducing an experiencer is common. The causative structure in ‘to do’ thus does not involve any semantically empty preposition. The prediction that causatives in ‘do’ validate with respect to the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis is that absence of the semantically empty *da* correlates once again with absence of a realized subject in the infinitive. I now turn to purpose clauses introduced by the prepositional complementizers *da* and *evit*.

3.2. Intervening objects

The hypothesis of *Case Filtered Infinitives* correctly predicts that a raised object out of the infinitive should trigger the same competition effect as a subject does. In (30)a, the infinitive structure is the subject of the matrix copula. In (30)b, the object of the infinitive has raised and absorbs direct Case, triggering *da* insertion. The examples in (31) replicate the argument for ECM causatives.

- (30) a. Start ‘vez [PRO lipat *ar skorn* buan]
 b. Start ‘vez *ar skorn* * (da) [PRO lipat _ buan]
 hard is the ice P lick the ice rapidly
 ‘It is painful to lick ice-(cream) rapidly.’/ ‘Ice is painful to lick rapidly.’
- (31) a. Dec’h em boa lakaet *Fañch* * (da) [_ sevel un ti]
 yesterday 1SG had put *Fañch* * (P) build a house
 ‘I had *Fañch* build a house yesterday.’
 b. Dec’h em boa lakaet (*da) [*PRO sevel un ti*].
 yesterday 1SG had put (*P) build a house
 ‘I had a house built yesterday.’
 c. Dec’h em boa lakaet *un ti* * (da) [PRO sevel _]
 yesterday 1SG had put a house * (P) build
 ‘I had a house built yesterday.’ *Standard, Jouitteau (2005:339-340)*

3.3. Alternation paradigms in purpose clauses and privatives

The hypothesis of *Case-Filtered Infinitives* also finds support in two paradigms where the subject appears optionally either before or after *da*. The first one is the paradigm of purpose clauses with *evit*, ‘for’ as in (32).

- (32) a. Deuit tostoc'h eta **evit** [SC **din** ho klevet gwelloc'h].
 b. Deuit tostoc'h eta **evit-on d'** [SC ho klevet gwelloc'h].
 come closer ! for (1SG) to (1SG) 2PL.OBL hear better
 ‘Come closer so that I could hear you better.’ Trépos (1980 :261)

In (32)a., the pronominal subject of the infinitive is incorporated into a semantically vacuous *da*. The prepositional complementizer *evit* selects and licenses the infinitive. In (32)b., the pronominal subject is licensed by *evit*, and *da* is required and appears lower. In each alternative a. and b., both the pronominal subject of the infinitive and the small clause itself would receive Case. The second paradigm showing such alternations is that of privative constructions introduced by *hep*, ‘without’. In (33), the semantically vacuous *da* introduces the infinitive and appears lower than the subject. Both lexical or pronominal subjects can also appear below *da* as in (34). In accordance with the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis, *da* is incompatible with a PRO subject (35).⁶

- (33) **Hepdon da** welet ar bigi.
 without.me P see the boats
 ‘without my seeing the boats.’ Tallerman (1997:228), after Press (1986:124)

⁶ A frozen expression, *hep gouzout da X*, ‘without X to know’, even shows *da* appearing after the infinitive verb as in (i). This word order is however not productive. Kervella (1995:§585,616) treats *hep gouzout* as a complex preposition selecting *da*.

(i) **Hep** gouzout **d' e** re.

without know P his relatives

‘Without his relatives to know.’ Standard, Favereau (1997:§890)

- (34) a. **Hep** **din** _ gouzout mont war velo.
 without P.me know go on bike
 ‘without me to know how to ride a bike.’ *Kerne, Trépos (2001:§346)*

- b. Aet oa hebiou an ti **hep** **d’ar c’hi** _ harzal.
 gone was next.to the house without P the dog bark
 ‘He had passed close to the house without the dog to bark.’
Standard, An Here (2001:§’hep’)

- (35) Me am-oa greet se **hep** [*PRO* *soñjal*].
 I prt.1SG-had done this without think
 ‘I did it without thinking.’ *Treger, Gros (1970:235)*

As noted in Jouitteau (2005/2010), alternation paradigms are particularly tricky to account for by other means than the *Case Filtered Infinitive* hypothesis.

3.4. Purpose clauses with ‘da’ and ‘evit’

Purpose clauses can be introduced by the prepositional complementizer *da* (36) or *evit*. Word order is constant across dialects, for both pronominal and lexical realized subjects.

- (36) Banal sec’h a droc’has [**d’ e** *wreg* **da** aozañ krampouezh].
 broom dry prt cut for his wife to cook pancakes
 ‘He cut dry broom for his wife to make pancakes.’ *Kerne, Trépos (1980 :261)*

- (37) ... e-barzh an dour sal [**evito** **da** gemer blaz an holen]
 in the water salted for.them P take taste the salt
 ‘...in salted water, for them to take the taste of salt.’ *Bijer (2007:412)*

Like was the case in causatives, the lower *da* seems tied to extraction of the subject out of the infinitive domain (38).

- (38) a. *Ur studiañ hir a zo [**da** PRO **da** vezañ skolaer]
 a study long prt is to to be teacher
 ‘It is a long training to become a teacher.’ Tallerman (1997:209)
- b. Ur studiañ hir a zo [**da** PRO vezañ skolaer]
 a study long prt is to to be teacher
 ‘It is a long training to become a teacher.’ *Standard*, Jouitteau.
- c. Ur studiañ hir a zo [**d’ an den** **da** _ vezañ skolaer]
 a study long prt is to the man to be teacher
 ‘It is a long training to become a teacher.’ *Standard*, Jouitteau
- (39) Ne vezo nepred a-walc’h a-zivrec’h **evit** [PRO troc’hañ ha dastum an eost].
 NEG will.be never enough of-arms for cut and collect the harvest
 ‘There won’t ever be enough arms in order to cut and collect the harvest.’
Treger, Berthou (1985:78)

Stephens (1990:155) has shown that both purpose clauses with *da* and *evit* are forming a constituent, as they can be clefted.

- (40) a. Sonet e vije ar c’hloc’h [**d’ an dud** **da** zont da verenn].
 rung prt was the bell to the people to come to dinner
 ‘The bell was rung to call the people to dinner.’ *Treger*
- b. [**D’ an dud** **da** zont da verenn] ‘ni e vije sonet ar c’hloc’h.
 to the people to come to dinner FOC prt was rung the bell
- (41) a. Kreñv awalc’h eo Lomm [**evit** Yann **da** _ spontan dirazañ].
 strong enough is Lomm for Yann to frighten before.3SGM
 ‘Lomm is sufficiently strong to frighten Yann.’

b. [**Evit Yann da** _ spontan dirazañ] ‘ni eo Lomm kreñv awalc’h.

for Yann to frighten before.3SGM FOC is Lomm strong enough

Treger, Stephens (1990:155), cited in Tallerman (1997:221)

This paradigm shows alternation cases (C *da* S / C S *da*): some pronominal and lexical subjects of purpose clauses in *evit* appear to the right of the preposition *da*.⁷

(42) [**evit d’ar c’hezeg** gallout kerzhout ingal]

for P the horse can walk even

‘for the horse to be able to walk on an even surface’ Bijer (2007:21)

(43) [**evit deomp** nompas bezañ gwelet oc’h erruout asambles]

for P.us not be seen at arriving together

‘...so that we wouldn’t be seen arriving together.’ Bijer (2007:342)

3.5. Tripling paradigms

A final complication in the data is exemplified in (44), where the only semantically motivated preposition is the goal marker *evid*, ‘for’. Below it, two *da* prepositions appear, the former hosting the incorporated subject of the infinitive, and the latter preceding the infinitive structure.

(44) a. **evid din da** hounid ar repoz eternal.

for to.me P gain the rest eternal

‘For me to gain eternal rest.’ Seite (1998:189)

b. Méd hastom buan bremañ **evid deom da** veza a-raog an noz e Konkerne.

but speed fast now for to.us P be before the night in Concarneau

‘But let’s hurry up so that we could be in Concarneau before night.’

Leon dialect, Seite (1998:136)

⁷ The data in (43) provides evidence against Tallerman’s prediction in (1997:209,225) that the lower *da* can never ‘inflect’. The prediction seems however correct for the *da...da* construction. For discussion of agreement *versus* incorporation hypotheses for the formation of prepositional paradigms, see Jouitteau and Rezac (2006, 2008, 2009).

I propose that the tripling cases are due to defectiveness of inflected prepositions, which is subject to dialectal variation. The highest *da* in (44) provides morphological support for weak pronouns incorporation, as does *da* in (45). This hypothesis correctly predicts that lexical DPs will not be selected as arguments of the complex *evit da* preposition, and that *evit da* never appears as complementizer in tensed domains.

(45) N' int ket ken brokus **evitdezhi**. ...

NEG are not as generous for-to-3SGF

‘They are not as generous as she is.’ *Keit vimp Beo* (1983:25)

(46) Kavet ez eus un tu **evit (*da)** e teufe Yann e-barzh.

found prt is a way for P prt come Yann inside

‘A way was found for Yann to come in.’ Tallerman (1997:221-2)

Independent evidence for *da* suppletion in prepositional defective paradigms is easily found, as mentioned in Kervella (1995:§586) for standard and Humphreys (1995:585,616) for central Breton. For illustration, on the same page, Fave (1998) uses the preposition *a-enep*, ‘against’, with a direct object and a pronominal indirect one.

(47) a. Mond **a-enep** [*réd an dour*] n' eo ket êz.

to.go against tide the water NEG is not easy

‘It is hard to go against the tide’ *Leon dialect*, Fave (1998:140)

b. Evid ar votadeg ez in **a-enep dezañ**.

for the election prt will.go.1SG against P.3SGM

‘I’ll go against him at the elections.’ *Leon dialect*, Fave (1998:140)

4. Optional *da* : the hard cases

This last section presents two paradigms where the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis fails to predict optional *da*: (i) narrative matrix infinitives and (ii) concessive clauses.

4.1. Narrative matrix infinitives

Breton has matrix infinitives whose Tense is calculated as directly consecutive to the Tense of the last inflected sentence. I adopt the structure proposed by Rezac (2011:266) for Breton narrative infinitives as in (48). In (49) and (50), the marker *ha(g)*, homophonous with a coordination marker, introduces the infinitive. The *da* insertion paradigm of narrative matrix infinitives is peculiar for two reasons. First it is optional (Kervella 1995:§276, 279; compare (49) and (50)). The optional *da* can also be replaced by a second occurrence of the marker *ha(g)* as in (51).

(48) narrative matrix infinitives: (*hag*) + _ (+*da/hag*) + infinitival VP

(49) **Hag** *Erwan* **da** gemer e gontell

and Erwan P take his knife

‘And Erwan took his knife...’

Treger, Leclerc (1986: 162)

(50) **Hag** *eñ*, ker buan, _ mont ha sankañ e gontell...

and he adv. quick go and stick his knife

Standard,

‘Straight away, he went and stick his knife into....’

Kervella (1995:§276)

(51) **Hag** *hi* **ha** mont.

and she and go

‘And she went away.’

Leon, Fave (1998:136)

The phenomenon is observable independently of doubling: in (52), the higher optional *hag* is not realized at the left-edge of the infinitive and the lower element can still appear either as *da* or *ha(g)*. The *da/ha(g)/_* alternation seems free for the same author (54) (see also Meliner 2009:10, 106 for the Gwened dialect).

(52) Setu-*hi* **hag** azezañ war ar skabell-bediñ

presentative-she and sit on the prie-dieu

‘(Instead of going away...) she sat on the prie-dieu.’ *Standard, Drezen (1990:22)*

(53) Raktal, *ar merc'hed* **da** sevel o fenn ...

then the women P raise their head *Standard,*

‘Straight away, the women raised their head...’ Kervella (1995:§279)

(54) a. **Hag** *an teodoù* **ha** mont en-dro.

and the tongues C go again

‘People restarted talking.’ *Bigouden, Bijer* (2007:423)

b. **Ha** *leur boutin ar Gêrgloz* **da** zont bev-buhezek en-dro.

and place public the Gêrgloz P go alive-alive again

‘And the place of Gêrgloz went to life again.’ Bijer (2007:61)

c. **Ha** *me* _ diskenn *da* gerc’hat anezho.

and me go.down to look.for P.them

‘And I went down in order to look for them.’ Bijer (2007:399)

I propose that in narrative matrix infinitives, a temporal element like a deictic (52), an adverb (53) or *ha(g)* (‘and’ with a consecutive reading) licenses null Tense, which in turn provides Case to the subject. As pointed out by Rezac (2009, 2011:266), narrative matrix infinitives allow for postverbal subjects (55), which shows that subject movement is not Case related.

(55) **Ha** mont *Yann* diouzhtu *ha*...

and go Yann immediately and *Leon, Troude and Milin* (1870),

‘Yann went immediately and...’ cited in Rezac (2011:267)

Further research obviously needs to be done on these structures to accurately predict their alternations, but their existence does not impact the *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis because TP structures are not Case-Filtered.

4.2. Concessives

Concessive clauses are introduced by the semantically contentful prepositions *da*, *evit* and *daoust da* in the sense of ‘despite’. I propose the structure in (56), adapted from

Rezac (2011:266), for Breton concessives with *daoust da*. I follow Tallerman (1997) in postulating that selection of the higher and obligatory *da* by the complementizer *daoust* follows from the latter lacking an inflectional paradigm altogether. The lower, semantically empty *da* is optional, as illustrated in (57), (58) (see also Beyer 2009:5; Bijer 2003:11; Le Gléau 2000:§220 for similar examples in Kerne corpus).⁸

(56) C° + *da* + _ (+ *da*) + infinitival VP

(57) a. Serzh eo bepred [**dezhañ** **da** vezañ kozh]

fit is still despite.him P be old

b. Serzh eo bepred [**dezhañ** _ bezañ kozh]

fit is still despite.him be old Treger, Stephens (p.c)

‘He is still fit although he is old.’ cited in Tallerman (1997:227)

(58) a. **Daoust da Yann** (**da** v)/bezañ kozh, ez eo gren-brav c’hoazh.

despite P Yann (P) be old prt is beautiful still Standard,

‘He is still beautiful for being old.’ Kervella (1995:§278)

b. **Daoust dezhañ** (**da** v)/bezañ klañv

despite P.him P be sick

‘In spite of his being ill...’ Treger, Tallerman (1997: 231)

The preposition *evit*, that we saw can introduce purpose clauses, can also introduce concessive clauses (59). When the subject of the infinitive raises as internal argument of *evit*, *da* can optionally introduce the infinitive (60).

(59) **Evit** _ [PRO_i bezañ mezv hiziv], ne vezan_i ket bemdez.

for be drunk today NEG am not everyday Kerne (Plougastel),

‘Despite being drunk today, I am usually sober.’ Jacq (1977:82)

⁸ Leclerc (1986:209) specifically presents this structure as necessitating *da*, but the context ensures that his note concerns the higher *da*, not the lower one.

(60) a. **Evitañ** **da** [gaout mat...]

for.him P find good

‘despite his taste for ...’ *Standard* (Dirinon), Kervella (1995:§278)

b. **Evit** *an den-se* _ [bezañ kreñv]

for the guy-here be strong

‘despite the guy to be strong...’ *Standard*, An Here (2001:§’evit’)

Leclerc (1986:162, 209) signals a dialectal contrast between the Leon dialect (and standard) and the Treger dialect: in the latter, the concessive construction in *evit* is restricted to pronominal subjects. Lexical subjects in the Treger dialect are to be used with the *daoust da* construction.

(61) **Evidon/ *** ma mab **da** vean klanv

for.me / my son P be sick

‘despite the fact I’m sick...’ *Treger*, Leclerc (1986:209-219)

The subject of the infinitive, be it a pronoun or a full DP, can appear *in-situ* in the infinitive clause, as in (62)a, or incorporated into the second preposition, as in (62)b.

(62) a. **Evit d’** *ar vanell* bezañ dizarempred

for P the alley be desert *Standard*, Drezen (1972:106),

‘despite the alley to be desert’ cited in Le Gléau (2000:§241)

b. **Evit** **dezhañ** _ kaout mat...

for P.him find good *Standard* (Dirinon),

‘despite his taste for ...’ Kervella (1995:§278)

Like matrix narratives with null tense, concessives in *daoust da* also allow for postverbal subjects in intransitive infinitives (Rezac 2011:266), suggesting presence of an independent a Case-assignment strategy for the subject.

(63) **Daoust da** (*loened cheptel da*) greskiñ (*loened cheptel*) er vro-mañ
 despite to animal cattle P grow animal cattle in.the land-this
 ‘Despite the raising of cattle in this land.’ [D.L.], *Quimperlé Breton*

(64) Mont a rin da vale **evit** _ [bezañ fall *an amzer*].
 go prt will.do P walk for be bad the weather *Standard*
 ‘I will go for a walk despite of the bad weather.’ An Here (2001:§’evit’)

5. Conclusion

The *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis in Breton is accurate to account for (i) ECM paradigms (ECM verbs like *gortoz*, ‘wait’, and ECM causative structures), (ii) PRO infinitives and (iii) alternation paradigms. The hypothesis has been shown to make accurate predictions in the empirical domain of causatives, privatives with *hep*, ‘without’, and purpose clauses with both *da*, ‘to’ and *evit*, ‘for’.

Two paradigms pose a real challenge for the hypothesis : that of real *da* optionality in (i) narrative infinitives with *ha(g)* and (ii) concessives with *da*, *daoust da* and *evit*. However, availability of postverbal realized subjects in both cases suggest that these infinitives are structurally different from the regular Case-filtered infinitives, and has to provide a richer structure (temporal encoding in narrative « infinitives », speaker’s point of view toward acceptability of the previous sentence). If so, these untensed structures are not Case-filtered, accurately predicting bare uses. Note that narrative matrix infinitives and concessive readings are not incompatible.

(65) Labourat a ra c’hoazh, **ha** hi kozh.
 work R does still and she old
 ‘She is still working, although she is old.’ *Standard*, Kervella (1995: §813)

Obviously more research has to be done to understand the exact nature of the truly optional *da* marker in both narratives and concessives. The present article shows these

are not Case related. The *Case Filtered Infinitives* hypothesis resolves a typological contrast with English. On the surface these languages look dissimilar: in contrary to Breton, promotion of the argument of an infinitive under ECM structures in English does not trigger preposition/particle insertion as in (66)a.

(66) a. I made Lionel (*to) write a letter.

b. Lionel has been made *(to) write a letter

At a deeper level however, this makes Breton similar to English, where infinitives in perception and causative structures are Case-filtered, whereas other infinitive structures are not. Following Hornstein, Martins and Nunes (2008), ungrammaticality of *to* in active mood in English (66)a follows from the maximization principle by which the defectiveness of features of the infinitive allows the causative verb to probe and distribute Case twice. The passive verbal form in (66)b has a complete set of features that can intervene for Agree and triggers last-resort inherent Case marker *to*. The proper parameter between English in Breton here is that Breton infinitive clauses come with a complete set of interpretable ϕ -features and are full interveners for Agree (Jouitteau and Rezac 2006, 2008, 2009).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Milan Rezac for useful discussions and insightful comments, and two anonymous reviewers that helped clarify the paper.

References

- ARBRES, *Breton grammar on-line*. <http://arbres.iker.univ-pau.fr/index.php/Accueil>
- Borsley, R. & Roberts, Ian eds. (1996) *The Syntax of the Celtic Languages: A Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) 'Minimalist inquiries: The framework' In *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds.), 89-155. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.

- Hemon, R. (2000) *Yezhadur istorel ar Brezhoneg/Grammaire historique du breton*, Hor Yezh. [ed. 1958 - 1978, Preder, La Baule].
- Hornstein, N., Martins A.M. and J. Nunes. (2008) 'Perception and causative structures in English and European Portuguese: Φ -feature Agreement and the Distribution of Bare and Prepositional Infinitives', *Syntax* 11:2, 198-222.
- Hendrick, R. (1988) *Anaphora in Celtic and Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jouitteau, M. (2005/2010) *La syntaxe comparée du Breton*, éditions universitaires européennes.
- Jouitteau, M. (2005b) 'Nominal Properties of vPs in Breton, A hypothesis for the typology of VSO languages', *Verb First: On the Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*, Carnie, Andrew, Heidi Harley and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), xiv, 434 pp. (pp. 265–280) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jouitteau, M. & Rezac, M. (2009) 'De mihi est à 'avoir'' à travers les dialectes du breton', In *La Bretagne Linguistique* 14, CRBC.
- Jouitteau, M. & Rezac, M. (2008) 'From mihi est to have across Breton dialects', In Paola Benincà, Federico Damonte and Nicoletta Penello (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Unipress, Padova, special issue of the *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, vol. 32., 161 - 178.
- Jouitteau, M. & Rezac, M. (2006) Jouitteau, M. and M. Rezac 2006. 'Deriving Complementarity Effects', R. Borsley, I. Roberts, L. Sadler & D. Willis (eds.), *Lingua* 116, special issue on Celtic Languages, 1915-1945.
- Kervella, F. (1995) *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*, La Baule ; 1995 édition Al Liamm.
- Kervella, F. (1993) *Skridoù Frañsez Kervella*, dastumet ha kinniget gant Per Denez, Al Liamm.
- Leclerc, L. (1986) *Grammaire Bretonne du dialecte de Tréguier*, 3ième édition. Arskol Vrezhoneg, Emgleo Breiz.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. (1982) 'Syncategorematicity and English infinitival to', *Glossa* 16, 181-215.
- Rezac, M. (2011) 'Building and interpreting a nonthematic A-position: A-resumption in English and Breton', Alain Rouveret (ed.), *Resumptive pronouns at the interfaces*, Language faculty and beyond, Benjamins. 241-286.
- Rezac, M. (2009) pre-edition version of 'The Breton double subject construction', forthcoming in *Mélanges en hommage à Jean-Pierre Angoujard*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

- Stephens, J. (1990) 'Non-finite Clauses in Breton', In *Celtic Linguistics: Readings in the Brythonic Languages*, Ball, Fife, Poppe, Rowland, Celtic Linguistics: Readings in the Brythonic Languages Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 68, Benjamins, 151-166.
- Stump, G. T. (1989) 'Further remarks on Breton agreement: A reply to Borsley and Stephens', In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 7:429-71.
- Tallerman, M. (1997) 'Infinitival clauses in Breton', In *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, Special issue: Topics in Celtic Syntax, 205-233.
- Trépos, P. (2001) *Grammaire bretonne*, Brud Nevez, Brest.
- Urien, J.Y. (1987-9) *La trame d'une langue, Le breton*. Présentation d'une théorie de la syntaxe et application, Lesneven: Mouladurioù Hor Yezh. (first edition 1987).
- == Corpus ==**
- An Here ed. (2001) *Geriadur Brezhoneg*, Embannadurioù An Here.
- Barzhig (ar), E. (1976) *Ti Vatriona*, traduction de Soljenitsyn, Al Liamm.
- Berthou, E. (1985) *En bro Dreger a-dreuz parkoù*, Mouladurioù Hor Yezh.
- Beyer, M. (2009) *Teñvalijenn*, Mich Beyer & An Alac'h ambannadurioù.
- Bijer, Y. (2007) *Avel Gornôg*, Al Liamm.
- G. Dottin, ed. (1911) *Louis Eunius ou le Purgatoire de Saint Patrice*, [EN], Paris.
- Drezen, Y. (1990) *Sizhun ar Breur Arturo*, Al Liamm.
- Drezen, Y. (1972) *Skol-Louarn Veig Trebern*, tome I, Al Liamm.
- Fave, V. (1998) *Notennou yezadur*, Emgleo Breiz.
- Fleuriot, L. (2001) 'Skouerioù emdroadurioù e morfologiezh hag ereadur ar brezhoneg.', *Hor Yezh* 228, 14-34.
- Inizan, L. (1902) *Emgann Kergidu*, Brest- Quimper. [cited from edition 1977, Brest, Al Liamm].
- Jacq, G. (1977) *Pinvidigezh ar paour*, Al Liamm.
- Keit vimp Beo ed. (1983) *Hag ar menez a gano evidoc'h*, Jonathan 2, translation Cosey.
- Le Gléau, R. (2000) *Etudes syntaxiques bretonnes; les subordonnées énonciatives circonstanciées (suite) et les relatives*, vol 4., René Le Gléau (ed.) : Brest.
- Le Gonidec, J-F. (1821) *Dictionnaire celto-breton ou breton-français*, Angoulême: Trémenau.

- Gow (ar), Y. (1999) *Diwar dorgenn Karreg-an-Tan*, Mouladurioù Hor Yezh.
- Gros, J. (1970) *Le trésor du breton parlé I. Le langage figuré*, Emgleo Breiz, Brud Nevez.
- Meliner (ar), L. (2009) *Ar Bont ar Velin, / Sur le pont du Moulin*, Anagrammes édition.
- Menard, M. (1995). *Alc'hwez Bras ar Baradoz Vihan*, Geriahudur ar brezhoneg, An Here.
- Perrot, Y-V. (1912) *Bue ar Zent*, E. ar Moal (ed.), Montroulez
- Riou, J. (1944) *An ti Satanazet*, La Baule, Skridoù Breizh.
- Seite, V. (1988) *O pourmen dre Vreiz-Izel*, Levrenn genta. Emgleo Breiz.