From *mihi est* to 'have' across Breton dialects[*]

Jouitteau, M. and M.Rezac

Abstract: We address the syntax and parametric variation underlying the verb 'have' from the empirical domain of Breton diachronic and dialectal variation. We introduce the Celtic agreement system characterized by Complementarity Effects and show why Breton 'have' is special among the Celtic language and at the same time unique among Breton verbs. We propose syntactic tests for decomposing the structure of 'have'. With these tools in hand, we show that 'have' across Breton dialects appears to trace an ordered path in UG parameter space from a strictly analytic *mihi est* to a fully lexicalized 'have'. We develop the predictions our proposal makes internally to each dialect, and list predictions to be checked in future data collection.

1 From *mihi est* to *I have*

The verb 'have' has unique properties in the grammatical system of Breton. All other verbs are subject to the *Complementarity Effect* on agreement:

(1) *Complementarity Effect*: Agreement morphology is restricted to cross-referencing *pro*-dropped subjects of transitives and intransitives, whereas in the context of phonologically overt subjects the 3SG form of the verb shows up (Jouitteau & Rezac 2006 and references there).

(2) a. …e   oar/*ouzont/*ouz   ar merc'hed. b. …e   ouzont.
         that   know.3SG/3PL/know   the girls   that   know.3PL
         '… that the girls know.'   '… that they know.'

Jouitteau and Rezac (2006), henceforth J&R, propose that the effect is due to the intervention of a 3SG element between the phi-probe of T and the overt subject in the (extended) *v*P. The element intercepts the probe by relativized minimality and controls the phi-Agree of T to give verbs their 3SG form (3a). *Pro*-dropped arguments which cliticize / incorporate into T bypass the intervener and the agreement morphology of the verb, shown in Table 1a, spells out phi-Agree and/or *pro* itself (3b).

1

(3) a. $T_{u\text{phi}=3\text{SG}}$ … $^{3\text{SG}}$ $[_{vP}$ … subject …]   (overt subject)

b. $T_{u\text{phi}=i} + pro_i$ … $^{3\text{SG}}$ $[_{vP}$ … t_{pro} …]   (null subject)

J&R take the 3SG intervener to be specifically the boundary of the extended vP, transitive and intransitive alike, which has nominal properties in Breton. This extended verbal structure could be identified as a small clause. J&R show that overt subject Case licensing occurs low within it. The Case licensing of the direct objects of transitives occurs still lower in the vP. Case appears overtly only on postverbal weak pronouns. In Table 1b, objects appear as verbal proclitics, and subjects as *pro*-drop agreement on the verb, for example (we return to other variants).

Table 1: Agreement in Breton

X	a: X *knows*	b: *breaks* X	c: X *has*	d: X *has* (variant)
1SG	gouz-on	*a* m dorr	*a* m e(u)s	Meus
2SG	gouz-out	*a* z torr (ha torr)	*a* c'h eus (ha (t)es)	p/f/teus
3SGM	oar	en dorr	en de(u)s	Neus
3SGF		he dorr	he de(u)s	Deus
1PL	gouz-omp	hon dorr	hon e(u)s	m/neu(so)mp
2PL	gouz-oc'h	ho torr	hoc'h eus	peus/t/c'h, neusoc'h
3PL	gouz-ont	o dorr	o deus	neu(so)nt

The verb 'have' in Table 1c is a morphological anomaly in Breton. Its agreement is a prefix, not a suffix, and it recalls strongly the direct object proclitics of transitive verbs (1b) although not synchronically identifiable with them (1d). This prefix is tacked onto a root whose initial segment varies, recalling again the variation of the initial segment of the root *torr-/dorr* in function of the object proclitics, followed by *eus*. *Eus* is independently the existential form corresponding to French *il y a* "there is" but lit. "there has" and English "there is". The rest of the paradigm, not given here, makes it clear that 'have' is mostly built by prefixes on the same root on which *be* is built by suffixes, e.g. *am bez* 'I have (habitually), *bez-an* 'I am (habitually)'. Moreover, 'have' simply recruits the participle *bet* and mostly

the infinitive *bout/bezañ* of *be* for its own participle and infinitive[1]. That at least is the situation in the more conservative varieties. As Table 1d shows, innovation in others has gone a long way towards regularizing the morphology to suffixal exponence.

More importantly still for us, the verb 'have' is also anomalous syntactically: it is the sole verb in Breton that does not obey the Complementarity Effect, agreeing with an overt subject, (4)a. J&R present an account where 'have' is built on an applicative structure that introduces the possessor above the 3SG intervener for agreement with other subjects. The point of departure is the hypothesis that the structure underlying the verb is the copula *be* and a prepositional element (Benveniste 1960, Freeze 1992, Kayne 1993, Guéron 1986, 1995, Harley 2002). On this view, there is an intimate connection between *be* in (4)b, with a small clause complement relating the possessor and the theme similar to a theme and a location, and 'have' in (4)a.

(4) a. Daou   varc'h-houarn   **o deus**   ar merc'hed, …
        two   horses-iron   have.3PL   the girls
        'The girls have (own) two bicycles,

    b. … met hemañ   **'zo gante**   bremañ   **'zo din**.
           but   this.one   is   with.them   now   is   to me
        but the one that they have (lit. is with them) now is mine.'

The *analytic* copular constructions (4)b are attributed the structure (5)a, and they are the only possibility in the other Celtic languages for expressing possession. Breton too uses them for accompaniment and possession or attribution in (4)b. For possession however, Breton may also use the *synthetic* verb 'have' (4)a. According to the proposals cited, this is another way of distributing the same basic elements, suggested internally to Breton by the use of the root of *be* in 'have' noted above. The typical execution relates analytic 'be' to synthetic 'have' through movement, deriving (5)b from (5)a, corresponding to the derivational theory of applicative

---

[1] The infinitive of 'have' can in some varieties also be *kaout*, coopted from *kavout* 'find', but with a restricted syntactic distribution: it cannot be used for the perfect auxiliary *have*, where the infinitive of *be* always steps in. Like the verb 'be', 'have' can also not be targeted by 'long head movement'.

constructions where double object (6)b originates as prepositional (6)a (Baker 1988).

(5) a.　　$[_{VP}$ be $[_{SC}$ possessor theme$]]$
　　b.　　$[_{TP}$ possessor$_k$ (…) $[_{vP}$ be+P$_i$ $[t_k$ t_i theme$]]]$
　　c.　　$[_{PP}$ possessor $[P/Appl+be_i$ $[_{vP}$ t_i theme$]]]$

(6) a.　　she $[\sqrt{\text{gave}}$ [apples $[P/Appl$ John$]]]$　=　She gave apples to John
　　b.　　she $[$John $[P/Appl$ $[\sqrt{\text{gave}}$ apples$]]]$　=　She gave+P John apples

J&R propose rather to base-generate the elements of the analytic construction in a different configuration to give the synthetic one, (5)c. Doing so takes cue from the current nonderivational theory of applicative structures, which relates prepositional (6)a and double object (6)b by base-generating the same elements in different configurations, rather than by movement (Pylkkänen 2002). Starting with the applicative (5)c permits base-generating the possessor outside the extended vP with its 3SG intervener, explaining why it is the sole argument immune to the Complementarity Effect, insofar as 'have' is the sole verb with this structure. However, we may leave it open whether (5)c can first derive from (5)a, along the lines of Ormazabal and Romero (1998); it is only important that prior to T phi-Agree the structure (5)c obtains. J&R suppose that the same structure is also a possibility for the auxiliary 'have', replacing possessor by agent and the complement of *be* by the past participle phrase; this converges with the same parallelism proposed in Mahajan (1997), Kayne (1993), Guéron (1986).[2,3]

---

[2] We note that Guéron (1986: 166f.) proposes essentially the same two structures, one for possesor *have* with *have*+P selecting the thematic possessor in [Spec, IP], one for relational *have* where *be*+P select a small clause to the nonthematic subject of which P assigns a possessor reading. While we can connect Breton *have* to her proposal about theta-roles, we cannot do so for another hallmark of the relational construction for her, indefiniteness of the object. Among the uses of English *have*, Breton has only the possession and recipient ('get') reading, and the perfect auxiliary function; unavailable are the locational reading and as in French the experiencer and causative readings. However, the definiteness restriction seems to be about the same as in French or English, *The town has the resource / the fame #(to do this)*, with the attributive *X is to Y* construction used for definites when infelicitous here.

[3] A reviewer asks if our hypothesis predicts that all ditransitive verbs like 'give' should pattern with 'have', due to the presence of an Applicative structure. This is not the case. We predict that only ditransitive verbs *whose applicative structure is higher than the extended vP*

4

In this paper, we turn to the variation of 'have' across Breton dialects, which goes far beyond the morphological regularization note in J&R and indicated in Table 1d. The variation instantiates key points in the development from the analytic construction of the other Celtic languages to a fully transitive 'have' where full assimilation to regular transitive verbs has taken place, tracing an evolutionary path in UG parameter space. We follow this route, noting that it maps reasonably onto a procession among Breton dialects from the conservative peripheral regions to the innovative centre. The starting point is a surprisingly conservative variety where 'have' is essentially an intransitive applicative, the ending point a full transitive, and the syntactic stage proposed in J&R in between.

(7) Evolution of Breton 'have'
a. Analytic prepositional 'be': theme nominative subject + PP possessor
b. Synthetic applicative 'be': oblique applicative possessor as subject + nonagreeeing nominative theme as object (Gwenedeg).
c. Unique transitive: nonoblique possessor subject above *be-v*P, unique in visibility to phi-Agree + regular transitive object. (KLT / Central)
d. Regular transitive: possessor becomes agent in [Spec, *v*P]. (Marginal)

2   Gwenedeg: Applicative intransitive

The origin of the Breton synthetic 'have' is in an applicative construction regularly and literally expressing *X is to Y*, where the theme *X* is the subject of the intransitive copula *be* and the possessor *Y* is the indirect object. As a pronoun, the indirect object could be coded as an infix enclitic on an obligatory preverbal particle, glossed R. In (8), we see this with the indirect object of *give*, and in (9), that of *be*. Here the theme clearly behaves as the intransitive subject in controlling the agreement morphology of *be*.

(8) y   gwr a-m roddes i gwin
     the man R-me gave   the wine
       (*Middle Welsh,* Evans 1964: 57, Fleuriot 2002: 23, *Book of Taliesin* 40)
(9) Gueisson   a-m   bu-yint.
     servants   R-1SG   be-3PL.IMPF.HAB

should.

5

Servants were to me = 'I had servants.'

(*Middle Welsh*, *Black Book of Carmarthen* 96.2)

In Breton a reanalysis of this regular *be* + indirect object changed its structure to 'have'. In the first step, the theme ceased to be treated as the subject of the verb for agreement, and *be* froze in the 3SG form. It is tempting to link this to the Complementarity Effect, whereby phonologically overt subjects do not agree, for it was fully in vigor by Middle Breton when synthetic 'have' appears and the agreement seen in Middle Welsh (9) would be impossible.[4] As the theme lost its subjecthood for agreement, the possessor gained it, by coming to double the indirect object clitic. Thus (10) has two parses, as *be* with a theme subject, with no agreement because of the Complementarity Effect, or 'have' with a possessor theme. In (11), the latter structure is favored, because the possessor controls a covariant verbal morphology or agreement, a typological typical correlate of subjecthood. (11) extends doubling to a configuration where it was not available to indirect objects, of the independent pronoun in the preverbal focus position, creating a new possessor subject.

(10) Chwiriodd a-m   bu   hefyd   (*Middle Welsh*)
      C'hoarezed a-m   boe   ivez   (*Modern Breton*)
      sisters   R-1SG   be(PT).3SG   also
      Sisters were to me / I had sisters.   (Fleuriot 2002: 24)

(11) Me   a-m   boe   c'hoarezed
      I   R-1SG   had   sisters

The switch in agreement controllers from theme to possessor was a watershed in the transition from 'be' to 'have' (cf. Even 1987:125). From the earliest robust attestations of synthetic 'have' in Middle Breton, the case morphology and word order make it clear that the possessor is the subject and the theme is not. However, 'have' now comes with a unique agreement

---

[4] Notably the Complementarity Effect comes into force much later in Irish, and it is often violated with postverbal subjects in Middle Welsh and systematically with nonclefted preverbal subjects in the 'abnormal sentence' seen in (9) (Willis 1998, *vs.* clefted 'mixed sentence'). These languages did not develop syntetic *have* although they have the antecedent analytic structure.

6

pattern in the language: an overt subject that agrees, and an agreement / *pro*-drop morphology that is prefixal rather than suffixal.

The Gwenedeg dialect shows what appears to us to be pretty much this system (11), and establishing this point permits us to present diagnostics of the intransitive applicative structure. The possessor is the subject, albeit with the unique property of not obeying the Complementarity Effect. As a lexical noun or focused pronoun, it has direct case rather than the prepositional shell of indirect objects; as a weak pronoun, it is coded by the prefixal agreement of 'have' which has become distinct from particle + object proclitic, while in the meanwhile indirect objects have lost the ability to be coded by proclitics entirely; and it occurs in the structural position of the subject, preceding the theme. The theme, however, has not adopted the manner of transitive objects at all. Direct objects in Gwenedeg are coded by proclitics (O) on the finite verb, the *er* of (12)a. In contrast, the objects of 'have' are marked by a distinct series, the *absolute* enclitics (A) like *ean* of (12)b, and moreover they are restricted to 3rd person. The absolute pronouns had historically the same distribution as DPs, but by Middle Breton came to be used (i) in the preverbal focus position for focalized subject or object, (ii) in the postverbal position only for subjects, (iii) as a partly distinct *echoic* pronominal series to double clitics and *pro*-drop agreement (Hemon 2000; for echoics, Stump 1989).[5] The object of 'have' is the unique non-subject that uses the independent absolute pronouns rather than the clitic/agreement-dependent echoics in the postverbal field. In this, it looks on the surface like a subject, which it continues historically. Unlike all other absolute and echoic pronouns however, it is restricted to third person. So the theme of 'have' presents two mysteries: a subject-like morphological marking not found elsewhere for objects, and its restriction to 3rd person.

(12) a. M' er/hur guel   b. M' em es   ean / *te
          I   him/us(O) see.3SG   I   have.1SG him(A)/you(A)

---

[5] An example of a postverbal non-echoic, absolute subject is (16)a; *evit bout <u>me</u> koh* 'despite being <u>me</u> old' is another. Postverbal absolutes have some other uses, mostly subject-like (*setu huy* 'there you are'), except for objects of imperatives. Objects of imperatives fit the same story as for objects of *have* below, as discussed in Rezac (2004) for both Breton and Finnish, but we note that they are unexpectedly not always constrained to 3rd person (in Gwenedeg). Independently of this constraint, Central Breton (Humphreys 1995) and Low-Gwenedeg (Cheveau 2007) use a still further pronominal series for objects of imperatives.

7

This behavior of the objects of 'have' is brought into relation with the distribution of and restrictions on "nominative objects" in Finnish in Rezac (2004: 305-17). Finnish expresses 'have' by the *be* construction in (13), with an oblique (allative) possessor as the structural subject and the theme as the object (Kiparsky 2001). The theme is nominative if and only if it is 3rd person, and accusative like regular transitive objects otherwise. This person-based nominative-accusative alternation is general in Finnish for a certain class of structures. They fit the cross-linguistic *Person Case Constraint*, by which Case assignment and phi-agreement are out across an oblique intervener, (14) (Anagnostopoulou 2003). In Finnish the constraint restricts Case-licensing of the theme by T to 3rd person if there is a c-commanding oblique subject, which in (13) is the possessor. So (14) is instantiated as (15). Finnish has an alternative way of Case-marking the theme if it is 1st/2nd person, by the accusative lower down in the structure; other languages that show the same restriction may not, like Icelandic (Rezac 2007).

Finnish

(13)   Hänella   on kirja / se / *sinä   //   *kirjan / *sen / sinut
        him.ALL   is   book/ it /*you.NOM   //   *book / *it /√you.ACC
        'He has the book / it / you'.

(14)   AGR/Case … (*oblique) … XP   [*Person Case Constraint*]

(15)   possessor-oblique$_i$ T-AGR/Case$_{NOM}$ … t_i … theme=3   *Finnish*

The Gwenedeg 'have' is strikingly reminiscent of Finnish. The historical origins of 'have' are basically (13)/(15), and here and only here in the language do we find a non-subject postverbal absolute pronoun, and an absolute pronoun restricted to 3rd person. We take this to diagnose the constraint (14) and attribute to Gwenedeg the structure (15). The possessor is a Quirky subject that receives inherent direct Case. The Case of T thus can go to the theme. Restriction to 3rd person results from the possessor that intervenes between T and the pronoun that receives direct Case.[6]

---

[6] Weak subject pronouns are generally required to incorporate into T/V to trigger *pro*-drop agreement. The object of *have* does not have this option, along with the other postverbal absolutes of note 5. This is unsurprising, although it needs more work. First, there is already

Our approach thus stands on the property of the origin of the possessor as an indirect object to treat it as the oblique intervener in the structure (15). This is a theoretical prediction of our account for a grammar with "nominative" objects restricted to 3rd person, since a nonoblique element would absorb the Case licensing capacity of T and leave the object with only the Case of *v*, like transitive objects. Within Gwenedeg itself, the behavior of the possessor is consistent with its being oblique, unlike in the later stages of the development of 'have'. The verb 'have' in Breton is the signal exception to the Complementarity Effect in having an agreeing subject, but in fact in Gwenedeg this is not quite so: the possessor only controls prefixal morphology on the verb if 1st/2nd person. A 3rd person DP co-occurs with the 3SGM prefix instead of the proper 3SGF or 3PL prefix, which shows up only under *pro*-drop, (16). Gwenedeg varieties differ in treating independent 3rd person pronouns as 1st/2nd person or as 3rd person lexical DPs.

(16)   a.   ar peh en des   ind / er sent   groeit
                  what   have.3SG   they / the saints done

                                                   (Larboulette, *Buhe er sent*)

        b.   m' am-eus   me glinet
              I   have.1SG I   slipped
              'I have slipped.'   (Herrieu, *Kammdro an Ankoù*)

Person and pronominality based restrictions are familiar characteristics of *clitic doubling*, not of the phi-Agree underlying phi-agreement in English and French. Clitic doubling may be unselective, but it frequently picks targets high on the scale of personhood and pronominality (Poletto 2000)[7]. Clitic doubling differs from phi-Agree in another way: it can occur with arguments with or without structural Case, while phi-Agree is restricted to the latter (Rezac 2008). We conclude that the morphological covariance of 'have' with an overt possessor in Gwenedeg is not due to phi-Agree but to clitic doubling, making it possible for the possessor to be analysed as an

---

agreement with the possessor of *have*, below analysed as clitic doubling, arguably pre-empting the *pro*-drop agreement of the theme. Second, it is cross-linguistically common for 3rd person intransitive subjects to control agreement if postverbal rather than preverbal, as is indeed the case in Finnish independently of oblique-subjects (Kiparsky 2001).

[7] There is no variation in this matter according to the lexical or auxiliary status of *have*, and the preverbal or postverbal position of the subject.

oblique. The clitic that doubles the subject is 3SG and incorporates into the verbal complex. Being an oblique, it is invisible for Agree.

Historically, clitic doubling may represent a very early stage in the transition of 'have' to a possessor subject: a point where agreement of *be* with the theme has been lost, but its agreement with the possessor is relatively close to what is available to proclitics. This step may well have been aided because the proclitic in all uses (direct and indirect object, oblique subject of *be*) could be doubled by a following 'echoic' pronoun: *a-m boe me* (Fleuriot 2002: 19(2), 23(3)). Such postverbal "echoic" pronouns, non-argumental but of the same form as absolute pronouns, could have helped the rise of possessor-'have' agreement (16b).[8] In Gwenedeg we seem to glimpse the first step of possessor agreement by clitic doubling of an absolute pronoun[9].

Clitic doubling for 'have' agreement is suggested by another phenomenon unique to Gwenedeg in Breton: agreeing infinitives. If the agreement of 'have' arises from the clitic doubling of oblique arguments, it has nothing to do with phi-Agree and is not expected to be restricted to the canonical domain of phi-Agree, finite structures.[10] We briefly note three points about Gwenedeg agreeing infinitives here. First, they are obligatory in some varieties, in alternation with a nonagreeing infinitive in others, and absent in some other (Gwenedeg izel). Second, they occur in all contexts where other Breton dialects use an infinitive, including full CP control complements, reduced complements of modals, and even the X° infinitives fronted by long head movement in the *ober* conjugation (q.v. Borsley et al. 1996, Jouitteau 2005). Third, they co-occur with absolute objects. We get:

(17)   a.   Me / hi garehe   am bout / hi devout   bara/ean.

---

[8] Echoic doubling is sometimes restricted to 1st/2nd person, Trépos (2001), Kervella (1995).

[9] We find a pronoun doubled by a clitic in two contexts: (i) clitic doubling of a preverbal independent pronoun by the oblique proclitic of 'be', and (ii) doubling of such proclitics by a following 'echoic'. The two cases could have a common origin in the doubling of independent absolute pronouns in preverbal and postverbal position alike by the proclitics. In Modern Breton however, they are to be distinguished: the preverbal pronouns have yielded the absolute series that are generally preverbal (minor examples mentioned in note 5) and only ever doubled by the prefix (< proclitic) of 'have', while the postverbal pronouns have become the echoics that double a variety of preceding agreement morphemes (including the proclitics).

[10] Crosslinguistically, there do exist agreeing infinitives (Portuguese), but they are rare.

10

I / she   would.like   1SG / 3SGF have.INF   bread/him
'I / she would like to have bread / him.'

   (*Gwenedeg*, based on Guillevic and Le Goff 1986)

b. Em bout   a   ran plijadur o heuli   va gwall dechoù.
1SG have.INF   R   do.I pleasure at follow my bad tendencies
'I have pleasure to follow my bad tendencies.'

(Hemon 1958: 721)

c. em bout   ean   cheleuet
1SG have.INF   him(A) listened
'(I have had great good) having listened to him.'

(*Gwenedeg*, Guillome 1836: 44)

Clitic doubling need not be subject to the above illustrated 1st/2nd person restriction[11]. Extension of clitic doubling in Gwenedeg to all possessors would set up a situation identical to what phi-Agree would produce, creating a point of transition to a system where the possessor is analysed as a nonoblique goal of phi-Agree. As a consequence, the theme loses the ability to be Case-licensed by T which must license the possessor, and can only survive by become a regular transitive object. This will be the next stage in the evolution of 'have'.

Gwenedeg provides a second point of transition towards a transitive structure: auxiliary 'have' is found beside lexical 'have' in Gwenedeg and as far back in the history of Breton as synthetic 'have' goes. Analytic tense with 'have' auxiliary provide the sole context where 'have' can code the theme either by absolute pronouns, *ean*, or by the same proclitic series as regular direct objects, *er*, (18) (cf. partly Finnish (13)), and suggests free variation in the presence of the transitive Case-licensing system above the theme: Case-licensing by T is available only to 3rd person theme, by *v* to all.

(18)   a.   Te ha tes   ean/*ni   perpet   karet.
       b.   Te ha tes   perpet   er/hur   haret.
            you have.2SG   him/us (A) always   him/us (O) loved.
            'You have always loved him/us.'

(cf. Guillevic & Le Goff 1986: 30-1)

---

[11] Dialectal variation in subject doubling is not surprising. See Poletto (2002) for the range of subject doubling variation across related dialects.

The proclitic object option is available for all lexical verbs (cf. above or 'see' in (12)a). 'Have' stands out in the paradigm once again and cannot host the proclitic. Le Roux (1957: 202) and Kervella (1995: §428(k)) attribute complementary distribution of object proclitics and the prefix agreement morphology of tensed 'have' to their common origin. We do not disagree but it leaves unexplained the lack of object proclitics in non-finite lexical 'have'. We note that historically it is the participle in auxiliary construction that licenses the direct object proclitic. The participle either does or does not distribute case to its internal argument. In Gwenedeg, 'have' is intransitive and licenses no internal argument[12].

Gwenedeg therefore has a synthetic 'have' which is still close to the original analytic *X is to Y* structure. It is an applicative construction rather than a prepositional construction, mapping the possessor above the theme. The theme is still Case-licensed by the system Case-licensing subjects rather than direct objects, although the latter system has already obtained its foothold in auxiliary 'have'. The possessor shows an agreement pattern that makes 'have' the unique agreeing verb in Breton, but for now it is a clitic doubling rather than a phi-Agree pattern and it extends to infinitives.

In the next stage, the traits of an intransitive applicative vanish and a full if unique transitive has arisen, for which we have identified two points of transition.

3   KLT: Special transitive

In other Breton dialects, the transition of 'have' to a full transitive structure incipient in Gwenedeg has been completed. The result is a verb identical in case marking and infinitive formation to any other transitive, yet distinct in the syntax of agreement by displaying no Complementarity Effect: overt subjects agree. This is the pattern of the standard language, but not an artifact of it. It seemed earlier on to be the dominant pattern across the three non-Gwenedeg dialects which form a unit beside it for other isoglosses: Kerneveg, Leoneg, and Tregerieg (or KLT). In the central area at the Kerne-

---

[12] Proclitics of tensed verbs and proclitics of non-tensed verbs were morphologically distinct in earlier Breton, where the proclitics of the participle and infinitive belong to the distinct possessive series (Hemon 2000: §53(3)). Gwenedeg no longer keeps this distinction (Guillevic and Le Goff 1986: 154).

Treger boundary a new system has arisen and expanded across much of Kerne and Treger, relegating the older pattern to the periphery. We call the latter the KLT pattern, beside the newer Central pattern.[13]

When we left Gwenedeg, neither the possessor nor the theme of *be* behaved like the arguments of a transitive. In KLT, the theme has become a plain transitive object, (19). KLT dialects do not code weak pronoun objects as proclitics like Gwenedeg does. The older system survives in parts of Leon, beside a new system that replaces them elsewhere. The new *a*-forms consist of a preposition *a-* 'from', on which the pronoun incorporates. Contrary to the proclitics, the *a*-forms have no restrictions. The absolute and echoic pronoun series exist but are not used for objects of 'have'.

(19)　a.　Me oar　　anezho　　b.　Me am eus　　(gouezet) anezho
　　　　　I　know　　them(O)　　　　I　1SG-have　known　　them(O)

The treatment of the possessor also differs from Gwenedeg. All possessors, overt or null, control the same prefix agreement morphology, (20). On the surface, this makes 'have' more different from other verbs of the language than in Gwenedeg, because for the other verbs no overt subjects agree. However, in a deeper way the possessor comes closer to the plain subject of transitives: all possessors are treated alike regardless of person and type, and all control one of the typologically common traits of transitive subjects, phi-agreement, even if other subjects do not by the Complementarity Effect. Like other verbs, 'have' also has no agreeing infinitives.

(20)　　a.　A-wechoù o deus　　ar re yaouank seiz tonnel da droc'hañ.
　　　　　　　sometimes　3PL have　the ones young seven barrel to cut
　　　　　　　'Sometimes the young had 7 barrels to cut.'

<div align="right">(Leon, Blaz an douar, p. 175)</div>

　　　　　b.　Ar re-ze　　o-doa　　　komprenet pell 'oa.

---

[13] The traditional nomenclature of Breton dialects follows the old diocesal lines: Gwenedeg in the South-East (uhel 'low' in E and izel 'low' in W), Kerneveg SW (uhel inland, izel maritime), Leoneg NW, Tregerieg NE. Overlaid on it is a newer pattern where the innovative center at the Kerne-Treger boundary creates a Central continuum spreading out chiefly SW and NE, leaving Gwenedeg and Leoneg as peripheral conservative regions, beside over very distinctive though non-conservative pockets like Bigouden in Kerne.

13

these   3PL had   understood long.ago
These ones had understood long ago.

(*Kerne izel, Marvaillou* 11: 22)

It is this stage that is the focus of Jouitteau and Rezac (2006). They interpret it as a modification of the applicative structure (15) of Gwenedeg by the loss of oblique case on the possessor. It becomes a plain DP and as such participates in structural Case assignment and phi-Agree relations of T, (21). This simple change derives the dramatic differences of KLT from Gwenedeg. Loss of oblique case assimilates the possessor to transitive subjects and it gets the Case they get. However, its origin in the specifier of the applicative head P/Appl places it in a position where it avoids the intervention of the 3SG (extended) vP boundary that creates the Complementarity Effect for other subjects, which are within it. The result is a unique configuration where overt DPs control phi-Agree. The structural Case of the possessor has repercussions farther down for the theme, because the possessor absorbs the Case of T and it is not available for the theme. The latter must be Case-licensed by the same mechanism as transitive objects, so its absolute form disappears (it resorts to an *a*-form). Consistently with the idea that infinitives are not the locus for phi-Agree, in dialects where the agreement morphology of 'have' comes from phi-Agree, we find no 'agreeing' infinitives for 'have'.

(21) $T_{u\text{phi}}$ [$_{\text{ApplP/PP}}$ poss$_{i\text{phi}}$ Appl/P [$_{v\text{P}=3\text{SG}}$ be [$_{v\text{P}}$ v_{trans} … theme]]]
        --phi-Agree/Case--   -----------

There are two telling variations on the KLT pattern that fit into this proposal. The first is a regularization in agreement morphology of 'have'. Its historical origin (opaque in synchrony) as an indirect object proclitic makes it a unique proclitic subject agreement. In some KLT varieties a partial regularization to that used by other verbs occurs. In (22) for example, the 3PL future *def-i-nt* [have-FUT.3PL] replaces *o def-o* [3PL have-FUT.3SG] by taking on to the perceived stem *def-* of 'have' the regular future 3PL suffix *-i-nt*. Such regularization never seems to occur within a Gwenedeg-type system were prefixes reflect clitic doubling, not phi-Agree[14].

---

[14] J&R propose that the *pro*-drop morphology of regular verbs is reflecting phi-Agree with

these   3PL had   understood long.ago
These ones had understood long ago.

(*Kerne izel, Marvaillou* 11: 22)

It is this stage that is the focus of Jouitteau and Rezac (2006). They interpret it as a modification of the applicative structure (15) of Gwenedeg by the loss of oblique case on the possessor. It becomes a plain DP and as such participates in structural Case assignment and phi-Agree relations of T, (21). This simple change derives the dramatic differences of KLT from Gwenedeg. Loss of oblique case assimilates the possessor to transitive subjects and it gets the Case they get. However, its origin in the specifier of the applicative head P/Appl places it in a position where it avoids the intervention of the 3SG (extended) vP boundary that creates the Complementarity Effect for other subjects, which are within it. The result is a unique configuration where overt DPs control phi-Agree. The structural Case of the possessor has repercussions farther down for the theme, because the possessor absorbs the Case of T and it is not available for the theme. The latter must be Case-licensed by the same mechanism as transitive objects, so its absolute form disappears (it resorts to an *a*-form). Consistently with the idea that infinitives are not the locus for phi-Agree, in dialects where the agreement morphology of 'have' comes from phi-Agree, we find no 'agreeing' infinitives for 'have'.

(21) $T_{u\text{phi}}$ [$_{\text{ApplP/PP}}$ poss$_{i\text{phi}}$ Appl/P [$_{v\text{P}=3\text{SG}}$ be [$_{v\text{P}}$ v_{trans} … theme]]]
        --phi-Agree/Case--   -----------

There are two telling variations on the KLT pattern that fit into this proposal. The first is a regularization in agreement morphology of 'have'. Its historical origin (opaque in synchrony) as an indirect object proclitic makes it a unique proclitic subject agreement. In some KLT varieties a partial regularization to that used by other verbs occurs. In (22) for example, the 3PL future *def-i-nt* [have-FUT.3PL] replaces *o def-o* [3PL have-FUT.3SG] by taking on to the perceived stem *def-* of 'have' the regular future 3PL suffix *-i-nt*. Such regularization never seems to occur within a Gwenedeg-type system were prefixes reflect clitic doubling, not phi-Agree[14].

---

[14] J&R propose that the *pro*-drop morphology of regular verbs is reflecting phi-Agree with

14

(22)   Ma faotred def-i-nt…   [*defint* for regular *o defo*]
       my sons   have-FUT-3PL
       'My sons will have…' (*Kerne*, Ernault 1888: 265 < *Barzaz Breiz*)

The second change within much of KLT is the loss of gender distinctions in 3SG. Within Breton, pronouns but not verb agreement make the M(asc)/F(em) distinction in 3SG.[15] Supposing phi-Agree to be insensitive to gender distinctions, J&R suggest that the lack of gender in verb agreement comes from its spelling out phi-Agree with *pro* rather than *pro* itself. On 'have', the Gwenedeg systems shows gender distinctions, reflecting the nature of the prefix as an object proclitic. If in KLT, 'have' agreement with overt subjects is phi-Agree, it should neutralize gender distinctions. Many varieties do so, (23): some only for agreement with overt subjects, others for pro-dropped subjects of 'have' as well.[16] However, contrary to the proposal, it seems relatively common for a KLT system to reflect gender distinctions even with overt subjects of 'have', suggesting that phi-Agree does make gender distinctions and they do not appear on the *pro*-drop agreement of regular verbs by diachronic accident. We leave this for future research.

(23)   Marharid 'n eus laret din n'eus ket ' vara …
       Marharid 3SG.M has told to-me NEG is NEG P bread
       'Marharid told me there is no bread.'
                                                                 (*Leon, Amañ 'z eus plijadur*, p. 66)[17]

4 The Central innovation

In the "Central" dialectal area at the Kernev-Treger-Gwened border, the principal source of innovation in Breton dialects, the (arguably antecedent) KLT pattern is modified by one that at first sight looks like a mixture of

---

pro rather than the subject *pro* itself, so it is unsurprising that phi-Agree with the overt subject of 'have' undergoes phi-Agree starts using this morphology, although we will see a different road for a dialect to take in the next section.

[15] Independent and clitic pronouns, as well as the prosodically fused ones that surface as suffixes on prepositions with the behavior of strong pronouns: Jouitteau and Rezac (2006).

[16] In Le Roux (1977: map 84), the latter occurs in most of Kerne but is only rare in Leon and Treger.

[17] Jean-Pierre le Goff, Plounévez-Lochrist, *Amañ 'z eus plijadur*:66.

15

KLT and Gwenedeg properties. Mostly, it is KLT: the object is coded fully as the object of transitives (mostly with *a*-forms in this area), and there are no agreeing infinitives. As in KLT, a regularization of the agreement morphology of 'have' occurs, but generally goes considerably further than in KLT. The Gwenedeg-like characteristic is the apparent restriction of agreement with overt subjects to 1st/2nd person, as in the paradigm in Table 2.

Table 2: 'have' paradigm in Poher (Kerne uhel), Trevidig (1987)

	SUBJ 'have'	ãnoued 'a cold' 'have' + *pro* SUBJ
1SG	mé meus	ãnoued meus
2SG	té peus	ãnoued peus
3SGM,F	hẽw, hi neus	ãnoued neus
1PL	nĩ(m) meum	ãnoued meum
2PL	houi peus	ãnoued peus
3PL	i/hè **neus**	ãnoued **nẽũint**

Morphologically, we see that the old prefix paradigm has been reinterpreted to show only person distinctions (1 *m*, 2 *p*, 3 *n*), and plurality in 1st/3rd person is marked by recruiting the suffixes of the regular verb (1PL *m(p)*, 3PL *int*). However, the 3PL marking is only used for *pro*-dropped 3PL subjects; overt subjects use the 3SG form *neus*. Although this looks like Gwenedeg agreement with 1st/2nd person, the Central dialects do not show the properties of Gwenedeg that go with oblique possessors: absolute objects and agreeing infinitives.

There is another interpretation of the pattern in Table 2: phi-Agree occurs but does not affect suffix morphology. Other dialects in this area furnish evidence for it. In them, the 3PL overt/*pro* alternation *i neus* – pro *neuint* extends to 1PL as *ni beus/meus* – pro *meu(so)mp/neu(so)mp* (Favereau 1997: §424), showing that the prefix and suffix reflect distinct systems that correlate with overt and *pro*-dropped subjects respectively. We posit that the prefix reflects phi-Agree, and because it tends to make only person distinctions, 3rd person is neutralized, but 1-2-3 contrasts remain. Rarely, phi-Agree is also shown by the suffix, as in Table 2 *ni meum*. Typically however, the suffix reflects only *pro*, alone or in combination with the prefix for phi-Agree: 1PL *meu(so)mp/neu(so)mp*, 2PL *peuc'h*, 3PL *neuint*.

16

5 Plain transitive

The final stage in the evolution of Breton takes the KLT system one step further by removing the sole syntactic difference between it and regular verbs. Agreement with all overt subjects disappears, and 'have' falls under the Complementarity Effect, whereby it agrees only with *pro*-dropped subjects. All other properties of the KLT 'have' remain, which already are those of plain transitives. The system appears rarely.[18]

(24)　　ni/te/huy/ey　　　　　　(a) neus
　　　　I/you(SG)/you(PL)/he　　　R　have.3SG
　　　　'We/You have.'　or　'He has.'

　　This is the logical conclusion of the transitivization of the verb, the creation of a regular transitive. We suppose at this step to occur simply the loss of the applicative structure and thus to result a plain transitive like Czech *mít*, or Basque *eduki* 'have, hold'. Chiefly possessive, in combination with a small clause they also express the perfect (25) and so could serve as the perfect auxiliary. For Breton, this stage remains to be documented and investigated.

(25)　　Mám　tu　chybu　opravenou　　　　　　　　　　(*Czech*)
　　　　I.have　the　error　corrected
　　　　'I've got the error corrected' ≠ 'I have the error which is corrected.'

6 Conclusion and prospects

We have followed the development of the verb 'have' from an applicative intransitive to a plain transitive, tracing the path of its diachronic evolution through its incarnations across the spectrum of Modern Breton dialects.

---

[18] While the pattern is commonly cited, it seems hard verify. The loci classici give eighteenth century Treger sources where 2nd/3rd persons use the 3SGM form: Le Roux (Le Roux 1957: 186), Hemon (2000: §174). Le Roux (1977: maps 82ff.) finds (only) nearly complete regularization only at St. Fiacre (Treger). We note however that the posited evolution of 'have' has happened in the history of Breton to another, much rarer verb: *teurvezout* 'daign', which started out with the same history of the proclitic indirect object to become subject agreement and finished by full regularization before the modern period (Hemon 2000: §151).

17

Along the road, various tools have been used to probe the 'have' construction in order to ascertain its syntactic character:

(26)
a. Morphology and agreement of the theme as canonical intransitive subject, intransitive subject in object position, and regular transitive object.
b. The Person Case Constraint restriction on the theme, revealing a c-commanding oblique intervener for T-theme Case licensing.
c. Sensitivity to person and pronominality for agreement with overt subjects, indicating clitic doubling rather than phi-Agree.
d. Agreeing infinitives, indicating clitic doubling rather than phi-Agree.
e. Loss of gender distinctions, perhaps indicating phi-Agree.

There are many theoretical predictions here to be set against further data from Breton and elsewhere. The various aspects of the syntax of 'have' do not define a bi-polar opposition but a collection of combinable properties, some of which have not been met with. Gwenedeg has oblique possessors with restricted clitic doubling and absolute themes Case-licensed by T; eliminating the restriction on clitic doubling would produce a Gwenedeg system with fully "agreeing" possessors, while adding the transitive v would produce a Gwenedeg system with themes optionally and obligatorily marked as direct objects. However, other aspects of the system are fixed; absolute objects restricted to 3rd person indicate Case-licensing by T and a c-commanding intervener, rather than Case licensing by v or free Case licensing by T. Beside predictions, partial and partly contradictory syntax-morphology correlations emerge, whose status is unknown and that are to be explored in future work. Gwenedeg-type systems with clitic doubling show no tendency to regularize the prefix morphology of 'have', which might be explained if the suffix morphology of regular verbs indicates phi-Agree with *pro* rather than incorporated *pro* itself. However, in the Central area the suffix morphology seems recruited specifically to spell out *pro* and the prefix the person dimension of phi-Agree, in contrast.

Turning to diachronic development, the forms of 'have' across Breton instantiate key stages along the path of transformation from an analytic *X is to Y* to transitive *Y possesses X* construction (Le Roux 1957), along with the likely points of transition between adjacent stages. Gwenedeg proves surprisingly archaic, arguably a simple intransitive applicative, accounting

18

for most of the properties of its 'have' construction that diverge from Standard Breton: quirky subjects, absolute objects, their restriction to 3rd person, non-agreement with 3rd person overt subjects, agreeing infinitives. Yet already as in the earliest Breton sources for 'have', the verb is in use in auxiliary constructions where the object of the participle has regular transitive marking. It facilitates transition to the KLT pattern with its loss of inherent case on the possessor and a consequent unique pattern of agreement with an overt subject, revealing its syntactic origin in a high applicative above the extended *v*P barrier that envelops all other arguments. In KLT the anomalous prefixal agreement morphology tends to get fixed, and nowhere more so than in the innovative central zone whose pattern is rapidly spreading out across Breton and has relegated the classical KLT pattern to the western periphery, meeting the archaic Gwenedeg system at its South Eastern edge. At the end of the evolutionary road, in some North Eastern Treger varieties 'have' seems to be on its way to become a regular transitive with no applicativity to it anymore.

We have barely touched here on the factors facilitating the first steps of this transition and the difference between Breton (and Cornish), with stable synthetic 'have' as possession and auxiliary verb, and Old Irish and Middle Welsh which began but aborted its formation. The Complementarity Effect seems to us one answer: present from the beginning of Middle Breton and earlier, it is far more finicky in Middle Welsh for postverbal subjects and absent for preverbal ones (Willis 2005), and arises in Modern Irish by convoluted routes during the Middle Irish period (McCone 1987). As we have noted, the Complementarity Effect would have made it easy in Breton to reanalyse the theme as not a canonical subject for agreement, giving it its structural object status. Case also has a role, at least in Irish where dative distinguishes indirect objects and might have prevented their reanalysis as subjects. We leave the details for future work.

7 References

Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives*. de Gruyter: Berlin.
Benveniste, E., 1960. 'Etre et Avoir dans leurs fonctions linguistiques', In: *Bulletin de la société Linguistique de Paris*, LV, reproduced In: E. Benveniste, 1966, Problèmes de linguistique générale. Gallimard, Paris, 187-207.

Borsley, R. D., M.-L. Rivero, and J. Stephens. 1996. Long head movement in Breton. In *The syntax of the Celtic languages*, ed. R. D. Borsley and I. Roberts, 53-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheveau, L. 2007. Approche phonologique, morphologique et syntaxique du breton du Grand Lorient (bas-vannetais). Doctoral dissertation, Rennes 2.

Ernault, E. 1888. Etudes bretonnes VI. *Revue Celtique* 9: 245-266.

Evans, D. S. 1964. *A grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Even, A. 1987. *Istor ar yezhoù keltiek*, vol.I. Lesneven: Hor Yezh.

Favereau, F. 1997. *Grammaire du breton contemporain*. Morlaix.

Fleuriot, L. 2002. Ar raganvioù-gour er yezhoù predenek. *Hor Yezh* 229: 17-26.

Freeze, R. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68: 553–595.

Guéron, J. 1986. Le verbe avoir. In *Forme (Hommages à Mitsou Ronat)*, ed. Pierre Pica, Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes 14-15: 155-188.

Guéron, J. 1995. On HAVE and BE. *NELS 26,* 1: 191–206. Amherst: GLSA.

Guilliome, J. 1836. *Grammaire français-bretonne*. J.-M. Galles.

Harley, H. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. In *The linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2: 29–68.

Hemon, R. 1958. *Dafar geriadur historel ar brezhoneg*. Brest: Al Liamm.

Hemon, R. 2000. *Yezhadur istorel ar brezhoneg*. Plañvour: Hor Yezh.

Humphreys, H. L. 1995. *Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du parler breton de Bothoa*. Brest: Emglev Breizh.

Guillevic, A., Le Goff, P. 1986 [1902]. *Grammaire Bretonne du Dialecte de Vannes*. Brest: Ar Skol Vrezhoneg – Emgleo Breiz.

Jouitteau, M. 2005. La syntaxe comparée du breton. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Nantes.

Jouitteau, M., and M. Rezac. 2006. Deriving the Complementarity Effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement. *Lingua* 116: 1915-1945.

Kayne, R. 1993. Towards a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3–31.

Kervella, F. 1995. *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*. La Baule: Skridoù Breizh.

Kiparsky, P. 2001. Structural Case in Finnish. *Lingua* 111: 315-376.

Mahajan, A. K. 1997. Universal Grammar and the typology of ergative languages. In *Studies on Universal Grammar and typological variation*, ed. A. Alexiadou and T. Hall, 35-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McCone, K. 1987. *The Early Irish Verb*. Maynooth: An Sagart.

20

Pylkkänen, L. 2002. Introducing arguments. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Rezac, M. 2004. Elements of cyclic syntax: Agree and Merge. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Rezac, M. 2007. Escaping the Person Case Constraint: Referential computation in the φ-system. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 6: 97-138.

Rezac, M. 2008. Φ-Agree and θ-related Case. In *Φ theory: Φ-features across interfaces and modules*, ed. D. Harbour, D. Adger, and S. Béjar, 83-129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Le Roux, P. 1977. *Atlas Linguistique de la Basse-Bretagne*. Brud Nevez.

Le Roux, P. 1957. *Le Verbe breton.* Rennes: Librairie Plihon.

Poletto, C. 2000. *The higher functional field: Evidence from Northern Italian dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stump, G. T. 1989. Further remarks on Breton agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 429-471.

Trépos, P. 2001. *Grammaire bretonne*. Brest: Brud Nevez.

Willis, D. 2005. Historical syntax. In *The syntax of Welsh*, ed. R.D. Borsley, M. Tallerman, and D. Willis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.