



HAL
open science

The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg through Barisy's 1710 Cantiqueu Spirituel

Milan Rezac

► **To cite this version:**

Milan Rezac. The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg through Barisy's 1710 Cantiqueu Spirituel. 2021. hal-03509338

HAL Id: hal-03509338

<https://hal.science/hal-03509338>

Preprint submitted on 4 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg through Barisy's 1710
Cantiqueu Spirituel

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER
milan_rezac@yahoo.ca

[Version of Feb. 2021. This is the first stage of work in progress. Comments and
references are most welcome.]

1	DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PRONOMINAL SYSTEM OF W	3
2	BARISY'S CANTIQUEU	7
3	OTHER SOURCES	11
4	PROCLITICS IN W AND CS.BAR	14
5	MESOCLISIS LOSS AND ALIGNMENT CHANGES	16
5.1	1SG/2SG MESO-TO-PROCLITICS	16
5.2	1SG	18
5.3	2SG	21
5.4	1SG/2SG PROCLITICS IN HAVE	31
5.5	3SGM E VS. AR.....	37
6	MORPHOPHONOLOGY OF PROCLITICS IN CS.BAR	39
6.1	MUTATIONS	39
6.2	H-LINKER.....	44
6.3	H-	47
6.4	É/I 3SGM, 3SGF, A/E/É 2SG.....	48
6.5	A/E AND ELISION	50
6.6	1SG MAN	51
6.7	-R.....	52
6.8	FUSION WITH SUBJECT PRONOUNS.....	54
6.9	REFLEXIVE (EN) EM	56
7	INDEPENDENT AND ENCLITIC PRONOUNS	56
7.1	OVERVIEW	56
7.2	3 RD PERSON.....	57
7.3	FINITE SUBJECTS	60
7.4	DOUBLING	61
8	ENCLISIS-INDEPENDENCE WITH CHE- AND EME-	62
9	ENCLISIS-PROCLISIS WITH IMPERATIVES AND JUSSIVES	66
9.1	BACKGROUND.....	66
9.2	1=V!	70
9.3	NEG=3=V.PRES	70
9.4	V!=3	71
9.5	3=V!	72

9.6	RX=V!	73
9.7	NEGATIVE IMPERATIVES	74
9.8	JUSSIVE	76
10	ENCLISIS-PROCLISIS WITH HAVE	82
10.1	BACKGROUND AND RESUME	82
10.2	3 RD ENCLITIC-PROCLITIC IN 18C	83
10.3	3 RD ENCLITIC AND PROCLITIC IN CS.BAR	86
10.4	1 ST /2 ND	88
10.5	REFLEXIVE	89
11	A-FORMS	89
12	PARTICLES	91
12.1	A/EZ	91
12.2	EN PARTICLE	93
12.3	OTHER FINITE PARTICLES AND CONJUNCTIONS	100
13	AGREEMENT, NEGATION, HAVE-CONSTRUCTIONS	101
13.1	AGREEMENT AND NEGATION	101
13.2	AGREEMENT AND NEGATION WITH HAVE	103
13.3	AGREEMENT OF HAVE-INFINITIVE	104
14	APPENDICES	105
14.1	APPENDIX: TWO HYMNS FROM CS.BAR AND THEIR COUNTERPARTS	105
14.2	APPENDIX: INFLECTION OF THE PREPOSITION IN CS.BAR	109
14.3	APPENDIX: INFLECTION OF THE VERB IN CS.BAR	110
14.4	APPENDIX: COMPARANDA FOR DIALECTOLOGY	120
14.5	APPENDIX: 3 RD PERSON PRONOMINAL ARGUMENTS IN 21C INGUINIEL	122
14.6	APPENDIX: GUILLEVIC AND LE GOFF ON 1SG, 2SG	124

0. Symbols

Mutations: · none; L lenition, written for m,b-d-g → v-z-h/c'h, p-t-k(c,qu) → b-d-g, S spirantisation, written for p-t-k(c,qu) → f-z/s-c'h/h, P provection, written for b-d-g → p-t-k(c,qu); M mixed mutation or lenition + provection + variable neolenition, written for m,b-d-g → v/f-t-h/c'h; μ if unknown; Mα mutation L restricted to consonant α.

-α inserted before vowels, -μ if unknown.

N: nasal in 1SG before b-d-g, written -n before d-g, -m but early -n before b -.

R: n before vowels and n, t, d, h, variably l before l, r elsewhere.

α= pure proclitic, =α= mesoclitic, =α pure enclitic, α≠ not pro/mesoclitic.

α[†] exceptional, (α) variable, %α dialectal.

α~β vary, α%β vary dialectally.

! or IPV-JUSS imperative-jussive, H HAVE.

→ in tables indicates same as to the left.

Abbreviations:

MB Middle Breton, NB Modern breton, eNB early Modern Breton
W, K, L, T, W Gwenedeg, Kerneveg, Leoneg, Tregereg
HMSB, LVB: Hemon 1975, Le Roux 1957
Sources: section 3

1 Developments in the pronominal system of W

The present work examines the development of coding of pronominal objects and associated matters in early Gwenedeg (W) against the background of Middle Breton (MB), with a focus on one of the earliest extensive texts in the variety, Pierre Barisy's *Cantiqueu Spirituelle* of 1710 (CS.bar). Some of these developments are familiar, such as shift of 1st person objects in imperatives from proclisis in MB to enclisis in W, *me=cheleuet* to *cheleuet-mé*. Others are part of familiar descriptions but need working out in detail and consequences, such as shift from mesocclisis to simple proclisis, entailed by the recasting of MB *e=m=* 'PRT=1SG' and 'in=1SG' to W *en=em=* vs. *é=m*. Still others are less well known, such as the appearance in W of 3rd person proclitics in positive imperatives or spirantisation with 2SG *te*. CS.bar is a key early text for these developments shared with others, but also rich in others that are surprising: relative to their date in W, e.g. extension of nonagreement with prenegation nominal subjects to HAVE; or relative to W, e.g. collapse of the *a/ez* particles; or at any time and place, e.g. *en*-particle restricted to before clitics of the form (h)V but extended to after subjects and objects.

The development of pronominal clitics in W needs a sketch of the MB background. Table gives the clitic pronouns of MB, in comparison with independent forms that were mostly identical with them, and prepositional and verbal suffixes that interacted with them at certain points in development.

Table: MB personal pronouns (usual forms)¹

¹ Note to table: See in fine HMSB, Schrijver 2011a. The 3SGF mesoclitic is never unambiguously demonstrable, -amp, -ant are based on rhymes. Orthographic variants omitted, e.g. *y* for *i*, *ef*, *euff* for *ef*. The suffixes make certain analytical choices: vowels determined by prepositional or verbal stem or tense/mood rather than suffix are not included, the jussive is treated as jussive -et- + 3SG \emptyset , 3PL -nt, the future is treated as ending in *i* with allomorph *o* / C_# , and ... covers pret. 1SG -is, fut 2SG. -i- \emptyset , with no notice of irregular or rare forms like pres. 3SG *goar*, impf. 3SG *guily*, *dispartiat*.

	Indep.	Enclitic	Proclitic	Mesoclitic	P-suffix	V-suffix
1SG	me	=me	ma ^{=S} , va ^{†=S}	=m ^{=Stk}	-o(u)ff, -iff	-aff, -nn, ...
2SG	te	=te, =de	=z, Ø ^{=M}	=da ^{=L}	-o(u)t, it	-ez, -s, ...
1PL	ny	=ny	(h)on=		-omp	-o/*a [†] mp, -mp
2PL	huy	=huy, =hu	(h)o(z) ^{=P}		-o(u)ch, -e/ich	-e/it, -ch
3PL	y	=y	(h)o(z [†]) ^{=S}		-(h)e(u), -(h)o	-o/*a [†] nt, -nt
3SGF	hy	=hy	he(-h [†]) ^{=S}	*=s [†] /z [†] =	-(h)y	-Ø
3SGM	eff	=eff	ACC en=, GEN e= ^L		-(h)aff	-Ø
impers.	-	-	-		-	-e/i [†] r, -t
reflex.	-	-	(1/2/3SG/PL=)em- > (3SGM=)em-		-	-

The following features of the MB system will be of particular relevance:

Categories and splits: pronominal form is principally determined by syntactic context:

-Independent pronouns are restricted to coding arguments when clitics and suffixes are unavailable, namely certain environments like coordination, predicate use, the preverbal position, or complement of *sed, setu* ‘voici, voilà’.

-Elsewhere, suffixes code the pronominal subjects of verbs and objects of prepositions, proclitics the pronominal objects of verbs and arguments of nouns, enclitics can double argument-coding clitics and suffixes.

-Uniquely, objects of imperatives, lexical HAVE, and the HAVE-perfect split based on person, 3rd enclitic (to the finite verb), 1st/2nd proclitic (to the participle if there is one).

-A-forms appear sporadically over the course of MB to code objects of negative clauses beside clitics; they are recruited from inflections of a ‘of’.

Complementarity and doubling:

-Independent pronouns and nominals in any position are in complementary distribution with suffixes and clitics coding or doubling arguments; in particular, verbs with overt nominal and pronominal subjects appear the 3SG invariant form rather than agree.

-Systematic exceptions are agreement of suffix + subject before negation *ne*, more variably *na*, and of proclitic + subjects of *mihi est HAVE* in any position.²

Proclisis, mesocclisis, and particles:

-Most pronominal proclitics are “simple”, identical both initial and internal to the verbal and nominal complexes.

-1SG/2SG have mesoclitic versions that can and must be used internal to or “infixe” within the verbal complex, i.e. with certain conjunctions, particles, and prepositions.

-The finite-verb particles *a/ez* are absent before simple proclitics, unlike when supporting mesoclitics, but the *ez*-particle has a variant *en* available before simple proclitics.

Proclitic alignment and syncretism:

-3SGM distinguishes accusative *en=* as argument of finite verbs and *e=^L* of nominals.

-Verbal nouns are nominal on this score, even if there are hints of development to infinitives (periphrastic passives; early reflexive *en/e=em=*).

² A possible exception is the subject of imperatives-jussives, discussed separately. An apparent exception is created by the false, double, or broad subject construction of preverbal independent (pro)nominal + anaphoric pronominal clitic or suffix if not local subject or object.

Mihi est HAVE:

-Proclitic (accusative in 3SGM) + BE serves as lexical and perfect-auxiliary HAVE, mostly transparent in its composition, save for a de-prefix to BE with 3rd person proclitics.

-This formation exists for finite forms of BE alone.

While almost all elements of the above description are shared to some extent with Middle Cornish and/or Middle Welsh, e.g. proclisis and mesocclisis, the specifics are unique to Middle Breton, e.g. restriction of mesocclitics to 1SG/2SG, and characterise W as well as KLT when texts in these dialects appear, implying an extensive shared development exclusive to Breton.

Most these elements also differ in some way by 18C W, as may be illustrated in Table.

Table: MB-W differences in pronominal coding

	16-m17C MB	m18-m19C W	Development
love me!	<u>ma</u> =char!	car= <u>mé</u> !	proclisis→enclisis !
they have loved me	y <u>o</u> =deux= <u>eff</u> caret	ind <u>en</u> =dès= <u>ean</u> caret <i>or ... ar</i> =caret	enclisis→+proclisis H
in my house loves me	<u>e</u> = <u>m</u> =zi <u>e</u> = <u>m</u> =har	<u>e</u> = <u>m</u> =zi <u>en</u> = <u>em</u> =har	mesocclisis loss FIN
your/his kinsfolk have	<u>da</u> =/e= <u>guerent</u> <u>o</u> =deux	<u>ha</u> =/é= <u>guérent</u> <u>en</u> =dès	alignment change, agr.→invar. H
...loved you	... <u>da</u> =garet	... <u>ha</u> =caret	with nom. subjects
...loved him	... <u>e</u> =garet	... <u>ar</u> =haret	verbal nouns→inf,
their being loved	hac o=bout caret	hac ind bout caret	new inf. of H
my having loved them	-	ha mem/em=bout=ind caret	

Against this background, the developments examined here may be introduced as follows, roughly following the order of discussion:

-Loss of mesocclisis for 1SG/2SG: In W, loss of mesocclitics with finite verbs is familiar from late 19C (type ean em/me har ‘loves me’ but ém zi ‘in my house’), but there is evidence for it from the outside, partly in extension of the en-particle (type ... en em har). In CS.bar this is so as well for 2SG, along with other hints (e.g. o pout em accuset ‘their having accused me’).

-Alignment and 1SG/2SG objects: In W, the old mesocclitic-proclitic distinction and mutations associated with it are recruited in various ways: chiefly historical alignment by category and position (finite verbs, mé ha cuel ‘I see thee’ ≠ infinitives and participles, te/ha uélet ‘to see thee’ = nominals ha/te uel ‘they sight’, but in position internal to the complex, d’ha uélet = d’ha uél) accusative alignment (objects of all verbal forms align, mé ha cuél = ha cuélet ≠ ha/te uel, internal d’ha cuélet ≠ d’ha uél), and neutral alignment (uniform da or te), with various mixed situations. CS.bar is an early robust attestations of 2SG with W forms in historical alignment.

-Alignment and 1SG/2SG HAVE subjects: W extends finite to infinitival forms of mihi est HAVE, and in doing so aligns the new infinitives with finite forms (type em bout ‘my

having', ha pout 'thy having') or infinitives (type mem bout, ha/te vout), or mixes (including CS.bar man bout vs. finite em bo, te pout vs. é po). A further striking feature of for the date of CS.bar is the robustness of the new infinitives across various constructions (notably type hou poud a rei).

-Alignment and 3SG objects: In 17C W, evidence is already robust that old verbal nouns have become the infinitival counterparts to finite verbs (type ar guélet). This is so in CS.bar, save for one curious corner of the grammar involving 'do' and abstract referents.

-Proclitic forms: proclitics and enclitics undergo various developments in morphophonology, and these are chiefly examined here from the perspective of CS.bar, e.g. 3SGM er/en/el but 1PL invariant (h)on, 3PL/2PL (h)oc'h but 3SGF (h)é before vowels. The development of 1SG and 2SG is discussed in more detail as it bears on mesoclis and alignment changes, notably the varied continuations of 2SG MB daL=, =zM=, including unexpected variants confirmed by CS.bar (type te hrimeu, ta feden). Independently, the mutation system of CS.bar offers extensive anomalies, such as t/d→z for any mutation type with any trigger.

-Enclitic-independent form and distribution. In MB, enclitics as objects were identical to enclitics in doubling, and these in turn to independent pronouns apart from enclitic-specific by-forms of 2SG/2PL; there is some evidence of both enclitic and independent pronouns for arguments of sed/setu 'lo' and of eme 'quoth'. This is the situation of CS.bar. There is no trace of later splits of and changes in enclitics: 3PL independent and doubling ind vs. subject-doubling i; 3SGM, 3PL object-coding enclitics adding forms recruited from prepositional suffixes; shift to the latter forms of all pronouns in the west. Forms of eme are closer to ones attested in MB Nl than W. The characteristic W extension of doubling from suffixes/clitic to originally independent-pronoun subjects is already attested (type me zo-mé).

-Person split in HAVE-objects: The MB person-governed split for objects of HAVE-constructions, 3rd enclitics – 1st/2nd proclitics, is kept throughout the history of W. However, 18-19C adds 3rd person proclitics as an option in both W (late) and KLT (earlier). CS.bar offers a very early robust evidence of 3rd person proclitics. CS.bar also converges with late 17C W text NG in anomalies in 1SG proclitics to participles, matching evidence from MB of their relatively late grammaticalisation.

-Person split in imperative objects: The same MB person-governed split of positive imperatives ceded in W to uniform enclitics in 18C, but only proclitic 1st person is clearly attested in 17C, and so in CS.bar. Yet CS.bar is also robust in 3rd person proclitics in (apparent) imperatives, familiar from 19C KLT but rare and undescribed in W. Negative imperatives have the forms and object coding of presents as early as there is evidence in W, but CS.bar appears to witness the change in progress. Jussives or 3rd person-subject imperatives usually differ in object coding from imperatives but evidence is rare; CS.bar adds a 3rd person enclitic.

-A-forms for objects: in W these are mostly only attested at the western periphery, north adopting the general a-form use of KLT, south under certain conditions such as 3rd person generally but obligatorily in negative imperative and HAVE-constructions. There is little evidence of them in 18C W, apart from the negative imperative in early versions of the Lord's Prayer, as in CS.bar converges, but adds a new instance in the arabat + infinitive construction, another case of a-form objects in negative commands.

-Particles: W, the distribution of the finite verb particles e^L-é^M mostly tracks that of the a-ez in MB, including before proclitics, where both are absent but en can appear in é^M contexts. Here CS.bar is perhaps at its most unexpected. The a-ez distinction has collapsed, mostly in favour of a^L, save with a handful of 'strong' verbs, a phenomenon well attested from Breton, but later and outside W. The en-particle in turn has extended to a-contexts, i.e. after subjects and objects, but become restricted to before proclitics of the shape (h)V against (h)VC, otherwise apparently unattested (e.g. hi en é loncq' 'she swallows it').

-Agreement and invariance: In W, the use of the invariant rather than agreeing form has been extended to HAVE with independent nominal subjects, but a further step is found in CS.bar, otherwise only known to be systematic in modern varieties: the invariance is extended to prenegation nominal subjects.

By way of comparison, the unique innovations of CS.bar in particles and agreement seem as surprising as would be much later, local innovations that we do not find in CS.bar, such as loss of the DO-conjugation (Groix-Ternes, earlier G.GLG: 147 for St. Allouestre).

2 Barisy's Cantiqueu

Pierry Barisy's Cantiqueu Spirituel of 1710, CS.bar, is one of the earliest and most extensive texts of W. It has remained unpublished, but can be consulted on-line at: <http://mediatheques.quimper-communauté.fr/iguana/www.main.cls?surl=search&p=af3e6a0a-94ab-11e8-a80b-0050568050bf#recordId=1.373792&srchDb=1>

Pierre Barisy was born in July 1659 at Noyal-Pontivy and died in December 1710 at Noyal-Pontivy. The title page of CS.bar identifies the author, place, and date: "Composet / dré / PER BARISY / Person' a Parês Inguiniel. ~ / Escopti a Guenet. ~ / M.DCC.X."

The ms. is written in a careful humanist book hand, also used for small corrections, modifying letters in-line or adding them above or below with or without strike-through. It is revised in the same way, chiefly in a uniform cursive. There are a few revisions in block letters distinct from but close to both the book hand and the cursive. In the cursive are also extensive marginal additions of lines and verses, with or without strike-through of the replaced text.

The modifications including those in the cursive are usually close variations of the original, and their language seems to be the same as the original, insofar as may be judged by morphosyntactic and orthographic markers, e.g. HAVE-infinitive *man bezout*; ipv. with proclitic *hac ar meulet*; HAVE with 3rd person proclitic *an* and independent 3SGM *eun*, *Eun an des bet ar condanet.*, The orthographic conventions vary somewhat between hymns and between layers, e.g. choice of a or e in proclitics, but can also vary in the original layer between hymns, and overall they are highly consistent. The modifications tend to indicate somewhat more frequently mutations and certain other features, e.g. *hor hon^{rh}eoust'* (sc. *hon coust* original, modified to *hor houst*).

The book hand is fully legible except when obscured by strike-throughs or rewriting, a persistent problem with vertical strike-throughs vs. insertions of l, i in e.g. *goal[>l]* or *goall*, where readings are somewhat conjectural. The cursive is more opaque to me and the vowels are either not interpreted here or partly conjectural, with the note “clear” used when important here. The conventions of transcriptions are given in the appendix (briefly; • illegible, ✕ struck-out, [>x] insertion, [a>b] change, ^x or _x added in-line above or below, *x* added in margin, with common changes abbreviated as [•>•]: @, [a>e]: e, [•>e]: e, [u>v]: u, [•>v]: u).

An illustration of the language of CS.bar and its transcription with corresponding hymns in later 18C sources is given in Appendix.

The author’s preface describes the language as that of his parish, Inguiniel, with certain orthographic modifications (p. 11-15):

Personne n’ignore que la langue Bretonne n’est pas la même dans tous les pays de la Bretagne ou elle est en usage. [...] Nous en avons un exemple sensible dans l’Evêché ou j’écris. les Diocesains du haut pas de Vannes, n’ont pas seulement un accent tres different de ceux qui demeurent sur les frontieres du Diocese de Quimper, leurs expressions sont encore moins semblables que leur accent. [...]

[...] j’ay pris la parti de parler, a quelque chose pres, de la maniere dont on parle dans la Paroisse que j’ay l’honneur de servir. J’ay cru qu’étant située entre le haut pays de Vannes, et le Diocese de Quimper, son langage pouvoit tenir quelque chose de l’un et de l’autre [...] il m’est echapé quelques mots qui ne sont nullement usités dans la partie superieure de Vannes [...]

[...] je me suis conservé la liberté de m’en écarter lors que je le jugerois a propos. Cest par un effet de cette liberté, que j’ay retranché presque toutes les expressions rudes, et gutturales qui sont en usage dans ces quartiers, et dans le reste du Diocese, pour substituer en leur place, les expressions douces et molles des autres Euèchés de la Basse Bretagne.

Par exemple our exprimer en Breton l’article, de, j’ay substitué la particule, *eus*, de Quimper, a celle d’*ag*, dont on se sert en Vannes, ainsi au lieu de dire, *m’o trugareca ag ho madeu*, je vous remercie de vos biens, je dis, *m’o trugareca eus ho madeu*, ce qui est sans doute bien plus doux a prononcer. Cette même raison m’a fait terminer par un, *z*, où par, *s*, comme on fait en Quimper, la plus part des mots [p. 14] que nous finissons en Vannes par un, *h*, ainsi au lieu de dire, *benoeh* benediction,

malloeh malediction, *madeleh* bonté, et autres semblables je dis, *benoés*, *malloés*, *madelez*, &c.

[...]

Je laisse la même liberté pour toute mon orthographe en general; j'ay taché autant que j'ay pù de l'accommoder a la maniere dont on prononce dans ces quartiers: mais ailleurs ou la prononciacion est differente je consens qu'on s'en tienne a l'usage des lieux [...] Il m'est indifferent par exemple qu'on dise, *ho pehedeu*, vos pechez ou bien *hou pehedeu*, *ar pehet* le peché, ou bien *er pehet*, *ta labour* ton travail, ou bien *te labour*, *en em convertisset*, convertissez vous, ou bien *un um convertisset*, *oc'hani* le vôtre, ou bien *ho hani* [...]

Je n'ajouteray plus qu'un remarque touchant la prononciation. Dans la Poësie Bretonne lors que deux voyelles se suivent en un même mot, il est libre d'en faire deux syllables, ou de les reduire en une seule, selon que la mesure du verse le demande, ainsi qu'il dit indifferement *Doué* Dieu, ou bien *Doü-é* [...]–*liéz* souvent ou bien *li-ez* [...] [italics mine, changes omitted -MR]

The language of CS.bar is W. Standard phonological and lexical hallmarks are not studied here as such, but they do conform to developments of W. In phonology, there is the characteristic $\delta > h$ of W, only little obscured by the choice to write *z* set out in Barisy's introduction: thus often only -h- medially, e.g. *lahet*, *cuhign*, *zicoueho*, *skuihet*, *dihuehat*, corrected $e[h > z]omeu$, ^{iz}*ehom*; -z often written finally but still frequent -h, *cuh* beside *dré cuh*, *madeleh* beside *madelez*, *malloeh* beside *maloez*, *goah*, *goeh* beside *ha goeh dar goez*, *henne[h > z]*. In the lexicon, there are specifically W developments such as *naoah* 'nevertheless', *chomel* 'rest', *gober* 'do', *bieu* 'own', *ne fehe-* 'would not know > could not'. In the syntax as well, there is for instance the specifically W distribution of the *eu* and *ema* forms of BE, roughly with *ema* suppleting for *eu* save after the participle or predicate associated with BE.

For morphological features, Table gives a selection distinguishing W from KLT in the literature of late 18C, mostly drawn from the HMSB, compared as possibly to the early 20C situation in ALBB, and to the major W text anteceding CS.bar, 1680 NG. The overall profile of CS.bar is clearly W against other varieties, e.g. the 1SG proclitic *man b,d,g-*, the nominal plurals -(i)eu never -(i)ou, the inflected infinitive of HAVE, or the systematic split in HAVE between agreeing pronouns and nonagreeing full nominals.³

Table: Morphological and closed-class lexical particularities of eNB-W in HMSB⁴

Syntax	Cl. W	CS.bar	ALBB	NG	HMSB
--------	-------	--------	------	----	------

³ As far as the ALBB, the W zone is here taken to be between SE Damguat, SW Groix, NW Ploërdut, NE Mûr-de-Bretagne of the ALBB (the last turns out to be esp. useful here for 2SG, and is squarely W in the ALBB, e.g. 'mon', 'ton', 'à lui', 'saurons', 'lait'). Within W, apart from geographical descriptives like northeast, the usual high-low i.e. east-west and Arvor-Argoed i.e. maritime-inland terms are sometimes used: Inguiniel is then interior low W, Noyal-Pontivy high Argoed, the usual literary language of 18C authors like Cillart, Pourchasse, Marion is high Arvor. See Crahé 2014 for a recent study particularly relevant to Inguiniel.

⁴ Note to Table: Resume of ALBB is indicative and contrastive, e.g. into the zone of -(e)hemp are counted various forms with -h- or -e- so that contrast with neighbouring -imp-, -fomp-, -femp-, and the conclusions are based on the few lexemes available like *saurons*. Resume of NG draws in Hemon 1956 for elements not studied here separately.

oll > def/poss	oll an/hon	-	(an/hon oll)		+/-	§98
bout zo	bout-zou	+	bout a so	W+ ^w K ^w T		§158
	bout a ra	-		W+ ^w K ^w T		
é→doh prn VN	doh ar gober	+/-	Etré ma vign d ^c oh ar gortos			§171
HAVE agr. *	er ré en dês	++	ar ré n dês		++	§174
	ind o dês		i o dês			
NEG !>PRS *	ne lahes quet	+	ne fies quet			
anom. particle	e/é/Ø bieu	++	Ø bieu			§154
anom. distrib	ne/sup. fêhé-		ne fehe-			
Clitics						
1SG=N *	mem/n bdg	++	man bdg	W	++	§54
!=1 *	credet-me	-	(me credet)		+	§51.7b
not 3=! *	*er c'hredet	-	ar guisquet		-	§54.3
ket=encl. *	quet-mé	++	quet mé			§52.b
refl. without en	(en) hum	+	(en) em		+	§173
to.have agrees *	em bout	++	man b(ez)out		++	§140
a>e *	en, pe, ma	+	an/en, pa/pe, ma/me	W+KT	+	passim
Inflections						
N-PL	-(i)eu	++	pehedeu	W	+	§24
P-2SG	-ous	-	(euit out)			§61
P-3SGM	-(h)ou/-(h)on	-/++	dehon	seW/rest W	+/-	§61
V-infl.						
V-1,3PL	-amp, -ant	+(+)	caramp, carant	W+ ^w K ^w T	++	§128
V-2SG	-es	++	larés (laréz)	KLTW	++	§128
V.FT-3SG	-ou	-	larei>laro, (v/bo)	°se/°eW	+	§131
V.FT-1,2PL,IMP	-ehe-mp,t,r	+(+)	credehemp, tennehet, ueleher	W	+(+)	§131
V.FT-1SG	-ein	-	(lavarign)	-e- W+eT, -ey- °W	++	§131
V.FT-3PL	-eint	-	(larint)	-e(i)- °W	++	§131
VN-iñ	-ign>ein	+>-	carign	W	+>+	§135
Va-PRT	-eit	(+)	lacait		++	§137
BE.2SG	ous	-	out	W (if 2SG kept)	-	§139
BE.FT.2PL	veint	(+)	vint	-i/e- W+K, -a/ei- °W	+	§139
BE.!2PL	beh	-	v/b(ez)et	°s/°seW	-	§139
Functional lex.						
prepos.	ar, diar, doh	+	ar, diar, doh	ar: W+ ^w K ^w T	+	§62
'where'	men	+	men		+	§84
'same'	memb	-	(memés)			§110
'when'	a pe(n)	+	a pe larés	W	+	§199
'other than'	istroh eid	+	istroh euit			§36
'this'	henn-	++	henneh, honneh	W	++	§76
'other'	arall	+	aral	W save most seW	+	§106

Symbols: + present, - absent, ++, exceptionless, +(+) isolated or qualified exception, (...) counterexample, * studied here; ALBB column W: all W but not KLT save exception, ^wK/T extensions to W-adjacent K/T; se, e south-east, east, ° occasional.

At many points, the morphology is specifically that of W outside south-east Arvor, whose Vannes-region speech most influenced 18C texts, e.g. 3SGM prepositional inflection -on, e.g.: dehon, not dehou of NG, Cillart, Purchasse, Marion. The study of the pronominal system addresses the specific situation of CS.bar within W when pertinent, e.g. 3SGM eun 'eñ'. However, the language is often particular, e.g. 2PL ad 3PL oc'h before vowels but 3SGF é not éc'h; 2SG é with lenition and spirantisation; 3SGF é with lenition. Other features are not securely mapable, some because a feature has been lost, e.g. 2SG outside the maritime zone and eastern border, or mem bout, en devout type infinitives, not attested outside the broadly maritime zone.

A non-southeastern origin is consistent with many features of the text, e.g. always breur rather than brær, brér. Outside this zone, at a first approximation, the language is more consistent with what is known of region of Inguiniel area, late 19C MPC-Guémené; 20C ALBB Ploerdut, Bubry; late 20C McKenna-Guémené; 21C Crahé-Languidic, BSDB-Inguiniel, than of the Noyal-Pontivy region, early 20C Thibault-Cléguérec, early

20C ALBB Noyal-Pontivy, late 20C ALRP. Examples are *breder* ‘breudeur’, *en^ho^cguelé* ‘en ho kwele’, *hiriv* ‘hiziw’, or through modification, the reasonably literary-influenced usual (da) *monet* once modified to what is hard to read as other than *da vont*; but an example modified to a counterexample is *ar hon^rh^eoust* sc. *ar hon coust* > *ar hor houst* ‘war hor c’houst’, and inversely, *ouï[ei>o]* sc. *ouïei* > *ouïo* ‘ouzo’. Frequently its features are characteristic of other regions entirely by 20C, e.g. *quæs* ‘keazh’, *lausquign* ‘leuskel’, *gallout* ‘gallout’. Yet it is only rarely that a particular feature can be traced with any certainty past 20C, still less so 19C, as ‘en ho kwele’ in Table. We cannot conclude from CS.bar *vo*, *vint* that the language of is that of Belle-Ile or Groix, since their survival there is an archaism, and 20C forms elsewhere like Ploerdut *wó*, *wěint* developed from *vo*, *vint* and may have been such in 1710, while other cases like the form and mutation of ‘hon’ or the form of the conjunction in *p’an dei* ‘pan deuy’ are good candidates for changing patterns of diffusion rather than linear evolution. Frequently evidence is indecisive: we cannot tell whether *monet*, *da monet*, *en ur monet* is a type that was available at Inguiniel in 1710 unlike later, due to influence of the author’s origin at Noyal-Pontivy or of southeastern literature, and why in that literature this type rather than others was picked, and what the unique cusive addition *da vont* signifies in light of this (see Appendix).

Finally, there are many ways in which the text is entirely unique for any expectations about W, apart from those specifically treated here like 2PL-3PL but not 3SGF prevocalic *c’h*, for instance the mutation in *deu zruet* ‘daou droad’ (cf. 21C Crahé-Languidic *deudruët*, BSDB-Inguiniel *daou drèd*), or regular verb futures of the type *type quemerei* without 3SG present type *quemera* (the usual view being that -ei extended at the expense of -o from the type *laquei* through -a, and indeed the to go together from early as 18C on, Ernault 1890: 107f., 116f. = EC 7.16-8, 35-7, and later, Crahé-Languidic, BSDB-Inguiniel). The matter is addressed at more length in Appendices, giving key comparanda relative to the ALBB and the early classical literary language, as well as prepositional and verbal inflections.

3 Other sources

For CS.bar, the study of pronominal object coding is exhaustive, and extensive if not exhaustive for associated forms such as independent pronouns and possessive proclitics, in intent, and thus allowing for errors of transcription, omission, and analysis.

The Table gives the principal sources used to study the antecedents, contemporaries, and continuations of the language of CS.bar:⁵

Table: Principal sources for W⁶

⁵ The study does not include two particularly relevant sources known to me: “Un recueil de cantiques imprimé vers 1700” and “Rec. Pourchasse” (both so cited in Le Goff 1927), where “Rec. Pourchasse” is partly excerpted as “Recueil Pourchasse” in GEG, and elsewhere described as “une série de cantiques en dialecte de Vannes « Cannèneu spirituel », publiés ... en 1793 et en 1734, et même antérieurement, à une date non identifiée” (Corbes 1938), and so too early at some point to have been due to Louis Pourchasse (1724-1796). These have proven inaccessible to me at present.

⁶ Note to Table: Most abbreviations here and below are inventoried in DEVRI (<http://devri.bzh/corpus/>) and/or ARBRES (<https://arbres.iker.cnrs.fr/>), and most works can be found by title and author in PRELIB (<http://mshb.huma-num.fr/prelib/>). GU here includes only the extracts in Loth’s *Chrestomathie*. Pourchasse

Author (birth : principal work)	Text	Date [ed.]	Type	Title (shortened)
?	Pron	1631	prône	An form da obér an Pron
?	PRone	1693	prône	Er forme ag er pron
?	NG	1680	hymns	[Christmas hymns]
Barisy (Noyal-Pontivy : Inguiniel)	CS.bar	1710	hymns	Cantiqueu Spirituel
de Chalons (Lyon : Sarzeau)	CHal	1723	dictionary	Dictionnaire breton-fr. ... Vannes
?	GU	1734	hymns	Guærzænnou Santel
de Rostrenen (Perret? : Roscoff?)	GReg	1732	dictionary	Dictinnaire françois-celtique
de Rostrenen	G.R	1738	grammar	Grammare françois-celtique
?	BT	1745	play	Buhé enn tri roue
?	CS.anon	1760	hymns	Cantikeu spirituel
Cillart (Sarzeau : Grand-Champs)	L'Arm	1744	dictionary	Dictionnaire fr.-breton ... Vannes
Cillart	SH	1766 [1806]	prose tr.	Stationneou hur-Salvêr
Cillart	SH.ver	1766 [1806]	hymns	SH: hymns
Pourchasse* (Plœren : Vannes)	GEG.rp°	[1857]	hymns	GEG (q.v.) "Recueil Pourchasse"
Pourchasse	IS.pour	1768 [1785]	prose tr.	Instructioneou santell
Pourchasse	AP°	1788	prose	Instructioneou aveit en adoration
Pourchasse*	CAG	1792 [1826]	hymns	Choæs a gannenneu
Pourchasse	CT.13°	18C [1800]	prose tr.	Catechim eit chervige ...
Pourchasse	COS°	1792 [1830]	prose, hymns	Considerationeou santel
Sanson (Grand-Champs : Meucon)	PT°	1787 [1901]	play	Passion ha Tragériss
Marion (Arradon : Houedic)	IS.mar	1790	prose tr.	Instructioneou santel
Marion	MG	1791	prose	Magasin spirituel
Marion	TE	c. 1795	prose	Histoëriou ag en eu testamand
Marion	EOV°	1838	prose tr.	En or hag er vuhez devot
Marion?	VN	≈1795	dialogues	Vocabulaire nouveau
?	G.VN	≈1795	grammar	VN: gramm. appendix
Guillome (Malguénac : Séné)	G.GU	1836	grammar	Grammaire française-bretonne
Guillome	LLB°	1849	verse	Livr el labourer
Guillome*	GEG°	1857	hymns	Guerzenneou eid Escobty Guénèd
Guillome	GEG.jg°	1857	hymns	GEG when signed JG
?	HMC°	1830	hymn	[Prodigal Child hymn]
Seveno (Moréac : Vannes)	HIVL	1908	prose	Histoër en intron Varia a Loud
Le Bayon (Auray : Palais)	G.BA	1878 [1896]	grammar	Grammaire bretonne ... Vannes
various	MPC	t19C [1890]	tale tr.	[Prodigal Child translations]
Guillaume [ed. Diberder]	ALLS	e20C [2000]	tales (oral)	A liù el loér hag er stéred
Guillevic (Vannes : Vannes) &	G.GL	1902	grammar	Grammaire bretonne ... Vannes
Le Goff (Baud : var.)		1931		
[ed. Cheveau et al.] (Inguiniel)	BSDB	e21C	spoken	Banque Sonore des Dialectes Bretons

Symbols: * editor, partial author; ° study limited to 1SG/2SG; [...] edition used

The focus of comparison are W texts before the late 18C, with later extensions particularly to examine the subsequent evolution of 1SG/2SG proclitics. It is only from late 19C that descriptions and corpora of the spoken language become available, of which the following have proved particularly useful for their earliness or detail:

MPC: dialectal versions of the Prodigal Child in Loth 1890, Ernault 1890, Ernault-Sarzeau 1897, Ernault-Batz 1883, cf. G.GLG31: 5.⁷

Le Goff 1927: study of 2SG proclitics and associated argument coding, esp. 1SG, across classical and contemporary varieties.

and Marion are attributed unsigned works following PRELIB. On unsigned L'Arm, VN, G.Vn, see Le Goaziou 1957, Lambert 1979. MPC see below. HMC is a hymn on the Prodigal Child in versions 1809-1863, see under 2SG for details. The term hymn translates cantik, cannenn, q.v. Rivière 1998.

⁷ The chief versions apart from Loth 1890 used here are in Ernault 1890: one published in 1818 in Lorient by Jacques Guiquello from Merlevenez, and using forms such as 3PL pronoun hint that are expected specifically for there in the ALBB, and one published in 1779 in the grammar of Jacques Le Brigant from Pontrioux in Tregor.

ALBB, NALBB, ALRP: ALBB is particularly of use as reflecting the earliest situation and including a considerable number of pronominal arguments.

Partial dialectal studies or sketches of late 19C - early 20 C W, cited as author-locality: Ernault 1886 for Sarzeau, Loth 1895 for Quiberon, Loth 1909 for Sauzon, Thibault 1914 for Cléguérec, G.GLG31: 147 for S. Allouestre.

Comprehensive dialectal studies of later 20C - early 21C W, cited as author-locality: McKenna 1976 for Guémené-sur-Scorff, Ternes 1970 for Groix, Le Besco 1992 for Belle-Île, Cheveau 2016 for Lorient, Crahé 2014 for Languidic.

It is difficult to determine just to what in spoken language and how far earlier literary usage corresponds. Litterary W formed itself against the background of MB. MB appears to have been characterised by a considerable degree of conventionalisation in all elements of grammar. MB prose abandons some of the archaic features of verse, e.g. *ha* 'and' as mesoclitic host, and shows innovations specific to authors, e.g. *a*-forms for objects of the HAVE-perfect for Tanguy Gueguen alone. Yet it remains striking to see the absence of certain expected features, e.g. the usual 1SG proclitic of 16C and most 17C MB is *ma*=, not *va*=, though the latter is expected on the basis of other dialectal markers or provenance of authors, and the earliest-attested form. The transition from MB to eNB-KLT, where later and local features appear, is gradual, there are hints of a considerable lag in the take-up of innovations, e.g. proclitics beside enclitics in 3rd person in the HAVE-perfect of KLT, described at least as early as de Rostrenen 1738. (On MB, its formation, and its relationship to W draw on standard sources, esp. Ernault 1886--, Hemon 1975 HMSB, Schrijver 2011a, and for object clitics my earlier study in Rezac 2020-1; for discussion of the conventionalisation of MB see Le Berre 2001, 2007.)

Literary W appears to have been formed at a period witnessed by major texts, starting with the *prône* of 1632 (see esp. Rolland 1995, Le Pipec 2018 for its formation, Châtelier 2016 for development from *Pourchasse* on, Le Goff 1908-- for early and later writers and their uses). It comes into its own by mid-18C, represented by the works of Cillart and *Pourchasse*, e.g. Cillart's dictionary of 1744 and translation SH of 1766, and anonymous texts including the BT of 1745 and CS.anon of 1760. By that point, it has assumed a choice of forms *5*.and an orthography that is both dramatically different from MB and from contemporary KLT. The selection of forms is drawn consistently on the south-eastern region centered on Vannes of all the large W zone, and may be set against descriptions of differences known to have existed and to have differentiated dialects, esp. thanks to explicit discussions and forms in de Rostrenen's dictionary of 1732 and his grammar GR.R of 1738, and somewhat later the grammar of G.Vn, as well as prefaces esp. to Cillart's dictionary L'Arm of 1744 and SH of 1766. To take an example, GR.R gives as forms of 3SGM the independent pronouns *ean*, *ëun* and *teh* prepositional suffixes in *dehou*, *dehon*, and their later distribution is roughly as southeast vs. the rest of W; in most 18C W literature only the former type is represented. The fixity is far from complete, but only rarely is there contemporary evidence that variation rests in dialectal features, rather than in variation due to changing, coexisting forms or to conventional retentions. Examples relevant here are the explicit statement in the preface to SH that the 1PL proclitics *hon*, *hur* reflect dialectal variation, or in more detail in the preface to L'Arm that 3PL independent *ind* is a Vannes form contrasting with *i* found north at both Moréac and Noyal-Pontivy.

By this mid-18C period, W has more than a century of recorded literary productions, though surviving only at considerable gaps. These are chiefly the 17C prônes, Pr of 1632 and PR of 1693 (see esp. Rolland 2004), in between the hymns NG of 1680 (studied in Hemon 1956), and the witness of the dictionary of de Chalons (1641-1718), in part published in 1723, in part in ms. of 1718 (here only drawn on through citations in Ernault 1886--, DEVRI; cf. Le Menn 1996). As early as Pr, these too reflect W, far more so than contemporary texts attributable to other varieties, and they too draw on Vannes-region forms like *dehou*. It seems generally difficult to tell what underlies forms like 1PL proclitic in Pr (and PR) *hon pedenneu*; word order in Pr *en hol fauteu but ol hé behet*; 2SG proclitics in Pr *ol hé behet ... ta Saluer but PR te béhédeu ... te salver*. Possibilities include conventions reflecting older or external usages like invariant *hon*; absence of developments at a given locality or time like *hon p- > hor f-*; or special developments like extension of the post-de/e *ha*-form of the 2SG possessive to after *ol* (all discussed here for CS.bar).

CS.bar comes between these groups, and while it shares the general developments of W, it is unique at this date as an extensive text with significant features outside the Vannes-region, e.g. 3SGM independent *eun*, prepositional suffix *-hon*, and developments not witnessed in early works at all, such as nonagreement with prenegation subjects.⁸

4 Proclitics in W and CS.bar

Table introduces the proclitics of CS.bar (simplified, elaborated below) against the background of MB on the one hand (see above), and 18-19C literary W on the other (illustrated from G.GU and largely uniform across 18C W save for 2SG forms). The proclitics of CS.bar are distinctively eNB and W, for instance in distribution of 3SGM forms and the form of 1SG. However, they are also distinctive within early W, sharing some aspects like 2SG forms and distribution with certain writers such as Marion against others like Guillôme, but often unique, for instance in the distribution of the *en*-variant of the *ez*-particle.

Table: Synopsis of proclitic pronouns in CS.bar vs. G.GU⁹

	Middle Breton e17C =N/INF/PRT/IPV	FIN	CS.bar 1710 =N/INF/PRT/IPV	=FIN	G.GU 1836 =N/INF/PRT	=FIN		
3SGM=N	e ^L	en=	é ^L =N	→	é ^L =N	→		
3SGM=V			a/eR ^{Sk} =V	→	eR ^{Sk} =V	→		
3SGF	he ^S (-h [†])	→	(h)é ^L [(h)é [†]]	→	hé ^S	hi ^S		
3PL	ho ^S (-z [†])	→	(h)o ^S -ch	→	ou ^S	→		
1SG	ma ^S % va ^S	m ^S	ma/eN ^S	em ^S	em ^S	meN ^S [em]	em ^S	em ^S
2SG	da ^L	z ^{LP}	ta/e ^L -S [te ^P]	é ^L	é ^L -S [é ^P]	ha ^L -ç % te ^L	ha ^L -ç	ha ^P -ç
1PL	(h)on ⁱ	→	(h)on ⁱ	→	hun ^S , huR ^{Sk}	→	→	
2PL	(h)oz ^P	→	(h)o ^P -ch	→	hou-ç ^P	→	→	
RX	pron/en em ^L	→	(en) em ^L	→	hum ^L	→	(e) hum	

Symbols: [†] disallows *en*-particle. [...]: b-forms of HAVE.

⁸ During this period my access to Le Goff 1908--, Le Menn 1996, Rolland 1995, 2004, has been limited to notes not originally made in relationship to this work and so possibly omitting key elements.

⁹ Note to Table: G.GU: %ha^L-ç Vannes region, te^L Lorient and Pontivy regions; 1PL described or illustrated as hun^S, huR^{Sk} as each of object and possessor at different points without note; evidence for INF, PRT supplied from LLB and GEG.jg.

Table offers a fuller indication of which proclitic forms are attested in what context in CS.bar, mostly discussed in detail in what follows:

Table: Proclitic pronouns in CS.bar¹⁰

	<u> </u> N	<u> </u> INF	<u> </u> PRT	<u> </u> IPV	en= <u> </u> N	d'= <u> </u> N	d'= <u> </u> INF	<u> </u> ≠ ^{a/ez} FIN	mar= <u> </u> FIN	n'/p'/m'= <u> </u> FIN	m'/t'= <u> </u> FIN	H: <u> </u> =b/d
3SGM	é ^{L!}	a/cR ^{Sk!,!!}	→	→	→	→	→ [†]	→	→	→	→	→ _v
3SGF	(h)é ^{L!}	→ ^o	→	?	→	→	→ ⁺	→	→	→	?	(h)é ⁺
3PL	(h)o ^{S!} -c'h	→	→	→	→	→	→ ⁺	→	→	→	?	→ _v ⁺
1SG	ma/eN ^{S!!}	ma/eN ^{S!!}	→	→	em ^{S*}	em ^S	→	→	→	→	?	→ _v
2SG	ta/e ^{L,S!}	→	→	?	é ^{L,S!}	→	→ ⁺	?	→	→	→	te ^P
1PL	(h)on [!] , hoR [†]	→ ^o	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	?	→ _v
2PL	(h)o ^{P!} -c'h	→ ^o	→	?	→	→	→ ⁺	→	→	→	→	→ _v ⁺
RX	(en) em ^L	→ ^o	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→

Symbols: → same as left, →_v same as FIN, INF. ⁺ found with en-particle. ^o found fronted with OBER. * en + em → ém. !,!! exceptions mutations, ! t/d→z to, !! others.

The identification of proclitic against enclitic and independent forms is largely straightforward in CS.bar and across Breton, but there are exceptions like 3SGM in Qu. It is thus useful to resume independent criteria. Proclitic pronouns are identifiable in texts through certain formal criteria: absolute adjacency to a given host such as the participle, and allomorphy of the clitic, e.g. 1SG me vs. mem/n in W depending on the initial consonant of the host, and of the host, i.e. consonant mutations and h-insertion. The adjacency requirements interacts with word order when potential separation is in play: notably, the participle-auxiliary order takes proclitics on the participle but enclitics on the auxiliary, and auxiliary-participle orders split by the finite-adjacent element quen and more freely placed elements like adverbs must not split up auxiliary and its enclitic or participle and its proclitic. There is a far less categorial criterion in coordination, which usually cannot share a clitic across coordinated hosts, and this is systematic in CS.bar, but both within Breton and in close comparanda like French, there are exceptions (for Modern French, Kayne 1975, Miller 1992; history, Jensen 1990: §301). In this case it is of interest that exceptions are never found with the reflexive element MB em-, W (h)um-&c, matching its origin as prefix rather than clitic.

Distribution of proclitics in coordination: ex. from CS.bar:

P≠ =N, P= =N:

Euit hon goarn' hac [[>] h]on sicour

En on chiffeu, ha clen[^{•>}v]jedeu

HAVE PRT:

Douë an des hon croüet, / Hon lacait er bed man:

~~An Iis hon Mam beniguet, An des a viscoaz hon desquet:~~

¹⁰ Note to Table: Column headings: H: =b/d is b-forms (nonpres.) of HAVE, ^{a/ez} are a/ez-particle contexts. Mutations are not equally attested across categories, see below, note esp. 2SG only with (x)N, with 3SGF only with FIN, INF. (h) tends to absence in 3PL, 2PL/3PL if -c'h present, 1PL after proclitics.

[> hon mam ilis an des brepet] / [> hon exhortet, hon instruget]

XP __ FIN:

A creiz hon calon, Guet devotion, / En oc'h inouramp, En o saludamp
Hanval doh drein, é zanué, / Ar picq', ar broud, ar bless' bamdé.

Distribution of proclitics in coordination: exceptions from W:

Ean enn-dèss me h'crouéet ha laqueit er bétt aveit h'enn hannaüein IS.pour
rac Doué en dès hé hrouéét ha joéntét doh hur horv IS.mar

5 Mesoclis loss and alignment changes

5.1 1SG/2SG meso-to-proclitics

In MB, evidence for mesoclis is simple, 1SG, 2SG have two forms, ma, da only initial to the verbal/nominal complexes (if we taken certain conjunctions and prepositions to be outside these), m, z only internal (after most conjunctions, all particles, and the prepositons da, e), and no evidence of am, em, either initially (modulo perhaps traces in imperatives, discussed separately), or medially with suppression of the preceding vowel (thus in a-particle and na-negation contexts appear am, nam, not em, nem, and inversely for e-particle and ne-negation contexts, but only pam, dam, mam).

In W, potential mesoclitic hosts remained in W as in MB prose, with partial but not complete a/e > e collapse: e.g. pa^L=FIN > pe^L=FIN, a^L/ez^L=FIN > ë^L/é-h^M=FIN, na/ne=FIN > ne^L=FIN, da^L=INF/N > de^L=INF/N, e=N > é=N, but ma^M=FIN. At first, 1SG continues to distinguish forms descending from the simple proclitic ma=, namely meN^S, and mesoclitic =m, but there is no simple evidence that is now syllabic: it is always em^{S(p)tk}, including crucially after ma, suppressing its vowel, e.g. eid m'em hredehai MG, not eid ma'm, as in MB. This appears to be the position of G.GLG.31: 152-3: “Les fomes vannetaises em et ha (=az) représentent l’agglutination d’une voyelle avec le pronom infixe; tandis que les formes me, te et ha (=da) ne sont en réalité que des pronoms possessifs absolus, qui, en l’ababsence de particule à voyelle, remplacent les pronoms personnels infixes.”¹¹

Yet it could still be that em= is a mesoclitic =em=, so that MB ma=m, pa=m, e=m, have become recast as m=em, p=em, e=em with suppression of the vowel of the preceding element. Indeed, with 18C writers, by and large, meN= tracks the distribution of ma=, (=?)em= of tracks the distribution of =m. This is explicitly described as early as 1795 G.Vn: 4: “Les pronoms accusatifs [ha but not te, em but not mem, men, me] se mettent aux temps simples des verbs, & après la préposition d', à”, echoed in the prescriptive recommendation of G.GLG31: 32 “Il convient d'employer les formes em, ha aux temps simples des verbes, les formes me, te aux temps composés et devant l'infinitif non précédé de de”. Even at this early date, the changing distribution of the particles suggests lack of mesoclis, differentiating MB e=m= ‘in=1SG’ and ‘EZ=1SG’ to W

¹¹ Evidence of the apostrophe, systematically d'em rather than d'em, is difficult to evaluate, in light of such uses as m'em brær ‘my brother’, n'a gloriuæd-é ‘how glorious she is’ (MG, with the same issue in other texts).

é=m= and en=em=, with extension of the en-particle to before 1SG/2SG from its earlier distribution to before simple proclitics. Yet from this state of affairs a reanalysis back to mesoclitic is simple upon loss of key evidence like the a/e distinction and the en-particle, and that is the description for Ternes-Groix, with a nuance (discussed below).

Later the mesoclitic view of em= becomes more difficult, when meN= extends to the environments of (=?)em=, a situation already documented in 1878 G.BA, “Doué em hâr, ou me hâr, Doué en dès me, ou em hâret” or “ha me hlaskéèt”, though still only d’em hlask, d’em fen, ém zi, against me fen, (a) me zi, and perhaps earlier depending on the analysis of the infinitive of HAVE em bout beside mem bout. The description of G.BA is also that of the That descriptive portions of G.GLG02, but with ambiguity in where d’em, ém rather than de me, e me survives at all. The single form me= prevails everywhere in 20C Cheveau-Lorient, Crahé-Languidic.¹²

Only 1SG has been illustrated so far. 2SG has a similar trajectory, and strengthens the evidence: in offering a distinct vowel to show suppression of that of proclitics, e.g. pe + ha > p’ha; in extending the modification of e=m > en em vs. ém to the preposition, e=z > en ha in both cases; and in earliness of accusative alignment, taking it back to 18C. However, it offers greater complexity. MB da=^L, =z=^M appear in W under a considerable range of forms, fundamentally (h)a-ç= or (h)é-ç= with L, P, or M mutations, and te= with L but also S mutations, some going back to the earliest text Pr of 1632, and in 18C giving rise to a great variety of systems in terms of distribution across #N/INF vs. xN/INF and FIN vs. INF/PRT, while still ending up at an invariant form like te^L= in all contexts in St. Allouestre, a^L= in Berric, or xa^{LP}= in Groix (G.GLG.31: 147, 153, Le Goff 1927, ALBB, Ternes-Groix).

One typical outcome is realignment of objects to accusative alignment, all verbal forms patterning together against nominal arguments, described in G.GLG.31: 153 “En principe on devrait donc dire: doh te huélet ou doh ha huélet (non doh ha kuélet); m’em es te zalhet ou ha zalhet (non ha talhet). C’est-à-dire que l’infinitif et le participe devraient être traités comme des noms. Mais depuis un siècle, l’usage contraire a prévalu dans presque tout l’Arvor: doh ha kuélet [note 1: §A Berric cependant on dit: doh ha huélet et mé ha huél.]”, and more fully studied in Le Goff 1927. This is also the state of affairs with 1SG in G.BA, with certain qualms noted below. Focusing on the alignment of verbal objects, the chief stages may be set out even with the material only in G.GLG and G.BA as in Table (not including other neutral or complex systems even if with differences from those presented or simply incomplete, all below). To go further, the study must be split into that of 1SG and 2SG.

Table: Realignment of 1SG/2SG from historical to neutral and accusative (shaded)¹³

¹² G.GLG02, 31 offer partly different descriptions at different points, abstracted in the Appendix and Le Goff 1927 clarifies. Apart from G.GLG, perhaps the most comprehensive discussion of the changing distribution of meN, em is Châtelier 2016: 429ff., with a certain tension in the presentation of the findings, if I understand it right. On the one hand, the study affirms Guillevic and Le Goff’s 1931 generalisation, referencing the 1902 but citing the 1931 edition, supported by examples from 18C writers; on the other, it proposes the different generalisation, that em is used with simplex and meN with compound verbal constructions, explicitly supported from em initially with the infinitives in Seveno’s EOVD. To this later aspect of the study we will return.

¹³ Note to Table: G&G: G.GLG02, 31, Le Goff 1927.

G&G (histor.)	=N meNS men dorn	x= =N emS	=FIN emS=FIN hui em guélou n'em lahet ket	=INF meNS aveit men guélet	x= =INF emS d'em guélet	=PRT meNS ean en des men guélet	=IPV+/JUSS meNS me sekouret teL teL te sekouret
G&G (new)	meNS men dorn	meNS	meNS=FIN ean men guélou ne me lahet ket	meNS=INF men guélet	meNS de men guélet	meNS ean en des men guélet	(indep.)
Arvor c.	haL-s ha dok	ha [?] L-s	haP-s m'ha kuélou	haP-s eit ha kuélet	haP-s	haP-s m'em es ha kuélet	N/A
Arvor e.	haL-s ha zorn	ha [?] L-s	haL-s mé ha huélou	haL-s doh ha huélet	haL-s	haL-s m'em es ha kuélet	N/A
Argoed w./e.	teL te dok	te [?] L de te zorn	teL me te huélou	teL eit te huélet	teL	teL m'em es te huélet	N/A
G.BA (interm.)	meNS men dorn	emS d'em zâl	meNS/emS Doué em/me hâr	*meNS/emS me zrompein	?/emS d'em hlask	meNS/emS Doué en des me/em hâret	(indep.)

5.2 1SG

Table details the form of 1SG over the history of W:

Table: 1SG proclitics in W¹⁴

Text	Date	Author	N	xN	INF	xINF	FIN	xFIN	PRT	IPV+	H-INF	xH-INF	(x)FIN
NG	1680		meN ^S				em ^{h?}		meN ^S *				en bou [?]
CS.bar	1710	Bar (N-Ptv -Ing)	ma/eN ^S	em ^S	ma/eN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S-}	em ^S	ma/eN ^S *	ma/eNS	m(*)an bout*		em b(ez) ^o
CS.anon	1760		meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S?}	em ^S	meN ^S	me _N S, =x	m(*)em bout		em bou [?]
SHs	1766	Cill (Sarz -G-Claup)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S+}	em ^S	meN ^S	=x	(m')em bout	em bout	em bou ⁺
IS.pour	1768	Pour (Ploer -Vns)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S?}	em ^S	meN ^S	=x	m(*)em bout	em bout	em bou [?]
IS.mar MG	1790 1791	Mar (Arr -Hued)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S+}	em ^S	meN ^S	=x	m(*)em bout (EOV: em bout)	em bout	em bou ⁺
VN	~1795	Mar?	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S+}	em ^S	meN ^S	=x	mem bout	?	em bou ⁺
G.GU	1836	Gull (Malg -Sies)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{S?}	em ^S	meN ^S	=x	em bout	em bout	em bou [?]
G.BA	1878	Bay (Aur -Pal)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	me ^S -em ^{S(+)}	em ^S	me ^S -em ^S	=x	em bout	em bout	em bou ⁺
HIVL	1908	Sev (Mor. -Vns)	meN ^S	em ^S	meN ^S	em ^S	em ^{h+}	em ^h	meN ^S	=x	em bout		em bou ⁽⁺⁾
study	t20C	Ter-Groix	məN ^S	m ^S	məN ^S	m ^S	məN ^{S-}	məN ^S	məN ^S	=x		əmbut	əmbow ⁻
study	t20C	McK-Guén.	mə ^S	mə ^S	mə ^S	ʔmə ^S	mə ^{S-}	mə ^S	mə ^S		--	--	mo ⁻
study	e21C	Chev-Lori, Crah-Lang	mə ^S	mə ^S	mə ^S	mə ^S	mə ^{S-}	mə ^S	mə ^S	=x	--	--	mo ⁻

Symbols: α inferred, =x uses enclitics. +/(+)/-/--/? : whether compatible with the en-particle: + yes, - robustly absent, -- variety lacks en, ? unknown, (+) no evidence but en treats HAVE and object proclitics same and does appear in the other environment.

Mesoclitic to proclitic switch in 1SG: In early W, the distribution of meN=, em= cannot at any point be distributed by nominal-verbal categories, since the infinitive and the participle take the accusative aR= form of 3SGM rather than nominal e= in W, and the imperative is certainly a verbal form, and all use meN^S against finite verb em=. However, it is also hard to construe the distribution through mesoclis, since although the em= form is the one to appear after proclitics like pe=, ne=, ma=, da=, e= it also appears as such before the finite verb in both a/ez-contexts. In particular, in in ez-contexts we could expect particle é + (e)m > ém, just like preposition é + (e)m > ém, yet ém= is never the

¹⁴ Notes to Table: Pr/PR: no evidence. NG: deviation from Hemon's 1956 introduction: line em=FIN 1626. Poursache: meN=INF supplied from CAG. Guillaume: (x)INF, PRT completed with LLB, GEG.Jg. G.BA: p. 50 note 2 implies, unintentionally?, that meN beats emS before b,d,g. xFIN can be exceptional after mar, and participle (below). Sources other than NG, CS.bar, IS.mar, MG, VN, and grammars, studies not examined exhaustively.

form before finite verbs when the e-é distinction is clear. Instead what we find is extension of the pre-proclitic variant en of the particle ez, en=em=. This is the situation in all 18C texts studied here, apart from mar=me=/em= mentioned below, and in CS.bar, apart from the failure of the en-particle to appear before consonant-final proclitics and nuances to meN= before participles, both discussed below.

This state of affairs is susceptible to different analyses. One keeps mesoclitic status, =em=, but admits a silent variant of the ez=particle to host it, and adds the en-particle to the set of mesoclitic hosts. A variant assumes that the form is =m= and posits the particle e= in ez-contexts just before it. Another simply stipulates the distribution of a pure proclitic em=, to contexts after proclitics and to before the finite verb. Details depend on the treatment of 2SG and are taken up there.

Such a system, recasting MB ma=, =m by a more stipulative allomorphic distribution of meN=, (=?)em=, would be susceptible to reanalysis if the key pieces of evidence disappeared. This is so in Ternes-Groix, where there is no en-particle, and the collapse of the a/e vowel to ə in proclitics eliminates the difference between pe, p'em and ma, m'em. Reanalysis apparently took it back to meN=, =m, reiterating the MB system, e.g. meN=N/INF, de=m=N/FIN, pe/ne=m=FIN. However, the reanalysis took the extra step of not leaving (=)em= to be accounted for somehow before the finite verb when there is no mesoclitic host. Rather, (=)em= is replaced by the form expected from the system in the context, meN=, as elsewhere in 20C low W: thus differentiating e.g. ne=m=FIN from meN=FIN, nə-m-μana:ŵ-ə-šet ~ mə-μana:ŵ-ə-šet 'tu ne me connais pas'.

Accusative alignment: By G.BA 1878 at least, me/em have extended to each other's environments in FIN and PRT. Thus while Le Goff 1927 gives Euit me freinein against *euit em freinein, on the basis of writers, we get in Le Bayon: Doué em/me hâr and Doué en dès me/em hâret, ean em/me frenas, ha me hlaskéet 'vous me chercherez'. There is nothing about infinitives apart from d'em hlask. For N, the description enforces meN=N, d'/é=em=N, e.g. d'em fen, ém fen, apart from a nonce, uncommented é me jardrin in a list of examples. The resulting distribution is accusative: initially the simple proclitic em= is the object of all and only verbal forms, while meN= is allowed with both nouns and verbs, and noninitially everywhere (=?)em= appears. The pattern is accusative.

This is close to the pattern in Châtelier 2016: 433f. for Héneu, filling the gap with em/me=INF when not after a proclitic, but without studying argument coding with nouns. Relevant is also Châtelier 2016: 430 for Seveno, with mar deziret em guélet, unlike ...en des men galùet, though HIVL clearly uses only meNS=INF in men galùein.

It is unclear how far back these developments go. For the extension of meN= to before the finite verb, HMSB §54.1 notes already cites MG mar me hredét, to which may be added mar me harét, againt mar em bai, mar em behai. If this distribution were systematic, it contrasts 1SG proclitics as objects of transitives and subjects of mihi est HAVE after mar=. 1SG is rare in most texts. IS.pour may only have me, mar me hare unan-benac, with no counterpart or other relevant evidence in IS.mar. CS.bar only has em, 1x Mar em' credet | 2x Mar em' sentet, not ex. with HAVE. This is a difficult domain to infer much from few examples. In contexts where the nonsyllabic mesoclitics =m, =z originally appeared after consonant-final proclitics like pan=, MB-MC-MW developed epenthetic vowel, always e in MB, save precisely after mar=, where a, e are both found, as objects of transitives and of HAVE, across different texts but also in the same text like

M (HMSB, positing *ma-ra-; DMH). Just what the situation of 1SG was after mar= over the history of W needs further study.

Inversely, for the extension of em= to before infinitives, it is curiously absent in two sources where it should be noted. One is G.GLG31: 152-3: when discussing the actual usage of 2SG ha^P= from the object of finite verbs to the object of infinitives and participles, at the expense of the historical and recommended ha^L=, te^L, they explicitly state that there is no such extension of em=: “A la première personne, en l’absence de la particule a voyelle, on dit partout me (non em): doh men guélèt, ean en des men dalhet; men Doé, me sekouret (impératif)”. The other, even stronger, is the ALBB, where the map of ‘me voir’ across all W witnesses no em=; rather, it attests to mostly meN=INF, just like meN=N, ma/me=INF in a part of eastern Arvor, Belle-Île, Houat, Sarzeau, matching ma/me=N in part mismatching meN=N. Before participles, there is CS.bar Goudé o pout em accuset, next.

Eventually, over much of the W area, the meN=, (=?)em= alternation of 1SG is lost, and me=^S alone remains: thus McKenna-Guémené, Cheveau-Lorient, Crahé-Languidic, and the usage observed in Châtelier 2016: 429ff. for e20C Herrieu from Lanester next to Lorient. These re variants without -N, though in the Lorient-area, the earlier generations represented in ALBB and ALLS do have meN=, as Groix still does in Ternes-Groix. The loss of an em= variant is also inferrable as describing much contemporary W in G.GLG02 (see Appendix).

Pre-participial variation: In the history of MB, in the HAVE-perfect, object coding by 3rd person enclitics to the auxiliary appear already in the first extensive securely dateable texts of early 16C like Pm, J, but object coding by 1st/2nd person proclitics to the participle seems to lag behind and appears in the second half of 16C. There is one MB prose author, 17C Tanguy Guéguén, who appears to lack 1st/2nd person proclitics with the participle entirely, and uniquely codes 1st/2nd person objects of the HAVE-perfect by enclitics or a-forms (DMH2). It is the curious that the earliest W texts with 1st/2nd person proclitics, NG and CS.bar, both have anomalies in their form that are absent with infinitives and nominals: in NG unusual distribution of -N and the mutations, in CS.bar likewise and also a nonce em otherwise restricted to the finite verb. It is in order to give a fuller inventory:

NG:

SU≠ em=FIN: Vnan a men disquiblion / E-m guerhou guet scandal

meN^S=N (Sk optionally written, St not written, men d-, men b): see below

1SG=PRT: as expected in *me trompet*, like *me tud*; *men douget*, like *men douar*

1SG=PRT: anomalous in *me gannet*, with no other evidence in NG; *men crouet*, contrast in MG *me caranté*, *me halon* in NG.

CS.bar:

SU≠ em=FIN, man/m(©)S=INF/IPV

1SG=PRT V-: as expected in D’e m’annemis ~~a mes me~~^{ec’hes te} pardonet, / Quen liez gueh an des ~~ma~~^{ta} offancet

1SG=PRT V-: anomalous in Goudé o pout em accuset

1SG=PRT C-: as expected in Brepet oc’hues me sicouret | Ha n’oc’hues quet me sicouret | Ar bed milliguet, / [A>E]n des man goall’ tromplet

1SG=PRT C-: anomalous + expected in P’oc’hues eus ho corf ma vaguet / P’oc’hues me nettait guet ho goet [vowels clear]

Mutations: Historically, me= was a straightforward spirantisation trigger, me=^S, but =m= a partial one, =m=^{Stk}, presumably by secondary provection of -mf-, as in CG: §216. CG attributes the failure to spirantise p after em= to the normative Le Gonidec 1850: 10, presumably for 19C-L, and it is frequent frequent in L texts, HMSB: §11, Le Roux 1896: 8-9, but absent in e.g. 19C-L Hingant 1868: 39 and passim with va fenn - em fenn. The contrast has been both noted, e20C-L Sommerfelt 1920: 123 va fen - em pen, and so has its absence, t19C-T Le Roux 1896, 8-9, 15, cf. Le Clerc 1911: §28. (See theoretically Stump 1987, with citations to normative 20C grammars of KLT apart from those here, Vallé 1926: 69, 79, Trépos 1968: 46).

18-19C grammars of G do not mention any exceptions to spirantisation with em=, save the second but not first edition G.GLG31: 8, and G.BA has explicit examples, e.g. ém fem, d’em fen. However, in 18-19C writers em p- can be unique in systematically escaping spirantisation, IS.pour ém poenn - me foëniou but ém zra - d’em Zatt - me Zatt, ém halon - me halon; or varying on it, MG d’em promesseu - d’em feuranté, em funissehai mé - em pedas. The exception is absent in the one W variety where the meNS - emS alternation survives and has been adequately described, Ternes-Groix.

5.3 2SG

With 2SG, we find the same loss of mesoclisism and changes in alignment as with 1SG, but with considerably more intricacy.

The “standard” distribution of 2SG forms draws on G.GU of 1836:

-ha^P=FIN, ha^L=N in Vannes-region, te^L=N in Lorient and Pontivy regions, but probably with the implication that the latter uses ha^L= after the proclitic prepositions d’, en, and perhaps with the implication that INF and PRT share the coding of N rather than FIN, whether ha^L or te^L.

This the normative recommendation of G.GLG31, set against the actual state of affairs in G.GLG02/31 and Le Goff 1927:

-Arvor central, around Vannes: INF and PRT have aligned with FIN on ha^P against ha^L in N.

-Arvor east, most in detail for Berric: ha^L throughout.

-Arvor west at Groix: ha^{LP} throughout.

-Argoed east, most in detail for S. Allouestre: te^L throughout, including after the proclitic prepositions

-Argoed central in high W: continues the distinction te^L=N against ha^P=FIN, probably with the implication that te^L is also used after the proclitic prepositions, and no indication of what.

-Most low W, Argoed: 2SG replaced by 2PL

A survey of mostly earlier 17-18C does bear out these pattern, but adds others:

Table: 2SG proclitics¹⁵

Text [Ed.]	Date	Author	N	xN	INF	xINF	(x)FIN	PRT	H-INF	H-FIN.FUT
Pr	1631		hé ^L , ta ^μ						é yout	
PR	1693		hé ^L						a vout	
NG	1680		te ^L	é ^μ				te ^L	e vout	
CS.bar	1710	Bar (N-P -Ing)	ta/e ^{L,S}	é ^L	ta/e ^μ	é ^μ	é ^{μ+}	ta/e ^μ	te pou	é p(ez)o ⁺
BT	1745		te ^μ , he ^{Lkp-ç}	e ^k	he ^{μ-ç}		he-ç [?]			
CT.anon	1760		he ^{Lmbdp,St,t-ç} , te ^{L=N}	é ^{Lp}	he ^{μ-μ} , te ^L		he ^{μ=x(+)}			he pou ⁺
SH *L'Arm	1766 [1744]	Cill (Sarrz -G-Ch)	te ^L , te ^S , he ^L , (h)e□□ ^{L-ç*}	é-μ, e ^{p-μ(*)}				te ^μ , he-μ	te-vout	he pou [?] *
PT	1787	Sans (G-Ch -Mex)	ha ^{Lc-p_s}	ha ^{μ-μ}	ha ^{L-μ}		ha ^{c-μ?}			ha vou [?]
GEG.rp	[1857]	Pour (Pleor -Vns)	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{μ-μ}		ha ^{c-ç+}			
CAG	1792	Pour (Pleor -Vns)	he ^{L-ç}	he ^{L-ç}	he ^{μ-μ}	he ^{μ-μ}	he ^{μ-ç?}	he ^{L-μ}		?te pou [†]
APs	1788		te ^L		te ^L				hé pou	é p ⁺
CO	1792		te ^L		te ^L				ha vout	
Cath	1800	Pour (Pleor)	te ^L		te ^L				he pou	he pou [?]
MG	1791	Mar (Arr -Hued)	t ^h he ^L	he ^{μ-ç}	he ^{L-μ}		he ^{L-ç?}		he pou	he pou [?]
IS.mar	1792	Mar (Arr -Hued)	t ^h he ^L		he ^{L-μ}		he ^{L-μ?}		(t ^h)he-pout	
TE	1795	Mar (Arr -Hued)	t ^h he ^L		he ^{L-μ}			t('h)e ^L		
VN	≈1795	Mar?	he ^{L-ç}	he ^{L-μ}	he ^{L-μ}	he ^{c-μ†}				he pou [?]
HJC	1818	Guéq (Mv)	te ^L , ha ^{μ-μ}	ha ^{L-μ}	te ^μ		te ^μ , ha ^{p-μ?}	ha ^{L-μ} , te ^μ		p'vehai
HMP	1809		ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{μ-ç=P}	ha ^{L-ç+}	ha ^{μ-μ}		
HMP	1856		ha ^{L-ç} , te ^L	ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{p-μ}	ha ^{μ-ç=P}	ha ^{p-ç+}	ha ^{μ-μ}		
HMP	1859		ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{μ-ç=P}	ha ^{p-ç+}	ha ^{μ-μ}		
HMP	1863		ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{μ-ç=P}	ha ^{p-ç+}	ha ^{μ-μ}		
G.GU	1836	Guil (Malg -Sén)	Vn. ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-ç}	ha ^{L-μ}	ha ^{μ-ç=P}	ha ^{p-ç(+)}		ha pout	ha pou ⁺
GEG.jg*	1957		Mb.,Ptv, te ^L							
G.BA	1878 [1896]	Bay (Aur -Palais)	% ha ^{L-s} , % ha ^{p-s} , % te ^L				% ha ^{p-s(+)} , % ha ^{L-s(+)}		ha pout	ha pou ⁺
HIVL	1908	Sev (Mor -Vns)	te ^L , ha ^{L†}		te ^μ	d ^h ha ^{k-μ†}	ha ^p			
study	e20C	GFArg. c.	te ^L {2PL}	{2PL}			ha ^{p?/-}			
study	e20C	GFArg. c.	te ^L {te ^{L-g} }	te ^L {te ^L }			te ^{L?/-}			{IPF tó} ^{?/-}
study	e20C	GFArv. c.	ha ^L {a ^{L-g} }	{da ^L }	ha ^p		ha ^{p?/-}	ha ^p		té ha pou ^{?/-}
study	e20C	GFArv. c.	ha ^L {a ^{Ldgk} }	{da ^L }	ha ^L		ha ^{L?/-}			té ha vou ^{?/-}
study	e20C	Ter-Groix	xa ^{L>P}	xa ^{L>P}	xa ^{L>P}	xa ^{L>P}	xa ^{L>P-}	xa ^{L>P}	d'afud	(xa/tə)fow ^{?/-}

Symbols: {ALBB}. ^{+/(+)/-/?}: see Table for 1SG.

¹⁵ Notes to Table: (x)FIN conflated as there is never any distinction comparable to p'em=FIN – me=FIN; (x)H-FIN conflated to H-FIN as xH-FIN mostly unattested but inversely Ternes-Groix. Restrictions of mutations are given if information seemed useful in terms of minimal contrasts or frequent exception. Pr, BT, CS.anon, SH, HMC: mixes and variants discussed below. PT: Excludes Pehour barbar hymn, below. H-FIN PT t^hhe vou, CAG te pou may include subject pronoun, see under HAVE. APs supplemented with CO for teL=INF, both have teL=N, as does IM, but IM differs in the vowel of finite forms of HAVE (na pou, hac en ah pehai). GEG.rp: except one hymn with systematic teL=N and nothing else. Marion: in MG, where 2SG is richly attested, the infinitive is te garehai/zezirou he pout, eit he poud ean, IS.mar cites this as Eit-t^hhe poud ean dré dromperi, -t- perhaps due to eit; xN form is filled in from MG guet-he ç'argand, see below; the MG-TE contrast in INF is nonce but clear, see below. G- is Le Goff 1927 + G.GLG31: 147, 153 {ALBB}: Argoed central: Pluméliau, Baud; Argoed east: Locminé, Saint Jean + S. Allouestre; Arvor central: Locmariaquer for N, FIN and “grande partie” and “presque tout” Arvor for INF and PRT, Arvor east concretely Berric for N, FIN, INF, and by implication ha vou (cf. impf. ALLB Theix twa). Ternes-Groix: same in Le Goff 1927, but cf. MPC d^hha^g(?) in dān de gouhemennèw; on L>P mutation i.e. lenition feeding partial provection see Ternes-Groix.

By and large, a given text is consistent per category, including CS.bar, though an author can differ across texts, as does Pourchasse in his hymns vs. prose, or Pourchasse and Guillome each in the exceptional hymn.

Even more remarkable in the light of grammatical descriptions is plain variation within a category in one and the same text, including and the same hymn and sometimes verse, and occasionally with undescribed and unexpected variants, notably te^S :

Prône 1631: Successive commandments mix $hé^L=N$ and $ta=N$: Ha cohessa ol hé behet / ... // Ha ta Saluer à receui, ‘confess all thy sins and thy saviour’. Contrast PR 1693 Te béhédeu a gonvessy ... // Ha te salver a receuy See however discussion of extensions of proclitic hosts below: if so we would have $ol=hé=N$ vs $\#ta=N$.

BT 1745: Same sentence mixes $te=N$, $he-\zeta=N$, beside $en=e^c=N$: Te hèss en e calon unn desirr miliguett ... Te nairh né aquitou meitt de gol he ζ' inean. Cf in the same text, Ar he gouste é ælléss | he peenn | he boaenn.

CS.anon 1760: Same hymn contrasts $heL-\zeta=N$, $teL=N$, $teS=N$: Change à-vrema he fal vuhé ... aquitein te zelé, Dré compassion doh he ζ' Iné ... Raccé quita te fal vuhé ... A te fal ditt lahein arré He Zatt ... He loskein ... ha groa te borfett. The unexpected te^S is also found in SH, next, and CS.bar, below.

SH 1766 [SHS 1806]:

-Coordination of $he^k=PRT$ and $te=PRT$ in prose: péhani enn déss he carrétt particulièrementant, te chériett, translating ‘qui t’a tant aimée & chérie’

-Same hymn $te^{L_{gp}}=N$ and $te^{Sk}=N$ in parallel contexts + $he^L=N$: SH Te béhédeu V ... Te horolleu V ... Dré he hloére.

-Same hymn $he^L=N$, $te^L=N$ variation against uniformity in closely corresponding hymn of CS.bar:: CS.bar varv’ IESUS ta zat :: SH Varhuë Jesus he datt; Ché en des groit ta θ^{Δ} ~~huhé~~ θ^{Δ} ~~huhé~~ :: Ché enn-déss groeitt he fal vuhé; dré te pehet :: dré he béhétt; sell’ θ labour :: séle te labour; sell’ θ IESUS :: séle te Jesus; en é [c>g]alon / énn é calon. (See full excerpt.)

MG 1791: Marion regularly and frequently uses $t'he=N$, e.g. ar t’he zeulin, but 1x guet-he ζ' argand, the ζ eliminating the analysis guet $he-\zeta=N$, cf. t’he argand, t’he inean in MG, t’he ol joé in TE. As with Pr above, we might have a new mesoclisic context, guet= $he=\zeta=N$ vs. $t'he=N$.

HJC 1818: Rare occasion to examine the usage of an early westward variety, from Merlevenez with corresponding dialectal markers: the remarkable mixture in the text comes out mostly in a single passage, and involves $te^L=/ha=N$, $en=ha^L=N$, $te=/ha^P=FIN$, $te=INF$, $ha/te=PRT$:

-p. 268: Ah, ahoèl in dé a hiniue péhani e zo hoàh un dé à hræce aveit did, p’avehai gouïet anxœt en dé e èlai te laquat i peah? Mæs aveit berman tout en dra-zen e zo cûhet doh te zeulegat[.] Hracce donet e rei-ion aveit te valeur un dé i péhani te énémiset te anvironneo guet retranchemanteu, te ranfermeo, ac ha sterdeo a bep tû; car int ha ræseo hac ha tistrugeo antièramant, té ac te vugalé peré a zo èn ha vurieu: ac idant ha réuin ne

lausqueint quet pas hemp quin mèn ar vèn; hrac ne hès chet gouïet anaüeign enn amzer i péhani en dès Doué ha visitet.” (cf. Luke 19:42).

-p. 336: “Messie, prophètise demp piue ë en hani en dès te scoeit.”

Variation across authors or texts can be examined through a couple of hymns. For 18C, there are variants of “Péhour barbar”, earliest in CS.bar (see full excerpt). Table compares lines with 2SG proclitics across three 18C sources (in each, independent and doubling is té, te). The usage of CS.bar is simple, $te/a=L^S N$, $=é=L^S N$ after d’, en (e^S not instantiated in this excerpt), and so would be that of PT $te=L^N$, $=ha=L^N$ if dré grouped with d’, en, but that of SH is offers clear variation within a category, $te^{L,S}=N$, $he^L=N$, $=é=$ (departures from CS.bar underlined):

Table: 18C Péhour barbar variants (italics are cursive additions/modifications to CS.bar)

CS.bar 1710 Noyal-Pontivy : Inguiniel <i>Péhour barbar</i> ’ 182-4 Caus’ out da varv’ IESUS ta zat!	SH 1766 Sarzeau : Grand-Champs <i>Pehour barbar</i> , 149-151 Causs-out de Varhuë Jesus <u>he</u> <u>datt</u> , Multrér horrible dré <u>he béhétt</u> , Dein dinatur, séle te labour Doh ur potance séle te Jesus; Mena santéss <u>énn é calon</u> Ché enn-déss groeitt <u>he fal vuhé</u> .	PT 1787 Grand-Champs : Meucon <i>Péhour barbar</i> 80-2 Dén dinatur, sél te labour Doh ur potans sèl te Jesus Ma ne santès <u>en ha calon</u>
Muntrér horribl’ dré te pehet, Den dinatur sell’ t̄ labour, Abars ar croés sell’ t̄ IESUS Me ne santés en é [c>g]alon, Ché en des groit ta o [^] all buhé [> fallanté]. Rennonci d’ é libertinag’ Mar dilezes ta o [^] all’ buhé, En é pezo ur fin eurus {2SG}, <i>N/A</i>	<i>Arreste ... péhour barbar</i> , 151-3 Enn-déss groeit ino te béhétt <u>Té hrimeu</u> enn-déss int forgétt Té béhédeu, dein maluruss <u>Te horolleu</u> hi harg à zrein <u>Dré he hloére</u> bédig er véleenn	<i>continues</i> Té béhædeu, dén maluruss Té gorolleu hè harc a zrin <u>Dré ha loèr</u> bédèc er vélèn
<i>t• profit a uers’ t• saluer</i> <i>Disco dehon te trugaré</i> <i>En ur amantign t̄ vuhé</i>	Te déad a seervige bamdé	

For 18C, there is HMP, variants of a hymn on the Prodigal Child in Table. One line of variation shows the historical categorial pattern where the ha= as object of infinitives lenites like ha= as possessor, the accusative pattern where it provects like object of finitive verbs and unlike lenition possessor, and one neutralisation pattern with lenition throughout. The other line of variation is a variety wher ha=, te= alternate freely, both with lenition. Thus we find:

FIN: $haP^g-\zeta=FIN$, save 1809 $haL^g-\zeta=FIN$, yet with no L^k in the other two instances of $ha=FIN$.

INF: 1863-1860-1856 ($\#d’=$) $ha=P^g-\zeta=INF$, like their FIN, 1859 ($\#d’=$) $ha’L^g-\zeta=INF$, unlike their FIN, and 1809 ($\#d’=$) $ha’L^g-\zeta=INF$, like its FIN.

PRT: haX-μ=PRT.

N: (#/d'/en=)haL^{mdpk}-ç=N, with occasional failure to write L^k that is independently observed in the text where it occurs, save 1856 strikingly also has teL^{dp}=N, but not to the exclusion of haL^{dp}=N, including in the very same phrase repeated in different verse.

Table: 19C HMP variants¹⁶

	1863	1860	1856	1859	1809
_ =FIN	é zorn ha condui	=	=	=	=
_ =FIN	Doué ha corto	=	=	=	Doué ha orto
_ =FIN	M'ha câr	=	=	=	=
_ =FIN	En ha ç'ancoéha	=	=	=	=
_ =FIN	N'ha lausquein	=	=	=	=
_ =PRT	me mès ha refuset	=	=	=	=
_ =INF	Doh ha cùélèt	=	=	D'oh ha huélet	Doh ha uélèt
d= _ =INF	d'ha ç'avertissein	=	=	=	=
_ =N	devat ha Zoué	=	devad te Zoué	=	=
_ =N	devat ha Zoué	=	=	=	=
_ =N	ha ç'annemis Lucifêr	=	=	=	=
	E gùittei, ag ha ç'inean				
_ =N	Rai é cârès ha visér	=	=	=	=
_ =N	Hag e bouis ha behédeu	=	Hag e bouis te béhedeu	=	=
_ =N	A pe gùittès ha Grouéour	=	=	=	ha Croèour
_ =N	gobér ha béhedeu	=	(comettein péhedeu)	=	=
_ =N	ag ha ç'ol œvreu	=	=	=	=
_ =N	ag ha visér	=	=	=	=
d= _ =N	d'ha Grouéour	=	d'ha Crouéour	=	d'ha Croèour
d= _ =N	d'ha calon	=	d'ha galon	=	=
en= _ =N	Én ha zistérran dobér	=	=	=	=
en= _ =N	én ha quevér	=	=	=	=

When approaching the 2SG systems, it is useful to begin by expectations of the historical development. MB had da^L=, =z^M=, and a couple of times en=ha^u=. In eNB in general, these could influence each other in complex ways, notable as early and explicit being G.R 179: “Daz caret a rañ, ou, da garet a rañ; je t'aime”. The mutation of =z^M= is only to be inferred from HAVE-forms and from later sources, and appear to have been lenition and provection of m, b, g to f, c'h, but variable neolenition back to v, h, and straight provection of d; it contrasts with 2PL (h)o(z)^P straightforwardly proprotecting voiceless stops. These map to what we find in W roughly as follows (HMSB: §54.2, Schrijver 2011a, CG: §198, §216):

MB da=^L: This underlies one of the chief W forms, te(/a)=^L, with usual ta beside da found as early as Bel.1625 (in free variation with da, p. 85-6), Cs.1642. It is thus expected in old

¹⁶ Note on Table: The history of HMP is not clear to me. The 1809 version is from Kowalski n.d., attributed to Mèrh ‘un recueil de cantiques factice’; 1856 is from reedition of CAG, absent in 1826; and the rest are from editions of the Catechism: 1859 Catechim euit chervige ... Édition Nehué; 1863 Catechim a Escobty Guénèd (first title page), Catechim eit chervij ... (second title page); and undated, approved 1828, attributed by Google to 1860, Catechim a Escobty Guénèd (first title page), Catechim eit chervige ... Edition Néhué. The hymn is absent from different reeditions of the Catechim eit chervige... Trizecvet Quevrenn that I have accessed.

simple proclisis contexts, i.e. #te=^LN, INF, PRT, but not elsewhere, where it is extended when found, and with no obvious source of te=^SN, occasional across sources and occasionally robust. Even in MB, we find the curious replacement in M, me pet haz em preder vs. mez pet da em preder, the latter usual; if archaic rather than innovative, it is expected with the a-support particle regular for proclitics with jussives though not imperatives of MC and in V1 in MW (DMH).

MB =z=^M: This underlies the mesoclitic environments corresponding to te=^L, at its most linear evolution giving da=z=^M=N, INF > d'=e^M-ç=N, INF. Evidence of the mixed or leniprovection mutation is found, but there is tendency to adopt the simpler lenition of #te=^LN, INF, or the simple provection also found with #ha=^PFIN. e=z=N is not continued, see next.¹⁷

MB =e=z=^M=N, en(=?)ha=N: We get en(=?)ha=N, attested in MB, perhaps nasal mutation of en=da= > en=(n)a=, adopting the vowel of the following in texts like CS.bar with en=é=.¹⁸

MB CONJ/PARTCL=z=^M=FIN: Expected to yield the types a=z= > e, e=z= > é, pa=z= > pe, ma=z= > ma ... + (h)^M=FIN for all, but with vowels redistributed throughout to give e.g. uniform é in CS.bar, a in G.GU, G.BA (see separate section), and usually with provection from 2PL (in detail below). As with 1SG, there is evidence for loss of mesoclisism of the pre=FIN form: syllabic form, suppression of the vowel of any preceding proclitic, appearance when there is no preceding proclitic, and extension of the particle en=.

INF/PRT-N: As with 1SG, we find a tendency towards accusative alignment whereby INF, PRT adopt the form and/or mutation of N.

To look at the developments in more detail, they may be separated into contrasts and interactions between =N and =FIN forms; contrasts and interactions between #N/INF and

¹⁷ The development of /θ/ in 2SG and 2PL is curious, apart from their unexpectedly different LP and P mutations. We should expect:

- intervocalic: MB z /θ/, L z, W h, KT variable, to the extent it resisted neolenition, but by neolenition rather /ð/, L z, elsewhere -;
- before h /h/: z /θ/ to s /s/ by voicing assimilation before h /h/, as in the comparative and superlative;
- before base /f/, /θ/, /x/ and leniprovection of /m/, /b/, /v/, /d/, /g/: loss certainly before /d/ with provection to /t/, probably before /f/ and /b/, /v/ with leniprovection to /f/, /x/ and /g/ with leniprovection to /x/, as with particle ez
- maybe loss before other stops, resonants.

This is not the distribution in MB and earliest eNB: particularly surprising is intervocalic c'h, h in eNB-L, IN me hac'h abandon, beside, me a tetest, cf. DEVRI s.v. az (but IN also has diouc'h), and MB J noh eux, as well as more widely before reflexive em in MB, Hemon 1954c: 249f., 251f., where also s /s/ is found here, cf. DEVRI s.v. -s; as well as the familiar z/- variation before consonants in MB, and ç before vowels in W, HMSB: §12, §53-5, Schrijver 2011a: 5.6.1 §53.2n1,3, §51.2, §12. On the face of it, only the distribution of leniprovection is aided by comparative material, MC 2SG ʒ/th/d^{LP} /ð/, 2PL (ga)s', MW 2SG th^L, PL (w)ch'.

¹⁸ This view, CG: §198, requires that as early as t16C Gk, =z= needed to be used with da=, but with e(n) could chose en= or e=, unlike 1SG =m=.

xN/INF forms; and alignment changes of INF and PRT to accusativity, or full neutralisation.

N : FIN forms: With both N and FIN documented are: haL, haP, haLP, teL; teP is missing; teS only with N. N and FIN simple combinations, setting aside te/ha=N mixes above, are: teL-teL (Le Goff: Argoed east), haL-haL (Le Goff: Arvor east), haP-haP (probably inferable from Additions), haLP-haLP (Groix), teL-haL (Marion in MG), teL-haP (inferable from G.GU for Morbihan-Pontivy; Le Goff: Argoed Central), haL-haP (G.GU for Vannes; Le Goff: Arvor central west of Vannes).

The missing combination are expected insofar as they would need more complex pathways of change: ha=N + te=FIN, i.e. if ha=N, then ha=FIN; and haP + haL, i.e. if haP=N, then haP=FIN.

CS.bar has the common pattern te=N/INF/PRT : d'/en=ha=N/INF : ha=FIN but with ta/e for te and é for ha, and any mutational differences impossible to detect. This is pattern of e.g. Cillart's SH, most of Pourchasse's works, Marion's MG, and ALBB's Mûr-de-Bretagne, one of the closest 2SG points to Noyal-Pontivy and Inguiniel.

Mesoclisism forms: The starting point is MB da=^LN/INF vs. da/e=z=^MN/INF, beside rare =en ha=[?]. With N, the MB contrasts if not particulars are continued at a few points at the periphery of the W zone by the early 20C (ALBB, G.GLG.31: 147, and Le Goff 1927):

-ha=^LN but na/da=^MN at Locmaria in Belle-Île, south-east corner island.¹⁹

-ha=^LN but na/da=^PN at Sauzon in Belle-Île, south-east corner island.

-te=^LN but ne/de=^PN at Mûr-de-Bretagne, north-east corner.

The contrasts are however neutralised elsewhere:

-Uniform (#, d=, n=) a=^LN in the south-east, even Houat next to Belle-Île and opposite litoral.

-Uniform (#, d=, n=) (h)a=^M at Groix, south-western corner island (Ternes-Groix: (x)a=^M).

-Uniform (#, de=, i=) te=^LN at S.Allouestre in eastern Argoed near Mûr-de-Bretagne, and residually at Ploemeur in western Arvor opposite Groix, so sole points to keep 2SG outside the south-east.

Outside W, the original pattern =z=^M also survives at another periphery in late 19C, the extreme north of T (Le Roux 1896: 15, 23 29: de=^L in de vrœḡ, de wleḡ, same as

¹⁹ The evidence of ALLB Locmaria \ Sauzon, *MPC for Locmaria, and **Le Besco 1992 s. v. az for Locmaria is consistent, apart from d/ð variation: m, b → v : f \ p (*ha vâb 'ton fils', **axvrœr 'ton frère', **avek 'ta bouche' : da frœdœḡ \ da perdœḡ 'à tes frères', na fêk \ na pék 'dans ta bouche'); d → d : t (ha dilât \ ha dil,ât 'tes habits' : na torn \ na torn 'dans ta main'); g → c'h : 'légère aspiration' (da °wëlé \ da kwëlé 'dans tons lit'; for *dan da c'hordêw 'sous tes ordres', neither the precise value of c'h as x-γ, nor the analysis as dan-d ha or dan d'ha, are clear, cf. Le Besco 1992 s.v. az); t → d/ð : t - (**axdi 'ta maison', **a(x)dat/a(x)dat 'ton père': da tād \ da tād 'à ton père'); k → g : ? (ha gāni \ a gāni he); f → ? : f (**na(x)foš 'dans ta poche'). There is uniform 2SGL=N in the neighbouring island of Houat and the facing mainland along with the rest of Arvor, e.g. Locmariaquer (da/en) aL=N, a zilât - da vrœdīr - é na zorn.

2SG=FIN, but =s=^M in des vugel, nestorn, des wele, not discussed for 2SG=FIN). More widely outside W, what survives is the contrast da=^L - =z=^P, with the mixed mutation replaced by provection (HMSB: §12; grammar of 19C-L Le Gonidec 1850: 10, Hingant 1868: 40-1, e20C-T, Le Clerc 1911: §34; and esp. study of e20C-L, Sommerfelt 1920: 126, 34 da^L ‘ton’ - da^P ‘à ton’).

For W before the limited late 19C evidence of MPC and the early 20C evidence above, G.Vn, G.GU, G.BA are reasonably interpreted as alternating #te=N in varieties that use te with d’/en=ha=N, but otherwise do not differentiate the mutations of d’/en=ha=N/INF from #te=N or #ha=N. In texts, there is a robust pattern of te= or te/ha= against only d’ha=, en=ha=, e.g. Marion’s MG, beside a uniform choice of ha=, e.g. Pourchasse’s GEG.rp, but mutational differences of initial and medial variants relative to N or INF are absent or uncertain. Le Goff (1927) finds some evidence for =ha=^PN/INF against te/ha=^LN, and some of it is given in Table, but it is scant: e.g. in L’Arm s.v. richesse d’e pugalé but s.v. patience: hé béhét; in Marion’s? VN nonce d’he cavouéd - he gorrigien - M’he quemér beside robust (#, d’=, en=) he=^MN; in Seveno’s HIVL nonce d’ha klah - te lakat beside robust te=N, d’/en=ha=^LN, ha=^PFIN.²⁰

CS.bar fits this profile, systematically contrasting ta/e=N/INF and d’/en=é=N/INF, but when mutations are written, both tend to lenition, ta vuhé, ta *[c>g]alon, en é [c>g]alon, both offer instances of spirantisation, dirac man^{ta} zdeu lagat, ta feden, d’é Zat, with evidence of both mutations more robust for ta/e than é (examples chosen from explicit modifications when available). The spirantisation has no known historical grounds, but it is not isolated: SH Te horolleu, Te hrimeu, CS.anon he Zatt (unless the last can be linked to the lexeme-specific a(x)d/ðat vs. a(x)di in Locmaria in Belle-Îli in Le Besco 1992).

In terms of conditioning the initial and medial variants when found, the same issues arise as with 1SG. When there is a te=N, =ha=N contrast, as in CS.bar or MG, we also get ha=FIN, so the medial restriction in =ha=N cannot depend on nonsyllabicity as in MB, and a priori so when the contrasts involve ha with different mutations, e.g. systems with ha=^LN, =ha=^{M/P}N of Belle-Île and Mur-de-Bretagne in the ALBB. The distribution of allomorphs for de is the same with 1SG d’em and 2SG d’ha, d’é, as before other (h)V-proclitics, differs for é, 1SG > ém but 2SG en ha, en é, and the latter is as with other (h)V-proclitics, e.g. IS.mar é pep ‘in each’, CS.Bar en pep or e pep or eæ pep, but for both only -n in én, en ‘in the’, en é ‘in his’, en (h)ou ‘in your’. This is some evidence that the medial variant of 1SG in such systems is =m=, not =em=, despite the orthography d’em, since for =em= we could expect the en-allmorph of é, but we get ém, e’m.

There is some evidence that systems with te=N, x=ha=N could extend the medial variant to elements that did not earlier host =z: dré in SH, PT (see comparison above); MG robustly t’he=N including in ar t’he zeulin, but cf. orthographic guet-he ç’argand where -ç- gives away he-ç, contrast t’he argand, t’he iné; HIVL teL=N robust but dré ha zorn; and Pr ol hé behet but Ha ta Saluer. If so, none of these host =(e)m, e.g. dré’m, dr’em.

²⁰ Le Goff’s 1927 ex. not in Table esp. Sainte-Julienne 1819: Doh ha ortoz; En dès ha uelleit; but d’ha tizober, d’ha carotein. L’Arm may be quoted fully: s.v. patience: Né réss meitt crisquein he béhét; s.v. richesse: Er marhuë a rey d’e pugalé / ... / Vou he çani té é huénon.

Accusativity: clear emergence of accusative alignment over time

-Historical alignment continuing MB forms in what became superficially initial contexts as te=N, INF, PRT against ha=FIN. Normative in G:GLG.31: 32. This pattern seems rarely and robustly documented, but it is so in CS.bar.²¹

CS.bar:

#FIN: ~~En~~ é lez té | M'é clevei

en(=?)FIN: Petra ri té, mar lavar dit IESUS / En é pardon | Goall' calet a galon / En é cavan Christen

=FIN (freq.): a pé guelan

INF: Ma hoant eu te convertissign | hep goulen te guelet | Doh^a te guelet^{te22}

=INF (freq.): D'é corrigign, den ostinet

PRT: PRT: An devezo te comëttet | Ha car en nep en des ta offancet | Quen liez gueh an des ~~ma~~^{ta} offancet

#N (v. freq.): te zigaré | ta vuhé | ta feden

=N (v. freq.): d'é Zat | en é [c>g]alon

-Historical alignment, recast with ha= using different mutations classically ha=^LN, INF, PRT against ha=^PFIN. Normative in G.GLG.31: 153. Not simply, fully, unambiguously described or attested in earlier grammars or the texts surveyed here.

-Accusative alignment, grouping INF, PRT with FIN against N.

(i) Using the earlier te=, ha= distinction: Fairly robust in Marion's 1791 MG, t'he=^Lfreq., nonce he^L=INF, he^L=FIN, more freq.; but may contrast with Marion's other works like TE.²³

(ii) Using ha=^L vs. ha=^P: Clearly described for "most", apparently central, Arvor, e.g. Auray, Locmariaquer, but not Vannes, Berric, in G.GLG.31: 153, Le Goff 1927: thus ha ben, d'ha ben, mé ha padé, me ven ha pahatat, doh ha kuélet, me mes ha kuelet.

-Neutral alignment: INF, PRT, FIN, N all same:

(i) Using te=: Absent early in Table, clear from G.GLG.02: 32: "On emploie aujourd'hui ha out te, suivant les régions: m'em es ha kuélet ou m'em mes te huélet, je t'ai vu ; m'ha kuélou out me te huélou, je te verrai.", and to be presumed specifically for S. Allouestre, G.GLG.32: 147.

(ii) Using ha=: Clear at least as early as 1809 HMP, perhaps earlier but evidence of mutations is unclear. Clearly described for eastern Arvor, notably Berric, in G.GLG: 153: doh ha huélet et mé ha huél.

²¹ The only earlier evidence for PRT, INF is 1680 NG: En deuoué té crouiet like robust type té vanden, Ar te lerh, vs. e ne gullé, dé Saluer, but no evidence of =FIN, unless very indirectly through HAVE-INF Rac e vout bet cruel.

²² The most likely analysis of the correction is bras ar glahar a mes / doh te guelet > ... / a te guelet te.

²³ If so, MG contrasts with TE, albeit in a limited fashion: specifically: MG: [Anna speaks:] hi e laras teign guet un ton colérous : Peëlla doheign , malheuruis ; n'he ç'ha-nàuan quet eit me hroaidur , ne vennan mui hé uélèt -- where é is anomalous for Marion's 2SG forms -- TE: lar dehou enta t'he zelvrein ha ni ehue, where t'he is not to be analysed as d'he, kept as such for 3SGF in TE, and the da-less INF is regular in this construction, cf. MG Hui e lar demb liès gobér tout a balamor de Zoué.

Deserving of a distinct study is the usage of 2SG as the T-form against 2PL as the V-form (see Jouitteau 2020 for the situation in 20C, with further sources).

By early 20C, 2SG is lost in Argoed save for parts of the eastern border, including at Noyal-Pontivy and Inguiniel, in interior of low W including at Guémené and Languidic, and apart from marginal uses in maritime low W of the Lorient-area, though it is Groix (ALBB, Le Goff 1927, Thibeault-Cléguérec, cf. also its absence in ALLS).

19C usage of spoken varieties is revealed in part by MPC. 2SG is used in Houat, Houedic, Sarzeau from father to son but not inversely, in Groix and Belle-Île both, neither in Guémené-sur-Scorff or Merlevenez, with Loth's observation that it is the ordinary mode of conversation in Groix and Houat-Huedic but absent in Guémené-sur-Scorff.

Earlier, uses by several authors suggest limitation of 2SG to various "negative" uses: admonishment, reproach, scorn, insult. One rich prose source is Marion's 1791 MG (Arradon : Huedic). 2SG is found in admonishing self-talk, God admonishing the potential sinner, male jailer in scorn to female prisoner, rich male farmer disparagingly to shepherdess. 2PL is used otherwise across all relationships, between instructing nun and children and adults of from indigent to affluent classes of either sex.

Similar is the usage of Guéquelleu (Gicquello)'s 1818 HJC (Merlevenez, see under 3SG/3PL). 2SG is always negative: Jesus to sinning cities or to Satan, Pharisisees and crowd and soldiers and criminal to Jesus. 2PL is found otherwise, including to and from Jesus and disciples, between parents and children, notably between Mary and Jesus and from Zachary to his son John when little, as well as between masters and servants. There is a revealing switch when Jesus addresses Judas, reproachful 2SG to neutral 2PL: *Mæs Jésus e laras dehon: "Petra! Judas, a-guet ur bocq i traïssès-té Mab Doué"? Ar gùement-cen Judas e vocquas dehon. Noàh Jésus e laras dehon: "Me ami, pèh dessign e huè-hui i tonet aman"?*

In contrast, Sanson's 1787 PT (Grand-Champs : Meuçon, southeast but close to center), has Caif and Pilate use 2SG to trusted subordinates without any negative element, though these use 2PL to them. The usual negative element of 2SG is found in addresses to Judas as traitor and to Jesus as prisoner.

Cillart's 1766 SH (Sarzeau : Grand-Champs, southeast to southeast-centre) may also witness a nonnegative use of 2SG: Mary-Magdalene to herself in pity without any negative element, and Jesus to Judas more in compassionate exhortation than reproach.

The hymns of CAG, GEG, CS.anon use 2SG only with negative pragmatis, as when admonishing the sinner. 2PL is used between Mary and Jesus or between the soul and body at their parting. Attributed hymns with 2SG usage are chiefly the work of Purchase (Ploeren : Vannes, so southeast), and Guillome (Malguénac : Séné, so northeast : southeast). This is also the usage of the hymns of 1680 NG, 2SG used only to reproach Adam or the sinner, 2PL from Jesus to Mary.

Barisy's 1710 CS.bar (Noyal-Pontivy : Inguiniel, so northeast to northwest) patterns with the hymns. 2SG is reserved to admonishment or vituperation: to the sinner and sin, the drunkard, the usurer, the hypocrite, the vengeful person, the rich in outrage to the poor and the poor's corrective reply. Two examples illustrate the tone and the epithets frequently associated with 2SG usage: the author to the vengeful person: *Me n'an deu quement man capabl', / D'é corrigign, den ostinet, / Te so, man Breur, un ececrabl' / Ur*

reprovet, un den danet; the dead rich person who finds a poor person in their burrial plot and back: Me coleras estranch, / ... / Bezout abars an douar, / Un den ma halité, / Tost d'un den quen dispar. // Me lavarar dehon, / Pella doh ign coquin, / Caé da vrainign duzé / Floder, n'an dout quet din / Bezout tal ma hosté. // Diveh, e respontas, / Doh piv a comsés té? / N'an don quet ur coquin; / Un den hep squiant oud é / Ma zretign quen indin. 2PL is found otherwise, even as through the author as himself or more rarely through personages like Jesus is instructing, exhorting, admonishing, reproaching, warning the rich and the poor, the young, men and women. Closest to self-talk come commands issued to one's heart and tongue, and these are 2PL. Address among relatives, friends, or companions, or colleagues or between masters and servants is absent CS.bar.

5.4 1SG/2SG proclitics in HAVE

The forms of HAVE are of interest for the study of the forms of other pronominal objects, and more so inversely. In such traces as there are of HAVE in MW, it was limited to finite forms. There it transparently combined finite forms of bare or prefixed BE with object proclitics, themselves realising descendants of both older accusative objects, regularly, and dative objects, sporadically. In MC-MB, the same mostly holds, but the combinations became partly idiosyncratic in distributing bare and de-prefixed BE according to person.²⁴

W appears to have innovated, rather than inherited, infinitival counterparts of finite HAVE, transparently built on the idiosyncratic infinitive of BE, b(ez)out. In this new formation, proclitics apart from 1SG/2SG are those of both b-forms of HAVE, with the de-prefix in 3rd person, and of objects before b-/d-initial infinitives, revealing little.²⁵ In particular, there is no occasion to examine the -n, -r, -l differentiation of 3SG, and only in a limited way for 1PL.²⁶

Table: Finite HAVE-forms in CS.bar vs. G.GU, LLB, GEG.jg²⁷

²⁴ In orthography, HAVE robustly shows the leniprovection of b associated with the 2SG mesoclitic, but the same leniprovection is also documented after the 2SG mesoclitic as object in MC (Toorians 2014) and in post-MB varieties (Le Roux 1896 and above), so there is no reason to believe it was limited to HAVE in MC-MB.

²⁵ The forms of HAVE may be divided into V-forms, continuing *es-, in MB present and imperfect but in W only present, and for the rest b-initial or B-forms, continuing *bh-, extended in W to the imperfect, and to some extent the present (esp. G.BA 1878, contrast G.GU 1836).

²⁶ For 1PL, the invariant honⁱ of MB appears in 18C writers and classical grammars of W as hunⁱ - hun^{Sptk} - hur^{Sk}-nⁱ-lⁱ - hur^{Sptk}-nSt-lⁱ (n before vowels and n, t, d, h, variably l before l, r elsewhere). The relevant hur b-variant is extended to HAVE by 18C, and a text usually shares variants across HAVE and proclitics, e.g. typical in both (h)unn b- in IS.pour, hur b- in IS.mar. Mismatches do exist, but it is not clear to what extent they reflect possibilities rather than accidents or conventions, e.g. restriction of the couple of r-variants to objects against n-variants elsewhere in NG. In Barisy there are only two r-variants introduced by change before p as object and possessor, and the rest is n-variants, including in HAVE.

²⁷ Notes to Table: Forms with preceding subject pronoun shown for 1SG, 2SG where fusion can occur, else transparent, e.g. CS.bar (h)i o des. Forms with preceding negation shown for 1SG, 2SG where 1SG loses a, else transparent, e.g. n'o des, and likewise for particles and conjunctions, e.g. p'o des. Jussive: CS.bar only 2PL (h)o pet, n'o pet; G.GU 2PL hou péet, but also the uniquely suffixed 3SG en déet, 3PL en déent, 2SG hé péès, 1PL hun béemb. En-particle: in CS.Bar available in 3SGF, 3PL, 2SG, in G.GU given only for 2SG ha-forms in G.GU but available generally in LLB and GEG.jg, both as with object proclitics, see below. CS.bar variants not noted: base vowel usually e, but common é, e.g. des/dés, hes/hés, oc'hues/oc'hués,

	V-forms		B-forms		Infinitive	
3SGM	Barisy a/en de(ve)s	Guillome en des	Barisy a/en dev(ez)-	Guillome en d-	Barisy a/en dev(ez)out	Guillome (d')en dout
3SGF	(#)é des		é dev-		é/e devout	
3PL	o des	ou dès	o dev(ez)-	ou d-	(d')o dev(ez)out	(d')ou dout
1SG	a mes [*em es] ne mes mé (a) mes [*mé em es], me mes	e mès ne mès me mès	em b(ez)- n'em b(ez)- m'em' b(ez)-	em b- n'em b- mem b-	m(')an, >mem b(ez)out	(d')em bout
2SG	é hes [*é es] né es	e hès [*ha çes] ne hès [*n'ha çes] te hès [*t'ha çes]	é p(ez)- n'é p(ez)- té pé	ha p- ne p- te p-	te pout	(d')ha pout
1PL	on es	hun nès	on b(ez)-	hun b-	d'on, (h)on b(ez)out	(d')hun out
2PL	oc'hues [*hoc'h es]	e huès [*hou çes]	(h)o p(ez)-	hou p-	d'o, (h)o p(ez)out	(d')hou pout

Symbols: [*...] expected from proclitic=transitive. +/(+)-/--/? : see Table for 1SG.

1SG/2SG proclitics are of the greatest interest, since they either export their form in finite HAVE, em bou > em bout, d'em bout, in which case it may speak to a nonmesoclitic analysis of em=; or they adopt regular object clitic forms for infinitives, mem bout, d'em bout, speaking to the nature of HAVE; or they do the unexpected, such as SH te vout, CS.bar te pout. Thus already Le Goff 1927: 202-3: “Quelques-uns y voient un simple possessif comme celui qui précède l'infinitif actif. Cette opinion paraît suggérée par l'orthographe du XVIIIe siècle : Me garehai mem bout treu d'em change (Mag., 220) ... Lauteur du recueil de 1700 écrit man Doué e[t], de la même manière, me mes quée man bout offanset..., evit man bout patiantet. ... Pour le plus grand nombre, le pronom ne serait autre chose que l'infixe, abstrait des formes de la conjugaison. C'est ce qui paraît dans ces textes : er peh e gares ha pout groeit (Considérationeu santel, 123) eit he pout int (Catéchisme de l'empire). -- La mutation forte atteste la présence de l'infixe.”

1SG forms, finite: By 18C texts like IS.pour, expected MB a/e=m > e/é=m, cf. MB e=m > ém ‘in=1SG’, has been recast for both object clitics of transitives and subject clitics of HAVE: in a-partiple contexts, Ø em; in ez-particle contexts, Ø/en em. CS.bar differs: a-particle contexts use a m- with 1SG forms of HAVE, but Ø em for 1SG objects, see Table. This is consistent and robust, but perhaps conventional, given the pervasive a/e variation of proclitics in CS.bar (q.v.).

Table: 1SG forms of HAVE²⁸

Author	Text	Date	1SG=BE.FIN [FIN.tr]	1SG=BE.INF [INF.tr]	d=1SG=BE.INF [INF.tr]
	NG	1680	en bou [?] [em ^{h?}]	? [meN ^S]	?
Barisy (N-Pvy - Ing)	CS.bar	1710	em b(ez)o [?] [em [?]]	m(')an bout* [meN ^S]	? [em ^S]
	CS.anon	1760	em bou [?] [em ^{S?}]	m'em boud [me[N] ^S]	? [em ^S]
Cillart (Sarz - G-Ch)	L'Arm,SH	1744,66	em bou ⁺ [em ^{S+}]	(m')em bout [meN ^S]	em bout [em ^S]
Pourchasse (Ploer-Vns)	IS.pour	1776	em bou [?] [em ^{S?}]	em bout [meN ^S]	?
Marion (Arr-Houed)	IS.mar	1790	em bou ⁺ [em ^{S+}]	m'em bout [meN ^S]	em bout [em ^S]
	MG	1791	=	=	=
[?]	VN	1795	=	=	?
[??]	G.Vn	1795	=	em bout [meN ^S]	?
	EOV	1838	=	em bout [meN ^S]	em bout [em ^S]

pezo/pézo, pezout/pézout, save devez-; and usual devez- is 1x deves-; rare unrevealing orthographic variants not noted for oc'hues, e.g. 1x o'chues beside; h- only as indicated save 1x ^hé des.

²⁸ Notes to Table: G.BA: but cf. de me jardrin in list of examples, contrary to d'em in grammar.

Guillome (Malg-Séné)	G.GU	1836	em bou [?] [em ^{S?}]	em bout [meN ^S]	em bout [em ^S]
Le Bayon (Aur-Palais)	G.BA	1878	em bou ⁺ [em ^{S(+)} , me ^S]	em bout [meN ^S , ?em ^S]	em bout [em ^S]
Ternes-Groix		t20C	əmbow ^{N/A} [mən ^S , =m ^S]	?	əmbut [=m ^S]

Symbols: ⁺/(+)⁻/--/? : see Table for 1SG.

1SG forms, infinitive: The use of the object-clitic form, type mem bout, requires the recognition of some shared property between objects of transitives and subjects of HAVE, such as historically was case in syncretic dative-accusative clitics. The use of the finite-clitic form, type em bout, requires emancipation of em from any potential mesoclitisis contexts, even a silent particle, since with infinitives there is none. That is independently so by the time of Le Bayon and Seveno, who can use em before participles and infinitives initially, but the infinitive of HAVE suggests it was so far earlier.

Both formations are early. The type mem bout is attested in 1710 CS.bar, and in a collection of cantiques of about 1700 cited in Le Goff: man Doué e [sic], de la même manière : me mes quée man bout ollanset, evit man bout patiantet. The type em bout goes back to at least the “recueil de cantiques” of 1734 cited in Loth 1886: 319, presumably GU, kai hem-houd offansét -- ha mem bout mil calon. The type mem bout and em bout both are found Cillart’s L’Arm of 1744: L’Arm drawn on only for INF forms, quena eellan m’emm boutt me henale ‘quen na hellan mem bout ma anal’ - Mé garehai em boud é gratt vatt.

The use specifically of the form man in CS.bar, and its analogue men in NG, is revealing for a separate reason. The later writing m’em bout, m’em bou is homographic with the initial of m’em bou ‘I will have, that I have’, and this has given rise to the hypothesis that the latter is responsible for the former, just as em bou is for em bout (Ernault 1888: 265 = EC 6). CS.bar, however, has man b(ez)out, m’an b(ez)out, apart from a couple of later changes, and man is always the spelling of object and possessor and them alone, while later m’em bou would be *m’em bo (cf. me a mes, em bo, p’em bo, conjunction + have-subject clitic m’an devo, subject + object object m’an discleri, m’er guel). It is not clear whether n for m is anything but orthographic, though it is not a convention elsewhere used in the text, as it is in NG; but the vowel probably is significant, see under 1SG forms.

2SG-2PL are more intricate because of the treatment and effects of *-ð-:

Table: Developments of 2SG/PL proclitics

MB	W: expected	W: object	also	W: HAVE	also 18-19C	also 20C
A/E=θ ^t =eus	e/é=hes	Ø/en=ha/e=ç’V-	Ø=t(a/e)=V-	Ø/en=e= <u>h</u> es	Ø/en=ha/e=pes	
A/E=θ ^t =b-	e/é=f-	Ø/en=ha/e=p-	Ø=ta/e=v-	Ø/en=ha/e=p-	te=p-	ha/e=v,p,f-
Ø/EN=hoθ ^p =eus	Ø/en=hohues	Ø/en=hou=ç’V-		Ø/en=e= <u>h</u> ues	Ø/en=hou=pes	
Ø/EN=hoθ ^p =b-	Ø/en=hou=p-	Ø/en=hou=p-		Ø/en=hou=p-		

Symbols: Underline: opaque phonological developments. h-: Ø/h/x. ha/e, ta/e: usual (h)a vs. te, but also (h)e vs. te, CS.bar é vs. ta/e. Ø/en ehues: variants e.g. ISmar Ø/en e hoès, IS.pour Ø/enn é-(h)ouess, but SH perhaps contrasting ë/é-ouess, and CS.bar invariant (h)oc’hues.

There are three relevant developments, differently repartitioned across transitive objects and b-forms of finite HAVE:

-In 2SG objects of finite transitives and subjects of finite HAVE, the ha-type continues *=z= after conjunctions and particles, e.g. MG p'he pou, n'he ç'hanàuan. The te-type is introduced from *da= in e.g. objects infinitives, perhaps clearest in 20C eastern Argoed, e.g. S. Allouestre te bou, me te vadé.²⁹ The particular vowel of the ha-type shows considerable variation, usually systematic é, (h)e, (h)a, apart from the present form of HAVE always with e or é; these can all be derived from particular environments like e=z=, a=z=, ma=z, but nowhere retain original alternations (see separate section).

-In 2SG object clitics, by 18-19C, the leniprovection of b- > f- seems usually to have been replaced by provection or lenition, though it remains at least at Locmaria in Belle-Île and at Groix (above). The same for 2SG in HAVE, e.g. ALBB 'tu avais' Ploeren ta pwè - Ile-d-Arz tè fwè - Sarzeau ta wè. The two replacements can match, and probably there was a tendency in this direction, discussed in Le Goff (1927): thus his Auray-area te ha pou like mé ha padé vs. Vannes-area te ha vou like me ha vadé; earlier G.GU 1836 ha pou like m'ha pade. However, they frequently mismatch, directly MG he pou -- Me he vadé, less directly PT caèr ha vou, n'ha vou, ha te n'ha vou -- m'ha conjur, ni ha credou. Often there is no evidence, including CS.bar é pézo, where the mutations written with 2SG é are only attested as possessor, d'/en é c→g, t→z.

-2SG/2PL -θ > -h > ∅ before consonants and s- before h and vowels through resyllabification of -θ (h)V to -∅ θ(h)V- > s(h)V- (Schrijver 2011a, with s- of shV-generalised over zV-). In V-forms of HAVE, the resyllabification did not take place, and intervocalic θ > h as expected. This is transparent in 2SG. In 2PL, it interacts with ho > hou to give -hw-, transparent in CS.bar oc'hues of all contexts, but generally replaced by e in e huès and its orthographic variants. SH may be exceptional here with ë/é ouess, but its particles are a/é.

The resulting 2SG finite B-forms of HAVE are set in Table against the corresponding infinitive:

Table: 2SG forms of HAVE³⁰

Author	Text	Date	2SG=BE.FIN [=FIN]	2SG=BE.INF [=INF]
	[Ed]			

²⁹ 20C eastern Argoed: Le Goff 1927 Locmine, Saint Jean mé te zalhou, mé te huélou like te ben, te zorn, te vah; G.GLG.31: 147 S. Allouestre me te vadé like de te zorn, HAVE initial vs. ez-contexts FUT te bou, te bou, IMPF to, e to, PRES teh, e teh, ALBB HAVE IMPF S. Allouestre tó, Locqueltas tè vó. With HAVE however, it can be difficult to distinguish te p/v- from te ha v/p- > ta, te v/p-, cf. Le Goff 1927 Vannes té ha vou, Auray té ha pou, and so likely ALBB types IMPF Ploeren ta pwè - Ile-d-Arz tè fwè - Sarzeau ta wè. To this latter type probably belong, earlier PT ha vou, n'ha vou, but Groa unan im presans, ha t'he vou inourieu; Ha té vé chonj from "Cannenneou de 1779" in Le Goff 1927. The syntactic context and early date would favour te pou < te ha pou in CAG En hi te pou confortance, were it not for its isolation.

³⁰ Note to Table: no data for d'=2SG=BE.INF, save Groix where it is the only datum. Marion: in MG, where 2SG is richly attested, the infinitive is regularly he pout, including citation of the commandment eit he poud ean dré dromperi, but IS.mar cites this as Eit-t'he poud ean dré dromperi.

	Pr	1631		e vout [?, cf. hé ^L =N, ta ^u =N]
	PR	1693		e yout [?, cf. ta ^u =N]
	NG	1680	?	e vout [?, cf. te ^L =PRT]
Barisy (N-Ptv - Ing)	CS.bar	1710	é p(ez)o ⁺ [é ^{u+}]	te pout [te ^u]
Sanson (G-Ch - Meuç)	PT	1787	ha vou [ha ⁻ -μ [?]]	?
Cillart (Sarç - G-Ch)	SH,	1766		te-voud [?, cf. te ^u /he ⁱ =PRT]
	L'Arm	1744	he pou [?] [?]	
Pourchasse (Ploer-Vns)	CAg	1792	?te pou ⁻ [he ^u -ç ⁺]	?
Pourchasse (Ploer-Vns)	CO	1792	é p ⁺ [?]	hé pout [te ^L]
Pourchasse (Ploer-Vns)	CT.13	1785	?	ha vout [?, cf. te ^L =N]
Marion (Arr-Hued)	MG	1791	he pou [?] [he ^L -ç [?]]	he pout [he ^L -μ]
Guillome (Malg-Séné)	G.GU	1836	ha pou ⁺ [ha ^p -ç ⁽⁺⁾]	ha pout [?, cf. %ha ^L -ç=N, %te ^L =N]
Le Bayon (Aur-Palais)	G.BA	1878	ha pou ⁺ [ha ^{p%} -s ⁽⁺⁾]	ha pout [?, cf. ha ^{L%} -s=N, %te ^L =N]
Seveno (Moréac-Vns)	HIVL	1908	?	ha pout [te ^u , cf. te ^L =N, ha ^L =N [†]]
(Le Goff) Arvor c.	study	e20C	(té) ha pou [ha ^p]	
(Le Goff) Arvor e.	study	e20C	(té) ha vou [ha ^L]	
(Ternes) Groix	study	t20C	[xa ^{L>p}]	d'afud [d=a ^{L>p}]

The commandments offers a glimpse of the range of forms of the infinitive:

Pr 1632: Mat ar en douar ne desiri / Euit é yout dré tromperi ... Ha cohessa ol hé behet ...
Ha ta Saluer à receui

PR 1692: Mat ar en douar ne houantey, evit a vout-y dré trompery. ... Te béhédeu a gonvessy ... Ha te salver a receuy

GU 1734: eitt te vould i [not in Table; cited in Loth 1886 q.v. as 'pour les avoir']

SH 1766: Mad ar enn Douar né houantehi / Aveit te-voud intt dré dromperi -- Te béhédeu a govessi ... Ha te Salvér a recehui

CT.13 1785: Mad ar enn doar ne hoantei, eit ha vout ean dré dromperi -- Te behédeu e govesssei ... Ha te Salvér e receüei

IS.mar 1792: Mad ar en doar ne hoantein, / Eit-t'he poud ean dré dromperi -- The béhédeu e govesssei ... The Dad Salvér e receuei

MG 1791: Mad ar en doar ne hoantei, eit he poud ean dré dromperi -- T'he béhédeu e govesssei

CAT.1810 Eit he-pout int dré dromperi -- ha behedeu a govesssei ... ha te Salver a receuei

The formation of the infinitive probably could use either the finite form of HAVE or the the object clitic with infinitives, when these differed, just as with 1SG. Evidence for recruiting the finite form is MG he pout, like he pou but not me he vadè. Evidence for recruiting the object + infinitive form just might be 1734 GU te vould, Cillart's 1766 SH te-voud, since a finite *te vou seems absent early, less so Pourchasse's 1785 CT.13 ha vout, 1680 NG e vout, 1692 PR e vout, 1632 Pr e yout, since we do not know in these sources whether the historically expected *...V=z=bo > *a/efou had given the types a/e pou or a/e vou, or whether indeed -v- is not in this instance a spelling of the historically expected lenition + provection of b.

However, unlike with 1SG, there is also a type that mixes the two types of 2SG coding: CS.bar in its extraordinary form te pout. The finite form of HAVE is é p(ez)o, the object clitic is é=FIN, ta/e=INF, d'é=INF, with unknown mutation unless it can be inferred from d'/en=é^{L,S}=N, é p(ez)o, and the infinitive of HAVE mixes the segmental content of 2SG=INF with the mutation of 2SG=BE in HAVE. The form d'=HAVE.INF is not attested in CS.bar for 1SG or 2SG.

Forms of the agreeing infinitive of HAVE other than 1SG/2SG are transparent with respect to proclitics and share those of finite HAVE-forms and objects of infinitives alike. Earliest are, apart from sources with only the commandments above (rich inventory and discussions of later forms in Ernault 1888b: 265-6, DEVRI s.v. *bout*, Le Roux 1957: 198-9, HMSB: §140.10, Châtelier 2016x):³¹

NG 1680: 2SG *rac e vout bet cruel* | 2PL *Hep hou but goulennet*

1700: 1SG *me mes quée man bout offanset* | *evit man bout patiantet* [recueil de cantiques of about 1700 cited in Le Goff 1927]

GU 1734: 1SG: 3SGM *d'en devoud* | *en doud* | *me méss kai hem-bout offansélt* | *aveit hou ç'adorein ha mem bout mil calon* | *d'emboud assolvæn* | 2SG *eitt te voud i* | 2PL *hou poud* [Loth 1886]

L'Arm 1744: 3SGM (d')*enn devoutt* (freq.) | 3PL *d'ou devoud* | 1SG *quena eellan m'emm boutt me henale* 'quen na hellan mem bout ma anal' - *Mé garehai em boud é gratt vatt* [cf. Ernault 1887: 43n2]

CS.bar is among the earliest sources in this list, and the richest in forms and constructions, including lexical and auxiliary uses, all persons of subject, most persons of object. Its formation is: base infinitive of BE *b(ez)out* (lexical and auxiliary and attested with lenition as *v(ez)out*) + proclitic whose form is same as the object of infinitives in finite-infinitive in general, independent and after proclitic, save 1SG/2SG (not attested after *d'*).

Table: Infinitive of HAVE in CS.bar.³²

	Initial	P≠	P=
3SGM	<i>an devout(**)</i> <i>an(>en) devezout</i>	<i>goudé an devout</i>	
3SGF	<i>e devout</i>	<i>oc'h é devout*</i>	
3PL	<i>o devezout, o devout*</i> <i>hac i naoah o devout tremenet !</i>	<i>euitt/dré/faut' ho/o[†] devout(*)</i>	<i>d'o devout i groit [3SG]</i>
1SG	<i>man bout</i> <i>m•'m bout*</i> <i>m^{m?} bout</i> <i>man^{em} bout</i>	<i>dré man bezout</i> <i>hep m'an bezout*</i> <i>goudé m'an bout</i>	
2SG		<i>hep/a/euitt te pout*</i> <i>euitt t• pout</i>	
1PL	<i>hon bout</i>	<i>euitt/doh hon bout*</i>	<i>d'on bout*</i> <i>d'on bezout*</i>
2PL	<i>ho pout(*)</i> <i>ho pezout(*)</i>	<i>a/eus/hep/dré/euitt/goudé ho/o[†]/ho[†] pout(*)</i> <i>goudé ho pout i recevet [3SGF]</i> <i>hep/a ho pezout*</i>	<i>d'o pout(*)</i> <i>do pézout</i>

³¹ Le Roux 1957: 198 refers to Ernault 1914: 277n8, cited in Châtelier 2016x, but Ernault is favours analysis of *ho bout* there as 'their being'; it would be the sole instance of 3rd person forms of HAVE without the *d*-prefix to BE in Breton, outside Batz, Ernault 1883, where they appear to be later reformations, DMH, and rare late formations repertoried in Le Roux 1957. Le Roux 1957: 198 cites BT for forms but seems to be referencing Loth's 1886 introduction to the work citing rather GU here.

³² Columns: Forms with enclitic objects given when present. Variants not noted: base vowel usually *e*, but common *é*, e.g. *pezout/pézout*, save *devez-*.

Quit' oh ho pout an diessamant*

Symbols: * lexical synthetic, ** lexical perfect, else perfect auxiliary.

Finally, the very occurrence of the proclitic + BE infinitive of HAVE in CS.bar is extraordinary. Attested forms mostly come from the literary language of 18-19C based on southeastern varieties, are last known from that region in 19C, apart from 20C Groix (Ternes-Groix). This has suggested that they are proper to Arvor high W, with extension to the partly high W variety of Groix, to which must however be added en dout in early 19C Merlevenez (MPC version in Ernault 1890). Yet CS.bar, in intent written in the language of interior low W Inguiniel by an author from Argoed high W Noyal-Pontivy, uses them frequently, and in unique forms like te pout. His 3rd person forms always contain v-, type en devout, not en dout, identified as a form of Vannes as early as the late 18C G.Vn, but also in 19C in Merlevenez, Groix and Sarzeau (MPC, absent in the versions from Belle-Île and Guémené), and common alongside the -ev- form in many early writers (Purchase, Marion but not it seems Cillart).

5.5 3SGM e vs. ar

In MB, 3SGM had the forms en=FIN and e=^LN/INF. The use of é= with INF like with N continues its origin as a nominalisation or verbal noun. By MB, its continuing analysis as a verbal noun depend on the right analysis of constructions of the type ma/o bout guelet, usually analysed as passive formations (esp. LVB). There are some hints of an extension of finite object coding in reflexive e/en=em=VN/INF, at a period where en=em= is not a general reflexive marker, but obscured by occasional reduplication with other pronouns (see in fine Hemon 1954). By the time of linguistic studies of 20C varieties, it is clear that both verbal nouns and infinitives exist, the latter with finite-clause object coding and tense/voice distinctions (esp. Stephens 1982).

Fully-developed infinitives are clear in W by mid-18C, including Cillart (SH), Purchase (IS), Marion (IS, MG). It is the only situation described by grammars.³³ In late-17C NG, however, object coding on INF is mixed, though clear e= is exceptional, and we cannot contrast the two types in anything like minimal pairs.³⁴

NG 3SGM in infinitives (ex.):

E:

³³ We would also expect verbal nouns, e.g. é uélet 'his seeing', used much in the same way as an *debrîñ-avalou*, beside 'ar guélet 'to see him'. An example is CHal.ms iii. "on paye a un Courier les frais de son retour, aussi bien que de son aller", *paiein arer d'ur c'hourrier querclous é ounet el é zonet*, cited in DEVRI. G.GLG02/31: 68 notes "Quelques infinitifs se construisent à la manière d'un substantif avec l'un ou l'autre article [e.g. en débrein le manger, ur herhet divalaù une demarche disgracieux, er guélet la vue]. Ces sortes d'expressions sont peu nombreuses dans le dialecte de Vannes: celles que nous venons de citer se rapportent aux fonctions du corps."

³⁴ Hemon 1956: §63 speaks of a general coding by e= and several examples of en/n/l, but the proportions are equal at first sight, and then only because of the orthographic ambiguity of e l-/r- that includes el/r l-/r-, clear from the articles and finite forms, Hemon 1956: §53 found in finite forms is taken into account.

Mar guelezen é gauouet euit e vartirou. ‘If they could find Him in order to martyr Him’.

Ema mé a deli e gouvernä. “I should rule over him”

Me m-es poiniet douh é gouarn. “to govern him”

EN/R/L:

Monet d-er secour.

D’en abr(euei)gn e yes ‘[the curs] went to give him a drink’

feçon / D-er crouguin

Euit her confondou

Cruel vo er guelet

In between this period falls CS.bar, and its evidence is striking. eR is universal with both FIN and FIN, apart from e one verse for both FIN and INF, and that in a a hymn that uses a/eR for both otherwise, plus one correction:

Ur fal begat buon a lausquer, / Souden a clasquer e zelhel, / ~~Hu~~^{ic} é zalh[ei>o]
[Preceding verse includes An offañç’ ... / Ne coust’ netra æ^{er} prononcign.]

Dreist pep tra ar^e carign^{et} {3SGM=Doué} / a delé^{enqua} pep unon

There is however, one systematic exception, (G)OBER (both forms used in CS.bar). Its objects use regular forms when covalued with to nominals, so sin ‘sign’, penigen ‘penance’ take 3SGM ar gober, an ober, 3SGF é gober, é gober. 3SGM eR is also the form used for anaphora to quantifiers without an overt nominal:

N’a les’ netra hep ar gober

Hani eus ar pevar quantan, / (Eueheit mat da quement man) / Hep ar gober, na lezet quet

Ar peh a ras IESUS, er moment sé, / Eun ordrennas ar gober goudezé.

However, clausal referents, take 1x ar gober, but 7x d’P/- ar gober > e ober, e.g.:

Ha brepet prest doh ar gober {sc. servig or sc. rentan servig}

D^coh æ^e gober {obey}

d’æ^e gober {sc. o sicour}

Me cred é hellan æ^e gober {sc. lacat argant ar pourfitamant}

d^eoh æ^e gober {sc. approach confession without exam}

Mir’ den diveh, mir’ ta secret, / Eleh me fedign d’ar miret, / ~~Førh~~ æs^e vihé dit æ^e gober {sc. miret ta secret}, / Ma na vihés ul’ langager.

An æssan sur eu æ^e ober {punissin pehet / ober penigen / penigen}

Hep @^{c’h} ober {interesting mutation}

This is not a general Contrast regular 3SGM elsewhere even for clausal referents:

Mæs goall’ ober mar o guelet, / Gourdrouzet i e[n>1] larehet

Later W does not make this distinction:

Allas ! distér-è en nombr ag er-ré en dès soign a zésquein hac a avertissein er vugalé d'er gobèr IS.mar

The use of é with gober for clausal referents is strikingly the inverse of the specialisation of (h)eR= against e¹= for inanimate referents in 19C KLT (HMSB: §52.3).

6 Morphophonology of proclitics in CS.bar

This section takes up the morphophonology of clitics, to which a good introduction is the preface of CS.bar (note that all forms are W when independently identifiable: pehedeu, pehet, ta/te): “Il m'est indifferent par exemple qu'on dise, ho pehedeu, vos pechez ou bien hou pehedeu, ar pehet le peché, ou bien er pehet, ta labour ton travail, ou bien te labour, en em convertisset, convertissez vous, ou bien un um convertisset, oc'hani le vôtre, ou bien ho hani [...]”

6.1 Mutations

Table resumes the linking consonant and consonant mutations of pronominal and selected other proclitics:

Table: Mutations after pronominal proclitics, selected verbal particles, and preposition a

		m	b	d	g	g-r	g-o	g-ou	g-u	p	t	tr	c/q	V
mar=FIN	·			!!z										
ér-c'h=FIN	M			t ^{E(*)}	c'h ^{E*}	t ^E								c'h V
ar=FIN	L ^{!!}	v ^A	v ^A	z ^{A,E} , !!t ^A	· ^{A,E}	· ^{A,E}	· ^{A,°A}	· ^A	· ^{A,E}	b ^{A,E}	d ^A , lz ^A	!zr ^{A,E}	g ^{A,(E?)}	V
na/e=FIN	L [!]	v		z	-	-	-	-	-	b	d	!zr	g	V
pa/e=FIN	L [!]	v		z								!z	g	V
em _{RX} =V	L			z									g	V
ap=NP	L	v	v	z (zr)						b	d		g	V
é _{3SGM} =	L [!]	v ^N		z ^{N,F,I}						b ^N	d ^N , lz ^N		g ^N	V ^N
aR _{3SGM} =	S ^{kt,!!}								!! ^{*F}				c'h ^F	V ^{F,IV}
(h)é _{3SGF} =	L [!]					!! ^{-F}						!zr ^F	!!g [!]	V ^{F,IN}
(h)o-c'h _{3PL} =	S [!]			!z ^{F,IN}						f ^{N†}			c'h ^N	c'h V ^{IV,PT,N}
em _{1SG} =	S ^k												c'h ^N	V ^{PT,N}
m(a/e) _{1SG} =	N,S ^{!!}	(!n) m ^N , !v ^{PT}	n b ^N	n d ^N	n g ^{N,IV}		n g ^N	n g ^N	n g ^N	f ^N	z ^N	zr ^I	c'h ^{M,PT,N}	V ^{I,PT,N} , m ^V N
(h)é _{2SG} =	L [!]										z ^N		g ^N	
t(a/e) _{2SG} =	L ^{!!}		v ^N	z ^N			· ^N			!!f ^N	z ^N		g ^N	V ^{PT,N} , t ^V N
(h)o _{1PL} =	·			!z ^I										V ^{PT}
(h)o-c'h _{2PL} =	P [!]		p ^N	t ^{F,N} , !z ^F				c ^N				!zr ^F		c'h V ^{F,I,PT,N}

Symbols: [!] indicates anomalies involving t/d→z, ^{!!} others. Symbols: ^F FIN, ^M IPV, ^I INF, ^P PRT, ^N NP, ^x after d'/e, ^A V-FIN in A-context, ^E V-FIN in EZ-context. [°] indicates instances additional to forms of gober, goal-, gout, guelet. * evidence only from or (*) also from the strong intransitives bezout, monet, donet, deleout, gallout.

Note on forms: (a/e) suppressed before other proclitics, variably before nonclitics. -c'h invariably added before vowels as c'h V, c'hV, hV. (h) only by addition in 3SGF, rare in 3PL, rare in 2PL/3PL if -ch is present, rare in 1PL after proclitics.

Mutations are typically not indicated after proclitics, and indeed within recognised compounds, though with exception such as preference for showing and indeed anomalous extension of d→z, to make such contrasts as after certain proclitics to make for such contrasts as: P@ zicoeh doh^{d'it} ho cofessat, / N'on pet distro a quemere[t>s] 'pa zegouezh

deoc'h ho c'hofessat, / N'ouzon pet distro a guemeret'. They are more more frequently so in revisions and additions, whether bookhand or cursive. Propensity to indicate them can vary within even the same verse or cantique for the same trigger but different items, or for the same item but different triggers, and for the same trigger-item.

Illustration from a given cantique: variable lenition in same item according to trigger and same trigger-item according to verse: Sell é deu zorn, sell' é deu zruet / ... // ... // ... / Didan é zreit

Illustration from a given verse: variable lenition with same trigger according to item (also illustrates mutations introduced by changes and unclarities due to changes): Da sant [j>?J]osep é Tat maguer, / Ha d'ar ^VG^[ʔ]uer^{c[ʔ]}hez é vam sacret.

Mutations are always shown for: as in MB, b→v- with forms of BE, beside b- after mar and in imperative, participle, and infinitives; unlike in MB, finite forms of DO, always in r-, beside gr- after mar and imperative and participle in gr-.

Frequency: mutations to z are often frequent, even typical esp. for finite-verb zr, others are sporadic, often limited to a single item, and provection and spirantisation more so than lenition: for instance, with 2SG ta/e=, the rule is t,d→z, and b→v, c→g, p→f are all limited to one lexeme each, even if at several occurrences, also usually found unmutated, against a preponderance of unmutated lexemes for each, including adjacent, e.g. Che ta Pater, che' ta feden (see below).

While the mutations broadly correspond to those expected of literary and later W, they have some remarkable anomalies, it seems without analogues in the detailed work on mutations in spoken varieties of W:

tr→zr: This is the most robust anomaly and a fuller inventory may be given to illustrate, though the anomalies are also given with their individual triggers.

-Finite verbs, 'tremen', 'tretiñ', 'tromplañ', with lenition and provection triggers, not otherwise, rarely not written, never tr→dr; the one nonfinite instance does not change (cf. nonfinite bare tremen, tremenet, tromplign, tromplet):

R=^L: Pequen æs a zremenet | Euit tanvat pligeadureu, / A zremen a cals' ho comseu | Eus an treu péré a zremen | Ar Bed man a zremen | ar Iustiç' a zremen || cf. Songet-u serius / A tremen ar vuhé; Pé ré a zromplei | Piv' bennac a zrompl' ar muihan

NEG=^L: Deueh ar bet na zremenamp

mar=^L: mar tremen

3SGF (h)é=^L: mar ^hé ^ztrettet

2PL (h)o=^S: justič' Doué, / O zrettei^o el m'a vi^critet

3PL (h)o=^S: hac o trétét

1PL (h)on=^L: n'on tromplint quet

-Nonfinite verbs 'tremen', 'tromplañ' in lenition or spirantisation contexts, rare, base form, and also other nonfinite verbs in tr-, rare:

2SG é^{L,S}=: D'é tromplign té

da=^L: da tremen (2x), da trafiquin

-Finite or nonfinite verbs ‘tremen’, ‘tretiñ’ ‘with leniting prefixes, base form, and also other nonfinite verbs in tr-, rare:

em^L: n’em tromplamp quet | n’em tromples quet | T’en em trompl’ | em troign
goall^L: Ma oall’ tretei | eun a oall’ tret | goall’ tromplet | goall’ trétign | Em goall’
tretign | *goaltrettet*

-Nouns ‘troad’, ‘tron’ with lenition triggers: vary tr→zr/dr:³⁵

‘troad’: deu zruet, é deu druet, é zreit, else only an treit
‘tron’: da zrôn/zron’ Douë, not otherwise instantiated

-Nouns ‘tro’, ‘tra’, ‘trindet’ with lenition triggers: only tr→dr:

‘tro’: only in: tro ar dro, en dro, otherwise only quement tro
‘tra’: singular regularly lenites, e.g.: un dra forh æs, un dra berzet, caëret un dra, un
dra eus é vuhé, an dra sé, quen/ur bihan dra, un dra vat, a dra sur; else pep tra, ar
memes tra, sort’ tra, *ar bihannat tra*; plural unchanged even after a^L ‘of’, pé ‘or’: treu,
an treu, a treu, pé treu arall
‘trindet’: only in: an Drindet, an Dr^[e] indet

-Nouns, other, do not mutate in any context, which is a^L ‘of’: a tribüil, a tromplerez, a
trugaré, a truhé, un truhé (also deu pé tri den, but pé ‘or’ shows no evidence of mutation
in general).

-Sporadic t→z in leniting contexts, sporadic beside lenition to t→d but replicated across
three triggers: leniting particles a_{PRT}, p_{EPRT}, é_{3SG}; and d→z in nonleniting context beside
regular retention or provection d→t: k-spirantising aR_{3SGM}, spirantising (h)_{O3PL},
provecting (h)_{O2PL}, nonmutating (h)_{on1PL}, ma_{PRT}. To illustrate with finite verb proclitics
that robustly lenite, a^L, pa/e^L, na/e^L: the few times they combine with a t-base, they
usually lenite, A pa^[e] tennant | Ne^d ten | Ar^{c’h} croadur a ra quement sé / A^d ten, or the base
remains, Hac a tenner | ar gounideu, / A tennés, but there is t→z with Pe zen | eun a
zanva, the last witnessed with expected base t- in Euit tanvat. The sporadicity might
suggests orthographic errors induced by regular t,d→z elsewhere, i.e. by spirantisation of
t, lenition of d, either of tr. However, there is one reasonably clearly intended instance, a
ti/di da zi, apparently ‘from house to house’: Bout a so Tut rai curius ... // [verse struck
out:] Ur bras a vat a ra dehé / Clevet goall’ coms, clevet conteu, / Euit monet d’ober
neusé / A ti da zi, ho rapporteu | Na vet quet da sevel ho fri, / Ahet an dé, a^dti da zi.)

-Nonce lenition g→- with ar_{3SGM}, alongside nonce d→z, perhaps attributed to é_{3SGM}
which it occasionally varies with or is revised to (q.v.).

-Nonce provection d→t after finite verb a^L, ma^L, perhaps influenced by the mixed
leniprovection of e_{PRT}, but after a= found in A rather than EZ context.

-3SGF (h)é with a couple of instances of lenition and tr→zr, so no clear evidence for
spirantisation.

-2SGF ta/e with lenition of voiced b,d,g, but voiceless stops have nonce lenition of c,
nonce spirantisation of p, and regular t→z.

³⁵ Unlike for other paired bodyparts, the plural rather than dual is common in W, explicitly so noted as early
as G.Vn 29.

-1SG=m- varies between nothing; maN, regular before b,d,g; and lenition, nonce with the participle, though p,t,c spirantise rather than lenite (q.v).

This seems atypical for early W texts, where mutations tend to fit expectations though often are not written, and to in the case of ^Lt→z, ^Ld→t for any variety. I am aware chiefly of three counterparts to the anomalies:

Lenition for spirantisation: familiar from 20-21C varieties (Wmmfre 2008), and sporadically in KLT back to late 17C (Ernault 1890: 190), in including with 1SG, 3SGF, 3PL proclitics, though absent in the ALBB (ma main, sa main). I am aware of few early W examples, but there is BT 1745: hi zeourrn joainntétt pè croaizéd ar hi halon.

Spirantisation beside lenition with 2SG: sporadic but not isolated in 18C W with the form te, see in full 2SG.

Double lenition t→z, sporadic in cases like a ti da zi, pe zen, systematic for tr→zr with finite verbs and certain nominal contexts like deu zruet in CS.bar: I am not aware of any descriptions as mutation, but it would be historically expected for the central-eastern high W area in ALBB where *t between vocoids becomes z /ð/ rather than d /d/ in words like peden, kadoer, koadoù, vadam. This is robust near Noyal-Pontivy at Pluméliau and S. Allouestre, in the case of vadam reaching even up to Noyal-Pontivy itself. If that is what lies behind the mutation, it is one of the clearest influences of Barisy's origin.³⁶

I am not aware of pertinent examples in 19-21C studies and corpora at localities most relevant to CS.bar: MPC-Guémené, Thibault-Cléguérec, ALBB-Ploerdut and Noyal-Pontivy, McKenna-Guémené, Crahé-Languidic, and BSDB-Inguiniel, nor indeed others even where mutational anomalies are highlighted, e.g. Ernault-Sarzeau.

Here follows a conspectus of mutations and their exceptions with pronominal proclitics, while those with particles are taken up in their section. The list of anomalies is in intent exhaustive.

3SGM é=: L is robust, e.g. é vuhé, é varv', é venoez, é zaorn, é [c>g]osté, eus é garanté, . !-anomaly:³⁷

t→t-!/z-: Doué é [T>D]a[t>d] | Ar marv' a virit ar ^{c'h}croadur, / ... / A sco é vam, a sco é zat

3SGM aR=: Sk is robust, including finite *mar ar c'hredet*. !!-anomaly:

ar=FIN gu→!!-: cursive but clear addition *raconciliet ar uelan*, against e.g. mar ar guelamp.

³⁶ I have not had the opportunity to consult the ALRP on this matter.

³⁷ ar, é both found with (g)ober which varies so independently in the text and so is not evidence of lenition.

3SGF (>h)é=: L has two nonce attestations through changes, anomalous for W, but see below on BT, and found outside W. S only potentially evidenced by tr→zr which is also the regular !-anomaly of L.

g→-: n' é ~~gr~~oa>ra [antecedent penigen; gr- in base always in IPV, PRT, after mar]
 c→g: [>he istimîn eta so ret] / Ret eu eta é istimign, É inourign, hac é [c>g]arign^{et}
 [antecedent priet, change clear]
 tr→!zr: mar^h é z^trettet

3PL (h)o=: S, not usually written, but o [p>f]ehedeu;!-anomaly d→z across categories:

d→!z: Nag^e enep rêson n'o zalhi (sc. madeu) vs. me n'o dalhet (sc. servitourien) | o zilivrign, base frequent d- | o zanué 2x, base frequent d-.

1SG =em=: only Sk, e'm halon.

1SG man=: always b-,d-,g-, save participle anomaly, q.v., variation before m-, q.v.

1SG ma/e=: S robust, e.g. me fedign, ma fen, mē fossibl', ma foen, ma far, ma feden; Ma zretign, m'a zromplign, ma zeat, ma zi, ma zut, ma zeilec, ma zat; ma homseu, ma halon, ma halité, ma hosté, ma hentel, ma c'hroadur, Mec'hredet.

2SG ta/e, é is of special intricacy and relevance. Mutations only in evidenced in (x)N, with no orthographic indication before FIN, INF, PRT, e.g. Goall' calet a galon / En é cavan Christen | Pé guelan | te guelet | ta deutrinign | An devezo te comētett (nonlenition of d esp. significant). With (x)N, both lenition of b,d,g,c,d and spirantisation of p,t are attested for #ta/e= but only lenition of c and spirantisation of t for =é=, and of these only t,d→z are robust, indeed regular, while at the same time elsewhere found for triggers of any mutation type. While spirantisation is for ta=feden, lenition of ta/é=galon (by change) is striking contrast to robust spirantisation with ma/em halon. Failure to write mutations here as elsewhere includes minimal an adjacent pair, Che ta Pater, che' ta *feden. In fine († nonce/rare):

ta/e^m: ta maliç &c.

ta/e^{Lb†,b=, =é^b=}: ta/e *vuhé, also ta buhé, else ta bless &c; dé buhé &c.

ta/e^{Lg†,g=, =é^g=}: ta *oall' buhé, else ta goall stat &c, ta gounit &c; dé grefier.

ta/e^{Sp†,p=, =é^p=}: ta *feden, else ta/e pehet &c; en é pehet &c.

ta/e^{Lc†,c=, =é^{Lc†,c=}//} ta *[c>g]alon, also ta calon, else ta carg &c; en é *[c>g]alon, else dé consailleu &c.

ta/e^{S/t,L/d→z,td†, =é^{t→z†}=}: ta *zeulagad, te *zigare, &c exceptional ta deulagat &c; t→z: ta *zermen, ta *zut &c, exceptional ta tut &c; d' é Zat.

1PL (h)on=: none for original (h)on, including Sk e.g. hon calon, save one !-anomaly, to be compared to one !-anomaly in the also otherwise unmutating mar=:

d→!z d'on zelhel, vs. e.g. hon desquet, hon dilivret, hon danger, hon dever; cf. 1x mar zalhet vs. mar dalhet.

1PL hoR= by modification: Sk: hon^r c^h eommodité | Ar hon^r h^eoust' vs. hon^r goapei | ^{hor} poen

2PL (h)o: P robust, ho [b>p]ugalé | ^{ho} pugalé (usually ho bugalé) || oll' ho puhé | d^ho [b>p]uhé | eus ho [b>p]uhé || eus ho ^tdever | ar ho ^tdever | ho teuer hui || Ar Bellec ho

tesquei || ho ^tdeu || ho ^tdigaré || En ^ho ^oguelé, but even with these items and with others often unwritten, Eus ho dever; a couple of !-anomalies:

d→!z: 1x quement sé / Ho zalhei

tr→!zr: justiç' Dotié, / O zrettei^o el m'a vi^eritet

(en) em: L clear, e.g. em glem', En em gav', en em zigoret, en em ^zdastum', > en em zebrin, but still usually not written even for c→g, and so absent for e.g. p→b, b→v.

6.2 H-linker

The h-linker or aspiration of following vowels is written systematically, 2PL and 3PL oc'h, nonce o'c'h, EZ-particle e c'h, ec'h, e h. Absence is thus significant.

This presents a couple of puzzlez. One is its basic distribution: h-linkers across Breton varieties seem to occur for 2PL alone, 2PL-3SGF, or a larger subset of spirantisation and provection triggers up to all of 1SG, 3SGF, 1PL, 2PL, 3PL, but a system grouping 2PL and 3PL against 3SGF is not known to me. Examples are Inguiniel in BSDB, 3SGF ih arrast, 3PL o argant, 2PL hoh oto, hoh ant, hoh ioud; and McKenna-Guémenè 3SGF poss. [hi], 3PL [o], 2PL [hoh] before vowels. (A post-Jackson 1967 overview for modern varieties is Wmffre 2008, to be completed by studies like Timm 1986, Noyer 2019, while for earlier states of affairs still useful remains the discussion of Ernault 1897, beside HMSB: §53.4, 7, Hemon 1954).

The second puzzle is the systematic suppression by the h-linker of initial h-, so before vowel oc'h-, not hoc'h, even in contexts that most favour h-: 2PL, and not after prepositions: Lacait en i {3SGF} oc'h oll' attention | ho corf, hac oc'h Iné | / Oc'h oll' vaniteïeu | Hep disolo' goall' obereu, / Oc'h amizian, pé tut ho ti | Dré ur cantiq oc'h instrugign. Exceptions are almost absent in the original layer are almost absent, ho calon, ~~ho~~^[oc'h] iné vs. ho corf, hac oc'h Iné in nearby hymns. The generalisation is destroyed by modifications, not systematic but frequent: Didan poen a coll' ^[h]oc'h Iné | O pequen bras, ar joy ^[e]an dés, / [>H]Oc'h annemis! | Euit bezout mat en quenver, / [>h]Oc'h oll' Tadeu spirituel | ~~P^ooc'hues~~ ~~affer~~ ~~d'un~~^{[pen de[>u] an Diaoul hoc'h]} annemis. However, these modifications insert h- where it was unlikely to be pronounced, d^[h]oc'h instrugign / Ha d^[h]o lacat | d^[h]oc'h accusign, and include plain suppression of the linker, Arlerh Doué é teléet^[Lacait brepet] / ~~Oc'h~~^[ho] ~~oll'~~ caranté do^[en ho] priet; they may be orthographic. The regularity is matched by the systematic suppression of the c'h-linker of the ez-particle in 2PL, é oh, against 1PL, 1SG, 2SG, é homp &c. Here there is less robust data for relevant later varieties, but the h-linker of the ez-particle is not affected by -c'h in the ALBB, at relevant localities, e.g. Ploerdut hoc', Bubry ih ôc', Noyal-Pontivy ih ôh.

Historical and comparative materials provide several possible sources for the h-linker, relating to it and distinguishing it from MB -z of 2PL and rarely 3PL, z/s/h/c'h of 3SGF, or MW h-linker of most spirantisers (see below). The phonetics of the linker is central to understanding its origin, since one would expect different outcomes for MB z /θ/, h /h/, and ch /x/. In this respect the study of CS.bar here is not exhaustive, but some indications can be given. The orthography of the linker is c'h with 2PL and 3PL, e.g. 2PL oc'h Iné, ^hoc'h Iné, d'oc'h in^{ueu}, 3PL *ar oc'h iné*, 3PL d^hoc'h instrugign, 2PL and 3PL en oc'h andret, only exceptionally h as in 2PL d'oh^c Ineueu, written as part of the proclitic, save exceptional 2PL ^{chetu o c'holl cofession}; before the h- of e.g. é hunon we get *Hui o e'hunon*.

That comes close to the writing of the development of final z of proclitics when this is fairly clear: the invariable (h)oz=eux > oc'heus, the robust ez=V- as e=c'hV- beside rare e=hV- as in E c'handuramp, and ouzh=pron=INF in oc'h ar guelet, though doh of such context is only once so written, doc'h o guerhet, and usually doh, doh o clevet, as is always with N, as in the nicley contrastive doh oc'h affer (2PL).

Table: Typical distributions of c'h, h spellings (nonexhaustive)³⁸

V/Rc'h(h)V/#: h, c'h [†]	pehet, pehedeu, buhé, bihanoh, sehet, cuhet, cuh, marhat, guerhez, delhel, a hanou[t>d]é, merh, goalh, arlerh, guenoh, doh, brassoh, liezoh, horriploh; but trec'h, tre ^c h, teuc'h (*γ: argant)
V/Rz(h)V/#: h	couhel, pe zicoeh, hoarhei, goeh, goehan, diuehan, querhet, aberh
VhV: h	muihan
h(w)V: h, incl. comp.	hiriv', horriploh, hoari, (Da) hoarhign, ma/o hoarezet 3PL, hoant, na hoantan, hoas, deuhanteret, an hanter,
Other	hanuet, na hanuet quet, en hanv', ehueheit, crehueit
SkV-: h	Ma haranté, ma halon, ar halon, e'm halon, ma homseu, ma halité, ma hosté, ar hentan
SkC-: c'h	me c'hredet mé, ma c'hroadur, ma C'hroüer
Sk: c'h by change	Ar c'hentan, ar c'harteu, d'ar c'hathequis ^{chis} , ar c'heomseu man, hon ^r c'heommodité, Ar ho ^r houst', <i>mar ar c'hredet</i> , Ar c'hroadur, ar c'hrim' sé,
ez=(g)V: h	é h'anzavamp, é hon; é heller, É hellamp, ma helli, é hellan
ez=(g)V: c'h	E c'handuramp, ec'h ancoueher, <i>ec'h adori</i> , ec'hon; É c'hel', ec'h el, <i>e c'halles, e c'hallet, ec'hel</i>
ouzh=(h)V- prog.: c'h	Oc'h imitign, O c'henuel, oc'h ar guelet, Oc'h ^[h] o guelet, Oc'h é devout
ouzh=C: c'h	Faç' oc'h faç'
diouzh=V-: h/c'h	doh ign, doh oc'h affer; doh o clevet, doc'h o guerhet [†]
hoz=eux: c'h	o c'hues, oc'hues

In terms of sources and analogues:

2PL: MB (h)o(u)z^P=C-, V-, with z taken to reflect /θ/. Usual development across Breton is to ho-h/c'h^P, where the linker is difficult to relate to /θ/, insofar as it is persistently /h/ or /x/ and never /z/, /s/ even in L (ALBB). In ALBB for the W zone, with 2PL in 'votre clef', the c'h-linker is robustly attested in west and north, including at points relevant to CS.bar: Bubry, Ploërdut/Guémené hoh-. At Guémené it is confirmed in the study of McKenna, in contrast to 3SGF and 3PL (§430-1). It is missing in the south, partly coinciding with loss of spirantised k→h in 'mon chien' in ALBB. However, it is found as s in the east and southeast, including at Noyal-Pontivy us-, reflecting resyllabification (hoθ (h)V > ho θ(h)V > ho s(h)V avoiding new lenition to z by influence of h-initial forms, Schrijver 2011a). This is the treatment in 18-19C W, the linker is ç/s, e.g. hou ç'hunan, hou ç'inean (IS.mar). Of this there is no trace in CS.bar: ~~Hui o c'hunan~~, ^hoc'h Iné (CS.bar).

2SG: MB =z^M, developing to prevocalic /z/ outside W including L, with cognates indicating /θ/, but with a different mutation in Breton than 2PL in -/θ/, and some hints of /ð/ (cf. Hemon 1954, if MB reflexive da hem=, dac'hem=, na hem beside daz hem, da em

³⁸ Set aside is rare c', e.g. en oc' [sic]. Cf. hc in IS.pour.

< *da/na=z=em). In 18-19C W, (h)a/(h)e reflexives shares the ç/s-linker of 2PL, and often the provection of 2PL, e.g. n'he ç'hanàuan, guet-he ç'argand but t'he argand (IS.mar). In ALBB, relevant evidence is limited to the southeast, where the base of 'le tien' is (h)V-initial, and the ha- rather than te-form of 2SG appears; then there is indeed coincidence of 2SG as V-, not a V-, and 2PL us V-, not uh V-, u V-. Any linker is strikingly absent in CS.bar: d'é annemis, En é Iné.

3SGF: MB he, rarely he-h, e.g. he haeren, but in reflexives all of e hem, chem, ez sem, with some evidence of mesoclitic =z expected from MC =s only when the outcome would be homophonous with particle ez (HMSB §53.4, 7, Hemon 1954, Ernault 1897). In the ALLB, an /h/, /x/ linker is far less widespread than 2PL, and seems to belong to the innovative southwest - northeast axis, being notably absent in L. In W, ALBB shows it only at a few localities of the northeast within this axis, against a far larger spread with 2PL: 3SGF ih- like 3PL uh- at Languidic (cf. Crahé p. 334, not clear), at Groix (where the x-linker has extended to all spirantisation triggers, i.e. 1SG-3SGF-3PL, Ternes-Groix, cf. for Lorient in 1818 Ernault 1890 from MPC), and at Locmaria in Belle-Île (but not Sauzon), and so not at e.g. Ploerdut/Guémené or at Noyal-Pontivy, though it is also not around Lorient where it has been reported (Cheveau, p. 102ff.). It is generally absent in 18C writers and classical grammars (G.BA hé avizeu; MG hé ancoehent, IS.pour hi intantion, hi avertissein, SH hi aprouein, but in a hymn SH hi hanfonsse). G.GLG31: 5 do attribute an aspiration 3SGF along with 2SG, 2PL, and 3PL, as continuants of MB z; it is unmentioned in G.GLG02 and evidently does not match either classical orthographies or later studies. It is entirely absent in CS.bar.

3PL: MB occasionally has 2PL-like hoz rather than its usual ho, before vowels, consonants, and in reflexives, and it has been related to the MC-MW mesoclitic =s (Buchmann 2011). Any continuation in expected -z seems absent later. There is no relevant data in ALBB (V-initial base for 'le leur'); any linker is absent in McKenna-Guémené which contrasts 2PL ho-h with 2PL hi, 3PL ho (§430-1), Cheveau-Lorient which contrasts 3SGF and 2PL h-linker with its absence in 3PL (p. 102ff.), and it is only present in Ternes-Groix as extension of the x-linker to all spirantisers. In CS.bar exactly like 2PL in the c'h-linker, and differing only in a preference for 2PL ho- vs. 3PL o-, apart from provection vs. spirantisation.

Table resumes the distribution of elements potentially relevant to the h-linker in the Middle stages of the Brythonic languages.

Table: -s, -ch, and +h in Middle Brythonic A accusative and G genitive proclitics

	MW -ch	MW +h	MW -s	MC -s	MB -s/z
3SGM		A =y-h=	A =s=		
3SGF		A =y-h=, G =y-h= ^S	A =s=	A =s=	AG he-h, A †=s/z/h/ch=?
3PL		A =y-h=, G (=)eu-h=	A =s=	A =s=	A †(h)oz=?
1SG		AG =m-h=			
2SG					AG =z= ^{LP}
1PL		AG =n-h=, G an-h=			
2PL	AG =(w)ch= G a(w)ch=			A =(ga)s= ^S , G =gas= ^S , G (ag)as= ^S	AG (h)o(z)= ^P

There are elements here that correspond to various distributions of the h/ç-linkers: the early and common 2PL only, as at McKenna-Guémené: §430-1 (MW -ch, MB -z^P); the common 3SGF-2PL only, as likely at Bubry in the ALBB (MB h/ch-linker + nonleniting z, setting marginal 3PL hoz); the codistribution with spirantisation in 3SGF-3PL-1SG-1PL, as at Ternes-Groix (MW +h in genitives, and in accusatives apart from 3SGM); maybe 3SGF-3PL if its linker is distinct synchronically or diachronically from that of 2PL, q.v. Ernault 1890: 209 = EC10: II.3 (MB -z, if the relic 3PL hoz differs from leniting and proventing -z, and goes with the -z of 3SGF; MC -s, if 2PL is set aside). One could find material here to correspond to the unique CS.bar 2PL-3PL (MB nonleniting -z, if distinct 3SGF because its -z alternates with -s). However, the diachronic pathways are not obvious: on the usual reconstruction, 3SGF s/z is < *s= + neolenition, beside =h/c'h= < intervocalic treatment of the same *s= earlier, and leniproventing =z of 2SG is *θ, while *ð left no trace in W, what links proventing =z of 2PL hoz with =z of the vestigial 3PL hoz? The alternative is analogical extension from 2PL to 3PL, building on the shared o-vocalism of 2PL and 3PL (a process available both in the development of a phonological system or an orthographic convention).

Finally, the status of the CS.bar c'h-linker needs to be addressed. Its 2PL-3PL distribution is not found in studies of spoken varieties known to me, but that is far from exhaustive. Even if it is unique, that need not mean that its origin is an orthographic innovation of the author, like his avowed orthographic replacement of W h by z/s in certain environments. To go by studies of spoken varieties known to me, we would not know that r can be the outcome not only of Ld buit also of St in me rād 'ma zad' at Locminé and Pénerf, observed in the 1795 G.Vn, surrounded as each is by Sz me zād in the ALBB.

6.3 H-

In initial (h)V- of proclitics, 18C W writers differ significantly within and among each other, e.g. SH 2PL Ni hou pétt hag ou suppli, 3PL figure ou horff – N'éellain quett hou rein deoh, but there are strong tendencies, e.g. SH ≠ 1PL honn, 2PL hou-ç but 3PL ou, 2SG he-ç, 3SGF hi but 3SGM é, with h tending to absence after proclitics – all a common pattern, but not universal, with e.g. IS.pour tending to h-less 1PL. There is a tendency to distinguish the initial of 3PL ou from 2PL hou and of 3SGM é from 3SGF hé, hi, early in e.g. BT for 2PL-3PL, and systematic in grammars.

ALBB here also shows variation, e.g. ALBB Ploerdut/Guémené hi hane - hon kane - ho kane - u hane, like hi - hun - h(o)-h- - o possessive in McKenna-Guémené (§431), though contrast consistent 2PL (P/#) o in MPC-Guémené, versus ALBB Groix hi hani - hun ani - u kani - u hani, unlike xixani - xunanəni - xukani - xuxani in Ternes-Groix (§11.4).

Of particular interest is the existence x/h in the ha-form of 2SG, in ALBB at Groix invariably, matching xa-μ- in Ternes-Groix, and Belle-Île variably, e.g. 'tes habits' Sauzon-Locmaria ha d- vs. 'le sien' Sauzon a g-, Locmaria ha g-, against a- elsewhere. The x/h- of 2SG does not readily fit any of the expected sources of 2SG in W, save influence of 2PL.

CS.bar has the following tendencies: across categories, h- in initial contexts is robust with 2PL (h)o, 1PL (h)on, rare with 3PL (h)o, absent save by correction with 3SGF (h)é, absent with 3SGM é and 2SG é; in postproclitic contexts it is robust only with 2PL, and with 3PL there is even a tendency to avoid h on objects when simply a clausemate precedes; and h tends to be absent both with 2PL and 3PL in prevocalic contexts where they take the linker, oc'h. This last is independently a property of BE where it has nothing to do with earlier h- but with -z= > h: ez omp > e homp, ec'homp vs. ez oc'h > e oh in CS.bar (see Appendix: like e homp are e hon, e hout, but note no e heu, only eu, or e hint, only int).

Some examples of (exceptions to tendencies underlined, note conformance through correction):

1PL-2PL-3PL, same hymn: 1PL Hon Mam Ilis ... hon Avocat ... hon Salver ... 3PL Oc'h imitign, ha liez o pedign ... 2PL ho Patronet ... 3PL d'oc'h imitign ... 3PL en o pedet ... 2PL Ho Patronet ... 3PL ho corf, hac oc'h Iné ... 3PL ho pourfit ... 3PL Doh ho Nessan... hon Doué ... 2PL Ho caranté ... 2PL Ho hieinison ... 2PL Ho lausconi, hac ho negligantet ... 3PL d'o Patronet ... 3PL en ur oc'h imitign ... 3PL o pedign

2PL: Dicleriet ho pehedeu / Hep disolo' goall' obereu, / Oc'h amizian, pé tut ho ti, / A^hoalh oc'hues a ho ré hui.

2PL c'h-linker effect, (same verse:) 2PL d'^hoc'h instrugign ... ^hoc'h Iné.

3PL =N: A pehedeu oll' tut o ti / Hep laret guer eus ho ré hi. ...

3PL =FIN, =N: Ha liez mat o visitet / ... / M'a vint patiant en ho clenvet

3PL =IPV, =N: Recevet-u guet caranté / En ho ti, ar Pelerinet, / Ha hervé ho commodité / Ho conduit, hac o trétét.

3SGF (same hymn): ^he villipantign ... n'^he pilet quet ... Mar ^hé des ... ^hé fantasi'.

2SG (same hymn): ~~Mé-é-guel~~ den ahurtet ... Pé guelan struiign an argant / D'é den mat a procurour

6.4 É/I 3SGM, 3SGF, A/E/É 2SG

In CS.bar, the vowel of 3SGM é, 3SGF é but by correction hé, and 2SG é is more rarely e, all for transitive-object and HAVE-subject proclitics alike, and é is also the vowel of the ez-particle. As in other orthographies, evidence suggests that é is a closed vowel.³⁹

The 3SGM/F vowels are expected: in the ALBB, 3SGM/3SGF end up with i, and classical orthographies use é or i for both, though the convention arises later on of distinguishing 3SGF as genitive hé, accusative hi.

³⁹ The usage of é in CS.bar in general needs study. Of greatest interest is the systematic é in 2SG, e.g. groés, credés, quemerés (classical ès, es, ALBB western ès, south-centre es, south-east øs, -ës, but east interior is, iz, the latter most relevant to any earlier form at Noyal-Pontivy) and occasionally but not isolatedly in the stem of the present forms of HAVE, e.g. an dés, é hés, oc'hués, man dévé (classical è, e, but ALBB mostly é, south-east also é, rarely è). Otherwise, é is frequent or regular where used in classical orthographies typically (buhé) or sometimes (liés, liès), e.g. moués, buhé, danvé, Doué, ivé, dré pé ré, é mé té, didé, choés, Croés, délé, péhet, mar é lézet, but not also sporadic elsewhere, quéméret, lévéné, iéhét, béniquet, nécésser.

Table: Usual forms of 3SGM, 3SGF, 2SG, ez-particle:⁴⁰

	3SGM	3SGF	2SG	ez (ez eux)	2SG HAVE
CS.bar 1710	é	(>h)é	é	é-h (é hes)	é hes, ^{ec'hes}
NG 1680	(h)e, é	(h)e	[e vout]	e h-es ⁴¹	e h-es
BT 1745	é	hi-h	he-ç	é-h (é héss)	é hès
SH 1766	é	hé/i-h	he-ç	é-h (é héss)	ë héss
MG 1791	é	hé/i-h	he-ç	é-h (é hès)	e hès
G.GU, G.BA	é	hé/i-h	ha-ç	é-h (é hès) ⁴²	e hès
ALBB us.	i	(h ^o)i(-h ^o)	a, è [†]	(no vowel)	(no vowel)
Ternes-Groix	i	xi-μ	xa-μ	ə-μ (-)	ə-μ ((xa)fes)
McKenna-Guéméné	i	(h)i	-	ə-h	-

The 2SG is also not unexpected from a historical perspective. When developments have independent support, they should have given the following:

*e=z=, like ez= > é everywhere: for 2SG, é is only systematic in CS.bar, elsewhere it seems virtually absent outside HAVE (L'Arm s.v. *richesse é héss ... d'e pugalé ... he pou ... he çani té é huenon*, beside SH *ë héss*), rare in HAVE (Pr *euit é yout* beside PR *evit a vout-y*, COS *é hès, né hès, pé pézai, hé pout*, beside *te=N*) or just its fossilised present (CAG *é hès, BT é hès*), and rare then, against systematic *é hès* 'ez eus' (see Table).

*a=z, *pa=z= > CS.bar a/e, cf. a-particle a but pa/e, elsewhere e, cf. a-particle e, pe: absent for 2SG in CS.bar, contrast *ta/e=N* < *da=N*, elsewhere (h)e common in earlier classical orthographies (e.g. L'Arm above).

*ma=z= > CS.bar a/e like ma/e, elsewhere a, cf. ma: absent for 2SG in CS.bar, contrast *ta/e=N* < *da=N*, elsewhere this is one context that should give rise to the a-vowel of classical (h)a, presumably fortified by whatever the source of (h)a=N, is, e.g. en (h)a=N, if the nasal blocks usual a > e as in *da* > *te* (the outcome of *na/e=z=* cannot be independently established). For =N, (h/x/-)a is the outcome in ALBB everywhere for the object proclitic (save è in *Ile d'Arz*), while for HAVE, -a- is clearly the majority outcome (in *ha, a, ta* + b-form, only *Sauzon* *hè* unlike *Locmaria ha*, often *te, tè* as in *Ile-d-Artz* where the vowel can come from the subject pronoun).⁴³

Expected vowel contrasts such as =a=z=FIN > (h)a/h(e)=FIN after subject/object against elsewhere =e=z > (h)é=FIN appear to be found neither with transitives nor with HAVE; they are robust with both throughout MB, though with HAVE signs of uncertain

⁴⁰ Note to Table: in sources like SH where the linker varies, it is given here as -h..

⁴¹ 'if hast' 813 *ma e h-es houant*, form not given in Hemon (1956: §80), cf. 'there is' 883 ...e h-es ur vlas.

⁴² In G.GU, only E *hès*, where E elsewhere used for É, E. In G.G, *é hès*, but *bout e hès* beside *bout e zou, e ra*.

⁴³ However, L'Arm s.v. *richesse* has both *é héss* and *é huenon* beside *he çani*: *Enn danné é héss dispignétt ... Er-péh he pou chairétt ... Vou he çani té é huénon*. Elsewhere *he*: s.v. *patiance he béhétt*, s.v.

vowel quality in a/e=1SG/2SG appear as early as the first full grammar, Maunoir (1659) (DMH).

6.5 A/E and elision

18C W a > e characterises certain proclitics but not others, affecting all of ar/n/l ‘the’, pa ‘when’, na ‘not’, ma ‘my’, but in close contrast usually not ma and never mar ‘if’, in both 18C writers like Pourchasse and Marion, representing /ə/ vs /a/ when this information becomes available, as typically for these two groups of proclitics in the ALBB.⁴⁴

Yet on each of these save mar CS.bar varies among a, e, a>e, including ma ‘if’ in e.g. me ne santés | ma na carés | ~~ma ne caves~~ | me na changet | ma n’^e chang’ | Me ne rante[t>s], though ALBB gives ma alone wherever it is found all across W. Moreover, the same a, e, a>e variation is found with er/n/l ‘him, his’ as such and as part of HAVE, though here a- is attested as early as Gk, and later characteristic of parts of T, e.g. MPC. It is even rarely attested with the en-particle, e.g. D’ar ré an o pezo leset (q.v.). Even in CS.bar there is no evariation on e(n) ‘in’. NG seems to be similar on these points to CS.bar.

Across these sources, the vowel of proclitics is elided before pronominal proclitics, all (h)V-, whenever there is evidence, e.g. m’er and not m’ar, p’hou, m’hou and not pe hou, ma hou, and this is so in CS.bar as far as the placement of the apostrophe goes, e.g. En heur m’o pedint, though the a/e evidence is obscured.

In the ALBB, there is comparable variation on a/e for 1SG in Houat and Belle-Île, e.g. Belle-Île Sauzon ma hi, Locmaria me hi, but shared ma zad, ma gwel(e)t, against typical mə of W, while the te-form only survives at Mur-de-Bretagne, S. Allouestre, and Ploemeur, in the form te or more usually tə. In the few cases where there is evidence, elision can take place before a vowel, underlying (e.g. S. Allouestre m ani_y, me hani, t ani_y, Sarzeau m ani mi) or due to Sk→h if continued by h→- (e.g. Sauzon m āni me, a gāni he).

Exceptions aside there is no comparable variation in CS.bar with independent and enclitic 1SG mé, 2SG té, apart from influence of the particle to me, te, nor with with proclitic 2SG é (q.v.)

3SGM a/e in CS.bar: a, e with all of -n, -r, -l variants, with ar predominant, and an, al more frequent than en, el, save when the consonant is anomalous, notably t’en (q.v.). Changes, where the vowel is clear, tend towards e: Ne coust’ netra æ^{er} prononcign | ~~m’ar~~^{er} pardon. Likewise forms of HAVE, where a>e is frequent, e.g. an inour en des groit.

1SG/2SG in CS.bar (apart from mVN, q.v.):

a/e (often only first syllable given):

-ma/me: ma regular, me freq before -e-, but with variation: IPV me cred, -chred, chel, lez/lest, rec, ser, | ma lezet lx (clear, multiple me lez); PRT me hon, net, sic | ma vag; INF ma par, zret, zrompl | me fed, chel; N C’hrouer, faper, foen’, halon, hani, haranté,

⁴⁴ Cf. na/e but ma before vowel-initial proclitics in MB texts like J, presumably because ma is ma ez.

zat, zeat, zeilec, zi, zut, Salver, maliç, maⁿ Mestr' [° clear] | me: speret, Roué [rwe] | me: fossibl' {fairly clear}.

-ta/e: ta regular, te rare, but each before all CV: PRT te comm; INF ta deut | te conv, guel; N ta b/vuhé, bless, caein, calon, carg, col, com, conf, cons, cont, crouer, d/zeulagat, disp, fal, fed, fol, fond, goal, gown, hen, hent, ial, ïei, ies, maliç, pat, peh, pen, pinv, sac, salv, sec, sot, squiant, tut, zam, zat, zerm, zeuch, zib, zor, zoué, zut | te hani, lavar, lod (systematic), miser, zigat, refus, sort | both Euit te p^rourfit, ta pourfit, in adjacent cantiques; ta proces, te proces in adjacent verses; te procurour, ta procurour in variants of same cantique.

__(h)V:

-ma/e/-, only me hV-: m' a-, ma o- incl. oll, me Æl: PRT ma off-, INF ma instr-, off-; N m'arg, ma oll, me Æl.

-ta/e/- V-: PRT ta o-; N t'a-,i-, t'e- > ta e-, ta a-,o- incl. oll,u- (t'e > ta)

Examples (chosen a.o. for clarity of vowels in writing):

O ma oll' vat, man guir buhé! / Me Roué, maⁿ Mestr' [° clear], man Doué, ma Zat

Na ma halon, na me speret {mV vowels clear}

Ma C'hrouer, ma Zat, man Doué

P'oc'hues eus ho corf ma vaguet, / P'oc'hues me nettait guet ho goet

Dihui a laran trugaré, / Ma C'hrouer, ma Zat, man Doué / A ho pezout me honservet

Caus' out da varv' IESUS ta zat! / Muntrer horribl' dré te pehet

Den Hypocrit' petra a lari té? / Pe hani vo neusé te zigaré? / Allas! Allas! iscus n'é pezo quet / Ta oll' feinteu a vezo anauet.

Non, pehour, arriv' eu ta zermen, / Ta varvei, n'an des quet a ramed / Dicours' eu ober ta penigen, [there the subject pronoun ta is entirely exceptional]

Me so ar ma zeilec, / El d'out, ar te hani.

6.6 1SG maN

In 18- W the usual vowel is e and the usual nasal is n before b,d but m before b, e.g. 1760 SH menn deulagatt, mem buhé. 1732 D.R: s.v. sauveur gives Van. maⁿ Douë, maⁿ Salvér, beside 1738 G.R 1SG Van. me - men^h - em, where n^h is nasalisation rather than n, G.R: 7. 1680 NG has the form men even before b-, along with other -n- for -m-, pendec and penzec, pendé but bamdé, -n boué, -n bou (Hemon 1956: §33). 1795 G.Vn, inferring from its characteristic stylme, seems to indicate dialectal variation in “mem avant b, men ou maⁿ avant d & g”.

1710 CS.bar differs from all of these. The form before b-, d-, g- is always man, e.g. man buhé, man bout apart from a few corrections of man bout to mem bout (q.v.) and an anomaly with the participle (q.v.); yet -n- is not a spelling of -m-, e.g. bamdé, pemzecvet, em boé, em bo. Thus:

O ma oll' vat, man guir buhé! / Me Roué, maⁿ Mestr' [° clear], man Doué, ma Zat

However, there is variation in CS.bar before m-, where elsewhere the nasal-less variant is usual, perhaps reflecting ma/e + contextual nasalisation: 1x ma maliç, 1x m•

ministret, 1x man Mæstr', 1x mæn^c Mestr' [° clear]. Cf. e.g. 1x mem mab against robust me mab in t18C IS.pour, but such cases can be taken as orthographic doubling of m, while -n m- cannot in CS.bar

There is an anomaly before m-:

1SG: m(ə)^{NS}, =em^S

In all these sources, the mesoclitic form with its mutation is used after de, é, CS.bar d'em Doué, e'm halon, with one exception perhaps related to the salience of the possessor: Euit en ma hani mé / Ne vo quet ar frigass' sé 'as for in MINE (sc. house) ...'.

In the ALBB, men d-,g-, mem b- is general, save partly the islands of eastern Arvor, e.g. ma uniformly in Locmaria in Belle-Île, with more subtle mixes at Sauzon and Houat, and also me b-/d- but men gw- in western Arvor at Calan. The mesoclitic form in general, dem t→z-, dem b-, is restricted to the south-west littoral from Groix to Auray, rest analytic de mem b- &c. By t20C, descriptions of western varieties give only me, de me in all contexts at McKenna-Guemene, Crahé-Languidic, Cheveau-Lorient, but earlier in the southeastern part of the Lorient area, the ALLS regularly has the nasal before b-, d-, g-, though not the mesoclitic: mem buhi, de men galùen.

In all these sources, the mesoclitic form with its mutation is used after de, é, CS.bar d'em Doué, e'm halon, with one exception perhaps related to the salience of the possessor: Euit en ma hani mé / Ne vo quet ar frigass' sé 'as for in MINE (sc. house) ...'.

6.7 -R

In MB, 3SGM(=FIN) is en', 1PL is hon', and final -n is generally invariant in other proclitics, e.g. the definite article an. In (not only) W, final -n differentiated, with the endpoint being n before vowels and n, t, d, h, including h < MB c'h but not c'h < Sk; l or l, r before l; r elsewhere, accompanied by Sk, apart from whatever additional mutations may be required otherwise, e.g. due gender-number after articles (so already G.Vn: l for the definite article, with l before l, G.GU with l/r before l). The development usual groups the definite article and 3SGM (G.Vn, G.GU), affects to a lesser extent 1PL (with variation explicit in G.Vn, G.GU, see below), as it may certain other proclitics (G.Vn: l quen 'as'), but fails to affect e(n) 'in'. With the definite article at least, the change goes considerably before being noted orthographically (HMSB §71).

CS.bar presents an asymmetry: the n-differentiation is the rule for the definite article, with n before vowels and n, t, d, h, variably l before l, and r elsewhere, but only optional for 3SGM, where the variant a/en can appear anywhere, and only introduced through chagnes for 1PL, where only changes introduce an r-variant. The mutation is fairly robust as -r^{Sk} for 3SGM and after changes for 1PL, but there are striking anomalies. In fine:

3SGM -n, -l, -r:

ar, rare er, er, couple of æn^{er}, en^r (all after finite particles): m-,b-,g-,gr-,gu-→u-,gu-; p-,c-→c'h-,c-,q-; ch-,f-,s-,v-: attested in all contexts. Illustration of corrections, none: mar en^r

credet, cf. *mar ar c'hredet*, cf. *mar ar guelamp*; A p'ar^{cr} gueler, a p'ar clever; commoner: P'er guelés

an h-: only n'an hanués

an V-: not attested in PRT, FIN subject pronoun __

an rare en d-, t-: d not attested in PRT, e only in FIN particle __, t only in i an tamal

an, rare en, ar r-: not attested in IPV, LHM, FIN XP __; xINF both an r- and ar^r; an save FIN particle __ only en

an, en across (x)INF, FIN XP __, FIN particle __, FIN subject pronoun __; corrections introducing l are: (x)INF: en^{al} l-, a[r>l] l-; FIN subjct pronoun __: m'/T'e[n>l], i a^{en} l- (T')en p-,c-,v- multiple times and across several cantiques, against only one t'er by correction, e.g. T'en pouss' vs. m'ar^{cr} pardon; contrast m', e.g. M'er guel, m'ar^{cr} pardon; cf. correction T'e[n>l] lez.)

3SGM exceptional mutation:

ar=FIN gu→!!-: only in cursive but clear addition raconciliet ar uelan, more frequent ar guel- though still rare as finite.

Cf. NG, with the distribution described in G.GU, for both the definite article and 3SGM, with Sk (Hemon 1956: §53, 62; 46). [The ALBB gives data on the definite article: across W -r k→h/- save Groix -n k→-, -r p(→b), -n V-, t(→d).]

1PL hon: The endpoint can be the same as the definite article, but need not be, and there is variation within and across writers, as well as in modern varieties. Two choice-points re whether the mutation is nothing, Sk alone, or S generally, and whether the form is invariant -n, or -r/-l/-n. These cross-classify with one exception, giving the types `hun ti, ki, pedenn; Sk hun ti, hun~r hi, fedenn; S hun zi, hun~r hi, fedenn. Thus Cillart regularly contrasts possessive honn p-, t-, h- with me f-, z-, h-, but hur beside honn in hur-Salver, and some evidence of unmutating honn, aveid honn quérentt, aveitt hon hérentt, a possibly not robust in the writers here but clear from ALBB. G.GU describes both hun f-, z-, h- and hur p-, hun t-, hur h- for possessives, though illustrating the former with possessives and the latter with objects. G.Vn describes possessive hu/or f-, hu/on z-, hu/or h-, but explicitly notes and illustrates the alternatives hu/on p-, hu/on t-. Mixtures occur, explicitly observed within the preface of SH as due to the author mixing dialects, but can be found even within a single sentence, hun Tad hur zen a beuranté GEG-RP. NG already has both -n^{Sk}, -r^{Sk}, and the n/l/r distribution (Hemon 1956: §46, 53).

The ALBB variation of 1PL is complex, but focusing on localities most relevant to CS.bar, we get (h)on ti in the Guémené - Pontivy - Bubry - Baud region rather than St in a center-east area with un zi Ploeren, ð ziy Locqueltas, nøe zi at S. Allouestre; (h)on ki in this region rather than (h)ur, or, er Sk to the south beginning with Languidic-Pluvigner-S.Allouestre all the way to the littoral, but again ð k in Belle-Île and including in the Sk zone un hi at Ploeren and ne hi at S. Allouestre; in the Vr Sk zone collapse with the article(s) is indicated by occasional doubling of type ur hi ni in Port-Louis; h- is only relic at western periphery, robustly in Groix, variably in Guémené and Sauzon; reversal is limited to nøe/ne Stk at S. Allouestre (and no tk at Batz). In Thibault-Cléguérec p. 170, invariable hõn does not mutate, nor does hon in McKenna-Guémené §408.

So for CS.bar (h)on^{tk} is expected, and expected to contrast with NG (h)un/n^{Sk}. That is and that is what we get in the original layer, but not the changes, where hor^{pSk} appear:

1PL -n:

Typical On guel | ~~hon poenieu~~ | hon goarn

By modification: Pep un^an hon^r goapei | hor^{poen} | hon^{r c'h} eommodité | Ar hon^{r h} eoust'.

1PL, exceptional mutation: one !-anomaly, shared with mar', and so likely to be set aside d→!z d'on zelhel, vs. e.g. hon desquet, hon dilivret, hon danger, hon dever; cf. 1x zalhet vs. 1 mar dalhet and no effect on consonants otherwise.

6.8 Fusion with subject pronouns

In MB, the 1SG and 2SG subject pronouns can fuse with following (h)V-intial proclitics, type m'ho, as they can host mesoclitics, type me'z, rarely also others, type ni'n. This fusion is limited in later L texts and studies, but systematic for 1SG, 2SG in W (see DMH with literature, and on W, esp. Chevalier 2016). Across early texts we get the following picture:

Pr: already m'ou beside me ou against ny ou, e.g.:

mou hauertisse

me ou salut Mary

ny ou recitou

NG: regular *me hou* > *m-ou*, not *ny ou*, *y er*, e.g.

M-ou contanteu incontinant. “me ho”

m-ou suply ol ‘I beseech you all’

Ny ou suply, bras ha bihan,

Y er guelou certainement.

BT: fusion 1SG, also unfused, none 1PL

m'er, m'enn 3SGM, mi 3SGF, m'ou 3PL

mé hou 2PL

ni hou 2PL

CS.bar: Subject pronoun + object proclitic combinations are transparent and have no elisions if the pronoun is not 1SG/2SG, straightforwardly tolerating hiatus, though the one case of /i i/ in 3SGF=3SGF is broken up by EN, anomalously independently available in CS.bar after subjects, and uniquely after a pronominal or even noncomplex subject here.

eun eR, é, ('h)on, en em (e.g. Eun hon conserv' | Eun on gorgo | Eun on assist')

hi en é: see EN (hi en é loncq')

i aR, (h)on (e.g. i an tamal | i [>h]on rantei)

ni 2PL (zh)o, ni 3PL o (e.g. Ni (h)o ped)

hui em, eR, o, (en) em (e.g. Hui em guel | Hui o lacai | Hui ar credei)

1SG/2SG can but need not fuse, losing their vowel before any (h)V proclitic:

1SG-3SGM: m'an d-; m'e[n>l] l-; m'ar, er gu-,p-

~~m'an discœi {sc. me en}~~

m'ar^{t'er} pardon

M'er guel | ~~M'er guel {sc. me er gwel}~~

Mæs m'e[n>l] lar {me en}

1SG-2PL: mé^(h)o, m'o gu-;p-,c-;s-; mé oc'h, m'och a-

*Mé o guel {2PL} | *Mé o guell {2PL} | *Ha mé o guel {2PL} | M'o guel {2PL} goall' abuset | M'o guel gourmant {2PL} | Tut ehomec m'o guel chiffet | M'o servige[i>o] {2PL}

*mé o ped

*Dr^eindet beniguet mé o car

*mé^ho cav' obliget {2PL}

*me o suppli | *me o suppli 3x | *Mé o suppli, Mam da IESUS

*Mé oc'h ador 2x | *Mé oc'h ador' Doué Tat Eternel | M'och ador' IESUS ma Salver

1SG-RX: m'en em ch-,r-

M'en em changei

M'en em ro doh 2x

2SG-3SGM: té and in corrections te ar, er, t'er p-,s-; t'en p-,c-;l-,v-

*Té ar ~~ped~~^{***}, té ar suppli

~~*Hui ar~~^{te er} promet

m'ar^{t'er} pardon

T'e[n>l] lez en é glahar

T'en carg 2x | ~~T'en carg~~

T'en confond

T'en laca | ~~T'en laca~~^{eun an rant {sc. rent}} da vout miserabl'

T'en pouss'

T'en villipant

2SG-3SGF: té é l-

*Té é laca {3SGF}

*Té • lez d'é bugalé

2SG-RX: te en, t'en em, t'em t-,c-

(*T'en^{te en} em cav' -- nice "defusion" by correction but the cursive poor evidence for te over té

T'em cav' 2x

T'em comport'

T'en em trompl'

Fusion distributes: We expect subject pronoun + fused object proclitic to distribute across coordination:

CS.bar Té ar ~~ped~~^{***}, té ar suppli, / Da raign ~~dit~~^{***} consail, sicour, [>didé]

BT M'er har ha m'enn dihuænn doh ur vandænn Diaulætt 'je le'

6.9 Reflexive (en) em

CS. bare em, en em in free variation, continuing the situation in e.g. Bel (Bel 64: holl desirou ... em adresse ... holl desirou ... en em adrecç):

SU-PRON __: t' (en) em cav;

MAR __: mar en em comport - mar em zouguet;

__ V-: mar en em acquitamp - mar em amantes;

__ PRT: Hep quen doh ar chicanour, / A mes en em quemeret -- n'an des em sourciet;

IPV // Em caret -- / En em changet

Metrical in versions of the same cantique to different melodies: An den santel, dré ar song' sé / A pep pehet em préservei, / Hac ar pehour indin iu'é / Dré ar song' sé en em changei. + An Den santel dré are song' sé / En em conservei, / Hac ar pehour indin i[•>v]é / Dré ar song' sé em changei.

Cf. NG both en um and bare (h)um with finite verbs at least, alongside at least bare (h)um with nonfinite verbal forms (Hemon 1956: §89).

A different pattern tends to (h)um preceded by an e-variant (e, ë, è, é) in finite a/ez context, where the e-variant does not correlate with a/ez distinctions and unlike them is preceded by the en-particle in ez-contexts, but can be elided, bare (h)um in finite en-contexts, and bare (h)um with nonfinite verbal forms, e.g. IS.pour ni é hum auffre | Dré er Religion enn é hum gloüstrer hac enn é hum consacrer .. pé enn hum obliger pé hum denne | hum affligein | Hum countantet (not studied exhaustively, however).

Remarkable here may be Cillart, where in SH a um, é hum seems it's a/é = a/ez particles, ind a um laca, aman u é um abiman, beside bare um before nonfinite verbal forms.

Of late varieties geographically relevant to CS.bar, the finite a/ez-context e(/a) hum, ez-context en hum, other hum distribution here is partly found in Thibault-Cléguérec p. 186 finite a-context (h)um, ez-context (i)n um, other (h)um [inferred] or nūm; it is absent in McKenna-Guémené §326ff. with nun and variants in all contexts.

It may be noted here that the reflexive alone is found in apparent dative use, though without a direct object (q.v. Ernault 1897: 206, cf. 1883: 22, DMH): in CS.bar as elsewhere, laret is used with da of the addressee, and proclitic only for that which is said, save when reflexive:

Songet-u en anqueu, / Liez en em laret / Mervel so ret.

7 Independent and enclitic pronouns

7.1 Overview

Table resumes the distribution of independent, enclitic doubling, and enclitic object forms in CS.bar, in comparison to the earlier NG and the later classical usage resumed in 19C grammars.

Table of object enclitics, doubling, independent – resume plus illustration of categories⁴⁵

	NG	G.GU/BA	CS.bar	Independent				Doubling			IO	G	P	HV
				S	C	-F	F	FS	IS	HS				
3SGM	enf	ean	eun	=	=	=	=	=	=	=				=
3SGF	hy, hi	hi	(h)i				hi, †i							=
3PL	y	ind/intt, °i	i			i	i	i	i				hi	i
1SG	mé, me	mé (me)	mé	=	=		me, †mé	=	-	=	=	=	=	=
2SG	té, te	té (te)	té	=	=	te	te, †té, 1 ^x ta	=		=	=	=	=	=*
1PL	ny, ni	ni	ni			=	=	=		=			=	=*
2PL	huy, hui	hui, °hu	hui	=	=	=	=	=	u*	=			=	=*

Symbols: ° can or must double finite subjects generally or in questions, (...) allowed as finite subjects, = same as basic form; *: té often BE oud(-)é, P-d(-)é; hui FIN/IPV-t-u vs. FIN-(c')h hui; ni, hui often joined in BE ompni, oc'hui, P-mpni, P-(c')hui.

Examples of types not discussed separately here:

S (strong): Gurun parfondet ar péhour, / Eun ar burreu', eun an traitour | Mé eu ar péhour | na té petra oud-é | Hui ma halon | Hui iué o Tut Santel

-F (nonfinite subject): Hac eun innoçant | Hac i en dro da zrôn Doué | hac i naoah o devout tremenet | ha hui^{te} bout quen^r cablus

F (finite subject): eun/I a quemer | Eun na ra | Ha hui n^hellet

7.2 3rd person

3PL: CSbar i as independent and enclitic alike.

MB has 3PL i, y, but int seems to appear by the end of the MB period (DEVRI: s.v.), and gradually expands in 18C, along with int-y in L and in special constructions elsewhere discussed under CHE-/EME- (G.R: 62f. already gives all: iy, cf. IN ii; y; ynt, ynt-y, noting of the latter that “ynt signifie proprement, sunt, existunt, sont, existent; & ynt-y sunt ipsi, sont eux, existent eux”, but for W only y). By 20C ALBB, in “eux ils V”, int and its variants is characteristic both of most KLT and southwestern maritime W int. At the peripheries of int, i remains in maritime L, and in northeastern and eastern T, as well as at the southwestern outlier of Batz. Only maritime L has inti. The northeast T i-zone transitions in eastern W to gi, including Noyal-Pontivy, and that westward to he, hye, çye, ye in W, including Ploerdut (Guémené) hè, and its K, T peripheries, making for a broad south-center to northeast zone, with transitional hint, gint types at either border.

In early W, 1795 G.Vn already notes ind, ghi, i, all apparently as W forms, and the 1818 HJC uses hint, by a Merlevenez author where hint, surrounded by yè, hè, gi, gin, ind, is still the form of the ALBB. Earlier, the 1744 preface to L'Arm of 1744 notes contrast “bon” Vannes Ind a lar, Ind a oai deitt (in ALBB's ind zone) against “mauvais” Noyal-Pontivy I e lar, Moréac I e yo deitt (ALBB gi zone). The 1680 NG has y alongside the 3SGM prepositional ending -ou, and since -ou is a southwestern development in a

⁴⁵ Note to Table: Columns: Independent: S(trong): vocative, dislocated, modified, predicate incl. in cleft structure; C(he): ché(dé), chétu constructions; -F nonfinite subject; F finite subject; Doubling: F finite, I imperative, H HAVE, -F infinitive + S subject, O object; G possessor, P preposition; HV objects of HAVE, IPV objects of imperative.

subregion of the int/ind-zone in ALBB, it seems that int/ind here was y earlier as well, linking it up with MB. This is of interest since the relatively peripheral distribution of the int-type could be interpreted as an archaism, though it has itself i at its own peripheries, and the two forms linked up with wy, wynt of MW, as well as wynt-wy to int-y (Ernault 1897) (only y in MC, cf. i in OSWB).

The 1710 CS.bar has i, at time close to where 1744 Vannes used ind but Noyal-Pontivy i, and may indicate that not only Vannes ind and ALBB Noyal-Pontivy gi but also ALBB Guémené-Bubry, BDSDB-Inguiniel hè go back to i, as expected.⁴⁶

3SGM: CS.bar has eun as independent, doubling, and object enclitic, uses, homographic with ‘aon’ and ‘eeun’, and these are alone to end in -eun. The interpretation is not straightforward but more consistent with Inguiniel area than with others.

MB 3SGM has eff, euff, cf. aoun, oun ‘aon’, effn, e’un ‘eeun’. 1680 NG has 3SGM enf, cf. eunē ‘aon’. 1732 G.R already witnesses a major later split of W, ean̄ going with dehou, ëun̄ going with dehon, southeast vs. west to go by the much later ALBB. 1795 G.Vn adds a third variant, giving ean, eon, yeu, southeast, west, and northeast by the ALBB. The 18C literary standard uses the southeastern G.R ean̄, G.Vn ean type, later mostly written ean, early in 1744 L’Arm ean, ein, einhuë, to be compared with L’Arm eann, eune ‘aoun’, Chal.ms eann ‘eeun’ (spoken 19C MPC Houat-Houedic eān̄, Ernault-Sarzeau iañ, Loth-Sarzeau iã, 20C ALBB iã, yã, i, éã in the region, but also Groix yã, Ternes-Groix jã). The G.R ëun̄, G.Vn eon type probably reflects the type later written ion, early 1818 HJC ion by a Merlevenez author (19C MPC Guémené, Groix yōn̄, ALBB yō including Merlevenez, Guémené, Bubry yō, but also Belle-Île éō, later a.o. Crahé-Languidic jō, BSDB-Inguiniel hoñ, hioñ against ion ‘eeun’, q.v. Appendix). G.VN’s third variant, yeu, fits the northeast in later sources (ALBB gœ, including Noyal-Pontivy subject and enclitic, Thibault-Cléguérec gyé; geographically between northeast and southeast is S. Allouestre ALBB ó vu, G.GLG31 o lar, lausket gjeu).

The final -n of CS.bar eun links it with the eã, iō type against the g/yeu type, and it could be taken as a spelling of /iõ/, though other uses of eu in CS.bar do not in the context of nasalisation both seeming possible.

Table: CS.bar -eu-, -ÿ and ALLB Ploerdut, Bubry, and Noyal-Pontivy counterparts⁴⁷

	CS.bar	Pd	Bb	N-P
eñ	eun	yō	yō	gœ
aon	eun	[aon]	[eun]	
aour	eur	ōr	œr	œr
paour	peur	pōr	pœr	pœr
daou	deu	dāv	dœw	dœw
tadou	tadeu	tadāv	tadœw	tadœw
levriou	cf. poenieu	[iɑo], [ijèò], [ijó]	luryœw	léyvrœw
peoh	peuh	pœh	pœh	pè _a h
breur	breur	brœ,	brœr	brē _y r

⁴⁶ In localities of interest to CS.bar specifically, we get ALBB gi at Noyal-Pontivy, cf. gi Thibault-Cléguérec, subject ia lar but enclitic lausket gji G.GLG S. Allouestre; ALBB hè at Ploerdut near Guémené and at Languidic; and so matching BSDB-Inguiniel hè only in all uses, illustrated in Appendix, but with greater variety in nearby Crahé-Languidic: ðʒe, ðʒi, he, verse ïn^l.

⁴⁷ Pd [...] is McKenna-Guémené, Bb [...] is BSDB-Bubry.

dour	deur	zòr	zoér	zòer
cf.				
preñv	preñv'	prẽw̃	prẽw̃	prẽw̃
klañv	clan(v')	klāw̃	klān	klā
gantañ	guet hon	getõ	getõ	getõ
evidon	euit on	widõñ, wĩdẽñ	awẽdẽñ	wẽzẽñ
leun	lan	lān	lān	lāñ

In CS.bar, 3SGM eun does not match other developments of *-eñv, MB -eff, as also in western HJC, against better match in southeastern sources (for other final nasalised vowels, cf. also euit on ‘evidon, evitañ’, clan, clanv’ ‘clañv’):

Table: -eñv in early W

	CS.bar 1710	NG 1680	GReg W 1732	L’Arm 1744	HJC 1818
eñ	eun	enf	ëunf, eañ	ean, ein, einhuë	ion
kreñv	creu, crev'	creu, cref	creñv, crean	crean, creihuë	criùoh
preñv	preñv'		preañv (nonW preñv, prêv)	prean, preinhuë	pran
neñv	[an, en] éé, ée, eé	nenf, nenfuë [en] enf, [in] enfuë	enñv, eaneü (nonW eê, eñ)	nean, einhuë	nian
eneñv	iné, pl. ineueu	pl. inefueu, eneueu	inanv, inëuñ, pl. inëeu, inean, pl. ineanéü	inean, pl. ineaneu	inian
annev		anenf	anneü	annean, anan, enan	
adreñv	ardran		ardranf	ardran	ar i dran

Relationship of enclitics to pronominal suffixes (see Appendix): The enclitic forms of 3SGM, 3SGF in later W can assume the forms of prepositional suffixes, 3PL /(h)ε/, 3SGM /(h)δ/ of the non-south-east area, in general (Crahé-Languidic, Cheveau-Lorient, McKenna-Guémené, only partly recalling the T development of the enclitic on all uses, Ernault 1897), or when object but not enclitic (G.BA, matching a development widespread in L and T from 18C on, DMH). The two systems can coexist, as seems implied in 1878 G.BA, and witnessed in 1818 HJV by western high-W Merlevenez author (at a quirky survey to be treated with caution, see DMH). There 3SGM is ion on independent, subject, doubling enclitic, as well as have, imperative object enclitic, but also hon as have and imperative object, hon being also the prepositional suffix; while 3PL makes the same contrast with (h)int, where only the h-less variant seems available as doubling and object enclitic, and hé, again only objects of have and imperatives, and the prepositional suffix. The types truly belong to the same register and can combine, e.g. trohet hé ac taulet-int pèle à zehoh. Independent and enclitic can also differentiate in other ways (G.GLG S. Allouestre 3SGM o lar but lausket gjeu, 3PL ia lar but lausket gji, cf. ALBB ó vu, yà vehè, contrast prepositional, ALBB 3SGM gètù, 3PL gètèy). BSDB-Inguiniel illustrates the western type in Appendix.

In CS.Bar they are invariant 3SGM eun, 3SGF hi, 3PL (h)i, against prepositional suffixes which are of the non-south-east area, e.g. 3SGM dehon, doh ton, 3SGF dehi, doh ti, 3PL dehé, doh té.

7.3 Finite subjects

1SG/2SG as finite subjects: In G.GU these are me, te, against other independent and doubling mé, té, e.g. *petra e laran-mé | te labour, té, ha mé ne hran nitra | ditto ne vennet quet monnet, ha mé, me iei mé [m'ha câre, té, mæs ne gân quet ha vrer | m'ha punissou té*. In G.BA: 3, me, te are explained as mé, té + A-particle e. The usage is followed by W writers, save that mé, té finite subjects do occur when emphatic, Châtelier 2016.

CS.bar bears this out. Usually finite subjects are me, te, against mé, té in other independent and doubling uses, and lack the particle that other pronominal subjects ordinarily require, while the few instances of mé, té take the particle. It is worth inventorying the anomalies:

eun: very frequent with particle, e.g. *Eun a ouïe*, incl. usually *Eun a so*, but the sole V-initial verb lacks it, *Eun ordrennas*

hi: the few instances have particle, *Hi a rei*, *Hi a vo*, save variation in *Hi (a) so*.

i: always with particle, *I a bedo*, *i a vezo*, *i a so*.

ni: always with particle, even before vowel, *Ni a oulen*, save variation *ni so*, *Ni a so*.

hui: always with particle, *Hui a gavo*, *Hui a tisirehé* (see mutations), save variation *Hui (a) so*.

mé: me without particle and frequent, *Me laquehé*, so also me so, save *me a lavar* where e/é distinctions are less consistent in cursive, and original where particle correlates with é, *Mé a zilez man go[^] all[^] teucheu*

té: te without particle and frequent, *Te varvei*, nonce but clear *Ta varvei*, save always te so, and by modification *Te^a cred*; té once without particle, *Té lar*, as well as *Té so*, and not with particle.

Exceptional in CS.bar is *bieu*, which never has the particle, *eun*, *hi*, *te*, *hui bieu*, as it is also exceptional in lack of the particle in *Dehon bieu ar Pouver*. See Châtelier 2016 for its exceptionality with other writers and its sources.

3rd person pronominal subjects of finite positive clauses: Typical of W is wider use of overt 3rd person than in KLT, and where typical pro-drop systems do not allow overt pronouns, roughly as continuing topic without intervening pause, including in close coordinations. The relatively unartificial verse of the hymns lends itself to testing this. However, apparent examples lend themselves to alternatives that are often not barred in typical pro-drop systems, such as repetition in “enumerations” of properties of a given subject, or to create a pause:

Typical contrast: *Ni o lacai da vout joyus*, / *I [> h]on rantei da vout eurus* |

Typical switch topic: *Goulenⁿ et bugalé*, / *Deguet ho tut honnest²*, [*> santel*] / *Ag i a garehé* / *Meruel, a gober fest²?* [*> en ur dansal mervel*] |

Continuing topic in enumerations, animate (including the last in a context otherwiser read as switch topic): *Pe quen bras an eurstet* / *Eus un den a vuhé mat*, ... // *N'an des anquen*, *na glahar* / *En é diuehan clenuet*, / *O Tilese! treu an douar* / *Pen'an des quet i*

caret. / Eun an des groit un ampli / Din a santel a nehé; / ... // Eun an des bet caranté / Dreist pep tra doh é Croüer / Adoret é Vajesté / Bet esper en é Salver; / É Nessian an des caret / Hervé Doué, hac é Lezen, / Eun an des ar sicouret / P'an des ar guelet en poen /

Continuing topic in enumerations, animate: ~~Diholl' a rer doh ar pehet / Dré Cantiqueu pe ver e pret. / Vertu o des certanemant / D'on lacat tree'h d'an arouant. // I a pella ar fal songeu, / Miret a rant doh goal comseu, / I a laca hon calonneu / Da pratiquign ar vertuieu.~~

7.4 Doubling

The following examples illustrating uses outside the typical doubling of suffixal subjects of finite verbs, imperatives, and prepositions.

Independent subject:

O den peur! men é songes? / Me clev' mé é doubl antant
[> me ch' redet mé]

Proclitic object:

Da prononcign oc'h instruget i
Eun é lez té ^{etré m' e les té} en miser'
quement sé quement sé / a so eaus a coler Doué / da spontign em laca mé
Na querh nemeit dré anguilleu, D'é tromplign té en pep guis

Proclitic possessor 3rd:

eus ho ré hi

Finite HAVE subject 3rd:

Guet en des eun anduret, / A [p>b]oenieu d'é lemel a miser'
pebeh ur joy en o des i
Mæs ar halon ne mes quet mé

Finite subject 3rd

... pebeh affliction, / ... / A sant eun neusé en é galon
Caëret musiq' a rant i

Doubling restrictions: The principal gap appears to be absence of doubling 3rd person inflection of prepositions. This a familiar gap in certain modern varieties, but not W, where it is noted in the earliest grammar (as used for emphasis in the 1795 G.Vn: 3, P-hou-ean, P-hi-hi); attested though infrequent in early texts (Purchasse's IS.pour usually complex dehou ean-mêmb, dehai intt-memp, rarely simplex rac ne fal quet dehai intt h'er gobér; the corresponding work by Marion IS.mar seems to lacks both; Marion's MG just once simplex, eit-ou-ean, n'en doai quæ meit...); and recorded in corpora over across the history and extent of W (e.g. anou-iañ, 19C southeast Ernault-Sarzeau: 238; gete-gi, 21C central/northwest Crahé-Languidic: 5.3; not mentioned in McKenna-Guémené: §242f., closest [i dizèon] 'e di[-ze?]-ean').

Note on special forms to finite subjects: G.BA: 50n1 gives 2PL -hu for -hui and 3PL -i for -int to doubling finite subjects in questions; G.GU: 32 allows both -hu, -hui for finite

subjects in general, *petra e laret-hu/hui*. CS.bar does not quite follow. 3PL is still the MB form *i*, nonce *hi*, as independent and doubling alike, in all contexts. 2PL is *-u* after the 2PL finite and imperative ending *-t*, but *-hui* after *-c'h*.

Doubling of independent-pronoun finite subjects: Widespread in W is doubling of independent pronominal subjects, already in 18C writers and G.GU. So CS.bar: *me la(va)r mé, me clev' mé, me cred mé*; also the more common type *ne fehen quen ober mé hunon*.

Doubling position: Characteristic of W is invariable position after *quet*, and so here: *Croadur dihui n'an don quet mé | n'ellan quet me | N'a fehen quet mé contamplign | N'ellamp quetⁿⁱ*. This along with a invariant and separate orthography of the text and the availability of independent objects before participles of the verse makes it impossible to show that enclitics truly are enclitics, though this is clear from prose and emphasised in grammars (see HAVE).

Doubling usage: This has not been specifically studied here; it appears to fit the general pattern of W of the period, doubling for contrast and clarification, apart from more neutral but not ubiquitous doubling in imperatives and questions, e.g. usual type *Den Hypocrit' petra a lari té?*, but also, *Den fol, men é songés?* See McKenna-Guémené §242-3 for observations in a modern W variety close to Inguiniel.

8 Enclisis-independence with CHE- and EME-

The presentationals *sed, se(l)de, setu* 'voici, voilà' have uncertain etymologies, e.g. *sell-te* 'look!=2SG', *sellit-hu* 'look.2PL!-2PL' (HMSB: §51.8, Ernault 1888: s.v. *chede* vs. 1899: §71). MB forms include *chede* 'voy', *sede, selde, chede* "uoecy" in C, elsewhere *sede, chede, setu, chetu, chetuy* (DEVRI, Ernault 1888). For W, de Rostrenen 1732 gives as W forms *chétu, chéteu, ché*. ALBB presents these as dialectal variants of 'voilà', cf. also DEVRI s.v. *che*³. However, earlier L'Arm of 1744 gives *ché* 'parlant par toi', beside *chetu, chetui*. The *chetu, chetui* difference presumably reflects the doubling enclitic =hu, =hui difference.

The MB situation remains to be clarified in certain respects, e.g. whether *chede ary*, if 'te voilà arrivé', B, codes the subject of its predicate complement as =*de*, more usually independent *chede te glan*, B, but at any rate there is no *(*da*) *em sel ary* or the like. In early texts, the u/non-u contrast seems to track the addressee, e.g. familiar *quemer y, / chede y glan en un manec* 'take them, here you have them in a glove' J, though at some point this ceases to be so, *setu te tizet* 'we have got you' EKG.

The presented subject can end up with a distinct pronominal form or inflection. In MB, *chetu* alone, it seems, appears with the new 3PL *inty, chetu-inty* beside *chetu y* in Qu, though otherwise only regular independent-enclitic forms are found. 18C T tragedies often present the unusual combination 3SG *a(n)*, there specifically an enclitic form against the independent *en* and its likes, and 3PL *ind-y*, against independent and enclitic *y, ind*, and the two elements of the construction can be written together, most frequently for

an but rarely otherwise: EN *chetuan*, *chedean*, *chedei*, *chetuind*, *chede te*, *chetu nin* &c, CT *chetua(n)*, *chetu y̆ndi*, *chetuni*, *chetu ni* &c, SP *chetuan*, *chetu int y*, *chetu nin* &c. For 18C W, G.Vn gives in discussion of vowel elision and its illustration by what are otherwise W forms, “on dit de même *éméndi*, *chetundi*, pour *émé indi*, disent-ils, *chetu indi*, les voilà”, but *indi* does not seem otherwise attested in W. It is only in L, starting with 19C sources like EKG, or the L-influenced BAZ.1837, that *indi* is a general independent pronoun, given as the subject pronoun beside *i* for maritime L in the 20C ALBB.⁴⁸

It seems possible that *indi* elsewhere does not reflect an independent 3PL *indi* amalgamated with *sed-*, *eme-*, but some combination and reanalysis of these elements with 3PL *ind*, *=ind*, *i*, *=y*, *-nd*, cf. below for *eme*. The details admit many options: *chetu=i* → *chetu=ind* by regular southeathern *=i* → general *=ind* but verbal *-nd*-doubling *=i*, followed by attachment of *=i* as to a verbal form, *chetu-ind-y*; or reanalysis of *chetu ind=y aman* ‘behold they are here’ to ‘behold them here’; or even early *chetui* + verbal inflection *-nd* + doubling *y* directly. The result is essentially *sed*, *eme* with their own suffial or enclitic pronouns, later and differently witnessed in Ternes-Groix, *šə-ma*, with inflectional 1SG/1PL *šə-mad-on/omp*, but enclitics in 3rd *šə-ma joŋ/xi*, *šə-mad int*, and no 2nd person forms. Extending the analysis, *eme-(i)nd=y* ‘say-3PL=3PL’ corresponds to *eme-ean/hi* ‘say.3SG/DFLT=3SGM/F’, and so *chetu-*, *chede-ind=y* ‘lo-3PL=3PL’ to *chetu-eun/hi* ‘lo.3SG/DFLT=3SGM/F’, a hypothesis fitting the t18C eNB-T tragedies CC, CT, EN, CP, where we find systematic contrasts of the type *chetuind* against independent and enclitic *y*, *chetu y̆ndi* against independent and enclitic *y*, *ind*, *chetuan* against independent 3SGM (*h*)*en* but enclitic *an*.

Curiously, an **-nd-* extension is also part uniquely of the etymologically unrelated *sed*-counterpart in MC and extended by enclitics, but in all persons, 3SGM *-ns-e*, 3SGF, 3PL *-ns-y*, 3PL *-ns-y*, e.g. *otensy* ‘behond them’ (LLC: §28.1, Toorians 2014: 5.6n, DHM).

To be compared is the development of French presentationals, *voi(s) nous la* > *nous voilà* > *nous v'lons* (Morin 1985, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §1100).

In CS.bar, the forms *ché*, *chéde*, *chedé* appear only when the addressee is 2SG, e.g. *Che ta Pater*, *che’ ta feden* | *Chédé ta proces collet*, and *chetu* 2PL, e.g. *Chetu ho quentel composet*. The subject of the presentational clause is independent even if identical, *Chédé té condanet*. They combine with the invariant independent-doubling series, though few pronouns are attested:

Ché eun en un stat truheus
 Allas chédé eun dislivet
 Chétu mé peur
 Peur quæs ^{chede té} ~~te so~~ condanet

⁴⁸ It is not entirely straightforward to conclude from G.Vn that there exist *chetu indi*, *émé indi* beside *chetundi*, *éméndi* in W. The work is rich in inferences, often insightful, e.g. HAVE as accusative clitics + BE, or fascinating, e.g. present of BE as prepositional suffixes but without noting 3SG, 3PL, sometimes fanciful, e.g. *gouvarnein* ‘gouverner’ as *gou* ‘sous’ + *barnein* ‘régler’ “D’ici vient le latin *gubernare*”.

That seems to match for the pronominal portion other 18C writers, modulo *chetu* - *chetui* variation across but also within texts like IS.pour, but the examination has been cursory:

Ché tergont péh argant amen en ur ialhat, / Ha cont int, mar carés PT

The quotative *eme* has an uncertain history and diverse patterns of subject coding, at various points involving distinctively verbal inflections (e.g. 3PL -nt), prepositional inflections (3PL -o, -e), and no inflections but independent or doubling pronouns (3PL -i) (*HMSB*: §152, *LVB*: 205-6, Ernault 1890: §74, §60). It is useful to compare CS.bar with the inventory of de Rostrenen 1732 s.v. DIRE, with many of the forms attested in the corpus of DEVRI s.v. eme, as well as the grammars of classical W (G.GLG is like G.BA without the inflected E ment-ind):

Table: eme in W⁴⁹

	CS.bar 1710	G.GU 1836	G.BA 1896	G.R W 1738	G.R other 1738
indep.		e mé Pierre	e mé Piar		eme Zouë
3SGM	é m'eun, é mé eun	e mé-ean	e mé-ean	emehon	emezá, emezañ, emean, emeon
3SGF	é mé hi	e mé-hi	e mé-hi	emihy	emezy, eme hy, eméy
3PL	é m'endi	e mé-ind	e mé/ment-ind	emêhé	emézeu, emézo, emézê, eméé, emint-y
1SG	é mé té	e mé [sic]	e mé-mé		eme-vé, eme-ven, eme-me, emioun-me, emoun-me
2SG		e mé-té	e mé-té		
1PL		e mé-ni	e mé-ni		
2PL	é mé tu	e mé-hui	e mé-hui		

CS.bar contributes several points of interest. Most forms are transparently é mé + independent-doubling pronouns. Others attest inflection, partly found in G.BA but with characteristics rather of MB forms:

2PL é mé tu: The -t- is clearly 2PL verbal and not prepositional inflection, attested in MB emet huy G, emet hy J if emended as in Ernault 1888b: s.v. eme, and continued in NB T, e.g. emet-hu, met-hu, Le Clerc 1908, quotative, also giving imperatives, LVB: 207-8. Later in W, cf. “mestoh-hui (à Cléguérec) et metu (pour emezet hui)”, G.GLG: 159, cf. Thibault-Cléguérec. Example from CS.bar: Allas e mé tu n^hellan quet.

3PL é m'endi: CS.bar ém'endi is not written like the 3PL verbal inflection -nt but -i matches the 3PL doubling/independent pronoun, cf. rant i. The same in late MB emend y vs. grenty NI, and elsewhere later, e.g. de Rostrenen 1732 s.v. dire: non-W emint-y, leverzont-y, or ement-ii, clasquent-ii BAZ.1837. G.BA e ment-ind beside e mé-ind is on the other hand written like verbal inflection, cf. ‘aorist’ of BE 3SG vé, 3PL vent. Ernault 1897, citing G.BA, adds “les Vannetaises disent emendint” in addition to citing G.BA. The form is the same in HJC é-m'en-dint, beside é-mé-ion, é-mé-hi. G.Vn gives éméndi attributed to independent pronoun and elision, “on dit de même éméndi, *chetundi*, pour *émé indi*, disent-ils, *chetu indi*, les voilà ... Sarzeau de *haind* pour de *hai-ind*” (with

⁴⁹ G.R: not including 3SGM eme-voa-ê, 3SGF eme-voa-hy, 3PL eme voant-y.

which last cf. Ernault-Sarzeau *d'ai-heint*, *d'ai* being the undoubled form, and *-(k)h*-generalised to e.g. *ou zei-khieint* ‘o zi-ind’).

It seems difficult to differentiate the role of verbal inflection and independent pronouns in these forms, i.e. *émé* + *-nt* + *=i* vs. *émé* + *indi*, granting the anomalous *indi* rather than *i* with *émé* as with *chetu* established for W in G.Vn and with parallel in MB Qu. The t/d alternation is expected from word-final neutralisation of voicing ubiquitous across Breton (recently Iosad 2017: 7.3.2, 7.2.1 with literature), including varieties of W (nearest to CS.bar, McKenna-Guémené §279ff., Crahé-Languidic 3.3, 5.3, and going back MPC, Ernault-Sarzeau) and its antecedents (Schrijver 2011a: 4.8). The *é/e* alternation follows the pattern of verbal inflection in *vé*, *vent*, but might reflect influence of phonotactics modifying G.Vn’s *éméndi* to the preferred phonotactics neutralising *é/e* before *-nC-* in W, and at any rate has a partial parallel in the elision with *ém’eun* below. In a similar way, V.GN’s Sarzeau *de haind* for *de hai-ind* might, along with the influence of verbs, underlie new *-nt* inflection of prepositions in the region, Quiberon *getënt*, *getünt* (Loth-Quiberon 1895), Quiberon *gétënt* (ALBB), again doubled in Merlevenez *getëndin* (ALBB) (unless particular verbal inflections are taken to lie behind vowel differences like Sarzeau, *gètānt* ALBB, not yet in Ernault-Sarzeau). The process is familiar in the MW *ganthu* > *ganthunt* (GMW §63).⁵⁰

MC offers a precise counterpart of the Nl *emend y*, CS.bar *emendi* type, in yn *methens i* PA, not apparently bare yn *emezens y*, and indeed of to CS.bar *eme-eun*, in yn *meth e* PA, clitic form rather than independent *ef*, which we would expect to give **eme=eun* in W. This is the situation in W. Nl itself however pairs *emend y* with *emezaff*, *emezy* – apparently prepositional, but perhaps enclitic to *emez*, though then we would expect *emezend y* as the counterpart of MC; it also witnesses the L composition with BE, *emez voe an Eal*, later richly attested in IN. Relevant are forms of *émé* in de Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *dire*, but there W 3SGM *emehon*, 3SGF *emihy* are not distinguishable from doubling of *ê ma* ‘be’, W *ê ma=hon*, *ê ma=hy*, de Rostrenen 1738: 182, and *emêhé* can be viewed as prepositional inflection, cf. again *emez-aff*, *emez-y* Nl, m17C MB.

Against any role of new 3PL *indy* is probably Donoet *[pe]mp emaindi*, cf. Ca *emahint* too early for the pronoun. The role of *-i* must be compared with both MC has *y m(m)a*, *y (m)mons* with or without doubling enclitic and MW *mae*, *maent* ditto, suggesting an early but optional part of *ema*, whatever its origin, absent in the W developments *emant* &c.

Table: Forms of ‘say’ with 3rd person pronouns in selected varieties

	3SGM	3SGF	3PL
MC e15C PA	yn meʒ≈e ^{V,A}	yn meʒ≈y ^{V,A}	yn meʒ-ens=y ^V
HJC 1818 wW	é-mé=ion ^{V,A}	é-mé=hi ^{V,A(+)}	é-m’e-n-d≈int ^V
Le Bayon 1878 scW	e mé≈eañ ^{V,A}	e mé≈hi ^{V,A(+)}	e mé-nt≈int ^V , e mé≈int ^A
de Rostrenen 1732 W	eme≈/-hon ^{P,A(+)}	emi≈/-hy ^{P,A(+)}	emê≈/-hé ^{P,A+}
Nl m16 MB	emez-aff ^{P,A?}	emez-y ^{P,A}	eme-nd≈y ^V

⁵⁰ Ernault 1890: §74, 1897, takes the t/d orthography to differentiate origins, and links *d-* to the *d*-linker of *n’en dint*, seeing here influence of BE, and of course it might well be that writers perceived *ément-i* to be a verbal inflection and *éméndi*, *ê m’endi*, *emendint* not to be, tracking the differential orthography of verbal-*nt* vs. enclitic *-nt* in e.g. IS.mar *vehënt-ind* Apostoliq vs. *vehënt-int* prest.

Symbols: consistent in text with V verbal inflection (+ doubling enclitic), P prepositional inflection (+ doubling enclitic), A old argument enclitic, A+ new argument enclitic

3SGM: The contraction ém'eun is isolated for a host in -é in the text, but see again G.VN cited.

CS.bar also contributes to the syntax of *eme*. In sources that consistently show mutations, the subject can be lenited, *eme Zouë* (GR.R), though it need not be (DEVRI s.v.). This is otherwise a characteristic of prepositional objects, against any verbal arguments. Yet it can appear on pronouns, *eme-vé/me* (GR.R), which goes beyond what is attested with pronouns, even those that appear after prepositions, e.g. *etre me ha hen* (EKG). Moreover, the lenition is also attested on other elements that intervene, as they never do before prepositional but do verbal arguments, *eme gerkent ar bugel* (BUAZ.perrot). In CS.bar affords evidence here, because Doué is the one noun that almost always lenites, with one exception only very frequent da Zoué, ta Zoué, a Zoué, but still émé Doué. Yet word order treats the subject as a verbal argument, allowing an intervener, É mé doh ar Profet Ioel | É mé dimpni salver ar bet | É mé dimp ar Profet.

For other environments where strong or doubling pronouns are found:

-There is no instance of *goe* 'woe'; cf. the regular construction CS.bar Malloeh d'em procurour.

-There is no instances of infinitival subject after a prepositional complementiser not incorporated into it, of the rare but robust type : Meid evit intt bout tri Person CS.1760; only the more regular construction, CS.Bar Euit ompni an offancign | Euit on bezout innoçant 'despite him being innocent' | Euit ~~on~~^{hi} bout ehus 'despite it (the prayer) being terrible'.

-There is no instance of doubling of silent infinitival subjects, of the type that seems particularly common in W : eit bout mé koh G.GLG | Eit bout eañ bihan G.BA | éit bout ean coëhet IS.pour.

9 Enclisis-proclisis with imperatives and jussives

9.1 Background

In MB, both positive and negative commands use imperative forms.⁵¹ Object coding is governed by a 1/2 proclitic - 3 enclitic split, as with HAVE, along with an all-proclitic option in the negative. The object proclitics are those of all other verbal constructions; 1SG/2SG have mesoclitic forms if there is a leftward proclitic in the verbal complex, always na= in negatives, usually none in positives, but in verse (h)a=. The enclitics are the same as objects of mihi est and as doubling enclitics generally. Reflexives behave the same in earlier MB, but in later MB the pronominal object coupled to the reflexive prefix is lost or neutralised to 3SGM.

⁵¹ The term imperative is here reserved to 2SG-2PL-1PL forms, with 3SG-3PL called jussive and addressed below.

Table: MB and W imperative patterns for tenn- ‘draw’ (constructed)

V!	OBJ	MB	W	MB	W
2/1 (2SG)	1/2 (1SG)	ma zenn †ha’m zenn	†me zenn tenn-mé	na’m zenn	n’em zennes
2/1 (2SG)	3 (3PL)	tenn y	tenn-ind tenn-hai	n’ho zenn na denn y	n’ou zennes
2/1 (2SG)	RX	da (h)em denn †ha’z em denn	hum denn	na’z em denn	n’hum dennes
1PL	hV- (3SGF)	tennomp hi	tennamb-t-hi	n’hi zennomp	n’hi zennamb

By mid-18C W writers and 18-19C grammars there have taken place the following changes:

- 1/2 proclitics: replaced by enclitics identical to doubling ones (unlike with HAVE; explicitly noted observed as early as G.Vn: 3).
- 3 proclitics: undocumented in grammars and unattested with unambiguously imperative forms but occasionally met with in verse in syncretic imperative-present commands (this development is robust early and documented in G.BA for HAVE-constructions, q.v.).
- Negatives: use present rather than imperative forms, and its proclitic-only object coding.

By late 19C W, G.BA adds further developments:

- 3 enclitics: beside or instead older forms identical to doubling enclitics, 3SGM =ean, 3PL =ind, there become available to imperative and HAVE-objects only newer forms abstracted from prepositional suffixes, 3SG =hoñ, 3PL =hai, with 3SGF =hi same in both.⁵²
- t-insertion: h- initial enclitic forms, i.e. 3SGF =hi and new 3SGM =hoñ, 3PL =hai, are preceded by t abstracted from the 2PL ending in 1PL.⁵³

Illustrative forms from grammars of classical W:

Table: IPV-JUSS + OBJ in grammars of classical W

OBJ	V!	G.Vn	G.GU	G.BA	G.GLG
RX	+2SG!		hum gâre		
	+2PL!		hum gâret	hum gâret	
	+1PL!			hum garamb	

⁵² In G.BA, the new forms are fairly clearly limited to object enclitics, against both doubling enclitics and independent pronouns. This is also clear in the analogous development in K and T, esp. in 3PL (DMH). Independently however, western W ultimately assimilates the syllabic nuclei across the board to 3SGM ò, 3PL e/é/aj, whereby object and doubling enclitics collapse completely, and so seem to mostly independent pronouns (Ternes-Groix, Cheveau-Lorient, Crahé-Languidic, BSDB-Inguiniel in Appendix here; no object enclitics documented in McKenna-Guémené). 19C data is typically too partial (e.g. MPC 1818 published in Lorient by a Merlevenez author, 3SGM subject pronoun ion, after chetu, chetu ion, imperative object lausquet hon, object of HAVE m’en dès hon hoàh cavet).

⁵³ G.BA does not specify the distribution of t-insertion precisely; the present formulation is a conjecture, guided partly by its description in Crahé-Languidic, Cheveau-Lorient.

3	+3SG!			hum garéet	
	+2PL!		lahet-ean	kâret-ean̄, ou hon	karet ean
			lahet-hi	lausket-ean̄, lakeit-hon̄	
			lahet-ind	mahet-hi	
	+1PL!			dastumet-hai	
				karamb ean̄, hon	
				lauskamb-t-hon̄,	
				lauskamb-t-hi	
1/2	+2SG	câr mé			
	+2PL		câret-mé	karet-mé	karet mé
			salvet-ni	tennet-ni	sekouret me
					†me sekouret
	-2PL				ne me lahet ket (20C)
					n'em lahet ket (classical)
	+3PL				me hélièent (suggested)
					te sekourent (normative)

This picture is reflected in 18C W prose. 1st person objects are regularly enclitics to imperatives, negative command use only proclitics, and are always present in form. The Pater illustrates (up to the a-forms, discussed separately)

Pr: Ha na casset quet àhenamp en tantation. / Mais hon delivret ac en drouc.

PR: idem save spelling.

GU: Meid ag enn droug honn dihuænnett [negative phrased without a pronoun]

SH: ha n'onn laussquét quét de gouéh énn tantation; mais délivrétt-ni ag enn droug

CT.13: N'hun délausquet quet énn tantation. Mæs delivret ni ag enn droug.

IS.mar: idem save spelling.

Some in contrastive combinations in prose and verse:

Imperative objects in prose:

Truguairecamp-ean: Um offram tehou | rante-mé ... groua-mé SH

mæs digueor-int ... hum zigueoret | n'ou desiret quet CO

Caret ean, cherviget ean | n'en ancoehét quet MG

N'ou cherviget quet ... mæs hum gomportet | lausquet ind IS.mar.

Sél mé | Lausque-mé BT

Imperative objects in verse:

Selétt-mé ... nunn ancouéhétt quét. SH

Hag implé-ean dévote matt SH

Ha grouamb-ind SH

Exceptionally 1st person objects remain proclitic in positive imperatives, in what are called “expressions consacrés” in Guillevic and Le Goff 1902, e.g. Doué ... me cheleuet CAG (cf. Le Goff 1927: 202). Thus in the hymns of CS.anon, the vast majority of 1st person objects is enclitic, but a few are proclitic.

Lamett-mé a visk er bleidi, Ha me hassett CS.anon.

me secouret | sécourett-mé CS.anon.

By the time of 20C studies, apart from fixed expressions, only enclitics are available at least in the west, Ternes-Groix, Cheveau-Lorient, Crahé-Languidic, and northeast, Thibault-Cléguérec, or else are replaced by a-forms at the KT periphery, McKenna-Guémené.

On the other hand, in the verse of t17C NG, there is still the pattern of MB and Pr/PR, with only 1st person proclitics in positive imperatives (with no evidence about negative commands):; dougam enf | hon lacait ol.⁵⁴

Finally, there are what look like 3rd person proclitics to imperatives in commands, undescribed in grammars or studies, and perhaps confined to verse.⁵⁵

Pé hui doar, unn um zigorétt ... Non, non, gurun, feaih, n'er scoeit quet, Hui douar, éhué er supportétt; M'er guéle ar beenneu é zeulin SH

This option is robust at least in LT outside W (HMSB: §51, §53), though more southward in K varieties have retained enclitics alone at least until Humphreys (1995) (cf. DMH). The appearance of 3rd person proclitics in HAVE in LT goes back at least to G.R of 1738. In 18C, imperatives tend to lag behind HAVE in sources such as the successive Leon editions of Quiquer-Ploesquellec Colloques in 18C (DMH). However, there are robust 18C cases, e.g. ag hé gouisket déan ... a lahet an (MPC 1779 by Le Brigant, Pontrieux, Tregor, see Ernault 1890).

In MB and W alike, 3rd person proclitics in imperatives have gone unremarked. There is a good reason for this. Usually, examples of what look like positive imperatives with proclitics, even coordinated with clear imperatives, are formally ambiguous with forms that can be used as command, usually present, sometimes future or infinitive, themselves coordinable with imperatives: Some examples from MB and from 18C T tragedies that otherwise use IPV=3:⁵⁶

Azeulet y ... / Hac ho caret ... ‘adore!2PL them ... / and love.INF them’.⁵⁷

Asezet, ha quemeret ef; / Oar hoz barlenn ent [var. en] astennet J

Qe buan de cavet a digasan genêt / ... / Hac en acuz neuze dan otro an Impalaer ‘Va vite le trouver et amène-le avec toi / ... / et accuse-le’ SP

Allas! mari, on sicouret, / ousim truve a quemeret! CT⁵⁸

CS.bar offers interesting evidence: 1 is still only proclitic in positive imperatives and unattested in negative commands (apart from a-forms discussed separately); 3 is only proclitics in negative commands which already use present form where it is possible to tell; and 3 is regularly enclitic in positive imperatives, but there is a far more robust

⁵⁴ There is one example that could be a 1SG enclitic in NB, but it is left as opaque in Hemon’s study, and the context does not readily fit such an analysis: Sellet me er flanë.

⁵⁵ Cf. CS.bar, richer than other sources in these proclitics, but with enclitic here: Non pas gurun, nar scoeit quet, Hui douar supportet eū brepet, M'er guel taulet ar é deu llin.

⁵⁶ Cf. a parallel in French from Villemarque’s translation of J: visiter-le et l’ensevelissez.

⁵⁷ Here caret appears to be infinitive, present and so by expectation imperative in the text being queret, pace Ernault 1888b: s.v.

⁵⁸ Here *quemeret* is finite because of the particle a.

pattern of 3 proclitic than is usually in or outside W, though all examples are formally ambiguous with present. Let us take these up in turn.

9.2 1=V!

CS.bar 1st person objects in positive imperatives are only proclitic, including when combining with distinctively imperative 2SG form (marked **), as well as with ambiguous imperative-present 1PL (marked *) and 2PL. As imperatives in general, they may be clause-initial or preceded by clausemate material but without a particle. The forms of 1SG, 1PL are regular, e.g. 1SG with its spirantisation and its nasal before voiced stops.

1SG:

**Da pep Sul, émé Doué, / Me servig' {clear 2SG IPV} ahét an de

**O Man Doué, Tat Eternel, / D'o Croadurien, Maguer fidel, / Me recev' guet umilité {2SG ipv}

**Fi en on "" me lez d'ober {clear 2SG ipv with proclitic 1SG} | **Ar process man so mat / Me lez d'ober {clear 2SG ipv with 1SG proclitic} | Me lest' d'ober / Fiet en on

// Mec'hredet | Me credet {ipv}, pé ne ret quet, | Me credet, Christenien, / Poezet er vat ma homseu, | me ch'redet mé | Me^{ch}credet, man Breder quer

Man galvet, IESUS, man Doué

Ma lezet en temptation

Christenien, me chele[•>v]et | Christenien, me cheleuet | Me hoarezet, me cheleuet | Me chevelet amizian

1PL:

Tut yaoanc hon credet

Hon Doué IESUS, doh imp ho pet truhé, / Hon conservet quen clouz el m'on maguet
mes hon dilivret eus an drouc | Hon dilivret | Eus a pep drouc hon dilivret

Hon dihoallet

Ni ho ped, hon desquet

Speret Croüer, Sclerigen Eternel! / Hon instruget en o Lezen santel

Ni o suppli, hon sicouret

Roit dimp ho peuh, en hi hon quendalhet

9.3 NEG=3=V.PRES

CS.bar negative commands are only only attested with 3 objects, always proclitic, combining in the one unambiguous case with is a present rather than an imperative verbal form, and including examples coordinated with positive imperatives with enclitics (conventions as above).

MIXED 3 POSITIVE-ENCLITIC + NEGATIVE-PROCLITIC EX

El tut estran n'o sellet quet, / Sellet i el ho bugalé

Non pas gurun, nar scoeit quet, / Hui douar supportet eū brepet, / M'er guel taulet ar é daullin 'no, thunder, do not strike him, you earth support him always, I see him ...' -- note overt subject of ipv

OTHER NEG!=3=PRES COMMANDS

3SGM:

**Quen liez gueh ma offancet^s Doué, / N'ar pede[t>s] quet, d[o>e] pardonign ivé {2PL>2SG}

Mæs en hanv' Dopué, n'an laret quet {neg ipv}

non pas gurun nar scoeit quet

3SGF:

Consideret, Christenien, / Consideret ho dinité, / N'é disinouret birhuiquen

Ha dreist pep tra, n^he pilet quet {3SGF}

3PL:

Hui so mat n'o leset quet / ~~bevi~~-ch•mel pelloh / en ur stat quen ehus {3PL}

9.4 V!=3

CS.bar usually uses enclitics for 3rd person in positive imperatives. The enclitics are the unique enclitic-independent series of CS.bar (**2SG, *1PL, unmarked 2PL; unmarked clause-initial, ^u if following a clausemate, always without particle, ^{uu}, ^u if following ha(c) 'and', underlining for proclitic=ipv & any other ipv save ipv=enclitic which is double under-lined; excluding examples coordinated with proclitics, above for negated imperatives, below for positive, below):

3SGM: eun

**servig' eun guet fidélité

^{uu}**A guer da guer poez eun^{hi} er vat {3SGF=pater noster}

*Sicouramp eun bamdé: / *Instrugeamp eun dré comseu

*Meulamp hon Salver beniguet, / *Trugarecamp eun umblemant

^uDesquet dehon, hui ~~œ~~^hhunon, [>propremant] / ~~Abret mat é devotion~~, / Ha digasset eun d'an Ilis

Ag o pehé un dra a poen, / Quemeret eun da penigen,

// Sellet eun en é guélé

// Contamplet eun en é guélé

// Sellet eun abars en é guélé

Suppliet eun dévotamant

Trugarecait eun euit on

imitet eun, Doué ho tat / pedet

Chetu Patrom an Usurer, / Contamplet eun man breder quer

D'un den a rant cals' a anquen, / Desquet eun dré ma homseu

Pellait eun doh pep fallanté

pratique eun / mæstr ha mæstres

D'an Den peur noaz roit-u dillat, / Ho pet truhé eus é miser', / Soulaget eun a galon vat

Trugarecait eun, man Breder

3SGF: (h)i

**^μA guer da guer poez eun^{hi} er vat {3SGF=pater noster}
*Groamp i eta, Christenien {3SGF=vertu}
*Respettamp i man Breder quer {3SGF=confirmation}
*Henan an excellantan / An dinan caranté / Pratiquamp i er bet man {3SGF=caranté}
^μLezet tremen^h é fantasi', / Goudé, dré [c>g]aër corriget i
^μMe n'^ean det en pen anehi, / Da Zoué recommandet [i?>hi] {3SGF=priet}
^μA pe rei d'oh, ho Cofessour, / Ho penigen, man breur pehour, / Quemeret i el aberh^z
Doué / Guet respet hac umilité. // A poent da poent acquitet i {3SGF=penigen}
Pedet ar Vajesté divin, / Adoret i devotemant,
Groit^{hi} ivé just' en amser {3SGF=penigen}
Priet divin eus ma Iné, / Conservet i ha nos, ha dé
pratique^{hi} fidellamant {3SGF=quentel}

3PL: i

*^μDa grondal lésamp i {3PL}
*^μAdmiramp ar Sent hep quen, / Ni a vezo collet, / Mæs imitamp i ouspen, / i a vezo
salvet.
^μPe vint arriv' en oét requis, / Digasset i d'ar^{c^h} cathequis^{chis}
^μMar dant ha clanvat en o ti, / Dré aluzon, supportet i
^μMæs goall' ober mar o guelet, / Gourdrouzet i e[n>l] larehet
^μP'o devo ho govr' achivet, / Païet i just me n'o miret
^μ// A^{be} pe vint clanv' conduct' i, / Pe vint chiffet, confortet i
^μDa vout tut mat instruget i, / Pa faviint corrigent i
^μGroit de hé m'a pedint Doué, / ... / D'ar cathequis daveit i
^μ[>an heur m'a commancint comsin] / ~~Da goms' a pe vint commancet~~, / Da prononcign
~~œ^h~~ instruget i [>da brononcin] / An hanv' adorabl' a IESUS / ... // Desquet i d'ober sin
ar groés, / Groit dehé ar formign liez
^μForh vat^d a ret o corrigign, / Mæs corriget i hep fachign
*Pratiquamp i en hanv Doué {3PL=seih oeuvr'}
// Ho promesseu n'ancouheit quet, / Acquittet i fidellamant
Renonciet da cant pehet, / Cofessait i, goüillet, chiffet,
Sicouret i, ~~man Breder quer~~ [>en ho miser] {3PL=ineueu}.
ho d'ever acquittet, / Exhortet i d'ober acteu a fé
Desquet i me ne rant er vat
Lezet i eta da laret / hui bet sur a fidel brepet

9.5 3=V!

In CS.bar 3=V in commands is robust, though less frequent than V!=3. Yet no instances are unambiguously imperative in form, being 2PL ambiguous with present by their form. They differ from V!=3 imperatives in all being found after clausemate XP or ha(c), while V!=3 can also be clause-initial. Yet they might differ from present in that no en-particle is found in this context in 3PL proclitics, whereas it is available, though not obligatory, elsewhere.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ In fact, every single instance of groit in CS.bar that is not the regular participle is imperative and it is

One might compare earlier the common usage in 18C French, where unlike now, in coordinated positive imperatives, the noninitial one allows proclitics, including when the relevant imperative is formally unambiguous: *Porte-lui ma réponse et me laisse en repos* (Corn.) | *Gardez ma lettre et la relisez* | *Va t'en à mon logis, chercher la musette, et l'apporte là* (Sand.) (Grevisse and Goose 2008: §683a).

MIXED 3 POSITIVE ENCLITIC + PROCLITIC:

Eus ar ré clan o pet sourci, / Ha liez mat o visitet, / Guet comseu douç' confortet i, / M'a vint patiant en ho clenvet.

Dalhet ar nehé, ho lagat, / Lacait i oll' d'ober er vat // Da vout ampert oc'h alliet, / Penos ober oc'h instruget

[>an heur m'a commancint comsin] / ~~Da goms' a pe vint commancet~~, / Da prononcign oc'h instruget i [>da brononcin] / An hanv' adorabl' a IESUS / ... // Desquet i d'ober sin ar groés, / Groit dehé ar formign liez

3SGM

D'ar clân douguet compassion, / Guet comseu douç' ar confortet Querhet bamdé d'ar visitign, / Lacait ho poen d'ar soulagign. // ^{ha dreist pep tra} ~~Mar bé goall' elan~~ ² an disposet {3SGM proclitic IPV}, / Da oulen bout sacramantet

Chevelet-u comseu Doüé / Hac ar groit guet attention

Hep clasq' a [d>Z]igaré, / Torret guet charité, / E nan "", hac é sehet, / Hac ouspen an dra sé / Mar bé noaz ar guisquet

Trugarecait an autrou Doué, / ^{Hac ar meulet} ~~A brassan gallout~~ ^{en} oc'h Iné

Umb! da Zoüé em adresset, / Hac a galon ar supplet
// Sicouret hoas, ho Nessian / ... / ... / ... / P'ar guelehet en clenvet, / En chif, en pauranté, / Prontamant an assistet / Eus ho commodité

3PL

Recevet-u guet caranté / En ho ti, ar Pelerinet, / Ha hervé ho commodité / Ho conduit, hac o trétét.

An [t>d]u[t>d] yaoanc aral, / Ar hon^r h'eoust' a hoarhei. // Da hoarhign o leset / N@ hoarhint quet brepet

9.6 RX=V!

Reflexive imperatives always use the prefix in W, even when all persons are enclitics, as is the typical state of affairs in all classical grammars and writers considered here.

TE hum sauv bermen ha sauv ni ehue guenid

So also in CS.bar:

frequent, while the two instances of the present are Me n'ar groet quet | me ne ~~sentet~~ ^{ar groet quet}, beside ret when in lenition contexts; so it is consistent with CS.bar that groit is imperative against present groet, ret, though I am not aware of other analogues to a systematic !2PL - PRES.2PL distinction in W or indeed earlier Breton outside BE/HAVE.

RX (sample): (en) em
 Euit hoⁿ [p>b]out ar Vertu sé, / Em accustumet^{amp} da songeal
 D'ar Cathequis en em cavet
 // Em caret man Disquibien {em reflexive}
~~Eus ar poent man em acquitet~~
 Mar em' sentet {1SG}, / En em changet

This is good evidence that the reflexive prefix continues to be morphology distinct from pronominal clitics, as it was qua prefix in its origin, and as is also hinted by other evidence (early L type hon/o beza gwelet vs. beza en em gwelet, cf. HMSB, DMH).

9.7 Negative imperatives

In MB, positive and negative commands use the same forms, imperative-jussive. In W, as soon as there is evidence in 18C, negative commands do not use the imperative forms, though they do use jussive ones, but rather present forms, always distinctive in 2SG, and for GO also in 2PL/1PL (so explicitly for 21C Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014):⁶⁰

CAG Ne zoutès quet, mæs cred fidel

Table: W positive ipv., negative ipv., negative pres. from G.BA⁶¹

⁶⁰ As in the “surrogate” use of negative subjunctive for positive imperative in Spanish, *haga-lo -- no lo hagas*; but this is not so in French, *ne le prends/sois pas, prends/sois -le pas - (que tu) ne le prennes, sois, sach -- tu ne l'est, prends pas; ne m'en veuillez pas, ne sachez mauvais gré à ceux qui....* Grammars and studies are rarely explicit about the negative imperative being identical to the present (so Crahé 2014: 5.1.5.2.4). What is frequent is to explicitly give different forms of the positive and negative imperative for 2SG, where they differ (not G.GU, but G.BA: 32, G.GLG02/33: 43): to explicitly note the restriction of special imperative forms like *dal, kerh, lest* to positive (*ober* type *groa, ne hrès*: G.BA 30, G.GLG31: pos. 52-3 vs. neg. 159 the latter not in 02; *donet* pos=neg=pres thanks to *deus > des*: G.BA 85, G.GLG31 op.cit.; *monet* interesting differences, G.BA: 33 pos. ipv. *kei-ké-ki, keit, damb*, neg *n'ies, n'iet, n'iamb*, juss. both *éét, éent*; same stem pattern for pos. in G.GU: 85: but GLG02/31: 52 pos extending *k*-step to jussives: *ke-kerh, keit-kerhet*, juss. *ét-kerhét, ent-kerhent*, neg=pres GLG31: 159; Crahé 2014: 5.1.5.2.4 *kerhet > [ˈtʃerət], [ˈtʃeˈt-u-]* affirmative only; Ternes 1970: 16.2.4.2 vs. 16.2.5.4 gives a wide range of special imperative forms reserved to positive, including less preference for *-a* and the types *gurtein, dal, ke, gwelt, lest*, and it is of interest that *damp* here limited to ‘go’ and gapped for ‘come’). Finally, their object coding may be differentiated, and that of the negative is that of the present (Cheveau 2007: 4.4.1.2, Ternes 16.6.3 vs. 16.6.5, modulo obligatoriness of 3rd person *a*-forms in the negative).

⁶¹ Note to Table: The negative imperative of lahein apart from 2SG and 3PL pres. of monet filled in from description rather than explicitly given in paradigms. With GO, *i/h*-insertion is independent, e.g. PRES, FUT *me ia, iei, n'iañ, iein*, but *é/ma hañ, hein*, cf. G.BA: 6. With DONET the idiosyncratic 2SG! dès collapses with present in negated ipv. *nen dès*, pres. *nend ès*. With GOBER, the stem alternation *gro-/hr-* is independent of imperatives, “Au lieu du radical Gr, on emploie, par endroits, le radical Gro, pour conjuguer le verbe Gobér. Ce dernier est seul usité à l'impératif affirmatif: Groa, etc.”. Clearer G.GLG02/31: 53-4, “la disparition de *g* entreine celle de l'*o*, *pe hreheh, ... m'er groeche ...*, *ne hrein*”, to which G.GLG31: 158 adds “On dit cependant *um hroa, se fait, en des um hroeit, s'est fait*”, illustrated with *ne hran ket - mar groan*”. Cf. IS.mar, 3SG *er groa, hé groa, ou groa, hur groa*, 3PL *mar groant, n'er groant, 2x mar groamb, 2PL mar groét, a p'er groait*, but e.g. *e rant, ne rant &c.*, but *hum hroa &c.* This fits the limited data in ALBB, where the distribution of *maL-* vs. *mar* ‘if’ seems to correlate with that of *r-* vs. *gro-*, *grw-*, *gwr-* all over the W area. So CS.bar, see Appendix.

	lahein			gober			monet		
	!	N!	N-PRES	!	N!	N-PRES	!	N!	N-PRES
	V1	ne_ket	ne_ket	V1	ne_ket	ne_ket	V1	n'_ket	n'_ket
2SG	lah	lahes	lahès	groa	hrès	hrès	kei/ké/ki	iès	iès
2PL	lahet	lahet	lahet	groeit	hret	hret	damb	iamb	iamb
1PL	lahamb	lahamb	lahamb	groamb	hramb	hramb	het/ket/keit	iet	iet
3SG	lahéèt	lahéèt	lah	groéet	hréèt	hra	éèt	iéèt	ia
3PL	lahéent	lahéent	lahant	groéent	hréent	hrant	éent	iéent	iant

On this point, there is no evidence in 17C W, since Pr/PR and NG have only 2PL negated imperatives. CS.bar however is intriguing. It has an unmodified 2SG imperative in its versification of the Commandments, along with two others of BE to which we return, and a couple of others modified to 2SG. Other similar cases are just as or more likely to be negative purpose clauses -- a reasonable origin of the replacement of the imperative by present under negation (apart from BE, see below). CS.bar thus captures a transition from the MB to W pattern, interestingly using the MB pattern at first.

NEG=2SG!

Na vés munter ... Na ves lubriq' ... Madeu reral na zizir quet ...

NEG=2SG!→PRES

Ne fi^{es} quet en é gounit

Eun a lar^{var} dit, coleret, / Ur sod ***out mar accordés / Na zoug^{es} quet, poursuiv' brepet, / Gounit a ri ta^{fal} procès

NEG=2PRES

O! mæs un dra consideret, [>usuror^{n^{em}} gouel quet] / Na prest[an>es] meit d'ar ré æzet, [>enon dan des usur er bet]

En un tavarn' neusé, / Ret eu monet: / Guet an den honnest sé, / Peur abuset, / Carguign é cof a guin, / Na vanques quet, / Pé ar pochart indin, / A vo fachtet.

BE/HAVE do not use present in negative commands, rather, in both positive and negative they have unique forms, e.g. G.BA 2SG béès, ne véès ket, 2PL béèh, ne véèt quet, VN beès (68) - ne vees quet (99), 2PL beaih (68, 184) - ne veaih quet (52, 78), cf. a.o. BT na vaiss, na vaih, CS.anon baih - na vaih, IS.mar ne veès multér, beaih - ne veaih. Its origin may be linked to the old consuetudinal present and subjunctive imperfect, themselves collapsing G.BA 27, G.GLG31: 9, type G.BA mar bè, bès, bèh, VN mar bè. The situation in CS.bar is not distinguishable from MB: 2SG Na vés munter ... Na ves lubriq', cf. continuative étre m'a vés, occurring alongside negated imperative rather than present, occurring alongside negated imperative rather than present, Madeu reral na zizir quet, in versified versions of the commandments; 2PL Bet doh al oll' caranteus, / Bezet doh té douç ha joyus; Doh té eta ne vet quet cri. Ditto Pr na uès multrer, SH na vaiss multrer; NG bet evitonp-ny ... aduocadet.⁶²

⁶² Unclear to me is CS.anon Hou-pé truhé à hanamb ol. // Jésus, bett truhé doh hæmp-ni; imperative of BE is: baih truhéus; cf. Loth 1910: 499, including strikingly: bydwyf or Trindaut trugared; we do get a suffix-paradigm of HAVE distinct from BE later in T, Hingant 1868: I §75 vs. 77.

9.8 Jussive

It will be useful to have as background coding in Matthew 16:24 in relevant systems as the chief comparandum across varieties of Breton.

Greek Septuagint: 3SG imperatives, *pro* subject, accusative object: *ει τις θελει οπισω μου ελθειν απαρνησασθω εαυτον και αρατω τον σταυρον αυτου και ακολουθειτω μοι.*

Latin Vulgate: 3SG subjunctives, *pro* subject, accusative object: *Si quis vult post me venire, abneget semetipsum, et tollat crucem suam, et sequatur me.*

French Olivetan 1535: *que* ‘that’ + 3SG subjunctive, nominative clitic subject, accusative clitic object. *Si quelqu’un veut venir apres moi, qu’il renonce à soi-mesme, et qu’il charge sur soi sa croix, et qu’il me suive.* So later versions, varying chiefly in choice of vocabulary, though in the last conjunct *et qu’il* is sometimes *et me*

West Saxon 990-: 2SG subjunctive, distinct from imperative, *pro* subject, accusative weak pronoun object: *Gyf hwa wylle fyligean me, wiðsace hys sylfne, and nyme hys rode, and me fylige.* Mercian interlinear gloss differs in indicative of the last verb though glossing subjunctive, ... *onsæcæ hin seolfne, 7 genimma roda-t-unhælo his 7 gefylgeð me,* and there is like variation across Anglian versions of the Lord’s Prayer. See further Millward 1971: the endings of 3rd person imperative are subjunctive, as rarely are but can be those of 2nd person.

Finnish 1548: 3SG jussive, nominative subject pronoun, partitive object pronoun, which in early versions characteristic of its human pronouns for 20C *t*-accusative, but here independently needed by semantics of the verb; so also later versions: *Jos ioku tactopi minua seurata / hen kieldeken itzens / ia ottakan ristins pälens/ ia seurataan minua.* Czech Bible Kralická 1613: 2SG imperatives, distinct from stem in *vezmi* and generally from other forms, *pro* subject, accusative clitic object: *Chce-li kdo za mnou přijíti, zapřiž sebe sám, a vezmi kříž svůj, a následujž mne.*

Descriptions of Breton usually conflate 2SG-2PL-1PL and 3SG-3PL special command forms of verbs as imperatives, but diachrony, synchrony, and comparison suggest two categories, here called imperative for 2SG-2PL-1PL, and jussive for 3SG-3PL (DMH)..

Diachronically, jussives but not imperatives are lost by NB, and imperatives but not jussives are replaced by present forms in negative commands in W at the latest by 18C.

Synchronically, Breton imperatives seem to be like French rather than English ones in lacking clearly clause-internal subjects, not analysable as addressee-inclusive vocatives, for instance downward-entailing or variable-binding quantifiers of the type in Nobody move!, Everyone raise her hand! (Jespersen 1961: V:24, Zanuttini 2008 on English, Grevisse and Goose 2008, Rowlett 2007 on French).⁶³ Breton jussives, on the other hand, are well attested with both quantificational and quasi-referential subjects, translated by the French ‘surrogate imperative’ of *que* + subjunctive.⁶⁴

⁶³ The French imperative used to allow but has lost noninflectional subject outside fixed expressions, (**Tu*) *sois sage!*, *Sois(*-tu) sage!* (Grevisse and Goose: §407 esp. H1, Rowlett 2007: 2.2.1). 3rd person subjects, with regular syntax and antecedence, use *that* + subjunctive, *que personne n’ait peur; que personne prenne son/*ton devoir avant que je ne dise!* with only marginal omission of *que* in the type *thy will be done* discussed below (cf. Grevisse and Goose 2008: §407-8, cf. Jones 1996: 4.9.3); or to some extent the indicative, *personne n’a/*ait peur!*; *personne ne prend son/*ton devoir avant que je ne dise; maintenant tout le monde est sage!, ... me suit!* (M. Jouitteau p.c.).

⁶⁴ Set aside is how to interpret in this respect paradigms such as *Te bez, ef bezet* ‘Sois, qu’il soit’ of Qu.

Referential subject of IPV ni CS.bar

Gurun parfondet ar péhour, / Eun ar burreu', eun an traitour, / Pe hui douar en em zigoret,
Man deu lagat goüillet, goüillet, / Hui ma halon deuhanteret
Tavet ma zeat em arrestet

Quantificational subject of JUSS in W

Én ur guir, peb-unan conserveèt é dra EOV
D'en hanhue a Jesus , ne véèt glin ne soublou én nean , ar eu doar hag én ihuern ; ne véèt téad ne avouéou a voéh ihuel é ma Jesus - Chrouist hur Mæstr é gloër Doué é dad. OSG
El-cé er péh en dès en Eutru Doué aliet , ne zéèt quet mab-dén d'en dispartiein
Pihue- benac e hel compren , compreneèt. OSG
Open en dra - zé , n'en déèt hanni de rein d'ain poén a nehué OSG
Ne hum drompeèt deine ennta HS
Ne oulenneèt deine petra er scontai HS
Mæss ne hum ancoheèt deine , enn ur guemer cass doh Judas HS

Referential subject of JUSS W

béèt hun inean triste pé joéius, béèt-hi é huerhoni pé é consolation EOV
déèt hou poéh de sonnein étal men discoharn OSG
beèt er peah gueneoh. HS
Réentt enn éile d'éguilé er peh zou deliet IS.pour
Reent en eil d'éguilé er péh zou deliét IS.mar
ingageent ind de hum laquad IS.mar
Mar dès er parrézieu tut obstinet de ouel ober , ne barreent quet er-ré-ral à obér erhat HS

Nonreferential subjects of JUSS in W

pligeèt guet hou misericord me rantein ehue pur IS.mar

Object coding of jussives is scantily attested. In MB, one of the earliest texts illustrates both quantificational subjects and object coding by 3rd person proclitic, while imperatives in the text systematically use the regular MB coding by 3rd person enclitics:

JUSS subject in Pm:

Sauet pep vnan e scouarnn "Que chacun dresse l'oreille" Pm
Quement so e-n fez badezet / Credet bezaff don pardonet "Quiconque est baptize dans la foi, / Qu'il croie qu'il sera complètement pardonné" Pm

JUSS object in Pm:

Pe eff ozech pe yuez groec / He miret louen ez hoantec. "Qu'il soit époux ou aussi épouse, / Qu'il la garde joyeusement avec zèle" Pm

IPV object in Pm

Pet eff "Prie-le" | Lavar hy "Dis-la"
ha-m miret "keep me" | ha-m couffhet
da em sycour "aide-toi" | da-em-breder "réfléchis en toi-même"

This is close to Middle Cornish: objects seem to be regularly coded by enclitics in imperatives, albeit for all persons, *holyough ve* ‘follow me’ (PA), *gorr y* ‘put them’ (OM), but by proclitics in jussives, again for all persons, *ha'th wereses amalek* ‘let Amalek help thee’ (OM), *a's kymereus* ‘let him take them’ (PC). However, beside the one proclitic, there is also one enclitic in another poem of the same 1530 edition: Roent ef (R; see DMH).

The jussive seems to remain a living grammatical device in the e18C works of Le Bris, rich in examples. With subjects, Le Bris continues a singular property of the jussive of MB, the general availability of agreement with clause-internal subjects (DMH). Le Bris also offers one of the rare attested instances of object coding, with a pronominal proclitic for 1st person, in translating Matthew 16:24. This translation continues to be used in other works, reeditions, and reworkings of Le Bris, e.g. IM of 1774, 1835, even the quite late HBR of 1849. By then other translations replace the jussive here.

JUSS subject agreement in MB Qu and Le Bris IN

hac hon calounnou bezent eleuet en ho carantez Qu 1626

Lequeant evez mad an eneou pur-ze'ta na... IN 1710

Presentent adversourien hor silvidiguez eta quement hac a garrint IN 1710

JUSS object in Matthew 16:24 in Le Bris and later

Plou bennac a fell dezàn (eme hor Salver) dont var va-lerc'h-me; renoncet dezàn ehunan ha douguet e Groas, ha va heulyet. “Qui vult venire post me, abneget semetipsum, & toliat crucem suã & sequitur me” PI (Le Bris, 1712)

Plou-bennac a fell dezan (eme hor Salver) dont var ma lerc'h-me, renoncet dezan heunan, ha douguet he groas, ha ma heuliet. HBR (reworking of Le Bris, 1849)

Mar fell da unan bennâg dont war va lerc'h, ra rai dilez anézhan hé-unan, ha ra zougo hé groaz, ha ra heuliò ac'hanoun. TJK (Le Gonidec, 1827)

In W, among grammars, G.GU gives no jussive + object, and G.BA almost avoids it, discussing 1/3/RX object coding for imperatives but only RX for jussives. G.GLG02: 31, 76 is revealing: again after giving independent pronouns as objects of imperatives, they note: “Il faut aussi noter quelques expressions consacrés: comme men Doué, me sekouret, mon Dieu, secourez-moi. A la troisième personne, pour se conformer à l’usage des autres dialectes, on devrait mettre le pronom avant le verb : déent ha me héliéent qu’ils viennent et me suivent” (more normatively G.GLG31: 31, 76). The phrasing of G.GLG02 indicates that object coding in the jussive is inferred by Guillevic and Le Goff, on the basis of older literature and moreover outside W, perhaps something like Le Bris’s Matthew 16:24 (see Châtelier 2016 on the influence of Le Bris, particular the works in question).

More importantly for early usage in W, Le Goff (1927: 27) reports that the jussive and imperative alike use proclitics in early usage, drawing on archaic, semifrozen imperatives (from the early 18C “Rec. Purchase”, noting “Ordinairement, on dit en

Vannes:” cheleuet mé), and a popular invective retaining a usage that is perhaps fossilised but not literary (no enclitic alternative noted; cited here slightly differently from original). These examples have 1st/2nd person.⁶⁵

Crechenion me cheleuet “Rec. Pourchasse” cited in Le Goff 1927: 27
Malloh Doué, malloh ru, malloh det, en diaul det, en diaul he gasset guetou SST 1790

At some point things changed in W, to judge by the literary work of Marion: object coding is clearly by enclitics in jussives for all persons in the positive, but proclitic in the negative, as with the imperative, despite keeping distinctive jussive forms rather than switching to the present in the negative. This including Matthew 16:24 in IS.mar, though not in closest comparanda within W where it is rephrased. Marion also seems to have concord, but a fuller examination suggests that clause-internal subjects lack it; so G.GLG02: 89, *déet rah en diauled ag en ihuern* ‘Viennent tous les diables de l’enfer’.

JUSS in W Matthew 16:24 in Marion, rephrased elsewhere in W

En-n’emb e fal dehou donnèt ar me lerh, é-mé Jesus, renoncieèt dehou é hunan, dougueèt é Groès bamdé, hac hélieèt mé IS.mar (Marion, 1790)
pihue-benac e zesir donnèt ar me lerh, renoncieèt dehou é hunan, queméreeèt é groéz hag hélieèt-mé OSG (Marion, cf. 1820)
Enn hani é gare é vuhé, é hollou ... Renonciet doh hui-mem, douguet hou Croéss ... Heliet mé. IS.pour (Pourchasse, 1767)
En n’emb e venne me héli, e zeli nahein anehou é unan, dougue é groéz ha donnet arh me lerh. AVImaheu (Terrien, 1857)
Mar ven unan benak donet ar me lerh, ret é ma um nahou ean memb, ma tougou é groéz ha ma me héliou. AVIE (Oliereu, 1913)

JUSS object coding elsewhere in Marion:

Tauleèt mé él léh ma carou a pe vein marhue , haval gueneign en er harein attàu. (subject=er) MG
impléeèt int de zessàu hé bugalé ha d’ou laquad ér stad de onnid hou bouéd ‘let him use them to raise MG
mar en dès Doué caranté doh-t-hou, délivreèt-ean bermen OSG
En Eutru Doué déèt d’er goarantein ha de rein dehou ur vuhé hir , guet lehuiné ar en doar , ha n’el lausqueèt quet de gouéh étré deourn é anemisèd OSG
Pédéent ean , béent fidél dehou ; ha nezé ean ou fecourou HS

JUSS concord in Marion: only when clause-external, the first clause-internal exx do not

Groeèt ennta er merhèt atancion ar guement-mènn. HS
En dén hag er voès quitteèt ou gulé-æréd. Deèt er Vélean ha Ministréd en Eutru Doué de ouilein étré er porche hag en autér, ha crieèt : OSG

⁶⁵ G.GLG31: 31, 76 clearly give proclitics, after discussing and illustrating enclitics as regular for imperative forms: “L’impératif sans négation peut être précédé de l’adjectif possessif absolu: men Doué, me sekouret, mon Dieu, secourez-moi; hon kredet, croyez-nous; me hélient, qu’ils me suivent; te sekourent, qu’ils te secourent.”

èl-cé enta, er ré e zou diméet, bihueènt el pe ne vehent quet diméet; er ré e ouil, ouileent èl pe ne ouilehent quet; er ré hum rejoeis, hum rejoeisseènt el pe n'hum rejoeissehent quel; er ré e bren, beènt [sic] èl er ré n'ou dès nitra; hag er ré hum chervige ag en treu ag er bed - men, groeènt él er ré n'hum chervigeant quet a nehai OSG

Revou goleit a véh ha carguet a scont ér memb amzér er ré péré a glasq me inean eit gobér d'ain hi hol. // Troent ardran guet claz a véh er ré e fal dehai gobér næz d'ain. // ... // Mæs sailent guet joé hag hum rejoeissent ol er ré hou clasq, men Doué, ... ha larent attàu ... OSG

Marion also uses the jussive after *re*, instead of the usual future, which is a mesoclitic host candidate, but examples found here lack object coding:

ha Doué re-vireèt ne rehén HT

I do not know of certain examples elsewhere, but there are some candidates, e.g. the Luke 16:29 if faithfully translating *qu'ils les écoutent, audiant illos, ἀκουσάτωσαν αὐτῶν*, rather than using a silent object:

Hint ou dès Moysé ac er Brophètet, e repliquas Abraham dehon, cheleüènt-int. HJC

Here again CS.bar brings important evidence: its one pronominal object is a 3rd person enclitic, likely to 3SG jussive, less likely 2PL imperative.

In CS.bar, jussives are 3SG with silent or clausemate subject, once 3PL with silent subject. They are not typically used as pure commands, apart from the nonreferential-subject pliget 'let it please'. Rather, they express conditional protases 'let them come' = 'if they come', an "exceptional usage" attested elsewhere for imperative and jussive alike (Le Gléau 1973: §23 on Breton, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §407R2-3 on French, Jespersen 1961: V:24.3 on English; generally Aikhenvald 2010: 7.1, theoretically Keshet and Medeiros 2019).⁶⁶ Imperatives are found both in commands and as such conditions.⁶⁷

CS.bar jussive apart from HAVE in conditions:

Guet m'an devo un den^{ul laër} madeu, / Pe dent a clei, pé a zeheu, / N^e an d^{eu} quet é m'eun un affer, / Cals' estroh euit on so laër. '... whether they come ... very different from me is a thief'

Doh an Daul Pasq', tosteit unon hep quen / Pé en control em presantet mil den {jussive}, / Recev' a rei an eil el erguillé / É corf, é goet, Iné, Divinité.

Bezét un den anquenet / ~~mar da d'un den bezout chiffet~~ / cantiq' beñac neusé canet {jussive cond 'if a person is' + command 'let him'}

En p[^a]uranté bezét un den, / Bezét en chiff, pé en clenvet, / Recev' a rei en pep anquen, / Dré sin ar Croés, confort meurbet {jussive as conditional with postverbal su}.

⁶⁶ Notably not jussive is are the commands in the Lord's Prayer that usually uses it in MB: CS.bar Ni a oulen a oll' galon, / Ma vo brepet santifiet, / Ho hanv' adorabl' ha sacret | Reveze groit ho volanté.

⁶⁷ The conditional use is not generally reducible to reanalysis as participle, either for syntactic reasons, as in the ex discussed below, or for formal, e.g. identity in galuet, presantet, canet, tosteit, but not JUSS det, dent vs. PRT deit, JUSS bezet vs. PRT bet.

Da torrign nan an ehomec, / Roit-u dehon an aluzon, / Bezet estran {jussive conditional},
p'e amezec, / Douguet dehon compassion.

CS.bar jussive of HAVE in conditions:

Defet, ho pet ar Fé {jussive as conditional}, / ... / ... / Sur a iéhet en Eé

CS.bar imperative in conditions:

Dirac t'on {3SGM} a hent aral, / Groit-u ur goall action, / E ta da vout un den fal, / ^{chetu}
^eCaus' ^{oh} d' ^é ^{chetu} e dannation.

Bet an eil, pé erguilé, / Ret eu doh bout patiant

CS.bar jussive in commands:

Ag a vihé cablus un den / A quement crim' a so er bet: / D'ar Sacramant a penigen, /
Tosteit, hac a vo pardonnet

Pliget guenoh illumnign brepet

Pliget guet Doué raign graç dehé

The example of interest belongs to this conditional type: *Galuet eun an oll' puissant*, 'if/when the omnipotent calls him', formally probably jussive, 'let the omnipotent call him', less likely imperative, 'the omnipotent call him'. The ex may be given more fully, with other jussives and imperatives in the same hymn:⁶⁸

Diarben ar marv', na sponet quet,

Det abret, det diuehat [Variant hymn: Pé det abret, pé diuehat]

...

Rac m'an des eus ar commanç'

Dihoallet doh ar pehet,

...

Beuet an des innoçant

N'an des netra da zoujign

Galuet eun an oll' puissant

Prest eu da comparissing. // ... //

...

Sellet eun en é guelé [Variant hymn: Contamplet eun en é guélé]

...

É deu lagat doh an Eé,

Hac é song' en é IESUS:

Deut, em'eun, deut ma Salver [Variant hymn: Deut, é mé eun, deut ma Salver]

⁶⁸ *groit ar groit* is probably 'done the done': Ur sod ""out mar accordés / Na zoug^{es} quet, poursuiv' brepet, / Gounit a ri ta^{fall} procès. // ~~Groit ar groit [clear]~~, na servig' quet^{Caer ec'hes coms} / Ret eu, anæs^{er vat} en desper d'it, / Poursuiv' ""pan deu commancet / Ta^{fall} proces, coll pé gounit. If so, it is unrelated formally to CS.bar *coustet a cousto*, N *hoaruezet rez a hoaruzeo*.

Enclitic objects of all persons in the jussive of Marion and Barisy seem to be a new development in W, against older proclitics of all persons, as is the extension of enclitic objects of imperatives to all persons in W, complete in Marion but absent from Barisy, against older 3rd person only. The two phenomena may be unified by supposing that the earlier object coding was sensitive to the imperative-jussive difference, as was subject coding, but later because sensitive to what exclusively unifies them, namely initial placement in the verbal complex, without proclitic particle or conjunction (DMH).

It may even be that the nature of the imperative-jussive distinction itself changed as the jussive became a marginal, literary category. Consider in this light expressions translating the jussive in English, French, and Czech. English has a restricted “formulaic subjunctive” or optative construction (see Waller 2017 with literature): Thy kingdome come, God save the queen, which is nevertheless productive within the religious domain, The angels of God guide you wherever you go, and even beyond it, The reader be warned, but ??The reader decide (for himself or herself). What little evidence there is about the verb form identifies it as imperative, subjunctive, or infinitive, thy will be done = that thy will be done, and it is hard to rule out omission of let by the case of the subject pronoun since case fluctuates (Jespersen 1961: 7:6.83). The French counterpart is que + subjunctive, but historically que could be absent, and that remains with a certain similar limited literary productivity, Plus opiniâtre que moi se mette à l’oeuvre (Grevisse and Goose 2008: §407-8a). The forms clearly subjunctive rather than imperative, and it has been given out as reflecting a silent que (op.cit.). The Czech counterpart, again with the same limited productivity, uses an unambiguous 2SG imperative, Přijď království tvé ‘Ton règne vienne’, rather than the forms used subjunctive-type environments, ... at přijde království tvé ‘que ton règne vienne’, again with marginal productivity and none at all for subjects that are not 3SG (perhaps for historical reasons, collapse of 2SG-3SG optative > Slavic imperative-jussive, cf. Aikhenvald 2010: 7.3, 10.1, Holvoet 2017). This last may be the most relevant: it seems possible that in the language of Barisy and Marion, the identity of the !3SG and !2PL inflections had led to reanalysis to the equivalent of the Czech !2SG subjunctive, a basic form usable for all root “imperatives”.

10 Enclisis-proclisis with HAVE

10.1 Background and resume

In MB, from the earliest extensive texts of 15/16 C, pronominal objects of HAVE are enclitics in 3rd person to finite HAVE-forms in both auxiliary and lexical uses of HAVE. Apparently somewhat later, after mid-16C, do there appear 1st/2nd person objects, only as proclitics to the participle of auxiliary HAVE.⁶⁹ By at least G.R of 1738, proclitics are added, diagnosable by form, mutation, and fronting with the participle:⁷⁰

⁶⁹ A particularly early example seems to show the proclitic in a rare formation on the auxiliary (ameur, J, mid-16C, s.v. Ernault dico). There are a couple of exceptional enclitics in 17C, and systematic extension of enclitics or a-forms in the work of Tanguy Gueguen, who avoids proclitics to the participle with HAVE though not with imperatives, while a-forms also appear to code objects of lexical HAVE in the works of Charles ar Bris (DMH).

⁷⁰ De Rostrenen, probably from Perret at the W-T boundary, reports W and, as here, nonW forms.

“Me am eus-ên bevet, *ou* me’m eus-hañ bevet, *je l’ai nourri*, me am eus-eñ caret ou me’m eus hañ caret *Je l’ai aimé*: eñ dournet : hañ guëllat: eñ miret : hañ poëset : eñ qelennet : me am eus-hañ ténnet [...] Me am eus y bevet (*ou* bevet anézo), *je les ai nourri*, &c me am eus o bevet, o c’haret, &c, *ou* o bevet am eus, o c’haret am eus, o dournet am eus.” (G.R 1738: 13-14)

In W, the situation is somewhat different, and CS.bar is revealing:

-Enclitic-proclitic alternation in 3rd person: G.GU reports only enclitics, G.BA both enclitics and proclitics, but texts as early as mid-18C already have proclitics, type *en des ind karet*, *o haret*, though their robustness differs greatly; studies of modern varieties have enclitics but not proclitics in the west, Groix-Ternes, Cheveau-Lorient, Crahe-Languidic, or only proclitics, McKenna-Guémené). CS.bar shows a robust enclitic-proclitic alternation even before G.R.

-Enclitic placement: in W, both object and doubling enclitics follow low negation *ket* in W, type *en des quet ean/ind karet*, precede in MB and eNB-KLT; CS.bar is the earliest evidence for the distinctive placement of W. Later, doubling and (rarely) object enclitics can appear on either auxiliary or *bet* in the pluperfect formations; there is no evidence in CS.bar.⁷¹

-Enclitic form: in MB and most 18-19C W, object and doubling enclitics are identical, and identical to doubling pronouns, modulo by-forms *hu*, *i* of the latter, and this is so in CS.bar, 3SGM *eun*, 3SGF *hi*, 3PL *i*. At some point, prepositional suffixes are adopted for enclitics in general in some western varieties, and for objects alone in others, type *en des ind/hai*, but there are no hints of this in CS.bar, using its 3SGM *hon*, 3PL *he* (for the phenomenon, see under imperatives).

-1st/2nd person proclitics in the HAVE-perfect are robust and regular in 18C W, but somewhat anomalous in the earliest W text witnesses them, 1680 NG, and so they turn out to be in CS.bar, perhaps to be related to their lateness in MB; elsewhere they also turn up sporadically on the auxiliary, but not in CS.bar.

-1st/2nd person pronouns are of uncertain coding and perhaps avoided when there is no participle (DMH), though enclitics have been noted in modern varieties (Cheveau-Lorient); there is no evidence in CS.bar.

10.2 3rd enclitic-proclitic in 18C

The appearance of 3rd person proclitics in HAVE-constructions brings with it several questions:

- whether they are available, type ... *en dès hé haret* (yes, by mid-18C, but rare until later);
- whether they are available with infinitival HAVE, ... *en devout hé haret* (unclear);

⁷¹ To my knowledge, the first post-quet placement is in fact in Maunoir (1659: I: 63), with an object *n’odeusquet-y laquet*, a nonnative speaker, but not chiefly drawing on W.

- whether they are available with lexical HAVE, ... en dès hé bet (maybe, but probably not);
- whether they can appear on the participle upon fronting, hé haret en dès (yes, by mid-18C, rare)
- whether they can be doubled, en dès hé haret-hi, hé haret en dès-hi (yes, but with limited and late evidence).
- whether they are found with subject-doubling enclitics, en des hi ean caret (yes)⁷²

In 19C grammars, G.BA reports proclitics beside enclitics, G.GU doe snot (here and below, * infinitive, ° lexical):

G.BA 1896: enclitics and proclitics:

me mes eañ kavet

kavet e mès-eañ, hon̄ (cf. karet-eañ, ou hon̄; karamb-eañ, hon̄)

kavet e mès ur blañk, hag e mes er, ou eañ, hoñ reit t'ur peur

°mem bou ind

Tri e mès-me kavet, hag e mès ou, ou ind, ou hai goarnet get-n-eign (cf. kasset-hai, dastumet-hai)

G.GU 1836: enclitics

°m'em bou-ean, -hi, -ind (cf. lahet-ean, -hi, -ind)

n'e mès-mé ean câret (cf. perec nen dès ean studiet, n'e mès-mé pedet Doué?)

me mès ean douguet (cf. me mès douguet me zad)

Earlier than G.GU, proclitics are already robust in the undoubted and putative works of Marion:

HAVE x=PRT -- HAVE=x PRT

mèn-è en e hoès an groeit ... perac en e hoès ean groeit (same sentence) IS.mar

ma mès er huitteit -- Rac-ce me mès ean quitteit MG

n'ou dès er groeit -- èl ma hoès ean groeit MG

me mès el larèt d'em bugalé -- Me mès ean hoah larèt deoh MG

n'em bezai quet hé hemérét ém zi MG

n'em behai quet ou remerquét -- n'hur bou quet int difcoeit MG

hui e hoès ou delaufquét, ou goaldrætét, ou abandonét d'en diaul – Ha hui e hoès int foucadét MG

a p'en dès é inean er huittét -- hui hou pehai ean contraignét IS

Doué en dès hé hrouéét -- Doué-è en dès int crouéét IS

er Mistèr-ze en en dès ou delivrét -- de béhani en ou devou int disclæriét IS

Gùerço ne mès quêt er gùélét – ma mès ean gùélét VN

Gùélét e mès-hi en dé-aral – mæs biscoah ne mès hé gùélét VN

°ha bet em boai ean MG -- ma n'hou poai quet hé bet IS⁷³

⁷² Statements about lack of evidence are to be taken with a grain of salt: apart from NG, BT, IS.mar, MG, early works have not been studied here exhaustively in this respect, even by intention.

⁷³ The example is an apparent exception to Le Goff (1927: 203): “On dit bien m'em es ean bet, m'em es ind bet. Mais bet ne s'emploie jamais avec un pronom infixé ou possessif”. That is generally true in the survey

*pé en dout hé reparét IS -- mem boud ind commettét MG

PRT HAVE=x but not x=PRT HAVE (it seems)⁷⁴

Larét e mès ean deoh déjà MG
hac acourcét em boai int MG
épliquét hun nès ind assès IS

Synthetic HAVE.LEX=x only

°en hani en dès ean
°*én occasion d'en dout int. IS
°*ne fehèmb quet hur bout hi a hanamb hun hunan IS
°*eit he poud ean dré dromperi MG

In the earlier Pourchasse, Cillart, BT, NG, there may be only enclitics, apart from a few examples in Pourchasse (unlike the reflexive, always a prefix on the participle, see below):

AUX x=PRT vs. AUX=x PRT

en doa hi quemeret, quenttéh el ma hou doai hé hanaüet AP
rac Jefufs-Chrouift Doué ha Deine enn defs hel laret - ean enn-dess intt laret IS.pour

AUX=x PRT only

Doué enn-dess int reit oll dehai IS.pour
el ma houess int bét abandonnet IS.pour
n'enn dess quet ean meritett : IS.pour
arlerh m'enn déss ean offrét te Zoué SH
Te hrimeu enn-déss int forgétt SH
Pihue enn-déss intt disquétt BT
Pur bezé ean guiétt ... Ur bezé, Ean gùélétt BT
Pihue en-déss ind instituett GU
Jézus map Doué enn déss intt groeïtt GU
Me e-n bou enf da gas d-er gauter. ... Me m-es enf casset d-en dauarnë. ... Quen ne deues enf ol gronnet. NG
°ha pihue n'enn-dess quet hi (absolven) IS.pour
°à pé houèss intt (madeu) IS.pour
°hac enn aral enn-dess ean énn é scoharn (the other, i.e. listener, has him, i.e. the devil) IS.pour
*Aveit te-voud intt dré dromperi SH
*evit a vout-y dré trompery PR (cf. Pr Euit é yout dré tromper)

PRT AUX=x only

lacaït ë-houes-hi AP 94

here, and the counterexample here is only orthographic: hé = hi.

⁷⁴ Contrast x=INF DO: hac hé seëllèt e rér èl ur figur a Jesus-Chrouist IS | hou cuélèt e rér liès assambl IS

Going back before Pourchasse, however, a proclitic and one on a fronted participle is already in place by 1760:

hi Horf béniguett ... Enn-dess hi bett douguet [hi = Inean] ... Meid hi changed enn-dess Adam [hi = Lézenn] CS (same hymn)

There has been found in these sources no doubling PRT AUX=x=y, and only in later work has there been found here doubling x=PRT AUX=y:⁷⁵

Ou reit hou poé ind d'ain BSPD

Clusters combining an object proclitic with a subject-doubling proclitic are always rare, but scattered over the history of W as of other varieties, and explicitly mentioned in Crahé-Languidic:

mæs pet gùéh en e hoès-ind-hui méritet? EO
Ne mès-mé ean caret G.GU
Me em boe gi me torchet Crahé-Languidic
ni'bes ket hê ni guelet BSDB-Inguiniel

10.3 3rd enclitic and proclitic in CS.bar

CS.bar bucks the lack of proclitics in earlier works: 3rd person enclitics dominate, but proclitics are robust, including a coordination with enclitic.

The proclitics and enclitics have their regular forms, sc. 3SGM aR= and eun=, 3SGF (h)i= and =(h)i, 3PL (h)o-c'h= and =i, with no mutations attested. The proclitics are left-adjacent to the main participle, including when separated from the auxiliary by adverbs or the pluperfect participle bet, and are not found on fronted participles (i.e. attested type is ... en des bet bepret ar caret). The enclitics are right-adjacent auxiliary(+quet), and not found with pluperfect bet, and found with fronted participles (i.e. attested type is ... en des (quet) ean caret, caret en des ean). The enclitics but not proclitics are attested with infinitives of HAVE (type en devout ean caret). Neither is doubled by enclitics, and there are no object enclitic + doubling enclitic clusters.⁷⁶

3 proclitic + enclitic in AUX (ADV) PRT:

// Mé a mes hi, ~~quent evit on guelet~~^{hep laret gaeu er...}, / É mé un^a n, ~~dign e man delect~~^{quent evit on}
~~guelet~~^{guelet}; Ag é pehe ar [h>g]^hentan é guelet, É mé an ~~eh~~^{all}, mé a mes hi savet⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Cf. the type ma n'em hredét-quet-mé IS.mar. I am not aware of explicit discussion of this construction; in other varieties, for x=PRT AUX=y, cf. 3SGF E entetet oc'heus-y COL, for x=PRT=y, 2SG and 3SGF me am bise da lazet-te, hac e reservet-hi e buez, IN, both 18 Leon.

⁷⁶ In prose, enclitic status is also dianosable because enclitics precede the participle, but in verse including here so can independent objects, though enclitic placement before the lowest participle and all adverbs is obligatory in general, and here.

⁷⁷ That is, before changes: Mé a mes hi, quent evit on guelet, é mé unan ...; Ag é pehe ar hentan é guelet, É me an eil, mé a mes hi savet, sc. 'I have seen her (enclitic) before him, says one ... Though hadst seen her first, says the other, I have picked her (proclitic) up', her = oyster.

3 proclitic in AUX (ADVP) __ PRT

É Nessim an des caret / Hervé Doué, hac é Lezen, / Eun an des ar sicouret / P'an des ar guelet en poen

// É man éta certenamant, / P'an des Doué ar commandet, / Un dra santel [ar = priédelez]

// Chetu deja ur coll' amser, / ... / P'en des Doué an r^eit d^ompni [an = amser]

// *Eun an des bet ar condanet* [ar = e Vap]

Doué en des oc'h inspiret / hir amser so d'ar profet [oc'h = comseu]

* infinitive of HAVE, ° lexical HAVE

3 enclitic in: infinitive of auxiliary HAVE, including in perfect of lexical HAVE:

3SGM,F enclitics in: HAVE.FIN (QUET) __ (ADV)

°An amser a collet, / Eun a so pretius, / N'o po quet eun brepet

°na piv' an devo hi [hi = istren]

3SGM enclitic in: PRT AUX __ SU

Laret oc'hues eun ma C'hrouer

Groit oc'hues eun ma amiet / P'oc'hues ar peurien assistet.

3SGM enclitic in: AUX __ (PP) PRT;

Me m'es eun huiet

Ni on es eun cleuet

Hui oc'hues eun dign refuset / P'oc'hues ar peurien dispriset

Doué an des eun carguet

En Ée é mañ hon Roantelez", / Doué an des eun dimp preparet

Henneh ar vertu, ar pouver, / An des Badiant recevet / Deguet IESUS CHRIST hon

Salver / A p'an des eun instituet

ur guir examen; / En heur m'o po eun achivet

Eun a clev' goet sacret hon IESUS, / En em clem', an deus eun profanet

3SGF enclitic in: AUX __ (ADVP) PRT;

*°An nep an des i recevet / Lacait en i ho confianç / Hac ar ré n'an des quet i bet / D'o devout i groit dilijanç' [i=confirmation].

*Goudé ho pout i recevet [i=penigen]

*Goudé ho pout i recevet [i=benediction]

°Hac ar ré n'an des quet i bet [3SGF=confirmation, lexical]

Ar Santanç' man, pehourien, / IESUS an des [i>hi] prononcet:

Doué memés en div' daulen, / An des hi scroi[•>v]et da vap den [hi = lezen]

3PL enclitic in: AUX QUET __ PRT, AUX __ (ADVP/PP) PRT.

O Tilesel treu an douar / Pen'an des quet i caret [pa n'en deus ket]

O lezel an treu eus an douar, / Brepet an des i dispriset

Piv' an des i doh ansaignet // ... an drouc speret, / An des i da quenta desquet

[3PL=ramedeu]

D'on dihoall' doh ar pehet, / Ha raign dimp cals a graceu / An des i instituet [3PL]
 eus an hani en des i composet [3PL=cantiqueu]
 a po^{pezo} ~~p{ø}2~~ i lamet a boen [3PL=an anoun]⁷⁸

10.4 1st/2nd

From the outset of W, 1st/2nd person objects are proclitics to the participle:

den nep en dèS hon offancet Pr - d'er ré en dèS hon offencet PR
 Rac ma-n des hon prenet NG
 D'er ré enn-dés honn ofancett GU
 ur stirænn, Enn-déss hunn dégassét à honn bro BT

This is so in CS.bar also; only postauxiliary participles are attested. However, there is more to say about the form of the proclitics in CS.bar and also in NG. 1PL (in both), 2PL, and 2SG (in CS.bar) are regular, but 1SG is anomalous (in both). In NG, the anomaly is distribution of the n-final form, Ha d-en Doué en des men crouet for expected me h/crouet, also me gannet for expected men gannet, in contrast to regular n/spirantisation distribution with possessor and object 1SG. In CS.bar, the anomaly is lenition for an expected n-final form, P'oc'hues eus ho corf ma vaguet, in contrast to regular n-final/spirantisation distribution in possessor and object 1SG, and prevocalic em, Goudé o pout em accuset, where otherwise em is the pre-finite form. It might be that these anomalies are to be related to the relative lateness of the appearance of 1st/2nd person proclitics with participles in MB, only after mid-16C unlike with imperatives, and their avoidance by Bernard Tanguy as late as 17C (DMH). It may also be that this relates to the mesoclitic to proclitic reanalysis and uncertainty about whether participles are to be aligned with finite forms or infinitives. (Below, the anomalies receive *)

1/2 roclitics with the infinitive of auxiliary HAVE:

1SG:

Dihui a laran trugaré, / Ma C'hrouer, ma Zat, man Doüé / A ho pezout me honservet
 *Goudé o pout em accuset

1PL:

Goudé an devout hon crouet

2PL:

Queu bras a mes, ~~man~~^{em} bout oc'h offancet

Dré o devout rai o caret

Doh hon bout ho clevet | Doh hon bout ho cle[•>v]et

Trugarec'ait an autrou Doué, / ^{Hac ar meulet} ~~A brassan gallout~~^{en} oc'h Iné, / An devezout ho pardonet

trugaré lavaret, / [>E]an devezout ho sicouret

1/2 proclitic with finite HAVE

1SG:

⁷⁸ Sc. a p'o po > a p'o pezo.

*P'oc'hues eus ho corf ma vaguet, / P'oc'hues me nettait guet ho goetBrepet oc'hues me sicouret

Ha n'oc'hues quet me sicouret

Ar bed milliguet, / [A>E]n des man goall' tromplet !!!

D'e m'annemis a ~~mes me~~^{ec'hes te} pardonet, / Quen liez gueh an des ~~ma~~^{ta} offancet

2SG:

d'an Tut abuset, / An devezo te comēttet

Ha car en nep en des ta offancet

D'e m'annemis a ~~mes me~~^{ec'hes te} pardonet, / Quen liez gueh an des ~~ma~~^{ta} offancet

1PL:

D'an nep an des hon offancet.

Doüé an des hon croüet, / Hon lacait er bed man:

Doüé an des hon crouet,

~~An Ilis hon Mam beniguet, An des a viscoaz hon desquet:~~

[> hon mam ilis an des brepet] / [> hon exhortet, hon instruget]

Dré é graç' en des hon croüet, / Dré é graç' en des hon prenet

2PL:

El a mes ho caret

Ineueu quæs ar Purgatoer, / An des ho pedet umblamant

Me cred a mes ho desquet

Pé de cours' on es ho guelet | Pe n'on es déavlé ho guelet

R[ai>e] an é des oc'h offancet.

10.5 Reflexive

The reflexive at all stages of W is prefixed to the participle. What does vary across W and within CS.bars is HAVE/BE auxiliary choice with intransitives, not studied here.

hum hroeit en dès dén MG

Hum hroeit enn dess Deine IS.pour

Hep quen doh ar chicanour, / A mes en em quemeret CS.bar (HAVE)

n'an des em sourciet CS.bar (HAVE)

Mar doh en em examinet CS.bar (BE)

Mat euit on a so em cavet / Ta fal proces CS.bar (BE)

11 A-forms

In MB, a-forms occasionally extend from usage as partitives to direct objects under negation, including but not only pronominal ones and including but not only in imperatives (Ernault 1897, HMSB §69). Exceptional texts avoid coding 1st/2nd person objects of the HAVE-perfect with proclitics, and use a-forms independently of negation (DMH). In 18C KLT, a-forms came to freely occur beside proclitics in all contexts during 18C, and took over for the most part in 20C, apart from isolated survivals of enclitics documented for Bothoa positive imperatives (Humphreys 1985).

n'en receuet quet en ho=ty ha na saludet quet à Nezafu Gk

In 19-21C W, the KLT-type extension has only been documented at the western border with K, fully in McKenna-Guémené, where it is already robust in MPC, and attested in corpora for nearby localities like BSDB-Inguiniel (see Appendix), though not Crahé-Languidic; but also rarely and with limitations to the east of the Lorient-area in ALLS, though not Cheveau-Lorient.

A remarkably different use of a-forms has been integrated into the 20C system of Ternes-Groix. Direct objects are coded by a-forms only under negation, as mostly in MB and only in 3rd person, unlike in MB. The a-forms alternates with proclitics generally; but they is obligatory in imperatives and HAVE-constructions, where they corresponds to enclitics rather than proclitics in positive clauses, i.e. where MB allows and requires enclitics (3rd person objects of HAVE-constructions) or simply allows them but may have originally required them (3rd person objects of imperatives). It is as if Groix built on an MB stage and replace enclitics with a-forms in the negated-clause + 3rd person system, yet Groix underwent the common W replacement of negative imperative forms by present, and that elsewhere brought along proclitics by 18C.⁷⁹

The earliest W texts 1632 Pr, 1692 PR contain an intriguing a-form that links it it both to MB and 20C Groix: 1PL object of the the negative imperative of the Lord's Prayer. 1710 CS.bar follows suit, against general proclitic in negative imperatives, only attested for 3rd person. Other MB versions of the Lord's Prayer come from L authors and do not have a-forms at all, rather use proclitics or rephrase, that is remains so all the subsequent KLT versions in Nedelec (1978). In W, the a-form here remains under suitable morphophonological adjustments in some later versions, while in others it is replaced by the expected proclitic. It cannot be ascertained for the 2PL imperative in question when a text has imperative and when it has present form.⁸⁰

Gk: Ha n'on leset da couezo en temptation. Hoguen hon diliuret vez an drouc.

Qu: Ha na permetet quet ez couezem en tantation. Hogen *hō* deliuret à pechet

-

Pr: Ha pardonnet dimp hon offañeu, eual ma pardonamp den nep en dès hon offancet. / Ha na casset quet àhenamp en tantation. / Mais hon delivret ac en drouc.

PR: ha pardonnet d'emp hon offenceu, evel ma pardonamp d'er ré en dès hon offencet, ha na gasset quet a hanamp en tentation, mais hon delivret ag en drouc.

CS.bar: ni o ped, / Na casset quet en nep fêçon, / Ahanamp en temptation.

CS.bar: Ha na casset quet ahanomp en temptation

SST: Ne gasset quet a nehomp d'en tentation.

-

SH: ha n'onn laussquét quét de gouéh énn tantation; mais délivrét-ni ag enn droug

CT.13: N'hun délausquet quet énn tantation. Mæs delivret ni ag enn droug.

IS.mar idem save spelling.

⁷⁹ Faverau 1997: §247, discussing the enclitic coding for imperative and HAVE-constructions, “on le trouve même, à Groix, après un infinitif: gorteñ-he [gurtɛɲaj] les attendre”. I have found no other mention or attestation of this use and in light of CS.bar below it would be of interest to know the context of the infinitive.

⁸⁰ All versions use proclitics with HAVE (Pr den nep en dès hon offancet and its variants), save one MB anomaly with an enclitic (Qu, see DMH).

In CS.bar, the a-form object here is almost isolated, but there is one more, and in a remarkable context: the object of an infinitive under the arabat-construction for negative commands, one that later comes to supplete the negative imperative:

^{Ar}Rebat eu lacat a nehé, / En ^ho ^cguelé quent cuit blée ‘Arabat eo lakaat anezhe [bugale] / En ho kwele kent evit bloa’

HMSB: §69 conjectures about PR that the a-form of the Lord’s Prayer here “may well have been influenced by a text in another dialect”. However, the other a-form in CS.bar raises a note of caution, as does the remarkable system of Groix distinct from straightforward KT influence in mainland west, and perhaps the localities of author of SST that updates the a-form of the Lord’s Prayer, Pierre Nourry born in eastern Arvor Lauzach 1743, and working mainly in southeastern Argoed Bignan.

12 Particles

12.1 A/EZ

Verbal particles have not been studied here only for a couple of points, chiefly the continuations of a/ez/en. The most striking features is the collapse of a^L, ez^M, known from other dialects, but later, and not at all, it seems, from the W area. In W, the distinction is described in the earliest grammar of the literary language, 1795 G.Vn: 4, much as in the latest, G.GLG31: 88f., cf. 02: 90f.: a-particle “à Vannes, è presque muet” after nominative and accusative, é after adverbs and prepositional phrases, a suppressed and é become en before accusative proclitics, a suppressed after mé, té subjects, and neither when there is an inseparable conjunction or in imperative. This is observed in classical writers as e^L – é-h^M, as in IS.mar, or just e-variants distinguished by ^L and -h^M, IS.pour, though the slightly earlier Cillart SH has a^L – é(-h)^M, and NG has a^L – é^M-h (Hemon 1956: §91). This does not materially change later anywhere in the W zone where there are in-depth studies, all describing or witnessing the a-ez distinction as at least lenition vs. mixed mutation, even if the vowels collapse to ə: fully 20-21C Ternes-Groix, Cheveau-Lorient, Crahé-Languidic, McKenna-Guémené, and cf. earlier Thibault-Cléguérec, Ernault-Sarzeau, Loth-Quiberon, Loth-Sauzon.

It is therefore remarkable to see the collapse so early in CS.bar, and the form that its residue takes, where it is well preserved with a handful of “strong” verbs.⁸¹

In CS.bar, e^M-h is limited to a small subset of ez-contexts:

- Regularly after men (a few examples mostly men é song-).
- With pé ‘or’ outside IPV-JUSS (é) (a couple of ex, pé é p-, r- < gr-) (so G.Vn: 4, G.GLG31: 89);
- Regularly with vowel-initial regular verbs; regularly with vowel-initial forms of plain BE in EZ contexts (é (h)V-, independently not in A-contexts), but not consonant-initial

⁸¹ The ALBB offers no evidence for e^M, evidence about a^L indirect through ‘moi je peux’, no particle but L throughout, modulo independent factors (Quiberon g- does not lenite here or after negation, unlike g + resonant in ‘je sais’, ‘je fais’, ‘sa laine’).

forms ((a) v- in A/EZ contexts) and possibly but without expected mutations in positional forms of BE (é ma-, (m')é d-, independently not in A-contexts);

-Exceptionally with consonant-initial verbs, namely *desquign*, *da Zesquign*: é t- in the ez-context *Mar plig' guenoh, ... / Chélev' d'oh ign é tesquehet*, a z- in the ez-context *Dimp a zesquint*, and a-contexts, *Quement sé a zesquehet | Ar Cantiq' man a zesquehet | ho Lezen a zesquehet | D'an nep ... / a zesquei | ar pratiq' eus ar vertuïeu / a zesquer | ar ré so clân pareillamant /a zesq[ei>o] | [>d']* *Ar pinvic a zesquant*, z also in A *pa zesquet*.

-Regularly with the 'strong' intransitives DONET (EZ-context é t- vs. A-context a z-, base d-), MONET (é h- vs. a ï, base V-), DELEOUT (é t- vs. a d-, cf. *na z-/t-*), GALLOUT (é (h)V- vs. nothing, base g-). (see Appendix).

Otherwise a^L is found in both a/ez-contexts; the lenition has a couple of !-anomalies, and one !!-anomaly expected for e^M, but not found in an EZ-context:

d→z/!t: z freq, t 2x: *Ar pehet vil a tilezet*, cf. *Me a zilez*; *Hui a tisirehé*, cf. *na zizir quet, na ziziri*.

t→d/!z: d only *Ar ^{c'h}croadur a ra quement sé / A ^dten dreist'on coler' Doué*, cf. Ne ^dten, *Pe zen*; z only *eun a zanva, dré avanç' / Ar bonheur eus ar ré salvet*.

tr→!zr: regular in forms of *tremen, trompl-*, 1x *tr-* retained (EZ context).

Omission of the particle has been studied only with BE. With v/b-forms of BE, the particle is a, and it is available and omissible across all contexts, save the participle of periphrastic constructions. With V-forms of BE and their é-particle, the situation seems more complicated. The é-particles seems the rule with those forms that take it in most contexts, i.e. all but *eu, int*, omission is the rule with nominal, adjectival predicates and invariable with participles, and here again *eu, int* occur as such, but clause-initially é is again required, and *eu, int* are replaced by *é ma, é mant*. Apart from e/é conflation outside V-forms of HAVE, this is all as expected for W: cf. G.GLG31: 88f., 02: 90f. (on the W peculiarity of a/e and not ez/é between predicate and BE, unlike predicate and other verbs, cf. also G.BA: 27, 36, 57, 62-3, Thibault-Cléguérec: 168).

B-forms of BE:

SU PRON: *Ni a vezo collet - te vezo condanet*

SU: *O guet a tut a vezo condanet - ur farç' vezo cavet*

PP-ADV: *En pep Canton, en pep feçon / A vezo - En un tavarn vezo certain*

ADJ-PRED: *Bras a vezo ho recompans' - Bras vezo é hardihet*

NP-PRED: *Ur mal' a vezo te lod | Un amezec mat a vihét - Ur mal' quent m'a vo pel, / Vezo te lod*

RET: *Ret a vo caout - Ret vo respont*

PRT: *Guelet vezo en amser sé*

V1: ?

V-forms of BE (* as main verb):

ADV*: *Aman e homp égal | enon é oh iu'é |*

ADV: *Sur é homp collet | perac é hon mé bet ganet*

PP-ARG*: doh piv' é ~~en~~^[out] hanval | d'an oll' é hout ur sant | Doh ar péhour é oé facht -
 En gorto[>/] on an amser da zonet
 PP: Euit on é homp croüet | A peh danger é oh tennet | Dré an eil poent é oh carguet | ~~En~~ é
~~ereiz e homp erriet~~
 PP-INF: Da sentign é homp disopet | Da vout fouetet, é hon bet lacait noeh
 ADJ-PRED*: Sur omp eus ar sicour divin | sur out a couehel | Lan oh a graceu | Scuih
~~en~~^[out] anfin | Innoçant o^[u] é ta Salver - Forh guridic, é oh p'oc'h offancer
 NP-PRED*: Caus' oh eta d'é goall' comseu | Caus' out da varv' salver ar bed | Usurer oh
 certenamant | Quen barbar oh el an turquet | Un den hep squiant oud é
 PRT: Collet oh pur | Deit oh en on | Oeit out | Calétait out
 V1*: Ni a cred é oh ouspen / Mam a truhé | En ur laret é oh péhour
 V1: Sant Paul a lar é oh carguet | Avis guenign é out couehet | Me cred é out couehet

Possibly to be correlated to the collapse of the particles are a couple of uses of a so for eu, but here bare so/zo has a longer pedigree (NG, e-n ty zo ray a dud, Hemon 1956: §79; MB, HMSB: 168.1e):⁸²

Mat euit on a so em cavet / Ta fal proces
 Forh vat a so ^{en} em cavet / Euit ~~en~~^{***} ta fal proces

As everywhere in W, imperatives and jussives are initial in the verbal complex, lacking any particles (explicitly observed already in G.Vn: 3).

12.2 EN particle

In MB, the en-particle appears in ez-contexts before pure proclitics objects of transitives and subjects of HAVE, not invariably, its alterantive being \emptyset , while before mesoclitics there is only the ez-particle in the form e. In 18-19C W prose is studied in Châtelier (2016: 367ff). In the early southeastern author Marion, and the later Seveno, en is frequent in all ez-contexts with proclitics both as objects of transitives and subjects of haveand freq. in all E-contexts with all proclitics of HAVE and transitives, but not obligatory; it is less robust with more western authors. With these authors, it does appear before the old mesoclitics (above and DMH).⁸³

Table illustrates with the slightly earlier Pourchasse's IS.pour, and Marion's MG for proclitics rare in IS.

Table: en-particle in IS.pour and MG

3SGM=TR discoein dehou en er haret

IS.pour 1785

⁸² Regular is (a) so with clausal subjects (e.g. G.BA: 63): Gout perac, so un dra æs? | Em changign eus an teuch' sé / So dehon un dra diéz

⁸³ The distribution of EN in Guillome 1836 is only indirectly hinted at by giving EN with 2SG HAVE ha-forms but not with eh es in paradigms. It seems unlikely that unavailability with other forms is asserted, and indeed on this score the usage of LLB is regular, e.g. Ha penauz en hou pou; hiniw en hou kuélan; as is that of GEG.jg, e.g. hoah en er stagues. It also seems unlikely but not in evidence presence with fronted objects is asserted, to give the type: Mall en ha pou.

3SGM=HV	El-cé enn enn doai S. Uiçant	IS.pour 1785
3SGF=TR	perac en hé feder	MG 1791
3SGF=HV	perac en hi doai caz	MG 1791
3PL=TR	goult e-rerr enn ou ancohant	IS.pour 1785
3PL=HV	é ùélet enn-ou-dèss ré	IS.pour 1785
1SG=TR	n'en dès quet promettét teign en em lausquou	MLG
1SG=HV	a béhani en em bou quæ	MG 1791
1PL=TR	A quement-cé enn unn avertisse	IS.pour 1785
1PL=HV	Pegourse enn unn-ness-ni hou cuélet	IS.pour 1785
2PL=TR	avertisse en hou lairerr	IS.pour 1785
2PL=HV	dré golere enn-ou pou raison	IS.pour 1785
RX=TR	à hou fal oberu enn e hum vanter	IS.pour 1785
RX=TR	a-ze en hum dromp en darn muyan	MG 1791

Of earlier texts, an exhaustive study is still needed, and minimal pairs are more scant, but the en-particle does appear to be regularly available in the same way, i.e. before all proclitics, including old mesoclitics, and symmetrically with objects of transitives and subjects of HAVE:

Table: en-particle in earlier texts

1SG=TR	a senefi enn em pardonet	SH 1766: 93, 160
1SG=HV	Pihuë enn devé ... Enn em bé bét er bonur-zé	
2PL=TR	A zisco scler de bebunan Enn hou car	CS.anon 1760
2PL=HV	Pé huéleind enn e huess pédettt 'when they cry	
2PL=TR	A hou tonœzenneu enn hou trugairècan	BT 1745
1PL=TR	Hac é græce Doué énn onn lacantt	GU 1734
1PL=TR	Mais dre e varuë hac e pasion / En ur lamas	NG 1680
3SGM=TR	nezet en er maillerezant	
3PL=TR	Rac cé, en ou pedamp	

CS.bar bucks these generalisations. As generally in MB and W, it treats the same object clitics of transitives and subject clitics of HAVE, limiting EN to them.

Unlike in MB and 18C W alike, there is a singular limitation on the proclitics that combine with EN: they have the form (h)V, i.e. 3SGF-2SG (h)é, 2-3PL (h)ou, not (h)VC, i.e. 3SGM, aR, 1SG em, 1PL (h)on, while RX (en) em is of course difficult to judge since its en is in all contexts optional, but there is no en en em. The negative evidence is fairly rich for 3SGM, 1PL objects and HAVE-subjects, less the rarer 1SG objects, and 1SG HAVE-subjects given their tendency to combine with a pronomial subject, itself a rare category to license EN.

Unlike in MB and W as well, there are robust examples of EN after subjects and objects, i.e. A-contexts, mostly complex subjects, but also less complex and even pronomial ones, as well as across other categories, i.e. EZ-contexts.⁸⁴

Where available, the en-particle is not obligatory and not even particularly frequent, as in many W works, but it is found in the few instances of 2SG objects though not all 2SG HAVE.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ However, see J[†] 110.

⁸⁵ Subjects of HAVE are not followed by EN, while subjects of transitives rarely are, but any asymmetries seem accidental: nonpronomial subjects of HAVE are restricted to 3SGM an-, itself not an EN-licenser, leaving only a couple of instances where EN would be expected based on transitives, namely 3SGF, 3PL,

The interest of the phenomenon calls for a fairly full presentation of the data; note occasional an rather than en of the particle.:

A-contexts

SU PRON (* unfused)

+3SGF Iustiç' habil a zigor' an istren, / Ha dirac té, hi en é loncq' souden

-3SGF *Té é laca

-3SGF Eun é consacr da vout é tampl': / Eun é choés da vout é Priet / Guet caranté eun é contampl' {é-VFIN = iné, eun=é-GEN = speret}

-3SGF *Té • lez d'é bugalé

-3PL Ni o lacai da vout joyus, / I [> h]on rantei da vout eurus

-2PL *Mé o guel | *Mé o guell | *Ha mé o guel | M'o guel goall' abuset | M'o guel gourmant | Tut ehomec m'o guel chiffet | M'o servige[i>o]

-2PL *mé o ped

-2PL *Dr^eindet beniguet mé o car

-2PL *mé^h o cav' obliget

-2PL *me o suppli | *me o suppli 3x | *Mé o suppli, Mam da IESUS

-2PL *Mé oc'h ador 2x | *Mé oc'h ador' Doüé Tat Eternel | M'och ador' IESUS ma Salver

-2PL Ni ho ped | ni o ped | Ni o ped

-2PL Ni o suppli

-3PL Ni o lacai {3PL} da vout joyus, / I [> h]on rantei da vout eurus

-3PL Hui o @ilez abars en ho miser'

-3PL Hui o lacai d'andurign o clevet

SU DP

+3SGF Ur song', ur coms', un action, / Ha quen clous un omission, / A enep da lezen Doüe, / En é laca Mæstré d'an Iné

-3SGF Ar muntret a lam guhavé / Guet un taul hep quen ar vuhé: // Mæs en control' an Usurer

E lam brepet dré hir amser

-3SGF Reral é lez

+2SG *quen fal mecher en e laco pehour*

+2SG En un Tavarn' a pa antrés, / An Tavarnour, an Hostisés / En é recev' guet joyustet

+2/3PL [A>E]r peh ne uelet quet breman, / En o lacai souehet un dé

-2PL Ar Bellec ho tesquei

-2PL Ho Mam Ilis, ho carg

-2PL Ho bombanceu, ho festeu [> danseu] / O taulei

-2PL justiç' Doüé, / O zrettei^o el m'a vi^eritet

-2PL Pehani p'è varvehet, / Ho lacai

-2PL quement sé / Ho zalhei

-2PL quement sé / Ho lacai

2PL subjects + HAVE, where absence of e.g. i en o des, is reasonable given only one instance for pronominal subject + such clitics with transitives.

SU REL

-2PL d'un Doué o guell 'who sees you'

OBJ DP

-2SG-HLEX Frezieu é po
+3PL-HLEX *pebeh ur joy en o des i*
-3PL-HLEX Glahar o des a pe uelant
-3PL-HLEX ~~Vertu o des certanemant~~
-3PL-HAUX Ar vertuïeu, o des bet pratiquet
+2PL-HLEX //Occasion en oc'hues d'ar meulign
-2/3PL Tut ~~infam~~^{didail} o hanuan mé
-2PL-HLEX Guet a graceu, o pezo hui
-2PL-HAUX Songet peh tut oc'hues hemptit
-2PL-HAUX Dec Gourhemen oc'hues / Receuet
-2PL-HLEX Un ti oc'hues, hac a so fal
-2PL-HAUX Ar memes tra ~~oc'hues~~^{ec'hes} ivé laret
-2PL-HLEX An intention oc'hues^{poue} bet
-2PL-HLEX Deu dra oc'hues eta d'ober
-2PL-HLEX Pemp poent oc'hues da pratiquign
-2PL-HLEX Treu aral oc'hues da laret
-2PL-HLEX A^hoalh oc'hues a ho ré hui

OBJ REL

+3SGF-HLEX Eus an Iné ret eu di^omp coms' breman, / Bras an ^{iz}ehom en é des a sicour
+3PL-HLEX Bras an anquen en o devé
-3PL-HAUX Pé treu aral, o devehé caret
-3PL-HLEX D'an Urz o des
-3PL-HLEX Ar carg' o des
-3PL-HLEX d'ar graceu o des bet
-3PL-HLEX ar peh o des
+2PL-HAUX ... -2PL-HAUX D'ar ré an o pezo leset, / En ho ti euit ar miret, / Desquet
ar comseu a vuhé, / O po cleuet an deueh sé
-2PL-HLEX diar guerh pe ré^h o pezo bet
-2PL-HLEX dré ar caranté, / Oc'hues doh imp
-2PL-HLEX Ar mat oc'hues lezet d'ober
-2PL-HLEX ar peh oc'hues d'ober
-2PL-HAUX er peh ho po clevet guet é
-2PL-HAUX d'ar peh oc'hues clevet
-2PL-HAUX pé ré oc'hues croüet
-2PL-HAUX an argant oc'hues prestet
-2PL-HAUX Iames anfin na ziscriet / An nep o pezo serviget

INF COMPLEMENT

+3PL ~~En em servign~~^{liez ivé} en o gueler

IDIOM

-2SG-HLEX Caër é hés clasq' en em iscus'

EZ-contexts

NP/DP ADV

-2PL-HLEX Un dé o po sicour ivé

NP/DP PRED

+2PL Brassoh pehour en^ho cavan

ADJP PRED

+2SG Goall' calet a galon / En é cavan Christen

FQ TO SU

+2PL Mam a garanté / Oll' en o pedamp, / En o supliamp,

ADV

+3SGF-HAUX R[ai>e] an é des oc'h offancet

+3PL ~~En em servign~~^{liez ivé} en o gueler

+2PL Enon, man Doué, en o cavan

+2PL Guel en o servigint ivé

+2PL ^{Calet'}Goall' ~~eri~~, ha hiein, liez en^ho guelan, / Christenien

-2PL-HLEX Breman oc'hues, avis guenign, / Ar guir feçon

CLAUSE ADV

+3PL-HAUX Mar det en pen a quement man, / En o po groit an diæsan

INF PP-ADV

+3PL-HAUX Dré o devout rai o caret, / En o des groit meur a pehet

PP

+3SGF mar é lézet, / Er fin en é ancouehet

+3PL Dré quement sé en o gueler

+3PL en væn en o pedet

-3PL Ha guet ar comseu terribl' man, / O condandei

-3PL-HAUX A^b poen o deve commancet

-3PL-HAUX D'an e[h>•]omec, o des roit aluzon

+2PL A creiz hon calon, Guet devotion, / En oc'h inouramp, En o saludamp

+2PL Aberh Doüé en o cargan

+2PL Liez en faus' [>ç?] ha dré gaeuier, / En o lacant

+2PL-HLEX Pendarben d^ho [b>p]uhé, / En o pezo benoéz

-2PL-HLEX Er bet man, o po é benoez

-2PL-HLEX En hi oc'hues, naoah credet / Un tresor bras

-2PL-HLEX É leh mirit' o po pehet

PP REL

-3PL-HAUX Ar pé ré o pé pourfitet ‘[animals] on which you would have profitted’

EMBEDDED V1

+2SG Petra ri té, mar lavar dit IESUS / En é pardon

+2SG-HLEX Me promet d’it aberk^z Doüé, / En é pezo ur fin eurus,

-2SG-HLEX Mæs ret eu coffessat ivé / É hes, helleih a fallanté

-2SG-HAUX ^{Mæs lavaret} ~~Laret hardih~~, diar quement sé, / ~~É hes helleih~~^{en em cav’ calh [sic?] a} fallanté

+3PL Da ziscoen en o respettet {3PL=consailleu or conducturet}

-3PL-HAUX Na^c [c>g]redant quet o des pehet

-2PL-HAUX O songeal oc’hues miritet

PE ‘OR’, HA(C) ‘though’ (HMSB: §191-2)

-2SG-HAUX Ag é pehe ar [h>g]^hentan é guelet

+2PL-HLEX Pé en o po certen / Cals’ a chiffeu

A/EZ-context

HA(C) WITH SHARED SUBJECT

-2SG-HLEX servig’ eun guet fidelité / umilité ha caranté, hac e pezo / ur fin eurus

+2PL-HLEX Pardonnet-u a oll’ galon, / D’an nep an des oc’h offancet, / Hac en o po remission, / Eus oc’h offañceu commetet {note EN}.

+2PL-HAUX *pratiquet eun / mæstr ha mæstres / hac en o po avis guen^gn / tut*

Some contrasting apirs of EN present/absent with EN-licensing proclitics + absence with nonlicensing ones:

PP

+3PL Dré quement sé en o gueler {3PL}

-3PL Ha guet ar comseu terribl’ man, / O condandei {3PL}

-3SG hep meh an offancamp

SU DP

+2PL [A>E]r peh ne uelet quet breman, / En o lacai souchet un dé {probably 2PL}

-2PL Pehani p’^e varvehet, / Ho lacai

-2PL quement sé / Ho lacai {2PL}

SU PRON HIATUS

+3SGF Iustiq’ habil a zigor’ an istren, / Ha dirac té, hi en é loncq’ souden {she swallows it = oyster}

-3SGF *Té é laca {3SGF}

EMBEDDED V1

+3PL Da ziscoen en o respettet {3PL=consailleu or conducturet}

-1PL-HLEX Ha Discoen on es doujanc

-1PL En ur songeal, / On guel {note no EN}
-3SGM Na credet quet ar changehet
-1SG-HAUX Songet^{amp}, an des Douë condanet / É Vap IESUS {note no EN}

GUET-PP

+2PL A creiz hon calon, Guet devotion, / En oc'h inouramp, En o saludamp {2PL}
-3PL Ha guet ar comseu terribl' man, / O condandei {3PL}

ADV(P) GUEL

+2PL Guel en o servigint ivé {2PL}
-3SGM Guel cals' an anauehet {you will learn it much better}

ADV TEMP

+2PL ^{Calet}Goall' eri, ha hiein, liez en^h o guelan, / Christenien {2PL}
+3PL ~~En em servign~~^{liez ivé} en o gueler {3PL}
-3SGM Hoas an laran
-3SGM Breman an dismantet, / Un dé benac ar clasquehet
-1PL-HLEX *hoas on es ni / Euit hon Tat spirituel, / Pep Escop

INF COMPLEMENT

+3PL ~~En em servign~~^{liez ivé} en o gueler {3PL}
-1SG *da spontign em laca mé*

Variation within A-contexts when EN is independently licensed in each:

+2PL-HAUX ... -2PL-HAUX D'ar ré an o pezo leset {clear AN, not EN}, / En ho ti euit ar miret, / Desquet ar comseu a vuhé, / O po cleuet an deueh sé {no EN}

Variation in EN + given form when independently licensed (contrast Guillome's fixed en ha):

+2SG-HLEX *Me promet d'it aber^hz Douë, / En é pezo ur fin eurus {2SG}
-2SG-HLEX *servig' eun guet fidelité / umilité ha caranté, hac e pezo / ur fin eurus

The en-particle is absent in imperative forms with proclitics. Only 3 is relevant and only 3PL found, and only ez-contexts are relevant, and the numbers are thus very small (see imperatives), but still, outside imperatives here en is more frequently present than absent. Thus cf:

Non-imperative:

~~En em servign~~^{liez ivé} en o gueler
en væn en o pedet {3PL}

Imperative:

Ha liez mat o visitet
Da hoarhign o leset

The en-particle never seems to appear between participle and auxiliary in any variety. It also never appears before proclitics on infinitives, only finite forms.⁸⁶

12.3 Other finite particles and conjunctions

CS.bar na/e^L=FIN does not track the earlier na-ne distinction, e.g. Da Zoué na plig' quet an tourmant | Quement sé ne plig' quet / D'é procurour | ne vet quet cri | Na vet mouher. This is the usual collapse of MB na, ne characteristic of W (HMSB §184). Exceptional remains Cillart 1744 SH, retaining n(a)^L in imperatives, but the same distinction is explicit much later in 1795 G.Vn, na 'ne, quand le vebe défend' vs. né 'ne' otherwise, na dostès quet 'n'approches pas', né dostès quet 'tu n'approches pas' (note the specifically W forms, though G.Vn discusses KLT as well: *na dosta quet). N'a/en d- is foud before vowel-initial forms of BE and GO. Mutation is lenition without anomalies.

CS.bar (a) pe^L 'when' has a unique pen in Pé conducer Doué Eternel {Ilis} vs. ^{oc'h e laret} ~~p'en e-lares~~ [3SGF, sc. peden]: it is tempting to correlate the en-particle specifically before 3SGF in hi en é loncq' souden. The lenitio presents anomalies:

t→!z: ~~Pe zen / eta d'on Ineueu / Quement a vat ar Cantiqueu.~~ (contrast Ne ^dten & A ^dten; no other evidence for pe t-). There seems to be no relevance of the na-ne distinction, still partly kept in SH, but not e.g. IS.pour, IS.mar.

CS.bar mar' is robustly without mutation, e.g. mar bé; mar groant (gober) vs. mar ro (rein); mard before vowel-initial forms of monet, bezout, e.g. mard ant (monet), has one striking !-anomaly; it is without mutation elsewhere (ALLB for 'ober', 'venir', though the couple of instances of b-forms of BE lenite, classical writers even for b-forms of BE).

d→!z: Mar zallhet beside expected mar dalhet.

CS.bar ma/e may be divided into conditional uses as alternative to mar, MB ma rarely maz, and other subordinative uses, MB usually maz, e.g. purpose or part of complex conjunctions like el ma in CS.bar (HMSB: §198, §202). In CS.bar Both prefer a but allow e (cond. Me na changet, ~~Ma ne cavés~~; subord. el m'a uelet, el m'e uelet), and neither elides before vowel-initial verbs (subord. m'a ivés, Ma anavign).

⁸⁶ I am aware of two possible attestations of EN in infinitives, both isolated and susceptible to alternative analysis. One is in the t18C Trégorrois play EN, da led eun tol cleue vid (en)o tianpechin 'tenez, un coup d'épée pour vous dépêcher', with a verbal form and context ambiguous between infinitive and future, and the infinitive analysable with a 3SGM subject pronoun anaphoric to 'tol cleue', cf. Dottin 1911: 86 (also Dottin's translation). The other, directly pertinent, is Marion EOV: 33: ha ne gredein jamæs en em bout groeit assès eit reparein fauteu quen énorme, against other instances of em bout and other forms of the infinitive of HAVE in similar contexts that lack en, and given that credein occurs regularly with finite complements in the text, this is likely an error for the future, as independently in Pourchasse CAG: 104: A pe n'em bout que affær. One might expect the type *Pegourse enn unn-néss-ni hou cuélet doh hou pout nanne pé sehett* (IS.Pour, sim HJC) to give rise to *...en hou pout...* given that *doh* is allomorph here of *é* and *é* = *ouz* here collapsed with *é* = *ez* in W and *en* is a variant of *ez* -- but I know of no clear examples.

Proportionally, there are only a few mutations. With regular verbs, conditional and subordinative *ma* mostly both lenite, two verbs in *d-* and two in *g-*:

M'a ounihemp (purpose): cf. *na ounihet*, *na gounihet*, *a gounihet*, *da gounit da ounit*, prt. *gouniet*, inf. *gounit*.

El/el m'a uelet 4x, *El/el m'e uelet* 2x (subord.): see Appendix, regular *guel*, freq. *uel* in lenition contexts, e.g. after *a*, *pa/e*, *na/e*.

ma zicoueh (cond.): cf. *pe zicoueho*, *pe zicoueh*, prt. *dicouehet*.

sell mui m'a zihuenet (subord.): cf. same verse inf. *dihuen*, else *a zihuen*, *a zihuennet*, *pe zihuen*, *da zihuen*, inf. *an dihuen*.

However, two verbs in *d-* show the expected provection element of mixed mutation, once conditional, with a verb that shows other mutation anomalies, and once subordinative, with a verb that does not:

El ma tisiréoh: *hui a tisirehé* (same hymn), cf. *na ziziri* (commandments), *na zizir* (commandments, archaisms), *hep disirign*.

Ma tisquenehet (purpose): regular *d-*: *disquen a ri*, *a zisquen*, *mar disquennan*, prt. and 2PL *disquennet*;

Er guis m'a delé, *El m'a télé*, *el ma teleamp*: independently shows both expected *z-* and unexpected *t-* in leniting contexts, *na télé*, ~~*na zeleamp*~~, *t-* in *é*-particle contexts, ~~*na zeleamp*~~, mostly unrevealing *d-* (see Appendix).

With irregular verbs (see Appendix), there is lenition both with verbs that show nonlenited finite forms, *bezout v-* (cf. *mar bé*), *gout ouï-*, *oer* (cf. *hep n'ar gouïet*), and those that do not, *gallout*, *(h)el-*. However, there is again lenition/provection variation with *d*-initial *donet*: *Ma zeign*; *m'a tei*; *M'a tehet* (all purpose clauses), elsewhere leniting *a*, *pa*-context *z-*, *é*-contexts *t-*. *Monet* is also regular relative to its behaviour, *Él' leh m'a iant*^[e c'hant].

The *edy*-forms of *BE* are restricted to subordinative *ma* in *CS.bar*, e.g. *Doh m'édi bras o dinité* | *An dé mé doh bet badezet* | *Etré mé domp er bed man* (see Appendix; on these forms, see Chatelier 2016x).

CS.bar re, *da* is rare:

Doué da rei dign an inour sé
Reveze groit ho volanté
Ho benoéz revezo guenign
Deit mat, é méndi, revihet

13 Agreement, negation, HAVE-constructions

13.1 Agreement and negation

In MB, nominal subjects use the default form when postverbal or preverbal, save if preverbal and negation intervenes, when they agree. Exceptions exist in both directions (Ernault 1888b: sec. 2).

Agreement instead of default is not found in CS.bar, either in the context where it is most common elsewhere, jussives, since the one 3PL jussive is pro-drop, or in other contexts, where they are rare.

Default instead of agreement for prenegation subjects is more robust across Breton. In MB, preverbal subjects control corresponding agreement across the negation NE, more variably across NA, with variable agreement noted chiefly in its matrix use, i.e. interrogatives with 2nd person subjects, *ha huy na goar* Qu, but also relatives, *an re nen care* J (Ernault 1888b: 247-8, less nuanced HMSB: §174.1, cf. §182 on the negations). This recalls the situation in MC, where agreement is typically found with NY but not NA, including in (Lewis 1947: §30, §47, Toorians 2014: §6.31, Edwards 2005: s.v. na).

In classical W, the negations have collapsed, and the rule is agreement. However, exceptions are known from modern W: Cheveau-Lorient 2007: 214 notes that agreement is variable for preverbal esp. 3PL subjects, nominal and pronominal; Ternes-Groix 1970: 2.2.5 indicates no agreement for preverbal 3rd person subjects, nominal and pronominal, with examples; but McKenna-Guémené 1976 does not discuss the matter and the few examples do have agreement (e.g. §375 for transcriptions of *pesantet n'ouiant ket*, §429 of *i debent ket*, *ni evamb ket*). Absence of agreement has been sporadically noted outside W (repertoried in ARBRES).

CS.bar is striking here. The negations are written *ne*, *na* and frequently emended *na>ne*, with no discernible difference for use (q.v.). Unexpectedly, 3rd person nominal subjects regularly use the default form, both in matrix and relative clauses, wheven when they precede negation, not only when they follow. As expected, they also use the default form if The attested postverbal plural subjects just as ones following negation where this is expected. Exceptions involve extra clausal material, e.g. coma-offset topics, vocatives, or matrix arguments.⁸⁷

MATRIX NOMINAL SUBJECT + NEG

Mæs, allas, ma oll' comseu, / Na touch' quet ho calonneu!
Ho goall' pligeadureu / N'a bado quet brepet

RC NOMINAL SUBJECT + NEG

D'an oll treu e ueler er bed / Ha d'ar ré n'ell' quet bout guelet.
D'ar ré n'é ~~grœa~~ra en o buhé [3SGF, sc. penigen].
N'e rer quet el an darn muïan / Pé ré n'a clasq' meit tenn' ardran,
E leh gober é guis an darn' muïan, / Tut dinatur', hanval doh barbaret, / Pe ré na ro dehé sicour ar bet.

⁸⁷ Probably irrelevant: *Ar sort tut sé, na f@l[>] quet dign* [possibly *fel > fall*, uncertain: The verb is not attested with agreement, and usually does not take nominal subjects, but rather experiencer + infinitival, rarely finite clause, and if there is a preverbal element, it can be the experiencer argument *Tadeu, ha Mameu me fel dign*, *Dré ur cantiq oc'h instrugign*; the clause, *Ober hervé oc'h exempleu*, / *A fell dign*, or a fronted argument of the clause, *Ha hui, ho cof a fel doh contantign | Man g^oall buhé a fel di^gn da changign*

NEG + NOMINAL SUBJECT [nonagreeing expected in all varieties of W]
 Diar ar foar, pé ar marhat, / N'an da quet an oll' d'ar guer,

EXCEPTIONS (apparent):

Ar résonieu sé / Di^om̄ ni discleriet, / N'en dint quet martresé,
 Allas, tut quæs! ne vint quet cheleuet / Que n'o devo, ho santaç' receuet.
 Da guentan oll' berzet er vat, / Hac ar ^mam, hac quen^rclous an tat, / Næ^c lacaint quet en o
 guelé, / Ar C^hroadur que n'en devo blée.

Pronouns only show agreement, though only 1st/2nd person are attested:

1/2 PRONOUN SUBJECT + NEG

D'an tut honnest', mé ne mes quet | *Dan dut honnest, mé ne mes quet*

Hui n'em pardonet quet ivé.

Tut honnest a sent fidel, / D'ar Gourhemeneu santel, / Hui n'a sentet quet doh té

Ha hui n^hellet souffrign

Ha hui n^e ret servig'

Ha hui n^hellet, annemis pardonign

13.2 Agreement and negation with HAVE

The verb HAVE typically differs from others. In MB, subjects in any position in any clause type regularly control its proclitic in agreement, though exceptions are attested, e.g. pan en deues an tud argant Qu. W is distinctive. In the classical literary language, nominal subjects in any position usually combine with the 3SGM/default form, but pronouns agree, whether preverbal or doubling, though exceptions with 3rd persons occur more extensively in 19-20C, and may well reflect partial neutralisations of 3SGM/3SGF/3PL HAVE-forms themselves in certain contexts (e.g. as an option when pronoun predes, Ternes-Groix 16.3.1, or inversely esp. when it does not, Cheveau-Lorient 6.6.1, but only exceptionally in McKenna-Guémené §326cn2 vs. §342ff.).

CS.bar shares the W characteristics that 3rd person nominals control 3SGM forms of HAVE in the preverbal position if there is no intervening negation, while other subjects control agreeing forms, i.e. all pre-negation subjects, all preverbal personal pronouns even if pronouns including 3SGF, and all enclitic doubling pronouns. This is the situation already in Pr/PR and NG (Hemon 1956: §81). Where CS.bar differs is that like outside HAVE, intervening negation has no effect on this nonagreement:

Table: (Non)agreement with HAVE in NG and CS.bar

_ NOM	Ol poinieu e-n ifern en des a ré danet	NG
_ NOM	Mæs an horriplan tourmant / An des enon an Iné ar pouver, / An des ar seih Sacramant	CS.bar
	O pebeh meh! an devezo neusé, / Man breder quer, an tut a oall' buhé	
NOM _	euit er ré en dès reit ranteu	Pr
NOM _	En ol eneueu ac e ré so saluet / En des ur joy bras	NG
NOM _	hon Mam Ilis / an des Beleïan	CS.bar
	An Escopet paraillemant / An des o lod	
	Ar ré an des ... offancet hon Doüé / An des chiffet, an des groit penigen	

	a pehani, / Meur a tut n'an des quet sourci [meur PL?]	
NOM NE _	Er fâl traierion-man n-ou devoue quin gred	NG
NOM NE _	Hac ar ré n'an des quet i bet / D'o devout i groit dilijanç' [see below]	CS.bar
3 _	I o des renc	
1/2 _	Ny on bou	Pr
1/2 _	Ha huy ou h-ues cals a ronset?	NG
	ni ont n-es meritet	
1/2 _	mé a mes hi savet	CS.bar
	Té pé song' mat	
	Ni on es eun cleuet	
	Hui oc'hues eun dign refuset	
_ =1/2	pebeh occasion / Ou poué-huy d-e lahou	NG

An apparent anomaly reflects a hanging topic:

CS.bar An den santel, ar quæs pehour, / O des an eil, hac erguilé / Ehom a caout, ho sicour, / Da pep cours' ahét o buhé

13.3 Agreement of HAVE-infinitive

Nonagreement of HAVE appears to strictly concern proclitics. It does not affect matching with dependent pronouns (attested in CS.bar), nor even enclitics (data are scarce):

An Escopet paraillemant / An des o lod CS.bar
Penaus lod a nehé en dès ind hum gollet? HISA

More intricate is any effect of nonagreement with a preverbal or postverbal subject of HAVE on features of a controlled subject given away by an agreeing infinitive. Regularly we find no effect even in closest embedding, but the opposite exists (Ernault 1887: 42n2):

Er-ré n'ou dès guet e carrehaï hou devout 'those who do not have would like to have'
IS.pour
Ind e eëll sur ou devout bihuance délicatoh MG
rac bout-ç'ou certæn tud e garehaï ou devoud MG
Péh avañtaj en dès bet ar arvorizion d'ou devout Jesus én ou mesk? HISA

Boelleu unn deine à buemp troaitéd a deli enn-devoutt puemp-troætéd-ha-tregontt.
(L'Arm)

However, there is a confound, since one and the same text that shows an agreeing infinitive can independently show a nonagreeing one in pretty much the same context.

hac è zeliamp henn devout grateit ni-memb 'and we should have promised it ourselves' --
er sourci é zeliamp hunn boutt IS.pour
mæss hum rejouisset quenttoh henn devoutt lod à boenieu 'rejoice rather to have' -- ne
ziziret quet rai hou pout danné IS.pour

In the one CS.bar example noted here, there is no effect of nonagreement with HAVE, here as usually despite negation:

Hac ar ré n'an des quet i bet / D'o devout i groit dilijanç' 'And those who have not had it / To have it make diligence' CS.bar

There is one construction where HAVE independently varies in agreement: the DO or ober-conjugation. The DO-conjugation with HAVE seems restricted to W, distinguishing about a ra 'there is', shared with MB and other varieties, from em bout a ra/ran 'I have' of only W. Here we find two basic patterns (cf. Ernault 1887: 43n2, 1888: 265, 1890: 473-4): mismatching, where the DO-auxiliary is in default form, and matching, where the DO-auxiliary matches the proclitic (an instance of which would be when both are default due to an overt subject).

Both matching and mismatching occur early (Ernault op.cit.)

hou poud ra 'vous avez' CHal.ms [presumably 1718 Sarzeau; cited in Ernault 1890: 473-4]

Em bout e hran pligeadur GEG.rp [18C]

en devout e rehé m'annemiséd [IMS, edition nehué of 1850: 435, in additional material not present in Pourchasse IMS 2nd ed. of 1813

In CS.bar, there is only one example, one of the earliest attested, and it is strikingly mismatching, like the earliest form above from CHal.ms:

En em changet; ho pout a rei pardon

Later matching seems typical: a rich inventory comes from 19C, 1839 BESquil of Quillére, 1854 PSA of Le Diot, repertoried in DEVRI: s.v. bout2 (e.g. BESquil: hé dout e ré 'elle avait', hur bout e ramb, hou pout e ret-ui, en dout e ré BESquil 1839; PSA: ou devout e hrent, hàg em bout e hran).

14 Appendices

14.1 Appendix: Two hymns from CS.bar and their counterparts

The language and orthography of Barisy's 1710 CS.bar, and the conventions of transcription, may be illustrated by comparing two of its hymns with counterparts in slightly later 18C sources, Cillart's 1766 SH, and the 1760 anonymous collection of hymns CS.anon. (Underlining is added to highlight pronominal forms discussed.)

The conventions of transcription are:

Illegible: characters •, ••, and so on when part of a word, but when separate, ••• is a word and •••• any longer phrase within a line (numbers of characters or words often being conjectural).

Changes:

-Strike-through/out: Linear strike-through ~~x~~, occasionally with an included, earlier strike-through, ~~xy~~, distinct from diagonal strike-out of groups of lines or verses, indicated by “strike-through”.

-Short changes to the original, usually in-line, above, below, or to immediate right or left of text, with or without strike-out which is indicated as above, are indicated by:

--modification [x>y]; shorthands are: [•>•]: @, [a>e]: e, [•>e]: e, [u>v]: u, [•>v]: u

--insertion indicated at rough the point in the ms [>x]

--insertion ^{above} or _{below} within the line rather than in a separate line

-Extensive extra material, often entire marginal lines or verses next to struck-through or struck-out material or marked by for insertion by x, is in italics.

CS.bar II.28 p. 182ff., and SH p. 151ff. SH corresponds to all but last two verses of CS.bar. CS.bar has marginal cursive replacements without counterparts in SH and not given here.

EIHVET ARN'UGUENT

CANTIQUE

IESUS Crucifiet, presantet d'ar pehour
euit an excitign d'ar contrition

Ar Ton an Hymn'
Vexilla Regis prodeunt.

Ar ton mélodiuss: *Terripled unn dra é
guélett!*

Péhour barbar', croadur ingrat
Caus' out da varv' IESUS ta zat!
Muntrer horribl' dré te pehet,
Caus' out da varv' salver ar bed.

PEhour barbar, Croaidur ingratt
Causs-out de Varhuë Jesus he datt,
Multrér horrible dré he béhét,
Causs out de Varhuë Salvér er-bétt.

O den indi^{gn}! o torfettour!
Den dinatur sell' te labour,
Abars ar croés sell' te IESUS
Ché eun en un stat truheus!

O dein indigne, ô torfaittour
Dein dinatur, séle te labour
Doh ur potance séle te Jesus;
Ché-eun énn ur statt truheus!

Péhour, el ar sclaç' é[>c']hout hiein,
Te so quen calet el ar mein,
Me ne santés en é [c>g]alon,
Chif bras diarben é bassion.

Péhour, eell er sclassé é hous yieinn;
Té zou quer caléd eel ur mein,
Mena santéss énn é calon
Chiff é chongeal ér Bassion.

Sell' ha contapl' é tourmanteu,
Consider' é oll' goulieu,
Sell' penos e [d?]iret é goet,
Pen darbet d'ar croés beniguet.

Contapl' erhad é dourmanteu;
Considére é oll' goulieu;
Séle pénauss é tivér é ouétt,
Pen-d'er-benn d'er Groéss beniguétt.

Sell' péhour cri, é corff muntret,
Sell' é pen guet an drein piquet,
Sell' é deu zorn, sell' é deu zruet,

Séle, péhour cri, é gorff hachétt,
Séle é benn gued enn drein trezétt:
Séle e zournn, séle é zeu droaitt

Guet an tacheu, er croes staguet.
[> ~~*** tacheu doh ar croes~~]

Sell' malh^eurus é faç' sacret,
Allas chedé eun dislivet,
Chédé digoret é [c>g]osté,
Ché en des groit ta o[^] all' buhé [> fallanté].

Man deu lagat goüillet, goüillet,
Hui ma halon deuhanteret,
Marv' eu man Mæstr', marv' eu ma zat.
Marv' eu IESUS, ma Salver mat.

[strike-out: verse]
O Madelez eus ma IESUS,
Mervel euit map den cablus!
He^unne[h>z] eu, guet guirioné,
İa he^unne[h>z] ar garanté.

[strike-out: first line of verse, at bottom of page]

Gurun parfondet ar péhour,
Eun ar burre^u', eun an traitour,
Pe hui douar en em zigoret,
Didan é zreit, ma n'è chang' quet;

Non pas gurun, nar scoeit quet,
Hui douar supportet eū brepet,
M'er guel taulet ar é deu llin,
Chiffal eus é vuhé indi^gn.

Ça péhour peur quemer courag'
Rennonci d'è libertinag'
Pella doh an occasion
Ha resist d'an temptation.

Mar dilezes ta o[^] all' buhé,
Me promet d'it aberk^z Doüé,
En é pezo ur fin eurus,
Dré marv', ha passion IESUS.

Guet tacheu doh er Groëss staguet.

Séle, malhuruss, é face sacréett,
Séle pénauss éma dislihuétt;
Séle é galon diguor éhué,
Ché enn-déss groeitt he fal vuhé.

Menn deulagatt, ouilétt, ouilétt,
Hui, me halon, deuhantérett:
Marhuë-é me Zad, marhuë-é me Roué
Marhuë-é Jéssuss, marhuë-é menn
Doué!

O medeleah à me Jéssuss,
Merhuel aveit Map-dein cabluss!
Honéh-é guett guirionné,
Ah, honéh-é ur garanté!

Gurunn, feaih, dismante er péhour;
Ean-é er bourrhéhuë, ean-é enn traitour;
Pé hui doar, unn um zigorétt
Édan é dreitt, quena change quétt.

Non, non, gurun, feaih, n'er scoeit quet,
Hui, douar, éhué er supportétt;
M'er guéle ar beenneu é zeulin,
Fachét doh é vuhé indign.

CS.bar II.2 p. 97ff. and CS.anon p. 136ff. All but one verse correspond save penultimate of CS.anon corresponds to fourth of CS.bar and so moved here. CS.bar has marginal cursive replacements without counterparts in CS.anon and not given here.

EIL CANTIQU'.

EUS ar Pehet Marvel.

Ar un Ton neué.

Crennet, spontet, o Pobl' fidel,
Guet eun eus ar pehet marvel:
Eun a so sur, eus ar bed man,
An drouc brassan, an horriplan.

[>A cals eman goeh da vap den]

~~Eun a so goeh d'an den Christen,~~
nan deu Euit famin, ^{bresel} quertri, bossen:
Ar horf a varv' dré ar clenuet,
Hac an Iné dré ar pehet.

O Monstr' enorm! o Monstr'
horribl':
An drouc a res a so terribl';
En heur m'antres en un Iné,
Té é laca da coll' grac' Doué.

Ur song', ur coms', un action,
Ha quen clous un omission,
A enep da lezen Doüe,
En é laca Mæstré d'an Iné.

Souden m'a ves en i placet,
Te ra disordre estranch' meurbet;
Saisiet on, spotign a ran,
Quen liez gueh m'ar contamplan.

Te so hanval doh ur serpent,
Picquign a res soutilamant;
Nemeit dré cuh' na tinissés,
Euit ober suroh ta bless.

Dallign a res ar quæs péhour,
Dré ur seblant douç', ha traitour;

CANTIC-SPIRITUEL,

Ar er Péhétt-Marvel.

Creinett, sponett, o Pobl fidél!
Gued eune ag er Péhétt-Marvél;
Ean a zou sur ag er Bett-man
Enn droug, er maleur, teriplan.

Ean a zou goah d'unn Dein Crichenn
Eit berzel quertri na bossenn:
Er horf a varhue dré er hlinhuett,
Hag enn Inean dré er péhett.

O monstr énorm, o monstr orib!
Enn droug a ress a zou terib;
Enn ér ma hiess, énn un Iné
Ti laca de gol gress Doué.

[this verse is penultimate in orig.]
Ur chonge, ur gons, un accyon,
Unn dézir, unn omisson,
A eineip de lezen Doué,
A zou causs d'er maleurieu-zé.

Enn Diaul a guemer pozicion,
O tra étrange! ag er galon
E péhani é hoai Jézuss:
O statt tristt! O statt irvouduss!

O monstr énorm! o monst orib!
Enn droug a ress a zou terib;
Saizyé-d-on, spontein a-ran
Kel-lyess gueh me hontanplan. [sic]

Té zou hanval doh ur serpentt,
Piquein a ress sontilemantt;
Nameitt dré guh né denessés
Eveitt gober suroh he vless.

Dallein a er peur péhour
Dré ur seblantt douss ha treitour;

Changign a res pen euit pen,
Antandemant, Speret map den.

Changein a ress penn eveitt penn
Antandemantt, Sperett, Map-Denn.

En ur calon étré m'a vés,
El un Tyrant em comportes,
T'en laca hiein doh é Croüer
Ingrat iué doh é Salver.

Enn ur galon étré ma vess
El un Tirand um gonportess;
Ti laca ieien doh hi hrouéer,
Ingrad éhué doh hi salver.

Delhel a rés é song' brepet,
En faus' pligeaduren ar bed,
Te serr' doh t'on dor an Eneu,
T'en pouss' abars an Inverneu.

Derhel a ress hi chonge perpett
E fauss plijadurieu er Bett;
Té chairr doh ti dor enn Neinhueu,
Ti boutt abarh énn Inhuerneu.

Te so anfin^{***} te so caus' malheurus,
Eus an tourmanteu estlamus,
Preparet d'an Tut abuset,
An devezo te comëttet.

[here verse given as fourth above]

O considerign quement man,
Crial d'an oll', mat é hellan,
Crenet, spontet, o Pobl' fidel,
Guet eun eus ar pehet marvel.

E considerein kemen-man,
Cryal d'enn ol mad é hellan:
Creinett, sponett, o Pob fidél,
Gued eah ag er péhett-Marvel.

14.2 Appendix: Inflection of the preposition in CS.bar

The paradigms here are not necessarily exhaustive, though an attempt has been made in that direction.

Table: Selected prepositions of CS.bar

1SG	guet, deguet guenign, guenign, gueni ^{gn}	euit, evit euit on, euit on mé	doh	a, eus a hanon, a hanan mé	ar	dré; étré, etré	da, de, dé dign, dign mé, dign mé
2SG	guenit, deguenidé	euit out, euit out ^d , >euid oudé	<i>doh oudé</i> , doh it, doh oh ^{it}	a hanou[t>d]é			dit, d'it, didé, d'id'é
3SGM	guet on	euit on	doh ton, doh t'on	a nehon		dré don	de hon, dehon
3SGF	guet ^h i		doh ti	a nehi		dré di	de hi, dehi
1PL	degueni ^o mp	euit omp, euit ompni	doh imp, doh ⁱ [^o]mp	a hanamp, ahanamp, ahanomp	ar nomp	etré domp, etré dompni	dimp, d'imp, d ^h mp
2PL	guehoh, guenohui	euit oh, euit oc'h	doh oh, doh oc'h	a hanoh		etré doh	doh
3PL	guet é	euit é	doh té	a nehé	ar nehé		de hé, dehé

Conclusions from prepositional forms for localising the language of CS.bar are not straightforward. The key forms are 2SG and 1PL, whose distinctive variants are described as early as G.Vn: 3, but whose detailed distribution only becomes clear by the ALBB. However, for 2SG, 20C data is limited to parts of southern and eastern W, and 1PL shows remarkable microvariation in i/o and their descendants, and that would make diachronic variation likely as well. That makes it hard to come to a firm conclusion about CS.bar, in reading for instance d^omp as a change relating to the Bubry-Ploerdut difference, or Ploerdut and a more eastern type by 20 restricted to Mûr but possibly at Noyal-Pontivy at 1710, or that make it hard to come to firm conclusions about CS.bar. Table presents a sample, including some apparent cases of changes in a locality.

Table: Variation in prepositional inflection

	ganimp	deomp	ganit	dit
NG 1680	guenemp	dimp, dem		dit
CS.bar 1710	(deguen ^o mp)	d ^o mp	guenit	dit, d'it
G.R W 1738		dymp		did
L'Arm 1744	guenemp	d'eemp	guenitt	d'itt
G.Vn 1795	guen emb, omb	d'emb, omb B.B. d'imb	guen ad, ez, id	d'id
ALBB north				
Ploerdut	g ^{en} ũmp	dũmni		
Bubry	k ^{en} ẽm	dẽm		
Noyal-Pontivy	g ^{en} œmp	dœmni		
Cléguérec	g ^{en} œm ni	dœmni		doh
Mûr	g ^{en} im ni	dimni		dité
S. Allouestre	g ^{en} ẽm	dẽm	g ^{en} js	dis
ALBB s-east				
Quiberon	g ^{en} ãmp	dœmnœy	g ^{en} œs	dœetĩ
Loth 1895	genomp	dõmp	genes	des
Ploemel	g ^{en} ẽmp	dẽmp	g ^{en} ą	dátĩ
Locmariaquer	g ^{en} õmp	demnéy, dõmp	g ^{en} ąt	datĩ, dīt
Ploeren	g ^{en} yẽmp	dimnèy	g ^{en} js	dis
Sarzeau	g ^{en} yẽmp	g ^{en} œmnèyk	g ^{en} ęs	dœeti
Ernault 1890				d'ëz
Sauzon	g ^{en} ãmp	dẽmp	g ^{en} ut	dit
Merlevenez	g ^{en} œm ni	dœmni	g ^{en} œtti	dœt
HJC 1818	guenemb	d'emb	guenid	did

Prepositional inflection is extended to a new prepositional complementiser in: CS.bar ~~Quit' oh ho pout an dicsaman~~; contrast Gk à propos ef in MB.

The preposition étre offers no evidence about the types etre me ha te, etrezon ha te, etrezon ha etrezout (q.v. DEVRI s.v.).

14.3 Appendix: Inflection of the verb in CS.bar

Verbs are given with their verbal complexes, of which a selection is drawn to illustrate variants of the verb-form itself, not possible complexes, and for clarity and simplicity

(e.g. 2SG -és is frequently es in modifications or additions, so the original layer is preferred, but the changes do more frequently show mutations).

As generally in earlier W, -ehemp and -eher occur both as future and conditional, -ehet is future, but for conditional -ehe(o)h there is rather -eoh, -éoh, itself never imperfect, while other -he-formations are conditional only (cf. HMSB; Hemon 1956; Châtelier 2016).⁸⁸

The paradigms here are not necessarily exhaustive, though an attempt has been made in that direction. Quick checks suggest that missing categories are indeed missing: no past conditionals, no non-3SG preterites other than the couple given among irregular verbs, and few imperfects.⁸⁹

Table: Regular verbs in -C in CS.bar

Pres.	lavarout	karout	kavout	kredout	gwelout
1SG	a laran mé, na lavaràn	en ^h o caran	a cavan	a credan mé	pe uelan, a pé guelan
2SG	a pe larés	a carés	ma ne cavés	mar credés	na uelés, a p'ò guelés
3SG	a lar, a lavar	n'a gar, pe ne car'	a cav', em cav', em gav	cred	a pe uel, mar guel, o guell
1PL	a laramp	me ne caramp		a credamp	a pe uelamp, mar ar guelamp
2PL	a laret-u, a la ^{va} ret	en ho caret, mar caret-u	mar é cavet	na credet	m'a uelet, p'on guelet
3PL		mar carant • carant i	pen em cavant		a pe uelant, p'é guelant
IMP	a larer		mar caver		a ueler, en o gueler
Impf.					
3SG	a lavaré	ar caré,	a cave		a uelé
3PL					
Pret.					
3SG	lavaras		a cavas		
Fut.					
1SG	a larign, a lavarign		em cavign		
2SG	a lari té, na lavari	a gari	n'ar cavi		
3SG	a laro, a lavaro a lar[ei>o], a lavarei	a pe caro	a gavo, a cavo	a credei	a uelo, a uelei
1PL				m'a credehemp	

⁸⁸ Exhaustive examples of -eoh, éoh: Groit eta d'o Nesson, / El ma tisiréoh, / ~~Ma veoh en é stat~~, abars ar mémés stat / A vihé groit doh oh, / Hac a rehet er vat. | O vezout guir quement man, / Lavaret dré peh réson, / A veoh hui ar^{ch}quentan, / Hep andur' é nep feçon. | N@ ret jamés d'oc'h amizian, [>jamés ne ret^{anffn} d'amizian] / ... / Nemeit er guis ma careoh, / A vihé groit brepet doh oh. | Pe véoh en^{iz}ehom / Hui a tisirehé, / Bezout, o den calet,! [sic] / Abars ho peuranté / Prontemant sicouret. | O tut pinvidic, pequen^f bras charité! | A réoh hui, sicour ar peür iué.

⁸⁹ There is 1x n'ellomp, 1x n'elle^[a]mp, with good evidence that these are present rather than imperfect forms.

2PL	e[n>l] larehet	a garehet, m'a carehet	a cavehet		a uelehet, p'o guelehet
3PL	a larint i, pa larint		<i>en em cavint</i>		
IMP			a caveher		
Cond.					
1SG	<i>ma larehen</i>	n'o carehen mar carehés	<i>pa gavehen</i>	mar eredehen	
2SG		a garehé, pa carehé		a credehé	
3SG		na carehemp ma careoh			
1PL					
2PL					
IMP					a ueleher
!					
2SG	lavar, lar	car			
1PL	laramp			credamp	
2PL	lavaret, laret-u	em caret		me ^[ch] credet, me c'hredet mé, mec'hredet	
-!					
2SG	na laréz, na larés				
2PL	na laret		en em cavet	næ ^c gredet	
PRT	la ^{va} ret, laret	caret		credet	guelet, guellet
INF	lavarign, da laret	da carign, ha carout, <i>da caret,</i> euit ho caret, <i>ar^e carign^{et}</i>		credet da credout credign	da uelet, doh ho guelet, ar guelet a ret

Other inflections: impf. 3SGM a pe songent; cond. 2PL el ma tisiréoh; neg. ipv. 2SG na zizir (archaism in commandments).

Present 3SG -a typical of many varieties including BSDB-Inguiniel does not seem to occur, apart from 1x rinca in the original layer and a number of renqua introduced for gallout by modification.

Future in -o is rare in the original layer, cousto, cresquo, *zicoueho*, ~~ziseoei~~, gorto, *vanquo*, ^[b]pedo, quemero, servigeo (contrast BE, HAVE, only -o); ei-futures are regular, adresei, andurei, canei, changei, chomei, clevei, collei, commandei, comsei, condandei, conservei, zalhei, zesquei, zilesei, zistaguei, zoujei, hoarhei, lenei, pligei, pratiquei, préservei, quemerei, rantei, recevei, reprechei, sentei, sonnei, taulei, tesquei, tretei, varvei, zrettei, zromplei; but a number of ei-futures are changed to o-futures, chom[ei>o], chomei^[o], coms[ei>o], zalh[ei>o], *zesq[ei>o]*, joent[ei>o], malloeh[ei>o], ordrenn[ei>o], *recev[ei>o]*, reprechei^[o], retourn[ei>o], sant[ei>o], zrettei^[o] (these lists do not include verbs given in the paradigms).

This is an unexpected state of affairs if ei-future are extended to regular verbs through a-presents, type kar, karo :: laka : lakai, lakei → kara : karei, and it seems that even early, ei-futures depend at least the existence of a-presents for regular verbs in a variety, as they

do later (early: Ernault 1890: 107f., 116f. = EC 7.16-8, 35-7, e.g. 1718 Sarzeau in CHal.ms, 1818 in HJC; later: see esp. Crahé-Languidic, and so in BSDB-Inguiniel).

Diskouez has by loss of -z- become a verb in -V, but inflects as if in a silent -C, forming future in -ei, not -i: fut. ~~an discoign~~, ~~m'an disoeoi~~, ~~en em ziseoei~~, ipv. disco, inf. discoen, da ziscoen. Verbs in -zh are regular -C verbs in -h: e.g. kouezhañ: a coueh, a goueh, n'a couehet, n'a couehehemp, n'a couehet, prt. couehet, inf. couehel; degouezhout: pe zicoueh, *pe zicoueho*, prt. dicouehet; skuizhañ: é scuihe[t-u>s te], na^[e] scuihet quet, pe scuihehé.

Anaout is a regular -C verb in -v: ipv. anav', anavet, prt. anauet, inf. , d'anavign, euit an anavign, but also m'hallign anav'.

Table: Regular verbs in -V in CS.bar

Pres.	lakaat	tostaat	ankouaat	reñ	dleout	gounit
1SG	a lacan mé					
2SG	p'en em laqués					
3SG	a laea , é laca	pe tosta		a ro	a délé, na délé, na télé ⁹⁰	
1PL	pe lacamp				é teleamp, na zeleamp	
2PL	pe nem lacait, pe taulet [>laquet]				e teléet, na déléet	
3PL	en o lacant				é téléant	
IMP	a laquer		ec'h ancouher	a roher		
Fut.						
1SG	na lacaign					
3SG	en o lacai, <i>en e laco</i>	m'a tostei	<i>nancoueho</i>	rei		
2PL	p'em laquehet	pe tostehet				m'a ounihemp na ounihet, na gouihet a gounihet
3PL	na ^e lacaint					
Cond						
2SG				a rahés [sic]		
3SG	laquehé					
!+						
2SG				ro		
1PL	lacait ^{mp}			roit, roit-u, re ^e it		
2PL	lacamp	tosteit				
!-						
2PL	n'e lacait		n'ancouehet			
PRT	lacait		ancouehet	roit	deléet, deléet	gouniet
INF	lcat	tostat	ancouehat	raign, ra ^e ign	deleout	gounit, da ounit, da gounit gounit a rant

⁹⁰ Other spellings: a dele, a délé, *a delé*, a ~~telé~~, e télé, m'a delé, m'a télé.

Verbs in 3SG -a in the text belong to the expected -V group, a zanva, (calétait), cofessa (cofessait, cofesseit), (crehueit, créhueit), (daveit), douça, (duheit), (euehait, eueheit, eueheit), (goapeit, fut. goapei), (jotadeit), hardiha, (honnesteit), netta (nettait), pella (pellait), quitta (quittait), (pinvitait), (scoeit), é tinissa, (trugarecait) -- apart from rinca (base-layer), renqua (modifications only) (no other forms). It is for these that that -Vi futures are expected.

Table: Irregular verbs in CS.bar (cont. below)

Pres.	gallout	gouzout	ober
1SG	é hellan, m'a ellan, n'ellan	na ouïamp	- : a ran, a ran mé
2SG	<i>e c'helles</i> , pe n'elles	na ouïet ^[z]	n'ar groés : a rés, a res
3SG	<i>ec'hel</i> , n'ell', n'ell, n'hell, m'a el', m'a ^[h] el', mar guel ^[all]	a oer, n'a oer, na ouer	n'é groa >ra : a ra
1PL	é hellamp, n ^[h] ellamp n'ellamp, n'elle ^[a] mp	a ouïet, hep n'ar gouïet	- : a ramp, <i>a ramp ni</i>
2PL	é ^[c] ellet, é ^[ch] ellet, <i>e' c'hellet</i> , n ^[h] ellet	na ouïamp	me n'ar groet : a ret, n'a ret-u, mar ret
3PL	m'a hellant, <i>n'hellant</i>	n'a ouïant	mar groant : a rant, a rant i
IMP	é heller		n'ar groer, mar é groer : a rer
Impf.			
3SG	<i>n'elle</i>	a ouïe	- : a ré
Pret.			
3SG			- : a ras
Fut.			
1SG	n ^[h] ellign		- : a raign
2SG	ma helli , n'elli		- : a ri, a ri té
3SG	n'ello, ma ^[h] ello, ma ellei	m'a ouïei, m'a ouï[ei>o]	- : a rei, a re ^a i
1PL	ma hellehemp		- : na rehemp, a rehemp ^[rainp] , re ^[he] mp
2PL	é hellehet , m'a ellehet, m'a ^[h] ellehet	a ouïehet	- : a rehet, pé é rehet
3PL	m'a ellint, m'ellint		- : a raint
IMP			- : a reher
Cond.			
1SG		ne fehen, e fihen mé*	
2SG		na fihez*	
3SG		ne fehé, n'a fehé ^[ouffé] *	- : el m'a rehé
1PL		ne fehemp ^[ouffemp] *	
2PL		[>ne ouffech]*	- : a réoh hui
3PL			
IMP			
Cd.Pt.			
3SG			- : na rezé
!			
2SG			groa : -
1PL			groamp, groamp i : -
2PL			groit, ar groit, groit-u : -
-!			
2SG			
1PL			na ramp
2PL			ne ret
PRT	guellet, <i>gallet</i>		groit : -
INF	gallout, hep gallout,	euit - gout	gober, gober : ober,

gallout a raint, **g**ue^[a]llout a ret ar gout a ret

o_{PROG} gober : oc'h_{PROG} ober
 e leh gober : euit|dré|hep|da ober,
 o_{3PL} gober : hep o_{3PL} gober,
 euit é_{2SGF} gober : doh é_{2SGF} gober,
 hep|doh|- ar_{3SGM} gober :
 eus an_{3SGM} ober,
 a^[c']oh ar^e_{3SGM} gober,
 a^[c']oh|d' ar^[c']_{3SGM} gober.

Gallout: The absence of any forms in a-particle contexts seems significant.

*Gouzout, conditional: in W fehe- &c is a defective verb 'could' with negation or comparison, and that is the usage of these forms in CS.bar; no regular conditional is found in CS.bar (including without local negation: Na men e fihen mé monet).

Table: Irregular verbs in CS.bar (cont.)

Pres.	dond	mond
1SG		é han
2SG		é hes, é[>c']he[t>s]
3SG	é ta, a za, pa za	ia, a[ĩ>y]a
1PL		n'ën damp
2PL		é het, e ^[c'] het, p'an det
3PL	pe dent	é hant, m'a iant ^[c' hant] , mar dant
IMP		é ^[c'] her, pe n'ën der
Pret.		
3SG		
2PL		pa ïesoh
Fut.		
1SG	ma zeign	
2SG		
3SG	é tei, a zeï, nan dei, pan dei	a ïei
1PL	e tehemp	a ïehemp
2PL	é tehet	a ïéhet, n'an dehet, p'an dehet, p'ën dehet
3PL	é tint	pa zint
IMP		p'en deher
Cond.		
1SG		
2SG		
3SG		n'an dehé
1PL		
2PL		
3PL	e tehent	
IMP		
!		
2SG		caé
1PL		
2PL	deut, deut-u	
-!		
2SG		
2PL		n'an det, n'an det-u
PRT	deit	oeit

INF donet, donnet, d'onet, d'onnet monet
 da zonet, da zonnet, da zonnet da monet [da vont]⁹¹

Mond, -n d-forms: a couple could be dond, esp. n'an dehé.

Other verbs of interest:

falvezout: only mar fell, mar fel; a fell, a fel;

talvezout: only na talvo;

piaouañ: only bieu, never with rannig or mutations, eun | te | hui bieu, dehon bieu;

For BE, again an attempt has been made to be exhaustive, but it is likely variants are missed. More contexts within the verbal complex are given than elsewhere, and to compress them, a/b is used for a and b, and (a/b) for a, b or nothing. Note rannig regularly absent after fronted participle and predicate, see under particles.

Table: BE in CS.bar

Pres.		Notes
1SG	bet on, é hon (mé), ec'hon [†] , n'a/en don; é hon mé	
2SG	collet out, é out, é hout, n'an dout, petra oud-é	
3SG	bet eu, eu, na/en deu, pa/n deu, mar deu; contant eu eun	no h-
1PL	bet omp, é homp, e homp, éc'homp [†] , n'an domp; pell' ompni	
2PL	collet oh, é oh, n'a/en doh, p'a/en doh, mar doh; criet oc'hui	no h-, cf. 2PL/3PL oc'h=
3PL	bet int, int, p'en dint, n'e/and int	no h-
IMP		
Impf.		
1SG	é oen, a o ^[u] en	o ^[u] reg., e.g. o ^[u] et 'oad'
2SG		
3SG	ret o ^[u] é, a o ^[u] é, XP / o ^[u] e	
1PL		
2PL	pœ o ^[u] eh	
3PL	na o ^[u] ent	
IMP		
Fut.		
1SG	e/ne/ma vign	
2SG	pa/na/ma vi, na vezi [†]	
3SG	a/pe/ne/na/ma vo, a/pe/n'a vezo	
1PL	a/e/ma/pe vihemp	
2PL	caret vihet, a/pe/ma/na vihet	
3PL	a/pe/ne/m'a vint, ne vihent ^{[vezint][†]}	
IMP		
Cond.		
1SG	a vihen	a 'hag'
2SG	ma na vihés, ioyus vihen ^[s] , a ve ^[i] eh ^{[hes]⁹²}	
3SG	diez vihé, a/m'a/n'a vihé vihé, pa ne vehé [†]	
1PL		vihemp only fut.

⁹¹ The unique cursive modification da vont does not look like da vonet, but I cannot exclude it entirely. The initial is clearly v or u, not m, against systematic da monet elsewhere. Cf. G.Vn: 6, where monèd & mōnt are listed among exceptions to Lm→v, and ALBB 'd'aller', Ploerdut hōn, Bubry i m^oñ, Languidic i mōnēt, Pluméliau i mōnēt, Noyal-Pontivy i wōnēt, but also the southeast Locmariaquer i mōnēt, Ploeren i mōnt, whose m-region is surrounded save to the north by the é hon(e)t type frequent in literature.

⁹² Sc. a veoh > vihes.

2PL	a veoh hui, a ve ^[i] oh ^[hes] , ma veoh, pe véoh	
3PL	el pe vihent	
IMP		
Cd.Pt.		
2PL	<i>bet visent</i>	
Cons.		
1SG	pe ven	
2SG	m'a vés, m'a ves	
3SG	mar bé, a/m'a/ma vé	
1PL	pe vemp, M'a vihemp ^[vihemp] _[vemp]	
2PL		
3PL	pa vent	
IMP	m'a ver, pe ver	
!		pos.,neg. ipv. same
2SG	ne vés, <i>ne ves</i>	
3SG	bezet	
1PL		
2PL	bezet, bet, ne/n'a vet	no be(o)h
3PL		
INF	bezout, bézout	bézout rarer
PRT	bet	no bezet

zo-form: (a) so, 1x zo, 1x a zo, freq. bout a so (not bout (a) ra, bout es)

eus-form (G.GLG31: 92):

ez eus:⁹³

Mæs ret eu coffessat ivé / É hes, helleih a fallanté

Anzavet-u ~~en pep sort stat~~ ^[e hes tut mat]

~~En ho calon é hes repos,~~

predicate/participle + eus:

Ur curun Spern' so lacait ar ma fen, / Ret es bet dign, mantel ru ha corzen {sc. ez eus?}

Bet es ~~fest~~ [[>]dans] gueh aral

nend eus:

N'an des en on, meit fragiltet, / Nemeit miser', ha fallanté.

El n'én des den, n'én deñ cablus {there is not a person who is not}

Positional forms (cf. G.GLG02/31: 40, Châtelier 2016x):

ema-: freq. é ma, é man, é mañ, 1x é mint, 1 mé ma, 1x mé man (sc. no na/e, pa/e, other ma/e).

edi: freq. médi, m'édi, me ~~di~~ ^{ma}; m'é doh, mé doh, mé d'oh; mé domp, me domp.

For HAVE, mostly the 3SG form of BE is transparent, though absence may be noted: 3rd person pres. d-es rather than nonce dev-es, 3rd person future. dev(ez)o never do, cond. stem -ché never -ihé. There is a past conditional not attested with BE. When stems in e have an alternative in é, the latter is exceptional. Present forms are given less exhaustively than others, being discussed above. The infinitive is fully discussed above and not given here.

⁹³ Note syncretic 2SG pres. of HAVE: / ~~É es hoant~~ | Lahet é és ta Salver | Caër é hés clasq' en em iscus'.

Table: BE in HAVE

pres.	b- (1SG, 1PL) a/pe/ne/na mes on es/és	p- (2SG, 2PL) é-hes , (mar) é hés oc'hues, oc'hués	d- [c]an des/dés, an deves ⁹⁴ an/en é des, mar (^h)é des, n'é des (en/p/n'/m')o dés
impf.	em bo ^[u] é	mar o po ^[u] é, o poé	m' é devoé
fut. -z-	n'em bezo (m')on bezo	(en, n')é pezo, né pézo (en,an,m',n',p)o pezo, ^[h] o pezo	an devezo, [a>e]n devezo i o devezo
fut. -Ø-	(n'/p')em bo, m'em' bo on bo	a po ^[pezo] p'ho? ⁹⁵ o pehé	(n')o devehé an devisé
cond.		té pé [?, see below] o pé	an devé, n'en devé, p' é devé en o devé, pe n'o devé
pt.cn.			
cont.	m'on bé		
juss.		(h)o pet, n'o pet	

Notes on tense-mood usage:

Rare past or irrealis conditionals (see generally Le Gléau 1973, 1999; note no such forms even mentioned for W in G.GLG02: 93f. or G.GU: ch. 5):

-future after past with intention, expectation (only usage in G.GLG31: 93, 95, only ex. in G.BA: 36): Mæs meur a gueh an des bet prometet / Na rezé mui dign mé^[dide] offans' ar bet? / Ha na cess' quet [...]

-counterfactual apodosis: *Caerret santañ euit deu den ar^[im] / Eus^[u] an istren ar clorat d'ø zijun / [>bet visent fur] ~~fin visent~~ bet lesel justic tremen / Ha partagign hep proces an istren*

-counterfactual apodosis of BE/HAVE (past conditional forms absent with BE/HAVE unlike with regular verbs even in G.GLG31, G.BA, where the expected forms like vezen are those of the consuetudinal imperfect, but argued to be present as such in IS.mar in Châtelier 2016: 290ff.): Ni on es dré graç' special, / Buhé deguet on receuet; / Quentoh euit cala a reral, / an devisé quen æs crouet

Conditional example and apparent alternations:

Mir' den divéh, mir' ta secret, / Eleh me fedign d'ar miret, / ~~Ferh~~ æs^[c] vihé dit^[c] ar gober, / Ma na vihés ul' langager.

Miret eta ne ~~vihent~~^[vezint] surprenet

Eus a pep drouc hon dilivret, / M'a ~~vihemp~~^[vihemp]_[vemp] ~~sur~~^[sur]_[certen] da vout salvet.

The “aorist” (G.BA) BE and HAVE in W reflects both the MB consuetudinal formation in bez-, and an h-less past subjunctive in be- (on MB, HMSB, Schrijver 2011b, cf. Ernault 1890: 97 = EC 7.4; on development, Hewitt 2001).

The usage in W is (i) generic or habitual, paraphrasable by ‘usually, typically, always, (when) ever’, e.g. pe vé tuem é ven klan “when it is warm, I am ill”; and (ii) as future

⁹⁴ Isolated ex, and not continuative, with no ...devez-: IESUS hon Salver béniguet / Dré Carante doh ar Christen / An deves bet instituet, / Ar Sacramant a Penigen.

⁹⁵ Sc. a po po ‘p’ho po’ > a po pezo ‘p’ho pezo’.

conditions after mar even if not generic or habitual, mar bet klan arhoah “if you are ill tomorrow” (G.GLG31: 92, 02: 91, G.BA: 60, explicitly not mar doh; only future such conditions and forms only with BE discussed and illustrated in G.GU, 36f.).⁹⁶

In CS.bar, we get mostly the generic-habitual uses:

[Sant ha Patron:] En heur m'on bé receuet hanv' ar Sant, En em laca, da vout hon Avocat
 Dré é vertu goudé m'on bé / Commetet pehedeu marvel
 Parailmant n'en devé quet / An Usurer, ami er bet
 Ur moués parfet a chom' er guer, / Nemeit just' p'é devé affer
 An Tut dré Priedelez, / An devé deguet Doüé / Graceu bras
 D'al' laër diveh, d'an usurer, / Restituign a pe larer, / Bras an anquen en o devé
 O peh disordr'! peh tintamar'! / A vé abars an tavarneu,
 Diarben ar meh a sav' en on, / Pe ven guet ma cofession.
 En ur calon étré m'a vés,
 ... / A za liezoh d'on temptign, / Pe vemp en divehan clenvet.
 Broudign a ra hon conscianç' / Pe tosta dimp an drouc speret: / Pe vemp temptet, en
 assuranc'
 Mæs a ~~pa vent abars o passion~~^[**] [e control pe e chomant diuchat], / Pe n'o devé ~~jugemant~~^[na rêson], na
 rêson, [>squiant mat] / Recev' a rant oc'h oll' sacramanteu, / Hep glaharign diarben o
 [p>f]ehedeu.
 Etré m'a ver en Offeren

In mar-conditions, these forms are indeed found a couple of times, but the conditons are generic, and the nonconsuetudinal present is the rule, even in generic conditions:⁹⁷

Groit eta d'o Nessian, / El ma tisiréoh, / ~~Ma veoh en é stat~~, [abars ar mêmés stat] / A vihé groit doh
 oh, / ... // ... Mar bé noaz ar guisquet
 Mar bé goall' elan^[A] v' an disposet / Da oulen bout sacramantet

Mar deu ho priet ur mevier,
 Ur pehet mar deu marvel / A virit, ~~el m'a ouët~~ [ar gout a ret], / Castimant, poen eternal
 Tut a dimezign dihoallet, / N'a couchet quet er péhet sé, / Mar deu groit doh, tut dimezet,
 / Do pardonnign pedet Doüé.
 Ta fond, didé, mar deu païet, / Na zigass' mui p^[r]ourfit^[c] ar bet,
 Mar doh, man breur, amezec mat,
 Mar doh ur [c>•]risten santel,

⁹⁶ ALBB's 'si je suis actuellement malade' is not the future condition discussed in the grammars; it remains of interest that the consuetudinal is used at Locmariaquer-Plœmel but nowhere else.

⁹⁷ With regular verbs, mar usually takes the present for present and future conditions: Consider' crucifiet, / En ur groéz ta Zoué IESUS, / Ha mar credés lar na^[b] pardoni quet | Penos ec'h el un den / Discoen an des ar Fé / ... / **Eun a rei** quement sé / Mar cred parfetamant, / Mar sent fide ivé, / Mar goulen umblemant.. Rarely, mar takes the conditional, presumably to distinguish “si je osais, if I dared” and “si j'ose, if I dare”: see already G.Vn: 6 on this usage: Doüé e'm' guel[>] O coms capabl', / D'[*>é] changign pehour ececrabl', / Mar carehés ar pronnoncign, / En heur m'a vés, prest da pehign. [Sc. “Doue em gwel”, O komz...] | Mar ~~eredehen~~ [carehen] presentemant, / Discleriign ma santimant / Ø guet a^[sort] tut a ueleher, / Marchet aman ar ma faper.

Ne clasquehet mar doh guir' catholiq'
 Mar doh^[dout] capabl' a harzign an avel
 Mar doh choezet, da zat paëron / Cleuet an obligation,
 Guir ar peh a laret, / D'un den a coll', / Mæs, me mes gouniet / ... / Mar d'on mé en
 avanç' / Eus ma argant / P'em bo tennet santanç' / Em bo paymant.

The forms are found in a couple of counterfactual apodoses and one apparent command (cf. G.BA: 60, adding to generic-habitual and future conditons a usage specifically with periphrastic tenses for not only indefinite past but also future past, without example):

Guet^[h] oc'h argant oc'hues^[pouc] contet, / Mar caret-u prenign lounet, / ~~Ar pé ré o pé gouniet, [> profitet]~~ [>diar guerh pe ré^[h] o pezo bet] / ~~Cals pé nebet, do^[e'] h o guerhet~~ {3PL}. [>profit benac, cals pe nebet]
 Hui a consant en ul' laret, An intention oc'hues^[pouc] bet / ~~D'o pout guet on prenet~~^[da trafiquin guet on] lounet, / Ar pé ré o pé pourfitet.
 Doh un tam pecq' a lacan mé, / É mañ forh hanval an danué / Té pé song' mat eus ar coms' man, / Euit te p^[r]ourfit en laran.

14.4 Appendix: Comparanda for dialectology

An attempt to localise the forms of CS.bar is fraught with difficulties turning on incompleteness of descriptions like the ALBB for any given locality, microvariation among speakers and through registers revealed in detailed studies of a locality like Thibault-Cléguérec, McKenna-Guémené, Crahé-Languidic, and for many markers, diachronic change at a given locality. A good example is 3PL subject pronoun in e20C ALBB 'eux ils seraient' Languidic ġin against the detailed study e21C Crahé-Languidic, ordinary dʒe, dʒi, he, songs ĩn^t.

Consider in this light the infinitive of 'mont' in CS.bar, monet, da monet, en ur monet, once by cursive addition da vont, illustrating the two relevant features differentiating the infinitive across place and time in W: final -t vs. -et, and outcome of mutations, expected lenition to v-, leniprovection to f- + neolenition to v-. In 21C BSDB-Inguiniel, we get 'mont' mont, and nearby in early 20C ALBB 'o vont' Ploerdut hõn, Bubry i m'õn, Crahé-Languidic 'mont' [mu'nɛt], 'o vont' [imu'nɛt], ALBB 'o vont' Languidic i mónɛt, Pluméliau i mónɛt, with unfortunately only partial evidence still earlier, t19C MPC-Guémené 'mont' mont, mõnt. At the author's birthplace, we get early 20C ALBB 'o vont' Noyal-Pontivy i wónɛt, nearby Cléguérec i hõnɛt, but earlier in 20C Thibault-Cléguérec 'mont' monɛt, 'da vont' de wonɛt. Early literature has -et, CS.anon 1760 monett, de monett, enn ur monett, IS.pour 1768 monett, de monet, enn ur monet.

Mutations frequently fail to be written in CS.bar, but their absence with 'mont' can be significant. Its can be specifically immune to mutations, G.Vn 1795 includes it alone among open-class lexemes in its list of exceptions, as monèd, mònt, or change to h, see ALBB Ploerdut but not Languidic above, or disappear and then it is as a rule so written, including in all literature close to 1710, NG monet, a ounet, Chalon's 1723, CHal monet, 1718 CHal.ms é ounet, Cillart's 1744 L'Arm monétt, é onéd, 1765 SH énn ur onétt, BT 1744 monétt, de onétt; only rarely is its mutation regular in a system, with the old

leniprovection systematic in ALBB Groix é fõnt, with neolenition and weakening in ALBB Noyal-Pontivy i wõnet.

In turn, these early forms raises the same issues about ending and mutation, relative to the forms found in 19-20C at the localities of known authors, which keep m and can lack e: for Pourchasse, ALBB Ploeren i mõnt, for Chalons, ALBB Sarzeau i mõt, i munyèt, Ernault-Sarzeau mond, dë mont, also moñet, mouniet, moniet, so also nearby e.g. ALBB Locmariaquer i mõñët, while the m-less type is peripheral to these, Quiberon i_w unīët, Damguat, i_w unyèt, Houat é (w)unīët, Belle-Île hõt.

Table: Key ALBB items for CS.bar [t.b.a.]

Table: Selected additional markers of CS.bar

	CS.bar 1710	L'Arm 1744 (*SH 1766)
aet, da vond	oeit, da monet, ^{da vont}	ouiett, de onétt
anv; oc'h anvñ, anvet	hanv'; o c'henuel, hanuet	hanhuë; [hannhuein], hannhuétt
aon	eun	eunë
aour	eur	eure
autrou	autrou	eutru, autrou
badeziant	badiant	badien, badienntt
bemdez	bamdé	bamdé
breur, ma breudeur	breur, man breder	brêre, [berdêrr]
buan	buan	buan, bion
c'hoar	hoer, hoarezet	hoairr, hoarezétt
c'hoarziñ	hoarhet, hoarhign	hoarhein, -étt
daoudroat, treid	deu zruet, treit	trœitt, pl. treitt
debrñ	[en em] zebrin	daibrein, [de] zaibrein
deomp	dä ^o mp	d'eemp
derc'hel, zalc'h	delhel, zalh	dalhein, derhél
dour	deur	deure
digeriñ	digor a rei, a zigorign	diguiorein, digorein
dihunet	dihunet	dihunétt
dilhat	dillat	dillatt
diwezhañ; diwezhat	diuehan; diuehat	déuéhan; déhuéhatt
dorn; daouarn	dorn; daorn	dourne; deourne
eneñv, -où	iné, -veu; ée	inean, -eu
eñ	eun	ean, ein, einhuë
eveldoc'h	el doh	eell doh* [eell, e'veell]
ezhomm;	^{iz} ehom;	e'hom
ezhommek/-g	^{iz} ehomec, ehomec, éhomec, e[h>z]omec	
gallout	gallout, é (h)ell-	eëllein, guellein, guëlloutt
gouelañ	gouillign	ouil-ein, -étt
gouzout	gout	gouyein, goairin, goutt
ouzomp, n'ouzon	ouïamp, n'on	
ouzo	ouï[ei>o]	
gwiskañ	guisquet, guisquign	gussquein
heol	hiall	hiaule
heuliañ; prt. heuliet	heuli [a rant]; huliet [sic, also 2PL]	hélyein, -étt
heur	heur	ære
hiziv	hiriv'	hirihuë, hinihuë
int (pronoun)	i	Vannes ind, Noyal-P., Moréac i
kemero	quemero, quemerei	[quemér, -ein]
klañv	clan, clanv', elân	clan

kouezhañ	couehel	couéh-ein, -eh, -éll
kreñv; kreñvaet	crev'; créhueit	créan, crehuë; créhuennétt
kuzañ	cuhet, cuhign	cuh-ein, -étt
leun (a zour)	lan a, carguet a, ^{carguett} lan a	leine (a zeure)
ma fen	ma fen	peenn
menezioù	maneïeu	mannéyeu
merc'h	merh, merhet	mærh, pl. étt, rare ædeu
mezvier	mevier	meaouérr
naon	nan, na ^{ou} n	nanne
neñv	[an] ée, eé, éé	nean, einhuë
oferenn	offèren	ovérènn, offèrènn, offèrne
paour kaezh den	peur quæs; den	peure; quéah; deine
pec'herion keizh	péhourien quæs	[er] béhèrion queih
pinvidig	pinvic, pinvidic	pihuic, pihuinic
prenañ	preñgn	preinein
preñv	prenv'	prean, preinhuë
redek	redec	rid-ein, -éc
reiñ; roet - ober; graet	raign, reign; reit - ober, gober, gober; groit	rein; reitt - gobèrr; groeitt
sec'hed	sehet	séhétt
sizhun	suhun	suhunn
teod	teat	téatt, téyatt
tro	tro	tro
unan	un ^a n	unan, unon
vadelezh	vadelez, vadeleh	vadeleah

Table: ez kwele, en ho kwele

	2SG	2PL
CS.bar 1710	en é guelé	En ^{ho} ^e guelé
NG 1680	e ne gullé	
MG (Arradon-Huédic) 1791		én hou culé
Kanaouennoù-pobl a vro Wened 1891	én ha hulé	
Thibault-Cléguérec 1914		n' hu kēle
ALBB c.-east type, Noyal-Pontivy		i nu kçélé (#gçélé)
ALBB west type, Ploerdut (Guémené) ⁹⁸		nò kwèlé (#gwèlé)
ALBB s.-east type, Ploeren	na wīlī (#gulī)	
ALBB Houat	na ulé _e (#gœl'é _e)	

14.5 Appendix: 3rd person pronominal arguments in 21C Inguiniel

The following illustrates 3rd pronominal argument coding in 21C Inguiniel drawn from BSDB. The usage is that expected for 21 western varieties: strong = HAVE-object, proclitic object elsewhere (only attested in infinitives, but cf. 1SG here with finite form), a-forms (finite and nonfinite, not attested with HAVE), with no evidence for imperative objects. 3SGM has two forms but they not appear to be distinguished by syntactic context. 3SGF also has two forms, hi independent and enclitic, î-h proclitic.

Table: 3rd person pronouns in BDSB-Inguiniel

	3SGM
Strong	Déh ni'bes guelet i vreur ha hioñ

⁹⁸ Cf. BSDB-Inguiniel or guele 'ur gwele' in Appendix.

Doubling	i gadoér-hioñ i brad-hioñ
Subject	Hioñ 'nes nim lahet Pe lakeh ledu ba or poufèr foñt, hioñ iè de vout vil bemann, hioñ 'nes laket - Heu, hoñ 'noa laket Kè hoñ zè de labourat goudé hoñ chomè eih té hoñ zo oeit doh tu ha hoñ uelè tout en dud ... ha hoñ larè
Proclitic object	oeit oér d'en klah
Enclitic object	laket 'moè hioñ ar en auter - ha ni'bes hoñ laket tout
Possessor	see doubling
	3PL
Strong Doubling	ha lod zo pet tapet de noz hale-sen, hè, e zichennè anze ion, a ia mè hè ⁹⁹
Subject	Kè hè stèrda o dént Mè hè me guela moarhat lém hè ou dè feurmet en doar
Proclitic object	hioñ jonjè or sort 'h oè rhet dehoñ, o hiemer. Ia, mè, kemeret 'noa hè.
Enclitic object	ni'bes ket hè ni guelet see strong, proclitic object
A-form	pe glaouet anehè doh nim binkein èl-sen me uela anehè èl rhouañnezed Hémb mont de zeskein anehè d'er skoul
Possessor	o sèd ¹⁰⁰ ou sud o hiezeg 'o c'hezeg' o argant
	3SGF
Strong Doubling	
Subject	mè hi zè a-gul ha hi'doa hoarh see possessor
Proclitic object	deskauz vezè rhet î sroein 'mehè ket bet-mein gellet îh arrast keñn
Enclitic object	m'mes hi laket mont
A-form	
Possessor	Hi'doa pet î sèrtifikat, hi ouiè, heu, galleg èuè ou sud

BSDB-Inguiniel has comparanda to the dialectal markers in Table, e.g. 'h 'ont 'o vond', kreñuhañ 'kreñvañ', kohel^h rè 'kouezañ a rae', ion 'eeun', or guele 'ur gwele'.

⁹⁹ "...int, a ziskenne aze eeun, a ya mes int"

¹⁰⁰ "o zeod"

14.6 Appendix: Guillevic and Le Goff on 1SG, 2SG

The two editions of G.GLG differ in description vs. normative guidelines for 1SG, 2SG clitics, with different information given at different points:

Table: G.GLG editions on 1SG/2SG clitics

<p>p. 1902</p> <p>10 Possessive teL, haL: te dok, ta vizied, ha dok, ha vizied</p> <p>13 Object teP, haP, m'ha talhou, with te deleted in corrigenda</p> <p>32 “On emploie aujourd’hui ha out te, suivant les régions: m'em es ha kuélet ou m'em mes te huélet, je t'ai vu ; m'ha kuélou out me te huélou, je te verrai. On emploie aussi généralement me, en toute position. Mais, em s'emploie aussi aux temps simples des verbes et après de: ean men guélou ou em guélou, il me verra; ean e zeï de men guélet, ou d'em guélet, il viendra me voir. Les écrivains feront bien de s'en tenir à l'usage ancien, gardé par les autres dialectes, et d'employer toujours me, te aux temps composés, em, ha aux temps simples et après de: m'em es te huélet vs. m'ha kuélou, d'ha kuélet.”</p> <p>34 “Les formes em, ha devraient s'employer après certaines particules terminées par une voyelle de, é; les formes me, te partout ailleurs. -- De fait on emploie aujourd'hui en toute position, ha dans certaines cantons, te dans autres. On emploie partout me en toute position; mais on se sert volontiers de em après de et é: d'em zad à mon père; ém zi dans ma maison (ém = é + em).”</p> <p>76 Negative imperative is ne me lahet ket. “Il faut aussi noter quelques expressions consacrés: comme men Doué, me sekouret, mon Dieu, secourez-moi [contrast ex. of ipv in the Corrigenda though not wrt this, sékouret me ém feuranté]. A la troisième personne, pour se conformer à l'usage des autres dialectes, on devrait mettre le pronom avant le verb : déent ha me héliéent qu'ils viennent et me suivent”</p> <p>147</p> <p>153</p>	<p>1931</p> <p>Possessive teL in Argoed, haL in Arvor: te dok, te vizied; ha dok, ha vizied</p> <p>Object haP, m'ha kuélou: “Dans l'Argoed la forme ha n'est employée que dans le verbe en devout et devant un verbe actif à un mode personnel: en tout autre cas, on se sert de la forme te. Dans l'Arvor te est inconnu aussi bien comme adjectif que comme pronom: on emploie toujours ha, avec affaiblissement devant les noms, et avec renforcement devant les verbes même à l'infinitif et au participe. Argoed: eit te huélet, m'em es te huélet. Arvor: eit ha kuélet, m'em es ha kuélet.”</p> <p>“Il convient d'employer les formes em, ha aux temps simples des verbes, les formes me, te aux temps composés et devant l'infinitif non précédé de de: M'ha kuél je te vois, hui em guélou vous me verrez, ean en des te huélet il t'a vu, ean en des men guélet il m'a vu, aveit te huélet, aveit men guélet, pour te voir, me voir, mais d'ha kuélet, d'em guélet.”</p> <p>“Il convient d'employer ha (au lieu de te) après la préposition de, em (au lieu de me) après les prepositions de et é. De là les combinaisons suivants: d'em, à mon; ém, en mon.”</p> <p>Negative imperative is n'em lahet ket. “L'impératif sans négation peut être précédé de l'adjectif possessif absolu: men Doué, me sekouret, mon Dieu, secourez-moi; hon kredet, croyez-nous; me hélient, qu'ils me suivent; te sekourent, qu'ils te secourent. La forme em et aussi dans l'Argoed la forme ha ne s'emploient qu'en liaison avec une particule à voyelle (e, é, ne, pe, re, de) ou après ma et mar.”</p> <p>[Supplementary notes on the variety of St. Allouestre:] “te, ton, te, jamais ha: me te vadé, de te zorn.”</p> <p>Les fomes vannetaises em et ha (=za) représentent l'agglutination d'une voyelle avec le pronom infixé; tandis que les formes me, te et ha (=da) ne sont en réalité que des pronoms possessifs absolus, qui, en l'absence de particule à voyelle, remplacent les pronoms personnels infixés. En principe on devrait donc dire: doh te huélet ou doh ha huélet (non doh ha kuélet); m'em es te zalhet ou ha zalhet (non ha talhet). C'est-à-dire que l'infinitif et le participe devraient être traités comme des noms. Mais depuis un siècle, l'usage contraire a prévalu dans presque tout l'Arvor: doh ha kuélet [note 1: §A Berric cependant on dit: doh ha huélet et mé ha huél.] A la première personne, en l'absence de particule à voyelle, on dit partout me (non em): doh men guélet, ean en des men dalhet; men Doé, me sekouret (impératif).</p>
---	--

Cf. Le Goff 1927, discussing classical usage with haL=N but haP=FIN: “L'infinitif, le participe, l'impératif étant assimilés à des noms devraient subir après ha la mutation douce de l'initiale. Or, à partir de 1830, on commence à trouver dans les manuscrits des exemples de renforcement. Peu à peu le renforcement passe en habitude et s'impose à la

plus grande partie de l'Arvor, où l'on écrit aujourd'hui m'em es ha kuelet, me ven ha pahatat. C'est une déviation de la langue. Nous ne la croyons pas irrémédiable. Les habitants de l'Arvor ne sont nullement choqués quand ils entendent prononcer m'em es ha uélet ou même m'em es te uélet.”