The earliest forms of endevout or mihi esse in Breton

Milan Rezac

The earliest forms of *endevout* or *mihi esse* in Breton

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER
milan_rezac@yahoo.ca

Abstract: The *mihi est* or *en d-eus* formation of Middle Breton combines finite forms of 'be' with accusative clitics and an element *de* in 'be to, have'. In 18C, coastal varieties of the southeast make regular use of its infinitive, *mihi esse* or *en de-vout*, where finite forms of 'be' are replaced with their infinitive *bout* of 'be'. Here earlier forms of *mihi esse* are identified in a 1612/25 Middle Breton text by an author from the southwest. They include other verbal nouns of 'be', *en de-uezout* and *en de-uezaff*. The *en devezout* type is fully elaborated in an unpublished text by an inland southeastern author of 1710. These forms suggest earlier, more widespread, and more diverse *mihi esse*, and clarify its formation.

Dans la formation *mihi est* ou *en d-eus* du moyen breton, des formes finies de 'être' se combinent avec des clitiques accusatifs et un élément *de* en 3e personne pour obtenir 'avoir'. Au XVIIIe siècle, l'infinitif *mihi esse* ou *en de-vout* de cette formation fait partie des variétés maritimes du sud-est, substituant leur infinitif *bout* de 'être' aux formes finies de 'être' en *mihi est*. Dans cet article, des formes antérieures de *mihi esse* sont identifiées dans un texte moyen breton de 1612/1625 d'un écrivain du sud-ouest. Elles incluent d'autres formes du nom verbal de 'être', *en de-uezout* et *de-uezaff*. La formation *en devezout* est pleinement élaborée dans un texte inédit de 1710 d'un auteur de l'arrière-pays du sud-est. Ces nouvelles formes donnent à *mihi esse* une attestation plus précoce, large, et diverse, et contribuent à la compréhension de sa formation.

1 Introduction

In the *mihi est* formation of Middle Breton MB, finite forms of *be* combine with accusative clitics in a usage similar to lexical *have/avoir*, as in *a=m=bezo* "I will have" of 1331 (Bo[†]) with the 1S clitic *=m=* and *bezo* "will be".[1] An element *de* intervenes when the clitic is 3rd person, as with the 3M clitic *en=* in *en=de-uezo* "he will have" of 1530 (J[†] 2225). The formation is shared with Middle Cornish MC, and apart from the distribution of *de*, with Middle Welsh (Fleuriot 2001, *CG:* §476ff.). In Breton alone, it combines with the resultative participle to form the *have/avoir*-perfect of active transitives. After 17C, the formation remained *mihi est* in varieties of the southeast or Gwened, in the sense that it continued to be renewed by new forms of clitics and of *be* as these developed (Rezac 2020: 4.3, cf. esp. Le Goff 1927).

Historically, only finite forms of *be* seem to have participated in the formation, and only these are found there until 17C in Breton. In this restriction, *mihi est* is unusual. There were verbal nouns of *be* in MB and MC, and they appear as counterparts of finite

[1] The Leipzig convention is followed of using = for clitic boundary, 1/2/3 abbreviate person, S/P number, M/F gender, only distinguished in 3S and written 3M/F. The term accusative is used for clitics that code direct objects of finite transitives, genitive for various arguments of nominals such as possessors; these are distinct before MB, only in 3M in MB, and draw apart after MB. The application of the terms *mihi est* and *mihi esse* to Breton follows Ernault 1888, *apud me est* Greene 1979 for Irish, cf. generally Heine 1997.

be in constructions similar in use to *mihi est*: in *apud me est* where *be* combines with prepositions like 'to' in 'be to, be one's, have'; in the *be*-passive of transitives that often translated *have*-perfects; and in the *be*-perfect of intransitives, joined by reflexivised transitives in Breton. Yet for constructions that only used *mihi est* in finite clauses, like 'have regret', there was no *mihi esse* based on verbal nouns of *be*, and instead, the verbal noun of transitive 'find, get' was used, MB *caffout*, MC *cafos*, in suppletion with *mihi est*, since finite forms of this verb did not have this usage.

This state of affairs remains largely stable throughout texts of 14-17C MB. It is the usual pattern even for the first author that will be seen to extend *mihi est* to verbal nouns of *be* in *mihi esse*: Yves Gueguen of early 17C. The use of *caffout* for lexical *have* is seen in his *Nep à confes hep* ***caffout*** *attrition* "Whoever confesses without **having** contrition" (Cnf² 92). The rest of the sentence shows the verbal noun *bezaff* of *be* in the *be*-passive, *da lauaret eo, hep nep cueuz da* ***bezaff gantaff offancet*** *an Autrou Doué dré è pechedou maruel* "that is to say, without any regret of **being by him offended the Lord God** through his mortal sins". The same verbal noun is found in *apud me est* in his *oz* ***ò bezaff dimp*** *breman euel goestlou quer* "**nous estans** maintenant cõme chers gages" (Bel 93). Y. Gueguen's precedessor G. Keranpuil and contemporary T. Gueguen in catechisms and confessionals have the same patterns. An example from the latter illustrates *apud me est* in translating lexical *have/avoir*, *A quement ha me oz* ***bezaff bet diff*** *an Lecteur ves an leur ancien Latin* "Pour moy **ayant eu** la lecture du liure ancien Latin" (Be 40).[2]

In 18C Gwenedeg, one formation of *mihi esse* prevailed in coastal varieties and builds on their sole verbal noun or infinitive of *be*, *bout* (section 2). This formation may already appear in a 1612/1625 Middle Breton text of Yves Gueguen's from the southwest or Kerne, but it adds *mihi esse* forms built on the verbal nouns of *be* of his variety, *bezout* and *bezaff*, in the types *en deuezout* and *endeuezaff* (section 3). Later in 17C, forms built on *bout* have been identified in the first texts of Gwenedeg, the *prônes* of 1631 and 1693 (section 4). These are completed paradigmatically and syntagmatically in one of the earliest texts of 18C, Per Barisy's unpublished *Cantiqueu Spirituel* of 1710, but beside *bout* he also uses *bézout*, and both are bases of full paradigms of *mihi esse* in the types *endevout* and *endevezout* (section 5). They include some of the earliest 1S and 2S forms and these shed some light on the construction of *mihi esse* (section 6). The findings bear on the place and time of the formation and the factors that entered into it (section 7).

2 Background: 18C Gwenedeg

Background to the rise of *mihi esse* is the changing nature of nonfinite forms of *be*. Historically, these were nominalisations like *existence*, or verbal nouns. Of this origin, they kept genitive clitics, and used them to code the intransitive subject, as in *their existence*, and transitive object or rarely subject, as in *their destruction*. However, they had enough of the syntax of finite clauses to occur in constructions where English needs gerunds rather than nominalisations, *their being people, ready, fallen, invited*. This is the usage of verbal nouns in both MB and MC, including Y. Gueguen in early 17C: transitive *…en enorer ouz é gueruell* "one honors him [acc. *en*] by calling him [gen. *e*]" for "on

[2] Translations into English are mine and as close to glosses as is feasible for the elements of interest which are often highlighted, save when Breton translates a known source and it is useful to give it (for Bel, French rather than Italian is used, see the Appendix; for Be, French in Le Menn 2002).

l'honore en l'inuoquãt" (Bel 97); intransitive in *ouzpen é bezaff diuin* "outre son estre diuin" (Bel 5); passive in *ouz e bezaff bet barnet* lit. "his [*e*] being been judged" for "qu'ayant esté … contamné" (Bel 37).

Gwenedeg texts start to appear about this time, and as soon as they offer evidence, verbal nouns have become true infinitives with respect to argument coding: they take accusative clitics for the transitive object, like finite clauses, and they lose genitive clitics for the intransitive subject. In the "Christmas Hymns" of c. 1680, the older and newer system coexist (Hemon 1956: §53), genitive *e* in *euit e vartirou* "for his martyring", sc. "to martyr him" (NG 1511) but accusative *er* in *Euit er confondou* "for confounding him" (NG 1419). The next brief text of 1693 only has an isolated accusative (PR 328). P. Barisy's CS.bar of 1710 almost invariably uses accusative for the object and the genitive is gone for the subject (Rezac 2021b). This is the rule thereafter (further section 4).

It is in Gwenedeg of 18-19C that *mihi esse* is best known (*LVB*: 198f., *HMSB*: §140, Chatelier 2016a). This "classical" formation takes *mihi est* with a finite form of *be* such as future *bou*, e.g. provected *pou* in *hou=pou* '2P=be.FUT' or lenited *vou* in *en=de-vou* '3M=de-be.FUT', and replaces it with the infinitive *bout* of *be*, *hou=pout*, *en=de-vout*. There is revealing early variation in 1S and 2S discussed later, and a contraction of *en devout* to *en dout*, attributed to Vannes in an anonymous 1795 grammar, but also characteristic of western varieties at all periods. Most forms of this type of *mihi esse* are already found in a 1734 collection of hymns GU, including 2P *hou poud* and 3M in *en devoud* and *en doud*. These *mihi esse* forms are used in all the same enviroments as *mihi est*, i.e. as lexical *have* alongside the older suppletive *caout*, and the *have*-perfect of active transitives that had no infinitive form earlier (cf. section 7).

This *mihi esse* type is best known from texts of authors originating from the eastern coastal area around Vannes. They include L. Pourchasse *1724 and his student J. Marion *1759, where *mihi esse* is studied and contextualised in Châtelier 2016ab.[3] It is also used by Pourchasse's contemporary M. Sanson *1736 in his Gospel retelling PT, and earlier in two influential works of C.-V. Cillart *1686, his 1766 translation SH of Parvilliers's *Les stations de Jerusalem*, and his pseudonymous 1744 dictionary, which aims to describe the usage at Vannes over that even of its suburbs and elsewhere in Gwened (p. vi). From the southeast, and partly through Cillart, come the *mihi esse* forms in the unpublished material of the dictionary of P. Châlons, the 1718 CHal.ms. The formation is set out in the unsigned grammatical appendix to *Vocabulaire nouveau* of c. 1795 (Lambert 1979), which attributes the contracted *en doud* to Vannes, and so *en devoud* to elsewhere (Anon 1795: 13). It is part of the 1836 grammar of J. Guillome, practicing near Vannes though of more central-inland origin at Malguénac. In the early 20C *ALBB*, *mihi esse* is documented on the coast only in the southeast around Vannes, but inland, at least traces of it seem to go up along the eastern border all the way to St. Allouestre (map 360).

On the western coast of Gwened, *mihi esse* is early present in the Gospel retelling HJC, written by J. Géquélleu (Gicquello) *1787 from Merlevenez and published in 1818 at Lorient, systematic in its use of western features in break with the southeastern literary tradition (Le Pipec 2015). From the island of Groix facing Lorient comes the sole full paradigm of *mihi esse* in 20C, in the grammar of Ternes 1970, matched by usage in the literary works and family correspondences of Y.-B. Calloc'h *1888 (cf. Le Besco 1995). Between Vannes and Lorient, perhaps the formation can be inferred for Auray through

[3] Biographical details given often draw on *PRELIB*.

the grammar of A.-M. Le Bayon 1878, for though he gives forms of different varieties, he writes as if *mihi esse* was native to his own (p. 72-3).

Finally, there are a number of sources as early as or earlier than all these in 18C, but anonymous and unprovenanced within Gwenedeg. They include the collection of hymns *Cantikeu spirituel* CS.anon published in 1766, the play *Buhé enn tri Roué* BT of 1745, the only partly published *Guærzenneu santél* GU of 1734, and forms from another collection of hymns reported in Le Goff 1927 and dated there to 1700. The dialectal markers of these works are specifically of southeast Gwened, for instance the type *dehou* rather than *dehon* 'to him', but both are found in CS.anon.

This distribution in 18C is completed by the grammar of Rostrenen 1738, which gives as the infinitive of *mihi est* corresponding to *avoir* not only *cahout* but also *en devezout, en devout*, and his dictionary of 1732, where under *avoir* is found "Cahout … èndevout. endevezout. èndeffout. *Van*. Qéhut, endevout." If the structure of the entry is intentional and consistent with his preface, then all these are pronounced differently, and there is an *endevout* used only in the diocese of Vannes, and *èndevout, endevezout,* and *èndeffout* that are not so limited. The form *endevout* is of the formation described so far, but *endevezout* is not, and has been described as "ajouté" by Rostrenen's in *LVB*: 199 and "not found elsewhere" in *HMSB*: §140.10. It will presently be seen in Y. Gueguen's text Bel and P. Barisy's CS.bar. Bel is among the few sources that Rostrenen cites by name, but his examples in this and other entries of the dictionary do not come from Bel.

Apart from Groix, *mihi esse* is gone in well-documented varieties that retain *mihi est* in 20-1C. They use *caout* for lexical *have*, which had always remained available beside *mihi esse*, and *bout* for the auxiliary of perfect actives, which had not been so used in the above works (so early generally in Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 42, cf. for several authors in Chatelier 2016ab; late, west Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014). In some areas *bout* is also found alongside *caout* as lexical *have* (*ALBB*: map. 360, Ternes 1970: 16.3.3 beside *mihi esse*, Le Besco 1992: 119 with earlier *mihi esse*) and may have been so used quite early (Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *droit*, *suffir*, there too beside *mihi esse*).

3 1612/25 Middle Breton: Y. Gueguen

3.1 The formation

Yves Gueguen is the author of one late Middle Breton text, the confessional Cnf, and the translator another, Bellarmin's catechism Bel. Both were first published in 1612 at Nantes, but Bel only remains in a 1625 edition at Morlaix (Appendix). According to their prefaces, Y. Gueguen was from the bishopric and diocese of Kerne, and composed Cnf as priest in Kerne, but translated Bel as almoner to the bishop of Nantes (cf. Dujardin 1956). His language in these works may be compared to his contemporary T. Gueguen from Saint-Pol-de-Léon and parson of Plougerneau, translating similar material in Do, Mc, as well as a saint's life Be in the 1620's (Le Menn 2002); slightly earlier, G. Keranpuil from near Morlaix but practicing near Carhaix, translating the catechism of Canisius in 1576 (Ernault 1928); more distant in subject matter, the anonymous translator of a saint's life Cath in 1576 (Keranpuil in Schrijver 2011a); and G. Quiquer "of Roscoff", translating a didactic colloquy in 1626 (Le Goaziou 1950).[4]

[4] The study of Bel and Cnf is in intent exhaustive in certain respects, including *mihi esse*, while other

Bel offers twelve forms of *mihi esse*, inventoried with context, sources, and translations in the Appendix. All are 3M or 3P. They are used both as lexical *have* and *have*-perfect, though they are rare in the text relative to the usual strategies of the period for translating *have*-constructions like the *be*-passive or *caout*, which can stand alongside them even in the same sentence. They may be introduced through one fuller passage, the sole where *mihi esse* is not translated from Bellarmin, and several briefer ones that illustrate the range of formations found in Bel.

(1) *Mihi esse* and *mihi est* in Y. Gueguen's Bel of 1612/25

a. Lexical *have*, 3P, *ò dezuout*, based on *bout*
Ouzpen, pennaus bizhuic-|quen ne dléont esperiff da caffet dispancc, mar **oz deueus** bet an hardizder nequet hep muy quen oz vezaff eureudet, hoguen yuez græt com-|pagnunez charnel, (autramant consomet an priedelæz neant) oz **ò dezuout** an aznaoude-|guez deueus an ampeschamant à yoe entrezo da gallout bezaff priedou,
"Moreover, how they must never hope to have dispensation, if they **have had** [3P=de(v)-be] the hardihood, not only being married, but also made carnal companionship (in other words consumed the void marriage) with **them having** [3P=de(v)-be.INF] knowledge of the impedance that was between them to be able to be spouses". (Be 255)

b. Lexical *have*, 3M, *en dezuout*, based on *bout*
ouz **en dezuout** an den an eneff, an corf,
"[Parce que] l'hõme **ayãt** l'ame, le corps, " (Bel 161)

c. Perfect *have*, 3P, *hoz deuezout*, based on *bezout*
ouz **hoz deue-|zout** collet an mat souueran
"**ayant** perdu vn souuerain bien, " (Bel 174)

d. Perfect *have*, 3M, *en deuezaff*, based on *bezaff*
quent euit **endeuezaff** an holl consantet gant an volontez
"auant **que d'auoir** consenty entierement auec la volonté" (Bel 192)

e. Perfect *have*, 3M, *en dezout*, based on *bezout* or *bout*
ouz **en-|dezout** desquet
"**ayant** apprins" (Bel 104)

The forms may be compared to finite *mihi est* and *be* in Table 1.[5]

---

generalisations about them are based on examination of the entire texts but searches of transcripts of only about two-thirds in continuous passages of varying length. -| indicates hyphen at line boundary.

[5] Several forms do not match expectations (*HMSB*: §139-140, Schrijver 2011a: 5.8.5-6). The *veze, vez(h)ent* forms of *be* put here under present conditional do seem to be so used even at this date, and not habitual imperfect, which has not been found here (already through loss of /ð/, Hewitt 2010: 299?). The habitual present of *be* is regular, but that of *mihi est* does not always seem used as expected (esp. Bel 120). *en deus* vs. *en deue(u)s* looks like older /en døs/ and newer /en devøs/ with *v* introduced from *b*-forms, and that is consistent with other *eueus* orthographies, save that the negation of *eus* 'be' can be *n'en deueus* beside *n'en deus* (e.g. Bel 28, Cnf² 38), so either *en deueus* can spell /en døs/, or *nend eus* has acquired *nen deveus* as

Table 1: Forms of *mihi est* and 3S *be* in Bel (° rare, *-eus* also *-eux*)

	mihi est (3M *en,* 3F *he,* 3P *ò/hoz* +)	be (in brackets additional 3P)
Pres.	deueus, deus, °deues	eus, *negated* n'en deueus, n'en deus
Fut.	deuezo	vezo(ff), °vezho
Ipf./Pret.	de(z)uoe, °de(z)ue	b/voe, °voue
Cond. pres.	de(u)ffue, deuff(h)e, de(u)ffuhe	ve, °veze [°vent, °vehent, vez(h)ent]
Cond. past	°deuise	°vise
Hab. pres.	deuez	vez
Hab. past	–	–
Jussive	°deuezet	b/vezet
Participle	*same as be*	bet, bezet
Verb. noun	*see discussion*	b/vezaff, b/vezout

The clitics of *mihi esse* are the usual accusative 3M *en*, accusative-genitive 3P *(h)oz, ò* of the text, followed by the element *de*, as in *mihi est*. This beginning is twice followed transparently by the verbal nouns of of *be* used in the text, *bezout* and *bezaff*, and for the rest by forms that can be related to them, or the third verbal noun, *bout*.

3.2 Verbal nouns of *be*

The verbal nouns of *be* in MB are *bout*, the sole form with an external cognate in MC *bos*, later the form used in Gwened and adjacent parts of Kerne; *bezaff*, the form whose descendants prevailed elsewhere; and *bezout*, later rare, with a distribution left to later (section 7). Y. Gueguen of Kerne uses *bezaff* and *bezout* as the verbal noun of *be*, but not, it seems, *bout*, save in compounds of *be* like *aznauout* 'recognise' (*HMSB*: §141ff.). The distribution of these forms in *mihi esse* is given in Table 2.

Table 2: verbal noun endings of *mihi esse* in Bel (perfect+ lexical *have*)

	3M	3P	3M/1P
-deuezaff	1 en		
-deuezout		1 hoz	1 hon
-dezuout	+1 en	2+1 ò	1 hon
-dezout	4 en		

The form *bezout* seems transparent in its expected lenited fom *uezout* in 3P *hoz deuezout* /(h)o devezut/. The formation is found later in P. Barisy's 1710 *o devezout* discussed below, beside Rostrenen's 1732, 1738 *endevezout*.

The form *bezaff* likewise would seem to be transparent in 3M *endeuezaff ... consantet*. The conjunction *quent euit* 'before' is well attested in Bel and Cnf, and as elsewhere in MB, it is directly followed by verbal nouns, while finite verbs need the

byform (cf. Schrijver's 1997: 173 origin for *eus*). Rare *en deues* is clearly = *en deueus* (Bel 25). *uffu, uff, ffu* is commonly /v/ after /e/, /i/, rarely /a/, beside usual /ṽ/, not /f/, which usually lacks *u*, *effet, diffen* &c, cf. Cnf² *en deffé* rare beside *deffué* &c, but /evhe/ has not been noted here outside *mihi est* in Bel.

addition of *ma* or *na*, as … *quent euit ma con-|sante an volontez* "auant que la volonté y consente" that closes the sentence with *endeuezaff*. The verbal noun here as elsewhere translates infinitive in the sources, *d'auoir consenty* or *d'averci … consentito*. The sole reason to hesitate is because *bezaff* is not elsewhere attested in *mihi esse* at all, but so would not be *en deuezout* if it were not for Barisy and Rostrenen, and Gueguen is the sole author with *mihi esse* in an area where *bezaff* survives later.[6]

The majority of *mihi esse* formations in Bel add to *en, ò de-* the endings *-zuout* and *-zout*. Of these the first, *-zuout*, looks like it reflects the remaining verbal noun, *bout*, and a full account of it can also explain *-zout*. The form *bout* is not used by Y. Gueguen for *be*, but remains in compounds of *be*, of which the most relevant to *mihi esse* is *deuruout* 'want'. In MB, *deur-* is the only verb to share with *mihi est* the coding of the subject by accusative clitics and their doubling of nonclitic subjects (Hemon 1975: §151, Rezac 2021a: 4.3, 5.1, 5.3). The oldest verbal noun of it is based on *bout*, *deuruout* /dørvut/ based on *bout* already in 14C (Ca), and frequent in Y. Gueguen (at least 6 in Bel). Even more frequent is *deu(z)ruezout*, etymologically /dørvezut/ (at least 4 in Bel, 5 in Cnf), elsewhere attested by late 16C (Gk). Finally, there is *deuzrueout* /dørveut/ (at least 1 in Bel, 1 in Cnf), derivable by loss of intervocalic loss of /ð/ (q.v. Jørgensen 2013:n7 on this period in Kerne, and earlier finally, Schrijver 2011a: 4.11). A consequence of the loss is nonetymological *z* in in Y. Gueguen's orthography, frequent finally, *dezez* 'to them', *restituz* 'restitutes', rare medially, *paezaff* 'pay' (Bel 128).

Like *deuruout*, *en dezuout* can be analysed with /vout/ from *bout*. If *z* spelled /ð/, that would give /en deðvut/, which calls for unprecedent attachment of *-vout* to an innvoated stem *ende(ue)z-*. However, as has seen, intervocalic *z* can be purely orthographic; *zu* in particular can have the value /θv/ > /ðv/ in frequent *eizuet, seizuet, bizuiquen*, but also rarely /v/ in *dezuer* 'duty' (Bel 112), *ez-|uelheñ* 'like this' (Bel 74), *aznazue* 'knew' (Bel 117) (cf. *HMSB*: §141n, Schrijver 2011a: 5.8.7; *aznazue* fills the attestation gap noted there for MB). The usage of *zu* for /v/ seems the best solution for the the imperfects *en dezu(o)e, he dezuoe, oz dezuoe*, less frequent than their *z*-less counterparts, but well attested in the text. If *endezuout* then is /en devut/, we have in it the regular formation of 18C Gwenedeg for *mihi esse*, attaching *bout* to clitic (+ *de*).

The remaining *mihi esse* form *endezout* can as /en deut/ formally bear the same relationship to *endezut* /endevut/ as *aznaout* /aznaut/ does to *aznauout* /aznavut/ (Bel 37 vs. 74). Both would then reflect reductions of *-vout*. Alternatively, *endezout* as /en de(ð)ut/ can be an early contraction of *endevezout* /en de(ð)ut/ of the type *en devez* > *en dez*. This seems unattested until considerably later, including in the grammar of

[6] If *endeuezaff* were anomalously a finite verb, it would perhaps best be taken as future in /o/, usually *off* in the text, but attested as *aff*, *d'ar fin maz exaucçaff Doué hon pedẽn* "so that God fulfill our prayer" (Bel 219, also 211). The future would be odd but not inexplicable in its context as part of the apodosis a counterfactual dependent on the present conditional. *aff* can also spell the 3M enclitic, usually *euff* in Cnf and always in Bel, but once *aff* in *nep en-|deuesaff graet à dougoff an toas d'ã fornn* "whoever has made it will bring the dough to the oven" (Cnf² 124), perhaps the forerunner of later change (Rezac 2021a: 349n17). This 3M is unlikely to be a direct object rephrasing the locative clitic of *auerci consentito*, since 'consent' in the text and sources is used absolutely or oblique argument, *ne consantet quet gant an volontez dan heuelep desir* "qu'on ne consente point à tel desir auec la volonté" (Bel 127). It is also unlikely to be an "echoic" doubling *en-*, since it satisfies none of the usual conditions on doubling in the text, such as disambiguation (Bel 24) or questions (Bel 151). Cnf² has what at first looks to be 1P *mihi esse* based on *bezaff*, *goudé ma hon bezaff lauaret* (Cnf² 107), but by the arguments given that should be future *hon bezo*.

Dumoulin 1800, an author from and with features of Kerne (Lambert 1976). The contraction gives such forms as 3M, 3P future *en, ho dezo* to Bel *en, ò deuezo*. An early contracted /ende(ð)ut/ might be spelled *endezuout* if there were precedent for *zu* as /∅/ or excrescent /w/, as in *gouzuie* 'knew' (Bel 22) which is presumably /guje/, and similarly *gouz-|uient* (Bel 255), *gouzuizieguæz* 'knowledge' (Bel 131) beside *gouizieguez* (254) (*HMSB*: §141n, Schrijver 2011a: 5.8.7). This path to *endezuout* does not predict the unattested orthography *endeuout* as /en devout/ does, nor does it make use of *bout* unattested for the author in an innovation that may have been his.

The *mihi esse* formations of Y. Gueguen are then all of them expected from the known formations of *mihi esse*, the forms of the verbal noun of *be*, and the author's orthography: straightforwardly his unique but elsewhere corroborated if rare *endevezout*, the unique *endevezaff*, and the orthographically obscured *endez(u)out* as reflex either of the same formation as *endevezout* or of the usual type *endevout*.[7]

3.3 Anomalies

The 3M forms of *mihi esse* are five times built on the expected *en de-*, like *mihi est*, but twice *hon de* appears, suggestig 1P *hon*, and at least once reflecting 1P.

One is *En* ***n'hon dezuout*** *neptra é propr* "A **n'auoir** rien de propre" (Bel 131), the beginning of the answer to "En quoy consiste le conseil de la Pauureté?" and continued by *oz vezaff r'hoet à diaraouc é holl madou dan paouryen* "ayant auparauant donné tout son bien au pauures". The 3M anaphor *é* suggests *hon dezuout* is 3M and 3M is indeed the form of *mihi esse* with such generic subjects of *mihi esse* later in Gwenedeg. The *o* might reflect the influence of another near-innovation of Y. Gueguen's found in this example, negation of verbal nouns (earlier *HMSB*: §186, later Rostrenen 1732 in what might be intentionally Gwenedeg examples, s.v. *avoir, savoir*). This could have influenced the orthography here, because Y. Gueguen's verbal nouns are almost always followed by *oz*, as in *n'oz lesell quet netra* "ne laissant rien" (Bel 157), or because *n'* here translates *non* in Italian *In non aver cosa alcuna propria* (see Appendix).[8]

The other exception looks similar, but reflects a different construction, with no earlier or later analogues known to me in *mihi esse*: *Ouz vezaff r'hoet domp é map propr, ha dre an moien à nezaff, ouz* ***hon deuezout*** *adoptet euit é bugale* "nous ayant donné son propre Fils, & par le moyen d'iceluy **nous ayant** adoptez pour ses enfans" (Bel 171). Y. Gueguen is one of the earliest writers to use the participle of the perfect as the host of

[7] It is tempting to relate *endezuout* : *endeuout* to Rostrenen's *èndeffout* : *èndevout*, by his conventions /f/ vs. /v/. In most 16C texts, there are *f* as well as *u* spellings of expected /v/ in *mihi est* imperfect and preterite, type *en deffoa, -e*, but not a.o. habitual *endeuez, -e*, nor plain *be voa, voe, vez* (cf. *LVB*: 195-6, *HMSB*: §140ff.). These could be linked to *endeffout* if reflex of /σuoV/ (cf. Schrijver 2011: 4.5(1), 5.8.5), or of late introduction of /v/ (preterite remodelled on imperfect). Then Bel's spelling *zu* could also be related, leaving open how: 20 type *en deuoe* against 5 type *en dezuoe*, so in *endezuout*, but 0 in type *en deuez-*. That distribution could also be avoidance of *zu* /v/ before *z*, but then cf. *gouzuiziegæz* (Bel), and the *f*-spellings as analogy from conditional to imperfect to preterite, Ernault 1890: §82, but cf. *deurfoe* ($B^{\dagger}$, emend. $M^{\dagger}$).

[8] A phonological road to *hon* as 3M is hard to evaluate. 3M *en=* is once *an* in *andeueus* (Bel 151). That is frequent for 3M of *mihi est* in late 16C Gk, and there *an* has been seen as reflex of a later change in Treger (Ernault 1928-30: 220n6, cf. Rezac 2020: 329n18), perhaps through /ẽn/, and then relateable to 3M *=e(u)ff* /eṽ/ > /ẽ/ > /ã/ *=aff* also common later in Treger but also attested early in 16C MB (Ernault 1914: 64n1, cf. Rezac 2021a: 339n17). In Bel /aṽ/ > /ã/ is at least once spelled *off* beside *aff*, *an re brassoff noz deuez an brassaff seaou* "que les plus grands, auroient des plus grandes robbes" (Bel 54).

object proclitics, e.g. *endeueus hon tennet* "il nous a retirez [lit. has us drawn]" (Bel 16), and contrasts on this with his contemporary T. Gueguen, who avoids and circumvents the proclitics here (Rezac 2021a: 3.4). We would then expect *ouz en deuezout hon adopted*. Yet there is some precedent for attempting to put the object proclitic on the auxiliary in the perfect, both earlier and later, and the resulting two-proclitic clusters can be reduced (Ernault 1890: 472, *LVB*: 202, Rezac 2021a: 353). Thus *ouz hon deuezout adoptet* might reflect near-haplology of *ouz hon en deuezout adoptet*.

Interpretively, *ouz hon deuezout adopted* cannot be a 1P form of *mihi esse*, and formally, it does not correspond to a a 1P form of *mihi est* of the period because of *de*. Yet it is precisely to 1P that *de* comes to extend in 18C (*HMSB*: §140n2), and again one of the earliest attestations is in the grammar of Dumoulin 1800 from Kerne: to MB *hon eux, hon oa, hon bezo*, etc., correspond his *hon dus*, ipf. *hon devoa,* fut. *hon dezo*, etc. (p. 80ff.). There is otherwise no trace of this in Y. Gueguen, and the absence is meaningful, since 1P *hon* + *b*-forms if *be* like fut. *(h)on bezoff* are well attested in the text (> 8), and include the verbal noun, *ouz on bezaff pecheryen* "estans pecheurs" (Bel 80). Nevertheless, an early role of this extension here cannot be excluded in this example, nor in the preceding despite its 3M anaphor, since 1P often has a generic role.

4 17C Gwenedeg: Prônes and Christmas Hymns

In 17C, there are three texts where there has been identified *mihi esse* as such, in *HMSB*: §140.10 or Hemon 1956: §80-1. All are southeastern Gwenedeg. Two postdate the innovation of accusative objects of infinitives, but the earliest offers no evidence.

Two of the texts are 1631 and 1693 *prônes*, that is texts of the dominical parish mass. Their *mihi esse* uses *bout* like later 18C, and its use appears systematic relative to expected usage in 18C, not the sporadic alternative to *caout* and *be*-passive of MB in Y. Gueguen. Yet in 1631, *mihi esse* is only found in 2S and 2P, that is forms syncretic with earlier genitive clitic + verbal noun of plain *be*, and the 3rd person with its distinctive *de*-element awaits the 1693 rephrasing a 1631 finite form (see further section 6).

(2) *Mihi esse* in 1631 and 1693 Prones (save 2S, see section 6)

2P: 1631 *è pehany è recommandanff de ouh* ***hou bout*** *dévotion particulier*
1693 *de péhany é recommandan doh hou pout dévotion particulière*
"to whom I recommend to you **to have** particular devotion"
1631 *peheny à recommandanff deuh* ***hou bout*** *ordinairement en ou intention*
"which I recommend to you **to have** ordinarily in your thought"
3P: 1693 *manque a* ***hou devout*** *houah groeit satisfaction*
"by lack of their having still made satisfaction"
(1631: *dré nou deuihé quet houeh groeit satisfaction*, "for they would not have…")

The other major Gwenedeg text of 17C is the "Christmas Hymns" NG, edited in Hemon 1956 and dated there to c. 1680 (see further Jørgensen 2013). Hemon 1956: §80-1 identifies two instances of *mihi esse*, i.e. verbal nouns of the 'to have' rather than 'to be', but they are not included in *HMSB*: §140.10. One is unlikely to be *mihi esse*: *rac e vout bet cruel* "for [thee] having been cruel" (NG 489, tr. Hemon). The main verb is *be*, and its

auxiliary should be plain *be*, not *be* in *mihi esse* – that is, the finite counterpart would be *rac ma hout bet cruel*, not *rac ma hes bet cruel*. That is so elsewhere in NG, for instance *e ré saluet, / a uo er baradoues goudé* ***bout bet*** *de guefuret* "the joys of the saved, / Who will be in Paradise after **having been** together" (NG 908; finite *be*-perfect of *be* NG 560, 821, 'fall' 1265, vs. of *mihi est* NG 1642). The other example is *Hep hou but goulennet* (NG 280; on *but* rather than *bout*, see section 7). It too lends itself to analysis with plain *be*, as passive auxiliary "Without [you] being asked", rather than *mihi esse* as auxiliary of the perfect active "Without [you] having asked" (tr. Hemon). Both suit the context, but perhaps plain *be* is supported by the absence of provection in *hou bout*, which is usual in the text (Hemon 1956: §46, e.g. *hou buhé* "your life" NG 948) – save for *mihi est*, where provection is regular (Hemon 1956: §80, 2P *ou pou, ou poué*).

The present analysis attributes to NG the MB syntagm where genitive clitics to verbal nouns coded the subject of intransitives and the promoted object of passives; that is, we have continuations of MB *rac da bout bet cruel, rac da bout bet goulennet*. Remnants of this use of genitive clitics are rare in 18C Gwenedeg, *é ounet el é zonnet* "son retour, aussi bien que … son aller" (CHal.ms iii, cited in *DEVRI*: s.v. *mont*, 1718). These may be lexicalised nominalisations, *his return*, and as such, rare in Gwenedeg (Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 68; cf. Stephens 1982: 4.2). Elsewhere NG uses rather the type *Euit huy bout en peurante* "Despite you being in poverty" (NG 230), as later Gwenedeg, while the older type continues throughout 18C in Tregereg, *vit ma boud maleurus* "despite my being unhappy" (EN 1007, cited in *DEVRI* s.v. *evit*, Rezac 2021a: 4.5). Yet at least *rac e vout bet cruel* seems fairly clear as instance of the older type going back to MB. Perhaps 2S genitive + *be e vout* remained here precisely because it coincided with the new *mihi esse* syntagm 2S accusative + *be*, as it would not in 3rd person where the older *e vout* "his being" type contrasts the newer *mihi esse* in *en devout* "his having" (cf. section 6).

5 1710 inland Gwenedeg: P. Barisy

Cantiqueu spirituel CS.bar† is the title of an unpublished manuscript collection of hymns "Composed by Per Barisy Parson of the Parish of Inguiniel, Bishopric of Gwened" and dated 1710. It is one of a number of such collections that start to appear in Gwenedeg at the time (Jørgensen 2013, Le Menn 1998). It is preceded by the "Christmas Hymns" NG of c. 1680, and an unpublished collection of 1700 cited in Le Goff 1927; it is followed by *Guærzænneu Santel* GU of 1734 partly excerpted in Loth 1886, 1890, and *Cantikeu Spirituel* CS.anon published in 1760. Among Barisy's hymns some have counterparts in this last collection, or are added to C.-V. Cillart's 1766 translation *Stationneu hur-Salvér* SH and M. Sanson's 1787 Gospel retelling *Passion ha Tragériss hon Salvér* PT.[9]

P. Barisy was born in 1659 at Noyal-Pontivy, near the northeastern boundary of Gwenedeg, but served as parson of Inguiniel, near its northwestern interface with Kerneveg. In the preface, he notes dialectal variation within Gwened, and states: "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

[9] Generalisations about 18C Gwenedeg are based on the full text of CS.bar, apart from certain cursive additions and emendations (Rezac 2021b), and of BT, GU, SH, MG, but more limited examinations of other texts, some focus of work drawn on here (esp. Châtelier 2016ab for J. Marion and L. Pourchasse).

m'est echapé quelques mots qui ne sont nullement usités dans la partie superieure de Vannes", although "je me suis conservé la liberté de m'en écarter lors que je le jugerois a propos", such as *eus* for *ag* 'of'.

The language is indeed Gwenedeg, with its characteristic /θ/ > /h/ or 1S proclitic *man, mem* or distribution of *ema* and *eo* forms of *be*. Within Gwenedeg, it differs from the emerging literary norms based on southeastern varieties, for instance in systematic 3M *dehon*, not *dehou*, perhaps alone this early (cf. Le Pipec 2018). In some ways, it is unique (cf. note 12). It is less clear what aspects of it to attribute to the northeast, Noyal-Pontivy, and which to the northwest, Inguiniel (see section 7).

CS.bar is the first text or nearly so known so far with a full paradigm of *mihi esse*, and that across all contexts of the usage of finite *mihi est*:[10]

(3) *Mihi esse* in in CS.bar and early analogues

1710 Queu bras a mes, **~~man~~^{em} bout** oc'h offancet
"Great regret I have [of] **me having** offended you" (CS.bar)
1700 me mes quée man bout offanset
"I have regret [of] **me having** offended" (Le Goff 1927: 203)
1734 me méss kai hem-boud offansélt [sic]
"I have regret [of] **me having** offended" (GU 1734 in Loth 1886: 320)

CS.bar uses two infinitives of *be*, *bézout* and *bout*. Its *mihi esse* recruits both, *bout* in the later familiar type 2P *ho pout*, 3M *en devout*, *bezout* in the type 2P *ho pézout, en devezout*, otherwise only in Y. Gueguen and Rostrenen. The forms and the elements that enter into them are given in Tables 3-4, beside those of the first full grammar of Gwenedeg, Guillome 1836. The forms of *mihi est* are largely transparent combinations of forms of *be*, accusative proclitics otherwise coding transitive objects, and the element *de* after 3rd person proclitics. The forms of *mihi esse* almost entirely follow this transparent formation, apart from 1S and 2S, which will be discussed separately (section 6).

[10] CS.bar is manuscript in bookhand emended in several layers of the same hand and in cursive. Quotations from it use *ɑ* for *a* emended to *e* or vice versa, *v* for *v* to *u* or vice versa, c^g for *c* to *g*, b^p for *b* to *p*, italics for forms found only as cursive, superscript if only in emendations, strikethrough for strikethrough. Reference to form *types* use *ɑ* even if there is simply variation of *a, e*, and similar *é* even if in variation with *e*.

Table 3: *Mihi est/esse* formations in CS.bar of 1710 and Guillome 1836[11]

	b- (1S, 1P)		p- (2S, 2P)		d- (3M|3F, 3P)		cf. BE (3S)	
	1710	1836	1710	1836	1710	1836	1710	1836
pres.	mes	mès	é hés	e hès	αn|$^{(h)}$é dés, an deves	en des	és	ès
	on és	hun nès	oc'hués	e huès	o dés	ou dès		
ipf.	em bo$^{(u)}$é	em boé		ha poe	αn|é devoé	en doé	o$^{(u)}$é	boé/oé
		hun boé	o po^{u}é	hou poé		ou doé		
fut.	em b(ez)o	em bou	é pezo	ha pou	αn devezo	en dou	v(ez)o	vou
	on b(ez)o	hun bou	$^{(h)}$o pezo, *po*	hou pou	o devezo	ou dou		
pr.cd.		em béhé		ha péhé		en déhé	vihé, vehé	b/véhé
		hun béhé	o pehé	hou péhé	o devehé	ou déhé		
pt.cd.					an devisé		cf. 3P *visent*	
hab.			é pé		αn|é devé		b/vé	bé
	on bé		o pé		o devé			
juss.				ha péès		en déet	bezet,	béet
			(h)o pet	hou péet		ou déent	cf. 2P b/v(ez)et	
inf.	man, *mem* b(ez)out	em bout	te pout	ha pout	αn|é dev(ez)out	en dout	b/vézout, b/vout	b/vout
	(h)on b(ez)out	hun bout	(h)o p(ez)out	hou pout	o dev(ez)out	ou dout		

Table 4: Relationship of proclitics in *mihi est/esse* to objects of transitives[12]

	1710		1836	
	trans. object	mihi est/esse	trans. object	mihi est/esse
3M	é$^{L!}$=N		é^{L}=N	*same*
	αR^{Sk}=$V_{FIN/INF}$	*same*	eR^{Sk}=$V_{FIN/INF}$	
3F	(h)é$^{L!}$=	*same*	hé^{S}=	*same*
3P	(h)o$^{S!}$-c'h=	*same*	ou^{S}=	*same*
1S	=em$^{S!}$=, mαN$^{S!}$=	mαN$^{S!}$=	=em^{S}=, meN^{S}=	(=)em^{S}=
2S	=é$^{L!}$=, tα$^{LS!}$=	=é^{P}=BE_{FIN} te^{P}=BE_{INF}	ha^{P}-ç=V_{FIN} ha^{L}-ç=N/V_{INF}	ha^{P}-ç=
1P	(h)on$^{\cdot!}$=	*same*	hun^{S}=, huR^{Sk}=	*same*
2P	(h)o$^{P!}$-ch=	*same*	hou-ç^{P}=	*same*

Table 5 resumes the distribution of *mihi esse* across the categories of lexical *mihi est* (synthetic, save once in the perfect) and perfects of transitives with various objects ('live', 'assent to' intransitives are given under –, with absolute uses 'do', 'receive').

[11] In 2S, *é* is part of *mihi est* and *mihi esse* in Barisy, not a preceding element like the *ez*-particle, and that is also so for *ha* in Guillome, but less certainly for his *e* in the present.

[12] Among proclitics, *=x=* are mesoclitic used in both Barisy and Guillome (i) after prepositions *dα=, é=* and (ii) with synthetic finite verb save imperative-jussive (see section 6). Guillome does not give 1S, 2S with infinitive or participle, but they are to an extent inferable from the author's other texts. The prevocalic linker is given after -. Mutations are superscripted, · none, *Sk* spirantisation of *k* alone. In Barisy, mutations are rarely indicated, e.g. only with the commonest nouns for 2S, and then partly expected, *ta c^{g}alon*, *en é c^{g}alon*, *ta oall' buhé*, partly not but with analogues elsewhere, *ta feden*, or finally part of a one or two systematic, anomalous, and unique patterns of *t/d→z* or *tr→zr* notated *!*, e.g both *ta zeulagad* and *ta zut* (see the inventories in Rezac 2021b).

Table 5: *Mihi esse* constructions in CS.bar (forms with *-ez-* after +)[13]

	Lexical	Perfect of transitives						
Obj. / Subj.	NP	=3F	=3F	1S=	1P=	2P=	em-	NP	–
3M		1			1	+1 +1		2+1 [2]	
3F	1								
3P	3 [3]		1			1		3+1	
1S	+1					1		1+2 [2]	2
1P	5+1 [4]			+1		2 [1]			1
2S	3 [3]							1	1
2P	18+4 [21]		2 [1]				1	9+2	1

The constructions are illustrated by the following sample:

(4) *Mihi esse* constructions in CS.bar

a. Perfect of lexical *have* 3P + 3F.INAN
   Hac ar ré n'an des quet i bet / D'o devout i groit dilijanç'.
   "And those who have not had it [sc. confirmation] / to have it make diligence."
b. Perfect of transitive 2P + 1S
   Dihui a laran trugaré, / … / A ho pezout me honservet
   "To you I say thinks, / … / For having preserved me."
c. Perfect of transitive reflexivised
   Goudé o pout em accuset
   "After you having accused yourself"
d. Perfect of intransitive 1P
   Bras an anquen … / Hon bout bevet, quen dissolit~~a~~[e]mant.
   "Great the chagrin … / [Of] us having lived so dissolutely"
e. Lexical *have* 3F + NP
   Oc'h é devout ar é pen / Ur curun pretius meurbet
   "With her having on her head"
f. Lexical *have* 2S + NP
   Hep te pout an avantag'
   "Without thee having the advantage"
g. Perfect of transitive 3P + NP
   O glaharign … / O devezout groit dibaucheu
   "[The gourmand, the drunkard …] regretting / having made debaucheries"

Of particular interest are examples with distinct clause-internal subjects, one as the inflection of a prepositional complementiser, one free (and another free in *A te pout*... "Despite thee having" discussed under 2S, section 6).

(5) *Mihi esse* with specified subjects in CS.bar

[13] [*x*] indicates that there are *x* distinct nouns for lexical *have*, verbs for *have*-perfect.

a. Prepositional complementiser 2P + Lexical *have* 2P + NP
   Quit' oh ho pout an diæsamant, / A so staguet doh an argant.
   "Without you having the unease / That is attached to your money"
b. Free 3P + Perfect transitive 3P + NP
   hac i naoah o devout tremenet / un hir amser é penigen calet
   "Despite them yet having passed / a long time in hard penance"

The text also has the first known occurrence of the *ober* 'do' conjugation of *mihi est* (for early instances, Ernault 1888: 265; 1890: 473-4).

(6) Earliest *do*-conjugations of *mihi est*

1710 En em changet; ho pout a rei pardon
"Change yourselves; You will have pardon" (CS.bar)
1718 hou poud ra
"vous avez" (CHal.ms, cited in Ernault 1888: 265)
1732 en devezout ara cals a spered éndevout ara *ou* en deffout ara, cals a spered
"il a beacoup d'esprit" (Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *avoir*, cf. s.vv. *a*, *corpulence*)

Other than for *mihi esse*, *have* and *be* constructions are much as expected. The infinitive *bout* of plain *be* is used where plain *be* is used finite clauses: nominal and adjectival predicates and locative expressions, *Eleh bezout digor* "Instead of being open", not infrequently passives, *Goudé bout bet, gueton caret* "After having been by him loved", and rarely perfects of intransitives, *A vezout deit d'o visitign* "[Give thanks to Jesus /] of having come to visit them", *Diarben bezout de hé manquet* "Because of having failed at them [sc. duties]". None of these use *mihi esse*, save transitive-like intransitives 'live', 'assent to' given in Table 5. *Caout* is frequent in contexts where lexical *have* or 'find, get' are possible readings, *Rac caout pardon* "to have/find pardon", but only *mihi esse* is attested in locutions like *ho pout song'* "have thought" that had *caffout* in MB.

6 The forms of 1S and 2S

In 18C forms of *mihi esse*, the accusative proclitic and *de* element in it largely remain constant, save for taking up certain innovations of accusative proclitics coding objects, like changes to the vowel and final consonant of 1P. To this generalisation 1S and 2S are exceptions, and offer hint about the systems where *mihi esse* was formed.

The distinctiveness of 1S/2S comes from their history, illustrated here for 1S. Accusative proclitics had earlier been mesoclitics under Vendryes's Restriction: they attached not only rightward to the finite verb, but also leftward to the first proclitic conjunction or particle of the verbal complex, like *a=* : *ez=* (in MB form). By 14C MB, they had remained mesoclitics only in 1S/2S, so that to 1S MC *a=m=* ~ *y=m=* correspond MB *a=m=* : *e=m=*. Otherwise become simple proclitics, so that 3M MC *a=n=, y=n=* lost the particle in MB *en=* : *en=*, or the latter became *en=en=* with a new variant *en* of the *ez*-particle used before vowel/*h*-initial proclitics. By 14C as well, accusative and genitive series of pro/mesoclitics had mostly collapsed apart from 3M, e.g.

MC 3F accusative *=s=* and genitive *hy=* but MB *he=* for both. The collapse made available simple proclitic forms of 1S/2S when needed; thus verb-initial imperatives needed enclitics in MC, but in MB they could resort to originally genitive forms, like 1S MB *ma=*, *va=*, 17C– Gwenedeg *mαN=*.[14]

In Gwenedeg, 1S on finite verbs had become a simple proclitic no later than the end of 18C (Rezac 2020: 329n17). By then, it can be seen that accusative *a=m=* : *e=m=* is no longer continued as the expected *e=m=* : *é=m=*, being rather *em=* : *(en=)em=*, like for instance 3M already in MB. In contrast, 1S on nouns and infinitives continued to make the distinction of proclitic *mαN=* and mesoclitic *é=m=* 'in the', *dα=m=* 'to the'. These patterns may go back to 17C and remained into 19C.[15]

Thus when *mihi esse* was formed by replacing finite by infinitive *be* in *mihi est* forms like 1S=be.FUT *em=bou*, mesoclisis was not an obstacle to keeping *em*, giving *em=bout*. That is attested no later than 1734, *kei* ***hem-bout*** *offansélt* 'regret [of] **me having** offended' (GU cited in Loth 1886: 320). Yet this formation broke the correspondence of object coding by *em=* with finite verbs and by *mαN=* with infinitives. This correspondence was recruited in the alternative formation of *mihi esse*, regular in the 1710 CS.bar *queu ...* ***man***^{em} ***bout*** *oc'h offancet* "regret [of] **me having** offended you", and first attested in a 1700 collection of hyms *qeé* ***man bout*** *offancet* (cited in Le Goff 1927: 203). Authors could combine both formations, early C.-V. Cillart in his 1744 dictionary of Vannes: *Mé garehai* ***em boud*** *é gratt vatt* 'I would like **to have** his good will"; *quena eellan* ***m'emm boutt*** *me henale* "until I cannot **have** my breath". After *dα=* 'to', objects of infinitives were always *em=*, and so was *mihi esse*, not found in CS.bar, but 1734 GU *d'emboud assolvæn* "to have absolution" (Loth 1886: 320).

These differing *mihi esse* formations tell us something about the systems where they arose. Only the *mαN=bout* formation is expected for a period where accusative *=m=* remained mesoclitic, and that perhaps underlies the earliness of *man=bout*. When accusative clitics were only mesoclitic, they could not have been extended from finite clauses in this manner, save after prepositions to host them. This goes not just for 1S but across the board: there was no way of taking shared MB-MC **=n=de=vɪð* and swapping in **but* to give a free-standing form. The *mαN=bout* formation relies on the recognition of *em=* in finite forms of *mihi est* as the same element as *em=* coding transitive objects so that it could be replaced by *mαN=* in infinitives (cf. Ernault 1888: 253-4, Le Goff 1927: 202-3). That would have worked early for 1st/2nd person forms, but in 3rd there was also the *de*-element: **en-de-vɪð > ɪ=ðe-vut* or *ɪ=vut*? Retention of *de* is characteristic of *mihi*

[14] *mαN* abbreviates forms that varies in *a, e* and add a homorganic nasal before voiced stops, usually with spirantising mutation (on the form, Schrijver 2011b: 4.7.1, mutations, Le Roux 1896, *CG*: §216).

[15] The accusative-genitive pattern described is robust in the works of J. Marion, esp. rich in 1S in MG, and earlier texts seem consistent with it, but object 1S in *ez*-context has almost not been found here in Pourchasse or Cillart (*... enn em pardonet*, SH 93), P. Barisy has mostly lost the *a : ez* distinction and redistributed *en* (Rezac 2021b), and NG has just one object *em*, in *a*-particle context (NG 1625, add to Hemon 1956: §62). Once *em=* was proclitic, it could be extended onto the old territory of *mαN*, as in Le Bayon's 1872 *Doue en dès em/me haret* "God has loved me" (see later Châtelier 2016b: 430, 433). More usual appears to have been extension of *mαN=* to finite verbs and nouns, for finite verbs sporadic in late 18 (*HMSB* §54.1) and systematic in Le Bayon 1872 (and once for *ém* with a noun, p. 70), often complete for all categories in 20C (west Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014, infinitives all areas Guillevic and Le Goff 1931: 152-3, cf. Châtelier 2016b: 429, but *mə=*, *=m=* with all categories in Groix, Ternes 1970).

esse formations as we have them, and gives away those of Y. Gueguen as such, rather than as some alternative, which would not be revealed by 1st/2nd person forms.[16]

For 2S, evidence of simple proclitic rather than mesoclitic goes at least to 1710 CS.bar, for its 2S *é=* is found in contexs of *a* > *e* and *ez* > *é* particles and after the *en-* variant of *ez/é*. Yet the distribution of 2S forms tracks the old proclitic-mesoclitic distinction through two proclitic forms: *tα=* with nouns, infinitives and participles initially, *é=* with them after the prepositions *dα, en*, and *é=* before finite verbs initially or after particles and conjunctions, Table 6. Except for details of form, this distribution of *tV=, (h)V=* seems to be also that of C.-V. Cillart's 1760 SH and J. Marion's 1790 MG, and that of nouns at least at Mûr-de-Bretagne in the early 20C *ALLB*. Early and late it stands beside a remarkable variety of other patterns such as uniform *tV=* or *(h)V=*.[17]

Table 6: 2S proclitic in CS.bar (not exhaustive)

	MB proclitic context	MB mesoclitic context
V_{FIN}	–	~~*Eun é lez té*~~ "He leaves thee"
		M'é clevei "I will hear thee"
		… En é recev' "[…] receives thee"
		a pé guelan "when I see thee"
PRT	*An devezo te comẽttet* "has committed thee"	–
INF	*te convertissign* "convert thee"	*D'é corrigign* "to correct thee"
	Doh$^{>a}$ *te guelet*^{te} "of seeing thee"	
N	*te zigaré* "thy excuse"	*d'é Zat* "to thy father"
	ta vuhé "thy life"	*en é c*^{g}*alon* "in thy heart"
	ta feden "thy prayer"	
mihi est	–	*Freziou é po* "expenses thou wilt have"
		… en é pezo "if … / thou wilt have"
		n'é pezo quet "thou won't have"
mihi esse	*te pout* [see below]	[unattested]

In forming *mihi esse*, Barisy may have followed analogues of both the *mαN bout* and *em bout* strategies, recruiting *tα=* from objects of infinitives, or importing *é=* from finite clauses. Evidence for *tα=* is *Usign a res ta buhé / **hep te pout** an avantag'* "Thou usest up

[16] The initial of the *mihi esse* type *mem bout* is homophonous with *mihi est* after proclitic *ma* 'that' or subject pronoun *mé* 'I' *m'em bou* "as I.will have", "I will have", which might have influenced *mem bout* (Ernault 1888: 265 for the latter). By the time of these examples of Cillart's, *mem bout* has already spread to environments where *ma* and *mé* not available independently. Intriguingly, Barisy systematically writes *man, m'an b(éz)out* but *M'em' bo*, before sometimes emending *man* to *mem* in all its uses.

[17] Gwenedeg forms, linker and mutation of 2S proclitics can usually be attributed to some plausible source, but became dissociated. For forms, the vowels of *he=* (widespead), *é=* (NG, CS.bar) parallel those of the *a-* particle *e, ez-*particle and *e-*preposition *é*, and in that sense are expected developments corresponding to MB *a=z=*, *e=z=* with both noun and verb. *ta=, te=* (widespread) seem to correspond to MB *da=* (HMSB: §54.2), and that has a by-form *ta=* in early 17C texts (e.g. Bel 85-6). NG *té=* is unclear. *ha=, he=* (widespread) can also be related to MB *en ha* of late 16C Gk (*HMSB* §54.2, *CG*: §216), but the contrast of mainland /a/ and island /xa/ is unclear (*ALBB*, Ternes 1970). The prevocalic *-ç* associated with *(h)V* forms is an expected counterpart of MB *=z=* and did not extend to *tV* (Schrijver 2011). On the other hand, mutations seem to have extensively migrated between forms from their origin in lenition with *da=* and complex changes with *=z=* /θ/ such as leniprovection of *b* (Schrijver 2011). Some mutation variants are well-described (Guillome 1836, Le Bayon 1872, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902, 1931, Le Goff 1927, Ternes 1970), others are only partluy documented (*ALLB*), and later apparently unknown types are well attested early (e.g. *te horolleu, hrimeu* of SH, *he Zatt* of CS.anon).

thy life / **without having** the advantage". The preposition *hep* otherwise only combines directly with the verbal complex, for instance *hep ar carign* "without loving him", including with *mihi esse*, ***Hep o pezout*** *pinvidiguez* "**without you having** wealth". Evidence for *é* comes from *Pé guelan struiign an argant / … / Hep gallout donet en pen / **A te pout** patiantet* "When I see thee scatter thy money / … / Without being able to succeed / **Despite thee having** patience". It should be analysed as *t'é pout* if we go by the few other instances of concessive *(h)a* because these are followed by subjects: *Naoah n'an deu, brepet caranteus, / Doh it, man Breur, **ha te bout** quer cablus* "Nevertheless is he not always loving / To thee, my Brother, **despite thee being** so guilty."

Remarkably, neither strategy is followed fully: the mutation of *te=, *é=* in *mihi esse* is provection, while whenever we get to examine their mutations independently, it is lenition, or the special *t/d* → *z* of the work, as in Table 6. It is tempting to suppose that Barisy's *te pout, *é pout* originated in varieties that differed from his by provection of 2S, such as those near Vannes that gave the form *hα pout* of early grammars (*ha pout* in Anon 1795: 13, Guillome 1836: 53) and used by writers from the area (J. Marion *he pout* in 1791 MG, L. Pourchasse *hé pout* in 1792 COS).

Yet that may overinterpret the limited evidence. There are few 2S forms of *mihi esse* in 17-18C, but one is frequently rephrased since its first attestation in 1631. It is in the commandment against coveting and lets us see the mutation of 2S, usually followed by commandments that reveal the form and mutation of 2S with nouns. A 17-18C sample is below; the first means *Good on the earth shalt not want / **For thy having** [sc. it] by deceit – And confess **all thy sins** – And **thy Saviour** shalt receive*, and the others are close.[18]

(7) 2S in commandments

1631 Mat ar en douar ne desiri / **Euit é yout** dré tromperi – Ha cohessa **ol hé behet** – Ha **ta Saluer** à receui[19] (Prone)
1693 Mat ar en douar ne houantey, **evit a vout-y** dré trompery. – **Te béhédeu** a gonvessy – Ha **te salver** a receuy (PRone)
1734 **eitt te voud i** (GU)
1766 Mad ar enn Douar né houantehi / **Aveit te-voud intt** dré dromperi – **Te béhédeu** a govessi … Ha **te Salvér** a recehui (C.-V. Cillart, SH)
1785 Mad ar enn doar ne hoantei, **eit ha vout ean** dré dromperi – **Te behédeu** e govessei … Ha **te Salvér** e receüei (L. Pourchasse, CAT.13)
1791 Mad ar en doar ne hoantei, **eit he poud ean** dré dromperi – **T'he béhedeu** e govessei (J. Marion, MG)
1792 Mad ar en doar ne hoantein, / **Eit-t'he poud ean** dré dromperi – **The béhedeu** e govessei … **The Dad Salvér** e receuei (J. Marion, IS.mar)
1810 Né zesirei madou hanni / **Eit he-poud int** dré dromperi -- **Ha behedeu** a govessei – Ha **te Salvér** a receuei (CAT.1810)

This sample suggests that from the outset of attestation, forms and mutations of 2S varied both across varieties, and within a given variety like that of the Prone of 1631.

[18] The form rather than mutation of 2S in *mihi esse* here is obscured by the preceding *t* of *euit*, cf. the orthographies of J. Marion's IS.mar and MG.
[19] Loth 1905: 345n3 "probablement *e vout* ou *e hout*".

Such variation is common in early verse, for instance C.-V. Cillart's 1766 mixed usage like *Causs-out de Varhuë Jesus* ***he datt*** *... séle* ***te labour*****,** reprising P. Barisy's consistent usage in *Caus' out da varv' IESUS* ***ta zat*** *... sell' tɑ labour* "Cause art to death of Jesus **thy father** … see **thy labour**" (SH 149-151, CS.bar 182-4). Cillart also has such mixtures in his prose, even in coordination, *péhani enn déss* ***he carrétt*** *particuliéremantt,* ***te chérissett*** "qui t'a tant aimée & chérie" (SH 100). Still in prose, such mixing is richly attested at the other end of the Gwenedeg area in J. Géquelleu's Gospel retelling HJC of 1818, again even in coordination, *te anvironneo ... te ranfermo, hac ha sterdeo* "will surround thee, enclose thee, and press thee" (HJC 268).

It may be that this unique variation of 2S relates to its early expressive dimension in many varieties. In 16C verse, 2S seems to indicate both familiary between kin or friend and superior authority, but it had become sufficiently associated with *dispris* 'contempt' for Y. Gueguen that he adds to his 1625 translation of Bellarmin's catechism: "I know well that you will find it strange, that one talks sometimes to God, and to the Virgin Mary his mother, through *thou* in this booklet, because one finds it contemptuous to talk like this in Breton; but if you consider, how the translator has been constrained to follow altogether the style of the author, I believe that you will take it as excuse" (Bel 284).[20] P. Barisy in 1710 typically uses 2S so, to reproach and admonish the sinner, and in the rich person's outraged address to the poor and the scathing reply, and when it is used merely to instruct, it is reserved to Jesus. Similar appears to be the usage of J. Marion's *Magasin Spirituel* of 1791, of 18C verses attributed to L. Pourchasse in various collections, and of the c. 1680 "Christmas hymns" NG, less obviously Cillart's few examles in 1766 SH. In J. Géquélleu's 1818 retelling of the gospels, Jesus addresses Mary, John, or Judas with 2P, but switches from 2P to 2S in reproaching Judas. Yet only an asymmetry of authority without reproach or scorn appears present in M. Sanson's gospel retelling of 1787 PT. The texts of the *Prodigal Son* reveal that in 19C suggest that no negative affect came with 2S at Groix, and it was even more ordinary at Belle-Île, while even from father to son and son to father 2P was used on the facing mainland and at Guémené near Inguiniel (Loth 1890: 373-380; on the 20C situation across varieties, see Jouitteau 2021).

7 Origins of *mihi esse*

The classical *mihi esse* formation of Gwenedeg appears in varieties whose sole infinitive of *be* is *bout* and is based on that infinitive. It is documented largely in varieties along the coast both east and west, but there are traces inland along the eastern border, and mostly from 18C on, but its development is full in the *prône* of 1693 and might have been in 1631. In 1710, P. Barisy uses not only *bout* but also *bézout* as *be* and in *mihi esse*, within the setting of an inland variety of Gwenedeg. In 1612/1625 Y. Gueguen of Kerne has fewer, less systematically deployed forms od *mihi esse*, and these are built on *bezout* and *bezaff*, his two verbal nouns for *be*, beside perhaps *bout* that he has in compounds. The dialectal and temporal distribution of these verbal nouns should tell us something about that of *mihi esse* formations built on them.

[20] *Me gouar en mat ez caffet estraing, maz cõpser aguizyou ouz Doué, hac ouz an Guerches Mary é mam, dre te en leffric-man, dre abec ma caffer dispris comps euelse en Brezonec; Hoguen pa consideret, pennaus ez eo bet contraingner* [sic] *an Translater da heul an oll dan oll stil an Autheur; ez credaff en er quemeret en escus.*

In MB verse prior to 17C, *bout, bezaff* and *bezout* all stand alongside each other (so Jer† attributed to 15C, J† of 1530, B† of 1557, M† of 1575 composed in 1519, G† of 1680, N†). In MB prose of 16C and early 17C, the chiefly northwestern authors use *bezaff* (G. Keranpuil, the author of Cath if distinct, G. Quiquer), rarely also *bout* (T. Gueguen), the one southwestern author has *bezaff* and *bezout* (Y. Gueguen), and the one southeastern text *bout* (Prône). By the early 20C *ALBB*, and mostly in good match other evidence after the period of MB, *bout* alone is continued in the southeast, Gwened and adjacent Kerne, and elsewhere mostly *bezaff* alone, including most of Kerne. Of *bezout* one set of later attestations may come from the distinctive central zone at the interface of Gwened, Kerne and Treger (q.v. Falc'hun 1981, Costaouec 2012, Solliec 2021).[21]

One possible interpretation then is that Y. Gueguen had *bezaff* and *bezout* but not *bout* because he was from Kerne near the central zone, while P. Barisy *bout* from Noyal-Pontivy – perhaps even in the *endevout* formation that seems to underlie nearby *dœvœt* in the *ALBB* – and *bézout* but not some descendant of *bezaff* under influence the central zone in his practice at Inguiniel. The sporadic use in Y. Gueguen may reflect innovation of the formation on his part, or he may have extended a borrowed syntagm based on *bout* with his own *bezout* and *bezaff*, as later might have Barisy. The nearly contemporary Prône suggests systematic use of the formation of southeastern Gwened, but lacks the key 3rd person forms that would establish that the formation was complete.

There need not have been a unique point of origin for *mihi esse*, and it might have been available once certain conditions were met, like the rise of sufficiently finite-like infinitives. That *mihi esse* was an innovation unavailable to most writers of 16-17C is suggested by its transformation of the expression of *have*-construction. The effect is perhaps most evident in the *have*-perfect, since there was constant pressure to translate its infinitives from Romance. Apart from Y. Gueguen's few *mihi esse* perfects, he and his contemporaries and predecessors lack anything that can be identified as a *have*-perfect formally, resorting rather to *be*-passives in their place (*LVB*: 198, 353, 356-9, *HMSB*: §140.10, Rezac 2021a: 4.5). That changes drastically with *mihi esse* in the 1631 and 1693 *prônes* and all later Gwenedeg (save NG).

It is the same for lexical *have*, where the commandment against coveting offers one testimony to the impact of the innovation. There are about a dozen versions in MB (Gk I 252, 262, II 136, Bel 217-8, Cnf 134, Do 29, Bihan 2010). Many are clearly attempting to render *pour les auoir* of the verse decalogue in the late 15C *livre d'heures* (Bühler 1959; cf. Ernault 1928: 252n7). Yet they do not do so by *mihi esse*, and either use *mihi est*, or the verbal noun *caffout* suppletive to *mihi est*, or finite and verbal noun transitives *derchel*

[21] The evidence of *bezout* is complex. In 20C, *beout* is known from the central zone (CRYK cited in *DEVRI*: s.v.), and perhaps so *beout* (CB 428) by *bean, bout* in an 19C manuscript of an 18C play, Tregereg but with a feature of Gwened-periphery (Schrijver 2011b: 5.6.4). Yet *bezout* has been related to *bezouet, besouet, besoet* of NG and nonce *bezoet* in MB (Hemon 1956: §79, §83; but cf. Schumacher 2004: 326), and NG is southeast Gwened (*dehou, gullé*). In any case *bezoutt* is beside *boutt* in Cillart's 1744 dictionary s.v. *exister* of usage at Vannes (see his p. vi), and both are used a few verses apart in GU of 1734 from that area (Loth 1890: 344-5). NG also frequently has *but* /byt/ beside *bout* /but/, and to this Hemon compares early 20C *but* and /bi/ only documented in northeastern Kerne in the interface zone (*ALBB*: map 80; MKRN cited in *HMSB*: §139.14, both early 20C; he also compares Gwenedeg /bœt/, unclear to me given NG's orthography, and /bœt/ *ALBB*: map. 80 for earlier /but/ in e.g. Ernault 1887). Rostrenen 1732: s.v. *être* gives all but *bezouet*: "*beza* … mais autrefois on a dit : *bezout* & à present … on dit hors de Leon, *bêa, beañ, bêout, bout, but*" (s.v. *être*), elsewhere further localising *bout* to Gwened (s.v. *force*).

'hold', *miret* 'keep', *possedifu* 'possess'. Then *mihi esse* appears in the *prône* of 1631, and is kept in one rephrasing (7) after another in Gwenedeg.[22]

It is hard to judge the role of external influence on the innovation of *mihi esse* in the languages of translated texts, Italian or French for Bel, and the other languages of the earliest writers with the formation, at least French for Y. Gueguen. Y. Gueguen's Breton is as "priest" as it gets for any *brezhoneg beleg* "priest-Breton", but within the range of the earlier G. Keranpuil and the contemporary T. Gueguen, who translated similar materials, yet did not introduce *mihi esse* (cf. Le Menn 2002: 12-14). In external influences, not all domains are equipollent. In Y. Gueguen's language like that of others, borrowing and calque are striking in lexemes and clause-combining devices, and just as remarkably absent in aspects of morphosyntax that seem more relevant to *mihi esse*. To take a concrete example, consider argument coding by bound-pronoun objects of transitives. Y. Gueguen's Breton shared with his Italian or French sources their coding by accusative proclitics on the finite verb, but diverged elsewhere, and in the divergences, there is no influence on his language, though there would be later:

- Objects of *have*-constructions and positive imperatives: 3rd person enclitics (with 8 or 9 occurrences in Bel with *have*, 5 with imperative), and 1st/2nd person proclitics (17 and 7). Contrast the early 18C shift in Gwenedeg to the French-like pattern of all-enclitic positive imperative and surrogate present for negative.
- Objects of *have*-perfects: proclitics attach to the participle, not auxiliary (17 in Bel). Contrast the sporadic innovations of attachment to the auxiliary in 19C (*LVB*: 202).
- No accusative clitics for indirect objects or reflexive direct objects. Contrast sporadic attestations later (already Maunoir 1659, Rezac 2020: 324n11).
- No accusative clitics with verbal nouns translating infinitive when this is visible with 3M. Contrast the shift to infinitives in 17C Gwenedeg (section 2).
- No clitic climbing, so that the frequent type of the sources *li può amazzare*, *il les peut tuer* is always translated by the type *ez gall ò lazaff* (Bel 113).

So at least preexisting argument coding patterns were rather immune to external influence for Y. Gueguen, and other writers of MB. This conservativeness might or might not have extended to an innovated coding in *mihi esse*. Even when developments might reflect external influence, as in the distribution of plain *be* and *mihi est* auxiliaries of the perfect, they might also, or even only, reflect internal dynamics, and do sometimes, for instance in the stubborn resistance to extending *mihi est* in calquing *j'ai été*, *j'ai été vu*, or in overreaching to give counterparts of *j'ai tombé, arrivé* (Le Bayon 1878: 31).

[22] *ho bout* of 16C M† 3350 is sometimes cited as an early lexical *mihi esse* (*LVB*: 198, Châtelier 2016a: 259), but as Ernault 1914: 277n8 points out, it is naturally analysed as "their being" rather than "their having", and comparison with the Latin source in its relationship to the preceding lines does not seem to me to favour *mihi esse*. Yet it remains that our 1575 edition of M has features otherwise attested only much later, and in particular negation of verbal nouns, linking it to Y. Gueguen within MB, and to Gwenedeg in Rostrenen 1732 (*HMSB*: §186). Moreover, while others of these features can belong to Treger-Kerne outside Gwened, as expected for its 1519 author from Plougonven (*nemert*, Ernault 1914: 46n2, *cleuaff* not *cleuoff* in 64n1 in cf. with *ALBB*: map 108 and Rezac 2021a: 339n17), some belong to Gwened or its periphery (op.cit. 74n7, 311 to v. 371, and *en* 'the', Schrijver 2011a: 5.6.4, also in CB, cf. *ALBB*: maps 117-121).

8 Appendix: *Mihi esse* in Y. Gueguen

The following are all the forms of *mihi esse* found here in Y. Gueguen. The history of Bel and Cnf is resumed with literature in Courouau 2008. Bel was first published in 1612 at Nantes, but that edition appears lost, and the one used here is the 1625 edition at Morlaix; Rostrenen 1732 in his list of sources also gives a 1616 printing at Nantes and 1618 at Morlaix. Cnf was also published at 1612 at Nantes; here the 1646 printing at Morlaix is used, Cnf², paginated differently from 1612, but whenever checked here against 1612 at *DEVRI*, it seems identical down to the orthography.

The forms in Bel are all but one of them in passages translated from the catechism of Robert Bellarmin. Bellarmin composed and published his *Dottrina cristiana breve* in Italian in 1597, and expanded it to *Dichiarazione piu copiosa della dottrina cristiana* of 1598, of which the earliest edition available to me is of 1770, published by Stamperia del Seminario in Padova. It was translated into French in 1600 as *Catechisme et ample declaration de la doctrine chrestienne* by Robert Crampon at the behest of François Pericard, of which the edition used here is of 1620, published by Iean de la Riviere at Camray. Y. Gueguen's 1612/1625 *Declaration abvndant eves an catechism, hac an doctrin christen* "Abundant declaration of the catechism, and the Christian doctrine" matches the 1598 rather than 1597 work, and states, "Composed in Italian … By the Reverend Father Robert Bellarmin … Translated now first from Italian to Breton", but one of the passages below is closer to the 1620 French than the 1770 Italian.[23]

The forms of the infinitive of *mihi est* found are, with their context:

Perfect, 3M

pennaus vn croeadur en oat à pemp bloæz, **ouz en-|dezout** desquet da blasphemiff an hanuo à Doué (Bel 104)
che un fanciullo di cinque anni, **avendo** imparato a bestemmiare IDDIO (95)
qu'vn enfant de l'aage, **ayant** apprins à blaíphemer Dieu (136)

hac yuez rac **oz en dezout** serret an porz ouz an desir dis-|ordrennet deues an delectationou (Bel 129)
e anco perchè **avendo** chiusa la porta al desiderio disordinato delle dilettazioni" (117)
d'autant aussi **qu'ayãt** fermé la porte au desir desordonné des dele-|ctatiõs (166)

[23] In this research, I have had much profit of Courouaou's 2008 survey of the religious texts of MB. On this point my description differs from his: "Le catéchisme de saint Robert Bellarmin (1542-1621), publié d'abord en latin (1593), a, quant à lui, été traduit en français par saint François de Sales (1601). Cette traduction, la première d'un catéchisme catholique dans la langue du royaume, a, à son tour, donné lieu à une traduction en breton parue anonymement à Nantes en 1612, rééditée en 1625." For all I can determine, Bellarmin's longer catechism was first published in Italian and in 1598. The first translation into French was "par le commandement" of François Pericard, bishop of Avranches, "de la traduction de Robert Crampon Parisien, secretaire dudit sieur évesque". This was first published in 1600 at Paris, 1601 in Rouen, 1604 in Lyon. The translation was apparently famously handed out to children in 1603 by the new bishop-in-exile of Geneva at Annecy, François de Sales, but I have not been able to confirm any involvement of his in the translation itself. Sales did base his *Les Controverses* on the *Disputationes de Controversiis* of Bellarmin, and the third volume of that seems to have been published in Latin and in 1593.

An Abostol sant Paul endeueus hon lamet deueus an dout-man, **oz en dezout** scriffuet, pennaus an hiny pehiny en em ioent é Priedelæz, à gra en mat. (Bel 166)
L'Apostolo S. Paolo ci ha dichiarato questo dubbio, **avendo** scritto, che chi si coniunge in Matrimonio fa bene; (149)
L'Apostre sainct Paul nous a esclaircy de ce doute, **ayant** escrit, que qui se cõjoint par Mariage, fait bien, (212)

Ahane hon Sal-|uer **ouz endezout** lauaret an [sic] vn paraboll pennaus (Bel 166)
Onde **avendo** detto il Salvatore in una parabola, che (150)
De sorte que nostre Sauueur **ayant** dit en vne parabole que (213)

Perfect, 3M, anomalous orthography

D. Pe en tra é consist an cusul deueus à paourentez ? §M. **En n'hon dezuout** neptra é propr, oz vezaff r'hoet à diaraouc é holl madou dan paouryen (Bel 131)
D. In che consiste il Consiglio della Povertà? §M. **In non aver** cosa alcuna propria; avendo prima dato tutta la sua roba a' poveri, (119)
D. En quoy consiste le conseil de la Pauureté? §M. **A n'auoir** rien de propre ayant auparauant donné tout son bien au pauures, ou l'ayant mis en commun, qui est autant que l'auoir donné aux pauures. (169)
Notes: Translation closer to the Italian. The *oz vezaff r'hoet* underscores sporadicity of *mihi esse* since even immediately after a *mihi esse* form the usual recourse is had to translation by *be*-passive rather than a *mihi esse have*-perfect.

Perfect, 3M, bezaff

euel pa en deffue vn re ben-|nac, vn coudet, pe desir souden da lazrez, pe da lazaff, pe da blasphemy, hac en em aduisæ econtinant, quent **euit endeuezaff** an holl consantet gant an volontez, ez vez hep muy quen pechet veniel. Euit se ez eo ret bezaff en mat var é gard, hac econti-|nant ma sant an den vn drouc youll, pe de-|sir, ez eo ret é chaceal quent euit ma con-|sante an volontez. (Bel 192)
come se uno avesse un pensiero, o uno desiderio repentino di rubare, o d'ammazzare, o bestemmiare, e subito si ravendesse prima **d'averci** pienamente consentito con la volontà, sarebbe solamente veniale. Però bisogna stare sopra di se, e subito che l'uomo s'accorge del mal pensiero, o desiderio, scacciar-|lo prima, che la volontà ci consenta. (172)
comme si quelqu'vn auoit vne pensee ou desir subit de desrober, tuer ou blasphemer, & soudain se rauisast, auant **que d'auoir** consenty entierement auec la volonté: il seroit seulement veniel. Toutefois il faut bien estre sur ses gardes, & incontinent que l'on s'apperçoit d'vne mauuaise pensee, ou desir, il la faut chasser auant que la volonté y consente. (244)
Note: The second sentence of the cited passage is closer to the French than the Italian at several points, but if so, the translation as elsewhere avoids clitic climbing.

Perfect, 3P

pennaus an bugale pere, **ò dezuout** receuet an buhez digant an Tat, || hac an Mam, maz procurent da conseruiff dezo an memez buhez (Bel 110)
che i figliuoli **avendo** ricevuta la vita dal Padre, e dalla Madre, procurino di conservare loro medesima vita. (101)
que les enfans **ayans** receu la vie du Pere & de la Mere, procurent de leur conseruer la mesme vie (212)

Hoguẽ en fin ez gueler, pennaus heuelep tut-se so bezet meurbet diot ha foll, **ouz hoz deue-|zout** collet an mat souueran à palamour da vn mat, meurbet bihanic. (Bel 174)
Ma alla fine si vederà, che questi tali sono il sommo imprudentissimi, **avendo** perduto il sommo bene per amor d' un bene picciolissimo. (157)
Mais en fin on verra que telles gens ont esté très-imprudents, **ayant** perdu vn souuerain bien, pour l'amour d'vn bien tres-petit & perissable. (222)
Note: Translation closer to the Italian.

da lauaret eo, guinuidic an re, pere **oz ò dezuout** iontet ouz an contemplation an Charité parfet, oz deuezo ordrennet an holl traezou en Doué (Bel 181)
cioè beati quelli, che **avendo** aggiunto alla contemplazione la perfetta carità, averanno ordinato tute le cose in DIO (162)
c'est à dire, bien-heureux ceux, qui **ayans** adjousté à la contemplation la parfaicte charité, aurõt disposé toutes choses en Dieu (231)

Perfect, 3M + 1P?

Ouz vezaff r'hoet domp é map propr, ha dre an moien à nezaff, **ouz hon deuezout** adoptet euit é bugale, ha promettet domp an heritaig Celestiel (Bel 171)
avendoci dato il suo proprio Figliuolo, e per mezzo suo **adottati** noi per figliuoli, e promesaci l'eredità del Regno el Cielo (154)
nous ayant donné son propre Fils, & par le moyen d'iceluy **nous ayant** adoptez pour ses enfans (219)
Note: Translation substantially closer to the French. On *ouz vezaff r'hoet* see above.

Lexical, 3M, clause-internal subject

ha|| chettu aman an ræson ; **ouz en dezuout** an den an eneff, an corf, hac an madou à dia-|uæs pe exterior, gant an Oræson , ez offr da Doué , deueus à madou an eneff ; (Bel 161)
E la ragion' è, perchè **avendo** l'uomo l'anima, il corpo, ed i beni esteriori ; con l'orazione offerisce a DIO i beni dell'anima, (145)
dont voicy la raison: Parce que l'hõme **ayãt** l'ame, le corps, & les biẽs exterieurs, auec l'Oraison, il offre à Dieu les biens de l'ame (206)

Lexical, 3P

Ouzpen, pennaus bizhuic-|quen ne dléont esperiff da caffet dispancc, mat [sic] oz deueus bet an hardizder, nequet hep muy quen oz vezaff eureudet, hoguen yuez græt com-

|pagnunez charnel, (autramant consomet an priedelæz neant) **oz ò dezuout** an aznaoude-|guez deueus an ampeschamant à yoe entrezo da gallout bezaff priedou (Bel 255)
Moreover, [the Council says] how they must never hope to have dispensation, if they have had the hardihood, not only to have been married, but also to have made carnal companionship, (in other words consumed the void marriage) **with their having** the knowledge of the impedance that was between them to be able to be spouses
Note: in section that follows that translated from any editions accessible to me, corresponding to title-page "*Goude ez eus vn Sommer ves an pez à dléer prin-|cipalaff da lauaret en Prosn an Offeren dan tut licq; Ha deueus à materiou arall vtil meurbet*".

9 Bibliography

Texts: Abbreviation follow *DEVRI*, with † appended for verse, with these additions:

Bel *Declaration Abvndant eves an Catechism, hac an Doctrin Christen. Composet en Italien, dre ordrenancc an Tat santtel An Pap Clemencc eizuet en hanuo. Gant an Tat Reuerand Robert Bellarmin, Bællec, a Compagnunez an Iesuisted. ... Troet breman quentaff à Italien en brezonec. Dre gourchemen an Tat Reuerand Gvilhelm an baellec Escop é Querneau. Gant Euzen Gueguen Bællec eueus an memes Escopty, hiziu Alusuner dan Tat Reuerand Escop an Naffnet. Goude ez eus vn Sommer ves an pez à dléer prin-|cipalaff da lauaret en Prosn an Offeren dan tut licq; Ha deueus à materiou arall vtil meurbet, euel à descuez an 207. follen. Imprimet e Montrovlles. Gant Georges Allienne, Imprimeur ha Liber. M. D. C. XXV*. [= 1725; as in DEVRI, with addition of details relevant here.]

CAT.1785 *Catéchim eit chervige d'er-ré e-ra profession ag er religion catholique, apostolique ha romenn – Trizecvet Quevrenn – É Guénet, É ty J.M. Galles*. 1785 [Attribution and date from *PRELIB*, Le Pipec 2018: 98n82.]

CAT.1810 *Catechim eid en ol ilisieu a France, laqueid é Brehonèc ha bèrreid dré hourhemen en Eutru de Bausset, Escop Gùénèd ... É Guénèd, É ti er Vugalé Galles*. 1810.

Cnf² *Confessional D'astvmet eves an Doctoret Catholic Apostolic ha romain. ... Composet ha laquet en goulo, gant Evzen Gvegven, Bellec ves à Dioces Querneau. E Qvemperc Avrintin. M.DC.XLVI*. [= 1646]

CS.anon *Cantikeu Spirituel pé Guerzenneu Devott ha Forh-pourfitab ... É Guénett, É ti er Vrederr Galles*. 1760. [Dated on last page.]

CS.bar *Cantiqueu Spirituel ... Composet dré Per Barisy Person' a Parês Inguiniel. ~ Escopti a Guenet. ~ M.DCC.X.* [= 1710; url: mediatheques.quimper-communaute.fr/iguana/www.main.cls?surl=search&p=af3e6a0a-94ab-11e8-a80b-0050568050bf#recordId=1.373792&srchDb=1]

GU *Guærzænneu Santel … É Guenétt, é ti Huiçantt Galles … 1734*. [Cited from extracts in Loth 1886: 319-310, 1890: 342-5.]

J [Cited from ed. of Le Berre, Yves, 2011, *La Passion et la Résurrection bretonnes de 1530*, Brest: CRBC–UBO.]

Pron [As in DEVRI, but cited from ed. of Loth 1905.]

PRon *Er forme ag er pron, é brehonnec Guennet.* [In Loth 1890: 326-332, dated there to 1693.]

SH *Stationneu hur-Salvér Jesuss-Crouistt én e Bassion … Lacaid é berhonéc Dré C. V. Cillart, Person à Guergamm, Missionér ag en Escopti à Huinétt … É Guinétt, É ty er Vinourett Galles … M.DCCC.VII* [= 1807, spotchecks suggest reimpression of the edition of 1760].

References:

ALBB: Le Roux, Pierre. 1927. *Atlas linguistique de la Basse-Bretagne*. Paris: Droz.

Anon. c. 1795. "Addition au vocabulaire français-breton". In: *Vocabulaire nouveau*. Vannes: J.M. Galles, 1–32 [separate pagination].

Bühler, Curt F. 1959. “At Thy Golg First eut of the hous vlysse the saynge thus”. In: *Studies in the Renaissance*, 6: 223–235.
Châtelier, Antoine. 2016a. “Noms verbaux dans la littérature en vannetais classique: le cas des noms verbaux « doubles » et de en devout « conjugué »”. *Etudes Celtiques* 42, 249–66.
Châtelier, Antoine. 2016b. Traductions et variabilité en langue bretonne. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
Cheveau, Loïc. 2007. Approche phonologique, morphologique et syntaxique du breton du Grand Lorient (bas-vannetais). Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
Cillart, C.-V. 1744. *Dictionnaire françois-breton ou françois-celtique du dialecte de Vannes*. Leide: La Compagnie.
CG: Lewis, Henry, and Holger Pedersen. 1961. *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Courouau, Jean-François. 2008. “L’imprimé religieux en langue bretonne (1526-1660)”. In: *Annales de Bretagne*, 115.3: 57–79.
Costauec, Dennis. 2012. “Linguistic Geography of Breton and Sociocultural Motivations”. In: *STUF* 65: 47-64.
Crahé, Maxime-Morvan. 2014. The Breton micro-dialect of Languidic. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
DEVRI: Menard, Martial, and Herve Le Bihan. 2020. *Devri: le dictionnaire diachronique du breton*. url: http://www.devri.bzh.
Dujardin, L. 1958. “A la recherche de deux auteurs bretons : Euzen Guéguen (1612) et Yves Le Baellec (1616).” In: *Annales de Bretagne*, 65: 431-438.
Dumoulin, Alan. 1800. *Grammatica latino-celtica*. Prague: [publisher unknown].
Ernault, Emile. 1888. “Études bretonnes VI”. In: *Revue Celtique* 9, 245–66.
Ernault, Emile. 1890. “Études bretonnes VII”. In: *Revue Celtique* 11, 458–87.
Ernault, Emile. 1914. *Le mirouer de la mort*. Paris: Champion.
Ernault, Emile. 1928–30. “Le breton de Gilles de Keranpuil”. In: *Revue Celtique* 45, 201–71, 47, 72–159.
Falc’hun, François. 1981. *Perspectives nouvelles sur l’histoire de la langue bretonne*. Paris: Union générale d’éditions.
Fleuriot, Léon. 2001. “Skoueroù emdroadurioù e morfologiezh hag ereadur ar brezhoneg”. In: *Hor Yezh* 228, 14–34.
Greene, David. 1979. “Perfects and perfectives in Modern Irish.” *Ériu* 30: 122–141.
Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff. 1902. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoyle.
Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff. 1931. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*, 3rd ed. Vannes: Lafoyle.
Guillome, Joachim. 1836. *Grammaire francaise-bretonne*. Vannes: J.-M. Galles.
Heine Bernd. 1997. *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hemon, Roparz. 1956. *Christmas Hymns in the Vannes Dialect of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
Hewitt, Steve. 2010. “Mood in Breton”. In: *Mood in the Languages of Europe*. Ed. by: Björn Rothstein & Rolf Thieroff. Amster: John Benjamins, 292–308.
HMSB: Hemon, Roparz. 1975. *Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2021. “The politeness systems of address, variations across Breton dialects.” *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 69.11, 107-127.
Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1976. “Les grammaires bretonnes jusqu’en. 1914”. In: *Etudes Celtiques* 15, 229–88.
Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1979. “Les grammaires bretonnes : additions au tome XV, fascicule 1”. In: *Etudes Celtiques* 16, 233–36.
Le Bayon, A.-M. 1878. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoyle.
Le Besco, Patrick. 1992. “Le Breton de Belle-Ile-en-Mer.”, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 45, 182 - 239, 48, 89-258.
Le Besco, Patrick. 1995. “Lettres de Yann-Ber Kalloc’h à sa mère”. In: *Etudes Celtiques* 31, 225–59.
Le Bihan, Hervé. 2020. “Ar skridoù krennvrezhoneg en oberenn Seán Ó Tuathalláin (John Toland), 1670–1722”. In: *Hor Yezh* 262: 39–48.
Le Goaziou, Adolphe 1950. *La longue vie de deux colloques françois et breton (1626–1915)*. Quimper: Le Goaziou.

Le Goff, Pierre. 1927. “Du tutoiement en breton de Vannes”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 37, 198–203.
Le Menn, Gwennole. 2002. *Vie de saint Yves – Buhez sant Euzen*, vol. 1. Saint-Brieuc: Skol.
Le Pipec, Erwan. 2015. “La palatalisation vannetaise.” In: *La Bretagne Linguistique*, 19: 297-327.
Le Pipec, Erwan. 2018. “Le breton de Jean-Pierre Calloc’h”. In: *Comment devien-to Jean-Pierre Calloc’h?* Ed. by Sébastien Carney. Brest: CRBC-UBO, 79–109.
Le Roux, Pièrre. 1896. “Mutations et assimilations de consonnes dans le dialecte armoricain de Pleubian (Côtes-du-Nord)”. In: *Annales de Bretagne* 12, 3–31.
Loth, Joseph-Marie. 1886. “Le mystère des trois rois”. In: *Revue Celtique* 7, 317–57.
Loth, Joseph-Marie. 1890. *Chrestomathie bretonne*. Paris: Buillon.
Loth, Joseph-Marie. 1905. "Le plus ancien texte suivi en breton de Vannes." In: *Annales de Bretagne* 20, 341-350.
LVB: Le Roux, Pierre. 1957. *Le verbe breton*. Rennes: J. Plihon.
Maunoir, Julien. 1659. *Le sacré college de Iesus*. Quimper: Jean Hardouyn.
PRELIB: Blanchard, Nelly, and Mannaig Thomas. n.d. *Projet de recherche en littérature de langue bretonne*. url: https://mshb.huma-num.fr/prelib/
Rezac, Milan. 2020. “Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton I”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125: 313-362.
Rezac, Milan. 2021a. “Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton II”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126: 325–385.
Rezac, Milan. 2021b. The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg. Ms., Researchgate.
Rostrenen, Grégoire. 1732. *Dictionnaire françois-celtique ou françois-breton*. Rennes: Vatar.
Rostrenen, Grégoire. 1738. *Grammaire françoise-celtique ou françoise-bretonne*. Rennes: Vatar.
Schrijver, Peter. 1997. *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland.
Schrijver, Peter. 2003. “Athematic *i*-presents.” In: *Incontri Linguistici* 26, 59-86.
Schrijver, Peter. 2011a. “Middle and Early Modern Breton.” In *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch*. Ed. by Elmar Ternes. Bremen: Hempen, 359–429.
Schrijver, Peter. 2011b. “Old British.” In *Brythonic Celtic – Britannisches Keltisch*. Ed. by Elmar Ternes. Bremen: Hempen, 1–84.
Schumacher, Stefan. 2004. *Die keltischen Primärverben*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
Solliec, Tanguy. 2021. “Des pages d’un atlas linguistique à une fenêtre sur l’histoire, le cas du breton.” In: *Géolinguistique* 21 [on-line].
Stark, Elisabeth, and Paul Widmer. 2020. “Breton a-marking of (internal) verbal arguments”. In: *Linguistics* 58, 745–766.
Stephens, Janig. 1982. Word order in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
Ternes, Elmar. 1970. *Grammaire structurale du Breton de l’ile de Groix (dialecte occidental)*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH.