



HAL
open science

The rise and fall of the Person-Case Constraint in Breton

Milan Rezac

► **To cite this version:**

Milan Rezac. The rise and fall of the Person-Case Constraint in Breton. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, In press. hal-03926945v1

HAL Id: hal-03926945

<https://hal.science/hal-03926945v1>

Submitted on 6 Jan 2023 (v1), last revised 18 Jul 2023 (v2)

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.

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER

Abstract: This work explores the coupling of person-split nominative objects with anomalous subjects, or Jahnsson’s Rule. In Breton, split-nominative objects spread from an Icelandic-like combination with oblique subjects of unaccusatives, to Finnish-like ones with subjects of transitives in constructions like the imperative, and then retreated piecewise. The developments admit of motivations external to (I-)language, such as frequency entrenchment [Haspelmath 2004], but are bounded by the coupling of Jahnsson’s Rule, and disfavour external sources for it like ambiguity avoidance [Dixon 1994]. An approach is explored through constraints on ϕ -dependencies, their relationship to case and licensing, and their interaction with grammaticalisable partial ϕ -specification, building on work on the Person-Case Constraint [Anagnostopoulou 2003]. The anomalies of the restricting subject are analysed as person-only specification, and extended from obliques to pronouns minimal in absence number + n/N, such as imperative *pro* [Zanuttini et al. 2013] and human impersonals [Malamud 2012]. The effect on the split-nominative in ineffability or accusative of the restricted persons is analysed through the integration of dependent case into Φ /Case theory [Kalin 2018] but the developments under study lead to recasting of apparent syntactic variation through externalisability [Coon and Keine 2020].

Keywords: Person-Case Constraint, Jahnsson’s Rule, person restrictions, agreement, case, licensing, parameters, externalisation, diachronic syntax, Breton, Finnish, Icelandic

1 Introduction

This work studies a common coupling of ϕ -restricted nominative objects with anomalous subjects through its development in Breton. The nominative object is usually restricted to 3rd person (3), and ineffable or accusative in 1st, 2nd, grammatically human-logophoric 3rd (½). It will be referred to as *split*-nominative. The anomalies of the subject are varied, such oblique rather than nominative case, or unique inflection for arbitrary human impersonals. The coupling will be called Jahnsson’s Rule JR, adapting the term for it in studies of Finnish (Jahnsson 1871: §11, Kiparsky 2001).

Aspects of JR have motivated primitives and principles *internal* to the faculty of language, including relativisation of ϕ -dependencies to person and number, and dependence approaches to case (for Icelandic, Taraldsen 1995, Sigurðsson 1996, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Richards 2008, Baker 2008, Preminger 2014, Coon and Keine 2020; Finnish, Timberlake 1974, Maling 1993, Nelson 1998, Kiparsky 2001, Rezac 2011, Baker 2015). They have also been attributed to factors *external* to it, such as dispreference for ambiguity, and correspondences between form and frequency (Finnish, Hakulinen and Karlsson 1975, Comrie 1975, Dixon 1994). The development of split-nominative objects in Breton offers novel controls for external factors. It is analysed as reflex of internal mechanisms: constraints on ϕ -specifications, ϕ -dependencies, and the relationships of ϕ , case and licensing.

Tables 1 and 2 introduces JR in Breton and its chief comparanda here of Icelandic and Finnish. The systems are accusative: S/A group as nominative against O as accusative in coding and structure. One or more constructions deviate: oblique-subject unaccusatives and passives, active transitives in the imperative, the perfect, or with arbitrary human impersonal subjects.¹

* [Accepted; final form TBS.] I am grateful to two anonymous readers’ helpful and encouraging remarks that have greatly improved the work; to A. Nevins, S. Béjar, M. Joutiteau, and P. Widmer for comments or discussion; to the audiences of the Typology of Breton and Iterativity in Grammar; to R. Bideault for undertaking the less dull of the twain enterprises of scanning and reading *Buhez Sant Euzen*; and to ones who would be nameless but took the time to explain that they only care to have finitely in Finnish. This work has been partially supported by ANR-18-FRAL-0006 UV2 (ANR) and FFI2014-51878-P (MINECO).

¹ Glossing follows Leipzig, plus ! imperative-jussive, *ADS* adessive, *PRT* participle, *PT* past, *R* particle, no gloss for 3SG/default -Ø, ° accusative-genitive syncretism, *N*, *A* abbreviating *NOM*, *ACC* as needed, ≈ for boundary unclear as = or -. In sources, verse is marked †; · stands for source -; the - boundary breaks up source words, =, ≈do not unless

Table 1: Split-nominative S/O in Breton, Finnish and Icelandic (constructed)

Obj.	Icelandic A	Finnish	Middle Breton
R>S			
3	Henni leiðast þeir 3SGF.DAT bore.3P 3PL.N	Hänella on ne 3SG.ADS be.3SG 3PL.N	He~d~eus=y 3SGF.A ~DAT~be=3PL.N
½	*	Hänella on meidät 3SG.ADS be.3SG 1PL.A	*
	She is bored with them/*us.	She has them/us.	She has them/*us.
V! O			
3	Taktu þá take!2SG 3PLM.A	Vie ne take!2SG 3PL.N	Kemer=y take!2S=3PL.N
½	Taktu okkur take!2SG 1P.A	Vie meidät take!2SG 1P.A	Hon=kemer 1PL.A=take!2S
	Take them/us!	Take them/us!	Take them/us!

Table 2: Breton weak-pronoun finite-clauses object coding

	Breton *12C	16C	17C	20/1C SE	C	NW	Finnish 20C
Synthetic general							
V _{tr}	A=	A=	A=	A=	A	A	A
HAVE	=3N~½*	=3N~½*	=3N~½*	=3N~½*	A	A	3N~½A
AUX + PRT _{tr} perfect periphrasis							
BE/Ø _{AUX}	–	A=	A=	A=	A	A	A
HAVE _{AUX}	–	=3N~½*	=3N~½A=	=3N~½A=	A	A	[3N~½A]
Imperative-Jussive							
V!3	A=, =A	A=, =A?	A=? , =A?	–	–	–	A
V!2	A=, =A	=3N~½A=	=3N~½A=	=A	=3N~½A	A	3N~½A
Human impersonals							
generic	–	–	–	–	–	–	A
arbitrary	A=	A=	A=	A=	A	A	3N~½A

Conventions: x= pro/mesoclitic, =x enclitic; N nom., A acc; SE southeast, C central, NW north-and-west, *12C reconstructed (3.1); * ineffable, – unavailable, [...] indirect comparison (4.3)

Breton has a couple of revealing properties for the study of JR. One is the spread and retreat of split-nominative constructions across its attested or nearly-attested history. The steps are consonant with external factors independent of JR, but they would take split-nominative objects beyond their persistent bounds, unless checked by something that favours the object-subject coupling of JR. The other is the development of enclitic coding for nominatives when objects. These turn out to limit any role for external factors that have been proposed to account for this coupling in JR. Other properties also prove useful in exploring external and internal analyses of split-nominative objects, notably changes in overt agreement and the development of nonagreeing infinitives.

The evolution of split-nominative objects in Breton is traced in section 3. JR is given an analysis building on Anagnostopoulou 2003 and subsequent work for the Person-Case Constraint PCC. The elements are interaction of constraints on ϕ -dependencies with partial ϕ -specification, explored further in section 4, and case and licensing, section 5:

accompanied by $_$. Citations and constructed examples use the orthography of Modern Breton. Conventions of Table 2 go by default for others. Throughout, 3 abbreviates 3rd person, ½ 1st, 2nd, and grammaticalised human-logophoric 3rd, but 1/2 is used for systems that lack the latter; and A, S, O, R adapt grammatical-role terminology: A, external argument of active transitives; O, internal argument of active transitives; S, of unaccusatives; O→S of passives; R, added or applicative argument; with O, (O→)S also for like-coded arguments in exceptional case-marking.

Partial ϕ -intervention and ϕ -bearers. The distribution of nominative on subjects and objects reflects the same ϕ -dependencies, constrained by intervention relativised to person π and number # ϕ -features, (1) (Anagnostopoulou 2003). The group of “quirky” π -only bearers is extended from certain obliques to pronominals special in absence of n/N, including imperative-subject and arbitrary human impersonal pronouns (cf. Malamud 2012; Zanuttini et al. 2013).

(1) T-nominative dependencies (π person, # number)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. No intervener: $\sqrt{\text{NOM}}$: | $[\text{T}_{\pi, \#=\text{NOM}} \quad \dots \quad \text{G.NOM}_{\sqrt{\pi, \#} \dots}]$ |
| b. Complete intervener: $^*\text{NOM}$: | $[\text{T}_{\pi=X, \#=X} \quad \dots \quad [\text{X}_{\pi, \#} [\dots \text{G.NOM}_{^*\pi, \#} \dots]]]$ |
| c. Person intervener: $\sqrt{3} \sim \sqrt{1/2} \cdot ^*\text{NOM}(\rightarrow \text{ACC})$: | $[\text{T}_{\pi=X/\emptyset, \#=\text{NOM}/\emptyset} \quad \dots \quad [\text{X}_{\pi} [\dots \text{G.NOM}_{^*\pi, \#} \dots]]]$ |

Case and licensing: Person-restricted nominatives objects can be ineffable or “repaired” by accusatives, and analogously for related restrictions. Their profile relates repairs to dependent case (Rezac 2011, Kalin 2018) if integrated with Φ /Case (Chomsky 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003) and adapted to its challenges (Preminger 2014, 2019). Variation between ineffability and repairs has been approached through sui-generis syntactic parameters, but in Breton it reduces to grammaticalisation of clitic hosts. This suggests general reduction to externalisability of case, in line with work on person restrictions (Coon and Keine 2020) and other variation (Berwick and Chomsky 2015; Eguren, Fernández-Soriano and Mendikoetxea 2016).

The analysis of the person-case interactions in Jahnsson’s Rule is explored relative to the ϕ -dependencies of nominatives with T. These give the large group of restricting elements of JR like imperative subjects, and clear repairs by dependent accusative. The mechanics build on those developed for similar restrictions on accusatives-absolute at the core of the Person-Case Constraint, and cover these. Yet it is not assumed that all restrictions discussed as the PCC have the same source (rather than, for instance, linearisation conditions, Arregi and Nevins 2012), or reflect internal principles (rather than say internally arbitrary gaps, Haspelmath 2004). These issues frame the study and the conclusions drawn from it, and are introduced in the next section.

2 Comparative and theoretical setting

For Icelandic and Finnish, internalist theories of nominative objects have typically correlated them with nonnominative subjects, but in different ways (see with lit. Timberlake 1974; Yip, Maling and Jackendoff 1987, Maling 1993; Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004; Schütze 1993; Nelson 1998; Kiparsky 2001; Vainikka and Brattico 2014). Their restrictions to 3rd person have also received different analyses even within similar theoretical settings (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Rezac 2011; Schütze 1993, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Coon and Keine 2020; Nelson 1998, Kiparsky 2001). These can suit one but not the other systems, and microvariations within them, for instance on nonagreeing environments (4.1, 5.3-4).

These analytical challenges may be set beside evidence that ϕ -restrictions can have different mechanisms even when superficially similar and of similar origin across related systems. A striking case-study is Rhodes 1994 for Ojibwa. The person agreement prefix oscillates between O and A according to the person hierarchy $2 > 1 > 3$. The oscillation is morphological for some speakers, but for others it has syntactic correlates, on the order of passives (on the history of the morphology, see Oxford 2014; for analogues, Rezac 2011: 3.2-3). Similarly diverse has proven the *me lui* subtype of the Person-Case Constraint in Romance. The strong version bars dative + 1/2 accusative clitics, and it too has a syntactic profile comparable to the pro/demotions of passives (Postal 1990, Rezac 2011: ch. 4). Weaker versions improve subsets of it like 1/2 dative + 2/1 accusative, but in ways that have been argued to involve grammatical illusion or idioms (Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Kempson and Chatzikyriakidis 2011), and may be invisible to syntax (Bonet 2008: 125n5). These contrasts suggest that identical ϕ -restriction can reflect different mechanisms, and variation on them might not be part of any given mechanism (for a broad survey and unifying analysis, see Deal 2020 for *me lui* analogues, often with further nuances, e.g. Postal 1990, D’Alessandro and Pescarini 2016).

Across these distinctions, φ -restrictions might be informative about internal primitives and principles that relate to φ -distinctions in form and meaning, but need not be, if they can be attributed to external factors. Particular well-explored have been effects of Zipf's 1949 least-effort principles, characteristic of natural-language use, but at least in part not specific to it (Haspelmath 2004, 2020 on the Person-Case Constraint, here 3.4; for other potentially external approaches to φ -restrictions, see a.o. Heath 1991, García 2009, Gildea and Zuñiga 2016, Yang 2016: ch. 5, 2017). At present, such accounts match findings about some φ -restrictions (like *amn't* in English), not others (constraints on bound and free pronouns in the *me lui* PCC of French, see 3.4, 5.2), but may contribute even to these (3.4). To the extent that φ -restrictions do receive such explanations, they *might* not offer evidence for internal content, though they can interact with it and overlap with its effects (Newmeyer 2005).²

The hedge *might* reflects uncertainty about the synchronic encodability of externally-induced φ -restrictions as arbitrary conventions. Yet there is reason to assume broad scope for such conventionalisations. They are often held to be available even within approaches with rich internal components in the phrase-structurally local domains of allomorphy (q.v. Paparounas 2010) and *c/s*-selection (q.v. Adger 2010). The *amn't* gap then need not reflect any internal principles relating 1st, singular, and negation (Broadbent 2009, Nevins 2012, Yang 2017). Like it have been analysed gaps in clitics-agreement that seem arbitrary with respect to φ -features and their relationships (Rhodes 1994, Bobaljik and Branigan 2006, partly Arregi and Nevins 2012) – but also ones explored in internal theories of φ (*me lui* in Miller and Sag 1997). The arbitrary gaps have nonlocal analogues like global case in Wampis (Bárány 2017: ch. 4 with lit.). These are not unexpected given the observation that beside local *c*-selection, like lexically restricted ergativity in Georgian (Harris 1985: 5.3), there less local analogues, like accusativity in Sierra Popoluca (Marlett 1986: sec. 3), and that to typical continuous idioms, there correspond unbounded ones like *___i has ___k where ___i wants ___k* (Bruening 2019, cf. Jackendoff 2002: ch. 6). In their light, it is not obvious what limits if any there are on conventionalisable φ -restrictions arising from external sources (though cf. 3.5).

These issues bear on the the coupling of (split-)nominative objects and anomalous subjects in Jahnsson's Rule, for external accounts of it have been advanced (sec. 1) and its known diachronic and dialectal profile does not plead for unity (3.8, 4.6). This is where Breton comes it. Over a relatively brief and directly or indirectly documented period, split-nominative objects have undergone extensions and retreats to a number of different end-points in terms of constructions like those in Table 2. The changes partly lend themselves to external accounts, but these do not enforce the coupling of subject-object anomalies in Jahnsson's Rule, and external accounts of the coupling do not transfer to Breton. They are explored in an internalist approach as intervention in φ /case-dependencies.

3 Development of split-nominative objects in Breton

3.1 Breton in context and the plan

Breton, Cornish and Welsh are Brythonic languages of the Insular Celtic group of Indo-European. Within this group, Brythonic and Goidelic are in an uncertain relationship adequately approximated here by sisterhood prior to 1C. Goidelic is attested in 7C– Old Irish and offers the oldest evidence of relevant morphosyntax. Brythonic gives rise to a dialect continuum where Old Welsh and Old Breton-Cornish become differentiable in 8C, and to Middle Welsh, Cornish and Breton in 11-12C. Evidence about their relevant morphosyntax starts to appear at the old stage, but much of it must await the first extensive texts, by manuscript dates 13–15C for Welsh

² Zipfian least-effort effects involved in such accounts have some direct evidence as external (form-frequency correlations in encoding, Kanwal et al. 2017; learning, Yang 2016; perhaps use, Horn 2004, cf. Yatsushiro and Sauerland 2019), but other mechanisms are less clearly external (ambiguity avoidance in natural language parsing and repetition blindness in visual search, cf. a.o. Walter 2007: 5.1, Harris 2017: 4.4), or quite internal in their details (iconicity in García 2009). Grouped as “external” for exposition but not raising such concerns are developments that need not refer to external principles (independent phonological erosion, discussed for φ -hierarchies in Gildea and Zuñiga 2006) or refer to internal ones unrelated to φ (see for *amn't* on superheavy codas Broadbent 2009, feature complexity Nevins 2012).

(prose and verse), 14–17C for Cornish (verse), 15/16–17C Breton (prose and verse) (see introductions in Ternes 2011 and lit. there).

Within Breton, dialectal differences are obscured by the *koine* of Middle Breton, but emerge sharply with the transition to Early Modern Breton from later 17C. At that point also the first grammars appear, while nonnormative descriptions, studies and corpora do so during 19C and continue to 21C. Relevant here is chiefly the split between the southeast SE and north-and-west NW, as well as an innovative central zone at their interface C (see Schrijver 2011, DME.I: 3.1 and Appendix for introduction and description of sources).

All the early Brythonic languages code object O by accusative pro/mesoclitics to the finite verb in most constructions, (2)a-(2)b. Enclitics are largely reserved to doubling these and other bound pronouns, (2)c. There are no restrictions of person.

(2) Finite-clause bound-pronoun objects in Middle Breton (T. Gueguen: Bel, Cnf; early 17C)

General

- a. n'a=z=lesse-n paour
NEG=2SG.ACC°=left-1SG.NOM poor
that I not leave you poor
- b. ma=en=pedé è=bugalé
as=3SGM.ACC=asked 3SGM.GEN=children
that his children asked him
- c. Milliguet r'a=vezy-Ø=tè
cursed R=will.be-2SG.NOM=2SG
may you be accursed

Prior to 14C Breton-Cornish had innovated enclitics coding of 3rd person (3) object S of BE when coupled with oblique subject R, the *mihi est* ‘to X is’ construction used as ‘have’, (2)d. Objecthood and person restriction of this S go back to an unknown time depth. 1st/2nd (1/2) person counterparts were and long remained ineffable.

Mihi est

- d. ...en≈de≈uoe=**auff** yuez en=é=guenou
3SGM.ACC≈DAT≈was=3SGM also in=3SGM.GEN=mouth
[for as St. Paul had Jesus-Christ in his heart,] he had him also in his mouth [cf. Isaiah 29:13]

By the first extensive texts of early 16C Breton, these 3-only enclitics had extended to coding O in constructions. One is the *have*-perfect, (2)e, innovated in Breton using *mihi est* as auxiliary. The other is the imperative, (2)g, through restriction of an earlier coding kept in Cornish. 1/2 counterparts were at first ineffable in the *have*-perfect, but accusative proclitics to the participle were innovated to express them and them alone in later 16C, (2)f. In the imperative, they specialised to do so by restricting an earlier coding by 16C, (2)h.³

Have-perfect

- e. rac ma=en≈de≈ues=**off** deliueret
for as=3SGM.ACC≈DAT≈is=3SGM delivered
for he has delivered him
- f. té a=z=heus ma=disquet
2SG R=2SG.ACC°=is 1SG.ACC°=taught
you have taught me

Imperative

- g. hoguen rent-omp=y da nep ...
but rend-!1PL.NOM=3PL to whoever

³ On glossing see note 1. Henceforth there is no case gloss for object-coding enclitics, and they are set in bold, object-coding accusative clitics in italics, and these + dative-marker coding subjects in *have*-constructions underlined. Source orthography is only commented on if it obscures relevant identities, here *auff*, *off* both /ã(ṽ)/.

- but let us restitute them to whoever ...
- h. *hon=diliur-et*
 1PL.ACC^o=deliver-!2PL.NOM
 deliver us!

The remainder of this section follows the developments of this person-split object coding by enclitics. First are set out relevant aspects of the pronominal system and its special development in imperatives (3.2) and unaccusatives (3.3). Then the history of person restrictions is traced as they spread across anomalous-subject constructions from unaccusatives (3.4) to the perfect (3.5) and the imperative (3.6), but not subjectless or canonical-subject constructions (3.7). Their analysis as split-nominatives restricted by person intervention in ϕ -dependencies is introduced, along with relevant externalist factors in each development.

The two chief comparanda for this object coding in Breton here are Icelandic and Finnish. Icelandic is a north Germanic language, and its context needs no discussion (see Leonard and Árnason 2011), apart from note of ongoing variation in relevant developments (Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013). Finnish is a north Finnic language, and its context does need comment (Häkkinen 1994, Lehtikoinen 1995). The relevant argument coding is part of native competence, and as such studied in the literature. Yet it presents a diachronic discontinuity, in importing the coding eastern varieties into a chiefly western basis, which could in part be side-stepped through the less-studied eastern varieties. Finnish represents an apogee of constructions with split-nominative objects in Finnic, and their development is drawn on here; but while also only attested from 16C, it covers a span and a diversity on the order of Celtic rather than Breton (3.8).

3.2 Pronominal objects and the imperative

3.2.1 *Brythonic pronominal system*

The puzzles of anomalous object coding in Breton may be introduced through the history of its imperative. It reveals the source of enclitic for coding O, the system of accusative pro-/meso- and enclitics that should have emerged and is found in Cornish, and the mysteries of person restrictions in Breton that will come from nominative S of *mihi est*.

Insular Celtic inherited nominative-accusative alignment in case and finite verb agreement. In Brythonic, case distinctions had been lost on free (pro)nominals, but S/A still grouped as nominative in controlling finite verb agreement when free and as bound, while accusative mesoclitics coded bound O. There were no infinitives, only ergatively-aligned nominalisations that would evolve into them in Breton. The inherited bound-pronoun forms were joined by suffixes to prepositions in Insular Celtic. All and only bound pronouns could be doubled by an invariant set of enclitics, reflecting late attachment of free pronouns.⁴

Table 3: Bound pronouns in Brythonic

Term	Form	Host	Codes	Bound-free relation
nominative	suffix	V _{FIN}	A, S	Bound doubles free
accusative	acc. mesoclitic	V _{FIN}	O, relic R	Bound-free complementary
genitive	gen. pro/mesoclitic	N	O, S of V→N, possessor of N	Bound-free complementary
oblique	suffix	P	argument of P	Bound-free complementary
doubling	enclitic	V _{FIN,N,P}	–	Doubles bound

Bound pronouns blocked free ones, but only when available. They were not available in certain syntactically characterisable environments like coordination or fronting (Fleuriot 1964: §138, Hemon 1975: §51, Willis 2008). This sort of clitic-free alternation is familiar from Romance systems like French, and taken to reflect different syntactic structure for pronouns in

⁴ Exposition simplifies as relevant, a.o. coding of residual R like O (3.3.1), mesoclitisis to separable preverbs (lost as such by Breton-Cornish, DME.II: 2.3), or nunaces of enclisis timing (DME.II: 2.4).

different environments, weak and strong (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). Within weak-pronoun environments, bound pronouns could run into morphophonological difficulties like syllabification. Here too free pronouns were available (DME.II: 2.2), unlike in French (Rezac 2011: ch. 4), but as in Irish (McCloskey 1986, Andrews 1990, Legate 1999). In the latter sort of systems then, free *forms* can grammaticalise for weak-pronoun *structures*, perhaps specific structures like accusatives, but bound forms are still preferred (for analyses, see op.cit.).⁵

3.2.2 Origin of enclitics in Breton-Cornish

Accusative clitics came in second position of the clause in Proto-Indo-European (Wackernagel's Law, Walkden 2020: 1.2). In Insular Celtic, this placement had become relativised to the morphological complex of the finite verb, so that they became mesoclitics, coming after the first clitic conjunction or particle if there was one (Vendryes's Restriction, Eska 1994). When the verb itself was the initial element of the verbal complex, henceforth V1, accusative clitics should have attached to it as enclitic, but these were lost and unblocked free pronouns in Brythonic. By the time evidence is available in Brythonic, positive imperatives and jussives are the sole relevant V1. Early Welsh tracks the resulting asymmetry with imperatives-jussives between free pronoun O in V1, and mesoclitic O to hosts like negation in nonV1 (DME.II: 2.1-3 with lit.).⁶

In Middle Cornish of 14C-, two further developments have taken place, shown in (3). One is enclisis of free pronouns, here =*ve*, =*vy* vs. free *my*. The new forms are identical to the preexisting doubling enclitics, and perhaps encliticised as part of the same tendency. The other development is generalisation of enclisis from V1 to imperatives, as here with negation *na=*, which earlier and elsewhere in the system hosts mesoclitics. Both developments are found in Breton, and the system is a good proxy for the early Middle Breton of 12C. Unlike in Breton, but as in Welsh, there is no person restriction of the enclitics (DME.II: 2.3-4).

(3) Imperative O in Middle Cornish (PA[†], early 15C)

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. holy-ough= <i>ve</i>
follow-!2PL=1SG
follow me! | b. na= <i>vlamy</i> -ough= <i>vy</i>
NEG= <i>blame</i> -!2PL=1SG
do not blame me! |
|--|---|

At some point the new enclitics as bound could no longer be analysed as unblocked free forms, so their distribution needed a new mechanism. One is sketched here that relates to subsequent development of Breton (3.3) and analyses of cognate system (Newton 2006, Adger 2006). In Brythonic, weak pronouns raised to some sufficiently high derived position and attached morphophonologically leftward to the highest of a set of left-peripheral heads, call it C (see 3.3 with lit, on the relevant derived position, Adger 2006, Matushansky 2006, Richards 2001: 2.3 and Hrafnbjargarsson 2004: 5.4.5). C was usually conjunction or particle like negation that amalgamated with the lower finite verb, and then the pronouns surfaced as accusative mesoclitics. In V1, the verb itself was in C, and the outcome was combinations of verb-form and accusative enclitic. They disappeared early, and case-syncretic free pronouns were unblocked, but much later these encliticised in Breton-Cornish (DME.II: 2.4). By then, V1 was productive only in the imperative-jussive, inviting reanalysis that linked enclisis with mood, both in V1 when the verb was in C, and when e.g. negation *na=* was in C (see Mavrogiorgos 2010, Rowlett 2014 on analogues). The new enclisis, like the old, is here taken to be take place from some derived position like Spec,v, but externalisable only with imperative-jussive verb forms, which had grammaticalised as enclitic hosts. NonV1 imperatives-jussives like those with negation *na=*

⁵ The difference between French and Irish will come up at several points. It may be illustrated by French *nous=ri/*frions* '1PL.NOM=laugh/*fry-1PL' or *bois-tu/*je* 'drink=2SG/*1SG', with the gaps ineffable, but Ulster Irish conditional *chuirfi-mis* 'choose-1PL', **chuirfeadh muid* 'choose 1PL' vs. gapped **chuirfi-dis* → *chuirfeadh siad* for 3PL. Celtic systems also show the preference for bound forms when these realise strong structures (in Breton only with prepositional inflection, Jouiiteau and Rezac 2006).

⁶ In Brythonic, the imperative has 2SG, 2PL, 1PL forms and no subject distinct from inflections, the jussive 3SG, 3PL and overt subject that include those ranging over speaker-addressee like *each of you* (DME.II 5.2, and 4.5 below).

then had two options, this new enclisis, and the older mesoclisis shared with other moods. The former is typical but not exclusive in Cornish, and both were input to Breton (DME.II: 2.3).

3.2.3 Proclisis in Breton and person restrictions

Early 16C Breton elaborates on the developments seen in 14C- Cornish in two ways. One is independent of the imperative: transformation of mesoclisis to proclisis (DME.II: 2.2; Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 354, Hemon 1975: §53). In Brythonic and in Cornish, accusatives were mesoclitic, while genitives were mesoclitic after certain prepositions and plain proclitic otherwise. In Breton, accusative and genitive clitic had become syncretic save for 3SGM, the mesoclitic forms of both had been replaced by proclitic ones save for 1SG/2SG (shaded in Table 4), and even in 1SG/2SG, the syncretism made available proclitic forms in environments where accusative mesoclitics earlier had had no leftward host (dark-shaded in Table 4).

Table 4: Breton old mesoclitic =x= (1SG/2SG) and new proclitic x= (all)

	Initial Middle Cornish		Middle Breton		a/na=__=V _{FIN} 'R/NEG', a=__=N 'of'		
	ACC	GEN	ACC	GEN	Middle Cornish	Middle Breton	
	ACC	GEN	ACC	GEN	ACC	GEN	
1SG	–	ow=	ma=		a/na=m=	a/na=m=	
1PL	–	agan=	(h)on=		a/na=(ga)n=	a=gan=	
3SGM	–	y=	en=	e=	a/na=n=	a=y=	
						Ø/n=en=	Ø=e=

This shift should have added proclisis to enclisis and mesoclisis for accusative coding in the imperative-jussives, and did, being witnessed for 3rd person in the jussive for V1 (DME II: 2.3). Here comes in the second innovation of Breton, person restrictions in the imperative. In 3rd person, there are used the enclitics attached from free pronouns, extended from V1 to nonV1, as in Cornish. In 1st/2nd person, pro/mesoclitics appear, i.e. the surviving mesoclitics in 1SG/2SG in nonV1, and the new proclitics in 1PL/2PL in (non)V1, and in 1SG/1SG in V1.

(4) Middle Breton imperative and jussive (J[†], Pm[†], early 16C)

1/2 pro/mesoclitic imperative

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <i>ma</i> =confirm
1SG.ACC ^o =confirm!2SG | b. <i>na</i> = <i>m</i> =ancoufha
NEG=1SG.ACC=forget!2SG |
| 3 enclitic imperative | |
| c. <i>les</i> =ef
leave!2SG=3SGM | d. <i>na</i> =blasfem=ef
NEG=blaspheme!2SG=3SGM |
| 3 proclitic or enclitic jussive | |
| e. <i>en</i> =miret
3SGM.ACC=keep!3SG | f. <i>roent</i> =ef
give!3PL=3SGM |

These person restrictions are mysterious at this point. There are none in Cornish or Welsh. They did not arise from issues with proclitic-host combinations in the development of Breton. The missing 3 proclitics are found outside the imperative-jussive (historically nonV1), and in the jussive (V1 in (4)). The missing 1/2 enclitics are like 3 regular in imperatives of Cornish, and in Breton also with 3 used in doubling, e.g. *ma=cred-et=me* '1SG=believe-!2PL=1SG' (J[†]), as well as for coding arguments in certain constructions like *gwa=me* 'woe=1SG' (3.7). External accounts of such personsplits look to form-frequency correspondences, but on these, the more recent and formally more marked enclitics should have specialised for the less frequent human objects (3.7). Internalist approaches to clisis splits look to host position or mood (see Mavrogiorgos 2010, Pescarini 2021 with lit.), or higher clausal positions of ½ than 3 (Wiltschko 2006), and these too leads to the wrong expectations about the imperative alone and in

comparison with the *have*-perfect (3.6). However, in the perfect, the restriction can be traced directly to *mihi est* ‘have’, and it offers a source for the imperative as well.⁷

3.3 *BE, Mihi est, and the perfect*

3.3.1 *The Insular Celtic Background*

Insular Celtic originally had indirective alignment in morphology: a dative case marked Rs like goals, experiencers, and possessors, while accusative marked O and nominative S. The closest cognate systems of Italic Latin and Germanic Gothic also have indirective alignment in syntax of the cognate cases: passives promote accusative O to nominative S without affecting dative R (Napoli 2018; Miller 2019; this cannot be examined in remnants of the promoting passive in Brythonic, q.v. 3.8, 4.4.3, but might be in Old Irish, cf. Thurneysen 1946: §409).

By the time Insular Celtic is attested, dative Rs had mostly been recoded as prepositional, but pronominal clitic Rs continued the inflectional dative as a receding option. In these clitics, dative and accusative had collapsed, making for secundative alignment, but indirective alignment remained in syntax: accusative clitics coding R but not O alternated with prepositional phrases, and corresponded to genitive clitics in nominalisations. In Brythonic, Rs with transitives and intransitives remain in earlier Welsh and coincide with Old Irish (Lloyd-Jones 1928). In Breton and Cornish, traces of these R clitics are found with several intransitives, but with productive with two, and one can combine with animate S: BE used as *have*, the focus here (DME.I: 4.3 with lit.).

In all early Insular Celtic systems, the uses of *have* are expressed in two different ways with BE. One construction, *apud me est*, always codes the possessum with the morphology and syntax of the nominative S of plain BE, and the possessor through prepositions, ‘to’, ‘on’, ‘with’. The other, *mihi est*, in its earliest form also codes the possessum like nominative S at least in morphology, and the possessor as the dative-accusative clitic R. This situation is continued in early Welsh, with *mihi est* rare and recessive and *apud me est* productive; neither ϕ -restriction nor subjecthood can be examined (DME.I: sec. 4-5). Both *apud me est* and *mihi est* are found in the cognate systems of Latin and Gothic (Baldi and Nutti 2001; Miller 2009; Bauer 2002). The rich corpus of early Latin reveals that S of *mihi est* had no phi-restrictions, (5)a, and could be the structural subject, (5)b, like S of *apud me est* (cf. DME.I: sec. 2).⁸

(5) S in *mihi est* of Latin (Plautus: *Casina*[†], *Rudens*[†]; Old Latin, -3C)

Agreeing 2nd person S in mihi est

a. ut tu mihi es
as 2SG.NOM 1SG.DAT be.2SG
as thou art mine

⁷ The one other ϕ -asymmetry in the clitic system is the survival of mesoclitics, productively accusative-genitive 1SG =*m*=, 2SG =*z*= to early 18C, marginally accusative-only 3rd person =*s*= in 16C; they may have been singled out as early nonsyllabic forms (DME.III). The asymmetry is irrelevant for the restriction of enclitics to 3, but it could have aided the restriction of pro/mesoclitics to 1/2: 3 mesoclitic become nonproductive > remaining mesoclitic 1SG/2SG block enclitics when available > analogy extends blocking to 1SG/2SG, 1PL/2PL proclitic. Even this is unavailable on descriptions of Middle Breton, where 3 proclitics are also available in old mesoclitic contexts of imperatives (Hemon 1975: §53); but they are not clearly so attested and set aside for simplicity (DMB.II: 2.3), though compatible with what follows (negative imperatives would have the system here and that other moods, a common duality, Rowlett 2014).

⁸ The terminology of *have*-constructions here is grounded in Latin (Baldi and Nutti 2001), following work on possession (Heine 1997): transitive *habeo* ‘have.1SG’; *be* in *mihi est* ‘1SG.DAT be.3SG’; *be* in *apud me est* ‘at 1SG.ACC be.3SG’; *have* serves to group these constructions, and BE is used for the suppletive stems corresponding to *be* of each system. Each *have*-construction’s range of uses varies across systems and their stages (Baldi and Nutti 2001 on Latin, Stolz et al. 2008 on Celtic, generally Heine 1997, Stassen 2010, Myler 2016); in Middle Breton *mihi est* and *apud me* overlap with different frequencies for almost all uses of *have/avoir* (DME.III). Obliques could be subjects of infinitives in Latin (Barðdal et al. 2020) and I do not know whether dative R of *mihi est* could at any point, nor how early its S is attested as PRO (late in *Institutiones*, Gaius 1, §60, Justinian 1, x, §2). In Middle Welsh S of *mihi est* is 3, which is unrevealing under its usual uses there, save in the nonce *us=be.2SG kind* ‘that thou beest kind to us’, also unrevealing, since in systems where high obliques restrict S, low obliques like the dative of *kind* do not (Sigurðsson 1996: sec. 2; Rezac 2016: sec. 4; cf. Postal 1984: 153-8, 1990: 177, Rezac 2011: 162-3).

Agreeing 2nd person S under passive ECM in *mihi est*

- b. qui [[__ Herculei socius esse] diceris]
 who Hercules.DAT companion.NOM be.INF say.PASS.2SG
 who art said be companion to Hercules

3.3.2 Dative subject in Breton-Cornish

In Breton and Cornish, *apud me est* remains unmodified in coding and structure, but *mihi est* undergoes several developments, traced here with focus on Breton, first for R and then for S.

In Breton, the elements BE and accusative-syncretic clitic coding R remain in *mihi est* to early 18C and then in the southeast to 21C. Morphophonological developments at the clitic + BE boundary can induce opacity. However, the clitic keeps on taking up new forms and allomorphies of accusative clitics as they develop for O, and the stem new forms of BE like the infinitive when it appears in 17C, as well as new form-usage couplings like those affecting the past subjunctive of BE (DME.I: 4.1-3 building on Ernault 1888, Le Goff 1927).

In the shared history of Breton and Cornish < 14C, there had also taken place two new innovations that reified the earlier secundative syntax of R. One can be interpreted as the introduction of dative morphology. It took the prefix **di-* > *de-*, originally perhaps a cislocative-applicative preverb and found with BE in usages other than *mihi est* and in *mihi est* after any-person R-clitics, and specialised it to after all and only 3 R-clitics in *mihi est*, (6)b (DME.I: 2.4, following Fleuriot 1964, 2002). The new distribution suggests dative coding because that tends towards syncretism with accusatives higher in the person hierarchy, e.g. 1/2 but not 3 in French (Adger and Harbour 2007; Næss 2008; Starke 2017; Bárány 2018).

(6) Development of dative *de* and clitic-doubling in *mihi est* (constructed)

Apud me est (at all stages)

- a. pa=vezo galloud {dezo, da tud, *dezo tud}
 when=will.be power to.3PL to people to.3PL people

Mihi est (reconstructed → 16C)

- b. pa=z=(de-)vezo (*tud) galloud → p=q≈de≈vezo (tud) galloud
 when=3PL.A=to-will.be people power when=3PL.A°-DAT=will.be
 When they/people will have power.

The other development is extension of dative morphosyntax from clitic to free (pro)nominals, also in (6)b. The residue of dative R in Brythonic was limited to clitics, nonclitics having become prepositional. The could double preverbal nonclitic R in certain constructions like clefts, reanalysis of which had given a new preverbal position across Brythonic (Meelen 2019 with lit.), and so nonclitic R + doubling dative clitic in *mihi est* (DME.I: 5.1-2, cf. Mac Cana 1973). By the time of relevant attestations in 15C-, this nonclitic R had spread to the postverbal field (6)b. In doing so, it kept its clitic doubling, which was unique in the system, though analogies extending doubling to the postverbal field might readily have introduced it elsewhere, say *apud me est* (6)a (DMH.I: 5.1-3). The result matches asymmetries in other systems where doubling distinguishes so-called quirky case, i.e. case that like typical inherent case reflects c/s-selection, but like typical structural case participates in φ/A-movement dependencies (Anagnostopoulou 1999, 2003, Michelioudakis 2015, DME.I: 5.3; see here 4.2).⁹

Among systems with such quirky obliques, in some they resist certain subjecthood dependencies, for perhaps trivial morphological reasons like the absence of oblique PRO (4.2). Breton and Cornish both hint early on in word order that R but not S is the subject of *mihi est* (DME.II: 5.2). That evidence becomes categorical in Breton (DME.II: 5.4). By 16C, the perfect periphrasis isolates a subjecthood position for S/A between auxiliary and participle, and R but not S of *mihi est* join them. By 17C infinitives develop from nominalisations and isolate the

⁹ Early, clitic doubling matches φ-features; in later southeastern varieties, it does so when doubling personal pronouns including (N)OC PRO, and otherwise neutralises to 3SGM, also used for doubling arbitrary PRO.

same group as specified subjects and PRO, (7)c. All other obliques are prepositional phrases inert to ϕ -dependencies and subjecthood diagnostics, (7)b, including the R of *apud me est*, (7)a. In these respects Breton is like Icelandic (DME.I: 5.4, also DME.II: 5.2).

(7) OC PRO in Breton (J. Marion: EOv, MG; late 18C - early 19C SE)

Apud me est

- a. eit PRO *bout* d'oh hou=ç'hunan
for be.INF to.2PL 2PL.GEN°=self
[you should withdraw yourself ... from the world] in order for you to be your own

Passive of ditransitive

- b. eit PRO *bout* presentét de=Zoué
for be.INF presented to=God
[desires of the Faithful] to be presented to God

Mihi est

- c. eit PRO *hou=poud=ean*.
for 2PL.ACC°=be.INF=3SGM
[except if you had deceived] in order to have it.

Only limited commitments to analysis are needed at this point. T is taken to be the locus of nominative ϕ -dependencies and of subjecthood in infinitives (their left periphery in Breton being poor as in English rather than Italian, Stephens 1990, Rezac 2010a). Two structures need to be available for unaccusatives that combine S with R, (8). One, general in Breton, codes R as PP; the other, as quirky dative (some other quirky oblique like accusative would also do). Further details can be left open, so long as S is the sole goal for ϕ /A-dependencies of T, for instance because S is closer than R, or because these dependencies see quirky obliques, but not ordinary inherent or prepositional ones (for α P then, see e.g. Wood and Marantz 2017; Myler 2016 for *mihi est*, Wood and Sigurðsson 2014 for similar unaccusatives in Icelandic, Anagnostopoulou and Sevdali 2020 in Greek; on obliques, 4.2 here).¹⁰

- (8) a. *Apud me* [S_{NOM} T ... [α S [... R_{PP} ...]]] or [S_{NOM} T ... [α R_{PP} [... S ...]]]
b. *Mihi est* [R_{DAT} T ... [α R [... S ...]]]

In Breton, BE is at first one of two verbs with productive quirky dative R (cf. for such distributions Icelandic psych-unaccusative codings, Thráinsson 2007: 4.2, English *strike*, Marantz 1983: 4.1, or English R + infinitive, Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 14.3.1.2-3). The other is *deur-* ‘matter to’ > ‘want’ with clausal or abstract S; it shares the developments of *mihi est*, but it is reanalysed with nominative S in 16-17C (DME.I: sec. 4-5, DME.III), as is *mihi est* over 18C outside the southeast (3.7). Other remnants of dative R are idiomatic and soon lost or reanalysed (much along the lines of *woe is us*, *woe are we* in English, Abbot 1870: §230).

3.3.3 Nominative object in Breton-Cornish

Brythonic inherited ϕ -agreement of free (pro)nominal and *pro* S/A with the finite verb by suffixes. It remained available after the loss of case inflections, with preverbal or postverbal S/A, including S of *mihi est*. This is the situation in earlier Welsh (Schumacher 2011 and further lit. in DME.II: 3.1). By 14C Breton and Cornish, free (pro)nominal S/A combine with the 3SG/default form, and the old agreement suffixes remain only to code otherwise silent bound-pronoun S/A (doublable by enclitics). S of *apud me est* participates in this development, (9).

¹⁰ Throughout, T and v are conventions, and may reflect complex systems such as v for the semantic introducer of A and accusative ϕ /case locus but Voice for the c-selector of A (Alexiadou et al. 2015), and T for the nominative ϕ /case locus but Fin for the highest A-position (cf. Holmberg 2017, Cardinaletti 2004, Rizzi and Shlonsky 2006).

(9) (Non)agreement with *S* of *apud me est* in Breton (J. Pourchasse: CGS[†]; 18C SE)

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------|----|--|--------------------------------------|
| a. | Deoh hemp
to.2PL without more will.be-1SG.N
I will always be yours. | perpet | b. | Mé vou
1SG will.be to.2PL
I will be yours alone. | deoh hemb partage
without sharing |
|----|---|--------|----|--|--------------------------------------|

Analyses differ, but concur that there was change from a system where ϕ -suffixes were agreement controlled by nominatives without restrictions of category/size, position, or distance, to one where the controller had to be a bound or weak pronoun in a local configuration (see a.o. for Breton, Anderson 1982, Stump 1984, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006; Irish, McCloskey and Hale 1984, Legate 1999, Ackema and Neeleman 2003; Welsh, Willis 1998). Here it is supposed that both earlier and later systems have a ϕ -dependency of T with nominatives. In both, silent nominative pronouns are of the Italian *pro* type, rather than weak *egli* or strong *lui* type, and like *pro* or *egli* licensed in a local configuration with the target of agreement, say Spec,T (Cardinaletti 2004, Cardinaletti and Starke 1999, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, Rizzi 1986; Holmberg and Roberts 2010). In the later system, agreement only surfaces in this configuration, for reasons left open here (e.g. realisation of ϕ -values on T in the local context of *pro*, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006, cf. 5.4; extra structure to free (pro)nominals, cf. note 41).

The *S* of *mihi est* was by then in object position and *R* in subject position, as in Icelandic (see above). With the agreement change, object-position *S* lost bound-pronoun forms licensed by agreement in Spec,T. Free pronouns should have become available to realise even weak-pronoun *S*, as with *V1*, and then encliticised, as in the imperative (3.2). That is the coding of *S* of *mihi est* found as soon as there is evidence, 14C in Cornish, 16C in Breton (DME.II: 3.1):¹¹

(10) 3rd person objects of *mihi est* in early Brythonic (verbs are 3SG/DFLT)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| Welsh (BT [†] , 14C) | Cornish (CE [†] , late 14C) | Breton (N [†] , 16C) |
| a. ny= <u>th</u> =vi
NEG=2SG.A ^o =be
you will not have it | b. ha ty a= <u>vy</u> 3= <u>hy</u>
and 2SG R.2SG.A ^o =be=3SGF
and you will have her | c. n= <u>oz</u> =boe=y
2PL.A ^o =be.PT=3PL
you did not have them |

As in the imperative, once free pronouns encliticised, their availability no longer followed from the unavailability of bound pronouns. The mechanism adopted here builds on known A-movements of nominative objects and encliticisation of nominatives. Icelandic reveals the interaction of case with derived phrasal A-positions. Each position is unselective about case and so filled by the highest of nominative, accusative, quirky inherent case in its domain. For the subject position, Spec,T, this is any of A, S, O, R, while for object position, Spec,v, it is all but A, i.e. S, O, R (Thráinsson 2007: 7.2.4). Scandinavian systems indicate that derived object position can licence all (pro)nominals or only weak pronouns (Holmberg 1999; but cf. Erteschik-Schir et al. 2020). Clitics have been analysed as another such class, with morphophonological attachment as the licensing mechanism (Kramer 2014, cf. Matushansky 2006).

In Brythonic, accusative bound pronouns were mesoclitics attached leftward to the highest overt left-peripheral head *C* and rightward to the finite verb amalgamated with it, unless the verb was in *C* in *V1*, when free pronouns were unblocked (3.2). The meso- to proclisis shift in Breton emancipated accusative clitics from leftward dependence on *C* by 14C (3.2). Their new host can be seen to be below *C*, from their attachment to infinitives once they develop in 17C (DME.II: 4.5), and to the participle rather than auxiliary of the periphrastic perfect from late 16C (3.5, cf.

¹¹ This pathway follows from observed changes in agreement. An earlier, compatible one would pass through initial loss of agreement with nominative objects in oblique-subject constructions (DME.II: 3.1, as in Icelandic, 5.4). It gives different if likely untestable predictions about early Welsh; it is inferred, but might be independently witnessed in early Breton where the old agreement system remains still in jussives (DME.II: 5.2, if for instance *V1* allows general nonrealisation of ϕ -values of T, but irrelevant if analysed C-agreement). The chief alternative is early reanalysis of *mihi est* from dative-nominative to dative-accusative, so that instead of nominative unblocked by nonagreement with objects, accusative is unblocked by incompatibility with the R-coding pro/mesoclitic (cf. later Lambert 1999: 823). A number of contrasts speak against accusative analysis of the enclitics (DME.II: 352, 357, and below 3.6.3), but if followed, *mihi est* would be the Breton counterpart of *falloir-manquer* in French (cf. Rezac 2022). Its person restrictions would then reflect the *me lui* type of PCC, and the conclusions here remain with technical changes.

(15)). The result is modeled here through optional A-movement of objects to Spec,v, and attachment of weak pronouns from Spec,v rightward to the v-containing host, by which they and only they are licensed (Rezac 2005; cf. Kramer 2014: esp. 4.5). This is Figure 1 (left).¹²

Figure 1: Object clitic development prior to person restrictions

	ACC object 's/he sees us'		ACC object 'see us!'		NOM object 'you have them'
Enc. to C	C=n _{1PL} .ACC=gwel _{see+v+T} <i>same</i>	Unbl. V1 Enc. to T	gwel _{see+...+C} ni _{1PL} gwel _{see+v+T!} =ni		=z _{2SG} .ACC=bez _{be} y _{3PL} =z _{2SG} .ACC=bez _{be} =y
Pro. to v (Cf. pf.	hon _{1PL} .ACC=gwel =z=bez hon=gwelet _{seen}		hon=gwel~gwel=ni =z=bezet hon=gwelet		<i>same</i> =z=bez=y gwelet)

In the imperative-jussive, there was an alternative going back to unblocked free pronouns of V1 and later changes in <14C Breton-Cornish (3.2.2). It can be integrated as alternative attachment of weak pronouns in Spec,v rightward to T. The outcome is well-formed only for verb-forms grammaticalised as hosts of the new case-syncretic enclitics, which were imperative-jussives forms in < 14C Breton-Cornish (3.2.2). This is Figure 1 (center).

This same unblocking and enclisis of free pronouns also attached nominative objects of *mihi est* in <14C Breton-Cornish. Their analysis relies on elements already posited, Figure 2 (right). Spec,v was available to objects of any case. Nominative objects could not be licensed there by pro/mesoclis, since these clitics were specified as accusative. The alternative attachment as enclisis from Spec,v to T was available and *be* grammaticalised as host. Here too the perfect sheds light on the outcome, since the enclitics attach to the auxiliary rather than participle as soon as they appear in 16C (DME.II: 3.3, cf. here (15)), and the auxiliary is revealed to be in T rather than C when infinitives are innovated in 17C (cf. 3.5). Close analogues of this nominative enclisis have been studied from Spec,T to C (esp. Bennet et al. 2019: sec. 3 on Irish, guiding the present analysis, see also for relevant discussion Sigurðsson and Wood 2019).

These displacement to object A-positions and morphophonological cliticisations are the synchronic encodings of diachronic reductions of the formal content of free pronouns, and/or their implementation, depending on the theoretical perspective, in interaction other changes such as reduction of V1 (cf. Hopper and Traugott 2003; Roberts 2007). The resulting accusative pro/meso- and case-syncretic enclitics are both clitic by criteria of form and position, but arose at different times through different mechanisms, with different position and correlates (3.6). The identical coding of accusative O in imperatives-jussives and nominative S as object of *mihi est* arises from their history of unblocked and encliticised case-syncretic weak pronouns.

For nominatives, the result was the coexistence of two bound pronoun types. One was the older *pro*, by its agreement-sensitive licensing restricted to subjects of finite clauses. The other was the newer enclitics, by their attachment mechanics restricted to objects but unaffected by finiteness and so available in infinitives when they arose (close to older *pro* and newer *egli* types of Italian save that both are restricted to subjects, Cardinaletti 2004). In Breton-Cornish, *mihi est* was the sole source of clear weak-pronoun nominative object S. Other oblique-subject unaccusatives are too poorly attested when still extant (3.3.2), and object-position nominatives in existential-presentational constructions need focus (4.3, unless in presentatives of 3.7.1).

In Breton, these nominative objects will presently be seen to extend from S to O in the grammaticalisation of *mihi est* as perfect auxiliary, and through analogy over the case-syncretic enclitics to the imperative. With this extension, the restriction of enclisis to structural objects gives them an absolute distribution, or split-absolute when taking into account their person restriction: object nominative S of *mihi est*, O of the *have*-perfect and imperative. This is in line with analyses of a class of absolute S/O as nominative (Legate 2017), and as there, it arises because of some deviation from nominativity of subject A/R (such as obliqueness of R with *mihi est* and A of the *have*-perfect built on it; sec. 4). However, they have a form specific to

¹² The residual mesoclitics are now simply nonsyllabic proclitics, and so need a leftward host (cf. DME.II: 330n6).

nominative S/O as object, because historically they only attached from object position, and so contrast with nominative S/A as subject (cf. 5.4).¹³

3.4 Person restrictions: *mihi est*

3.4.1 *The restrictions*

Person restrictions have been introduced above with the imperative: diachrony would expect an all-enclitic, all-proclitic, or free system, but instead there appear 1/2 accusative proclitics and 3 enclitics. The history of these restrictions is traced here from *mihi est* to perfects to imperatives. There are ready accounts of the 3 restriction on enclitics with *mihi est* in work on internal principles behind split-nominative objects, and external effects behind bound-pronoun restrictions (explored here). Both sorts of approach lend themselves to subsequent extension of the restrictions (3.5-6). They come apart in limits to them (3.7).

It is useful to introduce together the background and controls common to person restrictions in Breton. The restrictions are described in some of the earliest grammars in 19C (e.g. Le Bayon 1878), and then linguistic studies of 20-21C (e.g. Ternes 1970, Cheveau 2007, Crahé 2014) and are borne out by corpora (Hemon 1975: §11, DME.II). They affect imperatives, lexical *mihi est*, and the *have*-perfect built on it, the latter two grouped here as *have*-construction.

Each restricted construction stands beside unrestricted ones with similar use – future, present and infinitive for commands, independently and sometimes in suppletion (DME.II: 2.5); *apud me est* and transitive *kavout* ‘find, get’ for possession, also independently or in suppletion (DME.I: 5.4); past beside perfect that replaces it (Hemon 1975: §130n1). The restrictions limit enclitics to 3, while the missing 1/2 may be ineffable, or accusative but without accusative 3. The same clitics have no restrictions in uses, such as enclitics doubling bound pronouns proclitics coding O on synthetic forms. Their free, strong pronoun counterparts are also unrestricted even in the restricted constructions, for instance under focus-fronting (11). Such strong-pronoun objects are rare in all constructions, and of limited use here since free pronouns do not distinguish case. Another matter is use of free pronouns as weak to repair the restrictions on clitics; it will be seen to have been largely unavailable, and of theoretical significance.

(11) Free strong pronoun object of *have* constructions in Breton

Lexical mihi est (S. Guillome: ALLS; early 20C SE)

- a. Mi hou=pou doh en=nouz
1SG 2PL.ACC°=will.be from the=night
You will have me by night [or by day].

Have-perfect (E. Gueguen: Cnf; early 17C)

- b. huy a=m=eus galuet an=sarmant me eo an=guiznyen
2PL R=1SG=be called the=shoot 1SG be the=vine
[You in sacred place who serve me:] you I have called the branch, I am the vine.

Here the restrictions of *mihi est* are introduced. From 19C, descriptions and studies limit its S-coding enclitics to 3. Earlier, there are corpora, but these are limited for *mihi est* by base-line rarity of definite human “possessa” on many of its uses, as with English *have* (q.v. Brugmann 1988, Myler 2016 with lit.). Thus the earliest texts only show that such human enclitics were available as 3 even in earliest attestations of *mihi est*, Cornish (10)b and Breton (2)d.

¹³ The analysis here makes theoretical choices that would need to be recast under alternatives, including in the role afforded to morphophonology in cliticisation (Matushansky 2006, Kramer 2014, Bennett et al. 2019, cf. a.o. Morin 1979: 304n5, Arregi and Nevins 2018; alternatives in a.o. Pescarini 2021 with lit.), and the role of case (vs. e.g. an idiomatic construction for S in *mihi est*, cf. Barðdal 2006). Some elements have been left open: the trigger of A-movement (ϕ , Anagnostopoulou 2003; not ϕ , Preminger 2014), the interaction of ϕ /case with quirky datives to give their clitic doubling (for compatible approaches, op.cit., Kramer 2014, Anagnostopoulou 2017, 2018, Preminger 2019), and the realisation of these dative clitics as accusative-syncretic pro/mesoclitics + dative on the bearer of T, not v (largely following from their subject position, 3.3.2, historical syncretism with accusative clitics, ibid., and mechanics of doubling, op.cit.).

More revealing is the challenge of translating clitic + *avoir* from French. *Mihi est* and enclitics are the rule for 3, even human, but for 1/2, southeastern varieties turn to *apud me est* or transitive *kavout* ‘find, get’, which have no restrictions, as in (12)a (DME.II: 3.2).

(12) Lexical *mihi est* + 1/2 possessa in Matthew 26:11 in Breton

- Southeast* *apud me est* (J. Guequellou: HJC; early 18C SE)
- a. *ne=me=havehet* *quetberpet*
 NEG=1SG.ACC^o=will.find.2PL.NOM not always
- Northwest* *a-form* (J.-F. Le Gonidec: TJK; early 19C NW)
- b. *n'=hó=pézô* *két bépréd ac'hanoun*
 NEG=2PL.ACC^o=will.be not always of.1SG
 you will not always have me (source *vous ne m'aurez pas toujours*, DME.III)

Other varieties differ in a revealing way. In 18C, they replace accusative-proclitic O by free forms repurposed from inflections of *a* ‘of’, henceforth *a-forms*. Over 18C, they also partly or wholly recode the anomalous objects of imperatives and *have*-constructions as plain accusatives, using both the older any-person accusative proclitics and the new *a-forms*. The *a-forms* are thus used in (12)b. However, before *a-forms* generalise in early 18C, these varieties resort to them when neither clitics nor free pronouns might have been a good choice for coding O. Such is S of *mihi est* in 1/2, beside the regular enclitic in 3, (13) (DME.II: 4.2).¹⁴

(13) Lexical *mihi est* in Breton (C. ar Bris: IN, RP; early 18C NW)

- Tr. of F. de Sales *Introduction à la vie dévôte*
- a. *ho=pezo=ii* *evit compagnunezet*
 2PL.ACC^o=will.be=3PL for companions
 [that] you have them as companions (source: *que vous les eussiez ... pour compagnes*)
- Tr. of P. de Barry *Réflexions sur les quatre fins derniers*
- b. *ho=pezo* *ac'hanon [...]* *evit ho=Parner*
 2PL.ACC^o=will.be of.1SG for 2PL.GEN^o=judge
 you will have me [at least] as your judge (source: *vous m'avez du moins pour votre juge*)

These strategies all confirm the descriptions of person restrictions of enclitics to 3. They also suggest that free pronouns were unavailable to take over from enclitics in weak-pronoun contexts for 1/2. This is in fact an inference available from early grammars. They describe varieties that distinguish enclitics and free pronouns in position but not form, and unlike later work do not draw the distinction. They bar both when contrasting absence of 1/2 enclitics with *mihi est* with other constructions (esp. Le Bayon 1878, Guillevic and Le Goff 1902).

3.4.2 External source: Entrenchment

Mihi est lends itself to well-explored origins for person restrictions. On externalist approaches, this is reification of frequencies as gaps arbitrary with respect to internal principles (Haspelmath 2004, 2020 for *me lui* and analogues). Freely combinable elements can conventionalise in constructions, at least when grammaticalised as bound, and that can entrench low frequencies as gaps in bound forms (cf. Yang 2016: ch. 5). Human personal pronouns had likely been rare as S of *mihi est* on its early and even later extended uses (to go by early corpora of Brythonic, and proxies in *have*, *avoir* on Google n-gram). Grammaticalisation of enclitics from free pronouns

¹⁴ *A-forms* likely originate from use of ‘of’ to code partitive O/S (Stark and Widmer 2020) and are sporadically used to code pronominal O in negative clauses in all 16-17C varieties (DME.II: 4.2) before use as stopgaps in 17C and generalised in early 18C. Intriguingly, in none of these uses-stages, or later, are they restricted to pronouns with human or inanimate referents, and so not animacy-related differential object marking (ibid).

could then reify their low frequency as restriction of the enclitics to nonhuman when coding S of *mihi est*, leaving free pronouns to express human S.

To complete the account, some further elements are needed. A mechanism of analogy over forms can extend gaps to uses without the original frequency asymmetries or even its inverse (cf. *me lui* from ‘give’ to ‘introduce’, Haspelmath 2004). Analogy would allow spread of 1/2 gaps from ‘I have you’ to ‘I have you on my right’ uses *mihi est*, and absence of gaps in 3 from ‘I have it’ to ‘I have him’, since the distinction was not made in pronoun form, even if conventionalisation can gap particular usages of syncretic forms. Entrenchment is not deterministic, so it is not entailed that it should at any point have gapped the rarely-human S of BE + ‘to’ for possessor in *apud me est*, or the theme O of (*daz*)*pre*- ‘buy (back)’. Analogy might also have aided in absence of these gaps, say with BE + ‘with’ or *kele* ‘instruct’. When need arose to express 1/2 S of *be to* in devotional literature, (9), or O when ‘buy (back)’ was recruited for ‘redeem’, there were no issues, unlike with *mihi est* in (12).

The account lacks an explanation for why free pronouns did not remain available for 1/2 as weak-pronoun S of *mihi est*, as they seem not to have been (see above). The issue is pervasive with other person restrictions like *me lui* (Postal 1990, Rezac 2011: ch. 4 on French), and inherent in similar person restrictions on free pronouns like *mihi est* of Finnish and psych-unaccusatives of Icelandic (4.2). Up to this point, entrenchment of gaps from frequencies has been fairly neutral about theoretical frameworks, including internalist approaches like the one here (cf. Yang 2016). This becomes more nuanced when attempting to block free forms. That needs blocking the composition of free forms and their associated meanings when these exist, as free Merge and Function Application (Chomsky 1995, Heim and Kratzer 1998), though not when all composition is licensed by arbitrary specifiable constructions (Fillmore and Kay 1999, Goldberg 2009). It could be generally implemented by devices used in conventionalisation such as selection (sec. 2), but with limitations that might be inadequate (for the subject of ECM, if infinitives with perception verbs and their perfects are ECM in Breton, DME.III).¹⁵

3.4.3 Internalist: ϕ -intervention

Of internalist approaches to person restrictions involving interactions of arguments like subject and object, the one explored here for Jahnsson’s Rule and other phenomena of the Person-Case Constraint is partial intervention in ϕ -dependencies within Φ /Case Theory (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Chomsky 2000) and last-resort dependent case (Rezac 2011, Kalin 2018).

The mechanics is introduced through (14) (further 4.2). The syntactic dependency is Agree. It relates each of person π and number $\#$ ϕ -features as probes on a target like T with matching features on a c-commanded goals closest by c-command. Match unifies the features though other factors can affect whether and how the unification surfaces in valuation. In (14)a, T cannot match O past A for any ϕ -feature; in (14)b, the match is complete even with object-position S; in (14)c it is split, π with R and $\#$ with S. A fully-matched goal is attributed a property that can surface in case morphology, nominative for T. In (14)c that is so for $\#$ -only S but not the incompletely-matched $\pi, \#$ -bearing S. In Breton nominative objects are realised as enclitics, and so π -less, 3-only enclitics for S in *mihi est* (14)c. The nominative ϕ /case locus T is “independent”, but accusative v “dependent” in the sense that its ϕ probes only as needed for licensing: always in (14)a, never in (14)b, but only if there is a π -bearing S in (14)c. That would allow accusative proclitics in for 1/2 S in (14)c, but these will turn out to be ineffable here, and free pronouns have not typically grammaticalised to realise weak-pronoun accusatives.

(14) T-nominative dependencies

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|
| a. Complete intervener: * | NOM: | [T $_{\pi, \# = X}$ | ... | [X $_{\pi, \#}$ | ... | *NOM $_{\pi, \#}$ |]] |
| | including <i>kavout</i> ‘get’ | [T $_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}}$ | ... | [A.NOM $_{\pi, \#}$ v [... | →ACC $_{\pi, \#}$ |]]] |]]] |
| b. No intervener: $\sqrt{\text{NOM}}$: | | [T $_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}}$ | ... | | NOM $_{\pi, \#}$ | |]] |

¹⁵ Cf. Haspelmath 2004 on *me lui*: “If a language were found in which all bound-pronoun combinations were possible at an earlier stage and certain combinations became impossible at a later stage (without attendant further grammaticalization), this would constitute counterevidence to my theory.”

- including *apud me est* [T_{π,#=NOM} ... [(KP) v [BE S.NOM_{π,#} (KP)]]
- c. Person intervener: $\sqrt[3]{3 \sim \frac{1}{2}.NOM}$: [T_{π=X/∅,#=NOM} ... X_π ... NOM_{#π,√#}]]
- including *mihi est* [T_{π=X,#=NOM} ... [R.DAT_π v [BE S.NOM_{#,→ACC_{π,#}}]]]

The person ϕ -feature π is taken to be absent on 3rd person O/S, though it is convenient to assume that selection attributes some minimal π to 3rd A/R. The number ϕ -feature correlates closely with the presence of n/N. These ϕ -features may be invisible to clausal ϕ /case loci when embedded within larger structures that license them, and one is *inherent case*, understood as c/s-selected KP like the *to*-PPs of English experiencers and their dative counterparts in German. Inherent-case KPs can also be transparent to the ϕ -features within, as in innovative varieties of Icelandic. Finally, they may behave as π -only bearers, or quirkily, as in typical varieties of Icelandic, and as the clitic-doubling R of *mihi est* in Breton. Among ways to approach quirky obliques, it may be useful to have one to hand that is externalist: grammaticalisation of uses of obliques like dative experiencers for humans as π .

These mechanics make choices among alternatives introduced more fully later, some readily replaced (4.2, a.o. minimal π for A/R vs. no π for O/S), some the focus of discussion (distribution of π and #, sec. 4, relationship of ϕ , case, and licensing, dependent case, sec. 5).

Internal and external mechanisms can give rise to different expectations. In Jahnsson's Rule, the ones here overlap for *mihi est* in Breton, but not for similar person restrictions on free pronouns (Finnish, 4.3, Icelandic, 4.1), their correlations with structural position (Icelandic, 4.1) and their contrast in synchrony and diachrony with surface-syncretic arbitrary gaps (Basque, 4.1) (cf. lit. on *me-lui* above). When there is overlap, differentiation is difficult, since typically there are no deterministic surface-oriented predictions about diachronic transitions or synchronic states, or they are limited by available evidence (see e.g., for form-frequency correspondences, sec. 6; for subjecthood, 4.2). One way of proceeding is explored here in the tracing of the spread of person restrictions, to suggest an internal principle like ϕ -intervention linking split-nominative object with certain subjects. Even when external and internal mechanisms overlap, they need not be otiose and can interact. Frequencies, specifically low frequency of $\frac{1}{2}$ S, may cue the transition of a system of the Latin sort in (8), where S of *mihi est* could be the structural subject and then had no person restrictions on agreement like the S of *apud me est*, to a system like Breton (10) or Finnish (22), where R is the subject and S person-restricted object (cf. lit. in 3.7 for such transitions, Yang 2016 for the interaction of acquisition and frequencies in gaps).

3.5 Person restrictions: Have-perfect

3.5.1 *The perfect*

To go with their inherited synthetic verbs, Breton and Cornish innovated periphrasis of BE + resultative participle for the passive of transitives and perfect of intransitives, and Breton extended it to the perfect of transitives before 16C (Le Roux 1957: 120ff., 389ff., Hemon 1975: §154). The extension takes two forms, (15). One, the *be*-perfect, may be represented as *They are (them=)self-seen* beside synthetic preterite *They them=self-saw*, is reserved to transitives reflexivised by the inherited prefix *em-* 'self-'. It codes A like S of plain BE recruited as auxiliary, O as *em-* attached to the participle alone or with accusative proclitics. The other, the *have*-perfect *Them=is=they seen* beside preterite *They them=saw*, is used with other transitives, and can extend to unergatives and even intransitives. It codes A(/S) like R of *mihi est*, and O at first like its S. Structurally, S/A is subject, O object, for instance in infinitives (cf. 3.3.2).

(15) Breton periphrastic perfect in later 16C (a-c Cath, d Gk)

- Be-perfect of reflexivised transitives*
- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| a. me so ma=em-roet | b. ma=z=eo bezet e n=em-offret |
| 1SG be 1SG.ACC ^o =REFL-given | as=R=be been 3SGM.ACC=REFL-offered |
| I have given myself | as he had offered himself [for me] |

Have-perfect of transitives

- c. oll e=m=eux=y dispriset d. euel ma=m=eux ho=advertisset
 all R=1SG.ACC^o=be=3PL despised like as=1SG.ACC^o=be 2PL.ACC^o=warned
 I have despised them all. as I have warned you.

The coding identities between lexical and perfect-auxiliary BE remain over the history of Breton: as forms, syntax and usage of BE and its R and S-coding clitics and suffixes change, so do those of the perfect auxiliaries, under the correspondence A = R and O = S, seamlessly it seems. The stability suggests that the mechanics of argument coding ensures these identities. It should not do so by taking the perfect to be BE and participial resultative predicate, *We had a child born yesterday*, since that contrasts in form and usage with *She/They had born a child yesterday* in Breton much as in English from at least 16C (DME.III; cf. with lit. Salzmann and Schaden 2019). Crosslinguistically, it seems unproblematic to code A(/S)-O like R-S in *be/have*-perfects, for that is common in systems where *have* is based on *be* (*mihi est* in circum-Baltic systems, Seržant 2012, Georgian, Hewitt 1995: 501-2, Harris 1985: 13.2, cf. Hewitt 2016, Latin, Heine 1997: 4.3; *apud me est* in Irish, Wigger 2020; perfect-nonperfect coding matches if alignment is nominative and *have* transitive, as in Romance, Drinka 2020).

The needed mechanisms are available if perfect tense can influence the coding of A. Here for Breton, the v of transitives selects for bare (pro)nominals as A, and in virtue of this, it is the ϕ /case locus of accusative as dependent case. In the perfect, there can then be posited a variant of v selected by perfect T, innovated by adopting the properties of Appl in *mihi est*. It selects quirky dative A, and in consequence, it is not an accusative ϕ /case-locus (cf. Skopeteas et al. 2012 for Georgian, and generally Bjorkman 2018, further 4.3).¹⁶

The coding of A-O in the perfect and its persistent identity with R-S of *mihi est* sets certain useful boundary conditions on the mechanisms responsible for the dative of subject A(S)/R, nominative O/S, and person restrictions of the latter in virtue of the former. Various interpretive approaches are inadequate, for instance any reference to specific theta-roles of the arguments, their interpretive relationships like possessor raising from possessum, and perhaps even their coargumenthood insofar as there is exceptional case marking of the sort *We-DAT have seen them-NOM arrive* (DME.III). Phrase-structurally local allomorphy is also excluded, and more uncertainly phrase-structurally unbounded conventionalisations, because of the unbounded distance between 3 enclitics and 1/2 proclitics in the *have*-perfect of transitives (see below).

3.5.2 Gaps, stopgaps, and repairs

When A and O of the *have*-perfect adopted the coding of R and S of *mihi est*, enclitics for O came with the 3 restriction of enclitic S, *A=BE=3.O ... PRT*. Unlike with *mihi est*, in the *have*-perfect there was functional pressure on the gap, since many verbs common in early texts are typical with human Os, e.g. *karet* ‘love’, *keleñn* ‘instruct’, *pediñ* ‘ask’.

Over 16-17C, there appears a use of accusative proclitics on the participle for 1/2 but not 3 O, is richly attested as such, and alone is described in grammars and studies down to 21C for systems that keep enclitics (see lit. in DME.II: 3.3). This accusative coding will be called the *repair* use of the accusative proclitics, *Them=be you=seen*, because the accusative proclitic is available only when an enclitic is not, *Them=be=they seen*. It is illustrated in (11) and in the context of the fuller system in (2). In its restriction to 1/2, the repair contrasts with unrestricted accusative proclitics in the older synthetic tenses of the finite verb attested at all periods from 9/10C and in all cognate systems, *O=V-A* also shown in (2), and their infinitives when these developed in 17C. It also contrasts with unrestricted accusative proclitics on the participle of the *be*-perfect of reflexivised transitives when these were added to the reflexiviser *em-* in later 16C, *They be them=self-seen*, cf. (15). Finally, it contrasts with unrestricted accusative proclitics on

¹⁶ This implementation sweeps under the rug the varying coding of S of unaccusatives and even passives as R of *mihi est* or S of plain BE in Breton (DME.II: 3.3). A more adequate alternative and closer to multipredicate structures is to introduce the dative subject of the perfect by a functional head H related to the perfect, and either have the highest argument of the vP raise to this dative in Spec,H (Bjorkman 2018, cf. 4.3), or have the dative in Spec,H interpret the highest argument of the vP left open if external or passed up through function composition if internal (Wood 2015). However, other solutions have been also advanced for similar variation in coding the S of unaccusatives (Postal 1989: 96-101; Schäfer 2008: 6.6; Berro 2019: sec. 4).

bare participles in reduced clauses, *them=seen*, rare in 16C, more clear in 18-19C (DME.II: 3.3, DME.III). Table 5 resumes this system and sketches further changes.¹⁷

Table 5: Accusative (A) pro/mesoclitic in varieties with 3 enclitics for O/S to BE_{V/AUX}

		Late 16C	Conservative	Innovative	<i>a</i> -forms
Synthetic	tr.	A=V	A=V	A=V	V <i>a</i> -form
	tr. refl. <i>mihi est</i>	A= <i>em</i> -V *	– *	– *	– R=BE <i>a</i> -form
Perfect	tr.: DAT=BE +	1/2A=PRT	1/2A=PRT	A=PRT	PRT <i>a</i> -form
	tr. refl: BE(-NOM) + <i>mihi est</i> : DAT=BE +	A= <i>em</i> -PRT *	– *	– (A=PRT)	– ?
Participle (bare)	tr.	(A=PRT)	A=PRT	?	PRT <i>a</i> -form
	tr.refl <i>mihi est</i>	? ?	– ?	– ?	– ?

Note: (...) marginal attestation; conservative 17C– southeast, 17C rest; Innovative: part of 18-19C southeast and rare, 18C rest; *a*-forms: 18C rest.

In earlier 16C, enclitics are still limited to 3, and frequencies of 3-1/2 suggest that 1/2 on the participle is avoided in the perfect (DME.III), supported by nonce recourse to a different auxiliary and host (DME.II: 3.4). Later in 16-17C, one author still does not seem to have them available, and resorts to several strategies to code the missing 1/2 O of perfects when demanded by translation: recruitment of the 1/2 forms of enclitics to the auxiliary, whose forms were available for doubling; object drop not otherwise used in the relevant contexts; and *a*-forms, found in similar last-resort uses to code objects at this stage (cf. 3.4). None grammaticalise as regular alternatives to 3 enclitics. Such variable use for ineffable person restrictions of otherwise unavailable coding strategies has parallel elsewhere and yields various degrees of deviance (see Sigurðsson 1996 on Icelandic, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Kempson and Chatzikyriakidis 2011 on Spanish and Greek, cf. Baker 1996a: 238n2 on translations to Mohawk). There may be analogues with other ineffabilities (e.g. intrusive resumption, Heestand et al. 2011, local overlapping reference, Rezac 2016). Strategies with these properties be called *stopgaps* here for ease of reference. Whatever the proper analysis, stopgaps bring out the absence of the later repair in the variety where they are found, the absence of such strategies in varieties that have the repair, and, strikingly, the absence of free pronouns in weak pronoun environments as either repair or stopgap (as with French *me lui*, see lit in 3.4).

3.5.3 Internal and external sources

The transfer of person restrictions from *mihi est* to the *have*-perfect is a natural accompaniment of the transfer to R, S to A, O coding under external and/or internal approaches to these restrictions analyses, but with different commitments and expectations. In the present internal account, the transfer involves transfer of nominative objects from *mihi est* to the *have*-perfect, and is an automatic consequence of the overtly cued transfer of dative coding of the subject, under its analysis as quirky inherent dative. ϕ -intervention arises in (14)c whether the dative subject is possessor R of unaccusative v or agent A of transitive v, with crosslinguistic parallels in and beyond perfects (4.3).

In external analysis like frequency entrenchment that does not feed internal principles like ϕ -intervention, the 3 restriction on enclitics is synchronically an arbitrary gap in the enclitic coding of S (cf. Miller and Sag 1997: 598n29 for *me lui*). When enclitics come to code O, the

¹⁷ In Middle Breton, proclitics to the participle as elsewhere show accusative-genitive syncretism outside 3SGM, but 3SGM suggests that they were accusative as early as late 16C when introduced on participles (DME.II: 3.3, 4.1). This could be obscured by allomorphy in north-and-west in early 18C (DME.II: 4.3-4), but comes out in southeastern varieties of 18C– by genitive-accusative differentiation in 1SG, 2SG, 1PL in form, and for all proclitics in the syntax of doubling for all proclitics (DME.II: 3.3). Still, a genitive analysis in some early varieties is compatible with all that follows, most simply under the analysis of 1st/2nd proclitics as genitive by differential object marking (5.1).

gap extend to it. This gap lies within the domain of theories of allomorphy like gaps of the *amn't, stridden* sort. The use of 1/2 accusative proclitics as repair escapes the traditional domain of allomorphy (Paparounas 2021): they are only restricted to 1/2 on the participle if 3 is available as enclitic to the auxiliary (Table 5), and the auxiliary and participle can be separated by elements of the clausal spine like low negation, by a subject A-position occupied by free A, and by adjuncts (Rezac 2005). This same discontinuity might prove challenging for person restrictions and other aspects of argument coding of the perfect even as phrase-structurally unbounded conventionalisations (see Bruening 2019 on the type *NEG V! the golden goose, partly extending to the imperative in Breton).

To the extent that the 1/2 restriction can be encoded as an arbitrary gap, an external source of it is available in tendency towards “antisynonymy” or unique form-function couplings (if an external principle; Hawkins 2004: 3.2, Traugott 2004, and for actual complexity, e.g. Wolk et al. 2013). This reduction does not privilege use of accusative clitics in repairs over alternatives like those witnessed by stopgaps, or say passives under the felicity conditions of the gapped actives rather than independent passives. The deployment of accusatives in repair of person restrictions would be an accident of development rather a property of a class of person restrictions as on ϕ -intervention + dependent case (5.1).

3.5.4 Grammaticalisation of the accusative repair

When accusative clitics appear in the *have/be*-perfects of Breton, they do so on the participle, not the auxiliary, in contrast to ad/superstrate French (cf. Le Roux 1957: 120ff., Hemon 1975: §154). There is a straightforward reason for this clitic restrictions. Breton-Cornish had no clusters of accusative pro/mesoclitics, and no diachronic source for them, since its R-coding accusative + dative clitics had become limited to unaccusatives, and indeed were rare enough earlier that they might not cluster with O-coding clitics even in Welsh ditransitives (DME.II: 3.3). By the time the perfect was innovated in Breton and created pressure to code O by accusative proclitics in a structure where these also coded A, there was no evidence to guide the ordering and allomorphy of the two accusative clitics and the dative marker. Such partly haplological feature combinations seems to favour grammaticalised idiosyncrasies elsewhere (see e.g. on Romance with lit, opacities Pescarini 2021; gaps Miller and Monachesi 2003, Rezac 2010b; cf. a.o. Basque, Arregi and Nevins 2012; Nunggubuyu, Noyer 2001). The issue persists independently of repairs when varieties outside the southeast shift dative-nominative to dative-accusative *have*-constructions in 18C. They then use new accusative *a*-forms for S of *mihi est* and O of the *have*-perfect (cf. 3.4, 3.7.2), but usually still cannot cluster accusative-clitic R/O and S/A here (DME.II: 3.2, 4.2-4 with lit.).

This is the situation by the earliest extensive texts of 16C. In them perfects only have 3rd person objects apart from one early “stopgap” (3.5.1). The participle as host of accusative proclitics was an innovation, since the participle did not earlier combine with unpromoted, accusative O. In the similar development of the perfect in Romance, closely related varieties came to differ in whether the auxiliary or participle or both serve as hosts for accusative clitics, and partly independently of this, in whether a given participle hosts proclitics on uses such as absolute vs. modifier, and which proclitics among adverbial vs. dative vs. accusative (see for French, Benucci 1993, Vinet 2003, Miller and Monachesi 2003, diachrony, Jensen 1990: §341, more broadly Pescarini 2021: 3.8, 4.4, ch. 10, role of morphophonology Morin 1979: 304n5).

In Breton, two elements were needed to grammaticalise the participle as accusative proclitic host. One is the right syntactic configuration to allow clisis, here grammaticalisation of the participle as externalisation of *v* in a system with object shift to Spec,v (3.3). The other involves the surface-opaque allomorphies of the onset of pro/mesoclitic hosts known as mutations in Breton (Iosad 2021). These have arbitrary irregularities and gaps (Hemon 1975: §1-17) and their acquisition suggests limited generalisability (Stephens 1996, Kennard and Lahiri 2015). Other innovations indicate need to grammaticalise these allomorphies relative to novel hosts: when infinitives were innovated and accusative proclitics were first added to the infinitive of BE in *mihi est*, their mutations could be aberrant with respect to both those of finite *mihi est* and accusative clitics with other infinitives of a system (Rezac 2021); when ‘whom/whose is’ was grammaticalised as the transitive ‘own’, mutation triggers led to irregularities (Chatelier 2016:

180ff.) or ineffability (Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 54). In attested varieties of Breton, these steps were completed for participles in later 16C and early 17C, not only for the 1/2 accusative clitics of the repair in the *have*-perfect, but for any-person ones in the *be*-perfect of reflexivised transitives, and likely also in bare participles in reduced clauses (DHM.II: 3.4).¹⁸

In an only external account of person restrictions where they are synchronically arbitrary gaps, these steps grammaticalising proclitic + participle combinations are part and parcel of the innovation of the repair. In the internal approach here, the 1/2 restriction of accusative proclitics arises from the mechanics of dependent case, and they may have always been abstractly, but only grammaticalisation of the participle allowed their externalisation. Nothing more needs saying about the late emergence of accusative proclitics in the *have*-perfect within a system that had them already on finite verbs. This in turn suggest a way of approaching other variation in the availability of repairs such as Icelandic vs. Finnish (explored in sec. 5).

3.6 Person restrictions: Imperative

The imperative of active transitives has the same split-enclitic coding as the perfect from the first texts to document it in early 16C, not only 3 enclitic but also 1/2 proclitic. This difference between the two constructions is expected from their history, because the perfect had to grammaticalise the participle as proclitic host to allow the proclitics, but on imperatives-jussives enclitics go back to <12C Breton-Cornish and proclitics to Brythonic mesoclitics modified by the general meso- to proclisis shift in 12-14C Breton (3.2). It remained to add person restrictions. These transfer from *have*-constructions any approach, with different commitments.

The steps in the development of the imperative are given in Figure 2. It chooses among several similar dynamics in the poorly documented 12-16C, and suggests external driving forces at each step. Entrenchment of frequencies with *mihi est* left arbitrary gaps for 1/2 in the enclitics coding its S. These could spread to enclitics coding O in imperatives by generalising coding from S to O directly or via the *have*-perfect. Thanks to the availability of pro/mesoclitics, there was no functional loss, and antisynonymy could restrict these as in the *have*-perfect. This is the system of 16C Middle Breton, earliest southeastern varieties, and others later. The southeast unrestricts enclitics in imperative but not *have*-constructions in early 18C, giving the former a uniformly enclitic paradigm and returning to part of Breton-Cornish attested in 14C Cornish.

Figure 2: Externalist rise of person restrictions in imperative

12C≈Middle Cornish 14C

Enclitics for O and 3.S V!=O ~ =V!=O ~ =O=V! vs. general =O=V_{FIN}
R=BE=3.S vs. general =V_{FIN}=S [low frequency of 1/2 possessa]

Before 16C

Meso→proclisis V!=O joined by O=V!
Have-perfect innovated R=BE=3.S → A=BE=3.O PRT
V!=O restricted to 3rd V!=O ~ O=V! → V!=3.O ~ O=V! [from *have*-constructions]
O=V! restricted to 1st/2nd V!=3.O ~ O=V! → V!=3.O ~ 1/2.O=V! [antisynonymy]

16C/17C

Participle→host to 1/2= A=BE=3.O PRT → ... ~ 1/2=PRT [antisynonymy or from ipv.]

18C north-and-west

Have → accusative S/O A=BE=3.O PRT → ... 1/2/3=PRT + *a*-forms alongside 1/2/3=

18C southeast

¹⁸ There often remained a gap for the participle of *be* itself, giving *They have=them had* ~ **They have you=had* (Le Goff 1927, with possible innovations in varieties, DME.II: 355n36, Rezac 2021). This is expected, for with *be* unlike with transitives, synthetic finite forms did not offer guidance about mutations induced by accusative clitics. It might seem that free pronouns should be unblocked to externalise the repair if it cannot be due to clitic gaps, and that seems generally not so (*mihi est* 3.4.2, *have*-perfect 3.5.1, but not always, Cheveau 2007: 5.4.2, cf. DME.II: 355n36). However, unblocked use of free pronouns in weak-pronoun contexts needs grammaticalisation (see 3.3.1 on French vs. Irish), perhaps for specific structures such as weak pronoun that are accusative (consistent a.o. with accusative-genitive differences in Welsh, see lit. in DME.II: 2.3, and Irish, McCloskey 1986), and after the Brythonic stage there is typically no evidence for unblocking of accusatives in most varieties (cf. Fleuriot 1964: §116n3, DME.II: 2.3).

Ipv., pos. → all-enclitic V!=3.O ~ 1/2.O=V! → V!=O
 Ipv., neg. → surrogate pres. NEG=V!

On ϕ -intervention or other internal principles to person restrictions, the outward steps and even forces can be the same, but the consequences differ. Analogy over enclitic forms between *mihi est* S and imperative O transferred split-nominative to accusative, not as such, but through change in the ϕ -specification of the subject S/A from ϕ -complete to π -only, like the dative subject of *mihi est*. With it came repair by dependent case for the restricted 3 nominative. It was realised immediately by the preexisting accusative proclitics for 1/2, with 3 lost after ϕ -completeness was lost even as an option for A. If that is tenable, ϕ -quirkiness can be explored as the unifying property of the anomalous subjects with which split-nominative objects are coupled in Jahnsson's Rule, variation in the rule as variation in #-specification, and substantive constraints on it as constraints on the distribution of #. Each construction might correspond to one with unrestricted nominative under the right conditions, such as inert inherent oblique R + unrestricted nominative S of *apud me est*. This is the analysis of split-nominative objects and their associated ϕ -quirky subjects explored here (sec. 4).

There is no simple expectation about what anomalies of subject coding couple with split-nominative objects, but there are limitations relative to a system. Certain person splits of objects coding, like 3-only enclitics, can cue acquisition of ϕ -quirky subjects, but only if the system allows such an analysis. In Breton, the split-enclitic coding of O should not couple with regular coding of A, by free (pro)nominals and bound-pronoun suffixes for any person, if other factors are held constant. This expectation is met in Table 6: imperatives have a unique coding of S/A, through restriction to 1/2, to bound pronouns, and to inflectional realisation with some unique inflections. In these anomalies they are unique in the system among moods, including those used regularly for commands like the future, and or even as surrogates for imperatives like the present in negative commands of southeastern varieties.

Table 6: A-O coding for weak-pronoun arguments (N nominative, A accusative)

	Breton *12C	16-17C	18-20C C	18-21C SE	Finnish
Present, future, past indicative, conditional of plain (in)transitives					
S/A	-N	-N	-N	-N	-N N
O	A=	A=	A	A=	A
Jussive of plain (in)transitives					
S/A	-N N [?]	-N α → -N	? → -	-N	-N (α)
O	A=, =A	A=, =A [?]		=A [?] , =N [?]	→ - A
Imperative of plain (in)transitives					
S/A	-1/2	-1/2	-1/2	-1/2	-1/2 (α)
O	A=, =A	=3N~1/2A=	=3N~1/2A	=A [?] , =N [?]	3N~1/2A
Oblique-subject unaccusatives; transitives in perfect [restructuring-raising]					
R/A	DAT=	DAT=	DAT=?	DAT=	[DAT-GEN, ADS]
S/O	=3N	=3N~1/2A=	A	=3N~1/2A=	[3N~1/2A]

Note: -1/2 only bound-pronoun coding exists, α nonbound coding has special restrictions

The anomalous coding of imperative subjects does not determine their ϕ -specification directly, but offers a point of lability in the system, and so availability as O of accusative (*12C, 18C- southeast? in Table 6), split-nominative (16-18C, 19C- central), and unrestricted nominative (18C- southeast?). One other mood is unique in its subject coding in Breton, the jussive in 16-17C, but its uniqueness is extra number agreement, and thereby favours ϕ -completeness (note 11). The jussive did indeed split from the imperative at this stage and did not adopt the split-enclitic coding of O (DME.II: 2.3, 5.2). By the time it recollapsed with the imperative in 18-19C southeast, extra subject number agreement and split-enclitic coding had both been lost (Table 6, Rezac 2021).¹⁹

¹⁹ Evidence about the jussive is very limited; the sole clear inferences permitted for 16-17C is that person restrictions on

These same subject-object coding relationships are characteristic of Finnish, also in Table 6, and more generally Finnic, including the shifting character of the jussive according to its number agreement (4.5). For Finnic, there is a seminal external account of the coupling of nominative objects with anomalous subjects through dispreference for ambiguity (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1975, Comrie 1975, Dixon 1994; cf. Hawkins 2004: ch. 3-4, 2014: ch. 7-8). The accusative codings of Finnic would reflect innovations in a hypothetical system with unmarked nominative-accusative. Preference to disambiguate would have favoured spread of innovated accusative in function of potential ambiguity between O and A coding, and the imperative would have been the least ambiguous. The history of Breton seems to have no role for ambiguity. The system came with unambiguous nominative and accusative bound pronouns. In this setting, the relevant enclitic coding of O and S originated in unblocked free weak pronouns, their encliticisation, and their spread from S to O in formation of the *have*-perfect. Any spread beyond this independently motivated range might be entertained by analogy over coding-classes such as O, i.e. imperative enclitic : future (for commands or generally) + accusative proclitic → future enclitic, but would have encountered no more or less ambiguity than in its source, since enclitics did not code A.

Ambiguity avoidance would not have restricted nominative objects to 3 in Finnish, but here there is available an external account through form-frequency correspondence, and it too does lead to the right result for Breton. The best-established form of the correspondence is tendency to shorter form in encoded expression in proportion to their frequency in use across communication systems. It has inspired concrete but less clearly external proposals deriving such generalisations as differential object coding correlating greater markedness of form with higher animacy O (see with lit. DeLancey 2001: ch. 8, Newmeyer 2005: 4.9, Hawkins 2014: ch. 8, Vihman and Nelson 2019, Haspelmath 2020; Kiparsky 2001 for an internalist reification for Finnish). In Breton, the historically older accusative pro/mesoclitics are used for the higher-animacy 1/2 O in the split-enclitic coding. These by dint of their earlier origin are less formally marked than the newer nominative enclitics coding 3, in the ways that have been relevant to form-frequency correspondence in differential object coding, like dative for accusative clitics and prepositional phrases for bare (pro)nominals for O in Romance. They are more phonologically reduced and more morphophonologically restricted in such terms as allomorphic effects on host and cluster restrictions (DME.II: 2.4, 3.2).

In Breton then, there are external steps that could give rise to and spread its split-enclitic coding, but they do not speak to any constraints on the coupling of this coding of objects with any properties of subjects, and to any parallelism of split-enclitic and split-nominative object coding across systems like Breton and Finnish. There remain to take up a few contexts and developments that suggests those couplings and parallelism not to be accidental.

3.7 Nominative object group and immunities to person restrictions

3.7.1 *The nominative object group*

In Brythonic and its immediate successors, several environments other than structural objects of verbal constructions had no coding for bound pronouns, allowed unblocked free forms for weak pronouns, and these sometimes encliticised in Breton-Cornish (DME.II, Rezac 2021):

Table 7: Elements with unblocked free pronouns

Defective element	Origin	Cf.	Nondefective alternative
<i>hag</i> ‘as’ of comparison	‘and’	<i>que</i>	<i>euel</i> ‘like’ (origin: Lambert 1975)
<i>gwa</i> (BE) ‘woe (is)’	‘woe’ + BE + dative	<i>woe (is) me</i>	<i>goa</i> + ‘to’ PP

clitics characteristic of the imperative could be missing, and that number agreement was available with free (pro)nominals uniquely in the system. At some later point before 20C the jussive was lost. In between, southeastern authors lose the agreement and person restrictions, leaving open a number of analyses, but it is unclear to what to make of its avoidance by some but use by other translators of these varieties (for e.g. Matthew 16:24; op.cit.). In these varieties O-coding enclitics of imperatives-jussives are unrestricted, and may be accusative or nominative, with complex evidence, but when the latter is at all motivated, the jussive has been lost (DME.II: 2.5, and here note 18 re: Ternes 1970: 307).

(origin: Barðdal et al. 2013; cf. English: Abbott 1870: §230)
ched(e), chetu ‘lo!, *voilà*’ fossil *look!* *lo!, voi(s)-là* –
 (cf. origin of *voilà*: Morin 1985, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §1100)
eme(z) ‘quoth’ defective verb *quoth* *lavarout* ‘say’
 (origin: Lewis and Pedersen 1961: §590.6n, Hemon 1975: §152)

Only the *gwa* ‘woe’ construction is fully cognate down to encliticisation across Breton and Cornish. With the other items, free pronouns encliticised separately, or were replaced by inflections of verbal or prepositional origin, or vanished in favour of Alternatives. The complex developments are sketched for reference in Table 8. The point of interest is that all failed to undergo the development of the imperative did, transfer of the 3 restriction over enclitic coding, to give ineffability or alternation with an alternative for 1/2, such as *woe=them* ~ *woe to-us*.

Table 8: Special pronoun codings in Breton-Cornish

Host	Cornish 14-16C	Breton 16-17C	18C NW	19-21C SE	20C C
V-objects					
R=BE	=3	=3	▶ [°]	▶ [°]	<i>a-form</i>
A=BE + PRT	–	=3 → =3~1/2=	▶ [°]	▶ [°]	<i>a-form</i>
V!	=α	=3~1/2=	▶ [°]	=α ^{°!}	=α ^{°?}
Other unblocked					
<i>hag</i> ‘as’	–	#α	▶	▶ –	–
<i>gwa</i> ‘woe’	=α ‘to’-α	=α #α	▶ ‘to’-α	<i>N/A</i>	?
<i>che-</i> ‘voilà’	[=α]	≈α (-3=3)	≈α	≈α -α -1~3	?
<i>eme</i> ‘quoth’	-α=α	-α=α -3	-α ≈α (≈1/2) (=1/2) <i>eme</i> +BE	-3=3 ≈α –	-3(≈.1/2)
Other					
<i>ema</i> ‘be at’	-3~BE-1/2	-3=3~BE-1/2	-α	▶	▶

Legend: # free, =enclitic, ≈ free or enclitic?, - V-suffix, ~ P-suffix, ° sui-generis bound, + compound, ° new forms of 3-enclitics exist, ! new forms specific to imperative exist, ▶ same as Middle Breton, (...) poorly attested, [...] noncognate analogue, | subvariety separator

Arbitrary gaps and splits did arise in this group, such as the 2 gap in innovated verbal inflections of *che-* ‘voilà, here’s’ (Termes 1970: 16.2.2). These could gap 1/2 for same sort of external reasons posited for spread of the 3 restriction over enclitics (analogies of form, Rezac 2021). Similar arbitrary gaps arose elsewhere, such as innovated contextual form *ema* of ‘be’ in Brythonic, and have extensive parallels (Sims 2015, Yang 2016; cf. 5.1).

The 3 enclitic restriction and their alternation with something else for 1/2 remained confined to the Jahnsson’s Rule group of objects coupled with anomalous subjects, though the sort of external spread that took the 3 restriction from *me is they* to like *behold them, it has grieved me*, should have allowed its spread to *here’s them, woe is me*. Internalist analyses like φ-intervention expect this, since their mechanism cannot restrict arguments of constructions without any restricting elements, and often cannot spread φ/case-dependencies like nominative at all (at best, to the presentatives *che-* ‘voilà, here’s’, cf. Morin 1985: sec. 8 on French). Not too much can be made of this observation at this point, since the number of constructions is small. However, the internal mechanism does expect the observed distinctiveness of the subject-object group.

By 18C, the subject-object group was singled out again by a further innovation in many varieties: its 3-only enclitics adopted new forms, like 3PL (*h*)e for *y, int* (DME.II: 2.5):

(16) Differentiation of enclitics in Breton (COL; early 19C NW)

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|----|---|
| | <i>Imperative object: 3PL / (h)e/</i> | | <i>HAVE object: 3PL / (h)e/</i> |
| a. | grit= he e=r=c’his | b. | bezâ <u>h</u> o=pezo= he |
| | make!2PL=3PL in=the=manner | | be.INF 2PL.ACC [°] =will.be=3PL |

Make them in current fashion.

You will have them.

Other coding free/enclitic/suffix: 3PL /int/

Doubling: 3PL /i/

c. chetu=²/₁²/_#²·int amâ

d. ur=C'harros caër o≈d≈eus=y

lo=²/₁²/_#²3PL here

a=carriage fair 3PL.ACC°≈DAT≈be=3PL

Here they are.

They have a beautiful carriage.

On the ϕ -intervention analysis, the innovation is new realisation of nominative objects, i.e. encliticised nominatives. That properly limits the spread of new forms. However, data only support clearly the exclusion of doubling enclitics from the new forms, for by the time their emerged, coding enclitics in subjectless constructions are hard to identify as such.

3.7.2 Impossible restricted nominatives: nominative subject environments

Breton allows the examination not only of the spread of the 3-restriction over preexisting enclitics, but of also enclitics and accusative proclitics for novel coding themselves, as from S of *mihi est* and O of synthetic tenses to O of the *have*-perfect. These extensions are inventoried for reference in Table 9.

Table 9: Spread of clitics across verbal constructions (deep/light shade = new/lost restrictions)

Source	Target	Innovation	Variety	Sec.
<i>3-restriction on enclitics</i>				
R _{DAT} =BE= ₃ S	V! ₃ O	Restr. of ipv.	12-15C	3.5
<i>3-restricted enclitics</i>				
R _{DAT} =BE= ₃ S	A _{DAT} =BE= ₃ O	<i>have</i> -pf.	12-15C	3.5
finite	A _{DAT} =BE _{INF} = ₃ O/S (PRT)	<i>have</i> -inf.	17C se	3.5
finite/preceding	BE= ₃ O/S (PRT)	<i>have</i> -inf.	20C se	3.5
<i>Unrestricted enclitics</i>				
V! ₃ O	V! ₀	Unrest. of ipv.	early 18C se	3.6
<i>1/2-restricted accusative pro/mesoclitics</i>				
₀ O=V _{FIN}	_{1/2} O=V _{FIN}	Repair	12-15C	3.2
₀ O=V _{FIN}	A _{DAT} =BE _{FIN/INF} _{1/2} O=PRT	Repair	late 16C	3.5
<i>Accusative pro/mesoclitics</i>				
₀ O=V _{FIN} , ₀ GEN=V _{NMLZ}	₀ O=V _{INF}	Infinitives	16-17C	3.3
₀ O=V _{FIN}	BE _{FIN/INF} ₀ O=PRT	Pf. refl. tr.	late 16C	3.5
₀ O=V _{FIN}	₀ O=PRT	Reduced tr.	late 16C	3.5
₀ O=V _{FIN} , ... _{1/2} O=PRT	A _{DAT} =BE _{FIN/INF} ₀ O=PRT	Rgl'n. of <i>have</i>	18C nw, %se	below
₀ O=V _{FIN} , _{1/2} O=V!	₀ O=V!	Rgl'n. of ipv.	19C %nw	below
<i>Accusative + dative de pro/mesoclitics</i>				
_{R/A} =BE _{FIN} (PRT)	_{R/A} =BE _{INF} (PRT)	New <i>have</i> -inf.	17C se	3.3

In the extensions of clitic coding, there are several points where analogy might be expected to spread 3-restricted enclitics alone or in alternation with 1/2-restricted proclitics, but did not. They fail to meet the dependence of such enclitics on anomalous subjects in Jahnsson's Rule. These are clearest in the perfects. The *be*-perfect of reflexive transitives coded A like subject S of plain BE from the outset, and did not code O. When the participle grammaticalised as proclitic host in later 16C, the *be*-perfect added unrestricted accusative proclitics to the reflexivised participle, on the model of synthetic tenses -- rather than restrict them to 1/2 in alternation with 3 enclitics, on the model of the plain *have*-perfect, (15). The pattern is expected since it coded A as regular nominative, not as dative like the *have*-perfect. Yet later when infinitives were innovated from nominalisations, one pattern of forming infinitives of *have*-constructions looks precisely like this untaken path on and only on the surface (DME.II: 5.4). At first, the infinitives of *have*-constructions used not just the infinitive of BE, but also dative clitic doubling of A doubling PRO or specified subject, (17)a. This later disappeared, giving bare BE, so the string in (17)b is ambiguous as 'despite PRO having mocked him', with 3-only O-coding

H	you=is they/ ^{l/*?} we	agr restriction		(open)	[[%] Ic]
!	keep! them/us	enclisis V4		Π	
H	you=is=THEY/*WE	ease , enclisis, =½	freq. entr.	DAT _{∅→π}	F, I
!	keep!=THEM/US	ease , enclisis	<i>R</i>	Π	
X	woe=THEM/US	ease , enclisis	<i>R</i>	Π	
	< 16C				
!	them/us=keep!	meso>proclisis	<i>F</i> uniformity	Π	
!	keep!=THEY ~ US=keep!	=½, 3=	<i>F</i> H, <i>E</i>	<i>pro!</i> _{π→φ}	F
Pf	you=is=THEY/*US seen	new pf.	<i>F</i> H	new v _{Ag}	
	16-17C Middle Breton				
Pf	you=is us=seen	½=	<i>F</i> non-Pf., <i>E</i>	Π	[F]
	18C SE				
H,!,Pf	(new forms of enclitics)			Π	
!	keep!=THEM/US [?] ,=THEY/WE [?] ,	proclisis in !, =½	<i>F</i> uniformity	<i>pro!</i> _{π→φ/∅}	[%] F
Pf	[%] you=is/are them=seen	3=	<i>F</i> uniformity	DAT _{π→φ}	[%] F
	18C NW, C				
H,Pf	(realignment to accusative)	enclisis H,Pf, 3=, <i>a</i>	<i>F</i> uniformity	DAT _{π→φ}	[%] F, [%] I
	19C NW				
!	(realignment to accusative)	enclisis !, 3=, <i>a</i>	<i>F</i> uniformity	<i>pro!</i> _{π→φ}	[%] F
	> 18C all				
X	woe , [%] lo-they/we/*you, ...	various	<i>F</i> various	Π	

Legend: CASE-SYNCR., *arb* arb. hum. impers., *pro!* ipv. subj., *F* form-analogy with/by, *E* antisynon., *R* reduction of freq. forms, Π externalisation, F(innish), I(celandic), [%] dial., *a* *a*-form

The evolution of the split-enclitic coding has been interpreted here as the evolution of split-nominative coding and evidence for its dependence on a certain class of anomalous subjects. The φ-intervention account here faces several challenges brought out by Breton, and these are studied next. One is the theory of φ-quirkiness, which must unify elements like oblique and imperative subjects, allow their dissociation, and limit the membership of this class (sec. 4). The other is relationship of φ, case, and licensing, which must address variation in dependent-case repairs, their relationship to other repairs, their variation relative to other dependent case, and apparent mismatches between agreement, case and licensing (sec. 5).

The specific expectations of the present approach depend on its embedding in a fuller theory linking linguistic data, acquisition, synchronic diagnostics, and diachronic trajectories. In a more limited fashion though, they can be illustrated through a particular counterfactual. The evolution of the perfect in Breton fits Jahnsson's Rule in confining the split-nominative enclitics to dative subjects and so not transferring them to nominative-subject perfects (3.7). If it had transferred them, analyses would be available, including biclausal nominative A + quirky PRO + nominative O, and idiomatic and arbitrarily-gapped coding of accusative O. These then come with properties that may prove relatively detectable synchronically or diachronically (4.6).

Breton has proven useful in examining the evolution of Jahnsson's Rule, because the steps involved are attested directly or inferable through recently diverged systems, and because case-syncretism and encliticisation limit alternative analyses. The findings should be complemented. Finnic is the obvious comparandum, though with a far greater time-depth relative to witnessed systems and corresponding diversity (see 3.1 and cf. on Jahnsson's Rule esp. Laanest 1982, Janhunen 2002, Lehtinen 2007, Havas 2008, Smit 2020; A*). At a first look, Finnic developments too bear out the subject-object coupling of Jahnsson's Rule. Like Breton they sidling up to the creation of double-nominative constructions, but balk at the completion, or leave complex structures. More limited comparison with similar conclusions is offered by developments in Germanic (esp. Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013). These systems are brought in to compare with Breton in the following two sections.

4 Quirky intervention

4.1 Quirkiness: Introduction

The φ -intervention approach to person restrictions takes its cue from complete φ -intervention. It is useful to introduce the analysis through Basque, under the hypothesis that its richer agreement morphology tracks key aspects of the proposal with transparency (Rezac 2011: 5.2 with lit., and for discussion and alternatives, Albizu 1997, Arregi and Nevins 2012):

(18) Basque datives (illustrative, standard morphology)

- a. guri gustatzen/etortzen zai-zki-gu [a' **ga-it**-u-zki]
 1PL.DAT liking/coming ...-PL-1PL.DAT 1PL-PL-...-PL
 We like/approach them (pseudogloss: Us like/approach they)
- b. guri *gustatzen/%etortzen **za**-tzai-zki-gu [b' %di-gu-zu (with gustatzen)]
 1PL.DAT liking/coming 2PL-...-PL-1PL.DAT ...-1PL.DAT-2PL.ERG
 We like/approach you (pseudogloss: Us liked/approached you)

The verbal complex includes a 1/2 prefix (*za-*, *ga-*, bold) and a PL infix (*-zki-*, *-it-*, underlined). Both are typically controlled by absolutive S/O, but not exclusively, so for instance if the absolutive O is 3, the prefix can be controlled by ergative A. R is dative and controls distinct morphology (*-gu*). Some dative Rs block the absolutive's control of the person prefix. These are φ -quirky, in the sense that they restrict morphology they seem not to control. These restriction involves structural intervention – with unaccusatives in (18), dative R as high experiencer but not low goal of motion; in transitive, restriction on prefix control by absolutive O/S but not by ergative A. The nonagreeing 1/2 absolutive O/S is ineffable, unless a repair has been innovated, notably its shift to ergative coding (*-zu*). The result is a 3-only split-absolutive alternating with ineffability or ergative for 1/2. Under the analysis here, it reflects a φ -intervention person restriction or IPR and its repair. In one close contrast, (18)a', the quirkiness goes away in varieties where some datives have become φ -complete, in sense that they control the prefix and suffix (*ga-it-*), and an extra PL is innovated to track the split-absolutive (*-zki*). In another contrast, (18)b, the ergative of the repair can be seen to go with IPRs in varieties where arbitrary gaps in agreeing forms overlap with IPRs, but only the latter allow 1/2 ergative S.

In systems like Icelandic, Finnish and Breton, morphology is less obvious about person-number splits, but otherwise their split-nominative (O→)S of Jahnsson's Rule shows similar interaction with dative R. They contrast restricting high with nonrestricting low dative R in their effect on split-nominative (O→)S, and avoid the split by raising (O→)S past R, with certain verbs, or even under certain conditions like extraction of R (Icelandic: Sigurðsson 1996: 2.5, Eythórsson and Barðdal 2005: 9.2, cf. Wood and Sigurðsson 2014; Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 267). They can show variation between φ -quirky and φ -complete high datives (Icelandic: Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013), and cognate systems add φ -inert ones in the same structures like psych/raising experiencers (German: op.cit.). These systems add some useful boundary conditions on analysis of IPRs (cf. Thráinsson 2007: 8.2.6-7, 4.2.5). One is evidence that structurally low nominatives can control full agreement when quirky datives are absent, (19)a. Another is that quirky datives need not themselves control agreement or clitics, (19)b. Third, licensing need not improve with nonagreement and in nonagreeing infinitives, (19)c.²¹

(19) Split-nominative in Icelandic “A” agreeing and nonagreeing clauses

- a. Það hafið/?hafa/*hefur líklega verið þið.
 it have.2PL/3PL/3SG likely been 2PL.NOM
 It has probably been you.

(Thráinsson 2007: 4.2.5.2)

²¹ In Icelandic the deviance of infinitives holds across a variety of structures (Nomura 2005: 79f., Bobaljik 2008: 10.6, Boeckx 2008: 51, Pesetsky 2021: 2.6.2, “A”) but can be weaker than finite clauses (Sigurðsson 2004: 155n14, “C”) and perhaps absent (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 271; cf. note 41 “C+”). Distinct is licensing of specified subjects in opaque infinitives (with Preminger 2011: 932-4 cf. esp. Bobaljik 2008: 10.6, Schütze 2003: 297n2, 1997: 4.1.1.5).

- b. Henni hafa leiðst þeir/*þið
 3SGF.DAT have.3PL bored 3PL/*2PL.NOM
 She is bored with them/*you. (pseudgloss: Her bore they/*you)
 (Thráinsson 2007: 4.2.5.2; *þeir* needs 3PL, 3SG or 2PL do not rescues *þið*)
- c. Við vonumst til [að _____ leiðast hún/*þið ekki]
 1PL.NOM hope for to PRO.DAT bore.INF 3SGF/*2SG.NOM not
 We hope not to be bored with her/*you.
 (Bobaljik 2008 : 319n27 citing H. Thráinsson p.c.)

The proposal for Jänsson’s Rule in this section starts with the φ -intervention of quirky obliques on split-nominative objects, and adds human impersonal and imperative subject pronouns as potential person-only bearers, while excluding most other (pro)nominals.

4.2 Quirky obliques: Theory

4.2.1 Varieties of inherent case

Historically the best-studied type of obliques has coding fixed by local *c/s*-selection, or *inherent case*, and is φ -inert even if structurally on the path of φ /case and “A” dependencies like raising to subject. Examples are the *to*-experiencer of English *seem* and its dative counterpart in German. The same obliques are φ -quirky in Icelandic, limiting nominatives to 3rd person and usurping their A-dependencies. These can become φ -complete, usurp otherwise nominative-linked φ -agreement despite oblique case, and nominatives switch to accusative (see lit. in 4.1).²²

Here these inherent case types should interact with structural nominative to yield (20). (Pro)nominals without inherent case control φ -dependencies according to locality; ones with inherent case do so if φ -complete and are invisible if φ -inert; but if φ -quirky they block dependencies for $\frac{1}{2}$ yet result in 3SG/default agreement morphology. When a φ -dependency is blocked for a nominative, it is usually either not licensed or appears as accusative.

(20) T-nominative dependencies (π person, # number)

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. No intervener: $\sqrt{\text{NOM}}$: | $[T_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}} \dots \text{G.NOM}_{\sqrt{\pi, \#} \dots}]$ |
| b. Complete intervener: $\sqrt{\text{NOM}}$: | $[T_{\pi = X, \# = X} \dots [X_{\pi, \#} \text{H} [\dots \text{G.NOM}_{\pi, \#} \dots]]]$ |
| c. Person intervener: $\sqrt{3} \sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \text{NOM}$: | $[T_{\pi = 3 / \emptyset, \# = \text{NOM}} \dots [X_3 \text{H} [\dots \text{G.NOM}_{\pi, \#} \dots]]]$ |

Inherent case is taken to involve content structurally between the target and the goal of a φ -dependency (cf. Andrews 1982; Sag et al. 1992; Chomsky 1986). That content is here an adposition-like structure abbreviated K (cf. Belletti 2006, Rezac 2008a). The oblique is φ -inert when K renders φ -features of its (pro)nominative inaccessible to clausal φ -dependencies, φ -complete when not, leaving open the mechanisms (for instance, phasehood of K modulated by N-K extension, Gallego 2010, by K-N Agree, Rezac 2008a, or by concord under some proposals, reviewed in Norris 2020).²³

²² Interaction of φ /A-dependencies with obliqueness can be nuanced within and across systems (for lit. from different perspectives, see Barðdal and Eythórsson 2018, Citko et al. 2018, Metslang 2013). Of A-dependencies, PRO is the most restrictive (against “EPP”, Holmberg 2017, Cardinaletti 2004; local anaphora, Metslang 2013, Barðdal and Eythórsson 2018; WCO, Bruening 2019, Postal 1993); with PRO go specified subjects of infinitives when diagnosable as such (Icelandic, Holmberg 2017, and so Breton, 3.3; unlike Italian, Cardinaletti 2004). However, PRO and oblique specified subjects are often incompatible with what are otherwise oblique subjects (e.g. Anagnostopoulou 2003; Rezac 2008b, Sigurðsson 2003), for what may be trivial morphological reasons such as absence of oblique PRO and oblique + genitive stacking (cf. Jung 2008: 3.4.1, 6.3.3.2 for Russian), and then if the nominative-absolutive cannot independently also be subject, entire constructions can be ineffable (a.o. in Finnish *mihi est*, Koskinen 1998, Seržant 2015, cf. Kiparsky 2001: 2.4, Vilkuina 1996: 4.4.2, and on *mihi est* in Russian, McAnallen 2011).

²³ The mechanics allows extension of inherent case from *c/s*-selection at generation to e.g. raising to Voice (cf. Dotlačil and Šimik 2013, Anagnostopoulou and Sevdali 2015, Sigurðsson 2017: ch. 2, but idiosyncratic in e.g. Postal 1986: 2.3.2, Grevisse and Goose 2008: §279), or prepositional/oblique complementisers (McCloskey 1983, Postal 2003, Jung 2008, cf. Sigurðsson 2003). Such derived obliques always seem local to the assigner, shared with structural ergative case but not agreement in Basque (Rezac et al. 2014, cf. Deal 2019), consistent with distinction between nonlocal featural dependencies through Agree realised in classical structural case (Chomsky 2000), and Merge that yields KP shells upon

Φ -quirky inherent case behaves as a (pro)nominal with no number and person that interferes as 1/2 but controls as 3, or “marked” 3 such as human in systems that differentiate among 3s. This ϕ -quirkiness is reified as ϕ -specification (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Taraldsen 1995; Richards 2008). Quirky K is inert K plus [3rd], roughly ‘human’, grammaticalised on K by various paths, such as from typical usage like that of experiencer datives. This analysis is closely similar to that of (pro)nominals with opaque or complex ϕ -dependencies (Danon 2013; Landau 2016; Höhn 2015), as is the diachrony (cf. Corbett 2015, 2021, Rappaport 2009). In both sorts of phenomena, grammaticalised ϕ -features can mismatch typical interpretations, but there is no issue of interpretability itself if [3rd] can be interpreted on K’s like experiencer datives, say as a restriction to ‘human’ (cf. person as operator on predicate meanings, Harbour 2016, N and P as predicates, Heim and Kratzer 1998).²⁴

4.2.2 Φ -dependencies and ϕ -features

Syntactic dependencies involve the relation Agree between features of atoms (Chomsky 2001: 10, Collins and Stabler 2016: 44). In Agree, the occurrence of a feature F with no value, the *probe*, can match with that of the occurrence of F, the *goal*, in its domain, roughly c-command, which is closest to it, also roughly measured by c-command (Chomsky 2000, Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). Match results in feature unification, but externalisation of the feature can depend on that of the local context (5.4).²⁵

Φ -features in the systems here are “number” # and “person” π . # is perhaps number-gender-class, and characteristic of (pro)nominals built of (n+)N, including typical personal pronouns. There will be #-less impersonal and imperative pronouns below, but it is left open whether they are #-less because n/N-less, or because built on exceptional n/Ns. Interpretation alone offers limited guidance for values of #, even when not idiomatic, since absence of # can be close to availability of homophonous SG and PL, or to specifications that may be called *minimal*: no value, default value, SG or PL if the other is not available as alternative.

Person π has values that distinguish 1st, 2nd, and when present also a marked 3rd that groups with 1st and 2nd for person restrictions, such as human-logophoric *hän*-series in Finnish (Kaiser 2018). These values are written [1st], [2nd], [3rd], and jointly ½, leaving open their theory (Heim 2008, Kratzer 2009, Harbour 2016, Ackema and Neeleman 2018). It is convenient to assume that all are distinct from *minimal* π analogous to minimal #, and that general 3rd person on A is minimal π , but can be absence of π on O/S. There is support for such a difference between A and O/S (Adger and Harbour 2007: 4.3.1). However, the chief use made here of this A-O/S split is to halt T’s π -probe at A. It would instead be possible to treat general 3rd uniformly as minimal π , if only nonminimal π -bearers need π -match for case/licensing (5.4), or as π -less, if A-introducing v is a barrier to ϕ /case (but see Keine 2017 on agreement, Vainikka and Brattico 2014 on case), or if #-match prevented separate π -match (see lit. on quirkiness above).²⁶

Quirky obliques are attributed the human-logophoric [3rd], though minimal π would do (cf. Béjar and Rezac 2009: 47). This follows work on the role of dative Rs in person restrictions or

generation or displacement (Pesetsky 2013: 4.2, 2021: 5.1.2; contrast Sigurðsson 2017: ch. 2). All types of inherent case seem available to inflectional obliques (for revealing variation within/across Icelandic and German, Barðdal and Eythósson 2006, Wood and Sigurðsson 2014; Greek, Michelioudakis 2015; Basque, Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2009: 3.3), and here quirky vs. transparent is independent of exponence (including case-number fusion in Atlamaz and Baker 2018, but not in other systems, Rezac 2008a, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013); adpositions need better study (for reanalyses of quirky-like paradigms, see on intervention Bruening 2014, subjecthood Cardinaletti 2004; for unclarity in various respects, Miller and Sag 1997: 589n21, Landau 2008: 893-4, 905n25; Gallego 2019: 3.3).

²⁴ Other ways of getting quirky inherent case to interact only with person dependencies could be adopted here: quirkiness as ϕ -completeness interacting person and number probe position or ordering (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; Béjar and Rezac 2003, Preminger 2014, Coon and Keine 2020), but cf. number agreement across undisplaced quirky obliques (Anagnostopoulou 2018, Kučerová 2016: 50n4); quirkiness by filtering probes on K (Rezac 2008a), with richer assumptions than so far about match-valuation (q.v. Deal 2015, 2020).

²⁵ These assumptions are picked among adoptable alternatives (e.g. no atom-feature distinction, cf. Sag 2012: 1.2; copy not unification, cf. Haug and Nikitina 2016; syntactic match and value and its modulation, cf. Deal 2020).

²⁶ A vs. O/S approximates: object A under oblique-subject raising verbs in Icelandic is licensed and so π -less as 3rd even if agreeing for number while 1st/2nd are only licensed if in an opaque infinitive that provides its own licensing to Spec,T (4.1); object-position S that is also subject in Finnish raising-restructuring leads to accusative rather than split-nominative on embedded O and so has π (cf. Kiparsky 2001: 2.2.3, Rezac 2019).

their typical interpretation (Burston 1983, Boeckx 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003: 5.4.2, Adger and Harbour 2007, Rezac 2008a, Harbour 2016: 5.4.2, Coon and Keine 2020: 3.4.1; parallel in different terms Medová 2008: ch. 9-10). It is supported by greater formal markedness of 3rd person dative R against ergative, absolutive, nominative A and O/S (often analysable as dative exponence, but cf. secundative-aligned, person-only indexing in Georgian in Anagnostopoulou op.cit.), though not readily relatable to human-logophoric morphology (diachronically maybe Basque, Ariztímuno 2013: 9.3.1, Breton, 3.3.2, not e.g. Georgian, Harris 1985: 12.1.1, Romance, Alkire and Rosen 2011: 8.8). These usually human Rs give rise to person restrictions even if inanimates (Ormazabal and Romero 2007: 3.1.2 on *me lui* in Spanish but cf. D’Alessandro and Pescarini 2016; Rezac 2011: 4.2, 2022 *me lui* in French; DME.III for Breton and Finnish; cf. Manzini 2012: 11), but such form-use mismatches seem ubiquitous in ϕ -features (Wechsler and Zlatic 2003, including animate, human, and person, for IPRs see lit. in 4.6).

4.2.3 Case and licensing

Φ -dependencies have some relationship with case and licensing. As an initial useful strategy, Φ /Case theory is adopted here: (pro)nominals need licensing which includes case assigned under ϕ -Agree as well as inherent case (Chomsky 2000, 2001). This is adapted to person restrictions by requiring any and all of π , # of a (pro)nominal to match in ϕ -Agree in order to get case (Anagnostopoulou 2003). It is augmented with a theory of dependent case formulated so that loci of dependent ϕ /case, like accusative v, are available only to (pro)nominals not licensed by loci of independent ϕ /case, like nominative T. This fits IPRs: they disappear when the restricted argument is recoded as inherent (e.g. ‘with’-coding for S in Icelandic, Maling and Jónsson 1995, Basque, Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2009: 3.3); they can be repaired by switching to dependent case (Rezac 2011: ch. 5); and when there are divorces between ϕ and case, ϕ is affected primarily (which also challenges Φ /Case, 5.3-4).²⁷

For oblique + S unaccusatives like BE in *míhi est*, this modified Φ /Case designs the space of variation illustrated for Germanic in (21) (see lit in 4.1).

(21) Psych-unaccusatives and transitives in Germanic (IPR in bold)

a.	$T_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}}$	<u>DAT</u> _{inert-R}	> NOM.S	German <i>gefallen</i> ‘like’
b.	$T_{\pi = 3, \# = \text{NOM/DFLT}}$	<u>DAT</u> _{quirky-R}	> 3.NOM.S	Icelandic <i>leiðast</i> ‘bore’, <i>falla í geð</i> ‘like’
c.	$T_{\pi, \# = \text{DAT}}$	<u>DAT</u> _{complete-R}	> ACC.S	Icelandic <i>líka</i> ‘like’
d.	$T_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}}$	<u>NOM.S</u>	> DAT.R	Icelandic <i>falla í geð</i> ‘like’
e.	$T_{\pi, \# = \text{DFLT}}$	<u>DAT.R</u>	> PP	Icelandic <i>líka</i> ‘like’
f.	$T_{\pi, \# = \text{NOM}}$	<u>NOM</u>	> ACC	English subject-exp <i>like</i> , object-exp <i>bore</i> (structural subject underlined, > c-command of highest A-positions in TP)

The three initial combinations are the chief focus. If the oblique R subject is ϕ -inert (21)a, it does not interfere in the ϕ /case dependency of T and S. If it is ϕ -complete (21)b, it blocks the dependency like an argument without inherent case would, say A for O with transitive *like*. ϕ -complete R should and does license accusative on S, like A does on O with *like* (Jónsson 1996, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013). If the oblique is ϕ -quirky (21)c, it blocks only the π -dependency of S with T, and allows nominative #-only S. There is no issue if S can be higher than R within the TP, (21)d. In Icelandic this can be so for “alternating” unaccusatives and even for asymmetric ones in exceptional derivations where A’-displacement of R feeds A-raising of S (see lit. in 4.1). There is also no issue if instead of S the theta-role of S is coded as inherent case (21)e. If both arguments had structural case, (21)c would come out like *like* and (21)d like *bore* in (22), though that is not the usual analysis for English (Baker 1996b, Pesetsky 1995).

²⁷ Licensing of quirky obliques is left open. French contrasts DAT > 1/2.*ACC/DAT clitic clusters, and comparison of dative clitics with the locative one in the system suggest the former are quirky and the latter inert; but analyses have treated the lower dative as locative-like (Postal 1990, Rezac 2011: ch. 4 Appendix). Slovenian has DAT > 3/*1/*2.ACC, ACC > 3/*1/*2.DAT clitics with ditransitives with order argued to reflect c-command (Stegovec 2018); but it would also follow if 1st/2nd person were limited to the high dative construction (available, Haspelmath 2005). Revealing here would be Icelandic dative-extraction + nominative-fronting with 1/2.DAT (cf. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 167).

4.3 Quirky obliques: Configurations

The foregoing mechanics for quirky obliques has been sketched for *have*-constructions in Breton and is now completed by comparing the more transparent Finnish and Icelandic.

In Finnish, the finite verb agrees for person and number with nominative S/A in high and most low structural subject positions, (22)a. It is taken to realise $\pi, \#$ -Agree of T. In an analogue of existential-presentational constructions of English, (22)c, S is indefinite in object position, and uniquely, a nominative with tendency not to agree. These are the patterns of most S's, including that of BE + adessive R in *apud me est* 'be with, at ... 's'. The same case combination in *mihi est* has the usage of *have* (22)b-(22)c and behaves quite differently. The adessive or dative-genitive R is subject, S is in object position, can be definite, nominative when 3, accusative when ½. This is analysed as IPR and the adessive or dative-genitive as quirky inherent case (see Kiparsky 2001, complemented esp. for low subject positions Holmberg 2005, agreement in the existential-presentational construction a.o. Hakulinen et al. 2004, nonfinite clauses Koskinen 1998, Vainikka 2003, Hakulinen and Karlsson 1979).²⁸

(22) Person restrictions in Finnish unaccusatives, agreeing clause

BE in apud me est, neutral word order

- a. {Se on, ne ovat, sina olet} heillä
 3SG.NOM be.3S, 3PL.NOM be.3PL, 2SG.NOM be.2SG} 3PL.HUM.ADS
 {It is, they are, thou art} with them.

BE in mihi est, neutral word order

- b. Heillä on {se, ne, *sinä, sinut}
 3HUM.PL.ADS be.3SG {3SG.NOM, 3PL.NOM/ACC, 2SG.NOM, 2SG.ACC}
 They have {it, them, thee}.

BE in apud me est, mihi est existential-presentational

- c. Heillä on kaupungin parhaat voileivät
 3HUM.PL.ADS be.3SG town.GEN best.PL.NOM sandwich.PL.NOM
 {At their place are, They have} the best sandwiches in town.

Nonfinite clauses work the same way, (23), to the extent confounds can be set aside, such as optional availability of matrix accusative here.

(23) *Mihi est* in Finnish infinitive under active ECM

...tietää [minulla olevan {se/sen, sinut/*sinä}]
 ...know.3SG 1SG.ADESS be.INF {3SG.NOM/ACC 2SG.ACC/*NOM
 ...she knows that I have you.

The case-agreement-restriction patterns of quirky-oblique subjects of unaccusatives in Finnish are nearly the same as in Icelandic "A" in (19) (4.1), and with its coding of nominative objects by enclitics, in Breton (sec. 3). One important difference and challenge is ineffability rather than accusativity of the restricted ½ in Icelandic and Breton (taken up in 5.3). Another is variation in agreement for object-position nominatives across and within Finnish and Icelandic, while overt agreement has been lost in Breton (taken up 5.4). Finally, Finnish and Icelandic raise the challenge that quirky dative R should, but does not, give rise to IPRs for accusative O (active ditransitives in Icelandic, as in passives, Sigurðsson 1996: sec. 2; Anagnostopoulou 2003: 5.2) or repair-accusative S (in *mihi est* of Finnish, where it cannot be inspected due to clitic cluster restrictions in Breton, 3.6) (this also taken up in 5.3).

²⁸ Finnish has been drawn from studies or corpora, adapted to minimal pairs, and checked with two native speakers..

The analysis of IRPs does not expect any role for thematic interpretation. All the systems here meet the expectation, but most so Finnish through its richness of infinitives transparent for φ /case (Vainikka and Brattico 2014). When the silent subject S/A of the infinitive is linked to matrix nominative S, (24)a-b, O of the infinitive is accusative. When it is linked to matrix dative-genitive R, it is split-nominative, (24)c. This is expected if the matrix nominative is structural, the dative-genitive quirky, and the latter links to the silent subject by raising, raising to oblique, restructuring, or φ -inert/quirky PRO (Koskinen 1998; Nelson 1998).²⁹

(24) Clausal domains in Finnish

Transparent clause, control

- a. He tulevat [] ottamaan sen / minut mukaan].
 3PL.N come.3PL to.take 3SG/1SG.ACC along
 They will come to take it/me along.

Transparent clause, raising to nominative

- b. He osavat [] ottaa sen / minut mukaan].
 3PL.N hit.3PL to.take 3SG/1SG.ACC along
 They know how to take it/me along.

Transparent clause, raising to oblique or restructuring

- c. Heidän tulee [] ottaa se / minut mukaan].
 3PL.GEN come.3SG to.take 3SG/1SG.ACC along
 It becomes them to take me along

Icelandic offers similar patterns as Finnish in different multipredicate structures, with matrix quirky dative experiencer R and embedded split-nominative A/(O→)S (see lit in 4.1). Breton lacks transparent multipredicate constructions with lexical predicates. The periphrastic perfect is their counterpart, with perfect-selected *v* introducing the quirky oblique S/A (3.3.4). There is no expectation that periphrasis is essential, and synthetic perfects also show oblique-A + nominative-absolutive O (e.g. Georgian, lit. in 3.3.3). Perfect tense should also be inessential to this coding, for instance when it spreads beyond perfects (cf. Harris 1985, Haig 2006, Coghill 2016). There do indeed seem to be nonperfects and perfects with restricting φ -quirky oblique As like ergative and person-restricted O as nominative-absolutive (e.g. Rezac 2008a, cf. Bhatt 2008; Doron and Khan 2012, Kalin and van Urk 2015), beside similarly-flagged but φ -inert As and unrestricted Os (e.g. Anand and Nevins 2006, Shklovsky 2012).

In all of Finnic, Icelandic or Breton, split-nominative (O→)S is restricted to case-agreement domains that include a distinct subject. It is difficult to examine person restrictions for other object-like (O→)S in such constructions like the existential-presentational one, since all three systems impose independent antipronominal restrictions. One line of evidence available is escapes from these restrictions in English and French, *There were only we three in all that vast country* (English, Chomsky 2000: 149n90, Schütze 1997: 4.1.6, Kay and Michaelis 2017: 0.11-12; French, Grevisse-Goose 2008: §660f, Postal 1986: 114). This has been studied in Finnish. There the split-nominative S under oblique subject in *mihi est* (22)b has been contrasted with unrestricted nominative S combined with another fronted element that does not satisfy subjecthood properties as in *apud me est* (25)a (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1975: 4.2; Kiparsky 2001: 2.2.3), but the latter likely is in a subject position (to judge by its obligatory narrow focus,

²⁹ Matrix nominative S here can be nonagreeing in the existential-presentational construction (Kiparsky 2001: 2.2.3), embedded S is usually silent under linking to matrix dative-genitive (but for nonstandard types, Laitinen and Vilkkuna 1993, A*). In standard varieties the matrix dative-genitive (q.v. Huomo 1995, Inaba 2007) has invited analysis as raised genitive subject of infinitives (Laitinen and Vilkkuna 1993, Koskinen 1998), here readily analysable as quirky, but nonstandard adessive favours matrix origin (e.g. Ahtia 2014: §20; A*), and restructuring (Nelson 1998: II.C.3), or raising to oblique (adapting Koskinen 1998: ch. 4, cf. note 23), and so does even standard absence of possessive suffixes in matrix infinitives corresponding to this dative-genitive (A*). Other subjects of infinitival clauses do not link to obliques; for transparent infinitives, their subject can be only genitive, only possessive-suffix, or OC PRO, the only analysis of which excluded here is as φ -complete, while the nominal-like genitive+possessive-suffix and NOC PRO of opaque infinitives could be φ -complete (see Vainikka and Brattico 2014, Koskinen 1998 with lit., cf. Rezac 2019).

Holmberg and Nikanne 2002). The other line of evidence is binominal predications like (25)b. These do have unrestricted agreeing nominatives that are not in subject positions (Hakulinen and Karlsson 1975; for analyses, Hartman and Heycock 2018).³⁰

(25) Candidates for nominatives in object position

<i>BE in apud me est vs. mihi est</i>			<i>Binominal copula</i>	
a.	Heillä	olet SINÄ.	b.	Se=han olet sinä.
	3HUM.PL-ADS	be.2SG 2SG.NOM		3SG=EMPH be.2SG you.
	YOU are with them,	*They have you.		It is you.

Icelandic goes with Finnish on these constructions, to a first approximation, and its clause-structure improves evidence that binominal copula constructions do have their unrestricted nominatives in object-like positions (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: sec. 4, Coon and Keine 2020: sec. 4). Breton also goes with Finnish; in particular, its 3-only enclitics do not code S in these constructions (potentially but with no certainly contrasting with unrestricted enclitic coding of object-position nominatives in a presentative *there's* ___... type, 3.7.1).

The restriction of split-nominative (O→)S to constructions with subjects is of particular interest for Finnish and Breton, because their ½ is not ineffable but accusative, and could be labeled differential object marking (5.1). Theories of differential object marking codistribute it with typical dependent accusative, so that it is available to O but not (O→)S, for instance dative ½ ~ accusative 3 in Spanish impersonals but not ~ 3 nominative in passives (4.4). That is so also for the split-nominative coding in Finnish and Breton. In both systems, it contrasts strikingly with coding that is sensitive to position, and shared by existential-presentational (O→)S with O: partitive of negation, available for personal pronouns and so directly comparable with split-nominative (Finnish, Kiparsky 2001: 2.2.2, Vilkuna 1996: 3.5.1; Breton, Schapansky 1996, Stark and Widmer 2019, DME.II: 358n39).³¹

4.4 Quirkiness in impersonals

4.4.1 *Arb* features and consequences

The attribution of bare [3rd] to ϕ -quirky obliques has limited support outside IPRs (4.2). It is strengthened by the coupling of split-nominative objects of IPRs with arbitrary human impersonal and imperative subjects in Jahnsson's Rule of Finnic and Breton. These are not oblique, yet have properties suggesting π -bearers, and suggest substantive constraints on possible π -only bearers, and so IPRs in Jahnsson's Rule.

The section introduces this class of pronouns with human impersonals, which include arbitrary *arb* in French *on*, German *man*, Irish autonomous inflection, and Spanish *se*, all confined to nominatives, and generic *gen*, including English *one*, Spanish *uno*, without case restriction (a.o Egerland 2003, Moltman 2005, McCloskey 2007, Malamud 2012, Ackema and Neeleman 2018, Fenger 2018). All are restricted roughly to humans, but in a way that differs from nouns like *person*, *people*, with various consequences such as unparaphraseability of *I wonder what it feels like if one is a horse* (cf. Moltman 2006 on *one*, Rezac and Jouitteau 2016:

³⁰ There is a 3-only nonagreeing nominative S in a dialectal raising construction, but again strikingly unavailable as accusative (Laitinen and Vilkuna 1993, Kiparsky 2001; A*).

³¹ The antipronominal restrictions of existential-presentational and other inversion constructions are complex when studied in depth (English, Kay and Michaelis 2017, Deal 2009: sec. 8, Birner and Ward 2003, Kayne 1979; cf. lit. in Rezac 2010c for French), and those of the systems here seem similar (Icelandic, Thráinsson 2007: ch. 6; Finnish, Hakulinen et al. 2004 and further A*; Breton, DME.III). It would be intriguing to reduce antipronominal restrictions on low-S generally to π -intervention (as in Richards 2008 with lit. for expletive constructions in English). However, their patterns do not seem to easily lend themselves to this, nor to the reverse enterprise of reducing person restrictions on S of oblique-subject constructions to other restrictions (cf. Sigurðsson 2012: sec. 3). Thus the definiteness effect in Icelandic does not constrain S or a given clausal or A-position whether or not there is a higher one available, but rather whatever argument would raise to the canonical subject position if it does not raise there (Sigurðsson 1989: 6.3, 2011). Even more unrelated seem whatever limitations *have*-constructions have on definites (Myler 2016: 6.3). Certain binominal copula constructions have restrictions analysed as ϕ -intervention, but then their absence in the systems here needs understanding (Coon and Keine 2020, Béjar and Kahnemouyipour 2017, Bhatia 2019, Vigo 2016).

ch. 3 on *on*; *ibid* on logophoricity, as well as Malamud 2012 on *man*). The restriction is here construed as $\pi=[3^{\text{rd}}]$, like human-logophoric 3rd person pronouns of Finnish (following esp. Malamud 2012; differently Ackema and Neeleman 2018, Fenger 2018).

For #, the generic impersonals like *one* are singular for # on interpretive and formal grounds, here $\#=[\text{SG}]$, and as such correctly expected to be φ -complete nominatives and combine with accusative O. The arbitrary impersonals have more leeway. They are consistent with freely-valued or minimal #, which should go with accusative O, but also with no #, and so split-nominative O. Both options are well attested for the *arb se* of Romance (cf. Pescarini 2017): accusative and 3-only nominative in Italian (D'Alessandro 2007), 3 nominative coupled with ineffable 1/2 in Piedmontese (Parry 1998) and Portuguese, (Narò 1976), but with repair accusative ½ in Genovese (Parry 1998, Mendikoetxea and Battye 1992), perhaps Spanish (Mendikoetxea 1999, Fernández-Ordóñez 1999: A*). This split-nominative O has been studied as an IPR analogous to one with quirky oblique subjects (D'Alessandro, 2007: ch. 4, Pescarini 2017 on Italian, Rezac 2011: 6.4, Dobrovie-Sorin 2017 on French, Mendikoetxea 2008, MacDonald 2017 on Spanish, Giurgea 2019 on Romanian; A*). Romance systems also show a promising candidate for *arb se* minus the remaining π -specification in anticausative *se*, expletive-like and coupled with unrestricted nominative O→S (Schäfer 2008, Alexiadou et al. 2015). Table 10 gives the expected correlations of subject S/A φ -specification and object O coding in these and functionally related constructions.

Table 10: Varieties of noncanonical A

A	Form	Syntax	O	See
<i>arb</i>	<i>above</i>	π -only Spec,v	split-nom.	<i>above</i>
	<i>above</i>	$\pi,\#$ Spec,v	acc.	<i>above</i> , Legate 2014
anticaus.	expletive	φ -less	nom.	Alexiadou et al. 2015
can. passive	oblique	inert inh., adjunct?	nom.	Alexiadou et al. 2015
	implicit	v-adj. and v projects	nom.	Legate 2014
noncan. pass.	implicit	default $\pi,\#$ Spec,v	acc.	Legate 2014
quasiarg./fate	pro	default $\pi,\#$ Spec,v	acc.	Schäfer 2008, Wood 2016

4.4.2 Finnish *arb*, split-nominative, and double nominative

Romance systems have split-nominative objects with *arb* subject alone, because their quirky obliques are not subjects (Béjar and Rezac 2003). Finnish has them both with *arb* and quirky oblique subjects (Rezac 2011: 5.6). To introduce *arb*, it is useful to first introduce *gen* in Finnish. The Finnish *gen* is 3SG *pro* close to *one*, and like *one*, close to say *ihminen* 'a/the person': 3SG for agreement, 3SG for anaphora, SG for secondary predicates, not restricted to a particular case or role. Thus when it substitutes for nominative S/A, it comes out as 3SG *pro* and O is accusative, (29)a; when it substitutes for a quirky oblique subject A/R in the constructions discussed earlier, it is silent, and O/S is split-nominative (see a.o. Kaiser and Vihman 2006, Holmberg 2018, Kaiser 2019).

(26) Human impersonals in Finnish

<i>Generic impersonal</i>		<i>Arbitrary impersonal</i>	
a.	jos tuo {sen, minut}.	b.	jos tuodaan {se, minut/*minä}.
	if bring.3SG 3SG.ACC 1SG.ACC		if bring.ARB 3SG.NOM 1SG.ACC/*NOM
	if one brings it/me		if one brings it/me

The Finnish *arb* is expressed by a distinctive inflection of the finite verb. It is close to *man-on-se arb*'s, substituting only for nominative S/A, and with full (pro)nominalhood on diagnostics from control to anaphora to secondary predicates (cf. Landau 2010, Legate 2014). Unlike with *gen*, primary and secondary predicates and local anaphora are found as both SG and PL, consistently with absence of # on *arb* and semantic # on dependents (Kaiser and Vihman

2006: sec. 3, 6.1, complemented by Vilkuna 1996: 4.1.4, Hakulinen et al. 2004: §1324; A*). As then expected of a π -only *arb* as A, it combines with split-nominative O, (26)b.³²

The Finnish system thus has both φ -complete nominative S/A, in regular (pro)nominals and *gen*, with accusative O, and π -only S/A, in quirky obliques and *arb*, with split-nominative O/S. This strengthens the correlation of split-nominative objects with π -only subjects under φ -intervention. Of the two systems discussed so far alongside Finnish, Icelandic has *gen* but not *arb maður* (Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009), while Breton has both *gen den* and inflectional *arb* but both φ -complete with accusative O (Rezac and Jouitteau 2015). At a point prior to the period studied here for Breton, the inflectional *arb* combined with 3 nominative ~ 1/2 accusative O (Table 9), itself perhaps merging an earlier passive with nominative O and *arb* with accusative O (Cowgill 1983, cf. Graver 2009; Fleuriot 1964: §138).

4.4.3 Variation and personification

The origin and extensions of the Finnish *arb* are revealing about theoretical details of partial φ -intervention and its limits. The likely source is the reflexive of an implicit-causee causative in Proto-Finnic, *They made __ help themselves* → *Helped.ARB them* (Lehtinen 2007; cf. Bellec 2014 on French). The construction retained nominative of the reflexivised A=O, and reanalysed its causative + reflexivised A=O agreement in 3rd person as new “4th person” inflection, which extended to S. Implicit causees have proven invisible to IPRs (Albizu 2000). The invisibility can be readily incorporated here on various analyses of them, such as φ -sets adjoined to *v* and invisible due to the adjunction structure (cf. Wood and Sigurðsson 2021 with lit.). On this view, the original *arb* construction had no person restrictions. Reanalysis of the inflected causative morphology could have kept inflectional implicit S/A with unrestricted nominative O and further innovated agreement to track nominative O; shifted to φ -complete *arb* S/A with accusative O; or to π -only *arb* S/A and split-nominative O. All the O codings are attested (Jahnsson 1871: §11, Lehtinen 1984, Smit 2016; A*). The associated *arb*’s should be differentiable by diagnostics like local anaphora, though complexities of these diagnostics elsewhere have resisted consensus (Legate 2014: ch 4, Alexiadou et al. 2015, Collins 2021).

More recently, *arb* has “personalised” in Finnish by coming to partly or wholly express 1PL, displacing their older person-number agreement inflection, and in closely related varieties 3PL (Kaiser and Vihman 2006; A*). The morphosyntax of these new formations is shown in (27). Split-nominative O is kept, and as is then expected here, so are characteristics of *arb*: its old inflection, its *pro*-drop even when *pro* is unavailable to personal pronouns in a given register, and its antecedence of 3/default anaphora. However, there also appears the possibility of overt 1PL nominative pronouns, and with or without them, antecedence of 1PL anaphora.

(27) *Arb* and its personification in Finnish

Classical and continuing arb

- a. Minusta *pro* ollaan yhä enemmän huolissa -an.
 1SG.ELAT BE.ARB still more worry.PL.INESS -3/DFLT
 People worry more and more about me.

New IPL

- b. Nyt (me) ollaan yhä enemmän huollissa {-an, -mme}.
 now 1PL.NOM BE.ARB still more worry.PL.INESS 3/DFLT 1PL
 (...) we worry more and more.

Unchanged 2PL for plurality or for the addressee in V-use

³² The description of the morphology of *arb* is limited here to finite synthetic verbs, but *arb* behaves the same with finite periphrastic formations (A*). Nonfinite “passive” clauses share part of the morphology of *arb* in finite clauses, but either are have no relationship to *arb* (Vainikka 1989: 5.3.1.1), or are difficult to probe (Vainikka 1989: 5.3.1.3, 5.3.2.3). However, in “active” nonfinite clauses, NOC PRO combines with split-nominative O (Taraldsen 1986, Hakulinen et al. 2004: §939), and is straightforwardly analysed with the same φ -content as *arb*, though the origin is different (Havas 2008 with lit.; A*), beside φ -complete PRO in Icelandic and Breton (3SGM for φ -dependencies).

- c. Nyt te ole-tte yhä enemmän huollissa -nne
 now 2PL.NOM be-2PL still more worry.PL.INESS 2PL
 You worry more and more.

The nominative 1PL A has been challenging for approaches to Jahnsson’s Rule that relate split-nominative O to the absence of nominative A (discussed in Timberlake 1975, Maling 1993, Nelson 1998, Kiparsky 2001). Here, since evidence reveals clearly the presence of *arb*, *arb* can be taken to be the goal of the nominative ϕ /case dependency with T. 1PL can then be associated with *arb* in a big-DP structure that has been studied for similar doublings elsewhere (Belletti 1999, Höhn 2015, Craenenbroeck and van Koppen 2008, Cardinaletti 2019, including Romance 1PL personifications of *arb* with similar dual properties, Taylor 2009, Costa and Pereira 2013, Rezac and Jouitteau 2016: ch. 6). The ϕ -dependency of nominative T sees only the π -only *arb* at the top of the doubling structure, matches it for π and skips it for # match with O. Each ϕ -match is complete relative to the ϕ -features of the goal, and so satisfies the conditions on case-assignment. Nominative thus appears not only on the #-matched O, but also π -matched *arb*, visible on its 1PL doublee, and detectable elsewhere by the nominative-clitic/pro-like distribution of *arbs* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2017; Kayne 2000; Fenger 2018). The 1PL is not expected to need case for its own licensing, since doublees often have their own mechanisms in the big DP (op.cit.; on contribution of the doublee to ϕ -dependencies with anaphora, cf. 4.5).

The ϕ -intervention approach to Jahnsson’s Rule then allows double-nominative constructions dependent on a single nominative locus, but under heavily circumscribed conditions (already inherent in Anagnostopoulou 2003): π -only subject and #-only object. The next step of personification of *arb* is simple but unexpected under the analysis and absent in these systems. This is reanalysis of *arb* with 1PL, detectable in regularisation of agreement and limitation to 1PL anaphora, without concomitant replacement of split-nominative by accusative O (see Taylor 2009, Costa and Pereira 2013 for this step with accusative O).

4.5 Quirkiness in imperatives

4.5.1 Imperative pronouns and person

The subject of imperatives (28)b, addressee-inclusive 2SG, 2PL, 1PL, is the last subject S/A combining split-nominative O in Jahnsson’s Rule, in Finnish, varieties of Breton, but not Icelandic. Even the jussive (28)a, used to issue commands targeting non-addressee inclusive subjects, takes accusative O in Finnish, and such clear traces as there are of it in Breton (3.6). Like *arb*, the imperative has challenged to analyses of Jahnsson’s Rule, because it can code subject S/A in ways similar to other moods, including nominative in (28)b (see lit. in 4.4.3).

(28) Imperative vs. jussive in Finnish

Jussive A.NOM + O.ACC

- a. (He) tuo-koo-t (he) {sen, minut}
 3PL.NOM bring-!3-PL 3SG.ACC 1SG.ACC
 Let them bring {it, me}.

Imperative A.NOM + O.3.NOM~1/2.ACC

- b. (*Te) tuo-kaa (te) {se, minut/*minä}.
 2PL.NOM bring-!2PL 3SG.NOM 1SG.ACC/*NOM
 (You) bring {it, me}.

On the approach here, imperative subjects lend themselves to a π -only analysis that groups them with *arb* but does not generalise to other agreeing nominatives. Theories of imperatives have most of the necessary ingredients (Zanuttini et al. 2013, Isac 2015). Imperatives allow and require pronouns with special properties as subjects, like infinitives do (N)OC PRO (Potsdam 1998). They have been seen as elements with only ϕ -features as content, and this content derivable from syntactic ϕ -dependencies, like PRO (op.cit.; Landau 2015 with lit.). An

imperative left periphery constraints imperative pronouns to addressee-inclusion and gives them their π -features, [2nd] and optionally [1st] (Zanuttini 2008: 216, Zanuttini, Pak and Portner 2012: sec. 3, Isac 2015: 8.2.1.1). The pronoun can have distinctive morphosyntax. One is exceptionally available as *pro* (English, French, Finnish). Another is a restricted set of 3-only free nominal doubles like *no one*, and correlatively, both 3 and 1/2 local anaphora, *No one raise your/their hand!* (so Zanuttini 2008 for English; available in Finnish, op.cit., along with exceptional *pro*, Vainikka and Levy 2000; no doubling in Breton or French, DME.II: 5.2).

4.5.2 Imperative number and associatives

This leaves the 2SG-2PL (1PL) distinction in imperative inflections. One candidate is value of # born on the imperative pronoun itself (Zanuttini et al. 2013). The result is \varnothing -complete imperative subject S/A and so accusative O. For Finnish and Breton with their split-nominative O, another way of making that distinction is needed. It should exempt imperative subject pronouns from presence of #, in a system where subject pronouns of other moods have #. It should lead to #-like distinction that makes 2PL (1PL) behave like pluralities rather than collectives. Finally, either the exemption to # or the #-like device or both is such that it has resisted extension beyond imperative subjects. The literature offers candidates in comitative, inclusive, and associative constructions, the last explored here (Corbett 2004).

Associatives be examined independently of # in systems like Cantonese, where bare nominals are ordinarily used neutrally for number and lack numerosity-related morphology. An associative morpheme combines with personal pronouns and to some extent referential nouns, and picks out the contextually salient group containing their referent (Cheng and Sybesma 1999; Cysouw 2009: 4.3.5). That group is semantically a plurality (Vassilieva 2005: 2.1.2, Ackema and Neelman 2018: 292n23). Associatives have been proposed as universal part of the content of plural 1st/2nd personal pronouns (cf. Corbett 2004: 4.3), but combined with # in systems like English, perhaps as consequence on the presence of n/N (Kratzer 2009: sec. 5; Elbourne 2009). Associatives should then build semantically plural pronouns without # to the extent #-n/N can be absent, including imperative pronouns. This use of associatives may be compared to analyses of partial control that rely on singular PRO and comitative content, with somewhat different properties (Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nuñez 2007: 5.6.1, Sheehan 2014).

It is not straightforward to test for associatives. They yield pluralities, and that suffices for plural number in local anaphora. It would suffice for plural concord on nonfinite predicates under interpretative analyses of it (Pollard and Sag 1994, Sauerland 2004, Sudo and Spathas 2020, fitting well both singular and plural with *arb* in Finnish in 4.4.2), but there is also good evidence that such concord can reflect arbitrary conventionalisation (Corbett 2004: 6.4), and covert doubles nuance expectations (see above). Morphology only leads to the expectation that associative exponence can dissociate from that of #=[PL]. That makes sense of tendencies in varieties close to Finnish in eliminating regular plural inflections from the imperative (cf. Sebeok 1944; A*), and to regularise the way plural is marked in the jussive (see below), but these are not evident in Breton (cf. Rezac 2021 for lit.).

4.5.3 Variation and its limits

The 2SG-2PL-1PL distinctions of imperative morphology are not deterministic about the analyses of the underlying content. So far π with # has given accusative O, π with associatives split-nominative O. Varieties of Finnish have unrestricted nominative O. This is expected if π is not transmitted to the imperative pronoun but still constrains its interpretation (close to Zanuttini et al. 2013, and parallel to semantic control for OC PRO, Chierchia 1984, Pearson 2016, while configurationally close to leaving the imperative subject outside the domain of φ /case, Nelson 1998: IV.C.6). An unrestricted nominative O should also arise in other ways, for instance if the imperative subject A were a v -adjoined φ -set, like the implicit A of passives, but unlike in typical passives, indicated on the finite verb (Legate 2014 on Acehnese, cf. Table 10). These analyses are in principle differentiable, but not necessarily easily (4.4.3).

The core content of imperatives may be compatible with their not selecting an imperative pronoun, and thereby lends itself to the analysis of jussives, along the lines of *See to it that they*

eat (Zanuttini et al. 2013: 3.2.2, 4.2). In Finnish and Breton, the jussive takes 3SG/PL nominatives subjects, in regular positions, and tracks their number by the same agreement morphology as other moods. It is then expected to take accusative O. The systems can lose number agreement, but also innovate or regularise it (on Finnic, e.g. Lönnbohm 1879, Timonen 2008, Zaikov 2000: ch. 3, A*; on Breton, DME.II: 5.2). Its loss allows reanalysis, for instance with imperative subject *arb* doubled by nominative for S/A, and so split-nominative O (on Finnic, Timberlake 1974: 245n66, cf. 1975: sec. 7).

4.6 Parameters and expectations

ϕ -intervention unites person restrictions due to obliques with those due to nonoblique special pronouns as quirky, π -only X in $H_{\phi(case)} > X > \alpha$. With H as the nominative ϕ /case locus T, π -only X defines the set of constructions that fall under Jahnsson's Rule. This choice of locus allows the examination of a greater than typical range of interveners in ϕ -dependencies, because several special elements are only subjects: imperative pronouns, arbitrary human impersonals, PRO. Other factors should determine the distribution of arguments that can lack #, π and #, or neither. These factors leave considerable leeway for the potential π -only bearers here. The acquisition of their ϕ -specification might not be readily cued by their own form and interpretation, but it can be trivially cued IPRs.

Constraints on the distribution of # would offer substantive constraints on IPRs. The boundaries of Jahnsson's Rule across the history of Breton and Finnic suggest that # is entailed by lexical N or its associated n. If so, the only way to build π -only bearers is complex structure hiding the # contributed by n/N, as in obliques, or absence of n/N, defining a class special pronouns, relatable by their limited content to those discussed in the literature as minimal pronouns (Kratzer 2009). These have been independently proposed as the analysis of arbitrary human impersonals, imperative subjects, and PRO (Malamud 2012; Zanuttini et al. 2013; Landau 2015 with lit.). Inversely, by the time a noun like *human* has become a π -only bearer with split-nominative O, it should have lost its lexical n/N and so grammaticalised as a human impersonal with human-logophoric π [3rd] (consistent with known diachronies, q.v. Giacalone Ramat and Sansò 2007; Muller 2007, Giacalone Ramat and Sansò 2011, Narò 1976; Meyer 2010; Taylor 2009, Costa and Pereira 2013). It is not clear where run-of-the-mill personal pronouns here fall relative to the #-n/N correlation, but the systems here are consistent with not only available but also obligatory n/N (cf. Elbourne 2009, Kratzer 2009).

This n/N-# correlation could be weakened and then predict systems where Jahnsson's Rule extends to subjects like personal pronouns, kinship nouns, animate nouns, or masculine animate nouns (cf. lit. on π in IPRs in 5.4). It should interact differently with systems that differ in their ϕ -probes, either through presence and absence of π , #, or through more complex probes for each. A system without #-probes cannot be sensitive to presence vs. absence of #, and even in the systems here subsystems that differ from T such as that of accusative v may differ (5.3). Conversely, a system with extra π (/case)-loci can be immune to person restrictions.³³

Among elements that can lack #, there are no correlations predicted. That seems right. Any subject can be unique in quiriness, and the paths to them are varied. In Breton, imperative and *have*-constructions had both gained split-nominative objects in 16C, but by 19C only the latter kept them in the southeast, and only the former elsewhere. Finnic shows the same independence, and *arb* can differ from either (e.g. Jansson 1871; Oranen 1984; Canneli 1889: §55; A*). *Arb* alone is quirky in Romance (4.4). In Breton, split-nominative objects spread from obliques-subject constructions by periphrases built on them, and through case-syncretisms to imperatives.

³³ Georgian illustrates the consequences both these expectations. Its number agreement has been argued to be cumulate PL by skipping #-less subjects, which can be approached as lack of # on singulars or more complex #-probe that is only satisfied by PL (omnivorous number or high #-probe, Béjar 2003, 2011; Nevins 2011; Deal 2020), and conversely entails #-specification even of the default (masculine) singular in the systems here, though the absence of licensing-repair effects of #-agreement also separates it from π -agreement (the absent Number-Case Constraint, Nevins 2011, Preminger 2014; cf. nonsyntactic analyses, Trommer 2006, Blix 2020). Conversely, its datives R/A controls π -probes in preference to S/O but only gives rise to licensing-repair effects in R-O configurations (Béjar 2003: 3.8, 3.10, 2011: 984 note 2, cf. Bonet 1991: 198-9), but the apparently immune A-O and R-S configurations have extra π -agreement tracking just O/S (formally identical to the copula, e.g. 2.DAT A/R + 1.NOM O/S as 2.DAT-V-I_{NOM}-BE, 3.DAT + 1.NOM I_{NOM}-V-I_{NOM}-BE-, Hewitt 1995, cf. Rezac 2016: sec. 5 for Basque).

In Finnic, as far as can be told, nominative objects might have arisen piecemeal, as in reanalysis of indirect causatives to passives (4.4) or modifying to governing infinitives (see lit. in Havas 2008; A*). In Tangkic and Ngayarda languages, the nominative object of imperatives has been seen as an absolutive unshifted to accusative because unambiguous as object, and then sometimes split through differential argument marking and so form-frequency correspondence (Dixon 1994: 6.3, Evans 1995: 10.4, Klokeid 1979: 388).

Where ϕ -intervention and #-distribution does give rise to expectations is in the set of constructions under Jahnsson's Rule. In a system where # correlates with n/N, n/N is present on personal pronouns, there is no straightforward extension of (split-)nominative object O from the imperative to other moods, to couple it in them with nominative subject S/A – say to the present, through and on its surrogate-imperative use, or future, on and through its use for injunctions. The extensions are not impossible, but need complex structures, such as nominative S/A that are really *arb* doubled by the apparent nominative, and so with consequences detectable in ϕ -features of various dependencies (4.4.3, 4.5.3, cf. Zanuttini et al. 2013: 1252 note 30). Such subversion of expectations about possible case-agreement patterns has been well studied for biclausal constructions realised in periphrastic or even synthetic constructions (see Coon and Preminger 2016, Salanova and Tallman 2020 for discussion), and such biclausality often comes with surface-clear or easily-detectable correlates (op.cit.; cf. A* on the Finnic type in Ogren 2015: 286). The theoretical expectations about these subversions depend on the interactions of potential structures and their externalisations with overt cues available to the learner (see Walkden 2017 for discussion, and e.g. Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013: 4.2-3 for a pertinent study of partial double-nominativity in Icelandic, related to Breton in DME.II: 5.1).

5 Agreement, case and licensing in and beyond repairs

5.1 Repairs

In Jahnsson's Rule, 3-only nominative alternates with ineffable or accusative $\frac{1}{2}$. This distribution of $\frac{1}{2}$ accusative has been described as repair, because it depends on the restriction of a coding that is more general with respect to the argument ($\frac{1}{2}$ accusative pronouns vs. 3 nominative pronouns and nominals), and its context ($\frac{1}{2}$ accusative S/O under certain subjects against 3 nominative S/O in this configuration, other object positions, and any person as subject). Table 11 gives repairs with similar conditions.

Table 11: $\frac{1}{2}$ repairs of 3 IPRs (underlined recoded in repair)

Construction	Repair	System
Jahnsson: A subject + O object		
A.ARB + <u>O.NOM</u>	–	(Piedmontese)
A.ARB + <u>O.NOM</u>	O.ACC	Finnish; Spanish nonleista
A.DAT + <u>O.NOM</u>	O.ACC	Finnish, Breton
A.IPV + <u>O.NOM</u>	O.ACC	Finnish, Breton, (Lardil)
Jahnsson: R subject + (O→)S object		
R.DAT + (O→)S.NOM/ABS	–	Icelandic, Breton, Basque
R.DAT/ADS + <u>S.NOM</u>	S.ACC	Finnish
R.DAT + <u>S.ABS</u>	S.ERG	Basque [%] , (Choctaw)
<u>R.ABS</u> + S.ABS	R.ERG	(Chinook)
Ditransitive: high R + O object		
A.NOM + <u>R.DAT</u> _{clitic} + O.ACC	R.DAT _{low}	French, Spanish nonleista
A.ERG + <u>R.DAT</u> _{agr} + O.ACC/ABS	R.DAT _{low}	Basque
A.NOM/ERG + <u>R.DAT</u> _{agr} + O.ACC/ABS	R.DAT _{low}	Georgian [%]
A.NOM + <u>R.DAT</u> _{clitic} + O.ACC	R.LOC _{low}	French [%] (Catalan)
A.NOM + R.DAT _{agr} + <u>O.ACC/ABS</u>	O's self.ACC/ABS	Georgian [%]

Symbols: [%] variation; (X) not all repairs included; Romance/Basque sc. nonleista

Sources: Bonet 1991, 2008, Rezac 2011: ch. 4-5, Tyler 2018 with lit.

For the nominative objects of Jahnsson’s Rule, and their absolutive counterparts, the repairs look like increases in ϕ -case potential, and are identical to increases found when an argument is added beyond the nominative-absolutive one: addition of “dependent” accusative or ergative. More broadly, repairs of person-hierarchical argument interactions seem to regularly use such ϕ /case-increases, either obviously as in Jahnsson’s Rule, or less obviously, in the removal of one argument through ϕ -inert obliques that can be analysed as ϕ /case-increase in oblique K (Rezac 2011: ch. 4-5; cf. for more complex syntax with finer ϕ -distinctions or different configuration of targets and goals, a.o. Béjar and Rezac 2009, Keine 2010: ch. 6, Rezac 2011: 4.3, 5.9, Walkow 2012, Georgi 2012, Bárány 2017: ch. 4, Driemel et al. 2020, Sheehan and Bárány 2020).³⁴

The theoretical potential of such a generalisation is brought out by expectations about repairs without it. One proposed source of these repairs is residue of the grammaticalisations that have led to the restrictions, notably in free for bound pronouns in ditransitive *me lui* and its analogues (Haspelmath 2004, 2020, further 3.4). Another is originally independent constructions and so circumlocution, such as passive beside active in inverses (Zuñiga 2006 with lit.). At the moment, these pathways, do not seem to match expectations unless supplemented by something like an internal preference for ϕ /case-increase.

The residue pathway would alone result in a system where the grammaticalised bound pronouns are obligatory when available, but free pronouns remain grammaticalised to take over overwise even in weak-pronoun environments – regardless of the source of bound-pronoun gaps: ϕ -hierarchical or ϕ -arbitrary or ϕ -unrelated, argument interaction or not (cf. Sierra Zapotec, Foley and Toosarvandani 2020: 2.2; Classical Arabic, Walkow 2012; Modern Irish, McCloskey 1986, Andrews 1990, intriguingly with an altogether different origin, Roma 2000). This is not the profile of bound-free alternations specific to ϕ -hierarchical argument interactions like the *me lui* of French or its analogues in Basque and Georgian. They recode datives with something close to locatives in morphology, syntax, and use. These only partly overlapping with free for weak pronouns, and often leaving ineffability when the locative conditions are not met, though dative or accusative free pronouns would fix it (Postal 1990, Rezac 2011: ch. 4-5, Sheehan 2018).

Circumlocutions are often deployed to avoid problems of various sorts, such as passives for ambiguous actives (de Rostrenen 1738: 177 for Breton), including bound-form gaps (Embick and Marantz 2008 on *amn’t*). They seem reasonable sources of some repairs in Table 11, including the locative repair of *me lui*, supplemented by analogies like goal of motion : transfer coding. However, their range is surprisingly limited, both in terms of what circumlocutions repair ϕ -hierarchical interactional gaps, and what gaps are repaired by any circumlocutions. These points may be illustrated through the gap of plural forms in the present indicative for *frire* ‘fry’ and *moudre* ‘grind’ in French (cf. Boyé 2000; Grevisse 2008: §844c). *Frire* ‘fry’ can be intransitive as well as transitive, so its causative *faire frire* ‘make fry’ is close in usage to that of transitive *frire*, and is regularly used for the gapped forms, but grammatical alongside the ungapped forms. *Moudre* ‘grind’ is only transitive, the causative *faire moudre* only means ‘make *arb* grind (something)’, and it is unavailable for the gapped forms. The causative circumlocution is thus independent of the gap it circumvents, and recourse to it is pragmatic. It has not grammaticalised as repair, and extended by analogy as such, whether to *moudre*, or to *me lui* as with *introduce to* → *make known by*, or elsewhere like nonrestructuring accusative for restructuring dative-causee causatives that give rise to *me lui* (Rezac 2011: ch. 4).

It seems likely that circumlocutions can conventionalise as ways to supplete for ineffable expressions, but then have properties of arbitrary conventionalisations: common in the domain of allomorphy and without effect on syntax or interpretation (cf. opaque clitics and agreement in Rhodes 1994, Bonet 1995, Arregi and Nevins 2012), rarely beyond this domain (sec. 2; cf. DME.I: 5.4). The repairs of IPRs in Table 11 go beyond the domain of allomorphy and are common or regular for IPRs. They are also remarkably limited. Absent seem, for instance, for

³⁴ Differential object marking when available in the systems here is seen as abstractly accusative or absolutive, i.e. as accusative, it codes O, not object-position (O→)S. Typically, there is complementarity of forms, e.g. dative for ½ and accusative for 3 in Spanish. Varieties of Finnic however let us study recruitment of the normally partial or negated object partitive as human-pronoun differential object marking (Ojajärvi 1950). These need more study; some can use either accusative or partitive of human pronouns in general and in repairs (Larjavaara 1990 on a system close to Finnish), others partitive specifically in repairs (Miljam 2008 on Estonian; perhaps due to independent reasons, A*).

me lui, internal possession for possessive datives, *into ...'s keeping* for transfer of possession datives, *for ...'s benefit* for benefactive datives, passive for active, *present with* for *present to*; for Jänsson's Rule's, future or infinitive for imperative, generic for arbitrary impersonal.

It is of interest then to explore the hypothesis that there is an internal mechanism that systematically makes systematically certain structures as repairs of IPRs. In the IPRs studied here through Jänsson's Rule, this internal mechanism gives rise to accusative or ergative. As such, it fits analyses of structural accusative and ergative as dependent case. That gives rise to the conundrum of why the repairs can be unavailable in systems where accusative and ergative are available otherwise -- as in Breton where emergence of the repair accusative has been traced here (sec. 3), or Basque where ergative has been recruited as repair recently (Rezac 2008b, Arregin and Nevins 2012). That conundrum is approached in the rest of this section as variation in the externalisability of the structures underlying dependent case in repairs.

5.2 Primary-dependent and Φ /Case theories

The Φ /Case recasting of classical Case Theory attributes some case morphology and some (pro)nominal licensing to the mechanism responsible for some ϕ -dependencies, ϕ -Agree (Chomsky 2000). Through locality conditions on Agree, Φ /Case implements one element of dependence theories of case: the nominative is independent of other cases and goes on the highest (pro)nominal without *c/s*-selected case (Maling 1993). Here, those locality conditions are relativised to π , # probes, so that each on the nominative locus T matches only the closest π , #. The outcome is modulated by similar relativisation of case and licensing: Agree leads to case and licensing only if all the ϕ -features of the goal match with probes of ϕ /case loci (Anagnostopoulou 2003), or more weakly, each matches some locus (Rezac 2003).³⁵

The other element of dependence theories of case is that accusative (ergative) dependencies are dependent in some way on nominative (absolute) ones. This has been incorporated into Φ /Case by mechanisms that order independent over dependent ϕ /case (Bobaljik 1993, Laka 2000). The implementation here uses global computation: independent ϕ /case loci like nominative T have ϕ -probes, dependent ones like accusative *v* have them only as needed for convergence, including case-licensing (Rezac 2011, Kalin 2018).³⁶

These mechanisms correctly distribute dependent ϕ /case-dependencies in canonical contexts like actives and passives of transitives with ϕ -complete A, O, (O \rightarrow)S, and in other configurations with ϕ -complete arguments like unaccusatives and passives with secundative R + (O \rightarrow)S (Jónsson 2009, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013; Deal 2009, Baker 2015: esp. 3.2, 5.1, 6.1, Baker and Bobaljik 2017). This outcome is shared across implementation of dependence theories of case (note 35). It is the ϕ -case link of Φ /Case theory that distributes dependent ϕ /case properly in repairs of IPRs, as in Jänsson's Rule in Finnish and Breton. In this environments, there is a higher π -only, subject-position A/R + lower, object-position O/S. The expected and attested outcome is independent nominative with the higher π -only A/R, and the lower O/S if #-only, but accusative on O/S if it also has π (Rezac 2011: ch. 5).

Dependence theories of (ϕ)/case face challenges in variation that deviates from expectation. One is dependent without independent ϕ /case. Here the apparently missing independent ϕ /Case has often proven present as full, quasi, or implicit argument (Szucsich 2007, Schäfer 2008: 6.6, 7.4, Legate 2014: ch. 4, Wood 2016; cf. Bittner and Hale 1996), or as agreeing oblique (Jónsson 1996, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013; Rezac 2008a), with a residue of ϕ -expletives (cf. Schäfer 2012: sec. 6; Rezac 2022). Jänsson's Rule involves such apparent exceptions in the construct of quirky obliques that are attributed π -[3rd] (4.2). The inverse challenge is the focus here: unavailability of dependent ϕ /case. English has no double-object constructions with

³⁵ Maling 1993 is the seminal application of independent nominative to Jänsson's Rule of both Icelandic and Finnish (cf. Nelson 1998, Rezac 2011: 5.2), and close to the mechanics of case through ϕ -Agree in Chomsky 2000 (q.v. cf. esp. Schütze 1997: 4.1.1.2), under the identification of the nominative locus as one that has all arguments in its domain: "NOM is assigned not by a particular category or in a particular configurational position, but rather ... to the highest available grammatical function which lacks morphological case at whatever level grammatical case is assigned" (Maling 1993: 71-2). Dependent case has very different implementations (see lit. in Baker 2015, Preminger 2014, and op.cit.).

³⁶ Nothing obvious derives why the independent locus of accusative systems is T so as to have A, S, O in its domain, but that of ergative systems is *v* and only has O, S in its scope (cf. Kalin 2018: sec. 5, but also Yuan 2021).

unaccusative (Baker 1996b; contrast Baker 2015 in Amharic and Maricopa), perhaps passives (Rezac 2013, Pesetsky 1995: 4.1, but cf. Haddican and Holmberg 2018), and some verbs lack actives (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 16.10.1.2). Independent solutions have been proposed (Baker 1996b), but also parametrisations of ϕ /case loci (Kalin 2018: sec. 5). These are rather stipulative with dependent-case repairs of IPRs: a system like Icelandic must have accusative available in plain transitives, but not to fix unaccusative-passive IPRs (as in Rezac 2011: ch. 5).

Arbitrary limitations are the expected outcome when developments of agreement and case are taken into account. Breton has revealed causal chains that can give rise to this level of microvariation in dependent case, and contrasted imperatives, where imperatives could externalise the repair by preexisting accusative proclitics, and *have*-perfects, where the externalisation had to await grammaticalisation of the participle as proclitic host (sec. 3). This suggests modulating dependent ϕ /case by externalisability always, in line with the hypothesis that externalisability underlies syntactic variation including IPRs (Coon and Keine 2020). Jahnsson’s Rule offer a ready fulcrum for variation of this sort, because repairs can be isolated from other dependent case in its systems by split matching and multiple case.

5.3 Multiple ϕ /case

In constructions with partial ϕ -intervention, an argument relates to two ϕ /case-loci, and in virtue of them gets multiple case. In canonical active transitives, A is ϕ -complete, while in canonical passives or unaccusatives, A is absent.³⁷

(29) Derivations

Canonical active transitive and passive transitive or unaccusative, accusative system

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. | $T_{\pi=A, \#=A}$ | $A_{\pi, \#; \text{NOM}}$ | $V_{\pi=O/\emptyset, \#=O}$ | $O_{(\pi), \#; \text{ACC}}$ |
| b. | $T_{\pi=S/\emptyset, \#=S}$ | | v | $S_{(\pi), \#; \text{NOM}}$ |

In structures with π -only A and $\#$ -only O, T matches multiple goals, boxed. If O has π , it fails ϕ -relativised case licensing unless the dependent locus has a ϕ -probe, indicated by \rightarrow , and then receives multiple case, also boxed. This is IPR + repair of a system with agreeing or clitic accusatives (Breton dative-subject perfects; perhaps Spanish *arb se*, A*). Both goals of a split-valued locus like T here get its case, such as nominative π -only *arb* and $\#$ -only O (overt in 4.4, filtered a.o. by resolution of oblique-nominative case stacking, Yoon 2004).³⁸

Quirky-A active transitive, accusative system

- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| c. | $T_{\pi=A, \#=O}$ | $A_{\pi; \text{NOM}}$ | v | $O_{\#; \text{NOM}}$ |
| d. | $T_{\pi=A, \#!=O}$ | $A_{\pi; \text{NOM}}$ | $V_{\rightarrow \pi=O, \#!=O}$ | $O_{\pi, \#; \text{ACC+NOM}}$ |

In ergative systems, v-absolutive is independent and T-ergative dependent, so ϕ -quirkiness of A does not affect v-O dependencies.³⁹

Canonical active transitive and passive transitive or unaccusative, ergative system

³⁷ $O \rightarrow S$ is like S, ϕ -complete oblique A like nonoblique, ϕ -inert oblique A and implicit A like absent A.

³⁸ Tentatively and for simplicity, it is assumed that loci are ϕ -complete even when π -only probes would do, though that is inessential (otiose $\#$ in repairs is in broken underline; Rezac 2008b), and that nothing like phasehood or case inactivation limits multiple goal-to-probe matches (such a second match directly or probe-to-probe is indicated by !; Keine and Bhatt 2017). The typical outcome follows from other mechanisms: externalisation of multiple unified probes with one value (see below) and externalisation of split-matching probes as default (5.4). This gives outcomes such as *arb se* + nominative $\#$ -only O valuing T for number, π +# accusative O with T default.

³⁹ Complexities are added if the π -probe of v can match 1/2 A if O is 3, e.g. in Basque past but not present and not in French (Béjar and Rezac 2009). Modeling the difference is largely orthogonal to here (options richer assumptions about probes such that $\#$ -match prevents further π -match; externalisability of v+T case on A; different height of A relative to v). Often their expected consequence is that π -only *arb* A can be matched by π on v, and must be if realisable only as absolutive (cf. Albizu 2000). When evidence is clear, in nonleista varieties, *arb* A + O might have dative repair for 1/2 O, and ditto in Spanish on which it might be calqued. This can be incorporated here as distinct realisation of v-case for *arb*-selecting v (5.4; and in other ways, Kalin 2018: sec. 5). However, *arb* A originated in structures with c-selected dative for otherwise accusative O, and c-selection linking them remains analytically possible for both systems (A*).

- e. $T_{\pi=A, \#=A}$ $A_{\pi, \#; \text{ERG}}$ $V_{\pi=O/\emptyset, \#=O}$ $O_{(\pi), \#; \text{ABS}}$
 f. T $V_{\pi=S/\emptyset, \#=S}$ $S_{(\pi), \#; \text{ABS}}$

R is below v and gives rise to IPRs for both accusative and absolutive O (French, Béjar and Rezac 2003; Basque, Rezac 2008b, unless O shifts past R, Slovenian, Stegovec 2018). Repairs need other dependent loci (P, D, perhaps Appl, Table 11 with lit.).⁴⁰

Canonical ditransitive in accusative/ergative system, without and with O-raising

- g. $T_{\pi=A, \#=A}$ $A_{\pi, \#; \text{NOM/ERG}}$ $V_{\pi=R, \#=O}$ $R_{\pi; \text{ACC/ABS}}$ $O_{(*\pi), \#; \text{ACC/ABS}}$
 h. $T_{\pi=A, \#=A}$ $A_{\pi, \#; \text{NOM/ERG}}$ $V_{\pi=O, \#=O}$ $O_{\pi, \#; \text{ACC/ABS}}$ $R_{\pi?; \text{ACC/ABS}}$

R + S will differ according to system. In accusative systems, S often raises past R generally (French or German, but R is arguably inert inherent) or conditionally (Icelandic if quirky R displaces, see lit. in 4.1). Otherwise, R should give rise to split-valued T for #-only S. This expectation is met, save in variation in whether split-valued T realises number from S or shifts to default (5.4). It should also give rise to IPR for π -valued S relative to both T and v (so in systems where S cannot be PRO, whether or not R can: Icelandic, Finnish). This expectation is apparently not met when S is accusative in repairs, but will be nuanced presently (Finnish; it would meet the expectation if R were equidistant to v but not T, Rezac 2011: 5.5).

Quirky-R unaccusative or passive, accusative system, without and with S-raising

- i. $T_{\pi=R, \#=S}$ v $R_{\pi; \text{NOM}}$ $S_{(*\pi), \#; \text{NOM}}$
 j. $T_{\pi=R, \#=S}$ v $R_{\pi; \text{NOM}}$ $S_{(*\pi), \#; \text{NOM}}$
 k. $T_{\pi=S/\emptyset, \#=S}$ $S_{(\pi), \#; \text{NOM}}$ v $R_{\pi?}$ t_S

In absolutive systems, S would also avoid IPRs if raised past R in the domain of v (not shown, and not demonstrated, but it would get the right coding for e.g. Old Basque). Otherwise, R gives rise to IPR relative to absolutive v, but not for ergative T, to which S often raises as subject (as in Basque, where S not R is PRO). The result is IPR + repair by ergative (as in Basque, see Table 11 with lit.). The expected π , # and valuation of the dependent locus T is found, and independent mechanisms reduce same-matching # on v at externalisation (see a.o. Rezac 2008b: 4.3 with lit., and on the nature of T-agreement, Rezac et al. 2014: 4.4).

Quirky-R unaccusative or passive, absolutive system, without and with S-raising

- l. T $V_{\pi=R, \#=S}$ $R_{\pi; \text{ABS}}$ $S_{(*\pi), \#; \text{ABS}}$
 m. $T_{\pi=S/\emptyset, \#(l)=S}$ $S_{(\pi), \#; \text{ABS+ERG}}$ $V_{\pi=R, \#=S}$ $R_{\pi; \text{ABS}}$ t_S

Across the systems here, IPRs hold for arguments in a case and a clause type where they would either control agreement or be clitic, but not necessarily otherwise. IPRs constrain nominative or absolutive in finite agreeing clauses of Icelandic or Basque, but nonfinite nonagreeing clauses vary in Icelandic, and are not constrained in Basque; they constrain accusative clitics in active ditransitives French or Spanish, but not its nonclitic counterpart in Icelandic (where active-passive contrasts show that active ditransitives do have quirky R, 4.3). These observations are well approximated by the hypothesis that π only needs licensing if there is a π -probe in its ϕ /case domain and π -probes tend to be cued by agreement and clitics (Preminger 2019), though also by other evidence (on infinitival T in Icelandic, under influence of finite on infinitival clauses and proportional to the robustness of agreement in the former; on infinitival T in Finnish, categorically by overt case-based repair, 4.3).⁴¹

⁴⁰ If π of quirky obliques needs licensing, here there should arise IPR of R on shift of O past R, indicated by ? (so Slovenian, Stegovec 2018, but 4.2.2); similarly below with S shift past R (not detectable in either French-German, where in principle it could be masked by accusative repair, or Icelandic, where that repair can be seen to be absent).

⁴¹ Differences from Preminger 2019 mostly do not seem pertinent here, apart from tentative attribution of # to v not cued by clitics, and indeterminacy for arguments not agreeing or clitic (Icelandic, Finnish), and even these (given microvariations on *me lui* in Romance clitics, Pescarini 2021: 4.5.4, Garcia 2009: ch. 3, 5, Nicol 2005, cf. Basque, Rezac 2016: sec. 5 – leaving uncertainty when accusative clitics that cannot interact with dative ones, as in Breton, 3.3.2, 3.5.3). Under Preminger’s proposal, systems with IPRs for accusative clitics but not free strong pronouns like Greek or

The hypothesis can be integrated here by extending ϕ -relativisation of case licensing: case is available under match if the match is complete with respect to the intersection of the ϕ -features of the goal and the locus. This requirement is met for accusatives in Icelandic or Finnish if they have on v some non- π probe that matches any O but no R, like # (corresponding closely to categorial features, Chomsky 1995). There are then no IPRs for quirky R + accusative O in active ditransitives, or for transparent R + accusative (O \rightarrow)S in their passives and in unaccusatives (varieties of Icelandic, Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2012: 130n30), or for repairs of IPRs with quirky oblique R + nominative (O \rightarrow)S in these (as in Finnish).⁴²

Quirky-R transitive and unaccusative or passive if accusative not agreeing/clitic

n.	$T_{\pi=A, \#=A}$	$A_{\pi, \#; \text{NOM}}$	$V_{\#!=O}$	$R_{\pi; \text{ACC}}$	$O_{(\pi), \#; \text{ACC}}$
o.	$T_{\pi=R, \#!=S}$		$V_{\rightarrow \#!=S}$	$R_{\pi; \text{NOM}; \text{ACC}}$	$S_{(\pi), \#; \text{ACC} + \text{NOM}}$

The non- π probe can be extended to the independent locus of infinitives when they lack IPRs – Icelandic “C”, not “A”, nor Finnish (but cf. Pesetsky 2021 and here note 41).

All and only derivations with π -only higher arguments have T-probes split-valued from different goals, boxed, π from R/A and # from O/S. There is no variation on effability of these structures unless O/S also has π . These are also the only derivations where O/S gets multiple case, from T and v in repairs. Multiple case is an independent limitation on effability (Young 1988, Béjar and Massam 2000, Yoon 2004, Richards 2012, 2017). It is thus possible to attribute variation in repairs to the externalisability of the relevant multiple case structures, e.g. [[[...] ACC] NOM] or {< π , ACC>, <#, NOM>} (cf. 5.4). Silence is only expected to resolve the issue if it avoids realisation, in the way posited for ellipsis, not if it is realisation by PF \emptyset (cf. the fine-grained variation in Rezac 2008b: 86 for Basque). Syncretism too should only resolve multiple case if its exponent externalises the syncretised features, and there is evidence of variability in its rescue of multiple case (Young 1988: 2.2.4; cf. Arregi and Nevins 2012: 2.3.2 for Basque).

Technically, multiple case can be used to eliminate the distinction between independent-dependent loci and global computation in activating dependent loci. All ϕ /case loci are always active; a goal fully matching both T and v is usually resolved to absolutive or nominative (cf. Richards 2017), but more variously in more complex systems like active-aligned ones (Dixon 1994); variation in repair then reflects extension of this resolution when a goal split-matches T and v (cf. 5.4). Such full recasting of IPRs and their repairs through problems of externalisation eliminates ϕ /case licensing conditions in syntax along with globality, and in this joins other recent work (most fully in Coon and Keine 2020, adaptable here more directly).

There are two boundary conditions on repairs that need addressing on such an extension. One condition is the nature of the externalisation problems that license repairs. It has been possible to contrast IPRs with arbitrary gaps that bar the same agreement-clitic combinations, but only IPRs allow repairs by dependent ϕ /case (see on Basque, Chinook, French in Rezac 2011: ch. 5 with lit., and cf. Coon and Keine 2020: 3.5). The other boundary condition speaks to nature of syntactic conditions that license repairs. It is clearest in systems that fix IPRs of accusative-absolutive in ditransitives by recoding quirky datives as locative-like obliques (like French or Basque, see Table 11 with lit.). Here IPRs bar π -bearing O structurally below quirky R, and the repair involves R structurally below O, otherwise unavailable for a given R like goal of transfer with ‘give’, but similar to locative obliques that are always low in these systems like

Italian treat the latter like 3rd person nominals of the system. That works readily for Breton, where free pronouns do not control overt agreement, but must be specific to accusatives in Greek and Italian, where they do as nominatives. Suppose then nominatives (and perhaps accusatives) can externalise case-marked (pro)nominals, but only accusative strong pronouns (also) larger structures invisibilising ϕ in a shell (like inert oblique K, 4.3, and doubling 4.4; similarly Béjar and Rezac 2003: 54, Preminger 2019: note 7, Coon and Keine 2020: 3.5; cf. richer accusative than nominative structures in other work, Caha 2009, Starke 2018 with lit.). The same analysis would also account for insensitivity of accusative strong pronouns to IPRs in the non-agreement/clitic systems of Icelandic and Finnish, and can be extended to nominatives in Icelandic varieties where they do not agree when not raised to subject and are then immune to IPRs, if at least one raising step still needs the shell-less structure because driven by ϕ -Agree (“C+”, q.v. Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2008, Wood and Sigurðsson 2019, vs. contextual nonagreement and some IPRs in “C”, agreement and IPRs in “A” Sigurðsson 1996, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008; cf. differences in varieties of Basque, Rezac 2008b - Arregi and Nevins 2012: 2.3.4). There is then little need for ϕ -relativisation of case (incomplete improvement in infinitives of Icelandic “C”, see lit. in 4.1, and complete in Basque, less clearly Georgian).

⁴² The l-marked split-valued T again surfaces as default (note 40).

goals of motion. The repair is thus compatible only with low-position interpretations, like goal of transfer but not external possessor. In the global approach, the repair can be incorporated with K as dependent locus. In local approaches, the structure of the repair seems to be the same as that of a regular transitive with a low oblique like goal of motion, and so should always be available to say goals of transfer – yet it only is when repairing IPRs (Rezac 2011: ch. 4).

5.4 The nature of case and licensing

Classical case theory takes cue from systems where (pro)nominals seem to lack caseless forms: Latin ‘friend’ appears with nominative *-s* in *amīcus*, ‘he’ *is*, accusative *-m* in *amīcum*, *eum* but caseless **amīco*, **e* are “morphologically ill-formed” (Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980: 190). Case theory abstracts over this observation to a condition of syntax in the Case Filter, and Φ /Case extends it to agreement in the Inverse Case Filter (Chomsky 2000). The abstractions have been challenged (for discussion, see a.o. McFadden 2004, Preminger 2014, Pesetsky 2021). Here the case abstraction has been useful for dependent-case repairs, and the corresponding agreement abstraction could be swapped in for it (Laka 2000). That abstractness is useful in approaching person restrictions or their repairs when surface morphology is not at stake – when they bar free pronouns, in nonagreeing clauses, or to draw contrasts with syncretic arbitrary gaps (see lit. in 4.1, Rezac 2008b). By the same token, the abstraction is most challenged when surface forms do matter and syncretisms affect restrictions (Coon and Keine 2020, cf. Thráinsson 2007: 2.5.2.3, and see Sigurðsson 1996: 2.5 for a paramatrical approach adaptable here).

For IPRs, only a limited use is made of this abstraction: licensing of “marked π ”, and even then detectable only on (pro)nominals in certain configurations like object position. These may then be singled out for their own abstract licensing requirement independent of other work done by Case Theory (see a.o. Béjar and Rezac 2003, Preminger 2014; Kalin 2018; Baker 2008; Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2018; Stegovac 2018; Bianchi 2006). The membership of the “marked π ” group typically includes 1/2 (perhaps inclusive of some covertly-1/2 3’s, and overturnable for inanimate 1/2’s, Rezac 2011: 6.4). It also includes human and/or logophoric 3 when grammaticalised as such (Finnish, Kaiser 2018; but logophora even when not distinctively coded, Charnavel and Mateu 1995, cf. analysis as shifted 1/2, Schlenker 2003, Anand and Nevins 2004). Beyond there is evidence of finer degrees of grammaticalisability (animate masculine, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Siverstein 1977, Timberlake 1979, Foley and Toosarvandani 2020, as person in Coon and Keine 2020: 3.4.3).

Nevertheless, (Φ)/Case Theory retains explanatory force beyond IPRs (Rezac 2013, Bárány and Sheehan 2020). There are ways of meeting its challenges. One noted at several points here is absence of overt agreement when there is morphology available to express it: general for free (pro)nominals in Breton (3.3.3), specific to object-position nominatives in Icelandic “C+” (Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013), and to existential-presentational constructions with *it*-type expletives in French (Rezac 2010c) or no overt expletives in Finnish (4.3). Here there are relatively straightforward recourses. One relies on the externalisation of agreement, such as its limitation to spec-head configurations (D’Alessandro and Roberts 2008, cf. Schütze 2019: sec. 6; further a.o. Bhat and Walkow 2013, Marusic and Nevins 2018). The other looks to *it*-type expletives controlling agreement, if the associate can get case through them or otherwise (*it*-associate big-DP, Kayne 2019, Chomsky 1995: 4.4.5, with case sharing, cf. 4.4, or inherent case for the associate, cf. Belletti 1988, 1999; *it*, *associate* equidistance, cf. on mechanics Oxford 2018; *it*-associate φ -Agree at some point, cf. on mechanics Frampton et al. 2000).

Theoretically more germane to IPRs here is nonagreement limited to IPR configurations, i.e. 3 nominative or absolutive where 1/2 is out (cf. Preminger 2014). Such are quirky dative subject + 3rd person nominative object in Icelandic “C” (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008 with lit.; cf. Spanish, Mendikoetxea 1999; Basque, Etxepare 2006). This restriction has an intriguing analysis here because it is the only context where the φ -probes of T have split match in the π -only intervener and #-only object. So long as externalisation has access to this split, it can realise precisely split-matching loci with default values, Icelandic “C”, rather than the unified values,

“A”. That is so, for instance, if match leads to unification rather than copying, as well as with copying in architecture where externalisation is fed in tandem with copying.⁴³

On the φ -case link of Φ /Case theory, there is an intriguing analogue expected of this agreement restriction in forms of case, if case reflect enough of the properties of the φ /case locus, say if it is a copy of the locus (see Pesetsky and Torrego 2007, Pesetsky 2013: 3.2, 9.1, Rezac 2003). Then coherent vs. split match could influence the realisation of case, and make the nominative of IPR configurations distinct from nominative elsewhere. Precisely that is found in the distinctive 3-only enclitic coding of nominative objects in Breton when these alone assume new forms (3.7.1). Because they are enclitics and do not clearly contrast with enclitics for unrestricted nominative objects (but cf. 3.6, 3.7.1), it has been possible to approach them simply as forms whose conditions recapitulate their diachrony: nominative attached from object position (3.3.3). If there were a pathway to a similar system that could not be so analysed – say if they degrammaticalised as free pronouns in Breton – the result would be special forms of the split-nominative (cf. Chomsky 2000: 149n90 given Richards 2008).

6 Conclusion

This study has traced the rise, spread, and retreat of an object coding anomaly in Breton as a manifestation split-nominative objects in Jahnsson’s Rule, and analysed it through a theory of the Person-Case Constraint. The Breton developments have suggested principles linking (split-)nominative objects with certain subject anomalies in general, and placed boundary conditions on analyses of the subject anomaly. These principles have been explored as partial, person-only intervention in φ -dependencies (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2017) and recruitment of dependent φ /case as needed for licensing (Rezac 2011, Kalin 2018). Spread of split-nominative objects has been approach as variation in the class of person-only bearers from the quirky obliques of these approaches to pronouns special in allowing absence of # perhaps contingent on absence of n/N, a.o. imperative subjects (Zanuttini et al. 2012), arbitrary human impersonals (Malamud 2012), arguably PRO (Landau 2015). Variation in ineffability and dependent case with split-nominatives has been localised in externalisability of φ /case-dependencies, with potential extension to the elimination of licensing (Coon and Keine 2020).

By way of ending, certain shortcomings may be highlighted. There is a gap between the argument for internal mechanisms of the relevant subject-object couplings, and the form advanced for those mechanisms. Close alternatives can regiment the patterns here in similar ways with different commitments. Such would be recasting split- φ intervention as split- φ selection + Agree, accompanied by minor modifications like a special *arb*-selecting v, and more major ones like a v-locus nominative (cf. Adger and Harbour 2007; sim. e.g. Bianchi 2006, Stegovec 2018). The patterns can also be regimented differently. One choice would relate $\frac{1}{2}$ accusative repairs with object position, rather than properties of subjects (4.3; cf., in part, Kiparsky 2001 on Jahnsson’s Rule). Another would take as explandandum systems with amelioration of person restrictions under nonagreement and agreement syncretisms, not as here their persistence, and contrasts with syncretic agreement ineffabilities (5.4).

Background to these internal mechanisms is resolution of which if any φ -restrictions reflect internal principles, and which are internally arbitrary encodings of gaps resulting from external factors like frequencies in use. Evidence from the history of Breton here is limited, for a far more complete theory would be required to give possible analyses of any given system in it, calculate its possible transitions, and see if the absence of transitions violating some form of Jahnsson’s Rule is robust. The same goes for other hypotheses, notably that of internal principles carving out a class of repairs of person restrictions. One way of sidestepping these limitations would be the study of less externally motivatable developments of person restrictions than those studied here. In this respects, the Basque split-absolutive may be promising both with respect to the gapped verbs, and to the distribution of repairs (Rezac 2008b, Arregi and Nevins 2012: 2.3). Another would be study of potential transitions between internally-derived and arbitrarily

⁴³ Even in “C”, O→S controls number agreement in passives rather than unaccusatives (Sigurðsson 1996: 2.3a), arguably under influence of the separate number agreement of the participle between R and (O→)S, and there is other evidence for this agreement influence (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 266, cf. perhaps Schütze 1997: 109n17).

encoded ϕ -restrictions, as also with split-absolutives in Basque (cf. Albizu 2010), or in other documented emergences and unravellings of instances of the Person-Case Constraint, including Jahnsson’s Rule in its various forms (Timberlake 1974, Jung 2008, Yazhinova 2018; Árnadóttir and Sigurðsson 2013: 4.2-3; DME.II: 5.1). Finally, it would be worth comparing the range of systems expected under external principles like form-frequency correspondences, and the attested patterns of person restrictions and repairs (5.1), as well as of phenomena directly targetted by these explanations (see recently on the differential object marking of Spanish, García García 2018: 4.2, Ormazabal and Romero 2013: 3.1, Basque, Itxaso-Rodríguez 2020: 5.2 and *passim*, and for pertinent discussion Walkden 2017).

7 References

Breton texts

- ALLS Yves Le Diberder and Stéphanie Guillaume (2000). *A liù el loér hag er stéred*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- AVIE Jean-Baptiste Oliéru (1913). *En Aviél*. Guéned: Lafolye.
- Bel Euzen Gueguen (1625). *Declaration abvdant eves an catechism*. Montrovlles: George Allienne.
- BT Ed. in John Gwenogvryn Evans ed. (1910). *The Book of Taliesin*. Llanbedrog.
- CGS Louis Pourchasse (1810). *Choes a gannenue spirituel aveit er retraid*. Guennet: Galles.
- Cath Anon. (1576). *Aman ez dezraov bvhez an itron sanctes Cathell*. Montrolles. Ed. in Emile Ernault (1887), *La vie de Sainte Catherine*, *Revue Celtique* 8: 76–95.
- CE Ed. in Lauran Toorians (1991). *The Middle Cornish Charter Endorsement*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Cnf Evzen Gvegven (1612). *Confessional dastvmet eves an doctoret catholic apostolic ha romain*. Naffnet: George Allienne. 2nd ed (1646), *Qvemper Avrintin*: George Allienne.
- COL Jean de Ploesquellec (1773). *Nouveau dictionnaire ou colloque françois et breton* (1773). 5th ed. Quimper: Marin Blot.
- EOV Jean Marion (1838). *En nor ag er vuhé devot*. Guéned: J.M. Galles.
- Gk Gilles de Keranpuil (1576). Ed. in Émile Ernault (1928-1930), “Le breton de Gilles de Keranpuil. Catechisme et heuryou”, *Revue Celtique* 45, 202-271, 47, 72-159.
- HJC Jacques Géquelleu (1818). *Histoer a vuhe Jesus-Chrouist*. Lorient: Le Coat Sant-Haouen.
- IN Charles ar Bris (1710). *Introduction dar vuez devot*. Quemper: J.L. Derrien.
- J (1530). *A Man es dezrou an passion* Paris: Quilleuere. Ed in: *Le Berre*, Yves (2011). *La passion et la résurrection bretonnes de 1530 suivies de Tremenuan an ytron guerches Maria, Pemzec leuenez Maria, Buhez mab den*, Brest: C.R.B.C.
- M Jean Marion (1790). *Magasin spirituel er beurerion, en artisanet, er serviterion, hac en dud diar er mæzou*. Guéned: Galles.
- N Aman ez desraou buez san nonn Ed. in Yves Le Berre, Bernard Tanguy and Yves-Pascal Castel ed. (1999), *Buez Santez Nonn*, Brest: C.R.B.C.
- PA Ed. in Whitley Stokes ed. (1860–61). *Poem of Mount Calvary*. *Pascon agan Arluth*. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1–100.
- Pm See J; also ed. in Roparz Hemon ed. (1981). *Trois poèmes en moyen-breton*. *Baile Átha Cliath*: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- RP Charles ar Bris (1722). *Reflexionou profitabl*. Saint-Paul de Leon: Le Sieur.
- TJK Jean-François Le Gonidec (1827). *Testamant Nevez hon Aotrou Jézuz-Krist*. Angoulem: Trémeau.

Literature

- Abbott, Edwin A. 1870. *A Shakespearan grammar*. London: Macmillan.
- Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman. 2003. Context-sensitive spell-out. *NLLT* 21: 681-735.
- Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman. 2018. *Features of person*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Adger, David, and Daniel Harbour. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the Person-Case Constraint. *Syntax* 10: 2-37.
- Adger, David. 2006. Postsyntactic movement and the Old Irish verb. *NLLT* 24: 605-654.
- Adger, David. 2010. A minimalist theory of feature structure. In *Features*, ed. Anna Kibort and Greville G. Corbett, 185-218. Oxford: OUP.
- Ahtia, Edvard V. 2014. *Karjalan kielioppi III*. Kopijyvä: Karjalan Kielen Seura.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1998. Generalized Person-Case Constraint. In *Theoretical issues on the morphology-syntax interface*, ed. Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Amaya Mendikoetxea, 1-33. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.
- Albizu, Pablo. 2001. Sobre la distribución sintáctica de las formas finitas del verbo vasco. *ASJU* 35: 65-106.
- Albizu, Pablo. 2011. Microvariación en las construcciones inacusativas de dativo posesivo del euskera. Handout from Wedisyn 2, University of Barcelona, February 17-18, 2011.
- Alexiadou Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Florian Schäfer. 2015. *External arguments in transitivity alternations*. Oxford: OUP.
- Alkire, Ti, and Carol Rosen. 2010. *Romance languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Allen, Cynthia. 1995. *Case marking and reanalysis*. Oxford: OUP.
- Allen, Cynthia. 2006. Case syncretism and word order change. In *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los, 201-223. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, and Christina Sevdali. 2020. Two modes of dative and genitive assignment. *NLLT* 38: 987-1051.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1999. On experiencers. In *Studies in Greek syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Geoffrey Horrocks and Melita Stavrou, 67-93. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2017. The Person-Case Constraint. In *The companion to syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 1-47. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2018. Defective intervention effects in two Greek varieties and their implications for ϕ -incorporation as agree. In *Order and structure in syntax*, ed. Michelle Sheehan and Laura R Bailey, 153-78. Berlin: Language Sciences Press.
- Anand, Pranav, and Andrew Nevins. 2006. The locus of ergative case assignment. In *Ergativity*, ed. Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 3-26. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1982. Where's morphology? *LI* 13: 571-612.
- Andrews Avery D. 1982. The representation of case in Modern Icelandic. In *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, ed. Joan Bresnan, 427-503. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1990. Unification and morphological blocking. *NLLT* 8: 507-57.
- Ariztimuño, Borja. 2013. Basque finite verb morphology. In *Basque and Proto-Basque*, ed. Mikel Martinez Areta. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Árnadóttir, Hlíf, and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson. 2013. Case in disguise. In *Variation in datives*, ed. Beatriz Fernandez and Ricardo Etxepare, 96-143. OUP.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2012. *Morphotactics*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2018. Beware Occam's syntactic razor. *LI* 49: 625-83.
- Atlamaz, Ümit, and Mark Baker. 2018. On partial agreement and oblique case. *Syntax* 21: 195-237.
- Baker, Mark. 1996a. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: OUP.
- Baker, Mark. 1996b. On the structural position of themes and goals. In *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, ed. Jonathan Rooryck and Laura Zaring, 7-34. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Baker, Mark. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Baker, Mark., and Jonathan Bobaljik. 2017. On inherent and dependent theories of ergative case. In *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, ed. Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Demena Travis, 111-34. Oxford: OUP.
- Baldi, Philip, and Andrea Nuti. 2010. Possession. In *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*, ed. Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 239-388. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Bárány, András. 2017. *Person, case, and agreement*. Oxford: OUP.

- Bárány, András. 2018. DOM and dative case. *Glossa* 3.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna & Thórhallur Eythórsson. 2018. What is a Subject? In *Noncanonically Case-Marked Subjects*, ed. Jóhanna Barðdal, Na'ama Pat-El, and Stephen Mark Carey, 257-273. Amsterdam: JB.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna, Eleonara Cattafi, Laura Bruno and Serena Danesi. 2020. Nonnominative subjects in Latin and Ancient Greek. Ms.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna, Valgerður Bjarnadóttir, Serena Danesi, Tonya Kim Dewey, Thórhallur Eythórsson, Chiara Fedriani and Thomas Smitherman. 2013. The story of 'woe'. *J. Indo-European Studies* 41: 32-377.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2006. Construction-specific properties of syntactic subjects in Icelandic and German. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17: 39-106.
- Béjar, Susana, and Arsalan Kahnemuyipour. 2017. Noncanonical agreement in copular clauses. *J. Linguistics* 53: 463-99.
- Bejar, Susana, and Diane Massam. 1999. Multiple Case checking. *Syntax* 2: 65-79.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance linguistics*, ed. Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux and Yves Roberge, 49-62. Amsterdam: JB.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *LI* 40: 35-73.
- Béjar, Susana. 2003. Phi-syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Béjar, Susana. 2011. Remarks on omnivory and complementarity. *NLLT* 29: 973-97.
- Belletti, Adriana. 1988. The case of unaccusatives. *LI* 19: 1-34.
- Belletti, Adriana. 1999. Italian/Romance clitics. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Henk van Riemsdijk, 543-79. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2006. Past participle agreement. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Bennett, Ryan, Emily Elfner, and James McCloskey. 2019. Prosody, focus, and ellipsis in Irish. *Language* 95: 66-106.
- Benucci, Franco. 1993. Temporal periphrasis and clitics in Central Romance languages. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 51-83.
- Berro, Ane, and Beatriz Fernández. 2021. Person matters in impersonality. To appear in *Syntax*.
- Berro, Ane. 2019. (In)transitive verbs. In *Aligning grammars*, ed. Ane Berro, 82-138. Brill.
- Berwick, Robert C., and Noam Chomsky. 2016. *Why only us: language and evolution*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bhatia, Sasia. 2019. Computing agreement in a mixed system. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Bhatt, Rajesh, and Martin Walkow. 2013. Locating agreement in grammar: an argument from agreement in conjunctions. *NLLT* 31: 951-1013.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 2005. Long distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. *NLLT* 23: 757-807.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2006. On the syntax of personal arguments. *Lingua* 116: 2023-67.
- Bittner, Maria, and Kenneth Hale. 1996. The structural determination of Case and agreement. *LI* 27: 1-68.
- Bjorkman, Bronwyn M. 2018. Ergative as perfective oblique. *Syntax* 21: 321-61.
- Blix, Hagen. 2020. Spans in South Caucasian agreement. *NLLT*.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Phil Branigan. 2006. Eccentric agreement and multiple case checking. In *Ergativity*, ed. Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 47-77. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's phi?. In *Phi theory*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 295-328. Oxford: OUP.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 1993. On ergativity and ergative unergatives. *MITWPL* 19: 45-88.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Quirky agreement. *Studia Linguistica* 54: 354-80.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2008. *Aspects of the syntax of agreement*, 42-63. New York: Routledge.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 1995. Feature Structure of Romance Clitics. *NLLT* 13: 607-647.

- Bonet, Eulàlia. 2008. The Person-Case constraint and repair strategies. In *Agreement restrictions*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 103-129. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bonet, M. Eulàlia. 1991. Morphology after syntax: pronominal clitics in Romance. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Boyé, Gilles. 2000. Problèmes de morpho-phonologie verbale en français, en espagnol et en italien. Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris-Diderot - Paris VII.
- Broadbent, Judith M. The *amn't* gap. *J. Linguistics* 45: 251-284.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2014. Defects of defective intervention. *LI* 45: 707-719.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2019. Idioms, collocations, and structure. *NLLT*.
- Brugman, Claudia. 1988. The syntax and semantics of *have* and its complements. Doctoral dissertations, UC Berkeley.
- Burston, Jack. 1983. Object clitic sequences and cooccurrence restrictions in French. *Linguistic Analysis* 11: 247-275.
- Canneli, Knut. 1889. Tutkimus Kemin kielenmurteesta. *Suomi* 3(2).
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency. In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, ed. Henk van Riemsdijk, Riet Vos, and Ludmila Veselovská, 145-233. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2019. Cliticization as extraction. *Revista da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística* 5: 1-16.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Victoria Mateu. 2015. The clitic binding restriction revisited. *The Linguistic Review* 32: 671-701.
- Châtelier, Antoine. 2016. Traductions et variabilité en langue bretonne. Doctoral dissertation: Rennes 2.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *LI* 30: 509-42.
- Cheveau, Loïc. 2007. Approche phonologique, morphologique et syntaxique du breton du Grand Lorient (bas-vannetais). Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language*.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by step*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89-156. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, Samuel Keyser, and Marilyn Goodrich, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Citko, Barbara, Allison German and Jacek Witkoś. 2018. If you cannot agree, move on! *Glossa* 3: 28.
- Coghill, Eleanor. 2016. *The rise and fall of ergativity in Aramaic*. Oxford: OUP.
- Collins, Chris, and Edward Stabler. 2016. A formalisation of minimalist syntax. *Syntax* 19: 43-78.
- Collins, Chris. 2021. Principles of argument structure. *Lingbuzz*.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1975. The anti-ergative. *CLS* 11: 112-121.
- Coon, Jessica, and Omer Preminger. 2012. Taking “ergativity” out of split ergativity. *Lingbuzz*.
- Coon, Jessica, and Stefan Keine. 2020. Feature gluttony. *LI*.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2004. *Number*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2015. Hybrid nouns and their complexity. In *Agreement from a diachronic perspective*, ed. J. Fleischer, E. Rieken, & P. Widmer, 191-214). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2021. Splits, internal and external, as a window into the nature of features. *Morphology* 34: 45-91.
- Costa, João, and Sandra Pereira. 2013. *a gente*. *TLR* 30: 161-184.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1983. On the prehistory of Celtic passive and deponent inflection. *Eriu* 34: 73-111.
- Crahé, Maxime-Morvan. 2014. The Breton micro-dialect of Languidic. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes 2.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Diego Pescarini. 2016. Agreement restrictions and agreement oddities in Romance. In *Manual of Grammatical interfaces in Romance*, ed. Susann Fischer and Christoph Gabriel. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Ian Roberts. 2008. Movement and agreement in Italian past participles and defective phases. *LI* 39: 477-91.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta. 2007. *Impersonal si constructions*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Danon, Gabi. 2013. Agreement alternations with quantified nominals in Modern Hebrew. *J. Linguistic* 49: 55-92.
- de Rostrenen, Grégoire. 1738. *Grammaire françoise-celtique ou françoise-bretonne*. Rennes: Vatar.
- De Smit, Merlijn. 2006. *Language Contact and Structural Change*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- de Smit, Merlijn. 2016. The problem of the Old Finnish passive. *J. Historical Linguistics* 6: 32-71.
- de Smit, Merlijn. 2020. Proto-Uralic primary argument case-marking. Ms.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2009. The origin and content of expletives. *Syntax* 12: 285-323.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2015. Interaction and satisfaction in ϕ -agreement. *NELS* 45: 179-192.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2019. Raising to ergative. *LI* 50: 388-415.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2020. Interaction, satisfaction, and the PCC. To appear in *LI*.
- Delancey, Scott. 2001. Lectures on functional syntax. Ms., University of Oregon.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: CUP.
- DME.I-III: Rezac 2020, 2021ab.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1998. Impersonal *se* constructions in Romance and the passivization of unergatives. *LI* 29: 399-437.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2017. Reflexive Marking in Romance. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 1-105. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Doron, Edit, and Geoffrey Khan. 2012. The typology of morphological ergativity in Neo-Aramaic. *Lingua* 122: 225-40.
- Dotlačil, Jakub, and Radek Šimik. 2013. Peeling, structural case, and retroactive infinitives. *FDSL* 9: 105-124.
- Driemel, Imke, Ahmet Bilal Özdemir, and Marie-Louise Popp. 2020. A repair for PCC and inverse contexts in Adyghe. *Lingbuzz*.
- Drinka, Bridget. 2020. Calquing a quirk. In *Perfects in Indo-European languages and beyond*, ed. Robert Crellin and Thomas Jügel, 591-614. Amsterdam: JB.
- Egerland, Verner. 2003. Impersonal pronouns in Scandinavian and Romance. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 71: 75-101.
- Eguren, Luis, Olga Fernández Soriano, and Amaya Mendikoetxea. 2016. Introduction. In *Rethinking parameters*, ed. Luis Eguren, Olga Fernández Soriano, and Amaya Mendikoetxea, 1-48. New York: OUP.
- Embick, David, and Alec Marantz. 2008. Architecture and blocking. *Linguistic inquiry* 39: 1-53.
- Ernault, Emile. 1888 Études bretonnes VI. *Revue Celtique* 9: 245-266.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi, Gunlög Josefsson, Björn Köhnlein. 2020. Mainland Scandinavian object shift. *LI*.
- Eska, Joseph. 1994. On the crossroads of phonology and syntax. *Studia Celtica* 28: 39-62.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2006. Number long distance agreement in (substandard) Basque. *ASJU* 40: 303-350.
- Evans, Daniel Simon. 1964. *A grammar of Middle Welsh*. Dublin: The School of Celtic Studies.
- Evans, Nicholas. 1995. *A grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Eythórsson, Thórhallur, and Jóhanna Barðdal. 2005. Oblique Subjects. *Language* 81: 824-881.
- Fenger, Paula. 2018. How impersonal does *one* get. *JCGL*.
- Fernández, Beatriz, and Ortiz de Urbina. 2009. *Datiboa hiztegian*. Bilbao: EHU.
- Fernández-Ordóñez, Iné. 1999. In *Gramática de la lengua española*, ed. Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, Wim van der Wurff. 2004. *The syntax of early English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Fleuriot, Léon. 1964. *Le Vieux-Breton*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fleuriot, Léon. 2002. Skoueroù emdroadurioù e morfologiezh hag eradur ar brezhoneg. *Hor Yezh* 228: 14-34.

- Foley, Steven, and Maziar Toosarvandani. 2020. Extending the Person-Case Constraint to gender. *LI*.
- Gallego, Ángel J. 2010. *Phase Theory*. Amsterdam: JB.
- Gallego, Ángel J. 2019. Long distance agreement in Spanish dialects. In *Agreement, case and locality in the nominal and verbal domains*, ed. Ludovico Franco, Mihaela Marchis Moreno and Matthew Reeve, 85-108. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- García García, Marco. 2018. Nominal and verbal parameters in the diachrony of differential object marking in Spanish. In *The diachronic typology of differential argument marking*, ed. Ilja A. Seržant and Alena Witzlack Makarevich, 209-252. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- García, Erica C. 2009. *The motivated syntax of arbitrary signs*. Amsterdam: JB.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2012. Local derivation of global case splits. In *Local modelling of nonlocal dependencies in syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Tibor Kiss & Gereon Müller, 305-336. Berlin: Gruyter.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna, and Andrea Sansò. 2007. The spread and decline of indefinite *man*-constructions in European languages. In *Studies in Language Companion Series*, ed. Paolo Ramat and Elisa Roma, 95-131. Amsterdam: JB Publishing Company.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna, and Andrea Sansò. 2011. From passive to impersonal. In *Impersonal constructions*, ed. Andrej Malchukov and Anna Siewierska, 189-228. Amsterdam: JB.
- Gildea, Spike and Fernando Zuñiga. 2016. Referential hierarchies. *Linguistics* 54: 483-529.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2019. On the person constraint on Romanian *se*-passives. In *Agreement, case and locality in the nominal and verbal domains*, ed. Ludovico Franco, Mihaela Marchis Moreno and Matthew Reeve, 109-147. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Graver, Jenny. 2009. Passives and impersonals. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Grevisse, Maurice and André Goosse 2008. *Le bon usage*. 14th ed. Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier.
- Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff. 1902. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoye.
- Guillôme, Joachin. 1836. *Grammaire française bretonne*. Vannes: J.M. Galles.
- Haddican, Bill, and Anders Holmberg. 2019. Object symmetry effects in Germanic. *NLLT* 37: 91-122.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2008. *Alignment change in Iranian languages*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Hakkinen, Kaisa. 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen*. Porvoo: Werner Soderstrom.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppi*. Jyväskylä: Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilku, and Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hakulinen, Auli, and Fred Karlsson. 1975. Suomen akkusatiivi. *Virittaja* 4: 339-363.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2016. *Impossible persons*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Harris, Alice C. 1981. *Georgian syntax: a study in relational grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Harris, Alice C. 1985. *Diachronic syntax: the Kartvelian case*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Harris, Alice. 2017. *Multiple exponence*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hartmann, Jutta M., and Caroline Heycock. 2018. A remark on Béjar and Kahnemouyipour 2017. *J. Linguistics*.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Explaining the Ditransitive Person-Role Constraint. *Constructions* 2.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types. *Linguistic Discovery*.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2020. Role-reference associations and the explanation of argument coding splits. *Linguistics* 59: 123-174.
- Haug, Dag Trygve Truslew, and Tatiana Nikitina. 2016. Feature sharing in agreement. *NLLT* 34: 865-910.
- Havas, Ferenc. 2008. Unmarked object in the Uralic languages. *Linguistica Uralica* 43: 1-33.
- Hawkins, John A. 1994. *A performance theory of order and constituency*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Crosslinguistic variation and efficiency*. Oxford: OUP.
- Heestand, Dustin, Ming Xiang and Maria Polinsky. 2011. Resumption still does not rescue islands. *LI* 42: 138-152.
- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa, and Maria Vilkuna. 2008. Impersonal is personal. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106: 216-45.
- Hemon, Roparz. 1975. *Historical morphology and syntax of Breton*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Hewitt, B. G. 1995. *Georgian*. Amsterdam: JB.
- Hewitt, Steve. 2016. The Georgian perfect tense series and the Western European BE/HAVE auxiliary split. Handout from The South Caucasian Chalk Circle, Paris, September 22.
- Höhn, Georg F. K. 2015. Unagreement is an illusion. *NLLT* 34: 543-92.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: OUP.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Urpo Nikanne. 2002. Expletives, subjects and topics in Finnish. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 71-105. Oxford ; New York: OUP.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2005. Is there a little pro? *LI* 36: 533-64.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2009. The null generic subject pronoun in Finnish. In *Parametric variation*, ed. Theresa Biberauer, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, and Michelle Sheehan, 200-230. Cambridge: CUP.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2017. Stylistic fronting. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Horn, Laurence. 2004. Implicature. In *The handbook of pragmatics*, ed. Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward, 3-28. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn. 2004. Oblique subjects and stylistic fronting in the history of Scandinavian and English. Doctoral dissertation, University of Aarhus.
- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Huumo, Tuomas, and Nobufumi Inaba. 1997. Irrallinen genetiivi ja omistusrakenteen ongelma. *Virittäjä* 101: 27-48.
- Inaba, Nofumi. 2007. Vanhan suomen asema diakronisessa kielentutkimuksessa. *Virittäjä* 4: 582-590.
- Iosad, Pavel. 2021. Mutations in Celtic. *Lingbuzz*.
- Isac, Daniela. 2015. *The morphosyntax of imperatives*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 2002. *Foundations of language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jahansson, A.W. 1871. *Finska språtakets satslära*. Helsingfors.
- Janhunen, Juva. 2002. The Nenets imperative sentence and its background. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 24: 71-85.
- Jensen, Frede. 1990. *Old French and comparative Gallo-Romance syntax*. De Gruyter.
- Jónsson, Johannes Gíslí. 1996. Clausal architecture and case in Icelandic. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gíslí. 2009. Covert nominative and dative subjects in Faroese. *Nordlyd* 36: 142-164.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac. 2006. Deriving the Complementarity Effect. *Lingua* 116: 1915-45.
- Jung, Hakyung. 2008. The grammar of *have* in a *have*-less language. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard.
- Kaiser, Elsi, and Virve-Anneli Vihman. 2006. Invisible arguments. In *Demoting the agent*, ed. Benjamin Lyngfelt and Torgim Solstad, 111-41. Amsterdam: JB.
- Kaiser, Elsi. 2018. Effets of perspective-taking on pronomial reference to humans and animals. *Open Linguistics* 4: 630-656.
- Kaiser, Elsi. 2019. Word order patterns in generic 'zero person' constructions in Finnish. *Proc. Ling. Soc. Am.* 4.51:1-15.
- Kalin, Laura, and Coppe van Urk. 2015. Aspect splits without ergativity. *NLLT* 33: 659-702.
- Kalin, Laura. 2018. Licensing and differential object marking. *Syntax* 21: 112-59.
- Kanwal, Jasmeen, Kenny Smith, Jennifer Culbertson, Simon Kirby. 2017. Zipf's Law of abbreviation and the principle of least effort. *Cognition* 165: 45-52.
- Kay, Paul, and Laura A. Michaelis. 2017. Partial inversion in English. Ms.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1979. Rightward NP movement in English and French. *LI* 10: 710-719.

- Kayne, Richard S. 2000. *Parameters and universals*. Oxford: OUP.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2019. Notes on the expletive *there*. *Lingbuzz*.
- Keine, Stefan. 2010. *Case and agreement from fringe to core*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Keine, Stefan. 2017. Agreement and vP phases. In *A schrift to fest Kyle Johnson*, ed. Nicholas LaCara, Keir Moulton, and Anne-Michelle Tessier, 177-86. Linguistics Open Access Publications.
- Kempson, Ruth, and Stergios Chatzikyriakidis. 2011. Standard Modern and Pontic Greek person restrictions. *J. Greek Linguistics* 11: 127-166.
- Kennard, Holly J., and Aditi Lahiri. 2017. Mutation in Breton verbs. *J. Linguistics* 53: 113-145.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2001. Structural case in Finnish. *Lingua* 111: 315-76.
- Klokeid, Terry Jack. 1976. Topics in Lardil grammar. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Koskinen, Päivi. 1998. Features and categories. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Kramer, Ruth. 2014. Clitic doubling or object agreement. *NLLT* 32: 593-634.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun. *LI* 40: 187-237.
- Kučerová, Ivona. 2016. Long-distance agreement in Icelandic. *JCGL* 19: 49-74.
- Laanest, Arvo. 1982. *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Hamburg: H. Buske.
- Laitinen, Lea, and Maria Vilkuna. 1993. Case-marking in neccessive construction and split intransitivity. In *Case and other categories in Finnish syntax*, ed. Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne, 23-48. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Laka, Itziar. 2000. Thetabind case. In *Arguments and case*, ed. Eric J. Reuland, 103-29. Amsterdam: JB.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves 1999. L'actance dans les langues celtiques. In *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, ed. Jack Feuillet, 295-345. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves 2010. Le passif impersonnel du breton moyen. In *L'impersonnel*, ed. Françoise Daviet-Taylor and Didier Bottineau, 177-219. Paris: PUR.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1975. Emplois dissymétriques de la coordination. *Études Celtiques* 14: 479-502.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 2011. Notes de vieux-breton. In *Etudes Celtiques* 37: 183-197.
- Landau, Idan. 2008. Two routes of control. *NLLT* 26: 877-924.
- Landau, Idan. 2010. The explicit syntax of implicit arguments. *LI* 41: 357-88.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2016. DP-internal semantic concord. *NLLT* 34: 975-1020.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 1990. Karjalan kielen partitiiviobjekti. *Virittäjä* 95: 419-437.
- Le Bayon, A.-M. 1878. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Vannes: Lafoyle.
- Le Goff, Pierre. 1927. Du tutoiement en breton de Vannes. *Annales de Bretagne* 37: 198-203.
- Le Roux, Pierre. 1957. *Le verbe breton*. Rennes: J. Plihon.
- Lees, Aet. 2005. *Case alternations in five Finnic languages*. Brill.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2014. *Voice and v*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2017. The locus of ergative case. In *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, ed. Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Demena Travis. Vol. 1. Oxford: OUP.
- Legate, Julie. 1999. The morphosyntax of Irish agreement. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33: 219-40.
- Lehikoinen, Laila. 1995. *Suomea ennen ja nyt*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
- Lehtinen, Tapani. 1985. Vanhan persoonallisen passiivin jatkajiako? *Virittäjä* 76: 270-289.
- Lehtinen, Tapani. 2007. *Kielen vuosituhanet*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Leonard, Stephen Pax and Kristján Árnason. 2011. Language ideology and standardisation in Iceland. In *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*, ed. T. Kristiansen and N. Coupland, 91-96. Oslo: Novus Press.
- Lewis, Henry, and Holger Pedersen. 1961. *A concise comparative Celtic grammar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lloyd-Jones, John. 1928. Some features of Middle Welsh syntax. *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 17: 81-101.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2020. Are there arguments for the subject analysis of Mainland Scandinavian presentational sentences? *LFG* 20.

- Lönbohm, O. A. F. 1879. Jääsken, Kirvun, ja osittain Rautjärven ja Ruokolahden pitäjien kielimurteesta. *Suomi* 2(13).
- Mac Cana, Proinsias. 1973. On Celtic word-order and the Welsh "abnormal" sentence. *Ériu* 24: 90-120.
- MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2017. An implicit projected argument in Spanish impersonal and passive *se* constructions. *Syntax*.
- Malamud, Sophia A. 2012. Impersonal indexicals: one, you, man, and du. *JCGL* 15: 1-48.
- Maling, Joan, and Johannes Gísli Jónsson. 1995. On nominative objects in Icelandic and the feature [+human]. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 56: 71-79.
- Maling, Joan. 1993. Of nominative and accusative. In *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax*, ed. Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne, 49-74. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 2012.
- Marantz, Alec. 1983. *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Marlett, Stephen A. 1986. Syntactic levels and multiattachment in Sierra Popoluca. *IJAL* 52: 359-387.
- Marušič, Franc, Andrew Ira Nevins, and William Badecker. 2015. The grammars of conjunction agreement in Slovenian. *Syntax* 18: 39-77.
- Matushansky, Ora. 2006. Head movement in linguistic theory. *LI* 37: 69-109.
- Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2013. Enclisis at the syntax-PF interface. In *Challenging clitics*, ed. Christine Meklenborg Salvesen and Hans Petter Helland, 27-54. Amsterdam: JB.
- McAnallen, Julia. 2011. The history of predicative possession in Slavic. Doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley.
- McCloskey, James, and Kenneth Hale. 1984. On the syntax of person-number inflection in modern Irish. *NLLT* 1: 487-533.
- McCloskey, James. 1983. Raising, subcategorisation and selection in Modern Irish. *NLLT* 1: 441-481.
- McCloskey, James. 1986. Inflection and conjunction in Modern Irish. *NLLT* 4: 245-81.
- McCloskey, James. 2007. The grammar of autonomy in Irish. *NLLT* 25: 825-57.
- Medová, Lucie. 2008. Reflexive clitics in the Slavic and Romance languages. Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya, and Adrain Battye. 1990. Arb *se/si* in transitive contexts. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 15: 161-195.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 1999. Construcciones con *se*. In *Gramática de la lengua española*, ed. Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, 1631-1722. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 2008. Clitic impersonal constructions in Romance. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106: 290-336.
- Metslang, Helena. 2013. Coding and behavior of Estonian subjects. *J. Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 4: 217-293.
- Meyer, Roland. 2010. Reflexive passives and impersonals in North Slavonic languages. *Russian Linguistics* 34: 285-306.
- Michelioukadis, Dimitris. 2015. Dative arguments and abstract case in Greek. Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Miljan, Merlin. 2008. Grammatical case in Estonian. Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Miller, Gary. 2019. *The Oxford Gothic grammar*. Oxford: OUP.
- Miller, Philip H., and Ivan Sag. 1997. French clitic movement without clitics or movement. *NLLT* 15: 573-639.
- Miller, Philip H., and Paola Monachesi. 2003. Les pronoms clitiques dans les langues romanes. In *Les langues romanes*, ed. Danièle Goddard, 53-106.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 2007. Generic one, arbitrary PRO, and the first person. *NLS* 14: 257-81.
- Morin, Yves-Charles. 1979. More remarks on French clitic order. *Linguistic Analysis* 5: 293-312.
- Morin, Yves-Charles. 1985. On the two French subjectless verbs *voici* and *voilà*. *Language* 61: 777-820.
- Muller, Claude. 2007. L'évolution cyclique du réfléchi. In *L'énoncé réfléchi*, ed. André Rousseau, Didier Bottineau and Daniel Roulland, 187-202. Rennes: PUR.

- Myler, Neil. 2016. *Building and interpreting possession sentences*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Næss, Ashild. 2008. Varieties of dative. In *The Oxford handbook of Case*, ed. Andrei Malchukov and Andrew Spencer. Oxford: OUP.
- Napoli, Maria. 2018. Ditransitive verbs in Latin. *J. Latin Linguistics* 17: 51-91.
- Narò, Anthony J. 1976. The genesis of the reflexive impersonal in Portuguese. *Language* 52: 779-810.
- Nelson, Diane Carlita. 1998. Case competition in Finnish. *Nordic J. Linguistics* 21: 145-1789.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *NLLT* 25: 273-313.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2012. Haplological dissimilation at distinct stages of exponence. In *The morphology and phonology of exponence*, ed. Jochen Trommer, 84-116. Oxford: OUP.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1995. *Possible and probable languages*. Oxford: OUP.
- Newton, Glenda Elizabeth. 2006. The development and loss of the Old Irish double system of verbal inflection. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Nicol, Fabrice. 2005. Romance clitic clusters. In *Clitic and affix combinations*, ed. Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordóñez, 141-97. Amsterdam: JB.
- Nomura, Masashi. 2005. Nominative case and AGREE(ment). Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Norris, Mark. 2020. Description and analyses of nominal concord. To appear in *Language and linguistics Compass*.
- Noyer, Rolf. 2001. Clitic sequences in Nunggubuyu and PF convergence. *NLLT* 19: 751-826.
- Ogren, David. 2015. Differential Object Marking in Estonian. *SKY* 28: 277-312.
- O'Herin, Brian. 2001. Abaza applicatives. *Language* 77: 477-93.
- Ojajarvi, Aulis. 1950. *Sijojen merkitystehtävistä Itä-Karjalan Maaselän murteissa*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2007. The Object Agreement Constraint. *NLLT* 25: 315-47.
- Oxford, Will. 2014. Microparameters of agreement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Parry, Mair. 1998. The reinterpretation of the reflexive in Piedmontese. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96: 63-116.
- Pescarini, Diego. 2017. Parametrising arbitrary constructions. *Probus*.
- Pescarini, Diego. 2021. *Romance object clitics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In *Phrasal and clausal architecture*, ed. Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins, 262-94. Amsterdam: JB.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 2021. Exfoliation. *Lingbuzz*
- Postal, Paul M. 1986. *Studies in passive clauses*. State University of New York.
- Postal, Paul M. 1989. *Masked inversion in French*.
- Postal, Paul M. 1990. French indirect object demotion. In *Studies in Relational Grammar* 3, ed. Paul M. Postal and Brian D. Joseph, 104-200. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1993. Remarks on weak cross-over effects. *LI* 24: 539-556.
- Potsdam, Eric. 1998. *Syntactic issues in the English imperative*. New York: Garland.
- Preminger, Omer. 2011. Asymmetries between person and number in syntax. *NLLT* 29: 917-37.
- Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Preminger, Omer. 2019. What the PCC tells us about "abstract" agreement, head movement, and locality. *Glossa* 4: 1-42.
- Rappaport, Gilbert 2009. The grammaticalization of the category masculine personal in West Slavic.
- Rezac, Milan, and Mélanie Joutiteau. 2015. The Breton inflectional impersonal. *Dialectologia* V: 261-292.
- Rezac, Milan, and Mélanie Joutiteau. 2016. The ways of referential deficiency. *Lingbuzz*.

- Rezac, Milan, Pablo Albizu, and Ricardo Etxepare. 2014. The structural ergative of Basque and the theory of Case. *NLLT* 32: 1273-1330.
- Rezac, Milan. 2003. The fine structure of cyclic Agree. *Syntax* 6: 156-82.
- Rezac, Milan. 2005. The EPP in Breton. In *Triggers*, ed. Anne Breitbarth and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 451-92. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008a. Phi-Agree and theta-related Case. In *Phi theory*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 83-129. Oxford: OUP.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008b. The syntax of eccentric agreement. *NLLT* 26: 61-106.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010a. A-resumption in English and Breton. In *Resumptive pronouns at the interfaces*, ed. Alain Rouveret, 241-86. Amsterdam: JB.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010b. Ineffability through modularity. In *Defective Paradigms*, ed. Matthew Baerman, Greville G. Corbett, and Dunstan Brown, 151-80. British Academy.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010c. Phi-Agree vs. movement. *LI* 41: 496-508.
- Rezac, Milan. 2011. *Phi-features and the modular architecture of language*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rezac, Milan. 2013. Case and licensing. *LI* 44: 299-319.
- Rezac, Milan. 2016. Gaps and stopgaps in Basque finite verb agreement. In *Microparameters in the grammar of Basque*, ed. Beatriz Fernández and Jon Ortiz de Urbina, 139-92. Amsterdam: JB.
- Rezac, Milan. 2019. The derivation of an unsatisfiable probe. Handout: Zenodo.
- Rezac, Milan. 2020. Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton I. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125.
- Rezac, Milan. 2021a. Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton II. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 126.
- Rezac, Milan. 2021b. Mihi est from Brythonic to Breton III. Zenodo.
- Rezac, Milan. 2021c = 2021. The development of pronominal clitics in earlier Gwenedeg through Barisy's 1710 Cantiqueu Spirituel. Zenodo.
- Rhodes, Richard A. 1994. Agency, inversion, and thematic alignment in Ojibwe. *BLS* 20: 431-446.
- Richards, Marc. 2008. Quirky expletives. In *Agreement restrictions*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 181-213.
- Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Richards, Norvin. 2013. Lardil "case stacking" and the timing of Cf case assignment. *Syntax* 16: 42-76.
- Richards, Norvin. 2017. Multiple case assignment and the English pseudopassive.
- Rizzi, Luigi, and Ur Shlonsky. 2006. Satisfying the subject criterion by a nonsubject. In *Phases of interpretation*, ed. Mara Frascarelli, 341-62. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *LI* 17: 501-57.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anders Holmberg. 2010. Introduction. In *Parametric variation*, ed. Theresa Biberauer, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, and Michelle Sheehan, 1-57. Cambridge: CUP.
- Roberts, Ian. 2007. *Diachronic syntax*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Roma, Elisa. 2000. How subject pronouns spread in Irish. *Ériu* 51: 107-157.
- Rowlett, Paul. 2007. *The syntax of French*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rowlett, Paul. 2014. French imperatives, negative *ne*, and nonsubject clitics. *J. French Language Studies* 24: 29-47.
- Sag Ivan, Lauri Karttunen, and Jeffrey Goldberg. 1992. A lexical analysis of Icelandic case. In *Lexical matters*, ed. Ivan Sag and Anna Szabolcsi, 301-318. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI.
- Sag, Ivan. 2012. Sign-based construction grammar.
- Salanova, Andrés Pablo, and Adam Tallman. 2021. Nominalisations, cas domains, and restructuring in two Amazonian languages. In *Nominalisations*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Hagit Borer, 363-390. Oxford: OUP.
- Salzmann, Martin, and Gerhard Schaden. 2021. The syntax and semantics of past participle agreement in Alemannic. *Glossa* 4.
- Schäfer, Florian. 2008. *The syntax of (anti)causatives*. Amsterdam: JB.
- Schäfer, Florian. 2012. The passive of reflexive verbs and its implications for theories of binding and case. *JCGL* 15: 213-268.

- Schapansky, Nathalie. 1996. Negation, referentiality and boundedness in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Schrijver, Peter. 2011. Middle and Early Modern Breton. In *Brythonic Celtic*, ed. Elmar Ternes, 359-429. Bremen: Hempen.
- Schumacher, Stefan. 2011. Mittel- und Frühneukymrisch. In *Brythonic Celtic*, ed. Elmar Ternes, 85-235. Bremen: Hempen.
- Schütze, Carson. 1997. INFL in child and adult language. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Schütze, Carson. 2003. Syncretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In *Grammar in focus*, ed. Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, 295-303. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. 1944. The imperative in spoken Finnish. *Language* 20: 240-42.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2012. The so-called possessive perfect in North Russian and the Circum-Baltic area. *Lingua* 122: 356-85.
- Seržant, Ilja A. 2015. Dative experiencer constructions as a circum-Baltic isogloss. In *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics*, ed. Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet, and Björn Wiemer, 325-48. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sheehan, Michelle, and András Bárány. 2020. When dependent case is not enough. Handout.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2014. Partial control in Romance languages. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory*, ed. Karen Lahousse & Stepanie Marzo, 181-198. Amsterdam: JB.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. The Romance Person-Case Constraint is not about clitic clusters. *Lingbuzz*.
- Shklovsky, Kirill. 2012. Person-Case effects in Tselal. *The Linguistic Review* 29: 439-490.
- Sigurðsson, Einar Freyr. 2017. Deriving case, agreement and voice phenomena in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Anders Holmberg. 2008. Icelandic dative intervention. In *Agreement restrictions*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 251-80. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Verner Egerland. 2009. Impersonal null-subjects in Icelandic and elsewhere. *Studia Linguistica* 63: 158-85.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57: 1-46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2003. To be an oblique subject. *NLLT* 20: 691-724.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. Icelandic nonnominative subjects. In *Nonnominative subjects*, vol. 2, ed. Peri Bhaskararao and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao, 137-60. Amsterdam: JB.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2011. On the new passive. *Syntax* 14: 148-178.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2012. Minimalist C/case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 191-227.
- Sims, Andrea. 2015. *Inflectional defectiveness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Skopeteas, Stavros, Gisbert Fanselow, and Rusudan Asatiani. 2012. Case inversion in Georgian. In *Case, word order and prominence*, ed. Monique Lamers and Peter de Swart, 145-71. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Stark, Elisabeth, and Paul Widmer. 2020. Breton a-marking of (internal) arguments. *Linguistics* 58: 745-766.
- Starke, Michal. 2017. Resolving (DAT = ACC) ≠ GEN. *Glossa* 2.
- Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative possession*. Oxford: OUP.
- Stegovec, Adrian. 2019. Taking case out of the Person-Case Constraint. *NLLT*.
- Stephens, Janig. 1990. Nonfinite clauses in Breton. In *Celtic Linguistics*, ed. Martin J Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe, and Jenny Rowland, 151-65. Amsterdam: JB.
- Stephens, Janig. 1996. The acquisition of mutations in Breton. *Teod* 2: 22-32.
- Stolz, Thomas, Sonja Kettler, Cornelia Stroth, and Aina Urdze. 2008. *Split possession*. Amsterdam: JB.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1984. Agreement vs. incorporation in Breton. *NLLT* 2: 289-348.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1989. Further remarks on Breton agreement. *NLLT* 7: 429-71.
- Szucsich, Luka. 2007. Nothing wrong with finite T. *Proceedings of FASL* 15: 401-19.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1986. On the distribution of nominative objects in Finnish. In *Features and projections*, ed. Peter Muysken and Henk van Riemsdijk, 139-62. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1995. On agreement and nominative objects in Icelandic. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, ed. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner, 307-27. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Taylor, Michael. 2009. On the pronominal status of Brazilian Portuguese *a gente*. *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 1-36.
- Ternes, Elmar, ed. 2011. *Brythonic Celtic*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Ternes, Elmar. 1970. *Grammaire structurale du Breton de l'île de Groix (dialecte occidental)*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1946. *A grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1974. The nominative object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic. München: Sagner.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1975. The nominative object in Finnish. *Lingua* 35: 201-230.
- Timonen, Saara. 2008. 3. persoonan imperatiivin käyttö Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa. MA thesis, Joensuu.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2004. Historical pragmatics. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, 538-561. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trommer, Jochen. 2006. Hierarchy-based competition and emergence of two-argument agreement in Dumi. *Linguistics* 44: 1011-1057.
- Tyler, Matthew. 2018. Absolutive promotion and the condition on clitic hosts in Choctaw. *NLLT*.
- Vainikka, Anne, and Pauli Brattico. 2014. The Finnish accusative. *Linguistics* 52: 73-124.
- Vainikka, Anne. 1989. Deriving syntactic representations in Finnish. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Vainikka, Anne. 2003. Postverbal case realization in Finnish. In *Generative approaches to Finnic and Saami linguistics*, ed. Diane Carlita Nelson and Satu Manninen, 235-66. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, and Marjo van Koppen. 2008. Pronominal doubling in Dutch dialects. In *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*, ed. Sjeff Barbiers, Olaf Koenenman, Marika Lekakou, and Margareet van der Ham, 207-49. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Vassilieva, Maria Borisovna. 2005. Associative and pronominal plurality. Doctoral dissertation, Stony Brook.
- Vigo, Eugenio M. 2016. Copular inversion and nonsubject agreement. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Vihman, Virve-Aneli, and Diane Nelson. 2019. Effects of animacy in grammar and cognition. *Open Linguistics* 5: 260-7.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 2003. French clitics and object splits. *LSRL* 32.
- Walkden, George. 2017. The actuation problem. In *The Cambridge handbook of historical syntax*, ed. Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts. Cambridge: CUP.
- Walkden, George. 2020. Introduction. In *On a law of Indo-European word order*, Jacob Wackernagel, 3-32. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Walkow, Martin. 2014. Cyclic AGREE derives restrictions on cliticization in Classical Arabic. In *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics 26*, ed. Reem Khamis-Dakwar and Karen Froud, 135-60. Amsterdam: JB.
- Walter, Mary Ann. 2007. Repetition avoidance in human language. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Wechsler, Stephen, and Larisa Zlatić. 2003. *The many faces of agreement*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Wigger, Arndt. 2020. Celtic past tenses past and present. In *Perfects in Indo-European languages and beyond*, ed. Robert Crellin and Thomas Jügel, 49-94. Amsterdam: JB.
- Wiltschko, Martina. 2006. On "ergativity" in Halkomelem Salish. In *Ergativity*, ed. Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 197-227. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Wolk, Christopher, Joan Bresnan, Anette Rosenbach and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. 2013. Dative and genitive variability in Late Modern English. *Diachronica* 30: 382-419.

- Wood, Jim, and Alec Marantz. 2017. The interpretation of external arguments. In *The Verbal Domain*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Irene Franco, and Ángel Gallego, 255-278. Oxford: OUP.
- Wood, Jim, and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson. 2014. *Let* causatives and (a)symmetric DAT-NOM Constructions. *Syntax* 17: 269-98.
- Wood, Jim, and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson. 2019. Cyclic cliticization in Icelandic. *Nordic J. Linguistics* 42: 111-127.
- Wood, Jim. 2015. *Icelandic morphosyntax and argument structure*. SNLLT.
- Wood, Jim. 2016. The accusative-subject generalization. *Syntax* 20: 249-91.
- Yang, Charles D. 2016. *The price of linguistic productivity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Yang, Charles D. 2017. How to wake up irregular (and speechless). In *On looking into words (and beyond)*, ed. Claire Bowern et al., 211-233. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko, and Uli Sauerland. 2019. How to be brief. *Languages* 4.
- Yazhinova, Uliana. 2018. Case variation in nominative object constructions in the history of Russian. Doctoral dissertation, Humboldt University of Berlin.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling, and Ray Jackendoff. 1987. Case in tiers. *Language* 63: 217-50.
- Yoon, James. 2004. Nonnominative (major) subjects and case stacking in Korean. In *Nonnominative subjects*, ed. Peri Bhaskararao & Karumuri V. Subbarao, vol. 2, 265-314. Amsterdam: John Benjamin
- Young, Catherine McCreight. 1988. Multiple case assignment. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Zajkov, P.M. 2000. *Glagol v karel'skom jazyke*. Petrozavodsk: Izdatel'stvo Petrozavodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak, and Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *NLLT* 30: 1231-74.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. Encoding the addressee in the syntax. *NLLT* 26: 185-218.
- Zipf, G.K. 1949. *Human behavior and the principle of least effort*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2017. A formal characterization of person-based alignment. *NLLT* 35: 1161-1204.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and alignment*. Amsterdam: JB.