

The Breton Double Subject Construction*

Milan Rezac, CNRS UMR 7023

milan_rezac@yahoo.ca

April 2009

Introduction

The following Breton sentences are in the *double subject construction*. In bold is the *narrow subject* of the predicate, which corresponds to the subject of English or French. To the left of it the underlined *broad subject* appears, linked to a *resumptive pronoun* on its right through which it receives its thematic interpretation.

- (1) an tamm-douar-se a zeu **gwinizh kaer** ennañ
this bit of land R comes wheat fair in.it
Fair wheat grows on this bit of land (the bit of land that there grows fair wheat in)
(Trépos 2001: 245)

- (2) Pèr a zo kouezet **e zi**
Per R is fallen his house
Per's house has fallen

(Fave 1998: 51)

This widespread construction has its place in most grammars of the language, and it is studied in depth by Urien (1989ab) and Hendrick (1988). There is an analogue in Irish, McCloskey and Sells (1988), Ó Baoill and Maki (2007), and others perhaps farther afield, Doron and Heycock (1999). Yet, if it is truly a double *subject* construction rather than a more commonplace one such as dislocation, it corresponds to nothing in English or French, and theories of their syntax are designed to block it. Thus its linguistic interest.

In languages like English, French, or Icelandic, there is a subjecthood position inside the 'sentential core' TP (InflP, FinP), but only arguments of the predicate or ones raised from another may occur there, and expletives. Left-peripheral noun-phrases linked to a pronoun are outside it. They do not count for the requirements of the core that the narrow subject satisfies, such as the need for something to precede the verb (the EPP), or the licensing of reflexives and floating quantifiers. Nor can they occur inside infinitives reduced to the core such as raising/ECM or specified-subject infinitives.

- (3) a Ces arbres, (***il**) tombe (***tous**) **de la neige** sur leurs branches.
These trees, (***there**) fall (***all**) **snow** on their branches.
b On voit [(***ces arbres**) tomber **de la neige** sur leurs branches].
We expect (for) [(***these trees**) *(**there**) fall **snow** on their branches].

* This work is complementary to Rezac (2008) and I am grateful to participants at the Resumptives Workshop (Paris VII, June 2007), the Fifth Celtic Linguistics Conference (Gregynog, September 2007), and especially M. Joutteau for discussion and comments. Initial funding provided by a postdoctoral grant 2006-7 to the Laboratoire de Linguistique de Nantes from the French Ministry of Education and Research.

Profound theoretical principles bar such true double subject structures. One is the need for noun phrases inside the core to receive Case, if the narrow subject takes up the last available one, but it runs up against structures without a narrow subject such as impersonal passives or the French unaccusative *falloir* 'need'. More general are thus postulates limiting the subjecthood position inside the core to A-movement from theta-positions, leaving the expletive as the only alternative.

- (4) Drake *(, **il**) a été tiré sur son bateau.
Drake it has been shot on his boat

The Breton double subject construction does not obey these restrictions, if the broad subject is really a subject inside the core. A first reason to distinguish it from dislocation is its visibility for the V2/EPP requirement that something precede the finite verb. In Breton finite clauses, all arguments are licensed beneath the tensed verb. In root clauses furthermore, something must appear before the finite verb. This element is related to the finite verb through a preverbal particle or *rannig*, glossed R.

- (5) Breton root clauses: __ R AUX/V (SU) (V.PARTICIPLE) (SU) DO PP

- (6) a Warc'hoazh e welo **Naig** ur vag er porzh.
tomorrow R will.see **Naig** a boat in.the port
b **Naig** a welo ur vag er porzh warc'hoazh.
c Ur vag a welo **Naig** er porzh warc'hoazh.
d Er porzh e welo **Naig** ur vag warc'hoazh.
e Ar porzh a welo **Naig** ur vag enni 'in.it' warc'hoazh.

The form of the *rannig* is determined by the element satisfying the V2/EPP requirement: a^L for a nominal argument, e^M otherwise in most dialects that make the distinction, where superscripts refer to an effect on the consonant of the following verb. The broad subject of the double subject construction counts for satisfying the preverbal-element requirement and for determining the form of the *rannig*, as in (6)e. A more complex example making the same point is in the following, with a broad subject within the complementizer layer of an embedded clause:

- (7) [Pa welas ar jeant kement-se, e voe anat dezhañ]
penaos e enebour a oa a-du gantañ unan bennak galloudus-bras,
how his enemy R was in-agreement with.him someone powerful-very
[When the giant saw this, it was obvious to him] how his enemy had on his side
someone very powerful,
(UF-KB 1: 127)
- (8) Ar pezh a zo diarvar eo penaos ar c'haz du a zo **e vicher** dizolei ar c'huziadennou.
What R is doubtless is how to cat black R is his trade discover the hidings
Ce qui est incontestable, c'est que le chat noir a pour office de découvrir les cachettes.
(KJ-RT: 40)

But this observation does not go very far. The broad subject could still be basically analogous to a dislocated nominal in English or French, if rannig control and the preverbal-element requirement occur in a domain larger than the 'sentential core'. Technically, the broad subject would be a resumptive topic/focus (Jouitteau 2005: 5.1.2). Alternatively, it could be the focus of a cleft like (9), because the telltale markers of a cleft are all optional: the focus marker *an hini*, the copula *eo*, the relative complementizer *hag*. On either analysis, the broad subject has nothing subjectlike to distinguish it from, say, a fronted or clefted object or prepositional phrase.

- (9) me (an hini eo hag) a zo deuet **ma zro** da baeañ
 me the one it.is that R is come my turn to pay
 It's me whose turn it is to pay (lit. that it's my turn to pay)

(BY-AG: 402)

However, there is evidence in Breton for a more subject-like character to the broad subject. There are properties that it shares with the narrow subject, and with no other element, including a fronted object or the head of a relative clause. Four are considered here: the subject of an infinitive (robust if rare), the highest postverbal nominal (less clear), the controller of agreement (uncertain), and the controller the forms of *be* (ubiquitous but weak). The first seems enough to make out the broad subject a subject in some sense, in agreement with Hendrick (1988) who puts it in [Spec, TP], yet also to show it to relate to a true resumptive rather than an A-movement trace, in agreement rather with Urien (1989a). The implications are discussed further in Rezac (2008).

The evidence here is drawn from a corpus (given at the end), with grammaticality judgments added for one key point. Hamstrung though a corpus is by the absence of negative evidence and minimal pairs, the coherent mostly written narratives comprising it have the advantage of contextualization essential for some of the constructions under study, whilst free of the disfluencies and processing limitations of oral expression. It affords a look at the lie of the land and its boundaries, for those who go exploring later.

A first look at broad subjects

Before turning to structures with true broad *subjects*, first a brief look at finite clauses where a preverbal noun phrase links to a resumptive pronoun. Some might be resumptive topicalizations, come covert clefts, and some or all true double subject constructions.

Breton is a language with *resumption*. The head of a relative clause may relate to a gap in subject or object positions, but otherwise it links to a pronoun, typically signalled by verb or preposition agreement, or by possessor or object proclitic. The constraints on resumption in relative and apparent double subject structures seem to be the same. In the grammars most like the Irish pattern of McCloskey (2005), the resumptive in both structures may be pretty much at any distance from its noun:

- (10) Ar bilhaouerien a dremene dre amañ a ouezed mat [piv e oant].
 the chifonniers that passed through here R one.knew well who R they.were
 The chifonniers that passed through here, one knew well who they were

(MY-OF: 111)

- (11) Ar ganevedenn, [...], a deu en eun taol-kont **kement liou** [_{RC} **a zo warni**] da veza flamm kenañ
 the rainbow R comes suddenly every colour R is on.it to be bright very
 Every colour that is on the rainbow ... becomes suddenly very bright

(MY-OF: 28)

Of more doubtful grammaticality because from spontaneous oral expressions are links in temporal adjuncts:

- (12) O! ni a oa dija **kreisteiz hanter** [pa oam en em gavet e Lokournan]
 O we R was already midday half when we.were REFL found in L
 O! It was already 12:30 when we found ourselves in L
 (MM-M 3:21).
- (13) Pa'z eo gwir Job a veze **poent lein** bemdeiz [a-benn ma save diouz e wele].
 because J R was time lunch everyday when he.rose from his bed
 Because everyday it was lunchtime when Job got up from his bed.
 (MM-M 1:10)
- (14) Ha Tintin Mari a yoa **ar siminal** o vogedi e-pad an deiz, [oh PRO ober boued dezo].
 and aunt Mari R was the chimney a-smoking during the day a- making food to.them
 And the chimney was smoking throughout the day, as Aunt M was making food for them.
 (MM-M 1:25)

The resumptive pronoun may also be very close to the noun it picks up, save that it may not be the local narrow subject as in the first example. There may be some variation for the local object (Urien 1989b: 220) and remote subject (Borsley and Stephens 1989: 424).

- (15) Kleier Landremel a dregerne(*nt) **o mouezh** [loc. subj.]
 bells Landremel R toll(*they) their voice
 The voice of the bells of Landremel tolled.
 (Urien 1989a: 209)
- (16) Toud ar rehire ... a lavarfed ez int bet savet gwechall. [rem. subj.]
 all the rocks R one.said R they.are been raised long.ago
 All the rocks were said to have been raised long ago.
 (Urien 1989a: 211)
- (17) Homañ a weler anezi diwar an hent braz [...] [loc. obj.]
 this.one R one.sees her from the road big
 This one [a valley] one sees from the autoroute.
 (MY-OF: 96)
- (18) ar vugale o c'hemerin warc'hoaz [loc. obj.]
 the children them I.will.take tomorrow
 I shall take the children tomorrow.
 (Stephens 1982: 145)
- (19) An nor-se a vo red prena (anezhi) [rem. obj.]
 the door-this R will.be necessary to.shut her
 The door must be shut
 (Stephens 1983: 247)

The typical reading that clause-initial resumed DPs have is that of a discourse topic or discourse participant, not necessarily the most emphatic. However, other readings are available. Thoroughly nontopical is a discourse-new indefinite or a quantifier:

- (20) rak nep piv bennak a lazhe ur bleiz a veze roet dezhañ un tamm arc'hant
 for any who some R killed a wolf R was given to.him a bit money
 for whoever killed a wolf was given a bit of money
 (GY-ST: 23-4)
- (21) Ur gêr all a zo dezhi an hevelep anv en hanternoz:
 a town another R is to.it the same name in.the north
 [The name of Caer Llion comes from Castra Legionum. Here Caer Llion ar Wisg
 is spoken of.] There is another town with the same name in the north: [Chester of
 the Saxons; Caer for the Welsh.]
 (AF-M: 103 note 6)
- (22) Eur gudenn all a vez c'hoaz bemdez **ano** out-i war ar gazetenn...
 a problem another R is still everyday name of-3SGF on the newspaper
 There is still another problem that is discussed every day in the newspaper...
 (MY-DM)
- (23) rag, gouzoud a ouzoh, eur marh [pa ne da ket] a vez kresket **ar herh** dezañ [a goude ez a].
 a horse R is increased the oats to.him
 for, you know, a horse when it doesn't walk is given more eats and after it goes
 (MM-M 1:29)
- (24) eur Gall a zo êz awalh dezañ [...]
 a French person R is easy enough to.him
 It is easy enough for a French person [to follow what Canadians say]
 (MY-OF: 68)
- (25) Lod a zo heñvel **-a- hag -e-** deho.
 some R is same -a- and -e- to.them
 To some *a* and *e* are the same. [And yet they don't sound the same to me...]
 (Urien 1989a: 118, oral response)

Next are quantifiers over context-established sets, weak and strong.

- (26) Unan bouzar all oa e hano Tin ar C'hozdandvad, [ginidik eus C'hap-Sizun, du-hont pell.]
 one deaf another was his name T
 There was another deaf person [speaking of deaf people] whose name was Tin the Kozdandvad, [by
 birth from Cap-Sizun, far over there.]
 (KI-ZM: 118)
- (27) ha kement hini eus kement familh a oa deut gantañ e lodig:
 and every one from every family R was come with.him his bit
 [High was raised the pile of the bonfire, when Lan Ofret approached; for
 Kerunkun is a big town, with ten fair families living in it from the slate mines;]
 and every one from every family came with his part: [the boys, a bunch of
 blackthorn with its hard wood, and peerless to make an enduring fire; the girls, an
 armful of twigs; the adolescents, ...].
 (RJ-GW: 89)
- (28) Gwazed, merhed ha bugale vraz, pep hini a vo gantañ eur falz dioutañ:
 men, women, and children big each one R will.be with.him a sickle from.him

Men, women, and older children, each one_i will have a_i scythe of his_i own.

(SV-MR: 92)

- (29) Setu pep hini a veze taillet **e lod** dezañ.
voilà every one R was cut his part to.him
So everyone had his part (of sea-weed) cut.

(M-MM 8: 24)

Likewise found are quantifiers scoping under negation (*hani* perhaps a negative polarity item: cf. ARBRES s.v. *La négation*). The finite negation *ne* may but need not satisfy the first-position requirement, and if not, a nondislocated element precedes, as below.

- (30) Hani ag an ofiserion arall ... ne ra **vad** dezhon er gwelet.
any of the officers other NEG does good to.him him see
It does no good to any of the other officers of the regiment to see him.

(*Kammdro an Ankou*, Loeiz Herrieu, 1994 [1933, Gwenedeg])

- (31) Evel-se 'ta n'eo ket eun den ez eus **ano** anezan e lizer ar Pengawr
thus NEG it.is not a man R is mention of.him in letter the P
Ainsi donc ce n'est pas un homme don't il est question dans la lettre du Pengawr.

(KJ-RT: 42)

Wh-words over both presupposed and nonpresupposed ranges occur:

- (32) [Eas a-walc'h ... e oa d'am filhor entent] peseurt gwezenn e oa **va c'hoant warni**.
what.kind tree R was my desire on.her

[Easy enough ... was it for my godson to understand] what kind of a tree I desired
(KI-ZM:16)

- (33) da c'houzout piv a yafe **ar maout gantañ**
to know who R would.go the sheep with.him
(in order) to know who would win

(BY-AG: 366)

- (34) Ped mamm a ranno **o c'halon**.
how.many mother R will.break their heart
How many a mother's heart will break?

(LI-EK II:52)

- (35) Piou/Ar c'hlasger-bara a vez roet **bara** dezhañ?
who/the seeker-bread R is given bread to.him
Who is given bread? -- The beggar is given bread.

(Stephens 1982: 50)

Many of the above examples are with intransitives. Some lack narrow subjects entirely: impersonal passives, unaccusatives with only a prepositional argument, or *be*-predications of the type *she is a baker*, expressed in Breton as *is a baker from.her* to which a broad subject may be added. Thus:

- (36) Ar yez [ma ra ganti un den] a zo anezi eur bed
the tongue R is of.her a world
[ma vev ha ma striv ennañ; bez ema en e berhenniez donnoh ha startoh en e zalh
eged an douar hag an traeziou a ra outo e vro.]

Le langage [qu'on homme parle] est un monde [dans lequel il vit et agit; il lui appartient plus profondément, plus essentiellement que la terre et les choses qu'il nomme son pays].

(HJ-ML II: 117, translating Romano Guardini, *The rosary of our lady*)

However, transitives are perfectly compatible with apparent broad subjects:

- (37) Va breur a brenin eur gontell dezañ
 my brother R will.buy.I a knife to.him
 I will buy my brother a knife.

(Fave 1998: 50)

- (38) O, honnez 'oa he zud o terhel eur plas war ar mêz, sur.
 this.one was her folk PROG hold a place in the country sure
 Her folks had a place in the countryside, sure.

(MM-M 11:40)

Transitive subjects furnish a nice contrast to preverbal resumed nominals, particularly in the active/passive and transitive/anticausative alternation. For *terriñ* 'break', *Nolwenn a dorr he bazh* lit. 'Nolwenn R breaks her staff' may be transitive '**Nolwenn** breaks her staff', or anticausative with a broad subject 'Nolwenn, **her staff** breaks'. The passive is ... *eo torret he bazh* 'is broken her staff', to which a broad subject may be added, *Nolwenn a zo torret he bazh* 'Nolwenn, her staff is broken' (we return to *eo/zo*).

Two telling differences between transitive subjects and broad subjects may then be observed. First, while passives and (to varying extent across the varieties) intransitives and (less) reflexives use *be* as their perfect auxiliary, transitives use *have*. Adding an (apparent) broad subject retains *be*. Second, transitive subjects require that local linked pronouns assume reflexive/emphatic forms similar to English/French *self/même* forms. An (apparent) broad subject links to an ordinary pronoun, as Hendrick (1988: 98-101) observes. It seems then that broad subjects are outside the domain where transitive subjects count for these requirements, such as the thematic structure of the clause.

Nonfinite structures

Infinitives of the specified subject, control, and ECM types in Germanic and Romance have a designated left-peripheral position where only the narrow subject or an expletive can occur, Spec, TP]. Thus the following contrasts between finite and infinitive clauses:

- (39) a Two books were placed on the shelf. (neutral order)
 b There were two books placed on the shelf. (expletive, postverbal subject)
 c On the shelf were placed two books. (locative inversion)
 d On the shelf, two books were placed. (topicalization)
- (40) a The shelf has enough room [for two books to be placed on it.]
 b The shelf has enough room [for there to be two books placed on it.]
 c The shelf has enough room [*for on it to be placed two books.]
 d The shelf has enough room [*for on it two books to be placed.]

Breton infinitives are similar. Specified subject infinitives occur as subordinate clauses headed by various prepositional complementizers, and as independent narrative infinitives optionally headed by *hag* (Stephens 1990, Tallerman 1997).

- (41) a Prepositional infinitives: P°/C° (+ da₁) + ___ (+ da₂) + infinitival VP.
 b Narrative infinitives: (hag) + ___ (+ da/hag) + infinitival VP

The ___ position can host but a single argument, the narrow subject (Stephens 1990: 154, Favereau 1997: §698; Hendrick 1988: 142). The object and prepositional phrases must follow. The narrow subject may do so as well, at least for intransitives.^{1 2}

- (42) a Daoust da **loened cheptel** da greskiñ *t* er vro-mañ, ...
 despite to cattle to grow.INF in.the land-this
 b Daoust da greskiñ loened cheptel er vro-mañ.
 c *Daoust da er vro-mañ_i da greskiñ loened cheptel
 (D.L.)

When a pronominal narrow subject follows the prepositional complementizer, it is realized as agreement on it, in the manner of pronouns after prepositions generally:

- (43) Daoust da Yann / (daoust) dezhañ / evitañ da vezañ kozh e oa serzh bepred.
 despite to Yann despite to.him for.him to be old R was fit always
 Despite Y./him being old, he was still fit.
 (Stephens 1990: 162, Kervella 1995: §278)

The less-understood narrative infinitive seems to be much the same:

- (44) (Hag) Yann/eñ da lenn al lizher.
 HAG Yann/he to read.INF the letter
 Yann/he read the letter.
 (Stephens 1990:163)

- (45) ha mond Yann diouzhtu ha ...
 HAG go.INF Yann immediately and
 Yann went immediately and ...
 (TA-LW: 73; cf. Hemon 2000: §170(4))

One noun phrase other than the narrow subject may appear in the pre-infinitival position: the broad subject of a double subject construction. Though unmentioned in grammars, the corpus instances are robust. All are built on intransitives like *bezañ* 'be', *mont* 'go', *treiñ* 'turn', the same ones as found independently with a post-infinitival narrow subject.

First, the prepositional-complementizer adjunct infinitives:³

¹ D.L. is a speaker of Kerneveg (Quimperlé), p.c. to M. Joutteau.

² The postverbal subject is usually bare, but in (i) it appears with *da* (*gallout* 'be able to' is not impersonal + *da X* + *INF*, while *rankout* 'must' can be). See McCloskey (2001) for an Irish parallel as remote quirky case, and Joutteau (2005: 4.3) for *da* inserted for Case reasons in causatives. Perhaps a special case is the fixed *heb gouzout da X* 'without know to X' = 'without X knowing', as if *gouzout* were impersonal + *da* like *fellout* 'want'; the expected *hep PRO gouzout* is also possible (Trépos 2001: 196).

(i) eun all a zo nevez beza bet savet dezo ... [da helloud d'ar **batimañchou** dont ennañ]
 another one has been recently built for them for be.able to.the vessels come in.it (FV-PV 2: 33)

- (46) Daoust d'ar vro-mañ da greskiñ **loened cheptel enni/e-barzh**
 despite to the land-this to grow.INF cattle in.it/within(.it)
 'Despite cattle growing in this land'
 (D.L.)⁴
- (47) daoust d'an tevinier beza enno **kalz a frankiz.**
 despite to the dunes be.INF in.them lots of freedom
 [So many horse-drawn carriages! It was difficult to find place for them,] despite
 there being lots of space in the dunes.
 (SV-MR: 30)
- (48) daoust d'ezan beza hir e **ziousskouarn!**
 despite to.him be.INF long his ears
 [for he was a man of living faith,] despite having heard a lot of racy things!
 (KI-ZM: 131; D.L.)
- (49) Evit-han da redek **he wad.**
 despite-him to run.INF his blood
 [Il ne cesse pas de faire son devoir] quoique son sang coule.
 (*Kanaouenn al levier, Barzaz Breizh*, H. de la Villemarqué, 1963: 359)
- (50) [Du-hont ... e vez gwelet tud gwisket kran ... ha teltennoù savet war ar sabl]
 evit d'ar re a ya da neuial bezañ diwallet **o c'hroc'hen** deus an heol berv.
 for to the ones that go to swim be guarded their skin from the sun burning
 [There ... are seen finely clothed folks ... and tents raised on the sand] in order
 for those who go swimming to be their skins guarded from the burning sun.
 (BY-AG: 357)

One example, from a poem I do not have access to myself, has both the broad and narrow subjects before the infinitive. It is not particularly surprising: finite verbs must follow the broad subject as the first element for the V2/EPP property of Breton finite clauses, but there is no reason to expect infinitives to do so, which often occur lower than finite verbs cross-linguistically (cf. (*souvent*) *paraître (souvent) triste*; cf. small clause (74)).

- (51) Evidon ma liou da veza ken divad [Me n'am euz bet biskouaz na merc'h na mab.]
 for.me my tint to be so bloodless
 Despite my colour being so bloodless [I have never had neither daughter nor son.]
 (*Le Fureteur breton*, 1906: 178, via Google Book Search)

Next narrative infinitives:

- (52) Ha me mond **eur zahad droug ennon.**
 HA me go.INF a bag-ful anger in.me

³ In these examples in Breton *redek* 'run', *mont* 'go', *don't* 'come', *kreskiñ* 'grow', *sevel* 'rise' are intransitive, as is *treiñ* 'turn', cf. *Treiñ a reaz eur frouden enn he benn* 'turn did an idea in his head' = 'Il lui passa dans la tête une idée bizarre', Troude 1886 s.v. *passer*). *Beza(ñ)/bout* is likewise intransitive 'be' here. In the lexical use of 'be', 'have', *bezañ* is the infinitive of 'be' and in some dialects of 'have' (distinct in finite forms), but not for SV and KI who use *kaout* 'have', and it cannot be used to express the analogue of English *The dunes have lots of space in them* where Breton must use 'be' (Jouitteau and Rezac forthc.). In their auxiliary use, *bezañ* is the infinitive of passive 'be' as in (50) and perfect 'have/be' everywhere.

⁴ *Enni* is more literary than *ebarzh*. The latter is glossed 'within.it' despite not showing overt agreement, since as Urien (1989a: 212) shows it is the sole adverb that behaves as if it had a resumptive *pro*.

I became angry.

(MM-M 1: 36; D.L.).

- (53) Hag ar jeant ha dont da soñj dezhañ ez edo atav e zaou breizh war e choug
HA the giant HA come to thought to.him that was still his two preys on his back
And the giant realized that his two victims were still on his back.

(TA-LW: 76)

- (54) (Setu) hag hen a trei **eur froudenn** enn he benn.
thus HA he HA turn a current en his head

(Voilà qu') il lui passa par la tête un idée. / Une idée bizarre lui passa par la tête.

(Troude 1886, sv. *bizarre, style, idée*)

Both are found with nonnative but expert authors, having remained through re-editions:

- (55) [Kent din bezañ kromm **va c'heñ**], e oan eskuit hag helavar
before to.me be.INF curved my back

Before my back was bowed, [I was prompt and eloquent]

(*Canu llywarch hen, Hor Yezh* 1938: 19, M. Klerg)

- (56) Hag ar mab hena mont **droug** enhan
and the son oldest to.go evil in.him

And the oldest son became angry.

(*Sarmoniou an Aotrou Quéré, J. Quéré, ed. K. Jézégou, 1906*)

Obligatory control infinitives also have broad subjects, as their silent controlled element. The examples are rather intricate:

- (57) beza ma teu kentoh d'ar re-man_x [PRO_x sevel **c'hoant ganto** da zrailla galleg genen]
although comes rather to these rise.INF desire with.them to cut French with.me
although these ones happen rather to want to speak in French with me

(MY-OH: 3)

- (58) Me, neuze, o klevet anezañ a zo tost din_x [PRO_x mond **droug ennoni**] hag ...
me, then, hearing him R is near to.me to.go anger in.me and
I, then, hearing him, almost get angry and (say to him).

(MY-OH: 113)

- (59) ha tost e oa dezhañ_x [PRO_x da vezañ graet **tro ar bed** gantañ]
and near R was to.him to have done turn the world by.him
and he had nearly done the turn of the world

(TA-LW: 96)

- (60) emaoun-me_x, PRO_x en eur ober neuz PRO_x da veza lorc'h ennoun
making appearance to be pride in.me
[Le chat!] dis-je, en faisant semblant d'être fier

(KJ-RT: 38)

- (61) Douarneneziz_x o deus anv PRO_x da vezañ distag-meurbet **o c'halon** ouz ar baourentez
D 3PL have name to be unattached-very their heart to the poverty
Douarnenezians have a reputation of their hearts being very liberal to poverty.

(DY-DI: 15)

- (62) E-doug ar wech
eo bet brudet ar Vro-Vagan_x PRO_x da veza pinvidig **he douar**.
is been renowned the Bagan Country to be rich her land
[over time] the land of the Bagan Country has been renowned as rich

(SV-PI: 204)

- (63) ne oa ket ken tost da gêr Jeruzalem an amzer-ze_X [PRO_X bezan ken braz enni_X ha bremañ **ar greizenn a reer anezi ar gêr goz.**]
 it was not close to [the] city [of] J [of] that time_X [PRO_X be so big in.her_X as now **the district that one.calls it the old town**]
 In the city of J of that time did not have the district that is called the old town nearly as big as now.

(MY-MI: 81)

The matrix clauses selecting the infinitives are locutions such as *dont da X V-INF* lit. 'come to X V-INF', meaning 'X happens to V-INF', and *bezañ tost da X V-INF*, lit. 'be close to X V-INF', meaning 'X almost Vs'. The matrix argument *X* normally must control the silent narrow subject of the infinitive, not any other empty position. This restriction is one reason for positing the special element PRO reserved to subject positions, or its theoretical equivalents. In these examples however, the narrow subject is overt and postverbal, and the matrix *X* argument controls rather a pronoun inside the infinitive – arguably by the mediation of a broad subject PRO (cf. McCloskey and Sells 1988). That is, the infinitives correspond to finite double subject constructions like the following:

- (64) Neuze ar mezvier a yae **droug ennan**:
 then the drunkard R went anger in.him
 Alors l'ivrogne se mettait en colère:

(KJ-RT: 90, cf. MY-OH: 113, UF-KB 2: 204)

- (65) Per a oa **eur sac'had droug ennañ**.
 Per R was a bagful anger in.him.
 Per était joliment furieux.

(KJ-RT: 86)

- (66) Yun a oa savet **c'hoant dezhañ** labourat!
 Yun R was raised desire to.him work.INF
 Desire arose in Yun to work!

(RJ-GW: 33)

The striking and telling character of such control through a broad subject is best brought out by trying out parallel structures in English or French: **he was about PRO to be finished a turn of the world by him for he was about PRO to finish a turn of the world.*⁵

One construction presently ambiguous between control and prepositional infinitive is the negative imperative, composed of frozen *arabat* 'forbidden' + *be* + *da* + *X* + *INF*. *Da* + *X* is either an argument of *arabat*, or a prepositional complementizer of the infinitive.

- (67) Met *arabat* deoc'h bezān **re a vall warnoc'h**.
 but forbidden to.you to.be too.much of haste on.you
 But don't be too much in haste.

(BY-AG: 205)

⁵ Rather than control, the foregoing constructions might involve 'raising of the object of a preposition', where *X* raises from the subject position of the infinitive to the matrix prepositional object (see McCloskey 1983 for Irish). Their significance remains the same, for just as PRO can only be a subject, so can a raisee.

The foregoing infinitives indicate that broad and narrow subjects form an exclusive group, the *subjects* to which refer the constraints on specified subject and control infinitives. In them, the double subject construction cannot be A'-dislocation or movement of the type *The dunes there's lots of freedom in (them)*, since it is impossible in infinitives. Nor can it reflect a cleft of the type *Despite me being *(the one) whose blood runs* for (49): it is impossible to drop nonfinite *bezañ* 'be', transform finite *red* 'runs' to an infinitive, omit *an hini* 'the one', and code the focus *me* as complementizer agreement.

Another nonfinite structure seems to single out the broad and narrow subjects: small clauses. They are not as well understood as infinitives and their evidence is weaker, but double subjects in them are even mentioned by grammars. Breton small clauses have the format in (68) and are exemplified in (69) (cf. Chung and McCloskey 1987 for Irish). They are built on pretty much any lexical predicate (types *Kate – strong / to the city / his friend / arrived late*), and occur as independent clauses in narration, as concessive adjuncts, and without *hag* under perception verbs and prepositional complementizers.

(68) Small clause format: (HAG) (SUBJ) (HAG) PRED (SUBJ)
(NB: *hag* is independently 'and' and a relative complementizer; **hag hag*)

(69) Labourat a ra c'hoazh, ha **hi** kozh.
work R does still HAG she old
She is still working, although she is old.

(Kervella 1995: §813)

(70) Ha laouen **Bilzig**.
HAG happy B.
Bilzig was happy.

(LF-B: 57)

They are common with the double subject construction (the predicate is in italics here):

(71) Ne oa ket evit hen ober, hag eñ nerzh dezhañ kouskoude.
HAG he strength to.him nevertheless
He was not able to do it, despite him being strong.

(Kervella 1995: §813)

(72) Ar zoubenn a zo yen, ha Jan teñval **he fenn**.
and J dark her head
The soup is cold, and Jan is in a mood.

(BC-SD: 129)

(73) ar zelaouerien, hag int ken digor **o diou-skouarn**...
the listeners, HAG (=despite) they so open their ears
The listeners, despite their ears [being] so open, ...

(Trépos 2001: §626)

(74) Ha hi **he dorn** ouzh al lamp petrol ... [Ha hi gaoliata ar bank,]
And she her hand to a petrol lamp ... [and straddled the bench,]

(BY-AG: 136)

(75) Hag ar Brusianed kemeret **Pariz** ganto.
and the Prussians taken Paris by.them

- (76) ha me diez **va fenn** ...
 HAG me uneasy my head

and I became uneasy [seeing that my ladder was not long enough]

(LI-EK II: 50, cited in Hemon 2000: 65.)

There is an interesting parallelism shared by finite and nonfinite double subject constructions: both look identical to resumptive modifiers. For finite clauses, the modifier analogue is a finite resumptive relative, as in the second translation of (1) (Urien 1989a, Fave 1998; the relative reading is forced by a complementizer like *hag* before the *rannig*). For small clauses, the modifier analogue is a resumptive adjective phrase, unavailable in English or French (Hingat 1868: §211, Hemon 1995: §23, §41):^{6 7}

- (77) pa voe gwelet [ur vagig [**he goueliou** digor]] o tont eus tu an enezenn
 when was seen a little.boat her sails open a-coming from side the island
 When there was seen a little *boat with her sails unfurled* (**boat its/whose sails unfurled*) coming from the direction of the island

(RJ-GW: 107)

These constructions are a good clue for analyzing the double subject construction in general. An adjective phrase with a free pronoun and a narrow subject for the adjective gives rise to a modifier if adjoined to a noun phrase, and to a small clause if predicated of it. In the same way, a verb phrase (or rather T'/Fin' with its *rannig*) with a free pronoun and its narrow subject can modify a noun phrase as a relative or be predicated of it to create the double subject construction (cf. Doron and Heycock 1999).

⁶ Mittendorf and Sadler (2008) study such adjective phrases in Welsh, where they occur as both modifiers and after *be* + the predicative particle *yn* in independent clauses, the latter being perhaps the only instance of something like double subject construction in Welsh (as opposed to resumptive focus, Borsley et al 2007: 123, 207). They observe that adjectives that change their stem vowel in concord agree with neither of the nouns involved, though earlier they could agree with either, and in Arabic they agree with the narrow subject. Thus cf. the concord of the simple modifier *bachgen byr* 'boy(MSG) short(MSG)', *merch fer* 'girl(FSG) short(FSG)', versus the resumptive modifier *merch fyr ei thymor* 'girl(FSG) short(MSG) her temper(FSG)'. These examples also show that the resumptive like the simplex modifier does undergo initial consonant lenition after FSG but not MSG nouns, *byr/ber* > *fyr/fer*, and so also as predicate in *Mae Siân yn fyr/*fer (ei thymor)* 'is Siân(FSG) PRED short (her temper)'.
 In Breton, there is no concord but modifier lenition: *ur stêr vras/*bras* 'a river big' from adjective *bras*, and transitive *ur stêr vihan c'hlas* 'a river small (*bihan*) blue (*glas*)'. For resumptive modifiers, lenition is possible: *ur stêr bras/vras he genou* 'a river(FSG) big her mouth' with adjective *bras* 'big' (Hemon 1995: §20). It suggests that they do not derive from a relative clause *ur stêr a zo bras/*he he genou* 'a river R is big her mouth', as predicate adjectives do not lenite; independently, *zo* cannot be dropped (unlike *eo* with a post-copular subject). The optionality of lenition is regular for complex modifiers, e.g. *ur stêr vras/*bras* 'a river big' but *ur stêr bras/vras-meurbet* 'a river big-very', *stêr bras/vras ar Faouët* '[the] river big of the Faouët'. The reverse order *ur stêr he genou bras* is also possible and then lenition is (probably) not.

⁷ DPs frequently appear in similar structures: *verboù dezho daou rener* 'verbs to.them two subjects' (Kervella 1995: §211) *paotr e c'houlou 'guy his light'*, i.e. 'le gars à la lumière, the guy with the light' (KJ-RT: 76), *e teuas soñj d'ezan ... eus mern poent he fardañ* 'R came thought to.him ... of lunch time her prepare', i.e. 'thought came to him of lunch to prepare' (KI-ZM: 92). To complete the parallelism there are also resumptive infinitival modifiers beside double subject infinitives, *ur vaouezh PRO da gousket ganti* 'a woman to sleep with.her' (FA-M: 120).

Postverbal placement

Broad subjects always occur to the left of all the arguments of a predicate: there are no instances of a resumed noun phrase between the subject and the object, for example. However, perhaps they do not always occur at the left periphery of finite clauses, before the verb. Postverbal broad subjects are expected if the verb can sometimes raise past the usual position of a broad subject (e.g. [Spec, TP]), or if they can occur in one of the variety of postverbal positions that are known to be available to narrow subjects:⁸

- (78) N' en deus ket (**Yann**) seblantet (**Yann**) karout ar vugale.
 NEG 3SGM has not Yann seemed Yann to.love the children
 (Jouitteau 2005: 146, cf. Hendrick 1988: 106 note 8, 157)

However, postverbal subjects have been claimed to be impossible. Urien (1989a: 209-210) states that one does not have beside *Yun a ziver ar gwad diouzh e zorn* 'Yun R flows the blood from his hand' an internal version **Pa ziver Yun ar gwad diouzh e zorn* 'When flows Yun the blood from his hand', beside the ordinary *Pa ziver ar gwad diouzh dorn Yun* 'When flows the blood from (the) hand (of) Yun'. Hendrick (1988: 106 notes 6, 8) likewise finds that Breton speakers do not accept postverbal broad subjects. He expects them to be available at least when there is no narrow subject, and proposes they are not because of discourse conditions on them, beyond the pale of sentential syntax.

- (79) (Ar vugale) o deus plijet (*ar vugale) dezho sellout ouzh an tele.
 the children 3PL have pleased the children to.them to.look at the TV
 (Hendrick 1988: 106 note 8)
- (80) *Seblantent o deus ar vugale plijet dezho sellout ouzh an tele.
 seemed 3PL have the children pleased to.them to.look at the TV
 (Hendrick 1988: 106 note 6)

A large and varied corpus such as Urien's or the one here comes in useful, because it provides opportunities for meeting even difficult contextual requirements. Indeed, Urien (1989a: 210) finds a couple of exceptions to his statement, and there are more here.

The examples can be put into two groups, ones where the putative broad subject is adjacent to the constituent hosting its resumptive, and rarer ones where it is not. The latter involve either the *be* auxiliary of passives or the *be* copula. The passives are interesting because changing the *be*-auxiliary to *have* and omitting the *by*-phrase yields a nearly synonymous transitives with the broad subject as the transitive subject: *Pa he do an arme noar treuzet ar ganol* 'when the black army will have crossed the channel'.

- (81) Pa vezo an arme noar treuzet **ar ganol** ganti, ... e skoimp a-unan
 when will.be the army black crossed the channel by it

⁸ Some texts consistently use the postparticipial position for the subject, others frequently the preparticipial one for transitive subjects (i) (Hewitt 1988), still others even for intransitives and passives (Rezac 2004).

(i) a Biskoazh n'he doa gwelet **Naig** kement a gaoterioù o virviñ [...]
 Never NEG 3SGF had seen Naig so.many of cauldrons a-boiling
 b Biskoazh n'he doa **Naig** gwelet ken bras bag.
 Never NEG 3SGF had Naig seen so big boat (BY-AG: 388, 392)

When the black army well have traversed the channel, we will strike all together.

(LI-EK I: 147, cf. Urien 1989a: 210)

- (82) ... peogwir e oa hemañ troet **e gein** gantañ
 ... because R was this.one turned his back by.him
 ... because this one had turned his back

(BY-AG: 125)

The rest involve the *be*-copula. The first is of interest because if *lod all* were preverbal, the auxiliary would probably be *zo* as discussed later on.⁹ So *lod all* either is never in the right configuration to condition *zo*, or the choice of *zo* applies after the verb raises higher.

- (83) [Mar deus tud hag a zo inouus, ...]
 ez eus lod all eur blijadur tremen ganto eun eur pe ziou.
 is some others a pleasure pass.INF with.them an hour or two
 [If there are people that are annoying, ...] there are others that it is a pleasure to
 spend an hour or two with them.

(AF-HG: 110, see Urien 1989a: 210)

- (84) [Ha m'en dije gouzet mestr ar Vari Vorgan]
 e oa an den dianav-se **eur harr gamm** outañ!
 R was the man unknown-this a leg game to.him
 [And if the master of the M.M. knew] that this unknown man had a game leg!

(BY-TM: 46)

- (85) poltred diouti hec'h-unan [a zo Mari lorc'h enni gantañ]
 picture of herself R is Mari pride in.her with.it
 a picture of herself that Mary is proud of

(Guilliot 2006: 1894, data by M. Jouitteau from a native speaker from Carhaix)

- (86) Eur wech e oa, pe ne oa ket, ... hag e oa eun den e hano Mizerig.
 once there was, or was not ... there WAS a man his name M

(KI-ZM: 77)

One can imagine alternative analyses of these examples.¹⁰ It is worth noting that the usual naming-construction is like the last example save with the broad subject preverbal: *Ma merc'h-vihan a zo Viviana hec'h anv* 'my granddaughter R is Viviana her name' (EM-H: 75), *Me a zo Pèr Toullgoad va ano* 'I R is Pèr Toullgoad my name' (BY-TV: 48).

The second group has broad subjects at the edge of narrow subjects with the resumptive:

- (87) ma teufe ar c'haor **he bronnou** da ehana bera!
 so.that should.come the goat her teats to pause.INF drip.INF
 so that the goat's teats should ceasing dripping.

(KI-ZM: 103)

- (88) [... e oa aet Naig da bardon Itron Vari ar Joa_i]

⁹ M. Jouitteau p.c.

¹⁰ One might take the broad subject of the passives as narrow subject predicated of an adjectival participle phrase containing the narrow subject as the Ancient Greek accusative of respect, *troet e gein* 'turned [in respect to] his back' like *tuphlòs tòn noûn* 'blind [in] mind' (and so also some instances above, *hir e ziskouarn* 'long (of) his ears'). But there is no warrant for an accusative of respect, because unlike in Greek, the participle / adjectival phrases always contain a pronoun resumptive to a preceding noun in the clause.

- hag a zo houmañ **he chapel** savet du-hont
 who R is this.one_i her_i chapel raised over-there
 [N. had gone to the Pardon of Lady M. of Joy] whose chapel is raised over there
 (BY-AG: 366)
- (89) ... stag deus kumun Triagad hag a zo houmañ **hec'h iliz-parrez** ... diazezet war an uhel
 next to commune T. that R is this.one her church-parish set on the hill
 ... next to the commune of Triagat whose parish church is ... set on high
 (BY-AG: 9)
- (90) ... d'ar mare ma oa c'hoazh Napoleon III **e vazh impalaer** gantañ
 at a time that was still Napoleon III his sceptre imperial with.him
 at a time when Napoleon III still had his imperial sceptre
 (BY-AG: 28)

Here some broad subjects fitting this description are particularly low. In one (albeit oral) example, it follows the participle:

- (91) [Pa veze digoret klas, ober tro d'ar park tout, e ben]
 e peze troc'het da bark **an hanter de outañ** gant ar falz vihan
 R you.have cut your field a half from of.it with the sickle small
 [a-raok lakaat ar falc'herez e-barzh.]
 [Quand tu avais ouvert la coupe, fait le tour du champ,] eh ben tu avais coupé la
 moitié de ton champ avec la faucille [avant de mettre la faucheuse dedans.]
 (MP-BD: 34)

In others, it co-occurs with so-called long head movement of an infinitive and a participle before the verb, which seems to raise the highest postverbal element (Rezac 2004, Jouitteau 2005). The broad subject then ought to start out structurally below them.

- (92) Koueza 'reaz Loeiza **he meud** en he dorn.
 fall did Loeiza her thumb in her hand
 Loeiza became disillusioned (*thumb fall in hand* 'become disillusioned')
 (BY-TM: 132)
- (93) Kouezet e vije bet, sur-awalc'h, Jul Ferry **e veud** en e zorn...
 fallen R would.be been sure enough J. F. his thumb in his hand
 [Think of it, learn to read and write, at the cost of the state, in a school of the
 Republic if you please, a mother tongue that was not French? Well I never! Only
 in the head of an old *chouan* could such a thought arise.] Jules Ferry would have
 been disillusioned...
 (BY-AG: 95)

One might be tempted to analyse these examples quite differently, as [_{DP} broad subject [_{DP} narrow subject]], perhaps thinking of early Modern English *Pallas her glass* for *Pallas's glass* (Abbott 1884: §217), or Norwegian *Per sin bok* 'Per his book', German *dem Hans sein Buch* 'the Hans.DAT his book'. But such noun phrases should have a general distribution, *war ar c'haor he bronnoù* 'on the goat's teats', never found.

To end on a particularly fascinating postverbal broad subjects, the following two versions of the same sentence have a variety of analytical possibilities, depending on where the clausal boundaries are put and how the structure of the complement clause is analyzed

(cf. English ECM *I expect her veins to be boiling...*, control *I feel her veins PRO boiling ...*, prolepsis *I expect of grandma that her veins must be boiling...*).

- (94) a Santout 'ran Mamm-gozh he gwazhiennou o virviñ gant ar c'hoant flapiñ.
 feel I.do grandma her veins a-boiling with the desire to.chat
 I have a feeling that grandma's veins are boiling with the desire to chat.
 b Santout 'ran Mamm-gozh o virviñ he gwazhiennou gant ar c'hoant flapiñ.
 (EM-H: 46, published vs. PDF)

Agreement

Agreement in Breton comes is of three kinds with different properties and underlying mechanisms (Stump 1984, Jouitteau and Rezac 2006). In most contexts, both pre/post-verbal overt subjects co-occur with a 3SG verb, and only silent pronouns control other agreement suffixes. However, a negated verb agrees with a *preverbal* subject, by the same suffixes as elsewhere reflects a silent pronoun. The verb *have* is special: it always agrees with a subjects anywhere, at least in the Leoneg dialect. For all three scenarios, it may be asked whether broad subjects behave like narrow subjects.

Consider first broad subjects as silent pronouns coded by agreement suffixes. They do very rarely occur, but mostly for *have*, whose evidence is suspect as will be seen.

- (95) Hag a forz da chom da zelled outañ em-oa savet c'hoant ganin e brena.
 I-have risen desire with.me him buy
 And by staying to look at him, I came to want to buy it.
 (MM-M 2: 31)
- (96) N' he doa ket faotet dezi gwiska he botou-lèr o zalonou uhel-pik.
 NEG she-had not liked to.her put.on her boots-leather their heels high-very
 She did not want to to put on her leather boots with extra-high heels.
 (BY-TV: 121)
- (97) met biskoazh n' d-eus fellet dezhi mont war-gil
 but never NEG she-have liked to.her go a-back
 (EM-H: 52)

There are exceptional counter-examples of the sort below, an agreeing verb is shared by two conjuncts, and its agreement acts as the narrow subject of the first but the broad subject of the second. However, such sentence need not imply that the combination string combining the agreeing verb and the second conjunct is grammatical, *ne vijent ket bet lakaet an doenn warno*, any more than the English translation implies the grammaticality of **they have not been a roof put over them*. Rather, the full form of the silent part of the second conjunct might correspond only indirectly to the first via an ellipsis that ignores agreement, e.g. *ne vije ket bet lakaet an doenn warno* 'they NEG would.be.3SGS not been put the roof on them', in much the same way that the full form of the second conjunct in the English translation would be *a roof has not been put over them*.

- (98) ne vijent ket bet adreñket ha lakaet an doenn warno!
 NEG would.be.3SG not been restored and put the roof on.them

[What a pity] they have not been restored and a roof put over them!

(SV-PI: 262)

Perhaps quite different is the following 3SG verb followed by the 'echoic' pronoun, *hi*. In the Leonneg dialect and standard Breton, echoic pronouns are emphatic in meaning but enclitic to an agreeing verb or preposition, and a noun or participle with a possessor or object proclitic (Stump 1984, Timm 1994). However, in Kerneveg including BY, they need not be emphatic, not so closely dependent on agreement, and potentially at quite a distance from the verb (German 2007). Their historical antecedents did not depend on agreement and such uses remain, e.g. *ha lennet hi al leor* 'and [having] read **she** the book' (ME) (Jouitteau and Rezac forthc). So *hi* is a postverbal broad subject, but since it is 3SG it cannot be seen whether it is an agreeing one.

- (99) ... peogwir e oa-hi dija, heb gouzout dezhi, **he c'halon** o vont
 because R was-she already without knowing her heart a-going
 [level ur vlevenn gant froud didrec'hus ar garantez o tiwan]
 ... because her heart, without her knowing, was already going [like a hair with the
 unconquerable current of love growing]

(BY-AG: 193)

- (100) Ur saro gwenn; eo [a oa-hi t_i war he zro.]
 a robe white it.is R was-she on her round
 semi-lit. A read robe_i is (what) she.was t_i around her
 A red robe is what she had around her.

(*Piv a glevo*, H. ar Gall, 2003: 121, nonnative speaker)

The next agreement scenario is a broad subject before a negated verb other than *have*. Narrow subjects in this position agree, as if the negation forced pick-up by a pronoun to repair a movement violation, though one that does not seem to impose any interpretative restrictions (cf. Stump 1984, Schafer 1995, Jouitteau 2005).¹¹

- (101) a ar vugale [a lenn/*lennont] b ar vugale na [lennont/*lenn] ket
 the children R read/*read.they the children NEG read.they/*read not
 the children (who) read the children (who do) not read

Urien (1989a: 205) claims that this agreement cannot be controlled by a broad subject (or the head of a relative clause, the same configuration for him). The claim seems solid. The couple of exceptions below against scores of confirmations in the corpus again involve *have*. This contrast between broad and narrow subjects might bespeak a difference in their origin. If broad subjects originate within the sentential core but high enough not to move past negation, they would trigger no rescuing pronoun.

- (102) [Ar re n'o doa ket fuzuilhoù] ne deue/*deue-nt ket ganto **filc'hier**
 those who did not have guns NEG come/*come-they not with.them scythes
 Those who did not have guns brought scythes.

(Urien 1989a: 205)

- (103) ar hasted a zizaillo-ze n' o doa ket fellet dezo troha eeun
 the bitches of scissors NEG 3PL had not wanted to.them cut straight

¹¹ *Ne/na* is often dropped in speech, but it remains as 'lenition' of the first consonant of the verb.

those bitches of scissors did not want to cut straight

(EM-M: 16)

- (104) Hi, [hag he-doa karet kemend-all,] n'he doa ket fellet dezhi leuskel he relegou ganto
 she NEG 3SGF had not liked to.her leave her remains with.them
 She, [who had loved so much,] did not want to leave her remains with them [to honor].'

(HJ-MB: 132)

The final scenario is involves the verb *have*. *Have* is the only Breton verb to agree with both a preverbal and postverbal overt subject as well as a silent one. Hendrick (1988) claims that it also obligatorily agrees with a preceding broad subject:

- (105) a Plijet en/*o deus d'ar vugale sellout ouzh ar tele.
 pleased 3SG/*PL have to the children look at the TV
 b *Hiziv o deus plijet d'ar vugale sellout ouzh an tele.
 today 3PL have pleased to the children look at the TV
 c Ar vugale o deus plijet dezho/*da Ø sellout ouzh an tele
 the children 3PL have pleased to.them/*to look at the TV
 d Ar vugale o deus semblantet plijout dezho/*da sellout ouzh an tele
 the children 3PL have seemed to.please to.them/*to look at the TV
 (Hendrick 1988: 79, 81, 90)

However, in investigating the agreement of *have*, one must proceed with the utmost care. Consider the following apparent counter-example to Hendrick's generalization:

- (106) Neoazh ar soudarded n'en deus ket faotet dezhe ober netra [enep d'ar bobl]
 Still the soldiers NEG 3SGM-have not want to.them do anything
 Yet the soldiers did not want to do anything [against the people].
 (Loeiz Herrieu, letter, 6/6/1917)

The example is irrelevant because in the Gwenedeg dialect, where *have* fails to agree with overt 3rd person *narrow* subjects. This is true of much Tregereg and Kerneveg as well, optionally or obligatorily (Jouitteau and Rezac forthc), and Hendrick's data are from Kerneveg speakers. By contrast, in Leoneg and the literary standards based on it, *have* must agree. So the status of *have* agreement above is difficult to evaluate: it might be comparable to the prescriptive *whom* in *Whom does it seem is the best candidate?*, probably not part of core grammar (Lasnik and Sobin 2000). The same qualms apply to examples in the corpus where *have* agrees with a *pro*-dropped or pre-negation broad subject, as HJ, BY, and EM are all Kerneveg writers (and MM-M is an oral text).

A salient property of all these examples (save the one from MM-M) is that there is no narrow subject: the broad subject is added to the psych-unaccusatives *fellout*, *faotañ*, *plijout* 'like', with a clausal argument and prepositional phrase experiencer linked to the broad subject. This is an extremely common broad subject context, the only one of some. Rarer are configurations where the verb *have* has both a narrow and broad subject. For the majority of them, the narrow subject is a silent pronoun which must and does agree, pre-empting the broad subject. In the remaining few, sometimes there is no conflict, and once it is the broad subject that controls agreement:

- (107) Fañch e-neus **ar hi** aon razañ
 Fanch(M) 3SGM-has the dog(M) fear before.him

(Fave 1998: 50)

- (108) Va hoar-kaer Maragrid he-doa **he c'hoar** dimezet gand eul labourer er porz
 my sister-in-law M 3SGF-had her sister married with a labourer in.the port
 My sister in law's Margarid's sister had married with a labourer in the part
 (BC-SD: 189)

- (109) Martinika he deus **an dud** enni ar memez rikouriou
 Martinique(F) 3SGF have the people(MPL) in.her the same resources
 In Martinique people have the same resources [...]
 (FV-RM)

FV/Fave is a Leoneg writer, for whom the agreement of *have* should be robust, and for whom the narrow subject controls agreement in object fronting and resumptive relatives.

- (110) Fiziañs o-deus **an Tadou** __ en amzer da zond
 faith 3PL-have the fathers in time to come
 Faith the fathers have in time to come.
 (FV-RM)

- (111) eur groaz vraz hag o-deus **an dud** kalz devosion eviti.
 a cross big that 3PL-have the people lots devotion for.her
 a great cross that the people have a lot of devotion for.
 (FV-RM)

There are no conclusions to draw from such piecemeal data, only questions that are now more clearly formulated. One should eventually like to link any potential agreement of these configurations to agreement with the head in Middle Welsh relative clauses (Manning 2001: 308-9), keeping in mind that the agreement of preverbal and even postverbal subjects in that language is quite different from Breton (Willis 2003).

A configuration that might shed much light on matters is a broad subject with the infinitive of the verb *have* in the High Gwenedeg dialect where it has agreement morphology (Jouitteau and Rezac forthc). A narrow subject here may agree, as in the following example. Whether a broad subject could, giving *deusto d'ein em bout komzet mem breur d'ein* 'despite to.me 1SG have spoken my brother to.me', is wholly unknown.

- (112) Deusto d'ein em bout baléet é meur a gornad
 despite to.me 1SG to.be walked in many a corner
 (*Ar en deulin*, Y.-B. Kalloc'h, 1935: 147)

Forms of *be*

The last diagnostics grouping broad and narrow subjects against all else are the forms of *be* (Hendrick 1988; on *be*, see Kervella 1995: §206, Fave 1998: 63ff., Hewitt 1988, 2002, Favereau 1997: §441-3, German 2007). Of interest here are the forms of the present indicative in the presence of an overt subject in Leoneg, which depend on its position, definiteness, and the presence of a locative argument:

- (113) a Ar/ur vag (A) ZO er porzh / gwenn. [SU __]
 the/a boat (R) is outside / white

(MY-OF: 95, cf. MY-MI: 122)

These examples come from Leoneg, but Hendrick's observation is made on the basis of Kerneveg, where the relevant contrast also exists. Narrow subjects use *zo*, extracted objects must use *emañ/eo*, and broad subjects are allowed both:¹³

- (119) **Per** A ZO o klask Mona er c'hoad
Per R is PRG seek Mona in.the wood
Per is looking for Mona in the woods.

(Hendrick 1988: 105-6 note 2)

- (120) Per EMAÑ / *A ZO **Mona** o klask ___ er c'hoad.
Per is R is Mona PRG seek in.the wood
Mona is looking for Per in the woods.

(Hendrick 1988: 105-6 note 2)

- (121) Yann a zo / eo bet sentet outañ / komzet anezhañ gant ar vugale
Yann R is / is been obeyed to.him spoken of.him by the children
Yann was obeyed / talked about by the children

(Hendrick 1988: 84, 102 note 12)

- (122) Peogwir ar re-ze a zo [**moyen [da lakaad anezo]**] (...)
because these R is means to put them
Because these ones can be worn (no matter what the weather is).

(MM-M 11: 20)

If these contrasts hold true, broad and narrow subjects form an exclusive group for the *be*-alternation, and that makes for another property that makes them both subjects: for example, [Spec, TP] (cf. Hendrick 1988: 74-5, 85). Two consequences may be mentioned. First, whilst broad subjects in infinitives are rare, those followed by *a zo* are legion, and leave no doubt, for example, that a broad subject can be indefinite as in (21) or link to a deeply embedded resumptive as in (122). Second, broad subjects and heads of resumptive relatives may pattern alike for *be* and contrast with moved objects and heads of object-gap relatives, suggesting that resumptive relatives always involve (a copy of) the relative head in the double subject configuration, bearing out the parallelism of the two constructions highlighted by Urien (1989ab: 108-9), Fave (1998: 51).

Much investigation remains ahead to confirm the reality of the broad subject – moved object contrast. For instance, *zo* sometimes occur after moved objects, but apparently in analogues of English *tough* and purpose infinitives, which involve a silent pronoun:

- (123) Amañ **an traou** a zo diêz (OP) da zirouestla *pro*
here the things R is difficult to untangle
Here things are difficult to untangle.

(FA-M)

After broad subjects, even in the core Leoneg area, there is some rare vacillation not attributable to the factors enumerated by Urien (1989b), for example *Ar voulladenn-ze ez*

¹³ To be compared is that unlike in Leoneg, Hendrick (1988: 76) finds the *rannig* to vacillate after broad subjects, *Ma breur a breñin / e prenin al levr-se evitañ* 'My brother R will.buy the book-this for.him' (vs. *a^L* after moved objects). But see Urien (1989a, 1996) for a cautionary note: most varieties in Kerne and Treger seem to have lost the *a^L/e^M* distinction of Leoneg and of the literary norm.

eus enni 30 barzoneg 'the printing-this is in.it 30 poems' (MY-YK), *Te ez eus arhant ganez, Jobig?* 'You is money with.you, J?' (MM-M 3: 31), *An iliz-parrez a welom bremañ eo bet savet he zour gand ar houarnamant saoz* 'The parish church we see now is(=has) been raised her tower with the British government' (SV-PI: 255). *Eo/emañ* for *zo* is well-noted for Tregereg-Kerneveg (Gros 1984: 294-6, 301, Fave 1998: 51 citing Le Clerc 1908: 153, Favereau 1997: §442, Trépos 2001: 214, Plourin 2000, Hendricks above). It may be that only *a zo* marks the double subject construction, and *ez eus / eo / emañ* one of the alternatives such as a cleft or a dislocation (cf. Stephens: 1982: 27-31).

Conclusion

It seems likely that there exists in Breton a true double subject construction, whose broad subject has some of the subjecthood properties otherwise reserved to the narrow subject. Beyond the affirmation, only a rudimentary conclusions may be drawn, a scaffold for further inquiry – what verbs appear in the infinitival double subject construction, what readings are available postverbally to a broad subject, how agreement treats it.

There remain likewise other potential correlates of subjecthood to explore. It may be that overt narrow and broad subjects pattern together in licensing echoic pronouns in the absence of agreement (Jouitteau and Rezac 2006: 1941, ARBRES s.v. *Les pronoms echo*). The echoic *ni* can certainly pick up the narrow subject in a sentence like *ni zo-ni laouen* 'we are-we happy' or *ni yae-ni da welout ar saout* 'we went-we to see the cows', at least in Gwenedeg, and probably not the fronted object, *ni yaent(*-ni) da welout* 'us(obj) went.they(*-us) to see'. As for broad subjects, the corpus seems not to have a single instances of *ni zo-ni laouen hor c'hoar* 'we is-we happy our sister', but nothing can be concluded from silence. Floating quantifiers might provide a similar diagnostic, licensed by the broad subject in *An aotrou person a grie abalamour ar merhed a veze toud sakochou ganto en overenn* 'The lord priest R cried because the girls R were all bags with.them at the mass.' (MM-M 3: 6)

Finally, there may be considerable dialectal variation in the double subject construction. Virtually all the good evidence for the subjecthood of the broad subject comes from Leoneg and Kerneveg writers. Little Gwenedeg is included in the corpus, but Tregereg has a good presence. Other asymmetries suggest there is something to be looked into here, notably the frequent use of *eo/emañ* in Tregereg for Leoneg *zo* mentioned in the last section. Broad subjects with control infinitives occur mostly with Leoneg writers, postverbal broad subjects linked to a possessor of an adjacent narrow subject with Kerneveg authors. More certainly, Guillevic and Le Goff (1986: 138) observe that in Gwenedeg the double subject construction *Pièr e zou milén é vlèu* 'Peter R is yellow his hair' is avoided for pronouns, *me zou milén mem blèu* 'I is yellow my hair', where it is very common elsewhere. There are many potential correlates: absence of the *ez eus* copula outside Leon, unemphatic character of overt pronouns in SVO in Gwenedeg and Kerneveg, the prevalence of neutral SVO in Gwenedeg only. As time runs out on the old richness of the Breton dialects, there is a "Last Chance to See".

References

- ARBRES: Vers un Atlas numérique des variations dialectales du breton en syntaxe. <http://makino.linguist.jussieu.fr/ARBRES/>.
- Abbott, E. A. 1884. *A Shakespearian grammar*. London: McMillan and Co.
- Borsley, Robert D., Maggie Tallerman, and David Willis. 2007. *The syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borsley, Robert D., and Janig Stephens. 1989. Agreement and the position of subjects in Breton. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 407-427.
- Chung, Sandra, and James McCloskey. 1987. Government, barriers, and small clauses in Modern Irish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 173-237.
- Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 1999. Filling and licensing multiple specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist approaches*, ed. David Adger, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett, and George Tsoulas, 69-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fave, Visant. 1998. *Notennou yezadur*. Emgleo Breiz. [= FV in corpus]
- Favereau, Frances. 1997. *Grammaire du breton contemporain*. Morlaix: Conseil Général du Finistère.
- German, Gary. 2007. Language shift, diglossia, and dialect variation in Western Brittany: The case of Southern Cornouaille. In *The Celtic languages in contact*, ed. Hildegard L. C. Tristram, 146-192. Potsdam: Potsdam University Press.
- Gros, Jules. 1984. *Le trésor du breton parlé*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz – Brud Nevez.
- Guilliot, Nicolas. 2006. A top-down analysis for reconstruction. *Lingua* 116: 1888-1914.
- Guillevic, August, and Pierre Le Goff. 1986 [1902] *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Brest: Ar Skol Vrezoneg - Emgleo Breiz.
- Hemon, Roparz. 1995. *Breton grammar*. Translated, adapted, and revised by Michael Everson. Dublin: Everson Gunn Teoranta.
- Hemon, Roparz. 2000. *Yezhadur istorel ar brezhoneg*. Plañvour: Hor Yezh.
- Hendrick, Randall. 1988. *Anaphora in Celtic and Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hewitt, Steve. 1988. Un cadre pour la description de la syntaxe verbale du breton. *La Bretagne Linguistique* 4: 203-11.
- Hewitt, Steve. 2002. The impersonal in Breton. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 7: 1-39.
- Hingat, Jean. 1868. *Éléments de la grammaire bretonne*. Tréguier: A. Le Flem.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2005. La syntaxe comparée du breton. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Nantes.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac. 2006. Deriving the Complementarity Effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement. *Lingua* 116: 1915-1945.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie, and Milan Rezac. forthcoming. From *mihi est* to *have* across Breton dialects. In *Proceedings of Incontro di Grammatica Generativa XXXIV*, ed. Federico Damonte.
- Kervella, Frances. 1995 [1945]. *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*. La Baule: Skridoù Breizh.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Nicolas Sobin. 2000. The *who-whom* puzzle: On the preservation of an archaic feature. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 343-371.
- Manning, H. Paul. 2001. Typology, history, and tetratology. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

- McCloskey, James. 1983. Raising, Subcategorization and Selection in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 441–485.
- McCloskey, James, and Peter Sells. 1988. Control and A-chains in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 143-189.
- McCloskey, James. 2001. The distribution of subject properties in Irish. Ms.
- McCloskey, James. 2005. Resumption. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 4, case 55. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mittendorf, Ingo, and Louisa Sadler. 2008. NP would like to meet GF: A Welsh adjectival construction. In *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*, ed. Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. Stanford: CSLI.
- Ó Baoill, Dónall, and Hideki Maki. 2007. A Paradox in Interaction of A and A' Chain Formation in Modern Irish. Paper presented at the Fifth Celtic Linguistic Conference, Plas Gregynog, September 7-9, 2007.
- Plourin, Jean-Yves. 2000. *Initiation au breton familier et argotique*. Crozon: Armeline.
- Rezac, Milan. 2004. The EPP in Breton: An uninterpretable categorial feature. In *Triggers*, ed. Henk van Riemsdijk and Anne Breitbarth, 451-492. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008. Building and interpreting a nonthematic A-position: A-resumption in English and Breton. Ms., UMR 7023.
- Schafer, Robin. 1995. Negation and verb second in Breton. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 135-172.
- Stephens, Janig. 1982. Word order in Breton. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.
- Stephens, Janig. 1990. Non-finite clauses in Breton. In *Celtic linguistics*, ed. Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe and Jenny Rowland, 151-165. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1984. Agreement vs. incorporation in Breton. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 289-348.
- Timm, Lenora A. 1994. Pronominal *a*-forms in Breton: a discourse-based analysis. *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 4: 1-34.
- Tallerman, Maggie. 1997. Infinitival clauses in Breton. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 42: 205-233.
- Trépos, Pierre. 2001. *Grammaire bretonne*. Brest: Brud Nevez.
- Troude, Amable. 1886. *Nouveau dictionnaire pratique français et breton*. Brest: Lefournier. [= TA in corpus]
- Urien, Jean-Yves. 1989a. *La trame d'une langue, le Breton: Présentation d'une théorie de la syntaxe et application*. Lesneven: Mouladurioù Hor Yezh.
- Urien, Jean-Yves. 1989b. Le verbe "bezañ" et la relation médiante. *Klask* 1: 101-128.
- Urien, Jean-Yves. 1999. Statut morphologique de la particule verbale. In *Breizh ha pobloù europa* [Supplements of *Klask*], 645-676. Rennes: Hor Yezh and Klask.
- Willis, David. 2003. The diachrony of Brythonic Celtic syntax. In *The syntax of Welsh*, ed. Robert Borsley, Maggie Tallerman, and David Willis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corpus

Systematically investigated corpus (native speakers), annotated by hand, in intention exhaustively (* marks incomplete). More details about individual writers are to be found on the site ARBRES. Marked as such are transcripts of oral performances or interviews. Abbreviations: L Leoneg, K Kerneveg (b Bigouden, k Kap), T Tregereg, G Gwenedeg.

| Code | Author | Title | Year | Author's origin |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| AF-M | Abeozen, F. | <i>Ar mabinogion</i> | 1991 ['25-] | [L (Dre Nevez)] |
| AF-M | Abeozen, F. | <i>Hervelina Geraouel*</i> | 1943 | [L (Dre Nevez)] |
| BY-TV | Bijer, Y. | <i>Trêz ar Vari-Vorgan</i> | 2003 | [Kb (Lec'hiagad)] |
| BY-AG | Bijer, Y. | <i>Avel Gornôg</i> | 2007 | [Kb (Lec'hiagad)] |
| BC-SD | Briant-Cadiou, Y. | <i>E skeud daou dour ar barrez</i> | | |
| DA-EP | Dizuet, A. | <i>Eñvorenou ur prizoniad</i> | 1980 | [T (Roche-Derrien)] |
| DBL-AP | Dastum, ed. | <i>Amañ 'z eus plijadur</i> | 2003 | [L, oral] |
| DY-DI | Drezen, Y. | <i>An dour en-dro d'an inizi</i> | 1972 ['31] | [Kb (Pont L'Abbé)] |
| DY-SBA | Drezen, Y. | <i>Sizhun ar breur Arturo</i> | 1990 ['49] | [Kb (Pont L'Abbé)] |
| EM-DM | Ewen, M. | <i>Danevellou merhed-bihan Ana</i> | 1987 | [K (Scaer)] |
| EM-H | Ewen, M. | <i>Hañvezhioù</i> | 2004 | [K (Scaer)] |
| EM-MM | Ewen, M. | <i>Ar mor, a-dreñv ar menez...</i> | 1993 | [K (Scaer)] |
| FV-RM | Fave, V. | <i>War roudou are misionerien*</i> | 1989 | [L (Cléder)] |
| GY-SK | ar Gow, Y. | <i>E skeud tour bras Sant Jermen</i> | 1978 ['55] | [T (Pleiben)] |
| GP-EE | Gouedig, P., ed. | <i>Eñvoriou tud Enez Eusa</i> | 1984 | [L (Eusa), oral/ed.] |
| HJ-ML | Helias, J. | <i>Marh al lorh 1, 2*</i> | 2002 ['75] | [Kb (Pouldreuzic)] |
| HJ-MB | Helias J. | <i>Mojennou Breizh</i> | 2001 | [Kb (Pouldreuzic)] |
| JK-KO | Jezevou, K. | <i>E korn an oaled</i> | 1992 ['23] | [K (Gwineventer)] |
| KF-DG | Kervella, F. | <i>Dindan gouriz ar bed*</i> | 1985 | [K (Dirinon)] |
| KI-ZM | Krog, I. | <i>Ur zac'had marvailhou</i> | 1924 | [Kk] |
| KJ-RT | Kerrien, J. | <i>Ar Roc'h Toull</i> | 2000 ['24] | [L (St. Thégonnec)] |
| KY-D | Kalloc'h, Y.-B. | <i>Ar en deulin</i> | 1935 | [G (Groix)] |
| LF-B | al Lay, F. | <i>Bilzig</i> | 1925 | [T (Locquirec)] |
| LL-BJ | Leclerc, L. | <i>Ma beaj Jeruzalem*</i> | 1997 ['03] | [T] |
| LI-EK | Lan, I. | <i>Emgann Kergidu</i> | 1977 ['77] | [L (Plounévez-Loch.)] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 1</i> | 1990 | [L (Gorre), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 2</i> | 1990 | [L (Bro Bagan), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 3</i> | 1998 | [L (Goueled), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 5</i> | 1998 | [L (Cléder), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 8</i> | 1993 | [L, oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 11</i> | | [K (Traoñ), oral] |
| MM-M | Madeg, M., ed. | <i>Marvailloù 13</i> | 1994 | [K (Menezioù), oral] |
| MP-BD | Mellouet, P. | <i>Blaz an douar</i> | 2001 | [L, oral] |
| MY-OH | Miossec, Y. | <i>O haloupad war henchou</i> | 1987 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-DM | Miossec, Y. | <i>Dreist ar mor bras</i> | 1981 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-FB | Miossec, Y. | <i>O foeta bro er hanada</i> | 1981 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-MI | Miossec, Y. | <i>Mond da Izrael</i> | 1991 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-TE | Miossec, Y. | <i>Tammou eñvorenou</i> | 1994 | [L (Guiclan)] |
| MY-YK | Miossec, Y. | <i>Yann-Ber Kalloh</i> | | [L (Guiclan)] |
| ME-PG | le Moal, E. | <i>Pipi gonto</i> | 2002 [1902-] | [T (Coadout)] |
| PJ-ZB | Priel, J. | <i>Va zammig buhez</i> | 1975 ['55] | [T (Priel)] |
| RY-EB | Riou, Y. | <i>Envoriou eur beizantez</i> | 1995 | [L (Milizac), oral/ed.] |
| RJ-GW | Riou, J. | <i>Geotenn ar Werc'hez</i> | 1957 ['28] | [T (Lothey)] |
| RN-M | Rozmor, N. | <i>Ar mestr</i> | 1988 | [L (Rosco)] |
| SV-MR | Seite, V. | <i>Ar marh reiz</i> | 1985 | [L (Cléder)] |
| SV-PI | Seite, V. | <i>O pourmen dre Vreizh-Izel 2</i> | 1998 | [L (Cléder)] |
| SJ-BK | Skragn, J.-M. | <i>Ma buhez e ker ar Vinaoued</i> | 2002 | [Ku (Huelgoat)] |
| TP-LA | Trépos, P. | <i>Lod all a varv...</i> | 2001 [c. '60] | [Kb (Plozévet)] |
| TA-LW | Troude, A., | <i>Labous ar wirionez</i> | 1950 ['70] | [L (Brest)] |

Appendix: Mimicks

In reporting the four properties of the double subject construction, certain structures were set aside because although they resemble it and may have that analysis in Breton, they also have parallels in English and French where they are analyzed quite differently.

(i) Secondary predicate expressed in English by *with*-phrases or by *have*, but in French sometimes as bare AP secondary predicates of *be*. Some resemble internal broad subjects:

(124) Me am eus aour hag arc'hant leiz ma godelloù!
 I 1SG have gold and money full my pockets
 I have my pockets full of gold and money!
 cf. French: J'ai de l'or et d'argent plein mes poches!
 (UF-KB 1: 156)

(125) marh ar roue a ziwade leiz e fri
 horse of.the king R bled full his nose
 the king's horse's nose wall bleeding a lot
 (HJ-MB:163)

(126) [A-boan m'en doa lakaet ar Rusian kentañ e dreid war alez veur ar c'hamp]
 ma voe an holl brizonidi all o fri e toull ar prenestr
 that were the all prisoners other their nose in hole of window
 [Barely had the first Russian put his feet on the great alley of the field] that all the
 other prisoners had their noses in the window.
 cf. French: Je suis/reste le/*mon nez à la fenêtre.
 (DA-EP: 55).

Some resemble agreeing broad subjects:

(127) hag e chom-is **va fri** war ar gloued
 and R stayed-I my nose on.the fence
 and I stayed with my nose on the fence (i.e. watching others depart)
 cf. French: Je suis resté le nez collé à la barrière
 (DA-EP: 78)

(128) ma chom-en sabaturet ha digor **ma genou** da sellet outo.
 so stayed-I amazed and open my mouth to look at.them
 So I stayed amazed and with my mouth open to look at them.
 cf. French: Je suis resté la bouche ouverte
 (GY-ST: 164)

(129) Bet on bet oc'h embauchiñ er porched e Kastell,
 e vez-ent tout **ur pech** war o brec'h
 R were-they all a hoe on their arms
 Je suis allé embaucher sous le porche à Sait-Pol. Ils avaient tous une houe sous le
 bras
 (MP-BD: 140)

(130) en eur lavared dezañ; e oa; jalouz hag aon ennañ;

in telling to.him R was jealous and fear in.him
 in telling him that he was jealous and afraid

(FV-PV 2: 155)

Such secondary predication exists in Breton quite independently of the double subject construction, as in the following example where *Enoret* is the narrow subject of the main predicate, predicated of an AP containing its own subject:

(131) ne oa ket dereat distrei d'ar Roc'h Toull goullou hor godellou
 NEG was not proper return to the R T empty our pockets
 ce n'était pas correct de retourner au Roc'h Toull avec nos poches ... vides
 (KJ-RT: 86)

(132) Ne oa ket deuet an Enoret goullou e zaouarn gantañ
 NEG was not come the Enoret empty his hands with him
 Enoret did not come empty-handed.
 (BY-AG: 50)

(133) Nondedyah, p' he-doa gwelet he hlujar drebet eun askel dezi
 when 3SGF-had seen her chicken eaten a winng to.her
 when she had see her chicken with its wing eaten
 (MM-M: 17)

Of particular frequency is *X mond/mond [diaes/teñval X's benn]* 'X goes/comes [= becomes] uneasy / dark[=angry] X's head', where the bracketed constituent might be a secondary predicate of the type *his nose to the window*. Simplex examples without broad subjects are *Setu perak ez a diaes e benn*, 'that's why R goes.he uneasy his head', *Diaes e benn, an Tunk a yae dre ruioù Ploueskad...* 'uneasy his head, the Tunk R went through [the] streets of Ploueskad' (LI-EK)

(134) Ken ha mar doa deuet Soaz [PRO da vond diêz he fenn], diêz [PRO da goll he fenn].
 Until S's head became worried, worried to lose her head.
 (MM-M 1: 30)

(135) An Tunk ivez 'ta a dlee bezañ diaes e_i benn[, ha setu perak ez eas a-du gant ar Republikaned.]
 The Tunk [sc. someone who had lost his possessions to the priests] also had to be worried in his head [and that's why he agreed with the Rrepublicans].
 (LI-EK I:178).

(136) Ha Fantig en eur e lenn dond da veza teñval he fenn ha lavared d'ar roue:
 and Fantig reading come to be dark her head and say to the king
 (JK-KO)

(137) Ar roue kêz, pa welas, a deuas da veza teñval e benn [ha d'en em jala forz].
 the king poor, when he.saw, R came to be dark his head [and ...]
 (JK-KO)

(ii) When a broad subject rather than an argument apparently controls PRO, itself a broad subject or not, it is not possible to ensure that there is involved a PRO under obligatory control by an argument, and so an alternative analysis is available: e.g. *the car had.to.be PRO broken an axle to.it* may instead be *the car had.to.be an axle_i PRO_i be broken t_i to.it* with extraposition of *an axle*, or alternatively simply a failure of *an axle* to raise or PRO

being expletive, *the car had.to.be (PRO=expl) be broken an axle to.it*. Of this type are the following:

- (138) An eil, pelloh, er memez tu, e daou pe dri dachadig all, bihannoh c'hoaz, izel war gostez an dorgenn, lakeet enno plant olivez yaouank, glaz o deliou, gand tud eur hibbutz en em staliet a nevez 'zo hag a dle beza kuzet **o zeltennou pe o habanennou**, eur pennad euz an hent, uhelloh en eun draonienn striz.
by folk of a kibbutz newly installed that must be PRO hidden **their tents** ...
(MY-MI: 149)
- (139) Ar stankou-ze, diouz ma veze, a ranke beza cheñchet **plas dezo** beb an amzer.
The pools-these, as it was, R had.to.be be changed place to.them now-and-then.
(VS-MR: 77)
- (140) Ar harr evid d'e rojou trei brao, heb ober re a drouz, a ranke **e ahel** beza lardet aliez a-walh.
the car despite to his wheels turn well, without doing too.much of noise, R had.to.be its axle be greased often enough.
(VS-MR: 28)
- (141) ez eus amañ, peadra, evid Juloded Sant-Tegonec, da veza lorh enno [...]
is here what for J S T to be pride in.them
there is enough here for the Julods (rich folk) of S-T to be proud of
(SV-PV 2: 130)

Similarity:

- (142) Diouz an noz, arabad eo beza pres warnor o hortoz koan: 8 eur, 9 eur...
at night forbidden is be haste on.one a-waiting dinner: 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock
(FV-RM)

The frequent locution *heb gouzoud da X* 'without know to X', i.e. 'without X knowing', belongs here.

(iii) Quantifiers picking up the narrow subject, whether they precede or follow:

- (143) Holl e oa jalous outi ar merc'hed yaouank [hag ivez ar gwrazez a oa eno].
all R was jealous to.her the women young
The young women were all jealous of her [and also the women that were there].
(UF-KB 1: 225)
- (144) Gwelloc'h e ve de-omp, bremañ, mont pep hini deus e du...
better R would.be to-us, now, go each one from his side
It would be better for us, now, to go each in his (own) direction...
(BY-AG: 342)

Floating quantifiers can even include a pronominal link:

- (145) The Homeric infinitives, *ídmén* and *ídménai*, and *eidénai* are **none of them** inherited[.]
(Sihler 1995: 573).
- (146) Ar pont a-raok hag ar pont a-dreñv a oa **pep a doull enno** evit diskenn

the bridge before and the bridge behind R was each a hole in.them for descending
 (BY-AG: 288f.)
 The following would seem an internal broad subject, if not for the French analogue:

- (147) Setu e veze, evel-se, pep hini he zro da dommañ ar re all
 thus R was, thus, each one her turn to warm the others
 C'était (à) chacune son tour de chauffer les autres
 (BY-AG: 265)

Unclear is:

- (148) Ha bremañ ez eus moteurien toud enno
 and now R is motors all in.them
 And now there are motors in all of them.
 (MM-M 8: 28)

(iv) Pronominal *a*-forms picking up the narrow subject in negative clauses, a different phenomenon (Timm 1994, German 2007):

- (149) Honnez n'he-deus ket greet sin ar groaz anezi [a-raog treuzi ar ster!]
 she NEG 3SGF has not made sign the cross her
 She had not made the sign of the cross before crossing the river!
 (MM-M 11: 32)

So irrelevant to broad subjects are the fascinating:

- (150) Med hi 'lavar: "gwelloh deom ni ahanom mond da Gemper da glask ahanom, ni
 mond da di Andre."
 But she says: "better to.us us us go to Kemper to search [for things] us, us go to
 [the] house [of] Andre [sc. a department store]."
 (MM-M 11: 19)

- (151) Disadorn e oam bet ahanom e-barz Kemper c'hoaz
 Saturday R were.we been us in Kemper again
 (MM-M 11: 19)

- (152) [Setu, a-benn diou eur nemed kard bennag]
 e oa degouezet ahanom e-barz Kemper avad.
 [So, at about 13:45] R was arrived us in Kemper indeed.
 (MM-M 11: 20)

(v) There are very rare instances in the spontaneous oral corpus only where the broad subject might be repeating the preposition of its pronominal link (though it is not excluded that *e-barz ar re-ze en enno* is a possible constituent):

- (153) Hag a-benn 'zo glao oh ober, e-barz ar re-ze ne chom ket **an dour** en enno, kwa.
 and when is rain a-doing inside these NEG stays not the water in in.them
 And when it's raining, in these water doesn't stay in them.
 (MM-M 11: 20)

- (154) D'an neb a dlee dont er sal pe er gambr o diskoueze dezhañ.
 To whoever R ought come into.the hall or into.the room, he them showed to.him
 (AF-M: 177)

