



HAL
open science

The Breton Inflectional Impersonal

Mélanie Joutteau, Milan Rezac

► **To cite this version:**

Mélanie Joutteau, Milan Rezac. The Breton Inflectional Impersonal. *Dialectologia*, 2015, Syntactic variation in western european languages, from the noun phrase to clause structure, 5, pp.261–292. hal-02553895

HAL Id: hal-02553895

<https://univ-pau.hal.science/hal-02553895>

Submitted on 17 May 2022

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

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

*The Breton inflectional impersonal**

Milan Rezac, Mélanie Jouitteau
IKER, UMR 5478, CNRS

Abstract: The subject agreement inflection of the Breton verb distinguishes six person-number forms and a seventh impersonal form. The impersonal has the generic and arbitrary uses of the class best studied for Germanic *man*, French *on*, and Romance *se/si*, as well as its Irish cognate. We take up two remarkable aspects of the Breton impersonal. One is recent dialectal extensions of the impersonal morphology to prepositional and nominal inflections, completing the otherwise thoroughgoing parallelism of these three systems characteristic of Breton and related languages. In the theory of impersonals, the extensions have the potential to shed light on the limitation of this class of impersonals to subjects. Our second focus is the phi-features of the impersonal in anaphoric dependencies. Breton bolsters the generalisation that this class of impersonals is deficient in phi-features and thereby unable to antecede personal pronouns. However, recent dialectal developments have resulted in grammars where different personal pronouns have become impersonals, and their convergence has created systems where the impersonal antecedes a remarkably wide but still limited range of pronouns. Our study aims to cover the rich but partial descriptions of these phenomena over the Modern Breton period, bolstered by corpus examples, and to extend it by a pilot study of current native speaker competence.

1 Introduction

There are different "impersonal" expressions in Breton.¹ All varieties have arbitrary PRO and the implicit agent of the passive. All also have 2nd person generic pronouns, (1). Most but not all use the cardinal *unan* 'one' as a generic impersonal pronoun, (2). Outside NW-Leon, *an den* 'the person' tends to be grammaticalised in a similar meaning: in (3), it occurs in a position otherwise unavailable to definites (Jouitteau 2015; ARBRES: impersonnel).²

- (1) *Petra e v-malec'h gant ar vilin-se?*
what R grind.2p with the grinder-that
What can you grind with that grinder? (Evenou 1987: 581)

* We thank the audiences of the 7th Celtic Linguistics Conference (Rennes, June 2012), Workshop on Impersonals (Paris, November 2012), and WEDISYN (Madrid, 2014), the editors, a helpful and keen-eyed reviewer, and the generosity of native speakers we have consulted. This research was partially supported by the projects *Towards a typology of human impersonal pronouns* (ANR-11-FRAL-0011), *ATheME* (GA 61345), and *Towards a theory of syntactic (micro)variation: Basque and beyond* (FFI2014-51878-P).

¹ Overviews of Breton may be found in Press (2010), including a dialectal sketch, for which also helpful is Hewitt (2002). In citations and the bibliography, we indicate broad dialectal affiliation by combining a compass rose indicator with traditional bishopric terminology, e.g. W-, SW-, and S-Kerne for western Kerne (interfacing with Leon), SW Kerne (Bigouden), and S Kerne (interfacing with Gwened); the "central zone" is a distinctive zone localised in eastern Kerne with adjacent parts of Treger and Gwened. We append ° to sources specifically describing a particular dialect. Data from our elicitations with is coded {Initial.Session}. A and Y are a couple from Kerlouan living in Lesneven, NW-Leon. A-M is from Plougastell-Daoulas and L from Cast, both W-Kerne. B is from Bannalec, S-Kerne/Gwened. French data are M. Jouitteau's unless referenced.

² Glosses indicate person-number inflection by person and number, e.g. 1s for 1st person singular, but independent pronominal morphemes as pronouns; the verbal base indicates tense, e.g. *is* vs. *was*; after *is/was*, (H) is habitual, (S) individual-level, (L) stage-level or locative, bare *is/was* a special invariant form, see section 2; R is a preverbal particle, NEG is the first element of a bipartite negation, REFL is the reflexive-reciprocal clitic.

- (2) *Skoet e vez unan...*
 hit R is(H).3s one
 One is shocked ... (Seite 1998:38)
- (3) *Ben 'vez (an nen) klañv (Yann), ne vez ket gwelet ken.*
 when is(H).3s the man sick Yann NEG is(H).3s not seen anymore
 When a person/Yann is ill, he is seen no more. {B. 2009/1}

Here we are concerned with an impersonal that joins the six person-number inflections of the finite verb as a seventh member, the *-r* inflection in (4), and its counterparts in prepositional and nominal inflection.

- (4) *Arabat klask rebech d'ar re all, pa ne vezer ket didamall.*
 forbid search reproach to the ones other when NEG is(H).IMP not blameless
 One must not seek to reproach others when one is not blameless oneself. {A.Q1,2}

This impersonal in Breton belongs to a distinctive class of impersonals we will call ρ -impersonals, including French *on* that we use to illustrate. They have the following properties.³

- (I-a) Both *generic* and *arbitrary* uses. The generic use (5) occurs in the scope of quantifiers like *often* or the silent generic operator. The ρ -impersonals covaries with the quantifier in the manner of a weak indefinite or bare noun and pronominal anaphora to them to give rise to *quantificational variability*. The arbitrary use (6) occurs elsewhere. It is translatable by a weak indefinite or bare noun, or by a universal, and pronominal anaphora to them.⁴

- (5) *A Douarnenez, quand on_i apprend le breton, on_i l'apprend Ø/souvent à ses_i amis.*
 In Douarnenez, when **people** learn Breton, **they** Ø/often teach it to **their** friends.
 → All/Many who learn Breton teach it to their friends. (*quantificational variability*)
- (6) *On_i m'a dit qu'on_{i/k} ne s'est pas accordé les uns avec les autres.*
i: **People**_i told me that **they**_i did not agree with each other.
k: I was told_{agent=i} that **people**_k did not agree with each other.

- (I-b) *Specific* uses. These are found with some but not all ρ -impersonals, and have the properties of a personal pronoun. French *on* a specific use with the properties of the older 1p subject clitic *nous*, which it mostly replaces. In (5), *on* can be focus doubled by the strong pronoun 1p *nous* as *nous on*, and the anaphor *ses* can be 1p *notre*, changing the translation to 'we ... our'.⁵

- (II) *Reduced referentiality* on non-specific uses. Here we focus on absence of person and number phi-features, which makes an impersonal neutral about them and prevents anaphoric relationships to expressions specified for them. In (5), *on* can range over the speaker and

³ For the class and its differentiation from generic and arbitrary impersonals, see Cinque (1988), Egerland (2003), Malamud (2012), and literature there. For reasons of space, we are minimal about the theory of and literature on ρ -impersonals; both are more fully discussed in Rezac and Joutteau (2015), henceforth R&J. There is no fixed term for the class: we use ρ -impersonal for its similarity to larger *r*-impersonal class of the typological literature (Siewierska 2011).

⁴ The terms *generic* and *arbitrary* are standard (Egerland 2003). *Generic* includes all adverbial quantification, including when it does not support generic impersonals, *Yesterday afternoon, if people/#you sent me an email, I answered within the hour*. Determiner quantifiers with ρ -impersonals are less understood; see R&J.

⁵ See Kayne (2010: chapter 7), R&J for the 1p behavior of French *on*, Cinque (1988) for Italian *si*.

addressee as well as third parties, unlike *ils* 'they' or *nous* 'we' in its place, and likewise over atoms or pluralities. The anaphoric *on* and *son* in these examples cannot be replaced by a fully phi-specified pronoun such as 3p *leur* 'their'. ρ -impersonals are not as referentially reduced as the implicit agent of the passive, for they can form anaphoric dependencies with phi-reduced expressions: in these examples, with the *s*-pronoun *ses*, lacking number, and the reciprocal, lacking person.⁶

(III) *Pronominal status* for Condition C.

(IV) Other restrictions partly under debate: to *humans*; to *subjects*; in arbitrary uses to *agents*.

ρ -impersonals may be contrasted with generic impersonals like English *one* and generic 2nd person, limited to certain generic contexts: **One learned Breton*. ρ -impersonals may also be contrasted with arbitrary impersonals like arbitrary *they* that cannot vary with quantifiers. To a good first approximation, ρ -impersonals behave as if both weak indefinites or bare nouns and anaphora to them, and semantic approaches to them usually pursue this parallelism (e.g. Chierchia 1995, Mendikoetxea 2008, R&J).

ρ -impersonals have diverse origins and morphosyntax. Of the two best-studied types, one originates in bare singular nouns meaning *person*: cognates of Germanic *man* and of French *on*. Grammaticalisation has led to pronominal status and partial loss of phi-features (Giacalone Ramat and Sansò 2007). The other has followed a wholly different path, that of reflexive clitics from transitives to inchoatives to passives to impersonals, giving Romance and Slavic *si/se* impersonals (Giacalone Ramat and Sansò 2011, Meyer 2010). Among ρ -impersonals, there are minimal contrasts on the specific use: Italian *si* has a 1p specific use like *on*, but its Spanish cognate *se* has none. Most known ρ -impersonals resolutely have the human and subject restrictions in (IV), and some resistance to non-agentive arbitrary uses.

In what follows, we characterise the Breton ρ -impersonal, starting from its clearest instance, the verbal inflections, proceeding to their recent expansion to prepositional inflection, and to recruitment of the definite article *ar* as an impersonal pronoun. Our focus is the history of and variation on these developments, and their contribution to the debated properties in (IV). We then study phi-incompleteness (V) through anaphoric relations.

2 Verbal inflection

The Breton finite verb inflects for six subject person-number combinations given in Table 1. The impersonal is the seventh member of this paradigm. Morphologically, the impersonal inflexion is *-r* in the present and future, *-d* in the preterite (literary), imperfect, and conditional present and past. In Breton, agreement inflections appear only under *pro*-drop or doubled by *emphatic enclitic* pronouns, while full DPs combine with the uninflected form in a phenomenon known as the *complementarity effect*. The impersonal has no pronominal or other counterpart outside the inflection. Table 1 also gives parallel prepositional and nominal systems, which we take up later, and the object proclitic system that now mostly remains only in NW-Leon and SE-Gwened varieties. There are minor asymmetries between the systems that do not concern us here; one worth noting is that among full DPs count strong pronouns, but strong pronouns can only occur in the preverbal position and so are never prepositional objects or possessors.⁷

⁶ We establish these properties of *on* and their implication in limits on anaphoric dependencies in R&J. Other aspects of reduced referentiality involve for instance neutrality about novelty-familiarity and maximality.

⁷ The complementarity effect and emphatic enclitics in Breton are discussed in Anderson (1982), Stump (1984,

Table 1: Breton inflectional morphology (standard, save developments in →)

	V + subject	object + V	possessor + N	P + object
1s	rann-an 'I share'	em/ma rann 'shares me'	ma rann 'my share'	gan-in 'with me'
1s+emph.	rann-an-me	em/ma rann-me	ma rann-me	gan-in-me
2s	rann-ez	ez/da rann	da rann	gan-it
3s (m, f)	rann	e(r), he rann	e, he rann	gant-añ, -i
1p	rann-omp	hor rann	hor rann	gan-eomp
2p	rann-it	ho rann	ho rann	gan-eoc'h
3p	rann-ont	o rann	o rann	gant-o
IMP	rann-er	N/A	N/A → ar rann	N/A → gan-eor
full DP	rann ar chas 'the dogs share'	rann ar chas 'shares the dogs'	rann ar chas 'the share of the dogs'	gant ar chas 'with the dogs'

The *r/d*-inflection of the verb is part of the paradigm of every tense-mood combination, save the imperative, in Middle Breton (Hemon 2000), in early modern varieties (e.g. Rostrenen 1738), and in some current ones (W-Kerne/Leon, Kervella 1995 [1947]: §190; NE-Treger, Leclerc 1986 [1906]: 68,4; NE-Goueloù, Le Coadic 2010°: 30). In some varieties, *-r* has encroached on the territory of *-d* (Ernault 1897; NW-Leon, Sommerfelt 1921°, NE-Treger Le Dû 2012°).⁸ However, the inflection has been losing ground over the twentieth century. The dialectal Atlas of Le Roux (1927), investigating translations of French *on*, suggests loss in certain tenses, notably in the future as compared to the present, loss with particular verbs, and more general loss in E/SE varieties, to alternatives like the passive. Already at the turn of the twentieth century, the *r/d*-inflection is an archaism in SE Gwened (Guillevic and Le Goff 1902: 47, but not yet Le Bayon 1986 [1878]). Among current varieties, detailed descriptions show complete loss in dialects of SE-Gwened (Cheveau 2007°; Ternes 1970°; Crahe 2013°) and the central zone (Plourin 1982°: 664, 682; Humphreys 1995°), elsewhere limitation to the present tense and to certain verbs (SW-Kerne, Goyat 2012°: 4.7; W-Kerne, Ploneis 1983°: 165; central, Wmffre 1998°: 2.24; S-Kerne, Jouitteau 2015°, ARBRES; for a nuanced description, central Favereau 1984°, cf. 1997: §472). The loss of the *r/d*-inflection does not go together with attrition of other subject inflections.⁹

1989), Borsley and Stephens (1989), Jouitteau and Rezac (2006), and in literature on other Celtic languages, seminally McCloskey and Hale (1984) on Irish and Rouveret (1991) on Welsh.

⁸ The impersonal inflection is absent from the verb *kaout* (*endevout*) 'have'. The gap is due to the origin of the agreeing forms of *have* in the existential form of *be*, object proclitics, and nominative subjects restricted to the 3rd person, known as the *mihi est* type. The oblique + nominative profile remains in SE and NW dialects, but by and large the verb has aligned with plain transitives, first in syntax where objects receive object case, and then in inflection that has been regularised to suffixes, e.g. *hon-eus-i gwelet* us-be/have-3p.nom seen, to *neus-omp o gwelet* have-1p them seen (Jouitteau and Rezac 2006, 2009). One might expect the regularisation to add the *-r/-d* inflection, especially since the *have/be*-perfect is the only productive punctual past tense, and indeed Ernault (1884: 202) gives *a-m-eur cruciffiet* R-me-be/have.IMP crucified 'who has crucified me' as an archaism without further citation. However, by and large regularisation of *have* coincides with loss of the *r/d*-inflection.

⁹ A reviewer raises the question of reasons for the loss of the *r/d*-inflection. Influence of French is possible, with its 1/2/3+s/p subject but no impersonal inflection: the period of *-r/-d* loss roughly coincides with the introduction of French in primary education and the development of Breton to the recessive language of bilinguals. However, other changes took place in Breton over roughly the same period that go contrary to expected influence of French: the object clitics, for instance, have been replaced by strong pronouns. Internal dynamics of the Breton system may well have been a factor in the loss of *-r/-d*, notably use of the passive which systematically overlaps and interacts with the impersonal (Hewitt 1997, Jouitteau 2015). The Breton passive is more common and neutral than in French, more

The origin of the *r/d*-inflection differs from that of *man/on* and *se/si* impersonals (Cowgill 1983). The *-r* ending has cognates in Indo-European mediopassives, such as Latin *videtur* 'she is seen', and 3p actives, Latin *vidēre* 'they have seen', whose mutual relationship remains debated (Clackson 2007). The *-d* ending descends from the past participle in *-t-*, usually forming periphrastic passives with *be*, Latin *vistus est* 'she is seen'. The two gave a Celtic formation with passive syntax for transitives with 3rd person objects, promoted to agreeing nominative, and impersonal syntax otherwise, for transitives with accusative 1st/2nd person objects and availability for intransitives. This stage is reflected in Old Breton, and rare Middle Breton examples with passive characteristics like agent *by*-phrases. By and large in Middle Breton, and strictly in modern varieties, the syntax is impersonal rather than passive. Cognate inflections have undergone a similar development (Welsh, Borsley et al. 2007: 8.3.3, Irish, McCloskey 2007).

Syntactically, *r/d*-forms participate in structures where the impersonal argument behaves as a regular pronominal subject (Anderson 1982, Hewitt 2002). Among intransitives, *r/d*-inflections are found for all verbs, unergative, unaccusative, psych-verb, passive and copula:¹⁰

- (7) *Plijout a reer din pa vezer tener.*
 please R do.IMP to.1s when is(H).IMP tender
 One pleases me when one is tender. {A.Q1}
- (8) *Goude an abadenn kanañ e houlenner alies diganin mond da sinañ ar bladenn.*
 after the session singing R ask.IMP often from.1s go to sign the disk
 I am often asked to go sign the disk after a concert. {A.Q2}
- (9) *A greiz m'edon gant va lein, e teujot d'am c'herc'hat ...*
 at middle as was(L).1s with my lunch R came.IMP to me search
 As I was in the middle of my lunch, someone/people came to look for me. (Morvan 1894)

The verb *be* is of particular interest for its range of forms (Favereau 1997: §407ff, Hewitt 2002, ARBRES: *emañ*). In the present and imperfect, *be* distinguishes unmarked and habitual aspects, the latter glossed (H), and both have their impersonal. The present and in NW-Leon the imperfect moreover distinguish two stems, both with *r/d*-inflections: one for the individual-level copula and passive and perfect auxiliary (10), present *eur/oar* and imperfect *oad*, glossed (I) and one for the stage-level copula (11) and progressive auxiliary (12), present *emeur* and imperfect *edod*, glossed (H).¹¹

- (10) *Eet eur_i da PRO_i gerhed an Aotrou 'n Eskob*
 gone is(I).IMP to seek the lord the bishop
 Someone/people went to fetch the bishop. (Fave 1989)
- (11) *Edod neuze er XVIIved kantved.*
 was(L).IMP then in.the 17th century
 [Describing someone's life:] It was then the 17th century. (Seite 1998)
- (12) *E meur o c'hortoz ac'hanon.*
 is(L).IMP at waiting of.1s

widely available with intransitives, and particularly common in generic use with the habitual form of the *be* copula.

¹⁰ This include oblique experiencer *please*-type verbs, excluded in Irish (McCloskey 2007).

¹¹ With full DP subjects, non-habitual present uses invariant *zo* is used if preverbal, *eus* if postverbal and indefinite, otherwise 3s forms of appropriate *be*'s. Varieties may resist the form *eur/oar*, and habitual *ver* or locative *emeur* takes its place (Favereau 1997: §410), and further *emeur* may be replaced by *ver* (Favereau 1984°).

Someone/people/they is/are waiting for me. (Hélias n.d.a.), {A.Q1}

(10)-(12) are of interest because they weaken the generalisation that ρ -impersonals are restricted to agentive subjects in arbitrary contexts (Cinque 1988, Egerland 2003). Their French translations likewise allow the ρ -impersonal *on* (R&J).

Active transitives with impersonal agents align on all points with other active transitives against passives (Anderson 1982, Hewitt 2002). The external argument of a transitive cannot be realised by a *by*-phrase, unlike the agent of the passive which very frequently is.¹²

- (13) *Eul lizher a skrived (*gant an den).*
 a letter R write.IMP with the man
 (Some)one was writing a letter (*by the man). (Anderson 1982)

The direct object of an impersonal verb has coding of objects in transitives. The active codes it by object proclitics or strong pronouns based on *a-* 'of'. The passive promotes it to *pro*-drop inflection or unmarked strong pronouns.

- (14) *Ne weler ket ahanout.* cf. passive *N' out ket gwelet*
 NEG see.IMP not of.2s NEG is(I).2s not seen
 One does not see you. (Hewitt 2002) You are not seen

The impersonal subject antecedes obligatory control PRO (10), (15), the reflexive-reciprocal clitic *en em* analogous to French *se* (16), phrasal reciprocals (17), even floating quantifiers (18), (19), as well as impersonal anaphora to which we return.¹³ As far as we can tell, the implicit agent of the Breton passive is like that of English and French in never anteceding any of these elements save complement PRO.

- (15) *Ne ouezer_i ket mui petra PRO_i ober.*
 NEG know.IMP not anymore what do
 One doesn't know what to do anymore. (Anderson 1982); {A.Q2}
- (16) *En em zikour a reer etre amezeien.*
 REFL help R do.IMP between neighbours
 Neighbours help each other. (Fave 1998)
- (17) *Ne blij ket din pa gomzer an eil ouzh egile (diwar-va-fenn).*
 NEG please.3s not to.1s when talk.IMP the second to other (from-my-head)
 I don't like it when people talk to each other (about me). {A.Q2}
- (18) *eur penn-braz bennag eo peogwir emeur toud o hond 'benn ma en em gavo.*
 a head-big some is(I).3s because is(L).IMP all at go so that REFL will.find.3s
 It's someone important because people are all going to meet up. (Gouedig 1984°)
- (19) *An holl a oar breman Sez nec a zo divlamm, ha goulen a reer holl terri eul lezen-gamm.*
 the all R know.3s now S R is blameless and ask R do.IMP all break a law-bent
 All know now that Sez nec is innocent, and people all ask to abrogate a false law.

¹² See McCloskey (2007) for Irish, Borsley et al. (2007: 8.3.3) for Welsh: in both the syntax of impersonals is essentially active, but with some variation on the possibility of *by*-phrases (cf. Anderson 2002, Hewitt 2002).

¹³ In French, impersonal *on* can license floating quantifiers that do not have number concord (R&J). Breton has no number concord. In (19), speaker-exclusion by adding *ouzomp* 'at.us' after *holl*, i.e. *ask us*, still allows *holl* {A.Q2}.

(traditional song), {A.Q1, Q2}

There is one limit on syntactico-semantic dependencies of the *r/d*-form: the antecedence of pronominal anaphora. This is characteristic of ρ -impersonals generally on their non-specific uses. In R&J, we argue that it follows from the poor content of ρ -impersonals, including deficient phi-specification (cf. McCloskey 2007). PRO, the reflexive-reciprocal clitic, phrasal reciprocals, and floating quantifiers are all themselves deficient in phi-features, at a minimum person as they can be used with an antecedent of any person. The phi-specification of the Breton ρ -impersonal and its interaction with anaphoricity is studied in section 5.

Examples above show the *r/d*-forms in generic and arbitrary uses, and others are given in section 5. Specific uses, parallel to the French 1p *on*, do not seem to exist (Hewitt 2002). There are indeed uses in contexts where the referent is clear and may be *we*, as in (20), but, as Hewitt points out for a similar example, they are associated with an obliqueness that does not characterise specific *on*. This is so for our consultants as well: (21) is used obliquely to avoid direct reference. 1p doubling and 1p anaphora are essentially impossible, though we take up this question in more detail in section 5. Apparent specific uses are simply extensions of arbitrary uses, in the same way as indefinites may be so extended in *Someone's sulking, aren't we?*; they may be called pseudospecific (McCloskey 2007).

- (20) *Ale, poent sevel, bugalez, poent sevel!* - "*Ya, ya! o hond emeur!*"
time rise children time rise yes, yes at go is(L).1p
Come on, time to get up, children, time to get up! - Yes, yes! Coming! (Gouedig 1984°)
- (21) [Women on the bus are giggling and pointing to me. I tell my friend:]
Emeur o komz an eil ouzh eben (*diwar-va-fenn*).
is(L).IMP at speak the second to other.FEM from-my-head
They are talking to each other about me. {A.Q2}

The *r/d*-form of the verb, like ρ -impersonals generally including French *on*, are restricted to humans (Hewitt 2002).¹⁴ Like *on* as well, they may be satisfied by atomic individuals, see (50) later for a clear example, or by pluralities, required by the reciprocals in generic (17) and arbitrary (21) and by floating quantifiers in (18), (19).

3 Prepositional inflection

The Breton person-number inflection of verbs has its parallel in prepositional inflection in Table 1. In pre-modern Breton and current NE, SE, and central dialects, there is no counterpart to the verbal *r/d*-inflection in prepositional inflection. Prepositions may then make use of the form *an unan* as an impersonal anaphor to the verbal *r/d*-form, which we discuss in the next section:

- (22) *Pa labourer évid ann-unan, é labourer gwella ma c'heller.*
when work.IMP for IMP-one R work.IMP best as can.IMP
When one works for oneself, one works the best one can. (Hingant 1868: §125)

¹⁴ In this it contrasts with Irish, where the impersonal inflection of the verb is also used with inanimate causers as *It wrecked him on the coast of China once* (McCloskey 2007). Syncretism with a quasi-expletive may be a possibility.

However, some modern NW-Leon and SW-Kerne dialects have innovated impersonal inflection for prepositions, attaching the *-r* ending of the verbal impersonal to the 1st/2nd person plural base of inflected prepositions: *gan-eor* like 2p *gan-eoc'h*. Falc'hun (1981 [1963]: 437-8) notes the first forms in Leon and Kerne writers and grammarians in the early 1940s and deems them recent. He attributes them to phonological convergence of the impersonal *-r* of verbs upon the change [r] > [ʀ]/[ʁ] with 2p *-c'h* [x]; the generic use of 2p might have helped (see section 5). Falc'hun's hypothesis accounts for limitation of the forms to certain late modern varieties of Breton, the lack of counterparts in other Celtic languages, which do have inflected prepositions, and the use of the 1p/2p stem of the preposition shown in Table 1. The prepositional *r*-forms are emphasised in influential grammatical notes by the NW-Leon dialect writer V. Fave (1943, 1986, 1998) and is common in his writings, e.g. Fave (1989), as well as the writings of V. Seite (1985, 1998) of the same origin. However, it is also noted in grammatical observations across the W/SW-Kerne area, Nedelec (1943), ar Gow (1963), Trépos (2001 [1968]), further cited in e.g. Morvanou (1978: 215, 1980: 468), Favereau (1997: §767).

In Fave's use, the *r*-inflection extends to all inflected prepositions, from core arguments to verbal and nominal adjuncts, both when anaphoric to a verbal *r*-form or arbitrary PRO and when independent:

- (23)a *ar pez a gaser ganeor a gaver*
 that piece R send.IMP with.IMP R find.IMP
 What one takes with one, one finds.
- b *Ganeor an-unan eo e vez ar muia a boan*
 with.one IMP-one is(I).3s R is(H).3s the most of pain
 It's with oneself that one has most trouble. (*C'est avec soi-même qu'on a le plus de mal.*)
- (24)a *Pa vezer o tastum danvez deor an-unan*
 when is(H).3s at gather stuff to.IMP IMP one
 When one gathers stuff for oneself. (*Quand on thésaurise pour soi.*)
- b *Pa gred deor PRO beza an-unan.*
 when believe.3s to.IMP PRO be IMP-one
 When one thinks that one is alone.
- (25)a *Ne gaver ket atao tud hegarad eveldor an-unan.*
 NEG find.IMP not always people cheerful like.IMP IMP-one
 One does not always find people as cheerful as oneself.
- b *Estregedor a zo pinvidig.*
 except.IMP R is rich
 Others than oneself are rich. (*D'autres que soi sont riches.*) (Fave 1998)

We have confirmed the productivity of these *r*-forms of prepositions with a NW-Leon speaker originally from Kerlouan but living in Lesneven in 2012. The forms were inaccessible at the beginning of the initial elicitation, unlike verbal *r/d*-inflections, but emerged at its end with activation of his childhood grammar, and subsequent elicitations revealed strong and consistent grammaticality judgments. The speaker's wife by contrast lacks *r/d*-forms of both verbs and prepositions, understanding them as generic 2p thanks to a phonological collapse of final *-r* and 2p *-c'h* in her dialect but not that of her husband. For half century, each member of the couple has been using a different impersonal without the other noticing. We report details in section 5.

The innovation of an impersonal inflection on prepositions is of great potential interest for the study of ρ -impersonals. The usual view is that ρ -impersonals are restricted to subjects, while

generic impersonals have no such restrictions.¹⁵ There generalisation is poorly understood, but there is considerable force to it: when German and Romance 'person' nouns have grammaticalised as ρ -impersonals, they are limited to subject positions, such as German and Swedish *man*, but when they have grammaticalised as generic impersonals, Icelandic *maður*, they occur more freely (Egerland 2003). However, McCloskey (2011) has raised possible counter-examples from inflectional impersonals in Nahuatl (Andrews 2003). For Breton, we do find an extension of *-r* from verbs to prepositions, but to prepositions that, like the verb, inflect. Yet at this point, all our examples of the prepositional *r*-form are generic. It may thus be that the prepositional *r*-form is a generic impersonal, and its anaphoric relationship to the verbal *r/d*-form is that of the German nominative *man* to generic *ein-* 'one' (Cabredo-Hofherr 2008). That too would speak to the restriction of ρ -impersonals to subjects, for the ρ -impersonal inflection would have become generic-only when extended from the subject to the prepositional object.¹⁶

4 Possessive proclitic

The possessive proclitic system of Breton shows a strong parallelism with verbal and prepositional inflections: see Table 1. A pronominal possessor must be a possessive proclitic, possibly doubled by an emphatic enclitic, but not by a full DP. Conversely, a full DP possessor occurs in the so-called construct state, possessum-possessor, where the possessum cannot have the definite article (**al*) *labour an dud* 'the work of the people'. Most sources mention no proclitic counterpart to the impersonal, and we would expect ineffability, as happens for the object proclitic in French (26). However, some dialects have recruited the definite article *an* as an impersonal counterpart to other possessor proclitics.¹⁷

- (26) **En voyage on me demande toujours que je __ photographie.*
 *In travel **one** always asks me that I photograph __.

(cf. Kayne 2000: 177)

Before we turn to it, we need to discuss the form *an unan*, litt. 'the one', already seen in (22). Breton has emphatic/anaphoric expressions of the form possessive proclitic + *unan*, similar French *même*-forms. Ordinarily, they double a controller, for instance the possessive proclitic, save in structures where there can be no controller, when they serve as anaphora.¹⁸ In (27), it is not possible to replace the first *ma* with the definite article *ar*, because it would leave *ma-unan* without an antecedent, nor is it possible to omit the first *ma*, as that would give the possessum-possessor construct state and *ma unan* cannot be the possessor in it. Grammars and dictionaries often note that the *ma unan* series is completed by *an unan*, where *an* is the definite article, in order to double impersonal controllers, as in (28). However, unlike *ma unan*, *an unan* can occur

¹⁵ Non-subject *one* is sometimes given as ungrammatical, and in it is in (26) *photograph one*, but not in general: *One had the absurd feeling it could follow at ...*; *One found oneself running as one entered it*; *The staring dial faces ... gave one the impression of looking at ...* (C.S. Lewis); *...a pinkness of the sort that made one's breath catch in his throat* (Clifford D. Simak). By contrast, *on* and *man* are categorically impossible as non-subjects.

¹⁶ Fave translates the prepositional *r*-form either by *on*, or by *soi*, which is itself not an ρ -impersonal but a logophor to a centre unspecified for phi-features (simplifying somewhat: see R&J with literature).

¹⁷ The definite article as the forms *al* before *l*, *an* before coronals, vowels, and *h*, *ar* before labials, palatals, and velars; *an* is usually cited as the basic form.

¹⁸ Our description is tentative; see Stephens (1990) for use as local anaphora, and Gros (1984: 187) for examples. As controller counts: agreement inflection of verbs and prepositions, object and possessive proclitics, the subject combining with 3s inflection under the complementarity effect, and the whole DP if the *unan*-form is attached to it.

as a full DP without any controller, both as possessor (29) and as subject (30). It recalls then English *one*, including the 3s anaphor in (30) (see (61) below).¹⁹

- (27) *Paeet em eus ... gant ma gwenneien ma-unan*
 paid R.1s have with my pennies my one
 I've paid with my own money. (Menard and Kadored 2001 s.v. *unan*)
- (28) *Beza laosket PRO_{arb} d' en em geita an-eun a vez kavet displejuz.*
 be left to REFL adjust IMP-one R is(H).3s found unpleasant
 One finds it unpleasant to be left to manage by oneself. (Ar Gow 1963)
- (29) *Madou an nesa peurliesa a gaver gwelloh evid re an-eun.*
 goods IMP closest generally R find.IMP better than ones IMP-one
 One usually finds the goods of others better than one's own. (Ar Gow 1963)
- (30) *Ne vez ket an-unan sur eus e vuhez*
 NEG be(H).3s not IMP-one sure from his life
 One is not sure of one's life. (Menard and Kadored 2001, s.v. *an unan*).

In *an unan*, the definite article looks like an impersonal possessor proclitics. Two grammars of NW dialects, that of Hingant (1868, N-Leon/Treger boundary) and Fave (1998, NW-Leon) use the definite article itself as an impersonal possessor proclitic: independently, (31), and as anaphor to verbal and prepositional *r/d*-forms (32), and to arbitrary PRO (33). Usually this impersonal proclitic *an* is doubled by *an unan*, but not always, as in (39) below.²⁰

- (31) *Esoh eo ar falz an-unan da vedi.*
 easier is(I).3s IMP sickle IMP-one to harvest
 One's own sickle is easier to harvest with. (Fave 1998)
- (32) *Muioc'h é kérer ar vugalé ann-unan égét bugalé ar ré-all.*
 more R love.IMP IMP children IMP-one than children the ones-other
 One loves more one's own children than the children of the others. (Hingant 1868: 194)
- (33) *Arabad eo PRO_{arb} beza re striz e-r heñver an unan.*²¹
 forbidden is(I).3s be too strict in-IMP respect IMP one
 One mustn't be too strict with oneself (lit.: in one's respect). (Fave 1998)

Fave shows the apparent definite article to be a possessor pronoun from its meaning and morphophonology, to which we add an argument from *unan*-forms. First, the definite article is a not felicitous translation in (31), (32), and strictly impossible in (33), where the noun *heñver* is the fixed part of a complex preposition and must occur with a possessor, like English *on X's*

¹⁹ Grammars give scant information: for instance *an unan* is only mentioned in Kervella (1995 [1947]: §436), and given with the reflexive-reciprocal clitic as antecedent in Hemon (2000: §58). It usually fails to be mentioned in otherwise comprehensive descriptions outside NW-Leon, e.g. NE-Treger Le Clerc (1986 [1906]), Le Dù (2012°), SW-Kerne Trépos (2001 [1968]), Goyat (2012°), SE-Gwened Guillevic and Le Goff (1902), Cheveau (2007°), central Humphreys (1995°), Favereau (1997°: §258), the last contrasting its absence in Poher with Fave. It is not reported among the paradigm of *unan*-forms even for St. Pol de Léon, Sommerfelt (1921°), adjacent to Cléder (Fave), while Pluigneau (Hingant) is farther off.

²⁰ Fave's but not Hingant's grammar has prepositional *r*-forms. Other grammars like Kervella (1995 [1947]) do not mention this use of the definite article, and of dictionaries most do not do so explicitly, with the exception of Merser (2009, s.v. *son*), but examples of *an unan* usually include the type *ar falz an-unan* (Menard and Kadored 2001, Merser 2009, s.v. *an unan*), which requires the apparent definite article as impersonal possessor.

²¹ Note that *e-r* here is *e* 'in' + *ar*, not the impersonal form of the preposition, which is *ennor*.

behalf. Second, *ar vugalé ann-unan* in (31) can only be analysed with *an unan* as an *unan*-form doubling *ar* as its possessor controller. It cannot be analysed as possessum *ar vugalé* 'the children' and possessor *an unan* in the construct state, since the possessum cannot take the definite article. Third and most strikingly, in Fave's grammar the impersonal possessor is not in fact morphophonologically identical to the definite article. The definite article lenites following feminine singulars, *falz* [f] - *ar falz* [v.] 'sickle', and most masculine plurals, *bugale* - *ar vugale* 'children'. The impersonal possessor does not, so that *falz* is unlenited in (31), and we get the contrast in (34). Interestingly, in Hingant's grammar the impersonal possessor does trigger the same lenition as the definite article, (32).

- (34) *Aez eo kared ar vugale. Aesoh eo c'hoaz kared ar bugale an-unan.*
 easy is(I).3s love the children easier is(I).3s still love IMP children IMP-one
 It is easy to love children. It is easier still to love one's own children. (Fave 1998)

The impersonal possessive *an* comes with its share of mysteries. In the first place, we do not know the origin of the *an unan* impersonal.²² The very existence of possessed *ma unan* 'my one' leads to the expectation of *an unan* 'the one', since possessor proclitics are in the same structural position as the definite article: they occupy the same place in the DP and both are excluded on the possessum in construct state. However, that does not give *an unan* its impersonal meaning, as anaphor (29) or alone (30). The recruitment of the definite article *an* as possessive proclitic generally seems to be a development additional to the rise of impersonal *an unan*. Possibly, it was aided by inalienable possession (35), where the definite article is a pronominal anaphor, as but more rarely than in French (q.v. Guéron 1985, Vergnaud and Zubizarretta 1992). With an impersonal subject, (35) would look like *an* is anaphoric to it. The origin of Fave's nonlenition might be kinship nouns like *mamm* 'mother'; it usually lenites to *ar vamm*, but lenition can be idiosyncratically suspended (Menard and Kadored 2001, Merser 2009, s.v. *mamm*). It is of interest but of unclear import that in neither Hingant's nor Fave's grammar has the object proclitic system developed an impersonal, though possessor and object proclitics have much influenced each other since Middle Breton, to near convergence in Table 1 (Hemon 2000; ARBRES: *Contraste entre les déterminants possessifs et les clitiques objets*).

- (35) *den ebed ne sav an dorn* →? *Ne saver ket an dorn*
 person none NEG raises the hand NEG raise.IMP not the hand
 No one raises his hand. (Hélias n.d.b) One does not raise one's hand.

As with the *r*-form of prepositions, the impersonal possessive *an* has the potential to contribute to the understanding of ρ -impersonals because it is not a subject, and as with

²² *Unan* has the range of meanings of *one* (Payne et al. 2013): cardinal 'one', in many varieties generic impersonal *one* (section 1), and to an extent varying with variety a pro-NP, *pez unan* 'which one', *eur mell unan* 'a large one' (Goyat 2012°). However, the *unan* of *unan*-forms is identical with *unan* 'one' only in some varieties: Hingant's and Fave's grammars and elsewhere (standard Breton; in varieties, e.g. Sommerfelt 1921°: §250, Le Dù 2012°: 54). In other varieties *unan*-forms use rather the distinct *hunan* (e.g. central Humphreys 1995°: 326, Wmffre 1998°: 2.16, Favereau 1984°: III.1.h vs. e, 1997: §258, 2000 s.v. *hunan*, SE-Gwened Cheveau 2007°: 5.1.2, SW-Kerne Goyat 2012°: 9.2.4.3). Both sets of varieties have counterparts to *unan*-forms with other cardinals, *hon daou* 'our two'. The historical situation is debated (Lewis and Pedersen 1937: §326, §276 vs. Schrijver 1997: 83). For a comparative picture, in Middle Welsh we get *un* 'one' versus possessed *hun(an)*-forms, while counterparts with other cardinals do not use quite the same pronominal prefixes (Morris Jones 1913: §160).

prepositions, we do not know whether it exists outside generic contexts. It is also telling in another way. We have seen that ρ -impersonals are phi-deficient and cannot antecede phi-complete personal pronouns. The definite article contrasts with possessor proclitics in not having any phi-features of its own. That makes it an ideal candidate for recruitment as a phi-less anaphor to the verbal *r/d* ρ -impersonal and as an ρ -impersonal itself.

Not all grammars have developed the definite article to the impersonal possessor. Some use the 3s masc. possessor proclitic *e*, anaphoric to both verbal *r/d*-forms (36) and to arbitrary PRO (37). There has also been noted the existence of apparent 1p anaphora to the *r/d*-form in (38).

- (36) *El léach ma klaskeur hé c'hounid hé-unan, énô é kouez ar garantez.*
 in.the place as search.IMP his gain his-one, there R fall.3s the love
 Where one looks for one's own interest love vanishes. (Troude 1842, s.v. *cesser*)
- (37) *Emeer o sevel e di.*
 is(L).IMP at building his house
 Someone is/people are building their house. (Trépos 1968: §343)
- (38) *Atao a gaver eost ann amezek gwelloc'h evit hon-hini.*
 always R find.IMP harvest IMP/the neighbour better for our-one
 One always finds the neighbour's harvest better than one's own. (Hemon 2000: §58)

Fave (1943: 371, 1998) views the 3s possessor anaphoric to impersonals as a gallicism, in terms that suggests it is simply not present in his variety:

- (39) Let us take the sentence: *Red eo kaoud unan bennag war e dro* [necessary is(I).3s have one some on his turn 'One must have someone around one' -MR/MJ]. One thinks at first that it's someone else than "oneself" [...] the impersonal form of the possessive does exist. It is the form AN, AL, AR: *Red eo kaoud unan bennag war AN tro* [note absence of lenition of fem. *tro* 'turn', vs. *an dro* 'the turn' -MR/MJ].

The 3s possessor has no impersonal use except when anaphoric to another impersonal, and elsewhere 3s does not seem to be used even as anaphor to impersonals.²³ In view of this, Fave's ascription of the use to French influence may be right; as we will see below, in French the apparently 3s possessor is in fact phi-less when anaphoric to the ρ -impersonal. We turn now generally to anaphoric dependencies between impersonal *r/d*-forms and personal pronouns.

5 Phi-features of pronominal anaphora

The typical behaviour of ρ -impersonals as antecedents in anaphoric dependencies may be illustrated with French *on*. Nonspecific *on* is deficient for person and number, and can be the antecedent only of other phi-deficient expressions. These include another *on*, phrasal reciprocals that lack person, and pronouns in *s-* that lack phi-features entirely, and PRO. (40) is a telling example: the impersonal *on* must range over pluralities to antecede the reciprocal, as must the

²³ However, for the eighteenth century, Rostrenen (2008 [1738]: 62) does give prepositions inflected for 3s as anaphoric to the *r/d*-form: *gaou a rear oud-hâ e-unan* or *oud e-unan* wrong R do.IMP to.3s his-one or to his-one 'One does wrong to oneself, *On se fait tor à soi-même*', and Troude (1842), Moal (1890) give give such examples with arbitrary PRO as subject of infinitive dictionary entries. Other sources use *an unan* if they do not have *r*-forms in prepositions, thus Moal *sonjal ervad var ann-unan* think well on IMP-one 'think about oneself' vs. *komz out-han he-unan* talk to.3s his-one 'talk to oneself', or else use other impersonals, Rostrenen *an den*.

possessor *ses* of *common interests* though independently of *on*, *ses* is a only 3s possessor. All other personal pronouns are phi-complete and cannot be anaphoric to *on* without change of meaning: in (40), the *s*-pronouns cannot be replaced by 3p *eux* 'them', *leurs* 'their', though *on* ranges over pluralities that exclude the speaker and addressee.²⁴

- (40) *Dans le film, il y a quatre couples, et on_i se_i parlait les uns aux autres_i;*
 In the film, there were four couples, and IMP REFL talked the ones to.the others
de soi_i-même et de ses_i intérêts communs pendant des heures?
 about S-self and about S- interests common for hours
 In the film, there were four couples, and people talked to each other about themselves and their common interests for hours? (R&J)

Other expressions only seem to be anaphoric, thanks to similar meaning, notably kind and generic 1p/2p pronouns as in (41). Here generic 2p *vous* seems anaphoric to *on*, though only at a distance, because their meanings are similar enough. This is not always available, because *on* has a broader meaning, including in (26) when the matrix clause includes a deictic 2p *vous*, or (41).

- (41) *On_i n'ose plus se_i/*vous_i/#vous_{deic} demander si cela vous_{gen~i} plait.*
 One_i doesn't dare ask oneself_i/*yourself_i/#you_{deic} anymore if it makes you_{gen~i} happy.
 (Grevisse 2008: §754)

In contrast, specific *on* has the phi-properties of a 1p pronoun in anaphoric relationships and it can combine with strong pronoun *nous* as an emphatic doublee, for which there is no impersonal counterpart, save that the reflexive-reciprocal clitic remains *se* because verb agreement remains 3s.

In Breton, anaphora to the *r/d*-form of the verb as given in grammars and evidenced in texts are also limited to ones plausibly phi-deficient:

- Controlled PRO, getting phi-features from its antecedent, and arbitrary PRO, plausibly itself reflecting a phi-deficient ρ -impersonal.
- Reflexive-reciprocal clitic *en em*, invariant and used for antecedents of any person and number.
- Phrasal reciprocal, differentiating gender, and floating quantifiers, invariant, both used with any antecedent.
- Prepositional *r*-forms, invariant and impersonal.
- Possess proclitic *an* and doubling *an unan*, invariant and impersonal.
- 3s possessors, arguably under the same phi-less analysis as French.
- Remote kind/generic 1p/2p pronouns, (38), in the same way as (41).

We have carried out a pilot study with four speakers with verbal *r/d*-forms: most extensively with the couple A and Y (NW-Leon), partly with A-M and L (W-Kerne). Our focus was those pronominal anaphora that are strictest about requiring phi-identity with their antecedent: coargument DPs/PPs and their possessors, and particularly inherent/inalienable reflexives like *be*

²⁴ See R&J for extensive development of this point. The hypothesis that ρ -impersonals are phi-deficient is seminally advanced in Cinque (1988) for person, while Egerland (2003) argues that their exponents are entirely phi-less; phi-deficiency of anaphora is used to account for the limits of anaphoricity to ρ -impersonal in Albizu (1998) for Basque and McCloskey (2007) for Irish, allowing antecedence of phi-less reciprocals but not phi-complete reflexives.

at one's ease, be beside oneself, take on oneself, which resist even the easiest phi-mismatches with their antecedent.

- (42) L'équipe est à son/*leur aise.
The team is at its/*their ease.

Example (43) serves as a synopsis of A's grammar. There is a bewildering freedom of pronominal anaphora to the verbal *r/d*-form: only 1s and 2s are excluded. In French, by contrast, only the phi-less possessor *son* is possible, if we set aside specific *on* 'we' on the "nurse" use of *we* which is odd here. However, behind (43) there appear to be the expected limitations on *p*-impersonals, covered up by developments in originally different grammars that converge in A's.

- (43) [A visits a friend, his wife welcomes him and says the friend is on the balcony with a great cocktail; A says to his friend:]
*Klevet am eus emeur en Ø / hon / hoc'h / o / e / *da / *ma eas; gwir eo?*
heard R.1s have is(L).IMP in the /our/your(pl)/their/his/your(sg)/my ease, true is(I).3s
I have heard that someone's taking it easy, is it true? {A.Q2}

cf. *J'ai entendu qu'on est à l'/(*)notre/*votre/*leur/son/*ton/*mon aise, c'est vrai?*

A has access to a childhood grammar close to that described by Fave, possessing prepositional *r*-forms beside verbal *r/d*-forms, and the *an-unan* doublee of both, seen in (44), as well as the *an* possessor seen later in (45). These reflect the expected phi-deficient anaphora.

- (44) *Ar skiant-prenet eo ar pezh a zesker dreizeur an-unan.*
the experience is(I).3s the piece R learn.IMP by.IMP IMP-one
Experience is what one learns on one's own. {A.Q2}
- (45) [A psychoanalyst to another about her new group of patients]
Gwelout a ran mat emeur o vond down enneur an-unan.
see R do.1s well is(L).IMP at go deep in.IMP IMP-one
I see well that people(they) dwell deep down, but never enough. {A.Q2}

In A's most-used grammar however, 1p personal pronouns are the anaphora to verbal *r/d*-, and even prepositional *r*-forms of the childhood grammar can be doubled by 1p *unan*-forms. 1p is also anaphoric to verbal *r/d*-forms for A-M and L, who lack prepositional *r*-forms and *an*-possessors. We have already seen this possibility in (38).

- (46) *Pa gemerer warneur (an-unan) / deskiñ brezhoneg*
Pa gemerer / warnomp (hon-unan) deskiñ brezhoneg
when take.IMP on.IMP (the-one) / on.1p (our-one) learn Breton
When one takes upon oneself to learn Breton. {A.Q2}
- (47) *Pa vezer re gounnaret ez eer er-meas ac'haneur on-unan.*
when is(H).IMP too angry R go.IMP outside of.IMP our-one
When one is too angry, one goes out of one's mind. {A.Q2}
- (48) *Muioc'h e karer eost an amezog eged an-hini hon-unan.*
more R like.IMP harvest the neighbour than the-one our-one
One likes better the neighbour's harvest than one's own. {A.Q2}

- (49) [translation task introduced by the idea of being one's own boss]
Pa labourer evidomp hon-unan, e labourer diouzh hon holl galon. {A.Q2}
Pa labourer evidomp-(ni) hon-unan, e labourer mat. {A-M.Q1}
 when work.IMP for.1p-(us) our-one R work.IMP from our all heart / well
 When one works for oneself, one works with all one's heart/well.

However, these 1p seem to have become phi-deficient for person and number. Strikingly, for all three speakers 1p anaphora to *r/d*-forms are available even when the speaker is excluded, when English *we* is banned and French *on* cannot have 1p anaphora (R&J):

- (50) [Goldilocks context:]
*O kousket emeur hon/*e-unan em gwele!* {A.Q2}
*O kousket emeur ?hon/*e-unan barzh va gwele!* {A-M.Q1}
 at sleep be(L).IMP our-one in my bed
 Someone is sleeping by themselves in my bed!
- (51) [A psychoanalyst to another about her new group of patients]
Gwelout a ran mat emeur o vond don e diabarzh hon-unan...
 see R do.1s well is(L).IMP at go deep in interior our-one
 I see well that they/people have delved deep within themselves. {A-M.Q1}
- (52) ... *e kemerer ur sakre sammad war hom c'hein.*
 ... R take.IMP a mighty burden on our back
 ... that someone/people carry a mighty burden on their backs. {L.Q1}, {A-M.Q1}

More remarkably still, for A even non-anaphoric 1p inflection and pronouns seem to have lost the usual commitment of 1p pronouns to speaker inclusion.

- (53) [A policeman looking for a missing person finds traces of a fight:]
Amañ omp kouezhet! / Kouezhet eur amañ.
 here is(I).1p fallen / fallen is(I).IMP here
 Someone fell here. {A.Q2} (The only difference A can imagine between is that surprise is more salient with 1p.)
- (54) *Gwelet a ran hon beus graet eus hor gwellañ.*
 see R do.1s R.1p have done of our best
 I see that someone/people did their best. {A.Q2}

These results suggest that 1p forms have become grammaticalised as phi-less pronouns, possibly beside also allowing 1p phi-specification. The development might be due to the same reasons as the tendency for ρ -impersonals to gain 1p as their specific use: Cinque (1988) suggests that 1p is closest to the meaning of the impersonal because it is inclusive of all persons. French *on* generalised the specific 1p use mostly from the late nineteenth on (King et al. 2011), and French in turn might have influenced Breton 1p forms to create phi-deficient impersonals in these grammars. There is an important gap in the impersonal use of 1p: the 1p emphatic enclitics cannot easily double *r/d*-forms, (55). However, the doubling does not seem categorically impossible, and the difficulty might rather reflect the rarity of strong emphatic forms of impersonal pronouns generally (Bolinger 1979).²⁵

²⁵ Of interest is the NW Leon dialect of Ouessant in the texts in Gouedig (1984^o): 1p *on unan* is used as the *unan-*

- (55) *?/*Bremañ, anavezout a reer-ni ac'hanout!*
 now know R do.IMP-we of.2s
 Now people know you! $\sqrt{\{A.Q1\}}$, $\{*A.Q2\}$, $?/*\{A-M.Q1\}$

As in French, generic 2nd person may seem anaphoric to *r/d*-forms at a distance, (56), but also in *except*-phrases, (57)-(59) where it is unavailable in French. In French, the generic 2nd person linked to *on* is usually 2p, though 2s occurs. In A's Breton, 2s seems to be the unmarked generic 2nd person, and it links to verbal *r/d*-forms, but 2p also occurs:

- (56) *Pa labourer evidour hon-unan, e labourer / labourer a holl galon.*
 when work.IMP for.IMP our-one R work.2s/IMP from all heart
 When one works for oneself, one works / you work with full heart. {A.Q2}
- (57) *Ne weler ket mat nemet da-unan ha da dud.*
 NEG see.IMP not well only your(sg)-one and your(sg) people
 One only sees well oneself and one's folks. (lit. yourself and your folks) {A.Q1}
- (58) *Gwelloc'h e kaver atav eost an amezog eget da eost da-unan.*
 better R find.IMP always harvest the neighbour than your(sg) harvest your(sg)-one
 One finds better the neighbour's harvest than one's own [lit. your own] {A.Q1}
- (59) *Paouroc'h egedoc'h/egedor e kaver atav.*
 poorer than.2p/IMP R find.IMP always
 One always finds someone poorer than oneself. {A.Q2}

2p may have itself grammaticalised as a phi-deficient impersonal. When the *r/d*-form is absent in a grammar, 2nd person is left as the sole generic impersonal pronoun, but there seems furthermore to have been interaction between 2p *-c'h* [x] and impersonal *-r* [r] > [ʀ] forms due to their partial or complete phonological convergence. Already Ernault (1897) reports 2p *-c'h* inflections extending into the space of *r/d*-inflections, and the expansion includes the simple past which is not generic: older *kanjeur*, *kanjot*, but also *kanjoc'h* 'on chanta, IMP sang'.²⁶ A's wife Y lacks *r/d*-inflections and perceives them as 2p inflections, collapsing *-[x]* and *-[ʀ]*. A makes the distinction phonologically and morphologically. However, he does allow 2p as the local anaphor to *r/d*-forms in (43). 2s remains impossible locally.

In (43), A also allows 3s and 3p. We have already noted the 3s possessor anaphoric to *r/d*-forms in (37) and the potential influence of French. In French, *son* is both the 3s possessor generally, and the phi-less possessor anaphoric to *on*. The use of 3s in Breton may be modelled on this syncretism, but it may be an independent development. For A, it is a rare option even as possessor, (60), and absent otherwise, (50). The 3p possessor in (60) is more common. A possible analogy is the options in English as possessor of *one* in (61) British *one*, older US *his*, more frequently nowadays the so-called epicene *they*.

form doubling 1s in all cases, and the sole occurrence of 1s *ma unan* is exempt (other *unan*-forms keep their phi-features): *am-eus gwelet on-unan gwechall* 'that have.1s seen myself once'; *din on-unan* 'to.1s myself'; *me yoa on-unan* 'I was.3s [by] myself', *Med ya, laren-me, on-unan emañ zur* 'But yes, said.1s-I, myself am.1s certain'; versus *An dra-ze zepande, ma-unan a gaozee brezoneg*, 'That depended, myself PRT spoke.3s Breton'. The development recalls older French *je sommes = nous sommes* with 1s *je* for 1p *nous* plus 1p verb (King et al. 2011).

²⁶ See section on prepositional *r*-forms, and citation there to Ernault (1897) who already reports mix of *r* and 2p *c'h* forms the verbal impersonal. A distinguishes final *-c'h* [x] and *-r* [ʀ]; his wife does not hear the difference.

- (60) *Pa vezer en hon/*e /?o eas e kaner gwelloc'h.*
 when is(L).IMP in our / *his / ?their ease R sing.IMP better
 One sings better when at ease. {A.Q2}
- (61) a. *One had to live one's own life.* (C.S. Lewis, *That Hideous Strength*)
 b. *It was a sight to make one_i catch his_i breath.* (C.D. Simak, *The Goblin Reservation*)
 c. *Guidelines don't mean a whole lot when one_i fears for their_i own survival.*

The grammar of A thus ends up allowing a remarkable latitude for local anaphora to the ρ -impersonal of the verbal *r/d*-forms, but for explicable reasons:

- Phi-deficient prepositional *r*-forms and possessor *an* impersonals of his childhood grammar.
- 1p developing into a phi-deficient impersonal, found elsewhere.
- 2p developing into a phi-deficient impersonal, widespread, through A's wife's grammar.
- 3s as phi-deficient impersonal perhaps from French, widespread and marked for A.
- 3p so far unreported but with analogue in English epicene *they*.
- No 1s/2s, save generic 2s at a distance.

6 Envoy

The Breton inflectional impersonal is both familiar, in the light of ρ -impersonals like French *on*, and surprising, thanks to grammatical and sociolinguistic particularities of Breton. Grammatically, there have taken place extensions of the verbal impersonal to create counterparts in prepositional and nominal inflection. This development is another piece of evidence for the parallelism of verbal, prepositional, and nominal inflections in Celtic. In the theory of impersonals, it makes for a rare opportunity to understand the nature of the robust but still mysterious restriction of ρ -impersonals to subjects. Sociolinguistically, the history of Breton in the twentieth century has been one of growing dialectal disintegration and differentiation, as a once contiguous language community has broken up into islets each changing unchecked by former neighbours yet still meeting up at times. A's remarkable grammar is one outcome. It is at first sight a checkered collection of impersonalised uses of personal pronouns and so of unexpected anaphora to the ρ -impersonal. Yet each impersonalisation seems to be a natural development, and their confluence leaves an untouched core where the expected anaphoric restrictions of the phi-less ρ -impersonal shine through.

7 Bibliography

Note: bibliographical information on grammars/dictionaries not listed here can be found on ARBRES: <http://arbres.iker.cnrs.fr/index.php/Bibliographie>

- Albizu, Pablo. 1998. "Impersonal constructions of Basque revisited." Handout from Mayfest '98, University of Maryland, July 6-8 1998.
- Anderson, Stephen. 1982. "Where's morphology?". *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 571-612.
- Andrews, J. Richard. 2003. *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- ARBRES: <http://arbres.iker.cnrs.fr>.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. "To catch a metaphor: You as norm." *American Speech* 54: 194-209.
- Borsley, Robert D., and Janig Stephens. 1989. "Agreement and the position of subjects in Breton." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 407-427.
- Borsley, Robert D., Maggie Tallerman, and David Willis. 2007. *The syntax of Welsh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia. 2008. "Les pronoms impersonnels humains." *Modèles linguistiques* XXIX-1(57): 35-56.
- Crahe, Maxime. 2013. Le breton de Languidic. Doctoral dissertation, Rennes II. [SE-Gwened]
- Cheveau, Loïc. 2007. Approche phonologique, morphologique et syntaxique du breton du grand Lorient. Doctoral dissertation, Rennes II. [SE-Gwened]
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. "The variability of impersonal subjects". In *Quantification in natural languages*, E. Bach et al. (eds.), 107-143. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1988. "On *si* constructions and the theory of Arb". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 521-581.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowgill, Warren. 1983. "On the prehistory of Celtic passive and deponent inflection". *Ériu* 34: 73-111.
- Egerland, Verner. 2003. "Impersonal pronouns in Scandinavian and Romance". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 71: 75-102.
- Ernault, Emile. 1884. *Dictionnaire étymologique du moyen breton*. Paris.
- Ernault, Emile. 1897. *Petite grammaire bretonne*. Saint-Brieuc: Prud-homme.
- Evenou, Erwan, 1987. Description phonologique du breton de Lanvenegen. Doctoral dissertation, Rennes II. [S-Kerne]
- Falc'hun, François. 1981. *Perspectives nouvelles sur l'histoire de la langue bretonne*. Union Générale d'Édition: Paris.
- Fave, Visant. 1943. "Ar ragano gourfenger "or"". *Feiz ha Breiz* 79: 271-272, 371-3. [NW-Leon]
- Fave, Visant. 1986. "Ar stumoù dibersonel e brezhoneg". *Brud Nevez* 93: 69-74. [NW-Leon]
- Fave, Visant. 1989. *War roudou hor misionerien*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [NW-Leon]
- Fave, Visant. 1998. *Notennou yezadur*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [on-line version has corrections; we incorporate a slightly different French version, 2004, *Notes de grammaire bretonne*, C. Miossec (ed.). Cléder : Mairie de Cléder.] [NW-Leon]
- Favereau, Francis. 1984. Langue quotidienne, langue technique et langue littéraire dans le parler et la tradition orale de Poullaouen. Doctoral dissertation, Rennes II. [central]
- Favereau, Francis. 1997. *Grammaire du breton contemporain*. Morlaix: Skol Vreizh. [all]
- Favereau, Francis. 2000. *Geriadur ar brezhoneg a-vremañ*. Morlaix: Skol Vreizh. [all]

- Giacalone Ramat, Anna, and Andrea Sansò. 2007. "The spread and decline of indefinite man-constructions in European languages." In *Europe and the Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas*, P. Ramat and E. Roma (eds.), 95-131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna, and Andrea Sansò. 2011. "From passive to impersonal. A case study from Italian and its implication." In *Impersonal constructions*, A. Malchukov and A. Siewierska (eds.), 189-228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gouedig, Patrig. 1984. *Enez-Eusa: Eñvorion tud Eusa*. Brest: Emgleo breiz. [NW-Leon]
- Goyat, Gilles. 2012. Description morphosyntaxique du parler breton de Plozévet (Finistère). Doctoral dissertation, Rennes II. [SW-Kerne]
- Gros, Jules. 1974 [1984]. *Le trésor du breton parlé III*. Lannion: Barr-Heol. [NE-Treger]
- Grevisse, Maurice, and André Goosse. 2008. *Le bon usage*. Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier.
- Guéron, Jacqueline. 1985. Inalienable possession, PRO-inclusion and lexical chains. In *Grammatical representation*, Jacqueline Guéron, Jean-Yves Pollock and Hans Obenauer (eds.), 43-86. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Guillevic, Augustin, and Pierre Le Goff. 1986. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Brest: Ar Skol Vrezhoneg- Emgleo Breiz. [original 1902] [SE-Gwened]
- Heim, Irene. 1982. The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Hélias, Per-Jakez. n.d.a. *Ar biz er pinsar*. CRBC. [on-line] [SW-Kerne]
- Hélias, Per-Jakez. n.d.b. *Jobig an Turluter*. CRBC. [on-line] [SW-Kerne]
- Hemon, Roparz. 2000. *Yezhadur istorel ar Brezhoneg*. Rennes: Hor Yezh. [original 1975]
- Hewitt, Steve. 2002. "The impersonal in Breton". *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 7: 1-39.
- Hingant, Jean. 1868. *Éléments de la grammaire bretonne*. Tréguier: A. Le Flem. [N-Leon/Treger]
- Humphreys, Humphrey Lloyd. 1995. *Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du parler breton de Bothoa en Saint-Nicolas-du Pélem (Côtes d'Armor)*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [central]
- Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2005. "Nominal Properties of vPs in Breton, A hypothesis for the typology of VSO languages". In *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial Languages*, A. Carnie et al. (eds.), 265-280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2015. "Pronoms impersonnels dans le breton vannetais de Loeiz Herrieu : Syntaxe, sémantique et usages en concurrence avec le passif". *La Bretagne Linguistique* 19: 261-280.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie and Milan Rezac. 2006. "Deriving the Complementarity Effect: Relativized Minimality in Breton agreement". *Lingua* 106: 1915-45.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie and Milan Rezac. 2008. "From *mihi est* to *have* across Breton dialects". *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 32: 161-178.
- Kayne, Richard. 2000. *Parameters and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 2010. *Comparisons and contrasts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King, Ruth, France Martineau, and Raymond Mougeon. 2010. "The interplay of internal and external factors in grammatical change: First-person plural pronouns in French". *Language* 87: 470-509.
- Le Bayon, A.-M. 1986 [1878]. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Vannes*. Rennes: Hor Yezh. [SE-Gwened]
- Le Coadic, Ronan. 2010. *Brezhoneg Goueloù*. An Alarch. [NE-Goueloù]
- Leclerc, Louis. 1986 [1906]. *Grammaire bretonne du dialecte de Tréguier*. Emgleo Breiz: Ar Skol Veur. [NE-Treger]
- Le Dù, Jean. 2012. *Le trégorrois à Pougrescant*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [NE-Treger]
- Le Roux, Pierre. 1957. *Le verbe breton*. Rennes: Plihon.

- Le Roux, Pierre. 1927. *Atlas linguistique de la Basse-Bretagne*. Rennes: Plihon. [all]
- Lewis, Henry, and Holger Pedersen. 1937. *A concise comparative Celtic grammar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Supplement 1961.
- Kervella, François. 1995 [1947]. *Yezhadur bras ar brezhoneg*. La Baule: Skridoù Breizh. [W-Kerne/Leon]
- Malamud, Sophia. 2012. "Impersonal indexicals." *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14: 1-48.
- McCloskey, James, and Ken Hale. 1983. On the syntax of person-number inflection in Modern Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 487-533.
- McCloskey, James. 2007. "The grammar of autonomy in Irish". *NLLT* 25: 825-857.
- McCloskey, James. 2011. "Irish impersonals in context". Talk presented at the Workshop on Impersonal Pronouns, Paris, CNRS-University of Paris 8, September 20, 2011.
- Menard, Martial, and Ywan Kadored. 2001. *Geriadur Brezhoneg*. Plougastell-Daoulas: An Here.
- Merser, Andreo. 2009. *Ar Geriadur, dictionnaire Breton-Français / Français-Breton*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 2008. "Clitic impersonal constructions in Romance." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106: 290-336.
- Meyer, Roland. 2010. "Reflexive passives and impersonals in North Slavonic languages". *Russian Linguistics* 34: 285-306.
- Moal, Jean. 1890. *Supplément lexico-grammatical au dictionnaire pratique français-breton du colonel A. Troude en dialecte de Léon*. Landerneau: Desmoulins. [NW-Leon]
- Morris Jones, John. 1913. *A Welsh grammar, historical and comparative*. Oxford: Clarendon
- Morvan, Gabriel. 1894. *Buhez ar zent*. Quimper: Kerangal. [W-Leon/Kerne]
- Morvannou, Fanch. 1978. *Le breton sans peine*, vol. 1. Chennevières sur Marne: Assimil.
- Morvannou, Fanch. 1980. *Le breton sans peine*, vol. 2. Chennevières sur Marne: Assimil.
- Nedelec, Pierre Jean. 1943. *Yezadur ar brezoneg*. Lesneven. [W-Kerne]
- Oukada, Larbi. 1982. "On on." *The French Review* 56: 95-105.
- Payne, John, Geoffrey K. Pullum, Barbara C. Scholz, and Eva Berlage. 2013. Anaphoric *one* and its implications. *Language* 89: 794-829.
- Plourin, Jean-Yves. 1982. Description phonologique et morphologique comparée des parlers bretons de Langonnet (Morbihan) et de Saint-Servais (Côtes-du-Nord). Doctoral dissertation, Université de Rennes II. [central]
- Ploneis, Jean-Marie. 1983. *Au carrefour des dialectes bretons – Le parler de Berrien*. Paris: SELAF. [W-Kerne]
- Press, Ian. 1986. *A grammar of modern Breton*. Mouton: Berlin.
- Press, Ian. 2010. "Breton". In *The Celtic languages*, M. J. Ball et al. (eds.), 427-487. Routledge: London.
- Rezac, Milan, and Mélanie Jouitteau. 2015. The ρ -impersonal *on*: Nature and consequences of referential deficiency. Ms., CNRS-IKER.
- Rostrenen, Gregoire de. 2008 [1738]. *Grammaire française-celtique ou française-bretonne*. Quimper: Al Lanv.
- Rouveret, Alain. 1991. Functional categories and agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 8: 353-87.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2004. "Person and binding". *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 16: 155-218.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1997. *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles*. Maynooth: National University of Ireland.
- Seite, Visant. 1985. *Ar marh reiz*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [NW-Leon]
- Seite, Visant. 1998. *O pourmen dre Vreiz-Izel*. Brest: Emgleo Breiz. [NW-Leon]

- Siewierska, Anna. 2011. "Overlap and complementarity in reference impersonals". In *Impersonal constructions*, A. Malchukov and A. Siewierska (eds.), 57-89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1921. *Le breton parlé à Saint-Pol-de-Léon*. Paris: Champion. [N-Leon]
- Stephens, Jannig. 1990. "Non-finite clauses in Breton". In *Celtic linguistics*, Martin J. Ball et al. (eds.), 151-166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1984. "Agreement vs. incorporation in Breton". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 289-348.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1989. "Further remarks on Breton agreement". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7: 429-471.
- Ternes, Elmar. 1970. *Grammaire structurale du breton de l'Ile de Groix*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. [SE-Gwened]
- Trépos, Pierre. 2001 [1968]. *Grammaire bretonne*. Brest: Brud Nevez. [SW-Kerne]
- Troude, Amable. 1842. *Dictionnaire français celto-breton*, Brest: Lefournier. [N-Leon]
- Vergnaud, Roger, and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta. 1992. "The definite determiner and the inalienable construction in French and in English". *Linguistic Inquiry* 595-652.
- Wmffre, Iwan. 1998. *Central Breton*. Munich: Lincom. [central]