LANGUAGE CONTACT IN WELSH AND BRETON:
THE CASE OF REFLEXIVE AND RECIPROCAL VERBS

Kevin J. Rottet

The two closely related Celtic languages Welsh and Breton represent an interesting comparative laboratory for exploring contact phenomena. Here I will trace the development of reflexive and reciprocal verbs, arguing that these languages have, over time, aligned their patterns with those of English and French respectively in a process of convergent evolution which is distinct from, though related to, grammatical borrowing. The historical pattern for marking reflexives and reciprocals deployed reflexes of the prefix IM (Breton *em*, Welsh *ym*). Subsequent developments are revealed by tracing the history of this prefix in the two languages and its ultimate replacement in Welsh with postverbal expressions (e.g. *ei hun* 'himself', *ei gilydd* 'each other'). In neither language are the matches with the host language perfect, but the isomorphy with similar constructions in English and French is striking, especially when seen against the backdrop of other effects of intense contact in these languages.

1. Introduction

The two closely related Celtic languages Welsh and Breton began to diverge from their common Brythonic ancestor (along with Cornish[1]) some time after the ancestors of the Bretons fled the British Isles in the third-sixth centuries C.E. The sociolinguistic settings of the two languages have much in common; both are minority languages which, through much of their post-split history, have been in increasingly intense contact with the dominant, official language of their respective host states. Nonetheless there are important differences between the two settings; Welsh is (cautiously) considered a success story, whereas Breton is a textbook example of abrupt and catastrophic decline. For the specialist in language contact, the two settings represent an interesting comparative laboratory. Some of the language contact effects are unsurprising, as when one finds heavy French lexical influence in Breton, and similar levels of English influence in Welsh. However, the effects of intense contact can go much further than lexical or even lexicosemantic influence. In fact, I suggest that Welsh and Breton have been evolving in ways that are convergent with the dominant languages of their respective host states with respect to a number of grammatical patterns.

In this paper I will trace the development of a particular set of constructions, namely reflexive and reciprocal verbs, to explore the roles of internal and external language change. It happens that the Breton reflexive and reciprocal patterns closely mirror French ones in some striking ways, while the Welsh patterns closely reflect English ones. Even though it is

---

[1] Cornish officially died out in the late 18th century (though some argue that there were at least semi-speakers well into the 19th), so there is no "modern" version in the same sense as for Welsh and Breton. Today there are several hundred speakers of Modern or Revived Cornish, a partially engineered language which looks to its Breton and Welsh sisters for models to help fill gaps. I will have very little to say about Cornish in this paper.

certainly possible to provide purely language-internal accounts of the development of the relevant patterns in both Breton and Welsh, I suggest that, given the larger sociolinguistic picture and the unmistakable contact effects elsewhere in these languages, it is unlikely to be an accident that the patterns explored here have evolved in the ways that they did.

Many historical linguists have been slow to accept the possibility of grammatical borrowing or replication, though in recent years there has been a fair amount of important work in this area (e.g. Heine and Kuteva 2005, Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006, Matras and Sakel 2007). There are several constructions in Brythonic where grammatical borrowing may be precisely what is involved, but in the case of reflexives and reciprocals I suggest that what has happened is more subtle than straightforward grammatical borrowing. Rather than suggesting that there was a specific moment in time when something was overtly "borrowed", I propose to view this as a case of convergent evolution: out of the range of possible choices and linguistic preferences that were available naturally to speakers of Welsh and of Breton, the patterns that came to be preferred were selected (tacitly and subconsciously) in part because of how the contact language worked. Although it is probably impossible to prove beyond any doubt that convergent evolution draws its motivation from contact rather than simply being a coincidence, I would suggest that an explanation appealing partly to contact makes sense when seen against the backdrop of other kinds of extensive contact-induced grammatical realignments found in the languages in question. [2]

Let us look now at the ways in which Breton reflexives and reciprocals resemble French patterns, while the Welsh patterns look more than casually like their English counterparts.

The first point of similarity concerns whether reflexives and reciprocals are typically represented by a single construction, or by different constructions. In Breton, reflexives are normally expressed in the same way as reciprocals (as in French), whereas in Welsh the two kinds of verb are expressed differently (as in English). Thus, the Breton *en em welout* is ambiguous between reflexive and reciprocal readings just as is the French *se voir*, whereas Welsh and English distinguish the two readings: *gweld ei hun* / *to see himself* versus *gweld ei gilydd* / *to see each other*. This point is illustrated in (1), showing the reflexive use, and (2), showing the reciprocal use.

(1) John sees himself in the mirror.

    a. Yann   **en em wel**   er   melezour. (Breton) [3]

        John   RR[4]   see   in.the mirror

---

[2] Other Welsh constructions amenable to analysis as convergent evolution include phrasal verbs (Rottet 2000, 2005) and tag questions (Rottet and Sprouse 2008). Similarly Breton, due to contact with French, has acquired a 'have' perfect (Heine and Kuteva 2005, Rottet [in progress]), i.e. it constructs perfect tenses using a verb of possession plus a past participle. It is the only Celtic language to do this. I suggest that a number of other phenomena in both languages are amenable to such an analysis as well, though to attempt a complete catalog would go well beyond the scope of this article.

[3] Breton word order is fairly complex, with several patterns usually available for any given utterance. The choices are partially pragmatically determined and have further syntactic ramifications, including matters of subject-verb agreement. (For instance, in affirmative sentences, when the subject occurs before the verb, the verb must be 3sg). Thus, "I see" can be expressed as *Gwelout a ran* (lit. seeing PRT do.1sg), *Me a wel* (lit. 1SG PRT see.3SG), *X a welan* (lit. X PRT see.1SG, where X is a direct object), or *X e welan* (lit. X PRT see.1SG, where X is a topicalized adverbial). In Welsh, the basic word order (*dwi'n gweld*, lit. am.I PRT see.VN) does not correspond exactly to any of the Breton options.

    b. Jean   **se**   **voit** dans la   glace. (French)
       John   RR-3SG see   in   the   mirror

    c. Mae   Siôn yn   **gweld** **ei hun**   yn   y   drych. (Welsh)
       is   John PRT   see.VN himself   in   the mirror

    d. John   **sees** **himself** in the mirror. (English)

(2) I think they see each other.

    a. Krediñ   a   ran   ec'h   **en em welont**.
       believe.VN PRT   do.1SG PRT   RR   see.3PL

    b. Je crois   qu' ils   **se**   **voient**.
       I believe.1SG that they RR-3PL   see.3PL

    c. Dwi   'n   credu   eu   bod   nhw 'n   **gweld**   **ei gilydd**.
       am.I   PRT   believe.VN   their be.VN they PRT see.VN   his fellow

    d. I   think they **see**   **each   other**.

Though Breton and French generally use a single construction for both reflexives and reci-procals in the default case, both offer the possibility of disambiguating the two constructions by adding optional postverbal NPs. To insist on a reciprocal reading one can add *an eil egile* ('the second the-other') [5] in Breton and *l'un l'autre* ('the one the other') in French, as shown in parentheses in (3). These phrases consist of two juxtaposed NPs, each iconically representing one of the parties involved in the reciprocal action. When both parties are grammatically feminine, Breton and French can indicate that by using *an eil eben* / *l'une l'autre* respectively.

(3) John and Mary do not see each other.

    a. Yann ha Mari   n'   **en em welont**   ket   **(an   eil   egile)**. [6]
       John and Mary   NEG   RR   see.3PL   NEG   the   other   his-fellow

---

[4] The following abbreviations are used in the morpheme glosses: VN = verbal noun; PRT = particle; NEG = negative; PRET = preterite; PSV = passive; FUT = future; IMP = imperative; IMPF = imperfect; RR = reflexive/reciprocal marker. I will gloss the Welsh prefix *ym-* with YM.

[5] This phrase is difficult to gloss literally. In an etymological sense *egile* means 'his fellow', but since the noun *cile* no longer exists as an independent word, its analysis is opaque to modern Breton speakers. *Egile* functions here and in other contexts as a pronoun meaning 'the other one (masc.)'; cf. *eben* 'the other one (fem.)'. For instance, Chalm (2008: 172) gives *Roit egile din* 'Give me the other one (masc.)' and *Roit eben din* 'Give me the other one (fem.).'

[6] It is also possible to use an inflected form of the preposition *etre* (or in the Léon dialect, *kenetre*) 'between' instead, thus *(ken)etrezomp* 'between us', *(ken)etrezoc'h* 'between you (pl.)' and *(ken)etrezo* (or *−e*) 'between them'. In French the adverb *mutuellement* 'mutually' can be used instead of the phrase *l'un l'autre*.

b. Jean et Marie   ne   **se**   **voient** pas   (**l'**   **un**   **l'**   **autre**).
    John and Mary   NEG   RR-3   see.3PLNEG   the   one   the   other

The material that can be added to insist on a reflexive reading consists of a possessive plus *unan* 'self' in Breton and a stressed pronoun plus *–même* in French, as shown in (4).

(4) They do not see themselves in the mirror.

a. N'   **en em welont**   ket   **o-unan**   er   melezour.
    NEG   RR   see.3PL   NEG   themselves   in-the   mirror

b. Ils   ne   **se**   **voient** pas   **eux-mêmes**   dans   la   glace.
    they   NEG   RR-3   see.3PLNEG   themselves   in   the   mirror

The postverbal NPs used optionally in Breton and obligatorily in Welsh reflexives are clearly cognate, based on what is historically a form of the numeral 'one' (Evans 1989: 89): [7]

	Breton	Welsh
1sg	ma-unan	fy hun ~ fy hunan[8]
2sg	da-unan	dy hun ~ dy hunan
3sg masc.	e-unan	ei hun ~ ei hunan
3sg fem.	hec'h-unan	ei hun ~ ei hunan
1pl	hon-unan	ein hun ~ ein hunain
2pl	hoc'h-unan	eich hun ~ eich hunain
3pl	o-unan	eu hun ~ eu hunain

A third shared similarity is that in Welsh and English, the obligatory material for reflexives and reciprocals occurs postverbally and is polysyllabic, consisting of phrases (e.g. *ei hun* 'himself,' *ei gilydd* 'each other (lit. his fellow)') rather than affixes or clitics. In Breton and French, the obligatory grammaticalized material occurs preverbally, and this material is phonologically bound [9] and monosyllabic. Despite the Standard Breton spelling in two syllables (and the possibility of pronouncing *en em* as [ɛnɛm] in that variety), most traditional dialects for which a local pronunciation is recorded have monosyllabic realizations. Favereau (1997: 263) gives the variants [nom], [nõm], [nõn], [don], [nim], [ym] and [(h)əm].

---

[7] These pronouns share functions outside of reflexive contexts, e.g. to mean 'alone, by oneself':
(a)   Aeth y ferch yno *ei hun*.   (Jones 1976: 46)
         'The girl went there alone / by herself.'
(b)   Graet o doa al labour *o-unan*. (Chalm 2008: 130)
         'They do the work alone / (all) by themselves.'
And they can also be used after a possessed noun to reinforce the possessor: *fy mrawd fy hun* (Welsh), *ma breur ma-unan* (Breton) 'my own brother'.
[8] The Welsh pattern on the left, using invariable *hun* 'self', tends to be used in the North, while the South tends to prefer *hunan* in the singular and *hunain* in the plural. Both patterns are acceptable in Standard Welsh.
[9] In French the reflexive/reciprocal pronouns *me, te, se, nous, vous, se* are clitics, like other preverbal object pronouns. I leave open the question of whether Breton *en em* should be analyzed as a clitic pronoun or simply a verbal prefix. The history of Breton *en em* is discussed in section 2.

Fourthly, when the reciprocal verb is the oblique object of a preposition, the postverbal phrase takes the form *the one(s) (PREP) the other(s)* in Breton and French but *(PREP) each other* in Welsh and English. In Breton and in French, the preverbal bound material does not appear (except with the preposition *à* 'to' in French; we come back to this point in section 2). These points are shown in (5).

(5) They talk about each other.

 a. Komz a reont **an** **eil** EUS **egile**.
   speak.VN PRT do.3PL the other about his-fellow

 b. Ils   parlent **l'un**   DE **l'autre**.
   they speak. 3PL the one about the other

 c. Maen nhw 'n siarad **AM** **ei** **gilydd**.
   are   they PRT speak.VN about his fellow

 d. They talk **ABOUT** **each other**.

The points illustrated in the above examples are summarized in Table 1.

Characteristic	**French**	**Breton**	**Welsh**	**English**
Reflexives are typically expressed:				
• with the same pattern as reciprocals	+	+	−	−
• with a different pattern from reciprocals	−	−	+	+
Reflexives and reciprocals can be disambiguated by adding optional postverbal material (full NPs)	+	+	NA	NA
The obligatory material marking reflexives and reciprocals is positioned:				
• preverbally	+	+	−	−
• postverbally	−	−	+	+
The obligatory material:				
• is phonologically bound and monosyllabic	+	+	−	−
• is phonologically free and polysyllabic	−	−	+	+
The postverbal reciprocal material (whether optional or obligatory) takes the form:				
• *NP (PREP) NP*	+	+	−	−
• *(PREP) NP*	−	−	+	+

Table 1: Summary of characteristics of reflexive and reciprocal verbs

To be sure, neither pair of languages (Breton-French or Welsh-English) is completely isomorphic with respect to reflexive and reciprocal constructions. Indeed, there are numerous differences within each pair, as there would be with almost any construction one might wish to examine. But the language contact literature stresses that total isomorphism is rarely achieved. I suggest that the similarities outlined above are unlikely to be a coincidence. The fact that each language pair (Breton-French and English-Welsh) is broadly isomorphic with respect to the relevant constructions suggests rather that the dominated language in each pair has evolved in ways that align it with the host language. This alignment or convergence is not perfect, as we will see clearly in the following sections, but it is still unmistakable.

What is of particular interest is to examine how Breton and Welsh, closely related as they are, changed so as to end up with such different reflexive and reciprocal constructions. In fact, modern Welsh still preserves relics showing that it formerly worked much more like Breton. Cognate with the *em* of the Breton particle *en em* is a Welsh prefix *ym* which still occurs with a reflexive or reciprocal sense on a limited number of verbs:

(6) golchi   'to wash (someone/something)'
     ymolchi   'to wash oneself, wash up'

     paratoi   'to prepare (someone/something)'
     ymbaratoi   'to prepare (oneself)'

There were many more such verbs in Middle and early Modern Welsh, but most of the *ym*-prefixed verbs have either fallen out of use entirely, become restricted to formal registers, or evolved semantically so that the presumed original reflexive/reciprocal sense is no longer transparent. (These points will be illustrated in the next section).

The history of reflexive and reciprocal verbs in Brythonic is thus at least partly the history of the prefix *ym-*. We will show that, from a historical perspective, reflexive and reciprocal patterns involve three elements associated with the verb, numbered here to show the diachronic order in which they were most important, i.e.

     [2]   [1]   verb   [3]

Position [1] is occupied by a prefix taking the form *em* in Breton, and *ym-* in Welsh. Position [2] can be occupied by an infixed pronoun[10], of which the Modern Breton *en*, originally a 3sg masculine pronoun, is a frozen relic. Position [3] refers to postverbal full NPs which are different for reflexive and reciprocal verbs and which are generally optional extensions in Breton but obligatory in Welsh. The three elements do not appear to have been especially common in the same utterance, although their co-occurrence is attested, as in (7):

(7) …a   llawer a   aethant …   i'w   **hymlanhau   eu hunain**…
    … and many PRT   went.3PL   to-their   YM-purify.VN themselves
    'and many went … to purify themselves' (1588 Welsh Bible, John 11:55)

---

[10] Infixed pronouns are enclitics which require a host, generally a preposition or a particle, to attach themselves to. Typically an infixed object pronoun occurs with finite verb forms, and an infixed possessive with nonfinite verbal nouns (analogous to infinitives). Their behavior is too complex to lay out in detail here.

Here we see position [2] filled by the pronoun *'w* which is the infixed form of *eu* 'their', attaching in this case to a prepositional host, *i* 'to'. This is followed by an *ym*-prefixed verb (which here takes an <h> caused by the 3pl possessor), and lastly position [3] is filled by the postverbal pronoun *eu hunain* 'themselves'. But much more often the data show one or two of the three elements in a given utterance, with changes in the patterns over time.

We will see that, in a nutshell, Modern Breton preserves reflexive and reciprocal patterns in which the element in position [1] is still primary. Position [2] is filled today with an invariable relic of a former pronoun, and position [3] gets filled only for emphasis or disambiguation. Modern Welsh, on the other hand, has lost the element in position [1] as a productive component of reflexive / reciprocal constructions, and fills position [2] only in very conservative styles. It is the material in position [3] which is obligatory in contemporary Welsh. The net result of these changes is a construction which looks quite different today in the two languages and which brings each more in line with the dominant language of its host state.

In the next sections we will trace the development of these patterns, starting with the particle *ym-*.

2. Reflexes of the prefix *ambhi- in Welsh and Breton

The data reveal that the prefix *em* / *ym* has played a role in the expression of Brythonic reflexives and reciprocals throughout their recorded history. The prefix ultimately derives from IE *ambhi* which is also the source of Latin *ambi*, Greek *amphi*, and German *um* (Jones 1913: 263). Cornish had a cognate prefix *om-*, and in fact Irish shows frozen traces of a prefix *im-* which sometimes has a recoverable notion of reciprocity (e.g. *imbhualadh* 'collision' (< *bualadh* 'hitting, striking') but more often is quite opaque today (e.g. *imphleasc* 'collapse' < *pleasc* 'explode', *imchaint* 'comment' < *caint* 'talk').[11]

The most direct successor of IE *ambhi- > Brythonic *ambi* 'around' is the Welsh preposition *am*, which can still occasionally mean 'around' in Modern Welsh, especially with parts of the body (e.g. *"gan roi ei fraich yn dadol **am** ysgwydd Bethan"* 'putting his arm paternally *around* Bethan's shoulder', Williams 1999: 124), though it has largely come to mean 'for' or 'about' today (e.g. *siarad am* 'to talk about'). The form *ym-* is a pretonic form of *am*.

It appears that, in the earliest period, reflexes of *im-* could be used by themselves to make a verb reflexive or reciprocal, without requiring the support of any additional element.[12] This stage is attested in the earliest texts for both Welsh and Breton. For Welsh, the Black Book of Carmarthen, a manuscript from the mid-13th century which is thought to be the work of a single scribe at the Priory of St. John in Carmarthen, contains a dozen or so examples of verbs bearing this prefix, variably spelled as *ym-* or *im-*, such as the following:

---

[11] Thanks to Nancy Stenson (p.c.) for providing the Irish data.

[12] Fleuriot (1989: 331-332) refers to "l'ancienneté de la construction dans laquelle IM, *em* suffit à donner au verbe un sens réfléchi ou réciproque." Pilch (1996: 45), on the other hand, suggests that the construction in which a preverbal object pronoun (in what I have called position [2]) co-occurs with IM must be reconstructed for Brythonic and perhaps even for Common Celtic. Although it is possible that this usage existed quite early on as a variant, it is equally clear that IM sufficed by itself in the early texts.

(8)   Nac   **imadneirun** /   nev.r   **imwaredun**
        NEG YM-reproach.1PL   PRT   YM-save.1PL
        'Let us not **reproach one another** / but rather **mutually save ourselves**'[13]
        (Jarman 1982: 10, l. 114-115)

(9)   Ny   llesseint   heb   **ymtial**.
        NEG kill.PSV-3PL   without   YM-avenge.VN
        'They would not succumb without **avenging themselves**.'
        (Jarman 1982: 36, l. 4-5)

(10) Sew a   wnaethant   plant kai   y   vrth   y medel   **ymchueli**.
        thus PRT   do.3PL.PRET children Cain to   from   the reapers   YM-turn.VN
        'What the children of Cain now did, was **to turn away** from the reapers.'
        (Jarman 1982: 22, l. 79-80)

(11) Guae   tidi   hewid /   pir   doduid   im   bid.
        woe   to.2SG also   if   give.PSV   to.1SG world
        'Woe to thee [also]; if the world were given me,'

        Onid   **imwaredit**. / or   druc   digonit.
        unless   YM-save.2SG of.the evil   sate.2SG
        'Unless thou wert to **deliver thyself**, thou wouldst be satiated of the evil.'
        (Jarman 1982: 7, l. 22-25)

Reflexes of this prefix caused (and still cause) lenition of the initial consonant of the verb; thus, *imwaredit* in (11) represents *im + gwaredit*. Lenition is one of several initial consonant mutations which involve the systematic replacement of an initial consonant by another in specific syntactic or morphosyntactic contexts. Basically, in lenition (usually called the soft mutation in Welsh grammar), voiceless stops become voiced, voiced stops become fricatives, and nasal consonants become voiced fricatives. There are some differences in detail between the Brythonic languages.[14]

      The prefix is found also in *Y Gododdin*, considered one of the earliest Welsh texts though of uncertain date of composition:[15]

---

[13] The translations I give for Old and Middle Welsh examples are from the collection of Medieval Welsh texts and translations available online at: http://www.maryjones.us/index.html.

[14] In Breton, lenition involves the following changes: k > g, t > d, p > b, g > c'h ([ɣ] or [h] in this context, though elsewhere <c'h> represents [x] or [h]), gw > w, d > z, b > v, m > v. (Except where specified, the letters have their usual values). Welsh differs from the Breton system in several ways: g > Ø (i.e. it is deleted both phonologically and orthographically) and d > ð (spelled <dd>). In addition, [k] is spelled <c> and [v] is spelled <f> in Welsh. Welsh has two additional changes: /ɬ/ > /l/ and /rh/ > /r/. The spoken languages, particularly in the case of Breton, include some additional changes which are not represented in standard spelling.

[15] The text survives in only one much later manuscript, called the Book of Aneirin, in which most of the orthography, at least, had been "modernized" to Middle Welsh.

(12) Doleu   deu ebyr   am gaer. /   **Ymduhun**   am galch   am glaer.
      noise   two abers   around Caer   YM-awake   for shield   for bright
      'The noise of two Abers around the Caer! / **Arouse thyself** to arms and splendor.'
      (Williams 1961: 55, l. 1412-13)

For Breton, Fleuriot (1989: 331-332) notes that the construction in which the prefix *em* alone sufficed to mark reflexivity/reciprocity survived into Middle Breton, e.g. *Em tennet!* ('Retirez-vous!' ('Stand back!').[16] But it was during the Middle Breton period that the prefix came to be reinforced by the addition of a preverbal object pronoun (in what I have called position [2]) agreeing with the subject. Thus one finds the following combinations, with other variants attested in spelling: 1sg. *ma em,* 2sg. *da em,* 3sg. masc. *en em,* 3sg. fem. *he em,* 1pl. *hon em,* 2pl. *ho(z) em,* 3pl. *o em.* Some of these forms can be seen in the following examples (quoted from Hemon 1954):

(13)   me   yelo … bed   sanct Devy … eguit   **ma**   **em**   **descuez**   dezaff [17]
      1SG   go.FUT pray.3SG   St. Devy   for   my   RR   show.VN to.3SG.MAS
      'I will go find St Devy in order to *show myself* to him'

(14)   scriffet   eo   na   dle   den   **en**   **em**   **meuly**
      written   is   that.not   should man   him   RR   praise.VN
      'it is written that man should not *praise himself*'

(15)   euit **hon**   **em**   **tommaff**
      for   our   RR   warm.VN
      'in order for us to *warm ourselves*'

(16) **ho**   **em**   **delchet**   var   an   hinchou
      your RR   keep.2PL   on   the   road.PL
      '*keep* to the roads' (lit. *hold yourselves*)

Eventually, the 3sg masculine pronoun *en* became frozen in this function and was extended to all persons, leading to the situation that persists today in which *en em* is used to mark such verbs for all subjects.[18] Thus in Modern Breton, reflexive verbs are constructed by placing the invariable particle *en em* in front of a transitive verb, the latter of course undergoing lenition:

---

[16] Nouns and adjectives derived from reflexive verbs continue to use only *em* in Modern Breton, and the prefix is then written with no space. Compare *en em glevout* 'to agree' with *emglev* 'agreement'.

[17] Initial consonant mutations were not always written in Middle Breton or Middle Welsh texts. The expected modern forms of the verbs in (13)-(16), in verbal noun forms, would be *en em zisgouez*, *en em veuliñ*, *en em dennañ*, and *en em zelc'her*.

[18] The Vannetais dialects still form reflexives/reciprocals without the pronoun, by simply prefixing their reflex of *im* to the verb. On the other hand, there may be local dialects in other parts of Brittany that still use a variable pronoun. Troude (1869: 909) gives the following example from a Kerneweg dialect: *poan vezo d'hon em zifenn* "nous aurons de la peine à **nous défendre**" (we will have trouble defending ourselves).

(17) gwiskañ   'to dress (someone)'
      en em wiskañ   'to get dressed, dress oneself'

      diwiskañ   'to undress (someone)'
      en em ziwiskañ   'to get undressed, undress oneself'

      gwalc'hiñ   'to wash (someone or something)'
      en em walc'hiñ   'to wash oneself, wash up'

      magañ   'to feed, nourish'
      en em vagañ   'to feed oneself, take sustenance'

      krougañ   'to hang'
      en em grougañ   'to hang onself'

Reciprocal verbs are constructed in the same way:

(18) sikour   'to help, aid'
      en em sikour   'to help each other'

      karout   'to love'
      en em garout   'to love each other'

As in French, many verbs are potentially ambiguous between a reflexive and a reciprocal reading, the relevant interpretation being assigned by the context:

(19) lazhañ   'to kill'
      en em lazhañ   'to kill oneself' or 'to kill each other'

      gwelout   'to see'
      en em welout   'to see oneself' or 'to see each other'

A small number of verbs have idiomatic meanings when used reflexively. Most of these seem to be calqued on French:

(20) dibab   'to choose'
      en em zibab   'to get by, manage'

      klevout   'to hear'
      en em glevout   'to hear each other; to come to an agreement' (cf. *s'entendre*)

      goulenn   'to ask'
      en em c'houlenn   'to wonder' (cf. *se demander*)

lakaat	'to put, place'
en em lakaat da	'to begin (cf. *se mettre à*)
kavout	'to find'
en em gavout	'to be located' (cf. *se trouver*)

An important difference from French is that *en em* is never separated from the verb or postposed to it, regardless of whether the verb occurs as a verbal noun, as in (20) above, in an inflected form as in (21), or in a past participle as in (22):

(21) **En em**　　wiskit　　　buan!
　　　RR　　　　dress.2PL　　fast
　　　'Get dressed quickly!'

　　　Habillez　　-**vous**　　vite!
　　　dress.2PL　self.2PL　　fast
　　　'Get dressed quickly!'

(22) An　daou　baotr　o deus　　　　**en em glevet** dija.
　　　the　two　boy　have.3PL　　　RR　　heard　already
　　　'The two boys have already come to an agreement.'

　　　Les　deux　garçons　**se**　　　　sont　déjà　**mis**　d'　　accord.
　　　the　two　boys　　self.3PL　are　already put　in　　agreement
　　　'The two boys have already come to an agreement.'

Whether Breton uses its auxiliary 'to be' or 'to have' to conjugate these verbs in compound tenses is a matter of dialect variation, with some dialects following the French pattern of using 'to be' for all such verbs, and others preferring 'to have'.

　　　French and Breton also have in common that the preverbal reflexive/reciprocal material cannot be used for oblique objects. Thus, 'to talk about each other' or 'to need each other' cannot be expressed pronominally in French because the verbs involved are *parler DE* 'to talk about' and *avoir besoin DE* 'to have need of'. The object is thus not direct but oblique:

(23) Ils　(*se)　parlent　　l'un　　　　**de**　　l'autre.
　　　they　self　talk.3PL　the-one　　of　　the-other
　　　'They talk about each other.'

　　　Ils　(*s')　ont　　　besoin　l'un　　　**de**　l'autre.
　　　they　self　have.3PL　need　　the-one　of　l'autre.
　　　'They need each other.'

The same is true in Breton. Thus, when using the expression *ober gaou ouzh (unan bennak)* 'to do wrong to (someone)' where the preposition *ouzh* is required, *en em* cannot be used:

(24) (*en em)   ober   gaou   an eil   **ouzh**   egile
   (*EN EM)   do.VN   wrong the second   to   his-fellow
   'to do wrong to each other'

Breton and French differ in how verbs taking an indirect object behave. In French, these pattern with transitive verbs—that is, the pronominal verb is possible (e.g. *se parler* 'to talk to each other', cf. *parler à quelqu'un* 'to talk to someone') whereas in Breton they pattern with oblique objects and so *en em* is not possible:

(25) *En em   gomz   an eil   da   egile
   EN EM   talk.VN   the other   to   his-fellow
   'to talk to each other'

   Komz   an   eil   da   egile
   talk.VN   the   other to   his-fellow
   'to talk to each other'

The relevant generalization, then, is that *en em* can be used only with transitive verbs. (But we will come back to this point in the last section).

  Turning now to Modern Welsh, we find that a certain number of transitive verbs still have intransitive counterparts using the prefix *ym-*. Some of these can take a complement which traditionally occurs after the preposition *â* 'with' (though in Modern Welsh some use other prepositions, and a few can even take a direct object). It must be noted that, despite the prefix *im-* having been productive in Breton and Welsh since before they split into separate languages, the two languages actually share very few verbs showing this prefix.

  Some of the Welsh *ym*-prefixed verbs do have a more or less straightforwardly reflexive or a reciprocal sense (although it is almost always possible to render these with an intransitive equivalent in English):

(26) golchi   ymolchi (cf. Breton *en em walc'hiñ*)
   'to wash'   'to wash oneself, wash up'

   croesi   ymgroesi
   'to cross'   'to cross oneself, make the sign of the cross'

   paratoi   ymbaratoi
   'to prepare'   'to prepare oneself, get ready'

But much more often, the prefixed forms show some level of semantic specialization giving a resulting conventionalized meaning that is less than fully transparent:

(27) diswyddo   ymddiswyddo
   'to dismiss'   'to resign'

   gostwng   ymostwng
   'to lower, reduce' 'to submit; to bow'

dangos   ymddangos
'to show'   'to appear (come into view)' (but also 'to appear, seem')

gwrthod   ymwrthod (â)
'to refuse'   'to abstain'

gwthio   ymwthio
'to push'   'to push oneself, squeeze (into a crowd, a tight space)'

gosod   ymosod (ar)
'to set, put'   'to attack'

ceisio   ymgeisio (am)
'to try'   'to apply (e.g. for a job)'

And there are many verbs prefixed with *ym-* whose meaning has evolved considerably and unpredictably. It is difficult to consider these reflexive or reciprocal verbs at all:

(28) chwilio   ymchwilio
      'to seek, search for'   'to investigate, look into'

      dwyn   ymddwyn
      'to steal; to bear'   'to behave; to conceive'

      teithio   ymdeithio
      'to travel'   'to march'

      gwneud   ymwneud (â)
      'to do, make'   'to concern, have to do with, be about'

      trechu   ymdrechu
      'to defeat, beat'   'to struggle, make an effort, exert oneself'

The semantic specialization characterizing many of the Welsh *ym*-prefixed verbs partly explains why, when Breton does have a cognate form, it often does not have the same meaning. Thus, based on *lazhañ* (B) */ lladd* (W) 'to kill', Breton has *en em lazhañ* 'to kill oneself' or 'to kill each other', whereas Welsh has *ymladd* 'to fight' and *ymlâdd* 'to exhaust'.[19] And whereas *en em welout* can still mean 'to see oneself' or 'to see each other' in Breton, *ymweld* in Welsh means 'to visit'. It is obvious that the initial idea of reciprocity ('see each other') is gone, since the object of *ymweld â* need not be a person but can be a monument, a city, a museum, etc.

---

[19] This is an unusual case in that *lladd* has two derivatives, with different stress patterns. *Ymladd* 'to fight' is stressed on the penultimate (i.e. in this case the prefix), which is the usual case; *ymlâdd* 'to exhaust' is stressed on the stem. There are only a handful of *ym*-prefixed verbs showing this irregular behavior in Welsh.

Finally, there are a number of verbs bearing what looks like the *ym-* prefix, but for which the presumed base does not actually exist (at least, not in the modern language):

(29) ymffrostio   'to boast'
     ymdopi   'to cope, manage'
     ymddeol   'to retire'
     ymddiried   'to trust'
     ymddiheuro   'to apologise'

The modern language does not offer any verbs **ffrostio*, **topi*, **deol*, **diried*, **diheuro* from which the verbs in (29) could be synchronically derived.

Thus it is potentially misleading to characterize *ym-* simply as a prefix used to create reflexive or reciprocal verbs, as is sometimes done (e.g. Gruffudd 2000: 21). A more accurate statement is the one found in King's (2000: 235) *Pocket Modern Welsh Dictionary* which says of the prefix that it is "… used to form verbs and derived nouns, and often, but by no means always, conveys the idea of 'self'." A still more accurate way to characterize it, at least in Middle Welsh when its use was more robust, is as a marker of the middle voice. In his study of *ym-*prefixed verbs in the classic Middle Welsh romances collectively called *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi*, Vendryes (1927) showed that *ym-* could color the meaning of the base verb in a number of ways, only some of which were reflexive or reciprocal. He proposed that *ym-* was really a middle voice marker, with semantics similar to the middle voice in Greek, where reflexive and reciprocal meanings are a subset but clearly not exhaustive of the possibilities.[20]

In contemporary Welsh, *ym-*prefixed forms still occur,[21] though they are clearly less frequent than in Middle Welsh in terms of types and probably also of tokens. While a number of such words are perfectly ordinary Welsh words today, such as *ymddangos* 'to seem, appear', *ymweld* 'to visit', and *ymladd* 'to fight', many others are limited to formal or literary styles. Thus, in the modern language, when the sense of the verb actually is reflexive or reciprocal, speakers (and writers) generally use the postposed reflexive or reciprocal noun phrases instead of the *ym-* prefix. Thus, while dictionaries sometimes still list a verb *ymgaru* 'to love each other', even the Welsh Bible, considered a monument of literary Welsh, has the periphrastic construction:

(30) [C]arwch   eich   gilydd fel   y   cerais   i   chwi.
     love.2PL.IMP your   fellow as   PRT   loved.1SG   I   you
     '[L]ove one another as I have loved you.' (John 15:12)

In some other cases it is interesting to compare the Welsh Bible of 1588[22] with a follow-up edition of 1620. In (31) and (32) we see that the verbs *ymganmol* 'to praise oneself' and *ym-*

---

[20] Kemmer (1993) is an extensive study of the middle voice in the languages of the world. Although she does not discuss Welsh, the Middle Welsh data do appear to me to be highly compatible with her cross-linguistic analysis.

[21] In a study of *ym-*prefixation in the modern contemporary novel *Cyfryngis* (Williams 1999), I counted 30 separate types, representing several hundred tokens.

[22] The text of the 1588 Bible is available online via the National Library of Wales:
(http://www.llgc.org.uk/index.php?id=1588welshbible).

lanhau 'to cleanse/purify oneself' have been replaced in the later edition by periphrastic equivalents:

(31) Canys   nid   ydym   yn   **ymganmol**   trachefn   wrthych
     for   NEG   are.1PL   PRT   YM-praise.VN   always   to.2PL
     'for we do not always praise ourselves to you' (2 Corinthians 5:12, 1588 translation)

     Canys   nid   ydym   yn   **ein   canmol**   **ein hunain**
     for   NEG   are.1PL   PRT   our   praise.VN   ourselves
     'for we do not praise ouselves to you' (2 Corinthians 5:12, 1620 translation)

(32) i'w   **hymlanhau**   **eu hunain**…
     to-their   YM-purify.VN   themselves
     'to purify themselves' (John 11: 55, 1588 translation)

     i'w   **glanhau**   **eu hunain**…
     to-their   purify.VN   themselves
     'to purify themselves' (John 11: 55, 1620 translation)

This suggests rather strongly that the period in question was one in which the use of *ym-*prefixed verbs to express reflexivity was weakening.

To show that this replacement is still ongoing, more recent examples are found in comparing the 1620 version of the Bible with a recent 1988 translation:

(33) hyd onid   **ymsathrai**   **y naill y llall**
     until   YM-trample.3SG.IMPF the one the other
     'until they were trampling on one another' (1620 translation)

     nes   eu   bod   yn   **sathru**   **ei gilydd**   dan   draed
     until their   be.VN   PRT   trample.VN   his fellow   under   foot
     'until they were trampling one another under foot' (1988 translation)

(34) ac   a   **ymguddiodd** bum   mis
     and   PRT   YM-hid.3SG   five   month
     'and she hid herself for five months' (1620 translation)

     ac   fe   **'i**   **cuddiodd**   **ei hun** am   bum   mis
     and   PRT   her   hid.3SG   herself for   five   month
     'and she hid herself for five months' (1988 translation)

Similarly, Jones and Thomas (1977: 28) note that today, instead of the theoretically still possible *Mae Mair yn ymbaratoi* 'Mair is preparing (herself)' or *Mae hi'n ymesgusodi* 'she's excusing herself', people are more likely to say: *Mae Mair yn paratoi ei hun* and *Mae hi'n esgusodi ei hun*.

The second modern solution for expressing ideas formerly covered by *ym*-prefixed verbs is to simply use the non-prefixed verb both transitively and intransitively. Formerly the language distinguished between *gwisgo* 'to dress (someone)' and *ymwisgo* 'to get dressed, to dress oneself' (cf. Breton *gwiskañ*, *en em wiskañ*):

(35) **Ymwisgais**   mor fuan ag   y   gallaswn,   ac   aethum yno.[23]
     YM-dress.1SG-PRET as fast as   PRT   could.1SG   and   went.1SG there
     'I got dressed as quickly as I could, and I went there.'
     (Jones 1871: 369)

Contemporary Welsh can simply use *gwisgo* for both, and *ymwisgo* is not even included in most modern dictionaries. Similarly *gadael* 'to leave' was transitive and *ymadael* 'to part, take leave of; to depart' was intransitive. Today Welsh speakers freely use *gadael* for both. *Ymadael* still occurs, but generally only in formal registers.

     For most verbs today one has no choice but to use the periphrastic construction. For instance, for 'to cut oneself', no verb **ymdorri* exists; the only possibility is *torri ei hun*. So the number of reflexives and reciprocals for which an *ym*-prefixed form is even available is quite limited today, and many (or most) of the verbs which have the *ym*-prefix are no longer straightforwardly reflexive or reciprocal at all.

3. Later developments

To get from the earliest period to the modern constructions, Welsh must have gone through something like the following sequence of stages to mark reflexivity:

Stage 1: The prefix IM- is used by itself: <u>IM-verb</u>.
Stage 2: Reinforced patterns in which the IM-prefixed verbs are accompanied by a preverbal infixed pronoun and/or a postverbal phrase using *hunan*, the maximal pattern being: <u>infixed pronoun + IM-verb + X-*hunan*</u>.[24]
Stage 3: IM ceases to be required on most verbs: <u>infixed pronoun + verb + X-*hunan*</u>.
Stage 4: X-*hunan* becomes obligatory with true reflexives; the infixed pronouns become optional and increasingly fall out of use in colloquial language. The resulting pattern is essentially isomorphic with English, <u>verb + X-*hunan*</u>.

Stage 1, presumably the original stage in Brythonic using IM alone, was illustrated in the previous section in examples (8)-(12). The passage to stage 2 is characterized by reinforcement of the reflexive sense of the IM-marked verb using a preverbal infixed pronoun and/or a postverbal pronoun using –*hunan* 'self'. It seems possible that the development of these reinforced reflexes may have been related to the development of *ym*-prefixed verbs in Middle Welsh into a middle voice marker, e.g. verbs of fighting, arguing, taking revenge, begging, requesting, conversing, and others where true reflexives formed only a subset (Vendryes

---

[23] This sentence would surely have sounded very literary and perhaps a bit archaic even in 1871.

[24] What I have called stage 2 "reinforced patterns" may be a conflation of several separate steps. It would be a major undertaking, and completely impossible in the scope of a single article, to conduct a full historical study of the history of *ym*- in Welsh verbs and to work out all of the details of these stages. I believe my general point is sufficiently clear with this broad overview.

1927; see also Kemmer 1993 for a crosslinguistic typology of semantic categories covered by middle voice constructions). Stage 2 was seen, for instance, in (32).[25]

At stage 3, the IM prefix ceased to be an obligatory marker of reflexives and reciprocals and even began being stripped away from verbs that had had it for centuries. Instead, the postverbal pronouns based on *hunan* 'self' came to be obligatory with most verbs where true reflexivity was involved. Conservative styles of Modern Welsh remain at stage 3 today; the preverbal pronoun is still required along with the postverbal form in *hunan*, giving the following pattern (note that the pronouns cause certain initial consonant mutations—the 1sg causes nasal mutation, 2sg causes lenition, etc.):

(36)   Dwi   'n   *fy*   ngweld   fy hun.
    am.I   PRT   my   see.VN   myself
    'I see myself.'

    Rwyt   ti   'n   *dy*   weld   dy hun.
    are   you   PRT   your   see.VN   yourself
    'You see yourself.'

    Mae   hi   'n   *ei*   gweld   ei hun.
    is   she   PRT   her   see.VN   herself
    'She sees herself.'

(37)   Gwelodd   Wyn   *ef*   ei hun.
    saw.3SG   Wyn   him   himself
    'Wyn saw himself'

Prescriptive grammar still insists that the postverbal pronouns in *hunan* are supplemental and that the preverbal pronouns are obligatory (Jones 1913: 307, Griffiths and Jones 1995). But the fact is that in less conservative modern styles it is perfectly acceptable (and in fact normal) to leave out the infixed pronoun and only include the postverbal one, and even prescriptive works acknowledge this colloquial pattern (e.g. Williams 1980: 61-62). This construction, representing stage 4 in the above historical sequence, is the usual way to construct reflexives in colloquial Welsh today:

(38)   Dwi   'n   gweld   fy hun.
    am.I   PRT   see.VN   myself
    'I see myself.'

    Rwyt   ti   'n   gweld   dy hun.
    are   you   PRT   see.VN   yourself
    'You see yourself.'

---

[25] It seems unlikely that every verb would have had to go through this triply marked stage; it is quite possible that, say, *ymguddio* 'to hide (one)self' could have given way to *ei guddio ei hunan* 'to hide himself' once this pattern had been established with other verbs, thus in a sense going directly from stage 1 to 3. But stage 2 is clearly attested for some verbs and is a logical intermediate pattern between 1 and 3.

Mae hi 'n gweld ei hun.
is she PRT see.VN herself
'She sees herself.'

Reciprocal verbs have gone a slightly simpler route in that infixed pronouns are not used in any register. Formerly constructed with the *ym-* prefix as seen in (8), reciprocals are today constructed using only postverbal phrases. These are not totally isomorphic with English since they take first, second, and third person plural forms:

(39) Dyn ni 'n gweld ein gilydd.
      are we PRT see.VN our fellow
      'We see each other.'

      Dych chi 'n gweld eich gilydd.
      are you PRT see.VN your fellow
      'You see each other.'

      Maen nhw 'n gweld ei gilydd.
      are they PRT see.VN his fellow
      'They see each other.'

The form of the postverbal reciprocal NP has, however, changed over time. It originally took the form *pawb ei gilydd* (or *pob un ei gilydd*) 'everyone his fellow (partner, mate)', using the archaic noun *cilydd* 'partner, mate,' which was lenited because of the 3sg masculine possessive *ei*:

(40) Gwelai pawb ei gilydd.
      saw.IMPF everyone his fellow
      'Everyone saw his fellow (i.e. each other).'

      Carwn bawb ei gilydd.[26]
      love.1PL.IMP everyone his fellow
      'Let us love one another.'
      (Jones 1976: 53)

The phrase *pawb ei gilydd* was invariable regardless of the referent; it would have been used in all three of the sentences in (39). By the 15th century (Jones 1913: 305) *pawb* came to be omitted from this expression, leaving *ei gilydd* alone to mark reciprocal verbs. Gradually the possessive pronoun *ei* 'his' began to vary to agree with each of the three possible plural referents; thus *ein gilydd* 'our fellow' and *eich gilydd* 'your fellow' came into use for 1pl and 2pl respectively, while the original *ei gilydd* 'his fellow', continued to be used in the 3pl.[27]

---

[26] The lenition seen in *pawb > bawb* is found when the phrase functions as the direct object of a synthetic verb.

[27] The expected 1pl and 2pl forms would actually have been **ein cilydd* and **eich cilydd*, since *ein* 'our' and *eich* 'your' do not cause any mutation on a following noun. But since the independent noun *cilydd* 'mate, fellow, partner' was apparently already falling out of use, the mutated form *gilydd* became frozen in this use. In the 3pl one might have expected the form **eu cilydd* 'their fellow' to emerge, but since the possessives *ei* and

The end result of these changes in Welsh is that the reciprocal construction too is nearly isomorphic with English although it is obviously not a simple calque on the English phrase *each other* since the Welsh equivalents in fact make a distinction between 1pl, 2pl, and 3pl that the English phrase *each other* leaves unstated.[28]

Clearly, the Welsh constructions have changed considerably more than the Breton ones since the Brythonic period. Indeed, it has been argued that in terms of morphology, "[i]t is difficult not to conclude that Breton has maintained the traditional morphological processes in better working order than Welsh." (Humphreys 1990: 148). Humphreys goes on to suggest that "Celtic studies […] would benefit if scholars, and others, ceased to assume that Welsh is the norm from which Breton has to varying degrees deviated." The present study reveals an additional area of the grammars of these two language in which his claims are borne out.[29]

4. Discussion and conclusions

In this last section I will mention some additional effects of recent intense contact which have emerged at a time when most everyone, if they speak the minority language at all, are also perfectly fluent in the host language.

French influence on Breton today extends to lexicosemantics of pronominal verbs. For instance, we saw in section 2 that Breton does not traditionally use *en em* with intransitive verbs. But some modern idiomatic pronominal verbs which are calqued on French represent a significant departure from this traditional Breton usage. Thus, the verb *goulenn* 'to ask' can be used reflexively, as *en em c'houlenn*, meaning 'to wonder' (cf. French *se demander*), even though *goulenn* is actually an intransitive verb requiring a preposition before its object—variously *ouzh*, *gant* or *digant*. The same is true of the calque *en em blijout* 'to have a good time, have fun' (cf. French *se plaire*), where *plijout* 'to please' otherwise takes an indirect object with *da* 'to'.

Pedagogical materials for Breton regularly mention that French speakers should avoid turning verbs into reflexive verbs just because their translation equivalents are reflexive in French, and some combinations are criticized and have been considered a feature of the speech of *néo-bretonnants* or those who have learned Breton as an L2 in a classroom setting. However, it appears that it is not only learners who do this but also native speakers, at least to some extent. For instance, to express 'to relieve one's boredom' (cf. French *se désennuyer*) Breton dictionaries give *dienoeiñ* or *dizenoeiñ*, not the reflexive form *en em zienoeiñ*. Yet the reflexive form is used, for instance, in the autobiography of Herve Herri (1982: 22), a native speaker born in 1904 whose Breton has been considered a good example of authentic Breton:

---

eu are both pronounced /i/ in normal speech, the 3pl reciprocal phrase has continued to be spelled with *ei* instead of *eu*.

[28] It should be noted that older stages of Welsh could also use the postverbal phrase *y naill y llall*, more or less literally 'the one the other', which resembled the Breton and French pattern by overtly naming each entity participating in the reciprocal action. This phrase was seen in (33).

[29] An anonymous reader of this manuscript raised the question of why Breton should have remained more conservative morphosyntactically, if not lexically, than Welsh. This is an intriguing question for which I am, unfortunately, not prepared to offer an answer.

(41) Evit **en em zienoeiñ**   e   kane   a-hed   an deiz.
     for RR   unbore.VN   PRT   sang.IMPF.3SG   throughout   the day
     'She sang all day long to relieve her boredom.'

Hewitt (1977) and a number of writers after him have given the example *en em dommañ a ra ouzh an tan* 'he warms himself by the fire' instead of the more traditional *tommañ a ra ouzh an tan*, calling the former a calque on the French 'il *se chauffe* auprès du feu' where the verb is reflexive. A calque it may well be, but the implication that it is purely an invention of 20th century *néo-bretonnants* who have incompletely mastered the norms of the language is challenged by the fact that *en em dommañ* is attested in Middle Breton (see example (15) above).

    In Welsh, the decreasing importance of the prefix *ym-* can be seen not only in verbs but also in nouns. In both Breton and Welsh, reflexes of IM- have been used not only with verbs but also with other parts of speech derived from them, particularly adjectives and nouns. Breton continues to use *em-* as a prefix in this way, so corresponding to the verb *en em lazhañ* 'to kill oneself' is the noun *emlazh* 'suicide', while corresponding to *en em garout* 'to love oneself' is the noun *emgarantez* 'selfishness.' In Welsh, some older derived nouns still have the prefix *ym-*, e.g. *ymadawiad* 'departure', *ymyrraeth* 'interference', *ymgolledigaeth* 'self-preoccupation' (cf. *ymadael* 'to depart', *ymyrryd* 'to interfere', *ymgolli* 'to lose oneself, become absorbed (e.g. in one's work)'). However, in many cases these compete today with forms using *hunan* as a prefix, a procedure completely unknown in Breton and most likely calqued on English words in *self-*. Some variable cases include the following: **hunan***ddarostyngiad* ~ **ym***ddarostyngiad* 'self-abasement'; **ym***ddisgybledig* ~ **hunan***ddisgybledig* 'self-disciplined'. In a few cases both *hunan* and *ym-* occur in the same word, revealing the felt need to reinforce the meaning 'self' even when the prefix *ym-* is present: **ym***wadiad* ~ **hunanym***wadiad* 'self-denial'.

    But the recent English-Welsh dictionary by Griffiths and Jones (1995), with its nine tightly packed columns of terms prefixed with *self-*, reveals that the vast majority of recently coined terms use *hunan-* alone, confirming that *ym-* is no longer able fully or reliably to convey the meaning 'self'; thus, it contains **hunan***garwch* 'selfishness' (cf. Breton *emgarantez*) and **hunan***laddiad* 'suicide' (cf. Breton *emlazh*) as well as **hunan***werthfawrogiad* 'self-appreciation', **hunan***lygriad* 'self-contamination', **hunan***ddinistr* 'self-destruction', and many others.

    There are also some possible candidates for direct calquing on English idioms using reflexive verbs as in these examples from two recent novels:

(42) Gwna   dy hun   yn   gyfforddus.
     make.2SG-IMP   yourself   PRT   comfortable
     'Make yourself comfortable.'
     (Williams 1999: 164)

(43) gwneud   ffyliaid ohonan   ni   'n hunain
     make.VN   fools   of.1PL   us   ourselves
     'to make fools out of ourselves'
     (Williams 1999: 180)

(44) Rhaid   fy   mod   i   wedi   crio   fy hun   i   gysgu.
     need   my   be.1SG 1SG   after   cry.VN myself   to   sleep.VN
     'I must have cried myself to sleep.'
     (Price 2010: 25)

(45) helpodd   ei hun   i   *vol-au-vent*
     help.3SG.PRET   himself   to   vol-au-vent
     'helped himself to some *vol-au-vent*'
     (Williams 1999: 164)

(46) tybiai   rhai   eu bod   yno   i   fwynhau   eu hunain
     consider.IMPF   some   their be.VN   there   to   enjoy.VN   themselves
     'some considered that they were there to enjoy themselves'
     (Williams 1999: 165)

In this paper I have attempted to sketch out the history of reflexive and reciprocal verbs in Welsh and Breton, and to show that, from a common starting point, both languages have evolved in ways that bring them in line, in broad pattern if not always in small detail, with English and French, the languages with which they are in intense contact. We have seen that, rather clearly, Welsh has changed the most dramatically and the degree to which the resulting Welsh patterns have come to resemble English is fairly striking. Although Breton has changed less from its presumed starting point, the resemblance of its reflexive and reciprocal patterns to French ones is also noteworthy. Yet in neither of these cases do we appear to have anything that could be straightforwardly called grammatical borrowing. It looks, rather, as though Welsh and Breton have simply evolved over time in ways that have brought them into greater alignment with the dominant languages of their host states, what we have proposed to call convergent evolution. My suspicion is that there are many other examples of convergent evolution yet to be uncovered both for these and for other pairs of languages in prolonged intense contact.

References

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA and DIXON, R. M. W. (eds.), 2006. Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology. Oxford University Press.

CHALM, EUGENE. 2008. La grammaire bretonne pour tous. Lannuon: Al Alarc'h Embannadurioù.

EVANS, D. SIMON. 1989. A grammar of Middle Welsh. Dublin: The School of Celtic Studies / Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

FAVEREAU, FRANCIS. 1997. Grammaire du breton contemporain. Morlaix: Skol Vreizh.

FLEURIOT, LEON. 1989. Le vieux breton: Eléments d'une grammaire. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints.

Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru: A dictionary of the Welsh language: 1950-present. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

GRIFFITHS, BRUCE and JONES, DAFYDD GLYN. 1995. The Welsh Academy English-Welsh dictionary. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

GRUFFUDD, HEINI. 2000. Cymraeg da. Talybont: Y Lolfa.

HEINE, BERND and KUTEVA, TANIA. 2005. Language contact and grammatical change. Cambridge University Press.

HEMON, ROPARZ. 1954. Le verbe réfléchi en breton. Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie 24: 248-263.

HERRI, HERVE. 1982. Evel-se e oamp. Brest: Al Liamm.

HEWITT, STEVE. 1977. The degree of acceptatibility of modern literary Breton to native Breton speakers. Diploma of linguistics thesis, University of Cambridge.

HUMPHREYS, HUMPHREY LLOYD. 1990. Traditional morphological processes and their vitality in Modern Breton and Welsh. In MARTIN J. BALL, JAMES FIFE, ERICH POPPE, and JENNY ROWLAND (eds.), Celtic linguistics: readings in the Brythonic languages, Festschrift for T. Arwyn Watkins. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 129-150.

JARMAN, A. O. H. 1982. Llyfr Du Caerfyrddin. Cariff: University of Wales Press.

JONES, MORGAN DAVID. 1976. A guide to correct Welsh. Llandysul: Gomer Press.

JONES, JOHN MORRIS. 1913. A Welsh Grammar: phonology and accidence. Oxford: Clarendon.

JONES, REV. T. JERMAN. 1871. Correspondence. Y Drysorfa 24.

JONES, MORRIS and ALAN R. THOMAS. 1977. The Welsh language: studies in its syntax and semantics. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press.

KEMMER, SUZANNE. 1993. The middle voice. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

KING, GARETH. 2000. Pocket modern Welsh dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MATRAS, YARON and SAKEL, JEANETTE (eds.). 2007. Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

PILCH, HERBERT. 1996. Word formation in Welsh and Breton: A comparative study. Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie 48: 34-88.

PRICE, ANGHARAD. 2010. Caersaint. Talybont: Y Lolfa.

ROTTET, KEVIN J. 2000. The calquing of phrasal verbs in language contact. In JULIE AUGER and ANDREA WORD-ALLBRITTON (eds.), The CVC of cociolinguistics: contact, variation, and culture. Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 2. Bloomington, Indiana: IULC,109-126.

ROTTET, KEVIN J. 2005. Phrasal verbs and English influence in Welsh. Word 56(1): 39-70.

ROTTET, KEVIN J. (in progress). Convergent change in Breton-French language contact.

ROTTET, KEVIN J. and SPROUSE, REX. 2008. Tag questions in Welsh. Diachronica 25(1): 20-53.

TROUDE, AMABLE. 1869. Nouveau dictionnaire pratique français-breton, du dialecte de Léon avec les acceptations diverses dans les dialectes de Vannes, Tréguier et Cornouailles et la prononciation quand elle peut paraître douteuse. Brest : Lefournier.

VENDRYES, JOSEPH. 1927. Les verbes composés avec ym dans les Mabinogion. In Mélanges bretons et celtiques offerts à M. J. Loth. Paris: Honoré Champion, 49-62.

WILLIAMS, ALWEN. 1999. Cyfryngis. Talybont: Y Lolfa.

WILLIAMS, IFOR. 1961. Canu Aneirin. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

WILLIAMS, STEPHEN J. 1980. A Welsh Grammar. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.