The Syntax of Predication in Haitian

Michel F. DEGRAFF¹

Computer & Information Science University of Pennsylvania E-mail: degraff@linc.cis.upens.edu

1 Introduction

At first glance, the pattern of Haitian (HA) predicative constructions is puzzling. The puzzle manifests itself most clearly in simple affirmative sentences that are unmarked for tense. In (ia)–(ic), AP, PP and bare NP predicates are string-adjacent to their subjects: these clauses show no overt copula. However, not all kinds of predicates are allowed to be string-adjacent to their subjects. In (id), the predicate is a nominal occurring with a determiner or is a proper name. I assume that such a predicate is a Determiner Phrase (DP) in the sense of Abney (1987). With a DP predicate, the morpheme se must occur between the subject and the predicate.

(1)	a.	<i>Bouki</i> Bouki	(*	se SE)	malad sick						"Bouki is sick"
	b.	<i>Bouki</i> Bouki	(*	se SE)		tab table	la DET				"Bouki is under the table"
	c.	<i>Bouki</i> Bouki	(??	ee SE)	doktě doctor						"Bouki is a doctor"
٠	d.	<i>Bouk</i> i Bouki	*(se SE)	{ you DE:		oktě octor	l	Aristide Aristide)	

"Bouki is { a doctor | Aristide }"

The distinction between AP/PP/NP and DP predicates with respect to occurrence of se is blurred in either of three cases: 1) when the predicate is preceded by a tense morpheme, 2) when the predicate is negated, or 3) when the subject is questioned.

For their ever-gracious help with this paper, I give many thanks to: Sabine latridou, Tony Kroch, Mitch Marcus and Gillian Sankoff; to: Julie Auger, Derek Bickerton, José Camacho, Enoh Titilayo Ebong, Caroline Heycock, John Lumsden, Jean Nicolas and Fred Weerman; and to participants at CLIFF, NELS and SPCL.

See Longobardi (1990) for arguments that proper names are DPs.

The following abbreviations are used: ANT 'anterior', DEM 'demonstrative', DET 'determiner', FUT 'future', IRREAL 'irrealis', PROG 'progressive', 1sg 'first singular', ..., 3pl 'third plural', # 'pause' (denoting comma intonation), # 'phonetically sall element'.

under

doktě

{

doctor

uon

b. kimoun who

c. kimoun

who

d. kimoun ki

KI

"Bouki {was|is}(n't) a doctor"

SE

se.

"Who is under the table?"

"Who is a doctor?"

A Tense, Mood or Aspect morpheme preceding the predicate gives rise to the pattern in (2), where se is illicit throughout.4

"Bouki was sick" malad 80 (2) a. Bouki (* sick SE Bouki "Bouki was under the tab anba 80 b. Bouki table DET under SE ANT Bouki table" "Bouki was a doctor" doktė ₽€ c. Bouki doctor ANT Bouki "Bouki was a doctor" doktě yon 80 ae d. Bouki DET doctor SE ANT Bouki

Negating the constructions in (1) produces the pattern in (3), which is similar to (2). In (2) and (3), se is uniformly absent between subject and predicate.

"Bouki is not sick" malad (3) a. Bouki **Bick** NEG tab la anba 80 80 b. Bouki table DET under SE NEG SE Bouki "Bouki is not under the table" doktě c. Bouki SE doctor NEG Bouki "Bouki is not a doctor" Aristide } doktě von 80 d. Bouki (* Aristide DET doctor SE NEG Bouki "Bouki is not { a doctor { Aristide }"

In (1d), (2d) and (3d), the predicate is a nominal co-occurring with a determiner, a DP; but (2d) and (3d) contrast with (1d) by the absence of se between subject and predicate.5

Another pattern of interest is produced when the subject is wh-moved, as in (4). Throughout (4), the complementizer ki uniformly surfaces in a position preceding the predicate. Interestingly, in (4d), the predicate, even though a DP, may occur without se.6

"Who is sick?" (4) a. kimoun ki (* se) malad SE **Bìck** Ы who

*Other Tenne, Mond or Aspect markets like prof 'FUT', ap 'PROG, IRREALIS, FUT', ka 'IRREALIS' produce patterns similar to (2). In Definalf (in press), I argued that HA Tense, Mood and Aspect markers are verbs

ee dokté Bouki #

of se.

SE doctor Booki

Hnuki

doktě 10 yon 1 DET ANT

Roski doktě yon PO (iii) Bouki 40 doctor

NEG

Relative clauses with the operator extracted out of subject position are similar to (4) with respect to occurrence DET

"Bouki, he was (not) a doctor" "Bouki, he is not a doctor"

ΚI SE DET doctor Aristide who "Who is { a doctor | Aristide } ?" At least one generalization can be drawn from the above data. Whenever there is a DP in predicate position (regardless of whether it is referential), it must be preceded by either se. or a tense morpheme such as te, or the negation marker pa, or the complementizer ki. What is the nature of se? It seems reasonable to discard the possibility that se is a

copulative verb, the counterpart of French être: all verbs in Haitian follow negation and tense

table DET

doktė

Aristide }

markers while se doesn't. Compare (5) and (6) which show a contrast between se and the verb chante 'to sing': Bouki te) (0 10 yon ANT DET doctor

chante malen sing rooster DET NEG ANT morning DET "The rooster didn't sing this morning"

in addition, neither can se precede negation and tense (when the subject is not leftdislocated):

doklè Bouki SE NEG DET doctor "Bouki {was|is}(n't) a doctor"

If se were a verb, (5) and (7) would be quite idiosyncratic. Sections 2 and 3 will provide further evidence that se is not verbal.

In what follows. I study the nature of se and provide an analysis for (1)-(4) focusing on the mechanisms that regulate the (non-)appearance of se. I argue that se is a resumptive nominal element functioning as a "last resort" to circumvent an ECP violation. The potentially offending trace occupies the base-subject position inside a Small Clause and results from movement of the subject to Spec(IP). At D-structure, predication in Haitian is realized inside a Small Clause. With AP, PP and NP predicate, the trace of the subject is head-governed by the head of the predicate; but in the case of DP in (1d), the trace is not head-governed, which causes the trace to surface as se to save the structure.8

Here, one major caveat is in order. There are utterances where se does co-occur with an apparent subject and where the predicate is either a hare NP or a tense-marked or negated nominal. This seems to contradict the data in (1c), (2c), (2d), (3c) and (3d). But these utterances crucially differ from the latter by having a pause after Bouki, which indicates that Bouki is actually in left-dislocated position, cf. (i), (ii) and (iii). (Left-dislocation structures with se will not be further discussed.) "Bouki, he is a doctor"

The se under study has different properties from the sentence-initial se of cleft constructions which uniformly precedes the clefted constituent, irrespectively of its category.

Previous GB analyses related to (IIA) predicative constructions include Lumsden (1990) and Dépres & Vinet (1991). In DeGraff (1992), I explain why these analyses need to be improved upon.

2 Predication vs. Equation?

Frege (1892), Williams (1980), Rothstein (1983), Rapoport (1987) and Baltin (1990), among others, have claimed that it is coincidental that, in English (and German, for Frege), both predication and equation use the verb be. Rapoport and Baltin, for example, distinguishes the two types of structures as follows: In predicative structures, like John is proud, be is inert for \$\theta\$-assignment, and predication at D-structure is accomplished inside of a Small Clause. In equative structures, like That man is John, \$\theta\$-roles are assigned to two arguments.

It is tempting to adopt the above hypothesis in order to explain (1). Such explanation would proceed in two steps: 1) Se is a \$-role-assigning verb, the IIA counterpart of 'equative' be, and its presence is required in, and only in, equative clauses in order to assign \$\theta\$-roles to the arguments being equated. (1a), (1b), and (1c) are predicative while (1d) is equative. In other words, IIA, unlike English, would overtly differentiate between predication and equation. In a nutshell, this is Fauchois's (1982) take on se and the paradigm in (1) — she calls the two types of clauses, exemplified in (1a)/(1b) and (1d) "relation d'attribution" and "relation d'identification", respectively.

Rapoport (1987) explains predication patterns in Hebrew along somewhat similar lines, using θ - and Case-theory to distinguish between predication and equation. The pattern of copular clauses in Hebrew present-tense matrix clauses overlaps with that of HA. In Hebrew, when the predicate is AP, PP or a bare NP, it can occur string-adjacent to the subject, but when the predicate position is occupied by a definite nominal, e.g., a proper name, there must be a number- and gender-agreeing morpheme between subject and predicate, which Rapoport assumes to be a spell-out of AGR in INFL. For Rapoport, a proper name in the predicate position of a copular clause must generally be θ -marked, and therefore requires Case, which it gets from the overt AGR, AP, PP and bare NP are not arguments; thus they don't need Case, and predication by these projections is accomplished directly inside a matrix Small Clause. θ

However the proposals (too briefly) sketched in the above three paragraphs don't seem to work for the case at hand. As I have argued in (5) and (6), if se were a verb, it would be in a subclass all by itself. This peculiarity casts doubts on the verbal status of se. Furthermore, in certain syntactic environments, the se of so-called equative clauses is absent, even though the sentence maintains its 'equative' reading. One such environment is produced when the subject of a nominal sentence is questioned, cf. (4d) (repeated in (9)). Se is obligatorily present in present-tense affirmative matrix clauses with a DP in predicate position:

(8) your non nèg sa yo *(se) { you dokté | Aristide } one in man DEM DET SE DET doctor Aristide } "One of these men is { a doctor | Aristide }"

Yet when the subject of (8) is questioned, se is optional (and even disfavored):

(9) kinoun ki (?? se) { you dokté ! Aristide) ?
who KI SE DET doctor Aristide
"Who is { a doctor | Aristide } ?"

In (8) and (9), the nominal predicate remains the same: in both cases a DP. Also, the

underlying meaning of the clause is constant, modulo identity of the subject. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that Fauchois's account was right and that se, as a θ -assigning verb, was responsible for the equative meaning of (8) (with Aristide in predicate position). Then, one would expect a DP occurring in predicate position with an equative meaning to require the presence of se; i.e., the occurrence of se should be obligatory in both (8) and (9). Indeed, in both cases, Aristide would be equated to the subject and would need a θ -role. This prediction is not compatible with the facts. 10,11

If argument-hood or referentiality of the nominal in predicate position is the harbinger of the distinction between predication and equation, then (8) and (9) pose a problem. Indeed, in both (8) and (9), you dokté does not seem to be an argument, nor does it have the same referential force as Aristide. In (8), you dokté seems to indicate a property of the subject white Aristide identifies the subject. But, if you dokté is neither an argument nor referential, then there is no reason why it should pattern like Aristide in requiring the presence of se (for θ -role and/or Case). This is a problem for any account of (1)-(4) based on the argument-hood or referentiality of the projection in predicate position.

Thus, it seems that the pattern of predication in IIA cannot be accounted using solely the contrast predication vs. equation. In my analysis, the term 'predication' encompasses both 'predication' (in its more traditional sense) and 'equation'. In particular, I will assume that a nominal in the predicate position of both 'predicative' and 'equative' clauses does function as a predicate over the nominal in subject position. If the nominal in predicate position is not referential, e.g., an indefinite noun, it predicates over the subject without transmitting a referential index to it. If the nominal in predicate position is referential, e.g., a proper name, it, too, predicates over the subject and, in addition, assigns its referential index to the subject through predication (Heggie, 1988). Whence the 'predicative' vs. 'equative' readings of copular clauses.¹²

My analysis does not directly rely on the traditional distinction between 'predication' and 'equation'. Instead, I argue that the different patterns in (1)-(4) result from structural distinctions between the various Small Clauses in which predication takes place at D-structure.

3 The Analysis

3.1 The Proposal

In (1), AP and PP and (arguably) NP behave alike with respect to the occurrence of se; DP patterns differently: it necessitates the presence of se between subject and predicate. What commonly distinguishes AP, PP and NP from DP? My answer is based on the distinct configurations of AP, PP, NP and DP Small Clauses. These configurational differences seem motivated by the distinct categorial and semantic properties of the predicates in these clauses. Here I am

^{*}For a related proposal for French and English embedded Small Clauses, see Pollock (1983, p. 105ff) where forms of the Case-assigning elements are fire and be.

¹⁰⁽⁸⁾ and (9) will be given an account in 3.6.

¹⁷Rapoport's (1987) proposal for Hebrew copular sentences does not seem to be adaptable to IIA, at least not in a straightforward manner. On her account, Aristide, a proper name, is an argument and requires Case; thus, assuming se to be the Case-assigning element (the counterpart of overt AGR in Rapoport (1987)), it should be present in both (8) and (9) with Aristide in predicate position. Aristide in (9) would therefore be incorrectly rated out.

¹⁹ in both cases, I consider the nominal in predicate position to be a predicate; thus, it is not assigned a #-role (nor is it assigned Case).

mainly inspired by, although not completely abiding to, Stowell's (1983; 1989) insights about Small Clauses.

3.1.1 Subjects at D-structure

108

I assume that, at D-structure, predication in HA is always realized within a Small Clause, and that the subject moves to Spec(IP) at S-structure.13 What varies is the internal structure of this Small Clause.

I take the lexical heads A, P and N to be inherently predicative. 14 According to Stowell (1989, p. 248), nouns and adjectives - and, I would like to suggest, prepositions - are "pure predicative categories". As such, at D-structure, they contain a subject which appears in Spec. directly under XP and as a sister of the (highest) X' predicate.

Differently from AP/PP/NP, nominal phrases containing a determiner, DPs, are not inherently predicative, but "have a dual nature" (Stowell, 1989, p. 233) (see also Williams (1983)): they can be either predicative, as in 'John is a good doctor', or referential, as in 'John met a good doctor'. As suggested by Stowell, the potential referentiality of DPs may be attributed to the occurrence of the functional head Do which selects NP. AP and PP do not usually admit determiners and are not referential. At S-structure, assuming Abney's (1987) structure for DP - [DP Spec [D' Do NP]] - and abstracting from linear order, the determiner and its projection hierarchically intervene between the subject and the head noun of the predicate. In what follows, I will argue that the subject predicated over by DP is generated not in Spec(DP), but in a position adjoined to DP.

Why can't the subject be generated in Spec(DP)? Before answering, I will briefly summarize my assumptions about deverbal and non-deverbal nominals. Deverbal nominals, like destruction, denote events and processes whereas non-deverbal nominals, like horse, denote results and concrete entities.

Only deverbal nominals have 8-grids (Williams, 1981; Grimshaw, 1990). Crucially, Grimshaw (p. 55) notes that "process nominals do not occur predicatively or even with equational be, while result nominals do". Witness the contrast: "That was the/an assignment' vs. "That was the/an assignment of the problem'. Assuming Grimshaw to be right, only non-deverbal nominals need be considered in my analysis of predication in HA, because only they can occur as DPs in predicate position.

Unlike deverbal nominals, non-deverbal nominals do not have a 6-grid. They can only predicate over a subject or assign a Possessor role. In a deverbal nominal like horse, Spec(DP) is one position where the Possessor of the head noun may realize genitive Case (Abney, 1987; Stowell, 1989). It is important to realize that 'Possessor' does not only refer to the literal owner of the entity described by the head-noun, but that it may refer to a 'metaphorical' owner, and, for that matter, to almost any entity which can be associated with the head-noun in some pragmatically relevant way. As Williams (1982) stresses, this association may be quite loose. But what matters is that, as noted by Williams, the relation expressed in a deverbal nominal between Spec(DP)15 and the head-noun excludes 'subject of predication': John's book might mean 'the book written by John', 'the book owned by John', 'the book about John', etc., but it never means 'John is a book'. 16

In addition, Lumsden (1989) has shown that in a complex DP in IIA the embedded Possessor DP may move into Spec of the matrix DP in order to get Case through Spec-Head agreement with a null Do, as in (10) and (11).17

- (10) $[DP [D' NP [DO \emptyset]] DP]$
- [DP Dr NP shwal] [De 0] | DP ti-moun yo "The children's horse" child

Thus, with a null Do, the subject, if generated in Spec(DP), would acquire Case in Spec(DP) before reaching Spec(IP), and, having acquired Case, would remain in Spec(DP). But this is a contradiction since in IIA, as shown in (10) and (11), Spec(DP) follows the head noun at Sstructure. This obviously does not correspond to the surface position of the subject of predication in (1d).

Besides Case and word-order considerations, there is another factor which rules out the possibility generating the subject of predication in Spec(DP). As shown above for English and Haitian. Spec(DP) in some constructions must be available to the Possessor DP as a node where it realizes genitive Case. Now, consider Baker's (1988, p. 46) Uniformity of θ Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) in (12).

(12) The Uniformity of θ -Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH):

Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.

Given that Spec(DP) of non-deverbal nominals may be occupied by the Possessor of the head-noun, it is a straightforward consequence of UTAH that the role 'subject of predication' never he assigned to Spec(DP). The only option left is for the subject predicated over by DP to be generated in a position adjoined to DP.

Conceptually, the above distinction between AP/PP/NP and DP regarding the position of their subjects seems well-motivated. Abney (1987) and Fukui & Speas (1986) distinguish functional and lexical categories in, at least, two crucial respects: 1) Functional categories are void of meaning whereas lexical categories have semantic content; 2) Only lexical categories assign 8-roles to both their complements and their specifiers. Given such diverging properties, it seems natural to assume that, at D-structure, only lexical categories have their subjects in Spec. The specifier positions of functional categories, Spec(DP), Spec(IP), Spec(CP), etc., potential landing sites for Move-a, must be empty at D-structure. Therefore, whereas the subjects of AP, NP and NP originate in Spec, the subjects of DP originate in adjoined position.

To recapitulate, I propose that the subject of all predicative sentences in HA be generated inside a Small Clause. For ease of exposition, I let SC-SP denote the base-generated Small Clause Subject Position. In the case of AP, PP and NP, SC-SP is in Spec. In the case of DP, SC-SP is left-adjoined to DP. This is illustrated in (13):

¹³ This is similar to Stowell's (1978) and Burrio's (1986) analyses of copular 'be' as a raising verb, except that the saining element in IIA is 10. See also Conqueaux (1981) for French être.

¹⁴Two exceptions: locative PPs may be arguments, and some Ps are merely Case assigners/spell-outs, not heads (Rothstein, 1983).

¹⁵ In 1982, the term Spec(DP) was not yet available to Williams. Whether he would now use it is irrelevant.

¹⁶ Also, see Stowell (1989) for the thematic distinction between Spec(NP) and Spec(DP).

¹⁷ Lumsden argues that proper nouns and kinship terms obey different rules of Case assignment and need not move to Spec(DP) to get Case.

3.1.2 Subjects at S-structure

The subject, generated inside a Small Clause, does not receive Case in this position, and would violate the Case filter if it remained in its D-structure position. In (1)-(4), the D-structure subject, no matter what the category of the predicate is, moves from SC-SP into Spec(IP) in order to get Case through Spec-Head agreement with I⁰, leaving a trace.

The trace left in SC-SP by movement of the subject to Spec(IP) must be both identified and head-governed, according to the conjunctive definition of ECP (Stowell, 1986). In all the relevant cases, identification of the trace in SC-SP is satisfied through antecedent-government by the nominal in Spec(IP). What about head-government?

Head-government is government by an overt head. I follow Aoun & Sportiche (1983) in assuming that government must be expressed in terms of maximal projections and not in terms of branching nodes. This relation, denoted m-command by Chomsky (1986b), is defined in (14):

(14) X m-commands Y iff

 $\forall \phi, \phi$ a maximal projection, if ϕ dominates X then ϕ dominates Y.

In (1), with AP, PP and NP predicates ((1a)—(1c), respectively) the trace in SC-SP is head-governed by the lexical head of the predicate, and, I⁰ being phonetically null, the mapping from D- to S-structure is string-vacuous. ^{18,19}

But in the case of predication by DP, (1d), where the subject moves from a position adjoined to DP, the trace is not head-governed from inside the Small Clause because of the intermediate DP node. Consider the adjunction structure in (15).

(15)
$$[DP, SC-SP \{DP, ... D^0 ... \}]$$

In (15), the segments DP₁ and DP₂ constitute the DP projection. D⁰ is dominated by DP (since it is dominated by both of its segments DP₁ and DP₂). But SC-SP is not dominated by DP (since it is dominated by only one segment of DP, namely DP₁). Thus, DP dominates D⁰, but does not dominate SC-SP. Given (14), D⁰ does not m-command SC-SP, which then fails to be head-governed from inside DP. Cf. May (1985) and Chomsky (1986b) for definitions.

Neither does 10 head-govern SC-SP, since 10 is phonetically null. In order to save the structure, the trace must be spelled-out as a resumptive nominal, se, which, being overt, is not subject to ECP. In (2), (3) and (4), head-government is uniformly ensured by po 'NEG', to 'ANT'20 and the complementizer ki, respectively, and se is not needed. Thus, head-government by po, to or ki obscures the distinction between AP/PP/NP and DP otherwise manifested by (non-)occurrence of se.

3.1.3 Summary

My analysis rests on the following assumptions:

- · At D structure, predication is realized within a Small Clause.
- At S-structure, the Small Clause subject raises from SC-SP to Spec(IP) in order to receive Case.
- The differences shown in (1) between AP/PP/NP and DP predicative sentences revolve around the structure of the predicative Small Clause. The subject of AP/PP/NP is generated in Spec of the predicate phrase and is head governed by the predicative head. The subject of DP originates in a position adjoined to the predicate phrase and is not head-governed by the head of the predicate, cf. (13).
- Se in (1d) is a resumptive nominal which is required when the trace in SC-SP is not head-governed, i.e., se is used as a "last resort" (in the sense of Chomsky 1989 and Shlonsky 1991) in order to avoid an ECP violation.
- When not needed, this resumptive nominal produces ungrammaticality. 21

I will show that so is indeed a resumptive nominal and, then, present the predictions made by my analysis.

3.2 Nature of Sc

When it co-occurs with a DP in Spec(IP), as in (1d) (repeated here as (16)), so is a spell-out of the trace left by that DP in SC-SP. In other words, so is the tail of an A-chain headed by the DP in Spec(IP).

In (16), se is an anaphor bound by *Bouki*. Because se in (16) does not have a governor, its Binding Domain is the whole clause, and Binding Principle A is obeyed. Se in (16) is thus more accurately characterized as a resumptive anaphor.²²

Notice that when se is absent — with AP/NP/PP predicates — the trace left in Spec of AP/PP/NP by movement of the Small Clause subject is also subject to Binding Principle A. There is a governor available to the trace in SC-SP inside of the Small Clause, namely the head of the predicate. In addition, the Small Clause contains "all the grammatical functions compatible with the head" (Chomsky, 1986a, p. 171f.). However there is no indexing strictly within the Small Clause which is Binding Theory compatible with the anaphor in SC-SP. Thus the Binding Domain needs to be extended to include the whole clause where the trace in SC-SP is correctly bound by the subject in Spec(IP).

¹⁸ This contrasts to Stowell's (1983; 1989) position according to which the head of a Small Clause does not govern its Spec because of, inter alia, canonical directionality of government. However, Cinque (1990, p. 42) argues that head-government is not directional.

¹⁹In order for the empty 1° not to violate ECP, I must assume that this empty head vanishes at LF because it is semantically empty. 1° is present at S-structure only to assign Case to Spec(IP) by Spec-Head agreement. When 1° is absent at LF, tense is, by default, interpreted as present with statives and asterior with non-statives ²⁰Recall that I assume Tense, Mood and Aspect markers to be V°s (DeGraff, in press).

²¹What about Small Clauses in embedded clauses, cf. English 'John considers/helieves James his friend' and 'John wants James to be a doctor'? In HA, Small Clauses in embedded clauses behave like those in matrix clauses because HA doesn't seem to have Exceptional Case-Marking verbs.

²²If my analysis is correct, it might be, I believe, the first documented case of a resumptive nominal which is A-bound (cf. Sells (1984) and Shlonsky (1991) for an overview of A-bound resumptive pronouns). Of course, it would be nice to find out whether similar resumptive anaphors exist in other languages.

Another question which comes to mind is this: Why can't some other nominal occur in stead of se in (1d), i.e., why is (17) ruled out, where se is replaced by is '3sg'?

(17) * Bouki li { yon doktê | Aristide }
Bouki 3sg DET doctor Aristide

"Bouki is { a doctor | Aristide }"

One possible answer revolves around the pronominal nature of *li*. Li is inherently specified for person and number features as a third-person singular pronoun. In this respect, *li* differs from se which which may co-occur with subjects of any person and number features, as shown in (18).

(18) { mwen | ou } li }; se; yon dokté
lsg 2sg 3sg SE DET doctor
"{ I am | You are | He/She is } a doctor"

Furthermore, li le not anaphoric:

(19) li ap gade *(tet-) li nan glas la
3eg PROG look head 3eg in mirror DET
"He/She is looking at {him|her}self in the mirror"

It seems thus reasonable to assume that li, contrarily to se, is inherently pronominal and subject to Binding Principle B. But, then, in (17), li is improperly bound by Bouki inside of its Binding Domain, whence the ungrammaticality of (17).

3.3 HA Resumptive Pronouns and Island Violations

I analyze se as a nominal which can be used resumptively to save a structure that would otherwise violate ECP. I believe that this is not an ad-hoc move. On the one hand, the use of resumptive pronouns as an escape hatch to ECP and/or subjacency is amply documented, cf. Sells (1984) and Shlonsky (1991) and references cited therein. On the other hand, the presence of resumptive pronouns is well attested in the grammar of HA, outside of 'sc-related' phenomena. Koopman (1982) produces (20) as an example of a resumptive pronoun (in bold-face) used in a relative clause in order to circumvent an ECP violation:

(20) [chen; [m te kase pat *(li;)]] a te mòde m dog lsg ANT break leg 3sg DET ANT bite lsg "The dog whose leg I broke bit me"

In (20), the head noun chen 'dog' is being modified by a relative clause formed by whosevement of a genitive empty operator. The entities referred by the operator and the head-noun put 'leg' are in a Possessor-Possessor relation. Koopman assumes that the Possessor position is not properly governed. Equivalently, given my assumptions about the structure of DPs in BA, the trace of the operator, being in Spec(DP), is not head-governed: put, does not m-command Spec(DP) because of the intervening NP projection, and null D⁶ does not qualify as a head-governor. Thus, the trace must be "lexicalized" as a resumptive pronoun, li, in order for the structure not to violate ECP.

In (21), I further exhibit that HA resumptive pronouns are not constrained by subjacency.

(21)a. Men eleman; Imwen te [makout |ki te here fellow 1sg ANT see thug KI ANT beat DET "Here is the fellow who I saw the thug who beat him" pral mande laprès 2sg FUT ask if 3sg ANT die Dress "Who will you ask the press whether he died?"

In both (21a) and (21b), the (bold-faced) resumptive pronoun li rescues a sentence which otherwise would have been ungrammatical because of subjacency: (21a) is extraction out of a complex nominal and (21b) is extraction out of a whisland.

Se, as well as h, can function as a resumptive pronoun. In (22), se occurs in Spec(IP) of the embedded clause (a whisland), and rescues a potential ECP violation. Compare (21b), (22) and (23).

- (22) kimoun; ou te mande m [si *(se;) yon pwofese?]
 who 2sg ANT ask lsg if SE DET professor
 "Who did you ask me whether he/she is a professor?"
- (23) kimoun; yo pral mande Aristide; [si pép lan renmen ??(lij)] ?
 who 3pl FUT ask Aristide if people DET love 3sg
 "Who will they ask Aristide whether the people likes (him)?"

The sentences in (21b), (22) and (23) all instantiate whisland extractions made possible by the spelling-out of the trace as a resumptive pronoun, h or $se.^{23}$

3.4 Absence of Se with Bare NPs

I have argued that what motivates the presence of se in (1d) is the failure of head-government of SC-SP from inside the predicative Small Clause. Only when the predicate is DP, does (a segment of) a maximal projection intervene between the subject and the head of the predicate. In other words, what forces the presence of se is the occurrence of the functional head D^0 .

That the occurrence of D⁰ has this effect is evidenced by the contrast between NP and DP shown in (24) and (25). Because Spec(DP) is sometimes occupied by the Possessor DP and because of UTAH (cf. 12), the subject of a DP Small Clause is base-generated adjoined to DP. However, when the noun is bare, i.e., occurring without a determiner, the predicative Small Clause is NP and the subject is generated in Spec(NP), and the lexical head dokté head-governs

	(n) and (n)	are Ly	vo altern	INTIAC ELM	mmali	C	retai	ons of	(22):		
(i)	kimoun, who										
(ii)	kimoun, who	OM					ri	4,	**	punfesêt	

It is important to note that in (22) and (i), se and li, respectively, occur in Spec(IP) of the embedded clause and not in SC-SP. The empty acope operator in Spec of the CP headed by si 'ii' prevents passage of kimoun 'who' through it (cf. Larson 1985). Thus, it is from Spec(IP) of the embedded clause that kimoun moves directly to the matrix Spec(CP) jumping over the intermediate Spec(CP), and it is from this position that emanates the threat of an ECP violation due to tack of antecedent-government. It is therefore the trace in Spec of the embedded IP that se spells out to avoid the ECP violation. The trace in SC-SP obeys ECP: it is head-governed by si and antecedent-governed from Spec(IP). In (ii), the traces in Spec(IP) and SC-SP are both spelled-out, by li and se, respectively. See 3.6 for why se in (ii) may realize the trace in SC-SP, even though it is head-governed.

THE SYNTAX OF PREDICATION IN HAITIAN

the subject in Spec. At S-structure, the trace left by movement in Spec(NP) is head-governed by the head noun, and need not (and cannot) be spelled-out as se.

(24) a. Bouki yon doktê Bouki DET doctor

"Bouki is a doctor"

b. Bouki doktě

(25) a. * Honoral premye minis la Honorat prime minister DET

"Honorat is the Prime Minister"

b. Honorat premye minis

"Honorat is Prime Minister"

3.5 Absence of Se in Tense-Marked and Negated Clauses

Recall what happens when a nominal sentence is overtly tense-marked or negated, as in (2d) and (3d). When a tense marker (te 'ANT', prof 'FUT') or the negation marker po precedes DP, se must be absent in the position preceding the tense or negation marker. Here I will argue that my analysis naturally extends to explain this pattern. I will focus on tense-marked nominal sentences. The analysis of other tense-marked predicative sentences and that of negated predicative sentences are very similar.

In (2d) (=(26)), the presence of te renders that of se superfluous. Why?

(26) Bouki te yon doktê Bouki ANT DET doctor

"Bouki was a doctor"

I hypothesize the following D- and S-structures for (26) (irrelevant nodes having been pruned):²⁴

In (26), the verbal head te combines with the nominal phrase you dokte to form a V-predicate. As shown in (27), Bouki is generated in the Spec(VP), and at S-structure moves to Spec(IP) to get Case. The trace e; left in Spec(VP) is head-governed by te. 25 Thus VP behaves like AP, PP and NP, with respect to occurrence of se. There is no need for the resumptive anaphor se to show up; given that it is "always a last-resort device" (Shlonsky, 1991) and that its superfluous occurrence would violate the principle of economy (Chomsky, 1989). 26

The analysis of negated predicative clauses is very similar to that of tense-marked clauses. Pa heads a Negation Phrase, and the subject is generated in Spec of the Negation Phrase, where it is head-governed.²⁷ In (28) I give the structures for the negated nominal phrase Bouki pa you dokté 'Bouki is not a doctor'.

²⁷But, as in note (25) regarding tense-marked clauses, Bouki could also originate adjoined to DP and still be head-governed (by pn in this case).

3.6 Absence of Se When the Subject Is Questioned

First note that, in simple questions, the complementizer ki co-occurs with the wh-element only when the wh-element originates in subject position:

(29)a. Bouki renmen Mari "Bouki loves Mari" Bouki tove Mari b. kimoun (Bouki renmen "Who does Bouki love?" Houki love c. kimoun *(ki /) renmen Mari "Who loves Mari?" who love Mari

That ki occurs only with movement from subject position suggests that its presence is required for head-government. This pattern resembles a classical case of subject/object asymmetry. The object position is head-governed by the verb, but the subject position, Spec(IP), is not head-governed by I⁰ which is null (although Spec(IP) is Case-marked though Spec-Head agreement with I⁰). Recall that the deep subject first moves from SC-SP to Spec(IP). Thus wh-movement of subjects in predicate sentences goes through Spec(IP).

When the subject is wh-moved, the appearance of ki does not depend of the category of the predicate, whether it be VP, Λ P, PP, NP or DP:

"Who loves Mary?"	ari j vi	renmen Ma love Ma	(VP	ki) KI	*(kimoun who	(30) a.
"Who is sick?"		malad]	[AP	ki) Kl	*(<i>kimoun</i> who	b.
"Who is under the table?"	la]	<i>anba tab</i> under table	[PP	ki) KI	*(kimoun who	
"Who is a doctor?"		doktě] doctor	[NP	ki) Kl	*(<i>kimoun</i> who	
"Who is a doctor?"		yon daktê DET doctor	DP	ki) KI	*(<i>kimoun</i> who	

(30) furthers my argument that subject wh-movement goes through Spec(IP) and not directly from SC-SP to Spec(CP). Indeed, with AP, PP and NP, SC-SP is in Spec and is headgoverned by the head of the predicate, whereas, with DP, SC-SP is in adjoined position and is not head-governed. Therefore, if the appearance of ki was regulated by whether SC-SP was head-governed, then ki would be required only with DP predicates. Given, that ki is required with all sorts of predicates, we must assume that its appearance is required for head-government of Spec(IP), which in the case of simple sentences is not head-governed. We further assume that ki is a complementizer, occupying the head of CP (Koopman, 1982).

Now, how can I explain (30e)? In (30e), the predicate is DP, SC-SP is not head governed from inside the Small Clause, but se is absent. The appearance of ki as head of CP has the following effect. Not only does ki head-govern Spec(IP), it also head-governs SC-SP, rendering the appearance of se optional. I⁰, a potential closer head-governor, does not block head-government

²⁴The structures in (27) fall directly in line with the 'subject-in-VP' hypothesis of Koopman & Sportiche (1988).

23 Alternately, if Bouki is base-generated adjoined to the DP you doktê, its trace there, after movement to Spec(IP), would also be head-governed by te.

Men se co-occurs with both te and a non-pronominal subject as in (i), the construction is a left-dislocated structure, with se in Spec(IP) (after movement from Spec of the VP headed by te) and with Bouki adjoined to IP (Cf. DeGraff (1992) and Déprez & Vinet (1991)).

²⁸ But, see DeGraff (to appear; in press) for the different behavior of ki in embedded clauses.

²⁹Instead of & occurring in C², why doesn't se (or 6) occur in Spec(IP) in order to prevent the ECP violation? I don't have a good answer at this point, but I can restate the question more suggestively as: Why is inserting the overthead & less 'costly' than inserting the maximal projection se?

of SC-SP through Minimality because I' and IP are defective in terms of barrierhood (Chomsky, 1986b, p. 47f).

(31)
$$[CP \ kimoun_i \ [C' \ | C^0 \ ki \] \ [IP \ e_i^* \ [P \ DP \ \{e_i \ se_i \ \} \ [DP \ yon \ dokte \] \}]]]]$$
who KI DET doctor

Why is the appearance of se in (31) optional, not ungrammatical, whereas such appearance would be ungrammatical in both (30b) and (30c)? I will venture that this distinction might be related to the 'distance' between governor and governee. In (31), intervening between the governor and the governee, there exist: 1) one maximal projection, IP; and 2) the site for one potential head-governor, I⁰. As a result, se may 'spell out' the trace e_i. In (30b) and (30c) the governor (the lexical head of the predicate) and the governee (in Spec) are under the very same maximal projection and the appearance of se spelling-out the trace e_i would produce ungrammaticality: Kimoun ki (* se) malad 9; Kimoun ki (* se) anba tab la?

4 Implications for the Syntax of Small Clauses

If my proposal is on the right course, Small Clauses are neither uniformly maximal projections with subject in Spec (as in Stowell) nor uniformly adjunction structures with subject sister to a maximal projection (as in Manzini (1983) or, more recently, Heycock (1991)). They are either 'Stowellian' or 'Manzinian' depending on the category of their head: In AP, PP, and NP Small Clauses, subject is in Spec; in DP Small Clauses, subject is adjoined to DP.

This 'hybrid' approach to the syntax of IIA Small Clauses solves Stowell's (Stowell 1983, note 30; Stowell 1989, p. 252ff) dilemma about the structure of English DP Small Clauses where the DP in predicate position contains a possessive pronoun or a genitive DP, as in the following: "John considers James { his | Mary's } best friend". As noted by Stowell, the preceding sentences are problematic given that he posits subjects in Spec for all Small Clauses. But Spec(DP) in the embedded clauses "James { his | Mary's } best friend" is preempted by the possessive pronoun or the genitive DP. In my account, the subject of DP is always adjoined to DP and there is no contention for the Spec(DP) position. Yet, my analysis takes advantage of Stowell's insights (with respect to Small Clauses which are headed by lexical categories).

In a related vein, my analysis of predication in HA supports the distinction between NP and DP (Abney, 1987; Stowell, 1989), and argues that this distinction has repercussions on the syntax of Small Clauses and on the syntax of predication. In Haitian, the structural differences between NP and DP are overtly reflected in the patterns they give rise to when used as predicates: only in DP Small Clauses is the deep subject not head governed by the predicate head, and this failure of head government is manifested by the surfacing of se as a resumptive anaphor.

One final generalization suggested by the data is that all lexical categories have their Spec position available as subject of predication at D-structure, whereas this might not necessarily be so with functional categories such as D⁰ (and I⁰, C⁰, etc.). Thus Stowell's (1983, p. 308) hypothesis that "the subject position should be generalized across [the Spec of] syntactic categories" might need to be restricted to lexical categories. So, in some sense, my proposal could be interpreted as a finer-tuned version of Stowell's.

References

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Abney. The English Noun Phruse in its Sentential Aspect. PhD thesis, MIT, 1987.
A cup L. D. Sportiche, On the formal theory of government, Linguistic Review, Z. 1963.
1. Baker. Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing. University of Chicago Press,
1000
A Baltin The syntactic distinction between specification and predication, 1990. Manuscript, NYU.
. Bursio. Italian Syntaz. A Government-Binding Approach. D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1986.
I. Chomeky, Barriera, MIT Press, 1986.
the subdiscret Language Departure New York 1986.
. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In Laka & Mahajan, eds., MIT
WPL 10, 1989.
Y Change Three of T December in MIT Press 1990
D. Couqueaux. French predication and linguistic theory. In Levels of Syntactic Representation, Foris
1001
M. DeGraff. On the structure of Small Clauses: Evidence from Haitian. GLOW Workshop. 1992.
In Unitian pro-dron? In Byrne & Holm, eds., The Atlantic Meets the Pacific Delectes Paper
ton the Cariety for Pidein & Creal Linguistics, John Henjamins, Amsterdam, in press.
Create languages is parameter selling; a case study using limiting and the pro-drup parameter
1. White of Court Languages & Language Acquisition, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, to appear.
V. Deprez & MTh. Vinet. On the categorial status of the Haitian Creole particle 'se'. Meeting o
CDC1 Chiange 1001
A. Pauchoin. Nature et Fonction des Monèmes 'Se' en Créole Haitien. Centre de Linguistique, Haiti
1097
3. From On assess and chiest Viertelishreschrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie, 16, 1892.
N. Fukui & M. Speas. Specifiers and projection. In Rapoport et al., eds., Papers in Theoretical Linguis
fics, 1986.
5 Colimbania Annument Structure MIT Prote 1998
C. Hauses L. Laures of Predication: the Non-Lexical Syntax of Clauses, PhD Thesis, Crenn, 1991.
1 Marcia The Santas of Complex Constructions, PhD thesis, University of houtnern Camornia, 1900.
r looph. In Ditermination Nominals on Crisis Hallien, PhD thrish, University Paris VII, 1906.
II. Koopman. Les relatives. In Leschvre et al., eda., Syntaxe de l'Haitien, Karoma, Ann Harbor, 1982.
H. Koopman & D. Sportiche, Subjects, Manuscript, 1988.
R. Larson. On the syntax of disjunction scope. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory, 3:217-264, 1985
G. Longobardi. N-movement in Syntax and LF. GLOW. 1990.
G. Longonardt. In instrement in Systate and D. Lumusden. On the distribution of determiners in Haitian Creole. Revue Québécoise de Linguistique
18(2), 1989.
The bickness structure of Haitian ciefts. Linguistics, 28:741-759, 1990.
R. Manzini. Restructuring and Reanalysis. PhD thesis, MIT, 1983.
R. May. Logical Form. Its Structure and Derivation. MTT Press, 1985. JY. Pollock. Sur quelques propriétés des phrases copulatives en français. Langue Française, 58:89-121
1983. PhD thesis MIT
T.R. Rapoport. Copular, Nominal, and Small Clauses: A Study of Israeli Hebrew. PhD thesis, MI
1987.
L. Rizzi. Relativized Minimality. MIT Press, 1990.
S. Rothstein. The Syntactic Forms of Predication. PhD thesis, MIT, 1983.
P. Sells. Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns. PhD thesis, UMass Amherst, 1984.
U. Shlonsky. Resumptive pronouns as a last resort. Draft, Haifa University, 1991.
T. Stowell. What was there before there was there. In CLS XIV, University of Chicago, 1978.
Subjects across categories. Linguistic Review, 2:285-312, 1983.
. Null antecedents and proper government. In NELS XVI, 1986 Subjects, specifiers and X-theory. In Alternative Conceptions of Phrase Structure, U. of Chicag
1989.
E. Williams. Predication. Linguistics Inquiry, 11(1):203-238, 1980.

- . Argument structure and morphology. Linguistic Review, 1(1):81-114, 1981.

- . Semantic vs. syntactic categories. Linguistics & Philosophy, 6:423-446, 1983.

. The NP cycle. Linguistics Inquiry, 13(1):277-295, 1982.