

The Syntax of Predication in Haitian

Michel F. DEGRAFF¹

Computer & Information Science
 University of Pennsylvania
 E-mail: degraff@iac.cis.upenn.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 (1a)-(1c), 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 (1d), 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).² With a DP predicate, the morpheme *se* must occur between the subject and the predicate.³

- (1) a. *Bouki* (* *se*) *malad* "Bouki is sick"
 Bouki SE *sick*
- b. *Bouki* (* *se*) *anda tab la* "Bouki is under the table"
 Bouki SE *under table DET*
- c. *Bouki* (?? *se*) *doktè* "Bouki is a doctor"
 Bouki SE *doctor*
- d. *Bouki* *(*se*) { *yon doktè* | *Aristide* }
 Bouki SE DET *doctor 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.

¹For their ever-gracious help with this paper, I give many thanks to: Sabine Iatridou, Tony Kroch, Mitch Marcus and Gillian Sankoff; to: Julie Auger, Derek Bickerton, José Camacho, Enoch Titiyayo Ebong, Caroline Heycock, John Lumsden, Jean Nicolas and Fred Weerman; and to participants at CLIFF, NELS and SPCL.

²See Longobardi (1990) for arguments that proper names are DPs.

³The 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 null element'.

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

- (2) a. *Bouki* (* *se*) *te* (* *se*) *malad* "Bouki was sick"
 Bouki SE ANT SE sick
 b. *Bouki* (* *se*) *te* (* *se*) *anba tab la* "Bouki was under the
 Bouki SE ANT SE under table DET table"
 c. *Bouki* (* *se*) *te* (* *se*) *doktè* "Bouki was a doctor"
 Bouki SE ANT SE doctor
 d. *Bouki* (* *se*) *te* (* *se*) *yon doktè* "Bouki was a doctor"
 Bouki SE ANT SE DET doctor

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.

- (3) a. *Bouki* (* *se*) *pa* (* *se*) *malad* "Bouki is not sick"
 Bouki SE NEG SE sick
 b. *Bouki* (* *se*) *pa* (* *se*) *anba tab la* "Bouki is not under the table"
 Bouki SE NEG SE under table DET
 c. *Bouki* (* *se*) *pa* (* *se*) *doktè*
 Bouki SE NEG SE doctor
 "Bouki is not a doctor"
 d. *Bouki* (* *se*) *pa* (* *se*) { *yon doktè* | *Aristide* }
 Bouki SE NEG SE DET doctor Aristide
 "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

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

⁴Other Tense, Mood or Aspect markers like *prmi* 'FUT', *ap* 'PROG, IRREALIS, FUT', *ka* 'IRREALIS' produce patterns similar to (2). In DeGraff (in press), I argued that HA Tense, Mood and Aspect markers are verbal.
⁵Here, 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 bare 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"
 (i) *Bouki* # *se doktè*
 Bouki SE doctor
 "Bouki, he was (not) a doctor"
 (ii) *Bouki* # *se* (*pa*) *te* (*yon*) *doktè*
 Bouki SE NEG ANT DET doctor
 "Bouki, he is not a doctor"
 (iii) *Bouki* # *se pa* (*yon*) *doktè*
 Bouki SE NEG DET doctor

⁶Relative clauses with the operator extracted out of subject position are similar to (4) with respect to occurrence of *se*.

- b. *kimoun ki* (* *se*) *anba tab la* "Who is under the table?"
 who KI SE under table DET
 c. *kimoun ki* (?? *se*) *doktè* "Who is a doctor?"
 who KI SE doctor
 d. *kimoun ki* (?? *se*) { *yon doktè* | *Aristide* } ?
 who KI SE DET doctor Aristide
 "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 markers while *se* doesn't. Compare (5) and (6) which show a contrast between *se* and the verb *chante* 'to sing':

- (5) *Bouki* (* *pa*) (* *te*) [*se* | *yon doktè*]
 Bouki NEG ANT SE DET doctor
 "Bouki (was/is)(n't) a doctor"
 (6) *Kòk la pa te* [*vo chante*] *maten an*
 rooster DET NEG ANT sing morning DET
 "The rooster didn't sing this morning"

In addition, neither can *se* precede negation and tense (when the subject is not left-dislocated):

- (7) *Bouki* [*se*] (* *pa*) (* *te*) *yon doktè*
 Bouki SE NEG ANT 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*.⁷ 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

⁷The *se* under study has different properties from the sentence-initial *se* of cleft constructions which uniformly precedes the clefted constituent, irrespectively of its category.

⁸Previous 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 θ -assignment, and predication at D-structure is accomplished inside of a Small Clause. In equative structures, like *That man is John*, θ -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 θ -role-assigning verb, the IIA counterpart of 'equative' *be*, and its presence is required in, and only in, equative clauses in order to assign θ -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 IIA. 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.⁹

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) *yonn nan n'eg sa yo *(se) { yon doktè | 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) *kimoun ki (?? se) { yon doktè | 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

⁹For a related proposal for French and English embedded Small Clauses, see Pollock (1983, p. 105ff) where forms of the Case-assigning elements are *être* and *be*.

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), *yon doktè* does not seem to be an argument, nor does it have the same referential force as *Aristide*. In (8), *yon doktè* seems to indicate a property of the subject while *Aristide* identifies the subject. But, if *yon doktè* 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

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

¹¹Rapoport'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 ruled out.

¹²In both cases, I consider the nominal in predicate position to be a predicate; thus, it is not assigned a θ -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

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 D⁰ 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' D⁰ 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 θ -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 θ -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

¹³This is similar to Stowell's (1978) and Burzio's (1986) analyses of copular 'be' as a raising verb, except that the raising element in HA is I⁰. See also Coqueaux (1981) for French *être*.

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

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 HA the embedded Possessor DP may move into Spec of the matrix DP in order to get Case through Spec-Head agreement with a null D⁰, as in (10) and (11).¹⁷

(10) [DP [D' NP [D⁰ \emptyset]] DP]

(11) [DP [D' [NP *shwal*] [D⁰ \emptyset]] [DP [*ti-moun yo*]]] "The children's horse"
horse child DET-pl

Thus, with a null D⁰, 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 HA, as shown in (10) and (11), Spec(DP) follows the head noun at S-structure. 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 be 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 θ -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- α , 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):

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

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

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

- (13) $\begin{bmatrix} AP \text{ SC-SP } [A^i \dots A^0 \dots] \\ PP \text{ SC-SP } [P^i \dots P^0 \dots] \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} NP \text{ SC-SP } [N^i \dots N^0 \dots] \\ DP \text{ SC-SP } [DP \dots [D^i \dots D^0 \dots] \dots] \end{bmatrix}$

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 I^0 , 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, I^0 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) $[DP, \text{SC-SP } [DP, \dots D^0 \dots]]$

In (15), the segments DP_1 and DP_2 constitute the DP projection. D^0 is dominated by DP (since it is dominated by both of its segments DP_1 and DP_2). But SC-SP is not dominated by DP (since it is dominated by only one segment of DP , namely DP_1). Thus, DP dominates D^0 , but does not dominate SC-SP. Given (14), D^0 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 I^0 head-govern SC-SP, since I^0 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 *pa* 'NEG', *te* 'ANT'²⁰ and the complementizer *ki*, respectively, and *se* is not needed. Thus, head-government by *pa*, *te* or *ki* obscures the distinction between AP/PP/NP and DP otherwise manifested by (non-)occurrence of *se*.

¹⁸This 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 I^0 not to violate ECP, I must assume that this empty head vanishes at LF because it is semantically empty. I^0 is present at S-structure only to assign Case to Spec(IP) by Spec-Head agreement. When I^0 is absent at LF, tense is, by default, interpreted as present with statives and anterior with non-statives.

²⁰Recall that I assume Tense, Mood and Aspect markers to be V^0 s (DeGraff, in press).

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 *se* is indeed a resumptive nominal and, then, present the predictions made by my analysis.

3.2 Nature of *Se*

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

- (16) $[IP \text{ Bouki}_i [I^0 [I^0 \emptyset]] [DP \text{ se}_i [DP \{ \text{yon dokte} \mid \text{Aristide} \}]]]]$
 Bouki SE DET doctor Aristide

"Bouki is { a doctor | Aristide }"

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).

²¹What about Small Clauses in embedded clauses, cf. English 'John considers/believes 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 *li* '3sg'?

- (17) * *Bouki li* { *yon doktè* | *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 may co-occur with subjects of any person and number features, as shown in (18).

- (18) { *mwen* | *ou* | *li* }_i *se*; *yon doktè*
 1sg 2sg 3sg SE DET doctor
 "{ I am | You are | He/She is } a doctor"

Furthermore, *li* is not anaphoric:

- (19) *li ap gade* * (*tèt-*) *li nan glas la*
 3sg PROG look head 3sg 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 subadjacency 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 'se-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 mède m*
 dog 1sg ANT break leg 3sg DET ANT bite 1sg
 "The dog whose leg I broke bit me"

In (20), the head noun *chen* 'dog' is being modified by a relative clause formed by *wh*-movement of a genitive empty operator. The entities referred by the operator and the head-noun *pat* 'leg' are in a Possessor-Possessed relation. Koopman assumes that the Possessor position is not properly governed. Equivalently, given my assumptions about the structure of DPs in HA, the trace of the operator, being in Spec(DP), is not head-governed: *pat*, does not m-command Spec(DP) because of the intervening NP projection, and null D⁰ 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 subadjacency.

- (21)a. *Men eleman*, [*mwen te wè* [*makout* [*ki te bat* * (*li*) *an*]]]
 here fellow 1sg ANT see thug KI ANT beat 3sg DET
 "Here is the fellow who I saw the thug who beat him"
 b. *kimoun*, [*ou pral mande laprés* [*si* * (*li*) *te mouri*]]
 who 2sg FUT ask press if 3sg ANT die
 "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 subadjacency: (21a) is extraction out of a complex nominal and (21b) is extraction out of a *wh*-island.

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

- (22) *kimoun*; *ou te mande m* [*si* * (*se*) *yon pwofesè?*]
 who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if SE DET professor
 "Who did you ask me whether he/she is a professor?"

- (23) *kimoun*; *yo pral mande Aristide*, [*si pèp lan renmen* ?? (*li*)] ?
 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 *wh*-island extractions made possible by the spelling-out of the trace as a resumptive pronoun, *li* 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 D⁰.

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 *doktè* head-governs

²³(i) and (ii) are two alternative grammatical versions of (22):

- (i) *kimoun*, *ou te mande m* [*si li* *yon pwofesè?*]
 who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if 3sg DET professor
 (ii) *kimoun*, *ou te mande m* [*si li* *se yon pwofesè?*]
 who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if 3sg SE DET professor

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 scope operator in Spec of the CP headed by *si* 'if' 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 lack 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.

