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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). With a DP predicate, the morpheme se must occur between the subject and the predicate.5

(1) a. Bouki (* se ) malad
   Bouki SE sick
   "Bouki is sick"

   b. Bouki (* se ) unba tab la
      Bouki SE under table DET
      "Bouki is under the table"

   c. Bouki (? se ) daktè
      Bouki SE doctor
      "Bouki is a doctor"

   d. Bouki *( se ) { yon daktè | 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 Baker, Joel Camacho, Enok Titiaye Ehouog, Caroline Heycock, John Lumsden, Jean Nicolas and Fred Weerman; and to participants at CLIFF, NELS and RICL.

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

5The following abbreviations are used: ANT='antecedent', DEM='demonstrative', DET='determiner', FUT='future', IRREAL='irrealis', PROG='progressive', tag 'first singular', ..., 3pl 'third plural', #='past' (denoting past tense), 9='phonetically null element'.
A Tense, Mood or Aspect morpheme preceding the predicate gives rise to the pattern in (2), where se is illicit throughout.

(2) a. Bouki (* se *) te (* se *) malad "Bouki was sick"
Bouki SE ANTS SE sick
b. Bouki (* se *) te (* se *) anba tab la "Bouki was under the
Bouki SE ANTS SE under table DET

c. Bouki (* se *) te (* se *) dokté "Bouki was a doctor"
Bouki SE ANTS SE doctor
d. Bouki (* se *) te (* se *) yon dokté "Bouki was a doctor"
Bouki SE ANTS SE DET doctor

Negating the constructions in (1) produces the pattern in (3), which is similar to (2).

(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
Bouki SE NEG SE under table DET

c. Bouki (* se *) pa (* se *) dokté "Bouki is not a doctor"
Bouki SE NEG SE doctor
d. Bouki (* se *) pa (* se *) yon dokté "Bouki is not a doctor"
Bouki SE NEG SE DET doctor

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.

Another pattern of interest is produced when the subject is unshifted, 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.

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

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 offendng trace occupies the base-subject position inside a Small Clause and results from movement of the subject to Spec(IP). At A-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.

Note that the se under study has different properties from the sentence-initial se of cleft constructions which uniformly precedes the clotted constituent, irrespective of its category.

Previous GB analyses related to (IIA) predicative constructions include Lamas (1990) and Dépens & Virzi (1996). In Dépens (1999), I explain why these analyses need to be improved upon.
2 Predication vs. Equation?

Frege (1892), Williams (1980), Rotstein (1983), Rapoport (1987) and Haitii (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 Haitii, for example, distinguish 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-roles-assigning verb, the HA 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, HA, 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 of attribution" and "relation of 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 predicator 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 subcase all by itself. This peculiarity casts doubt 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) ponn nam neg sa yo *( se ) { yon dökét 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 dökét Aristide } 9 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 predicative position). Then, one would expect a DP occurring in predicative 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- and 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 dökét does not seem to be an argument, nor does it have the same referential force as Aristide. In (8), yon dökét seems to indicate a property of the subject while Aristide identifies the subject. But, if yon dökét 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- and or referentiality of the projection in predicative position.

Thus, it seems that the pattern of predication in HA cannot be accounted using solely the contrast predication vs. equation. In my analysis, the term 'predication' encompasses both 'predicative' (in its more traditional sense) and 'equative'. 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 (Heggel, 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 DPT? 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 109(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 HA, 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. What varies is the internal structure of this Small Clause.

I take the lexical heads A, P and N to be inherently predicative. According to Stowell (1989, p. 233) (see also Williams (1985)), they can be either predicative, as in 'John is a good doctor', or reference, 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 D2 which selects NP. AP and PP do not usually admit determiners and are not at D-structure, assuming Abney's (1987) structure for DP - [np Spec [DP D2 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 adjacent 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 a θ-grid (Williams, 1981; Grimshaw, 1990). Crucially, Grimshaw (p. 55) notes that "process nominals do not occur predicatively or even with equational be, while nominal do", Witness the contrast: 'That was the/an assignment vs. 'That was the 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

15This is similar to Stowell's (1978) and Harris's (1985) analyses of regular 'be' as a raising verb, except that the raising element in HA is P. See also Cooper (1983) for French cite.

16Two exceptions: locative DPs may be arguments, and some Ps are surely case assigners/split-outs, not heads (Roethein, 1983).
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between Spec(DP)\(^\text{15}\) 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'.\(^\text{16}\)

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 DP, as in (10) and (11).\(^\text{17}\)

(10) [dp [np [NP [dp 0]]]]

(11) [np [np [nominale]] [dp 0]] [np [DP 0]]

"The children's horse"

horse

child DET-pl

Thus, with a null DP, 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. 40) Uniformity of θ Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) in (12).

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

Identical thematic relationships between 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 adjacent 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 & Spass (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, 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-adjointed 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 (1985) 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.
3.1.3 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 IP, 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):

\[(14) \text{X m-commands Y iff} \]
\[
\forall \phi, \phi \text{ a maximal projection, if } \phi \text{ dominates X then } \phi \text{ dominates Y.}
\]

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 IP being phonetically null, the mapping from D- to S-structure is string vacuous.10

But in the case of predication by DP, (1d), where the subject moves from a position adjacent 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):

\[(15) [\text{DP}, \text{SC-SP [DP}, \ldots \text{D}^p \ldots ]]
\]

In (15), the segments DP, and DP, constitute the DP projection. Dp is dominated by DP (since it is dominated by both of its segments DP, and DP,). But SC-SP is not dominated by DP (since it is dominated by only one segment of DP, namely DP,). Thus, DP dominates Dp, but does not dominate SC-SP. Given (14), Dp 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 p head govern SC-SP, since p is phonetically null. In order to save the structure, the trace must be spilled-out as a resumptive nominal, se, which, being overt, is not subject to ECP. In (2), (3) and (1), head-government is uniformly ensured by po 'NEG', or 'ANT' and the complementizer ki, respectively, and se is not needed. Thus, head-government by po, or ki obviates the distinction between AP/PP/NN and DP otherwise manifested by (non-)occurrence of se.

3.2 Nature of Se

When it co-occurs with a DP in Spec(IP), as in (14) (repeated here as (16)), se is a spill-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).

\[(16) [s_p \text{ Bouki; } [s_p \{ \text{a } 0 \} \text{ [m_p se; [o_p \{ \text{ pom doktir } \text{ Aristide } ]]]}]
\]

"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.32

Notice that when se is absent — with AP/NN/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.171). 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).

31This 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.

32In order for the empty p not to violate ECP, I must assume that this empty head vanishes at LF because it is lexically empty. p is present at S-structure only to assign Case to Spec(IP) by Spec-Head agreement. When p is absent at LF, treat it, by default, as present with stative and anterior with non-stative

33Recall that I assume Tense, Mood and Aspect markers to be Vors (Defraw, in press).
Another question which comes to mind is this: Why can’t some other nominal occur in stead of se in (14), i.e., why is (17) ruled out, where se is replaced by li ‘3sg’?

(17) * Bouki li [ yon dokté | 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 } se yon dokté
    1sg 2sg 3sg SE DET doctor
“*I am you are He/She is a doctor”

Furthermore, li is not anaphoric:

(19) li op gade *(éte) li nan glis la
    3sg PROG look head 3sg in mirror DET
“He/She is looking at [him]herself in the mirror”

It seems thus reasonable to assume that li, contrast 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 subordinacy is amply documented, cf. Sells (1994) 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 boldface) used in a relative clause in order to circumvent an ECP violation:

(20) [ chén | m te ka sa pòt *(lii) ] a te mòd m
    1sg ANT break leg 3sg DET ANT bite 1sg
“The dog whose leg I broke bit me”

In (20), the head noun chén ‘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 pot ‘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: pot, does not m-command Spec(DP) because of the intervening NP projection, and null D does not qualify as a head-governor. Thus, the trace must be “lexicalised” 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 subordinacy.

(21a) Men eleman, [mwen te wo [makeout kw te bat *(lii) an]]
    here fellow 1sg ANT see thing 1sg ANT heat 3sg DET
    “Here is the fellow who I saw the thing that he heated”

(21b) ki moun, ou mòd mante lòpèt [s’i *(lii) te moun]
    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 subordinacy: (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) ki mounj ou te mòd m [s’i *(se) yon profès] | who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if SE DET professor
    “Who did you ask whether he/she is a professor?”

(23) kí mounj ou mòd mante Aristide [s’i mòd lan renmen ?(lii)] | 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, se or se.30

3.4 Absence of Se with Bare NPs

I have argued that what motivates the presence of se in (14) 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 in the occurrence of the functional head D.

That the occurrence of D 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 heads governs

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

(i) kí mounj, ou te mòd m [s’i bi yon profès]
    who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if 2sg DET professor
(ii) kí mounj, ou te mòd m [s’i bi se yon profès]
    who 2sg ANT ask 1sg if 2sg DET professor

It is important to note that in (22) and (ii), se and li, respectively, occur in Spec(IP) of the embedded clause and not in SC-SP. The empty scop operator in Spec of the CP headed by e té ci is governed by a passage of ‘kímoun’ who through it (cf. Lamor 1995). Thus, it is from Spec(IP) of the embedded clause that kímoun moves directly to the matrix Spec(CP) jumping over the intermediate Spec(CP), and it is from this position that it incurs the threat of an ECP violation due to lack of antecedent government. It is therefore the trace in Spec of the embedded IP that e té ci spells out to avoid the ECP violation. The trace in SC-SP should, if so governed, be head-governed by se 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 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.

(24a) * Bouki yon doktè “Bouki is a doctor”

(24b) Bouki DET doctor

(25a) * Honore pramey ministre la “Honore is the Prime Minister”

(25b) Honore prime minister DET

“Honore 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 (24) and (3d). When a tense marker (e.g., ‘ANT’, prep ‘FUT’) or the negation marker pà 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 (24) (= (26)), the presence of tr renders that of se superfluous. Why?

(26) Bouki te yon doktè “Bouki was a doctor”

Bouki ANT DET doctor

I hypothesize the following D- and S-structures for (26) (irrelevant nodes having been pruned):25

(27) D-structure : [tr ] [p ] [VP Bouki [v ] [y se] [IP yon doktè ] ]

S-structure : [IP Bouki [p ] [tr ] [VP ] [v ] [y se] [IP yon doktè ] ]

In (28), the verbal head te combines with the nominal phrase yon doktè to form a V'-predicative. As shown in (27), Bouki is generated in the Spec(VP), and at S-structure moves to Spec(IP) to get Case. The trace se, left in Spec(VP), is head-governed by tr. 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” (Shulman, 1991) and that its superfluous occurrence would violate the principle of economy (Chomsky, 1986).26

The analysis of negated predicative clauses is very similar to that of tense-marked clauses. Ps 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 pò yon doktè ‘Bouki is not a doctor’.

(28) D-structure : [IP ] [p ] [VP Bouki [v ] [y se] [NP Bouki [x,y] [np Bouki [y se] [IP yon doktè ] ] ] ]

S-structure : [IP Bouki [p ] [tr ] [VP Bouki [v ] [y se] [NP Bouki [x,y] [np Bouki [y se] [IP yon doktè ] ] ] ] ]

25The structures in (27) fall directly in line with the subject-in-VP hypothesis of Koopman & Spottiswoode (1986).

26 Alternatively, if Bouki is base-generated adjacent to the DP yon doktè, its trace there, after movement to Spec(IP), would also be head-governed by se.

27 When se co-occurs with both tr and a non-nominal subject as in (1), the construction is a left-dislocated structure, with tr in Spec(IP) (after movement from Spec of the VP headed by tr) and with Bouki adjacent to IP (Delattre 1992 and Déprez & Vieri 1991).

28 But, as in note (21) regarding tense-marked clauses, Bouki could also originate adjacent to DP and still be head-governed (by pò 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:

(29a) Bouki renmen Mari “Bouki loves Mari”

(29b) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who does Bouki love?”

(29c) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who loves 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 pò which is null (although Spec(IP) is Case-marked through Spec-Head agreement with pò). Recall that the deep subject first moves from SC-SP to Spec(IP). Thus, movement of subjects in predicate sentences goes through Spec(IP).

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

(30a) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who loves Mari?”

(30b) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who is sick?”

(30c) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who is under the table?”

(30d) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who is a doctor?”

(30e) ki Bouki renmen Mari “Who is DET doctor”

(30) Thus justifies my argument that subject wh-movement does occur but not directly from SC-SP to Spec(IP). Indeed, with AP, PP, and NP, SC-SP is in Spec and is head-governed by the head of the predicate, whereas, with VP, SC-SP is in adjacent 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 VP 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.28 We further assume that ki is a complementizer, occupying the head of CP (Koopman, 1982).29

Now, how can I account for (30)? In (30b), 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. pò, a potential closer head governor, does not block head-government.

29 But, see Degraff (to appear; in press) for the different behavior of ki in embedded clauses.
of SC-SP through Minimality because I' and IP are defective in terms of barrierhood (Chomsky, 1986b, p. 497).

(31) \[ \text{ki} \text{nomoun gey p} \text{doket(1)} \] [ki]

who
dokter

Why is the appearance of as in (31) optional, not grammatical, 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 governor. In (31), intervening between the governor and the governor, there exist: 1) one maximal projection, IP; and 2) the site for one potential head-governor, PP. As a result, as may 'spell-out' the trace e. In (30b) and (30c) the governor (the lexical head of the predicate) and the governor (in Spec) are under the very same maximal projection and the appearance of an spelling-out the trace e would produce ungrammaticality: ki nomoun as "inside f; ki nomoun as "inside taf laf."

4 Implications for the Syntax of Small Clauses

If my proposal is on the right course, Small Clauses are neither uniform nor maximal projections with subject in Spec (as in Stowell) nor uniformly adjoined structures with subject sister to a maximal projection (as in Manzini (1983) or, more recently, Heycock (1991)). They are either 'Stowellian' or 'Manzini' 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 IA Small Clauses solves Stowell's (Stowell 1983, note 30; Stowell 1989, p. 225f) dilemma about the structure of English DP's Small Clauses where the DP in predicate position contains a possessor 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 puts subjects in Spec for all Small Clauses. But Spec(DP) in the embedded clauses "James [his | Mary's] best friend" is preempted by the possessor 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 IA 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 as 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 IP (and PP, CP, etc.). Thus Stowell's (1983, p. 308) hypothesis that the Spec 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.
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