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Abstract

As its phonetic resemblance with French pas suggests, Haitian Creole pa marks sentential negation, like French pas. Yet, this paper establishes a phrase-structural distinction between pa and pas, their cognation notwithstanding: I argue that Haitian pa heads NegP while French pas is in Spec of NegP. In so doing, I explore the syntax and semantics of sentential negation in Haitian, especially the structural basis of negative concord in the presence of pa, compared with the double (cancelled) negation in the presence of pas in Standard French. I then explore the implications of my analysis of Haitian pa vis-à-vis the syntax of predication. I conclude with a sampling of the diachronic puzzle posed by pa, as Haitian is compared to two of its source languages.

Haitian Creole emerged in the 17th century primarily from the contact between French and a few West-African languages. This paper can be motivated from
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two perspectives. On the one hand, I provide an analysis for one aspect of Haitian Creole syntax, namely negation. On the other hand, I use this analysis in comparing Haitian Creole with French, the language from which Haitian Creole derives the phonetic shapes of most of its morphemes. I also take a brief look at negation in Fon, a Kwa language spoken mostly in Benin, West Africa. Fon, along with a few Kwa neighbors, played a key role in the genesis of Haitian Creole. Altogether, dialects of Fon (and of other Kwa languages) and of French are perhaps the most influential languages implicated in the development of Haitian Creole. Interestingly, with respect to negation, Haitian Creole seems different from both (standard) French and Fon.

Because of the audible parallel, the comparison between Haitian Creole and French is the most alluring. As its phonetic resemblance with the French morpheme pas suggests, pa in Haitian Creole — like French pas — marks sentential negation. In what follows, I will establish a phrase-structural distinction between Haitian Creole pa and French pas, their cognition notwithstanding.

Specifically, I argue that Haitian Creole pa heads NegP while French pas is in the specifier of NegP. In order to derive this distinction, I develop the specifics of the syntax and semantics of Haitian Creole sentential negation, especially the phenomenon of negative concord in presence of pa. I draw relevant comparisons with (standard) French pas, which blocks negative concord and induces double (cancelled) negation. I then explore consequences of my analysis of Haitian Creole pa for one other area of the grammar — predication. I conclude by considering the diachronic puzzle posed by the properties of Haitian Creole pa.

1. Pa and pas in their surface strings

It is quite straightforward to characterize the position of Haitian Creole pa in the surface string: when expressing sentential negation, pa generally precedes the sequence of tense, mood and aspect (TMA) markers and main verb. This is shown in (1a). Typically, it is ungrammatical for pa to follow a TMA marker or a main verb occurring in its clause; see (1b)–(1d).

4. Apparent counter-examples to this generalization are constructions like (i) where pa occurs between the epistemic modal ka ‘might’ and the tense marker te ‘ANT’:

(i) Jan ka pa te vini.
‘Jan might NEG ANT come
‘Jan might not have come.’

However, Magloire-Holly (1982) analyzes such modals as “EQUI-verbs” subcategorizing for a clausal complement. (DeGraff 1992c reinterprets Magloire-Holly’s arguments within a control structure with an embedded PRO subject.) Such analyses defuse the counter-example.

(ii) is another potential counter-example:

(ii) Jan pa -p pa vini.
‘Jan NEG IRREAL NEG come
‘Jan wouldn’t (wan’t) not come.’

However, it can be argued that the second negation in (ii) only takes scope over the VP headed by vini ‘come’, not over the whole clause; see the English translation and French Jean peut ne pas venir ‘Jean might not come’ (I thank Yves Dejean for data and discussion).

All characters used in this paper’s examples are fictional. Any resemblance with living, dead or legendary figures is purely accidental.
Does the contrast between (1) and (2) constitute sufficient evidence to posit a phrase-structural distinction between Haitian Creole pa and French pas? Probably not. Within the principles-and-parameters framework, (1) and (2) are accounted for by possibility of verb movement in French and English (as per Emonds's 1978 and Pollock's 1989 accounts) and by impossibility of verb movement in Haitian Creole. At D-structure in all three languages, the negation markers pa, pas and not would govern and precede the VP node that dominates the verbal sequence. However, it is only in French and English that the finite auxiliary verb raises at S-structure out of its VP, to the left of the negation markers pas and not; see (8) below for a schematization of verb raising in French. The absence of verb raising in Haitian Creole sets (1) apart from (2).

In Pollock's theory, verb movement in French derives in syntax the inflectional morphology of the tensed verb: the verb stem undergoes cyclic-successive head movement to various inflectional heads in order to collect its inflectional suffixes. Given that Haitian Creole has virtually no inflectional morphology, it is not surprising that the language has no verb movement: in Haitian Creole, there is no tense affixes to be collected and the verb stays in place. Recall that Haitian Creole tense--mood--aspect markers are independent morphemes which precede the semantically main verb; see (1a).

Given the above verb raising hypothesis, the patterns in (1) and (2) do not suffice to phrase-structurally differentiate Haitian Creole pa from French pas. Indeed, the differences between (1) and (2) may be the sole result of verb (non-)movement and are most likely not the result of an eventual phrase-structural difference between the Haitian Creole and French negation markers. If anything, the above patterns do liken Haitian Creole pa to French pas: at D-structure they both govern and precede VP (assuming along with DeGraff 1992d that Haitian Creole TMA markers are auxiliary verbs). This means that the differences in (1) and (2) are compatible with the assumption that Haitian Creole pa and French pas are phrase-structural homologues.

In fact, if no other discriminating evidence were available in addition to (1) and (2), one could very well assume that Haitian Creole pa and French pas occupy identical position in their syntactic trees — perhaps in Spec of NegP. This would seem a natural assumption given that Haitian Creole pa and French pas are cognates. However, I will argue on empirical and theoretical grounds that Haitian Creole pa and French pas are systematically differentiated.

2. Pa versus pas: negative concord and double negation

There is one well-defined class of facts distinguishing Haitian Creole pa from French pas. One conspicuous dissimilarity between Haitian Creole pa and French pas involves the interpretation of negative quantifiers. The essential point is that, semantically, negative quantifiers interact differently with Haitian Creole pa than they do with French pas. Compare (3) and (4): the interpretation of each acceptable French sentence in (3) is truth-conditionally opposite to that of its Haitian Creole counterpart in (4).7

(3) a. Personne n'est pas venu.
   nobody ne+is pas come
   'Everybody came' (lit. 'Nobody has not come. ')
   b. ?Je n'ai pas vu personne.
   1SG ne+have pas seen nobody
   c. Ce n'est pas rien.
   3SG ne+is pas nothing
   'This is something.' (lit. 'This is not nothing.')

(4) a. Peson pa vini.
   nobody pa come
   'Nobody has come.'
   b. Mwen pa w pezon.
   1SG pa see nobody
   'I haven't seen anybody.'
   c. Sa pa anyen.
   3SG pa nothing
   'This is nothing.'

To the extent that the French sentences in (3) are interpretable, they give rise to instances of double negation. In double negation, co-occurring negative elements cancel each other, giving rise to a net positive statement — duplex negatio affirmat. In (3a) for instance, personne n'est pas venu — like nobody has not come — in standard varieties of English — actually means 'everyone has come', a positive statement, and (3c) Ce n'est pas rien means 'This is something'. On the contrary, the perfectly grammatical Haitian Creole sentences in (4), with two negative elements each, are immediately construed as net negative statements. Peson pa vini in (4a) means 'nobody has come' and Sa

6. These facts were also noted in Déprez (1992), although they lead her to conclusions very different from mine. Déprez's analysis is discussed in section 6.2.
7. Native speakers vary considerabelu as to their acceptance of (3b). (3a) seems more readily acceptable, especially with stress on personne. (See Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 for relevant comments.)
pa anyen means "This is nothing." In the linguistic literature, for example Labov (1972), the phenomena illustrated in (4) has been called "negative concord". The semantic contrast between double negation in (3) and negative concord in (4) is a robust empirical distinction between Haitian Creole pa and French pas.\(^9\)

Now, with respect to negative concord, Haitian Creole pa behaves very much like another French negation marker, that is to say, ne. Each clause in (5), like in (4), produces a single instance of negation in the presence of two negative markers:\(^1\)

(5)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Personne n'est venu.} & \quad \text{(French)} \\
& \quad \text{nobody ne'+is come} & \quad \text{\'Nobody has come.'} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Je n'ai vu personne.} \\
& \quad \text{1sg ne'+have seen nobody} & \quad \text{\'I haven't seen anybody.'} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Ce n'est rien.} \\
& \quad \text{3sg ne'+is nothing} & \quad \text{\'This is nothing.'}
\end{align*}

There are cases in Haitian Creole and in French where several negative elements combine into a single instance of sentence negation (in the presence of Haitian Creole pa and French ne):

8. Haitian Creole negative quantifiers, when used in full clauses, require the presence of a negative marker such as pa 'not' or poko 'not yet'. The negative head in Haitian Creole must always be overt, like ne in Classical (and literary) French; see note 11. For the use of peson in isolation, see (18) and surrounding comments.

9. At this point, I am setting aside French varieties which do allow negative concord with pas. I come back to these varieties in Section 8 where I address diachronic implications.

10. With respect to negative concord and double negation, one can approximately say that Haitian Creole is to French what African-American English is to standard English; see Labov (1972) for data from several English dialects along with insightful comments. An ideal segue to this paper would extend the forthcoming analysis to the paradigms noted by Labov (and to all instances of negative concord and double negation).

11. The negation clitic ne tends to disappear in colloquial French. But there are contexts where ne tends to remain present. Ashby (1981), for example, notes that ne is retained categorically when the grammatical subject is a negative noun phrase. Three of Ashby's examples of obligatory ne are shown below:

(6) Nan katye sa-a peson pa di peson anyen. (Haitian C.)
\begin{center}
\text{in neighborhood DEM-SG nobody pa say nobody nothing}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\text{Dans ce quartier, personne ne dit rien à personne.}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\text{(French)}
\end{center}
\begin{center}
\text{\'In this neighborhood, nobody says anything to anybody.'}
\end{center}

(6) strongly suggests that Haitian Creole (like French) has a rule of negative concord involving pa (as the counterpart of French ne). Further note the absence of pas in the French translation of (6).

Based on the above data, Haitian Creole pa seems to have much more in common with French ne than with French pas — modulo, of course, the fact that French ne is a morphologically weak morpheme which is disappearing in certain registers (see notes 8 and 11) whereas Haitian Creole pa is a morphologically strong morpheme which is generally not optional where it occurs (but see note 22). Semantically, pa is also stronger than ne: it can express negation on its own, unlike French ne; contrast (1) with Jean ne serait *(pas) aille au marché. Now, how can the above data be mapped onto recent theoretical developments? As a prerequisite, a brief examination of the structure of French negated clauses is in order.

3. Sentential negation in French

Negation in French has been at the limelight of generative literature, due in great part to seminal papers by Emonds (1978) and Pollock (1989). French typically expresses sentential negation with two markers: a clitic ne (which is disappearing in colloquial French; but see note 11) and an independent morpheme pas. Descriptively, in finite declarative clauses, ne and pas embrace the tensed verb, as in (7).

(7)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Pierre n'est pas venu.} \\
& \quad \text{Pierre ne'+is pas come} & \quad \text{\'Pierre has not come.'} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Marie n'aime pas Pierre.} \\
& \quad \text{Marie ne'+loves pas Pierre} & \quad \text{\'Marie doesn't love Pierre.'}
\end{align*}

I adopt without discussion the assumption that sentential negation markers project their own phrases in syntax, according to the templates of X-bar theory, that is, with (i) a specifier under XP and sister to \(X^c\); (ii) a head \(X^h\), and (iii) a complement under \(X^c\) and sister to \(X^h\); see for example Pollock (1989) and Zanuttini (1991) for detailed motivations.

Following Pollock, many syntacticians have analyzed French pas as occurring in the Spec of NegP (specifier of negation phrase), with ne as the head of NegP. As shown in (8), Pollock derives the order ne ... V\(^0\) pas by head-movement of ne, along with the finite verb, into a head which is higher than NegP. For
Pollock's hypothesis is reinforced by the following constraint: only the tensed verb may precede \( \text{pas} \). This is instantiated in (9).

(9) a. *Pierre n'est venue pas.
   Pierre ne+ìs come pas
   'Pierre has not come.'

b. *Marie n'aime Pierre pas.
   Marie ne+ìs loves Pierre pas
   'Marie doesn't like Pierre.'

In (8), the tensed verb and the negation head \( \text{ne} \) move to a position higher than \( \text{pas} \), up to Tense (or to Infl, pre-Pollock) leaving behind the remnant of the verb phrase. Thus \( \text{pas} \) always precedes \( \text{past participles} \) and the verb's complements, as shown in (7) and (9).

Verb movement into Comp also shows that \( \text{ne} \) forms a complex head with the verb. In yes/no questions, \( \text{ne} \) is fronted, piggybacking on the verb:

(10) a. N'est il pas venu?
    ne+ìs 3SG pas come
    'Has he not come?'

b. *Est il ne pas venu?
    is 3SG ne pas come

c. *Est il pas ne venu?
    is 3SG pas ne come

In (10), \( \text{ne} \) obligatorily moves with the tensed verb into Comp. (10b) and (10c), where \( \text{ne} \) remains stranded, are ungrammatical.

In (7)–(10), movement of \( \text{ne} \) along with the tensed verb is also made necessary by the Empty Category Principle: as a head, \( \text{ne} \), if it were to remain in place, would intervene between the raised verb and the trace of \( \text{V}^0 \), preventing antecedent-government of the trace; cf. Chomsky (1986). That \( \text{pas} \), unlike \( \text{ne} \), may separate the raised verb from its trace in the VP further supports Pollock's hypothesis that \( \text{pas} \) is in the specifier position: by relativized minimality, elements in specifier position do not interfere with antecedent-government of heads (Rizzi 1990).

This overview of French sentential negation will suffice for our purposes, the main import being that French \( \text{pas} \) resides in Spec of NegP with \( \text{ne} \) acting as the head of NegP.

4. Haitian pa as head of NegP

The next questions are: (i) How does the configuration in (8) interact with negative concord and double negation? (ii) Is Haitian Creole \( \text{pa} \) in Spec of NegP, like French \( \text{pas} \)? The answer to (i) will suggest an answer to (ii). Question (i) itself brings me directly to Zanuttini's (1991) seminal work on negation, and to a lesser extent to the work of Haegeman (1991). These are very important works because they contribute to a more precise definition of the interface between syntax and semantics. Zanuttini studies the distribution of negative elements in a variety of languages. She sets, inter alia, the configurational conditions for their semantic interpretation. For the purpose at hand, the crux of Zanuttini's observations is her reliance on phrase structure configurations in order to distinguish double negation versus negative concord. The configurations she relies on significantly bear on whether Haitian Creole \( \text{pa} \) is in the head position or in the specifier position of NegP.

Let us return to instances of negative concord in Haitian Creole and in French. In particular, recall that Haitian Creole \( \text{pa} \) in (4), like French \( \text{ne} \) in (5) and unlike French \( \text{pas} \) in (3), may co-occur with the negative quantifiers \( \text{pèsonn} \) and \( \text{a ven} \) in either pre- or post-verbal position without inducing cancelled negation. For example, in (4) and (5), the a-sentences translate as 'Nobody has come' and the b-sentences translate as 'I didn't see anybody'. Both of these are negative statements. Notably, the negative force of the markers \( \text{pa} \) in Haitian Creole and \( \text{ne} \) in French does not cancel the negative force of the quantifiers \( \text{pèsonn} \) and \( \text{a ven} \), respectively.

In (4), (5) and (6), two or more negative elements occur in the same clauses. Each of these elements can by itself express sentence negation. Yet, when put together, their collective interpretation is not the sum of their individual negative forces, but rather a single instance of sentence negation. The intuition behind the phrase-structural underpinnings of negative concord is that it results from a configuration where a negative marker and a negative quantifier enter into agreement. According to Zanuttini, this sort of agreement (like other phenomena of grammatical agreement, for example, subject-verb agreement) is realized via a Spec–head relationship. At Logical Form (LF), the (trace of the) negative marker in head position and the negative quantifier in specifier position share their negative values under NegP.

Thus, in (4) and (5), Haitian Creole \( \text{pa} \) and French \( \text{ne} \) are heads of NegP. They enter at LF into Spec–head agreement with a negative quantifier in Spec of NegP. Quoting Zanuttini (p. 144), "when such a configuration occurs, the semantic contribution to the interpretation of the sentence is the same as that of the head." To sum up, I take the negative concord data in (4), (5) and (6) in

---

12. Example (ii) in note 4, \( \text{Jan pa-pa vayl} \), illustrates double negation in Haitian Creole. There we have two instances of \( \text{pa} \) (thus two NegPs) cancelling each other (but see note 20).
Haitian Creole and French to be symptomatic of the head status of Haitian Creole pa and of French ne.13,14

However, the head status of pa is not agreed upon in the literature on Haitian Creole. Previous work on negation in Haitian Creole has put pa in Spec of NegP, assuming that it was structurally similar to French pas; see Lefebvre and Lumsden (1992). But, given my reasoning thus far, if Haitian Creole pa were in Spec of NegP, it would prevent the negative quantifier in (4) and (6) from occurring there at LF. In absence of the Spec–head agreement configuration, negative concord in these sentences would remain unexplained (assuming Zanuttini’s framework and the quantifier status of pèsonn). Indeed, Zanuttini’s framework predicts that pa in Spec of NegP would impose a reading of double negation instead of one of negative concord. This is disconfirmed by the data in (4) and (6). By reductio ad absurdum, pa is not generated in Spec of NegP.

The above logic finds typological support. Compare Haitian Creole pa with French pas. As noted by Zanuttini, when it occurs with a negative quantifier, French pas does entail double negation, as in (3). Crucially, French pas, unlike Haitian Creole pa, is generated in Spec of NegP, as argued by Pollock for independent reasons (see Section 3). Because it is in Spec of NegP, French pas prevents negative concord by blocking (LF) movement of the negative quantifier

13. Haegeman’s (1991) framework, based on data from Standard Dutch, West Flemish, French and Italian, makes identical predictions when applied to the status of Haitian Creole pa. Haegeman writes (p. 16):

We might propose that in languages with NC [Negative Concord] readings the head of NegP is “strong”: it is autonomously licensed: it has its NEG feature in the base. The NEG criterion is met by a “strong” static agreement configuration. In non-NC languages, on the other hand, Neg is “weak” and would be assigned the NEG feature by its specifier by virtue of Spec–head agreement. ... What is crucial for NC ... is that the NEG feature on NegP is independently licensed, i.e., that NegP is strong head. In languages where the NEG feature on NegP can only be achieved via dynamic agreement the negative head is not strong and NC is not possible ...

Consider (6) for example in light of Haegeman’s hypothesis. Given that negative concord obtains in (6), the negative head must be “strong”. Thus pa must be heading NegP: If pa were in Spec of NegP, it would license a “weak” NegP and negative concord would not obtain.

Note that French data such as J’ai donné rien à personne ‘I haven’t given anything to anybody’ would be problematic for Haegeman; but see note 11 for a subset of negative concord cases in French where ne seems not to be optional. Haegeman herself toys with the idea that French ne is deleted only at PF.

14. In the LF representation of (6), with three negative quantifiers (pre-verbal pèsonn, post-verbal pèsonn and anon), one quantifier would be in Spec of NegP and the other two would be adjoined to Spec of NegP, as in Haegeman (1991). There they would undergo a process of absorption somewhat reminiscent to wh-absorption in certain questions with multiple wh-elements (Higginbotham and May 1981). Presumably, French pas in Spec of NegP, not being a quantifier of the sort of personne, rien, etc. cannot undergo absorption alongside the latter, see note 15.

into Spec of NegP. Therefore, in (3), the negative quantifier personne or rien, cannot enter into agreement with the negative head. Therefore, the negation marker and the quantifier each contribute separately their negative force to the interpretation of the sentence. This results in double-negation readings, as expected.15,16

5. More on pa versus pas

What other facts distinguish Haitian Creole pa and French pas, besides negative concord and double negation? (11) and (12) present two further kinds of distributional evidence in favor of a structural distinction between the two pa(s)’s.17,18

Firstly, in (11a), French pas may occur at the periphery of the clause it modifies, to the left of the complementizer. In the Haitian Creole clause in (11b), pa must occur clause-internally between subject and predicate.

15. At this stage, one could ask: Why doesn’t pas undergo absorption at LF when co-occurring with negative quantifiers? Such absorption would induce negative concord, contra the readings in (3); see note 14. However, note that negative quantifiers are distinct from pas because of their quantifying properties. The former have both a quantifier component and a negative component whereas the latter only has a negative component. Pas is akin to yes/no operators, like whether, which also block absorption; compare I wonder who loves whom and *I wonder whether Mary loves whom. It thus seems that absorbed operators must quantify over certain sets. Pas inverts the truth-value of its propositional argument and does not quantify over sets, at least not over sets of the sorts that personne and rien quantify over.

16. Liliane Haegeman (pers. comm. November 1993) alerts me to the fact that ne, the West Flemish equivalent of French pas, does enter into negative concord as in (i). (The head of West Flemish NegP is en.)

(i) Twe doa niemand nie over geklaap.
It has there no-one not about talked
‘No one talked about that.’

With respect to negative quantifiers, there might be one (perhaps, crucial) difference between Haitian Creole and French on one hand and West Flemish on the other. It seems to be the case that the latter must obligatorily scramble the negative quantifier which enters into negative concord. I hypothesize that this obligatory scrambling (adjunction to Spec of NegP at S-structure) is what permits the negative quantifier to be absorbed with nie. S-structure adjunction of niemand to nie in (i) would give quantifier-status to nie, allowing it to undergo absorption at LF. LF adjunction of negative quantifiers to French pas would occur too late for pas to become endowed of quantifier status; pas would remain a yes/no operator throughout the derivation and would not be able to undergo quantifier absorption. (See Haegeman 1993 for a different and fully-fledged analysis of West Flemish negative concord based on the Neg-criterion.)

17. I thank Richard Kayne for indicating to me the relevance of the data in this section.

relationship with negative quantifiers, whence the negative concord facts in (4) and (6)? One other possibility is that pa is in a position adjoined to VP. I must also address the hypothesis adopted by Déprez (1992) that pèsson (and perhaps anyen)\(^{21}\) in (4) and (6) may manifest properties of negative polarity items instead of negative quantifiers.

6.1. Pa in adjoined position?

I first look at the possibility that Haitian Creole pa is generated adjoined to VP. Adjunction, obviously, does not lend itself to a typical configuration of Spec–head agreement. Such a configuration is assumed to be necessary for negative concord. The possibility of adjoining pa (to VP, say) is thus excluded, in principle.

6.2. Pèsson and anyen: quantifiers or polarity items?

There is one other alternate analysis to consider. This analysis would obviate the need for pèsson and anyen in (4) and (6) to move at LF into Spec of NegP. Déprez (1992), for one, argues that Haitian Creole pèsson, similarly to French personne (and English nobody), is not a true negative quantifier. According to her, pèsson manifests in certain contexts properties of negative polarity items. These negative polarity item properties would account for (a few of) the cases of negative concord in (4) and (6).

Déprez (1992: 38) writes: “Sentences [similar to (3a) and (3b)] are usually judged by speakers either as uninterpretable or as involving canceled negation [double negation] which produces a positive statement. Clearly this is not the case in [Haitian Creole].” I agree wholeheartedly with Déprez that there is a clear semantic difference between (3) in French and (4) in Haitian Creole: the former instantiates double negation and the latter negative concord. But I disagree with her as to locating the reasons for that difference on Haitian Creole pèsson versus French personne — Déprez considers pèsson to potentially have negative polarity item properties and personne to be a true negative quantifier. As stated earlier, I believe that the comparison of (4) in Haitian Creole with (3) and (5) in French, coupled with Zanuttini’s insights, indicates that Haitian Creole pa is the equivalent of French ne and is not the equivalent of French pas. Hence, Haitian Creole (4) is the counterpart of French (5).\(^{22}\)

---

19. The contrasts in (11) and (12) might be related to Cardinaletti and Guasti’s (1992) observation that French pas may function as an adverbial projection and, as such, adjoin to, for example, AP Haitian Creole pa, a head, would not adjoin to a maximal projection (ditto for French ne; "Bouki fait le clown pour qu’il s’ennuie and "Voilà un type ne bête!).

20. Yves Dejean brings to my attention an optional use of pa, which doesn’t seem to affect the truth-conditions of its clause:

(i) Mwen pa \(\neg\) (pa) \(\neg\) moun moun

1SG NEG see NEG a single person

“I haven’t seen [anybody but one person].”

(ii) Se pa \(\neg\) \(\neg\) ki moun pa \(\neg\) moun

se \(\neg\) NEG little run 1SG \(\neg\) NEG run

"I really ran. (i.e. I ran a whole lot.)"

In (i), pa \(\neg\) moun seems to be a relic of French pas un (= aucun, as in Je n’ai vu pas une seule femme and Pas une seule femme n’est venue, for more data, see Gatsoin 1971: 49, 176ff.). Structurally, the second pa would be part of a larger nominal phrase (Neg\(^{h}\) taking DP as a complement and being an extended projection of NP)?). LF movement of the thus formed nominal phrase into the specifier position of the matrix Neg\(^{h}\) would then derive apparent negative concord.

As of (ii), I can only say that now its interpretation is suggestive of expletive (optional) ne in French Je crains qu’il (me) partie ‘I fear that he leaves’. Space and time prevents me from addressing many of Dejean’s fascinating data; their treatment require future papers.

21. Déprez doesn’t explicitly address the status of anyen.

22. Although some (colloquial) varieties of French do allow (3) to be interpreted on a par with (4); see Section 8.
Recall that in my own account, the direct opposition between (3) — double negation in French — and (4) — negative concord in Haitian Creole — does not stem from the different properties of personne and pèsonn. I claim that both pèsonn and personne act as negative quantifiers in the relevant cases. However, unlike French pas, which is in Spec of NegP, Haitian Creole pa, like French ne, heads NegP. This phrase structure distinction between French pas and Haitian Creole pa is what explains the contrast between (3) and (4).

But by Déprez’s arguments, the negative concord facts in (4) follow instead from pèsonn’s and anyen’s negative polarity item properties (while she implicitly maintains that pa and pas are homologous). Déprez directly compares Haitian Creole sentences similar to (4a) and (4b) to French sentences similar to (3a) and (3b) and concludes that Haitian Creole pèsonn must be different from French personne, the former having negative polarity item properties in certain environments and the latter being always a negative quantifier.

Negative polarity items are elements like English anybody. Negative polarity items enter into phenomena superficially resembling negative concord:

13. I didn’t see anybody.

However, negative polarity items display properties quite different from those of negative quantifiers. One such property is that negative polarity items are not inherently negative. For example, (14) in English has no negative import.

14. Did you see anybody?

Another distinction between negative quantifiers and negative polarity items is that negative polarity items must be in the scope of an appropriate trigger. Compare (15) and (16):

15. Nobody saw me.
16. a. *Anybody didn’t see me.
   b. *Anybody saw me.

(15) is acceptable with the negative quantifier nobody in subject position. Both sentences in (16) are ungrammatical because anybody is not in the scope of an appropriate trigger.23

The above distinction between anybody and nobody in English succinctly exemplifies the division between negative polarity items and negative quantifiers. What about pèsonn and anyen?

Déprez argues that pèsonn, if a negative polarity item, would not need to undergo movement at LF and could be interpreted in situ. (Recall that Déprez’s examples of true negative quantifiers are French personne and English nobody.) Contra Déprez, I now show that pèsonn and anyen are not negative polarity items.

There are two tests which have been commonly used in order to distinguish negative quantifiers from negative polarity items. (See Zanuttini 1991 and Haegeaman 1991 for application of these tests to Italian nessuno and West Flemish niemand.) I apply these tests to pèsonn and anyen.

6.2.1. Modification by prèske ‘almost’

Firstly, pèsonn and anyen may be modified by prèske ‘almost’, as in (17). Modification by almost is ruled out in the case of negative polarity items such as English anything.24 Witness the possible and impossible English translations for (17b).25

17. a. Préske pèsonn pa vote pou Manigat.
   almost nobody pa vote for Manigat
   ‘Almost nobody voted for Manigat.’

   b. Mwen pa manje prèske anyen jodi-a.
   1SG pa eat almost nothing today
   ‘I have eaten almost nothing today.’

   *I haven’t eaten almost anything today.26

6.2.2. Use in isolation

Secondly, negative polarity items like English anything and anybody cannot occur in isolation. This is because they must be licensed within the scope of an appropriate trigger. Unlike negative polarity items, pèsonn and anyen do occur in isolation, for example, as a negative answer to a question:

23. There are occurrences of any in matrix subject position, for example, anybody can do that. Any in such a context is not a negative polarity item, but a “possibility polarity item” (Lawler 1972) or “free-choice” any (Carlson 1981), and does not require a negative trigger. See Labov (1972), Horn (1989), Kadmon and Landman (to appear) and references therein for further remarks on various uses of any.

24. When modifying a negative quantifier, almost is interpreted relative to the cardinality of the set over which the quantifier ranges. Presumably, negative polarity items, unlike negative quantifiers, are not related to sets, whence the inadmissibility of almost as modifier of negative polarity items. (I thank Michael Hegarty for this observation.) (As noted in Carlson 1981, among others, free-choice any may be modified by almost: I could eat almost anything!; cf. note 23.)

25. English negative polarity items do not occur in pre-verbal position, so the issue does not arise as to whether (17a) can be translated using a negative polarity item. Actually, the sheer occurrence of pèsonn in subject position distinguishes it from English negative polarity item anybody.

26. A few speakers do accept I haven’t eaten almost anything today, although I didn’t see almost anybody at the party seems worse to most informants. I have nothing to say about this variation.
(18) a. *Kimoun ki wè ou? — Pésonn
   (Haitian Creole)
   who ki see 2sg nobody

   Qui t’va vu? — Personne
   'Who saw you? — Nobody/*Anybody'
   (French)

   b. Kisa ou manje? — Anyen
   (Haitian Creole)
   what 2sg eat nothing

   Qu’as tu mangé? — Rien
   'What did you eat? — Nothing/*Anything'
   (French)

Therefore, the data in (17) and (18) indicate that pésonn and anyen are indeed negative quantifiers.

6.2.3. Non-licensing by conditionals and comparatives

Further distributional facts distinguish Haitian Creole pésonn from negative polarity item anybody. These facts implicate conditionals and comparatives. Linebarger (1987), among others, has noted that English conditionals and comparatives license anybody in their scope. Laka has noted similar facts in Spanish, with ningun for example. Interestingly, in (19), pésonn is not licensed by conditionals and comparatives. This provides one additional reason for denying the status of negative polarity item to pésonn.27

(19) a. *Si ou touye pésonn, ou pral nan prison.
   (Haitian Creole)
   if 2sg kill 2sg go in jail
   'If you kill anybody, you go to jail.'

b. *Bouki pi wo pase pésonn.
   Bouki more tall pass?
   'Bouki is taller than anybody (I have ever known).'

27. This argument is somewhat muddled by Carlson’s (1981) intuition that the English translations in (19) actually instantiate “free choice” any and not negative polarity item any, as indicated by modification by almost: If you kill almost anybody, you go to jail and Mary is taller than almost anybody I have ever known. Is it coincidental that English any is ambiguous between negative polarity item and “free choice”? If this polysem is not accidental, but based on intrinsic properties of any and/or deeper principles of grammar (as alluded, but rejected, in Carlson p. 18; see also Kadmon and Landman, to appear), then one would expect pésonn, if an negative polarity item, to double as a "free choice" item (like any), which it doesn’t.

In this regard, note the following French examples: Je l’ai vue de plus près que personne ‘I saw her closer than anybody’ and Y a-t-il personne qui veuille venir? ‘Is there anybody who wants to come?’ There, personne is licensed in comparatives and interrogatives, much like English anybody, contra Dépréz’s tacit supposition that personne and anybody pattern more alike than pésonn and nobody, with pésonn in some environments equated to anybody; see note 29.

Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 observes further correspondences between personne and anybody; see also Gastone 1971.)

6.2.5. Further data

While arguing that pésonn is an negative polarity item under certain conditions, Dépréz (1992: 33f.), rightly notes a distinction between (20a) and (20b). (20a) has a single pa, in the matrix clause, and gives rise to a negative expectation (the party will be deserted). (20b) has two pa’s, one in the matrix and the other in the embedded clause, and gives rise to a positive expectation (at least some people will come to the party).

(20) a. Mwen pa kwè pésonn op vini.
   (Haitian Creole)
   1sg pa believe nobody irreal come
   'I don’t think that anybody will come.'
   (i.e. 'I think the party will be deserted.')

b. Mwen pa kwè pésonn pa op vini²⁸
   1sg pa believe nobody pa irreal come
   'I don’t think that nobody will come.'
   (i.e. 'At least some people will come to the party.')

From the contrast in (20) and from the similar contrast in the corresponding English translations, Dépréz concludes that it is only when the negation marker pa is in the embedded clause, as in (20b), that pésonn can be interpreted as a negative quantifier (equivalent to nobody). Otherwise, in (20a), pésonn is interpreted as a negative polarity item, similar to anybody, and is licensed by matrix negation.29 It is not clear to me how this alleged distinction between pésonn qua negative quantifier and pésonn qua negative polarity item would be derived. In any case, I believe that this distinction is unwarranted. Given my assumptions, pésonn in both sentences in (20) is a negative quantifier and moves at LF into Spec of NegP. The different readings may be derived as follows: In (20a), pésonn moves into Spec of matrix NegP.30 In (20b), pésonn moves into...
the specifier position of the embedded NegP. In (20a), negation concord within the single NegP gives rise to one instance of negation. This explains the negative expectation. In (20b), negative concord through Spec–head agreement still obtains within the lower NegP. But the matrix pa is obviously unable to participate into Spec–head agreement within the lower NegP; on the contrary, it adds its negative force to the lower pa. This gives rise to two separate instances of negation which cancel each other and result in the positive expectation (see (ii) of note 4). Therefore, the data in (20) receive a natural explanation within my assumptions about the interpretation of negative quantifiers in Haitian Creole; there is no need to postulate an interpretive ambiguity for pèsonn (negative quantifier or negative polarity item). 3334

To recapitulate, it appears that Haitian Creole pa is indeed the head of NegP. One would expect this property of pa to have consequences in other areas of the grammar. And it does — fortunately for my analysis. Predicative patterns in Haitian Creole constitute one domain where such consequences are clear. Pa being a head, its head-governmental capacities affect the distribution of traces occurring in the position of base-generated subjects, between surface subjects and nominal predicates — this contrasts with certain clauses without pa where a resumptive nominal, se, must spell-out the trace of the deep subject because of the absence of an appropriate head-governor. This is the topic of the next section.

7. Negation and predication in Haitian

As extensively argued in DeGraff (1992a, b, c, e),34 predicative patterns in Haitian Creole are partly determined by the distribution of traces and of resumptive pronouns spelling-out traces. Universally, the distribution of traces must respect the Empty Category Principle (ECP). The ECP requires that all traces be both licensed and identified. What matters here is the licensing condition on traces. This condition operates via head-government. In certain predication contexts, the trace of the base-generated subject is not head-governed and must be realized as a resumptive pronoun in order to avoid an ECP violation. However, because it is a head, pa can license a non-overt trace in its governing domain and the trace of the deep subject need not be overtly realized as se.

7.1. Basic data

Haitian Creole predicative structures do not contain an overt verbal copula. (21) presents the basic data; the crucial fact is that predicates not headed by verbs may be string-adjacent to their subjects, in (21a)–(21c).35

(21) a. Bouki (*se) malad.
   Bouki se sick
   'Bouki is sick.'
b. Bouki (*se) anba tab la.
   Bouki se under table the
   'Bouki is under the table.'
c. Bouki (*?se) abitan.
   Bouki se peasan
   'Bouki is a peasant.'
d. Malis (*se) /yon doktè/ doktè a Aristide.
   Malis se a doctor doctor the Aristide
   'Malis is a/the doctor/Aristide.'

However, not all kinds of predicates are allowed string-adjacent to their subjects. In (21d), the predicate is a proper name (Aristide) or a nominal occurring with a pre-posed or a post-posed article (yon doktè 'a doctor' or doktè a 'the doctor'). These predicates are determiner phrases (DP) or number phrases (NumP).36 With DP and NumP predicates in simple, present-tense clauses, the morpheme se must occur between subject and predicate.

However, there are clauses where DP and NumP predicates occur without a

31. Given the interpretation of (20b), it must also be the case that pèsonn must move to specifier position of the closer, embedded NegP. In other words, pèsonn cannot escape the lower NegP and enter into agreement with matrix pa. This constraint might be implemented via relativized minimality.

32. In French, LF movement of personne exhibits a subject–object asymmetry: *Je n'ai exigé qu'elle ait assisté personne versus *Je n'ai exigé que personne soit assisté (Kayne 1984: 23ff.). Such asymmetry is absent in Haitian Creole, perhaps because of the mechanisms which allow the language to be pro-drop, namely identification of a null subject from Inf. Haitian Creole also permits long-distance subject extraction over overt Comp (absence of Comp-trace effects) although it, unlike Italian, does not freely allow subject inversion (DeGraff 1992d, g). Italian, somewhat like French, shows a pre-post-verbal asymmetry with respect to LF movement of nessun (Rizzi 1982: 118ff.).

33. Literacy French shows a contrast similar to (23), as in Je ne veux pas que personne vienne versus Je ne veux pas que personne ne vienne (data from Kayne 1984: 40, notes 4, 5) with the embedded se filling the role of Haitian Creole embedded pa in (20b).

34. Actually, this section is a concentrate prepared out of extracts from DeGraff (1992a, b, c, e).

35. When se is present, the grammaticality of (21c) improves with Bouki left-dislocated and se in subject position (Spec of IP). Left-dislocated structures will be mostly kept at bay for the purpose of this discussion; but see (24) and surrounding text, Damoiseau (1987) and DeGraff (1992c) for more comments.

36. I motivate these labels in DeGraff (1992e).
preceding se. This happens precisely when the predicate is preceded by morphemes qualifying as heads: tense, mood or aspect (TMA) markers, or a complementizer. Significantly, pa also excludes occurrence of se between predicates and subjects. This similarity between TMA and complementizer heads on the one hand and pa on the other hand confirms that pa is a head. I elaborate on this similarity in section 7.4.

Finally, se never occurs between subject and predicate when the predicate is adjectival or prepositional. Therefore, what seems to demand explanation is the presence or absence of se with nominal predicates.

7.2. Is se a verb?

What is the nature of se? One possibility that immediately comes to mind is that se is a verbal copula, the counterpart of English be or French être. It seems reasonable to discard that possibility for the following reasons.

All verbs in Haitian Creole follow negation and TMA markers while se does not. (22) and (23) illustrate the positional difference between se and the verb chante 'sing'.

(22)  Bouki (*pa) (*te) [a se] yon dòkè.
     Bouki NEG ANT se a doctor
     'Bouki [was/is] not a doctor.'

(23)  Kòk la pa te [yò chante] maten an.
     The rooster NEG ANT sing morning DET
     'The rooster didn't sing this morning.'

The ungrammaticality of (22) illustrates a robust generality: under no circumstances does se follow negation and TMA markers in Haitian Creole.

In addition, whenever se precedes negation and/or TMA markers, it is in subject position (Spec of IP), with the pre-se nominal in left-dislocated position, as indicated by the comma-intonation in (24). Furthermore, se in such environment can be replaced by li, which is undisputedly pronominal:

(24)  Bouki # [selli] (pa) (te) (yon) dòkè.
     Bouki se 3SG NEG ANT a doctor
     'Bouki, he [was/is] (not) a doctor.'

If se may occur in Spec of IP and be replaced by a personal pronoun, than it is unlikely that it is a verb. The generalization that se before negation and/or TMA markers is in Spec of IP is reinforced by the observation that any pre-se nominal occurring in these contexts must necessarily be able to left-dislocate.

(25) shows that the pronoun li — which cannot bear stress and cannot be left-dislocated — renders illicit the sequence of se and negation/TMA markers.

(25)  Li [a se] (*pa) (*te) yon dòkè.
     Li se NEG ANT a doctor
     'He/she is/was (not) a doctor.'

The data in (24) and (25) illustrate two sites of occurrence for se: (i) when preceding negation/TMA markers, se fills Spec of IP, forcing any pre-se nominal to dislocate, as in (24); (ii) when preceded by an atomic pronoun like li, se is in a non-verbal position, between Spec of IP and the (phonetically realized part of the) predicate, and excludes negation and TMA markers; hence the ungrammaticality of *Li se pa te yon dòkè in (25). I now turn to identifying the position of se in (25), between Spec of IP and a nominal predicate.

7.3. Analysis

In what follows, I summarize my analysis of the paradigm in (21), focusing on the mechanisms that regulate the (non)appearance of se. I assume that the subject of all Haitian Creole predicative clauses is generated internal to a small clause. This is similar to analyses in Stowell (1978) and Burzio (1986), among others. In (26), the acronym “SC-SP” denotes the base-generated small clause subject position. In the case of AP, PP and NP, SC-SP is in specifier position. In the case of DP and NumP, SC-SP is left-adjointed to DP and NumP. This is for reasons involving, inter alia, the functional nature of D and Num, mechanisms of θ-role assignment and predication, and Baker’s (1988) Universality of Theta-Role Assignment (UTAH) (see DeGraff 1992a, c, c). Briefly, Spec of DP and Spec of NumP are reserved for a genitive phrase or its trace, and, because of UTAH, cannot contain the base-generated subject. I also

38. Se also occurs clause-initial in cleft sentences. There as well, it precedes TMA and negation markers. I argue in DeGraff (1992b) that clause-initial se in clefts is in Spec of IP.
40. More extensive data implicating se and analyses of its occurrences can be found in Faucheux (1982), Dannoiseau (1987), Khan (1990), Lumsden (1990), Déprez and Vinet (1991), Manfredi (1991), etc. Most of these analyses are criticized in DeGraff (1992c).
41. Universal Theta Assignment Hypothesis: Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.
42. Tinjes Veenstra amusingly points out that my UTAH argument might do violence to a strict version of the hypothesis. Especially, the last three lines of (25) locate the subject of a nominal predicate in three different positions, namely in Spec of NP or adjoined to DP or NumP. However, it is central to my analysis that the thematic relationships in the three cases be different. Although DP and NumP are extended projections of NP, the actual predicates in (21a) — and their corresponding structures in (26) — are crucially different from their inner NPs (and give rise to distinct interpretations).

37. See DeGraff (1992c) for arguments that TMA markers are verbal heads.
assume that, in general, specifiers of functional heads are not assigned θ-roles at D-structure. The D-structures of the predicate small clauses are shown in (26):

\[ (26) \]

\[ \begin{align*}
[AP & \text{ SC-SP } [A^0 \ldots ]] \quad (1a) \\
[pp & \text{ SC-SP } [p^0 \ldots ]] \quad (1b) \\
[dp & \text{ SC-SP } [d^0 \ldots ]] \quad (1c) \\
[dp & \text{ SC-SP } [\text{dokté a and Aristide}] \\
[NumP & \text{ SC-SP } [\text{NumP } \ldots \text{Num}^0 \ldots ]] \quad (1d) \\
\end{align*} \]

Now, the deep subject, generated inside a small clause, does not receive Case in this position. It must move into Spec of IP in order to get Case.\(^{43}\)\(^{44}\) By the ECP, the trace left in SC-SP by movement of the subject to Spec of IP must be both identified and head-governed. In all the relevant cases, identification of the trace in SC-SP is satisfied through antecedent-government from Spec of IP. What about head-government?

I follow Aoun and Sportiche (1983), in assuming that m-command is the relevant command-relation for head-government. X m-commands Y if and only if (27) holds:

\[ (27) \quad \text{For all Z, a maximal projection, if Z dominates X then Z dominates Y.} \]

In (21) and (26), with AP, PP and NP predicates (21(a) through (21(c), respectively) the trace in SC-SP is head-governed by the lexical head of the predicate. Infl, being phonetically null, the mapping from D-structure to S-structure is string-vacuous. However, in case of predication by DP and NumP, as in (21(d), the subject moves from a position adjoined to DP or NumP. In (28), the trace must be spelled-out as a resumptive nominal which, being overt, is not subject to ECP. That resumptive nominal is se.\(^{43}\)

\[ (28) \quad \begin{align*}
[XP_1 & \text{ SC-SP } [X^0 \ldots ]] \\
\end{align*} \]

In order to save the structure, the trace must be spelled-out as a resumptive pronoun which, being overt, is not subject to ECP. That resumptive pronoun is se.\(^{43}\)

7.4. Predictions

This analysis predicts that se need not occur with DP and NumP predicates whenever there is an alternate head-governor for SC-SP, external to the small clause. This prediction is upheld in at least the following contexts:

- when the predicate is preceded by a complementizer, as in (32), and
- when the predicate is preceded by a TMA verbal marker, as in (34).

Also the minimal pairs in (29) and in (30) support the idea that it is exactly the occurrence of a functional head within the nominal phrase that entails the potential ECP violation, not the nouniness of the predicate.

I consider these data in turn.

7.4.1. Absence of se with bare NPs

When the noun in predicate position is bare — occurring without a functional head — the predicative small clause is NP and the subject is generated in Spec of NP, cf. (31a), and its trace, after movement into Spec of IP, is head-governed by the predicate head. Such trace need not be spelled-out as ze. As soon as a functional head occurs, in (29a) and (30a), head-government of SC-SP in adjoined position fails, as witnessed in (31b) and (31c), and the trace in SC-SP violates the ECP.

(29)

\[ a. \quad *\text{Bouki yon abitan.} \quad \text{Bouki} \text{ NUM peasant} \]

\[ b. \quad \text{Bouki abitan.} \quad \text{Bouki is a peasant.} \]

(30)

\[ a. \quad *\text{Preval premie minis} \quad \text{la.} \quad \text{Preval prime minister DET} \]

\[ b. \quad \text{Preval premie minis.} \quad \text{Preval is Prime Minister.} \]

(31)

\[ a. \quad \begin{align*}
[& \text{ SC-SP } [N^0 \ldots ]] \\
b. \quad [& \text{ SC-SP } [d^0 \ldots ]] \\
c. \quad [& \text{ SC-SP } [\text{NumP } \ldots \text{Num}^0 \ldots ]] \\
\end{align*} \]

7.4.2. Absence of se when the subject is questioned

In matrix questions, the complementizer ki must follow the wh-phrase when the wh-phrase originates in subject position. Furthermore, ki only occurs with subject extraction. This constraint suggests that the presence of ki is required for head-government. In (32), the predicate is DP or NumP, SC-SP is not head-governed from inside the small clause, yet se is absent. It must be the case that ki head-
governs SC-SP, allowing the trace there to remain phonetically null, as schematized in (33).\(^{46,47}\)

(32) Kimoun ki {yon doktèl doktè a}?

who ki a doctor the

"Who is a/the doctor?"

(33) a. \[\text{[CP Kimoun, [CP ki [IP e\text{\textsuperscript{i}}. e\text{\textsuperscript{c}} [\text{DP doktè a}]])]]\]

who ki

‘Who is the doctor?’

b. \[\text{[CP Kimoun, [CP ki [IP e\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, e\text{\textsuperscript{c}} [\text{NumP e\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, NumP doktè}]])]]\]

who ki

‘Who is the doctor?’

7.4.3. Absence of se in TMA-marked clauses

The effect of TMA markers vis-à-vis se is similar to that of the complementizer ki. When a TMA marker, for example, te ‘ANT’, occurs, se must not precede the predicate. In (35), the TMA head te head-governs the trace in SC-SP and se is not needed.

(34) Bouki te yon abitan.

Bouki ANT NUM peasant

‘Bouki was a peasant.’

(35) DS: [IP [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}, [\text{VP [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, v, te]] [\text{NumP Bouki, [\text{NumP, yon abitan}]])]]

SS: [IP Bouki, [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}, [\text{VP [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, v, te]] [\text{NumP e\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, NumP yon abitan}]])]

7.4.4. Absence of se in negated clauses: pa head-governs SC-SP

Now, let us go back to pa. Pa in (36), like ki in (32) and te in (34), renders superfluous the presence of se in SC-SP:

(36) Bouki pa yon doktè.

Bouki NEG a doctor

‘Bouki is not a doctor.’

In other words, se need not (and must not) precede the predicate when the latter is governed by pa. What makes pa similar to the complementizer ki and the TMA marker te with respect to whether se is needed? This similarity is not at

all surprising, given that pa, like ki and te, is a head and can head-govern SC-SP. However, if pa were in Spec of NegP or adjoined to VP, it would not head-govern SC-SP and the parallel between (33), (34) and (36) would be mysterious. This further substantiates the claim that Haitian Creole pa heads NegP. As such, pa does head-govern the trace in the small clause subject position, as shown in (37).\(^{48,49}\)

(37) DS: [IP [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}, [\text{NegP [Neg\text{\textsuperscript{c}} pa]] [\text{NumP Bouki, [\text{NumP yon doktè}]])]]

SS: [IP Bouki, [\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}, [\text{NegP [Neg\text{\textsuperscript{c}} pa]] [\text{NumP e\text{\textsuperscript{c}}, NumP yon doktè}]])]

8. Diachronic implications

As an epilogue, I contemplate the diachronic implications of my analysis of Haitian Creole pa as head of NegP (instead of Spec of NegP). In particular, what do these findings implicate for the genesis of Haitian Creole? If my analysis of Haitian Creole pa is correct, it would not only provide some insight into the emergence of negative concord in Haitian Creole, but it might offer some clues about the evolution of Haitian Creole — at least considering the superstrate, French, and (too sparse) data from one representative substrate, Fon.

I have argued that Haitian Creole pa and French pas, in spite of being cognates, occupy different positions in their respective syntactic structures. Now, I briefly look at one eminent progenitor of Haitian Creole and see how sentential negation functions there.

8.1. Sentential negation in Fon

For negation in Fon, I rely on work by Lefebvre and Lumsden (1992) and da Cruz (1992). According to them, Fon is very much like French in having two negation markers: \(d\) and \(md\), in head and specifier of NegP, respectively. \(A\) would correspond to French \(ne\) and \(md\) would correspond to French \(pas\). Unlike French though, the negation head in Fon, \(d\), is post-verbal while the specifier \(ma\) is pre-verbal, as shown in (38). Thus the two negation markers necessarily bracket the verb phrase, when they co-occur.\(^{50}\)

46. My analysis of ki as being in C\text{\textsuperscript{e}} is incompatible with Law's (1992) analysis where ki occupies Spec of IP as a resumptive pronoun bound by the wh-operator kimoun. Ki in Spec of IP would not head-govern the trace in SC-SP, and the absence of se in (32) would remain unexplained.

47. If one assumes with Chomsky (1986: 47f) that IP is defective as a barrier, then ki in (33) does head-govern the most embedded subject trace e\text{\textsuperscript{c}}.

48. See (34), DeGraff (1992b) and Danoise (1987) for occurrences of se in the position preceding pa/t-e — se there is in Spec of IP, not in the subject's base-position. As expected, se never precedes C\text{\textsuperscript{e}} ki.

49. There is a surprising dissimilarity between te/pa and ki as of whether se may succeed them. Te and pa categorically prohibit a subsequent se whereas some speakers allow se subsequent to ki. This might be related to the distance between governor and governed: the trace e\text{\textsuperscript{c}} of the base-generated subject is hierarchically further away from ki in (33) than it is from both te and pa in (35) and (37); see DeGraff (1992b) for more speculation.

50. Da Cruz notes that md and d cannot co-occur in declarative simplex clauses.
from French while maintaining grammatical and semantic properties of their native language. Put in a simplistic way, Haitian Creole grammar would actually be the grammar of one of its West-African source languages (Fon, say), and the audible part of its lexicon would originate from French.

Regarding negation, Lefebvre and Lumsden argue that Haitian Creole pa results from relexification of Fon mà into French pas. Consequently, like Fon mà and French pas, Haitian Creole pa would be in Spec of NegP. In this account, NegP in Haitian Creole would be head-final, like in Fon, but with a null Neg.

In contrast with their position, I hope to have shown in this paper that Haitian Creole pa, if anything, shares more properties with French ne than with French pas. I have argued that Haitian Creole pa, like French ne, heads NegP, unlike Fon mà and French pas, which are in Spec of NegP. Also, like French ne, Haitian Creole pa may partake in negative concord. As it appears, the phrase-structural characterization of Haitian Creole pa resists a straightforward explanation via relexification, at least not in the fashion outlined in Lefebvre and Lumsden (1992).

In this respect, it would be fascinating to compare Haitian Creole with Romance varieties that allow negative concord with homologues of pas (PA, for short), for example, Valdôtain (Franco-Provençal) and Occitan. In these dialects, PA when co-occurring with negative quantifiers is compatible with negative concord; see Zanutiri (1991) and references therein.53,54 This is unlike

8.2. Relexification?

On the surface, negation in Haitian Creole shares properties with both French and Fon. The sentential negation marker in Haitian Creole is phonetically identical to French pas. And like Fon mà, Haitian Creole pa always precedes the VP, including TMA markers (see note 2). In Haitian Creole, like in Fon, verbs do not move out of VP. It is these similarities, among other things, that have enticed Lefebvre and Lumsden into proposing that Haitian Creole pa is one further instantiation of the relexification process.

In Lefebvre and Lumsden (1992), relexification is the process whereby adult native speakers of one prominent ancestor language, specifically Fon, created Haitian Creole by replacing phonetic shapes in their lexicon with forms derived

51. Da Cruz (pers. comm., June 1993) has provided me with Fon examples of apparent cases of negative concord in the presence of mà and d. To be further investigated are the precise conditions regulating Fon negative concord with mà (as made clear in da Cruz’s 1992 insightful work, the distribution of mà is subject to subtle semantic nuances). Also, great care must be taken in distinguishing negative quantifiers from negative polarity items. As indicated in Section 6.2, the latter might give rise to apparent negative concord via distinct interpretive mechanisms. (See Zanutiri 1991 and references therein.)
standard French *pas* in, for example, (3). This similarity might guide the historical linguist in looking for the exact varieties of Romance which actually participated in the genesis of Haitian Creole. *Vis-à-vis* negation, were these varieties similar to Valdóin and Occitan or to the French of examples (3) and (5)? In other words, did *pas* in the grammars of 17th-century French settlers in Haiti induce double negation or negative concord?  

8.3. Restructuring of French?

Also fascinating is the scenario which was suggested to me by Bill Stewart (pers. comm. October 1992). Recall that the Haitian Creole verbal system has no inflectional morphology. Most verbs occur in uninflected form, and they are possibly preceded by independent morphemes marking tense, mood or aspect; see (1). Haitian Creole verb forms were plausibly derived from the corresponding French infinitival or participle forms. But it is crucial to note that in French both infinitives and past participles occur mostly after *pas*. In Pollock's framework, this is because only the finite verb needs to move beyond *pas* to get its inflectional morphology. Also of interest is the historical fact noted by Stewart that, in earlier Haitian Creole texts, *nepa* and *napa* — from French *nes(t)s* and *na(s)* *pas*, respectively — were used as single morphemes marking negation. Thus the sequence *ne*+auxiliary+*pas* would have been reanalyzed as a pre-verbal negation marker, with the emergent negation morphemes *nepa/napa*, and later *pa*, inheriting their head status from French *ne*. This might sketch the mutation of Fon *md...a* and French *ne...pas* into Haitian Creole *pa*, on their maiden voyage from Africa and Europe to the Caribbean — and from specifier to head of the Negation Phrase. As for myself, I am sailing toward a solution to this riddle on negation in Haitian Creole?

Richard Kayne (pers. comm., June 1992) judiciously points out that viewing *Pa* as a syntactic affix is incompatible with data where material (like adverbs) intervenes between *V* and *Pa* and where an infinitival verb follows, instead of precedes, *Pa*. Should we then resort to Zanuttin's (less restrictive) proposal that *Pa* is in Spec of NegP at S-structure (permitting V-raising), but in head of NegP at LF (permitting negative concord)? (I owe many thanks to Richie for many long and enriching discussions on this, and many other topics.)

55. Stepping beyond the Haitian Creole case into (more debatable) issues of Creole genesis, it is striking that Bickerton (1981: 65) remarks that negative concord is quite common among Creole languages. Relevant data are drawn from Guyanese Creole, Papia Kristang and Hawaii Creole English. Of course, it is necessary to buttress this claim against a wider inspection of Creole languages; see Holm (1988: 171-174) for an effort in this direction. Perhaps negative concord is typologically unmarked (Labov 1972: 774, 803).

56. Yves Dejean advises caution in using early Haitian Creole texts for historical purpose. These texts were written by non-native speakers that were often disdainful of the Creole. Moreover, the language is systematically betrayed by the then-prevalent French-based orthography. In any case, Dejean corroborates Stewart's findings about the use of *nepa/napa* as negation markers (but with much lower frequency than *pa*).  

8.4. *Pa* pa *Pas*

Wherever I may land, one proposition, in this sea of conjectures, remains certain: synchronically, Haitian *pa* is systematically different from (standard) French *pas*. Given that Haitian has no copula, the riddle now reads:

(40) *Pa* pa *Pas*.  
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