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1. Pronouns as copulas?¹

This presentation is about the bearable lightness of being. Indeed be (qua verbal copula) is so light that, cross-linguistically, it disappears more often than not (Benveniste 1966:Ch13,16). For example, certain languages, dispersed across genetic classifications, seem to use pronominal-like? morphemes as ‘copulas’, i.e. in places where more familiar European languages (Germanic and Romance, say) would use a be-type verb (see Sec. 2). Among languages manifesting “pronominal copulas” (cf. Benveniste’s (1966:189ff) “pronom-copule”), we find Arabic, Aramaean, Haitian, Hebrew, Irish, Turkish, etc. In this vein, there has been some productive (cross-linguistic) investigation on the morphosyntactic requirements of non-verbal predicates, going back as early as Aristotle (see Moro 1997:248ff), then (much?) later to Benveniste (1966), Li & Thompson 1977, etc., finally up to more recent generative treatments by (among many others) Carnie (1995), Déchaine (1993), DeGraff (1992a,b, 1993, 1994b, 1995), Déprez & Vinet (1992), Doherty (1996a,b, 1997), Doron (1985), Heggie (1988), Lumsden (1990), Manfredi (1993), Rapoport (1987), Rothstein (1983), etc.²

¹For enlightening discussions, I owe thanks to Elena Anagnostopoulou, Andrew Carnie, Noam Chomsky, Viviane Déprez, Cathal Doherty, Ken Hale, Morris Halle, Eva Juárez Dausik, Victor Manfredi, Alec Marantz, Maire Noonan, David Pesetsky and Cheryl Zoll. Special thanks go to Jose Camacho for first alerting me to the Haitian-Irish connection (see fn. 8), and to Norvin Richards for bringing up Irish, Tagalog and relevant aspects of Carnie’s work at the right moment. I am indebted to Andrew, Cathal, Ken and Maire for guiding me through parts of the Irish maze, and to audiences at MIT, LSRL and WCCFL in 1996/7 for heroically sitting through my first experiments with Irish predication and for their helpful feedback. Thanks to WCCFL editors — and to Enôh — for their patience while I was finishing this paper. All remaining errors stem from my reading Irish with a heavy Haitian accent.

²Also see McWhorter’s (1995) diachronic study of “demonstrative” and “sero” copulas in English-lexicon Carribean creoles. These morphemes show diachronic patterns similar to those outlined for their Haitian counterpart in DeGraff (1995).
What unites most of these works is, inter alia, the (explicit or implicit) focus on: (i) non-verbal (in particular, nominal) predication in absence of an overt (verbal) copula; (ii) the obligatory presence of a pronominal-(like) element alongside the subject, with a particular subclass of nominal predicates. One long-standing hunch is that there must be some deep connection between pronominal forms and the syntax of predication; cf. e.g. Benveniste’s “pronominal copulas”.

One goal of this paper is to capture (aspects of) the pronoun-copula connection in a constrained fashion, i.e. using independently-needed syntactic principles. To this end, Sec. 4 presents my analysis of non-verbal predication in Haitian Creole. Then, in Sec. 5, I take my analysis to one language spoken far-away from Haiti, namely Irish. In particular, I will sketch a preliminary, minimal attempt toward a unified way of thinking about the (quasi-)pronominal morphemes that obligatorily appear across these two distant languages alongside the subject and certain nominal predicates. The ‘distance’ between Haitian and Irish is both genetic and typological. Haitian is an SVO French-lexifier creole with isolating morphology, sans V-raising (DeGraff 1994a, 1997); but see Déprez & Vinet 1992 and fn. 16. Irish is a VSO Celtic language with rich inflectional morphology and with V-raising (Sproat 1985, McCloskey 1996a, b etc.) If this first effort at a unified account for Haitian and Irish predication patterns meets with any success, then we might be inching closer toward some deeper understanding of ‘pronominal copulas’. Furthermore, my Haitian-inspired analysis of Irish has non-trivial implications for certain ill-understood aspects of Irish morphosyntax and for the theory of movement, e.g. clitics vs. agreement markers, pronominal status of raised predicates, trace licensing, resumptive nominals, scope of (clitic) movement (syntax vs. PF), …

Before addressing the Haitian and Irish details in Secs. 4 and 5, I illustrate in Sec. 2 the domain under discussion with a misleading sample of predication phenomena from more familiar languages, then I proceed with an overview of the Haitian and Irish facts in Sec. 3.

2. Predication — A misleading sample

English is typical of Germanic in that matrix non-verbal predicates in standard registers, unlike verbal predicates, require a form of be as support for tense and/or agreement morphology: e.g. Mary [pred walks to the library] vs. Paul *(is) [pred {happy | in the garden | prime minister | a doctor }].

English adjectives, prepositions, nouns, etc., are not morphologically specified to host tense and agreement suffixes. To wit, the ungrammaticality of *John happy-s. Romance languages typically be have like English with respect to be-support in non-verbal predication.

Take French for example: Jean *(est) [pred {content | au jardin | (un bon médecin)] } “I. is {happy | in the garden | (a good) doctor}.”

Must all languages use a be verb with non-verbal predicates? As already alluded to, the English/French/Ewe sample above is rather misleading. For example, contrast these examples with their be-less counterparts in Arabic, Hebrew, Russian, Turkish, Hungarian, Ancient Greek (cf. Benveniste 1966:Ch13,16). The Haitian and Irish data to be discussed below also contrast with the English, French and Ewe data. Furthermore, Ken Hale (1994), inter alios, has noticed that “Equational and identificational predication [is] expressed by null in Warlpiri, Navajo, and Hopi … by a particle in ‘O’odhia, a verb in English, and by a special tense-inflation in Modern Irish”. Thus, as Benveniste (1966:139) concluded, the necessity of be in e.g. English, French and Ewe only creates the “illusion” that be-verbs fulfill some deep, necessary function, i.e. the surfacing of be in certain languages might only be the result of superficial morphological idiosyncrasies. Many other linguists (e.g. Hengeveld 1992) have brought forth further diversity in the cross-linguistic expression of predication. Here I’ll take a modest stab at understanding what might be SOME of the internal sources of such diversity, focusing on the ‘pronominal copulas’ of Haitian and Irish.

3. Haitian & Irish non-verbal predication

Predication patterns in Haitian have challenged many scholars. A small subset of the relevant facts are exhibited in (1) and (2). In declarative clauses that show no overt Tense-Modality-Aspect (TMA) marking, the following generalization emerges: (i) AP, (most) PP, and NP predicates are string-adjacent to their subjects, as in (1) (compare with the French, English and Ewe data in Sec. 2 and fn. 4; (ii) DP predicates require the morpheme se between subject and predicate, as in (2); (iii) with ‘bare’ nominal predicates, like dōtė in (1b), se may
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Incidentally French is Haiti’s European ancestor. Yet the two languages differ markedly vis-à-vis the syntax of predication (DeGraff 1995). Interestingly, Haitian also shares part of it with its African ancestors. In Ewe, a representative West-African source, different ‘copulas’ are needed for different classes of predicates; e.g. 4 vs. nse: Ẹ̀dọ̀ ọnụ ọ̀ọ̀ọ̀ 3sg-BE well (“He is well”), Ẹ̀dọ̀ tẹ̀ sọ me 3sg-BE house in (“He is in the house”), Ẹ̀dọ̀ ọ̀ọ̀ọ̀ ọ̀ọ̀ọ̀ 3sg-BE house in (“The crocodile is an animal that lives in water”) etc. (see Westermann 1980:91). Thus, the representative source languages of Haitian Creole make use of copulas with non-verbal predicates, unlike the Creole itself. This raises fascinating questions with respect to processes of creolization, language change and language acquisition; for related issues (in particular, the role of morphology in creolization), see e.g.
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Following e.g. Doherty's terminology) This augment, although obligatory with definite nominals like an dochtuir 'the doctor' in (4a), is not obligatory with indefinite nominal predicates like dochtuir 'a doctor' in (4b). This is, of course, intriguingly reminiscent of the distribution of Haitian se, and begs for a unified analysis.8

At this point, I might as well note a number of word-order and morphological patterns in (4) with no counterpart in Haitian Creole — I will address these discrepancies in Sec. 5 when extending to Irish my analysis for Haitian. In (4a) the predicate an dochtuir 'the doctor' follows the subject Seán while in (4b) the predicate dochtuir 'a doctor' precedes the subject Seán. In (4a), the augment é follows the particle (PTCL) is. Together they form a phonological word pronounced [is é] (Doherty 1996a:28). In (4b), the optional augment é intervenes between the predicate dochtuir 'a doctor' to the left and the subject Seán to the right, with material (e.g. adverbs) possibly preceding the augment (Doherty 1996b).

What properties does Irish é in (4) have in common with Haitian se in (1b) and (2)? In particular, what are the syntactic mechanisms regulating the (non-)appearance of se in (1)–(2) and é in (3)–(4)? Following Camacho's intuition (see fn. 8) that the alluring similarity between (1)–(2) and (3)–(4) is not accidental, a unified analysis of Haitian se in (2) and Irish é in (4) seems most desirable. Given the threatening sharpness of Occam's razor, such analysis should be tried cross-linguistically whenever possible, beyond Haitian and Irish even; but this is for future work. For now, I'll turn to my analysis of Haitian se, then extend it to Irish é-type augment.

4. Predication in Haitian — The analysis

Here I can only give a synopsis of my analysis for Haitian se.9 Recall the basic schema in (1)–(2). Why is se obligatory in (2)? Note that non-nominal predicates do not always entail occurrence of se: if the predicate is governed by a TMA (e.g. ANT(erior) or PUT(ture)) or NEG(ation) marker (in bold), then se is ruled out:

(5) Li (*se) te/ap/3pa 3sg SE ANT/FUT/NEG SE a good doctor

"He/She { was | be | was not } a good doctor"

The basic observation inspiring my analysis is that se, in other contexts, behaves unambiguously like a pronoun, and not like a verbal copula.

8 In an auspicious e-mail message (6 March 1992), Jose Camacho wrote: "Irish has almost exactly the pattern Haitian has [...] I haven't found any analyses of the phenomenon, Stenson has only a description, she says it is a "mystery", but maybe your analysis [of Haitian se in DeGraff (1992a)] will give some clues." I wrote back: "It would indeed be nice if my analysis would generalize to this case." This paper is a first step in fulfilling this long-overdue promissory note.

9 For further empirical and theoretical details, please consult DeGraff 1992a,b, 1993, 1994a, 1995. NB: Here I am not considering the morpheme se that precedes the moved predicate in clefts; see DeGraff 1992b, 1994a and references in fn. 5.
Typical Haitian verbs follow TMA and NEG, like chante ‘sing’ in (6a). However se cannot surface in such post-TMA/NEG position, as shown in (6b).

(6) a. Kok la pa te [vp chante maten an] rooster the NEG ANT sing morning the

“the rooster didn’t sing this morning”

b. * Li pa te se yon bon dokté 3sg NEG ANT SE a good doctor

On the other hand, in structures involving left-dislocation with topicalized nominals outside of IP, se finds itself in pre-TMA/NEG position, which is exactly where run-of-the-mill subject pronouns find themselves. To wit, compare the parallel distribution of se and the 3sg pronoun li in (7).

(7) Jak, li/se pa te yon bon dokté

Jaki 3sg/SE NEG ANT a good doctor

“Jack, he wasn’t a good doctor”

This suggests that se in (7) functions as a pronoun, which sits in Spec(IP), just like li; both se and li are co-indexed with the left-dislocated nominal Jak. My explanation for the (non-)occurrence of se in (1)–(2) rests on the assumption that there, also, se is a nominal element co-indexed with a c-commanding nominal, but unlike se in (7), se in (1b) and (2) is in a position lower than Spec(IP) while Bokki, the nominal c-commanding (and co-indexed with) se, sits in Spec(IP). More precisely, se in (2) is in the position where the subject Bokki is base-generated within a Small-Clause(-like) extended projection of the predicate. It is from within this Small Clause that Bokki raises to Spec(IP). In other words, se in (1b) and (2) overtly realizes the (illicit) subject trace left behind by Bokki. What makes the subject trace illicit in (2), forcing it to be spell-out as se? This question takes us directly to the core of my analysis.

This paragraph and the next are summarized in (8) where ellipses abbreviate further possible structure. 12 Crucial to the explanation are the following three assumptions: (i) Underlyingly, predication is realized within a S(mall)/C(lause), with the subject generated internal to the SC; i.e. the subject is first merged with an extended projection of the predicate. (ii) Crucially, such deep subjects are merged with either a NON-MAXIMAL projection of the predicate or with an extended MAXIMAL projection of the predicate. In the former case, the deep subject is dominated by a further projection of the predicate head. Such merger is possible when the SC is headed by a predicative head, as in (1); see (8a). In the latter case, the deep subject is altogether outside of the predicate’s immediate maximal projection. This situation is

10 DeGraff 1995 contrastse se and French ce and c’est.
11 What follows summarizes (and updates) earlier work already cited.
12 Most likely, Small Clauses have finer structure than what I am assuming here; see e.g. papers in Cardinali & Guasti 1995.

13 For the corresponding examples in French (and English), the trace left by move-ment in (8) is always governed, either by the predicate’s lexical head (with predicates as in (8a) or by the copula (with predicates as in (8b)).
14 What about the ‘optionality’ of se with bare nominals, as in (1b)? My analysis leads to the following account. In Bokki dokté, the predicate is an NP with subject generated in Spec(NP), as in (8a); in Bokki se dokté, the predicate is a DP headed by a null DP, with the subject generated outside of the predicate DP, as in (8b). There are subtle interpretive differences between the two structures. For example, Bokki dokté tends to have a temporary, stage-level flavor (e.g. “Bokki is doctor now—he currently practices as such”) whereas Bokki se dokté describes a characteristic property of Bokki, with an individual-level flavor (e.g. “Bokki is a doctor by profession, although he no longer practices”). See Fauchi 1982, Dames 1982 for relevant observations. Somewhat similar facts obtain in Irish with PP vs. DP predicates in té and is clauses, respectively (Stenson 1981:24f).
To sum up, se in (1)–(2) is the “last resort” overt realization of the ‘unlicensed’ tail of an A-chain.\textsuperscript{15,16} What about Irish è in (4)?

5. Predication in Irish — The analysis

Recall the two basic schemas in (3)–(4) (≡ (9)–(10)) for ‘non-verbal’ predication, with tā and is (and their inflected variants); cf. Stenson 1981, Ó Siadhail 1989, Doherty 1996a,b, 1997, Carnie 1995, etc. Firstly, tā occurs with non-nominal predicates: AP, AdvP, PP, VP, etc:

\[(9)\]
\[
\text{Tā Seáin \{ císte | go math | i n\textit{Dhairre} | ag rith \} Be\text{pres} John \{ clever | well | in Derry | running \}
\]

Secondly, is is used PRODUCTIVELY only with nominal predicates. With such predicates, there is an ‘extra’ pronominal(-like?) element, è, showing up to the left of the subject. This extra element, the ‘augment’, has long been a “mystery” (Stenson 1981:96). In the little remaining time, I will try to let the parallels with Haitian se shed some light on this mystery.

\[(10)\]
\[
a. \text{Is * (è) Seáin an dochtúir “John is the doctor”}
\]
\[
b. \text{Is dochtúir (è) Seáin “John is (a) doctor”}
\]

Tā forms are not used with NPs: replacing is with tā in (10) produces ungrammaticality. Conversely, is forms are not used with APs, PP, VP, etc., modulo some lexically-determined exceptions; see e.g. Doherty 1996a for sets of PP and AP that do occur with is.

\textsuperscript{15}“Last resort” is used in the sense of Chomsky 1995:Ch2 and Shlonsky 1992.

In a pre-minimalist framework, such Res-N’s provide a minimal escape hatch to ECP violations (cf. Sells 1984). In a framework sans government (i.e. an ‘architectural’ framework), government might be re-suscitated as “being in the minimal domain of an appropriate (lexical! predicative!) head”, i.e. a minimalistic account of a (subset of) ECP effects would allow traces to be licensed in such domains.

\textsuperscript{16}Déprés and Vinet’s (1992) alternative analysis of se (hereafter D&V) suffers from a number of fatal flaws. Three central features of their proposal are: (i) Haitian is claimed to manifest overt V-, A-, and F-raising into an aspectual head Asp\textsuperscript{2} (D&V:14–19); (ii) adjunctive heads move to Asp\textsuperscript{2}; hence the ungrammaticality of “Jan fin esetljan ‘John COMPL(ative-marked) intelligent’; (iii) se in (2) is argued to be underlyingly related to the morpheme ye, found in instances of XP-movement of predicates, e.g. “Kine Bouki ye? ‘What Bouki YEs?’ (‘What is Bouki?’): ye is the strong form of se (cf. English Mary is/? smart vs. And smart, Mary is/?’s tool (D&V:22–26)).

All three assumptions are problematic: First: there is no evidence for predicate-head raising (DeGraff 1997). Second, adjunctive heads are compatible with aspectual heads, as in: “Jan fin fou ‘J. COMPL crazy’ (‘John is completely (or has gone crazy’); cf. D&V’s “Jan fin esetljan. Thirdly, se is quite distinct from ye; e.g. in Bouki non jaden an (from (1a)) where the predicate non jaden an (“in the garden”) remains in situ, both se and ye are ruled out: * Bouki se/ye non jaden an. Ye, ye (and not se) must surface when the cleft moves, as in “Nan ki jaden Bouki ye? ‘in which garden is Bouki?’”. This seems incompatible with assumption (iii) above. (See Fauchais 1989, DeGraff 1994b.)

Before trying my Haitian-based Res-N’s analysis on Irish è, let us start by laying out (without defending) some central observations and assumptions about Irish morphosyntax.\textsuperscript{17} First, a note on word order. Irish is VSO presumably with V-raising to the highest inflectional head within IP (e.g. Sproat 1985, McCloskey 1996a,b, Carnie 1995). I’ll be referring to this head as INF\textsubscript{high} for simplicity, to avoid entering the debate on whether this head is Agr or Tense or something else (see e.g. Bobaljik & Carnie 1996 vs. McCloskey 1996b).\textsuperscript{18} Such V-to-INF\textsubscript{high} directly accounts for the position of tā in (9): tā, like English be, is verbal and supports the clause’s tense and agreement features (‘be-support’). Like English be, it selects a S\{small\}-C\{clause\} complement. In this clause, this SC complement is an (extended projection of) AP, AdvP, PP, etc., (somewhat) à la Chung & McCloskey 1987. At spell-out, tā is in INF\textsubscript{high} with the subject to its right, in the Spec of the next inflectional head down, Spec-INF\textsubscript{low}, which results in VSO order. In the context of the analysis presented in the previous section, not much else needs to be said regarding the licensing of the subject trace in the ē-clauses such as (9): like in Haitian, the subjects of predicates whose heads are inherently predicative (AP, PP, etc.) are generated/merged in the minimal domain of these heads and the subject traces are licensed within the SCs, to è is not nesed.\textsuperscript{19}

Unlike tā in (9), is in (10) is taken to be a C\{particle\} particle (Carnie 1995) and it occurs in three types of clauses with distinct word orders, as instantiated in (10a) and (10b).\textsuperscript{20} In both types of is-clauses, we find the extra pronoun è (the ‘augment’\textsuperscript{21}) to the left of the subject Seán; è is co-indexed and agrees with Seán in person, number and gender. (The form of the augment co-varies with the Φ-features of the co-indexed subject, e.g. è is the 3sg feminine form, but I’ll be referring to all augment as “è(-type) pronouns”.) Let’s pre-theoretically call the first type of is clauses, in (10a), IDENTIFICATORY COPULA CLAUSE (ICC) and the second type, in (10b), CLASSIFICATORY COPULA CLAUSE (CCC), following Stenson 1981, Ó Siadhail 1989, etc. In ICCs like (10a), the predicate is an dochtúir ‘the doctor’, a defi-
finite nominal (a DP) occurring with an article an ‘the’; an dochtáir is ‘equated’ to the subject Seán. Such non-bare nominal predicates require é; compare with Haitian (2). In CCCs like (10b), the predicate is dochtáir ‘a doctor’, an indefinite determiner-less nominal (a bare NP); dochtáir ‘classifies’ the subject Seán. With such bare nominal predicates, é is ‘optional’; compare with Haitian (1b). To summarize, we have the following patterns for (10a) and (10b) respectively:

(11) a. ICC: C O Augment1 Subj; Pred

[ in (10a)] is *é/é/etc.) DP1 DP2[+-def]

b. CCC: C O Pred ‘Augment1 Subj;

[ in (10b)] is NP[+-def] (é/é/etc.) DP1

In previous treatments, é-type pronouns have been claimed to be agreement morphemes, affixed either on some abstract copula (à la Carnie 1995) or on the copula particle (à la Doherty 1996a). However, there are reasons for doubting these claims. Irish shows robust complementarity between agreement morphology and overt realization of subjects (McCloskey & Hale 1984): subjects must be null (pro) whenever governed by agreement morphology, as in (12b) where 1pl agreement morphology on chuirfimid ‘put’ excludes the overt subject muid ‘1pl’ (from McCloskey & Hale 1984:490):21

(12) a. Chuirfhimid Eoghan isteach ar an phost sin put(CONDIT) Owen in on that job

“Owen would apply for that job”

b. Chuirfhimid (*muid) isteach ar an phost sin put(CONDIT+1pl) wé in on that job

“We would apply for that job”

Furthermore, the (affixal) agreement status of é is puzzling given its optionality with, and its separability from, bare nominal predicates, as in (10b) (cf. Is dochtuir cinnte é Seán “John is certainly a doctor”).22 Hence, let’s put the é-as-agreement proposal in abeyance and pursue another possibility, namely, that é is the counterpart of Haitian se.

Looking at the obliqueness of Irish é in (10a)/(11a) with Haitian eyes, my proposal is a straightforward extension of the se-as-Res-N1 analysis. It proceeds in now-familiar steps: (i) Irish subjects raise from a SC-internal subject position like in Haitian (see (8)), with the difference that the Irish subject surfaces in Spec(INFLlower), a Spec

\[\text{lower than INFL}_{\text{high}}\text{ (as in e.g. McCloskey 1996b, Bobaljik & Carnie 1996). (ii) Exactly like in Haitian, the subject trace is not licensed (i.e. it is unlicensed) whenever the subject is merged/generated outside the extended projection of the) predicate phrase, as with definite nominal (DPs). (iii) In such cases and in the absence of a SC-external governor, the subject trace must be overtly realized as a se/é-type augment.23} \]

At this point, there are at least three still-unresolved problems: (A) Why does é occur to the left of the DPbody in (10a)/(11a), instead of merely remaining within the SC, between subject and predicate, just like its Haitian counterpart?24 (B) Why does the definite, non-bare, nominal predicate dochtáir an surfaces to the right of the subject in (10a)/(11a) while the indefinite, bare nominal predicate dochtáir surfaces to the left of the subject in (10b)/(11b)? (C) Why is é optional in (10b)/(11b)? Answers to (A)–(C) will rest on: the licensing conditions of subject traces, the function of the augment as realizing unlicensed subject traces, the phonological (PF) status of the Irish augment, and finally the syntax of Irish VSO-ness, augmented with a provocative new proposal from Carnie 1995 about predicate-raising.25

To solve problem (A), let’s note at the onset that the Irish pronominal augment in ICCs qualifies for clitic status. In arguing that the augment marks agreement on is, Doherty 1996a:285 makes the three following important observations: (i) “the pronominal augment [as in (10a)/(11a)] forms a single phonological unit with the copula pronounced [‘é’]”; (ii) “when [is] is omitted […] the pronominal augment is also obligatorily omitted”; (iii) “the copula + augment [s+t-e] sequence acts as a unit for elitosis….”26 Assuming that the augment is an enclitic is compatible with Doherty’s observations while shunning the pitfalls noted above for the é-as-agreement proposal. Descriptively, cliticization of the augment to INFL_{high} results in its placement to the left of the subject, as depicted in (10a)/(11a). But we’re now left wondering why the augment must cliticize? I will assume that this is related to whatever parameter(s) underlyes Irish ‘VSO-ness’: Irish INFL_{high} must be ‘lexicalized’ (by PF) — via a morpheme bearing, or entering into agreement with (the subject’s) Φ-features. In predicate with a definite DP, the sole candidate for lexicalizing INFL_{high} is the Res-N1 in the SC-internal subject position. If this

\[\text{21See McCloskey & Sells 1995 and McCloskey 1990 for (ECP-motivated) analyses where Irish realizes tales of A- and A-bar chains via resumptive nominals.}\]

\[\text{22As pointed out in Carnie 1995:256f, the word order apparently predicted from my Haitian account would be: Is Seán é an dochtáir, with é as Res-N1, inside the SC, to the right of the subject.}\]

\[\text{23Carnie’s proposal can be interpreted as a treatment of how Irish enacts its ‘VSO-ness’ (or more accurately its Pred-so-ness) when there is no V in the structure as in clauses with indefinite nominal predicates. My proposal in the paragraph below somewhat extends this treatment in relating yet another kind of movement to Irish ‘VSO-ness’, in clauses with definite nominal predicates.}\]

\[\text{24For further copious evidence for cliticization of Irish (repetitive) subject pronouns, see Chung & McCloskey 1987:222–228, McCloskey 1990, etc.}\]
However, although attractive, the story might not be that simple. In fact, there is reason to believe that the CCC predicate may be more complex than NP and that it may project some inflectional layers, which would force the subject to be generated outside of the minimal domain of the predicate head, in an unguessed position. Thus, in (14), the predicate must have a structure with enough functional structure for genitive Case-assignment to horses (cf. Carnie 1995:183 for the Irish data). So, if the trace of Sédan/Jan is not governed from within the predicated SC. That this is so seems confirmed by (14b) where the subject trace must be spelled-out by se.

(14) a. Is [xp docktir capall] Sédan (Irish) doctor horses.gen John
b. Jan *( se ) dokté shwal (Haitian) Jan SE doctor horse "John is a doctor of horses"

At this point, I seem to have driven myself in an impasse: Haitian (14b) suggests that the subject trace there is unlicensed; yet if Irish é is truly se’s counterpart then it is expected to be obligatory in (14a), contra the data. But, wait! There is yet another difference between Irish (14a) and Haitian (14b): the predicate in the former mysteriously surfaces to the left of the subject whereas the predicate in the latter stays in its canonical subject-position. How does the Irish predicate in (14a) get to its pre-subject position? Is this related to (possible) absence of é in CCCs? This takes us to problem (B) about Irish word-order in CCC vs. ICC and to Carnie’s radically innovative claims about Irish predicate-raising. Carnie’s claims may take us out of our impasse. Before turning to Carnie’s proposal, let me summarize my intuitive lead: Although the complex predicate in (14a) projects some functional head, the subject trace is not overtly realized. Hence, given my analysis so far, there must be some SC-external governor licensing the subject trace in the SC. This SC-external governor seems related to the fact that the CCC predicate surfaces to the right of the subject. My account will connect the word-order facts to the absence of pronominal in CCCs (thus, licensing of CCC subject traces) via Carnie’s analysis of predicate-raising in CCCs.

What are the sources of the word-order differences between ICCs and CCCs? There is a growing consensus among celticists that the CCC word-order is obtained via predicate-raising; cf. Hendrick 1994, Carnie 1995, Doherty 1995b, etc. What distinguishes among these proposals is the mechanics of such raising. For instance, this is movement to INFLh for Carnie 1995 (cf. Hendrick 1994), but movement to Spec(INFLh) for Doherty 1995b. If the latter holds, then predicate-raising as XP-movement should have no effect on head-government of the subject trace (and absence/presence of é). However in Carnie’s (1995:Ch6) analysis, head-movement of indefinite nominal predicates up to INFLh would have direct consequences vis-à-vis licensing of
the subject trace as envisaged in my analysis. Once INFL\textsubscript{high} is so lexicalized (by this non-canonical head — see Carnie 1995:Ch6 for details), it (or, most likely, one of its traces) may head-govern into the SC-internal subject position, making the pronominal augment (qua Res-N') superfluous. Thus, if we adopt Carnie's claims regarding Irish predicate raising along with his "derived notions of X\textsuperscript{2} vs. X\textsuperscript{0}-ness" (cf. Chomsky's 1994 bare phrase structure), then, given my \( \epsilon \)-as-Res-N' analysis, \( \epsilon \)’s absence in (10b)/(11b)/(14a) becomes a side-effect of the (derived) status of the predicate dochtúir (napall) as an X\textsuperscript{0} governing the subject trace. The situation is summarized in (15) where YP is, as before, a(n extended) projection of the SC: \( \boxed{1} \) is subject-raising; \( \boxed{2} \) is predicate-raising via X\textsuperscript{0}-movement à la Carnie — this step crucially provides a head-governor to \( t_i \), making \( \epsilon \) unnecessary.\footnote{31}{See Doherty 1996b and Legate 1996 for counter-arguments to predicate-raising as head-movement.}

\begin{center}
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What about \( \epsilon \)'s ‘optional’ presence in (10b)/(11b)? As noted by Doherty (1996a,b), \( \epsilon \)-[like] pronouns in CCCs have different phonological properties than the enclitic augment in ICCs. Unlike the latter, the former need not criticize the preceding morpheme; e.g. adverbs may intervene between the predicate and the pronoun in CCCs: Is dochtúir cinnte \( \epsilon \) "He is certainly a doctor" (Doherty 1996b, example (6)). At Doherty (1996a:39n34, 1997:146-162) suggests for the dialects that allow \( \epsilon \) in (10b), the pronoun there may well be a resumptive copy of a topocalized (postposed) subject (cf. English She's a doctor, Mary).\footnote{32}{This makes C\textsuperscript{0} \( \epsilon \) in (10b) quite distinct from ICC \( \epsilon \) in (10a) (and from Haitian se in (2)), but quite like Haitian se in (7).}

Unavoidably, I've had to take many shortcuts, ignoring many intricate data and staying away from many difficult issues. As stated at the start, this is but a "sketch of a preliminary, minimal attempt". If not all of this proves wrong-headed (or headed by the wrong XPs), I project further details in forthcoming work. In the meantime, comments welcome!\footnote{33}{In fn. 22, I noted that Irish Is (*m\textsuperscript{m}d\textsuperscript{m}e) m\textsuperscript{m}ise an dochtúir was problematic: there is a ban on augment co-indexed with pronominal subject, contra the expectations of my analysis. (In Doherty's analysis, it is not entirely clear why pronouns should count as "predicative expressions" and not require an "unsaturated". How to handle these facts within our current proposal? Pending further details; one could argue for now that this is just a result of haplography, which is a PF constraint against repeating phonologically-identical morphemes — "identity avoidance" (Yip 1995). One repair strategy is the use of a single overt morpheme for double duty. In Irish, pronominal subjects may not criticize onto INFL\textsubscript{high} (McCluskey & Halle 1984, Chung & McCluskey 1987, etc.). With a DP predicate like an dochtúir, the subject trace is realized by a Res-N' with identical \( \epsilon \)-features as the subject pronoun. Plus, this Res-N' is enclitic in that it in turn also cliticizes onto INFL\textsubscript{high} at PF, as assumed in my proposal. With two identical elements in INFL\textsubscript{high}, we get haplography and only one is pronounced. (See McCluskey & Halle 1984:48ff for evidence that enclitic suffixes on pronouns, as in mise (= m\textsuperscript{m}e+se '1sg+EMPH') are compatible with pronominal encliticisation.)}
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