A riddle on negation in Haitian[1]

MICHEL DEGRAFF

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

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 cognation 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.[2] 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).[3,4]

---

2. In DeGraff (1992d, e), I argue that TMA markers should be syntactically analyzed as verbs.
3. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses and in the examples:

ANT	anterior	PROG	progressive
FUT	future	SG	singular
IRREAL	irrealis	PL	plural
NUM	number	REfl	reflexive
NEG	negation	TMA	tense-mood-aspect

\# pause (comma intonation)
Ø phonetically null element

(1) a. *Jan* pa <u>t-</u> <u>av-</u> <u>ale</u> *nan mache.* (Haitian Creole)
          Jan NEG ANT IRREAL go in market
          'Jan would not have gone to the market.'

    b. **Jan <u>te</u>* pa *(<u>av-</u>)* <u>ale</u> *nan mache.*
          Jan ANT NEG IRREAL go in market

    c. **Jan (<u>t-</u>)* <u>ava</u> pa <u>ale</u> *nan mache.*
          Jan ANT IRREAL NEG go in market

    d. **Jan (<u>t-</u>)* *(<u>av-</u>)* <u>ale</u> pa *nan mache.*
          Jan ANT IRREAL go NEG in market

Compare Haitian Creole *pa* in (1) with French *pas* and English *not* in (2). Both *pas* and *not* may occur after a finite verb. Also, in English, *not* can follow a modal, as in the translation of (2a).[5]

(2) a. *Jean (ne)* <u>serait</u> pas <u>allé</u> *au* *marché.* (French)
          Jean (ne) would-be pas gone to-the market
          'John would not have gone to the market.'

    b. *Jean (n')* <u>était</u> pas <u>allé</u> *au* *marché.*
          Jean (ne) was pas gone to-the market
          'John has not gone to the market.'

    c. *Jean (n')* <u>ira</u> pas *au* *cinéma.*
          Jean (n') go+FUT pas at-the movies
          'John will not go to the movies.'

The sentences in (2) show that, in French and English, the sentential negation markers *pas* and *not* can interrupt the sequence composed of one or more auxiliaries and of the main verb. This is not possible with Haitian Creole *pa*, as witnessed by (1).

---

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 1992e 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 (won'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).

5. 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*.[6] 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*.   (French)
           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.   Pèsonn pa *vini*.   (Haitian Creole)
           nobody *pa* come
           'Nobody has come.'
      b.   *Mwen* pa *wè* pèsonn.
           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. *Pèsonn 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 considerably as to their acceptance of (3b). (3a) seems more readily acceptable, specially with stress on *personne*. (See Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 for relevant comments.)

pa anyen means 'This is nothing'.[8] 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*.[9,10]

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:[11]

(5)   a.   Personne n'*est venu*.   (French)
          nobody   *ne*+is come
          'Nobody has come.'

      b.   *Je* n'*ai*   *vu*   personne.
          1SG *ne*+have seen nobody
          'I haven't seen anybody.'

      c.   *Ce* n'*est* rien.
          3SG *ne*+is nothing
          'This is nothing.'

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 *pèsonn* 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:
    (i)   Rien   ne *me surprend*.
          nothing *ne* 1SG surprise
          'Nothing surprises me.'
    (ii) Personne n'*est ici*.
          nobody   *ne*+is here
          'Nobody is here.'
    (iii) Aucun *étudiant* n'*arrive* à *l'heure*.
          no   student *ne*+arrive on the-time
          'No student arrives on time.'

(6)   *Nan katye*   *sa-a*   pèsonn pa *di* pèsonn anyen. (Haitian C.)
      in   neighborhood DEM-SG nobody *pa* say nobody nothing
      Dans ce quartier, personne ne dit rien à personne.   (French)
      'In this neighborhood, nobody says anything to anybody.'

(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) allé au marche*. 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)   a.   *Pierre* n'*est* pas *venu*.
          Pierre *ne*+is *pas* come
          'Pierre has not come.'

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

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'; (ii) a head X^0; and (iii) a complement under X' and sister to X^0; 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, the landing site of this movement is explicitly the head of TP (tense phrase). Movement of *ne* is motivated by its clitic nature, among other reasons.

(8)   DS: $[_{TP}$ ... T^0 ... $[_{NegP}$ *pas* $[_{Neg'}$ $[_{Neg^0}$ *ne*] $[_{VP}$ ... V^0 ...]]]]
      SS: $[_{TP}$ ... $ne_i+V^0_j+T^0$ ... $[_{NegP}$ *pas* $[_{Neg^0}$ e_i $[_{VP}$ ... e_j ...]]]]

Pollock's hypothesis is reinforced by the following constraint: only the tensed verb may precede *pas*. This is instantiated in (9).

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

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

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

Verb movement into Comp also shows that *ne* forms a complex head with the verb. In *yes/no* questions, *ne* is fronted, piggybacking on the verb:

(10)   a.   N'*est il*   pas *venu?*
            ne+is 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), *ne* obligatorily moves with the tensed verb into Comp. (10b) and (10c), where *ne* remains stranded, are ungrammatical.

In (7)–(10), movement of *ne* along with the tensed verb is also made necessary by the Empty Category Principle: as a head, *ne*, if it were to remain in place, would intervene between the raised verb and the trace of V^0, preventing antecedent-government of the trace; cf. Chomsky (1986). That *pas*, unlike *ne*, may separate the raised verb from its trace in the VP further supports Pollock's hypothesis that *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 *pas* resides in Spec of NegP with *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 *pa* in Spec of NegP, like French *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 *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 *pa* in (4), like French *ne* in (5) and unlike French *pas* in (3), may co-occur with the negative quantifiers *pèsonn* and *anyen* 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 *pa* in Haitian Creole and *ne* in French does not cancel the negative force of the quantifiers *pèsonn* and *personne*, 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 *pa* and French *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."[12] To sum up, I take the negative concord data in (4), (5) and (6) in

---

12. Example (ii) in note 4, *Jan* pa-*p* pa *vini*, illustrates double negation in Haitian Creole. There we have two instances of *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 Neg[0] is independently licensed, i.e., that Neg[0] is a strong head. In languages where the NEG feature on Neg[0] 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" Neg[0] and negative concord would not obtain.

Note though 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 *anyen*), 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 *nie*, the West Flemish equivalent of French *pas*, does enter into negative concord as in (i). (The head of West Flemish NegP is *en*.)

   (i)   *T-ee   doa   niemand nie   over   geklaapt.*
         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.

18. Gaatone (1971) contains additional pertinent data from French.

(11) a. *Bouki fait   le clown pour* (pas) *qu'ils   ' s'ennuient.*
          Bouki makes the clown for   *pas* that+they bore+REfl
      b. *Bouki ap   fè   komik pou* (*pa) *yo* (pa) *anniye.*
          Bouki PROG make comic for   *pa* 3PL *pa* bore
          'Bouki is clowning around so that they (don't) get bored.'

Secondly, French *pas* may modify adjectival phrases, as in (12a). This is unlike Haitian Creole *pa* in (12b).

(12) a. *Voilà un type   * pas *bête!*
          there a fellow *pas* stupid
      b. **Men   yon moun* pa *sot!*
          here/there a   fellow *pa* stupid
          'There goes a man who is not stupid!'

It is not clear to me how to account for the contrast in (11) and (12) in a precise manner. Suffice to say that this contrast could be the indirect result of the different structural statuses of Haitian Creole *pa* and French *pas*.[19,20]

6. Alternatives to pa as head of NegP

Let us now go back to the interaction of Haitian Creole *pa* with what I have assumed to be negative quantifiers. In particular, are there alternatives to my hypothesis that *pa* heads NegP and enters at LF into a Spec–head agreement

---

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 (dito for French *ne*: **Bouki fait le clown pour ne 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   wè* (pa) *yon grenn moun.*
           1SG   NEG see NEG a   single person
           'I haven't seen {anybody/not one person}.'
     (ii) *Se pa   ti   kouri mwen* (pa) *kouri.*
           se NEG little run 1SG   NEG run
           'I REALLY ran.' (i.e. 'I ran a whole lot.')
     In (i), *pa yon* 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 Gaatone 1971: 49, 176ff.). Structurally, the second *pa* would be part of a larger nominal phrase (Neg⁰ 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 NegP would then derive apparent negative concord.
     As of (ii), I can only say for now that its interpretation is suggestive of expletive (optional) *ne* in French *Je crains qu'il (ne) parte* 'I fear that he leave'. Space and time prevents me from addressing many of Dejean's fascinating data; their treatment require future papers.

---

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 *pèsonn* (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. Pèsonn *and* anyen: *quantifiers or polarity items?*

There is one other alternate analysis to consider. This analysis would obviate the need for *pèsonn* and *anyen* in (4) and (6) to move at LF into Spec of NegP. Déprez (1992), for one, argues that Haitian Creole *pèsonn*, contrarily to French *personne* (and English *nobody*), is not a true negative quantifier. According to her, *pèsonn* 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 *pèsonn* versus French *personne* — Déprez considers *pèsonn* 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]

---

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

---

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*.

---

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 Haegeman 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.   <u>*Prèske*</u> *pèsonn pa vote pou Manigat.*   (Haitian Creole)
             almost nobody *pa* vote for Manigat
             Presque personne n'a voté pour Manigat.   (French)
             'Almost nobody voted for Manigat.'
       b.   *Mwen pa manje* <u>*prèske*</u> *anyen   jodi-a.*   (Haitian Creole)
             1SG *pa* eat   almost nothing today
             Je n'ai presque rien mangé aujourd'hui.   (French)
             '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:

---

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?* — Pèsonn   (Haitian Creole)
            who   *ki* see 2SG   nobody
            Qui t'a vu? — *Personne*   (French)
            'Who saw you? — Nobody/*Anybody'

       b.   *Kisa ou   manje?* — Anyen   (Haitian Creole)
            what 2SG eat   nothing
            Qu'as tu mangé? — *Rien*   (French)
            'What did you eat? — Nothing/*Anything'

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

6.2.3. *Non-licensing by conditionals and comparatives*

Further distributional facts distinguish Haitian Creole *pèsonn* 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), *pèsonn* is not licensed by conditionals and comparatives. This provides one additional reason for denying the status of negative polarity item to *pèsonn*.[27]

(19)   a.   **Si ou touye* pèsonn, *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* pèsonn.
            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 polysemy 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 *pèsonn*, 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 anyboby' 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 Déprez's tacit supposition that *personne* and *nobody* pattern more alike than *pèsonn* and *nobody*, with *pèsonn* in some environments equated to *anybody*; see note 29. (Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 observes further correspondences between *personne* and *anybody*; see also Gaatone 1971.)

6.2.5. *Further data*

While arguing that *pèsonn* is an negative polarity item under certain conditions, Déprez (1992: 38f.) 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   pèsonn* ap   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   pèsonn pa ap   vini*[28]
            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, Déprez concludes that it is only when the negation marker *pa* is in the embedded clause, as in (20b), that *pèsonn* can be interpreted as a negative quantifier (equivalent to *nobody*). Otherwise, in (20a), *pèsonn* 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 *pèsonn* qua negative quantifier and *pèsonn* qua negative polarity item would be derived. In any case, I believe that this distinction is unwarranted. Given my assumptions, *pèsonn* 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), *pèsonn* moves into Spec of matrix NegP.[30] In (20b), *pèsonn* moves into

---

28. The sequence 'NEG IRREAL', which I choose to write *pa ap* for expository reasons, is always pronounced [pap]. See Dejean's (1980) most comprehensive treatise on Haitian Creole orthography.

29. More precisely and in Déprez's words (p. 38):

   When it immediately precedes negation, [*pèsonn*] has the meaning of the English negative quantifier *nobody*. When it follows the negation however, it behaves like the [negative polarity item] *anybody*. Descriptively, we can say that the meaning of the sum of [*pèsonn*] and the negation *pa* is ambiguous between that of a negative quantifier like *nobody* and that of an negative polarity item like *anybody* depending on the position of [*pèsonn*] with respect to the overt negation. In this, Haitian Creole [*pèsonn*] differs from the French quantifier *personne*, which is always interpreted as a negative quantifier.

30. To be explored is whether such movement is licensed by "Neg-raising" verbs (in the sense of Horn 1989).

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).[31] 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).[32,33]

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. Predication patterns in Haitian Creole constitute one domain where such consequences are clear. *Pa* being a head, its head-government 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] predication patterns in Haitian Creole are partly determined by the distribution of traces and of

---

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'ils arrêtent personne* versus **Je n'ai exigé que personne soit arrêté* (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 Infl. 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 *nessuno* (Rizzi 1982: 118ff.).

33. Literary French shows a contrast similar to (20), 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 *ne* 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).

resumptive pronominals 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 pronominal 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*   peasant
            '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

---

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 (1992e) 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,[37] 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) [α se] *yon doktè.*
        Bouki   NEG ANT   *se* a   doctor
        'Bouki {was/is}(n't) a doctor.'
(23)   *Kòk   la pa te* [V° chante] *maten   an.*
        rooster the 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* follows 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* # {se/*li*} (*pa*) (te) (yon) *doktè.*
        Bouki   *se* 3SG NEG ANTa   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.

---

37. See DeGraff (1992d) for arguments that TMA markers are verbal heads.

(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.[38]

(25)   *Li* [α se] (*pa) (*te)   *yon doktè.*
        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 atonic 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 doktè* in (25). I now turn to identifying the position of *se* in (25), between Spec of IP and a nominal predicate.[39]

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*.[40] 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-adjoined to DP and NumP. This is for reasons involving, inter alia, the functional nature of D^0 and Num^0, mechanisms of θ-role assignment and predication, and Baker's (1988) Universality of Theta-Role Assignment (UTAH)[41] (see DeGraff 1992a, c, e). 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.**[42] I also

---

38. *Se* also occurs clause-initial in cleft sentences. There as well, it precedes TMA and negation markers. I argue in DeGraff (1992e) that clause-initial *se* in clefts is in Spec of IP.
39. DeGraff (1992b) differentiates between Haitian Creole *se* and its French cognate *c'est*.
40. More extensive data implicating *se* and analyses of its occurrences can be found in Fauchois (1982), Damoiseau (1987), Kihm (1990), Lumsden (1990), Déprez and Vinet (1991), Manfredi (1991), etc. Most of these analyses are critiqued in DeGraff (1992e).
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. Tonjes Veenstra astutely points out that my UTAH argument might do violence to a strict version of the hypothesis. Especially, the last three lines of (26) 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 (21d) — and their corresponding structures in (26) — are crucially distinct from their inner NPs (and give rise to distinct interpretations).

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) $[_{AP}$ SC-SP $[_{A'} ... A^0 ...]]$ (1a)
      $[_{PP}$ SC-SP $[_{P'} ... P^0 ...]]$ (1b)
      $[_{NP}$ SC-SP $[_{N'} ... N^0 ...]]$ (1c)
      $[_{DP}$ SC-SP $[_{DP} ... [_{D'} ... D^0 ...] ...]]$ (1d) *w/doktè a and Aristide*
      $[_{NumP}$ SC-SP $[_{NumP} ... [_{Num'} ... Num^0 ...] ...]]$ (1d) *w/yon doktè*

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)   For all Z, Z a maximal projection, if Z dominates X then Z dominates Y.

In (21) (and [26]), with AP, PP and NP predicates ([21a] through [21c], 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 (21d), the subject moves from a position adjoined to DP or NumP. In (28), the trace is not head-governed because of the intermediate DP or NumP segment (represented by XP2) causing failure of m-command of SC-SP by the predicate head.

(28) $[_{XP1}$ SC-SP $[_{XP2} ... X^0 ...]]$

In order to save the structure, the trace must be spelled-out as a resumptive pronominal which, being overt, is not subject to ECP. That resumptive pronominal is *se*.[45]

---

43. Haitian Creole Infl being phonetically null should not prevent Case assignment to Spec of IP through Spec–head agreement. Note that the subject of *I love Lucy* also gets Case through agreement with a phonetically-null Infl.

44. One anonymous reviewer asks "Does [Infl] have features? If [so], how are these checked?" Movement of the subject into Spec of IP would allow the (Case-assigning) features of Infl to be checked. (One could also imagine that Haitian Creole verbs, being morphologically non-inflected, procrastinate their moving to Infl until LF, where they would check Infl's weak features — the subject would still need to move at S-structure, perhaps to provide the IP-predicate with a syntactic subject.)

45. I am reminded by a *Probus* reviewer that resumptive nominals are also assumed to require Case. Presumably, *se* gets (nominative) Case by being in a chain with the subject that has landed into Spec of IP.

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 *se*. 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. **Bouki* yon *abitan.*
           Bouki NUM peasant
       b. *Bouki abitan.*
           'Bouki is a peasant.'
(30)   a. **Preval premye minis*   la.
           Preval prime   minister DET
       b. *Preval premye minis.*
           'Preval is Prime Minister.'
(31)   a. $[_{NP}$ SC-SP $[_{N'}$ N ...]]
       b. $[_{DP}$ SC-SP $[_{DP} ... [_{D'} ... D^0 ...] ...]]$
       c. $[_{NumP}$ SC-SP $[_{NumP} ... [_{Num'} ... Num^0 ...] ...]]$

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 doktè/ doktè a*}?
    who   *ki* a doctor doctor the
    'Who is a/the doctor?'

(33)   a. $[_{CP}$ *Kimoun*$_i$ $[_{C'}$ *ki* $[_{IP}$ e_i' $[_{I'}$ $[_{DP}$ e_i $[_{DP}$ *doktè a*]]]]]]
        who   *ki*   doctor DET-SG
        'Who is the doctor?'

     b. $[_{CP}$ *Kimoun*$_i$ $[_{C'}$ *ki* $[_{IP}$ e_i' $[_{I'}$ $[_{NumP}$ e_i $[_{NumP}$ *yon doktè*]]]]]]
        who   *ki*   NUM doctor
        'Who is the doctor?'

7.4.3.   *Absence of* se *in TMA-marked clauses*

The effect of TMA markers vis-a-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: $[_{IP}$ $[_{I'}$ I^0 $[_{VP}$ $[_{V°}$ *te*] $[_{NumP}$ *Bouki* $[_{NumP}$ *yon abitan*]]]]]
      SS: $[_{IP}$ *Bouki*$_i$ $[_{I'}$ I^0 $[_{VP}$ $[_{V°}$ *te*] $[_{NumP}$ e_i $[_{NumP}$ *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

---

46.   My analysis of *ki* as being in C^0 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_i.

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: $[_{IP}$ $[_{I'}$ I^0 $[_{NegP}$ $[Neg° $ *pa*] $[_{NumP}$ *Bouki* $[_{NumP}$ *yon doktè*]]]]]]
      SS: $[_{IP}$ *Bouki*$_i$ $[_{I'}$ I^0 $[_{NegP}$ $[Neg° $ *pa*] $[_{NumP}$ e_i $[_{NumP}$ *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 on the right track, not only would it shed light on negative concord in Haitian Creole, but it might offer as a bonus one more puzzle with respect to the genesis 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: *ǎ* and *má*, in head and specifier of NegP, respectively. *Ǎ* would correspond to French *ne* and *má* would correspond to French *pas*. Unlike French though, the negation head in Fon, *ǎ*, 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]

---

48.   See (24), DeGraff (1992e) and Damoiseau (1987) for occurrences of *se* in the position preceding *pa/te* — *se* there is in Spec of IP, not in the subject's base-position. As expected, *se* never precedes C^0 *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 governee: the trace e_i 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 (1992e) for more speculations.

50.   Da Cruz notes that *má* and *ǎ* cannot co-occur in declarative simplex clauses.

(38) $[_{NegP}$ *má* $[_{Neg'}$ VP $[_{Neg^\circ}$ *ǎ*]]]
(39)   a.   (*Nĭ*) *Kɔ́kú* má *dù* *àsɔ́n* ǎ.
             if   Koku *má* eat crab *ǎ*
             'If Koku has not eaten crab ... '

       b.   *(*Nĭ*) *Kɔ́kú* *dù* má *àsɔ́n* ǎ
             if   Koku eat *má* crab *ǎ*
             'If Koku has not eaten crab ... '

The data in (39a) suggest that in Fon, there is no verb movement. This is like Haitian Creole, see (1), and unlike French, see (2).

From the above data, I conclude that Haitian Creole differs not only from French, but also from Fon, which I take to be one representative Kwa ancestor of Haitian Creole (pending further data from other relevant Kwa languages). Remarkably, Neg^0 (*pa*) is head-initial in Haitian Creole while it is head-final in Fon (*ǎ*). Looking at it from the pre-verbal perspective, the pre-verbal negation marker in Haitian Creole heads NegP instead of being in Spec of NegP like it is in Fon (*mà*).

Finally, contrary to both French *pas* and Fon *má*, Haitian Creole *pa* seems excluded from attributive environments; both *pas* and *má* may be used in such environments (see [12a] for French and da Cruz (1992) for Fon where *má* is shown to modify adnominal participles).[51]

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 *má*, 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 *má* and *ǎ*. To be further investigated are the precise conditions regulating Fon negative concord with *má* (as made clear in da Cruz's 1992 insightful work, the distribution of *má* 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 Zanuttini 1991 and references therein.)

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 *má* 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^0.

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 *má* 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).[52]

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 Zanuttini (1991) and references therein.[53,54] This is unlike

---

52. As it stands, my analysis of *pa* is neutral as to whether the substrate languages played some role in the genesis of Haitian Creole *pa*. At issue here is a relexification-based analysis of Haitian Creole NegP à la Lefebvre and Lumsden where Haitian Creole NegP is isomorphic to Fon NegP and where Haitian Creole *pa* is in Spec of NegP and results from the relexification of Fon *má* with French *pas*, both in Spec of NegP. As alluded in the main text, such an analysis is formulated as part of a larger hypothesis in which Haitian Creole is the product of a somewhat direct re-analysis of French surface strings through the superimposition of Fon phrase structures. (See Lefebvre and Lumsden 1992 for details and DeGraff, to appear, for a critique.)

53. Québec French also allows PA with negative concord readings (Julie Auger, pers. comm. October 1992).

54. With respect to the structural characterization of PA in these languages, there is one difficulty that I inherit from Zanuttini's proposal. Because of negative concord, Valdôtain, Occitan and Québec French PA must head NegP. However, contrarily to Haitian Creole *pa*, PA follows the finite verb (like French *pas*). If PA were exactly like Haitian Creole *pa*, then we would expect it to block head-movement of V^0 across it and to rule out the sequence V^0+PA, contrary to fact. Notwithstanding my current unfamiliarity with the data, I will venture that PA is not only a head, like Haitian Creole *pa*, but it is also syntactically affixal. As such, it allows a finite verb to attach to it; the complex V^0+PA then moves to a higher (Tense) projection, conceivably like $ne+V^0$ in (8).

Adding (slight) credence to this suggestion is the exclusion of PA from certain clauses where there is no Tense head forcing movement of V^0 — V-raising would be required in order to provide affixal PA with morphological support. Tenseless clauses excluding PA include a subset of "true" imperatives (in the sense of Zanuttini 1991, who has a different account of these data based on the structural positioning of PA; also see Kayne 1991).

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 Valdôtain 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?[55]

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 *n'es(t) pas* and *n'a(s) pas*, respectively — were used as single morphemes marking negation.[56] 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 *má ... á* 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, am I 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^0 and *PA* and where an infinitival verb follows, instead of precedes, *PA*. Should we then resort to Zanuttini'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 taken from Guyanese Creole, Papia Kristang and Hawaiian 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 the unmarked case (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'.[57]

The University of Michigan
City University of New York
e-mail: ~~mfd@timessqr.ac.cuny.edu~~

ⅅℰℊℛᴀℱℱ @ ℳⅈ⊤. ℰⅅⓊ

References

Abney, Steven (1987). The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Aoun, Josef and Dominique Sportiche (1983). On the formal theory of government. *The Linguistic Review* 2: 211–236.

Ashby, William (1981). The loss of the negative particle *ne* in French. *Language* 57: 674–687.

Baker, Mark C. (1988). *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bickerton, Derek (1981). *Roots of Language.* Ann Harbor, Michigan: Karoma.

Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Cardinaletti, Anna and Maria Teresa Guasti (1992). Negation in small clauses. Paper given at the Sixth Symposium on Romance Languages and Linguistics. Utrecht.

Carlson, Greg (1981). Distribution of free-choice *any. Papers from the Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Barriers.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

da Cruz, Maxime (1992). Contribution à l'étude de la négation en fongbè. Unpublished manuscript, Université du Québec à Montréal.

Damoiseau, Robert (1987). Situation de communication et fonctionnement de la langue en Créole Haïtien: Approches pour une analyse. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique Théorique et Appliquée* 6.

DeGraff, Michel (1992a). On the structure of small clauses and on Creole genesis: Evidence from Haitian. GLOW Workshop. Lisboa.

——(1992b). On certain differences between Haitian and French predicative constructions. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania. (To appear in *Selected Papers from the 22nd Annual Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam).

——(1992c). The syntax of predication in Haitian. *Proceedings of NELS* 22. Graduate Linguistic Student Association, University of Amherst at Massachusetts.

——(1992d). Is Haitian Creole a *pro*-drop language? In *Atlantic Meets Pacific: A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization,* Byrne and Holm (eds.), 71–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

---

57. And I smile, contemplating how I will break the news to my dear father — *'Pa' pa 'pas',* Papa! ...

—— (1992e). Creole grammars and acquisition of syntax. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

—— (1992f). 'Pa' pa 'pas'. Meeting of the Society of Caribbean Linguistics. Barbados.

—— (1992g). Haitian null subjects revisited. *Travaux de Recherche sur le Créole Haïtien* 11. Université du Québec à Montréal.

—— (To appear). Review of "Travaux de Recherche sur le Créole Haïtien, 10". *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages.*

Dejean, Yves (1980). *Comment Écrire le Créole d'Haïti.* Québec: Collectif Paroles.

Déprez, Viviane (1992). Is Haitian Creole really a *pro*-drop language? *Travaux de Recherche sur le Créole Haïtien* 11. Université du Québec à Montréal.

Déprez, Viviane and Marie-Thérèse Vinet (1991). On the categorial status of the Haitian Creole particle *se.* Paper given at the meeting of the Society of Pidgin and Creole linguistics in Chicago.

Emonds, Joseph (1978). The verbal complex V'-V in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 151–175.

Fauchois, Anne (1982). Nature et Fonction des Monèmes *se* en Créole Haïtien. Centre de Linguistique, Université d'État d'Haïti.

Gaatone, David (1971). *Étude Descriptive du Système de la Négation en Français Contemporain.* Geneva: Droz.

Haegeman, Liliane (1991). Negative heads and negative operators. Unpublished manuscript, University of Geneva.

—— (1993). Syntax of negation. Unpublished manuscript, University of Geneva.

Higginbotham, James and Robert May (1982). Questions, quantifiers and crossing. *The Linguistic Review* 1: 41–79.

Holm, John (1988). *Pidgins and Creoles. Vol. 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, Laurence (1989). *A Natural History of Negation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kadmon, Nirit and Fred Landman (To appear). *Any. Linguistics and Philosophy.*

Kayne, Richard (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching.* Dordrecht: Foris.

—— (1991). Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing. Unpublished manuscript, City University of New York Graduate Center.

Kihm, Alain (1990). What is it that you said? A study of obligatory focalization in two Creoles and beyond. Paper given at the Conference on Focus and Grammatical Relations in Creole Languages. University of Chicago.

Labov, William (1972). Negative attraction and negative concord in English grammar. *Language* 48: 773–818.

Laka, Itziar (1990). Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Law, Paul (1992). Subject extraction in Haitian interrogatives. Paper given at the *23rd Annual Conference on African Linguistics.*

Lawler, John (1972). Ample negatives. *Papers from the Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lefebvre, Claire and John Lumsden (1992). Precision on word order in relexification. Paper given at the meeting of the Society of Pidgin & Creole Linguistics in Philadelphia.

Linebarger, Marcia (1987). Negative polarity and grammatical representation. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10: 325–387.

Lumsden, John (1990). The bi-clausal structure of Haitian clefts. *Linguistics* 28: 741–759.

Magloire-Holly, Hélène (1982). Les modaux: Auxiliaires ou verbes? In *Syntaxe de l'Haïtien,* Lefebvre et al. (eds.). Ann Harbor: Karoma.

Manfredi, Victor (1991). Ágbò and Éhugbò: Ìgbo linguistic consciousness, its origins and limits. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

May, Robert (1985). *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.

Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax.* Dordrecht: Foris.

—— (1990). *Relativized Minimality.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Stowell, Tim (1978). What was there before there was there. *Papers from the Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Zanuttini, Raffaella (1991). Syntactic properties of sentential negation: A comparative study of Romance languages. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.