MORPHOLOGY AND WORD ORDER IN "CREOLIZATION" AND BEYOND

MICHEL DEGRAFF

1 PROLOGUE

AN introduction to "Creole" morphosyntax would be incomplete without a sociohistorically based discussion of the term Creole and its implications for comparative-historical linguistics. This essay thus starts with a brief and preliminary critique, in section 2, of certain foundational assumptions in Creole studies.[1]

Then I provide a theoretically grounded overview of a selected subset of VP-related properties in Haitian Creole (HC)—a bona fide Creole, on the sociohistorical grounds outlined in section 2. Section 3 introduces the basic comparative data related to verb and object placement in HC and some of its major source languages. Section 4 contemplates the theoretical implications of verb-placement contrasts between HC and its European ancestor, French—the principal etymological source of the HC lexicon. Section 5 extends this discussion to the morphosyntax of object pronouns. (The basic data and observations in section 3–5

are taken mostly from DeGraff 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000. In fact, this chapter is the payoff of long overdue promissory notes; see DeGraff 1997: 90 n42, 91 n51.)

Section 6 enlarges the discussion to include relevant patterns in Germanic and French diachrony and to inquire about the ("abnormal"?) theoretical status of CREOLE EXCEPTIONALISM—the long-posited opposition between "abnormal" "nongenetic" transmission in Creole genesis, supposedly with "significant discrepancies," and "normal"/"genetic" transmission in "regular" language change, whereby a language is "passed down from one speaker generation to the next with changes spread more or less evenly across all parts of the language" (see, e.g., Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 8–12, 206, 211, etc.).

Section 7 ends the chapter by considering the consequences of the theoretical discussion in sections 3–6 vis-à-vis Creole Exceptionalism. In this section I also compare the Haitian Creole data with germane data from a couple of other Romance-lexifier Creoles: namely, Cape Verdean Creole (lexifier: Portuguese) and Palenquero Creole (lexifier: Spanish). This preliminary comparison suggests that, even within a small sample of Romance-lexified Creoles, there is no structural "Creole" uniformity in the VP and its extended projections. More generally, there is no distinct and uniform "Creole" typology.

My overall conclusion is that, from a Cartesian and Uniformitarian (e.g., a Universal Grammar [UG] based and mentalist) perspective, Creole genesis ultimately, and unsurprisingly, reduces to the same of sort of mental processes that underlie the diachrony of non-Creole languages.

2 SOME HISTORI(OGRAPHI)CAL BACKGROUND ON CREOLES AND CREOLE STUDIES

2.1 Sociohistorical and Epistemological Assumptions

Creole Exceptionalism—the dogma that Creole languages constitute an exceptional class on either genealogical or typological grounds or both—is a corollary of the twin (neo-)colonial history of Creole speakers and Creole studies (see DeGraff 2001a: 90–105; 2002a).

The languages we call "Creoles" (e.g., Caribbean Creoles) do share well-documented commonalities across sociohistorical profiles (e.g., history of large-scale language contact) and across structural tendencies (e.g., reduction of inflec-

tional paradigms). These commonalities seem uncontroversial, even if these sociohistorical and structural tendencies are also found among other products of language evolution that are not usually labeled "Creole."

What is more controversial is the claim that, across time and across space, Creole languages can be defined as a *typologically* distinct language grouping whose *exceptional diachrony* makes them cluster around an *exceptional structural* "prototype" (see the critiques in, e.g., Givón 1979; Mufwene 1986, 2001; Muysken 1988, and the references in note 1). Such exceptionalist stereotypes have a long history in linguistics—see, for example, the Creole morphological profiles postulated by Jespersen (1922: 233), Hjelmslev (1938), Bickerton (1988: 276), Seuren and Wekker (1986), McWhorter (1998), and Seuren (1998: 292–293). Notwithstanding their long-standing popularity, these stereotypes for Creole morphology have now been shown to be empirically, theoretically, and sociologically problematic.

For my purposes in this chapter, I assume that a valid "Creole" grouping can be reasonably defined on sociohistorical grounds (cf. Mufwene 1986, 2001), not necessarily on genetic, typological, or topological grounds. I thus use "Creole" as an atheoretical ostensive label to point to certain linguistic varieties that are typically perceived as having "abruptly" emerged out of massive language contact as restructured versions of some (erstwhile) "target" language. (I have more to say later in this essay about the terms in quotes.) The most celebrated examples are in the Caribbean, where Creole languages emerged in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, as one linguistic side effect of colonization and slave trade by the British, the French, the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the Spaniards. It is thus that the Caribbean has long been known for its history of population contact, and therefore language contact. Prototypical examples of Creole languages usually include the popular vernaculars spoken in the (greater) Caribbean area: Haitian Creole, Jamaican Creole, Papiamentu, Saramaccan, Sranan, and so on.

From the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onward, the basic ingredients of Europe's imperialist projects in the Caribbean came to typically include the following sociolinguistically relevant factors:

1. Initial contact between Europeans and Africans in and around the slave ports of Africa
2. The enslavement of increasing numbers of Africans and their subsequent dislocation to the "New World"
3. More and more Africans would become exposed to European languages or to approximations thereof by second-language learners with various (European and African) native languages[2]
4. Small homestead settler communities with relatively few slaves, in the early Caribbean colonial stages
5. The gradual and partial replacement, in economically successful colonies

such as Saint-Domingue (i.e., preindependence Haiti), of the original settler communities by large-scale and brutally inegalitarian slave-based plantation economies with a vast majority of Africans and their locally born descendants.

The increased reliance on regimented slave labor for economic expansion would, over time, reduce the ratio of Europeans to non-Europeans, with the two groups becoming more and more segregated, especially at the opposite poles of the power hierarchy and especially so on labor-intensive plantations (e.g., large sugar plantations) like those in Saint-Domingue. This social transformation would, in turn, lead to a complex array of language-contact and language-acquisition settings, with a complex array of linguistic varieties as outputs: a continuum of more or less restructured approximations of European languages with varying amounts of substratum effects and structural innovations. Throughout the colonial period, there existed "middle populations"—"middle" in terms of class, civil status, or race—with relatively close contact with both ends of the continuum. These intermediary populations included the mixed-race (the MU-LATTOES) and the free people of color (the AFFRANCHIS). The Mulattoes were locally born (i.e., "Creole"),[3] and so were many of the Affranchis. These middle populations, specially the Creoles, would play a key stabilizing role in Creole language formation. This is an oversimplified sketch of the extraordinarily complex sociohistorical matrix of Creole genesis (for details, see, e.g., Alleyne 1971; Chaudenson 1992; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Singler 1996; Mufwene 1996, 2001; DeGraff 2002b, 2002c; and the many references therein).

No matter the complexity of, and the horrors inherent in, the sociohistory of Caribbean Creole genesis, it can still be assumed, in Cartesian-Uniformitarian fashion, that native Creole speakers, like native speakers of every other language, have always conformed to UG. Notwithstanding the inhumanity of slavery, the slaves and their descendants were still human. I thus assume, against Creole Exceptionalism, that the cognitive resources and strategies enlisted by language acquirers during Creole genesis are *not* fundamentally different from their analogues in friendlier and better documented cases of language change and creation. Like with any other language acquirers, the cognitive task facing native speakers of (the incipient) Creole languages represents yet another instance of the "poverty of stimulus" paradox, also known as "Plato's Problem" (Chomsky 1986): How does the mind/brain of the language acquirer come to possess complex and abstract linguistic properties for which the Primary Linguistic Data (the PLD) provide relatively little evidence? Linguistic theory's central paradox, namely "Plato's Problem," can be paraphrased as follows: For each speaker, the abstract properties that eventually characterize his or her idiolectal grammar—his or her stable I(NTERNAL)-LANGUAGE, a recursive combinatorial system—are not, and could not be, directly observable from the PLD (a finite set of data) available in the social

context of language acquisition. In Creole genesis, too, language learners develop complex I-languages via exposure to relatively impoverished and superficial data sets.

With these basic assumptions in mind, let us proceed to briefly revisit some of the sociology underlying Creole Exceptionalism and its traditional import in comparative-historical linguistics.

2.2 Creole Exceptionalism in Early Creolistics

Creole studies in the colonial period are characterized by the widespread belief that Creole speech originally emerged as radically "corrupted" versions of the colonizers' European languages as spoken by the colonized *non-Europeans*—that is, by people of an "inferior" race. The term "negrified French," which E. F. Gautier coined to refer to French-lexicon Creoles, gained universal appeal in France (Brunot 1966 8:1136).

Racially based classifications of Creole varieties became part of early creolists' orthodoxy as canonized in (e.g.) Larousse (1869), Vinson (1889), and Adam (1883). In Larousse's (1869) dictionary, Creole speech is defined as "corrupted French" and is assumed to be "unintelligible when spoken by an old African [while] extremely sweet when spoken by white Creole women." In Vinson's (1889) encyclopedia, "Creole languages result from the adaptation of a language, especially some Indo-European language, to the (so to speak) phonetic and grammatical genius of a race that is linguistically inferior." In Adam's (1883) treatise on *Hybridologie Linguistique,* Creole languages such as Cayenne Creole (French Guyana) are the structural equivalents of European languages "back in infancy" (p. 157), "*sui generis* new languages . . . to be genetically classified with [West-African] languages, notwithstanding the Aryan nature of [the Creole] lexicon" (p. 5). Adam (1883: 4–7) postulates that African speakers—in his view, speakers of primitive, thus simple, languages—had not evolved the cognitive capacity required to master the structural complexities of European morphosyntax. For Adam, the postulation of race-based cognitive-biological constraints would explain why Cayenne Creole was necessarily African even if its words are etymologically European. Adam's *Hybridologie Linguistique* was thoroughly and explicitly in keeping with the Darwinian evolutionary tropes of the (neo-)Schleicherian linguistics of his era.

More generally, linguists from the seventeenth century onward (see, e.g., Pelleprat (1965 [1655]) have attempted to ascribe generally negative *structural* properties to Creole languages individually or as a group, and this as a matter of (natural) course. Instantiations of this dogma still flourish in twentieth-century linguistics. For example, Seuren, in his 1998 *Western Linguistics: An Historical Introduction*, claims that "Creole grammars . . . lack the more sophisticated fea-

tures of languages backed by a rich and extended cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society" (p. 292).

It is thus that Creole languages have traditionally been defined by what linguistic features they (allegedly) do not, and cannot, have because of the limited intelligence or the evolutionarily or culturally primitive status of their speakers. (Also see, e.g., Saint-Quentin 1989: 40f. [1872] and Baissac 1880: 23, 32, 92, 103f., for illustrations of Creole Exceptionalism in early Creole studies; the references in note 1 offer extended reviews and critiques of Creole Exceptionalism.)

2.3 Creole Exceptionalism in Contemporary Creolistics

Most contemporary linguists seem to have abandoned the explicitly racist claims of the colonial era. Yet, one widely held dogma in historical linguistics still considers Creole languages to have emerged through "broken," thus "abnormal," transmission. The postulation of such extraordinary "break in transmission" has traditionally forced Creole languages in an exceptional class—namely, the class of "non-genetic [i.e., parentless] languages."[4] In contradistinction, non-Creole languages are taken to gradually evolve "genetically" via the sort of "normal transmission" represented by Stammbaum branches (as, e.g., in Latin-to-Romance or Proto-Germanic-to-English diachrony).

Thomason and Kaufman's (non)genetic-(ab)normal litmus test is primarily structural: broken, or abnormal or nongenetic, transmission implicates "a *significant discrepancy* between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence—in some or all grammatical subsystems" (1988: 206, emphasis added; see also p. 8–12). But, as I show later in this chapter, "significant discrepancy" as a criterion for "abnormal" creolization as opposed to "normal" language change is, at best, elusive and, at worst, circular: the kind of discrepancies that are manifested in bona fide cases of Creole genesis seems to be on a par with corresponding discrepancies in the diachrony of "genetic" languages (see sections 6–7; see also Mufwene 2001 and some of the references therein).

In a vein somewhat similar to Thomason and Kaufman's classification, both classic and contemporary creolistics postulates sui generis ("abnormal") developmental processes that apply exclusively to Creole genesis. One such process is pidginization that, in the limit, eschews all morphology (Jespersen 1922; Hjelmslev 1938; Bickerton 1984; Seuren and Wekker 1986; McWhorter 1998; Seuren 1998; and others). This hypothetical morphological bottleneck is allegedly one symptom of some "radical break in transmission." More spectacularly, pidginization creates a "born again" proto-Language—a living fossil of prehistoric Language at its evolutionary incipience (see note 4). Such neo-Darwinian hypotheses are empirically disconfirmed by robust data sets and various theoretical observations about Creole diachrony and synchrony (see note 1).

Creole Exceptionalism, implicitly if not explicitly, also underlies the Relexification Hypothesis (Lefebvre 1998). With respect to the genealogy and ontology of Creole languages, Lefebvre (1998: 3) evokes the claims of Adam's (1883) *Hybridologie Linguistique*. Following Adam, Lefebvre argues that Haitian Creole grammar essentially reflects substratum grammar with the French contribution having been strictly limited to phonetic strings "deprived of [syntactic and semantic] features" (pp. 16.f) and to word-order patterns in lexical (e.g., N, V, Adj, P) projections only (pp. 39.f). Given the massive and systematic etymological and word- and affix-order correspondences between French and HC, Lefebvre must assume that the Creole creator was somehow able to segment and (re)analyze French strings and adopt and adapt a great deal of French phonetics and surface order—down to the phonetic shapes and surface distribution of many affixes and grammatical morphemes—while ignoring virtually *all* abstract structural properties of French. Such a feat would make the Creole creator unlike any other language learner documented in the psycholinguistics and language-acquisition literature. After all, word segmentation and word- and affix-order are reflexes of *abstract* morphosyntactic properties. The language acquirer cannot identify, for example, morphemes and their order in the target language without some amount of *abstract* knowledge about morpheme boundaries, morphosyntactic features, lexical categories, and other nonphonetic properties of the target language. Later (in, e.g., section 3.3) I illustrate additional aspects of Haitian Creole morphosyntax that cannot be accounted for by the sort of strict relexification posited by Adam and Lefebvre (see also section 6.2, 6.4; Fattier 1998; DeGraff 2001a, 2002b, 2002c).

In effect, the discussion in this chapter revisits all of the above-mentioned traditional assumptions about Creole languages. I question current dogmas on Creole diachrony and synchrony, using Haitian Creole—a bona fide plantation Creole—as a case study, with a focus on core aspects of Haitian morphosyntax in the domain of the verb phrase and associated functional layers. A preliminary comparison of a small sample of HC versus French morphosyntactic similarities and dissimilarities with counterparts thereof in Germanic and French diachrony suggests that there may be no independent *structural* basis for the now-orthodox dichotomy between Creole languages and non-Creole languages. Furthermore, the sort of language-contact and language-shift effects and structural innovations visible in the formation of HC can also be documented in non-Creole diachrony and in language acquisition (see section 6).[5] Such parallels are neither accidental nor surprising in a mentalist (i.e., Cartesian) framework that assumes UG. The latter offers no conceptual room for a fundamental opposition between Creoles and non-Creoles.

3 The Basic Comparative Data: VP-Related Morphosyntax

3.1 Some Creole Data

Haitian Creole (HC), like its major source languages, is canonically SVO. The examples that follow illustrate the fact that the majority of HC morphemes—whether lexical or functional, whether free or bound—are etymologically related to French (Fr). HC morphemes with Fr etymology include productive affixes such as the "diminutive" suffix *-èt* (cf. French *-ette*). Also, the HC verb in (1), *konnen* 'to know', has lexico-semantic properties similar to those of its Fr analog in (8), *connaître*. Compare, say, their argument structures and their thematic properties. In fact, such similarities hold for the majority of HC lexical items, from concrete terms (e.g., HC *tab* 'table; cf. Fr *table*) to abstract terms (e.g., the psychological predicate *konnen*). Fattier (1998) provides a wealth of additional evidence for the deep etymological relationship between HC and its lexifier; see also DeGraff (2001a, 2001b, 2002c).

Notwithstanding pervasive etymological connections and structural continuities between HC and Fr, there exist striking and robust morphosyntactic differences between the two languages. One such difference concerns the distribution and inflection of verbs and object pronouns. Here I summarize observations from Dejean (1992), DeGraff (1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000), and Roberts (1999).

Let's start with the distributional facts. First, consider the HC data. HC pronominal objects, like their nonpronominal counterparts, systematically occur to the *right* of their θ-marking verb:[6]

(1) a. Bouki konnen <u>Boukinèt</u>. (HC)
        Bouki know   Boukinèt

     'Bouki knows Boukinèt.'

     b. Bouki konnen <u>li</u>
        Bouki know   3sg

     'Bouki knows him/her/it.'

(2) a. *Bouki <u>Boukinèt</u> konnen. (HC)

     b. *Bouki <u>li</u> konnen

Not only do HC objects uniformly occur to the right of their θ-marking verb but also, whether pronominal or nonpronominal, they must be *adjacent* to that

verb, as in (3). Except for the indirect object in the double-object constructions, clause-internal elements (e.g., adverbs or negation markers) cannot intervene between verb and their objects:

(3) a. Bouki <u>deja</u>   konnen Boukinèt. (HC)
        Bouki already know   Boukinèt

     'Bouki already knows Boukinèt.'

     b. Bouki <u>pa</u>   konnen Boukinèt. (HC)
        Bouki NEG   know   Boukinèt

     'Bouki doesn't know Boukinèt.'

(4) a. *Bouki konnen <u>deja</u> Boukinèt. (HC)

     b. *Bouki konnen <u>pa</u> Boukinèt.

In addition to the distributional uniformity of objects in postverbal position, HC displays another sort of uniformity. Abstracting away from dialectal variation (see, e.g., Fattier 1995) from morphosyntactically conditioned phonological reduction (see, e.g., Cadely 1997) and from a subset of pro-forms that are restricted to certain subject or predicate positions (see, e.g., DeGraff 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 1992d, 1995a, 1995b, 1998), we find the same pronominal forms occurring in distinct structural positions: as subjects, as objects (of verbs, prepositions, and adjectives) and in the "possessor" position of noun phrases. Outside the eighteenth and nineteenth-century varieties mentioned by Fattier (1995: 138f.) and documented in Ducœurjoly 1802, there is no overt marking of morphological case on HC pronouns. Here's a partial sample of HC personal pronouns (these pronouns are generally atonic; see DeGraff 1992b, 1992c; we return to the etymology of these atonic pronouns, from Fr tonic pronouns, in section 6.4):

(5)   **A sample of HC personal**
            pronouns with no morphological
            Case distinction

Person	Singular	Plural
1	mwen	nou
2	ou	nou
3	li	yo

The inflectional profile of HC pronouns is, in some sense, on a par with the inflectional profile of the HC verb, which is not morphologically inflected for grammatical distinctions such as Tense, Mood, Aspect (TMA), or agreement. A

form like *konnen* 'know' in (6) does not morphologically covary with the person, number, or gender features (ϕ-features) of its subject:[7]

(6) {Mwen | Ou | Li | Nou | Yo} konnen Boukinèt. (HC)
       1sg | 2sg | 3sg | 1pl/2pl | 3pl know Boukinèt

     '{I | You | He/She | We | They} know(s) Boukinèt.'

As of TMA features, these are expressed by preverbal free morphemes, as in (7) (also see section 4; in section 6.2 I discuss the etymology of HC TMA markers):

(7) a. Boukinèt te   renmen Bouki. (HC)
        Boukinèt ANT renmen Bouki

        'Boukinèt loved Bouki.'

    b. Boukinèt ap   renmen Bouki.
        Boukinèt FUT love   Bouki

        'Boukinèt will love Bouki.'

    c. Boukinèt a   renmen Bouki si . . .
        Boukinèt IRR love   Bouki if

        'Boukinèt Would Love Bouki if . . . '

3.2 Some Superstratum Data

The Fr patterns here, which are well known in the comparative-syntax literature (see, e.g., Pollock 1989 and Sportiche 1995), are somewhat the mirror image of the HC patterns in (1)–(7), at least with respect to the following:

    1. Object-pronoun placement vis-à-vis the θ-marking verb in nonimperative clauses[8]
    2. Placement of the finite verb vis-à-vis clause-internal adverbs and sentential negation
    3. Morphological case on pronouns
    4. TMA-and agreement-related verbal morphology.

In (8)–(9), Fr object clitics, unlike Fr nonclitic objects, precede the finite verb (when the latter is not in the positive imperative).

(8) a. Bouqui   connaît   <u>Bouquinette</u>. (Fr)
       Bouqui   know   Bouquinette
       'Bouqui knows Bouquinette'.

     b. Bouqui   <u>la</u>   connaît.
        Bouqui   3sg-fem   know
        'Bouqui knows her.'

(9) a.   *Bouqui <u>Bouquinette</u> connaît. (Fr)

     b.   *Bouqui connaît <u>la</u>

Fr IP-internal adverbs and sentence negation follow the finite verb:

(10) a. Bouqui   connaît   <u>déjà</u>   Bouquinette. (Fr)
        Bouqui   know   already   Bouquinette
        'Bouqui already knows Bouquinette.'

      b. Bouqui   (ne)   connaît   <u>pas</u>   Bouquinette.
         Bouqui   NEG   know   NEG   Bouquinette
         'Bouqui doesn't know Bouquinette.'

(11) a.   *Bouqui <u>déjà</u> connaît Bouquinette. (Fr)

      b.   *Bouqui (ne) <u>pas</u> connaît Bouquinette

Fr *atonic* pronouns are morphologically inflected for case. Here's a sample of Fr atonic personal pronouns and case distinctions therein:

(12) **A sample of Fr (atonic) personal pronouns showing morphological Case distinctions**

Person	NOM	Non-NOM
1sg	je	me
2sg	tu	te
3sg	il (masc.), elle (fem.)	le (masc, ACC), la (fem, ACC), lui (dative)
1pl	nous	nous
2pl	vous	vous
3pl	ils (masc), elles (fem)	les (ACC), leur (DAT)

In Standard French, finite verbs host a relatively robust set of agreement and TMA suffixes:[9]

(13)   J'aime '1sg-love+1sg'   Nous aim<u>ons</u> '1PL love+1pl'
        Tu aim<u>es</u> '2sg love+2sg'   Vous aim<u>ez</u> '2pl love+2pl'
        Il/Elle aime '3sg+m/f love+3sg'   Ils/Elles aiment '3pl+m/f love+3pl'

(14)   a. Bouquinette   aim-<u>ait</u>   Bouqui.
           Bouquinette   loved   Bouqui

        b. Bouquinette   aim-<u>era</u>   Bouqui
           Bouquinette   will love   Bouqui

        c. Bouquinette   aim-<u>erait</u>   Bouqui si . . .
           Bouquinette   would love   Bouqui if

The table in (15) sums up the contrasts between HC and Fr with respect to the distribution and morphology of verbs and objects, as sketched so far:

(15)   **Summary of HC-versus-fr VP-related contracts**

	HC	Fr
V Pronoun$_{Obj}$	OK	*
Pronoun$_{Obj}$ V	*	OK
NEG/Adv V$_{+fin}$ Obj	OK	*
V$_{+fin}$ NEG/Adv Obj	*	OK
TMA verbal suffixes	*	OK
Morphological case on pronouns	*	OK

3.3 Some Substratum Data

What could the substratum contribute, *in principle*, to the emergence of the contrasts in (15)? Consider Fongbè, for example, which is often taken as the most influential substrate language for the formation of HC grammar (see Lefebvre 1998 and references therein). First, verbs in Fongbè, as in HC, are not morphologically inflected for TMA or agreement. Second, TMA markers in Fongbè, as in HC, are generally, though not always (see da Cruz 1995), nonaffixal morphemes in preverbal position (Avolonto 1992). Third, verbs in Fongbè and many other West African languages have interpretative properties reminiscent of HC (e.g., all these languages manifest the "factative" effect; Déchaine 1991, Avolonto 1992, Aboh 1999 and chapter 4 in this volume, Ndayiragije 2000, and others).

This said, HC is not structurally isomorphic to its substratum—and neither is it isomorphic to its superstratum. Da Cruz 1995 documents postverbal completive markers in Fongbè, and Aboh (1999: 59f. and this volume) documents suffixal Aspect markers in Gengbe and Ewegbe. As we see in (20), Fongbè verbs

do manifest inflectional and syntactic processes that are *not* attested in HC; see also Aboh (1999 and this volume).

For now, let's note that the distributional uniformity of HC objects and the morphological uniformity of HC pronouns—sans morphological case—distinguish HC from its major source languages, including Fr and Fongbè. Take the following four verb-syntax characteristics that have been argued to hold of Fongbè and of the Gbe grouping in general[10] (see Fabb 1992; Kinyalolo 1992; Déchaine and Manfredi 1997; Aboh 1999 and chapter 4 in this volume; Ndayiragije 2000):[11]

(16) a. An IP-internal leftward movement moves objects to the left of the θ-marking verb in certain contexts, as in (18)–(19).

   b. The object-movement rule in (16a) distinguishes full NPs, including tonic pronouns, from atonic pronouns: the full NPs may undergo IP-internal object-movement to the left of the verb (as in (18)–(19), whereas the atonic pronouns are generally enclitics hosted by the θ-marking verb, as in (20).

   c. Pronouns are overtly marked for morphological case distinctions—compare the first-person singular nominative pronoun in (18) and its nonnominative counterpart in (20).

   d. The pattern in (20) illustrates verb reduplication (see Fabb 1992, Déchaine and Manfredi 1997, Ndayiragije 2000, and Aboh 1999 and this volume, for various treatments of reduplication and Object Shift in Gbe; see also note 58).

(17) Ùn ɖú mɔ̌lìnkún. (Fongbè)
     I   eat rice

   'I eat rice.' (Adapted from Fabb 1992: 21)

(18) a. Ùn ɖò mɔ̌lìnkún ɖú wɛ̀. (Fongbè)
       I   be   rice   eat CFP

   b. * Ùn ɖò ɖú mɔ̌lìnkún wɛ̀.
       I   be   eat rice   CFP

      'I am eating rice.' (Kinyalolo 1992: 39)

(19) a. Yé ɖídó   nyè   xò gbé. (Fongbè)
       they take-to-the-road me (tonic) beat CFP

   b. * Yé dídó xò nyè gbé.

      'They took to the road to beat me.' (Adapted from Kinyalolo 1992: 37)

(20) Yé   ɖídó   xixò mì   *gbé*. (Fongbè)
      they take-to-the-road beat me (atonic) CFP
                                    (Adapted from Kinyalolo 1992: 37)

None of the four properties in (16) hold of HC. This is unexpected in the strict-relexification proposals of, for example, Adam (1883) and Lefebvre (1998), even though a more moderate sort of substratum influence via L1-transfer in second-language acquisition is quite likely (see the surveys in Mufwene 1990, 2001; DeGraff 1999c, 2001a, 2001b, 2002b, 2002c; Siegel 2003).

To recapitulate, both Fr and Gbe dialects, major source languages of HC, extensively instantiate word-order and case-morphology patterns that are totally absent in HC.[12] Can this be taken as evidence of nongenetic "abnormal transmission" (or "pidginization" or "radical break in transmission") of the kind that would set creolization apart from the diachronic processes that give rise to non-Creole languages?

The main goal of this chapter is to use the observations in this section to revisit the theoretical status of Creole Exceptionalism. In doing so, I'll show that the foundations and desiderata of modern comparative syntax erase the traditional distinction between "nongenetic" creolization and "genetic" language change. Using the Principles-and-Parameters approach to syntax, I will try in sections 4 and 5 to relate the positions of verb and objects in HC to each other and to the morphological profile of the language, enlisting what may be universal grammatical constraints. This is in keeping with the hunch in current generative work that the ultimate locus of language variation is in the lexicon, especially in the inventory and morphosyntactic properties of functional heads (see, e.g., Chomsky 1995). In turn, these theoretical considerations may shed light on the mechanics that underlie, and *unite*, creole genesis and language change (see section 6). In section 7, I examine verb- and pronoun-placement data in two other Romance-lexicon Creoles.

4 THE MORPHOSYNTAX OF HAITIAN CREOLE VERBS

4.1 Basic Facts

Recall the basic verb-placement contrasts that obtain across HC and its lexifier Fr in (3)–(4) versus (10)–(11). These are simplex clauses: the main, and only, verb

therein (i.e., the θ-marking verb) occurs without any auxiliary. Let's call such clauses MONOVERBAL CLAUSES. In (Standard) French, these are clauses where the main verb inflects for, at least, person-number agreement and in some cases also evinces TMA suffixes (see (13)–(14)). In contrast, HC verbs evince no inflectional morphology for TMA or agreement, whether or not the main verb is the sole verbal element (see (6)–(7)).

In both languages, there is a class of adverbs that can appear, among other positions, clause-internally—strictly within the space delimited to the left by the subject and to the right by the nonpronominal, unmoved object. It is this clause-internal position that is most relevant for the contrasts at hand, so I abstract away from the other positions (e.g., clause-final) where some of these adverbs can surface, in both languages. (Recall that both HC and Fr are canonically SVO and that only Fr has preverbal object clitics.)

In HC and Fr monoverbal clauses, the clause-internal adverbs and the sentential negation marker appear, respectively, to the left and to the right of the verb. Witness (3a) / (4a) versus (10a) / (11a) and (3b) /(4b) versus (10b) / (11b).[13] The Fr verb-placement facts have been in the limelight of theoretical comparative syntax since Pollock (1989). Dejean (1992) and DeGraff (1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000) provide additional HC and Fr data with other adverbs. These examples can be schematized approximately as in (21)–(22), abstracting away from the intricate stacking of negation and adverbs à la Cinque:

(21) a. Neg/Adv V NP_{Obj} (HC)

      b. *   V Neg/Adv NP_{Obj}

(22) a. *Neg/Adv V NP_{Obj} (Fr)
      b.   V Neg/Adv NP_{Obj}

4.2 Theoretical Proposals

The analysis proposed in DeGraff (1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000) is relatively straightforward. In fact, the HC-versus-Fr contrasts shown previously are obviously reminiscent of the English versus Fr contrasts extensively studied in the prolific Pollockian tradition on comparative verb morphosyntax. The central assumption that I'll adopt from this tradition is that there is something like a "verb-placement parameter." The setting of this parameter determines for each given language the absence or presence or, more accurately, the *height* of verb movement to some INFL (inflectional) head within an increasingly intricate Cinquean layer of INFL projections between the CP and VP projections (cf. notes 14, 15, 16, and 18). It is

assumed that in all languages the verb is generated within the verb phrase (VP), adjacent to its object (if any). In certain languages, the verb is pronounced inside the VP shell(s)—or their most immediate extended projection(s) such as vP, but I'll gloss over that distinction. When the verb is pronounced in VP, it is pronounced adjacent to its object (if any), in a position that is c-commanded by any material that c-commands the VP. Let's call such languages V-IN-SITU languages. In other languages, the finite verb overtly moves out of the VP into some attracting head within the INFL system below CP. That INFL head—call it x—c-commands the VP. The verb is thus pronounced outside of the VP, to the left of any material that is c-commanded by x, assuming Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry. Let's call these languages the V-TO-I languages.[14]

In this terminology, HC is V-in-situ while Fr is V-to-I, and the HC-versus-Fr differences in verb placement obtain in a manner similar to analogous word-order contrasts between English and Fr (DeGraff 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000). Assume that the relevant clause-internal adverbs and sentential negation markers are generated in some intermediate y_iP projection between VP and some higher xP whose head is the landing site for verb movement, if any. The integer i in y_iP ranges between 1 and some small n, smaller than, say, 29, which is the cardinality of the universal inventory of INFL heads postulated by Cinque (see note 14).[15] The HC-versus-Fr verb-placement contrast follows directly from these assumptions.[16]

The next questions to ask toward explanatory adequacy are: What ultimately forces verb movement in V-to-I languages? What sorts of evidence ("triggers") in the Primary Linguistic Data (PLD) help the language learner decide on the value of the V-to-I/V-in-situ parameter? Is the setting of this parameter an arbitrary property that is free to independently vary across languages, or is this setting reducible to, or deducible from, some more basic, more fine-grained, properties—some Kaynian "microparametric" values?

Here is one tentative generalization to start with.[17] Verb movement seems related to properties of verbal inflectional morphology: (i) languages with relatively larger paradigms of verbal inflections, or with the required distinctions therein, are V-to-I; (ii) languages with relatively smaller inflectional paradigms or without the required distinctions therein, tend to be V-in-situ. In one (here oversimplified) implementation (à la, e.g., Rohrbacher 1994: 114–124; cf. Lasnik 1995), verbal affixes in languages whose paradigms make enough distinctions are listed separately in the lexicon and enter the derivation as syntactically active affixal heads that c-command the VP. Since these affixes need a syntactic host, they force the verb to undergo head-movement in order for the verb to serve as their host under the nodes where the affixes are generated as syntactic heads. This is the Fr case. Otherwise, inflectional morphemes either are nonaffixal (the HC case) or combine with their verbal host postsyntactically, in the morphophonological component (the English case).

In Bobaljik's (2001) recent proposal, it is the *structure* of inflection, not the inventory of the INFL paradigms, that determines verb movement. Multiple inflectional suffixes on the verbal stem diagnose multiple INFL heads in the syntax, leading to the need for V-to-I for the verb to enter into a local checking relation with nonadjacent INFL heads. In absence of multiple INFL heads, as in English, the verb can locally check its inflectional features without movement, thus the possibility of V-in-situ.[18]

In all these proposals, the basic intuition to be captured is that, if the verb is "richly" inflected (with "richness" measured in one way or the other), then the verb must undergo head-movement. No matter what technology is adopted to handle morphology–syntax interactions in verb placement, the HC-Fr comparison already suggests the possibility of a correlation between the respective degrees of verbal inflection and degrees of verb movement (this was first noticed, I believe, in Dejean 1992). For now, let's take HC and Fr to fall on opposite sides of both the V-in-situ/V-to-I and the poor/rich inflectional clines, even though there exist intermediate cases whose positions in the verb-movement and verbal-inflection continua are more ambiguous and problematic. This is perhaps due to still mysterious markedness or change-in-progress factors (see note 20).[19]

Going back to explanatory adequacy, one can ask: How important is verbal inflectional morphology *to the learner* for the setting or resetting of the verb-placement parameter in Creole formation and elsewhere (e.g., in Germanic diachrony)? Let's temporarily assume for the sake of the argument that acquisition of verb placement is completely orthogonal to the presence or absence of verbal affixes. Given the postulation of V-to-I in both Fr (Pollock 1989) and Gbe (Aboh 1999 and chapter 4 in this volume), one could reasonably imagine, pending further data and further insights about learnability, a scenario in which V-to-I would have survived into HC, even in absence of verbal inflectional affixes. This scenario may seem quite reasonable if one assumes that all the language acquirer needs in order to acquire V-to-I is exposure to patterns that instantiate V-to-I (e.g., utterances with the sequence V Neg/Adv NP_{Obj}). French readily provides the relevant V-to-I patterns, so it may seem mysterious why V-to-I did not persist in HC (but see section 6.2 for some relevant speculations regarding the evolution of HC's TMA system from Fr verbal periphrases).

Regardless of the developmental fate of V-to-I, the paradigms of bound inflectional morphology are a well-known casualty in the *initial* stages of language acquisition, *independently of the inflectional profiles represented in the PLD* (see note 9). The reduction of bound inflectional paradigms seems even more spectacular in second-language acquisition under duress in the context of learner-unfriendly language contact with relatively reduced access to native target data (cf. Meillet 1919, Weinreich 1953: sec. 2.3; see DeGraff 1999b: 491–499, 517–518 for an overview). This point was already adumbrated by Schleicher (1852) [1850]) who compared English with its "poor" inflectional morphology and Icelandic with its

"rich" inflectional morphology. Schleicher concluded that this spectacular inflectional contrast between these two sister languages is due to the much higher degree of language contact in the history of English (Schleicher 1852: 23–30, [1850]; see DeGraff 2001b: 219 n.5 for some historiographical discussion; also see note 31).

In this vein, that the Fr inflectional paradigms would eventually not survive into HC is not surprising given the nature of language contact on Haiti's colonial plantations and given similar developments in other language-contact situations. Compare Creole genesis to the evolution of Old to Middle to Early Modern English and of Old Norse to Mainland Scandinavian (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish). There, too, the catalyst for inflectional erosion may have been so-called imperfect learning by adult learners in contact situation, *notwithstanding the rich inflectional systems of the languages in contact* (for case studies, data, and analyses, see, e.g., Bunsen 1854; Haugen 1976: 285f, 1982: 14; Kroch and Taylor 1997; Roberts 1999; and Kroch et al. 2000).

In what follows, I'll speculate further on a learnability account in which the "right" configuration of verbal affixes in the PLD is one, *and only one*, of the triggers that force the learner to adopt the V-to-I setting; in this account, the V-in-situ setting (and absence of movement, in general) is an innate preference of the learner (perhaps for economy considerations as in Roberts 1999).

As Bobaljik (2001: 5) points out, such learnability-theoretic considerations are related to, but do not necessarily determine, the synchronic grammatical factors that force V-to-I or V-in-situ in the relevant I-languages. That certain verbal affixes *can* be used as *part* of the triggering evidence vis-à-vis (often quite abstract) verb-placement options does not necessarily entail that it is verbal affixes, and only verbal affixes, that determine verb placement in the adult grammar.[20]

These caveats will lead me to look, in sections 6.2 and 7.1, at the possible contribution of various *syntactic* patterns, alongside inflectional patterns, as acquisition-cum-reanalysis triggers in the diachronic emergence of HC V-in-situ. My learnability considerations will tentatively connect the emergence of V-in-situ in HC to similar diachronic scenarios beyond "creolization" (see, e.g., Roberts 1999; Lightfoot 1999; DeGraff 1999b, 1999d, and references therein; see also V-to-I possibilities in other Creoles such as Capeverdean Creole and Palenquero, as discussed in section 7.3).

Section 5 looks at a wider set of comparative data, including object-placement facts in (the diachrony of) HC, Fr, and Germanic. Section 6 returns to diachronic-cum-learnability issues and entertains a Creole-genesis account whereby certain superstrate and substrate patterns, in tandem with the inflectional-erosion facts, would have tilted the linguistic ecology toward the eventual decline of V-to-I and preverbal object-cliticization in the emergence of HC. The comparative data suggest that such a decline is not an "exceptional" Creole development but a run-of-the-mill diachronic tendency, modulated by UG principles and species-wide language-acquisition mechanisms.

5 The Morphosyntax of Haitian Creole Object Pronouns

5.1 Basic Facts

Can the diachrony of the morphosyntax of HC verb placement, as examined in section 4, be related to the diachrony of the morphosyntax of object pronouns in any theoretically constructive way? Recall these two basic facts from section 3: (i) object (pro)nouns in HC, unlike in Fr in and in Fongbè, are uniformly postverbal (as in (1)–(2)); (ii) pronouns in HC (see, e.g., (5)), unlike in Fr and Fongbè, do not manifest morphological case distinctions.

5.2 Theoretical Proposals

Is there any theoretical basis for a possible correlation between inflectional morphology, verb placement, and object-pronoun placement? Let's keep the working assumption that what induces V-to-I are the morphological properties of certain functional heads above the VP. Does IP-internal object movement rely on some analogous property of functional heads above VP? Are the two types of movement in any sort of dependency? These questions are all the more intriguing in that English diachrony manifests the same sort of "discrepancies" and "losses" that characterize HC's diachrony: (i) loss of V-to-I; (ii) loss of preverbal objects; (iii) loss of inflectional morphology on verbs; and (iv) loss of inflectional (case) morphology on (pro)nouns (see section 6.3).[21]

A number of proposals in the generative literature on Germanic and Romance offer an attractive analytical link among inflectional morphology, the placement of verbs, and that of (pronominal) objects. In these proposals, certain sorts of object placement depend on verb movement or on inflectional morphology on the verb and its arguments. Such proposals include Holmberg (1985); Platzack and Holmberg (1989), Holmberg and Platzack (1990), Kayne (1989a, 1989b, 1991), Déprez (1989), Chomsky (1993), Sportiche (1995), Bobaljik and Jonas (1996), and Bobaljik (1995,2002).[22] For Déprez, Kayne, Chomsky, Roberts, Sportiche, and others, it is inflectional heads dominating VP that are implicated in object cliticization and in other types of clause-internal leftward object movements.[23]

To better understand these proposals, let us first examine cases where *full* NPs behave *somewhat* like object clitics in being pronounced outside of the VP in which they are generated. The prototypical, and much discussed, case is that of OBJECT SHIFT (OS) in Icelandic (IC) and a subset of Germanic; see, for example,

Holmberg (1985), Déprez (1989), Bobaljik and Jonas (1996), Bobaljik (1995, 2002), and, especially, the recent review in Thráinsson (2001). OS is illustrated by the following Icelandic data from Holmberg (1985):

(23) a. Skúli segir Sveini <u>oft</u>   sögur. (IC)
         Skuli tells Sveini <u>often</u> stories
         'Skuli often tells Sveini stories.' (Holmberg 1985: 161)

      b. Stúdentarnir stungu smjörinu   <u>allir</u> í   vasann.
         the students   put   the butter <u>all</u>   in the pocket
         'The students all put the butter in their pockets.' (Holmberg 1985: 161)

      c. Hann keypti   bókina   <u>ekki</u>.
         he   bought the book   <u>not</u>
         'He did not buy the book.' (Holmberg 1985: 178)

That *Sveini*, *smjörinu* 'the butter' and *bókina* 'the book' have "shifted" in (23) is indicated by the position of the objects relative to the underlined items, which are taken to indicate the left boundary of (some extended projection of) VP. Icelandic, unlike English, allows both the verb and the object to overtly move leftward, outside of VP, while the verb moves up higher than the object, giving the surface orders in (23). (Incidentally, nouns and verbs in IC are more richly inflected than in English, for Case and for person and number agreement, respectively; see Holmberg and Platzack 1990; cf. notes 21 and 53.)

Let's (provisionally) assume that OS is related to Case and that its landing site is within the projection of a functional head whose function vis-à-vis the object is somewhat similar to that of the head(s) responsible for V-to-I in section 4 (see Déprez 1989, Chomsky 1993, Sportiche 1995, Bobaljik and Jonas 1996, and others). In this perspective, OS, like V-to-I, is related to some morphological requirements of either the moved element or its landing site (or both). Thus, vis-à-vis morphology and word order, OS versus object-in-situ offer intriguing parallels to the contrast between V-to-I versus V-in-situ discussed in section 4. Compare the Icelandic and English data in (23): Icelandic has OS, while objects in English remain in situ.[24]

Is there a theoretical link between V-to-I and object cliticization (qua OS?) in a way that will give a principled explanation to the emergence of the morphosyntax of verbs and object pronouns in HC? Consider the now familiar, if controversial, claims that (i) elimination (reduction?) of V-to-I typically depends on a prior reduction in verbal inflectional suffixes and (ii) elimination (reduction?) of object cliticization is associated with reduction in morphological case marking (but see note 21.) Is the theory able to relate aspects of (i) and (ii) via independently needed principles?

I now turn to a theoretical proposal whereby overt V-to-I is a necessary condition for object cliticization, here viewed (controversially) as an instance of OS.[25] In such a theory, that HC lacks both V-to-I and preverbal object clitics is not an arbitrary combination of facts. Neither would such combination support Creole Exceptionalism. In the Cartesian-Uniformitarian perspective on Creole genesis that is adopted in this chapter, the constellation of facts in (i)–(ii) would directly fall out from constraints imposed by UG, without any ad hoc assumptions about developmental mechanisms that would apply exclusively in Creole genesis.

The fundamental insight making V-to-I a pre-requisite for OS goes back, I think, to Holmberg (1985).[26]

(24) "Object Shift: Move an object NP leftwards within the X-bar projection of its governing verb, when this verb is phonetically empty." (Holmberg 1985: 184).

For Holmberg, the principle in (24) would explain why OS in IC is not possible in the presence of an auxiliary: in such contexts it is only the auxiliary that moves, not the main verb; the absence of main-verb movement (which entails that the governing verb is *not* phonetically empty) is what bans OS. Compare (23b) with (25):[27]

(25) Stúdentarnir hafa allir stungið smjörinu í vasann
      the students have all put the butter in the pocket
      "The students have all put the butter in their pockets." (Holmberg 1985: 187)

Holmberg (1985: 189f.) also notices that Swedish (SW), which allows OS only with unstressed personal pronouns ("cliticization" in our terms), allows such cliticization in main clauses only. Interestingly, as observed by, for example, Holmberg and Platzack (1990), the paradigms of verbal and nominal inflections are more restricted in SW than in IC: "Disregarding the genitive, . . . [there is] no Case morphology [in SW], except on pronouns, and no subject-verb agreement" (p. 93). Holmberg and Platzack also observe that SW, unlike IC, has no independent V-to-I: V-to-I in SW only occurs in connection with verb-second (V2)—generally, in main clauses. Given Holmberg's Generalization in (24), it seems no accident that SW has OS in main clauses only: SW object cliticization occurs only when V overtly moves out of VP—on its way to C, since SW lacks independent V-to-I (see Josefsson 1992 for one study of SW object cliticization).[28]

Holmberg's constraint tightly unites V-to-I to OS: the latter happens *only if* the former also happens.[29] If we adopt one of the various implementations of Holmberg's constraints (see note 26) and assume that object cliticization is an

instance of OS, then absence of V-to-I in HC would force all objects to surface postverbally in HC: cliticization sans verb movement would entail a violation of an independently motivated principle of grammar. Object cliticization in Fr versus absence thereof in HC is thus related to another morphosyntactic difference between the two languages: namely, Fr V-to-I versus HC V-in-situ (in section 6.4, I explore the possible contributions of both Fr and Gbe source-language patterns to the emergence of the HC patterns). In this perspective, HC and Fr stand in the same typological relation as Swedish and Icelandic: (i) HC and Swedish do not have independent V-to-I movement, modulo the possibility of short verb-movement and of verb-movement outside IP (see notes 14, 15, 16, and 34); (ii) HC and Swedish manifest less verbal inflectional morphology than Fr and Icelandic, respectively; (iii) comparative data from both HC-versus-Fr and Swedish-versus-Icelandic suggest that cliticization is not allowed without verb movement; and (iv) HC and Swedish have a higher degree of case syncretism than Fr and Icelandic, respectively (but see note 21).

6 ON THE THEORETICAL STATUS OF CREOLE EXCEPTIONALISM

Is "creolization" *fundamentally* distinct from "language change"? How do the "discrepancies" in HC diachrony, as discussed in sections 3–5, compare with "discrepancies" in the diachrony of non-Creole languages?

This section shows that a deep congruence of morphosyntactic patterns obtains across various sorts of ontogenetic and phylogenetic developments, including "creolization." My claim is that certain VP-related "discrepancies" in the so-called genetic diachrony of Germanic and Romance seem as "significant" as in the so-called nongenetic diachrony of HC. HC morphosyntax does not, *and could not*, isolate HC and its diachrony in some exclusively "Creole" empirical domain of linguistic inquiry.[30]

6.1 Verbal Morphosyntax beyond "Creolization"

In the domain of verb placement and verbal morphology (see sections 3–4), it seems rather clear that there is nothing particularly and exclusively "Creole" about the emergence of the HC V-in-situ patterns with verbs that do not inflect for TMA and agreement. The genesis of HC's VP-related morphosyntax, from the

contact of (relatively more) richly inflecting V-to-I languages, falls naturally within a larger domain of developmental "discrepancies" that go beyond creolization proper.

Take first-language acquisition by children (L1A). It is now a celebrated fact that, in the very early stages of acquiring richly inflecting V-to-I languages such as Fr, children may use in situ infinitivals in contexts where the adult language requires finite verbs that undergo V-to-I; when finite forms are used in child French, they tend to undergo V-to-I as in adult French (Pierce 1992, Wexler 1994; see Lardiere 2000 for a recent survey). This is the OPTIONAL (ROOT) INFINITIVE stage which has now been documented in a wide variety of languages (see Wexler 2002 for one recent overview). Here's a sample of "optional root infinitives" in child French:

(26) a. pas   attraper   une   fleur
         NEG   catch   a   flower

      b. pas   tomber   bébé
         NEG   fall   baby

Each of the words in (26) straightforwardly corresponds to an adult French word, even though these utterances show morphosyntactic "discrepancies" when compared with adult French. In the latter, negated declarative root clauses usually contain a finite verb. One may thus be tempted to conclude *erroneously* that the sample in (26) illustrates "a significant discrepancy between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence" between child and adult French, thus diagnosing, on a baby scale (so to speak), "abnormal transmission" of the sort envisaged by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 206). Such a hypothetical claim about "abnormal transmission" seems a theoretical abnormality: pervasive "discrepancies" are quite normal in language learners' developmental paths.

The sort of "discrepancies" exemplified in (26) and in related child-versus-adult developmental mismatches are fully expected in any model of L1A in which language-specific, and often quite abstract, parameter settings must be set (and thus, possibly, 'mis-set') from necessarily spare and often structurally ambiguous cues in the Primary Linguistic data (PLD) (see, e.g., Rizzi 1999 and Roberts 1999). This is what Rizzi (1999: 463f.) calls "grammatical invention"—that is, "the 'trying out' of various UG options [a.k.a. parameter settings] not adopted by the target system." As Chomsky (1995: 6) puts it, "language acquisition is interpreted as the process of fixing the parameters of the initial state [UG] in one of the permissible ways." Discrepancies in L1A are also expected if certain grammatical and processing constraints are in the scope of a maturational schedule, some biological clock (see, e.g., Wexler 2002). In fact, the morphological and syntactic "discrep-

ancies" illustrated in (26) have been replicated in a wide range of acquisition scenarios, both within and across groups of children acquiring typologically different languages (with and without V-to-I, with and without verb-second, etc.). (See Schütze 1997, Roberts 1999: 294–301, and Rizzi 1999: 456–462 for some theoretical alternatives, and see the literature surveys in Lardiere 2000 and Wexler 2002.)

Second-language acquisition (L2A) by adults and even by children seems to allow an even larger scale of morphosyntactic "discrepancies" than in L1A. Furthermore, these "discrepancies" seem to extend over a longer period than in L1A—in some cases, until L2A's endstate. And that, too, is considered a "normal" property of L2A (see the papers in Archibald 2000 for recent discussion—in particular, Lardiere's comparison of L1A and L2A morphosyntactic development in verb placement; see also Prévost and White 2000, Wexler 2002, and Ionin and Wexler 2002): "Adult [second-language] learners have much more difficulty than young child [first-language] learners in learning the exact properties of inflections" (Wexler 2002; for further discussion and references in the context of Creole genesis and its similarities to language change, see DeGraff 1999b: 491–499, 517–518).

What seems particularly affected in L2A is the learning of inflectional paradigms and their relations to morphosyntactic features in the narrow syntax. For example, Prévost and White (2000: 125–130) report that second-language (L2) learners, unlike first-language (L1) learners, often overgeneralize the use of "default" infinitivals to structural positions that are reserved for finite verbs (e.g., VP-external heads in V-to-I languages). More generally, it is argued that "aquisition of L1 morphology is always successful (except in pathological cases)," while "L2 learners have difficulty with the overt realization of morphology" (Prévost and White 2000: 104, 128). These and similar results can be taken as evidence for "morphological non-convergence (or 'fossilization') with respect to the target language [in L2A] as opposed to virtually inevitable convergence in [L1A]" (Lardiere 2000: 113); see also Klein and Perdue's (1992: 302f., 312f.) similar results in the context of a cross-linguistic survey of migrant adult learners with various source and target languages.

This L1A-versus-L2A contrast is crucial: the output of L2A by adults—under "duress," in many cases—has a crucial role in language change, particularly in the context of language contact. In such contexts, L2A's output, including widespread morphological fossilization, substantially contributes to the PLD used by subsequent generations of nonnative and native learners; this is the "cascade" relationship discussed in DeGraff (1999b: 497f., 504, 511, etc.) in the context of creolization and language change. The important—if familiar, but often neglected—point here is that the nature of the PLD, obviously a key factor in language change and creation, is greatly influenced by the absence or presence of adult learners and by their cognitive and psychosocial limitations—for example,

take the aforementioned morphological fossilization, which is a hallmark of adult learners' early interlanguages.

In the context of VP-related morphology–syntax interaction in the formation of HC, the L2A–L1A "cascade" relationship suggests the following hypothetical, and overly idealized, sequence. The adult learner, who in effect is the ultimate locus of language contact, is chiefly, but not singly, responsible for various degrees of inflectional "fossilization," depending on the specific and gradient conditions of the contact situation.[31] If rich verbal inflection is an unambiguous morphological trigger for V-to-I, the initial contact interlanguages, or most likely some subset thereof, may well be V-to-I, structurally on a par with the Fr target varieties, but with infinitival-like forms often substituted as default for targetlike finite forms in V-to-I environments (see note 19). Among substrate speakers of proto-HC, the substitution of invariant forms for inflecting forms, although presumably common across early interlanguages (independently of source languages; see Klein and Perdue 1992: 302f., 312f.), may have been more natural for the Kwa speakers than, say, the Bantu speakers: Kwa, unlike Bantu, generally do not manifest Tense and Agreement affixes.

Another class of input that competes with, and reduces, the proportion of finite verbs in the linguistic ecology are targetlike verbal periphrases that are built around in situ infinitival and participle forms (see section 6.2). These verbal periphrases, which are quite frequent in regional and colloquial Fr varieties (Gougenheim 1929), would "conspire" with early learners' inflectionally fossilized interlanguages to weaken the robustness of V-to-I triggers in the evolving linguistic ecology of incoming learners. The latter will have fewer and fewer instances of finite verbs and *V Neg/Adv NP$_{Obj}$* patterns in their PLD then will the PLD of the initial "cohorts" of learners. That is, the linguistic ecology will witness a gradual decrease of morphological and syntactic triggers for V-to-I, along with an increase in the frequency of infinitival- and participial-like forms, thus the increased possibility for the development of stable V-in-situ grammars with verb forms that, overall, show less inflection than their counterparts in the original target language. In turn, these changes may be favored by other (arguably) converging factors such as the unmarkedness and economy of V-in-situ; the relative frequency, transparency, and saliency of verbal periphrases as opposed to their synthetic counterparts; the use of tonic pronouns alongside, or instead of, atonic clitics in colloquial regional varieties, and so on. (These grammatical, learnability-theoretic, stochastic, and processing factors are further speculated on in following paragraphs and in sections 6.2 and 6.4.)[32]

For now, note that "discrepancies" of various sort are indeed expected in ontogenetic and phylogenetic developments—in the history of *both* Creole and non-Creole languages. V-in-situ patterns that do not replicate the morphosyntax of the erstwhile "target" languages have emerged in the history of English, for

example. It is well established that Middle English (ME) until the sixteenth century was a robustly V-to-I language. Consider the following examples—a staple in the literature on Germanic syntactic change:

(27) a. Wepyng   and   teres   <u>counforteth</u>   not dissolute   laghers.
weeping and   tears   comfort   not dissolute   laughers
(1400–1450: N. Love, The Myrour of the Blessyd Lyf of J.C.; quoted in Roberts 1993: 250)

b. Quene Ester <u>looked</u> never with switch an eye.
"Queen Esther never looked with such an eye." (Chaucer, *Merchant's Tale, line 1744*; (quoted in Kroch 1989b)

c. . . . if man <u>grounde</u> not his doinges altogether upon nature. (Ellegård 1953: 40; cited in Kroch 1989a: 143)

d. How <u>like</u> you this sonnet? (Ellegård 1953: 84; cited in Kroch 1989a: 143)

Yet, notwithstanding the V-to-I nature of its ancestor, Modern English (NE) is a V-in-situ language:

(28) a. *Peter understands <u>never</u> his lesson.

b. *Jane comforts <u>not</u> Mary.

c. *How <u>like</u> you this sonnet?

In the diachrony of English, an erosion in verbal inflectional morphology seems to have been a precondition, although not a sufficient condition, for the subsequent transition from V-to-I to V-in-situ (this is a gross oversimplification that abstracts away from intricate facts of dialectal and register variation). At least as long as English verbal inflection was approximately on a paradigmatic and structural par with that of Fr, English exhibited V-to-I, on a syntactic par with Fr. Witness, from selected ME dialects, the paradigmatic distinctions in (29) and the morphosyntactic structure of the doubly inflected verb in (30) with the stacking of Tense and Agreement suffixes:

(29) singe '1sg'; sing<u>est</u> '2sg'; singen, '3sg'; singe<u>n</u> '1pl, 2pl, 3pl' (Midland ME, Mossé 1968; cited in Roberts 1993: 256)

(30) [[show + ed] + st] '[[show + PAST] + 2sg]' (Kroch 1989b: 238)

The morphology–syntax correlations in (27)–(30) and their (arguable) parallels elsewhere (e.g., in the diachrony of Mainland Scandinavian; see, e.g., Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 76f.; Vikner 1995: 161–163, 1997: 205–207) suggest a parameter-setting approach in which verbal inflectional morphology serves as one class of triggers, *perhaps alongside word-order triggers*, for the acquisition of verb placement.[33]

From such a perspective, there is nothing particularly "Creole" (as opposed to non-"Creole") with the fact that HC is V-in-situ while its lexifier is V-to-I. Modern English and Mainland Scandinavian—neither of which fits the sociohistorical profile of Caribbean Creoles—are, like HC, languages without V-to-I[34] and with ancestors that are robustly V-to-I and robustly inflecting (see Falk 1993; Rohrbacher 1994; Vikner 1995, 1997; Roberts 1999, and references therein). Again, this is not surprising: as already discussed, L2A often entails a reduction in inflectional paradigms, and the reduction is greater in the learner-unfriendly situations of abrupt language contact (see note 31). It may thus be expected that parameter-setting in such contexts—in the history of HC as in the history of English and Mainland Scandinavian—would witness a decline in V-to-I.

For this argument to go through, we must assume (i) that V-in-situ is the innately preferred option (i.e., the one initially entertained by the language acquirer, in absence of contrary evidence) and (ii) that V-to-I is partly triggered by the right set of inflectional affixes on the verb (see sections 6.2, 6.4, and 7.1 for other syntactic factors in the decline of V-to-I in HC diachrony; see also Roberts 1999 and Lightfoot 1999 on the general issue of morphological and syntactic triggers). Once the V-in-situ/V-to-I parameter is set, UG will constrain which other morphosyntactic options can or cannot be adopted in the steady-state grammar. For example, V-in-situ will rule out Object Shift, if the discussion in section 5.2 is on the right track (also see sections 6.3–6.4).

At this point, even the nonalert reader should have noticed the empirical and theoretical fragility of our speculations about the learner's acquisition, and the linguist's analysis, of morphology–syntax interactions in verb placement in ontogeny and phylogeny. Yet the central observation here, independently of one's favorite theory of verb placement, is that the diachrony and synchrony of V-in-situ in HC—a natural language, no matter one's definition of "Creole"—do not, *and could not*, constitute a litmus test that would set "creolization" and its products apart from the "normal" and "genetic" processes and products of language change (qua parameter-setting and resetting), as in the diachrony of English and Mainland Scandinavian. On the contrary, the HC data support the hypothesis that—perhaps since Meillet—has posited a deep cross-linguistic connection between (degrees of) syntactic movement and (degrees of) inflectional morphology, at least in certain domains (e.g., in verb and noun-phrase placement).

6.2 Reanalysis in the Emergence of HC Verb Syntax

Corroborating the nonexceptionalism of creolization are the Tense-Mood-Aspect (TMA) morphemes that project the IP layers in HC and other French-lexicon Creoles. Bickerton (1981 and subsequently) has popularized the claims that the morphosyntax and semantics of TMA markers are virtually identical across Creole languages, independently of their respective superstrate and substrate languages. Such pan-Creole similarity is often considered a telltale of massive diachronic "discrepancies" in the history of Creole languages. Yet it can be reasonably argued that Creole TMA markers are not Bickertonian entirely new creations and, thus, do not diagnose any "radical break in transmission." Instead, these morphemes can be analyzed as the product of, inter alia, run-of-the-mill reanalysis or grammaticalization (cf. Mufwene 2001: 28f., 54f., 77f., 2002). Here, too, I argue that, once we look at the appropriate data sets with the appropriate theoretical lenses, creolization reduces to UG-guided restructuring of patterns in the PLD.[35]

In DeGraff (2000: 102–108, 2002c), I point out a number of VP-related structural similarities and dissimilarities among HC and its source languages (e.g., Fongbè and regional varieties of vernacular French). Here it will suffice to point out that *all* the preverbal TMA morphemes in HC, including those illustrated in (7) can be straightforwardly traced back to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Fr etyma, some of which still exist in certain contemporary French dialects, including sometimes the "standard" dialect. Such similarities between a French-lexicon Creole and its lexifier were already noted, explicitly or implicitly, by, for example, J. J. Thomas (1869), Van Name (1870), Baissac (1880), Gougenheim (1929), Denis (1935), and Sylvain (1936) (see notes 37 and 44). The Fr etyma of HC's TMA morphemes are used preverbally as verbal auxiliaries and as prepositional markers for mood and aspect. These auxiliaries and prepositions are used in the kind of verbal periphrases that were—and, in some cases, are still—popular in vernacular and regional varieties of French (Gougenheim 1929). The sketchy comparison in (31)–(39) highlights the relevant correspondences. In most of these examples, I underline the Fr etymon in its verbal periphrase and its reanalyzed TMA-marker counterpart in HC:

(31) a. Il   <u>était</u>   (déjà)   allé. (Fr)
         3sg+masc was   (already)   go
         'He had gone.'

      b. Li   <u>te</u>   (deja)   ale. (HC)
         3sg ANT   already   go
         'He had (already) gone.'

(32) a. Il <u>était</u> au   cinéma. (Fr)
         He was   at-the movie-theater
         'He was at the movies.'

      b. Il a   <u>été</u> au   cinéma. (Fr.)
         He has been to-the   movie-theater
         'He has been to the movies.'

      c. Il <u>était</u> malade. (Fr)
         'He was sick.'

      d. Il a <u>été</u> malade. (Fr)
         'He has been sick.'

      e. Li <u>te</u>   nan sinema. (HC)
         3sg ANT in   movie-theater
         'He/She was at the movies.'

      f. Li <u>te</u>   malad.
         3sg ANT sick
         'He/She was sick' or 'He/She has been sick.'

(33) a. Je suis maintenant <u>après</u> à   demesler le
         1sg be   now   after PREP   untangle the
         cahos. (17th-c. Fr)
         chaos
         'I am now untangling the chaos.'

      b. M <u>ap(e)</u> demele   pwoblèm. (HC)
         1sg PROG untangle problem
         'I am untangling problems'.

(34) a. Je suis <u>pour</u> me   marier la   semaine
         1sg am   for   1sg+ACC marry   the   week
         prochaine. (Canadian Fr)
         next
         'I am to get married next week.' (Gougenheim 1929: 120)

      b. Mwen <u>pou</u> marye semèn pwochèn. (HC)
         1sg   for   marry week   next

(35) a. Tu <u>vas</u> aller demain. (Fr)
         'You will go tomorrow.'

b. W <u>ava</u> ale demen. (HC)

c. To <u>va</u> allé demain. (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802: 377)

(36) a. Nous   avons   <u>fini</u>   de   sarcler. (Fr)
        we   have   finished   to   weed

   'We have finished weeding.'

b. Nou <u>fin(i)</u> sakle. (HC)

c. Nou <u>fini</u> sarclé. (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802: 376)

The data in (31)–(36) only begin to illustrate semantic, distributional, and phonological correspondences between Fr verbal periphrases and their grammaticalized counterparts in HC (for a much more detailed comparison, see Fattier 1998: 864–888). As is typical of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Meillet 1912), these HC preverbal markers generally have more reduced phonology than their Fr counterparts, and they have their own specialized distribution and semantics, some of which is unsurprisingly influenced by the substrate languages (cf. Sylvain 1936). Let's flesh this out a bit.

The parallels in (31)–(32) suggest that etyma of HC *te* 'ANTERIOR' include two sorts of inflected forms for Fr *être* 'be': (i) the singular-imparfait *étais/était* and (ii) the past participle *été*. In (33), HC *ap(e)* 'PROGRESSIVE/FUTURE' is from the Fr preposition *après* 'after'. The Fr preposition *après* enters the periphrastic template *être après (à/de) V$_{-fin}$* with V$_{-fin}$ an infinitival verb. This . . . *après* . . . periphrase expresses the same sort of progressive that is now expressed by Modern French *être en train de V$_{-fin}$*. In his Early Creole manual, Ducœurjoly's (1802: 307) reports *ly té après couyé café* 'he was picking coffee' (lit.: '3sg ANT PROG pick coffee') alongside the eighteenth-century Standard French translation *il ceuilloit du café*; contrast with modern HC *li te ap keyi kafe*. In Modern HC, unlike in its eighteenth- or nineteenth-century ancestor that is reported in the available texts, the preposition *apre* 'after' is not homophonous with the TMA marker for PROGRESSIVE/FUTURE *ap(e)*. Judging from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century written samples,[36] it can be concluded that, over the years, grammaticalization has reduced the phonetic and lexical heft of the erstwhile preposition; thus, *après > ap(e)*; this reduction eventually led to a syntactic-category change from prepositional to TMA-marker (i.e., from lexical, or quasi functional, to fully functional). In turn, this categorical reanalysis would lead to a pruning of structure and to higher attachment in the tree, as in the cases of grammaticalization considered in, for example, Roberts (1999).

Similar paths of reanalysis cum grammaticalization can be sketched for HC *pou, ava, fini*, and others. HC *pou* 'DEONTIC' (as in (34b)) is from the Fr prep-

osition *pour* 'for', which enters the periphrastic template *être pour* V$_{-fin}$ expressing futurity, likelihood, and obligation (Fattier 1998: 872). HC *ava* 'IRREALIS' (as in (35b)), along with its variants *a / av / va*, is from Fr *va(s)*, present singular forms of the verb *aller* 'to go' (cf. HC *al(e)* 'to go'). The Fr periphrastic template *aller* V$_{-fin}$ expresses certain kinds of future (cf. English *to be going to*.) Reanalysis cum grammaticalization has also produced the HC future marker *(a)pral(e)* 'to be going to' via the "pruning" of the seventeenth-century French verbal periphrase *après (de/à) aller*.

Thus far, this is a simplistic distillation of a complex set of correspondences. Similar patterns are found, by and large, in the eighteenth-to nineteenth-century Early Creole samples that I consulted for this essay (see note 36). More extensive etymologies for these and other HC preverbal markers are discussed in Fattier 1998: 864–888.[37] A relatively straightforward case can be made that the syntax of the HC extended VP emerged via parameter resetting (from V-to-I to V-in-situ) in tandem with the reanalysis cum grammaticalization of French verbal periphrases.

One other reanalysis case vividly supports such a scenario: the evolution of the HC sentential negation marker *pa* from Fr *n'a(s) pas* (*NEG HAVE-Auxiliary NEG*) via Early HC / *napa* / (DeGraff 1993: 90). The negative marker in the nineteenth-century Creoles of Réunion and Mauritius in the Indian Ocean is also /*napa*/ (Chaudenson 1992: 166 n52, Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001: 193 n20). The following reanalysis path can be hypothesized, skipping some intermediate stages: Fr *n'a(s) pas* / *n'es (t) pas* > Early Creole (*na*) *pa* > Modern Creole *pa*, with HC *pa* now the head Neg⁰ of NegP, while Fr *pas* is in Spec(NegP) (see DeGraff (1993):

(37) a. Il   n'a pas   parlé. (Fr)
         3sg+masc   NEG+has NEG   spoken
         'He has not spoken.'

      b. Li   napa   pale. (Hypothetical Early 'HC')
         3sg   NEG   spoken
         'He/She has not spoken.'

      c. Li   pa   pale. (Modern HC)
         3sg   NEG   spoken
         'He/She has not spoken.'

(38) a. Tout   être   qui   peut   parler   n'est pas   un   cheval. (Fr)
         all   being   that   can   speak   is not   a   horse
         'Any being that can speak is not a horse.'

b. Monde qui   konn   parler n'a pas
   person who knows speak   NEG
   chouval . . . (Early HC c. 1796)
   horse (from an official proclamation; Denis 1935: 347)

c. Moun ki konn pale pa chwal. (Modern HC)

In the mentalist approach adopted here vis-à-vis the mechanisms responsible for both creolization and language change, the ultimate locus of reanalysis (of, e.g., *n'a(s)* and *n'est pas* into *napa / nepa* then *pa*) is the language learner. As it turns out, adult learners of French from diverse L1s (e.g., Arabic and Spanish) also reanalyze *n'a(s) pas* and *n'est pas* as monomorphemic sentential negation markers / *napa* / and / *nepa* / in their early interlanguages. Abdelmalek, a Moroccan learner of French, produced / *Mwa napa kone* /.[38] Compare with HC *Mwen pa konnen* and the French *moi, je* (*ne*) *connais pas*. Abdelmalek also produces *Les français nepa kone l'espagnol* instead of the targetlike *Les français* (*ne*) *connaissent pas l'espagnol* 'The French don't now Spanish' (also notice the invariant verb form / *kone* /) (Véronique 2000: 307). Other sentential negation markers in Abdelmalek's interlanguage include *ne . . . pas, non, pas*, etc. (idem). We also find / *nepa* / as one of the sentential negation markers in the early interlanguages of Hispanophone learners, as in / *nepa puve* / instead of (*ne*) *pouvait pas* 'could not'.[39]

Keeping acquisition-based reanalysis in mind, there is another hypothetical, and possibly convergent, scenario for the evolution of HC *pa*. Ducœurjoly's (1802) Creole manual, whose Creole utterances are etymologically transcribed, explicitly notes the Early Creole use of / *napa* / in negative imperatives (e.g., on pp. 292, 325, 332, and 393) alongside the use of *pa* in negative declaratives with verbal predicates (e.g., on pp. 287, 290, 305, and 392). Fattier (1998: 882f.) proposes a reanalysis path whereby *napa* derives historically from the reanalysis of yet another type of verbal periphrase—namely, the singular negative imperative with *aller: ne va pas* V_{-fin} 'Don't go V_{-fin}' as in *Ne va pas croire que . . .* 'Don't go believe that. . . . ' In Fattier's words: "The French colonists would use, it seems, this 'future associated with the imperative' to express prohibition" (p. 883; my translation). Fattier considers that this usage may have been widespread in the colonial French varieties spoken in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, as she notes parallel constraints on the use of *pa* across (the diachrony of) the Creoles of Haiti and Réunion.[40] We can thus posit the etymon *ne va pas* for the Early HC negative marker *napa* in imperatives, which, in turn, seeded *pa* in modern HC: that is, Fr *ne va pas* > Early HC *napa* (in negative imperatives) > Modern HC *pa*. Fattier (1998: 883) also mentions, as one other possible etymon for *napa*, the negative subjunctive of *aller* 'to go'—namely, *n'ailles pas*—which she rejects in favor of the Fr *ne va pas* V_{-fin} periphrase.

With respect to verb placement, contrast the colloquial *Ne va pas tarder dav-*

antage 'Don't go delay any further', where the main verb is in the infinite and stays to the right of *pas*, with Standard French *Ne tarde pas davantage*, where the main verb is finite and undergoes V-to-I to the left of *pas*. Now compare both kinds of imperatives with their Early Creole equivalent (e.g., in (39a)) where the verb is invariant and in situ. The reanalysis of Fr *ne va pas*, in the *ne va pas V₋fin* periphrase, into Early Creole *napa*, then into Modern HC *pa*, instantiates yet another developmental path both toward V-in-situ in Modern HC (e.g., *pa tade* 'don't delay' vs. **tade pa*) and toward the phonological shape of the HC verb, with the /e/ ending (in, e.g., *tade*) identical to that of French first-conjugation infinitivals (in, e.g., *tarder*).

It is worth noting that, in Ducœurjoly (1802), both imperative /napa/, as in (39a), and declarative /pa/ with verbal predicates, as in (39c), can coexist in a single text—namely, in the "classic" eighteenth-century Creole chanson *Lisette quitté la plaine* on p. 392f.[41] There we also find /napa/ with nonverbal predicates, as in (39b), a construction where French would use *n'est pas*: contrast *na pas* in (39b) with *n'est pas* in Fr *Le manger n'est pas doux*. Denis (1935: 347 n21) explicitly notes the *n'est pas > n'a pas* connection, noting that this substitution, as illustrated in (38b) and (39b), is already "populaire" in Normandie and elsewhere:

(39)   a. <u>N'a pas</u>   tardé   davantage.
          NEG   delay   anymore

       'Do not delay any further.' (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802: 392f)

       b. Mangé   <u>na pas</u>   dou.
          Food   NEG   sweet

       'Food is not sweet.'

       c. Mo   <u>pa</u>   mire   toué.
          1sg   NEG   look   2sg

       'I don't see you.'

As for the *Lisette* song, its lyric is presumably all from the same Creole idiolect. Moreau de Saint-Méry (1958: 81 [1797]) attributes it to a certain Duvivier de la Mahautière and dates it to circa 1760.[42] The coexistence in this eighteenth-century Creole idiolect of / pa / and / napa /, as illustrated in (39), seems a signpost in the reanalysis-cum-grammaticalization path of Fr *ne va pas, n'a pas*, and *n'est pas* into Early HC (*na)pa*, then into modern HC *pa*. It is thus possible that the negative markers in eighteenth-century Creole are related to at least three distinct reanalysis paths: (i) negative imperative /napa /, as in (39a), is from Fr *ne va pas*, as suggested in Fattier (1998: 882f.); (ii) negative declarative / napa / with non-verbal predicates, as in (38b) and (39b), is from French *n'est pas*, perhaps via an earlier Creole form / nepa / or directly from the dialectal (Norman?) French variant *n'a pas* (for *n'est pas*), which is noted in Denis (1935: 247 n21); (iii) de-

clarative / *pa* /, as in (39c) is from Fr *n'a(s) pas*, perhaps via an earlier Creole form *napa*. In modern HC, the negative markers in (i)–(iii) have all "converged" to a uniform realization of clausal negation as the shorter form *pa*. The longer form *napa*, in imperatives and in nonverbal predication, has undergone the sort of phonetic reduction that is typical of grammaticalization, perhaps concomitantly with changes in categorial status (i.e., reanalysis). (DeGraff 1993 speculates on the transition of clausal negation from Spec(NegP) to Neg^0 in the course of HC genesis; cf. Jespersen's famous "cycle".)[43]

The correspondences in (37)–(39) lend further credence to a scenario in which Fr verbal periphrases like those in (31)–(36) triggered the formation of the HC-extended VP system, via language learners' reanalysis of target strings that are delimited to the right by the thematically main predicate and to the left by the subject in Spec(IP), which is either covert in imperatives or overt in declaratives. (See Fattier 1998: 864–888 and Howe 2000 for larger empirical samples and for more extensive discussions of the combinatorial and interpretive properties of TMA markers in HC.)

This hypothesis is buttressed by a comparison of the inflectional morphology of first-conjugation verbs in Fr periphrases and the default verb marker in HC. As attested in various examples in (31)–(39), main verbs in Fr verbal periphrases are either in the infinitive or in the past participle. It is important to note that most Fr verbs, and generally all new verbs (e.g., borrowings from English), enter the language through the first conjugation, whose infinitives and past participles are marked with the verbal suffixes *-er* and *-é(e)*, respectively, both of which are pronounced /e/.

I have already noted the key role of imperative constructions in the structuring and restructuring of HC's VP-related syntax; see (39) and surrounding comments (later we return to other cases that involve the restructuring of imperative patterns; see note 56). I have also noted that L2 learners of French often substitute infinitival-like invariant forms, most of which end in /e/, for finite forms (Prévost and White 2000: 125–130). It is thus no surprise that the HC verbal marker par excellence is the etymologically related suffix *-e*, which in Fr is found not only in the infinitive (e.g., *chanter* 'to sing') but also in the participle (e.g., *chanté(e)* 'sung(+FEM)') and the second-plural present indicative and imperative (e.g., *chantez*). Although not all HC verbs end with the verbal marker *-e*, the latter is the sole overt productive verbal marker in HC, as in the English-based neologisms *klipse* 'to clip', *ploge* 'to plug,' and *tepe* 'to tape' (see note 7). This, too, alongside the parallels and reanalysis paths previously discussed, indicates that the proto-typical etyma for HC verbs include Fr infinitives, past participles and the second-plural of the indicative present and of the imperative, all from the first conjugation (cf. Denis 1935: 435 n4). That this is so seems a straightforward consequence of, inter alia, the sort of L2A tendencies studied in, for instance, Prévost and White (2000).

These recurrent parallels suggest that the distributions and environments of the nonfinite verbal forms both in Fr and in interlanguages with Fr targets provided the creator of early HC with an important class of triggers for the creation of HC's verbal morphosyntax—in particular, the formation of its verbal morphology and its verb-placement syntax. As documented, phonetic and structural pruning characterizes the diachrony of each TMA marker in HC. In some cases, this pruning is associated with an elimination of head-to-head movement and with base-generation higher in the clause: whereas some of the French etyma of HC's TMA markers are lexical heads that in some cases undergo V-to-I, their HC descendants are invariably generated as functional heads high up in the INFL domain, thus obviating head-to-head dependencies (cf. Roberts 1999). Fr verbal periphrases and the reanalysis and grammaticalization thereof—perhaps in tandem with the fossilization of inflection that is independently known to occur in L2A—would have thus conspired to induce the loss of V-to-I in HC grammar. The erosion of inflection would have weakened the morphological triggers for the V-to-I setting, whereas the (presumed) preponderance of verbal periphrasis over synthetic forms would have weakened the word-order triggers for that setting—thus the "conspiracy" toward the emergence of a uniform V-in-situ setting alongside the grammaticalization of key items in certain Fr verbal periphrases (e.g., *étais / était, été, après, pour, va*, and *ne va pas, n'a(s) pas, n'es(t) pas*). (See section 7.1 for additional learnability-related comments.)

At any rate, the systematic correspondences sketched here are quite unlike what one might expect from a "radical break in transmission." And they also disconfirm Lefebvre's (1998: 16f, 39f, etc.) relexification-based claims that the French contribution to HC genesis was limited strictly to phonetic strings "deprived of [abstract, e.g., syntactic and semantic] features" and to major-category word order (see also Adam 1883; cf. sections 2.2, 2.3, 3.3 earlier). These correspondences suggest that, in creating their NEG + TMA system and much else in their lexicon and grammar, the creators of HC not only had to segment and reinterpret French phonetic shapes but also reanalyzed and grammaticalized certain French configurations.

The reanalysis of Fr verbal periphrases into the HC-extended VP system may have also been favored by substratal features, via L2A by Kwa-speaking adults. Recall from section 3 that Fongbè verbs (like HC verbs) are not morphologically inflected for TMA or agreement and that Fongbè TMA markers are, like in HC, nonaffixal morphemes in preverbal position (Avolonto 1992), except for the postverbal completive markers (see, e.g., da Cruz 1995).

This said, it must be noted that Aboh (1999 and chapter 4 in this volume), with respect to a variety of Gbe dialects, argues for (i) V-to-I; (ii) verbal inflection (e.g., aspectual suffixation and morphosyntactically conditioned reduplication); (iii) Object Shift (with Object-Verb order); and (iv) pronominal case morphology. These four morphosyntactic properties, like many others (e.g., postverbal com-

pletive markers; da Cruz 1995), have no counterpart in HC (see section 3.3), which suggests that HC and Fongbè differ vis-à-vis the formal specifications of their respective functional heads in the relevant domains, pace the relexificationist claims in Lefebvre (1998). Moreover, some of the Object Shift patterns, in Gbe and in Kwa more generally, are related to specific TMA configurations, and this is well documented in the Africanist literature (see, e.g., Déchaine and Manfredi 1997; Aboh 1999 and chapter 4 in this volume, and references therein; see also note 10). It thus seems unlikely that it is *specifically* the Gbe substratum that was crucial to the emergence in HC of preverbal TMA morphemes alongside verb and object both in-situ. Robust morphosyntactic discrepancies between HC and its substratum remain unaccounted for in Creole-genesis theories based on strict relexification (à la Adam 1883 and Lefebvre 1998); see DeGraff (2002b, 2002c).

Furthermore, HC-like extended TMA systems—with preverbal markers originating from the reanalysis of Fr verbal periphrases—exist in non-Creole French varieties and in non-Caribbean Creoles, including Indian Ocean Creoles (see references in note 37). The linguistic ecology in the formative period of these varieties was quite different from that of HC. In particular, the Indian Ocean Creoles had a much lesser, if any, Kwa input than HC, and it appears unreasonable to claim Kwa influence whenever "Creole-like" preverbal TMA markers are used in regional Fr varieties such as Québec French in (34a) (also see examples from Cajun French and Missouri French in (43)).

Regarding Mauritian Creole (MC), Baissac (1880: 24) calls the MC utterance *Mo va allé* 'I will go' a "pure calque" from Fr (cf. (35)). Also compare MC *Li va vini* 'He will come' with Fr *Il va venir*; cf. Baissac (1880: 80).[44] Brunot (1966 8: 1137 n3) also notes that "[i]n [MC], it's obvious that the periphrastic system of popular and vernacular French . . . has essentially been analyzed, assimilated and utilized."

Regarding non-Creole French varieties, it has been shown that some of the HC preverbal markers find contemporary counterparts in regional dialects of vernacular French—dialects that obviously did not emerge through the sort of pidginization or relexification invoked in, respectively, Bickerton's and Lefebvre's Creole-genesis scenarios (for relevant data and observations, see, e.g., Sylvain 1936: 79–105, 136–139; Chaudenson 1974: 684, 840, 1992: 162–167; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001: 154–163, 178–182; Chaudenson, et al. (1993: 81–97), Fattier (1998: 863–888); see also note 37, the examples in (43), and the surrounding comments).

One last comparative note on the evolution of "Creole-like" TMA systems in non-Creole languages: Roberts (1999: 317) contemplates "creolization-like" reanalysis in the history of the English auxiliary system. As a closed class of functional heads with restricted distribution and specialized semantics, Modern English modals have emerged from the reanalysis of a subset of erstwhile main (i.e., lexical/thematic) verbs with full θ-marking capacities. More generally, reanalysis and grammaticalization have been extensively documented in the formation of TMA

systems across genetic families (see, e.g., Bybee, et al., 1994). Pending solid evidence that the creators of Creole languages constitute a cognitively exceptional subspecies of *Homo sapiens*, our ongoing observations suggest a Uniformitarian scenario for Creole genesis, one that seriously considers parameter-(re)setting in language acquisition, alongside substrate-influenced reanalysis and grammaticalization of superstrate patterns, as crucial factors in the emergence of HC's extended VP (see DeGraff 1999b, 1999d; Roberts 1999; Lightfoot 1999; Mufwene 2002 for related arguments).

6.3 Object-Pronoun Morphosyntax beyond "Creolization"

The object-placement "discrepancies" that differentiate HC from Fr in sections 3 and 5 find analogs outside of "creolization" proper. Let's look, say, at the morphology and placement of object nouns and pronouns through English diachrony.[45]

I take as empirical starting point van Kemenade's (1987) data and observations on English diachrony. She shows that, throughout Old English (OE) and, to a lesser degree, during the early stages of Middle English (ME) until the mid-1300s, object and subject pronouns cliticized leftward in various positions throughout the clause, as far up as COMP.[46] Consider the following data from van Kemenade (1987) and focus on the underlined object pronouns:

(40) a. Fela   spella   him   sœdon   þa   Beormans, . . . (OE)
          many   stories   him   told   the   Permians
          'The Permians told him many stories.' (van Kemenade 1987: 130)

      b. þa   sticode   him   mon   þa   eagan   ut. (OE)
          then   stuck   him   someone   the   eyes   out
          'Then his eyes were gouged out.' (van Kemenade 1987: 130)

      c. . . .þet   he   him   ʒeaue   uyftene   ponds   of
              that   he   him   gave   fifteen   pounds   in
          gold. (ME, c. 1340)
          gold
          ' . . . that he would give him fifteen pounds in gold.' (van Kemenade 1987: 195)

A few preliminaries are in order before discussing the position of object pronouns in (40). OE is controversially considered to be a verb-second (V2) language, *somewhat* on a par with contemporary Germanic languages, with the exception of Modern English (NE). One current controversy concerns the exact nature of

V2 in OE. The following question summarizes, and oversimplifies, the debate: Is OE "asymmetrically" V2 like German and Dutch—with V2 in COMP and with the sentence-initial constituent in Spec(CP) whenever COMP is not lexicalized (e.g., in main clauses)—or is OE "symmetrically" V2 like Icelandic and Yiddish, with V2 in INFL and with the sentence-initial constituent in Spec(IP), which makes V2 applicable, with certain exceptions, in both root and embedded contexts?

Van Kemenade (1987, 1997) takes OE to have the underlying order Subject–Object–Verb (SOV) with V2 in COMP, not in INFL. However, German and Dutch do not allow the "verb-third" (V3) patterns in (40a). This can perhaps be accounted by the absence in German and Dutch of OE-type pronominal clitics adjoining to the left of V in COMP (but see van Kemenade 1987: 52, 126–141 for a rapprochement between OE, German, and Dutch clitics). Alternately, V3 orders in OE, as in (40a), have been taken to result from movement of some XP into Spec(CP) in sentence-initial position, followed by the clitic left-adjoined to IP and the verb in medial INFL (i.e., in "third" position); see Kroch and Taylor 1997: 305f.[47]

One last, but surely not least, bit of background: According to van Kemenade, two major changes occurred in the transition to late ME: English went from SOV to SVO by 1200 (and presumably from head-final IP to head-medial IP), and V2 was "lost" by 1400 (but see note 52). Van Kemenade connects these two changes—SOV-to-SVO and loss of V2—to radical reductions in nominal and verbal inflections, respectively.

Going back to the OE object clitics in (40), two of them (in (40a) and (40c)) surface to the left of their θ-marking verbs. The pattern in (40a) might not surprise us given OE's widespread SOV order, whether it be base-generated (à la van Kemenade) or derived from an underling Kaynian SVO order (à la Roberts 1997). But note that (40b) has the object clitic to the left of the subject *mon* and that (40c) is from circa 1340; at that time, ME—or, perhaps more accurately, most ME idiolects—had already switched from OV to VO.[48] Thus, as van Kemenade argues, the data in (40) suggest that OE and Early ME had a rule that, under certain conditions, forces the verb's complement to be pronounced outside of VP, to the left of the verb. A somewhat similar rule exists in Fr (see, e.g., (41)), but not in NE or HC. A direct comparison of (40a) and (40c) with (41) accentuates the parallels between English and HC diachrony and advances our agenda against Creole Exceptionalism: OE, Early ME, and Fr manifest preverbal object clitics, whereas both NE and HC lack such clitics:[49]

(41) a. Quelles histoires <u>lui</u>   raconteront ils? (Fr)
         what   stories   3sg-DAT tell   3pl
      'What stories will they tell him/her?'

b. Il   lui   donna   quinze   livres   d'or.
   he   3sg-DAT   gave   fifteen   pounds   of gold

'He gave him/her fifteen pounds of gold.'

As amply documented by van Kemenade (1987), cliticization started disappearing in English around the time when morphological case marking on OE nouns was also disappearing. Van Kemenade (1987: 101) gives the following example of nominal case markings, on *stan* 'stone' (similar markings are found on pronouns):

(42)   **Nominal declension of *stan***
                              'stone' in OE

	Sg	Pl
NOM	stan	stan<u>as</u>
ACC	stan	stan<u>as</u>
GEN	stan<u>es</u>	stan<u>a</u>
DAT	stan<u>e</u>	stan<u>um</u>

From van Kemenade 1987: 101.

It is estimated that by 1200 a substantial reduction in morphological case paradigms had taken place. In van Kemenade's analysis, this reduction in morphological case directly led to the demise of cliticization: "Clitics are in a sense case affixes and thus are dependent on the presence of inflectional morphology. Accordingly, when inflectional morphology was lost, case affixing was lost" (p. 204).

Van Kemenade (1987: 188–205) further notices that among the various sites where cliticization was lost, C^0 was the last stronghold. The presence of (object) clitics hosted by V in C^0, as in (40a), outlasted IP-internal cliticization, as in (40c) where V remains in IP.[50] She surmises that, unlike IP-internal cliticization which is directly connected with *nominal* case morphology, the (late) C^0-cliticization patterns are connected to V2 effects and to *verbal* morphology; both V2 and a (somewhat) 'rich' system of verbal inflections survived until 1400, along with C^0 clitics (pp. 188–205), whereas (most) IP-internal cliticization and 'rich' nominal case inflections disappeared by 1200. Thus, in addition to morphological case on NPs, cliticization in English diachrony would also be associated to properties of verbal inflections and to V-movement (in this case, V-to-C movement and V2).[51]

Roberts (1997) tentatively couches some of van Kemenade's observations (on the correlation between cliticization and overt case morphology) within "classic" Minimalist assumptions (as in Chomsky 1993). He takes OE object cliticization to be driven by some "strong" features in the INFL layers dominating VP. These strong features are morphologically diagnosed by OE's case declensions (see (42)).

These strong inflectional features are "affixal" in some abstract way, somewhat on a par with the overt affixal heads that trigger V-to-I in Fr and in OE/ME. Thus, "strong" or "affixal" inflectional features of verbs and of nouns, as manifested by "rich" verbal inflections and "rich" nominal case morphology, correlate with the possibility of overt leftward movement out of VP of both V and its object (if any). The loss of preverbal object clitics, in Roberts's (as in van Kemenade's) account is connected to the massive weakening of nominal case morphology in ME: the INFL head that formerly attracted objects from within VP became "weak" or non-"affixal" and stopped driving object movement[52] (see Roberts 1997 for details and Thráinsson 2001 for a critique).

Roberts's and van Kemenade's accounts of the morphology–syntax interface in English diachrony are not without theoretical and empirical problems.[53] But what matters most here is the attractive, if controversial, speculation that the collapse of OE's morphological case system was a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for the subsequent loss of cliticization. This is similar in spirit to the hypothesis that the loss of rich verbal inflection is a precondition for the loss of verb movement.[54]

In Roberts's (1997) scenario, in situ settings have a learnability edge over settings that force movement (see, e.g., p. 421). When a parameter has both a movement option and an in situ option, the latter is taken as the default setting for reasons of economy: "The simplest representation compatible with the input is chosen, where representations lacking overt movement are defined as simpler than those featuring movement dependencies" (this is in keeping with Minimalist conceptual desiderata). *Ceteris paribus,* any reduction in morphological triggers for the movement setting makes it more likely that the language acquirers will adopt the nonmovement alternative. (See Roberts 1999 for learnability considerations and for their relevance to Creole patterns, including V-in-situ and unmoved object pronouns; see also section 7.1.)

The diachronic similarities vis-à-vis morphology and word-order in VP's extended projections in creolization and in language change weaken any empirical basis for Creole Exceptionalism, with its alleged nongenetic "discrepancies." In the history of both HC and Germanic, we have somewhat congruent word-order and morphological changes in VP's extended projections.

6.4 Reanalysis in the Emergence of HC's Object Placement

On a par with the Haitian TMA markers surveyed in section 6.2, the morpho-syntax of HC objects was not created ab-ovo from some hypothetical radically impoverished pidgin.[55]

To begin, HC has not incorporated any restructured forms from the Fr *clitic*

and *atonic* system: HC pronouns (e.g., those in (5)) are all derived from Fr *non-clitic* and *tonic* pronouns; for example, HC *mwen* '1sg' from Fr *moi*, HC *li* '3sg' from Fr *lui*, HC *yo* '3pl' from Fr *eux* (cf. the Gascony and Auvergne variant *yo* discussed in Sylvain 1936: 36), and HC *nou* '1pl, 2pl' and *ou* '2sg' can be argued to etymologically derive from the nonclitic uses of Fr *nous* and *vous*. As recently argued by Fattier (1995), the relevant regional French vernaculars may have readily provided the Creole creator with at least the basic patterns to be reanalyzed toward the pronominal system of Early HC. Let's elaborate.

It has long been argued (see, e.g., Meillet 1958 [1920]; Brunot and Bruneau 1949) that the Fr clitic pronouns are better analyzed as subject- and object-agreement markers—or as inflectional heads in modern parlance (see, e.g., Sportiche 1995). For Meillet (1958: 177–178 [1920]), Fr subject clitics such as *je, tu,* and *il* should be analyzed as "grammatical markers of person inflection." Meillet adduces the use of (presumably nontopicalized) nonclitic subjects followed by subject clitics—as in *Moi, je dis* 'Me, I say' and *La vache, elle mange* 'The cow, she eats'—as evidence that the subject clitics are really marks of "verbal inflection" that are part of the verbal forms. In the same vein, Brunot and Bruneau (1969: 225 [1949]) write:

> Very early on . . . *moi, toi, lui, eux* (which had "more body") replaced . . . *je, tu, il, ils* (which were pronounced *j, t, i, i*). As early as the end of the thirteenth century . . . *moi* can serve as subject of the verb. . . . As a logical conclusion of this evolution, the former pronouns *je, tu, il*, etc., have become "person markers" and become an integral part of the verbal forms. (my translation)

Thus, Brunot and Bruneau distinguish the pronouns *moi, toi, lui*, and so on from the "prefixes" *je, tu, il*, and so on. In contemporary terms, the former would be subjects in Spec(IP), whereas the latter would function as affixal agreement markers, associated with some functional heads above VP, and thus their cooccurrence ("double-marking") in preverbal position, as in *Moi j(e) . . . , Toi t(u) . . . , Lui, i(l) . . .*, et cetera.

More recently, Chaudenson (1992: 157–162); Chaudenson et al. (1993: 103–107), and Chaudenson and Mufwene (2001: 172–176) have noted related facts in regional varieties of French, such as Cajun French, Louisiana French, and Missouri French. Chaudenson et al. note that, in these regional varieties, object clitics in Standard French (*me, te, le, la, les*, etc.), along with (other) verbal inflections, are "instable," "phonetically fragile," and "disappearing" as a result of "self-regulating processes" (104–106, 120). Chaudenson et al. (1993: 105) give the following examples in (43), to be contrasted with their Standard French counterparts in (44) (focus on the underlined object pronouns):

(43) a. I   v'nont   voir   <u>moi</u>. (Cajun French)
          3pl   FUT+3pl   see   1sg
          'They will see me.'

b. J'   vas   mettre <u>toué</u> tout en
   1sg+NOM FUT   put   2sg   all   in
   blanc. (Missouri French)
   white

   "I will dress you all in white."

c. M'   as   enterrer <u>elle</u>   dans les
   1sg   FUT   bury   3sg+fem in   the+PL
   feuilles. (Missouri French)
   leaves

   "I will bury her in the leaves."

(44) a. Ils <u>me</u>   verront. (Standard French)
         3pl 1sg+ACC   see+FUT+3pl

      b. Je   <u>te</u>   mettrai   tout en blanc.
         1sg+NOM 2sg+ACC put+FUT+1sg all   in white

      c. Je   <u>l'</u>   enterrerai   dans les   feuilles.
         1sg+NOM 3sg+ACC bury+FUT+1sg in   the+PLleaves

In (43), Cajun French and Missouri French, like HC, exhibit postverbal object pronouns such as *moi, toué,* and *elle* (cf. HC *mwen, ou,* and *li*) in contexts where Standard French requires preverbal object clitics (cf. *me, te,* and *l'* in (44)). Also note the periphrastic future marking in (43c), which is phonetically, structurally, and semantically similar to its HC analog: *M a antere li* 'I will bury him/her/it'. Baissac (1880), Brunot (1966), Chaudenson (1992), Chaudenson et al. (1993), Chaudenson and Mufwene (2001), and Fattier (1998) observe similar periphrastic-future patterns across an array of French-lexicon Creoles and regional varieties of vernacular French, including Québecois (see section 6.1–6.2 and the references in notes 37 and 44). Here, we have "creole-like" restructuring of French morpho-syntax, sans "creolization" (*and* sans relexification; cf. note 57).

The diachrony of pronouns in these regional varieties of French and in French-lexicon Creoles—in some, though not all, respects—is similar to what has occurred in English diachrony, where preverbal object clitics have given way to postverbal counterparts. It is also quite possible that the French varieties that were fed into the genesis of HC were more like Cajun French and Missouri French than Standard French vis-à-vis cliticization possibilities; this would be in line with the previous comments by Meillet (1958 [1920]) and Brunot and Bruneau (1969 [1949]) about popular vernacular varieties (see also note 32, in particular Frei's and Gadet's comments to the effect that popular French uses more postverbal tonic object pronouns than Standard French).

It can also be argued that the preference for tonic pronouns may make sense

from a processing or acquisition perspective: Fr tonic object pronouns, unlike their Fr atonic counterparts, are uniformly postverbal and obey the canonical placement rule of full-NP objects—this is very much like the system of HC (atonic) object pronouns. By overgeneralizing the use of Fr tonic pronouns, early learners sidestep the extra complications of preverbal object cliticization, which in any case applies to inflectionallike phonologically and semantically weak elements—namely, the atonic clitics (cf. Fattier 1995: 140–142). The latter belongs to what, in the early stages of L2A, seems to constitute a "brittle" morphological component of the target language (see note 32). Moreover, Fr tonic pronouns are often phonologically and semantically stressed; they are thus made more salient. To wit: MOI, *j'l'ai vu*, LUI, *pas* ELLE 'I myself, I have seen HIM, not HER'.

At any rate, van Kemenade's (1987: 204) generalization—about the loss of OE clitics—can be adapted to fit the emergence of object-placement patterns in HC, Cajun French, and Missouri French: "[Syntactic] clitics are in a sense case affixes and thus are dependent on the presence of inflectional morphology. Accordingly, when inflectional morphology [is] lost, case affixing [is also] lost." Let's suppose that the ancestors of NE, HC, Cajun French, and Missouri French all had robust preverbal clitics. In turn, it can be speculated that their descendants all witnessed a reduction in inflectional paradigms alongside a reduction in cliticization possibilities: object clitics, or some subset thereof, got lost along with other "inflectional" markings on the verb. This is the sort of inflectional erosion that seems typical of language change (via L2A in contact situations), as pointed out by Meillet (1958 [1919]) and Weinreich (1968 [1953]) among many others, and as experimentally confirmed in recent theoretical L2A studies such as Klein and Perdue (1992), Perdue (1995), Lardiere (2000), Prévost and White (2000), and Ionin and Wexler (2002).

More generally, the link noted by van Kemenade between inflectional erosion and loss of cliticization can also be captured in Sportiche's (1995) more recent approach, which "treats [Romance pronominal] clitics as complex agreement morphemes" that head "clitic voices" in the extended projection of the VP (pp. 237, 265, but see 270 n18): in such an approach, the loss of cliticization in HC and its congeners naturally becomes part of the larger loss of agreement morphology—a recurrent phenomenon in the early interlanguages created by L2 learners.[56]

Yet another potential influence toward uniform V-Obj order in HC can be found in the Gbe substratum as the native languages of some of the L2 learners that were exposed to regional French varieties in colonial Haiti. Given the demographics and sociolinguistics of the colony, some of these French varieties would have been nonnative or, in Chaudenson's (1992) term, "approximations of approximations" (i.e., recursive approximations). As for the Gbe languages, they are canonically SVO, with both pronominal and nonnominal objects, once we abstract away from the complex verbal constructions with OV order (see section

3.3). Furthermore, Gbe *atonic* pronominal objects are postverbal, even in the contexts where full NP objects and tonic pronouns shift to a preverbal position (see Aboh, chapter 4 in this volume); such postverbal atonic pronouns are, in their surface distribution, on a par with HC pronominal objects and in contradistinction with their Fr analogs, independently of how pronominal enclisis should be analyzed in these languages. In any case, current results in acquisition research make it quite likely that VO patterns in the substratum would have favored the adoption by L2A learners of congruent VO patterns into the incipient Creole. Similar "substratum" effects (e.g., influence from English in North America) may have contributed to the postverbal pronoun patterns in (43).[57]

7 "Creole Genesis" versus "Language Change": A Mythical Dualism?

7.1 Recapitulation: Creolization, Language Change, and Language Acquisition

Robust VP-related differences between HC and its source languages have been argued to depend on prior erosion of inflectional morphology in the emergence of HC. This scenario makes the emergence of V-in-situ in HC syntax quite similar to its analog in English diachrony (see section 6.1; see also Roberts 1999 and Lightfoot 1999). In turn, HC's lack of preverbal objects can be taken as a corollary of its V-in-situ setting, assuming some implementation of Holmberg's Generalization (see Bobaljik 2002 for one recent proposal). Object-in-situ patterns in HC have analogs in Modern English (NE) and in a subset of Scandinavian languages: these patterns conform to a constraint that is presumably rooted in UG (see section 5). In this account, the reason why the syntax of HC objects differs so robustly from that of its major source languages is rather straightforward: Holmberg's Generalization, to the extent that it applies to the placement of object pronouns, predicts that object cliticization, as an instance of Object Shift to the left of the verb, could not (stably) exist in HC in the absence of V-to-I.[58]

The VP-related divergences between HC and its source languages have recurrent analogs in language acquisition and in language change (section 6). Such congruences suggest that key aspects of Creole genesis can be apprehended by an investigation of the same UG principles that are known to constrain paths of parameter setting (or resetting) in developmental patterns arising outside of "creolization."

Let's also recapitulate our learnability-theoretic speculations vis-à-vis this sce-
nario. It is second-language acquisition (L2A) under duress that, in the develop-
ment of HC, led to the eventual reduction of inflectional paradigms and thus to
the loss through L2A of one class of potential triggers for V-to-I in Creole genesis.
The relative salience-cum-transparency of the Fr verbal periphrases, as compared
with their synthetic counterparts, may have further biased the language learner
toward the V-in-situ setting. If verbal periphrases are, for one reason or another
(e.g., salience and transparency), preferred over their synthetic counterparts in
popular and second-language varieties of French, then the net effect is a propor-
tional reduction of unambiguous V-to-I syntactic triggers (e.g., instances of verb
negation—V_{+fin} *pas*—order with thematic verbs) in the Primary Linguistic Data
(PLD) of incoming learners, including the locally born (i.e., Creole) children that
created the first native varieties of proto-HC—the first proto-HC I-languages (see
the sociohistorical sketch in section 2.1). The main verb in Fr verbal periphrases
is in the infinitive or the past participle and always to the right of sentential
negation. Thus, every use of a negated clause with a verbal periphrasis instead of
its synthetic counterpart entails that the learner is exposed to one less utterance
that robustly "expresses" the V-to-I setting with a lexical thematic verb. (See
Roberts 1999: 293f. and Lightfoot 1999: 438–441 on the structural and frequency
factors that affect the reliability of the PLD with respect to the "expression" of
the V-to-I setting.)

In the context of HC's development, the conspiracy between fossilization of
inflection in L2A and the processing benefits of verbal periphrases in either lan-
guage use or language acquisition may thus attract more and more learners toward
the V-in-situ option. Besides, V-in-situ may be the unmarked setting since it
entails more economical representations (à la Robert's 1999; see section 6.3). In
turn, the adoption of the V-in-situ would bias the learner toward PLD patterns
that are superficially compatible with, and thus reinforce, the adopted V-in-situ
option. Such patterns would include utterances where objects are postverbal, as
in Fr positive imperatives (see note 56), independently of the actual representa-
tions of these utterances in the grammars that provide some of the PLD. In other
words, specific PLD patterns (e.g., Fr imperatives and their postverbal objects)
are assigned underlying structures that are distinct from their targetlike represen-
tations. Because the latter, in any case, are not directly accessible to the learner,
we have the possibility and pervasiveness of reanalysis.

The phenomena described in this chapter vis-à-vis the development of
VP-related morphosyntax in HC (namely, paradigmatic reduction in inflectional
morphology, the switch to V-in-situ and object-in-situ, reanalysis-cum-
grammaticalization, and substrate influence) all make "creolization" look quite
similar to contact-induced language change in the diachrony of so-called genetic
languages. Independently of which account of the relevant facts ultimately pre-
vails, what matters here is the relevance of the non-Creole diachronic patterns

vis-à-vis Creole Exceptionalism as the allegation of a fundamental (developmental and structural) divide between creolization and language change. The admittedly partial evidence available thus far offers recurrent parallels between the patterns of verb and object morphosyntax in HC, English, and French diachrony. The "discrepancies" that obtain in the genesis of HC (see sections 3–5) also obtain outside of "creolization." For example, if we take HC and NE as end points of diachronic developments, we find in both scenarios that a reduction in inflectional morphology is associated with a reduction in IP-internal leftward movement outside of VP.

Once "creolization" and "language change" are viewed from the Cartesian-Uniformitarian perspective, what we're dealing with throughout are individual speakers engaged in UG-guided language creation and re-creation (see DeGraff 1999b, 1999d, 2001a, 2001b). The task of *any* such learner is to use whatever cues are available in the PLD to create or re-create an I-language that is compatible with UG, thereby leading to the intrinsic possibility of "grammatical inventions" (à la Rizzi 1999) alongside the systematic congruence previously observed vis-à-vis morphosyntactic development across various types of linguistic ecologies. As with the PLD in other situations of language contact, the PLD in the creation by Creole children of Creole I-languages would have been influenced by adult learners' early interlanguages and the latter's substrate-influenced innovations. In this perspective, "Creole" and "creolization" do not, and cannot, refer to typological profiles and processes of "grammatical invention" that are qualitatively and fundamentally distinct from their counterparts in non-Creole synchrony and diachrony, as in the Romance and English cases, which I now summarize.

7.2 "Abnormal" Discrepancies in "Normal" (i.e., "Genetic") Diachrony?

The evolution of Latin into Romance (e.g., Fr) constitutes one case of "genetic," "normal," and "continuous" development par excellence. Yet this is what Meillet, who very much believed in "genetic" families, had to say about the evolution of Romance:

(45)   "From a linguistic standpoint, Romance languages, while maintaining many Latin features . . . have structures that are *fundamentally different* from their Latin counterparts: total ruin of case inflection which entails and is conditioned by the relatively fixed word order; the creation of articles; the total restructuring of verb conjugation where, notably, person features are expressed more often by preverbal pronouns than by verbal inflection. *All*

> *this makes neo-Latin languages fall into a typological class that is quite remote*
> *from the structural type represented by Latin."*
>
> (Meillet 1951: 80 [1929]; my translation; emphases added)

Now, recall Thomason and Kaufman's litmus test for so-called nongenetic dia-chrony: "a *significant discrepancy* between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence—in some or all grammatical sub-systems" (1998: 206; my emphasis; see also pp. 8–12). So, are the discrepancies alluded to by Meillet in (45) of a "significant" degree? Meillet, as a pro-Stammbaumtheorie historical linguist, had this to say about discrepancies in the evolution of classic Stammbaumtheorie phyla:

(46)   The use of word order in French and English to express relations between phrases is a *creation* of these languages: such innovation did not have any model in Latin or Old Germanic. (Meillet 1958:148 [1912], my translation)

So, for Meillet, the "discrepant" word-order innovations in French and En-glish diachrony are a matter of language "creation." A generative-grammar spin on Meillet's words in (45)–(46) would then suggest that the creation of French and English morphosyntax in diachrony is quite commensurable with the me-chanics of Creole genesis: both are UG-guided language "creation" in the face of necessarily sparse and heterogeneous PLD made available in contingent linguistic ecologies. This Cartesian-Uniformitarian view leaves no room for the orthodox dualism between "genetic" versus "nongenetic" phylogeny.

Indeed, it could also be argued that along *certain* parameters, such as lexical case morphology and movement-related properties like so-called free word-order scrambling, French and HC are more similar to each other than French and Latin are (see DeGraff 2001b: secs. 3.2–3.3). It can also be argued that, again along certain parameters, English and Jamaican Creole are closer to each other than English and Old Germanic are. Such dissimilarities are, it must be stressed, an artifact of what parameters we choose to compare, how, and why. But the comparison so far teaches us that there is no precise and operational structural litmus test, and no coherent theoretical framework, that consistently and reliably discriminates where "language change" ends and where "creolization" begins (for a sustained argument along similar lines, see Mufwene 1986, 1997, 2001). More generally, there is much debate on the feasibility of syntactic reconstruction in the establishment of phylogenetic correspondences (for one recent argument against such recon-struction, see, e.g., Lightfoot 2002).

7.3 VP-related Morphology and Word Order in a Creole Sample

Given the comparative data in this chapter, should we expect *all* Creoles to be like HC in having both verbs and objects uninflected for TMA, agreement, and case and being pronounced where they are generated—that is, in situ within the VP? To the extent that language acquisition under duress, as in abrupt language contact, entails a certain degree of inflectional erosion, à la Weinreich, Meillet, and others, and to the extent that inflectional "erosion" contributes to a diachronic decrease in clause-internal movement out of VP, à la van Kemenade, Roberts, and others, then one may be tempted to answer "yes." Yet, language contact happens in the diachrony of virtually *all* languages, be they Creoles or not (cf. Mufwene 2001)—to wit, the history of Romance and of English. Of course, the degree of contact and the degree of inflectional erosion are not uniform across all instances (cf. note 31). Compare, say, inflectional morphology in HC with Cape Verdean Creole (see later) or within and across Germanic, Romance, and others. Within Germanic, the most celebrated cases include the inflectional contrasts between English and Icelandic and between English and German. Besides, alongside morphological erosion, there is grammaticalization where free morphemes are reanalyzed as bound elements, for one example. In Givón's phrase, "yesterday's syntax is today's morphology," à la Bopp, Humboldt, Meillet, and the like (see DeGraff 2001b: sec. 6).

Be that as it may, language contact, like many other sociolinguistic phenomena, does happen along a continuum, both across time and across space. Given that each contact situation will vary with respect to, among many other things, the degrees of contact and the inventories of the languages, dialects, and idiolects in contact, there is no a priori reason that the outcome of "creolization" should uniformly fall within a predetermined and exclusive typological subspace of variations. Furthermore, as we saw in the comparison of HC and English diachrony, there exist robust development parallels (e.g., vis-à-vis morphology and word order) that cut across phenomena that go by the traditional labels of "creolization" and "language change." At the same time, there exist substantial differences even among Creoles, and even among Creoles with Romance-based lexicons. For example, both Cape Verdean Creole (CVC), with a Portuguese-based lexicon, and Palenquero (PL), with a Spanish-based lexicon, differ from HC along the verb-placement parameter. Both CVC and PL, unlike HC, are V-to-I, as indicated by the verb-adverb-object order in (47) and (48):[59]

(47) a. *João   xina   ben   se   lison.* (CVC)
         João   learned well   his   lesson

         'João learned his lesson well.' (Baptista 1997: 90; see also p. 225)

b. *João   ta   ama   mutu Eliza.*
   João   TMA   love   Eliza

'João loves Eliza too much.' (Baptista 1997: 207)

(48) *I   asé   ammirá   mucho   ese   monasito.* (PL)
      I   HAB   admire   much   this   boy

'I admire this boy (very) much.' (Armin Schwegler, pers. comm. October 9, 2000)[60]

And it is perhaps not accidental that both CVC and PL, unlike HC, express some of their TMA values via affixes. CVC has an affix *-ba* for "past," "past perfect," and "present perfect" (Baptista 1997: 69).[61] PL has a similar affix *-ba* for "past imperfective," in addition to an affixal progressive marker *-ndo*; and the two affixes can cooccur in the same word, as in *toká-ndo-ba* in *Ata la sei música toká-ndo-ba* 'Until six (in the morning) the band was playing' (see Schwegler and Green, in press, for further details). The link between TMA affixes and verb movement in CVC and PL, modulo the caveats in notes 59 and 61, can be made by postulating that CVC and PL, like Fr and unlike HC, carry abstract affixal features in their inflectional heads. Like their Fr counterparts, CVC and PL affixal features are associated with the verb moving to the corresponding inflectional heads in order to provide a host to these affixal heads (see sections 4 and 6).[62]

Do CVC and PL have movement of objects outside of VP? This is a more difficult question to answer in the space remaining. Both Creoles have their object pronouns in postverbal positions, but there may be some evidence that object pronouns cliticize onto the verb and then ride along with the latter when it moves outside of VP.

Let's start with the CVC data. Baptista (1997: 90) notes that, at PF, adverbs like *ben* 'well' sit most comfortably in the clause-internal position, between the verb and its object, as in (49a). She observes the following contrast, noting some dialect variation in (un)grammaticality with respect to the clause-final position of *ben* in (49d):

(49) a. João xina   <u>ben</u> se   lison. (CVC)
          João learned well   his   lesson

'João learned his lesson well.'

b. *<u>Ben</u> João xina se lison.

c. *João <u>ben</u> xina se lison.

d. ?João xina se lison <u>ben</u>.

When the object of *xina* is a clitic (e.g., *l* '3sg'), *ben* becomes perfectly acceptable in clause-final position. Compare (49d) and (50):

(50) João xina+*l*   <u>ben</u>. (CVC)
      João learnt+it   <u>well</u>

Here is Baptista's analysis of (50) (her example (71b)):

(51) 'The [object] clitic [*l* '3sg'] originates in the VP complement and incorpo-
      rates to V [*xina*]. When the verb raises across a VP-internal adverbial [e.g.,
      ben] . . . the object clitic raises with it. (Baptista 1997: 262)

Alternatively, one could take (50) to arise in three successive steps (cf. the analysis of Portuguese enclisis in Raposo 2000: 285f.): (i) V-to-I; (ii) object cliticization to a functional head (say, F) higher than INFL, the landing site in (i); (iii) movement of the V+I complex created in (i) to a landing site still higher of F. In (i)–(iii), "higher than" implies "to the left of," adopting Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry. In Duarte and Matos's (2000: 130) account of Portuguese enclisis, the clitic and then the verb left-adjoin to an inflectional head that c-commands VP.

   Somewhat similar verb- and clitic-placement facts hold in PL, to which similar analyses can be given. Compare (48), with a nonpronominal object, with (52), with a pronominal object:

(52) *I asé   ammiré+lo   mucho.* (PL)
      I HAB   admire+him   much
      'I admire him (very) much.'

Further evidence suggesting movement of objects outside of VP in PL is given in (53) (courtesy of Armin Schwegler, pers. comm. October 11, 2000):

(53) a. *I miná +lo +ba.*
          'I looked at him.'

      b. **I miná +ba +lo*

Schwegler and Green (in press) note that object pronouns (e.g., *lo* 'him' in (53a)) are allowed to cliticize onto a verbal host, to the right of the verbal stem and to the left of the suffixal TMA marker *-ba*, thus mesoclisis of *lo* in *miná +lo +ba* of (53a). This is reminiscent of certain forms in Caribbean Spanish (Rivera-Castillo 1992); and in European Portuguese, Galician, and Old Iberian (Durate and Matos 2000; Raposo 2000: 283–287). Assuming that the verb undergoes head movement

(out of VP, as in (48)) and moves to adjoin to the left of, and host, the TMA head *-ba*, then the object pronoun must also be able to shift out of VP for it to occur to the left of *-ba*, perhaps along the lines proposed in Baptista's (1997: 262) analysis in (51) (see also the accounts of similar cases of mesoclisis in Rivera-Castillo 1992 and Raposo 2000: 285f.: there, too, mesoclisis depends on instances of verb movement to a variety of VP-external landing sites). The word-order and morphological patterns exemplified in (53a) may thus count as triggers for PL's V-to-I setting (see note 62).

These are all tentative arguments, but the lesson here is that VP syntax in both CVC and PL is *not* isomorphic to that of HC, despite the fact that CVC, PL, and HC are all Romance-lexicon Creoles. VP-related facts seem to draw HC closer to Modern English (both have verbs and objects in situ) than to HC's fellow Romance-lexicon Creoles like CVC and PL (both have verbs and objects outside VP). Conversely, the V-to-I properties of CVC and PL draw them closer to, say, Fr and OE, both of which are non-Creole V-to-I languages, than to HC, a V-in-situ Creole language. Of course, going outside the realm of Romance-lexicon Creoles should, I suspect, afford us even greater variation in the VP domain and elsewhere (see DeGraff 2001b). The implication is that there is no uniform VP syntax across Creole languages—there is no sui generis "Creole" typology (see, e.g., Givón 1979; Mufwene 1986, 2001; Muysken 1988: 300; DeGraff 1999a, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b).

This chapter can thus be read as one more plea for constructively combining research on creolization, language change, and language acquisition toward a triangulation of the mental bases of language creation. At any rate, UG itself offers no conceptual room for any fundamental (diachronic or synchronic) opposition between Creoles and non-Creoles. If "language acquisition is interpreted as the process of fixing the parameters of the initial state [UG] in one of the permissible ways" (Chomsky 1995: 6), then acquisition is not "transmission" *sensu stricto*, but UG-guided "creation" or "re-creation," with contingent, limited, and heterogeneous PLD. "Language creation" happens everywhere and always, and each and every I-language develops in accordance with necessarily invariant UG and necessarily contingent and heterogeneous ecologies.

NOTES

This chapter's insights, if any, are due entirely to constructive discussions with colleagues and friends, too numerous to all be named. This chapter's shortcomings, and there are many (witness the notes!), are due to my not being yet able to incorporate a

long series of questions, suggestions, and disagreements from said colleagues and friends. My future work will be vastly improved once I can take into account all the comments that have so kindly been offered while I was writing this chapter and its fore-runners in the past few years.

In the meantime, heartiest thanks are due specially to Marlyse Baptista, Jonathan Bobaljik, Robert Chaudenson, Yves Dejean, Dominique Fattier, Morris Halle, Richard Kayne, Alec Marantz, Salikoko Mufwene, Juvénal Ndayiragije, Marilene Phipps, Fernanda Pratas, Carson Schütze, Armin Schwegler, Almeida Jacqueline Toribio, Daniel Véronique, Cecília Vieira, and Ken Wexler. I am eternally indebted to Richie Kayne and Salikoko Mufwene for many pointed comments at various stages of this chapter's long gestation. The main proposal in this chapter and much else I am thankful for, I owe to the ground-breaking work, constant inspiration, and joyful camaraderie of Yves Dejean (*Papa Iv*).

1. See DeGraff (1999a, 1999b, 2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b, 2000c, 2003) for more thorough reviews; also see Mufwene (2001) for a related critique in a different theoretical framework.

2. In Caribbean Creole-genesis scenarios, the SUPERSTRATE language is the European language (e.g., French, English, Portuguese, Spanish, and Dutch), as spoken by those in the socioeconomically dominant positions in the language-contact situation. The superstrate language, in all its varieties and approximations, is the most popular language-acquisition target for those who are newly born or newly arrived into the language-contact situation. Among the newly arrived, we find adult second-language learners from Africa, speakers of the so-called substrate languages; these speakers are typically in subordinate positions vis-à-vis the superstrate speakers. On a structural-phylogenetic note, the superstrate is, inter alia, the LEXIFIER of the Creole—that is, the etymological source of the Creole lexicon. One example: In the context of Haitian Creole's genesis, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century regional varieties of French—and whatever koiné they produced upon contact (see Mufwene 2001: 34–38)—constitute the superstratum/lexifier, while Niger-Congo languages constitute the substratum. (See Goodman 1993 for useful terminological caveats regarding creolists' uses of the terms *substrate* and *superstrate*.)

3. In the Caribbean colonial context, the use of "Creole" vis-à-vis human beings and other biological species seems to have preceded its use vis-à-vis speech varieties. In both the biological and the linguistic cases, certain locally grown varieties were identified as "Creole" in opposition to their imported counterparts. In the Caribbean, the label "Creole" was thus initially used to contrast certain nonlinguistic entities indigenous to the New World of the islands with the analogous varieties that developed in the Old World of Europe and Africa. In colonial Haiti, for example, the locally born descendants of expatriates from the Old World came to be known as Creoles. Subsequently, the denotation of the label was extended from Creole individuals to the latter's locally grown speech varieties, which were often contrasted with the corresponding metropolitan varieties. (For more complex terminological-cum-historical details, see, e.g., Moreau de Saint-Méry 1958: 28–111; Mufwene 1997, 2001: 3–11; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001: ch. 1 and references therein.)

4. If Proto-Human exists—a big "if"—then Creole languages cannot really be "nongenetic" in a strict interpretation: since Creole speakers are human beings, there

must exist some "genetic" branch relating each Creole language to Proto-Human. This conclusion can be avoided by claiming either that Creole languages are effectively artificial languages that altogether lie outside the scope of (normal) human languages or that Creole languages are "born again" instantiations of Proto-Human grammar, modulo the etymologies of Creole lexicons—these etymologies unmistakably link Creole languages to their lexifiers (i.e., to *non*-Proto-Human languages). As it turns out, Creole studies are rife with claims that Creoles are (direct descendants of) born-again Proto-languages or that they are artificial languages (see DeGraff 2001a, 2001b, for details and critiques).

    5. See, for example, DeGraff 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 2000, 2001a, 2002c; also see DeGraff 1998, 2001b, and the references therein.

    6. The following abbreviations are used throughout: ACC, accusative; ANT, anterior; ASP, aspectual marker; CFP, clause-final particle (with discourse-presupposition functions); COMPL, completive marker; DAT, dative, FUT, future; HAB, habitual; INDEF, indefinite; IRR, irrealis; NEG, negation; PL, plural; PROG, progressive; SG, sing; 1sg, first singular; . . . , 3pl, third plural; masc, masculine; fem, feminine.

    Abbreviations for languages: CVC, Cape Verdean Creole; Fr, French; HC, Haitian Creole; IC, Icelandic; LC, Louisiana Creole; MC, Mauritian Creole; ME, Middle English; NE, New English (i.e., Modern English); OE, Old English; PL, Palenquero; SW, Swedish.

    7. This does not mean that HC verbs are morphologically simplex. In fact, an argument can be made that *konnen* itself is made up of a root *konn* and a verbal marker *-en* (the nasalized variant of *-e*, which is etymologically related to the Fr infinitival *-er* and participial *-é(e)*). HC *-e/-en* is subject to apocope (e.g., *konn* from *konnen*) under conditions that I still don't understand (but see DeGraff 2001a: 74f.). The HC verbal marker *-e/-en* is also used productively, for example, to derive verbs from nouns as, say, in *klipse* 'to clip', *ploge* 'to plug', and *tepe* 'to tape' from the nouns *klips* 'clip', *plòg* 'plug', and *tep* 'tape', all of which are English borrowings. As noted by Clark (1993), the Fr suffix *-er* is also the one that language learners use as a default verbal marker in their spontaneous, nonconventionalized, verb coinages. See also related remarks in Van Name (1870: 139–149) and Baissac 1880: 52–55; I return to the origins of the HC verbal marker in section 6.2.

    8. I come back to Fr imperatives in Section 6.2 and note 56.

    9. When it comes to elucidate Creole genesis, we must consider cross-dialectal and diachronic variations in colloquial speech to better delineate the kind of patterns the Creole creators were exposed to (Chaudenson 1992; Chaudenson et al. 1993; Fattier 1995, 1998; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Mufwene 2001). In the case of HC's genesis, it can be safely assumed that Standard French as we know it today played little, if any, role in Creole formation (see section 2.1). Chaudenson et al. (1993) discuss the paradigmatically sparser inflectional suffixes on verbs in various regional varieties of popular spoken French.

    In spoken varieties, *nous aimons* in (13) is giving way to *on aime* with the second-person plural *vous aimez* becoming the only form that is distinguishable from /ɛm/. Notwithstanding this "erosion" of agreement, agreement marking still exists in popular varieties. In addition to second-person plural forms, we also find a distinct third-person plural present for certain verbs (Chaudenson et al. 1993: 57), and certain irregular and frequently used verbs such as *être* 'to be', *avoir* 'to have', and *aller* 'to go' manifest a larger set of inflected forms. It can also be argued that popular colloquial French is

gradually replacing the agreement suffixes underlined in (13) with prefixes derived from subject clitics (see section 6.4).

Regarding TMA marking, regional varieties of vernacular French seem to favor, when available, verbal periphrases over their synthetic counterparts illustrated in (14). In section 6.2, I consider the role of such Fr periphrastic verbal constructions in the genesis of the TMA system in HC.

10. All examples are from Kinyalolo's (1992) study of Fongbè word order. See Fabb 1992, Aboh, 1999 and chapter 4 this volume, and Ndayiragije 2000 for more NP_{Obj}-V examples in the Gbe languages. Various chapters in Déchaine and Manfredi (1997) and Mchombo (1993) suggest that the Obj-V order is actually quite widespread in Kwa and in Bantu, which means that Obj-V is quite widespread in HC's substratum. This makes absence of Obj-V in HC a thorny counterexample to the Relexification Hypothesis (see DeGraff 2002b, 2002c, for further discussion).

11. The Fongbè NP_{Obj}-V sequences mentioned in (16a) and illustrated in (18)–(19) are also found after verbs meaning 'start, 'end', 'stop', 'can'/'know', 'refuse', 'make'/'order', etc. (Fabb 1992: 6–7).

12. See DeGraff 2000: 106–108 for further differences between HC and Fongbè (e.g., with respect to the syntax of sentential negation and the placement of certain adverbs).

13. Fr clauses with auxiliaries preceding the main verb (as in compound tenses of the *passé composé*, the *plus-que-parfait*, etc.) introduce more complicated patterns. I return to these in section 6.2.

14. As for the target of "V-to-I" movement, it is worth stressing that we need not assume a unique target position x (some INFL-related head) for all languages. Things are most likely much more complex. Verbs may move to different heights across languages; within a language, verb movement may occur in one fell swoop or cyclically via a number of potential landing sites. By and large I abstract away from these subtleties. In other words, I am letting "I(NFL)" in "V-to-I" stands for a range of INFL-related head positions—possible targets of IP-internal verb-movement to a position that c-commands the VP and that is c-commanded by the (highest) IP-internal subject's surface position. Cinque's (1997: 106) elaborate proposal offers an innate—species-uniform—hierarchy of some 29 "INFL" heads; but see Bobaljik (1999) for a critique and for some possible refinements.

I am purposefully abstracting away, for now, from verb-movement to COMP (aka, V-to-C) and from any intermediate V-to-I steps on V's way to COMP (but see section 6.3). A language can have V-(to-I)-to-C without having *independent* V-to-I (i.e., without verb-movement to INFL as the *final* landing site). According to Vikner (1994: 119; 1995: 142–147), Danish is such a language, along with other Mainland Scandinavian languages. The latter somewhat resemble HC to the extent that they (arguably) lack independent verb-movement to INFL (e.g., in embedded clauses where verb-second is excluded); although see Déprez (1989: 242f.), Thráinsson (1994: 151), and Kroch and Taylor (1997: 319, 325, nn25, 26) for more complex possibilities regarding Scandinavian IP-internal verb placement, including short verb-movement to a *low* inflectional head (cf. Lightfoot 1999: 449 n3). HC does not have V-to-C movement of the sort found in verb-second (V2) languages and does not manifest any type of (dependent or independent) V-to-I, modulo the caveat in note 16. (Also see note 34 for CP-level occurrences of V in HC and Kroch and Taylor 1997 and Kroch et al. 2000 for hypothetical V2-related diachronic implications of V-to-C with or without independent V-movement to INFL heads.)

15. The exact values for y_i, like that for x, may vary across languages and, within a given language, across adverb classes. Furthermore, Pollock shows that Fr *pas* 'NEG' is generated higher than clause-internal adverbs like *souvent* 'often' and that there is an intermediate landing site for verb movement "halfway" between *pas* and such clause-internal adverbs. Infinitives only reach that intermediate landing site, as in *Ne pas lire souvent le journal* versus **Ne lire pas souvent le journal*. (See Cinque 1999 for further elaboration and for additional relevant data.)

16. The Fr negation-placement facts are more complex: in certain dialects, they involve cliticization of *ne* to the finite verb, and movement of the [*ne* V_{+fin}] complex to the left of *pas*; see Pollock (1989) for details. In other (vernacular) dialects, *pas* is often used without *ne*.

Another way to account for the HC-versus-Fr verb-movement contrast would be to posit that both HC and Fr are V-to-I languages but that the landing site of verb-movement in HC, x_{HC}, is lower than the positions of the clause-internal adverbs and negation marker y_iP, and that the y_iP projections are, in turn, lower than the Fr verb-movement landing site x_{Fr}; that is, $x_{HC} < y < x_{Fr}$ ('<' stands for 'lower than'). In other words, HC verb movement (if any) is shorter than Fr verb movement. (In the main text, I abstract away from any possibility of (short) verb-movement in HC.)

17. What follows is a summary and update of DeGraff (1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2000), where I adopted as a working hypothesis a controversial proposal that combines insights from, among many others, Platzack and Holmberg (1989), Pollock (1989), Dejean (1992), Chomsky (1993), Roberts (1995), Rohrbacher (1994), and Vikner (1995, 1997). See also notes 18 and 19.

18. Although attractive, Bobaljik's (2001) treatment of morphology–syntax interactions in Germanic—or perhaps my (mis)interpretation of it—faces its own theoretical and empirical challenges.

Bobaljik assumes DISTRIBUTED MORPHOLOGY (DM) (Halle and Marantz 1993; Noyer 1997; Halle 1997; Harley and Noyer 1997; and others). DM instantiates "a realizational or 'Late Insertion' view [of grammar] in which the syntax concatenates abstract morphemes which are subsequently provided with phonological exponents (also called VOCABULARY ITEMS) via post-syntactic vocabulary insertion or morpheme realization rules" (Bobaljik 2001: 4).

Bobaljik's proposal relies on a one-way entailment from the complexity of verbal inflection to the complexity of the INFL layer: "I will argue here that the correct conception of morphological richness should be stated in terms of structural complexity and not paradigms . . ." (Bobaljik 2001: 5). In this proposal, the "structural complexity" of IP is a *necessary* condition for the "morphological richness" of verbal inflection, and "morphological richness" is diagnosed by stacking of the *phonological exponents* of inflectional affixes: (i) "If a language has rich [verbal] inflection then it has verb movement to Infl" (Bobaljik 2001: 4); (ii) "Verbal inflection is RICH iff finite verbs may bear multiple distinct inflectional morphemes."

A theory-internal tension immediately arises. In DM, the narrow syntax handles "*abstract* morphemes" that are *devoid of phonological exponence*. The phonological pieces of morphemes are inserted "late," postsyntax, in the morphophonology. Now, consider that, in Bobaljik's account, the stacking on the verb stem of *overt* inflectional affixes (i.e., phonological exponents aka "Vocabulary Items") counts as *unambiguous* evidence for the determination of "rich" inflection, which, in turn, entails V-to-I. Yet the

morphology-to-syntax entailment in (i) holds only in a model where inflectional affix stacking *necessarily* reflects structural complexity in the narrow syntax; the necessity of such isomorphism is alluded to in Bobaljik (2001: 21 n33). Is DM such a model?

In DM, not only "syntax may be sensitive to distinctions that are not systematically reflected in the overt morphology" (Bobaljik 2001: 13), but, vice versa, the morphology itself may manipulate (inflectional) forms that are introduced *postsyntax*, without being associated with distinct (INFL) head in the narrow syntax. Such forms have no direct structural reflexes in the narrow syntax. Indeed, DM entertains a number of *autonomous* morphophonological operations that routinely break down any one-to-one mapping between abstract morphemes in the syntax (e.g., INFL heads) and their postsyntactic late-inserted phonological exponents (e.g., inflectional affixes). Such postsyntactic operations (e.g., "Impoverishment" of morphosyntactic features, and the "Splitting" or "Fission" and "Fusion" of morphosyntactic units) create "mismatches between syntax and morphology" (Halle and Marantz 1993: 115–121; Noyer 1997: xx, lxvi; Halle 1997: 426, 431f.; and others).

These mismatches seem to defuse the morphology-to-syntax entailment posited by Bobaljik. Because of DM's autonomous, strictly morphophonological licensing of inflectional affixes, multiple inflectional affixes on the verb are not an unambiguous telltale of multiple INFL heads in the syntax. Conversely, Impoverishment and zero-affixation can create affixation patterns that do not unambiguously reflect the structural complexity that is licensed in the narrow syntax.

Can we ban Fission altogether or ensure that it is "constrained so as not to be able to apply in the cases under investigation" (Bobaljik 2001: 21 n33)? Noyer (1997: lxvi–lxvii, 3–104) takes Fission to apply in, inter alia, the Imperfect conjugation in Afro-Asiatic languages (e.g., Classical Hebrew, Egyptian Arabic); see also Halle 1997: 435–441. Harley and Noyer (1999: 5) discuss a Tamazight Berber AGR morpheme which, although a single head in the syntax, can be spelled-out with up to three distinct affixes—for person, number, and gender. Halle (1997: 441–446) argues that "Walbiri *Agr morphemes are subject to fission*" (p. 442; emphasis in original). If Noyer, Noyer and Harley, and Halle are right about the (INFL-related) syntax-morphology mismatches induced by Fission and if—and this seems a big "if"—there is no principled way to preclude Fission from applying to the cases at hand here, then DM cannot exclude the (marked) possibility of V-in-situ languages with "rich," but *Fissioned*, verbal inflection. The multiplicity of affixes resulting from Fission is effectively not visible in the syntax and should have no effect on verb placement, if the latter is, as in Bobaljik's proposal, a property of the narrow syntax and not a strictly PF phenomenon.

Perhaps a solution can be found by investigating learnability-based markedness (see note 20; cf Ackema 2001). If Fission exists, then what may disfavor a V-in-situ language with multiple (fissioned) inflection morphemes on the verb are the learnability difficulties—the markedness—entailed by Fission. Recall that Fission is one of "these departures [from the default situation that] are considered marked options within a grammar, and therefore are assumed to require (substantial) positive evidence during acquisition" (Harley and Noyer 1999: sec. 4.2). So, assuming Bobaljik's treatment, the "mismatched" V-in-situ/rich-inflection correlation is indeed possible, although marked, perhaps as marked as the inverse "mismatch"—namely, the V-to-I/poor-inflection correlation. The latter presumably arises because of some combination of zero-affixation, Impoverishment, and Fusion. Now, if the V-in-situ/rich-inflection combination is rarer than the

V-to-I/no-inflection combination or is altogether nonexistent (cf. Ackema 2001: 253–255), then this may count as evidence that Fission is more marked than Fusion, Impoverishment, and/or zero-affixation—and perhaps specially so in the domain of INFL morphemes—even though all operations that introduce morphology-syntax mismatches are "marked options" (Noyer 1997: xxi, lxvi; Harley & Noyer 1999: §§3.3, 4.2).

19. Dejean (1992: 1, 4, 8, 16–18) mentions the occasional appearance of verb–adverb word order in certain HC dialects and relates these cases to a well-documented sociolinguistic confound—namely, the influence of Fr grammar on the Creole speech of certain Creolophone-Francophone bilinguals. This is not strictly decreolization: the lexifier's V-to-I influence must have played a role from Creole genesis onward and may have been particularly strong in early HC; see for example, Dejean's (1992: 16f.) eighteenth-and nineteenth-century examples. Such influence is also manifested in modern Fr-to-HC translations (see Dejean 1992: 16f.). More generally, the calquing of Fr patterns in Creole speech and the ensuing production of "Frenchified" Creole utterances is often a tacit or deliberate choice on the part of Creole speakers. Frenchification of Creole speech, when possible, often seems to function as a register shift that raises Creole speakers' symbolic capital, according to the dictates of Haiti's linguistic market. Here it can be quipped that V's upward mobility in the INFL layers may diagnose the HC speaker's upward mobility in the socioeconomic layers.

See note 59 for possible analogs related to the diachrony of V-to-I in Capeverdean Creole, a Creole with a Portuguese lexifier. Also see DeGraff (1997: 81, 88, nn28, 33, and the references cited there in) for yet another possible analog in the diachrony of V-to-I in Louisiana Creole under the influence of Cajun French.

DeGraff (1992a, 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 1999b, 2000), Veenstra (1996), Baptista (1997), Vrzić (1997), Déprez (1999), and Roberts (1999) document various domains in Creole morphosyntax where inflectional morphology seems to interact with movement (e.g., within IP and DP).

20. The morphology-syntax mismatches discussed in note 18 regarding Bobaljik's (2001) proposal bear implications for the acquisition of verb placement. Let's consider Bobaljik's (2001: 5, 25) claim that "armed with UG, . . . the child presented with a finite verb bearing more than one overt inflectional morpheme is clearly licensed to conclude that their target grammar has . . . multiple functional heads between CP and VP"—that is, "[such] child . . . is clearly licensed to conclude that the target grammar must contain adequate functional heads to host the form"; thus V-to-I. If one assumes DM *with Fission* as a framework, this can be *clearly* so only in the "*default* situation." In the nondefault situation, as in, for example, Noyer's (1997: lxvi–lxvii, 3–104) Fission-based analysis of INFL in Afro-Asiatic languages such as Tamazight Berber, multiple affixes—the AGR prefixes and suffixes in the Imperfect conjugation—are not licensed by distinct functional heads but are (arguably) induced via Fission, which is driven by postsyntactic and autonomous "constraints on morphological well-formedess" (Noyer 1997: lxvi). If this is correct, the child learning Tamazight Berber is not a priori licensed to postulate multiple functional heads as hosts for the multiple AGR affixes.

The tension between Bobaljik (2001) and various DM assumptions is a constructive one: if Bobaljik is right, then all the INFL-related cases currently treated as Fission must be reanalyzed sans Fission. At any rate, a Fission-less reanalysis of the relevant cases would also tell a story about learnability: How would the learner, given much less evidence than the linguist, resist postulating affix-stacking in the presence of multiple in-

flectional affixes on the verb stem? (Cf. the Berber case here or the Faroese case discussed in Bobaljik 2001: 13–15.) And, if Fission does exist as a "marked option" and if it does apply to INFL morphemes, what kind of "(substantial) positive evidence" (Harley and Noyer 1999: sec. 4.2) would the child require in order to postulate Fission instead of distinct syntactic heads? Not an easy question—neither for the child nor the linguist. The right answer, for both child and linguist, seems to require a certain amount of inspection and comparison of verbal forms—specially their inflectional combinations—in order to decide whether, and which, particular instances of affix-stacking, if any, result from Fission or from multiple INFL heads (or both). This kind of inspection may well be as computationally expensive as the inspection of paradigms in the scenarios advocated by, for example, Rohrbacher (1994) and Vikner (1997), which Bobaljik argues against.

That verb placement both through acquisition and in the postacquisition steady-state grammar can in principle be driven by other factors besides those related to verbal inflection, is suggested by, for example, Fongbè (see note 33). If Aboh (1999 and chapter 4 in this volume) is right, Fongbè is a V-to-I language, even in absence of a "rich" system of verbal inflection. Outside of verbal inflection per se, there are other morphosyntax-related cues that may suggest a V-to-I setting to both the language learner and the linguist, once certain assumptions are adopted (cf. note 58).

I don't understand what exact factors drive V-to-I in Fongbè, as compared to V-to-I in Romance and Germanic. But it seems to me that the nature of Fongbè V-to-I, especially with respect to the reduplication facts noted in, for example, section 3.3, is quite distinct from V-to-I in Romance and Germanic. V-to-I, when properly investigated across a wider range of languages, may not be a unitary phenomenon. There may thus be other parameters at play in explaining the similarities and dissimilarities in verb syntax between Fongbè, on the one hand, and Romance and Germanic, on the other hand. For example, there is nothing in Romance and Germanic that looks like the aforementioned Fongbè verbal reduplication phenomena. In other words, the Fongbè-versus-Romance/Germanic comparison may not be of the same microparametric type. But at this point I seem far out on a limb, with no fruit in sight (yet).

21. It may be tempting to relate the distributional uniformity of HC postverbal objects to the morphological uniformity of HC pronouns and to postulate some general syntax–morphology correlation vis-à-vis object placement and overt case marking. But, as Holmberg (1999: 24) observes, "the correlation is extremely weak" (cf. Cinque 1999: 217 n18 and Thráinsson 2001: 167f., 185–188). For example, object placement in Norwegian is much "freer" than in English (see, e.g., Nilsen 1997; Cinque 1999: 217 n18; Thráinsson 2001: 199 n17), even though nominal case in Norwegian is not (appreciably) richer than in English. (Also see notes 53 and 54.)

22. The following discussion does not provide an exhaustive overview or analysis of the cross-linguistic syntax of object placement. Neither do I try to survey all the analyses that have been offered to account for object movement. In fact, I am being quite selective here, putting aside a number of interesting analyses of cliticization (e.g., those that do *not* posit object movement). My goal is only to explore the theoretical tools whereby the VP-related HC/Fr object-placement contrasts can be connected to the HC/Fr inflectional differentials, with an eye toward a larger sample of diachronic and cross-linguistic word-order patterns.

23. The term "object cliticization" is used throughout to refer exclusively to *syntac-*

tic cliticization, whereby an object pronoun undergoes leftward movement to some VP-external position, from which the pronoun attaches to its host, typically a verb. Syntactic cliticization is distinct from *phonological* cliticization, which applies to HC atonic pronouns and to a host of other morphemes, independently of syntactic cliticization. For example, *li* in (1b) phonologically cliticizes onto the preceding verb, giving *Bouki konnen-l*; see Cadely (1994) for discussion of the conditions under which phonological cliticization takes place in HC.

Passives, Scrambling, and unbounded object movements such as *wh*-movement and topicalization are not discussed here. Presumably such movements have different theoretical bases (e.g., different Case- and binding-properties) and do not proceed along the same paths as object cliticization; see, for example, Déprez (1989) (but see Sportiche 1995 for an approach where cliticization is likened to *wh*-movement and to Dutch-type Scrambling; compare, e.g., Sportiche's extension of the "*wh*-criterion," the "doubly-filled COMP filter," and LF-movement to clitic constructions).

24. More cautiously, it should be said that V-to-I and OS in English (if any) have lower landing sites than in Icelandic. Lasnik (1999) surveys various arguments in favor of overt OS in English.

25. Subsuming object cliticization under OS is far from uncontroversial; see Déprez (1989: 239–241), Holmberg and Platzack (1995: ch. 6), and Thráinsson (2001), and references cited there in for similarities and dissimilarities between object cliticization and canonical Object Shift. One of the more obvious dissimilarities is the height of Object Shift (to the right and below the main verb in (23)) versus that of (Romance) cliticization (often to the left and higher than the main verb (see, e.g., 8b)). I will tentatively abstract away from these differences. It will suffice to assume that object cliticization, as an instantiation of OS, involves leftward object movement to a position outside of VP and within IP (see, e.g., Déprez 1989: ch. 3 for such an implementation, with OS as XP-movement to Spec(Agr$_o$) and object cliticization as head-movement to, or via, Agr$_o$; see also Sportiche (1995) and references therein for an approach where object cliticization involves overt or covert movement, possibly through a Case-checking projection, of some-XP$_i$, possibly *pro$_i$*, to the Spec of a phrase headed by clitic$_i$.

26. For technical implementations of (24) in a number of frameworks, see, for instance, Déprez (1989), Kayne (1989a, 1991), Chomsky (1993), Roberts (1997), Bobaljik and Jonas (1996), Holmberg (1999), and Bobaljik (1995, 2002). For counterarguments against Holmberg's Generalization, see Lasnik (1999: 149 n36 and the references cited therein). See also note 28. Thráinsson (2001) provides a critical overview.

27. As remarked by Pollock (1989) and Kayne (1991), Fr participles and infinitives must be able to overtly move out of their VPs (see Pollock's "short movement," which is optional; i.e., the adverb *souvent* in (i)–(ii) can also precede the main verb *mangé/manger*):

(i) Jean a   mangé   <u>souvent</u> des   pommes.
     Jean has   eaten   often   INDEF-PL   apples
        'Jean has often eaten apples'

(ii) Manger <u>souvent</u> des   pommes, . . .
     to eat   often   INDEF-PL   apples
        'to often eat apples . . .'

(iii) Jean <u>les</u>   a   mangées.
       Jean them   has   eaten
       'Jean has eaten them.'

(iv)   Jean veut   <u>les</u>   manger.
       Jean wants them   to-eat
       'Jean wants to eat them.'

In Fr, both infinitives and participles may precede VP-adjoined adverbs (indicating verb movement), and both permit object cliticization. (See Kayne 1991 for further evidence for, and theoretical implications of, such short movement and for a rich array of comparative data on, inter alia, adverb and clitic placement in Romance.)

28. Liliane Haegeman (pers. comm., July 31, 1995) notes that West Flemish allows leftward movement of object clitics with nonfinite verbs, which arguably do not move (but see note 27), thus constituting one exception to Holmberg's Generalization. Bobaljik (1995, 2002) offers one explanation for why SOV languages generally escape Holmberg's Generalization, unlike SVO languages. Note that all the languages concerned here are SVO.

If the discussion in the main text is right, Object Shift in verb-second clauses cannot be taken as a trigger for independent V-to-I, contra Bobaljik (2001: 20). That OS does not strictly presuppose independent V-to-I (cf. notes 14 and 34) is suggested by Mainland Scandinavian data, where object cliticization is possible in verb-second environments only. Furthermore, Norwegian, as described in Nilsen (1997), has OS of full NPs in verb-second (e.g., matrix) clauses, in addition to the sort of object cliticization that exists in the other Mainland Scandinavian languages (see Cinque 1999: 217 n18, but see also Thráinsson 2001: 199 n17 for some complicating factors). Yet Norwegian does not seem to have Icelandic-type independent V-to-I. Thus, a child learning Norwegian could not use (apparent?) evidence for OS as a reliable cue for independent V-to-I.

29. A bidirectional implication would make the wrong generalization regarding the English diachronic facts discussed in section 6: the loss of cliticization started in English *before* the loss of overt V-to-I. According to van Kemenade (1987) and Roberts (1997), the demise of English cliticization took place, roughly, between 1100 and 1400, while Kroch (1989) estimates loss of main-verb movement to have been completed by the middle of the sixteenth century. Thus, V-to-I is a necessary, not sufficient, condition for OS (but see notes 26 and 28). In the case of English diachrony, the loss of V2 and of morphological Case may have also had a role in the demise of English cliticization, as argued by van Kemenade. (See also note 53.)

30. The arguments in sections 6 and 7 are expanded on in DeGraff 2003.

31. The effect of L2A on morphological change is presumably linked to the degree and nature of language contact. On one hand, low-contact situations (i.e., with relatively few nonnative speakers) may seem particularly favorable for the maintenance of morphological paradigms; on the other (extremely opposite) hand, abrupt and massive language contact (i.e., with relatively high numbers of adult learners in learner-unfriendly situations) may seem to accelerate inflectional erosion (see, e.g., the "Insular" vs. "Mainland" Scandinavian contrasts alluded to in section 4.2; see also DeGraff 2001b: 219 n5, 281f. 288). Yet, in all cases, the cognitive and linguistic factors that underlie, and constrain, the corresponding developmental patterns and any differences therein are ultimately rooted in individual-level properties of L1A and L2A. In the main, language-

acquisition mechanisms can be assumed to be species-uniform, even though the external (e.g., sociohistorical) factors that determine their specific effects and specific outcomes are necessarily particular and contingent (for some further discussion and references, see DeGraff 1999a: 37, 1999b: 528.

32. There may seem to be a potential contradiction between viewing preverbal object clitics as a V-to-I cue (in light of, e.g., Holmberg's Generalization in section 5.2) and my claim here that the linguistic ecology during HC's genesis became weak in V-to-I triggers. After all, as Richard Kayne (pers. comm.) reminds me, even if verbal inflections were eroding, every Fr sentence with a preverbal object clitic (e.g., *Elle nous voit*; lit. 'She us sees') would count as a V-to-I trigger, and such sentences seem pervasive.

Two empirical-cum-theoretical questions arise, which I will (too briefly) address here and in section 6.4: What is the status of (Standard) French object placement in the early interlanguages of adult learners learning French in learner-unfriendly contact situations? If, as argued by Meillet (1920), Brunot and Bruneau (1949), Sportiche (1995), and others (object) clitics really belong, alongside verbal inflectional affixes, to verbal inflectional morphology, then such clitics qua "agreement" markers would, like inflectional affixes, be hard to acquire in the *initial* stages of second-language acquisition, especially for learners whose L1s, like Fongbè, do not have object proclitics on the verb. One such case of learners doing away with object proclitics in *early* L2A is documented by Véronique's (1990, 2000) study of Moroccan adults learning French; these data are available from the European Science Foundation (ESF) bilingual database in the CHILDES System (see MacWhinney 2000). The Moroccan learners produce utterances like *la dame / frape / **lui*** (ESF file lafza32h.1.cha) with the postverbal pronoun *lui*. Compare the target-like utterance *la dame l'a frappé* with the proclitic object *l'* (see note 57). We also find the Fr preverbal clitic *le* in postverbal position in the Moroccans' interlanguages (Klein and Perdue 1992: 254). More generally and perhaps controversially (see, again, note 57), Klein and Perdue (1992: 284f., 297, 325f.) claim that Fr preverbal objects are usually avoided in the initial ("basic variety") interlanguages of adult learners, independently of the learners' respective native languages.

Such a developmental pattern may seem all the more likely given the facts mentioned by Meillet and Brunot and Bruneau (and others) about the use of the more-salient tonic pronouns alongside, or instead of, the less salient atonic pronouns. In the same vein, nonstandard "popular" varieties of French, as noted by, for example, Frei (1929:164–166), Gadet (1997: 65), and Fattier (1995: 140–142), often show a preference for postverbal tonic pronouns in context where Standard French uses verbal enclitics (cf. (43)-versus-(44)).

A related empirical question is this: What sorts of object-pronoun placement *did* obtain in the French varieties involved in the genesis of HC? These French varieties could well have been like Cajun French and Missouri French, as illustrated in (43), where we get, for example, *I v'nont voir moi* with a postverbal tonic pronoun *moi* (cf. HC postverbal *mwen*) instead of *Ils me verront*, in (43a), with a preverbal clitic *me*; the latter has no counterpart in HC.

If the actual French varieties in colonial Haiti were anything like Cajun French and Missouri French, and if learners of French do favor tonic over atonic pronouns in their initial interlanguages, then preverbal object clitics were perhaps not as pervasive in the ecology of HC genesis than they are among, say, contemporary Standard French speak-

ers. Be that as it may, the fact remains that preverbal object clitics did not make it into HC grammar. (I return to this question in section 6.4.)

33. For more nuanced details, important empirical and theoretical caveats, and counterexamples and counterarguments, see, for example, Rohrbacher (1994); Vikner (1997); Roberts (1993, 1999); Thráinsson (2001); Kroch and Taylor (1997); Kroch et al. (2000); Sprouse (1998); Lightfoot (1999); Bobaljik (2001).

That other factors besides inflectional morphology trigger V-to-I is suggested by a comparison of, for example, past participles across French and Icelandic. As noted by Richard Kayne (pers. comm.), even in varieties of French that lack past participle agreement, past participles must move to allow object cliticization to their left. There is no such movement with Icelandic past participles, notwithstanding the similar morphology (i.e., no agreement) across the relevant French and Icelandic varieties. In a related vein, Icelandic and mainland Scandinavian infinitives are unlike each other in movement, even though their infinitival suffixes are similar. We also find language-internal movement differences without any (apparent) morphological correlate: Kayne notes that Icelandic infinitives seemingly move in control constructions only, though the morphology of the infinitive is uniform throughout (cf. Bobaljik 2001 for related caveats). (See also notes 18, 20, 21, 49, 53, and 54.)

34. I use V-to-I for independent verb-movement to INFL, with the restrictions identified in note 14. Mainland Scandinavian languages, unlike English and HC, are verb-second (V2) with the verb moving to COMP in the appropriate environments (e.g., in main clauses and a restricted set of embedded clauses). These languages do not seem to have independent verb-movement with INFL as the final landing site (see Vikner 1995: 142–147). HC, a language without V-to-I movement, allows a copy of the verb to occur in the CP layer in appropriate environments, such as the predicate-cleft construction, with a copy of the verb also occurring in situ (see DeGraff 1995b and references therein).

35. Advocating a population-genetics perspective, Mufwene (1996, 2001) offers a competition-and-selection model that takes into account an array of internal and external factors, including markedness, typological, socioeconomic structures, and demography (e.g., the "Founder principle"). Some crucial differences between my and Mufwene's perspectives concern the role or nonrole of children in Creole genesis (contrast, in particular, DeGraff 1999b: 476, 478–495, 524–527, 2002b, 2002c, and Mufwene 2001: 131).

36. Conveniently enough, Ducœurjoly's (1802) Creole manual gives model French sentences and their Creole translations side by side, with the Creole translations written in the French-born author's etymologizing orthography.

Archival texts must be treated with great caution, however, as is the norm in historical linguistics. And extra caution seems warranted vis-à-vis early Creole texts: most of them were transcribed by nonnative speakers—colonial observers who often felt great condescension toward Creole varieties, as discussed in DeGraff 1993: 90 n56 and 2001a: 92–98, 110 n22, for example.

As it turns out, the basic TMA patterns in Ducœurjoly (1802) are by and large corroborated by similar data in a variety of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Creole samples, from a variety of native and nonnative idiolects (see, e.g., Descourtilz 1809 v3: 135f., 212, 260f., 264, 270f., 277 n1, 279–282, 304f., 353f., 359f., etc.; *Idylles et chansons* (1811); Rosiers (1818); Thomas (1869: 134); and Denis (1935: 346–359); see also references in note 44).

Descourtilz's Early Creole samples include reported speech from two famous Creole ex-slaves, both born of African parents: (i) Toussaint L'Ouverture, Haiti's best known eighteenth-century freedom fighter, born into slavery in colonial Haiti (then known as Saint-Domingue) in 1743; and (ii) Jean-Jacques Dessalines, also a freedom fighter, born into slavery in Saint-Domingue in 1758 and Haiti's first president and first emperor.

37. Gougenheim 1929 gives a comprehensive inventory of verbal periphrases through Fr diachrony. He explicitly notes that many such periphrases, of the sort illustrated in (33)–(36), were explicitly frowned upon as *prononciations vicieuses* 'vicious pronunciations' by eighteenth-and nineteenth-century purists (p. 59f., 104, 120, and passim). This makes it even more likely that such *prononciations vicieuses* were widespread in the 'vicious' environments of French Caribbean colonies, the birthplace of Caribbean French-lexicon Creoles (Gougenheim 1929: 378).

Taken together, Sylvain (1936: 79–105, 136–139), Goodman (1964: 78–90), Chaudenson (1992: 162–167), Chaudenson et al. (1993), Chaudenson and Mufwene (2001: 177–182), and Fattier (1998: 863–888) offer valuable data on the VP-related similarities and dissimilarities across Fr-lexicon Creoles, including HC. Chaudenson (1974, 1992, 1995), Chaudenson et al. (1993), and Mufwene (2001) stress the relevance of diachronic and dialectal (vernacular) data to the geneses of Creoles; also see section 2.

38. Date: November 13, 1982. File: lafae11a.2ch from European Science Foundation (ESF) bilingual database in the CHILDES System. (See MacWhinney 2000).

39. From Alfonso. Date: March 20, 1983. File: lsfal13a.1.cha from European Science Foundation database in the CHILDES System (see Klein and Perdue 1992 and MacWhinney 2000); see also Perdue (1995: 91) for similar data from another Hispanophone learner.

40. The sequence *pa va* to negate an IRREALIS event is ungrammatical in HC, Réunion Creole, other French-lexicon Creoles, and certain regional varieties of French. See Fattier (1998: 870, 883) for some speculations, further data, and relevant bibliographical pointers.

41. Tellingly, Ducœurjoly, in his etymologizing orthography, transcribes the eighteenth-century Creole negation marker / *napa* / as *n'a pa(s)*, on a par with French *n'a pas* 'does not have'. But, in fact, Early HC /napa/ is monomorphemic. Ducœurjoly himself indicates that French *ne/n'* is never pronounced in the Creole, where it is replaced by *pa(s)* (p. 335). Besides we don't seem to have *a(s)* as an auxiliary anywhere in Ducœurjoly's Early Creole text. As for French *avoir* as a main verb expressing possession, Ducœurjoly (1802: 293) notes that its Creole equivalent is *gagné* as in *mo pa gagné temps* 'I don't have time' (p. 331). Early HC *gagné* is now, in modern HC, *gen(yen)* as in *Mwen pa gen tan* 'I don't have time' and *Mwen pa genyen li* 'I don't have it'. (The apocope facts in *gen* vs. *genyen* are still not fully understood; see note 7.)

42. Whatever his actual name, the chansonnier was probably an upper-class Creole speaker. If so, *Lisette*'s lyrics would be more symptomatic of the less-restructured Creole varieties, those closer to French (i.e., the ACROLECTAL and MESOLECTAL varieties), than they would be of the more restructured (i.e., BASILECTAL) varieties. Such lyrics give us only a partial representation of the Creole continuum in colonial Haiti. These and related empirical limitations apply to all archival Creole texts: basilectal Creole speakers—usually from the lower social castes—would have had little opportunity for literature and other sorts of literate activities. (See the caveats in note 36.)

43. As can be expected, reanalysis paths are not uniform across all French-lexicon

Creoles. For example, the reanalysis trajectories of French NEG into HC *pa* and LC *pa* ended up at different heights in their respective inflectional layers—higher in HC and lower in Louisiana Creole (LC). HC has *pa te* 'NEG ANT' (cf. Fr *pas été*), whereas LC, as described in, for example, Neumann (1985: 322) and Rottet (1992: 272), has *te pa* (cf. Fr *étais/était pas*). In the diachrony of the French-lexicon Creole of Guyane, the now-archaic *te pa* was, through the nineteenth century, in competition with, before eventually giving way to, *pa te* (Schlupp 1997: 123–126).

Cinque (1999: 120–126) documents various positions of NegP across and within languages, within a framework that upholds a universal hierarchy of INFL heads; cf. note 14.

44. Baissac (1880: 57f.) argues that Fr synthetic forms like *j'irai* 'I go+FUT+1sg' are not as common in vernacular French as they are in literary French and would not be necessarily included in the "complications that Creole must necessarily avoid." In other words, invariant verbal forms (i.e., infinitivals and participials in verbal periphrases) were robustly represented in the input. Furthermore, Baissac (1880: 49–55) notes that, along with frequency, phonological invariance would have made Fr verbal periphrases particularly influential in the genesis of the Creole verbal system. Similar arguments are found in Van Name (1870: 139–149). Also see J. J. Thomas (1869: 50–65); Denis (1935: 346 n4, 347 n25, 348 n37, 351 nn64–66, 352 n73, 355 n4, 357 nn3, 9, 358 nn33, 37, etc.); Mufwene (1991: 131–138); Fattier (1998: 866f.), and others.

I agree with Baissac that Fr verbal periphrases are etymologically related to the Creole TMA+verb patterns. Yet the latter are now autonomous systems with their own morphosyntactic and interpretive complex calculus. Creole TMA systems are by no means the sort of simple systems that would straightforwardly result from what Baissac calls "necessary avoidance of complications" from Fr. As noted by Gougenheim (1929: 379), French verbal periphrases—the ancestors of Creole TMA systems—often express *nuances delicates, des nuances d'une richesse singulière*, with no synthetic counterpart. See Fattier (1998: 863–997) and Howe (2000) for thorough descriptions of the morphosyntactic, semantic, and pragmatic "complications" in the TMA system of HC.

45. With respect to object placement, the empirical and theoretical grounding of the similarities between HC and English diachrony is more tenuous than in the verb-placement case, especially because of current limitations on my understanding of the mechanics of object shift and cliticization (see section 5.2) and because of the complexity of the Old and Middle English diachronic and dialectal facts (see, e.g., Kroch et al. 2000). The parallels are worth noting anyway.

46. Here I focus on the behavior of object pronouns, as these are most relevant to the Fr and HC contrasts. Interesting issues also arise with respect to subject pronouns in both HC and English diachrony, but these issues would take us too far afield (see, e.g., DeGraff 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, and Déprez 1994 for HC and van Kemenade 1987 for English). For similar reasons, I do not discuss placement of full NP objects, except where directly relevant.

47. The full details of (the theoretical debates about) OE word order, with both medial and final INFL and with both VO and OV, are well beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to note that V2 in OE manifests apparent exceptions, as in (40a), with no counterpart in robust V2 languages such as non-English Germanic. See van Kemenade (1987, 1997), Kroch and Taylor (1997), and Kroch et al. (2000) for analyses and references.

48. Van Kemenade (1987: 195) considers the possibility that object cliticization in (40c) is a relic from the earlier OV stage. Postverbal object pronouns were actually more common around 1340, alongside the less-common preverbal object pronouns. This would be characteristic of a change in progress or just completed and of a certain degree of conservatism in the relevant written texts. Van Kemenade also mentions possible dialectal variations in which IP-internal cliticization *and* paradigms of nominal case morphology were preserved longer in the south than in the north of England. The details of these variations are further fleshed out, along with competing analyses, in van Kemenade (1997), Kroch and Taylor (1997), and Kroch et al. (2000).

49. Unlike in French, there are no preverbal object clitics in Icelandic, even though Icelandic, unlike French, has morphological case on both pronouns and nouns (Richard Kayne, pers. comm.). This contrast in object-placement is perhaps due to the Icelandic verb moving higher in the inflectional layer than its French counterpart. At any rate, given their respective morphological profile, the French and Icelandic object-placement contrasts suggest that inflectional morphology cannot by itself "drive" word order. (See note 33.)

50. Van Kemenade assumes that clause-internal cliticization is VP-internal, within the projection of the verb. In her framework, OE's strongly inflected verbs remain in VP (see, e.g., p. 189). Given my assumptions in section 4, OE finite verbs are outside of VP. I thus use the term "IP-internal cliticization" for examples like (40c). This is also consistent with arguments that cliticization is adjunction to a functional head higher than VP (see section 5).

51. There is yet a third, and lower, type of object cliticization that lasted through Early Modern English in the sixteenth century, as in *They tell v̲s̲ not the worde of God.* That, too, is dependent on verb movement, here to the left of *not*. (See, e.g., Roberts 1997: 424 n7.)

52. Actually, according to Roberts (1997), what was lost in ME, due to the collapse of the morphological case system, is the general capacity for a whole range of leftward movements from under VP, of which object cliticization is only one instance. Roberts's central claim is that OE was uniformly head-initial; thus, underlying VX, with cases of (non-*wh*) X . . . V surface order (e.g., Scrambling and Object Shift, including cliticization) derived by leftward movement via Agr_oP. See Kroch and Taylor (1997, 2000) for detailed evidence of dialectal variations affecting some of the relevant VX and XV word-order throughout OE and Early ME.

53. As discussed in note 21, the correlation between nominal and pronominal case markings and object cliticization is controversial: (i) Fr shows morphological case (only) on pronouns (like NE), yet allows cliticization (unlike NE) and even *preverbal* object clitics (unlike Icelandic; see note 49); (ii) Louisiana Creole (LC) first-person and second-person singular pronouns are morphologically distinguished for nominative versus non-nominative case, yet do not cliticize (Neumann 1985: 166–173, 187, 256). However, unlike NE and HC, Fr manifests V-to-I with main verbs, and Fr pronouns manifest more morphological case distinctions than English pronouns (e.g., dative vs. accusative). Furthermore, like NE and HC, and unlike Fr, basilectal LC has no V-to-I and shows fewer morphological case distinctions than Fr; the split is basically between nominatives and nonnominatives in first-person and second-person singular—thus LC morphological case is even poorer than in English. (See Rottet 1992 and DeGraff 1997 for further discussion of V-in-situ vs. V-to-I in the diachrony of LC.)

Other puzzles are posed by comparing Icelandic, German, and Dutch: they all allow Object Shift, but they manifest varying degrees of (pro)nominal case morphology. What is not fully understood includes (i) the threshold of verbal inflectional paradigms above which V-to-I obtains (see notes 18 and 54 and DeGraff 1997: 89); (ii) once V-to-I obtains, the threshold of case-marking paradigms above which overt object cliticization and NP object-shift obtain (does it even make sense to hypothesize such a threshhold given the aforementioned difficulties in connecting OS with case?); (iii) once both V and objects move outside of VP into the inflectional layer, the ordering restrictions between verb and objects. In any case, verb movement seems a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for object cliticization, as attested in the history of English and HC. (See the discussion in section 7, especially note 62, regarding verb and object movement in Capeverdean Creole and Palenquero.)

54. This section has glossed over many interesting details on the cross-linguistic placement of object clitics. The point here is rather broad: the HC–NE pair and the Fr–OE/ME pair oppose each other across the divide between the inflectional "haves" and "have-nots"; this divide corresponds to distinct syntactic effects—namely, movements out of VP versus the absence thereof. In the cases under study here, the distinctions can be made in a simplistic binary fashion: absence versus presence of V-movement, and "poor" versus "rich" inflection. But there are many languages (e.g., Romance languages and various Scandinavian dialects; also Capeverdean Creole and Palenquero Creole, as discussed in section 7) that are located on closer points on the inflectional and verb-movement continua, with much more subtle effects vis-à-vis the landing sites of verb and object placement. Furthermore, there are certainly other factors at play in verb and object placement that I have not considered here. (See notes 18 and 33 for additional caveats.)

55. Neither does the evidence support the claim that HC's object placement was arrived at via the sort of strict relexification whereby Creole syntax is virtually isomorphic to substratum syntax modulo reanalysis and dialect-leveling (see Lefebvre 1998 and its early antecedent in Adam 1883; cf. sections 2.2, 2.3, 3.3 and the critiques in DeGraff 2002b, 2002c and references therein).

56. At least one other, and more speculative, link can be established between HC object-pronoun morphosyntax and certain Fr patterns. In DeGraff (2000: 104f.), I extrapolate from observations in Bruyn et al. (1999), and I tentatively explore the potential role that Fr positive imperatives may have had in the emergence of HC's uniformly postverbal objects. This suggests another reanalysis scenario where imperatives, once again, have a crucial role as the terminus a quo of reanalysis (cf. section 6.2). The key observation here is that Fr positive imperatives (e.g., *Aimez les* 'Love them'), unlike negative imperatives (e.g., *Ne les aimez pas* 'Don't love them') and unlike declaratives (in, e.g., (8)–(9)), have their objects uniformly to the right of the verb, whether or not the object is pronominal. HC imperatives—both positive and negative—have their objects uniformly to the right of the verb, whether or not the object is pronominal (e.g., *Renmen yo*). This (superficial) word-order parallel suggests—and this is admittedly a weak suggestion—that Fr positive imperatives may have contributed additional triggers to the emergence of HC's uniform V-Obj word order.

57. One telling contrast in the development of pronoun placement in the L2A of French is provided by the comparison of Arabophone and Hispanophone adult learners, whose data are publicly available from the CHILDES System (MacWhinney 2000). The

Hispanophone learners seem to produce targetlike object clitics with shorter delays and fewer "discrepancies" than their Arabophone counterparts. As suggested by Véronique (1990: 188), Klein and Perdue (1992: 325f.), and Perdue (1995: 164f.), among others, this differential may be due to the learners' respective L1s: Arabic, unlike Spanish, lacks preverbal object clitics (cf. note 32). Véronique (1990) documents other word-order aspects of Arabophone learners' interlanguage that are influenced by the L1 (e.g., verb-initial orders; p. 190) while taking pains to indicate the limits of L1 transfer (p. 197f.); see also Véronique (2000). In sections 3.3 and 6.2, I offer additional caveats regarding the extent of substrate influence in Creole genesis, and in DeGraff (2002b, 2002c), I offer an extended argument against the relexification hypothesis.

58. Aboh's treatment of OS in (Gun) Gbe also conforms to Holmberg's Generalization: in his analysis (Gun) Gbe has both Object Shift and V-to-I—more precisely verb movement to Aspect (see, e.g., Aboh 1999: 59f., 205–222, and chapter 4 in this volume).

Unlike Aboh's, Ndayiragije's (2000) treatment does not assume V-to-I for Fongbè, at least not of the sort envisaged by Aboh. Yet Ndayiragije, to account for Gbe reduplication, postulates verb-copying to Tense and T-to-C raising, both at PF. Ndayiragije's treatment suffers from a couple of theory-internal inconsistencies:

Ndayiragije assumes that T in Fongbè has an [affix] feature that must be checked. This is supposed to explain certain cases of verb-doubling—namely, when there is no overt (shifted) object in Spec(TP) to provide phonological support to T. For example:

> After *wh*-movement of the shifted object . . . the [affix] feature of T, an uninterpretable PF feature, requires a phonological host in order to be "visible" in the Morphology component of PF . . . Therefore, [verb doubling]. (Ndayiragije 2000: 501)

Elsewhere, T's [affix] feature can be checked without verb doubling. In one such case—namely, subject-less infinitival complements with overtly realized complementizers—"two options arise":

> T's [affix] feature raises to the lexicalized C [this is T-to-C raising]; or it attracts the phonological features of V [this is verb-doubling]. The first option [i.e., T-to-C raising] is arguably better on economy grounds. Indeed, attracting the phonological features of V [i.e., verb-doubling] would involve a second operation: copying these features in the base position of V. . . . This analysis [with other details omitted here] correctly predicts the absence of object shift and verb doubling in nonfinite CP headed by an overt C. (Ndayiragije 2000: 508)

The problem here is that the T-to-C option seems to *incorrectly* rule out verb doubling elsewhere, including certain prospective and progressive constructions where verb doubling does take place (see (20) in section 3.3; see also Aboh 1999: 188–218 and chapter 4 in this volume and Ndayiragije 2000: 498f.). In these constructions, there is a c-commanding lexicalized head that governs T with the [afix] feature and is available as a phonological host to T. If the more economical T-raising option was taken in the prospective and progressive constructions, then there would be no V doubling there, contra the data. As it turns out, Ndayiragije (2000: 502 n16) explicitly allows T to "move to [some higher] head to find phonological support"—in this case, the higher F(inite) head which *also* had the [affix] feature (p. 500). This kind of T-raising to a higher lexicalized head, which may or may not have [affix] features, undermines Ndayiragije's

analysis: The option to check the relevant [affix] feature by T- or C-raising to a higher lexicalized head qua phonological host is more economical than, and incorrectly prevents, the (more costly) option of verb doubling to apply where it does apply.

Another apparent flaw in Ndayiragije's treatment is the very mechanics of PF verb movement as verb doubling. Recall that the latter takes place for checking T's [affix] feature when T is not lexicalized. Yet we also have cases when both C and T have [affix] features, while both C and T are not lexicalized, which would then seem to entail verb tripling. Ndayiragije claims that T-to-C, subsequent to V-to-T qua verb doubling, checks C's [affix] feature and that "this T-to-C does not trigger further verb-doubling since what has raised in T is nothing but the pure phonological features of V, categorical features being stranded in the base position of V." I am not sure I understand this, but what seems left unexplained is the absence of verb tripling, given that it is also assumed that "the [affix] feature of T, an uninterpretable PF feature, requires a phonological host in order to be 'visible' in the Morphology component of PF" (p. 501). After T-to-C raises V's "phonetic shell" from T up to C, T is left without a phonetic matrix, which should make T uninterpretable at PF, given Ndayiragije's own assumptions about the checking of [affix] features: absence of phonetic material in either T or C should make the corresponding [affix] feature uninterpretable at PF. Here, we seem to have one [affix] feature too many; without verb "tripling," there should be ungrammaticality, yet there is no verb tripling in the relevant Fongbè examples.

59. Furthermore, CVC manifests subject-verb inversion in conditionals (Baptista 1997: 132). But this is complicated by the occurrence of auxiliary+verb sequences in the "inverted" pre-subject position (Baptista, pers. comm., October 11, 2000). At any rate, HC manifests no such inversion. Baptista cautiously notes that the data in (47) are from her own dialect. She is concerned that such patterns, with these particular adverbs, may reflect V-to-I in the Portuguese spoken by speakers who are bilingual in CVC and Portuguese—such V-to-I patterns may not be "representative." See also note 60. Note 19 mentions a possibly analogous phenomenon vis-à-vis occasional V-to-I patterns in HC.)

60. One could reasonably argue that, in (48), the adverb is right-adjoined to VP, while the direct object is right-dislocated outside of VP, in some (focus?) position. If this is correct, the word order in (48) would not automatically count as evidence for V-to-I in PL. However, Armin Schwegler (pers. comm., October 11, 2000) informs us that the postadverbial position of the object in (48) is not assigned any special property (e.g., contrastive stress); contrastive stress on the object in (48) is obtained by heavy stress on the first syllable of *ese*. Thus, it can be reasonably assumed that the postadverbial object in (48) is within the VP and not in a focus position outside of VP, thus there is V-to-I in PL, as assumed in the main text; see Suñer 1994 for evidence of V-to-I in Spanish, the lexifier of PL. (I am most grateful to Armin Schwegler for extensive and informative discussion of PL data.)

61. Baptista (1997: 227) speculates on the possibility that *ba*-affixation (alongside, and perhaps as a trigger to, V-to-I) is a recent development in CVC. She notes that *ba* is an unbound morpheme in the neighboring Creole of Guinea-Bissau. The history of -*ba* from unbound to inflectional morpheme looks like a typical case of grammaticalization, somewhat on a par with the progression of Romance TMA markers from auxiliaries in verbal periphrases to inflectional suffixes in synthetic tenses. The latter "was achieved through a process of incorporation of the infinitive to the auxiliary ... [which]

was then progressively 'grammaticalized' in dialects such as Spanish and French; that is, the auxiliary was completely reanalyzed as a normal tense/agreement verbal inflection" (Raposo 2000: 283f.; see also Duarte and Matos 2000: 134, 138). As discussed by Raposo, this reanalysis had not proceeded uniformly across all Romance dialects, and not even across all Portuguese dialects. In Duarte and Matos's account, Portuguese dialects have both "the 'new' synthetic form" and "a survival of the analytic form." In this light, the morphosyntactic differences vis-à-vis affixal *-ba* in Cape Verdean and nonaffixal *ba* in Guinea-Bissau are hardly surprising.

62. Given English verb-placement data (see, e.g., (28)), it must then be argued that English inflectional affixes (*-ed*, *-s*, and *-ing*), unlike their CVC and PL counterparts (see (47)–(48)), do not induce V-to-I. Our account so far does not say anything about this difference between English (V-in-situ) versus CVC and PL (V-to-I). Are there any morphological contrasts to be correlated with this word-order difference? Are there CVC- and PL-specific morphological triggers, in addition to syntactic triggers, that enter into the learner's determination of the verb-placement setting for each specific language? Here I will speculate on some possibilities.

Quint (2000: 225) gives the following paradigm for *kanta* 'to sing,' a typical verb in Cape Verdean Creole (Santiago variety): active-present *kanta*, active-past *kantába*, passive-present *kantádu*, passive-past *kantáda*. Quint lists the following inflectional affixes and their "glosses":

(i) -∅: active present; *-ba*: active past; *-du*: passive present; *-da*: passive past

One can very well dispute Quint's glosses, especially the uniform attribution of "present" and "past" to specific verbal affixes, independent of the aspectual properties of the verbal stem. Witness the temporal interpretive contrast between *e kanta* '(s)he sang' versus *e ten febri* '(s)he has fever' (cf. Baptista 1997: 65f.). This is the factativity effect, a rather common feature of West-African and Creole languages (see section 3.3; see also Déchaine 1991; Aboh 1999: 223–225 and chapter 4 in this volume; and Ndayiragije 2000: 490f.).

Now, let's bravely abstract away from the "minefield" of dialectal variations in CVC studies. (This "minefield," which Marlyse Baptista warns me about (pers. comm., November 2001), can be glimpsed at by comparing the descriptions of passive morphosyntax in Veiga (1996), Quint (2000), and Baptista (2002).) Then let's assume DISTRIBUTED MORPHOLOGY (Halle and Marantz 1993; Noyer 1997; Halle 1997; Harley and Noyer 1999; keeping in mind the caveats in notes 18 and 20) and let's propose the following analysis for the INFL morphemes in (i) with the following associations between phonological exponents and morphosyntactic specifications:

(ii) a.   -/d/-: the exponent of a *passive* voice head

b.   -/a/: the exponent of an *anterior* tense head in the environment of the *passive* voice

c.   -/u/: the exponent of the tense head in the environment of the *passive* voice

d.   -/ba/: the exponent of an *anterior* tense head (cf. Baptista 1997: 97–99, 116–118);

e.   -∅: to be inserted elsewhere.

One possible correlate of V-to-I in CVC resides in the details of the morphemic decomposition in (ii), independent of interpretive subtleties. For any given INFL-related voice head or tense head that the syntax delivers to the morphophonology with the morphosyntactic features [±passive] and [±anterior], the phonological exponent of the "Vocabulary Item" with the greatest number of matching features is inserted in that head. The crucial point here is that the hypothesized structure of CVC passive forms such as *kantá +d +u* and *kantá +d +a* shows *stacking* of inflectional affixes. Thus, there are CVC verbal forms that, like Fr and ME ones, bear multiple inflectional affixes on the verbal stem. In other words, affixal stacking in CVC passives makes its verbal morphology very much unlike that of Modern English; such stacking may well count as a symptom of CVC "rich" inflection of the sort that triggers V-to-I (see Bobaljik 2001: 6, and notes 18 and 20 earlier).

One brief note on the "minefield" of dialectal variations in CVC and possible methodological confounds: Many CVC dialects, including some of those described in Baptista (1997, 2002), the *-da/-du* alternation appears quite elusive. Furthermore, there are dialects without the *-da/-du* alternation that do manifest instances of V-to-I (Baptista 1997; but see note 59). Nevertheless, my speculations here do invite CVC dialectologists to look for particular patterns—in particular, empirical correlations, or lack thereof, between V-to-I and the morphological profile of verbs—while controlling for Portuguese influence, dialect mixing, abstract (nonovert) residue of erstwhile overt affixes, and so on. Not a small task.

Here's another possible symptom of un-English "rich" inflection CVC. Baptista (1997: 263–266) notes that CVC "displays a ban on clitic clustering": there can't be two clitics following the verb. As it turns out, *-ba* participates in "clitic" clustering: once *-ba* affixes to a verb, the verb can no longer host an object clitic:

   (iii)   *João*   odja+m.
              João   saw+me

             "João saw me."

   (iv)   *João   odja+ba+m
              João   saw+PAST+me

   (v)   *João   odja+m+ba
             João   saw+me+PAST

Once the verb is affixed with *-ba*, it can only take a nonclitic pronoun (e.g., *mi* in (vi)):

   (vi)   *João*   *odjaba*   *mi.*
              João   saw+PAST   me

             "João had seen me."

It thus seems that *-ba* and object clitics are in competition to occupy, in atheoretical terms, an "affixal" slot on the verb. If this is correct, then it can be argued that both the TMA affix *-ba* and the clitic *m* are *syntactic* affixal heads that, in this particular case, compete for support from a verbal stem in the narrow syntax. Whichever analysis is offered for such a competition, its sheer existence distinguishes CVC *-ba* from English *-ed*—to wit, *I liked it* (vs. (iv)). The contrast in (iii)–(vi) may be yet another cue, for the linguist if not for the Cape Verdean child, that differentiates CVC *-ba* from English *-ed* vis-à-vis their respective potential for V-to-I. (I am greatly indebted to Marlyse Bap-

tista for her generous comments on some of the discussion in this section and for shar-
ing some of her results and fieldwork data in advance of publication.)

Similarly, PL *-ba* also shows PL-specific morphological properties that set it apart
from English *-ed*—properties of the sort that may lead the learner to endow the rele-
vant PL inflectional head(s) with V-to-I potential. In (53), PL *-ba* (unlike CVC *-ba*; cf.
(v)) can be separated from its verbal stem by an object clitic. Like CVC *-ba*, PL *-ba*
looks like an affixal head that is active in the narrow syntax, as it can attach to the
verb+clitic complex head, which is presumably created in the narrow syntax as well,
assuming that *-ba* is merged in a position that precedes and c-commands the base posi-
tions of both verb and object clitic. Forms like *miná+lo+ba* in (53) may then be one of
the triggers that force the learner to analyze PL *-ba* as an independent, syntactically ac-
tive head, to which the verb+clitic complex *miná+lo* moves in the syntax to host the
syntactically active suffix *-ba*, giving *miná+lo+ba*. This is yet another instance of "affix
stacking"—if we can call it that—that correlates with V-to-I. Another, perhaps clearer,
instance of affix-stacking in PL is the aforementioned *toká-ndo-ba*, which bears both
progressive and past inflectional affixes. Recall that English *-ed*, unlike Pl *-ba*, does not
enter into affix stacking of any sort: *like+it+ed* and *play+ing+ed*.

If these speculations are on the right track, then both CVC and PL provide the
learner with positive evidence that the relevant inflectional heads above VP are affixal
and trigger V-to-I. This line of reasoning also suggests that there is a multiplicity of
cues that, in principle, can be used to decide on the setting of the verb-placement pa-
rameter (cf. Lightfoot 1999; Roberts 1999; Bobaljik 2001).

REFERENCES

Aboh, Enoch (1999) *From the Syntax of Gungbe to the Grammar of Gbe.* Éditions à la
    Carte, Sierre.
Ackema, Peter (2001) "On the Relation between V-to-I and the Structure of the Inflec-
    tional Paradigm. *Linguistic Review* 18: 233–263.
Adam, Lucien (1883) *Les idiomes négro-aryen et maléo-aryen: Essai d'hybridologie linguis-
    tique.* Maisonneuve, Paris.
Alleyne, Mervyn (1971) "Acculturation and the Cultural Matrix of Creolization," in Dell
    Hymes (ed.) *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages.* Cambridge University
    Press, Cambridge, 169–186.
Archibald, John (ed.) (2000) *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory.* Black-
    well, Malden, Mass.
Avolonto, Aimé (1992) "De l'étude sémantico-syntaxique des marqueurs pré-verbaux à la
    structure de phrase en fɔngbé." Ph.D. thesis, University of Derek (1981) *Roots of
    Language.* Karoma, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Baissac, Charles (1880) *Étude sur le Patois Créole Mauricien.* Nomey: Imprimerie Berger-
    Levrault et Cie.
Baptista, Marlyse (1997) *"The Morpho-Syntax of Nominal and Verbal Categories in Cape-
    verdean Creole."* Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge.

Baptista, Marlyse (2002) *The Syntax of Cape Verdean Creole: The Sotavento Varieties.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Bickerton, Derek (1981) *Roots of Language.* Karoma, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Bickerton, Derek (1984) "The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2): 173–203.

Bickerton, Derek (1988) "Creole languages and the bioprogram," in Frederick Newmeyer (ed.) *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*. Vol. 2: *Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 268–284.

Bobaljik, Jonathan (1995) "Morphosyntax: The Syntax of Verbal Inflection." Ph.D. diss., MIT, Mass.

Bobaljik, Jonathan (1999) "Adverbs: The Hierarchy Paradox." *Glot International* 4 (9/10): 27–28.

Bobaljik, Jonathan (2001) "The Rich Agreement Hypothesis in Review" ("version 2.0, August 2001," 32 pages). Unpublished ms., McGill University.

Bobaljik, Jonathan (2002) "A-Chains at the PF Interface: Copies and "Covert" Movement." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20.2: 192–267.

Bobaljik, Jonathan, and Dianne Jonas (1996) "Subject Position and the Roles of TP." *Linguistic Inquiry* 27(2): 195–236.

Brunot, Ferdinand (1966) *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours.* A. Colin, Paris.

Brunot, Ferdinand, and Charles Bruneau (1969 [1949]) *Précis de grammaire historique de la langue française.* Masson, Paris.

Bruyn, Adrienne, Pieter Muysken, and Maaike Verrips (1999) "Double Object Constructions in the Creole Languages: Development and Acquisition," in Michael DeGraff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 329–373.

Bunsen, Christian (1854) "The Icelandic and the Modern Scandinavian, or the Effect of Colonization," in Christian Bunsen (ed.) *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History Applied to Language and Religion*, vol. 2. Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, London, 52–57.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca (1994) *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Cadely, Jean-Robert (1994) "Aspects de la Morphologie du Créole Haitien." Ph.D. dissertation, Université du Québec à Montréal.

Cadely, Jean-Robert (1997) "Prosodie et cliticisation en créole haïtien." *Études Créoles* 20(1): 77–88.

Chaudenson, Robert (1974) *Le lexique du parler créole de la Réunion.* Librairie Honoré Champion, Paris.

Chaudenson, Robert (1992) *Des îles, des hommes, des langues.* L'Harmattan, Paris.

Chaudenson, Robert (1995) *Les créoles.* Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Chaudenson, Robert, and Salikoko Mufwene (2001) *Creolization of Language and Culture.* [English translation and revision of Chaudenson 1992.] Routledge, London.

Chaudenson, Robert, Raymond Mougeon, and Édouard Beniak (1993). *Vers une approche panlectale de la variation du français.* Institut d'Études Créoles et Francophones, Aix-en-Provence.

Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Knowledge of Language.* Praeger, New York.

Chomsky, Noam (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," in Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1–52.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford University Press, New York.

da Cruz, Maxime (1995) "Aspectual Verbs *fó, vɔ̀ 'finish'* in Fɔngbè." *Linguistic Review* 12(4): 361–380.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie (1991) "Bare Sentences," in Steven Moore and Adam Zachary Wyner (eds.) *Proceedings of the First Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., 31–50.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, and Victor Manfredi (eds.) (1997) *Object Positions in Benue-Kwa*. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.

DeGraff, Michel (1992a) "Creole Grammars and Acquistion of Syntax." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.

DeGraff, Michel (1992b) "Haitian null subjects revisited," in Claire Lefebvre (ed.) *Travaux de Recherche sur le Créole Haïtien*. University of Quebec, Montreal, 59–74.

DeGraff, Michel (1992c) "Is Haitian a Pro-Drop Language?," in Francis Byrne and John Holm (eds.) *Atlantic Meets Pacific: A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 71–90.

DeGraff, Michel (1992d) "The Syntax of Predication in Haitian," in Kimberly Broderick (ed.) *Proceedings of NELS 22*. Amherst, Mass.: Graduate Linguistics Student Association, 103–117.

DeGraff, Michel (1993) "A Riddle on Negation in Haitian." *Probus* 5: 63–93.

DeGraff, Michel (1994a) "The morphology-Syntax Interface in Creolization (and Diachrony). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24(2): 115–132.

DeGraff, Michel (1994b) "To Move or Not to Move? Placement of Verbs and Object Pronouns in Haitian and in French," in Katharine Beals et al. (eds.) *Papers from the 30th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago Linguistics Society, Chicago, 141–155.

DeGraff, Michel (1995a) "On Certain Differences between Haitian and French Predicative Constructions," in Jon Amastae, Grant Goodall, Mario Montalbetti, and Marianne Phinney (eds.) *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 237–256.

DeGraff, Michel (1995b) "Predicate-Movement, Quantification, Events and Properties," in Victor Manfredi and Karl Reynolds (eds.) *Niger-Congo Syntax and Semantics* 6. Boston University African Studies Center, Boston, Mass.

DeGraff, Michel (1997) "Verb Syntax in Creolization (and Beyond)," in Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*. Longman, London, 64–94.

DeGraff, Michel (1998) "Nominal Predication in Haitian and in Irish," in Emily Curtis, James Lyle, and Gabriel Webster (eds.) *Proceedings of the Sixteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford, Calif., 113–128.

DeGraff, Michel (1999a) "Creolization, Language Change and Language Acquisition: A Prolegomenon," in Michel DeGraff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1–46.

DeGraff, Michel (1999b) "Creolization, Language Change and Language Acquisition: An

Epilogue," in (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 473–543.

DeGraff, Michel (ed.) (1999c) *Language Creation and Language Change: Creolization, Diachrony and Development*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

DeGraff, Michel (1999d) "Parameter-Setting in Language Acquisition and through Diachrony," in Rob Wilson and Frank Keil (eds.) *MIT Encyclopedia of Cognitive Sciences*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 624–627.

DeGraff, Michel (2000). "A propos des pronoms objets dans le créole d'Haïti: Regards croisés de la morphologie et de la diachronie." *Langages* 138: 89–113.

DeGraff, Michel (2001a). "Morphology in Creole Genesis: Linguistics and Ideology," in Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 53–121.

DeGraff, Michel (2001b) "On the Origin of Creoles: A Cartesian Critique of Neo-Darwinian Linguistics." *Linguistic Typology* 5(2): 213–311.

DeGraff, Michel (2002a) "Linguists' Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism." Unpublished ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

DeGraff, Michel (2002b) "On Creole Genesis and Language Acquisition: Some Methodological and Theoretical Preliminaries." Unpublished ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

DeGraff, Michel (2002c) "Relexification: A re-evaluation." *Anthropological Linguistics* 44.4: 321–414.

DeGraff, Michel (2003) "Haitian Creole Morpho-Syntax: A Micro-Parametric Approach to Its Structure and Genesis." Unpublished ms.

Dejean, Yves (1992) "Manifestations en créole haïtien du principe d'adjacence stricte." Unpublished ms., Institut de Linguistique Appliquée, Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

Denis, Serge (ed.) (1935) *Nos antilles*. G. Luzeray, Orléans.

Déprez, Viviane (1989) "On the Typology of Syntactic Positions and the Nature of Chains." Ph.D. diss., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Déprez, Viviane (1994) "Haitian Creole: A Pro-Drop Language?" *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 9: 1–24.

Déprez, Viviane (1999) "The Roots of Negative Concord in French and French-Lexicon Creoles," in Michel DeGraff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 375–427.

Descourtilz, Michel Étienne (1809) *Voyages d'un Naturaliste et ses Observations faites sur les Trois Règnes de la Nature, dans Plusieurs Ports de Mer Français, en Espagne, au Continent de l'Amérique Septentrionale . . .* 3 vol. Dufart, Paris.

Duarte, Inês, and Gabriela Matos (2000) "Romance clitics and the Minimalist Program," in Joõ Costa (ed.) *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, New York, 116–142.

Ducœurjoly, S. J. (1802) *Manuel des Habitans de Saint-Dominque*. Paris: Lenoir.

Ellegård, Alvar (1953) *The Auxiliary* Do: *The Establishment and Regulation of Its Use in English*. Almquist and Wiksell, Stockholm.

Fabb, Nigel (1992) "Reduplication and Object Movement in Ewe and Fon." *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13: 1–41.

Falk, Cecilia (1993) *Non-Referential Subjects in the History of Swedish Land*. University of Lund, Department of Scandinavian Languages.

Fattier, Dominique (1995) "Une si proche étrangère (quelques remarques à propos de la genèse du sous-système des pronoms personnels du créole d'Haïti)," in Françoise

Gadet and Dominique Fattier (eds.) *Situations du Français, LINX 33.* Centre de Recherches Linguistiques de l'Université Paris X-Nanterre, Paris.

Fattier, Dominique (1998) "Contribution à l'étude de la genèse d'un créole: L'atlas linguistique d'Haïti, cartes et commentaires." Ph.D. diss., Université de Provence. Distributed by Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France.

Frei, Henri (1929) *La grammaire des fautes.* P. Geuthner, Paris.

Gadet, Francoise (1997) *Le français populaire.* Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

Givón, Talmy (1979) "Prolegomena to Any Sane Creology," in Ian Hancock (ed.) *Readings in Creole Studies.* E. Story-Scientia, Ghent, Belgium, 3–35.

Goodman, Morris (1964) *A Comparative Study of Creole French Dialects.* Mouton, The Hague.

Goodman, Morris (1993) "African Substratum: Some Cautionary Words," in Salikoko Mufwene, (ed.) *Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties.* University of Georgia Press. Athens, 64–73.

Gougenheim, Georges (1929) *Etude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française.* Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

Halle, Morris (1997) "Distributed Morphology: Impoverishment and Fission," in Benjamin Bruening, Yoonjung Kang and Martha McGinnis (eds.) *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 30. MIT Linguistics and Philosophy, Cambridge, Mass., 425–449.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz (1993) "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection." In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger.* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Harley, Heidi, and Rolf Noyer (1999) "Distributed Morphology." *Glot International* 4(4): 3–9.

Haugen, Einar (1976) *The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to Their History.* Faber and Faber, London.

Haugen, Einar (1982) *Scandinavian Language Structures: A Comparative Historical Survey.* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Hjelmslev, Louis (1938) "Relation de parenté des langues créoles." *Revue des Études Indo-Européennes* 1: 271–286.

Holmberg, Anders (1985) "Icelandic Word Order and Binary Branching." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 9: 161–195.

Holmberg, Anders (1999) "Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization." *Studia Linguistica* 53(1): 1–39.

Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack (1990) "On the Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax," in Werner Abraham, Wim Kosmeijer, and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Issues in Germanic Syntax.* 93–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack (1995) *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Howe, Kate (2000) "Développement d'une théorie de la temporalité: Les cas du créole haïtien et du papiamento," Ph.D. diss., University of Provence.

Idylles et chansons; ou essais de poésie créole par un habitant d'Hayti. (1811) J. Edwards, Philadelphie.

Ionin, Tania, and Ken Wexler (2002) "Why Is 'Is' Easier Than 's'? Acquisition of Tense/ Agreement Morphology by Child L2-English Learners." *Second Language Research* 18(2): 95–136.

Jespersen, Otto (1922) *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin*. G. Allen and Unwin, London.

Josefsson, Gunlög (1992) "Object Shift and Weak Pronominals in Swedish." *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 49: 59–94.

Kayne, Richard (1989a) "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing," in Osvaldo Jaeggli and Kenneth J. Safir (eds.) *The Null-Subject Parameter*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 239–261.

Kayne, Richard (1989b) "Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement," in Paola Benincà (ed.) *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*. Foris, Dordrecht, 85–103.

Kayne, Richard (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–686.

Kayne, Richard (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kinyalolo, Kasangati (1992) "A Note on Word Order in the Progressive and Prospective in Fɔn." *Journal of West African Languages* 22: 35–51.

Klein, Wolfgang, and Clive Perdue (1992) *Utterance Structure: Developing Grammaras Again*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Kroch, Anthony (1989a) "Function and Grammar in the History of English: Periphrastic *do*," in Ralph Fasold and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.) *Language Change and Variation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 133–172.

Kroch, Anthony (1989b) "Reflexes of Grammar in Patterns of Language Change." *Language Variation and Change,* 1(3): 199–244.

Kroch, Anthony, and Ann Taylor (1997) "The Syntax of Verb Movement in Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact," in Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 297–325.

Kroch, Anthony, and Ann Taylor (2000) "Verb-Object Order in Early Middle English," in Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner (eds.) *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 132–187.

Kroch, Anthony, Ann Taylor, and Donald Ringe (2000) "The Middle English Verb-Second Constraint: A Case Study in Language Contact and Language Change," in Susan Herring, Pieter van Reneen, and Lene Sch∅sler (eds.) *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 353–391.

Lardiere, Donna (2000) "Mapping Features to Forms in Second Language Acquisition," in John Archibald (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*. Blackwell, Malden, Mass., 102–129.

Larousse, Pierre (1869) *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX siècle*. Larousse, Paris.

Lasnik, Howard (1995) "Verbal Morphology: *Syntactic Structures* Meets the *Minimalist Program*," in Hector Campos and Paula Kempchinsky (eds.) *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 251–275.

Lasnik, Howard (1999) *Minimalist Analysis*. Blackwell, Malden, Mass.

Lefebvre, Claire (1998) *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar: The Case of Haitian Creole*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lightfoot, David (1999) "Creoles and Cues," in Michel DeGraff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 431–452.

Lightfoot, David (2002) "Myths and the Prehistory of Grammars." *Journal of Linguistics* 38(1): 113–136.

MacWhinney, Brian (2000) *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk*. Erlbaum, Mahwah, N.J.

Marantz, Alec (1991 [2000]) "Case and Licensing," in Germán Westphal, Benjamin Ao, and Hee-Rahk Chae (eds.) *Proceedings of Eight Eastern States Conference on Linguistics.* Ohio State University, Columbus, 234–253.

Mchombo, Sam (ed.) (1993) *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar.* CSLI Publications, Stanford, Calif.

McWhorter, John (1998) "Identifying the Creole Prototype: Vindicating a Typological Class." *Language* 74(4): 788–818.

Meillet, Antoine (1951 [1929]) "Le développement des langues," in Antoine Meillet. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale.* Klincksieck, Paris, 2: 71–83.

Meillet, Antoine (1958 [1912]) "L'Évolution des formes grammaticales," In Antoine Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale.* Honoré Champion, Paris, 1: 130–148.

Meillet, Antoine (1958 [1919] "Le genre grammaticale et l'élimination de la flexion," in Antoine Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale.* Honoré Champion, Paris, 1: 199–210.

Meillet, Antoine (1958 [1920]) "Sur les caractères in Antoine Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale.* Honoré Champion, Paris, 1: 175–198.

Moreau de Saint-Méry, M.L.E. (1958 [1797]) *Description topographique, physique, civile, politique et historique de la partie française de l'isle de Saint Domingue.* 3 vols. Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, Paris.

Mufwene, Salikoko (1986) "Can Creole Languages Be Defined without Reference to Their History?" *Études Creoles* 9(1): 135–150.

Mufwene, Salikoko (1990) "Transfer and the Substrate Hypothesis in Creolistics." *Studies in Second Language Acquistion* 12(1): 1–23.

Mufwene, Salikoko (1991) "Pidgins, Creoles, Typology, and Markedness," in Francis Byrne and Thom Huebner (eds.) *Development and Structures of Creole Languages: Essays in Honor of Derek Bickerton.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 123–143.

Mufwene, Salikoko (1996) "The Founder Principle in Creole Genesis." *Diachronica* 13(1): 83–134.

Mufwene, Salikoko (1997) "Jargons, Pidgins, Creoles, and Koines: What Are They?," in Arthur Spears and Donald Winford (eds.) *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 35–70.

Mufwene, Salikoko (2001) *The Ecology of Language Evolution.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mufwene, Salikoko (2002) "Grammaticization as Part of the Development of Creoles," unpublished ms., University of Chicago, Chicago IL.

Muysken, Pieter (1988) "Are Creoles a Special Type of Language?" in *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey.* Vol. 2: *Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 285–301.

Ndayiragije, Juvénal (2000) "Strengthening PF." *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3): 485–512.

Neumann, Ingrid (1985) *Le créole de Breaux Bridge, Louisiane: Étude morphosyntaxe, textes, vocabulaire.* Helmust Buske, Hamburg.

Nilsen, Øystein (1997) "Adverbs and A-shift," *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 59: 1–31.

Noyer, Rolf (1997) *Features, Positions and Affixes in Autonomous Morphological Structure.* Garland, New York.

Pelleprat, Father Pierre (1965 [1655]) *Relato de las misiones de los padres de la Compañia*

de Jesús en las islas y en tierra firme de América Meridional. Fuentes para la Historia Colonial de Venezuela, Caracas.

Perdue, Clive (1995) *L'acquisition du français et de l'anglais par des adultes.* CNRS Editions, Paris.

Pierce, Amy (1992). *Language Acquisition and Syntactic Theory: A Comparative Analysis of French and English Child Grammars.* Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Platzack, Christer, and Anders Holmberg (1989) "The Role of Agr and Finiteness." *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 43: 51–76.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.

Prévost, Philippe, and Lydia White (2000) "Missing Surface Inflection or Impairment in Second Language Acquisition? Evidence from Tense and Agreement." *Second Language Research* 16(2): 103–133.

Quint, Nicolas (2000) *Grammaire de la langue cap-verdienne.* L'Harmattan, Paris.

Raposo, Eduardo (2000) Clitic Positions and Verb Movement," in João Costa (ed.) *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies.* Oxford University Press, New York, 266–297.

Rivera-Castillo, Yolanda (1992) "Enclitic Pronouns in Caribbean Spanish," in Laura Buszard-Welcher, Lionel Wee, and William Weigel (eds.) *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society.* Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, Calif., 424–434.

Rizzi, Luigi (1999) "Broadening the Empirical Basis of Universal Grammar Models: A Commentary," Michel De Graff (ed.) *Language Creation and Language Change.* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 453–472.

Roberts, Ian (1993) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French.* Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Roberts, Ian (1997) "Directionality and Word Order Change in the History of English," in Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 397–426.

Roberts, Ian (1998) *"Have/Be* Raising, Move F and Procrastinate." *Linguistic Inquiry* 29(1): 113–125.

Roberts, Ian (1999) "Verb Movement and Markedness," in Michel DeGraff (ed.). *Language Creation and Language Change.* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 287–327.

Rohrbacher, Bernhard (1994) "The Germanic VO Languages and the Full Paradigm: A Theory of V to I Raising." Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Rosiers, comte de (1818) *L'Entrée du roi en sa capitale, en janvier 1818, an 15ème de l'indépendance d'Hayti.* Imprimerie Royale, Sans-Souci, Haiti.

Rottet, Kevin (1992) "Functional Categories and Verb Raising in Louisiana Creole." *Probus* 4: 261–289.

Saint-Quentin, Alfred de (1989 [1872]) *Introduction à l'histoire de Cayenne,* with *Étude sur la grammaire créole* by Auguste de Saint-Quentin. *Cayenne: Comité de la Culture, de l'Éducation et de l'Environnement, Région Guyane.*

Schleicher, August (1852 [1850]) *Die Sprachen Europas in Systematischer Ubersicht: Linguistische Untersuchungen.* Trans. Hermann Ewerbeck. *Les Langues de l'Europe Moderne.* Ladrange, Paris.

Schlupp, Daniel (1997) *Modalités predicatives, modalités aspectuelles et auxiliaires en créole*

à base lexicale française de la Guyane française (XVIIIe–XXe siècles). Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Schütze, Carson (1997) "INFL in Child and Adult Language: Agreement, Case and Licensing." Ph.D. diss., MIT.

Schwegler, Armin, and Kate Green (In press) "Palenquero (Creole Spanish)," in John Holm and Peter Patrick (eds.) *Comparative Creole Syntax*. Battlebridge, London,–.

Seuren, Pieter (1998) *Western Linguistics: An Historical Introduction*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Seuren, Pieter, and Herman Wekker (1986) "Semantic Transparency as a Factor in Creole Genesis," in Pieter Muysken and Norval Smith (eds.) *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 57–70.

Siegel, Jeff (2003) "Substrate Influence in Creoles and the Role of Transfer in Second Language Acquisition." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25: 185–209.

Singler, John (1996) "Theories of Creole Genesis, Sociohistorical Considerations, and the Evaluation of the Evidence: The Case of Haitian Creole and the Relexification Hypothesis." *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11: 185–230.

Sportiche, Dominique (1995) "Clitic Constructions," in Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring (eds.) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 213–276.

Sprouse, Rex (1998) "Some Notes on the Relationship between Inflectional Morphology and Parameter-Setting in First and Second Language Acquisition," in Maria-Luise Beck (ed.) *Morphology and Its Interfaces in Second Language Knowledge*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 41–67.

Suñer, Margarita (1994) "V-movement and the Licensing of Argumental *wh*-Phrases in Spanish." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 335–372.

Sylvain, Suzanne (1936) *Le créole haïtien: Morphologie et syntaxe*. Wetteren, Imprimerie de Meester, Brussels.

Thomas, John Jacob (1869) *The Theory and Practice of Creole Grammar*. Chronicle, Port-of-Spain, Haiti.

Thomason, Sarah, and Terrence Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (1994) "Comments on the Paper by Vikner [1994]," in David Lightfoot, and Norbert Hornstein (eds.) (1994) *Verb Movement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 149–162.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2001) "Object Shift and Scrambling," in Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.) *Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Blackwell, Malden, Mass., 148–202.

van Kemenade, Ans (1987) *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English* Foris, Dordrecht.

van Kemenade, Ans, (1997) "V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English," in Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 326–352.

van Kemenade, Ans, and Nigel Vincent (eds.) (1997) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Van Name, Addison (1870) "Contributions to Creole Grammar." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 1: 123–167.

Veenstra, Tonjes (1996) "Serial Verbs in Saramaccan: Predication and Creole Genesis." Ph.D. diss., University of Amsterdam.

Veiga, Manuel (1996) *Introdução à Gramática do Crioulo de Cabo Verde*. 2nd ed. Instituto Caboverdiano do Livro e do Disco, Cabo Verde.

Véronique, Daniel (1990) "Reference and Discourse Structure in the Learning of French by Adult Moroccans," in Hans Dechert (ed.) *Current Trends in European Second Language Acquisition Research*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, England, 171–201.

Véronique, Daniel (2000) "Observations préléminaires sur *li* dans l'interlangue d'Abdelmalek," in Alain Giacomi, Henriette Stoffel, and Daniel Véronique (eds.) *Appropriation du français par des Marocains arabophones à Marseille*. Publications de l'Université de Provence, Aix-en-Provence, 207–323.

Vikner, Sten (1994) "Finite Verb Movement in Scandinavian Embedded Clauses," in David Lightfoot, and Norbert Hornstein (eds.) (1994) *Verb Movement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 117–147.

Vikner, Sten (1995) *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Vikner, Sten (1997) "V⁰-to-I⁰ Movement and Inflection for Person in all Tenses," in Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*. Longman, London, 189–213.

Vinson, Julien (1889) "Créoles," in Adolphe Bertillon et al. (eds.) *Dictionnaire des Sciences Anthropologiques*. Doin, Paris, 345–347.

Vrzić, Zvjezdana (1997) "A Minimalist Approach to Word Order in Chinook Jargon and the Theory of Creole Genesis." in Benjamin Bruening (ed.) *Proceedings of the Eighth Student Conference in Linguistics*. Working Papers in Linguistics 31. MIT, Cambridge, Mass., 467–478.

Weinreich, U. (1968 [1953]) *Languages in Contact*. Mouton, The Hague.

Wexler, Ken (1994) "Finiteness and Head Movement in Early Child Grammars, in David Lightfoot, and Norbert Hornstein (eds.) (1994) *Verb Movement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 305–350.

Wexler, Ken (2002) "Lenneberg's Dream: Learning, Normal Language Development and Specific Language Impairment," in Jeannette Schaeffer and Yonata Levy (eds.) *Language Competence across Populations: Towards a Definition of Specific Language Impairment*. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, N.J., 11–61.

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

COMPARATIVE SYNTAX

Edited by

GUGLIELMO CINQUE
RICHARD S. KAYNE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2005

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford   New York

Auckland   Bangkok   Buenos Aires   Cape Town   Chennai
Dar es Salaam   Delhi   Hong Kong   Istanbul   Karachi   Kolkata
Kuala Lumpur   Madrid   Melbourne   Mexico City   Mumbai   Nairobi
São Paulo   Shanghai   Taipei   Tokyo   Toronto