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Abstract

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

Haitian Creole emerged in the 17th century primarily from the contact between French and a few West-African languages. This paper can be motivated from

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

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

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

1. Pa and pas in their surface strings

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>FUT</th>
<th>SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREAL</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># pause (comma intonation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø phonetically null element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1) a. *Jan pa av- ale nan mache.  (Haitian Creole)
   Jan ANT IRREAL go in market
   'Jan would not have gone to the market.'
   b. *Jan pa (av-) ale nan mache.
   Jan ANT NEG IRREAL go in market
   c. *Jan (av-) pa ale nan mache.
   Jan IRREAL NEG go in market
   d. *Jan (av-) ale pa nan mache.
   Jan IRREAL go NEG in market

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

(2) a. Jean (ne) serait pas allé au marché.  (French)
   Jean (ne) would-be pas gone to-the market
   'John would not have gone to the market.'
   b. Jean (n') était pas allé au marché.
   Jean (ne) was pas gone to-the market
   'John has not gone to the market.'
   c. Jean (n') ira pas au cinéma.
   Jean (n') go+FUT pas at-the movies
   'John will not go to the movies.'

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

4. Apparent counter-examples to this generalization are constructions like (i) where pa occurs between the epistemic modal ka 'might' and the tense marker te 'ANT':
   (i) Jan ka pa te vini.
   Jan might NEG ANT come
   'Jan might not have come.'
   However, Magloire-Holly (1982) analyzes such modals as "EQUI-verbs" subcategorizing for a clausal complement. (DeGraff 1992e reinterprets Magloire-Holly's arguments within a control structure with an embedded PRO subject.) Such analyses defuse the counter-example.
   (ii) is another potential counter-example:
   (ii) Jan pa -p pa vini.
   Jan NEG IRREAL NEG come
   'Jan wouldn't (won't) not come.'
   However, it can be argued that the second negation in (ii) only takes scope over the VP headed by vini 'come', not over the whole clause; see the English translation and French Jean peut ne pas venir 'Jean might not come' (I thank Yves Dejean for data and discussion).

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

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

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

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

There is one well-defined class of facts distinguishing Haitian Creole pa from French pas.\(^6\) One conspicuous dissimilarity between Haitian Creole pa and French pas involves the interpretation of negative quantifiers. The essential point is that, semantically, negative quantifiers interact differently with Haitian Creole pa than they do with French pas. Compare (3) and (4): the interpretation of each acceptable French sentence in (3) is truth-conditionally opposite to that of its Haitian Creole counterpart in (4).\(^7\)

(3)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{Personne n'est pas venu.} \hspace{2cm} \text{(French)}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item nobody \textit{ne+is pas} come
    \item 'Everybody came' (lit. 'Nobody has not come.')
  \end{itemize}
  \item b. \textit{??Je n'ai pas vu personne.} 
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 1SG \textit{ne+have pas} seen nobody
  \end{itemize}
  \item c. \textit{Ce n'est pas rien.} 
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 3SG \textit{ne+is pas} nothing
    \item 'This is something.' (lit. 'This is not nothing.')
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

(4)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \textit{Pèsonn pa vini.} \hspace{2cm} \text{(Haitian Creole)}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item nobody \textit{pa} come
    \item 'Nobody has come.'
  \end{itemize}
  \item b. \textit{Mwen pa wè pèsonn.} 
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 1SG \textit{pa} see nobody
    \item 'I haven't seen anybody.'
  \end{itemize}
  \item c. \textit{Sa pa anyen.} 
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 3SG \textit{pa} nothing
    \item 'This is nothing.'
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

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

---

6. These facts were also noted in Déprez (1992), although they lead her to conclusions very different from mine. Déprez's analysis is discussed in section 6.2.

7. Native speakers vary considerably as to their acceptance of (3b). (3a) seems more readily acceptable, specially with stress on \textit{personne}. (See Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 for relevant comments.)
pa anyen means ‘This is nothing’. In the linguistic literature, for example Labov (1972), the phenomena illustrated in (4) has been called “negative concord”. The semantic contrast between double negation in (3) and negative concord in (4) is a robust empirical distinction between Haitian Creole pa and French pas.9,10

Now, with respect to negative concord, Haitian Creole pa behaves very much like another French negation marker, that is to say, ne. Each clause in (5), like in (4), produces a single instance of negation in the presence of two negative markers:11

\[(5)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{nobody } ne+\text{is come} \\
& ‘\text{Nobody has come.}’ \\
\text{b. } & \text{I haven’t seen anybody.} \\
\text{c. } & ‘\text{This is nothing.’}
\end{align*}\]

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

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

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

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

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

\[(i)\]
\[\begin{align*}
& \text{nothing } ne 1SG \text{ surprise} \\
& ‘\text{Nothing surprises me.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(ii)\]
\[\begin{align*}
& \text{nobody } ne+\text{is here} \\
& ‘\text{Nobody is here.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(iii)\]
\[\begin{align*}
& \text{no } \text{ student } ne+\text{arrive on the-time} \\
& ‘\text{No student arrives on time.’}
\end{align*}\]
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(6) Nan katye sa-a pèsonn pa di pèsonn anyen. (Haitian C.)

Dans ce quartier, personne ne dit rien à personne. (French)

‘In this neighborhood, nobody says anything to anybody.’

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

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

3. Sentential negation in French

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

(7) a. Pierre n’est pas venu.
   Pierre ne+is pas come
   ‘Pierre has not come.’

b. Marie n’aime pas Pierre.
   Marie ne+loves pas Pierre
   ‘Marie doesn’t love Pierre.’

I adopt without discussion the assumption that sentential negation markers project their own phrases in syntax, according to the templates of X-bar theory, that is, with (i) a specifier under XP and sister to X’; (ii) a head X0; and (iii) a complement under X’ and sister to X0; see for example Pollock (1989) and Zanuttini (1991) for detailed motivations.

Following Pollock, many syntacticians have analyzed French pas as occurring in the Spec of NegP (specifier of negation phrase), with ne as the head of NegP. As shown in (8), Pollock derives the order ne ... V0 pas by head-movement of ne, along with the finite verb, into a head which is higher than NegP. For
Pollock, the landing site of this movement is explicitly the head of TP (tense phrase). Movement of ne is motivated by its clitic nature, among other reasons.

(8) DS: \([T_P \ldots \ T^0 \ldots [\text{NegP pas } [\text{Neg' } [\text{Neg} \ne ] \ [V_P \ldots \ V^0 \ldots \ ]]]]\)

SS: \([T_P \ldots \ ne_i+V^0_j+T^0 \ldots [\text{NegP pas } [\text{Neg} \ne \ e_i \ [V_P \ldots \ e_j \ldots \ ]]]]\)

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

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

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

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

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

(10) a. N’est il pas venu?
   ne+is 3SG pas come
   ‘Has he not come?’

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thus, in (4) and (5), Haitian Creole \textit{pa} and French \textit{ne} are heads of NegP. They enter at LF into Spec–head agreement with a negative quantifier in Spec of NegP. Quoting Zanuttini (p. 144), "when such a configuration occurs, the semantic contribution to the interpretation of the sentence is the same as that of the head."\footnote{Example (ii) in note 4, \textit{Jan pa-p pa vini}, illustrates double negation in Haitian Creole. There we have two instances of \textit{pa} (thus two NegPs) cancelling each other (but see note 20).} To sum up, I take the negative concord data in (4), (5) and (6) in
Haitian Creole and French to be symptomatic of the head status of Haitian Creole *pa* and of French *ne*.\textsuperscript{13,14}

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

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

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

> We might propose that in languages with NC [Negative Concord] readings the head of NegP is “strong”: it is autonomously licensed: it has its NEG feature in the base. The NEG criterion is met by a “strong” static agreement configuration. In non-NC languages, on the other hand, Neg is “weak” and would be assigned the NEG feature by its specifier by virtue of Spec–head agreement. ... What is crucial for NC ... is that the NEG feature on Neg\textsuperscript{0} is independently licensed, i.e., that Neg\textsuperscript{0} is a strong head. In languages where the NEG feature on Neg\textsuperscript{0} can only be achieved via dynamic agreement the negative head is not strong and NC is not possible ... 

Consider (6) for example in light of Haegeman’s hypothesis. Given that negative concord obtains in (6), the negative head must be “strong”. Thus *pa* must be heading NegP. If *pa* were in Spec of NegP, it would license a “weak” Neg\textsuperscript{0} and negative concord would not obtain.

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

\textsuperscript{14} In the LF representation of (6), with three negative quantifiers (pre-verbal *pësonn*, post-verbal *pësonn* and *anyen*), one quantifier would be in Spec of NegP and the other two would be adjoined to Spec of NegP, as in Haegeman (1991). There they would undergo a process of absorption somewhat reminiscent to *wh*-absorption in certain questions with multiple *wh*-elements (Higginbotham and May 1981). Presumably, French *pas* in Spec of NegP, *not* being a quantifier of the sort of *personne*, *rien*, etc. cannot undergo absorption alongside the latter; see note 15.
into Spec of NegP. Therefore, in (3), the negative quantifier, personne or rien, cannot enter into agreement with the negative head. Therefore, the negation marker and the quantifier each contribute separately their negative force to the interpretation of the sentence. This results in double-negation readings, as expected.15,16

5. More on pa versus pas

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

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

---

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

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

(i) T-ee doa niemand nie over geklaapt.
   it-has there no-one not about talked
   ‘No one talked about that.’

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

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

Bouki makes the clown for pas that+they bore+RefI

Bouki PROG make comic for pa 3PL pa bore
‘Bouki is clowning around so that they (don’t) get bored.’

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

(12) a. Voilà un type pas bête!
there a fellow pas stupid

b. *Men yon moun pa sot!
here/there a fellow pa stupid
‘There goes a man who is not stupid!’

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

6. Alternatives to pa as head of NegP

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

---

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

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

(i) Mwen pa wè (pa) yon grenn moun.
1SG NEG see NEG a single person
‘I haven’t seen (anybody/not one person).’

(ii) Se pa ti kouri mwen (pa) kouri.
se NEG little run 1SG NEG run
‘I REALLY ran.’ (i.e. ‘I ran a whole lot.’)

In (i), pa yon seems to be a relic of French pas un (= aucun, as in Je n’ai vu pas une seule femme and Pas une seule femme n’est venue; for more data, see Gaatone 1971: 49, 176ff.). Structurally, the second pa would be part of a larger nominal phrase (Neg0 taking DP as a complement and being an extended projection of NP?). LF movement of the thus formed nominal phrase into the specifier position of the matrix NegP would then derive apparent negative concord.

As of (ii), I can only say for now that its interpretation is suggestive of expletive (optional) ne in French Je crains qu’il (ne) parte ‘I fear that he leave’. Space and time prevents me from addressing many of Dejean’s fascinating data; their treatment require future papers.
relationship with negative quantifiers, whence the negative concord facts in (4) and (6)? One other possibility is that pa is in a position adjoined to VP. I must also address the hypothesis adopted by Déprez (1992) that pèsonn (and perhaps anyen)21 in (4) and (6) may manifest properties of negative polarity items instead of negative quantifiers.

6.1. **Pa in adjoined position?**

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

6.2. **Pèsonn and anyen: quantifiers or polarity items?**

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

(13) I didn’t see anybody.

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

(14) Did you see anybody?

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

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

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

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

Déprez argues that pèsonn, if a negative polarity item, would not need to

---

²³. There are occurrences of any in matrix subject position, for example, anybody can do that. Any in such a context is not a negative polarity item, but a “possibility polarity item” (Lawler 1972) or “free-choice” any (Carlson 1981), and does not require a negative trigger. See Labov (1972), Horn (1989), Kadmon and Landman (to appear) and references therein for further remarks on various uses of any.
undergo movement at LF and could be interpreted in situ. (Recall that Déprez's examples of true negative quantifiers are French personne and English nobody.) Contra Déprez, I now show that pésonn and anyen are not negative polarity items.

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

6.2.1. Modification by prèské 'almost'

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

(17)  a. Prèské pèsonn pa vote pou Manigat. (Haitian Creole)
    almost nobody pa vote for Manigat
    Presque personne n'a voté pour Manigat. (French)
    'Almost nobody voted for Manigat.'

  b. Mwen pa manje prèské anyen jodi-a. (Haitian Creole)
    1SG pa eat almost nothing today
    Je n'ai presque rien mangé aujourd'hui. (French)
    'I have eaten almost nothing today.'

24. When modifying a negative quantifier, almost is interpreted relative to the cardinality of the set over which the quantifier ranges. Presumably, negative polarity items, unlike negative quantifiers, are not related to sets, whence the inadmissibility of almost as modifier of negative polarity items. (I thank Michael Hegarty for this observation.)

(As noted in Carlson 1981, among others, free-choice any may be modified by almost: I could eat almost anything!; cf. note 23.)

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

26. A few speakers do accept I haven't eaten almost anything today, although I didn't see almost anybody at the party seems worse to most informants. I have nothing to say about this variation.

6.2.2. Use in isolation

Secondly, negative polarity items like English anything and anybody cannot occur in isolation. This is because they must be licensed within the scope of an appropriate trigger. Unlike negative polarity items, pèsonn and anyen do occur in isolation, for example, as a negative answer to a question:
Therefore, the data in (17) and (18) indicate that pèsonn and anyen are indeed negative quantifiers.

6.2.3. Non-licensing by conditionals and comparatives

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

(19) a. *Si ou tòuye pèsonn, ou pral nan prison. (Haitian Creole)
if 2SG kill ? 2SG go in jail
‘If you kill anybody, you go to jail.’

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

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

In this regard, note the following French examples: Je l’ai vue de plus près que personne ‘I saw her closer than anyone’ and Y’a-t-il personne qui veuille venir? ‘Is there anybody who wants to come?’ There, personne is licensed in comparatives and interrogatives, much like English anybody, contra Dépréz’s tacit supposition that personne and nobody pattern more alike than pèsonn and nobody, with pèsonn in some environments equated to anybody; see note 29. (Kayne 1984: 39, note 4 observes further correspondences between personne and anybody; see also Gaatone 1971.)
6.2.5. Further data

While arguing that pèsonn is an negative polarity item under certain conditions, Déprez (1992: 38f.) rightly notes a distinction between (20a) and (20b). (20a) has a single pa, in the matrix clause, and gives rise to a negative expectation (the party will be deserted). (20b) has two pa's, one in the matrix and the other in the embedded clause, and gives rise to a positive expectation (at least some people will come to the party).

(20)

a. Mwen pa kwè pèsonn ap vini. (Haitian Creole)
   1SG pa believe nobody IRREAL come
   ‘I don’t think that anybody will come.’
   (i.e. ‘I think the party will be deserted.’)

b. Mwen pa kwè pèsonn pa ap vini28
   1SG pa believe nobody pa IRREAL come
   ‘I don’t think that nobody will come.’
   (i.e. ‘At least some people will come to the party.’)

From the contrast in (20) and from the similar contrast in the corresponding English translations, Déprez concludes that it is only when the negation marker pa is in the embedded clause, as in (20b), that pèsonn can be interpreted as a negative quantifier (equivalent to nobody). Otherwise, in (20a), pèsonn is interpreted as a negative polarity item, similar to anybody, and is licensed by matrix negation.29 It is not clear to me how this alleged distinction between pèsonn qua negative quantifier and pèsonn qua negative polarity item would be derived. In any case, I believe that this distinction is unwarranted. Given my assumptions, pèsonn in both sentences in (20) is a negative quantifier and moves at LF into Spec of NegP. The different readings may be derived as follows: In (20a), pèsonn moves into Spec of matrix NegP.30 In (20b), pèsonn moves into

---

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

29. More precisely and in Déprez’s words (p. 38):
   When it immediately precedes negation, [pèsonn] has the meaning of the English negative quantifier nobody. When it follows the negation however, it behaves like the [negative polarity item] anybody. Descriptively, we can say that the meaning of the sum of [pèsonn] and the negation pa is ambiguous between that of a negative quantifier like nobody and that of an negative polarity item like anybody depending on the position of [pèsonn] with respect to the overt negation. In this, Haitian Creole [pèsonn] differs from the French quantifier personne, which is always interpreted as a negative quantifier.

30. To be explored is whether such movement is licensed by “Neg-raising” verbs (in the sense of Horn 1989).
the specifier position of the embedded NegP. In (20a), negation concord within the single NegP gives rise to one instance of negation. This explains the negative expectation. In (20b), negative concord through Spec–head agreement still obtains within the lower NegP. But the matrix pa is obviously unable to participate into Spec–head agreement within the lower NegP; on the contrary, it adds its negative force to the lower pa. This gives rise to two separate instances of negation which cancel each other and result in the positive expectation (see [ii] of note 4).31 Therefore, the data in (20) receive a natural explanation within my assumptions about the interpretation of negative quantifiers in Haitian Creole; there is no need to postulate an interpretive ambiguity for pèsonn (negative quantifier or negative polarity item).32,33

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

7. Negation and predication in Haitian

As extensively argued in DeGraff (1992a, b, c, e),34 predication patterns in Haitian Creole are partly determined by the distribution of traces and of

---

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

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

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

34. Actually, this section is a concentrate prepared out of extracts from DeGraff (1992a, b, c, e).
resumptive pronominals spelling-out traces. Universally, the distribution of traces must respect the Empty Category Principle (ECP). The ECP requires that all traces be both licensed and identified. What matters here is the licensing condition on traces. This condition operates via head-government. In certain predication contexts, the trace of the base-generated subject is not head-governed and must be realized as a resumptive pronominal in order to avoid an ECP violation. However, because it is a head, pa can license a non-overt trace in its governing domain and the trace of the deep subject need not be overtly realized as se.

7.1. Basic data

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

(21) a. Bouki (se) malad.
   Bouki se sick
   ‘Bouki is sick.’
   b. Bouki (se) anba tab la.
   Bouki se under table the
   ‘Bouki is under the table.’
   c. Bouki (??se) abitan.
   Bouki se peasant
   ‘Bouki is a peasant.’
   d. Malis *(se) [yon doktè/ doktè a/ Aristide].
   Malis se a doctor doctor the Aristide
   ‘Malis is {a/the doctor/Aristide}.’

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

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

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

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

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

### 7.2. Is *se* a verb?

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

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

(22)  
\[ \text{Bouki} \{(*pa) \cdot (*te) [\alpha \ se] yon doktè.} \]
\[ \text{Bouki NEG ANT se a doctor} \]
\[ \text{‘Bouki {was/is}(n’t) a doctor.’} \]

(23)  
\[ \text{Kòk la pa te [v\text{-}chante] maten an.} \]
\[ \text{rooster the NEG ANT sing morning DET} \]
\[ \text{‘The rooster didn’t sing this morning.’} \]

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

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

(24)  
\[ \text{Bouki # \{sell\} (pa) (te) (yon) doktè.} \]
\[ \text{Bouki se 3SG NEG ANTa doctor} \]
\[ \text{‘Bouki, he {was/is} (not) a doctor.’} \]

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

---

37. See DeGraff (1992d) for arguments that TMA markers are verbal heads.
(25) shows that the pronoun *li* — which cannot bear stress and cannot be left-dislocated — renders illicit the sequence of *se* and negation/TMA markers.38

(25)  
\[ Li \ [\alpha \ se \ ] \ (\ast \ pa \) \ (\ast \ te \) \ yon \ doktè. \]
\[ Li \ se \ NEG \ ANT \ a \ doctor \]
\[ 'He/she is/was (not) a doctor.' \]

The data in (24) and (25) illustrate two sites of occurrence for *se*: (i) when preceding negation/TMA markers, *se* fills Spec of IP, forcing any pre-*se* nominal to dislocate, as in (24); (ii) when preceded by an atonic pronoun like *li*, *se* is in a non-verbal position, between Spec of IP and the (phonetically realized part of the) predicate, and excludes negation and TMA markers; hence the ungrammaticality of *Li \ se \ pa \ te \ yon \ doktè* in (25). I now turn to identifying the position of *se* in (25), between Spec of IP and a nominal predicate.39

7.3. Analysis

In what follows, I summarize my analysis of the paradigm in (21), focusing on the mechanisms that regulate the (non-)appearance of *se*.40 I assume that the subject of all Haitian Creole predicative clauses is generated internal to a small clause. This is similar to analyses in Stowell (1978) and Burzio (1986), among others. In (26), the acronym "SC-SP" denotes the base-generated small clause subject position. In the case of AP, PP and NP, SC-SP is in specifier position. In the case of DP and NumP, SC-SP is left-adjoined to DP and NumP. This is for reasons involving, inter alia, the functional nature of D0 and Num0, mechanisms of θ-role assignment and predication, and Baker's (1988) Universality of Theta-Role Assignment (UTAH)41 (see DeGraff 1992a, c, e). Briefly, Spec of DP and Spec of NumP are reserved for a genitive phrase or its trace, and, because of UTAH, cannot contain the base-generated subject.42 I also

38. *Se* also occurs clause-initial in cleft sentences. There as well, it precedes TMA and negation markers. I argue in DeGraff (1992e) that clause-initial *se* in clefts is in Spec of IP.
39. DeGraff (1992b) differentiates between Haitian Creole *se* and its French cognate *c'est*.
40. More extensive data implicating *se* and analyses of its occurrences can be found in Fauchois (1982), Damoiseau (1987), Kihm (1990), Lumsden (1990), Déprez and Vinet (1991), Manfredi (1991), etc. Most of these analyses are critiqued in DeGraff (1992e).
41. Universal Theta Assignment Hypothesis: Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.
42. Tonjes Veenstra astutely points out that my UTAH argument might do violence to a strict version of the hypothesis. Especially, the last three lines of (26) locate the subject of a nominal predicate in three different positions, namely in Spec of NP or adjoined to DP or NumP. However, it is central to my analysis that the thematic relationships in the three cases be different. Although DP and NumP are extended projections of NP, the actual predicates in (21d) — and their corresponding structures in (26) — are crucially distinct from their inner NPs (and give rise to distinct interpretations).
assume that, in general, specifiers of functional heads are not assigned θ-roles
at D-structure. The D-structures of the predicate small clauses are shown in (26):

(26)  [AP SC-SP [A' ... A 0 ...]]  (1a)
[lpp SC-SP [P' ... P 0 ...]]  (1b)
[NP SC-SP [N' ... N 0 ...]]  (1c)
[DP SC-SP [D' ... D 0 ...]]  (1d) w/doktè a and Aristide
[NumP SC-SP [NumP ... [Num' ... Num 0 ...]]]  (1d) w/yon doktè

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

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

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

In (21) (and [26]), with AP, PP and NP predicates ([21a] through [21c],
respectively) the trace in SC-SP is head-governed by the lexical head of the
predicate. Infl, being phonetically null, the mapping from D-structure to S-structure
is string-vacuous. However, in case of predication by DP and NumP, as in (21d), the
subject moves from a position adjoined to DP or NumP. In (28), the trace is not
head-governed because of the intermediate DP or NumP segment (represented
by XP2) causing failure of m-command of SC-SP by the predicate head.

(28)  [XP1 SC-SP [XP2 ... X 0 ...]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I consider these data in turn.

7.4.1. Absence of \textit{se} with bare NPs

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

(29) a. *Bouki yon abitan.
   Bouki NUM peasant
   ‘Bouki is a peasant.’

   b. Bouki abitan.

(30) a. *Preval premye minis la.
   Preval prime minister DET
   ‘Preval is Prime Minister.’

   b. Preval premye minis.

(31) a. [NP SC-SP [N’ N ...]]

   b. [DP SC-SP [DP ... [D’ ... D^0 ...] ...]]

   c. [NumP SC-SP [NumP ... [Num’ ... Num^0 ...] ...]]

7.4.2. Absence of \textit{se} when the subject is questioned

In matrix questions, the complementizer \textit{ki} must follow the \textit{wh}-phrase when the \textit{wh}-phrase originates in subject position. Furthermore, \textit{ki} only occurs with subject extraction. This constraint suggests that the presence of \textit{ki} is required for head-government. In (32), the predicate is DP or NumP, SC-SP is not head-governed from inside the small clause, yet \textit{se} is absent. It must be the case that \textit{ki} head-
governs SC-SP, allowing the trace there to remain phonetically null, as schematized in (33).\footnote{My analysis of ki as being in $C^0$ is incompatible with Law’s (1992) analysis where ki occupies Spec of IP as a resumptive pronoun bound by the wh-operator kimoun. Ki in Spec of IP would not head-govern the trace in SC-SP, and the absence of se in (32) would remain unexplained.}

\begin{equation}
\text{(32)} \quad \text{Kimoun} \ ki \ \{\text{yon dokitê/ dokitê } a\}?
\end{equation}

who \ ki \ a \ doctor doctor the

‘Who is a/the doctor?’

\begin{equation}
\text{(33)}
\begin{cases}
\text{a. } & [\text{CP Kimoun}_i \ [C_i \ ki \ [\text{IP e}_i \ [\text{DP e}_i \ [\text{IP dokitê a]}]]]] \\
\text{who} & ki \\
\text{doctor DET-SG}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

‘Who is the doctor?’

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
\text{b. } & [\text{CP Kimoun}_i \ [C_i \ ki \ [\text{IP e}_i \ [\text{NumP e}_i \ [\text{NumP yon dokitê]}]]]] \\
\text{who} & ki \\
\text{NUM doctor}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

‘Who is the doctor?’

7.4.3. Absence of se in TMA-marked clauses

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

\begin{equation}
\text{(34)} \quad \text{Bouki} \ te \ \text{yon abitan}.
\end{equation}

Bouki ANT NUM peasant

‘Bouki was a peasant.’

\begin{equation}
\text{(35)} \quad \text{DS: } [\text{IP} \ [\text{VP} \ [\text{VP} \ [\text{NumP Bouki} \ [\text{NumP yon abitan]}]]]] \\
\text{SS: } [\text{IP} \text{ Bouki}_i \ [\text{VP} \ [\text{VP} \ [\text{NumP e}_i \ [\text{NumP yon abitan]}]]]]
\end{equation}

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

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

\begin{equation}
\text{(36)} \quad \text{Bouki} \ pa \ \text{yon dokitê}.
\end{equation}

Bouki NEG a \ doctor

‘Bouki is not a doctor.’

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

\footnote{If one assumes with Chomsky (1986: 47f.) that IP is defective as a barrier, then ki in (33) does head-govern the most embedded subject trace $e_i$.}
all surprising, given that \(pa\), like \(ki\) and \(te\), is a head and can head-govern SC-SP. However, if \(pa\) were in Spec of NegP or adjoined to VP, it would not head-govern SC-SP and the parallel between (33), (34) and (36) would be mysterious. This further substantiates the claim that Haitian Creole \(pa\) heads NegP. As such, \(pa\) does head-govern the trace in the small clause subject position, as shown in (37).  

\[
(37) \quad DS: [IP [\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}_0 \text{ pa}] [\text{NumP} \text{ Bouki} [\text{NumP} \text{ yon doksè}]]]]
\]

\[
SS: [IP \text{ Bouki} [\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}_0 \text{ pa}] [\text{NumP} \text{ e}_1 [\text{NumP} \text{ yon doksè}]]]]
\]

8. Diachronic implications

As an epilogue, I contemplate the diachronic implications of my analysis of Haitian Creole \(pa\) as head of NegP (instead of Spec of NegP). In particular, what do these findings implicate for the genesis of Haitian Creole? If my analysis of Haitian Creole \(pa\) is on the right track, not only would it shed light on negative concord in Haitian Creole, but it might offer as a bonus one more puzzle with respect to the genesis of Haitian Creole — at least considering the superstrate, French, and (too sparse) data from one representative substrate, Fon.

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

8.1. Sentential negation in Fon

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

48. See (24), DeGraff (1992e) and Damoiseau (1987) for occurrences of \(se\) in the position preceding \(pa/te\) — \(se\) there is in Spec of IP, not in the subject’s base-position. As expected, \(se\) never precedes C\(^0\) \(ki\).

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

50. Da Cruz notes that \(ma\) and \(a\) cannot co-occur in declarative simplex clauses.
The data in (39a) suggest that in Fon, there is no verb movement. This is like Haitian Creole, see (1), and unlike French, see (2).

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

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

8.2. Relexification?

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

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

51. Da Cruz (pers. comm., June 1993) has provided me with Fon examples of apparent cases of negative concord in the presence of má and ā. To be further investigated are the precise conditions regulating Fon negative concord with má (as made clear in da Cruz’s 1992 insightful work, the distribution of má is subject to subtle semantic nuances). Also, great care must be taken in distinguishing negative quantifiers from negative polarity items. As indicated in Section 6.2, the latter might give rise to apparent negative concord via distinct interpretive mechanisms. (See Zanuttini 1991 and references therein.)
from French while maintaining grammatical and semantic properties of their native language. Put in a simplistic way, Haitian Creole grammar would actually be the grammar of one of its West-African source languages (Fon, say), and the audible part of its lexicon would originate from French.

Regarding negation, Lefebvre and Lumsden argue that Haitian Creole pa results from relexification of Fon mà into French pas. Consequently, like Fon mà and French pas, Haitian Creole pa would be in Spec of NegP. In this account, NegP in Haitian Creole would be head-final, like in Fon, but with a null Neg0.

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

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

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

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

54. With respect to the structural characterization of PA in these languages, there is one difficulty that I inherit from Zanuttini's proposal. Because of negative concord, Valdôtain, Occitan and Québec French PA must head NegP. However, contrarily to Haitian Creole pa, PA follows the finite verb (like French pas). If PA were exactly like Haitian Creole pa, then we would expect it to block head-movement of V0 across it and to rule out the sequence V0+PA, contrary to fact. Notwithstanding my current unfamiliarity with the data, I will venture that PA is not only a head, like Haitian Creole pa, but it is also syntactically affixal. As such, it allows a finite verb to attach to it; the complex V0+PA then moves to a higher (Tense) projection, conceivably like ne+V0 in (8).

Adding (slight) credence to this suggestion is the exclusion of PA from certain clauses where there is no Tense head forcing movement of V0 — V-raising would be required in order to provide affixal PA with morphological support. Tenseless clauses excluding PA include a subset of "true" imperatives (in the sense of Zanuttini 1991, who has a different account of these data based on the structural positioning of PA; also see Kayne 1991).
standard French *pas* in, for example, (3). This similarity might guide the historical linguist in looking for the exact varieties of Romance which actually participated in the genesis of Haitian Creole. Vis-à-vis negation, were these varieties similar to Valdôtain and Occitan or to the French of examples (3) and (5)? In other words, did *pas* in the grammars of 17th-century French settlers in Haiti induce double negation or negative concord? 55

8.3. *Restructuring of French?*

Also fascinating is the scenario which was suggested to me by Bill Stewart (pers. comm. October 1992). Recall that the Haitian Creole verbal system has no inflectional morphology. Most verbs occur in uninflected form, and they are possibly preceded by independent morphemes marking tense, mood or aspect; see (1). Haitian Creole verb forms were plausibly derived from the corresponding French infinitival or participle forms. But it is crucial to note that in French both infinitives and past participles occur mostly after *pas*. In Pollock’s framework, this is because only the finite verb needs to move beyond *pas* to get its inflectional morphology. Also of interest is the historical fact noted by Stewart that, in earlier Haitian Creole texts, *nepa* and *napa* — from French *n'es(t)* *pas* and *n'a(s)* *pas*, respectively — were used as single morphemes marking negation. 56 Thus the sequence *ne*+auxiliary+*pas* would have been reanalyzed as a pre-verbal negation marker, with the emergent negation morphemes *nepa*/napa, and later *pa*, inheriting their head status from French *ne*. This might sketch the mutation of Fon *má* ... *á* and French *ne* ... *pas* into Haitian Creole *pa*, on their maiden voyage from Africa and Europe to the Caribbean — and from specifier to head of the Negation Phrase. As for myself, am I sailing toward a solution to this riddle on negation in Haitian Creole?

---

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

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

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

(40) 'Pa' pa 'Pas'.
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