

HAITIAN CREOLE: A PRO-DROP LANGUAGE?

Viviane Déprez
Rutgers University

Haitian Creole has been argued to be a pro-drop language whose null subjects are licensed by syntactic clitics (DeGraff 1993). This paper analyzes the properties of Haitian Creole pronominal subjects, expletive and argumental, and argues on the basis of syntactic, phonological, and comparative considerations that Haitian Creole is better analyzed as a language whose argumental subjects cannot be null and whose pronominal subjects occur in argumental positions and cliticize in the phonological component.

1. *Introduction*

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the status of Haitian Creole (HC) with respect to the pro-drop parameter. DeGraff (1993, 1992) has proposed that Haitian subject pronouns are syntactic inflectional heads which serve to identify empty pronominal subjects in the specifier of IP. Under this view, the sentences in (1) have the structure given in (2), where the pronouns are generated in INFL and provide the rich agreement necessary to identify the argumental empty pronominal in the specifier of IP.

- | | | |
|-----|----------|------------|
| (1) | m'pati | I leave |
| | ou pati | you leave |
| | li pati | he leaves |
| | nou pati | we leave |
| | yo pati | they leave |

- (2) [pro [_{INFL} li [_{VP} vini]]]

Given the structure in (2), HC is a pro-drop language which manifests rich agreement in the form of syntactic clitics. In this paper, it will be

argued on the basis of both syntactic and phonological evidence that Haitian subject pronouns should not be analyzed as syntactic clitics but rather as phonological clitics. That is, it will be argued that HC is not an argument pro-drop language and that subject pronouns are syntactic pronouns with PF clitic properties. Under the view defended here, (1) has the syntactic structure given in (3) where subject pronouns are in the specifier of IP and cliticize at PF with no syntactic consequence.

- (3) [_{IP} li [_{INFL} Infl [_{VP} vini]]]

As I will show, an analysis of HC as a pro-drop language appears to raise more problems than it solves, both with respect to the properties of HC subject pronouns and from a typological and comparative point of view. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 considers the question of null nonargumental subjects in HC. Sections 3 and 4 proceed with an analysis of argumental pronominal subjects and compare their properties with those of the Northern Italian dialects which have been argued to license null subjects with syntactic clitics. Finally, section 5 takes into account syntactic properties which have been argued to correlate with pro-drop in rich agreement languages, and compares them with their HC equivalent.

2. *Nonargumental Empty Subjects*

As in more well-known pro-drop languages such as Spanish and Italian, nonargumental preverbal subject positions may remain empty in HC¹:

- (4) a. Rète twa nèg nan kamyon an.
'(There) remain three men in the truck.'
b. Gen jwèt sou tab la.
'(There) is a toy under the table.'
c. Gen lè Jak damou.
'(It) appears that John is in love.'
d. Sanble Mari renmen Jan.
'(It) seems that Mary likes John.'

While this possibility appears at first to suggest a parallel between well-known pro-drop languages and HC, I will argue in this section that the similarity is only apparent, and that it provides no argument in support of DeGraff's pro-drop analysis of argumental subjects.

Note, first, that in contrast to characteristic pro-drop languages such as Italian and Spanish, HC also manifests overt expletives. In certain nonargumental positions, such as the subject of some weather predicates, these overt expletives are optional. In others, such as the subject position of constructions with adjectival predicates, they are obligatory.

- (5) a. (Li) fè lapli.
(it) makes rain
'It is raining.'
- b. (Li) fè van.
(it) makes wind
'It is windy.'
- c. Van ap vante. / *(Li) vante.
'It is windy.'
- d. *(Li) difisil pou pale ak Jan.
'It is difficult to speak with John.'

The nonargumental subjects of (5a), (5b) and (5c) are commonly distinguished from those of (5d) as being quasi-arguments (Chomsky 1981). Descriptively then, we observe that HC permits both nonargumental and quasi-argumental overt and null subjects. That the licensing of nonargumental null subjects in HC is in part syntactic is suggested by the fact that they are possible in embedded contexts, as shown in (6):

- (6) a. Jak kwè rète twa nèg nan kamyon an.
'Jack believes that there remain three men in the truck.'
- b. Mari kwè gen lè Jak damou.
'Mary believes that Jack appears in love.'
- c. Mwen kwè gen yon pwoblèm.
'I believe there is a problem.'

As is indeed well-known, nonargumental null subjects are also possible even in uncontroversially non-pro-drop languages such as English:

- (7) a. Looks like an accident.
- b. Turns out you can't do that in Texas.
- c. Seems too dangerous.

In these languages, however, such null subjects often occur in restricted contexts under relevant pragmatic conditions. In particular, they are generally impossible in embedded contexts:

- (8) a. *I think that looks like an accident.
 b. *He said that turns out you can't do that in Texas.
 c. *I am afraid that seems too dangerous.

The contrast between the English sentences in (8) and the HC sentences in (6) suggests that the licensing of nonargumental null subjects in HC is not merely a pragmatic matter. In this respect, HC appears to be similar to languages such as German (Safir 1985), Yiddish, or Icelandic (Santorini 1989), termed in the literature semi-pro-drop languages, which permit both nonargumental and quasi-argumental null and overt subjects, but not argumental null subjects.

- (9) a. Gestern wurde getantzt. (German)
 yesterday was dancing
 b. Mir iz kalt. (Yiddish)
 to me is cold
 c. Rignði gær? (Icelandic)
 rained yesterday
 d. I baðkerinu hafa verið mýss. (Icelandic)
 in the bathtub have been mice

The conditions on the licensing of null subjects in HC, however, clearly differ from those of these languages.² In the Germanic languages, empty expletives have been shown to be licensed under particular structural conditions, such as verb movement to C (Safir 1985). In HC, however, such structural conditions do not appear to play a role. First, there is no evidence that V movement to C ever occurs in this language.³ Second, there are no obvious structural differences between the examples in (4), in which the preverbal subject position is empty, and those where it must be filled. Thus, the question arises as to what permits some nonargumental preverbal subject positions to remain empty in HC. I would like to suggest, tentatively, that the answer may lie in an adequate reformulation of the Extended Projection Principle, possibly along the lines of Borer (1986). Borer has proposed that empty nonargumental subject positions do not need to be structurally projected. In her view, the coindexation of INFL with an argument in its c-command domain is sufficient to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle.⁴ Assuming that in examples such as (4), INFL can be coindexed with an internal verbal argument that it c-commands, the Extended Projection Principle would be satisfied without any need for an overt or an empty expletive subject. An interesting conse-

quence of this suggestion is that it provides a possible explanation as to why null subjects are impossible in HC with verbs which do not subcategorize for any complements such as, for instance, the weather predicate of (5c).⁵ This proposal could also explain the necessary overt expletives found in constructions such as (5d), if the embedded clause were analyzed not as a complement of the adjectival predicate, but as an (extraposed) IP adjunct which does not occur in the c-command domain of INFL. In short, Borer's proposal predicts that apparent null subjects should be possible only with predicates that have some overt grammatical argument, not with those that have none. This seems to be by and large adequate to account for the behavior of expletives in HC.⁶

Setting aside a more detailed discussion of the conditions licensing nonargumental null subjects in HC, what remains clear is that their occurrence does not warrant any conclusion with respect to the pro-drop status of this language. Indeed, despite the fact that they permit nonargumental null subjects, languages such as German, Yiddish, and Icelandic clearly differ from pro-drop languages in that they do not license argumental null subjects. In recent years, it has been observed that although the existence of argumental null subjects in a language L often entails the existence of nonargumental null subjects, the reverse is not true (Jaeggli & Safir 1989). Thus, no conclusion can be drawn on the argumental pro-drop status of languages from the fact that they permit null expletive subjects. These two questions must be considered independently. In subsequent sections of this paper, we will turn our attention to the argumental subjects of HC and discuss their status with respect to the pro-drop parameter.

3. *Subject Clitics as Agreement Markers*

As shown by the ungrammaticality of (10), a pronoun in HC must always be present with verbs which assign an external thematic role.

- (10) a. *vini
 'comes'
 b. mwen, ou, li, nou, ou, yo vini
 c. *achte yon chemiz
 'bought a shirt'
 d. mwen, ou, li, nou, ou, yo achte yon chemiz

As DeGraff (1993) correctly argues, however, the ungrammaticality of

(10a,c) is not in itself sufficient to determine the pro-drop or non-pro-drop status of HC. In fact, it is also predicted if subject pronouns are agreement markers in INFL. On this view, when agreement markers are absent, empty pronominal subjects fail to be identified and licensed. Accordingly, DeGraff's analysis parallels the one proposed earlier by Rizzi (1986) and Brandi & Cordin (1989) to account for a number of interesting properties of the subject clitics which occur in certain Northern Italian dialects. Similar to the HC examples in (10), these dialects of Italian require the presence of a pronominal clitic.

- | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| (11) a. | *Parla. | E parla. | (Fiorentino) |
| b. | *Parla. | A parla. | (Torinese) |
| c. | *Parla. | El parla. | (Trentino) |
| | ('he speaks') | | |
| d. | *L'ha scrivuu. | El l'ha scrivuu. | (Milanese) |
| | ('he has written') | | |

Nevertheless, Rizzi (1986) and Brandi & Cordin (1989) argue convincingly that these dialects are pro-drop languages in which the pronominal clitics are identifying agreement markers.⁷ Their analysis is motivated in part by the properties of the subject clitics themselves and in part by properties which are common to the dialects and to Italian, a standard pro-drop language. I will begin by summarizing these properties, and then, in the next section, go on to compare them with the Haitian data.

The first characteristic of the Northern Italian dialects is that, as shown in (12), they require the presence of the pronominal clitic even in the presence of NP subjects:

- | | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|---------------|
| (12) a. | Mario e parla. | * | (Fiorentino) |
| | *Mario parla. | | |
| b. | Mario a parla. | | (Torinese) |
| | *Mario parla. | | |
| c. | El Mario el parla. | | (Trentino) |
| | *El Mario parla. | | |
| d. | Giuan a conoss gnunt a Turin. | | (Piedmontese) |
| | *Giuan conoss gnunt a Turin. | | |
| | 'John knows no one in Turin.' | | |

There is clear evidence that the sentential initial NPs in (12) are in subject position and not in dislocated positions. That is, the structure of (12) is as in (13a), not as in (13b) or (13c):

- (13) a. [_{IP} Mario [_{I'} e parla]]
 b. [Mario [_{IP} pro [_{I'} e parla]]
 c. [Mario [_{IP} e [_{I'} parla]]

First, the co-occurrence of NPs with overt clitics neither requires a pause nor an emphasis. Second, as shown in (14), bare quantifier subjects, such as other NP subjects, also require the presence of a subject clitic:

- (14) Gnun a l' a dit gnent. (Torinese)
 nobody he has said nothing
 Gnunt a l'ha vist Maria. (Piedmontese)
 nobody he has seen Mary

As (15) shows, however, constructions in which bare quantifiers are clearly dislocated are ungrammatical.

- (15) a. *Gnun, i l'hai vistlu. (Piedmontese)
 nobody I have seen-him
 'Nobody, I have seen him.'
 b. *Gnun, Maria a l'ha vistlu.
 nobody Mary she has seen-him
 'Nobody, Mary has seen him.'

The contrast between (14) and (15) thus suggests that the bare quantifiers of (13) are in a subject position, not in a dislocated position. Furthermore, (12) and (14) provide a strong argument for the nonreferential status of subject clitics in these Italian dialects, which suggests that the subject clitics neither carry a theta-role nor a Case. In other words, they do not behave like pronominal arguments, but rather like agreement markers on the verb. Further arguments to this effect are provided by structural tests. Note first, that subject clitics must be adjacent to the verb. That is, no adverbs can intervene between the clitics and the verb.

- (16) a. *La ieri ha cantato a Milano. (Fiorentino)
 'He yesterday has sung in Milan.'
 b. *A jer l'ha canta a Milan. (Piedmontese)
 'He yesterday has sung in Milan.'
 c. *La algeri ha canta a Milan. (Trentino)
 'He yesterday has sung in Milan.'

Consider, furthermore, coordinated structures such as in (17).

- (17) a. *I e t suma vnuit. (Piedmontese)
 ‘You and I came.’
 b. *A e a sun parti.
 ‘He and she left.’
 c. La canta e la balla. (Trentino)
 *La canta e balla.
 ‘She sings and dances.’

As (17a) and (17b) show, subject clitics cannot be coordinated. Moreover, coordination structures such as (17c) require the presence of a subject clitic in both conjuncts. As argued by Rizzi (1986), (17c) represents IP or I' coordination and thus provides a structural argument for the position of subject clitics within INFL.

Additional arguments for the pro-drop status of the Northern Italian dialects stem from the properties shared with other more well-known pro-drop languages in which the subject *pro* is identified by a strong agreement. Since at least Chomsky (1981), it has been proposed that the pro-drop parameter involves a cluster of properties of which the possibility of empty subjects is just one. Other well-known properties involve free subject inversion and the apparent absence of ECP effects in subject extractions. As argued by Brandi & Cordin (1989) and as illustrated in (18) and (19), the Northern Italian dialects manifest both.

- (18) a. Gli e venuto delle ragazze. (Fiorentino) (F)
 E vegnu qualche putela. (Trentino) (T)
 ‘came some girls’
 b. Gli e venuto la Maria. (F)
 E vegnu la Maria. (T)
 ‘came Maria’
 c. Gli ha telefonato delle ragazze. (F)
 ‘have telephoned some girls’
- (19) a. Quante ragazze tu credi che gli e sia venuto? (F)
 Quante putele tu pensi che sia vegnu? (T)
 ‘how many girls do you think that have come’
 b. Quante ragazze tu credi che gli abbia parlato? (F)
 Quante putele te pensi che abia parla? (T)
 ‘how many girls do you think that have spoken’
 c. *Quante ragazze tu credi che le siano venute? (F)
 *Quante putele tu pensi che sia vegnude? (T)
 ‘how many girls do you think have come [agreement]’

- d. *Quante ragazze tu credi che le abbiano parlato? (F)
 *Quante putele te pensi che le abia parla? (T)
 'how many girls do you think have spoken [agreement]'

Also, the two constructions are dependent on one another, as is indicated by the special form of the preverbal clitic in (18) and (19). Both inverted subjects and extracted subjects require a preverbal neutral clitic (*gli* in Fiorentino, and no clitic in Trentino). As has been argued explicitly by Brandi & Cordin (1989), subject extractions as in (19a) can lead to apparent COMP-trace violations only because the subject is extracted from an inverted post-verbal position. That this is so, is clearly shown by the necessity of the neutral preverbal clitic in Trentino, or its absence in Fiorentino, which marks the lack of agreement. A nonneutral clitic form manifesting agreement is excluded in (19c) and (19d).

We have shown in this section that the Northern Italian dialects in which pronominal clitics are agreement markers manifest a number of characteristic syntactic properties which, in part, they share with the more well-known pro-drop languages. Such properties, in turn, provide solid arguments favoring a pro-drop analysis of these languages. In the next section, we turn to an analysis of the HC subject pronouns and compare their properties to those of the syntactic clitics of the Northern Italian dialects. As will be shown, the properties of the subject pronouns of HC clearly differ from those in these dialects, to the extent that the differences raise serious problems for an analysis of HC pronouns as syntactic clitics.

4. *Haitian Pronominal Subjects*

Observe first that in contrast to the Northern Italian dialects, regular subject NPs in HC occur without subject pronouns. Furthermore, when a pronoun is present, NPs cannot remain in subject position. When NPs co-occur with pronouns, as in (20b), they are clearly perceived by native speakers as dislocated. As shown in (21), moreover, bare quantifiers cannot co-occur with subject pronouns in HC.

- (20) a. Jan ap dòmi.
 'John is sleeping.'
 b. *Jan li ap dòmi.
 Jan, li ap dòmi.
 'John, he is sleeping.'

- (21) a. **Pèsonn*, *li/yo pa vini*.
 ‘nobody, he/they came’
 b. **Aryen*, *li pa kase*.
 ‘nothing it is broken’
 c. **Toutmoun*, *li ap domi*.
 ‘everybody, he is sleeping’

We can thus safely conclude that the sentences in (20) and (21) do not have a structure comparable to the one posited by Rizzi (1986) and Brandi & Cordin (1989) for the Northern Italian dialects, namely (22):

- (22) [_{IP} *pèsonn* [_I *li pa* [_{VP} *V*]]]

There are, however, still two possible structures left, namely (23a) and (23b):

- (23) a. [_{IP} *pèsonn* [_{IP} *pro* [_{I'} *li pa* [_{VP} *V*]]]]
 b. [_{IP} *pèsonn* [_{IP} *li* [_I *pa* [_{VP} *V*]]]]

If the structure were as in (23a), HC could still be considered an argumental pro-drop language. Under (23b) however, this is not the case, since here the subject pronouns occupy the Spec of IP, just as they would in a non-pro-drop language like English. Note that (21) will correctly be ruled out under either structure since the bare quantifier *pèsonn* is in a dislocated position in both (23a) and (23b). Nevertheless, the structure in (23a) raises two theoretical problems not raised by (23b). First, some condition is needed to prevent the quantifier *pèsonn*, as well as other NPs, from occurring in the specifier of IP concurrently with a pronoun in INFL. Second, the question arises as to why (23a) does not violate the binding principle (B). Indeed, since we have an empty *pro* in the Spec of IP and a pronoun in the head of I, one might expect the pronoun to be bound by *pro* in violation of principle B. DeGraff (1993) addresses both questions: First, to prevent NPs and quantifiers from occurring in the Spec of IP when a pronoun is in INFL, he proposes that pronouns in INFL are Case absorbing. Consequently, the Spec of INFL cannot receive Case when INFL contains a pronoun. In other words, the structure in (23a) is banned in HC because the NP does not receive Case. Second, to prevent a principle B violation, DeGraff (1993), following a proposal by Rizzi (1986), proposes to redefine binding as in (24).

- (24) X binds Y iff X c-commands and is coindexed with Y and Y is not theta-dependent on X.

Arguably, in (23a), *pro* and the pronoun in INFL are theta-dependent. Although *pro* must be assumed to be the argument that receives the theta-role (otherwise, why should there be an empty category), the overt pronoun is the element that receives Case. If, as suggested by Chomsky (1981), Case assignment is a condition on theta-marking (the Visibility Hypothesis), then *pro* can only receive a theta-role if it enters in a Case chain with the pronoun in INFL. Thus, condition B is arguably not violated. Note, however, that if we adopt the structure in (23b), and thus consider HC as a non-*pro*-drop language, no additional assumptions are required. Under this view, the quantifier *pèsonn*, or any other NP, cannot occur in Spec IP when a pronoun is present, simply because the pronoun occupies this position. Furthermore, the question of a principle B violation simply does not arise. Clearly then, hypothesis (23b) is simpler.

As further shown in (25), HC pronouns, like HC NPs, can be separated from the verb by various types of adverbs, as well as by some exclamatory expressions such as *fout*.

- (25) a. Jan/ li toujou ap travay fò.
'John/ he is always working hard.'
b. Jan/ m pokò ap rakonte yon istwa.
'John/ I am not yet telling a story.'
c. Mari ak Jan/ yo deja ap dòmi.
'Mary and John/ they are already sleeping.'
d. Li prèske kite ak madanm li.
'He has almost abandoned his wife.'
e. M fout rayi sa.
'I f... hate this.'
f. M deja fout di w sa.
'I have already f... told you that.'

This again contrasts with the Northern Italian dialects and suggests that Haitian pronouns do not necessarily form a unit with the verbs or with the inflectional aspectual particles. Some further support for this view comes from coordination facts. (26), uttered in the context of a discussion about who will play which role in a soccer game, shows that subject pronouns in HC can be coordinated either with another pronoun or with an NP.

- (26) Men Trifis. 'Here comes Trifis.'
Mwen ave l ap fè aryè. 'I and he will be quarterbacks.'
Se Pokipe? 'And Pokipe?'
Li a Yonal ap fè estrèm. 'He and Yonal will be sideguards.'⁸

Though they can be separated from the verb and coordinated, Haitian subject pronouns also manifest some typical clitic-like properties. As shown in (27), they have reduced forms which often cliticize onto the following verb or TMA particle⁹:

- | | | | | |
|------|---------|----------------|----------|--------------|
| (27) | m'apiye | 'I pressed' | m' tande | 'I heard' |
| | w'apiye | 'you pressed' | ou tande | 'you heard' |
| | l'apiye | 's/he pressed' | l tande | 's/he heard' |
| | n'apiye | 'we pressed' | n tande | 'we heard' |
| | y'apiye | 'they pressed' | yo tande | 'he heard' |

It is important to note, however, that the appearance of these reduced pronominal forms is in no way limited to the preverbal position. As shown in (28) and (29), the same reduced pronominal forms occur both in object position and as possessive markers in NPs:

- (28) Jak we'm
 we ou
 we'l
 'Jak saw me/you/him'
- (29) kaye'm
 kaye'w
 kaye'l
 'my/you/his notebook'

It is thus clear that the appearance of the reduced forms is not conditioned by the potential location of pronouns in INFL.¹⁰ As argued by Cadely (1990), both the appearance of reduced forms and the locus of their attachment is conditioned by phonological factors. Reduced forms are always possible and clearly favored whenever they precede a word which begins with a vowel, as, for instance, in (27a) above. When the following word starts with a consonant, as in (27b), it will cliticize to the preceding word, if it ends in a vowel.¹¹ Examples of this leftward cliticization process are given in (30):

- | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|------|-------------------|
| (30) | Kaye li dechire a. | ---→ | Kaye'l dechire a. |
| | 'The notebook he has torn.' | | |
| | Kisa li fè. | ---→ | Kisa'l fè. |
| | 'What is he doing?' | | |
| | M wè lè li vini. | ---→ | M wè lè'l vini. |
| | 'I saw when he came.' | | |

Se pa nou li wè.	--→	Se pa nou'l wè.
'It's not us he saw.'		
lè mwen tande	--→	lè'm tande
'when I hear'		
lè li tande	--→	lè'l tande
'when he hears'		
lè nou tande	--→	lè'n tande
'when we hear'		

Cadely (1990)

Yè ou tande tire?	--→	Yè w tande tire? ¹²
'Yesterday did you hear shooting?'		

Note that the examples of (30) pose a serious challenge to an analysis of cliticization as a syntactic process in HC. If reduced pronominal forms were agreement markers that occur in INFL to license an empty pronominal subject, as proposed by DeGraff, one would not expect them to be able to cliticize to the previous words. A syntactic account of HC pronominal cliticization would suggest that (30) represents contexts of head movement. This, however, is quite doubtful since there are no other reasons to assume that the movement of INFL to C is ever permitted in Haitian. The facts in (30), however, pose no particular problems if HC pronouns are assumed to be phonological clitics.¹³

In sum, it appears that the properties of subject pronouns in HC raise serious difficulties for a syntactic analysis of cliticization. Structural tests indicate that HC pronouns clearly differ from the syntactic clitics of the Northern Italian dialects, in that they 1) do not co-occur with NPs or bare quantifiers, 2) can be separated from the verb by adverbs and exclamatory expressions, and 3) can be coordinated. Furthermore, the fact that under certain circumstances they can cliticize to constituents which precede them, suggests that the locus of their cliticization is determined more by phonological factors than by syntactic properties. Finally, as noted by Cadely (1990), the cliticization effects of HC subject pronouns cannot be isolated from those of its object pronouns and possessive markers. As is shown in (31), HC object pronouns do not need to cliticize onto the verbal head they syntactically depend on; if the required phonological conditions are fulfilled, they can cliticize onto any following word, even a clear adjunct¹⁴:

- (31) Jak rekonèt li ankò. --→ Jak rekonèt l'anko.
'Jack recognizes him again.'

Such examples suggest that the locus of object pronoun cliticization is determined mostly by phonological rules and not by syntactic factors. Given that the cliticization factors are essentially the same for subject and nonsubject pronouns in HC (see Cadely 1990 for details), the null hypothesis would be to assume that these two sets of pronouns have the same syntactic status. Such a unified analysis is possible if it is assumed that all HC pronominals are syntactic pronouns which occur in the same argument positions as full NPs and cliticize at PF. But under DeGraff's (1993) pro-drop analysis, subject pronouns are expected to have properties distinct from those of other pronouns, since they are assumed to be of a different syntactic type. The facts, however, provide no support for such a conclusion.

5. *Further Syntactic Properties*

In the previous section, I have analyzed the syntactic and phonological properties of HC subject pronouns and shown that a number of facts argue against analyzing them as syntactic clitics. In this section, I turn to more typological considerations and examine the Haitian equivalent of structures which have been argued to correlate with null subjects in standard pro-drop languages, namely free subject inversion and the absence of the COMP-trace effect. As it turns out, HC displays neither of these properties, a fact which casts still further doubts on the pro-drop status of the language.

First, as shown in (32), it is clear that HC does not permit free subject inversion.

- (32) *pati Jan
 'left John'
 *travay Mari
 'works Mary'
 *li pati Jan
 'he left John'
 *li travay Mari
 'she works Mary'

The question of whether HC permits apparent violations of the COMP-trace effect might at first seem slightly less clear. Subject extractions differ from object extractions in that they require the presence of *ki* in the complementizer immediately dominating the site of an extraction.

- (33) Kimoun ou kwè Mariz te wè a?
 'Who do you think Mariz saw?'
 [_{CP} kimoun [ou kwè [_{CP} Mariz te wè t]]]
- (34) Kimoun ou kwè ki pati?
 'Who do you believe that left?'
 [_{CP} kimoun [ou kwè [_{CP} ki [t pati]]]]

For the informants we have consulted, the presence of *ki* (or *k*, its reduced form) is obligatory (see also Koopman 1982), but there appears to be some variation in this matter. As reported by DeGraff (1993), *ki* can be missing for some speakers, so that subject extraction may involve, in parallel with English, an empty complementizer.¹⁵

In all dialects, however, object extractions differ from subject extractions in that, as shown in (35), *ki* is impossible.

- (35) *Kimoun Jan kwè ki Mari te we?
 'Who does John believe that Mary saw?'

Furthermore, as shown in (36), *ki* can only be present in the complementizer immediately dominating the site of a subject extraction, not in an intermediate complementizer.

- (36) a. Kimoun Jan kwè Mariz te di ki te vini a?
 'Who does John believe Mariz said KI has come?'
 b. *Kimoun Jan kwè ki Mariz te di ki te vini?
 'Who does John believe KI Mariz said KI has come?'

Clearly then, *ki* cannot be assumed to be simply an optional complementizer. Koopman (1982) proposed that the presence of *ki* in subject extractions is determined by the ECP. To put it simply, she proposed that *ki* provides the required proper governor for the subject trace. Under this view, the subject/object asymmetry can be explained easily. Since an object trace is already properly governed by the verb, no other proper governor is required. This explains the absence of *ki* in object extractions. A subject trace, however, is not properly governed by INFL; so *ki* is required.¹⁶

As first noted by Koopman (1982), the distribution of *ki* in HC parallels the better studied *quel/qui* effect manifested in French subject extractions. We have noted that in HC, *ki* is required only with subject extractions, not with object extractions, and that it can appear only in a position immediately adjacent to the trace of the extracted subject. Note further that *ki* must also appear when the subject of a sentence has been clefted or relativized, as in (37).

- (37) Se Jan ki pati.
 'It is John that left.'
 nèg ki renmen Mari
 'the man that loves Mary'

In all these properties, the distribution of *ki* in HC completely parallels that of the *quel/qui* effect in French. The French sentences are shown in (38):

- (38) a. Qui crois-tu *que/qui est venu?
 'Who do you think left?'
 b. *Qui crois-tu qui Jean a vu?
 'Who do you think John saw?'
 c. Qui crois-tu que/*qui Marie ait dit *que/qui est venu?
 'Who do you think Mary said that came?'
 d. C'est Jean *que/qui est venu.
 'It is John who came.'
 e. l'homme *que/qui est venu
 'the man who came'

The parallelism between these two constructions clearly suggests a common treatment. As currently understood, the *quel/qui* effect is the French manifestation of the COMP-t effect, i.e., a direct consequence of the ECP. As such, it demonstrates the existence of a subject/object asymmetry in extractions which is characteristic of the non-pro-drop languages.

Following Koopman (1982), I suggest that the analysis of the *quel/qui* effect extends to the *ki* in HC. Under this view, the presence of *ki* provides strong evidence that the subject/object asymmetry characteristic of non-pro-drop languages does occur in HC. The syntax of subject extractions thus casts further doubt on the validity of an analysis of HC as a pro-drop language.¹⁷

As noted by DeGraff (1993), there appears to be an intriguing difference between French and HC with respect to subject extractions which potentially occur at LF. Consider the contrast in (39), which has been argued by Kayne (1983) to show that French subject extractions are as impossible at LF as they are at S-structure, with the complementizer *que*:

- (39) a. *Je n'ai exigé que personne soit arrêté.
 'I requested that no one be arrested.'
 b. ??Je n'ai exigé qu'ils arrêtent personne.
 'I requested that they arrest no one.'

- (39') a. LF [personne_i ne[que t_i soit arrêté]]
 b. LF [personne_i ne[que ils arrêtent t_i]]

Kayne (1972) observed that the French negative quantifier *personne* can marginally relate to the negative clitic *ne* in the matrix sentence when it occurs in object position, but not when it occurs in subject position.¹⁸ If, as he suggests, the relation between *personne* and the negative clitic involves LF movement of *personne*, as represented in (39'), the contrast in (39) can be explained by the ECP applying this time at the level of LF. That is, under Kayne's analysis, (39) can be taken to show the existence of a subject/object asymmetry at LF in French. DeGraff (1993) argues that (39) contrasts with the HC examples in (40) in which the quantifier *pèsonn* can occur both in the subject position and in the object position of an embedded sentence dominated by a matrix negation.

- (40) a. Mwen pa te mande pou pèsonn (te) vini.
 'There isn't any x such that I asked x to come.'
 b. Mwen pa te mande pou lapolis te arrete pèsonn.
 'There isn't any x such that I asked the police to arrest x.'
- (40') LF: [...pèsonn_i pa[_{S'} pou t_i vini]]
 [...pèsonn_i pa[_{S'} pou lapolis te arrete t_i]]

Assuming that the HC quantifier *pèsonn* is parallel with its French equivalent and undergoes LF movement, as schematized in (40'), DeGraff (1993) concludes that at LF, HC manifests no subject/object asymmetry. He then attributes this property to the pro-drop status of Haitian which confers to INFL the status of a proper governor for the subject trace. Note that if correct, this conclusion is quite unexpected, since, as I have shown above, HC manifests a subject/object asymmetry with respect to S-structure extractions. It is also notable that under DeGraff's analysis, HC differs from a standard pro-drop language such as Italian. As argued by Rizzi (1986), the equivalent of (40a) in Italian is as impossible as its French equivalent. That is, in Italian, the relevant interpretation in which the quantifier *nessuno* is interpreted as dependent on the negation is not available.¹⁹

- (41) a. Non pretendo che nessuno sia arrestato.
 'I do not require that (*anybody) nobody be arrested.'
 b. Piero non crede che nessuno mi possa spaventare.
 'Piero does not believe that (*anybody) nobody can frighten me.'

It appears, in other words, that an analysis of (40) in terms of LF movement leads to the conclusion that an empty INFL in Haitian is a stronger governor than INFL in a standard pro-drop language such as Italian, a rather surprising result.

Such a conclusion would not be warranted, however, if the HC quantifier *pèsonn*, unlike the French negative quantifier *personne*, could be assumed to function as a negative polarity item (NPI) comparable in relevant respects to the English NPI *anybody*. In fact, as (42) shows, both subject and object NPIs are licensed in an embedded context, even in a non-pro-drop language such as English.

- (42) a. I don't think that anybody will come.
b. I don't think that he should see anybody.

Whatever the correct analysis of the licensing of NPIs may be (cf. Ladusaw 1979, Linebarger 1987), it seems reasonable to assume that it does not involve LF movement. Indeed, if NPI licensing involved LF movement, we would be led to the conclusion that ECP violations occur only at S-structure in English, and not at LF.²⁰

Although at first view, the quantifier *pèsonn* differs from English negative polarity items, there are reasons to think that in some relevant respects they behave in a parallel way. One distinction between *pèsonn* and NPIs is that *pèsonn* can be licensed by a negative element which follows it, as shown in (43):

- (43) a. *Pèsonn pa te vini.*
(literally, 'Anybody did not come.')
- b. *Mwen pa we pèsonn.*
'I didn't see anybody.'

But similar to English NPIs, and in contrast to the French quantifier *personne*, the Haitian quantifier requires the negation to be present:

- (44) a. **Pesonn te vini.*
b. **Mwen we pesonn.*

When it immediately precedes the negation, *pèsonn* has the meaning of the English negative quantifier 'nobody'. When it follows the negation, though, it behaves like the negative polarity item 'anybody'. Descriptively, we can say that the meaning of the sum of *pèsonn* and the negation *pa* in HC is ambiguous between that of a negative quantifier such as 'nobody' and that of an NPI such as 'anybody', depending on the position of *pèsonn* with

respect to the negation. In this respect, the interpretation of the sum of the HC negation and quantifier differs from the French combination of *ne* and *personne*, which is always interpreted as a negative quantifier. In contrast to NPIs, negative quantifiers in French and English are incompatible with the regular sentential negation.

- (45) a. *Personne n'est pas venu.
 b. *Je n'ai pas vu personne.
 c. *Nobody did not come.
 d. *I did not see nobody.

Sentences such as in (45) are usually judged by speakers either as not interpretable or as involving canceled negation which produces a positive statement. Clearly, this is not the case in HC.

What remains to be determined is whether *pèsonn* behaves as a polarity item or as a negative quantifier in contexts such as (40). Because of the ambiguity of the verb *mande*, which in HC can mean 'ask', 'require', or 'wonder', I have preferred to use simpler sentences with my informants so as to avoid irrelevant complexities in interpretation. Consider, first, the English paradigm in (46):

- (46) a. I don't think that anybody will come to the party.
 negative expectation: the party will be deserted
 b. I don't think that nobody will come to the party.
 positive expectation: at least some people will come

(46a) and (46b) clearly differ in meaning. For instance, pronounced in a context in which the speaker has organized a party, (46a) expresses the speaker's anxiety that the party will be a disaster because there will not be a single guest. (46b), on the other hand, expresses the speaker's expectation that at least some people will show up. That is, in (46b), the sentential negation and the negative quantifier cancel each other out to produce a positive expectation. There is no such canceling in (46a), where the expectation is negative.

Let us now turn to comparable examples in HC.

- (47) a. Mwen PA kwè pèsonn ap vini.
 'I don't think that ANYBODY will come.'
 negative expectation: the party will be deserted
 b. Mwen PA kwè pèsonn PA ap vini.
 'I don't think that NOBODY will come.'
 positive expectation: at least some people will come

Observe first that (47a) leads to a negative expectation, and is thus comparable in meaning to (46a), which suggests that in these contexts, the quantifier *pèsonn* is interpreted as a negative polarity item, not as a negative quantifier. It is only when the negation also occurs in the embedded sentence that *pèsonn* can be interpreted as a negative quantifier. (47) thus provides evidence that the quantifier *pèsonn* is interpreted as an NPI in a context in which it is licensed by a matrix negation. If this is correct, then (40) provides no support for the pro-drop status of HC. Rather, it illustrates a further parallel between HC and non-pro-drop English.

6. *Conclusion*

I have argued on the basis of phonological, syntactic, and comparative evidence that HC manifests properties which clearly differ from that of a "standard" pro-drop language (Italian) and a regional pro-drop dialect (Piedmontese). I have further argued that rather than being considered inflectional heads that license null subjects, the pronominal subjects of HC are better analyzed as fully pronominal, occurring in argument positions which can cliticize in the phonological component. One may object that some of the arguments provided in this paper are tied to current theoretical accounts of the pro-drop phenomenon and are thus not fully conclusive. It is possible indeed, as has already been suggested by Jaeggli & Safir (1989), that the cluster of properties deemed characteristic of rich agreement pro-drop languages is neither necessary nor sufficient to guarantee the licensing of null subjects. Other criteria such as verb movement to INFL have been recently argued to play a significant role (Benedicto 1993). Rather than aiming at a refutation, I hope that the arguments presented in this paper will serve to deepen the general questions raised by the status of all pronouns, overt or empty, clitics or not, in current syntactic models.

NOTES

An early version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, Philadelphia, January 10th, 1992. I wish to thank Marie Denise Sterlin and Marie Denise Bellocqu for kindly answering my questions, Jean Robert Cadely for sharing his work and judgments with me, Marie-Thérèse Vinet for her valuable comments and support, and Yves Dejean for invaluable written comments on DeGraff's work and on the first version of the paper. All remaining errors are my own. Support for this work has been provided in part by a Research Council grant from Rutgers University.

- 1) For a detailed analysis of constructions such as (4d), see Déprez (1992a).
- 2) For a more detailed discussion of some of these conditions, see Vinet (1990).
- 3) HC manifests no subject-Aux/verb inversion in interrogatives (*Ki kote ou/Jan ale?* 'Where you/John go?' **Ki kote ale ou/Jan?*), nor, to my knowledge, any of the matrix/embedded asymmetries with respect to the placement of the verb, which are characteristic of languages with V to C movement.
- 4) Borer's reformulation of the Extended Projection Principle is given below. See Borer (1986) for a precise discussion of the consequences of this definition.
 Coindex NP with INFL in the accessible domain of INFL. X is in the accessible domain of INFL_i iff INFL_i c-commands X and there is no Y I-subject of INFL_j such that INFL_i c-commands INFL_j and INFL_j c-commands X.
- 5) Other such predicates include: *loraj g(w)onde / li g(w)onde / *gwonde* ('it thunders'), and *lapli ap farinen / l ap farinen / *ap farinen* ('it rains'). I thank Yves Dejean for bringing these interesting examples to my attention.
- 6) The apparent optionality of overt expletives with weather constructions, such as *l ap fe lapli*, might be taken to stem from the possibility of analyzing these complex locutions either as pure predicates with a lexically incorporated noun, or as predicate argument structures. Since INFL could not be coindexed with anything, the former would require an expletive, while the latter would not.
- 7) In some dialects such as Trentino, subject clitics are not required for all verbal persons:

Trentino	
1st	parlo
2nd	te parli
3rd	el/la parla
4th	parlem
5th	parle
6th	i/le parla

This fact provides additional empirical support for the Rizzi (1986) and Brandi & Cordin (1989) analysis. Clearly, for the 1st, 4th, and 5th persons, this dialect is unambiguously pro-drop. In contrast, HC requires a pronoun for all persons.
- 8) I thank Yves Dejean for these examples. As clarified by him, such examples can be found only in specific informal conversational contexts. More commonly, coordinated pronouns are usually followed by a resumptive pronoun standing for the group: for example, *Mwen ak li, nou mache vit* 'Him and I, we walk fast.'
- 9) The appearance of the reduced form is in part conditioned by the type of initial sound of the verb. When the verb begins with a consonant, pronouns which consist of a single vowel (*ou*) or a vowel and a glide (*yo*) cannot be reduced if they are the first word of the utterance.
- 10) DeGraff (1993) further claims that HC subject pronouns are similar to bound morphemes in that they cannot bear phrasal stress and cannot occur in isolation. Both facts have, however, been contested by Yves Dejean in written comments on DeGraff's work. Dejean notes the following dialogue where *Li* indicates phrasal stress: — *Kot Pol?* 'Where is Paul?' — *Li pati*. 'He left.' — *Pa ranse non. Kote li?* 'Stop kidding. Where is he?' — *Li pati*. 'He left.' He also notes examples where a pronoun occurs in isolation as a response to a question: — *Kilès k'ap pale?* 'Who spoke?' — *Li*.

11) The phonological conditions of appearance of the reduced forms are greatly simplified here. For a detailed study, see Cadely (1990) and Cadely's forthcoming dissertation.

12) Note that in absence of the pre-sentential adverb, the second person singular pronoun *ou* cannot be reduced. **W tande tire?*

13) DeGraff (1992) recognizes this problem and suggests that clitics may syntactically attach to one particular host, and phonologically attach to another. In essence, his proposal means that in the surface structure there is no evidence that HC subject pronouns are ever syntactic clitics. But if that is so, it becomes quite unclear what is to be gained in maintaining the hypothesis that cliticization takes place in the syntax in absence of supporting empirical evidence.

14) As mentioned above, the cliticization of HC pronouns is conditioned by phonological and prosodic factors. In this regard, we should note that, in contrast, clear syntactic clitics are not subject to necessary prosodic conditions. In particular, lack of stress does not appear to be a necessary property of true syntactic clitics. Consider, for instance, the example in (i), where an object clitic can bear contrastive stress:

- (i) Il veut **TE** parler.

The grammaticality of (i) suggests that the reliable empirical criterion to determine the nature of a clitic (phonological versus syntactic) is positional rather than prosodic: that is, only pronouns occurring in positions NOT available to NPs can be considered syntactic clitics. With respect to this criterion, Haitian reduced object pronominal forms are not syntactic clitics. Strikingly, HC reduced object pronouns remain post-verbal and occur in the same position as object NPs. This possibility is not instantiated in any of the well-known pro-drop languages with rich agreement. Those languages also permit empty objects identified by a clitic. That this is not the case in HC raises yet further doubts as to the similarity of HC and clitic pro-drop languages. Languages which allow null argumental subjects generally appear to also allow null argumental objects. These null arguments can be identified either by agreement/clitics as in Italian and Spanish, or contextually/pragmatically as in Japanese and Chinese. In this regard, HC shows similarity to neither language type.

15) The obligatory character of *ki* in examples such as (34) has been further confirmed by Yves Dejean, a linguist residing in Haiti, who is also a native speaker of HC. It is possible that the optional character of *ki*, noted by DeGraff for some speakers, stems from an English influence.

16) For the speakers for whom *ki* is not obligatory, we suggest that verbs such as *kwè* may subcategorize for an IP, and not a CP. If so, the subject trace may be simply governed by the matrix verb. Cf. Déprez (1991, 1992b) for a detailed analysis of the COMP-t effect in English and French, and Déprez & Vinet (1992) for discussion of subject extractions in bare nominal sentences in HC.

17) DeGraff (1992) denies any parallel between the French *quel/qui* effect and the syntax of *ki* in HC. His conclusion, however, is based on a deliberate reduction of the relevant parallel phenomena to a number of technical details in his particular syntactic analysis of the *quel/qui* effect. That is, what DeGraff in fact argues is that an analysis of the *quel/qui* effect, in terms of agreement with an intermediate trace in Spec CP, cannot extend to the HC phenomena. Be that as it may, his rebuttal does not deter the point being made here, namely, that the obligatory presence of *ki* signals a subject/object asymmetry in HC extractions which is characteristic of non-pro-drop languages. This point, of course, has not been refuted by DeGraff.

18) It must be mentioned that these data are rather fragile, because, for a large number of speakers, (39b) is also excluded. Also, this putative contrast clearly does not extend to other quantifiers, such as *rien* 'nothing', which manifest a similar dependency on *ne*.

* Je n'ai exigé qu'ils fassent rien.

'I requested that they do nothing.'

19) Rizzi (1986) uses these data to argue that INFL does not properly govern the subject position in Italian. As a consequence, apparent violations of the COMP-t effect at S-structure must be related to subject inversion.

20) See, among others, May (1985) for arguments against this view. Moreover, Lasnik & Saito (1992) have argued that LF movement from an embedded subject position may, in fact, be possible universally. A discussion of the relevant data would lead us too far astray, but it is interesting to note that no matter whether May's, or Lasnik & Saito's, views prevail, both lead to the conclusion that LF subject extractions are irrelevant for determining the pro-drop status of a language.

REFERENCES

- Benedicto, Elena. 1993. The (IP) functional projections and the identification of pro. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. ms.
- Borer, Hagit. 1986. I-subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.375–416.
- Brandi, Luciana, and Patricia Cordin. 1989. Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter. In Jaeggli and Safir, 111–42.
- Cadely, Jean-Robert. 1990. Domaine prosodique d'une règle de sandhi externe et cliticization des éléments fonctionnels du créole haïtien. Montreal: Université du Québec à Montréal, Département de Linguistique. ms.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris.
- DeGraff, Michel Frédéric. 1992. Haitian null subject revisited. *Travaux de Recherche sur le créole haïtien*, 11. Montreal: Université du Québec à Montréal.
- . 1993. Is Haitian Creole a pro-drop language? The Atlantic meets the Pacific: A global view of pidginization and creolization, ed. by Francis Byrne and John Holm, 71–90. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Déprez, Viviane. 1991. Economy and the that-t effect. Paper read at the 10th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics.
- . 1992a. Raising constructions in Haitian Creole. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10.191–231.

- . 1992b. The role of agreement for government. Paper read at the 11th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics.
- , and Marie-Thérèse Vinet. 1992. Une structure prédicative sans copule. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique* 22.10–44.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo, and Kenneth Safir (eds.) 1989. The null subject parameter. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kayne, Richard. 1972. French syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1983. Connectedness and binary branching. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1982. Les questions. *Syntaxe de l'haïtien*, ed. by Claire Lefebvre, Hélène Magloire-Holly, and Nanie Piou, 204–33. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Ladusaw, Bill. 1979. Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations. Austin: University of Texas dissertation.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Affect a*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Linebarger, Marsha. 1987. Negative polarity and grammatical representations. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10.325–87.
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical form: Its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. *Studies in Romance linguistics*, ed. by Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 391–419. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Safir, Kenneth. 1985. Missing subjects in German. *Studies in German grammar*, ed. by Jindřich Toman, 193–229. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Santorini, Beatrice. 1989. The generation of the verb second constraint in the history of Yiddish. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Vinet, Marie-Thérèse. 1990. Observations théoriques sur les explétifs: Le cas du créole haïtien. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique* 20:195–214.