Morphology and word order in 'creolization' and beyond

MICHEL DEGRAFF
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
degraff@MIT.EDU

To appear after (copy-)editing in: Handbook of Comparative Syntax
(Guglielmo Cinque & Richard Kayne, eds., New York: Oxford University Press)

Revised Draft as of 27 March 2002 -- Comments welcome

Contents

Morphology and word order in 'creolization' and beyond

Michel DeGraff / *Massachusetts Institute of Technology* / degraff@MIT.EDU

Abstract

Linguists have long posited "abnormal" (i.e., "nongenetic") transmission in Creole genesis, supposedly with "significant discrepancies", in opposition to "normal" (i.e., "genetic") transmission in "regular" language change, whereby a language is "passed down from one speaker generation to the next with changes spread more or less evenly across all parts of the language" (see, e.g., Thomason and Kaufman 1988). This is what I call "Creole Exceptionalism".

In this paper, I select various patterns in morphology and word order in order to question Creole Exceptionalism. Take "discrepancies" in one core domain of Creole genesis, namely VP-related morphosyntax. Are such discrepancies at all "exceptional"?

I start with a sample of VP-related properties in Haitian Creole (HC)—a *bona fide* Creole on *sociohistorical* grounds. I compare the morphosyntax of verbs and object pronouns in HC and in some of its major source languages. I also speculate on the development of said morphosyntax from the perspective of second- and first-language acquisition and the role of grammaticalization and reanalysis therein. This, in turn, leads me to examine various theoretical proposals on the morphology-syntax interface vis-à-vis verb and object placement in language change/creation, and to consider germane patterns in Germanic and French diachrony. I also compare the HC patterns with their counterparts from a couple of other Romance-lexifier Creoles, namely Cape Verdean Creole (lexifier: Portuguese) and Palenquero Creole (lexifier: Spanish).

My conclusions are fourfold: **(i)** Even within a small sample of Romance-lexifier Creoles, there is no structural "Creole" uniformity in the VP and its extended projections. **(ii)** Certain "discrepancies" in French and English diachrony seem as "significant" as their analogues in Creole diachrony. **(iii)** This paper's observations argue against the classic (e.g., Bickertonian) Pidgin-to-Creole scenarios whereby pidginization qua structural "break in transmission" produces a macaronic and affixless pidgin that subsequently seeds a Creole qua *ab ovo* creation. **(iv)** Similarly, there is little evidence from HC to support Lefebvre's relexification hypothesis whereby HC grammar would essentially reflect substratum grammar with the French contribution strictly limited to phonetic strings "deprived of [syntactic and semantic] features" and to word-order patterns in lexical projections only (Lefebvre 1998).

The overall conclusion is that Creole languages do *not* constitute a well-delineated and exceptional class (i.e., there are no special diachronic processes of "creolization" and there is no distinct and uniform "Creole" typology): "creolization" and "language change" reflect processes of language development that are uniform across the species.

1 Prologue

An introduction to "Creole" morphosyntax would be incomplete without a sociohistorically based discussion of the term "Creole" and its implications for comparative-historical linguistics. This essay thus starts with a brief and preliminary critique, in Section 2, of certain foundational assumptions in Creole studies (see DeGraff 1999a,b, 2001a,b, 2002, and Mufwene 2001 for more thorough reviews).

Then I provide a theoretically-grounded overview of a selected subset of VP-related properties in Haitian Creole (HC)—a *bona fide* Creole, on the sociohistorical grounds outlined in Section 2. Section 3 introduces the basic comparative data related to verb and object placement in HC and some of its major source languages. Section 4 contemplates the theoretical implications of verb-placement contrasts between HC and its European ancestor, namely French—the principal etymological source of the HC lexicon. Section 5 extends this discussion to the morphosyntax of object pronouns. (The basic data and observations in Sections 3–5 are mostly taken from DeGraff 1994a,b, 1997, 2000. In fact, this paper is the payoff of long overdue promissory (foot)notes; see DeGraff 1997:90n42,91n51.)

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

Section 7 ends the essay by considering the consequences of the theoretical discussion in Sections 3–6 vis-à-vis Creole Exceptionalism. In doing so, I also compare the Haitian Creole data with germane data from a couple of other Romance-lexifier Creoles, namely Cape Verdean Creole (lexifier: Portuguese) and Palenquero Creole (lexifier: Spanish). This preliminary comparison suggests that, even within a small sample of Romance-lexified

Creoles, there is no structural "Creole" uniformity in the VP and its extended projections. There is no distinct and uniform "Creole" typology.

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

2 Some histori(ographi)cal background on Creoles and Creole studies

2.1 Sociohistorical and epistemological assumptions

Creole Exceptionalism—the dogma that Creole languages constitute an exceptional class on genealogical and/or typological grounds—is a corollary of the twin (neo-)colonial history of Creole speakers and Creole studies (see DeGraff 2001a:90–105, 2002). Besides, the languages we call "Creoles" (e.g., Caribbean Creoles) do share well-documented commonalities across sociohistorical profiles and across structural tendencies. These commonalities are uncontroversial, even if said structural tendencies are also found among products of language contact that are not usually labelled "Creole".

What is more controversial is the claim that, across time and across space, Creole languages can be defined as a *typologically* distinct language grouping whose *exceptional diachrony* makes them clusters around an *exceptional structural* "prototype" (see the critiques in, e.g., Givón 1979, Mufwene 1986, 1988, 2001, Muysken 1988, DeGraff 2001a,b, 2002). Such exceptionalist stereotypes have a long history in linguistics. Witness (e.g.) the Creole morphological profiles advocated by Jespersen 1922:233, Hjelmslev 1938, Bickerton 1988:276, Seuren & Wekker 1986, McWhorter 1998, Seuren 1998:292–293, etc. Notwithstanding their long-standing popularity, these stereotypes for Creole morphology have now been shown to be empirically, theoretically and sociologically problematic.

For my purposes in this chapter, I'll assume that a valid "Creole" grouping can be reasonably defined on sociohistorical grounds (cf. Mufwene 1986, 1998:324, 2001), not

necessarily on genetic, typological and/or topological grounds. I thus rely on a definition of "Creole languages" that is based on language-external factors. "Creole languages" refer to linguistic varieties that are typically taken by observers to have abruptly emerged out of particular sociohistorical types of language contact marked by psychological and social distance and extreme asymmetries of power (see DeGraff 1999a,b and references therein for overviews). In many parts of the Caribbean, such conditions prevailed through the 17th–19th centuries, as the results of colonization and slave trade by the British, the French, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the Spaniards. It is thus that the Caribbean has long been known for its history of language contact. Prototypical examples of Creole languages usually include the popular vernaculars spoken in the (greater) Caribbean area: Haitian Creole, Jamaican Creole, Papiamentu, Saramaccan, Sranan, etc.

From the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries onward, the basic ingredients of Europe's imperialist projects in the Caribbean came to typically include the following sociolinguistically relevant factors: (i) initial language contact between Europeans and Africans in and around the slave ports of Africa; (ii) the enslavement of increasing numbers of Africans and their subsequent dislocation to the "New World"; (iii) these Africans—speakers of typologically-diverse Niger-Congo languages, the so-called SUBSTRATE languages— would enter into (further) contact with European languages and approximations thereof by second-language learners with various (European and African) native languages; the European languages—French, English, Portuguese, Spanish and Dutch—constitute what creolists call the SUPERSTRATE languages;[1] (iv) small homestead settler communities with relatively few slaves, in the early Caribbean colonial stages; (v) the gradual and partial replacement, in economically successful colonies such as Saint-Domingue (i.e., pre-independance Haiti), of the original settler communities (see (iv)) by large-scale and brutally inegalitarian slave-based plantation economies with a vast majority of Africans.

The increased reliance on regimented slave labor for economic expansion would, over time, reduce the ratio of Europeans to non-Europeans, with the two groups becoming more and more segregated, specially at the opposite poles of the power hierarchy and specially so

[1] The superstrate language is typically the LEXIFIER of the Creole, that is, the etymological source of the Creole lexicon. For example, French is the lexifier of Haitian Creole.

on labor-intensive plantations like those in Saint-Domingue. This social transformation would, in turn, lead to a complex array of language-contact and language-acquisition settings, with a complex array of linguistic varieties as outputs: a continuum of more or less restructured approximations of European languages with varying degrees of substratum effects. This is an oversimplified sketch of the extraordinarily complex sociohistorical matrix of Creole genesis (for details, see, e.g., Alleyne 1971, Chaudenson 1992, Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001, Singler 1996, Mufwene 1996, 2001 and the many references therein).

No matter the complexity of, and the horrors inherent in, the sociohistory of Caribbean Creole genesis, it can still be assumed, in Cartesian-Uniformitarian fashion, that Creole speakers conform to UG. Notwithstanding the inhumanity of slavery, the slaves were still human. I thus assume, against Creole Exceptionalism, that the cognitive resources and strategies enlisted by language acquirers during Creole genesis are *not* fundamentally different from their analogues in friendlier and better-documented cases of language change/creation. Like with any other language acquirers, the cognitive task facing native speakers of (the incipient) Creole languages represents yet another instance of the "poverty of stimulus" paradox, also known as "Plato's Problem" (Chomsky 1986): How does the mind/brain of the language acquirer come to possess complex and abstract linguistic properties for which the Primary Linguistic Data (the PLD) provides relatively little evidence. Linguistic theory's central paradox—"Plato's Problem"—can be paraphrased as follows: For each speaker, the abstract properties that eventually characterize his/her idiolectal grammar—his/her stable I(NTERNAL)-LANGUAGE—are not, and could not be, directly observable from the PLD available in the social context of language acquisition. In Creole genesis too, language learners develop complex I-languages via exposure to relatively impoverished and superficial data sets (see DeGraff 1999a,b, 2001a,b for further justification of these assumptions).

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

2.2 Creole Exceptionalism in early creolistics

Creole studies in the colonial period is characterized by the widespread belief that Creole speech originally emerged as radically "corrupted" versions of the colonizers' European languages as spoken by the colonized *non*-Europeans, that is, by people of an "inferior" race. The term "negrified French", which E.F. Gautier coined to refer to French-lexicon Creoles, gained universal appeal in France (F. Brunot 1967v8:1136).

Racially-based classifications of Creole varieties became part of early creolists' orthodoxy as canonized in (e.g.) Larousse 1869, Vinson 1882 and Adam 1883. In Larousse's (1869) dictionary, Creole speech is defined as "corrupted French" and is assumed to be "unintelligible when spoken by an old African [while] extremely sweet when spoken by white Creole women". In Vinson's (1889) encyclopedia, "Creole languages result from the adaptation of a language, especially some Indo-European language, to the (so to speak) phonetic and grammatical genius of a race that is linguistically inferior". In Adam's (1883) treatise on *Hybridologie Linguistique*, Creole languages such as Cayenne Creole (French Guyana) are the structural equivalents of European languages "back in infancy"(p. 157), "*sui generis* new languages ... to be genetically classified with [West-African] languages, notwithstanding the Aryan nature of [the Creole] lexicon" (p. 5). Adam (1883:4–7) postulates that African speakers—speakers of primitive, thus simple, languages—had not evolved the cognitive capacity required to master the structural complexities of European morphosyntax. For Adam, the postulation of race-based cognitive-biological constraints would explain why Cayenne Creole was necessarily African even if its words are etymologically European. Adam's *Hybridologie Linguistique* was thoroughly and explicitly in keeping with the Darwinian evolutionary tropes of the (neo-)Schleicherian linguistics of his era.

More generally, linguists from the seventeenth-century onward (see, e.g., Pelleprat 1655) have attempted to ascribe generally-negative *structural* properties to Creole languages individually and/or as a group, and this as a matter of (natural) course. Instantiations of this dogma still flourish in 20th-century linguistics. For example, Seuren, in his 1998 *Western Linguistics. An Historical Introduction*, claims that "Creole grammars ... lack the more sophisticated features of languages backed by a rich and extended

cultural past and a large, well-organized literate society" (p. 292).

It it thus that Creole languages have traditionally been defined by what linguistic features they (allegedly) do not, and cannot, have because of the limited intelligence and/or the evolutionarily or culturally primitive status of their speakers. (Also see, e.g., Saint-Quentin 1872 [1989:40f] and Baissac 1880:23,32,92,103f,etc; for illustrations of Creole Exceptionalism in early and contemporary Creole studies; more elaborate reviews are offered in DeGraff 2001a,b, 2002).

2.3 Creole Exceptionalism in contemporary creolistics

Most contemporary linguists seem to have abandoned the explicitly racist claims of the colonial era. Yet, one widely-held dogma in historical linguistics still considers Creole languages to have emerged through "broken", thus "abnormal", transmission. The postulation of such radical "break in transmission" has traditionally forced Creole languages in an exceptional class, namely the class of "non-genetic [i.e., parentless] languages".[2] In contradistinction, non-Creole languages are taken to gradually evolve "genetically" via the sort of "normal transmission" represented by Stammbaum branches (as, e.g., in Latin-to-Romance or Proto-Germanic-to-English diachrony).

Thomason & Kaufman's (non-)genetic/(ab-)normal litmus test is primarily structural: broken/abnormal/non-genetic transmission implicates "a *significant discrepancy* between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence—in some or all grammatical subsystems" (1998:206, emphasis added; also see p. 8–12). But, as I'll show below, "significant discrepancy" as a criterion for "abnormal" creolization as opposed to "normal" language change is, at best, elusive and, at worst, circular: the kind of discrepancies that are manifested in *bona fide* cases of Creole genesis seems to be on a par

[2] If Proto-Human exists—a big "if"—then Creole languages cannot really be "non-genetic" stricto sensu: since Creole speakers are human beings, there must exist some "genetic" branch relating each Creole language to Proto-Human. This conclusion can be avoided by claiming that Creole languages are effectively artificial languages that altogether lie outside the scope of (normal) human languages and/or that Creole languages are "born again" instantiations of Proto-Human grammar, modulo the etymologies of Creole lexicons—these etymologies unmistakably link Creole languages to their lexifiers (i.e., to *non*-Proto-Human languages). As a matter of fact, Creole studies are rife with claims that Creoles are (direct descendants of) "born-again Protolanguages" or that they are "artificial languages" (see DeGraff 2001a,b for details and critiques).

with corresponding discrepancies in the diachrony of "genetic" languages (see Sections 6–7; also see Mufwene 1998, 2001 and some of the references therein).

In a vein somewhat similar to Thomason & Kaufman's classification, both classic and contemporary creolistics postulates *sui generis* ("abnormal") developmental processes that apply exclusively to Creole genesis. One such process is pidginization that, in the limit, eschews all morphology (Jespersen 1922, Hjelmslev 1938, Bickerton 1984, Seuren & Wekker 1986, McWhorter 1998, Seuren 1998, etc.). This hypothetical morphological bottleneck is allegedly one symptom of some "radical break in transmission". More spectacularly, pidginization creates a "born again" Protolanguage—a living fossil of Language at its evolutionary incipience (see note 2). Such Neo-Darwinian hypotheses are empirically disconfirmed by robust data sets about Creole diachrony and synchrony (see DeGraff 2001a,b, 2002, and references therein).

Creole Exceptionalism, implicitly if not explicitly, underlies a number of Creole-genesis theories, including the Relexification Hypothesis (see, e.g., Lefebvre 1998). With respect to the genealogy and ontology of Creole languages, Lefebvre (1998:3) evokes the claims of Adam's (1883) *Hybridologie Linguistique*. Following Adam, Lefebvre argues that Haitian Creole grammar essentially reflects substratum grammar with the French contribution strictly limited to phonetic strings "deprived of [syntactic and semantic] features" (p. 16f) and to word-order patterns in lexical (e.g., N, V, Adj, P) projections only (p. 39f). Given the massive and systematic etymological and word- and affix-order correspondences between French and HC, Lefebvre must assume that the Creole creator was somehow able to segment and (re)analyze French strings and adopt and adapt a great deal of French phonetics and surface order—down to the phonetic shapes and surface distribution of many affixes and grammatical morphemes—while ignoring virtually *all* abstract structural properties of French. Such a feat would make the Creole creator unlike any other language learner documented in the psycholinguistics and language-acquisition literature. After all, word segmentation and word- and affix-order are reflexes of *abstract* morphosyntactic properties. The language acquirer cannot identify (e.g.) morphemes and their order in the target language without some amount of *abstract* knowledge about morpheme boundaries, morphosyntactic features and categories and other non-phonetic properties of the target language.

At any rate, the Haitian Creole data does not support the strict-relexification hypothesis. The overwhelming majority of Haitian Creole morphemes, *including functional heads*, are derived from 17th-18th century French via relatively successful word segmentation and semantic analysis, with expected grammaticalization-cum-reanalysis effects and substrate influence in various domains. Similar phenomena are attested in current experimental research on language acquisition. In addition, *most of HC functional heads and affixes have French cognates with which they share substantial distributional and semantic properties* (see Fattier 1998, DeGraff 2001a; also see §§6.2,6.4 below). Below (in, e.g., §3.3) I illustrate additional aspects of Haitian Creole morphosyntax that cannot be accounted for by the sort of strict relexification posited by Adam and Lefebvre.

In effect, the discussion below will revisit all of the above traditional assumptions about Creole languages. I will question current dogmas on Creole diachrony and synchrony, using Haitian Creole—a *bona fide* plantation Creole—as case study with focus on core aspects of Haitian morphosyntax in the domain of the verb phrase and associated functional layers. A preliminary comparison of a small sample of HC-vs-French morphosyntactic (dis)similarities and counterparts thereof in Germanic and French diachrony suggests that there may be no independent *structural* basis for the now-orthodox dichotomy between Creole languages and non-Creole languages. Furthermore the sort of language-contact and language-shift effects and structural innovations visible in the formation of HC can also be documented in non-Creole diachrony and in language acquisition (see Section 6).[3] Such parallels are neither accidental nor surprising in an internalist framework that assumes UG. The latter offers no conceptual room for a fundamental opposition between Creoles and non-Creoles—diachronically, synchronically or otherwise.

[3] See, e.g., DeGraff 1994a,b, 1997, 1999a,b, 2000, 2001a; also see DeGraff 1998, 2001b and the references therein

3 The basic comparative data: VP-related morphosyntax in Haitian Creole (HC) diachrony

3.1 Some Creole data

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

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

Let's start with the distributional facts. First consider the HC data. HC pronominal objects, like their non-pronominal counterparts, systematically occur to the *right* of their θ-marking verb:[4]

(1) a. *Bouki konnen Boukinèt* (HC)
Bouki know Boukinèt

[4] The following abbreviations are used throughout: ACC 'accusative', ANT 'anterior', ASP 'aspectual marker', CFP 'clause-final particle' (with discourse-presupposition functions), COMPL 'completive marker', DAT 'dative' FUT 'future', HAB 'habitual', INDEF 'indefinite', IRR 'irrealis', NEG 'negation', PL 'plural', PROG 'progressive', SG 'sing', 1sg 'first singular', ..., 3pl 'third plural', masc 'masculine', fem 'feminine'.
Abbreviations for languages: C(ape)V(erdean)Creole, Fr(ench), H(aitian)C(reole), IC(elandic), L(ousiana)C(reole), M(auritian)C(reole), M(iddle)E(nglish), N(ew)E(nglish) (i.e., Modern English), O(ld)E(nglish), PL (Palenquero), SW(edish).

'Bouki knows Boukinèt'

b. *Bouki konnen li*
Bouki know 3sg
'Bouki knows him/her/it'

(2) a. * *Bouki Boukinèt konnen* (HC)

b. * *Bouki li konnen*

Not only do HC objects uniformly occur to the right of their θ-marking verb, but, whether pronominal or non-pronominal, they must be *adjacent* to that verb, as in (3). Except for the indirect object in the double-object constructions, clause-internal elements (e.g., adverbs or negation markers) cannot intervene between the verb and its object:

(3) a. *Bouki deja konnen Boukinèt* (HC)
Bouki already know Boukinèt
'Bouki already knows Boukinèt'

b. *Bouki pa konnen Boukinèt*
Bouki NEG know Boukinèt
'Bouki doesn't know Boukinèt'

(4) a. * *Bouki konnen deja Boukinèt* (HC)

b. * *Bouki konnen pa Boukinèt*

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

(5)

	singular	plural
1	*mwen*	*nou*
2	*ou*	*nou*
3	*li*	*yo*

A sample of HC personal pronouns:
no morphological Case distinction

The inflectional profile of HC pronouns is, in some sense, on a par with the inflectional profile of the HC verb, which is not morphologically inflected for grammatical distinctions such as Tense, Mood, Aspect (TMA) and agreement. A form like *konnen* 'know' in (6) does not morphologically co-vary with the person, number or gender (ϕ) features of its subject:[5]

(6) { *Mwen* | *Ou* | *Li* | *Nou* | *Yo* } *konnen* *Boukinèt* (HC)
1sg | 2sg | 3sg | 1pl/2pl | 3pl know Boukinèt
'{I | You | He/She | We | They } know(s) Boukinèt'

As of Tense-Mood-Aspect (TMA) features, these are expressed by preverbal free morphemes, as in (7) (also see Section 4; in §6.1 I discuss the etymology of HC TMA markers).

(7) a. *Boukinèt* *te* *renmen* *Bouki* (HC)
Boukinèt ANT renmen Bouki
'Boukinèt loved Bouki'

b. *Boukinèt* *ap* *renmen* *Bouki*
Boukinèt FUT love Bouki
'Boukinèt will love Bouki'

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

c. *Boukinèt a renmen Bouki si ...*
Boukinèt IRR love Bouki if
'Boukinèt would love Bouki if ...'

3.2 Some superstratum data

The Fr patterns below, which are well-known in the comparative-syntax literature (see, e.g., Pollock 1989 and Sportiche 1995), are somewhat the mirror image of the HC patterns in (1)–(7), at least with respect to: (i) object-pronoun placement vis-à-vis the θ-marking verb in non-imperative clauses,[6] (ii) placement of the finite verb vis-à-vis clause-internal adverbs and sentential negation, (iii) morphological case on pronouns, and (iv) TMA- and agreement-related verbal morphology. Let's survey these contrasts in turn.

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

(8) a. *Bouqui connaît Bouquinette* (Fr)
Bouqui know Bouquinette
'Bouqui knows Bouquinette'

b. *Bouqui la connaît*
Bouqui 3sg-fem know
'Bouqui knows her'

(9) a. * *Bouqui Bouquinette connaît* (Fr)

b. * *Bouqui connaît la*

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

(10) a. *Bouqui connaît déjà Bouquinette* (Fr)
Bouqui know already Bouquinette
'Bouqui already knows Bouquinette'

[6] I come back to Fr imperatives in §6.2 and note 59.

b. *Bouqui* (*ne*) *connaît* *pas* *Bouquinette*
Bouqui NEG know NEG Bouquinette
'Bouqui doesn't know Bouquinette'

(11) a. * *Bouqui* *déjà* *connaît* *Bouquinette* (Fr)

b. * *Bouqui* (*ne*) *pas* *connaît* *Bouquinette*

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

(12)

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

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

In Standard French, finite verbs host a relatively robust set of agreement and TMA sufixes:[7]

[7] When it comes to elucidate Creole genesis, we must consider cross-dialectal and diachronic variations in colloquial speech to better delineate the kind of patterns the Creole creators were exposed to (Chaudenson 1992, Chaudenson *et al* 1993, Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001, Mufwene 2001). In the case of HC's genesis, it can be safely assumed that Standard French as we know it today played little, if any, role in Creole formation (see §2.2). Chaudenson *et al* 1993 discuss the paradigmatically-sparser inflectional suffixes on verbs in various regional varieties of popular spoken French.

In spoken varieties, *nous aimons* in (13) is giving way to *on aime* with the second-plural *vous aimez* becoming the only form that is distinguishable from /ɛm/. Notwithstanding this 'erosion' of agreement, agreement marking still exists in popular varieties. In addition to second-plural forms, we also find a distinct third-plural present for certain verbs (Chaudenson *et al* 1993:57) and certain irregular and frequently-used verbs such as *être* 'to be', *avoir* 'to have', *aller* 'to go' manifest a larger set of inflected forms. It can also be argued that popular colloquial French is gradually replacing the agreement suffixes underlined in (13) with prefixes derived from subject clitics (see §6.4).

Regarding TMA marking, regional varieties of vernacular French seem to favor, when available, verbal periphrases over their synthetic counterparts illustrated in (14). In §6.1, I consider the role of such Fr periphrastic verbal constructions in the genesis of the TMA system in HC.

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

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

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

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

The following table sums up the contrasts between HC and Fr with respect to the distribution and morphology of verbs and objects, as sketched so far.

(15)

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

3.3 Some substratum data

What could the substratum contribute, *in principle*, to the emergence of the contrasts in (15)? Consider Fɔngbè, for example, which is often taken as the most influential substrate language for the formation of HC grammar (see Lefebvre 1998 and references therein). Firstly, verbs in Fɔngbè, like in HC, are not morphologically inflected for TMA or agreement. Secondly, TMA markers in Fɔngbè, like in HC, are generally non-affixal morphemes in preverbal position (Avolonto 1992). Thirdly, Fɔngbè and many other West-African verbs have interpretative properties reminiscent of HC (e.g., all these languages manifest the 'factative' effect; Déchaine 1991, Avolonto 1992, Aboh 1999, this

volume, Ndayiragije 2000, etc.).

This said, HC is not structurally isomorphic to its substratum—and neither is it isomorphic to its superstratum. Da Cruz 1995 documents postverbal completive markers in Fɔngbè and Aboh 1999:59f, this volume, documents suffixal Aspect markers in Gengbe and Ewegbe. And, as we'll see below in (19), Fɔngbè verbs do manifest inflectional and syntactic processes that are *not* attested in HC; also see Aboh, 1999, this volume.)

For now, let's note that the distributional uniformity of HC objects and the morphological uniformity of HC pronouns—sans morphological case—distinguish HC from its major source languages, including Fr and Fɔngbè. Take the following three verb-syntax characteristics which have been argued to hold of Fɔngbè and of the Gbe grouping in general (see Fabb 1992, Kinyalolo 1992, Déchaine & Manfredi 1997, Aboh 1999, this volume, Ndayiragije 2000): (i) an IP-internal leftward movement that move objects to the left of the θ-marking verb in certain contexts, as in (17)–(18); (ii) the object-movement rule in (i) distinguishes full NPs and tonic pronouns from atonic pronouns: the full NPs and tonic pronouns may undergo IP-internal object-movement to the left of the verb (as in (17)–(18)) whereas the atonic pronouns are generally enclitics hosted by the θ-marking verb, as in (19); (iii) pronouns are overtly marked for morphological case distinctions—compare the 1sg nominative pronoun in (17) and its non-nominative counterpart in (19); (iv) the pattern in (19) illustrates verb reduplication (see Fabb 1992, Déchaine & Manfredi 1997, Ndayiragije 2000 and Aboh 1999, this volume, for various treatments of reduplication and Object Shift in Gbe; also see note 61):[8,9]

(16) *Ùn ɖú mɔ̌lìnkún* (Fɔngbè)
I eat rice
'I eat rice' [adapted from Fabb 1992:2]

(17) a. *Ùn ɖò mɔ̌lìnkún ɖú wɛ̀* (Fɔngbè)
I be rice eat CFP

[8] All examples are from Kinyalolo's (1992) study of Fɔngbè word-order. Also see Fabb 1992, Aboh, 1999, this volume, and Ndayiragije 2000 for more NP_{Obj}–V examples in the Gbe languages. Various papers in Déchaine & Manfredi 1997 suggest that the Obj-V order is actually quite widespread in Kwa.

[9] Fɔngbè NP_{Obj}–V sequences are also found following verbs meaning 'start, 'end', 'stop', 'can'/'know', 'refuse', 'make'/'order', etc. (Fabb 1992:6–7).

b. * *Ùn* *ɖò* *ɖú* *mɔ̌lìnkún* *wɛ̀*
I be eat rice CFP
'I am eating rice' [Kinyalolo 1992:39]

(18) a. *Yé* *ɖídó* *nyè* *xò* *gbé* (Fɔngbè)
they take-to-the-road (tonic) me beat CFP

b. * *Yé* *dídó* *xò* *nyè* *gbé*
'They took to the road to beat me' [Adapted from Kinyalolo 1992:37]

(19) *Yé* *ɖídó* *xìxò* *mì* *gbé* (Fɔngbè)
they take-to-the-road beat me [Adapted from Kinyalolo 1992:37]

None of the properties in (i)–(iii) hold of HC, which is unexpected in the strict-relexification proposals of (e.g.) Adam 1883 and Lefebvre 1998, even though a more moderate sort of substratum influence via L1-transfer in second-language acquisition is quite likely (see, e.g., Mufwene 1990).

To recapitulate , both Fr and Gbe dialects, major source languages of HC, extensively instantiate word-order and case-morphology patterns that are totally absent in HC.[10] Can this be taken as evidence of (so-called) non-genetic "abnormal transmission" (or "pidginization" or "radical break in transmission") of the kind that would set creolization apart from the diachronic processes that give rise to non-Creole languages?

The main goal of this paper is to use the observations in this Section to revisit the theoretical status of Creole Exceptionalism. In doing so, I'll show that the foundations and desiderata of modern comparative syntax erase the traditional distinction between "non-genetic" creolization and "genetic" language change. Using the Principles-and-Parameters approach to syntax, I will try in Sections 4 and 5 to relate the positions of verb and objects in HC to each other and to the morphological profile of the language, enlisting what may be universal grammatical constraints. This is in keeping with the hunch in current generative work that the ultimate locus of language variation is in the lexicon, especially in the inventory and morphosyntactic properties of functional heads

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

(see, e.g., Chomsky 1995). In turn, these theoretical considerations may shed light on the mechanics that underlie, and *unite*, creole genesis and language change (see Section 6). In Section 7, I examine verb- and pronoun-placement data in two other Romance-lexicon Creoles.

4 The morphosyntax of Haitian Creole verbs

4.1 Basic facts

Recall the basic verb-placement contrasts that obtain across HC and its lexifier Fr in (3)–(4) vs. (10)–(11). These are simplex clauses: the main, and only, verb therein (i.e., the θ-marking verb) occurs without any auxiliary. Let's call such clauses MONOVERBAL CLAUSES. In (Standard) French, these are clauses where the main verb inflects for, at least, person-number agreement, and in some cases also evinces TMA suffixes (see (13)–(14)). In contrast, HC verbs evince no inflectional morphology for TMA or agreement, whether or not the main verb is the sole verbal element (see (6)–(7)).

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

In HC and Fr monoverbal clauses, the clause-internal adverbs and the sentential negation marker appear respectively to the left and to the right of the verb. Witness (3a)/(4a) vs. (10a)/(11a) and (3b)/(4b) vs. (10b)/(11b).[11] The Fr verb-placement facts have been in the limelight of theoretical comparative syntax since Pollock 1989. Dejean (1992) and DeGraff (1994a,b, 1997, 2000) provide additional HC and Fr data with other adverbs. These examples can be *grosso modo* schematized as in (20)–(21), abstracting

[11] Fr clauses with auxiliaries preceding the main verb (as in compound tenses — passé composé, plus-que-parfait, etc.) introduce more complicated patterns. I return to these in §6.1.

away from the intricate stacking of negation and adverbs à la Cinque.

(20) a. $Neg/Adv \quad V \quad NP_{Obj}$ (HC)

b. * $V \quad Neg/Adv \quad NP_{Obj}$

(21) a. * $Neg/Adv \quad V \quad NP_{Obj}$ (Fr)

b. $V \quad Neg/Adv \quad NP_{Obj}$

4.2 Theoretical proposals

The analysis proposed in DeGraff 1994a,b, 1997, 2000 is relatively straightforward. In fact, the HC-vs-Fr contrasts above are obviously reminiscent of the English-vs-Fr contrasts extensively studied in the prolific Pollockian tradition on comparative verb morphosyntax. The central assumption that I'll adopt from this tradition is that there is something like a 'verb-placement parameter'. The setting of this parameter determines for each given language the absence vs. presence or, more accurately, the *height* of verb-movement to some INFL(lectional) head within an increasingly intricate Cinquean layer of INFL projections between the CP and VP projections (cf. notes 12, 14 and 16). It is assumed that in all languages the verb is generated within the verb phrase (VP), adjacent to its object (if any). In certain languages, the verb is pronounced inside the VP shell(s)—or their most immediate extended projection(s) such as vP, but I'll gloss over that distinction. When the verb is pronounced in VP, it is pronounced adjacent to its object (if any), in a position that is c-commanded by any material that c-commands the VP. Let's call such languages V-IN-SITU languages. In other languages, the finite verb overtly moves out of the VP into some attracting head within the INFL(lectional) system below CP. That INFL head——call it x—c-commands the VP. The verb is thus pronounced outside of the VP, to the left of any material that is c-commanded by x, assuming Kayne's (1994)

Antisymmetry. Let's call these languages the V-TO-I languages.[12,13]

In this terminology, HC is V-in-situ while Fr is V-to-I and the HC-vs-Fr differences in verb placement obtain in a manner similar to analogous word-order contrasts between English and Fr (DeGraff 1994a,b, 1997, 2000). Assume that the relevant clause-internal adverbs and sentential negation markers are generated in some intermediate y_iP projection between VP and some higher xP whose head is the landing site for verb movement, if any. The integer i in y_iP ranges between 1 and some small n, smaller than, say, 29, which is the cardinality of the universal inventory of INFL heads postulated by Cinque; see note 12).[14] The HC-vs.-Fr verb-placement contrast follows directly from these assumptions.[15,16]

[12] As for the target of "V-to-I" movement, it is worth stressing that we need not assume a unique target position x (some INFL-related head) for all languages. Things are most likely much more complex. Verbs may move to different heights across languages and, within one language, verb movement may occur in one fell swoop or cyclically via a number of potential landing sites. I by and large abstract away from these subtleties; but see notes 13, 14, 16, 18 and 38). In other words, I am letting "I(NFL)" in "V-to-I" stands for a range of INFL-related head positions—possible targets of IP-internal verb-movement to a position that c-commands the VP and that is c-commanded by the (highest) IP-internal subject's surface position. Cinque's (1997:106) elaborate proposal offers an innate—species-uniform—hierarchy of some 29 "INFL" heads; but see Bobaljik 1999 for a critique and for some possible refinements.

[13] I am purposefully abstracting away, for now, from verb-movement to COMP (aka V-to-C) and from any intermediate V-to-I steps on V's way to COMP (but see §6.3). A language can have V-(to-I)-to-C without having *independent* V-to-I (i.e., without verb-movement to INFL as the *final* landing site). According to Vikner 1994:119, 1995:142–147, Danish is such a language, along with other Mainland Scandinavian languages. The latter somewhat resemble HC to the extent that they (arguably) lack independent verb-movement to INFL (e.g., in embedded clauses where verb-second is excluded); although see Déprez 1989:242f, Thráinsson 1994:151, Kroch 1997:319,325n25,26 for more complex possibilities regarding Scandinavian IP-internal verb placement, including short verb-movement to a *low* inflectional head (cf. Lightfoot 1999:449n3). HC does not have V-to-C movement of the sort found in verb-second (V2) languages and does not manifest any type of (dependent or independent) V-to-I, modulo the caveat in note 16. (Also see note 38 for CP-level occurrences of V in HC and Kroch *et al* 1997, 2000 for hypothetical V2-related diachronic implications of V-to-C with or without independent V-movement to INFL heads.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

[17] What follows is a summary and update of DeGraff (1994a,b, 1997, 2000) where I adopted as a working hypothesis a controversial proposal that combines insights from, *inter multos alios*, Platzack & Holmberg 1989, Pollock 1989, Dejean 1992, Chomsky 1993, Roberts 1995, Rohrbacher 1994, and Vikner 1995, 1997 (also see notes 18 and 20).

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

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

In all the proposals above, the basic intuition to be captured is that, given "'rich" morphology (with "richness" measured in one way or the other), the verb must undergo head-movement. No matter what technology is adopted to handle morphology-syntax

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

A theory-internal tension immediately arises. In DM, the narrow syntax handles "*abstract* morphemes", *devoid of phonological exponence*. The phonological pieces of morphemes are inserted "late", post-syntax, in the morphophonology. Now, consider that, in Bobaljik's account, the stacking on the verb stem of *overt* inflectional affixes (i.e., phonological exponents aka "Vocabulary Items") counts as *un-ambiguous* evidence for the determination of "rich" inflection, which in turn entails V-to-I. Yet the morphology-to-syntax entailment in (i) above holds only in a model where inflectional affix stacking *necessarily* reflects structural complexity in the narrow syntax; the necessity of such isomorphism is alluded to in Bobaljik 2001:21n33. Is DM such a model?

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

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

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

Perhaps a solution can be found by investigating learnability-based markedness (cf. Ackema 2001). If Fission exists, then what may disfavor a V-in-situ language with multiple (fissioned) inflection morphemes on the verb are the learnability difficulties—the markedness—entailed by Fission. Recall that Fission is one of "these departures [from the default situation that] are considered marked options within a grammar, and therefore are assumed to require (substantial) positive evidence during acquisition" (Harley & Noyer 1999:§4.2). So, assuming Bobaljik's treatment, the "mismatched" V-in-situ/rich-inflection correlation is

interactions in verb placement, it has already been unambiguously established that in the HC-vs-Fr case there is a robust correlation between the respective degrees of verbal inflection in the two languages and their respective degrees of verb-movement (this was first noticed, I believe, in Dejean 1992). For now, let's take HC and Fr to fall on opposite sides of both the V-in-situ/V-to-I and the poor/rich inflectional clines. We must note though that there do exist intermediate cases whose positions in, and correlations vis-à-vis, the verb-movement and verbal-inflection continua are more ambiguous and problematic. This is perhaps due to still mysterious markedness and/or change-in-progress factors (see note 21).[19,20]

Going back to explanatory adequacy, one can ask: How important is verbal inflectional morphology *to the learner* for the (re)setting of the verb-placement parameter in Creole formation and elsewhere (e.g., in Germanic diachrony)? Let's temporarily assume for the sake of the argument that (acquisition of) verb-placement is completely orthogonal to the presence or absence of verbal affixes. Given the postulation of V-to-I in both Fr (Pollock 1989) and Gbe (Aboh 1999, this volume), one could reasonably imagine, pending further data and further insights about learnability, a scenario in which V-to-I would have survived into HC, even in absence of verbal affixes. This scenario may seem quite

indeed possible, although marked, perhaps as marked as the inverse "mismatch", namely the V-to-I/poor-inflection correlation. The latter presumably arises because of (some combination of) zero-affixation, Impoverishment and Fusion. Now, if the V-in-situ/rich-inflection combination is rarer than the V-to-I/no-inflection combination or non-existent altogether (cf. Ackema 2001:253–255), then this may count as evidence that Fission is more marked than Fusion, Impoverishment and/or zero-affixation—and perhaps specially so in the domain of INFL morphemes—even though all operations that introduce morphology-syntax mismatches are "marked options" (Noyer 1997:xxi,lxvi; Harley & Noyer 1999:§§3.3,4.2).

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

See note 63 for possible analogues related to the diachrony of V-to-I in Capeverdean Creole, a Creole with a Portuguese lexifier. Also see DeGraff 1997:81,88n28,33 and the references cited there for yet another possible analogue in the diachrony of V-to-I in Louisiana Creole under the influence of Cajun French.

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

reasonable if one assumes that all the language acquirer needs in order to acquire V-to-I is exposure to patterns that instantiate V-to-I (e.g., utterances with the sequence *V Neg/Adv* NP_{Obj}). French readily provides the relevant V-to-I patterns; so it may seem mysterious why V-to-I did not persist in HC (but see §6.2 for some relevant speculations regarding the evolution of HC's TMA system from Fr verbal periphrases).

Regardless of the developmental fate of V-to-I, the paradigms of bound inflectional morphology are a well-known casualty in the *initial* stages of language acquisition, *independently of the inflectional profiles represented in the Primary Linguistic Data* (PLD) (cf. note 7). The reduction of bound inflectional paradigms seems even more spectacular in second language acquisition under duress in the context of learner-unfriendly language contact with relatively reduced access to native target data (cf. Meillet 1919, Weinreich 1953:§2.3; see DeGraff 1999b:491–499,517–518 for an overview). This point was already adumbrated by Schleicher (1850) who compared English with its 'poor' inflectional morphology and Icelandic with its 'rich' inflectional morphology. Schleicher concluded that this spectacular inflectional contrast between sister languages is due to the much higher degree of language contact in the history of English (Schleicher 1850 [1852: 23–30]; see DeGraff 2001b:219n5 for some historiographical discussion; also see note 35 below).

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

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

considerations as in Roberts 1999).

As Bobaljik 2001:5 points out, such learnability-theoretic considerations are related to, but do not necessarily determine, the synchronic grammatical factors that force V-to-I or V-in-situ in the relevant I-languages. That certain verbal affixes can be used as *part* of the triggering evidence vis-à-vis (often quite abstract) verb-placement options does not necessarily entail that it is verbal affixes, and only verbal affixes, that determine verb placement in the adult grammar.[21,22]

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

The tension between Bobaljik 2001 and various DM assumptions is a constructive one: if Bobaljik is right, then all the INFL-related cases currently treated as Fission must be (re-)analyzed sans Fission. At any rate, a Fission-less re-analysis of the relevant cases would also tell a story about learnability: How would the learner, given much less evidence than the linguist, resist postulating affix-stacking in the presence of multiple inflectional affixes on the verb stem? (Cf. the Berber case above or the Faroese case discussed in Bobaljik 2001:13–15.) And, if Fission does exist as a "marked option" and if it does apply to INFL morphemes, what kind of "(substantial) positive evidence" (Harley & Noyer 1999:§4.2) would the child require in order to postulate Fission instead of distinct syntactic heads? Not an easy question, be it for the child or the linguist. The right answer, for both child and linguist, seems to require a certain amount of inspection and comparison of verbal forms—specially their inflectional combinations—in order to decide whether, and which, particular instances of affix-stacking, if any, result from Fission and/or from multiple INFL heads. This kind of inspection may well be as computationally expensive as the inspection of paradigms in the scenarios advocated by (e.g.) Rohrbacher 1994 and Vikner 1997, which Bobaljik argues against.

[22] That verb placement in both acquisition and in the stable grammar can in principle be driven by other factors besides those related to verbal inflection, is suggested by (e.g.) Fɔngbè (see note 37). If Aboh (1999, this volume) is right, Fɔngbè is a V-to-I language, even in absence of a 'rich' system of verbal inflection. Outside of verbal inflection per se, there are other morphosyntax-related cues that may suggest a V-to-I setting to both the language learner and the linguist, once certain assumptions are adopted (cf. note 61).

I don't understand what exact factors drive V-to-I in Fongbe, as compared to V-to-I in Romance and Germanic. But it seems to me that the nature of Fɔngbè V-to-I, especially with respect to the reduplication facts noted in (e.g.) §6.2, is quite distinct from V-to-I in Romance and Germanic. V-to-I, when properly investigated across a wider range of languages, may not be a unitary phenomenon. There may thus be other parameters at play in explaining the (dis-)similarities in verb-syntax between Fongbe, on one hand, and Romance and Germanic, on the other hand. For example, there is nothing in Romance and Germanic that looks like the afore-mentioned Fongbe verbal reduplication phenomena. In other words, the Fɔngbè-vs.-Romance/Germanic comparison may not be of the same micro-parametric type. But at this point I am far out on a limb.

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

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

5 The morphosyntax of Haitian Creole object pronouns

5.1 Basic facts

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

5.2 Theoretical proposals

Is there any theoretical basis for a possible correlation between inflectional morphology, verb placement and object-pronoun placement? Let's continue to assume that what

induces V-to-I are (*possibly abstract*) morphological properties of certain functional heads above the VP. Does IP-internal object movement rely on some analogous property of functional heads above VP? Are the two types of movement in any sort of dependency? These questions are all the more intriguing that English diachrony manifests the same sort of "discrepancies"/"losses" that characterize HC's diachrony: (i) loss of V-to-I; (ii) loss of preverbal objects; (iii) loss of inflectional morphology on verbs; (iv) loss of inflectional (case) morphology on (pro)nouns (see §6.3).[23]

A number of proposals in the generative literature on Germanic and Romance offer an attractive analytical link among inflectional morphology, the placement of verbs and that of (pronominal) objects. In these proposals, certain sorts of object placement are dependent on verb movement and/or on inflectional morphology on the verb and/or its arguments. Such proposals include Holmberg 1985, Platzack & Holmberg 1989; Holmberg & Platzack 1990; Kayne 1989a,b, 1991; Déprez 1989; Chomsky 1993; Sportiche 1995; Bobaljik & Jonas 1996; Bobaljik 1995, to appear; etc.[24] For Déprez, Kayne, Chomsky, Roberts, Sportiche and others, it is inflectional heads dominating VP that are implicated in object cliticization and in other types of clause-internal leftward object movements.[25,26]

[23] It may be tempting to relate the distributional uniformity of HC postverbal objects to the morphological uniformity of HC pronouns and to postulate some general syntax-morphology correlation vis-à-vis object placement and case marking. But, as Holmberg 1999:24 observes, "[t]he correlation is extremely weak" (cf. Cinque 1999:217n18 and Thráinsson 2001:167f,185–188). For example, object placement in Norwegian is much 'freer' than in English (see, e.g., Nilsen 1997, Cinque 1999:217n18, Thráinsson 2001:199n17) even though nominal case in Norwegian is not (appreciably) richer than in English. (Also see notes 56 and 57.)

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

[25] The term 'object cliticization' is used throughout to refer exclusively to *syntactic* cliticization, whereby an object pronoun–or some associate thereof—undergoes leftward movement to some VP-external position, from which the clitic attaches to its host, typically a verb. Syntactic cliticization is distinct from phonological cliticization. The latter applies to HC atonic pronouns and to a host of other morphemes, independently of syntactic cliticization. For example, *li* in (1b) *phonologically* cliticizes onto the preceding verb, giving *Bouki konnen-l*; see Cadely 1994 for discussion of the conditions under which phonological cliticization takes place in HC.

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

To better understand these proposals, let us first examine cases where *full* NPs behave *somewhat* like object clitics in being pronounced outside of the VP in which they are generated. The prototypical, and much-discussed, case is that of OBJECT SHIFT (OS) in Icelandic (IC) and a subset of Germanic; see (e.g.) Holmberg 1985; Déprez 1989; Bobaljik & Jonas 1993, Bobaljik 1995, to appear, and, specially, the recent review in Thráinsson 2001. OS is illustrated by the following Icelandic data from Holmberg (1985):

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

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

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

That *Sveini*, *smjörinu* 'the butter' and *bókina* 'the book' have "shifted" in (22) is indicated by the position of the objects relative to the underlined items, which are taken to indicate the left boundary of (some extended projection of) VP. Icelandic, unlike English, allows both the verb and the object to overtly move leftward, outside of VP, with the verb landing up higher than the object, giving the surface orders in (22). (Incidentally, nouns and verbs in IC are more richly inflected than in English, for Case and for person and number agreement, respectively; see Holmberg & Platzack 1990; cf. notes 23 and 56.)

Let's assume that OS is related to Case, and that its landing site is within the projection of a functional head whose function vis-à-vis the object is somewhat similar that of the head(s) responsible for V-to-I in Section 4 (see Déprez 1989, Chomsky 1993, Sportiche 1995, Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, etc.). In this perspective, OS, like V-to-I, is related to some (abstract) morphological requirements of the moved element and/or its landing site. Thus, vis-à-vis morphology and word-order, OS vs. object-in-situ offer intriguing

and LF-movement to clitic constructions).

parallels to the contrast between V-to-I vs. V-in-situ discussed in Section 4. Compare the Icelandic and English data in (22): Icelandic has OS while objects in English remain in situ.[27]

Is there a theoretical link between V-to-I and object cliticization (qua OS?) in a way that will give a principled explanation to the emergence of the morphosyntax of verbs and (object) pronouns in HC? Consider the now-familiar, if controversial, claims that:
(i) elimination (reduction?) of V-to-I typically depends on a prior reduction in verbal inflectional suffixes; (ii) elimination (reduction?) of object cliticization is associated with reduction in morphological case-marking (but see note 23). Is the theory able to relate aspects of (i) and (ii) via independently-needed principles?

I'll now now turn to a theoretical proposal whereby overt V-to-I is a necessary condition for object cliticization, here viewed (controversially) as an instance of OS.[28] In such a theory, that HC lacks both V-to-I and preverbal object clitics is not an arbitrary combination of facts. Neither would such combination be an empirical correlate of Creole Exceptionalism. In the Cartesian-Uniformitarian view to be explored here, the constellation of facts related to the descriptive generalizations in (i)–(ii) above directly falls out from constraints imposed by UG, without any ad hoc assumptions about developmental mechanisms that would apply exclusively in Creole genesis.

The fundamental insight making V-to-I a pre-requisite for OS goes back, I think, to Holmberg 1985:[29]

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

[28] Note that equating subsuming object cliticization under OS is far from uncontroversial; see Déprez 1989:239–241, Holmberg 1995:Ch6, Thráinsson 2001 and references cited there for (dis)similarities between object cliticization and (canonical) Object Shift. One of the more obvious dissimilarities is the height of Object Shift (to the right and below the main verb in (22)) vs. that of (Romance) cliticization (often to the left and higher than the main verb (see, e.g., (8b)). I will tentatively abstract away from these differences. It will suffice to assume that object cliticization, as an instantiation of OS, involves leftward object movement to a position outside of VP and within IP (see, e.g., Déprez 1989:Ch3 for such an implementation, with OS as XP-movement to Spec(Agr_o) and object cliticization as head-movement to, or via, Agr_o; also see Sportiche 1995 and references therein for an approach where object cliticization involves involves overt or covert movement, possibly through a Case-checking projection, of some XP_i, possibly pro_i, to the Spec of a phrase headed by clitic_i.

[29] For technical implementations of (23) in a number of frameworks, see, e.g., Déprez 1989, Kayne 1989a, 1991, Chomsky 1993, Roberts 1994, Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, Holmberg 1999, Bobaljik 1995, to appear. For counter-arguments against Holmberg's Generalization, see Lasnik 1999:149n36 and the references cited there. Also see note 31 below. Thráinsson 2001 provides a critical overview.

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

For Holmberg, the principle in (23) would explain why OS in IC is not possible in the presence of an auxiliary: in such contexts it is only the auxiliary that moves, not the main verb; the absence of main-verb movement (which entails that the governing verb is *not* phonetically empty) is what bans OS. Compare (22b) with (24):[30]

(24)

Stúdentarnir	*hafa*	*allir*	*stungið*	*smjörinu*	*í*	*vasann*
the students	have	all	put	the butter	in	the pocket

'The students have all put the butter in their pockets" [Holmberg 1985:187]

Holmberg 1985:189f also notices that Swedish (SW), which allows OS only with unstressed personal pronouns ('cliticization' in our terms), allows such cliticization in main clauses only. Interestingly, as observed by (e.g.) Holmberg & Platzack 1990, the paradigms of verbal and nominal inflections are more restricted in SW than in IC: "disregarding the genitive, [...] no Case morphology [in SW], except on pronouns, and no subject-verb agreement" (p. 93). Holmberg & Platzack also observe that SW, unlike IC, has no independent V-to-I: V-to-I in SW only occurs in connection with verb-second (V2)—generally, in main clauses. Given Holmberg's Generalization in (23), it seems no accident that SW has OS in main clauses only: SW object cliticization occurs only when V overtly moves out VP—on its way to C, since SW lacks independent V-to-I (see Josefsson

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

(i)

Jean	*a*	*mangé*	*souvent*	*des*	*pommes*
Jean	has	eaten	often	INDEF-PL	apples

'Jean has often eaten apples'

(ii)

manger	*souvent*	*des*	*pommes,*	...
To eat	often	INDEF-PL	apples	

'To often eat apples'

(iii)

Jean	*les*	*a*	*mangées*
Jean	them	has	eaten

'Jean has eaten them'

(iv)

Jean	*veut*	*les*	*manger*
Jean	wants	them	to-eat

'Jean wants to eat them'

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

1992 for one study of SW object cliticization).[31,32]

Holmberg's constraint tightly unites V-to-I to OS: the latter happens *only if* the former also happens.[33] If we adopt one of the various implementations of Holmberg's constraints (see note 29) and assume that object cliticization is an instance of OS, then absence of V-to-I in HC would force all objects to surface postverbally in HC: cliticization *sans* verb movement would entail a violation of an independently-motivated principle of grammar. Object cliticization in Fr vs. absence thereof in HC is thus related to another morphosyntactic difference between the two languages, namely Fr V-to-I vs. HC V-in-situ (in §6.4, I explore the possible contributions of both French and Gbe source-language patterns to the emergence of the HC patterns). In this perspective, HC and Fr stand in the same typological relation as Swedish and Icelandic: (i) HC and Swedish do not have independent V-to-I movement, modulo the possibility of short verb-movement and of verb-placement outside IP (see notes 12, 13, 14, 16 and 38); (ii) HC and Swedish manifest less verbal inflectional morphology than Fr and Icelandic, respectively; (iii) comparative data from both HC-vs-Fr and Swedish-vs-Icelandic suggest that cliticization is not allowed without verb-movement; (iv) HC and Swedish have a higher degree of case syncretism than Fr and Icelandic respectively (but see note 23).

[31] Liliane Haegeman (p.c., 31 July 1995) notes that West Flemish allows leftward movement of object clitics with non-finite verbs, which arguably do not move (but see note 30), thus constituting one exception to Holmberg's Generalization. Bobaljik 1995, to appear, offers one explanation for why SOV languages generally escape Holmberg's Generalization, unlike SVO languages. Note that all the languages concerned here are SVO.

[32] If the discussion in the main text is right, Object Shift in verb-second clauses cannot be taken as a trigger for *independent* V-to-I, contra Bobaljik 2001:20. That OS does not strictly presuppose *independent* V-to-I (cf. notes 13 and 38) is suggested by Mainland Scandinavian data where object cliticization is possible in verb-second environments only. Furthermore, Norwegian, as described in Nilsen 1997, has OS of full NPs in verb-second (e.g. matrix) clauses, in addition to the sort of object cliticization that exists in the other Mainland Scandinavian languages (also see Cinque 1999:217n18, but see Thráinsson 2001:199n17 for some complicating factors). Yet Norwegian does not seem to have Icelandic-type *independent* V-to-I. Thus, a child learning Norwegian could not use (apparent?) evidence for OS as a reliable cue for *independent* V-to-I.

[33] A bi-directional implication would make the wrong generalization regarding the English diachronic facts discussed in Section 6: the loss of cliticization started in English *before* the loss of overt V-to-I. According to van Kemenade 1987 and Roberts 1994, the demise of English cliticization took place, roughly, between 1100 and 1400, while Kroch 1989 estimates loss of main-verb movement to have been completed by the middle of the 16th century. Thus, V-to-I is a necessary, not sufficient, condition for OS (but see notes 29 and 31). In the case of English diachrony, the loss of V2 and of morphological Case may have also played a role in the demise of English cliticization, as argued by van Kemenade. (Also see note 56.)

6 On the theoretical status of Creole Exceptionalism

Is "creolization" of a *fundamentally* distinct nature than language change via parameter-(re)setting? How do the "discrepancies" in HC diachrony as discussed in Sections 3–5 compare with "discrepancies" in the diachrony of non-Creole languages?

This section will show that a deep congruence of morphosyntactic patterns obtains across various sorts of ontogenetic and phylogenetic developments, including "creolization". My claim is that certain VP-related "discrepancies" in the so-called "genetic" diachrony of Germanic and Romance seem as "significant" as in the so-called "non-genetic" diachrony of HC. HC morphosyntax does not, *and could not*, isolate HC and its diachrony in some exclusively "Creole" empirical domain of linguistic inquiry.[34]

6.1 Verbal morphosyntax beyond "creolization"

In the domain of verb-placement and verbal morphology (see Sections 3–4), it seems rather clear that there is nothing particularly and exclusively "Creole" about the emergence of the HC V-in-situ patterns with verbs that do not inflect for TMA and agreement. The genesis of HC's VP-related morphosyntax, from the contact of (relatively more) richly inflecting V-to-I languages, falls naturally within a larger domain of developmental "discrepancies" that go beyond creolization proper.

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

[34] The arguments in this section (§6) and next (§7) are expanded upon in DeGraff, in preparation.

(25) a. *pas* *attraper* *une* *fleur*
NEG catch a flower

b. *pas* *tomber* *bébé*
NEG fall baby

Note that each of the words in (25) straightforwardly corresponds to an adult French word even though these utterances show morphosyntactic "discrepancies" when compared to adult French. In the latter, negated declarative root clauses usually contain a finite verb. One may thus be tempted to conclude *erroneously* that the sample in (25) illustrates "a significant discrepancy between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence" between child and adult French, thus diagnosing, on a small scale, "abnormal transmission" of the sort envisaged by Thomason & Kaufman (1988:206). Such an hypothetical claim about "abnormal transmission" seems a theoretical abnormality: pervasive "discrepancies" are quite normal in language learners' developmental paths.

The sort of "discrepancies" exemplified in (25) and in related child-vs-adult developmental mismatches are fully expected in any model of L1A in which language-specific, and often quite abstract, parameter settings must be set (and thus, *possibly*, mis-set) from necessarily spare and often structurally ambiguous cues in the Primary Linguistic data (PLD); see (e.g.) Roberts 1999, Rizzi 1999 and Roberts 1999. This is what Rizzi 1999:463f calls "grammatical invention", that is, "the 'trying out' of various UG options [aka parameter settings] not adopted by the target system". As Chomsky (1995:6) puts it, "language acquisition is interpreted as the process of fixing the parameters of the initial state [UG] in one of the permissible ways". Discrepancies in L1A are also expected if certain grammatical and/or processing constraints fall in the scope of a maturational schedule, some biological clock (see, e.g., Wexler 2002). As a matter of fact, the morphological and/or syntactic "discrepancies" illustrated in (25) have been replicated in a wide-range of acquisition scenarios, both within and across groups of children acquiring typologically-different languages (with and without V-to-I, with and without verb-second, etc.). (See Schütze 1997, Roberts 1999:294–301 and Rizzi 1999:456–462 for some theoretical alternatives, and see the literature surveys in Lardiere 2000 and Wexler 2002.)

Second-language acquisition (L2A) by adults and even by children seems to allow an

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

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

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

early interlanguages.

In the context of VP-related morphology-syntax interaction in the formation of HC, the L2A-L1A "cascade" relationship suggests the following hypothetical, and overly idealized, sequence. The adult learner, who in effect is the ultimate locus of language contact, is chiefly, but not singly, responsible for various degrees of inflectional "fossilization", depending on the specific and gradient conditions of the contact situation.[35] If rich verbal inflection is an un-ambiguous morphological trigger for V-to-I, the initial contact interlanguages or most likely some subset thereof, may well be V-to-I, structurally on a par with the target varieties of Fr, but with infinitival-like forms often substituted as default for target-like finite forms in V-to-I environments (see note 19). Among substrate speakers of proto-HC, the substitution of invariant forms for inflecting forms, although presumably common across early interlanguages (independently of source languages; see Klein & Perdue 1992:302f,312f), may have been more natural for the Kwa speakers than (say) the Bantu speakers: Kwa, unlike Bantu, generally do not manifest Tense and Agreement affixes.

Another class of input that competes with, and reduces the proportion of, finite verbs in the linguistic ecology are target-like verbal periphrases that are built around in-situ infinitival and participle forms (see §6.2 below). These verbal periphrases, which are quite frequent in regional and colloquial Fr varieties (Gougenheim 1929), would 'conspire' with early learners' inflectionally-fossilized interlanguages to weaken the robustness of V-to-I triggers in the evolving PLD of incoming learners. The latter will have fewer and fewer instances of finite verbs and *V Neg/Adv* NP_{Obj} patterns in their PLD as compared to the PLD of the initial 'cohorts' of learners. That is, the linguistic ecology will witness a

[35] The degree and nature of L2A influence and its effect on morphological change is presumably linked to the degree and nature of language contact. On one hand, low-contact situations (i.e., with relatively few non-native speakers) may seem particularly favorable for the maintenance of morphological paradigms; on the other (extremely opposite) hand, abrupt and massive language contact (i.e., with relatively high numbers of adult learners in learner-unfriendly situations) may seem to accelerate inflectional erosion (see, e.g., the "Insular" vs. "Mainland" Scandinavian contrasts alluded to in §4.2; also see DeGraff 2001b:219n5,281f,288). Yet, in all cases, the cognitive/linguistic factors underlying, and constraining, the corresponding developmental patterns and any differences therein are ultimately rooted in individual-level properties of L1A and/vs. L2A. In the main, the cognitive properties that are responsible for language acquisition are species-uniform, even though the external (e.g., sociohistorical) factors that determine their specific effects and specific outcomes are necessarily particular and contingent (see DeGraff 1999a:37, 1999b:528 for some further discussion and references).

gradual decrease of morphological and syntactic triggers for V-to-I, along with an increase in the frequency of infinitival- and participial-like forms. Thus, the increased possibility for the development of stable V-in-situ grammars with verb forms that overall show less inflection than their counterparts in the original target language. In turn, these changes may be favored by other (arguably) converging factors such as the unmarkedness and economy of V-in-situ, the relative frequency, transparency and saliency of verbal periphrases as opposed to their syncretic counterparts, the use of tonic pronouns alongside, or instead, of atonic clitics in colloquial regional varieties, etc. (These grammatical, learnability-theoretic, stochastic and processing factors will be further speculated upon immediately below and in §§6.2,6.4.)[36]

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

Two empirical-cum-theoretical questions arise, which I will (too briefly) address here and below, in §6.4:

What is the status of (Standard) French object placement in the early interlanguages of adult learners learning French in learner-unfriendly contact situations? If, as argued by Meillet 1920, Brunot & Bruneau 1949, Sportiche 1995, etc., (object) clitics really belong, alongside verbal inflectional affixes, to verbal inflectional morphology, then such clitics qua "agreement" markers would be exempt from the *initial* stages of second-language acquisition, alongside inflectional affixes, specially for learners whose L1s, like Fɔngbè, do not have object enclitics on the verb. One such case of learners doing away with object enclitics in *early* L2A is documented by Véronique's (1990, 2000) study of Moroccan adults learning French; these data are available from the *European Science Foundation* (ESF) bilingual database in the *CHILDES System* (see McWhinney 2000). The Moroccan learners produce utterances like *la dame /frape/ lui* (ESF file lafza32h.1.cha) with the postverbal pronoun *lui*. Compare with the target-like *la dame l'a frappé* with the proclitic object *l'* (see note 60). We also find the Fr preverbal clitic *le* in postverbal position in the Moroccans' interlanguages (Klein & Perdue 1992:254). More generally and perhaps controversially (see, again, note 60), Klein & Perdue (1992:284f,297,325f) claim that Fr preverbal objects are usually avoided in the initial ("basic variety") interlanguages of adult learners, independently of the learners' respective native languages.

Such a developmental pattern may seem all the more likely given the facts mentioned by Meillet, Brunot & Bruneau, etc., about the use of (the more salient) tonic pronouns alongside, or instead, (the less salient) atonic pronouns. In the same vein, non-standard "popular" varieties of French, as noted by (e.g.) Frei 1929:164–166 and Gadet 1997:65, often show a preference for postverbal tonic pronouns in context where Standard French uses verbal enclitics (cf. (42)-vs-(43)).

A related empirical question is this: What sorts of object-pronoun placement *did* obtain in the French varieties involved in the genesis of HC. These French varieties could well have been like Cajun French and Missouri French, as illustrated in (42), where we get (e.g.) *I v'nont voir moi* with a postverbal tonic pronoun *moi* (cf. HC postverbal *mwen*) instead of *Ils me verront*, in (42a), with a preverbal clitic *me*; the latter has no counterpart in HC.

If the actual French varieties in colonial Haiti were anything like Cajun French and Missouri French and/or if learners of French do favor tonic over atonic pronouns in their initial interlanguages, then preverbal object clitics were perhaps not as pervasive in the ecology of HC genesis than they are (e.g.) among contemporary Standard French speakers. Be that as it may, the fact remains that preverbal object clitics did not make it into HC grammar. (I return to this question in §6.4.)

For now, note that "discrepancies" of various sort are indeed expected in ontogenetic and phylogenetic developments—in the history of *both* Creole and non-Creole languages. V-in-situ patterns that do not replicate the morphosyntax of the erstwhile 'target' languages have emerged in the history of English for example. It is well-established that Middle English (ME) until the 16th century was a robustly V-to-I language. Consider the following examples—a staple in the literature on Germanic syntactic change:

(26) a. *Wepyng and teres counforteth not dissolute laghers*
Weeping and tears comfort not dissolute laughers
[1400–50: N. Love, *The Myrour of the Blessyd Lyf of J.C.* — Roberts 1993:250]

b. *Quene Ester looked never with switch an eye*
"Queen Esther never looked with such an eye"
[Chaucer, *Merchant's Tale, line 1744* — Kroch 1989b]

c. *... if man grounde not his doinges altogether upon nature*
[Ellegård 1953:40, cited in Kroch 1989a:143]

d. *How like you this sonnet ?*
[Ellegård 1953:84, cited in Kroch 1989a:143]

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

(27) a. * *Peter understands never his lesson*

b. * *Jane comforts not Mary*

c. * *How like you this sonnet ?*

In the diachrony of English, an erosion in verbal inflectional morphology seems to have been a precondition, although not a sufficient condition, for the subsequent transition from V-to-I to V-in-situ (this is a gross oversimplification that abstracts away from intricate facts of dialectal and register variation). At least as long as English verbal inflection was *grosso modo* on a paradigmatic and structural par with that of Fr, English exhibited V-to-I, on a syntactic par in Fr. Witness, from selected ME dialects, the paradigmatic distinctions in (28) and the morphosyntactic structure of the doubly inflected verb in (29)

with the stacking of Tense and Agreement suffixes:

(28) *sing<u>e</u>* '1sg', *sing<u>est</u>* '2sg', *sing<u>en</u>*, '3sg', *sing<u>en</u>*, '1pl, 2pl, 3pl'

[Midland ME, Mossé 1968 cited in Roberts 1993:256]

(29) [[*show*+*ed*]+*st*] '[[show+PAST]+2sg]'

[Kroch 1989b:238]

The morphology-syntax correlations in (26)–(29) and their (arguable) parallels elsewhere (e.g., in the diachrony of Mainland Scandinavian; see, e.g., Holmberg & Platzack 1995:76f, Vikner 1995:161–163, 1997:205–207) suggests a parameter-setting approach whereby verbal inflectional morphology serves as one class of triggers, *alongside word-order triggers*, for the acquisition of verb placement.[37]

From such a perspective, there is nothing particularly "Creole" (as opposed to non-"Creole") with the fact that HC is V-in-situ while its lexifier is V-to-I. Modern English and Mainland Scandinavian—none of which fits the sociohistorical profile of Caribbean Creoles—are, like HC, languages without V-to-I[38] and with ancestors that are robustly V-to-I and robustly inflecting (see Falk 1993, Rohrbacher 1994, Vikner 1995, 1997, Roberts 1999 and references therein). Again, this is not surprising: as already discussed, L2A often entails a reduction in inflectional paradigms, and the reduction is greater in the learner-unfriendly situations of abrupt language contact (see note 35). It may thus be

[37] For more nuanced details, important empirical and theoretical caveats and/or counter-examples and counter-arguments, see e.g. Rohrbacher 1994; Vikner 1997; Roberts 1993, 1999; Thráinsson 1996; Kroch & Taylor 1997; Kroch *et al* 2000; Sprouse 1998; Lightfoot 1999; Bobaljik 2001.

That other factors besides inflectional morphology trigger V-to-I is suggested by a comparison of (e.g.) past participles across French and Icelandic. As noted by Richard Kayne (p.c.), even in varieties of French lacking past participle agreement, past participles must move to allow object cliticization to their left. There is no such movement with Icelandic past participles, notwithstanding the similar morphology (i.e., no agreement) across the relevant French and Icelandic varieties. In a related vein, Icelandic and mainland Scandinavian infinitives manifest distinct movement possibilities even though both have similar inflectional suffixes. Kayne notes that Icelandic infinitives seemingly move in control constructions only, though the morphology of the infinitive is uniform throughout (cf. Bobaljik 2001 for related caveats).

(Also see notes 18, 21, 22, 23, 52, 56 and 57.)

[38] Note that I use V-to-I for *independent* verb-movement to INFL, with the restrictions identified in note 13. Mainland Scandinavian languages, unlike English and HC, are verb-second (V2) with the verb moving to COMP in the appropriate environments (e.g., in main clauses and a restricted set of embedded clauses). What these languages seem to not have is *independent* verb-movement with INFL as the *final* landing site (see Vikner 1995:142–147). Note that HC, a language without V-to-I movement, allows (a copy of) the verb to occur in the CP layer in appropriate environments such as the predicate-cleft construction, with a copy of the verb also occurring in situ (see DeGraff 1995b and references therein).

expected that parameter-setting in such contexts—in the history of HC as in the history of English and Mainland Scandinavian—would witness a decline in V-to-I.

For this argument to go through we must assume: (i) that V-in-situ is the innately preferred option (i.e., the one initially entertained by the language acquirer, in absence of contrary evidence); and (ii) that V-to-I is partly triggered by the right set of inflectional affixes on the verb (see §6.2,6.4,§7.1 for other *syntactic* factors in the decline of V-to-I in HC diachrony; also see Roberts 1999 and Lightfoot 1999 on the general issue of morphological and/vs. syntactic triggers). Once the parameter is set, V-in-situ or V-to-I in the stable grammar will constrain other morphosyntactic options in the in the grammar according to UG-related constraints. For example, V-in-situ will rule out Object Shift (see §5.2 above and §§6.3–6.4 below.

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

6.2 Reanalysis in the emergence of HC verb syntax

Corroborating the non-exceptionalism of creolization are the Tense-Mood-Aspect (TMA) morphemes that project the IP layers in HC and other French-lexicon Creoles. Bickerton (1981 and subsequently) has popularized the claims that the morphosyntax and semantics of TMA markers are virtually identical across Creole languages, independently of their respective superstrate and substrate languages: such pan-Creole similarity is considered a

telltale of massive diachronic "discrepancies" in the history of Creole languages. Yet, it can be reasonably argued that Creole TMA markers are not *ab ovo* creations and, thus, do not diagnose any Bickertonian "radical break in transmission". Instead, these morphemes can be analyzed as the product of, inter alia, run-of-the-mill grammaticalization (cf. Mufwene 2001:28f,54f,77f, to appear). Here too, I will argue that, once we look at the appropriate data sets with the appropriate theoretical lenses, creolization reduces to UG-guided restructuring of patterns in the PLD.[39]

In DeGraff (2000:102–108, in preparation), I point out a number of VP-related structural similarities (and dissimilarities) among HC and its source languages (e.g., Fɔngbè and regional varieties of vernacular French). Here it will suffice to point out that *all* the preverbal TMA morphemes in HC, including those illustrated in (7) can be straightforwardly traced back to 17th–18th century Fr cognates, some of which still exist in certain contemporary French dialects, including sometimes the 'standard' dialect. Such similarities between a French-lexicon Creole and its lexifier were already noted, explicitly or implicitly, by (e.g.) J.J. Thomas 1869, Van Name 1870, Baissac 1880, Gougenheim 1929, Denis 1935, Sylvain 1936, etc. (see notes 41 and 47). The Fr cognates of HC's TMA morphemes are used preverbally as verbal auxiliaries and as prepositional markers for mood and aspect. These auxiliaries and prepositions are used in the kind of verbal periphrases that were—and, in some cases, are *still*—popular in vernacular and regional varieties of French (Gougenheim 1929). The sketchy comparison in (30)–(38) highlights the relevant correspondences. In most of these examples, I underline the Fr cognate in its verbal periphrase and its grammaticalized TMA-marker counterpart in HC.

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

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

[39] Advocating a population-genetics perspective, Mufwene (1996, 2001) offers a competition-and-selection model that takes into account an array of internal and external factors, including markedness, typological, socioeconomic structures, demography (e.g., the "Founder principle"), etc.

(31) a. *Il* *était* *au* *cinéma* (Fr)
He was at-the movie-theater
'He was at the movies'

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

c. *Il* *était* *malade* (Fr)
He was sick

d. *Il* *a* *été* *malade* (Fr)
He has been sick

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

f. *Li* *te* *malad* (HC)
3sg ANT sick
'He/She was sick'/'He/She has been sick'

(32) a. ... *je* *suis maintenant* *après* *à* *demesler le* *cahos* ... (17th-c. Fr)
1sg be now after PREP untangle the cahos
'I am now untangling the cahos'
(Descartes 1630 quoted in Gougenheim 1929:120)

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

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

b. *Mwen* *pou* *marye semèn pwochèn* (HC)
1sg for marry week next

(34) a. *Tu vas aller demain* (Fr)
You will go tomorrow

b. *Ou ava ale demen* (HC)

c. *To va allé demain* (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802:377)

(35) a. *Nous avons fini de sarcler* (Fr)
We have finished to weed
'We have finished weeding'

b. *Nou fin(i) sakle* (HC)

c. *Nou fini sarclé* (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802:376)

The data in (30)–(35) only begin to illustrate semantic, distributional and phonological correspondences between Fr verbal periphrases and their grammaticalized counterparts in HC (see Fattier 1998:864-888 for a much more detailed comparison). As is typical of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Meillet 1912), the HC preverbal markers above generally have more reduced phonology than their Fr counterparts and they have their own specialized distribution and semantics, some of which is unsurprisingly influenced by the substrate languages (cf. Sylvain 1936). Let's flesh this out a bit.

Starting with (30)–(31), the parallels there suggest that cognates of HC *te* 'ANTERIOR' include two sorts of inflected forms for Fr *être* 'be': (i) the singular-imparfait *étais/était*; (ii) the past participle *été*. In (32), HC *ap(e)* 'PROGRESSIVE/FUTURE' is from the Fr preposition *après* 'after'. The Fr preposition *après* enters the periphrastic template *être après (à/de) V_{-fin}* with V_{-fin} an infinitival verb. This ... *après* ... periphrase expresses the same sort of progressive that is now expressed by Modern French *être en train de V_{-fin}* . In his (Early) Creole manual, Ducœurjoly's (1802:307) reports *ly té après couyé café* 'he was picking coffee' (literally: '3sg ANT PROG pick coffee') alongside the 18th-century (Standard) French translation *il ceuilloit du café*; contrast with modern HC *li te ap keyi kafe*. In Modern HC, unlike in its 18th-/19th-century ancestor that is reported in the available texts, the preposition *apre* 'after' is not homophonous with the TMA marker for PROGRESSIVE/FUTURE *ap(e)*. Judging from the

18th-/19th-century written samples,[40] it can be concluded that, over the years, grammaticalization has reduced the phonetic and lexical heft of the erstwhile preposition; thus, *après* > *ap(e)*, with a switch of categorization from prepositional to TMA-marker (i.e., from lexical to functional). The latter switch would lead in a pruning of structure, of the sort considered in Roberts 1999 to be characteristic of grammaticalization and of language change, more generally.

Similar paths of grammaticalization can be sketched for HC *pou*, *ava*, *fini*, etc. HC *pou* 'DEONTIC' (as in (33)) is from the Fr preposition *pour* 'for', which enters the periphrastic template *être* <u>*pour*</u> V_{-fin} expressing futurity, likelihood and obligation (Fattier 1998:872). HC *ava* 'IRREALIS' (as in (34)), along with its variants *a/av/va*, is from Fr *va(s)*, present singular forms of *aller* 'to go'. The latter is *al(e)* in HC. The Fr periphrastic template <u>*aller*</u> V_{-fin} expresses certain kinds of future (cf. English *to be going to*). Grammaticalization has also produced the HC future marker *(a)pral(e)* 'to be going to' from the reanalysis-cum-pruning of 17th-century French *après (de/à) aller*.

This is thus far a simplistic distillation of a complex set of correspondences. Similar patterns are found, by and large, in the 18th-/19th century Early Creole samples that I consult for this paper (see note 40). More extensive etymologies for the above and other HC preverbal markers are discussed in Fattier 1998:864–888.[41] A relatively straightforward

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

However, archival texts must be treated with great caution, as is the norm in historical linguistics. And extra caution seems warranted vis-à-vis early Creole texts: most of them were transcribed by non-native speakers—colonial observers who often felt great condescension toward Creole varieties, as discussed in (e.g.) DeGraff 2001a:92–98,110n22.

As it turns out, the basic TMA patterns in Ducœurjoly 1802 are by and large corroborated by similar data in a variety of 18th-/19th-century Creole samples, from a variety of native and non-native idiolects (see, e.g., Descourtilz 1809v3:135f,212,260f,264,270f,277n1,279–282,304f,353f,359f,etc.; Anonymous 1811; Rosiers 1818; Thomas 1869:134; Denis 1935:346–359; also see references in note 47).

Descourtilz's Early Creole samples include reported speech from two famous Creole (ex-)slaves, both born of African parents: (i) Toussaint L'Ouverture, Haiti's best-known 18th-century freedom fighter, born into slavery in colonial Haiti (then known as Saint-Domingue) in 1743; and (ii) Jean-Jacques Dessalines, also a freedom-fighter, born into slavery in Saint-Domingue in 1758 and Haiti's first president and first emperor.

[41] Gougenheim 1929 gives a comprehensive inventory of verbal periphrases through Fr diachrony. He explicitly notes that many such periphrases, of the sort illustrated in (32)–(35), were explicitly frowned upon as *prononciations vicieuses* 'vicious pronunciations' by 18th/19th-century purists (p. 59f, 104, 120 and passim). This makes it even more likely that such *prononciations vicieuses* were widespread in the 'vicious' environments of French Caribbean colonies, the birth-place of Caribbean French-lexicon Creoles

case can be made that the syntax of the HC extended VP emerged via parameter-resetting (from V-to-I to V-in-situ) in tandem with the reanalysis-cum-grammaticalization of French verbal periphrases.

There is one other reanalysis case that vividly supports such a scenario, namely the evolution of the HC sentential negation marker *pa* from Fr *n'a(s) pas* (*NEG HAVE-Auxiliary NEG*) via Early HC */napa/* (DeGraff 1993:90). The negative marker in the 19th-century Creoles of Réunion and Mauritius in the Indian Ocean is also */napa/* (Chaudenson 1992:166n52, Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001:193n20). The following reanalysis path can be hypothesized, skipping some intermediate stages: Fr *n'a(s) pas / n'es(t) pas* > Early Creole *(na)pa* > Modern Creole *pa*, with HC *pa* now the head Neg^0 of NegP while Fr *pas* is in Spec(NegP); see DeGraff 1993.

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

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

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

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

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

(Gougenheim 1929:378).

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

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

In the internalist approach adopted here vis-à-vis the mechanisms responsible for Creole genesis, the ultimate locus of reanalysis is the language learner. As it turns out, adult learners of French from diverse L1s (e.g., Arab and Spanish) also reanalyze *n'a pas* and *n'est pas* as monomorphemic sentential negation markers */napa/* and *nepa/* in their early interlanguages. Abdelmalek, a Moroccan learner of French, produces (e.g.) */Mwa napa kone/*.[42] Compare with HC *Mwen pa konnen* and the French *moi, je* (*ne*) *connais pas*. Abdelmalek also produces *Les français [nepa kone] l'espagnol* instead of the target-like *Les français* (*ul*ne) *connaissent pas l'espagnol* 'The French don't now Spanish' (also notice the invariant verb form /kone/) (Véronique 2000:307). Other sentential negation markers in Abdelmalek's interlanguage include *ne ... pas*, *non*, *pas*, etc. (idem). We also find */nepa/* as one of the sentential negation markers in the early interlanguages of Hispanophone learners, as in (e.g.) */nepa puve/* instead of (*ne*) *pouvait pas* 'could not'.[43]

Keeping acquisition-based reanalysis in mind, there is another hypothetical, and possibly convergent, scenario for the evolution of HC *pa*. Ducœurjoly's (1802) Creole manual, whose Creole utterances ar etymologically transcribed, explicitly notes the Early Creole use of */napa/* in negative *imperatives* (e.g., on pp. 292, 325, 332, 393, etc.) alongside the use of *pa* in negative *declaratives* with verbal predicates (e.g., on pp. 287, 290 , 305, 392, etc.). Fattier (1998:882f) proposes a reanalysis path whereby *napa* derives historically from the reanalysis of yet another type of verbal periphrase, namely the singular negative imperative with *aller*: *ne va pas* V_{-fin} 'Don't go V_{-fin} ' as in *Ne va pas croire que ...* 'Don't go believe that ...' In Fattier's words: "The French colonists would use, it seems, this 'future associated with the imperative' to express prohibition" (p. 883, my translation). Fattier considers that this usage may have been widespread in the colonial French varieties spoken in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, as she notes parallel constraints on the use of *pa* across (the diachrony of) the Creoles of Haiti and Réunion.[44]

[42] Date: 13 November 1982. File: lafae11a.2ch from *European Science Foundation* (ESF) bilingual database in the *CHILDES System*. (See McWhinney 2000).

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

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

We can thus posit the cognate *ne va pas* for the Early HC negative marker *napa* in imperatives, which in turn seeded *pa* in modern HC; that is, Fr *ne va pas* > Early HC *napa* (in negative imperatives) > Modern HC *pa*. Fattier (1998:883) also mentions, as one other possible etymon for *napa*, the negative subjunctive of *aller* 'to go', namely *n'ailles pas*, which she rejects in favor of the Fr *ne va pas* V_{-fin} periphrase.

With respect to verb placement, contrast the colloquial *Ne va pas tarder davantage* 'Don't go delay any further', where the main verb is in the infinite and stays to the right of *pas*, with Standard French *Ne tarde pas davantage*, where the main verb is finite and undergoes V-to-I to the left of *pas*. Now compare both kinds of imperatives to their Early Creole equivalent (e.g., in (38a)) where the verb is invariant and in-situ. The grammaticalization of Fr *ne va pas*, in the *ne va pas* V_{-fin} periphrase, into Early Creole *napa*, then into Modern HC *pa*, instantiates yet another developmental path both toward V-in-situ in Modern HC (e.g., *pa tade* 'don't delay' vs. **tade pa*) and toward the phonological shape of the HC verb, with the /e/ ending (in, e.g., *tade*) identical to that of French first-conjugation infinitivals (in, e.g., *tarder*).

It is worth noting that, in Ducœurjoly 1802, both imperative */napa/*, as in (38a), and declarative */pa/* with verbal predicates, as in (38c), can co-exist in a single text, namely in the 'classic' 18th-century Creole chanson *Lisette quitté la plaine* on p. 392f.[45] There we also find */napa/* with non-verbal predicates, as in (38b), a construction where French would use *n'est pas*: contrast *na pas* in (38b) with *n'est pas* in Fr *Le manger n'est pas doux*. Denis (1935:347n21) explicitly notes the *n'est pas* > *n'a pas* connection, noting that this substitution, as illustrated in (37b) and (38b), is already "populaire" in Normandie and elsewhere.

(38) a. *N'a pas tardé davantage* (18th-c. HC; Ducœurjoly 1802:392f)
NEG delay anymore
'Do not delay any further'

[45] Tellingly, Ducœurjoly, in his etymologizing orthography, transcribes the 18th-century Creole negation marker */napa/* as *n'a pa(s)*, on a par with French *n'a pas* 'does not have'. But, in fact, Early HC */napa/* is monomorphic. Ducœurjoly himself indicates that French *ne/n'* is never pronounced in the Creole, where it is replaced by *pa(s)* (p. 335). Besides we don't seem to have *a* as an auxiliary anywhere in Ducœurjoly's Early Creole text. As for French *avoir* as a main verb expressing possession, Ducœurjoly (1802:293) notes that its Creole equivalent is *gagné* as in *mo pa gagné temps* 'I don't have time' (p. 331). Early HC *gagné* is now, in modern HC, *gen(yen)* as in *Mwen pa gen tan* 'I don't have time'.

b. *Mangé na pas dou*
Food NEG sweet
'Food is not sweet'

c. *Mo pa mire toué*
1sg NEG look 2sg
'I don't see you'

As for the *Lisette* song, its lyric is presumably all from some the same Creole idiolect. Moreau de Saint-Méry (1797 [1958:81]) attributes it to a certain Duvivier de la Mahautière and dates it to circa 1760. The co-existence in this 18th-century Creole idiolect of */pa/* and */napa/*, as illustrated in (38), seems a signpost in the grammaticalization path of Fr *ne va pas*, *n'a pas* and/or *n'est pas* into Early HC (*na*)*pa*, then into modern HC *pa*. It is thus possible that the negative markers in 18th-century Creole are related to at least three distinct reanalysis paths: (i) negative imperative */napa/*, as in (38a), is from Fr *ne va pas*, as suggested in Fattier 1998:882f; (ii) negative declarative */napa/* with non-verbal predicates, as in (37b) and (38b), is from French *n'est pas*, perhaps via an earlier Creole form *nepa* or directly from the dialectal (Norman?) French variant *n'a pas* (for *n'est pas*), which is noted in Denis 1935:247n21. (iii) declarative */pa/*, as in (38c) is from Fr *n'a*(*s*) *pas*, perhaps via an earlier Creole form *napa*. In modern HC, the negative markers in (i)–(iii) have all 'converged' to a uniform realization of clausal negation by the shorter form *pa*. The longer form *napa*, in imperatives and in non-verbal predication, has undergone the sort of phonetic reduction that is typical of grammaticalization, perhaps concomitantly with changes in categorial status. (DeGraff 1993 speculates on the transition of clausal negation from Spec(NegP) to Neg^0 in the course of HC genesis, modulo the *napa* stage documented above; cf. Jespersen's famous "cycle".)[46]

The correspondences in (36)–(38) lend further credence to a scenario in which Fr

[46] As can be expected, reanalysis paths paths are not uniform across all (French-lexicon) Creoles. For example, the reanalysis trajectories of French NEG into HC *pa* and LC *pa* ended up at different heights in their respective inflectional layers, higher in HC and lower in Lousian Creole (LC). HC has *pa te* 'NEG ANT' (cf. Fr *pas été*) whereas LC, as described in (e.g.) Neumann 1985:322 and Rottet 1992:272, has *te pa* (cf. Fr *étais*/*était pas*). In the diachrony of the French-lexicon Creole of Guyane, the now-archaic *te pa* was, through the 19th century, in competition with, before eventually giving way to, *pa te* (Schlupp 1997:123–126).

Cinque (1999:120–126) documents various positions of NegP across and within languages, within a framework that upholds a universal hierarchy of INFL heads; cf. note 12.

verbal periphrases like those in (30)–(35) triggered the formation of the HC extended VP system, via reanalysis by language learners of the string that is delimited to the right by the thematically main predicate and to the left by the subject in Spec(IP), which is either covert in imperatives or overt in declaratives. (See Fattier 1998:864–888 and Howe 2000 for larger empirical samples and for more extensive discussions of the combinatorial and interpretive properties of TMA markers in HC.)

Our ongoing reanalysis is buttressed by a comparison of the inflectional morphology of first-conjugation verbs in Fr periphrases and the default verb marker in HC. As attested in various examples through (30)–(38), main verbs in Fr verbal periphrases are either in the infinitive or in the past participle. Now note that most Fr verbs, and generally all new verbs (e.g., borrowings from English), enter the language through the first conjugation, whose infinitives and past participles are marked with the verbal suffixes *-er* and *-é(e)* respectively, both of which are pronounced /e/.

We have already noted the key role of imperative constructions in the (re)structuration of HC's VP-related syntax; see (38) and surrounding comments (below we return to other cases that involve the restructuring of imperative patterns; see note 59). We have also noted that L2 learners of French often substitute infinitival-like invariant forms, most of which end in /e/, for finite forms (Prévost & White 2000:125–130). It is thus no surprise that the HC verbal marker par excellence is the etymologically-related suffix *-e*, which in Fr is found not only in the infinitive (e.g., *chanter* 'to sing'), but also in the participle (e.g., *chanté*(*e*) 'sung(+FEM)') and the second-plural present indicative and imperative (e.g., *chantez*). Although not all HC verbs end with the verbal marker *-e*, the latter is the sole overt productive verbal marker in HC, as in the English-based neologisms *klipse* 'to clip', *ploge* 'to plug' and *tepe* 'to tape' (see note 5). This too, alongside the parallels and reanalysis paths discussed above, indicate that the prototypical cognates for HC verbs include Fr infinitives, past participles and present indicatives and imperatives in the second-plural, all from the first conjugation (cf. Denis 1935:435n4). That this is so seems a rather banale consequence of, inter alia, the sort of L2A tendencies studied in (e.g.) Prévost & White 2000.

What these recurrent parallels suggest is that the distributions and environments of

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

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

The reanalysis of Fr verbal periphrases into the HC extended VP system may have also been favored by substratal features, via L2A by (e.g.) Kwa-speaking adults. Recall from Section 3 that Fɔngbè verbs (like HC verbs) are not morphologically inflected for

TMA or agreement and that Fɔngbè TMA markers are, like in HC, non-affixal morphemes in preverbal position (Avolonto 1992).

This said, it must be noted that Aboh (1999, this volume), with respect to a variety of Gbe dialects, argues for: (i) V-to-I; (ii) verbal inflection (e.g., aspectual suffixation and morphosyntactically-conditioned reduplication); (iii) Object Shift (with Object-Verb order); (iv) pronominal case morphology. These four morphosyntactic properties, like many others, have no counterpart in HC (see §3.3), which suggests that HC and Fɔngbè differ vis-à-vis the formal specifications of their respective functional heads in the relevant domains, pace the relexificationist claims in Lefebvre 1998. Moreover, some of the Object Shift patterns, in Gbe and in Kwa more generally, are related to specific TMA configurations, and this is well documented in the Africanist literature (see, e.g., Déchaine & Manfredi 1997, Aboh 1999, this volume, and references there). It thus seems un-likely that it is *specifically* the Gbe substratum that was crucial to the emergence of preverbal TMA cum verb- and object-in-situ in HC. Robust morphosyntactic discrepancies between HC and its substratum remain unaccounted for in Creole-genesis theories based on strict relexification (à la Adam 1883 and Lefebvre 1998).

Furthermore, HC-like extended TMA systems—with preverbal markers originating from the reanalysis of Fr verbal periphrases—exist in non-Creole French varieties and in non-Caribbean Creoles, including Indian Ocean Creoles (see references in second paragraph of note 41). The linguistic ecology in the formative period of these varieties was quite different from that of HC. In particular, the Indian Ocean Creoles had a much lesser, if any, Kwa input than HC and it appears unreasonable to claim Kwa influence whenever preverbal TMA markers are used in regional Fr varieties such as Québec French in (33a) (also see examples from Cajun French and Missouri French in (42)).

Regarding Mauritian Creole (MC), Baissac (1880:24) calls the MC utterance *Mo va allé* 'I will go' a "pure calque" from Fr (cf. (34)). Also compare MC *Li va vini* 'He will come' with Fr *Il va venir*; cf. Baissac 1880:80.[47] Brunot (1966v8:1137n3) also notes that

[47] Baissac (1880:57f) argues that Fr synthetic forms like *j'irai* 'I go+FUT+1sg' are not as common in vernacular French as they are in literary French, and would not be necessarily included in the so-called "complications that Creole must necessarily avoid". In other words, invariant verbal forms (i.e., infinitivals and participials in verbal periphrases) were robustly represented in the input. Furthermore, Baissac (1880:49–55) notes that, in addition to frequency, phonological invariance is another factor that would have

"[i]n [MC], it's obvious that the periphrastic system of popular and vernacular French ... has essentially been analyzed, assimilated and utilized".

Regarding non-Creole French varieties, it has been shown that some of the HC preverbal markers find contemporary counterparts in regional dialects of vernacular French—dialects which obviously did not emerge through the sort of pidginization or relexification invoked in the classic "creolization" scenarios (see, e.g., Sylvain 1936:79–105,136–139, Chaudenson 1974:684,840, 1992:162–167, Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001:154–163,178–182, Chaudenson *et al* 1993:81–97, Fattier 1998:863–888; also see note 41, the examples in (42) and the surrounding comments).

One last comparative note on the evolution of 'Creole-like' TMA systems in non-Creole languages: Roberts (1999:317) contemplates 'creolization-like' reanalysis in the history of the English auxiliary system. As a closed class of functional heads with restricted distribution and specialized semantics, Modern English modals have resulted from the reanalysis of a subset of erstwhile main (i.e., lexical/thematic) verbs with full θ-marking capacities. More generally, reanalysis and grammaticalization have been extensively documented in the formation of TMA systems across genetic families (see, e.g., Bybee *et al* 1994). Pending solid evidence that the creators of Creole languages constitute a cognitively exceptional subspecies of Homo Sapiens, our ongoing observations suggest that a Uniformitarian scenario for Creole genesis should seriously consider parameter-(re)setting in language acquisition, alongside reanalysis and grammaticalization of target patterns, as crucial factors in the emergence of HC's extended VP (see DeGraff 1999b,d, Roberts 1999, Lightfoot 1999, Mufwene, to appear, for related arguments).

---

made Fr verbal periphrases particular influential in the genesis of the Creole verbal system. Similar arguments are found in Van Name 1870:139–149. Also see J.J. Thomas 1869:50–65; Denis 1935:346n4,347n25,348n37,351n64–66,352n73,355n4,357n3,9,358n33,37,etc.; Mufwene 1991:131–138; Fattier 1998:866f; etc.

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

6.3 Object-pronoun morphosyntax beyond "creolization"

The HC/Fr object-placement "discrepancies" in Sections 3 and 5 find analogues outside of "creolization" proper. Let's look, say, at the morphology and placement of object (pro)nouns through English diachrony.[48]

I take as empirical starting point van Kemenade's (1987) data and observations on English diachrony. She shows that, throughout Old English (OE) and, to a lesser degree, during the early stages of Middle English (ME) until the mid-1300s, object and subject pronouns cliticized leftward in various positions throughout the clause, as far up as COMP.[49] Consider the following data from van Kemenade 1987 and focus on the underlined object pronouns:

(39) a. *Fela spella <u>him</u> sædon þa Beormans, ...* (OE)
many stories him *told* the *Permians*
'The Permians told him many stories' (van Kemenade 1987:130)

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

c. *... þet he <u>him</u> ȝeaue uyftene pond of gold* (ME, c. 1340)
that he him gave fifteen pounds in gold
'... that he would give him fifteen pounds in gold' (van Kemenade 1987:195)

A few preliminaries are in order before discussing the position of object pronouns in (39). OE is controversially considered to be a verb-second (V2) language, *somewhat* on a par with contemporary Germanic languages, with the exception of Modern English (NE). One current controversy concerns the exact nature of V2 in OE. The following questions

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

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

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

Van Kemenade (1987, 1997) takes OE to have the underlying order Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) with V2 in COMP, not in INFL. However, German and Dutch do not allow the 'verb-third' (V3) patterns in (39a). This can perhaps be accounted by the absence in German and Dutch of OE-type pronominal clitics adjoining to the left of V in COMP (but see Kemenade 1987:52,126–141 for a rapprochement between OE, German and Dutch clitics). Alternately V3 orders in OE, as in (39a), have been taken to result from movement of some XP into Spec(CP) in sentence-initial position, followed by the clitic left-adjoined to IP and the verb in medial INFL (i.e., in 'third' position); see Kroch & Taylor 1997:305f.[50]

One last, but surely not least, bit of background: According to van Kemenade, two major changes occurred in the transition to late ME: English went from SOV to SVO by 1200 (and presumably from head-final IP to head-medial IP), and V2 was "lost" by 1400 (but see note 55). Van Kemenade connects these two changes—SOV-to-SVO and loss of V2—to radical reductions in nominal and verbal inflections, respectively.

Going back to the OE object clitics in (39), two of them (in (39a) and (39c)) surface to the left of their θ-marking verbs. The pattern in (39a) might not surprise us given OE's widespread SOV order, whether it be base-generated (à la van Kemenade) or derived from an underlying Kaynian SVO (à la Roberts 1997; see below). But note that (39b) has the object clitic to the left of the subject *mon* and that (39c) is from c. 1340; at that time, ME—or, perhaps more accurately, most ME idiolects—had already switched from OV to VO.[51] Thus, as van Kemenade argues, the data in (39) suggest that OE and Early ME had

[50] The full details of (the theoretical debates about) OE word-order, with both medial and final INFL and with both VO and OV, are well beyond the scope of this paper. Be that as it may, V2 in OE manifests (apparent) exceptions, as in (39a), with no counterpart in robust V2 languages such as non-English Germanic. See van Kemenade 1987, 1997, Kroch & Taylor 1997 and Kroch *et al* for analyses and references.

[51] Van Kemenade 1987:195 considers the possibility that object cliticization in (39c) is a relic from the earlier OV stage. Postverbal object pronouns were actually more common c. 1340, alongside the less common preverbal object pronouns, as would be characteristic of a change in progress or just completed

a rule that, under certain conditions, forces the verb's complement to be pronounced outside of VP, to the left of the verb. A similar rule exists in Fr (see, e.g., (40)), but not in NE or HC. In order to accentuate the parallels between language change and creolization, compare (39a) and (39c) with (40): OE, Early ME and Fr manifest preverbal object clitics whereas both NE and HC lack such clitics.[52]

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

b. *Il <u>lui</u> donna quinze livres d'or*
He 3sg-DAT gave fifteen pounds of gold
'He gave him/her fifteen pounds of gold'

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

(41)

	sg	pl
NOM	*stan*	*stan<u>as</u>*
ACC	*stan*	*stan<u>as</u>*
GEN	*stan<u>es</u>*	*stan<u>a</u>*
DAT	*stan<u>e</u>*	*stan<u>um</u>*

Nominal declension of *stan* 'stone' in OE
(van Kemenade 1987:101)

and of a certain degree of conservatism in the relevant written texts. Van Kemenade also mentions possible dialectal variations in which IP-internal cliticization *and* paradigms of nominal case morphology were preserved longer in the South than in the North of England. The details of these variations are further fleshed out, along with competing analyses, in van Kemenade 1997, Kroch & Taylor 1997 and Kroch *et al* 2000.

[52] Unlike in French, there are no preverbal object clitics in Icelandic, even though Icelandic, unlike French, has morphological case (Richie Kayne, p.c.). This is perhaps due to the Icelandic verb moving higher in the inflectional layer than its French counterpart. At any rate, given their respective morphological profile, the French-Icelandic object-placement contrasts suggest that inflectional morphology cannot by itself "drive" word-order. (See note 37.)

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

Van Kemenade (1987:188–205) further notices that among the various sites where cliticization was lost, C^0 was the last stronghold. The presence of (object) clitics hosted by V in C^0, as in (39a), outlasted IP-internal cliticization, as in (39c) where V remains in IP.[53] She surmises that, unlike IP-internal cliticization which is directly connected with *nominal* case morphology, the (late) C^0-cliticization patterns are connected to V2 effects and to *verbal* morphology; both V2 and a (somewhat) 'rich' system of verbal inflections survived until 1400 along with C^0 clitics (p. 188–205) whereas (most) IP-internal cliticization and 'rich' nominal case inflections disappeared by 1200. Thus, in addition to morphological case on NPs, cliticization in English diachrony would also be associated to properties of verbal inflections and to V-movement (in this case, V-to-C movement and V2).[54]

Roberts 1997 tentatively couches some of van Kemenade's observations (on the correlation between cliticization and overt case morphology) within 'classic' Minimalist assumptions (as in Chomsky 1993). He takes OE object cliticization to be driven by some "strong" features in the INFL layers dominating VP. These strong features are morphologically diagnosed by OE's case declensions (see (41)). These strong inflectional features are 'affixal' in some abstract way, somewhat on a par with the overt affixal heads that trigger V-to-I in Fr and in OE/ME. Thus, 'strong'/'affixal' inflectional features of verbs and of nouns, as manifested by 'rich' verbal inflections and 'rich' nominal case morphology, correlate with the possibility of overt leftward movement out of VP of both V and its object (if any). The loss of preverbal object clitics, in Roberts's (as in van Kemenade's) account is connected to the massive weakening of nominal case morphology in

[53] Van Kemenade assumes that clause-internal cliticization is VP-internal, within the projection of the verb. In her framework, OE's (strongly) inflected verbs remain in VP (see, e.g., p. 189). Given my assumptions in Section 4, OE finite verbs are outside of VP. I thus use the term IP-internal cliticization for examples like (39c). This is also consistent with arguments that cliticization is adjunction to a functional head higher than VP (see Section 5).

[54] There is yet a third, and lower, type of object cliticization that lasted through Early Modern English in the 16th century, as in *They tell <u>vs</u> not the worde of God.* That too is dependent on verb movement, here to the left of *not.* (See, e.g., Roberts 1997:424n7.)

ME: the INFL head that formerly attracted objects from within VP became 'weak'/non-'affixal' and stopped driving object movement[55] (see Roberts 1997 for details and Thráinsson 2001 for a critique).

Roberts's and van Kemenade's accounts of the morphology-syntax interface in English English diachrony are not without theoretical and empirical problems.[56,57] But what matters most here is the attractive, if controversial, speculation that the collapse of OE's morphological case system was a necessary, although not sufficient, condition for the subsequent loss of cliticization. This is similar in spirit to the hypothesis that the loss of rich verbal inflection is a pre-condition for the loss of verb movement. In Roberts's (1997) scenario, in-situ settings have a learnability edge over settings that force movement (see,

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

[56] As already discussed in note 23, the correlation between (pro)nominal case markings and object cliticization is controversial: (i) Fr shows morphological case (only) on pronouns (like NE), yet allows cliticization (unlike NE) and even *preverbal* object clitics (unlike Icelandic; see note 52); (ii) Louisiana Creole (LC) 1sg and 2sg pronouns are morphologically distinguished for (non-)nominative case, yet do not cliticize (Neumann 1985:166–173,187,256). Note however that, unlike NE and HC, Fr manifests V-to-I with main verbs; also Fr pronouns manifest more morphological case distinctions than English pronouns (e.g. dative vs. accusative). Furthermore, like NE and HC, and unlike Fr, basilectal LC has no V-to-I and shows less morphological case distinctions than Fr; the split is basically between nominatives and non-nominatives in 1sg and 2sg—thus LC morphological case is even poorer than in English. (See Rottet 1992 and DeGraff 1997 for further discussion of V-in-situ vs. V-to-I in the diachrony of LC.) Other puzzles are posed by comparing Icelandic, German and Dutch: they all allow Object Shift, but they manifest varying degrees of (pro)nominal case morphology. What is not fully understood includes: (i) the threshold of verbal inflectional paradigms above which V-to-I obtains (see notes 18 and 57 and DeGraff 1997:89); (ii) once V-to-I obtains, the threshold of case-marking paradigms above which overt object cliticization and NP object-shift obtain; (iii) once both V and objects move outside of VP into the inflectional layer, the ordering restrictions between verb and objects. Be that as it may, verb-movement seems a *necessary*, but not sufficient, condition for object cliticization, as attested in the history of English and HC. (Also see the discussion in Section 7, specially note 66, regarding verb and object movement in Capeverdean Creole and Palenquero.)

[57] This section has glossed over many interesting details on the cross-linguistic placement of object clitics. The point here is rather broad: the HC-NE pair and the Fr-OE/ME pair oppose each other across the divide between the inflectional 'haves' and 'have-nots'; this divide corresponds to distinct syntactic effects, namely movements out of VP versus absence thereof. In the cases under study here, the distinctions can be made in a simplistic binary fashion: absence vs. presence of V-movement, and 'poor' vs. 'rich' inflection. But there are many languages (e.g., Romance languages and various Scandinavian dialects; also Capeverdean Creole and Palenquero Creole as discussed in Section 7) that are located on closer points on the inflectional and verb-movement continua, with much more subtle effects vis-à-vis the landing sites of verb and object placement. Furthermore, there are certainly other factors at play in verb and object placement that I have not considered here. (See notes 18 and 37 for additional caveats.)

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

The diachronic similarities vis-à-vis morphology and word-order in VP's extended projections in creolization and in language change weaken any empirical basis for Creole Exceptionalism, with its alleged non-genetic "discrepancies". With respect to HC and Germanic, we have rather spectacular and somewhat congruent word-order and morphological changes across diachronic stages and/or within synchronic stocks that are closely related lexicon-wise.

6.4 Reanalysis in the emergence of HC's object placement

On a par with the Haitian TMA markers surveyed in §6.2 above, the morphosyntax of HC objects was not created *ab ovo* from some hypothetical radically-impoverished pidgin.[58]

To begin with, note that HC has not incorporated any (restructured) forms from the Fr *clitic* and *atonic* system: HC pronouns (e.g., those in (5)) are all derived from Fr *non*-clitic and *tonic* pronouns; e.g. HC *mwen* '1sg' from Fr *moi*, HC *li* '3sg' from Fr *lui*, HC *yo* '3pl' from Fr *eux* (cf. the Gascony and Auvergne variant *yo* discussed in Sylvain 1936:36), and HC *nou* '1pl, 2pl' and *ou* '2sg' can be argued to etymologically derive from the non-clitic uses of Fr *nous* and *vous*, modulo semantic and pragmatic reinterpretation. The relevant regional French vernaculars may have readily provided the Creole creator with at least the basic patterns to be reanalyzed toward pronominal system of (Early) HC. Let's

[58] Neither does the evidence support the claim that HC's object placement was arrived at via the sort of strict relexification whereby Creole syntax is virtually isomorphic to substratum syntax modulo reanalysis and dialect-leveling (see Lefebvre 1998 and its early antecedent in Adam 1883; cf. §§2.2,2.3,3.3 above).

elaborate.

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

> "very early on ... *moi*, *toi*, *lui*, *eux* (which had 'more body') replaced ... *je*, *tu*, *il*, *ils* (which were pronounced *j*, *t*, *i*, *i*). As early as the end of the 13th century ... *moi* can serve as subject of the verb. ... As a logical conclusion of this evolution, the former pronouns *je*, *tu*, *il*, etc., have become 'person markers' and become an integral part of the verbal forms ..." [my translation]

In this vein, Brunot & Bruneau distinguish the pronouns *moi*, *toi*, *lui*, etc., from the 'prefixes' *je*, *tu*, *il*, etc. In contemporary terms, the former would be subjects in Spec(IP) whereas the latter would function as affixal agreement markers, associated with some functional heads above VP, thus their co-occurrence ('double-marking') in preverbal position, as in *Moi j(e)* ..., *Toi t(u)* ..., *Lui, i(l)* ..., etc.

More recently, Chaudenson 1992:157–162; Chaudenson *et al* (1993:103–107) and Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001:172–176 have noted related facts in regional varieties of French such as Cajun French, Louisiana French and Missouri French. Chaudenson *et al* note that, in these regional varieties, object clitics in Standard French (*me*, *te*, *le*, *la*, *les*, etc.), along with (other) verbal inflections , are "instable", "phonetically fragile" and "disappearing" as a result of "self-regulating processes' (ibid:104–106, 120). Chaudenson *et al* (1993:105) give the following examples in (42), to be contrasted with their Standard French counterparts in (43) (focus on the underlined object pronouns):

(42) a. *I* *v'nont* *voir* *moi* (Cajun French)
3pl FUT+3pl see 1sg
"They will see me"

b. *J'* *vas* *mettre* *toué* *tout* *en* *blanc* (Missouri French)
1sg+NOM FUT put 2sg all in white
"I will dress you all in white"

c. *M'* *as* *enterrer* *elle* *dans* *les* *feuilles* (Missouri French)
1sg FUT bury 3sg+fem in the+PL leaves
"I will bury her in the leaves"

(43) a. *Ils* *me* *verront* (Standard French)
3pl 1sg+ACC see+FUT+3pl

b. *Je* *te* *mettrai* *tout* *en* *blanc*
1sg+NOM 2sg+ACC put+FUT+1sg all in white

c. *Je* *l'* *enterrerai* *dans* *les* *feuilles*
1sg+NOM 3sg+ACC bury+FUT+1sg in the+PL leaves

In (42), Cajun French and Missouri French, like HC, exhibit postverbal object pronouns such as *moi*, *toué* and *elle* (cf. HC *mwen*, *ou* and *li*) in contexts where Standard French requires preverbal object clitics (cf. *me*, *te* and *la* in (43)). Also note the periphrastic future marking in (42c) which is phonetically, structurally and semantically similar to its HC analogue: *M a entere li* 'I will bury him/her/it'. Baissac 1880, Brunot 1966, Chaudenson 1992, Chaudenson *et al* 1993, Chaudenson & Mufwene 2001 and Fattier 1998 observe similar periphrastic-future patterns across an array of French-lexicon Creoles and regional varieties of vernacular French, including Québecois (see §§6.1–6.2 above). Here, we have 'creole'-like restructuring of French morphosyntax, sans "creolization" (*and* sans relexification; cf. note 60).

The diachrony of pronouns in these regional varieties of French and in French-lexicon Creoles is somewhat similar to what has occurred in English diachrony where preverbal object clitics have given way to postverbal counterparts. It is also quite possible that the French varieties that fed into the genesis of HC were more like Cajun French and Missouri French than Standard French vis-à-vis cliticization possibilities; this would be in line with

the above comments by Meillet 1920 and Brunot & Bruneau 1949 about popular vernacular varieties (also see note 36, in particular Frei's and Gadet's comments to the effect that popular French uses more postverbal tonic object pronouns than Standard French).

It can also be argued that the preference for tonic pronouns may make sense from a processing/acquisition perspective: Fr tonic object pronouns, unlike their Fr atonic counterparts, are uniformly postverbal and obey the canonical placement rule of full-NP objects—this is very much like the system of HC (atonic) object pronouns. By (over)generalizing the use of Fr tonic pronouns, early learners sidestep the extra complications of preverbal object cliticization, which in any case has scope on inflectional(-like) phonologically- and semantically-weak elements, namely the atonic clitics. The latter belongs to what, in the early stages of L2A, seems to constitute a 'brittle' morphological component of the target language (see note 36). Moreover, these Fr tonic pronouns are often phonologically and semantically stressed, thus made more salient. To wit: MOI, *j'l'ai vu,* LUI, *pas* ELLE 'I myself, I have seen HIM, not HER'.

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

More generally, the link noted by van Kemenade between inflectional erosion and loss of cliticization can also be captured in Sportiche's (1995) approach, which "treats [Romance pronominal] clitics as complex agreement morphemes" that head "clitic voices" in the

extended projection of the VP (pp. 237,265; but see 270n18): in such an approach, the loss of cliticization in HC and its congeners naturally becomes part of the larger loss of agreement morphology—a recurrent phenomenon in the early interlanguages created by L2 learners.[59]

Yet another potential influence toward uniform V-Obj order in HC can be found in the Gbe substratum as the native languages of some of the L2 learners that were exposed to regional French varieties in colonial Haiti. Given the demographics and sociolinguistics of the colony, some of these French varieties would have been non-native or, in Chaudenson's (1992) term, "approximations of approximations" (i.e., recursive approximations). As for the Gbe languages, they are canonically SVO, with both pronominal and non-nominal objects, once we abstract away from the complex verbal constructions with OV order (see §3.3). Furthermore, Gbe *atonic* pronominal objects are postverbal, even in the contexts were full NP objects and tonic pronouns shift to a preverbal position (see Aboh this volume); such postverbal atonic pronouns are, in their surface distribution, on a par with HC pronominal objects and in contradistinction with their Fr analogues, independently of how pronominal enclisis should be analyzed in these languages. Be that as it may, current results in acquisition research make it quite likely that VO patterns in the substratum would have favored the adoption by L2A learners of congruent VO patterns into the incipient Creole. Similar 'substratum' effects (e.g., influence from English in North America) may have contributed to the postverbal-pronoun patterns in (42).[60]

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

[60] One telling contrast in the development of pronoun-placement in the L2A of French is provided by the comparison of Arabophone and Hispanophone adult learners, whose data are publically available from the *CHILDES System* (McWhinney 2000). The Hispanophone learners seem to produce target-like object clitics with shorter delays and fewer 'discrepancies' than their Arabophone counterparts. As suggested by (e.g.) Véronique (1990:188), Klein & Perdue (1992:325f) and Perdue (1995:164f), this differential may due to the learners' respective L1s: Arabic, unlike Spanish, lacks preverbal object clitics (cf. note 36). Véronique 1990 documents other word-order aspects of Arabophone learners' interlanguage that are

7 "Creole genesis" vs. "Language change": A mythical dualism?

7.1 Recapitulation: Creolization, language change and language acquisition

Robust VP-related differences between HC and its source languages have been argued to depend on prior erosion of inflectional morphology in the emergence of HC. This scenario makes the emergence of V-in-situ in HC syntax quite similar to its analogue in English diachrony (see §6.1; also see Roberts 1999 and Lightfoot 1999). In turn, HC's lack of preverbal objects can be taken as a corollary of its V-in-situ setting, assuming some implementation of Holmberg's Generalization (see Bobaljik, to appear, for one recent proposal). Here, object-in-situ patterns in HC mirror their analogues in Modern English (NE) and in a subset of Scandinavian languages: these patterns conform to a constraint that is presumably rooted in UG (see Section 5). In this account, the reason why the syntax of HC objects differs so robustly from that of its major source languages is rather straightforward: Holmberg's Generalization, to the extent that it applies to the placement object pronouns, predicts that object cliticization, as an instance of Object Shift to the left of the verb, could not (stably) exist in HC in the absence of V-to-I.[61]

influenced by the L1 (e.g., verb-initial orders; p. 190) while taking pains to indicate the limits of L1 transfer (p. 197f); also see Véronique 2000. §§3.3,6.2 above offer additonal caveats regarding the extent of substrate influence in Creole genesis.

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

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

Ndayiragije assumes that T in Fɔngbè has an [affix] feature that must be checked. This is supposed to explain certain cases of verb-doubling, namely when there is no overt (shifted) object in Spec(TP) to provide phonological support to T. For example, "After *wh*-movement of the shifted object ... the [affix] feature of T, an uninterpretable PF feature, requires a phonological host in order to be 'visible' in the Morphology component of PF. ... Therefore, [verb doubling]" (Ndayiragije 2000:501).

Elsewhere, T's [affix] feature can be checked *sans* verb-doubling. In one such case, namely subject-less infinitival complements with overtly realized complementizers, "two options arise": "T's [affix] feature raises to the lexicalized C [this is T-to-C raising]; or it attracts the phonological features of V [this is verb-doubling]. The first option [i.e., T-to-C raising] is arguably better on economy grounds. Indeed, attracting the phonological features of V [i.e., verb-doubling] would involve a second operation: copying

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

Let's also recapitulate our learnability-theoretic speculations vis-à-vis the above scenario. It is second-language acquisition (L2A) under duress that, in the development of HC, led to the eventual reduction of inflectional paradigms; thus the loss through L2A of one class of potential triggers for V-to-I in Creole genesis. The relative salience cum transparency, both structural and interpretative, of the Fr verbal periphrases, as compared to their synthetic counterparts, may have further biased the language learner toward the V-in-situ setting. If verbal periphrases are, for one reason or another (e.g., salience and transparency), preferred over their synthetic counterparts in popular and second-language varieties of French, then the net effect is a proportional reduction of un-ambiguous V-to-I

these features in the base position of V. ... This analysis [with other details omitted here] correctly predicts the absence of object shift and verb doubling in nonfinite CP headed by an overt C" (Ndayiragije 2000:508).

The problem here is that the T-to-C option seems to *incorrectly* rule out verb-doubling elsewhere, including (e.g.) certain prospective and progressive constructions where verb-doubling does take place (see (19) in §3.3; also see Aboh 1999:188–218, this volume, and Ndayiragije 2000:498f). In these constructions, there is a c-commanding lexicalized head that governs T with [affix] feature and is available as a phonological host to T. If the more economical T-raising option was taken in the prospective and progressive constructions, then there would be no V-doubling there, contra the data. As it turns out, Ndayiragije (2000:502n16) explicitly allows T to "move to [some higher] head to find phonological support"—in this case, the higher F(inite) head which *also* has [affix] feature (p. 500). This kind of T-raising to a higher lexicalized head, which may or may not have [affix] features, undermines the argument: The option to check the relevant [affix] feature by T- (or C-) raising to a higher lexicalized head qua phonological host is more economical than, and incorrectly prevents, the (more costly) option of verb-doubling to apply where it does apply.

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

syntactic triggers (e.g., instances of verb-negation—V_{fin} pas—order with thematic verbs) in the Primary Linguistic Data (PLD) of incoming learners (cf. Lightfoot 1999). The main verb in Fr verbal periphrases is in the infinitive or the past particle and always to the right of sentential negation. Thus, every use of a negated clause with a verbal periphrase instead of its synthetic counterpart entails that the learner is exposed to one less utterance that robustly "expresses" the V-to-I setting with a lexical/thematic verb; see Roberts 1999:293f and Lightfoot 1999:438–441 on the structural and frequency factors that affect the reliability of the PLD with respect to the "expression" of the V-to-I setting.

In the context of HC's development, the conspiracy between fossilization of inflection in L2A and the processing benefits of verbal periphrases in language use and/or language acquisition may thus attract (more and more) learners toward the V-in-situ option. Besides, V-in-situ may be the unmarked setting since it entails more economical representations (à la Robert's 1999; see §6.3). The adoption of the V-in-situ would, in turn, bias the learner toward PLD patterns that are (superficially) compatible with, and thus reinforce, the adopted V-in-situ option. Such patterns would include utterances where objects are postverbal, as (e.g.) in Fr positive imperatives (see note 59), independently of the actual representations of these utterances in the native speakers' I-languages. In other words, specific PLD patterns (e.g., Fr imperatives and their postverbal objects) are assigned underlying structures that are distinct from their targetlike representations. The latter, in any case, are not directly accessible to the learner; thus the possibility and pervasiveness of reanalysis.

The phenomena described in this paper vis-à-vis the development of VP-related morphosyntax in HC (namely, paradigmatic reduction in inflectional morphology, the switch to V-in-situ and object-in-situ, reanalysis/grammaticalization and substrate influence) all make "creolization" look quite similar to "regular" contact-induced language change. Independently of which account of the relevant facts ultimately prevail, what matters here is the relevance of the non-Creole diachronic patterns vis-à-vis Creole Exceptionalism—the allegation of a fundamental (developmental and structural) divide between creolization and language change. The (admittedly partial) evidence available thus far offers recurrent parallels between the patterns of verb and object morphosyntax in HC, English and French diachrony. The so-called "discrepancies" that obtain in the genesis of

HC (see Sections 3–5) also obtain outside of "creolization". For example, if we take HC and NE as end-points of diachronic developments, we find in both scenarios that a reduction in inflectional morphology is associated with a reduction in IP-internal leftward movement outside of VP.

Once "creolization" and "language change" are viewed from the Cartesian-Uniformitarian perspective, what we're dealing with throughout are individual speakers engaged in UG-guided language (re-)creation (see DeGraff 1999b,d, 2001a,b). The task of *any* such learner is to use whatever cues are available in the PLD to (re-)create an I-language that is compatible with UG; thus the intrinsic possibility of "grammatical inventions" (à la Rizzi 1999) alongside the systematic congruence observed above vis-à-vis morphosyntactic development across various types of linguistic ecologies. In this perspective, "Creole" and "creolization" do not, and cannot, refer to typological profiles and processes of "grammatical invention" that are qualitatively and fundamentally distinct from their counterparts in non-Creole synchrony and diachrony, as in the Romance and English cases, which I now summarize.

7.2 "Abnormal" discrepancies in "normal" (i.e., "genetic") diachrony?

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

(44) "From a linguistic standpoint, Romance languages, while maintaining many Latin features ... , have structures that are *fundamentally different* from their Latin counterparts: total ruin of case inflection which entails and is conditioned by the relatively fixed word order; the creation of articles; the total restructuring of verb conjugation where, notably, person features are expressed more often by preverbal pronouns than by verbal inflection. *All this makes neo-Latin languages fall into a typological class that is quite remote from the structural type represented by Latin.*"
(Meillet 1929 [1951:80]; emphases added)

Now, recall Thomason & Kaufman's litmus test for so-called "non-genetic" diachrony: "a *significant discrepancy* between the degree of lexical correspondence and the degree of grammatical correspondence—in some or all grammatical subsystems" (1998:206, my emphasis; also see p. 8–12). So, are the "discrepancies" alluded to by Meillet in (44) of a "significant" degree? Meillet, as a pro-Stammbaumtheorie historical linguist, had this to say about "discrepancies" in the evolution of classic Stammbaumtheorie phyla:

(45) "The use of word order in French and English to express relations between phrases is a *creation* of these languages: such innovation didn't have any model in Latin or Old Germanic."

(Meillet 1912 [1958:148])]

So, for Meillet, the "discrepant" word-order innovations in French and English diachrony are a matter of language "creation". A generative-grammar spin on Meillet's words in (44)–(45) would then suggest that the creation of French and English morphosyntax in diachrony is quite commensurable with the mechanics of Creole genesis: both are UG-guided language "creation" in the face of necessarily sparse and heterogeneous PLD made available in contingent linguistic ecologies. This Cartesian-Uniformitarian view leaves no room for the orthodox dualism between "genetic" vs. "non-genetic" phylogeny.

Indeed, it could also be argued that along CERTAIN parameters, such as lexical case morphology and movement-related properties like so-called "free word-order" scrambling, French and HC are more similar to each other than French and Latin are (see DeGraff 2001b:§§3.2–3.3). It can also be argued that, again along CERTAIN parameters, English and Jamaican Creole are closer to each other than English and Old Germanic are. Such (dis)similarities are, it must be stressed, an artifact of what parameters we choose to compare, how and why. But the comparison so far teaches us that there is no precise and operational *structural* litmus test, and no coherent *theoretical* framework, that consistently and reliably discriminates where "language change" ends and where "creolization" begins (see Mufwene 1986, 1997, 1998, 2001 for a sustained argument along similar lines).

7.3 VP-related morphology and word order in a Creole sample

Given the comparative data in this chapter, should we expect *all* Creoles to be like HC in having both verbs and objects un-inflected, for TMA, agreement and case, and pronounced where they are generated, i.e., in situ within the VP? To the extent that language acquisition under duress, as in abrupt language contact, entails a certain degree of inflectional erosion, à la Weinreich, Meillet, etc., and to the extent that inflectional 'erosion' contributes to a diachronic decrease in clause-internal movement out of VP, à la van Kemenade, Roberts, etc., then one may be tempted to answer yes. Yet, language contact happens in the diachrony of virtually *all* languages, be they Creoles or not (cf. Mufwene 1998:324, 2001). To wit, the history of Romance and of English. Of course, the *degree* of contact and the degree of inflectional erosion is not uniform across all instances (cf. note 35). Compare, say, inflectional morphology in HC vs. Cape Verdean Creole (see below) or within and across Germanic, Romance, etc. Within Germanic, the most celebrated cases include the inflectional contrasts between English and Icelandic and between English and German. Besides, alongside morphological erosion, there is grammaticalization where free morphemes are reanalyzed as bound elements. In Givón's phrase, "yesterday's syntax is today's morphology", à la Bopp, Humboldt, Meillet, etc. (see DeGraff 2001b:§6).

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

V-to-I, as indicated by the verb-adverb-object order in (46) and (47):[62,63,64]

(46) a. *João xina ben se lison* (CVC)
João learned well his lesson
'João learnt his lesson well' (Baptista 1997:90; also see p. 225)

b. *João ta ama mutu Eliza*
João TMA love Eliza
'João loves Eliza too much' (Baptista 1997:207)

(47) *I asé ammirá mucho ese monasito* (PL)
I HAB admire much this boy
'I admire this boy (very) much' (Armin Schwegler, p.c., 10/9/00)

And it is perhaps not accidental that both CVC and PL, unlike HC, express some of their TMA values via affixes. CVC has an affix *-ba* for "past", "past perfect" and "present perfect" (Baptista 1997:69).[65] PL has a similar affix *-ba* for "past imperfective", in addition

[62] Furthermore, CVC manifests subject-verb inversion in conditionals (Baptista 1997:132). But this is complicated by the occurrence of auxiliary+verb sequences in the ('inverted') pre-subject position (Baptista, p.c., 10/11/00). At any rate, HC manivests no such inversion.

[63] Baptista (p.c., 10/11/00) cautiously notes that the data in (46) are from her own dialect. She is concerned that such patterns, with these particular adverbs, may reflect V-to-I in the Portuguese spoken by speakers who are bilingual in CVC and Portuguese—such V-to-I patterns may not be "representative". (Also see note 65. Note 19 mentions a possibly analogous phenomenon vis-à-vis occasional V-to-I patterns in HC.)

[64] One could reasonably argue that, in (47), the adverb is *right*-adjoined to VP while the direct object is right-dislocated *outside* of VP, in some (focus?) position. If so, the word order in (47) would not automatically count as evidence for V-to-I in PL. However, Armin Schwegler (p.c., 10/11/00) informs us that the post-adverbial position of the object in (47) does not assign any special property (e.g., contrastive stress) on the object; contrastive stress on the object in (47) is obtained by heavy stress on the first syllable of *ese*. Thus, it can be reasonably assumed that the post-adverbial object in (47) is within the VP and not in a focus position outside of VP; thus V-to-I in PL, as assumed in the main text; see Suñer 1994 for evidence of V-to-I in Spanish, the lexifier of PL. (I am most grateful to Armin Schwegler for extensive and informative discussion of PL data.)

[65] Baptista (1997:227) speculates on the possibility that *ba*-affixation (alongside, and perhaps as a trigger to, V-to-I) is a recent development in CVC. She notes that *ba* is an unbound morpheme in the neighboring Creole of Guinea-Bissau. The history of *-ba* from unbound to inflectional morpheme looks like a typical case of grammaticalization, somewhat on a par with the progression of Romance TMA markers from auxiliaries in verbal periphrases to inflectional suffixes in synthetic tenses. The latter "was achieved through a process of incorporation of the infinitive to the auxiliary ... [which] was then progressively 'grammaticalized' in dialects such as Spanish and French; that is, the auxiliary was completely reanalyzed as a normal tense/agreement verbal inflection." (Raposo 2000:283f; also see Duarte & Matos 2000:134,138). As discussed by Raposo, this reanalysis has not proceeded uniformly across all Romance dialects, and not even across all Portuguese dialects. In Duarte & Matos's account, Portuguese dialects have both "the 'new' synthetic form" and "a survival of the analytic form". In this light, the morphosyntactic differences vis-à-vis affixal *-ba* in Cape Verdean and non-affixal *ba* in Guinea-Bissau are hardly surprising.

to an affixal progressive marker *-ndo*; and the two affixes can co-occur in the same word, as in *toká-ndo-ba* in *Ata la sei músika toká-ndo-ba* 'Until six (in the morning) the band was playing' (see Schwegler & Green, to appear, for further details). The link between TMA affixes and verb movement in CVC and PL, modulo the caveats in notes 63 and 65, can be made by postulating that CVC and PL, like Fr and unlike HC, carry (abstract) affixal features in their inflectional heads. Like their Fr counterparts, CVC and PL affixal features are associated with the verb moving to the corresponding inflectional heads in order to provide a host to these affixal heads (see Sections 4 and 6).[66]

[66] Given English verb-placement data (see, e.g., (27)), it must then be argued that English inflectional affixes (*-ed*, *-s* and *-ing*), unlike their CVC and PL counterparts (see (46)–(47)), do not induce V-to-I. Our account so far does not say anything about this difference between English (V-in-situ) vs. CVC and PL (V-to-I). Are there any morphological contrasts to be correlated with this word-order difference? Are there CVC- and PL-specific morphological triggers, in addition to syntactic triggers, that enter into the learner's determination of the verb-placement setting for each specific language? Here I will speculate on some possibilities.

Quint (2000:225) gives the following paradigm for *kanta* 'to sing' a typical verb in Cape Verdean Creole (Santiago variety): active-present *kanta*, active-past *kantá<u>ba</u>*, passive-present *kantá<u>du</u>*, passive-past *kantá<u>da</u>*. Quint lists the following inflectional affixes and their "glosses":

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

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

Now, let's bravely abstract away from the "mine field" of dialectal variations in CVC studies. This "mine field", which Marlyse Baptista warns me about (p.c., 11/01), can be glimpsed at by comparing the descriptions of passive morphosyntax in Veiga 1996, Quint 2000 and Baptista, to appear. Then let's assume Distributed Morphology (Marantz & Halle 1993, Noyer 1997, Halle 1997, Harley & Noyer 1999; keeping in mind the caveats noted in note 18) and let's propose the following analysis for the INFL morphemes in (i) with the following associations between *phonological* exponents and *morphosyntactic* specifications:

(ii)
- *-/d/-*: the exponent of a *passive* voice head;
- *-/a/*: the exponent of an *anterior* tense head in the environment of the *passive* voice;
- *-/u/*: the exponent of the tense head in the environment of the *passive* voice;
- *-/ba/*: the exponent of an *anterior* tense head (cf. Baptista 1997:97–99,166–118);
- *-∅*: to be inserted elsewhere.

One possible correlate of V-to-I in CVC resides in the details of the morphemic decomposition in (ii), independently of interpretive subtleties. For any given INFL-related voice head or tense head that the syntax delivers to the morphophonology with the morphosyntactic features [±passive] and [±anterior], the phonological exponent of the "Vocabulary Item" with the greatest number of matching features is inserted in that head. The crucial point here is that the hypothesized structure of CVC passive forms such as *kantá+d+u* and *kantá+d+a* shows *stacking* of inflectional affixes. Thus, there are CVC verbal forms that, like Fr and ME ones, bear multiple inflectional affixes on the verbal stem. In other words, affixal stacking

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

in CVC passives makes its verbal morphology very much unlike that of Modern English (NE); such stacking may well count as a symptom of CVC 'rich' inflection (see Bobaljik 2001:6 and note 18 above) of the sort that triggers V-to-I.

One brief note on the "mine field" of dialectal variations in CVC and possible methodological confounds: Many CVC dialects, including some of those described in Baptista (1997, to appear), the *-da/-du* alternation appears quite elusive. Furthermore, there are dialects without the *-da/-du* alternation that do manifest instances of V-to-I (Baptista 1997, but see note 63). Be that as it may, my speculations here do invite CVC dialectologists to look for particular patterns—in particular, empirical correlations, or lack thereof, between V-to-I and the morphological profile of verbs—while controlling for Portuguese influence, dialect mixing, abstract (non-overt) residue of erstwhile overt affixes and so on. Not a small task.

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

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

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

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

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

(vi) *João odjaba mi*
João saw+PAST me
"João had seen me"

It thus seems that *-ba* and object clitics are in competition to occupy, in a-theoretical terms, an 'affixal' slot on the verb. If so, then it can be argued that both the TMA affix *-ba* and the clitic *m* are *syntactic* affixal heads that, in this particular case, compete for support from a verbal stem in the narrow syntax. Whichever analysis is offered for such a competition, its sheer existence distinguishes *-ba* from English *-ed*. To wit: *I liked it* (vs. (iv)). The contrast in (iii)–(vi) may be yet another cue, for the linguist if not for the Cape Verdean child, that differentiates CVC *-ba* from English *-ed* vis-à-vis their respective potential for V-to-I. (I am greatly indebted to Marlyse Baptista for her generous comments on some of the discussion in this Section and for sharing some of her unpublished work—from Baptista, to appear—and some of her fieldwork results—also unpublished.)

Similarly, PL *-ba* also shows PL-specific morphological properties that set it apart from English *-ed*, properties of the sort that may lead to learner to endow the relevant PL inflectional head(s) with V-to-I potential. In (52), PL *-ba* (unlike CVC *-ba*; cf. (v) above) can be separated from its verbal stem by an object clitic. Like CVC *-ba*, PL *-ba* looks like an affixal head that is active in the narrow syntax, as it can attach to the verb+clitic complex head which is presumably created in the narrow syntax as well, assuming that *-ba* is merged in a position that precedes and c-commands the base positions of both verb and object clitic. Forms like *miná+lo+ba* in (52) may then be the trigger that forces the learner to analyze PL *-ba* as an independent, syntactically active head, to which the verb+clitic complex *miná+lo* moves in the syntax to host the syntactically active suffix *-ba*, giving *miná+lo+ba*. This is yet another instance of 'affix stacking'—if we can call it that—that correlates with V-to-I. Another, perhaps clearer, instance of affix-stacking in PL is (e.g.) the afore-mentioned *toká-ndo-ba*, which bears both progressive and past inflectional affixes. Recall that English *-ed*, unlike PL *-ba*, does not enter into 'affix stacking' of any sort: **I like+it+ed* and **play+ing+ed*.

If these speculations are on the right track, then both CVC and PL provide the learner with positive evidence that the relevant inflectional heads above VP are affixal and trigger V-to-I. This line of reasoning

the verb and then ride along with the latter when it moves outside of VP.

Let's start with the CVC data. Baptista (1997:90) notes that, at PF, adverbs like *ben* 'well' sits most comfortably in the clause-internal position, between the verb and its object, as in (48a). She observes the following contrast, noting some dialect variation in (un)grammaticality with respect to the clause-final position of *ben* in (48d):

(48) a. *João xina <u>ben</u> se lison* (CVC)
João learned well his lesson
'João learnt his lesson well'

b. * *<u>Ben</u> João xina se lison*

c. * *João <u>ben</u> xina se lison*

d. ? *João xina se lison <u>ben</u>*

When the object of *xina* is a clitic (e.g., *l* '3sg'), *ben* becomes perfectly acceptable in clause-final position. Compare (48d) and (49):

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

Here is Baptista's analysis of (49) (her example (71b)):

(50) "[T]he [object] clitic [*l* '3sg'] originates in the VP complement and incorporates to V [*xina*]. When the verb raises across a VP-internal adverbial [e.g., *ben*] ... the object clitic raises with it." (Baptista 1997:262)

Alternatively, one could take (49) to arise in three successive steps (cf. the analysis of Portuguese enclisis in Raposo 2000:285f): (i) V-to-I; (ii) object cliticization to a functional head (say, F) higher than INFL, the landing site in (i); (iii) movement of the V+I complex created in (i) to a landing site still higher of F. In (i)–(iii), "higher than" implies "to the left of", adopting Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry. In Duarte & Matos's (2000:130) account of Portuguese enclisis, the clitic then the verb left-adjoin to an inflectional head that c-commands VP.

also suggests that there is a multiplicity of cues that, in principle, can be used to decide on the setting of the verb-placement parameter (cf. Lightfoot 1999, Roberts 1999, Bobaljik 2001).

Somewhat similar verb- and clitic-placement facts hold in PL, to which similar analyses can be given. Compare (47) with a non-pronominal object with (51) with a pronominal object:

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

Further evidence suggesting movement of objects outside of VP in PL is given in (52) (courtesy of Armin Schwegler, p.c., 10/11/00):

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

b. * *I miná+ba+lo*

Schwegler & Green (to appear) note that object pronouns (e.g., *lo* 'him' in (52a)) are allowed to cliticize onto a verbal host, to the right of the verbal stem and to the left of the suffixal TMA marker *-ba*, thus mesoclisis of *lo* in *miná+lo+ba* of (52a). This is reminiscent of certain forms in Caribbean Spanish (Yolanda Rivera-Castillo 1992) and in European Portuguese, Galician and Old Iberian (Duarte & Matos 2000, Raposo 2000:283–287). Assuming that the verb undergoes head-movement (out of VP, as in (47)) and moves to adjoin to the left of, and host, the TMA head *-ba*, then the object pronoun must also be able to shift out of VP for it to occur to the left of *-ba*, perhaps along the lines proposed in Baptista's (1997:262) analysis in (50) above (also see the accounts of similar cases of mesoclisis in Rivera-Castillo 1992 and Raposo 2000:285f; there too mesoclisis is dependent on instances of verb movement to a variety of VP-external landing sites). The word-order and morphological patterns examplified in (52a) may thus count as triggers for the PL's V-to-I setting (see note 66).

These are all tentative arguments, but the lesson here is that VP syntax in both CVC and PL is *not* isomorphic to that of HC, despite the fact that CVC, PL and HC are all Romance-lexicon Creoles. VP-related facts seem to draw HC closer to Modern English (both have verbs and objects in-situ) than to HC's fellow Romance-lexicon Creoles like CVC and PL (both have verbs and objects outside VP). Conversely, the V-to-I properties

of CVC and PL draw them closer to, say, Fr and OE, both of which are non-Creole V-to-I languages, than to HC, a V-in-situ Creole language. Of course, going outside the realm of Romance-lexicon Creoles should, I suspect, afford us even greater variation in the VP domain and elsewhere (see DeGraff 2001b). The implication is that there is no uniform (VP) syntax across Creole languages—there is no *sui generis* "Creole" typology (see, e.g., Givón 1979; Mufwene 1986, 1998, 2001; Muysken 1988:300; DeGraff 1999a,b, 2001a,b).

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

Acknowledgements

This project has been supported by, inter alia, a much-appreciated fellowship from the *National Endowment for the Humanities* (Grant #: FA-37500-02).

This paper's insights, if any, are due entirely to constructive discussions with colleagues and friends, too numerous to be named all. This paper's shortcomings, and there are many (witness the footnotes!), are due to my not being (yet) able to incorporate a long series of empirical and theoretical questions, suggestions and disagreements from said colleagues and friends. My future work will be vastly improved once I can take into account all the comments that have been so kindly offered while I was writing this paper and its forerunners in the past few years.

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

Correspondence address

Michel DeGraff, MIT Linguistics and Philosophy, Cambridge MA 02139-4307 U.S.A.;
e-mail: degraff@MIT.EDU

References

Aboh, Enoch. 1999. *From the Syntax of Gungbe to the Grammar of Gbe.* Sierre: Éditions à la Carte.

——— **. In this volume.** Object shift, verb movement and verb reduplication.

Ackema, Peter. 2001. On the relation between V-to-I and the structure of the inflectional paradigm. *The Linguistic Review*, 18.3, 233–263.

Adam, Lucien. 1883. *Les Idiomes Négro-Aryen et Maléo-Aryen. Essai d'Hybridologie Linguistique.* Paris: Maisonneuve et cie.

Alleyne, Mervyn. 1971. Acculturation and the cultural matrix of creolization. In Hymes, eds., *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 169–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anonymous. 1811. *Idylles et Chansons, ou Essais de Poésie Créole par un Habitant d'Hayti.* Philadelphie: Imprimerie de J. Edwards.

Archibald, John, ed. 2000. *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory.* Malden MA, Blackwell.

Avolonto, Aimé. 1992. *De l'étude sémantico-syntaxique des marqueurs pré-verbaux à la structure de phrase en fɔ̀ngbé.* Montréal: Université du Québec à Montréal thesis.

Baissac, Charles. 1880 *Étude sur le Patois Créole Mauricien.*

Baptista, Marlyse. 1997. *The Morpho-syntax of Nominal and Verbal Categories in Capeverdean Creole.* Harvard University, Cambridge MA: doctoral dissertation.

——— **. To appear.** *The Syntax of Cape Verdean Creole: The Sotavento Varieties.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

——— **. 1984.** The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7, 2, 173–203.

——— . **1988.** Creole languages and the bioprogram. In Newmeyer 1988, 268–284.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 1995. *Morphosyntax: The Syntax of Verbal Inflection.* Cambridge, MA: MIT thesis.

——— . **1999.** Adverbs: The hierarchy paradox. *Glot International* 4.9/10, 27–28.

——— . **2001.** The rich agreement hypothesis in review. Ms. McGill Univerity ("version 2.0, August 2001", 32 pages).

——— . **To appear.** A-Chains at the PF interface: Copies and "covert" movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory.* (Ms. "written: 23 May 2000, latest revision: 31 July 2001".)

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Dianne Jonas. 1996. Subject position and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.2: 195–236.

Brunot, Ferdinand. 1966. *Histoire de la Langue Française des Origines à nos Jours.* Paris: A. Colin.

Brunot, Ferdinand & Charles Bruneau. 1949 [1969]. *Précis de Grammaire historique de la Langue Française.* Paris: Masson.

Bruyn, Adrienne; Pieter Muysken & Maaike Verrips. 1999. Double object constructions in the Creole languages: Development and acquisition. In DeGraff 1999c, 329-373.

Bunsen, Christian Charles Josias Bunsen. 1854. The Icelandic and the Modern Scandinavian, or the effect of colonization. In Bunsen, ed., *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History Applied to Language and Religion*, vol. 2, London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 52–57.

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

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

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

——— **. 1992.** *Des Iles, des Hommes, des Langues.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

——— **. 1995.** *Les Créoles.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Chaudenson, Robert; Raymond Mougeon & Édouard Beniak. 1993. *Vers une approche panlectale de la variation du français.* Aix-en-Provence: Institut d'Études Créoles et Francophones; Diffusion: Didier Érudition.

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

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

——— **. 1993.** A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Hale & Kayser 1993, 1–52.

——— **. 1995.** *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

Costa, João (ed.). 2000. *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

da Cruz, Maxime. 1995 Aspectual verbs *fó*, *vɔ̀* 'finish' in Fɔngbè. *The Linguistic Review*, 12.4, 361–380.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1991. Bare Sentences. *Proceedings of the First Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference.* 31–50. Ithaca: Cornell University. 1991.

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

DeGraff, Michel. 1992a. *Creole Grammars and Acquisition of Syntax.* PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

——— . **1992b.** Haitian null subjects revisited. *Travaux de Recherche sur le Créole Haïtien*, 11, ed. by Claire Lefebvre (ed.), 59–74. Montréal: Université du Québec à Montréal.

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

——— . **1992d.** The syntax of predication in Haitian. In *Proceedings of NELS 22*, Amherst, MA, 103–117.

——— . **1993.** A riddle on negation in Haitian. *Probus* 5.63–93.

——— . **1994a.** The morphology-syntax interface in creolization (and diachrony). *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 24(2), 115–132.

——— . **1994b.** To Move or not to move? Placement of verbs and object pronouns in Haitian and in French. *Papers from the 30th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Katharine Beals et al., 141–155. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

——— . **1995a.** On certain differences between Haitian and French predicative constructions. In Jon Amastae, Grant Goodall, Mario Montalbetti & Marianne Phinney, eds., *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 237–256.

——— . **1995b.** Predicate-movement, quantification, events and properties. In Victor Manfredi & Karl Reynolds (eds.), 69–82, *Niger-Congo Syntax and Semantics* 6, Boston Massachusetts: Boston University African Studies Center.

——— . **1997.** Verb syntax in creolization (and beyond). In Haegeman 1997, 64–94.

——— . **1998.** Nominal Predication in Haitian and in Irish In Emily Curtis, James Lyle & Gabriel Webster, eds., *Proceedings of the Sixteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 113–128.

——— . **1999a.** Creolization, language change and language acquisition: A prolegomenon. In DeGraff 1999c, 1-46.

——— . **1999b.** Creolization, language change and language acquisition: An epilogue. In DeGraff 1999c, 473-543.

——— . **1999c.** *Language Creation and Language Change. Creolization, Diachrony and Development.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

——— . **1999d.** Parameter-setting in language acquisition and through diachrony. In Rob Wilson & Frank Keil, eds., *MIT Encyclopedia of Cognitive Sciences*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 624–627.

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

——— . **2001a.** Morphology in Creole genesis: Linguistics and Ideology. In Michael Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language.* MIT Press, 53–121.

——— . **2001b.** On the origin of Creoles: A Cartesian critique of Neo-Darwinian linguistics. *Linguistic Typology*, 5.2, 213–311.

——— . **2002.** Linguists' most dangerous myth. The fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism. MIT: Ms.

——— . **In preparation.** *Haitian Creole Syntax: A Micro-Parametric Approach to its Structure and Genesis* [Working title]. New York: Oxford University Press.

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

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

Déprez, Viviane. 1989. *On the Typology of Syntactic Positions and the Nature of Chains.* Cambridge, MA: MIT thesis.

——— . **1994.** Haitian Creole: A pro-drop language? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 9.1–24.

——— . **1999.** The roots of negative concord in French and French-lexicon creoles. In DeGraff 1999c, 375–427.

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

Duarte, Inês & Gabriela Matos. 2000. Romance clitics and teh Minimalist Program. In Costa, ed., 116–142.

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

Fabb, Nigel. 1992. Reduplication and object movement in Ewe and Fon. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 13.1–41.

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

Fattier, Dominique. 1998. *Contribution à l'Étude de la Genèse d'un Créole: L'Atlas Linguistique d'Haïti, Cartes et Commentaires.* Université de Provence: Doctoral dissertation. (Distributed by Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France.)

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

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

Givón, Talmy. 1979. Prolegomena to any sane creology. In Ian Hancock, ed., 3–35. *Readings in Creole Studies.* Ghent, Belgium: E. Story-Scientia.

Goodman, Morris. 1993. African substratum: Some cautionary words. In Mufwene, 64–73.

Gougenheim, Georges. 1929. *Etude sur les Périphrases Verbales de la Langue Française.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1997. *The New Comparative Syntax*. London: Longman.

Hale, Kenneth & Samuel Jay Keyser, eds. 1993. *The View from Building 20.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Hale & Keyser, 1993, 111–176.

Halle, Morris. 1997. Distributed morphology: Impoverishment and fission. In Benjamin Bruening, Yoonjung Kang & Martha McGinnis, eds., *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 30, Cambridge MA: MIT Linguistics and Philosophy, 425–449.

Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 1999. Distributed Morphology. *Glot International* 4.4, 3–9.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian Languages. An Introduction to their History.* London: Faber & Faber.

——— **. 1982.** *Scandinavian Language Structures: A Comparative Historical Survey.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

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

Holmberg, Anders. 1985. Icelandic word order and binary branching. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 9.161–195.

——— **. 1999.** Remarks on Holmberg's generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 1, 1–39.

Holmberg Anders & Christer Platzack. 1990. On the role of inflection in Scandinavian Syntax. *Issues in Germanic Syntax*, ed. by Werner Abraham, Wim Kosmeijer and Eric Reuland, 93–118.

Holmberg Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian Syntax.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Howe, Kate. 2000. *Développement d'une Théorie de la Temporalité: Les Cas du Créole Haïtien et du Papiamento.* Université de Provence: Doctoral dissertation.

Ionin, Tania & Ken Wexler. In press. Why is "is" Easier than "s"? Acquisition of tense/agreement morphology by child L2-English learners. *Second Language Research.*

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

Josefsson, Gunlög. 1992. Object shift and weak pronominals in Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 49.59–94.

Kayne, Richard. 1989a. Null subjects and clitic climbing. *The Null-Subject Parameter*, ed. by Osvaldo Jaeggli and Kenneth J. Safir, 239–261. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

——— **. 1989b.** Facets of Romance past participle agreement. In Paola Benincà, ed., *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris, 85–103.

——— **. 1991.** Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.647–686.

——— **. 1994.** *The antisymmetry of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kinyalolo, Kasangati. 1992. A note on word order in the progressive and prospective in Fɔ̀n. *Journal of West African Languages*, 22.35–51.

Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1992. *Utterance Structure: Developing Grammars Again.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kroch, Anthony. 1989a. Function and grammar in the history of English: Periphrastic *do*. In Fasold & Schiffrin, eds., *Language Change and Variation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133–172.

——— **. 1989b.** Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change*, 1, 3, 199–244.

Kroch, Anthony & Ann Taylor. 1997. The syntax of verb movement in Middle English: Dialect variation and language contact. In van Kemenade & Vincent 1997, 297–325.

——— **. 2000.** Verb-object order in Early Middle English. In Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas & Anthony Warner, eds., *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 132–187.

Kroch, Anthony, Ann Taylor & Donald Ringe. 2000. The Middle English verb-second constraint: A case study in language contact and language change. In Susan Herring, Pieter van Reneen, Lene SchØsler. *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 353–391.

Lardiere, Donna. 2000. Mapping features to forms in Second Language Acquisition. In Archibald 2000, 102–129.

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

Lasnik, Howard. 1995. Verbal morphology: *Syntactic Structures* meets the *Minimalist Program* In Hector Campos & Paula Kempchinsky, eds. *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 251–275.

——— **(ed.). 1999.** *Minimalist analysis.* Malden MA: Blackwell.

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

Lightfoot, David. 1999 Creoles and cues. In DeGraff 1999c, 431–452.

Lightfoot, David & Norbert Hornstein, eds. 1994. *Verb Movement.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacWhinney, Brian. (2000). *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk..* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marantz, Alec. 1991 [2000]. Case and Licensing. In Germán Westphal, Benjamin Ao & Hee-Rahk Chae, eds., *Proceedings of Eight Eastern States Conference on Linguistics.* Columbus OH: Ohio State University, 234–253. (Reprinted in Eric Reuland, ed., *Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 11–30.

McWhorter, John. 1998. Identifying the creole prototype: Vindicating a typological class. *Language* 74(4), 788–818.

Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'Évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)* 12/26. Reprinted in Meillet 1958, 130–148.

——— **. 1919.** 'Le genre grammaticale et l'élimination de la flexion'. *Scientia. Rivista di Scienza)*, XXV, LXXXVI, 6. Reprinted in Meillet 1958, 199–210.

——— **. 1920.** Sur les caractères du verbe. *Revue Philosophique, tome LXXXIV.* Reprinted in Meillet 1958, 175–198.

——— . **1929.** Le développement des langues. In *Continu et Discontinu*, 119–131. Reprinted in Meillet 1951, 71–83.

——— . **1951.** *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale. Volume II.* Paris: Klincksieck.]

——— . **1958.** *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale. Volume I.* Paris: Honoré Champion.]

Moreau de Saint-Méry, M. L. E. 1797 [1958]. *Description Topographique, Physique, Civile, Politique et Historique de la Partie Française de l'Isle Saint Domingue.* Philadelphia: Chez l'Auteur. [1958 edition (3 volumes): Paris: Société de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises.]

Mufwene, Salikoko. 1986. Can Creole languages be defined without reference to their history? *Études Creoles*, 9, 1, 135-150.

——— . **1990.** Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in creolistics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 1, 1–23.

——— . **1991.** Pidgins, creoles, typology, and markedness. In Francis Byrne & Thom Huebner, eds., *Development and Structures of Creole Languages: Essays in Honor of Derek Bickerton*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 123–143.

——— **(ed.). 1993.** *Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

——— . **1996.** The Founder Principle in creole genesis. *Diachronica*, 13, 1, 83–134.

——— . **1997.** Jargons, pidgins, creoles, and koines: What are they? In Arthur Spears & Donald Winford, eds., *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 35–70.

——— . **1998.** What research on creole genesis can contribute to historical linguistics. In Monika Schmid, Jennifer Austin & Dieter Stein, eds., *Historical Linguistics 1997*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 315–338.

——— . **2001.** *The Ecology of Language Evolution.* Cambridge U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

——— . **To appear.** Grammaticization as part of the development of Creoles. In Viveka Velupillai, ed., *Perspectives on grammaticalization*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Muysken, Pieter. 1988. Are Creoles a special type of language? In Newmeyer 1988, 285–301.

Ndayiragije, Juvénal. 2000. Strengthening PF. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.3, 485–512.

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

Newmeyer, Frederick. 1988. *Linguistics. The Cambridge Survey. Vol 2: Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Pelleprat, Father Pierre. 1655 [1965]. *Relation des Missions des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Iles et dans la Terre Ferme de l'Amérique Méridionale.* Paris: Chez Sébastien Cramoisy & Gabriel Cramoisy. Translated and Reprinted in 1965 as *Relato de las Misiones de los Padres de la Compañía de Jesús en las Islas y en Tierra Firme de América Meridional.* Caracas: Fuentes para la Historia Colonial de Venezuela.

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

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

Platzack, Christer & Anders Holmberg. 1989. The role of Agr and finiteness. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 43.51–76.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.365–424.

Prévost, Philippe & Lydia White. 2000. Missing surface inflection or impairment in second language acquisition? Evidence from tense and agreement. *Second Language Research* 16.2, 103-133.

Quint, Nicolas. 2000. *Grammaire de la Langue Cap-Verdienne*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Raposo, Eduardo. 2000. Clitic positions and verb movement. In Costa, ed., 266–297.

Rivera-Castillo, Yolanda. 1992. Enclitic pronouns in Caribbean Spanish. In Buszard-Welcher, Laura; Lionel Wee & William Weigel (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley CA: Berkely Linguistics Society, 424–434.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1999. Broadening the empirical basis of Universal Grammar models: A Commentary. In DeGraff 1999c, 453–472.

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

——— **. 1997.** Directionality and word order change in the history of English. In van Kemenade & Vincent 1997, 397–426.

——— **. 1998.** *Have/Be* raising, Move F and Procrastinate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.1, 113–125.

——— **. 1999.** Verb Movement and Markedness. In DeGraff 1999c, 287–327.

Rohrbacher, Bernhard. 1994. *The Germanic VO Languages and the Full Paradigm: A Theory of V to I raising*. University of Massachusetts at Amherst: Doctoral dissertation.

Rosiers, comte de. 1818. *L'Entrée du Roi en sa Capitale, en Janvier 1818, an 15ème de l'Indépendonce d'Hayti*. Sans-Souci, Haiti: Imprimerie Royale.

Rottet, Kevin. 1992. Functional categories and verb raising in Louisiana Creole. *Probus* 4.261–289.

Saint-Quentin, Alfred de. 1872 [1989]. *Introduction à l'Histoire de Cayenne*, with *Étude sur la Grammaire Créole* by Auguste de Saint-Quentin. Antibes : J. Marchand *[1980 edition: Cayenne: Comité de la Culture, de l'Éducation et de l'Environnement, Région Guyane.]*

Schleicher, August. 1850 [1852 .] *Die Sprachen Europas in Systematischer Ubersicht: Linguistische Untersuchungen.* Bonn: H. B. König. [1852 Translation by Hermann Ewerbeck: *Les Langues de l'Europe Moderne*, Paris: Ladrange]

Schlupp, Daniel. 1997. *Modalités predicatives, modalités aspectuelles et auxiliaires en créole à base lexicale française de la Guyane française (XVIII^{e}–XX^{e} siècles).* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer

Schütze, Carson. 1997. *INFL in Child and Adult language: Agreement, Case and Licensing.* MIT: Doctoral dissertation. (Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.)

Schwegler, Armin & Kate Green. To appear. Palenquero (Creole Spanish). In John Holm & Peter Patrick, eds., *Comparative Creole Syntax.* London: Battlebridge Publications.

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

Seuren, Pieter & Herman Wekker. 1986. Semantic transparency as a factor in Creole genesis. In Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith, eds., *Substrata Versus Universals in Creole Genesis*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 57–70.

Singler, John. 1996. Theories of Creole genesis, sociohistorical considerations, and the evaluation of the evidence: The case of Haitian Creole and the Relexification Hypothesis. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 11: 185–230.

Thomas, John Jacob. 1869. *The Theory and Practice of Creole Grammar.* Port-of-Spain: Chronicle Publishing Office.

Thomason, Sarah & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1994. Comments on the paper by Vikner [1994]. In Lightfoot & Hornstein 1994, 149–162.

——— **. 2001.** Object shift and scrambling. In Mark Baltin & Chris Collins, eds., *Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Malden MA: Blackwell, 148–202.

Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. Clitic constructions. In Johan Rooryck & Laurie Zaring, eds., *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 213–276.

Sprouse, Rex. 1998. Some notes on the relationship between inflectional morphology and parameter-setting in First and Second Language Acquisition. In Maria-Luise Beck, ed., *Morphology and its Interfaces in Second Language Knowledge*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 41–67.

Suñer, Margarita. 1994. V-movement and the licensing of argumental *wh*-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 12: 335–372.

Sylvain, Suzanne. 1936. *Le Créole Haïtien: Morphologie et Syntaxe*. Belgique: Wetteren, Imprimerie de Meester.

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

van Kemenade, Ans & Nigel Vincent, eds. 1997. *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Veenstra, Tonjes. 1996. *Serial Verbs in Saramaccan: Predication and Creole Genesis.* University of Amsterdam: Doctoral dissertation. (Distributed by Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.)

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

Véronique, Daniel. 1990. Reference and discourse structure in the learning of French by adult Moroccans. In Hans Dechert, ed., *Current Trends in European Second Language Acquisition Research*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 171–201.

Véronique, Daniel. 1990. Observations préléminaires sur *li* dans l'interlangue d'Abdelmalek. In Alain Giacomi, Henriette Stoffel & Daniel Véronique, eds., *Appropriation du français par des Marocains arabophones à Marseille.* Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 207–323.

Vikner, Sten. 1994. Finite verb movement in Scandinavian embedded clauses. In Lightfoot & Hornstein 1994, 117–147.

——— **. 1995.** *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages.* New York: Oxford University Press.

——— **. 1997.** V^0-to-I^0 movement and inflection for person in all tenses. In Haegeman 1997, 189–213.

Vinson, Julien. 1889. Créoles. In Adolphe Bertillon *et al*, eds., *Dictionnaire des Sciences Anthropologiques*, Paris: Doin, 345–347.

Vrzić, Zvjezdana. 1997. 'A minimalist approach to word order in Chinook Jargon and the theory of Creole genesis'. In Benjamin Bruening (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Student Conference in Linguistics*, 467–478, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 31.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact* Number 1 of the Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York. (Reprint: The Hague: Mouton, 1968)

Wexler, Ken. 1994. Finiteness and head movement in early child grammars. In Lightfoot & Hornstein, 305–350.

——— **. 2002.** Lenneberg's dream: Learning, normal language development and Specific Language Impairment. In Jeannette Schaffer & Yonata Levy, eds., *Language Competence across Populations: Towards a Definition of Specific Language Impairment*, Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

The End