

TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF PREDICATE CLEFT LANGUAGES*

Claire Lefebvre
Université du Québec à Montréal

Why is predicate cleft available in some languages but not in others? This paper shows that the availability of predicate clefting in a grammar correlates with the availability of a syntactic position for clausal determiners within S. It is argued that the properties of these two sets of facts interact in a significant way. Furthermore it is shown that these two phenomena are either both available in a given grammar or both not available. The proposal then is that availability of predicate cleft (event focus) in a given grammar is dependent upon the availability of a syntactic position for clausal determiners (event determination).

Pourquoi le clivage du prédicat est-il possible dans certaines langues et pas dans d'autres. Cet article montre que la possibilité de cliver un prédicat dans une grammaire est en corrélation avec une position syntaxique pour le déterminant de phrase. Il est démontré que les propriétés de ces deux ensembles de faits interagissent de façon significative. De plus, je montre que ces propriétés sont soit toutes deux disponibles ou soit toutes deux non disponibles dans une grammaire donnée. La possibilité de cliver le prédicat (focus sur un événement) dépend de la disponibilité d'une position syntaxique pour le déterminant phrastique (déterminant d'événement).

0. INTRODUCTION

Clefting of NPs, PPs and even of clauses is available in a wide range of languages. The availability of predicate clefting, however, appears to be a more restricted phenomenon. The predicate cleft construction depicted in (1) is taken from Fongbe, a language of the Kwa family spoken mainly in Benin¹.

1. Lón wè súnù ó lón.
jump it-is man DET jump
'It is jump that the man did (not e.g. run away).'

Why is this construction available in some languages (e.g. Fongbe) but not in others (e.g. Ewe, a closely related language of the Kwa family)?

In (1), the particle *wè* (glossed as 'it-is' in the grammars on Fongbe) heads the clefted constituent². As is noted in Anonymous (1983: 11-3), *wè* may also occur in the context of a

* I want to thank my Fon informants from Benin for providing me with the data on which this paper is based: Iréné Fandohan and Aimé Avolonto from Abomey, Berthe Adegbidi and Dika Adotevi from Ouidah and Maxime da Cruz from Porto Novo/Cotonou. I thank Aimé Avolonto, Nick Clements, Maxime daCruz and Hilda Koopman for providing me with information on other West African languages.

I am grateful to Anne-Marie Brousseau, Kinyalolo Kasangati, Paul Law, John Lumsden and Tonjes Venstra for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. The present work is realized within the context of the Haitian project at UQAM. The project is financed by grants from CRSH, FCAR and PAFAC (UQAM).

¹ The type of predicate cleft depicted in (1) corresponds to the Vata type of predicate cleft (cf. Koopman, 1984) also found in Haitian (cf. Piou, 1982; Lumsden and Lefebvre, 1990 a, b), rather than to the Hausa type predicate cleft (cf. Tuller, 1986). For a comparison of the properties of the two types, see Lumsden and Lefebvre (1990b). For a detailed discussion on the predicate cleft construction in Fon, see Ndayiragije (in preparation).

² *Wè* also heads other clefted constituents. In (i), *wè* occurs with a clefted noun phrase and in (ii) it occurs with a clefted causal clause.

- i. Masè vɪ lé wè wá.
Massè child PL it-is arrive
'It is the people of Massè who have arrived.'

(Houkpatin, 1984-85: 218)

clause as in (2). In this context, *wɛ* signals new information.

- 2a. **Mí kó wɔn wɛ.**
 You already forget it-is
 'It is that you have already forgotten.' (Anonymous 1983: II-3)
- b. **É d̀ù nũ ǎ wɛ à.**
 he eat THING NEG it-is INT
 'Is it that he has not eaten ?' (Hounkpatin, 1984-85: 147)

In this context, *wɛ* is in complementary distribution with the clausal determiner *ɔ*³. While *wɛ* signals new information, *ɔ* signals known information. The contrast in meaning between *wɛ* and *ɔ* (which I will refer to as clausal determiners) is illustrated in (3).

- 3a. **Súnù ɔ gbà mɔ̀tò ɔ wɛ.**
 man DET destroy car DET DET
 'The man destroyed the car.' (New information: the man destroyed the car.)⁴
- b. **Súnù ɔ gbà mɔ̀tò ɔ ɔ.**
 man DET destroy car DET DET
 'The man destroyed the car.' (Known information: the man destroyed the car.)

It has been argued that *wɛ* and *ɔ* head a functional category projection within S (=IP) (cf. Lefebvre, 1991 and in press, respectively).

In this paper, I show that the availability of predicate clefting in a grammar correlates with the availability of a syntactic position for clausal determiners within S. I argue that the properties of these two sets of facts interact in a significant way. The discovery of this constellation of facts will bring us one step further towards an explanation of the appearance of predicate cleft in some languages but not in others.

Interestingly, the speakers of Fon divide into two dialects with respect to the distribution of *wɛ/ɔ* and of predicate cleft. In dialect A (e.g. Abomey), *wɛ* may appear as a clausal determiner (cf.(2)), in complementary distribution with *ɔ* (cf. (3)). Hence, in dialect A

-
- ii. **d̀ó t̄s cé kù wútù wɛ, ùn yì Glèxwé.**
 cause father my dead cause it-is, I go Ouidah
 'It is because my father died that I went to Ouidah (not e.g. because my brother had a baby).'
- (Anonymous, 1983: IX-7)

In (iii) *wɛ* occurs with a nominal predicate in a truncated cleft.

- iii. **Àtín wɛ.**
 tree it-is
 'It is a tree (not e.g. a bush).'
- (Hounkpatin, 1984-85: 186)

My suggestion that (iii) is a truncated cleft comes from the data in (iv):

- iv. **Àtín wɛ (é nyl).**
 tree it-is it is
 'It is a tree that it is.'

³ As can be observed from the example in (3b) the clausal determiner *ɔ* is homophonous with the [+definite] determiner occurring with NPs. In Lefebvre (in press) I argue that the determiner *ɔ* is deictic in addition to being [+definite]. This property is not further discussed in this paper since it is not pertinent for the present analysis.

⁴ Unlike Anonymous (1983) and Hounkpatin (1984-85), I do not translate clausal *wɛ* by 'It-is'. In this context, the presence of *wɛ* does not necessarily entail a contrastive reading.

there is a paradigm of clausal determiners heading a functional category projection within the clause. In this dialect, predicate cleft is available (cf. (1)). Furthermore, as will be demonstrated below, the properties associated with the two constructions interact in a significant way. In dialect B (e.g. Ouidah), however, neither *wè* nor *ɔ* appear as clausal determiners and predicate cleft is not available in this dialect.

In section one I discuss the distribution and the properties of *wè* and *ɔ* as clausal determiners. This evidence demonstrates the paradigm of clausal determiners and motivates an analysis where these elements head a syntactic position within the clause. In section 2, I discuss the properties of, and the constraints on, predicate cleft. I show that some of these properties and constraints interact in a significant way with those discussed in section 1 for clausal determiners. In section 3, I compare data from dialects A and B and discuss the relevance of the complementary distribution for a typology of predicate cleft languages. Finally, I further document my claim on the basis of data drawn from other languages.

1. THE CLAUSAL DETERMINERS OF FON DIALECT A

The distribution and properties of *wè* and *ɔ* as clausal determiners have been discussed separately in earlier work (cf. Lefebvre, in press, 1991). In this section I bring together the two sets of facts. I summarize the distributional and syntactic properties of *wè* and *ɔ* showing that they constitute a paradigm of clausal determiners and that they head a syntactic category within S.

The presence of *wè* and *ɔ* as clausal determiners correlates with the property [+definite] either of the subject of the clause or of the delimiting internal argument (in the sense of Tenny, 1987) of the verb⁵. In (4), in which both the subject of the clause and the object in VP are [-definite], neither *wè* nor *ɔ* can appear as a clausal determiner to signal new or known information.

4a. * *Súnù dé gbà mɔ̀tò dé wè*
 man a destroy car a DET
 [Lit.: 'A man destroyed a car.' (New information)]

b. * *Súnù dé gbà mɔ̀tò dé ɔ*
 man a destroy car a DET
 [Lit.: 'A man destroyed a car.' (Known information)]

The presence of clausal *wè/ɔ*, however, may be correlated with the property [+definite] of the subject of the clause. In this case, the information presupposed as new/known information includes the whole clause (to be compared with the data in (6) below).

5a. *Súnù ɔ gbà mɔ̀tò dé wè.*
 man DET destroy car a DET
 'The man destroyed a car.' (New information: The man destroyed a car.)

b. *Súnù ɔ gbà mɔ̀tò dé ɔ.*
 man DET destroy car a DET
 'The man destroyed a car.' (Known information: The man destroyed a car.)

⁵ The delimiting internal argument is the argument which imposes an end point to the event denoted by the verb. For example, in 'John ate the apple', **apple** is the delimiting argument: when all of the apple has been eaten, the event of eating is over.

Similarly, the presence of clausal *wè* or *ɔ* may be correlated with the property [+definite] of the delimiting internal argument. In this case, the information presupposed as new or known information excludes the subject.

- 6a. **Súnù dḗ gbà mṣtò ɔ wè.**
 man a destroy car the it-is
 'A man destroyed the car.' (New information: The car has been destroyed.)
- b. **Súnù dḗ gbà mṣtò ɔ ɔ.**
 man a destroy car DET DET
 'A man destroyed the car.' (Known information: The car would be destroyed.)

When *wè* or *ɔ* are correlated with the property [+definite] of the internal argument, this argument must be the delimiting argument. In (7) and (8), the internal arguments of *kpé* 'meet' and *mḍ* 'see' are [+definite]. These arguments do not delimit the events denoted by the verbs. Neither *wè* nor *ɔ* can appear in this context as is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (7) and (8).

7. * **Súnù dḗ kpé vṛ ɔ wè**
 man a meet child DET it-is
 [Lit.: 'A man met the child.' (New information: the child was met)]
8. * **Súnù dḗ mḍ mṣtò ɔ ɔ**
 man a see car DET DET
 [Lit.: 'A man saw the car.' (Known information: The car was seen)]

The ungrammaticality of the sentences in (7) and (8) contrasts with the grammaticality of the sentences in (6) in which the internal argument is a delimiting object.

The above data show that the presence of *wè* and *ɔ* is correlated with the property [+definite] either of the subject of the clause or of the delimiting internal argument. In the first case, the presupposed new/known information bears on the whole clause, while in the second case, the presupposed new/known information bears only on part of the clause: the predicate and its internal arguments.

The clausal determiners *wè* and *ɔ* may occupy the same two surface positions with respect to the negation particle *ǎ*. They can follow the negation particle. In this case, the presence of the determiners is correlated with the property [+definite] of the subject and the content of the whole clause is presupposed as new/known information, including negation. This is illustrated in (9).

- 9a. **Súnù ɔ fìn mṣtò ɔ ǎ wè.**
 man DET steal car DET NEG it-is
 'The man did not steal the car.' (New information: The man did not steal the car.)
- b. **Súnù ɔ fìn mṣtò ɔ ǎ ɔ.**
 man DET steal car DET NEG DET
 'The man did not steal the car.' (Known information: The man would not steal the car.)

Wè/ɔ may also precede the negation particle. In this case, the presence of the determiner is correlated with the property [+definite] of the delimiting internal argument. In this context, the

content of what is presupposed as new/known information excludes the external argument as well as negation. This is depicted in (10).

- 10a. **Súnù** **ɔ** **fín** **mɔ̀tò** **ɔ** **wɛ** **ǎ**.
 man DET steal car DET it-is NEG
 'The man stole the car.' (New information: The car has been stolen.)
- b. **Súnù** **ɔ** **fín** **mɔ̀tò** **ɔ** **ɔ** **ǎ**.
 man DET steal car DET DET NEG
 'The man did not steal the car.' (Known information: The car would be stolen.)

Since **wɛ/ɔ** do not exhibit the semantic content typically associated with lexical items defined in terms of the major features [α N, β V], I take **wɛ/ɔ** to be the head of a functional category projection⁶. On the basis of the fact that the presence of **wɛ/ɔ** is correlated with the property [+definite] of either the subject or the delimiting argument, and on the basis of the fact that at S-Structure **wɛ/ɔ** can either precede or follow the negation particle (Lefebvre, in press and 1991) argues that the functional projection headed by **wɛ/ɔ** is generated within S (=IP). This is further supported by the fact that as clausal determiners, **wɛ** and **ɔ** may occur in embedded clauses containing an overt complementizer, as in (11) (a fact which also dismisses the possibility of analyzing **wɛ/ɔ** as complementizers).

- 11a. **Kòkú** **lìn** **ǎ** **Àsibá** **gbà** **mɔ̀tò** **ɔ** **wɛ**.
 Koku think that Asiba destroy car DET it-is
 'Koku thinks that Asiba destroyed the car.' (New information: Asiba destroyed the car.)
- b. **Kòkú** **lìn** **ǎ** **Àsibá** **gbà** **mɔ̀tò** **ɔ** **ɔ**.
 Koku think that Asiba destroy car DET it-is
 'Koku thinks Asiba destroyed the car.' (Known information: Asiba would destroy the car).

Furthermore, Lefebvre (in press and 1991) argues that the clausal determiners of Fon are interpreted as determiners of events. Their presence within a clause correlates with the property [+definite] of the two arguments which delimit the event of the clause in the sense of van Voorst (1988): the subject of the clause which marks the beginning point of an event, and the affected object which marks the endpoint of the event.

2. THE BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE PREDICATE CLEFT CONSTRUCTION IN FON DIALECT A

Recall from the introduction that the particle **wɛ** also heads clefted constituents (cf.(1)). This should not come as a surprize since cleft constructions typically involve new information.

In Fon dialect A, predicate cleft is correlated with the property [+definite] of the delimiting internal argument. This is exhibited by the sentences in (12) in which the delimiting arguments are underlined.

⁶ The identification of that functional category is not pertinent for the point made in this paper. For a specific proposal on the structure of the Fon clause see Lefebvre (in press and 1991), where it is argued that the clausal determiners of Fon head AGRP. This proposal is based on two major observations. First, the clausal determiners of Fon have the same distribution as AGR(ement) in languages like French and English. Second, languages which have clausal determiners of the type of those found in Fon do not exhibit agreement in phi (person, number and gender) features.

- 12a. **ḍù wè Kòkú ḍù àsòn s.**
 eat it-is Koku eat crab DET
 'It is eat that Koku did to the crab (not e.g. throw it away).'
- b. **Yì wè Kòkú yì.**
 leave it-is Koku leave
 'It is leave that Koku did (not e.g. arrive).'
- c. **Wé wè àvó s wé.**
 become-white it-is dress DET become-white
 'It is white that the dress became (not e.g. yellow).'

In the context of a [-definite] delimiting argument, predicate cleft is not permitted. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (13) in which the delimiting argument is [-definite].

- 13a. * **ḍù wè Kòkú ḍù àsón**
 eat it-is Koku eat crab
 [Lit.: 'It is eat that Koku did to a crab.']
- b. * **Yì wè súnù yì.**
 leave it-is man leave
 [Lit.: 'It is leave that some man did (not e.g. arrive).']
- c. * **Wé wè àvó wé**
 become-white it-is dress become-white
 [Lit.: 'It is white that a dress became (not e.g. yellow).']

In the context of a non delimiting internal argument, predicate cleft is not permitted. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (14) in which the [+definite] internal argument is not a delimiting argument.

- 14a. * **Sé wè Kòkú sé fongbe**
 know it-is Koku know Fon
 [Lit.: 'It is know that Koku knows Fon.']
- b. * **Kpé wè Kòku kpé Àsibá**
 accompany it-is Koku accompany Asiba
 [Lit.: 'It is accompany that Koku accompanied Asiba.']

In recent literature on predicate cleft, it has been argued that predicate cleft involves events rather than predicates (cf. Lumsden and Lefebvre, 1990 a,b; Lefebvre, 1990; Larson and Lefebvre, in press). The contrast in grammaticality between the sentences in (12) and the sentences in (14) further shows that only delimited events can participate in the predicate cleft construction.

3. CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AVAILABILITY OF CLAUSAL DETERMINERS AND PREDICATE CLEFT WITHIN A GIVEN GRAMMAR

3.1 FON DIALECT A

There are points of intersection between the two constructions. First, both involve events. While clausal determiners are determiners of events, predicate cleft is focus on an event. Second, the property [+definite] of the delimiting internal argument is crucial to the

grammaticality of clauses presenting either a clausal determiner (associated with the internal argument) or a clefted predicate. The clausal determiners *wè/ɔ*, associated with the internal argument, is permitted only in the context of a [+definite] delimiting internal argument (cf.(6), (7), (8)); similarly, predicate cleft is permitted only in the context of a [+definite] delimiting argument (cf.(12) versus (13) and (14)). Finally, a single clause cannot include both a clefted predicate and an overt clausal determiner (i.e. they are in complementary distribution). This is illustrated in (15).

15. * *ɖù wè Kɔkú ɖù àsɔn ɔ ɔ/wè*
eat it-is Koku eat crab DET DET/DET

The constellation of facts summarized above show that there is a relationship between the properties of the clausal determiners and those of predicate cleft in a given grammar.

In Fon dialect A, both clausal determiners of the type of those discussed in section 1 and predicate cleft are available. The fact that both constructions appear in the same dialect suggests that there is a correlation between the availability of clausal determiners and predicate cleft in a given grammar. This suggestion is further reinforced when we contrast data from dialect A with data drawn from dialect B.

3.2 FON DIALECT B

In Fon dialect B, neither *wè* nor *ɔ* function as clausal determiners. The sentences in (16) (=5) in dialect A) and (17) (=6) in dialect A) are not interpretable for the speakers of dialect B⁷.

- 16a. * *Súnù ɔ gbà mɔtò dé wè.*
man DET destroy car a DET
[Lit.: 'The man destroyed a car.' (New information: The man destroyed a car.)]
- b. * *Súnù ɔ gbà mɔtò dé ɔ.*
man DET destroy car a DET
[Lit.: 'The man destroyed a car.' (Known information: The man destroyed a car.)]
- 17a. * *Súnù dé gbà mɔtò ɔ wè.*
man a destroy car the it-is
[Lit.: 'A man destroyed the car.' (New information: The car has been destroyed.)]
- b. * *Súnù dé gbà mɔtò ɔ ɔ.*
man a destroy car DET DET
[Lit.: 'A man destroyed the car.' (Known information: The car would be destroyed.)]

Furthermore, predicate cleft is not available in this dialect. Hence, while speakers of dialect B recognize the sentences in (18) (=12) in dialect A) as part of other Fon speakers' grammar, they do have them in their own grammar.

- 18a. * *ɖù wè Kɔkú ɖù àsɔn ɔ.*
eat it-is Koku eat crab DET
[Lit.: 'It is eat that Koku did to the crab (not e.g. throw it away).']

⁷ Sentences (9), (10) and (11) are also starred for these speakers.

- b. * **Yì wè Kòkú yì.**
 leave it-is Koku leave
 [Lit.: 'It is leave that Koku did (not e.g. arrive).']
- c. * **Wé wè àvó ó wé.**
 become-white it-is dress DET become-white
 [Lit.: 'It is white that the dress became (not e.g. yellow).']

The only possible clefted constituents in the grammar of speakers of dialect B are arguments, or clauses as depicted in the examples provided in (19) (repeated from footnote 2 for convenience).

- 19a. **Masè vî lè wè wá.**
 Massè child PL it-is arrive
 'It is the people of Massè who have arrived.' (Hounkpatin, 1984-85: 218)
- b. **ḍó tó cé kù wútù wè, ùn yì Glèxwé**
 cause father my dead cause it-is, I go Ouidah
 'It is because my father died that I went to Ouidah (not e.g. because my brother had a baby).' (Anonymous, 1983: IX-7)
- c. **Àtín wè.**
 tree it-is
 'It is a tree (not e.g. a bush).' (Hounkpatin, 1984-85: 186)

The fact that both clausal determiners and predicate cleft are lacking from dialect B strongly suggests that there is a relationship between the availability of these two constructions in a given grammar.

3.3 TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF GRAMMARS

The correlation between the availability of clausal determiners and the availability of predicate cleft in the two dialects of Fon, both being available in dialect A and both lacking from dialect B, strongly supports the proposal that the availability of predicate clefting in a given grammar is correlated with the presence of a syntactic position for clausal determiners within S (=IP). The correlation between the two sets of facts is also observed in other languages.

Yoruba, Gun, Gen and Xula, languages of the Kwa family spoken in Benin, Togo and Nigeria, pair with Fon dialect A: they exhibit both predicate cleft and clausal determiners (Maxime deCruz, pc.). Vata, a language of the Kru family spoken in the Ivory Coast, also appears to pair with Fon dialect A: this language exhibits predicate cleft (cf. Koopman, 1984) as well as particles, comparable to the clausal determiners, occurring within IP at S-Structure (Hilda Koopman, pc.). Haitian creole also appears to pair with Fon dialect A. Haitian has a syntactic position for clausal determiners (cf. Lefebvre, 1982; Lefebvre, in press) and predicate cleft is available in this language (cf. Piou, 1982; Lumsden and Lefebvre, 1990a, b; Lefebvre, 1990; Larson and Lefebvre, in press).

Ewe, however, which is a language of the Kwa family, appears to pair with Fon dialect B: Ewe presents neither a syntactic position within S for clausal determiners nor the predicate cleft construction (Nick Clements, pc.). Similarly, French and English lack both a syntactic position for clausal determiners and predicate cleft.

4. PROPOSAL

My proposal then is that availability of predicate cleft (thus event focus) in a given grammar is dependent upon the availability of a syntactic position for clausal determiners (thus event determination). This hypothesis is falsifiable. If we were to find a grammar with predicate cleft and no syntactic position for clausal determiners, then, the hypothesis would be falsified⁸.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 1983. *Éléments de recherche sur la langue Fon*. Cotonou.
- Houngpatin, B. 1984-1985. *Le verbal et le syntagme verbal du fon-gbe parlé à Massè*. Thèse de doctorat de troisième cycle. Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle, Paris III.
- Koopman, H. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs: from Verb Movement Rules in the Kru Languages to Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris.
- Larson, R. and C. Lefebvre. In press. *Predicate Clefting in Haitian Creole*. *Proceedings of NELS 1990*. T. Sherer et al. (eds).
- Lefebvre, C. 1982. *L'expansion d'une catégorie grammaticale: le déterminant la*. C. Lefebvre, H. Magloire-Holly, and N. Piou, eds. *Syntaxe de l'haïtien*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma. 21-63.
- Lefebvre, C. 1990. *On the Interpretation of Predicate Cleft*. *Linguistic Review* 6.169-194.
- Lefebvre, C. In press. *The Functional Category AGR and Creole Genesis*. *The Proceedings of the Leiden Workshop on Creole Languages and Language Acquisition* ed. by H. Wekker, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lefebvre, C. 1991. *On the Distribution of Clausal wè in Fongbe*. *Journal of West African Languages*. XXI.2. 21-34
- Lumsden, J.S. and C. Lefebvre. 1990a. *On the Haitian Predicate Cleft Construction*. *Current Issues in African Linguistics* 7. J. Hutchisson and V. Manfredi (eds.). Dordrecht, Holland: Foris.
- Lumsden, J.S. and C. Lefebvre. 1990b. *Predicate Cleft Constructions and Why They Aren't What You Might Think*. *Linguistics* 28.4.761-783.
- Ndayiragije, J. In preparation. *Clivage du prédicat en fon*. Thèse de doctorat. Université du Québec à Montréal.
- Piou, N. 1982. *Le clivage du prédicat*. C. Lefebvre, H. Magloire-Holly, and N. Piou, eds. *Syntaxe de l'haïtien*, Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma. 122-151.
- Tenny, C. 1987. *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*. Doctoral Dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Tuller, L. 1986. *Bijjective Relations in Universal Grammar and the Syntax of Hausa*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of California at Los Angeles.
- van Voorst, Jan. 1988. *Event Structure*. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, no 59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

⁸ Since the published grammars of the pertinent languages do not contain information on clausal determiners, the test of the hypothesis proposed in this paper requires careful work with native speakers of the relevant languages. If after a careful investigation, it turned out that, while West African languages did exhibit the correlation noted in this paper, creole languages did not (i.e. exhibiting predicate cleft but no clausal determiners), this discrepancy would suggest interesting questions for research on creole genesis.