(2001) point out, combining these two ideas leads to the postulation of three classes of languages as far as inflectional richness is concerned. These are given in (1):

(1)   a.   the rich: V-to-T and null subjects (Italian, Greek, Spanish, etc.);
        b.   the middle class: enough "wealth" for V-to-T but not enough for null subjects (French, Middle English);
        c.   the impoverished: neither V-to-T nor null subjects (Modern English, Mainland Scandinavian).

The implicational corollary of (1) is that no null-subject language lacks V-to-T movement. The connection between V-to-T movement and null subjects becomes still closer in the context of proposals such as those in Barbosa (1995) and Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998) to the effect that in null-subject languages T's EPP-property is satisfied by movement of a D-feature-bearing V.

Against this background, it is a tempting move to establish a relation between V-to-T movement and the null-subject parameter by supposing that wherever V raises to T, null subjects are licensed and overt expletives barred. The problem with this idea is that there is well known empirical evidence, notably from French, that V-to-T movement can exist in a non-null-subject language. Well-known examples

3   AN ALTERNATIVE: T AND TENSE INFLECTION

In this section we will make a proposal regarding the relation between (finite) T and n

Our approach thus postulates that there are two quite distinct types of "r

form of partial reprojection, in that the T-features of the compound element determine the formation of the TP (the V-features do not, as these have played their role in forming the thematic domain of VP, although they must move with T as part of the compound V+T element). Movement is thus triggered by the inherent features of the compound V+T element; and "richness" of tense morphology is what underlies the lexical requir

that has

      b.   *John has[Perf] being[Prog] smoked[Perf]

This locality is guaranteed by the non-intervention clause in the definition of Agree. We follow standard assumptions (Chomsky 2000, 2001) in taking the structural environment in which Agree holds to be defined as follows:

(1991), that cliticisation always involves adjunction to the left

Since *n't* triggers stem allomorphy on the auxiliaries it combines with (e.g. *will/won't*), we must therefore conclude that *n't* is an inflection which attaches to auxiliaries (see also Spencer 1991:381f.). Our analysis therefore implies that NE has a class of negative auxiliaries, similar to the Uralic languages, Latin, Old English, Afrikaans and various other languages. Negative *do* (i.e. the forms *don't, doesn't, didn't*) is thus the form that corresponds to negative, non-modal, finite T with various Tense and -feature specifications.

If we claim that auxiliary+*n't* combinations are lexically-formed negative auxiliaries, then we must provide an analysis of "non-contracted" *not*, which we now see as an element synchronically independent of *n't*. In many contexts, *not* has an interpretation and a syntax distinct from *n't*. I

(18)   *John always not smokes

that the subject is merged in a specifier of vP, then the fact that a trace of the subject appears to bind an anaphor

then V must have moved to T to create the orde

After the reanalysis in (28), English therefore had a class of auxiliaries,

(30)   a.   Where eyes did once inhabit   (from *Richard III* cited in Barber 1976: 164)

    b.   Rough windes do shake the darling buds of Maie   (from *Sonnet* 18)

But the modern *do*-support system does not emerge

Fuss, Eric (2003) 'On the historical core of V2 in Germanic.' *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26.2:195-231.

Gray, Donald (1985) *The Oxford Book of Late Medieval Prose and Verse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haeberli, Eric (1999) Features, Categories and the Syntax of A-positions. Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in the Germanic Languages. Ph.D. dissertation: Geneva. Published as: Haeberli, Eric (2002). *Features, categories and the syntax of A*

Richards, Marc and Theresa Biberauer (2005) 'Explaining <u>Expl</u>.' In Marcel den Dikken and Christina Tortora (eds). *The function of function words and functional categories*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp.115-154.

Rizzi, Luigi (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi (1986) 'Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:501-577.

Roberge, Yves (1990) *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Roberge, Yves and Marie-Thérèse Vinet (1989) *La variation dialectale en grammaire universelle*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Roberts, Ian (1985) 'Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries.' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 21-sc q 0.2400000 0 0 0.2400000 372.99 721.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1997). *The Morphosyntax of Verb Movement: A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Zwicky, Arnold and Geoff Pullum (1983) 'Cliticisation vs. inflection: English *n't*.' *Language* 59: 502-513.

Theresa Biberauer & Ian Roberts

Linguistics Department
Sidgwick Avenue
University of Cambridge
Cambridge
CB3 9DA
United Kingdom

mtb23@cam.ac.uk
igr20@cam.ac.uk