I Raising Asymmetries - A 8-based Approach  
(Chomsky (1993))

(1) He is here.  He isn't here.  Is he here?

(2) He (is) here.  He ain't here.  Is he here?

(3) He dances.  *He doesn't dance.  *Dances he?

(4) 'Inf' is not one head; it consists of (at least) Tense and Agr, each heading its own projection.

(5) English Agr, because not morphologically rich, is 'opaque' to 8-roles transmission. Thus, if a verb with 8-roles to assign were to raise, it would be unable to assign them, resulting in a violation of the 8-criterion. (Pollock (1989))

(6a) Bob be writing his assignments
   b Bob don't be *ben't writing his assignments

(7a) Do you be happy when you talk to your sister?
   b *Be you happy when you talk to your sister?

(8a) Bob be getting mail from his friends
   b Bob be writing his assignments
   b *Be you happy when you talk to your sister?

(9a) It be raining a lot during the summer
   b It be a blue car parked on the street at night

II A Minimalist Approach  
(Chomsky (1993))

(10a) Strong lexicalism: verbs are pulled from the lexicon fully inflected.
   b The inflected V raises to Agr (and T) to 'check' the features it already has. This checking can, in principle, take place anywhere in a derivation on the path to LF.
   c Once a feature of Agr has done its checking work, it disappears.

(11) So what's the difference between French, a language where all verbs can raise, and English?

(12a) In French, the V-features of Agr (i.e., those that check features of a V) are strong.
   b In English, the V-features of Agr are weak.

(13a) If V raises to Agr overtly, the V-features of Agr check the features of the V and disappear. If V delays raising until LF, the V-features of Agr survive into PF.
   b V-features are not legitimate PF objects.
   c Strong features are visible at PF; weak features are not. Surviving strong features cause the derivation to 'crash' at PF.
   d This forces overt V-raising in French.

(14) In English, delaying the raising until LF does not result in an ill-formed PF object, so such a derivation is possible. What makes it necessary is:
(15) 'Procrastinate': Whenever possible, delay an operation until LF.

(16) Why do auxiliary have and be raise overtly?
(17) Have and be are semantically vacuous, hence not visible to LF operations. Thus, if they have not raised overtly, they will not be able to raise at all. Their unchecked features will cause the LF to crash. If habitual be has meaning (even though it lacks 8-roles), it will be visible in LF, so nothing will demand that it raise overtly.

(18) Questions about (17): (A) Should syntactic operations, even those in the LF component, care about purely semantic properties? (B) Even instances of have and be are arguably possessing semantic content raise overtly. (C) According to (17), no language should allow inflected auxiliaries in situ, yet in Swedish, auxiliary verbs pattern exactly with main verbs in remaining in situ in embedded clauses.

(19a) Is there a solution / There isn't a solution
   b Have you any money / I haven't any money

(20a) ... om hon inte oftä sett honom
   b * om hon har inte oftä sett honom
   c * Om hon inte har oftä sett honom

III Notes Towards a Hybrid Minimalist Account

(21) Chomsky's lexicalist account demands that Agr and T are just abstract features that check against features of fully inflected verbs which raise to them. The earlier accounts treated such Inf items as bound morphemes that had to become affixes on otherwise bare verbs. Can both possibilities coexist? (22) sketches such a possibility.

(22a) French verbs are fully inflected in the lexicon (possibly correlating with the fact that there are no bare forms; even the infinitive has an ending).
   b English auxiliaries are fully inflected in the lexicon (possibly correlating with the fact that they are highly suppletive, although main verb go also has a highly suppletive past tense).
   c All other English verbs are bare in the lexicon.

(23) Inf is freely an affix or a set of abstract features.

(24a) Finite featural Inf is strong in both French and English.
   b Affixal Inf must merge with a V, a PF process (distinct from syntactic head movement) demanding adjacency. (Halle and Marantz (1993); Bobaljik (1993); Lasnik (1994); all essentially following Chomsky (1957))

(25a) ... Inf ... V ... OK. V will overtly raise.
   +F  +F
   b ... Inf ... V ... OK. PF merger.
   *A* +F bare
   c ... Inf ... V ... * at LF. +F of I won't be checked;
   +F bare * at PF as well, since +F is strong.
   d ... Inf ... V ... * at LF. +F of V won't be checked.
   *A* +F * at PF also, if merger fails.
(26)a French Inf is always to be a feature.
b English Inf will always to be a feature, when the verb is auxiliary have or be.
c English Inf will always to be a feature with any other verb.

(27)a *John not left (Merger couldn’t have taken place because of non-adjacency.)
b *John left not (Left isn’t in the lexicon, so no feature could drive raising.)

(28) Jean (n’)aime pas Marie

(29) John has not left

(30)a ..., om hon inte oft haar sett honom
b * om hon inte oft haar sett honom

(31) Swedish verbs, like French verbs, are pulled from the lexicon inflected. The features responsible for V-raising are weak in Swedish, strong in French.

(32)a John is not foolish
b *Be not foolish
c Be foolish
d Don’t be foolish

(33)a The Imperative morpheme (generated in the position of Tense) is strictly affixal, hence there will never be raising to it (just merger with it)
b OR Imp is freely affixal or featural, and be and auxiliary have (like main verbs) lack imperative forms in the lexicon.

(34)a *Not leave (Lack of adjacency blocks merger)
b *Not be foolish

(35) John slept, and now Mary will

(36)a *John slept, and now Mary will slept
b John slept, and now Mary will sleep

(37) *John was here, and Mary will too

(38)a *John was here and Mary will too here too
b John was here and Mary will be here too

(39) Leave. I don’t want to.
(40) Mary left. I don’t want to.

(41) Be quiet. I don’t want to.

(42) Mary is quiet. *I don’t want to.

(43)a Bob be writing his assignments
b Bob don’t be *bent writing his assignments

(44)a Do you be happy when you talk to your sister?
b *Be you happy when you talk to your sister?

(45) AAE has an affixal habitual morpheme. It is phonetically null, just like the imperative morpheme, yet morpho-syntactically active, just like the imperative morpheme.
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