when they have weak agreement -features."(Radford,1997: 227) Furthermore, "if we assume AgrS has strong specifier -features in English , it follows that subjects will always raise to spec- AgrSP." (Radford,1997: 227)

In order to account for the agreementless finite verbs and the auxiliaries that have objective subjects and do not allow subject inversion in Belfast English (BE) (e.g. *I/we/you/he/she /they hates syntax*), we maintain that since AgrS may have weak or strong head features , if it has weak head features ,then it also has weak specifier features, thereby its subject only raises as far as spec-TP, where it is checked objective case by default. That is, since the subject needs to be case-checked but is unable to raise to raise to spec-AgrSP to check nominative case, the subject checks objective case in spec-TP as a last resort . Thus, we maintain that all finite clauses contain an AgrSP projection in addition to (and *on top of*) a TP projection. (230)

A different kind of argument in favor of the split IP hypothesis is found in the phenomenon called **scrambling,** which is traditionally analyzed as involving adjunction of the moved constituent to a maximal projection higher up in the structure. (227) For example, in Early Modern English the complement of a verb could be scrambled -i.e. moved out of its underlying position as a complement of the verb into some position higher up in the clause ***Thy physics*** *I will try* ***t*** *(King, All s Well that Ends Well, II i)* . ***Thy physics*** is adjoined to the left of the IP headed by *will.*

Just as recent work has argued in favor of splitting IP into two different projections (a subject agreement phrase and a tense phrase), so too it has been argued that the verb phrase should similarly be split into a number of different projections including one headed by an **object agreement** constituent (designated as AgrO). (231) The object agreement phrase (=AgrOP) is