10.

(i) *She has gone to Paris ,**has'nt/ *doesn't** she?*

(ii) *She has her hair styled by Samy Saloon, doesn't she /*has 'nt she?*

"Given the I analysis of perfective *have* and the V analysis of causative *have* and the assumption that all clauses are IP constituents" (A.Radford,1997: 93), we can account for this difference between the perfective *have* and the causative *have* if we make the following assumption. "The I constituent which appears in the tag must carry the same semantic and grammatical properties as the I constituent in the main clause." (A.Radford,1997: 93) Thus, as the head I position of IP in 10(i) is filled by the perfective *have*, the tag question contains a copy of this auxiliary. But as the head I position of IP in 10(ii) is unfilled , it can only be tagged by the meaningless dummy auxiliary *does* (which carries the same present-tense feature as the unfilled I constituent in the main clause). "The assumption that auxiliaries in tags carry the same grammatical properties as the I constituent in the main clause provides us with evidence for positing that the unfilled I constituent ...carries tense-features (since these are copied in the auxiliary in the tag)." (A.Radford,1997: 93) This means that "the relevant tense-features percolate up from V to I when I is unfilled." (A.Radford,1997: 93) Therefore, "all finite clauses are IPs " ;and "since *to* infinitive clauses are also IPs ,we might generalize still further and say that all finite and infinitival clauses are IPs." (A.Radford,1997: 93)

Furthermore, "it would follow that all infinitive clauses contain an IP headed by *to* or its covert counterpart O ." (A.Radford,1997: 93) "We could say that verbs like *know/hear/let/watch/see* ...select an IP complement headed by the null infinitive particle O ;whereas