form the VP *smokes ø cigars;* then merging this VP with a null INFL to form the I-bar INFL *smokes ø cigars,* which in turn is merged with the pronoun *he* to form the IP above. The pronoun *he* carries the head -features [3MSNom] indicating that it is third person masculine singular nominative. The verb *smoke* carries the head -feature [Pres] indicating that it is a present -tense form. This feature is attracted to INFL , in order to ensure that INFL will be interpretable at LF (by virtue of carrying a tense-feature). The verb *smoke* also carries the specifier -feature [3MSNom], indicating that it requires a third person masculine singular nominative subject. But since the specifier-features of a head can only be checked in relation to the specifier of the phrase containing the head, we cannot check the specifier-features of *smokes* against the head- features of *he* because the two are contained in different phrases (*smokes* is the head of VP ;and *he* is the specifier of IP). And since finite verbs in MSE carry weak agreement-features (as indicated from the fact that null subjects are not allowed), the verb cannot move from V to INFL. Therefore, the weak agreement-features carried by the verb *smokes* are checked by **percolation(attraction)** to INFL. The [3MSNom] specifier-features of INFL can then be checked against the corresponding [3MSNom] person/number/ case head- features of *he,* and thereby erased (along with the uninterpretable nominative -case head-feature of *he*). This analysis correctly predicts that since INFL in this sentence contains no overt item (it only carries a present -tense head-feature), it may be tagged by a present-tense form of the dummy auxiliary *do* ;(i.e. *He smokes cigars ,does he? /*smokes he?* Or *He smokes cigars ,doesn't he?)*

II: Exercise

Discuss the derivation of the following Shakespearean sentences: