**Analysis: do is inserted in split head chains**

- Heads in the clausal spine form a head chain
  - (1) \( \chi \in C \times \{ T \} \times \{ V \} \times \{ v \} \cdots \)
  - (C is part of the head chain in V2 sentences)

A head chain is pronounced as an **inflected verb** in one of the positions (\( v \) in English, \( T \) in French, etc.).
(The precise mechanism of head chain formation is orthogonal. Possibilities include agreement, Head Movement/Lowering, or a mirror-theoretic complementation line.)

**Parameter:** Some languages require integrity of head chains

**Proposal:** In languages with special integrity conditions, head chains are built around a special \( V \):

- **Standard view:** Head chains are always in \( V \)
  - VP ellipsis & Split-by-deletion: *Standard view:*
    - Movement/Lowering, or a mirror-theoretic complementation line.
    - (The precise mechanism of head chain formation is orthogonal. Possibilities include agreement, Head Movement/Lowering, or a mirror-theoretic complementation line.)

- **Our proposal:** Heads in the clausal spine form a head chain
  - (1) A head chain that becomes dissociated from a lexical verb due to splitting
  - (2) Split-by-deletion (by heads & specifiers, not adjunctions: Bobaljik 1995)
  - (3) Split-by-intervention

**Disrupting the integrity of a \( V \)-chain causes do-support**

- **Standard view:** Do-support is due to blocking of head chain formation.
  - Our proposal: Head chains are fully formed but later split.
  - (2) Split-by-deletion
  - (3) Split-by-intervention (by heads & specifiers, not adjunctions: Bobaljik 1995)

**Do-support is not triggered by failure of Head Movement or Lowering**

- Do-support is not triggered by failure of some operation such as Head Movement or Lowering.
  - **Do-support is not triggered by idiosyncratic requirements of particular heads.**
  - **Do-support is triggered by special integrity conditions on certain head chains.**
  - **Variation in the surface position of do follows form independent parameters on verb position.**

**Do-support is not triggered by failure of Head Movement or Lowering**

**The traditional view**

  - **Do is inserted in stranded heads (typically \( T \)) as a Last Resort.**
  - A head is stranded if it’s affixal yet cannot combine with \( V \) (via Head Movement or Lowering).
  - **Wrong prediction: a language with V-to-T movement should not have do-support.**

- **Monnese has both V-to-T movement and do-support** (Bennicci & Poletto 2004, Bjorkman 2011)
  - Both auxiliaries and lexical verbs move to \( T \) and precede adverbs.

- **Do-support arises due to Split-by-intervention**
  - The lexical verb is pronounced low, despite the normal V-to-T.
  - A head chain is pronounced in \( C \) as do.

**Do-support is not triggered by idiosyncratic requirements of particular heads: Do can surface in \( C, T, v \) or in multiple positions, in a predictable way**

**Mainland Scandinavian (MSc): Do in C or v***

- **English: Do in C or T**
  - **VP ellipsis under auxiliaries: Do in v**
  - **VPE can result in do under auxiliaries:**
  - **CORRECT PREDICTION:** The lexical verb is pronounced low, despite the normal V-to-T.

- **Do surfaces in those same positions under VP ellipsis & Split-by-deletion:**
  - **With Split-by-intervention, do also surfaces in C or T:**

**Do in both T and v in the same sentence**

- **Do in both T and v in the same sentence**
  - (29) John said he would help ... but he doesn’t actually do any.