



---

You Don't Have Tó

Author(s): Arnold M. Zwicky and Nancy S. Levin

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (Summer, 1980), pp. 631-636

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178184>

Accessed: 04/10/2011 14:36

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The (b) examples, which involve conjoining of S and  $\bar{S}$  on my analysis, are judged by most informants to be worse than the (a) examples. Without pretending to know exactly what is going on here, I simply note that a filtering approach which categorizes *that*-less relatives as  $\bar{S}$ s seems not to be able to explain the contrasts in (23)–(24). If the badness of the (b) examples is not deemed sufficient to merit ungrammatical status (or if the coordination principle is wrong), something beyond what I have said may be required.

### References

- Böer, S. (1978) "'Who' and 'Whether': Towards a Theory of Indirect Question Clauses," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2.
- Bresnan, J. (1976) "Nonarguments for Raising," *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 485–501.
- Bresnan, J. and J. Grimshaw (1978) "The Syntax of Free Relatives in English," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 331–391.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik (1977) "Filters and Control," *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 425–504.
- Culicover, P. (1976) *Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.
- Gazdar, G. (ms.) "English as a Context-Free Language."
- Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 2, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- McCloskey, J. (1978) *A Fragment of a Grammar of Modern Irish*, Texas Linguistics Forum/12, University of Texas at Austin.
- Postal, P. (1974) *On Raising*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

### YOU DON'T HAVE Tó\*

Arnold M. Zwicky,  
The Ohio State University  
Nancy S. Levin,  
The Ohio State University

English contrastive VPs ending in *to* ((1)–(3) below), *have* ((4) and (5)), or *be* ((6)–(9)) are sometimes grammatical, sometimes not, depending on the stress pattern they have:

- (1) I didn't see the exhibit last time, but this time I'm  
 { likely to }  
 { \*likely tó }

\* We are indebted to Elizabeth Zwicky, for uttering the following sentences,

- (i) I'm sure you didn't enjoy mine [my first piano recital]. You would've had to be superhuman to há . . . tó have.

and thereby providing us with the puzzle we examine in this squib.

- (2) I don't think you'll have anyone want to take early exams. For anyone  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{to ásk to} \\ * \text{to ask tó} \end{array} \right\}$  is most unlikely.
- (3) Tony would have preferred not to sleep on a wooden pillow. However, he's been  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{persuáded to} \\ * \text{persuaded tó} \end{array} \right\}$  by his friends.
- (4) I'm sure you didn't enjoy my first piano recital. You would've had to be extraordinary  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tó have} \\ * \text{to háve} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (5) I'm sure you didn't enjoy my first piano recital.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Tó have} \\ * \text{To háve} \end{array} \right\}$  would have been extraordinary.
- (6) I can't believe you're acting in *Finian's Rainbow*. You would have to be crazy  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tó be} \\ * \text{to bé} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (7) I wouldn't be upset not to be chosen. But, on the other hand, I wouldn't be upset  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tó be} \\ * \text{to bé} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (8) Though the kids are trying to be quiet, we don't really expect them  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tó be} \\ * \text{to bé} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (9) A: I'm going to be very, very nice to everyone tonight.  
B:  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Dó be} \\ * \text{Do bé} \end{array} \right\}$ .

In the grammatical examples in (1)–(9), the stressed word is itself a verb or the infinitive marker *to*. But this is not essential. The same pattern holds when the stressed word is a *wh*-word like *how* in (10), an adverb like *never* in (11), or an NP like *Edith* in (12);

- (10) I'd like to yodel, but I don't know  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hów to} \\ * \text{how tó} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (11) Danny expects to finish the renovations in a week, but most of us think he's likely  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{néver to} \\ * \text{never tó} \end{array} \right\}$ .
- (12) Everyone intends not to fill in the questionnaire, but I think we can persuade  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Édith to} \\ * \text{Edith tó} \end{array} \right\}$ .

Moreover, the stressed word does not have to be the next-to-last in the VP:

- (13) We can't force her to fill in the questionnaire, but I think we can  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{persuáde Edith to} \\ * \text{persuade Edith tó} \end{array} \right\}$ .

We conclude that one determinant of ungrammaticality in these examples is contrastive stress on *to/have/be* as the *last word* of certain constituents.

Next, we note that the sources for the ungrammatical elliptical constructions above are all grammatical;<sup>1</sup> for instance:

- (1') I didn't see the exhibit last time, but this time I'm  
 { likely to see it }  
 { likely tó see it }.
- (4') I'm sure you didn't enjoy my first piano recital.  
 You would've had to be extraordinary  
 { tó have enjoyed it }  
 { to háve enjoyed it }.
- (7') I wouldn't be upset not to be chosen, But, on the  
 other hand, I wouldn't be upset { tó be chosen }  
 { to bé chosen }.
- (10') I'd like to yodel, but I don't know { hów to yodel }  
 { how tó yodel }.

That is, a second determinant of ungrammaticality in (1)–(13) is what follows—or rather, fails to follow—*to*, *have*, and *be*.

A third determinant is that ungrammaticality results only for *infinitive have*, not the finite verb *have*; compare (4), (5), and (14) with (15):

- (14) A: Has Wilma finished it?  
 B: No, but she soon { will have }  
 { \*will háve }.
- (15) A: You haven't made your bed yet.  
 B: I háve.

*Be*, of course, is only an infinitive, so that we can offer no infinitive/finite contrasts. For *to*, the infinitive/finite division does not apply in any straightforward way, since *to* is not a verb.<sup>2</sup> We will suppose in what follows that the complementizer *to* and the infinitive auxiliary verbs *have* and *be* constitute a grammatical class, for which we coin the name *infinitoids*.

Thus far we have argued that infinitoids are ungrammatical when they occur with contrastive stress at the end of certain constituents. It might be suggested that the problem with the original examples (1)–(13) has to do with a failure of parallelism

<sup>1</sup> There are speakers who disfavor the nonelliptical examples with stressed *to*. Some maintain that it simply does not make sense to place contrastive stress on a meaningless morpheme like *to*. But even these speakers show some form of the constraint we are discussing, since they share our judgments on (1)–(9).

<sup>2</sup> There is a possibly related contrast between the complementizer *to* in the examples above and the preposition and particle *to*, as in (i) and (ii), which have stressed *to* sentence-finally.

- (i) Who did you give it tó?  
 (ii) When did he finally come tó?

between the stress patterns of two clauses—that, for example, the problem with (2) arises from the fact that a pattern *ask tó* in the second clause simply would not be parallel to the pattern *ask to* of the first clause. This proposal predicts, incorrectly, that nonelliptical variants like (1'), (4'), (7'), and (10') should be as bad as the originals. And in fact there are elliptical examples like (16), in which the nonparallel version is grammatical and the parallel version is not.

- (16) I believe that Jim can *bé* happy, but no one else thinks that he  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{cán be} \\ \text{*can bé} \end{array} \right\}$ .

Now we propose to sharpen the sense of *at the end of certain constituents* in our earlier statement. First, a following gap appears to be crucial, since the constraint on infinitoids does not apply to the verb *be* 'exist', a verb that has no complement:

- (17) To *bé*, or *nót to bé*: that is the question.

Next, the gaps in all our examples thus far turn out to have been created by a single rule, namely VP Deletion (VPD). Stressed infinitival *have*, *be*, and *to* are fine when a following gap has some different source—*Wh* Movement in (18) and (19), Topicalization in (20) and (21), *Though* Inversion in (22), and Right Node Raising in (23); for instance:

- (18) I've made some pot roast, or I can get you some shrimp. What are you going to *háve*?  
 (19) At first you said you were going into the Marines; now you're planning to go to theological school. What do you want to *bé* when you grow up?  
 (20) I don't buy many clothes, but that suit I want to *háve*.  
 (21) I'm a competent researcher, but a good teacher I could never *bé*.  
 (22) Quiet though he tried to *bé*, Alex made enough noise to wake the dead.  
 (23) Barb decided *tó*—but Leo decided *nót to*—participate in the discussion.

The essential involvement of VPD in the constraint is further supported by the fact that only the peculiar set of items *to*, *have*, and *be* exhibit the constraint.<sup>3</sup> Verbs other than *have*

<sup>3</sup> It might be argued that examples like (18) and (20) are not comparable to VPD cases like (4) and (5), on the grounds that the former involve main verb *have*, the latter aspectual *have*. Crucial comparisons are not available with *have*, since the *only* rule creating gaps after (infinitival) aspectual *have* is VPD. With *be*, however, there are crucial comparisons: stressed main verb *be* is acceptable before gaps like those in (19) and (21), created by rules other than VPD, but unacceptable before VPD gaps like those in (8) and (9).

and *be* occur freely in their stressed infinitival forms before gaps—gaps created by rules other than VPD—as (24) and (25) illustrate.

- (24) Everyone thinks that Millie will pass the exam, but I don't even think she'll try.  
 (25) I asked Norman why he was sobbing, but he wouldn't say.

That is what we should expect if VPD is the only rule calling up the constraint, since VPD never leaves a main verb (other than *be*) as a remainder. The possible remainders of VPD are: the infinitoids *to*, *have*, and *be* (already discussed); the participles *been* and *being* (which, as (26) and (27) below demonstrate, follow the same pattern as the infinitoids); finite forms of the auxiliary *do* (which, like finite forms of *have*, do not show this pattern; see (28)); the modals (which pattern with the finite forms—see (29)); and perhaps, subject NPs of complements to the verbs *let*, *make*, *help*, *see*, and the like (which of course do not call up the constraint—see (30)).<sup>4</sup>

- (26) I expected that they would be troublesome, and they { háve been }  
           { \*have beén }.  
 (27) I expected that they would be troublesome, and they { wére being }<sup>5</sup>  
           { \*were béing }.  
 (28) I don't think the machines work, but Ann thinks they dó.  
 (29) She promised she'd help, and I'm sure she wíll.  
 (30) Trish will let David talk with his mouth full, but hé won't let hér.

Further support for the involvement of VPD comes from British English, where VPD can remainder infinitival *do*. The constraint applies just as we would predict, as illustrated in (31).

- (31) Trace theorists will solve these problems, Well, at least they { cóuld do }  
           { \*could dó }.

For British speakers, finite *do* left by VPD, as in (28) above,

<sup>4</sup> Grosu (1975, 201) refers to some speakers who reject examples like (30). The constraint for these speakers seems to be unrelated to the constraint we are discussing here.

<sup>5</sup> Sentences with stranded *be being* are rejected by many speakers; see the discussion in Pullum and Wilson (1977, 760–762). For these speakers, a constraint above and beyond the one we are examining here blocks both versions of (27).

does not obey the constraint, and of course neither does a (main verb) infinitival *do* followed by a gap due to some rule other than VPD:

- (32) We must do some of the exercises. Which shall we do?

But the participles *done* and *doing* obey it:

- (33) Two years ago Millie had never seen a penguin, but now she  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hás done} \\ \text{*has dóne} \end{array} \right\}$ .

- (34) We expected them to be making a great deal of noise, and when we walked in the door they  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{wére doing} \\ \text{*were dóing} \end{array} \right\}$ .<sup>6</sup>

We conclude that the offending configuration in our examples is the following: a contrastively stressed nonfinite verbal (infinitoid or participle) followed by a gap created by VPD. But why should this *be*? Why should this deletion rule be the offender, while other rules (as in (18)–(23)) are not? Why should zero anaphora offend, when anaphora with *do so* (as in (2') below) does not?

- (2') I don't think you'll have anyone want to take early exams. For anyone  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{to ásk to do so} \\ \text{to ask tó do so} \\ \text{to ask to dó so} \end{array} \right\}$  is most unlikely.

What is there about contrastive stress that calls up the constraint? And, finally, why should only *nonfinite* verbals be affected?

### References

- Grosu, A. (1975) "A Plea for Greater Caution in Proposing Functional Explanations in Linguistics," in R. E. Grossman, L. J. San, and T. J. Vance, eds., *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 170–208.
- Pullum, G. and D. Wilson (1977) "Autonomous Syntax and the Analysis of Auxiliaries," *Language* 53, 741–788.

<sup>6</sup> Many speakers reject stranded *be doing* as well as stranded *be being* (Pullum and Wilson (1977, 761f.)). For these speakers, both versions of (34) are unacceptable, and for the same reason that both versions of (27) are.