The (b) examples, which involve conjoining of S and Š 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 Šs 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.
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You Don’t Have Tô*
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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

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{likely to} \\
*\text{likely tó}
\end{cases}
\]

* 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 hâ . . . 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 \( \{ \text{to ask to} \} \) is most unlikely.

(3) Tony would have preferred not to sleep on a wooden pillow. However, he's been \( \{ \text{persuaded to} \} \) by his friends.

(4) I'm sure you didn't enjoy my first piano recital. You would've had to be extraordinary \( \{ \text{to have} \} \).

(5) I'm sure you didn't enjoy my first piano recital. \( \{ \text{To have} \} \) would have been extraordinary.

(6) I can't believe you're acting in *Finian's Rainbow*. You would have to be crazy \( \{ \text{to be} \} \).

(7) I wouldn't be upset not to be chosen. But, on the other hand, I wouldn't be upset \( \{ \text{to be} \} \).

(8) Though the kids are trying to be quiet, we don't really expect them \( \{ \text{to be} \} \).

(9) A: I'm going to be very, very nice to everyone tonight.
    B: \( \{ \text{Do be} \} \).

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 \( \text{wh-word like how} \) 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 \( \{ \text{hów to} \} \).

(11) Danny expects to finish the renovations in a week, but most of us think he's likely \( \{ \text{néver to} \} \).

(12) Everyone intends not to fill in the questionnaire, but I think we can persuade \( \{ \text{Edith to} \} \).

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 \( \{ \text{persuade Edith to} \} \).
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;¹ for instance:

(1') I didn’t see the exhibit last time, but this time I’m
   { likely to see it
   { likely to see it’

(4') I’m sure you didn’t enjoy my first piano recital.
   You would’ve had to be extraordinary
   { to have enjoyed it
   { to have enjoyed it’

(7') I wouldn’t be upset not to be chosen, But, on the other hand, I wouldn’t be upset
   { to be chosen
   { to be chosen’

(10') I’d like to yodel, but I don’t know
   { how to yodel
   { how to 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 have’.

(15) A: You haven’t made your bed yet.
    B: I have.

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.² 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

¹ 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).

² 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 to?
(ii) When did he finally come to?
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 ásk 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 \{cán be\}.

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.³ Verbs other than have

³ 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 partic-
iples *been* and *being* (which, as (26) and (27) below demon-
strate, 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 comple-
ments to the verbs *let, make, help, see*, and the like (which of
course do not call up the constraint—see (30)).

(26) I expected that they would be troublesome, and
they *

(27) I expected that they would be troublesome, and
they *

(28) I don't think the machines work, but Ann thinks they
do.

(29) She promised she'd help, and I'm sure she will.

(30) Trish will let David talk with his mouth full, but he
won't let her.

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 *

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

---

4 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.

5 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 has done.

(34) We expected them to be making a great deal of noise, and when we walked in the door they were doing.

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. 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 to ask to do so is most unlikely.

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