Speaker B: No ,I don't really want to. (omission of Infinitival *to-* complement)

*No ,I don't really want to go to. (omission of prepositional complement).

In the late 1970's ,Chomsky suggested that there are significant similarities between Infinitival *to-* and a typical auxiliary *should.*

(i) They occupy the same position within the clause (i.e. between subject and verb)

(ii) Both Infinitival *to-* and the auxiliary *should* require a verb in the infinitive form:

a- It's vital [that John *should* show interest].

b- It's vital [for John *to* show interest].

c-* It's vital [that John *should* showing interest].

d- -* It's vital [for John *to* showing interest].

(ii) Both Infinitival *to-* and the auxiliary *should* allow ellipsis of its complement:

a- I don't really want to go to the dentist's ;but I know I should.

b- I don't really want to go to the dentist's ;but I just don't want to.

c.* I don't really want to go to the dentist's ;but I just don't want.

Chomsky concludes that "the fact that *to* patterns like the auxiliary *should* in several respects strengthens the case for regarding Infinitival *to-* and auxiliaries as belonging to the same category."(Radford,1997:48)This category which comprises finite auxiliaries and infinitival *to* is labelled by Chomsky in 198(82) as **INFL** or **inflection** and in 1986b(3) as simply **INFL** or **I**. Thus, for