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I. Introductory Remarks

The phenomenon of wanna-contraction involves not only phonology but also morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Phonologically, /wənt#{tu/ (want to) contracts to /wата/ (wanna) by a chain of three mutations: the alveolar stop /t/ deletion, vowel reduction producing /ə/, and mutual assimilation between /n/ and /l/, creating alveolar nasal tap /n/. Morphologically, a rule of word-formation combines the verb want and its infinitival complement to to form a single word wanna. As a result, wanna no longer retains the original subcategorization of want. Unlike want, wanna takes neither an object nor infinitival to. The compound wanna is subcategorized for a verb in non-finite form. Syntactically, two conditions enforce the subject-verb agreement of wanna: (i) wanna is incompatible with subjects bearing the feature [+third person, +singular]; (ii) wanna is intrinsically either in present tense or in infinite tense. Semantically, the subject of wanna carries a [+animate] feature and AGENT role. Pragmatically, the wanna-contraction is permitted in casual, intimate, or derogatory contexts.

The scope of this paper is limited to the morphology and syntax of wanna-contraction therefore phonological, semantic, and pragmatic properties of wanna are treated only superficially. Section II consists of four subsections. Subsections 2.1. and 2.2. examine Barss' (1995) criticism of two types of previous analyses attempted within the framework of the principles and parameters approach: the linear adjacency analysis, and the government analysis. Subsection 2.3.
II. Previous Analyses and Their Problems

2.1. The adjacency analysis

Jaeggli’s (1980) linear adjacency analysis stipulates two conditions: Adjacency Condition on To-Contraction and PF Visibility (See Barss, 1995:682).

(1) Adjacency Condition on To-Contraction

An occurrence of infinitival to may contract leftward onto a verb α iff α and to are adjacent in the PF representation.

(2) PF Visibility

An EC α is visible (i.e., represented) at PF iff it has Case. PF Visibility (2) together with Adjacency Condition on To-Contraction (1) accounts for grammatical examples such as (3a) and ungrammatical examples like (3b), whose S-Structure representations are roughly shown in (4a) and (4b), respectively.

(3) a. I wanna be outside with John.
   b. *Who do you wanna kiss you?

(4) a. I [want [PRO to be outside with John]]
   b. Who do you [want [t to kiss you]]

The non-Case bearing PRO in (4a) will not be represented at PF due to (2). Consequently, the matrix verb want and the infinitival to will be adjacent at PF as required by (1), hence want and to can contract to wanna. On the other hand, the wh-trace in (4b) will be represented at PF because it has Case, thereby wanna-contraction is blocked by (1).

The adjacency account raises at least two problems. First, recent developments in Case theory (Chomsky 1993, Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Lasnik 1993) postulate that PRO is assigned null Case by the infinitival head. If this position is adopted, the adjacency account of
wanna-contraction cannot be maintained, since Adjacency Condition on To-Contraction (1) and PF Visibility (2) would predict that PRO blocks wanna-contraction. Second, the adjacency account cannot explain the ungrammaticality of examples like (5) taken from Postal and Pullum (1982:124). Here, the sequence want-PRO-to occurs and the adjacency account would incorrectly predict that want and to can contract to wanna.

(5) a. I don’t want [[PRO to flagellate oneself in public] to become standard practice in this monastery].
    b. *I don’t wanna flagellate oneself in public to become standard practice in this monastery.

2.2. The government analysis


(6) Government Condition on Contraction

An occurrence α of an inflected auxiliary or infinitival to may contract onto a head H iff H governs α at S-Structure.

As Aoun and Lightfoot (1984) argue, Government Condition on Contraction (6) precludes examples like (5b) since the matrix verb want does not govern the infinitival to. The disadvantage of the government account, however, is that if example (7a) has S-Structure representation (7b), then Government Condition on Contraction (6) prohibits wanna-contraction from occurring contrary to fact.

(7) a. I wanna be outside with John.
    b. Ii [vp want [cp [ip PROi [r to [vp be outside with John]])]]]

Notice that the maximal projection CP in (7b) intervenes between the infinitival to and the matrix verb want, blocking government and consequently want and to cannot contract to wanna. This problem can be resolved if the infinitival to is raised to C as in (8), where the matrix verb want governs the raised to.
The above solution encounters at least two problems. The first problem is that the above to-raising is dubious. There is no clear reason why the infinitival to should move to C. Barss (1995:685) points out that "recent work on movement theory (Chomsky 1986, 1991, 1993; Collins 1994; Epstein 1992; Rizzi 1991; Lasnik 1993) postulates that all movement must be forced by some morphosyntactic licensing requirement of the moved element (for example, NP-movement occurs to check the Case of NP; verb raising occurs to check Tense and Agr features of the verb; wh-movement occurs to license the [+wh] feature). Purely optional movement is precluded by economy principles (including the "Least Effort Principle," which licenses movement only if it is forced by some principle, and Greed, which further requires that an element move only to satisfy its own licensing requirements)."

Specifically, the alleged to-raising solution lacks a well-grounded motivation, and it is ad hoc. The solution is devised for the purpose of allowing want to govern to, so that a contraction rule requiring such a government relation can apply (See Pullum 1997:80n). It also raises problems about how the specifier-head feature checking between the checker to and the checked PRO is executed. The fact that PRO and to do not inflect for person, number, gender, and Case is not of advantage to the specifier-head feature checking. Moreover, a set of agreement features for PRO and to has not been clearly defined. In the absence of well-defined features for checking, the compatibility of the two elements remains nebulous. The same problem applies to Baltin's (1995:244) VP-internal subject hypothesis, in which an infinitival to base-generates in spec-IP, and a PRO subject originates in spec-VP, therefore PRO does not intervene between the matrix verb want and the infinitival to, allowing the two words to contract as in examples like (7a). Nevertheless, the assumption that the null Case of PRO is checked from outside its containing VP by infinitival to is questionable since the status of PRO and infinitival to are unclear with respect to the agreement feature specification as stated above. The second
problem is that the government account incorporates unrestricted movement of to to C, therefore it would predict contraction to be grammatical across a lexical subject. This contradicts fact as shown in (9a), whose S-Structure representation would be (9b).

(9) a. *I wanna John be outside with me.
    b. I [vp want [cp [c to] [ip John [t [vp be outside with me]]]]]

2.3. Barss' alternative analysis

Following the predicate-internal subject theory developed by Fukui and Speas (1986), Koopman and Sportiche (1991), Kuroda (1988), Manzini (1983), and Stowell (1981), Barss (1995) assumes two theses. One is that all θ-marking occurs within the maximal projection of the θ-marking (lexical) head, with the subject moved into [Spec, Agr,P] (in English type languages) to receive Case under specifier-head coindexing with Agr. The other is that auxiliary verbs raise to T, and the derived complex raises to Agr. Based on these assumptions, Barss claims that (7a)'s S-Structure representation is neither (7b) nor (8). The correct S-Structure representation would be (10), in which to is raised from TP to Agr. As a result of the to-raising, want governs to, allowing wanna-contraction. Barss (1995:690) immediately defends his analysis by saying that “want also governs PRO but this creates no problem under the reclassification of PRO as a Case-marked EC in Chomsky 1993, and Chomsky and Lasnik 1993”.

(10) I [vp want [agrp PRO [agr [t to] Agr]] [tp t [vp be outside with John]]]

Wanna-contraction, however, is blocked for infinitivals with overt subjects since they occur in structures like (11).

(11) I [vp want [agrp John [agr [t to] Agr]] [tp t [vp be outside with me]]]

Under the null Case theory of PRO, PRO in (10) receives Case within the complement clause in connection with a specifier-head relationship with to. Consequently, CP needs not be projected. But in (11) John remains Caseless because there is no C to assign Case to John. As for the reason why wanna-contraction is blocked in examples like (12), Barss (1995:690) explains that “the trace must receive Case from C,
forcing CP to be projected. CP blocks government of to by want, unless to moves to C; but such movement is blocked by Least Effort.”

(12) *Who do you wanna be outside with you?

Barss’ alternative account is not problem free. First, the null-Cased PRO in structures (10) and (11) would block the wanna-contraction, provided that Jaeggli’s PF Visibility (2) is in force and a null-Cased PRO counts as a visible empty category at PF. Second, rejecting the suggestion that control complements are uniformly CPs, Barss assumes that want takes a bare IP complement, thereby proposing structures (10) and (11). Such stipulation, however, creates a problem regarding the specifier-head feature agreement spelled out in the preceding section: The compatibility between PRO and to in terms of checking is unexecutable due to the absence of clearly defined agreement features for the two elements.

Tateishi (1996:131) recognizes a couple of more problems from a phonological point of view. First, phonological status of traces is unclear. Within the framework of the minimalist program, phonologically relevant information is separated from all other information at SPELL OUT. If this position is adopted, how can it be possible to check the syntactic information of wh-traces at PF? Relevant syntactic information of wh-trace is indispensable for the explanation of ungrammatical examples like (12). Second, wanna-contraction is an optional postlexical phonological adjustment. Since the wanna-contraction occurs after the syntax, it is too far from syntax to be stated in syntactic terms.

2.4. The morpholexical analysis

Acknowledging the importance of Brame’s (1976:142; 1981:286n) idea that wanna is a lexical item itself, Pullum (1997:85) puts forth a morpholexical rule defined under (13), which applies to what he calls therapy verbs such as want.

(13) To-Derivation

“The morpholexical rule (MLR_{to}) applies to therapy verbs to
derive synonymous lexemes of category V[-AUX] that are subcategorized for a bare infinitive complement and are associated with colloquial rather than formal style.”

To-Derivation (13) entails two postulations: Lexeme Wanna (14) and To-Derivation Constraint (15).

(14) Lexeme Wanna (Pullum 1977:95)
The morphologically derived item wanna has the verb want as its head, but has a distinct subcategorization from want (just as OVERCOME has a distinct subcategorization from COME): it needs an immediately following bare infinitival subjectless complement.

(15) To-Derivation Constraints (Postal and Pullum 1982:130)
A contraction trigger V can have a contracted form with infinitival to only if:
   i) to is the main verb of the initial direct object complement of the matrix clause whose main verb is V;
   ii) the final subject of the complement is identical to the final subject of the matrix.

To-Derivation (13) together with Lexeme Wanna (14) and To-Derivation Constraint (15) immediately explains grammatical examples (16) and ungrammatical examples (17).

(16) a. Teddy is the man I wanna succeed.
    b. I don't wanna be kissed by any frog. (final subject shared)

(17) a. *I wanna present themselves in my office all those students who failed the test.
    b. *I don't wanna any frog be kissed by me. (initial subjects shared)

(17a) is precluded, since the derived forms like wanna are subcategorized for a subjectless VP complement (or a nonfinite clause with controlled PRO subject). In (17b) the matrix subject and complement subject do not have the same referent, therefore by (15ii) the sentence is excluded.

Pullum (1977) also discusses the existence of liberal dialects which allow examples (18). The adjacency account, the government account
and Barss' alternative account all fail to explain such examples. In (18a-b) wanna-contraction is permitted across the alleged Case-marked trace. Example (18c), with high pitch and heavy accent on much, shows that an overt adverbial phrase fails to block wanna-contraction. The sequence want very much to is changed into want+to very much despite both syntactic and phonological nonadjacency of want and to.

(18) a. There wanna be a few changes made round here.  
   (Postal and Pullum 1978:16n)  
   b. Who do you wanna drive the car?  
   (Pullum 1977:96)  
   c. I wanna very MUCH go to the game this evening!  
   (Pullum 1977:91)

Setting aside (18a), Pullum (1997:96) accounts for (18b) by saying that liberal dialect speakers allow a phonological rule reducing want to to wanna that operates within the boundaries of intonational phrases in the sense of Selkirk (1984). As for (18c), Pullum (1997:92) explains that infinitival VPs with to can generally be separated from their matrix verbs as in examples such as I helped every night to wash the dishes.

Pullum's account is superior to the previous accounts we have seen so far, since it defies the idea that wanna contraction is purely syntactically conditioned. Pullum's analysis should be credited for pursuing the direction originally pointed out by Brame (1976:142) that wanna is a lexical item itself created through a rule of word-formation. We welcome such lexically-based analysis as corroborative to the RCS account, which we now turn to.

III. The RCS Analysis

I assume that the reader has a fair amount of knowledge regarding the theory of Recursive Categorical Syntax (RCS). If not then he/she is referred to Brame (1984, 1985, 1987, 1988) for the theoretical framework of RCS, and Aniya (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) for the recent RCS analyses of syntactic problems. It is, however, necessary for heuristic purposes to touch on the basic RCS
mechanisms. Immediately relevant to the present discussion are two devices: Word Induction, and the rule of Variable Continuation. Word Induction mechanically connects words and produces words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. Variable Continuation replaces variable X of variable words such as wh-words with appropriate category (or categories), thereby accounting for the long distance dependency relationship. The definition of each mechanism is given below.

(19) Word Induction

a. 1-Induction
If $L_i = \{x, \phi | y_1, ..., y_n \} \in \text{LEX}$ and $L_j = \{y, \psi_1, \sigma | \theta_1, ..., \theta_m \} \in \text{LEX}$, $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$, then $L_i(L_j) = \{x - y, \phi_1, \psi_1, \sigma | \theta_1, ..., \theta_m, y_n \} \in \text{LEX}$.

b. d-Induction
If $L_i = \langle \psi_n, ..., \psi_1 | x, \phi \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $L_j = \langle \psi_1, \sigma | \theta_1 \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$, then $(L_j)L_i = \langle \psi_n, ..., \psi_2, \theta_m, ..., \theta_1 | y - x, \sigma, \psi_1, \phi \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

c. generalized d-Induction
If $L_i = \langle \alpha_n, ..., \alpha_1 | x, \gamma_1, \sigma | \psi_1, ..., \psi_n \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $L_j = \langle \delta_n, ..., \delta_1 | y, \psi_1, \pi | \beta_1, ..., \beta \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $L_k = \langle \epsilon_n, ..., \epsilon_1 | z, \theta | \gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then $(L_k)L_i(L_j) = \langle \delta_n, ..., \delta_1, \alpha_n, ..., \alpha_1, \epsilon_m, ..., \epsilon_1 | z - x - y, \theta, \gamma_1, \sigma, \psi_1, \pi | \beta_1, ..., \beta, \psi_1, ..., \psi_n, \gamma_2, ..., \gamma_k \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

(20) Variable Continuation
If $\langle ..., | x, \phi | \psi \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $\langle ..., | y, \psi \sigma \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then $\langle ..., | x, \phi | \psi \sigma \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

The RCS analysis we are about to see assumes a twofold thesis (21).

(21) a. Wanna is created once and for all via a rule of Fusion, which combines words and create a new word.

b. Once wanna is created, it is registered in LEX as an induced lexical item with properties distinct from want.

Fusion is defined in (22).

(22) Fusion
If $\langle ..., | x, \phi | \psi \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $\langle ..., | y, \psi \theta \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then $\langle ..., | z, \phi \psi | \theta \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

There is one big difference between Fusion and Word Induction. In
Fusion the induced phonetic word is represented as z, whereas in Word Induction it is represented as x-y. What this means is that Fusion creates a new phonetic word, while Word Induction does not. Fusion is devised by the present author to account for contraction phenomena including wanna-contraction.

Let us now show in detail how Fusion works by taking concrete examples. Lexical items relevant to wanna-contraction are shown in (23) and (24).

\[(23)\]
\begin{align*}
a. \text{[want,VT}\ ^3 | T^e] & \\
b. \text{[want,VT} | T^e] &
\end{align*}

(23a) represents nonsingular, non-third-person want in present tense, which takes T^e as its argument, i.e. infinitival to. On the other hand, (23b) depicts want in infinite tense, which also takes T^e as its argument. Infinite-tense verbs are irrelevant to the subject-verb agreement features such as person, number, gender, etc., therefore agreement features are omitted in the lexical specification of (23b). Lexical specification (24) represents infinitival to, which takes a verb in infinite tense as its argument category. Given Fusion (22), lexical specifications (23) and (24), we can obtain wanna as shown in (25).

\[(25)\]
\begin{align*}
a. \text{[want,VT}^3 | T^e] & \rightarrow \text{[to,T^e|VT^e]} = \text{[wanna,VT}^3 | T^e|VT^e] \\
b. \text{[want,VT} | T^e] & \rightarrow \text{[to,T^e|VT^e]} = \text{[wanna,VT}^eT^e|VT^e]
\end{align*}

Notice that we get wanna instead of want-to. The latter word would be created if we apply Word Induction instead of Fusion. Fusion as it stands does not specify exactly what phonological process is involved in creating wanna. This belongs to the phonology of wanna-contraction. We do not go into this topic, since it is outside of the scope of this paper.5

Once wanna is created, it is registered as a lexical item. Two pieces of confirmatory evidence for this lexicalization are produced in Brame (1981:286n). First, the wh-movement operation into lexical
items is not possible as shown in (26). Second, wanna-contraction is not possible in subjunctive and quasi-imperative contexts as illustrated in the (b) examples of (27) and (28), respectively; while want to is much better as the (a) examples substantiate.

(26) a. who is John hit ing Bill.
   b. who do you wan na see Bill.

(27) a. The director requires that all the actors want to give their most.
   b. *The director requires that all the actors wanna give their most.

(28) a. Want to do that and you'll be rewarded.
   b. *Wanna do that and you'll be rewarded.

A couple of more corroborative examples are given under (29).

(29) a. I wanna be a super model.
   b. I saw a bunch of madonnawannabes at the civic center last night.

I suspect that the word wannabe(s) is a result of back-formation. First, want to be (like) Madonna contracts to wannabe (like) Madonna, and then undergoes a further change transforming into madonnawannabe. This means that the verb wanna is created first and then lexicalized prior to the noun wannabe. Closely related is the existence of back-formation words such as my would-be fiancee, his has-been wife, and her had-been husband. Here, each underlined word is created by amalgamating two predicative verbs: would be, has been, and had been, respectively. The back-formation words have established their lexicality just like wanna.

The lexicalized wanna analysis immediately explains why examples like (30) are ill-formed. Here, the symbol ?* means 'can be acceptable in an extremely limited situation'.

(30) a. *I wanned go home.
   b. *He / She wanna come to my birthday party.
   c. *Who wanna come to my birthday party?
   d. *I wanna him sing.
   e. ?*Who do you wanna sing?
   f. *Who do you wanna be outside with Mary?
Wanna is intrinsically either in present tense or in infinite tense, therefore it is unsuffixible with either the past tense suffix -ed nor the past participial suffix -ed. In (30b-c), the subject-verb agreement is violated. Wanna carries the feature [-third person,-singular] as shown in (25a), therefore it is incompatible with a subject in third person. Unlike want, wanna does not select D as its argument. This means that wanna does not take an object NP, therefore examples (30d-e) are precluded. Example (30f) contains a superfluous element, hence is ungrammatical. The example becomes grammatical by getting rid of either Mary or Who. In our RCS framework, examples like (30f) cannot be produced because a superfluous element is put out of the way in executing Word Induction.

In conjunction with the above analysis of ill-formed examples, let us now show how our RCS analysis accounts for well-formed counterparts of (30f): Who do you wanna be outside with? and Do you wanna be outside with Mary? The induction of the latter sentence requires the lexical items in (31).

(31) a. $VT^*_{\text{aux}} | \Lambda, \Delta | D_n$
   b. $|do_{\text{aux}}, VT^*| VT^>$
   c. $|\Lambda, \$, | D$
   d. $|you, D_2|$
   e. $|wanna, VT^-| VT^>$
   f. $|be, VT^-| A, P$
   g. $|outside, A|$
   h. $|with, P | D|$
   i. $|Mary, D|$

(31a) guarantees the subject-auxiliary inversion. Given the above lexical specifications, the target sentence can be obtained in a straightforward fashion as shown in (32).

(32) a. $|\Lambda, \$, | D > (|you, D_2|) = |you, D_2|$
   b. $(|do_{\text{aux}}, VT^*| VT^>) < V T^* | \Lambda, \Delta | D_n > (|you, D_2| | VT^>) = |do-you, VT^* | \Lambda, \Delta | D_n > (|you, D_2| | VT^>)$
   c. $|do-you, VT^* | D_2 | VT^* > (|wanna, VT^-| VT^>) = |do-you-wanna,
The induction of the sentence *Who do you wanna be outside with?* requires Variable Continuation (20), variable word (33a), free determiner (33b), and the lexical specifications of relevant words in (31a-i).

(33) a. $\text{who},?,D_3\mid\text{VT} \text{X} D_3$

b. $\Lambda_3 D$

Given the above development, the target sentence can be produced as shown in (34). Here, intermediate induction steps are omitted to save the space.

(34) a. $\text{do-you-wanna-be-outside-with}, V T_2\Delta D_2 VT^{-T'} VT^{-AP} | D > ( | \Lambda, x D | ) = \text{do-you-wanna-be-outside-with}, V T_2\Delta D_2 VT^{-T'} VT^{-AP} | D >$

b. $\text{who},?,D_3|\text{VT} \text{X} D_3 > ( | \text{do-you-wanna-be-outside-with}, V T_2\Delta D_2 VT^{-T'} VT^{-AP} | D >$

$\Delta D_2 VT^{-T'} VT^{-AP} | D >$

Notice that the variable X of $\text{who},?,D_3|\text{VT} \text{X} D_3 >$ is replaced with $\Delta D_2 VT^{-T'} VT^{-AP}$ by the rule of Variable Continuation as shown in (34b). Notice also that $\text{who},?,D_3|\text{VT} \text{X} D_3 >$ contains two instances of $D_3$, which bears two subscripted features: the coindex x, and third person feature 3. By virtue of these two devices, *who* is appropriately identified as the object of the preposition *with* in (34b).

What remains to be accounted for are the examples of liberal dialects (18). The examples are dialect specific and hence idiosyncratic: *wanna* can occur with existential *there* as in (18a);
wanna can take an object as in (18b); and wanna can occur adjacent to an adverbial phrase like very much as in (18c). The RCS approach to these cases is simple and straightforward. No theoretical elaboration or ad hoc device is necessary to explain (18c), since adverbs such as very much in general can occur adjacent to a verb either on the right side or on the left side; or it can occur sentence-finally. Therefore, the analysis predicts that the liberal dialect speaker also allows examples I very much wanna go to the game this evening! and I wanna go to the game this evening very much! And indeed they are a lot better than (18c) in the standard dialect. Example (18b) is explained by simply introducing the primitive word given in (35a). Notice that the word selects D and VT~ as its arguments. This means that the idiosyncratic wanna takes an object and to-infinitive complement, therefore sentences like (18b) are inducible. Lexical specification (35b) immediately accounts for (18c). Notice that (35b) does not require an animate subject bearing AGENT role. A speaker of the liberal dialect associates this property with wanna in his/her mental lexicon. This assumption is substantiated by the fact that the liberal dialect speaker allows examples in (36) taken from Postal and Pullum (1978:16n). Therefore, the selectional restriction feature [+animate], and AGENT role are irrelevant for the idiosyncratic wanna.

(35) a. |wanna,VT-T-|D,VT~

b. <THERE|wanna,VFORM PRES|INF>

(36) a. There want to be a few changes made round here.

b. It wants to rain for a few weeks to get the soil wet.

c. More attention wants to be paid to the things he says.

IV. Concluding Remarks

It has been shown that the adjacency account, the government analysis, and Barss’ (1995) alternative analysis all fail to explain the basic facts regarding the wanna-contraction because of two inadequacies: (i) theory-internal technical problems surface as by-products of the recent development of the principles and parameters
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approach; and (ii) a lexicalized wanna assumption is totally ignored. Achieving a sharp departure from purely syntactic accounts and acknowledging the significance of Brame's (1976:142; 1981:286n) idea that wanna is a lexical item itself, Pullum (1997) offers a morpholexical analysis, which gives a natural explanation for both the standard dialect examples and the liberal dialect examples. Pursuing Brame's (1981:286n) position, the RCS analysis advances a simple and natural account on the basis of two claims: (i) Once wanna is created by Fusion, it is registered in LEX as a lexical item; (ii) the lexical item wanna carries properties distinct from want. Without calling for any theoretical development or ad hoc device, the RCS analysis explains not only the distribution of wanna in the standard dialect but it also accounts for liberal dialect examples discussed in Pullum (1997) from the more lexically-oriented point of view. The liberal dialect examples follow from the existence of idiosyncratic wanna, which can not only take an object but it can also occur with a non-animate subject without AGENT role.

Notes

*I would like to thank Peter Skaer and two anonymous Hiroshima University Gengobunkakenkyu reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions.

1. Phonology of wanna-contraction is controversial. Radford (1997:269) analyzes the contraction into a couple of sound changes: assimilation of /n+t/ to /nn/, and degemination reducing /nn/ to /n/. Tateishi (1996) considers wanna a postlexical flapping on the dental nasal stop. I suspect wanna-contraction to be a tripartite mutation: deletion of the final /t/ of /wānt/ (want); vowel reduction changing the word final /u/ of /tu/ (to) into /o/; and coalescence uniting the word final /n/ of /wān/ and the word initial /t/ of /tə/ to form nasal tap /ŋ/. (See Aniya (in preparation)).

2. Postal and Pullum (1978:16) discuss the existence of liberal dialects which permit examples such as in (i).
(i) There wanna be a few changes made round here. Here, the subject of wanna bears neither [+animate] feature nor AGENT role. See Subsection 2.4. and Section III of this paper for details.

3. The therapy verbs include want, have, got, ought, supposed, prospective go, and habitual used, all of which can phonetically fuse with infinitival to. (See Pullum 1997:81)

4. Pullum (1997:85) also gives a phonological and semantic definition of the phenomenon: “Phonologically, MLR_{\alpha}(X)=X /t\ddot{o}/ for the therapy verbs, and otherwise is not defined. Semantically, the operation is vacuous: MLR_{\alpha}(X) denotes exactly what X denotes. In the case of want, for example, want'(to'(\beta))(\alpha)\Leftrightarrow wanna'(\beta)(\alpha)—and notice in addition that to'(\beta)\Leftrightarrow(\beta), for infinitival to is itself semantically vacuous.”

5. See footnote 1.
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