

An RCS Approach to the Morphology and Syntax of *Wanna*-Contraction*

Sosei Aniya

I. Introductory Remarks

The phenomenon of *wanna*-contraction involves not only phonology but also morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Phonologically, /wānt#tu/ (*want to*) contracts to /wāŋə/ (*wanna*) by a chain of three mutations: the alveolar stop /t/ deletion, vowel reduction producing /ə/, and mutual assimilation between /n/ and /t/, creating alveolar nasal tap /ŋ/.¹ 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.² 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.

discusses Barss' (1995) alternative analysis and its problems. Subsection 2.4. examines Pullum's (1997) morpholexical analysis, which marks a sharp departure from the previous analyses and serve as a stepping stone to a lexically-based RCS analysis offered in Section III.

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

According to Barss (1995:683), previous studies of Aoun and Lightfoot (1984), Zagana (1988), Browning (1991) analyze *wanna*-contraction analogously in terms of the government relation along the lines of (6).

(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. I_i [_{VP} want [_{CP} [_{IP} PRO_i [_{I'} 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*.

(8) I_i [_{VP} want [_{CP} [_C to_j] [_{IP} PRO_i [_Γ t_j [_{VP} be outside with John]]]]]

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_i] [_{TP} John [_T t_i [_{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_sP] (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_i [_{VP} want [_{AgrSP} PRO_i [_{Agr} [_T to_j] Agr]<sub>[TP t_i [_{VP} be outside with John]]]]]
Wanna-contraction, however, is blocked for infinitivals with overt subjects since they occur in structures like (11).</sub>

(11) I [_{VP} want [_{AgrSP} John [_{Agr} [_T to_i] Agr]_{[TP t_i [_{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 verbs³ 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.⁷⁴

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. l-Induction

If $L_i = |x, \varphi | y_1, \dots, \psi_n \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $L_j = |y, \psi_1 \sigma | \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m \rangle \in \text{LEX}$,
 $n \geq 1, m \geq 0$, then $L_i(L_j) = |x-y, \varphi \psi_1 \sigma | \theta_1, \dots, \theta_m, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

b. d-Induction

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

c. generalized dl-Induction

If $L_i = \langle \alpha_i, \dots, \alpha_1 | x, \gamma_1 \sigma | \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and
 $L_j = \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_1 | y, \psi_1 \pi | \beta_1, \dots, \beta_j \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and
 $L_k = \langle \varepsilon_m, \dots, \varepsilon_1 | z, \theta | \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then
 $(L_k)L_i(L_j) = \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_1, \alpha_i, \dots, \alpha_2, \varepsilon_m, \dots, \varepsilon_1 | z-x-y, \theta \gamma_1 \sigma \psi_1 \pi | \beta^1, \dots, \beta_j, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

(20) Variable Continuation

If $\langle \dots | x, \varphi | \psi X \sigma \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $\langle \dots | y, \psi \theta \sigma | \dots \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then
 $\langle \dots | x, \varphi | \psi \theta \sigma \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

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 $\langle \dots | x, \varphi | \psi \dots \rangle \in \text{LEX}$ and $\langle \dots | y, \psi | \theta \dots \rangle \in \text{LEX}$, then
 $\langle \dots | z, \varphi \psi | \theta \dots \rangle \in \text{LEX}$.

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) a. $|want, VT^{[3]} | T^{>}$

b. $|want, VT^{>} | T^{>}$

(24) $|to, T^{>} | VT^{>}$

(23a) represents nonsingular, nonthird-person *want* in present tense, which takes $T^{>}$ as its argument, i.e. infinitival *to*. On the other hand, (23b) depicts *want* in infinite tense, which also takes $T^{>}$ 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) a. $|want, VT^{[3]} | T^{>} (< |to, T^{>} | VT^{>} >) = |wanna, VT^{[3]} T^{>} | VT^{>}$

b. $|want, VT^{>} | T^{>} (< |to, T^{>} | VT^{>} >) = |wanna, VT^{>} T^{>} | VT^{>}$

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 fiancée*, *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 unsuffixable 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. $\langle V_{+aux} T_n^x | \Lambda, \Delta | \$D_n \rangle$
 b. $| do, V_{+aux} T_2^0 | VT^{\sim} \rangle$
 c. $| \Lambda, \$ | D \rangle$
 d. $| you, D_2 |$
 e. $| wanna, VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} | VT^{\sim} \rangle$
 f. $| be, VT^{\sim} | A, P \rangle$
 g. $| outside, A |$
 h. $| with, P | D \rangle$
 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. $| \Lambda, \$ | D \rangle (| you, D_2 |) = | you, \$D_2 |$
 b. $(| do, V_{+aux} T_2^0 | VT^{\sim} \rangle \langle V_{+aux} T_n^x | \Lambda, \Delta | \$D_n \rangle (| you, \$D_2 | V T_2^0 \rangle) = | do-you, V_{+aux} T_2^0 \Delta \$D_2 | VT^{\sim} \rangle$
 c. $| do-you, V_{+aux} T_2^0 \Delta \$D_2 | V T^{\sim} \rangle (| wanna, VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} | VT^{\sim} \rangle) = | do-you-wanna,$

- $V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} | VT^{\sim} >$
 $^{+aux}$
- d. $|do-you-wanna, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} | VT^{\sim} > (|be, VT^{\sim} | A, P >) = |do-you-wanna-be, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} | A, P >$
 $^{+aux}$
- e. $|do-you-wanna-be, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} | A, P > (|outside, A |) = |do-you-wanna-be-outside, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} A | P >$
 $^{+aux}$
- f. $|do-you-wanna-be-outside, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} A | P > (|with, P | D >) = |do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP | D >$
 $^{+aux}$
- g. $|do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP | D > (|Mary, D |) = |do-you-wanna-be-outside-with-Mary, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP D >$
 $^{+aux}$

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. $|who, ?_x D_3 | VTX _x D_3 >$
 b. $| \Lambda, _x D |$

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. $|do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP | D > (| \Lambda, _x D |) = |do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP _x D |$
 $^{+aux}$
- b. $|who, ?_x D_3 | VTX _x D_3 > (|do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP, D) = |who-do-you-wanna-be-outside-with, ?_x D_3 V T_2 \Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP _x D_3 >$
 $^{+aux}$

Notice that the variable X of $|who, ?_x D_3 | VTX _x D_3 >$ is replaced with $\Delta \$ D_2 VT^{\sim} T^{\sim} VT^{\sim} AP$ by the rule of Variable Continuation as shown in (34b). Notice also that $|who, ?_x D_3 | VTX _x D_3 >$ contains two instances of $_x D_3$, 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

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 /ə/; and coalescence uniting the word final /n/ of /wān/ and the word initial /t/ of /tə/ to form nasal tap /ŋ/. (See Anishi (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, $MLR_w(X)=X /tʊ/$ for the therapy verbs, and otherwise is not defined. Semantically, the operation is vacuous: $MLR_w(X)$ 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.

References

- Aniya, Sosei. 1994. “An RCS Approach to the *Tough*-construction,” *Hiroshima University Gengobunkakenkyu V*, 49–62.
- Aniya, Sosei. 1995. “An RCS Approach to the *It*-cleft Construction,” *Hiroshima University Gengobunkakenkyu V*, 53–68.
- Aniya, Sosei. 1996. “An RCS Approach to Agreement,” *Hiroshima University Gengobunkakenkyu V*, 55–69.
- Aniya, Sosei. 1997. “An RCS Approach to the *Tough*-construction: Part II,” *Hiroshima University Gengobunkakenkyu V*, 31–48.
- Aniya, Sosei. (in preparation) “The Phonology of *Wanna*-contraction”
- Aoun, Joseph and David Lightfoot. 1984. “Government and Contraction,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 465–473.
- Baltin, M. 1995. “Floating Quantifiers, PRO and Predication,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 199–248.
- Barss, Andrew. 1995. “Extraction and Contraction,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 681–94.
- Brame, Michael K. 1976. *Conjectures and Refutations in Syntax and*

- Semantics*. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Brame, Michael K. 1981. "Trace Theory with Filters vs. Lexically Based Syntax Without," *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 275–292.
- Brame, Michael K. 1984. "Recursive Categorical Syntax and Morphology," *Linguistic Analysis* 14, 4, 265–287.
- Brame, Michael K. 1985. "Recursive Categorical Syntax II: n-arity and variable continuation," *Linguistic Analysis* 15, 2, 137–176.
- Brame, Michael K. 1987. "Recursive Categorical Syntax III: d-words, l-words, and dl- induction," *Linguistic Analysis* 17, 3–4, 147–185.
- Brame, Michael K. 1988. "On the Nature of Cancellation," *Linguistic Analysis* 18, 3–4, 182–193.
- Browning, M.A. 1991. "Bounding Conditions on Representation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 541–562.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1991. "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation," in *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*. ed., Robert Freidin, 417–545. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," in *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. ed., Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1993. "The Theory of Principles and Parameters," in *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*. ed., Joachim Jacobs, Arnin von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 506–569. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Collins, Chris. 1994. "Economy of Derivation and the Generalized Proper Binding Condition," *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 45–62.
- Epstein, Samuel David. 1992. "Derivational Constraints on A-chain Formation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 235–259.
- Fukui, Naoki and Margaret Speas. 1986. "Specifiers and Projection," in

- MIT working papers in linguistics 8: Papers in theoretical linguistics*. 128–172. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jaeggli, Osvalde. 1980. "Remarks on *To*-contraction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 239–245.
- Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche. 1991. "The Position of Subjects," *Lingua* 85: 211–258.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1988. "Whether We Agree or Not: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese," *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12: 1–47.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1993. *The Minimalist Theory of Syntax: Motivations and prospects*. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 1983. *Restructuring and Reanalysis*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Postal, Paul and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1978. "Traces and the Description of English Complementizer Contraction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 1–29.
- Postal, Paul M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1982. "The Contraction Debate," *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 122–138.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1977. "Successive Cyclicity and the Theory of Traces," paper presented at the Amsterdam Colloquium on Bounded vs. Unbounded Transformations, Amsterdam, April 29–May 1.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1997. "The Morpholexical Nature of English *To*-contraction," *Language* 73, 79–102.
- Radford, Andrew. 1997. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1991. *Residual V2 and the WH-criterion*. Ms., University of Genova.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Stowell, Timothy. 1981. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Tateishi, Koichi. 1996. "Phonology and Syntactic Levels" Oral

presentation delivered at The Fourteenth National Conference of The English Linguistic Society of Japan, Kwansai Gakuin University, November 16-17.

Zagona, Karen. 1988. *Verb Phrase Syntax: A parametric study of English and Spanish*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.