

A Prosodic Account of *To*-Contraction

Takeru Honma Masao Okazaki Shinsuke Homma
Kazuhiko Tanaka Shin-ichi Tanaka

In this talk, we focused upon *wanna*-contraction, as exemplified below, and argued that it is possible to characterize the phenomenon as one of the cases for which any version of prosodic theory is responsible, as opposed to the generally accepted view that the presence or absence of *wh*-traces must bear the responsibility.

- (1) a. Who_i do you { want to } see t_i?
 { wanna }
 b. Who_i do you { want t_i to } see Bill?
 { *wanna }

Adopting the prosodic theory of Nespor and Vogel (1986), we propose that *want* and *to* are contracted only when they are within the same *intonational phrase* (IPh). Following the syntactic projection system of Fukui (1986), we assume that the S-Structures of (1a) and (1b) are given respectively as follows:

- (2) a. [who_i do you want [C' [I' to [v' PRO see t_i]]]]
 b. [who_i do you want [C' IPh t_i [I' to [v' see Bill
]]]]

We also assume that the categories of XP level constitute an IPh in the prosodic component. Thus (2a) and (2b) are mapped onto (3a) and (3b), respectively:

- (3) a. [IPh who_i do you want to see]
 b. [IPh who_i do you want] [IPh to see]

In (3a), contraction of *want* and *to* is permitted since they are within one IPh, while it is blocked in (3b) since they are contained in different IPh's.

Appealing to the prosodic domain in this way to account for *wanna* contraction, we have no need to say that *wanna* contraction is the isolated case that is sensitive to the presence of *wh*-traces, in light of the observation that external sandhi rules are generally not sensitive to the presence or absence of such traces:

- (4) Nasal Assimilation in Spanish:
 Que₁ canta[m] t₁ para navidad? (< canta[n])
 who they-sing for Christmas
 "Who do they sing for Christmas?"
- (5) Gorgia Toscana in Italian:
 Chi₁ hai invitato t₁ [h]on Marco? (<[k]on)
 who have you-invited with
 "Who did you invite with Marco?"

The *wh*-traces are invisible to the application of these rules. Rather, the rules may apply when the relevant elements are within the same IPh:

- (6) [IPh que₁ cantan t₁ para navidad]
- (7) [IPh chi₁ hai invitato t₁ kon Marco]

The prosodic-theoretic analysis can also cover the cases where the structural 'distance' between *want* and *to*, rather than the presence of traces, is relevant:

- (8) a. I don't want [c' [IP [to flagellate oneself in public] [to become standard practice in this monastery]]]

(*I don't *wanna* flagellate.....)

- b. I don't want [_C [_{IP} [_D anyone [who continues to want]]] [_{IP} to stop wanting]].

(*I don't want anyone who continues to *wanna* to stop wanting)

These syntactic structures are mapped onto the following prosodic structures:

- (9) a. [_{IPh} I don't want] [_{IPh} to flagellate oneself in public to become standard practice in this monastery]
- b. [_{IPh} I don't want] [_{IPh} anyone who continues to want] [_{IPh} to stop wanting]

In each structure, *want* and *to* belong to different IPh's so that contraction is not permitted.