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1 Introduction

• In German and French have portmanteau words:

(1) a. la maison **du** père (French)
    det.fs house  de+det.ms father
    the house of the father

   b. la maison **de la** mère
    det.fs house  de det.fs mother
    the house of the mother

(2) a. die Reise **zum** Mond (German)
    det.fs journey to+det.ms.dat moon
    the journey to the moon

   b. die Reise **zu den** Seychellen
    det.fs journey to  det.pl.dat Seychelles
    the journey to the Seychelles

• Distributionally, these portmanteau words correspond to structures with two terminals in the syntax, a preposition and a definite determiner.

(3) a. **Question 1a:** at what level does the contraction take place?

   b. **Question 1b:** what is the syntactic structure of the examples with a portmanteau word?

   Does the contraction amalgamate only the phonological parts (+/- simple clitics) or also the syntactic terminals?

(4) Larger questions:

   a. How do words relate to other linguistic structure, in particular to syntax?

   b. Is the internal structure of words the same as the structure of sentences?

   c. Is there a dedicated component that creates words (the **LEXICON**, say) and another system (the **SYNTAX**) that creates sentences?

   d. How much of the idiosyncratic properties of a word does the syntax see?

• I will contrast the properties of the German and French portmanteau morphemes.
• I will argue for the following:

(5)  a. French portmanteaux amalgamate the syntactic terminals while the German portmanteaux only amalgamate at the phonological level, leaving two terminals in the syntax.

b. French portmanteaux are inflected prepositions while German portmanteaux behave like a combination of a host plus a simple clitic, but the host+clitic exponent has a suppletive form.

c. The split morphology hypothesis allows to account for this pattern better than a head-movement account or an account along the lines of Embick (2006) within Distributed Morphology.

2 The data

2.1 French portmanteau P+Det

• Contracted forms for the prepositions à, 'to', and de, 'of/from'. Contraction interacts with elision:

   (6) Interaction between contraction and elision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>à</th>
<th>de</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM C-initial</td>
<td>femme, woman</td>
<td>à la femme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM V-initial</td>
<td>aurore, dawn</td>
<td>à l’aurore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC V-initial</td>
<td>homme, man</td>
<td>à l’homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC C-initial</td>
<td>garçon, boy</td>
<td>au garçon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>hommes</td>
<td>aux hommes [oz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>garçons</td>
<td>aux garçons [o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aurores</td>
<td>aux aurores [oz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>femmes</td>
<td>aux femmes [o]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Non-contracted form is ungrammatical:

(7) le père du garçon / *le père de le garçon  
the father DE+det boy / the father DE det boy  
the father of the boy

(8) il parle au garçon / *il parle à le garçon  
he speaks A+det boy / he speaks A det boy
he speaks/ is speaking to the boy

• The appearance of portmanteau forms is not uniquely conditioned by linear adjacency of the relevant forms, and thus cannot be taken to be a simple surface phenomenon (Miller, 1992), the same facts hold for *de*:

\[(9) \text{J'ai parlé} \]
I-have spoken

a. à la mère et la fille
A DET mother and DET girl

b. *au père et la mère
A+DET.M father and DET mother

c. *à le père et la mère
A DET.M father and DET mother

d. *à la fille et le garçon
A DET.F girl and DET.M boy

e. à la fille et l'autre garçon
A DET.F girl and DET.M+other boy

See discussion in Abeillé et al. (2003, 142-143). ex 9b. and 9d. show that the phenomenon is not only operative under adjacency,

• Need separate hypotheses for (9b) and (9d).

\[(10) \text{a. In ex (9b): hypothesis 1: the preposition does not take scope over both conjuncts} \]

hypothesis 2: the determiner takes scope over both conjuncts.

b. In ex (9d): even under non-adjacency cannot have à combining with the determiner le.

• Summary

\[(11) \text{a. French P+D contraction interacts with elision.} \]

b. French P+D contraction is obligatory wherever possible.

c. French P+D contractions block certain coordinations of DPs under P.

---

2The grammaticality judgements here are relative: certain speakers do not accept omission of the preposition in the second conjunct with the weak prepositions à, de, en. The speakers that permit the omission, only permit it in cases without P+D contraction as reported in (9).
### 2.2 German portmanteau P+Det

(12) The contracted forms in Standard German, table adapted following Hartmann (1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Case</th>
<th>an</th>
<th>auf</th>
<th>bei</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>um</th>
<th>vor</th>
<th>zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc Dat <em>dem</em></td>
<td>am</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>beim</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Neutr Dat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masc Akk <em>den</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Masc Dat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutr Dat <em>dem</em></td>
<td>am</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>beim</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>vorm</td>
<td>zum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Masc Dat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutr Akk <em>das</em></td>
<td>ans</td>
<td>aufs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ins</td>
<td>ums</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem Dat <em>der</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>zur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem Akk <em>die</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl Dat <em>den</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl Akk <em>die</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = possible but not attested
– = case incompatible with the preposition

- Contracted forms vary idiosyncratically with each preposition, depending on gender and case. No contracted forms for the plural.
- When a contracted form exists, the non-contracted form is still possible ( ≠ du, des, au, aux in French).

(13) a. Peter ist **im** Haus.
    P is **in** DET.DAT.NTR house
    P is in the house.

   b. Peter ist **in dem** Haus mit den grünen Fensterläden.
    P is **in** DET.DAT.NTR house with the green shutters
    P is in the house with the green shutters.

(14) a. Peter ist **ins** Kino gegangen.
    P is **in** DET.ACC.NTR cinema gone
    P went to the cinema.

   b. Peter ist **in das** Kino gegangen.
    P is **in** DET.ACC.NTR cinema gone
    P has entered the cinema.

- When the contracted form is possible the two forms differ in meaning.
a. The non-contracted forms have anaphoric and deictic function.
b. The contracted forms are used for non-anaphoric and non-deictic definite uses which are generally unique (Unika), e.g.
   within a flat: the kitchen, the bathroom,
   within the social setting: the father, the mother, the priest, the doctor on a ship: the rudder, the stern, the engine room.

• As Schiering (2002, 2005) points out, this corresponds to the distinction between pragmatic and semantic definiteness, discussed in Löbner (1985).
• This distinction is morphologically marked on the definite determiner in a number of Germanic dialects (North Frisian, see Ebert (1970), Bavarian Krifka et al. (1995)).
• Due to this semantic difference, the contracted form is obligatory in certain syntactic environments:

(16) a. proper names:
   am Main, zum Bodensee, zur Zugspitze
   on+DET Main, to+DET Lake-Constance, to+DET Zugspitze (a mountain)

b. with predicative superlatives:
   Das Gedicht / der Text / die Zeile ist am schönsten.
   DET.NTR poem / DET.M text / DET.F line is AM most-beautiful

c. with infinitives
   i. P+infinitive
      ans essen denken
      to+DET eat think
      to think of eating
   ii. with the prepositional progressive constructions:
      Er ist am/ beim Tanzen.
      he is at+M.DAT/ near+M.DAT/ danser
      He is dancing.

d. in certain frozen expressions
   aufs Land fahren
   on+M.DAT country go
go to the countryside

e. with predicative nouns:
zum Arzt ausbilden
train as a doctor

In other syntactic environments contraction is impossible (Hartmann (1980, p.172)).

(17) a. with relative pronouns that are homophonous with definite articles (Hinrichs (1986))

\[
\text{Das Haus, in dem } / \text{im } \text{Fritz wohnt, wird verkauft.}
\]
the house in which / in+\text{DAT} Fritz lives will-be sold

b. if the noun is modified by a restrictive relative:

\[
\text{Im } / \text{In dem Haus, das verkauft wird, wohnt Fritz.}
\]
\text{in+\text{DAT}} / \text{in \text{DET} house which will be sold lives F}

c. appositive relatives are ok:

Fritz wohnt am Schloss, das übrigens gerade renoviert
Fritz lives at+\text{DAT} castle, that by-the-way just renovated

is F lives near the castle, that by the way is just being renovated.

d. P and D need to belong to the same constituent Riemsdijk (1998, 651-667)

i. von [dem König treu ergebenen] Dienern
of the\text{DAT}\text{M} king faithfully devoted servants

ii. *vom König treu ergebenen Dienern
of-the\text{DAT}\text{M} king faithfully devoted servants

Riemsdijk (1998, 655)

The contracted forms interact with coordination.

Prescriptive grammar: Dosdrowski et al. (1984, 222): the contracted P+D should not combine with two nouns with different determiner forms; the preposition has to be repeated:

(18) a. Wir erkannten sie am Gant und der Haltung / an
we recognised her at+\text{DET}\text{.DAT}\text{M} gait and \text{DET}\text{.DAT}\text{.F} demeanour / at

der Haltung,
the demeanour

b. Er berichtete über die Arbeit der Abgeordneten
He reported on the work of-the members of parliament

im Plenum und den Kommissionen / in den
in+\text{DET}\text{.DAT}\text{.NTR} assembly and the committees / in the
Kommissionen.
committees.

- Examples in the *Cosmas II* corpus of the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache*\(^3\) show that the interaction is more complex.

- repetition of the preposition indicates that the two members of the coordination are independent of each other, while coordination under one single preposition favours an interpretation that the coordinated DPs are parts of a larger whole.

(19) With infinitives:

a. Am Mittwochmorgen ging's ans Packen und Putzen.
on Wednesday-morning went-it at+DET pack and clean
On Wednesday morning they started packing and cleaning.\(^4\) (=one complex activity)

b. Seit der Eröffnung am 2. Oktober kommen Berliner und Besucher
since the opening on 2 oct come Berliners and visitors
der Hauptstadt zum Bummeln und Bewundern.
of-the capital to+DET stroll and admire.
Since the opening on Oct 2nd locals and visitors of the capital come to stroll along while admiring.

c. Die Ukranierin denkt nicht ans Heimkehren und ans
the Ukrainian thinks not to+DET return-home and to+DET
Feiern.
celebrating
The Ukrainian does not think about returning home and about celebrating.

(= two separate activities)

(20) With nouns

a. In zwölf Komitees wurden Themen diskutiert und Resolutionen
in 12 committees were themes discussed and resolutions
verabschiedet, die ans Europaparlament und an die
passed that to+DET European-parliament and to the

---

\(^3\)https://cosmas2.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2-web/menu.home.do, with a description of the corpus under http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/referenz/korpora.html

\(^4\)When one of the activities is expressed as a noun, the preposition is repeated:

entsprechenden europäischen Institutionen weitergeleitet werden. 
corresponding European institutions passed-on were 
(= separate institutions)

b. In zwölf Komitees wurden Themen diskutiert und Resolutionen 
in 12 committees were themes discussed and resolutions 
verabschiedet, die ans Europaparlament und die 
passed that to+DET European-parliament and the 
entprechenden europäischen Institutionen weitergeleitet werden. 
corresponding European institutions passed-on were 
(=institutions within the European parliament)

• A clear example of a coordination meant as a larger whole is provided by coordi-
nations of a DP with a second DP introduced by a possessive that is co-referential 
with the first DP 5:

(21) a. Schöne Erinnerungen ans Christkind und seine Gaben 
beautiful memories to+DET Christkind and his gifts

b. Organisationschef Herbert Gunz bedankte sich beim Direktor und 
Organiser H G thanked REFLEFL at+DET director and 
seiner von Markus Dietrich geleiteten Spielcasino-Crew für das 
his by M D managed Casino-crew for the 
Engagement rund um die Mißwahl (und gab der Vorfreude 
active-help around the beauty-pageant (...) 

• Conclusion: coordination of DPs under P does not block P+D contraction.
• Coordination of Ps may occur even if the first P would otherwise appear in the 
contracted form (22b/d):

(22) the coordination of two prepositions over a weak determiner:

a. Vor nunmehr knapp zwei Jahren haben sich Regisseur Georg Riha 
Two years ago director G.R and his team

und sein Team zu dieser naturwissenschaftlichen St.-Stephans-Expedition 
went on an exploration of the St-Stephan (cathedral)

5 This configuration also seems to improve the French co-ordinations:

(i) a. Il s’adresse au président et son cabinet.

b. Il renvoie le problème au parlement européen et ses institutions

c. Il s’adresse à la ministre et ses conseillères.

d. Il renvoie le problème à la cour de cassation et ses juges
aufgemacht, um der Frage nachzugehen: "Ist der Steffl ein Biotop?"
in order to answer the question: is the Steffi a habitat?
Dabei stießen sie im Laufe der Zeit auf eine wundersame Tier-
In the course of this exploration they found a bizarre animal-
und Pflanzenwelt in und auf dem Dom:
and plant-world in and on the cathedral:
Raubtiere wie Falken und Marder, exotische Schmetterlinge,
predators like falcons and ferrets, exotic butterflies,
wie der chinesische Riesenfalter, mikroskopisch
like the Chinese Giant butterfly and microscopic
kleine Vertreter der "Weihwasserfauna", und sogar Bäume.
representatives of the Holy-water-fauna, and even trees.

b. Dabei stießen sie im Laufe der Zeit auf eine wundersame Tier-
In the course of this exploration they found a bizarre animal-
und Pflanzenwelt im Dom.
and plant-world in-the cathedral

Los geht’s auf dem Museumsschiff am Dienstag, 30. Juli, bis Freitag, 2.
August von 10 bis 13 Uhr mit Neckarnass. In dieser Ferienwoche tauchen
Teilnehmer - höchstens bis zu den Knien - in den Neckar ein und erforschen das Leben in und auf dem Fluss.

In dieser Ferienwoche tauchen Teilnehmer - höchstens bis zu den Knien
- in den Neckar ein und erforschen das Leben im Fluss.

- This is not due to limitations of the contracted form concerning coordination:

(23)  
a. two P+D contractions can be coordinated:

Wenn aber die Zeit der Sonnenwende kommt, drängt es die
when however the time of-the solstice comes forces expl the
ganze Bevölkerung ins Freie, ins Grüne,
whole population into-the open-air, into-the green-space
ans und aufs Wasser.
at+DET.ACC and on+DET.ACC water

b. one P+D contraction can be coordinated with a P+ weak determiner:

 Dann standen für die Männer einige Übungen
then stood for the men a-few exercises
im und auf dem Wasser an
in+DET.DAT and on the DET.DAT water on
then the men had to do some exercises in and on the water.

c. P can be coordinated with a P+D contraction:
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(24) Summary coordination of P+D in German

a. P+D contraction can introduce two coordinated DPs (ex 20).
b. Two P+D contractions can be coordinated (ex 23a).
c. P+D contraction can be coordinated with a P-D sequence (ex 23b).
d. 2 Ps can be coordinated over a DP whose D would contract with the first P if adjacent (ex 22a/c).
e. 2Ps can be coordinated over a DP where the D contracts with the second P (ex 23c).

(25) Summary: German vs French portmanteau P+D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-contracted form possible</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in meaning</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracted vs non-contracted</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with coordination</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The analysis

3.1 The P+D-contraction is not phonological

(26) a. There is no contraction in homophonous environments without D (see ex 27 for French, 17 for German)

b. In German, if the contracted form exists, contracted and non-contracted forms have different meanings.
3.2 P+D-contraction cannot be reduced to syntactic head-movement

An analysis where head-movement of D to P has only applied when a contracted form surfaces, seems difficult to defend:

(28) Purely syntactic approach:

a. Head-mvt → portmanteau form: *zum

\[
\text{PP} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{NP}
\]

b. No head-mvt → no portmanteau form: *zu dem

\[
\text{PP} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{zu} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{NP}
\]

• Problems:

(29) a. What would be the trigger for movement?

The determiner cannot be marked as contracting since this depends on the preposition.

The preposition cannot be marked as contracting since it contracts with a subset of values of the case/number/gender features of the determiner.

b. given the P in,

a [Masc, Dat] D would move im,

but not a [Masc, Acc] D in dem,
while a [Neutr, Acc] D would move **ins**, but never a [Pl] D, or a [Fem] D.

- At some point morphology must come in.
  - Riemsdijk (1998, p.661): two separate processes:
    
    (30) Preposition-Determiner contraction involves:
    
    a. syntax: D-to-P raising
    b. morpho-phonology: Article reduction

- However, this analysis poses a problem:

  (31) a. P can combine with an NP without D (so it cannot be a deficiency in P that triggers raising of D)
  
  b. DPs do not need to appear under a P (so it cannot be a deficiency in D that triggers raising of D)

### 3.3 A morphological analysis of P+D contraction

(32) Two questions for an analysis of P+D:

a. What is the syntactic structure that the contraction appears in?

b. In which component of the grammar does the contraction take place?

- Two types of analyses have been proposed:

  (33) a. Inflected prepositions
  
  b. Portmanteau morphemes

**Inflected prepositions:** a single word that combines traits of P, definiteness and gender/number/case; occupies a single syntactic position and selects an NP without D as complement (N' in earlier accounts, could also be an intermediate maximal projection) (see Hinrichs (1986) for German, Napoli and Nevis (1987) for Italian, Abeillé et al. (2003) for French, Schiering (2005) for a dialect of German, Ruhrdeutsch).

  (34) a. Inflected prepositions: P\textsubscript{fl}:

  \[ au = à [+DEF,+M,+SG] \]
b. Syntactic structure: \( PP = P_{fl} + N' \) (one syntactic terminal terminal for \( P+D \))

(\( N' = DP \) without the \( D \))

\[
\begin{array}{c}
PP \\
P_{fl} \\
N'
\end{array}
\]

- **Portmanteaux**: marked mapping of syntax and morphology where two syntactic terminals are matched with a single morphological object (Zwicky 1987, p.215).


(i) \( au = à [+DEF,+M,+SG] \)

(simple morphological object)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
P
\end{array}
\]

\( à [+DEF,+M,+SG] \)

(ii) \( au = [à + ART [+DEF,+M,+SG]]_P \)

(complex morphological object)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
ART [+DEF,+M,+SG]
\end{array}
\]

b. Structure syntaxique: \( PP = P + [ART [+DEF] + N'] \) (deux terminaux syntaxiques)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
PP \\
P \\
DP \\
D \\
NP
\end{array}
\]

(36) Questions

a. One or two positions in the syntax?

b. How does the matching between morphology and syntax for portmanteaux take place?

### 3.4 French

- For French I adopt the analysis in terms of inflected prepositions in Abeillé et al. (2003). As they point out this analysis excludes (37b) (repeated here from 9) since it is a coordination of a PP *au père* with an NP *la mère.*
(37) J’ai parlé
I-have spoken

a. à la mère et la fille
   A DET mother and DET girl
b. *au père et la mère
   A+DET.M father and DET mother
c. *à le père et la mère
   A DET.M father and DET mother
d. *à la fille et le garçon
   A DET.F girl and DET.M boy
e. à la fille et l’autre garçon
   A DET.F girl and DET.M+other boy

• For (37d), I propose that the underlying form that would yield (37d) is ill-formed.

   More precisely, I propose that the apparent coordination of two disjoint NPs under de or à is in fact a coordination of two full PPs with phonological omission of the second P under identity: (38a/e).

   If there is a P+D contraction, phonological under identity ellipsis is impossible (38b/d(ii)) ; since the sequence à le is independently excluded, the underlying structures in (38c/d(i)) that could give rise to (37c/d) are ill-formed.

(38) a. à la mère et à la fille —> à la mère et A la fille
b. au père et à la mère
   —> P cannot be elided under identity (no à in PP₁)
   —> * au père et A la mère
c. *à le père et à la mère —> *à le père et A la mère
   à le is independently excluded
d. i. *à la fille et à le garçon —> *à la fille et A le garçon
   ii. à la fille et au garçon
      —> P cannot be elided (no à in PP₂)
      —> * à la fille et AU garçon
e. à la fille et à l’autre garçon —> à la fille et A l’autre garçon

• DPs referring to a single entity can be conjoined under de and à:
(39)  a. _L’ancien champion olympique et nouveau premier ministre_, Jean Dupont, a donné une conférence de presse hier matin.
    The old champion Olympic and new prime minister, J. D. ...  
  b. Les journalistes ont posé de nombreuses questions à _l’ancien champion olympique et nouveau premier ministre_.  
  c. Les réponses de _l’ancien champion olympique et nouveau premier ministre_ n’ont satisfait personne.

- In these examples (39), the P+D contraction is not compatible with the second conjunct, and nevertheless the examples are perfectly grammatical.
  
  If there had been a "distant" effect of contraction with coordination based on what form would have been used if the coordination hadn't taken place, we would have expected (39b/c) to be bad.
- Coming back to (37c) the present analysis, as the other analyses, has to stipulate that the non-contracted sequences corresponding to _au/ aux, du/ des_ are independently excluded —→ blocking.

3.5 Blocking and Poser-blocking

- More general problem: the fact that certain forms that might be expected to be generated (either in the lexicon or in the syntax) do not exist:

(40)  a. went vs. *goed  
  b. children vs. *childs  

- Aronoff (1976, 41): **Blocking** "the nonoccurrence of one form due to the simple existence of another." In the ex above, the regular forms are blocked since there is a lexically listed exception.
- Why this blocking? Kiparsky (1982) extends the Elsewhere condition (proposed for modern phonology in Kiparsky (1973)) to morphological rules: more specific rules will apply before a more general rule (this principle is also called **PANINI’S PRINCIPLE**, after the Sanskrit grammarian Panini, cf.Stump (2001)).

(41)  Rule 1: for _N =ox, child —→ N+pl= N+en_ (oxen, children)  
  Rule 2: for _N —→ N+pl = N+s_ (houses, papers, cats)

  Being a lexical exception is the most narrow type of rule: it only applies to one root, and therefore takes precedence over (= blocks) all more general rules:
Rule 3: for $N =$ woman $\rightarrow N+\text{pl} =$ women

- This blocking is originally proposed for words and competition between words. Poser (1992), Börjars et al. (1997), Bresnan (2001), Hankamer and Mikkelsen (2005) et Stewart and Stump (2007) have proposed that this kind of blocking is also operative between words and phrases. Hankamer and Mikkelsen (2005) call this extended form of blocking Poser-blocking.
- I have to assume that the non-contracted forms à le, à les are blocked by Poser-blocking.
- Note: Embick (2006); Embick and Marantz (2006) do not admit this: there is no blocking of full forms or phrases: the only point where the Elsewhere Principle applies is on Vocabulary Insertion (example of comparatives in English), i.e. at the morpheme level.

3.6 German

- Proposal

(43) a. Contraction of P+D takes place under adjacency after the syntax.
   b. Comparable to simple cliticisation ("no effect on the syntax").
   c. The contracted forms do not correspond to forms that would be obtained by a phonological rule of German.
   d. Suppletive form for the contraction is listed but only inserted after the syntax.
   e. If the analysis of the contrast between German and French proposed here is correct, then this is support for a split model of morphology containing a pre-syntactic component and a post-syntactic component.

(44) Coordination of P+D in German can be obtained by post-syntactic contraction: wherever there is a contraction, can have a sequence
   a. P+D contraction can introduce two coordinated DPs (ex 20).
      ans Europaparlament und die entsprechenden europäischen Institutionen
      an die Europa-Kommission und die entsprechenden europäischen Institutionen
   b. Two P+D contractions can be coordinated (ex 23a).
ans und aufs Wasser

an die und auf die Gewässer

c. P+D contraction can be coordinated with a P-D sequence (ex 23b). (since
two P and D sequences can be coordinated, see previous ex)
d. 2 Ps can be coordinated over a DP whose D would contract with the first
P if adjacent (ex 22a/c)
   sie liefen an und in den Fluss
   they ran to and into the river
e. 2Ps can be coordinated over a DP where the D contracts with the second
   P (ex 23c).
f. If there is no adjacency, contraction does not take place:
   das Leben in und auf dem Fluss / im Fluss
   the life in and on the river / in+DET river

• The post-syntactic interaction between syntax and morphology can be thought of
  in terms of lexical sharing as proposed by Wescoat (2002): the contracted form is
  inserted over two (or more) terminals in the syntax, which have to be adjacent.

3.7 The syntax-morphology interface

• In recent papers the syntax-morphology interface receives particular attention
  (Ackema and Neeleman (2004, 2007), Embick and Noyer (2007), Stewart and Stump
  (2007), Williams (2007)).
  
  Mention periphrastic expression of part of the paradigm (Stewart and Stump
  (2007), two words, one terminal) but not the inverse case discussed here (two ter-
  minals, one word)
  
• At least three ways of analysing a syntax-morphology 2-1 mismatch illustrated
  here with am:

(45) a. Null categories:
   the contraction combines with an empty category, so the mapping is
   one-to-one.
   a. PP
      P
      \(\emptyset_P\)
      D
      NP
   b. PP
      P
      \(\emptyset_P\)
      D
      am[+P]
      NP
b. Head-movement:

```
PP
   p
      DP
         D
          NP
            am[+P,+D]
```

c. Post-syntactic fusion:

(see Zwicky (1987), lexical sharing as proposed by Wescot (2002), or fusion in Distributed Morphology (?).)

```
PP
   p
      DP
         D
          NP
            am[+P,+D]
```

- The present analysis is framed in terms of (45c).
- The coordination facts seem to suggest that the P+D behaves like two words that can take syntactic scope separately (against 45a).

- I have used post-syntactic insertion to account for a behaviour as two syntactic positions but only one morphological object. If all contractions belong to the same component, the question arises how to distinguish P+Ds that occupy one position from P+Ds that occupy two. Since I have no criteria /features that would plausibly have this effect, I have not adopted this type of analysis here.
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