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Intraword Codeswitching

Morphemes can switch within a single word, why can’t phonology?

The phonology does not switch within such a morphologically mixed word.

The above example has German ‘r’s (even in the Spanish root cabre).

Production and acceptability judgment data (Stefanini, 2019), and Stefanini and Cabrilli Amaro, 2018 demonstrate that an English root [imp] with Spanish affixes would be pronounced with Spanish phonology.

The language of the affix determines the phonology of the whole word. The phonological word is the domain for phonological uniformity.

This uniformity of word and phrase (with respect to codeswitching) is consistent with, and hence further support for a single-engine distributed morphology analysis of ICS (Alexiadou et al. 2015).

A Lexicalist Account

MacSwan & Collins (2014). PP Interface Condition assumes that morphology and phonology should come from the same language; phonemes are in the lexicon.

PP takes the syntactic word as the unit of analysis. A word is sent to PP, or not, can’t be sent to both.

A lexicalist model can account for why there is one phonology but not why it should be the phonology of the affix.

The phonological word is the domain of phonological uniformity for intraword morphological codeswitching…."

Match Theory

The mechanism which ensures that the phonology of the X’ matches the language of the affix in Match Theory (Selkirk, 2011).

The preferential mapping is between (a) syntactic phrase (SP) and phonological phrase (FP) and (b) syntactic heads (X’) and prosodic endpoints (X).

Language Tags

Match Theory’s (monolingual) assumption that syntactic and phonological structure are isomorphic can easily be extended to bilinguals through language tags (Green & Abutalebi, 2013; Archibald & Libben, 2019)

The phonological spell out must match the language which triggers the generation of the syntactic structure. No special architecture is required (Libben, 2008).

X₀ Spanish 0₀ Spanish
X₀ Spanish 0₀ German

The language of the syntactic frame is the one which governs the language of the affix, and Selkirk’s (2011) Match Theory denies that the phonological word matches the language of the X’, thus it follows from Blanco-Elorrietta et al. (2021) that it would be costly to disaggregate this language and switch to the phonology of the root.

Phonology & Inflecting

No qüero cierto [‘fan-fucking-credible’], qüero cierto en Madrid.

[‘fan-fucking-credible’] [‘fan-fucking-credible’]

No internal inflecting, but either language.

There is no affix to trigger Spanish phonology so English phonology is also allowed. Inflecting is governed by prosodic circumstances not affixation.

Conclusion

Phonological uniformity is found in both affixed and unaffixed words because X’ Spanish 0₀ Spanish

It’s Not Switching Cost

Language switching in binoids (ASL/English) bilinguals show that “in the absence of motor constraints, producing two languages simultaneously is not necessarily more cognitively costly than producing one” Blanco-Elorrietta et al. (2018: 590).

It’s Comprehensible

Phonological uniformity does not arise from seeking to meet the needs of the listener (Reinhart & Reuter (2012); Muñoz & Döring (1995); Goad/kane et al. (2018); listeners can adopt.

A Non-Lexicalist Account

Bilinguals have a single vocabulary list (Elordi & Marinz, 1996) containing the terms of both languages (Oyakata et al. 1999; López, 2020).

Interlingual homographs can facilitate activation, interlingual homophones can inhibit it.

Phases

López, Alexandra & VanMar (2015) argue in the Block Transfer Hypothesis (BTH) that “material that is transferred to the interface is sent in one fell swoop.”

Codeswitching may take place at phase boundaries but not within the phase.

The derivational morpheme head is in the head of a phase, and the head of the phase determines the grammatical properties of the phase.

Phonology Penetrates Phases

Novell (2017) argues against the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) for phonology.

Inflecting...