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EL Island Construction and Bound Morphemes

in Japanese/English Code-Switching\(^{(1)}\)

Teruaki Muto

1. Introduction

Morphemic code-switching is a phenomenon in which one language offers affix-like elements to attach to lexical items provided from another. The following sentences in (1) provide a few examples:

(1) a. She spent her own money \(\text{ACC}^{(3)}\) (Nishimura, 1997: 117)

b. Look at the things she buys for Sean \(\text{DAT}\) (Nishimura, 1997: 119)
c. She \textit{wa} took her a month to come home \textit{yo}.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{TOP} & \textbf{DISC} \\
\end{tabular}

‘As for her, (it) took her a month to come home, you know.’

(Nishimura, 1985: 77)

d. I don’t know the bus stop \textit{no} name.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{GEN} & \\
\end{tabular}

‘I don’t know the bus stop’s name.’

(Morimoto, 1999: 24)

All the examples in (1) show that one language (Japanese in this case) offers only morphemic elements to the lexical items provided from the other (i.e., English): In (1a), the English direct object ‘her own money’ is marked further with the Japanese accusative case particle ‘\textit{o}.’ Similarly, in (1b), the English proper noun ‘Sean,’ the object of the preposition ‘for,’ is marked with the dative case particle ‘\textit{ni}.’ In (1c), the pronoun ‘she’ is marked with the topic particle ‘\textit{wa},’ and the discourse particle ‘\textit{yo}’ is attached to the sentence-final position. In (1d), the genitive particle ‘\textit{no}’ is inserted between the two English lexical items ‘the bus stop’ and ‘name.’

Muto (2013) reviewed several major approaches to the structural properties of intrasentential code-switching and showed that none of them could explain the process of affixation in morphemic Japanese/English code-switching. Muto (2014) then suggested that morphemic code-switching construction in Japanese/English bilingual utterances should be broadly differentiated into three types (i.e., topic-comment construction, portmanteau construction, and EL island construction) and focused on topic-comment construction, proposing that there should exist an elliptical Japanese V (copula), which plays a crucial role in affixing Japanese nominal bound morphemes to English lexical items. Furthermore, Muto (2015) suggested that some Japanese/English bilingual utterances assume the form of portmanteau construction, a hybrid structure in which a constituent in one language is shared as a constituent in another, proposing that at the sentence-final position of such utterances there should exist a Japanese zero V anaphora semantically corresponding to the preceding English V and that Japanese nominal bound morphemes observed in those utterances should be derived from this
deleted anaphoric verb. In what follows, we focus on the third type, EL (embedded language) island construction.

2. EL island construction and bound morphemes

There are some code-switching constructions whose mixed constituent(s) should be treated as an EL island, which was proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993, 1995), though some of the English items are switched to Japanese nominal morphemes.

2.1 Genitive case assignment

One of those code-switching constructions involves genitive case assignment. Let us take a look at the sentences in (2) below:

(2) a. I don’t know the bus stop *no name.

   'I don’t know the name of the bus stop.’ (Morimoto 1999: 24)

b. That’s my sister *no son.

   'That’s my sister’s son.’ (Nishimura 1985: 119)

c. About variety *no culture toka variety *no language you know.

   'About variety of culture or variety of language, you know.’ (Kite 2001: 314)

In (2), the English genitive case marker ‘’s’ (or ‘of’) is replaced with the Japanese genitive case particle ‘no.’ As Fukui (1995: 27f, 31) points out, both ‘’s’ and ‘no’ have been identified as genitive case assigners dominated by the functional head D at D-structure. In this light, the syntactic structure of the English DP ‘the bus stop’s name’ is schematically drawn in (3) below:
In (3), D is realized as the genitive case assigner and selects an NP complement (the bare N ‘name’ with the DP ‘the bus stop’ in the [Spec, NP] position). The argument ‘the bus stop’ is then moved to [Spec, DP] to receive the genitive case assigned by D, as is illustrated in (4) below:

In (4), the functional head D of the DP is realized as the abstract nominal AGR, which assigns the genitive case to the argument ‘the bus stop.’

In this view, the most likely explanation for the switch between ‘’s’ and ‘no’ is that
the English ‘’s’ is switched to the Japanese ‘no’ as a genitive case assigner rather than as a genitive case marker (i.e., before the DP in [Spec, NP] is moved to [Spec, DP]). The reason for this is that switching after a movement operation causes a mismatch between the language of AGR and that of the switched nominal morpheme, as is shown in (5) below (Note the subscripts that stand for the languages concerned):

(5)  
```
      DP
     /    \
  DP   D'
   /  |  /
the bus stop       NP
   |   |  |
<AGR_e> Spec N'
   |   |   |
 t_i N    |
     | name
```

Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that switching between ‘’s’ and ‘no’ occurs at the D-structure level. Assuming it to be true, the schematic structure of the DP after switching is drawn in (6) below:
As we can see from (6), D dominates the Japanese genitive case assigner *no*. After the movement of the argument to [Spec, DP], the language of the genitive case marker does not conflict with that of AGR, as is shown in (7) below:

2.2 Adpositional construction

The examples in (8) below demonstrate that the English DP is marked with the Japanese locative particle ('*de*') or allative particle ('*ni*' and 'made'):
(8) a. I slept with her basement \textit{de}.

\hspace{1cm} \textbf{LOC}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I slept with her in (the) basement.’ (Nishimura 1985: 52, 117)

b. Vancouver, B.C. \textit{ni}.

\hspace{1cm} \textbf{ALL}

\hspace{1cm} ‘To Vancouver, B.C.’ (Nishimura 1997: 65)

c. I think B.C. \textit{de} \textit{ne}, I love the scenery.

\hspace{1cm} \textbf{LOC DISC}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I think, in B.C., I love the scenery.’ (Nishimura 1997: 66)

d. 1946 \textit{made}.

\hspace{1cm} \textbf{ALL}

\hspace{1cm} ‘Until 1946.’ (Nishimura 1997: 93)

These phrases should be treated as Japanese EL islands. This is due to the difference in head directionality between English and Japanese. English is a head-initial language and has prepositions, while Japanese is a head-final language and has postpositions. Hence, simply switching between the English preposition and the Japanese postposition in (8b), for instance, would lead to the ill-formedness of the phrase, as shown in (9) below:

\begin{equation}
\text{(9)} \quad *\text{ni} \text{ Vancouver, B.C.}
\end{equation}

From this viewpoint, we may say that the whole adpositional phrase is switched to each other, as is shown in (10) below:
3. Conclusion

The present paper has been written with the aim of exploring a little further into the structural properties of morphemic-level code-switching, focusing on the derivational process of affixation in Japanese/English code-switching. In this paper, I suggested that code-switching constructions involving genitive case assignment and adpositional phrase structure should be treated as an EL island. Specifically, I proposed that the English genitive morpheme ‘s’ should be switched to the Japanese ‘no’ as a genitive case assigner rather than as a genitive case marker whereas adpositional phrases should be switched to each other as a whole due to the difference in head directionality between English and Japanese.

Finally, I argue about a few theoretical implications that a series of papers I have written including the present one have for the formal aspects of code-switching research. First, the necessity to take into account covert constituents as well as overt ones in intrasentential code-switching should be said with some emphasis. This point has been strangely neglected in previous studies on formal code-switching, with the result that none of them was capable of giving a reasonable explanation for the phenomenon of morphemic-level code-switching. As was suggested in both Muto (2014) and Muto (2015), assuming the existence of a covert constituent—specifically, an elliptical V—in mixed utterances can find justification for the phenomenon in which one language offers only nominal morphemes to attach to lexical items provided from another. However, a few things still remain to be done. For one thing, it is debatable whether every bilingual utterance has a possibility of containing two Vs (i.e., a covert V and an overt V), or rather,
what kind of mixed sentence requires two Vs. One possible answer is that the two Vs possibility is strong when switching between a head-initial language and a head-final language occurs, but it calls for further consideration.

Secondly, these papers have a theoretical implication that it may give support to the idea that the head of a clause (i.e., main verbal or INFL-like element) determines the ML of that clause in code-switching construction (Klavans 1985; Treffers-Daller 1994). As I mentioned in Muto (2013), Myers-Scotton (1995) lists the relative frequency of morphemes from the participating languages as one of the criteria for identifying the ML, but it follows from what has been discussed that this criterion does not work in morphemic-level code-switching. Instead, if we assume that there exists an elliptical V as well as an overt V in Japanese/English code-switching and that the higher main verbal or INFL-like element, whether overt or covert, determines the ML of a bilingual utterance, it makes it possible to explain how Japanese particles affix to English lexemes in the utterance in which the overwhelming majority of morphemes are English.

Notes

(1) I am grateful to Prof. Rakesh Bhatt and Prof. James Yoon for their useful comments on earlier versions of this paper. All errors are mine.

(2) Following academic conventions, the italicized items in the examples indicate “switched” elements.

(3) The following abbreviations are used to annotate the examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>accusative</th>
<th>INFL</th>
<th>inflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>matrix language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>discourse</td>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>determiner phrase</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) The subscript ‘e’ stands for English, while the subscript ‘j’ stands for Japanese.

References


(tmuto@kansaigaidai.ac.jp)