Gender Features in Spanish-English Asymmetrical Codeswitches
Abel Cruz Flores, Georgetown University

This paper examines gender assignment to English nominals in Spanish-English asymmetrical codeswitches illustrated in (1). Gender is morphologically reflected on the determiners.

(1)   a. Piscando en   **los *fields***   (CESA001)
            Picking   in   the-MASC-PL fields
        b. Hazte cuenta que   **la grant**   (CESA014)
            Imagine   that   the-FEM-SG grant
        c. Pero queríamos   **el bishop**   (CESA006)
            But we wanted   the-MASC-SG bishop
        d. Pero aquí en Arizona   **la congresswoman**   (CESA032)
            But here in Arizona   the-FEM-SG congresswoman

The data in (1) raises questions about how bilinguals assign gender to genderless nominals in codeswitched DPs. To address this question, I analyzed 56 sociolinguistic interviews from *Corpus del Español en el Sur de Arizona* (CESA), a Spanish-English bilingual corpus (Carvalho, 2012-). The data reveal the following findings for gender in codeswitched DPs.

Table 1. *Gender distribution among English inanimate nominals in CESA*

Spanish-English codeswitched DPs		Spanish DP translations	
Masculine	*Feminine*	*Masculine*	*Feminine*
227	33	149	121
	Total: 270		Total: 270

Table 2. *Gender distribution based on biological gender*

Spanish-English codeswitched DPs		Spanish DP translations	
Masculine	*Feminine*	*Masculine*	*Feminine*
26	7	26	7

(I)   ***With inanimate nominals***, gender is binary and assigned arbitrarily like in Spanish. However, there is no perfect correlation between the assigned gender to the English genderless nominal and the gender of the Spanish translation nominal as shown in Table 1. In particular, inanimate nominals are overwhelmingly assigned masculine gender in codeswitched DPs. That is, masculine is the default gender.

(II)   ***With animate nominals***, biological sex of a nominal completely determines the morphological gender of a genderless nominal as shown in Table 2.

These findings pose a challenge for the standard analysis in which gender features form part of the idiosyncratic information in the lexical entry of a noun (e.g., Carstens, 2000, 2010 among others), specially for current codeswitching analyses (MacSwan, 2000 et seq.; Moro, 2014). For example, adopting the operation *Agree* as originally proposed in Chomsky (2000), Moro (2014) proposes that the uninterpretable/unvalued features {Person, Number, Gender} on the head D in a codeswitched DP (2) can be valued via *Agree* in a probe-goal fashion with the English head

nominal in a "one fell swoop" because the *goal* only bears a subset of these features {Person, Number} as illustrated in (2a). In the case of an English D and a Spanish N in (2b), the derivation crashes because English D is deficient, lacking gender, and cannot agree with the gender feature of the Spanish N; hence, only (2a), but not (2b), is a viable codeswitch in Moro's analysis.

(2)   a.   La {Person, Number, Gender}   chair {Person, Number}
               the-FEM-SG   chair
        b.   ~~The~~ {Person, Number}   ~~silla~~ {Person, Number, Gender}

Chomsky (2000) alludes to the notion that deletion is a "one fell swoop" operation, dealing with a ϕ-set as a unit, but he also points out that "[the set's] features cannot selectively delete: either all delete, or none" (p. 124). Thus, it remains unclear how the uninterpretable gender feature is deleted in Moro's analysis. The analysis proposed in this paper accounts for the gender features.

Given the generalizations in Tables 1 & 2, this paper develops a morphosyntactic analysis framed in the Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz, 1993) framework to account for gender assignment in Spanish-English code-switched DPs. I assume that gender is a syntactic feature (Kramer, 2015) and that DP-internal agreement associates the features on *n* with the determiner via a version of *Agree* (Pesetsky & Torrego, 2007). In particular, following Kramer (2009), I argue that there are two sources for gender in code-switched DPs illustrated in (3): (i) biological gender is a feature on *n* and (ii) gender is encoded in the √root with inanimate nominals.

(3)   a. *n*   *i* [+FEM]   →   Female natural gender
        b. *n*   *i* [− FEM]   →   Male natural gender
        c. *n*   'plain'   →   No natural gender, *masculine by default*
        d. √Root   *u*[+FEM]   →   Feminine grammatical gender

In this analysis, biological gender is an interpretable feature on *n* and grammatical gender is an uninterpretable feature on the √Root. That is, animate nominals are licensed by either *n i*[+FEM] or *n i*[− FEM] and have feminine or masculine gender respectively. Inanimate nominals, on the other hand, are licensed by either √Root[+FEM] or plain *n* and have feminine grammatical gender acquired via Agree or masculine gender by default. I further assume that roots are represented by non-phonological indices in the syntax and that licensing conditions match a root with a particular *n* post-syntactically per contextually-specified Vocabulary Insertion rules (Acquiviva, 2008; Kramer, 2009) illustrated in (4). The determiner Vocabulary Items are shown in (5).

(4)   Licensing Conditions on Vocabulary Insertion Rules
        a. √$_{100}$[+FEM] ↔ *grant* / *n*___   [+FEM] on √Root for grammatical gender
        b. √$_{101}$ ↔ *congresswoman* / *n*[+ FEM]___   [+FEM] on *n* for natural gender

(5)   *Spanish definite determiner VIs*
        a. [D], [DEF], [+FEM] ↔ *la*   → *La$_{the-FEM-SG}$ grant*
        b. [D], [DEF]   ↔ *el*   → *El$_{the-MASC-SG}$ bishop*

Biological and grammatical gender are represented via the feature [+/− FEM], and hence PF treats them as same for purpose of Vocabulary Insertion. That is, a [+FEM] feature on *n* or on the √Root will lead to a [+FEM] feature on the head D in codeswitched DPs, which spells out as *la* as shown in (5). Moreover, given that masculine is the default gender in codeswitching, *el* in (5b) must be used to expone any morpheme that does not have a [+FEM] feature, that is, 'plain' *n* and *n*[− FEM].

Selected References

Acquaviva, P. (2008). *Lexical Plurals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carstens, V. (2000). Concord in minimalist theory. *Linguistic Inquiry, 31*(2), 319-355.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries. In Martin, R., Michael, D., & Uriagereka, J. (Eds.), *Step by step: Studies in honor of Howard Lasnik*, pp. 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Halle, M. & A. Marantz (1993). Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Hale K., & Keyser, S.J. (Eds.), *The view from Building 20*, pp. 111-176. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kramer, R. (2009). Definite markers, phi-features, and agreement: a morphosyntactic investigation of the Amharic DP. Doctoral dissertation, UC Santa Cruz.

Kramer, R. (2015). *The Morphosyntax of Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MacSwan, J. (2000). The architecture of the bilingual language faculty: Evidence from code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *3*(1), 37-54.

Moro, M. (2014). The semantic interpretation and syntactic distribution of determiner phrases in Spanish-English codeswitching. In MacSwan, J. (Ed.), *Grammatical Theory and Bilingual Codeswitching*, pp. 213-226. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. & Torrego, E. (2007). The syntax of valuation and interpretability of features. In Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture*. Amsterdam, Benjamins, 262-94.