The evolving interface of U. S. Spanish: language mixing as hybrid vigor*

John M. Lipski

The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT: Spanish has been in contact with English—and with other varieties of Spanish—in the United States for more than a century, but the nature of its speech communities has changed considerably in recent decades. Language contact phenomena, grouped under the derogatory umbrella of "Spanglish," have generally been viewed as detrimental to both Spanish and English. The present study argues that stable contact varieties of Spanish have emerged and are playing an increasing role in the maintenance and spread of Spanish in the United States. Using the biological metaphor of hybridization, it is claimed that insistence on artificial notions of purity is a historically unrealistic endeavor that reduces Spanish to a "hot-house" product unable to survive in U. S. society. The study traces changes in Spanish usage both as new regional and social varieties have entered the U. S. Spanish mix in the past few decades but also as increasing numbers of native bilingual speakers enter the upper echelons of the communication mainstream. Language and dialect hybridization has not changed the fundamental grammatical and phonological structures of Spanish in the U. S., but it has contributed an authenticity that deserves wider recognition as a vehicle for social change.

Introduction

With as many as 35 million speakers, Spanish is the most commonly used language in the United States, after English, and the numbers continue to outpace the census's ability to count. On a world scale, the United States ranks as the 5th largest Spanish-speaking population, well on its way to 4th place—a position it may already hold if uncounted and undocumented Spanish speakers are added into the mix. This ranking occurs despite the fact that Spanish is not the official language of the nation, unlike even the countries whose Spanish-speaking populations are far smaller than our own. Moreover the census figures that permit an estimate of the number of Spanish speakers refer only to those individuals who declare themselves as "Hispanic"; there are untold millions of

* Many of the issues discussed here are further explored in Lipski (2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004, forthcoming).

proficient and not-so-proficient Spanish speakers who have learned this language not as part of their birthright but through formal instruction, residence in Spanish-speaking regions, work, travel, and other means of instilling knowledge of a second language.

In addition to being the language other than English spoken by the largest number of citizens and residents of the United States, Spanish is also the language of the U. S. that has aroused the most hostility among speakers and non-speakers alike; this involves not only resentment against its very existence as a potential competitor of English—to wit the many "English only" or "official English" movements—but also against its purported loss of "purity" when spoken within the United States. Most directly implicated is the denaturing effect of contact with English, axiomatically assumed to be both massive in scope and detrimental to the integrity of Spanish as a legitimate language. The vehemence of sentiment stands in stark contrast to the situation of other languages arising from colonization or immigration. "Pennsylvania Dutch" and Amish German are regarded as quaint and endearing, despite the objective fact that the dialects in question are regarded as highly non-standard within German-speaking countries. The same is substantially true of Cajun French, which has become a symbol of pride for Louisiana, despite stemming from a non-canonical provincial dialect and bearing the clear imprint of contact with English (to wit *laissez les bons temps rouler*). Languages such as Portuguese, Czech, Swedish, Polish, and Greek, all arriving in the United States in the form of a pastiche of vernacular and usually rural dialects, pass under the radar of metalinguistic commentary, although the immigrant groups in question have suffered their fair share of ethnic jokes and prejudicial treatment. The case most comparable to Spanish would be Italian in its many dialectal forms, which during the heyday of Italian immigration to the United States certainly provoked much mocking commentary and sociolinguistic stereotyping, although not from Italy itself, nor from established Italo-Americans. Why then has Spanish been targeted

disproportionately for criticism in the U. S. bilingual setting, and what if any elements of truth might lie behind the outpouring of critically unfiltered viewpoints on the deleterious effects of not-so-peaceful linguistic coexistence in *gringolandia*? What, in other words, is one to make of Spanish in the United States? To fully answer these questions would require far more time and resources than I have at my disposal, so I will limit myself to some general reflections on the issues involved, in three parts: first, the origins of general anti-U. S. Spanish sentiments; second, perceptions of Spanish in contact with English versus empirical observations of language contact phenomena among U. S. Latinos; and finally, the potential for emergent U. S. varieties of Spanish.

The "anti-U. S. Spanish" campaign: historical correlates

From the time the Spanish language became associated with the United States it has labored under a negative publicity campaign, waged both from within the national borders and from abroad. The central theme is that Spanish in the United States is a degenerate mix of Spanish and English that has broken from the fundamental patterns of Spanish and constitutes a hopeless gibberish that is all but unintelligible to Spanish speakers from other countries, and therefore not worthy to sit at the table of world Spanish. Given that most objective observations of Spanish-speaking communities in the United States do not confirm these assertions, it is useful to consider the motivation behind the widely held notions of the inferior quality of Spanish within the U. S. borders. The singling out of Spanish for an inequitably large share of criticism can be attributed at least in part to the fact that Spanish speakers represent the nation's largest linguistic minority and have done so for more than a century, and to the proximity of Latin American nations which, since the Monroe Doctrine, have formed an intrinsic component of the U. S. sphere of political action. The fact that rural varieties of Spanish have been disproportionately represented among U. S. Spanish speakers is also not irrelevant, especially as regards criticism from

educated elitists. Attitudes towards other languages spoken in the United States and their speakers have been affected by point events, such as sentiments against speakers of German and Japanese during the world wars. suspicion of Russian speakers during the Cold War, and current feelings regarding speakers of Arabic. The transitory nature of the events and the relatively small numbers of individuals involved, usually spread across the entire United States, have ensured that no substantive metalinguistic viewpoints coalesce and form part of the national educational and sociopolitical discourse.

I would argue that the image of the United States as the heartland of mixed-up Spanish is closely correlated both with the historical events that brought the Spanish language within the U. S. borders and with moments that placed the United States into conflict with Spanish-speaking countries. This convergence of internal and external circumstances has created an epistemological smokescreen behind which the Spanish language has been taking quite different directions within the United States.

INTERNAL HISTORICAL EVENTS

Discounting the very small number of native Spanish speakers who were present in the United States since colonial times, the major internal events involving Spanish and its speakers are (in greatly abbreviated form) the following. In each case, Spanish was seen as the language of an "enemy": another nation, an internal population demanding redress, or a group of uninvited gate-crashers.

1836-1848: The secession of Texas from Mexico, followed by the Mexican-American war, suddenly brings a huge expanse of Spanish-speaking territory within the borders of the United States. Mexicans and by extension their language are demonized, first in the lead-up to the war, then in its aftermath, with point events such as the siege of the Alamo used to whip up

anti-Mexican fervor even more. Despite the land and language rights guaranteed by the Guadalupe Hidalgo treaty, Mexicans are systematically stripped of their land and civil rights through various legal and illegal maneuverings.

1849: the California Gold Rush provides a dramatic scenario for land grabs by Anglo-American treasure seekers, pitting speakers of English against "enemy" Spanish-speakers.

1898: The Spanish-American war brings Puerto Rico and Cuba into the United States political sphere. After a 4-year military occupation, Cuba is allowed to become independent, although the Platt Amendment allows for U. S. military intervention when Cuban affairs are not to the liking of American politicians. Puerto Rico on the other hand remained in political limbo; citizens were not given U. S. citizenship until many years later, and then were beset with an English-only public school system that resulted in a "lost generation" of Puerto Rican-Americans.

1910-1920: The Mexican Revolution, during which thousands of Mexicans of all social classes sought refuge from chaos and destruction by moving across the border into the United States. For the first time, Spanish was deliberately taken into areas where English had been the prevailing language, and for the first time Spanish as a "foreign" language entered the southwestern United States from outside its (new) borders.

1912: New Mexico statehood. At this point the territory that is still the state with the largest Latino population opted for statehood; in order to overcome the prejudice in Washington against admitting a "Mexican" state into the union, New Mexican statehood activists set about to convince a dubious American public of the "purity" of New Mexico.

1918-1930: *Bracero* programs recruiting Mexican laborers from the poor states of central and southern Mexico. During and immediately after World War I, there arose a shortage of farm

laborers in the United States, particularly since so many young male farmers had been sent to the battle front. To compensate for this diminished work force, the United States government initiated the *bracero* program of actively recruiting Mexican laborers for "temporary" work in United States agriculture. As with other foreign labor recruitment movements, the perceived need for Mexican laborers quickly receded, but attempts at repatriation of Mexican immigrants during the labor-surplus years of the Great Depression (1930-1942) met with little success. This represents the beginnings of the annual pilgrimages from the U. S.-Mexican border to midwestern and northwestern states during each summer's agricultural harvest season, a migratory trend which continues even today.

1929: LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens, was formed in Corpus Christi, Texas, making it the oldest Latino advocacy organization in the United States.

World War II brought a new round of xenophobia, more strident and harsher than the isolationism that had followed World War I. On the west coast of the United States, Mexican-Americans (many of whom were native-born U. S. citizens) were subject to harassment and sometimes forced deportation. The Sleepy Lagoon "zoot suit" riots of 1943 in Los Angeles pitted U. S. servicemen and Mexican-American youths; this was the first major race riot involving a Latino community struggling against "mainstream" American culture, and further soured already problematic relationships between Latinos and Anglo-Americans in urban America.

1948: *Operación Fomento/Operation Bootstrap*. Puerto Ricans began working in U. S. cities beginning with the first decades of the 20th century, principally in the cigar and garment industries. Following World War II, the Puerto Rican territorial government attempted to attract industry and stimulate economic development, through the plan known as Operation Bootstrap or *Operación Fomento*, begun in 1948. The outward migration was aided by business interests in the

United States, for example through highly subsidized or free one-way air passage from Puerto Rico to New York, where the combination of poverty and racial prejudice against "non-white" Puerto Ricans resulted in the ghettoization of the Puerto Rican communities. These events mark the beginning of the long-standing prejudice against Puerto Ricans in the industrial Northeast, coupled with ideas about substandard language usage.

1959-60: The Cuban revolution brought first a trickle then a torrent of anti-Castro refugees to the United States, mostly to the greater Miami area. Although the first wave of Cuban exiles represented the professional classes, and many refugees had established professional and family ties in the United States and spoke at least some English, this represented the first "takeover" of a major metropolitan area of the United States by a Spanish-speaking population that could not be ghettoized and thereby dismissed, as had happened with Puerto Ricans in the Northeast and Mexicans in the Southwest. Resentment against the need to be conversant in Spanish in order to prosper in Miami began at this time, and continues to the present day.

1960's: This was the period of civil rights activism in the United States, which for the first time brought the plight of Spanish-speaking farm workers, predominantly of Mexican origin, into the public arena. César Chávez and other community leaders brought attention to the sordid side of U. S. agribusiness, while at the same time the word *Chicano,* previously used derogatorily in Mexico to refer to hapless expatriots in the United States, emerged as a symbol of Mexican-American social activism. The Brown Berets, MECHA, La Raza, and the Teatro Campesino were other manifestations of growing Latino activism. At the same time ASPIRA and other Puerto Rican organizations mounted a struggle against racism, housing discrimination, and educational inequities.

1974: The Lau vs. Nichols decision brought bilingual education within the realm of possibility for Spanish-speaking communities, and the polemic over bilingual education for Spanish speakers began in earnest and continues to seethe and occasionally erupt even today.

1980: the Mariel boatlift brought hundreds of thousands of "new" Cubans to the United States, including sectors of Cuban society hitherto unrepresented in the United States: lower working class, rural, and even some with criminal antecedents. Even the established Cuban-American community viewed the newcomers with considerable ambivalence, while the remainder of U. S. society collectively shuddered at the idea of assimilating yet another needy Spanish-speaking population.

1980-90: In 1979 the Sandinista revolution toppled the 40+-year dictatorship of the Somoza dynasty in Nicaragua; within a year many previously ardent supporters of the anti-Somoza resistance movement became equally disenchanted with the Sandinistas and fled to the United States, mostly to Miami, and also to Los Angeles and other large cities. The majority of Nicaraguan exiles represented the middle and professional classes, and their anti-communist sentiments should have endeared them to Cuban-Americans and to other right-wing segments of American society. In fact Nicaraguans and Cubans in Miami coexisted with considerable unease, while prevailing attitudes across the rest of the country regarded Nicaraguans as merely the latest Spanish-speaking gate crashers.

1980-1989: The same decade also brought hundreds of thousands of refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala, fleeing from the civil wars, paramilitary death squads, and U. S. sponsored counterinsurgency programs. Unlike the Nicaraguans, these refugees were almost entirely rural and poor. The Salvadorans largely moved to areas already containing substantial Mexican-American populations and attempted to commingle with communities largely left alone by

immigration officials. Many Guatemalan refugees spoke little or no Spanish, and gravitated toward rural areas of the southeast and northwest, although a substantial population settled in Los Angeles and other urban areas.

1990's and 2000's: A swelling Dominican population arrives in greater New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, but also in the southeastern United States. Many arrive by precarious small boats known as *yolas,* and are popularly lumped together with Haitian "boat people" and Cuban "raft people." Already shunned in the Caribbean and unfairly stigmatized as speaking substandard Spanish, Dominicans have struggled to advance in the United States, and are achieving success against a backdrop of considerable hostility from many segments of U. S. society.

This timeline demonstrates that speakers of Spanish and the Spanish language itself has been constantly in the public image for more than a century, usually in the guise of the struggle of Latinos to obtain basic human and civil rights in the face of systematic obstacles. As has occurred with other sectors of society that have waged similar struggles, lasting prejudice, fueled by misinformation and xenophobia, has been the unfortunate side-effect.

EXTERNAL EVENTS INVOLVING SPANISH-SPEAKING NATIONS

The relations between the United States and the Spanish speaking world—particularly Latin America—have been many and varied over more than a century and a half. On occasion the United States has aided Spanish-speaking peoples in fashions which while not devoid of self-interest, may have genuinely better the lives of common folk; the Peace Corps is the best instantiation of U. S. aid with few strings attached. However it is fair to say that within Latin America, Spain, and most of the rest of Europe and the Western Hemisphere, the United States is best remembered for its many military interventions, occupations and land seizures, support for repressive regimes, maintaining training schools for tyrants and torturers such as the infamous School of the Americas, and

relentless economic coercion by predatory multi-national corporations, ranging from banana production to mining interests and garment manufacture. It is primarily the military interventions that have made the most spectacular headlines, and which can be closely correlated with increased attention by foreign observers to Spanish within the United States. The 19th century saw expansionist wars with Mexico and Spain, as well as some failed annexationist attempts (most notably with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua), but it was in the 20th century that the most dramatic events occurred, in tandem with viewpoints in other countries toward the Spanish language within the U. S. borders. U. S. conflicts with the Spanish-speaking world are too numerous to cover exhaustively, but a very selective list demonstrates the point:

1903: Panama's independence from Colombia. The nation of Panama, some might argue, is a pure case of United States intervention, since this nation was "created" from Colombia with considerable help from the United States when Colombia balked at allowing U. S. interests to build a canal in that Colombian province. Until the Torrijos-Carter treaties of 1977 the entire Canal Zone was a de facto part of the United States, and it was not until the total reversion of this strip of land to Panamanian sovereignty in 1999 that Panamanians finally controlled all of their national territory.

1907: U. S. confrontation with Nicaragua in the Gulf of Fonseca.

1909-1934: Effective U. S. military occupation of Nicaragua, sometimes directly and at other times by means of puppet governments.

1916-1924: U. S. military occupation of the he Dominican Republic.

1954: The Central Intelligence Agency of the United States engineered the overthrow of the democratically elected president Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala; this is the first known triumph of the United States secret services in securing a regime change.

1961: Failed Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba by U. S.-supported Cuban exiles and mercenaries; the botched invasion came at a time when Fidel Castro still enjoyed great popularity in Latin America.

1965: U. S. invasion of the Dominican Republic.

1968: The Tlatelolco massacre of October 2, 1968 in Mexico City was tied, at least in public opinion, to official U. S. support for repressive Mexican governments; the C. I. A. was subsequently implicated in having provided logistical aid to the Mexican military and police during this crisis.

1973: The United States was also instrumental in organizing the overthrow and assassination of the democratically elected president Salvador Allende in Chile, and strongly supported the ensuring brutal dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet.

1980's: The United States actively supported right-wing dictatorships in Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and other countries, always under the guise of propping up anti-communist regimes as part of the overarching Cold War strategy.

1980-1990: From 1980-1990, during the Sandinista regime, the United States orchestrated an insurgency movement known as the Contras, formed of members of Somoza's ex National Guard and other disaffected Nicaraguans, together with mercenaries, and thereby intervened in all aspects of Nicaraguan life for another decade.

1982: The United States' open support of Great Britain during the Falkland Islands war produced a great upsurge of anti-American sentiment in Latin America, even in nations that had expressed repugnance for the brutal Argentine military dictatorship responsible for starting the conflict.

1989: U. S. invasion of Panama, to topple the former C. I. A. collaborator Manuel Noriega from power.

1999: U. S. Navy bombers accidentally killed a Puerto Rican civilian on Vieques island during target practice. The incident triggered massive protests in Puerto Rico, the mainland United States, and in Latin America; the U. S. Navy suspended all bombing practice four years later.

Once more this abbreviated time line reveals a nearly constant confrontation between the United States and Spanish-speaking countries. The widely held perception of a global struggle between Anglo-American and Hispanic societies adds to anti-American feelings and indirectly contributes to the notion that Latinos living in the United States are placing themselves and their languages at risk.

Scholarship on U. S. Spanish in correlation with historical events

Unlike popular opinion, which all too frequently reveals the basest human emotions, professional scholarship is implicitly assumed to be more objective and enlightened. In the case of Spanish in the United States, academic scholarship has often occupied an intermediate position, reflecting prejudices of the day but increasingly involved with social and educational issues. During the 20th century there is a noteworthy correlation between scholarship and the events described previously, particularly those that cast Spanish and its speakers in an unfavorable light.

In the early decades of the 20th century, Spanish in the United States--then described only for the Southwest--was not treated as an immigrant language, a minority language, a bilingual dancing partner, or a language in transition. It was simply a variety of Spanish coincidentally found within the United States and spilling across its borders. The fact that Spanish was not officially acknowledged, and that it was a captured language at times under siege, had little impact on the early scholarly treatments, with a few noteworthy exceptions.

Many later studies treated Spanish dispassionately, but exceptions were frequent enough to merit comment; a few representative samples of unfavorable comments on U. S. Spanish and the effects of bilingual contact with English will be presented here. They are not meant to suggest that all or even most scholarship followed similar lines, but rather to indicate a persistent thread of anti-U. S. Spanish sentiment stretching across many scholarly journals and publishing houses.

1912: In the year of New Mexico statehood, the president of the University of New Mexico Edward Gray (1912) published an article in the *University of New Mexico Bulletin* entitled "The Spanish language in New Mexico: a national resource,' assuming a stance that moved beyond academic curiosity-seeking and liberal posturing. That few others shared his views is exemplified by an article in another New Mexico journal just a few years later (Morrill 1918) entitled "The Spanish language problem in New Mexico."

1917: In the same year that the American Association of Teachers of Spanish celebrated its first annual meeting, Espinosa (1917) openly acknowledged that "race antagonism has always been very pronounced ..." and that... in the new cities ... where the English speaking people are numerically superior, the Spanish people are looked upon as an inferior race ..." .

1939-40: It is perhaps not coincidental that although a brief note by Rael (1934) in *Modern Language Notes* took a neutral tone, when Rael presented his work in the strait-laced *Hispanic Review* (1939, 1940) the title was the ominous "Associative interference in New Mexican Spanish." The "interference" is not from English but is rather language-internal analogy; nearly all the items mentioned by Rael are found in rural dialects of Spanish throughout Spain and Latin America. Nonetheless the focus is exclusively on forms which were sure to arouse hilarity and derision among the normatively-trained perusers of this periodical, and New

Mexico Spanish was inadvertently portrayed to outsiders as an infelicitous patchwork of all the bleeding stigmata of *la lengua de Cervantes*:

1930's-early 1960's: The 1930's and early 1940's saw a number of articles, theses, and dissertations dealing with southwest Spanish, centered on New Mexico; these almost inevitably dealt with perceived deficiencies of Spanish speakers, in school achievement, in learning English, and when taking intelligence tests. Many of these studies were written by educators seriously preoccupied by the educational difficulties of Spanish-speaking children, even though bilingualism was often hopelessly entangled with ethnocentric views of mental disabilities. Since the work was undertaken primarily by educators and psychologists there was little denigration of the characteristics of Spanish, but the entire discourse is permeated with the notion that knowledge of Spanish is a cognitive liability. That such notions did not disappear with war ration coupons and Al Capone's gangs is illustrated by a 1950's study (Marx 1953) referring to the "problem" of bilingualism among Spanish-speaking Americans, and a 1960's thesis addressing the "handicaps of bi-lingual Mexican children" (Marcoux 1961). Groups purportedly descended from "Spaniards" (implicitly white European, with no New World or African admixture) received more favorable treatment: Louisiana; Tampa, Minorcans in St. Augustine, and so forth (Friedman 1950, Canfield 1951, Hayes 1949, Ortiz 1947, 1949; Ramírez 1939, Claudel 1945, MacCurdy 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1952). As another example of the prevailing tendencies of the time, Kreidler (1958) continued the tradition of describing immigrant varieties of Spanish--in this case Puerto Rican Spanish in New Jersey--in terms of influence/interference from English.

1950: The study of social registers of Spanish made its first appearance in the 1950's, invariably choosing socially marked underclass speech for individual attention. It was during the

1950's that “Pachuco” Spanish was first studied by scholars, almost all of whom were from outside the Mexican-American community. Barker (1950) described Pachuco in Tucson as “an American-Spanish argot,” a term which Barker extracts from Webster's dictionary as “a secret language or conventional slang peculiar to a group of thieves, tramps or vagabonds; or, more broadly, a cant or class jargon.” While not fully committing himself to the criminal or non-criminal connotations of Pachuco language, Barker inclines towards the former by citing informants' accounts that Pachuco originated among `"grifos" or marijuana smokers and dope peddlers, in the El Paso underworld ... it seems probable that these individuals, in turn, obtained a substantial part of their vocabulary from the *Caló* or argot of the Mexican underworld.' He cites sources which claim that the language first reached Los Angeles when a group of El Paso hoodlums received suspended prison sentences in return for self-banishment. Although describing Pachucos as in effect youth gangs, Barker is judicious in describing the Sleepy Lagoon fights and the Zoot Suit riots and the kangaroo court justice that befell many of the participants. He also acknowledges that many young Chicano war veterans became disillusioned by the shabby treatment afforded by a society whose freedom they had risked their lives to protect. There remains an undercurrent of disapproval: “the habitual use of the argot, then, may be taken to indicate that the speaker is not interested in raising his social status above that of the laboring group. Such usage may also indicate his rejection of some of the conventional values of Mexican and American culture.” Barker concludes--not without some justification--that “... only when the goals of American society can be demonstrated as obtainable to him--perhaps then through such means as vocational education--will the pachuco as a linguistic and social type disappear ...” This compares with Pauline Baker’s (1953) description of Pachuco as “the slang of the dead-end kids.” In the same time period, Braddy (1953, 1956, 1965) wrote of “Pachucos

and their argot" together with "smugglers argot" and "narcotic argot" in Texas. In other studies, R. J. González (1967) believed that Pachuco was becoming a creole (taking this term to entail language degeneration), a view also shared by Webb (1976, 1980). Griffith (1947) referred to the "Pachuco patois," while May (1966) wrote of "tex-mex" and Ranson (1954) wrote of "viles pochismos."

1953: This year witnessed perhaps the first commercially published textbook for native Spanish speakers in the U. S.: Paulline Baker's *Español para los hispanos* (1953), reprinted many times in the following four decades. Baker, teaching in rural New Mexico where Spanish was essentially a monolingual language, offered the book as a supplement to traditional Spanish courses; speaking of U. S. Spanish speakers she noted that "we are witnessing a sorry decadence of Spanish in the United States," and "Every day the need increases to correct the errors of bad Spanish that should be avoided and to develop the proper Spanish that should be used" [my translation]. The book mentions Pachuquismos [Mexican-American slang] among the many peccadilloes to be eliminated from Spanish usage.

By the late 1960's and leading into the 1970's the conflicting currents of social activism and reactionary backlash had made their way into scholarship about Spanish in the United States. In 1968, the year of Martin Luther King's assassination and the Mexican massacre at Tlatelolco, the United Farm Workers' grape boycott was in its second year. In this same year Joshua Fishman, Robert Cooper, and Roxanna Ma delivered to the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the final report of a project entitled "Bilingualism in the barrio: measurement and description of language dominance in bilinguals," arguably the first major sociolinguistic survey of a Latino community in the United States (better known in the second edition, Fishman et al. 1975). For the first time the full human scope of a bilingual community was coherently

discussed by a multidisciplinary group of scholars, and language usage was integrated into a total community perspective; ghettoized Puerto Ricans were portrayed with the same care and in equally positive terms as more prestigious groups of French, Scandinavian, and German speakers had enjoyed.

1973: Just a few years later, and amidst the outpouring of Chicano and Puerto Rican literature and the founding of several important journals and conferences, the Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Española was founded; its inaugural meeting was held the following year. At least half of the members were originally from outside the United States, and the list of academicians contained more literary scholars than linguists. That U. S. born Spanish speakers or working-class immigrants were not the primary intended beneficiaries of the academy is suggested by the tone of the president's inaugural remarks: [Spaniards and Spanish Americans who reside in this country form a true society within the great American family ... this ethnic conglomeration naturally identifies with the speech patterns of the Spanish spoken in the respective home countries, and principally requires a clear Spanish, free of regional and provincial items ...]

1976: The first number of the Academy's *Boletín* appeared. The academy's own statement of purpose declares that the members will work for [the preservation of the unity, universality, purity, beauty, and greater dissemination of the Spanish language within the United States] The editor's introduction (Chang-Rodríguez 1976:5-6) notes that [the statues of our academy set forth a number of tasks in defense of the purity of our Spanish language] and concludes by saying [faced with these many linguistic challenges and aggravated by the prestige of English, we offer our love of Spanish and our own interpretation of the arduous task of purifying, stabilizing, and polishing it [my translation throughout].

By the end of the 1970's, scholarly approaches to Spanish in the United States were increasingly scientific, objective, and devoid of emotional commentary, although calls for purity and properness were never far in the background. This period saw the beginnings of serious inquiry into the linguistic and social constraints on Spanish-English code-switching, which had hitherto begun regarded as a degenerate practice symptomatic of the undesirability of bilingualism and the confounding effects of language contact. It was during this time period that poetry and narrative incorporating code-switching appeared prominently as U. S. Latino writers emerged as a new literary voice. From the neotraditionalism of Rolando Hinojosa to the experimental writings of Alurista and Tato Laviera, intertwined language was a defining characteristic of many U. S. writers, creating a third code in defiance of the colonialist literary canon which had held bilingual authors hostage to a single language or at best to the use of one language per work. The dual languages of bilingual communities were studied as a coherent system rather than as language deterioration punctuated by slips and errors.

Yet another landmark of the 1970's is the publication of the first commercially successful textbooks designed to teach Spanish grammar and literacy to bilingual native speakers in the United States. Just a couple of decades ago, homegrown Spanish was immediately suspect, and any oddity found in this country was held guilty of English interference until proven innocent, a proof that few bothered to provide. Teachers were discouraged from using speakers of U. S. Spanish as native models, while students besieged their teachers with doubts regarding the "authenticity" or "correctness" of Spanish-speaking groups in this country. Coupled with this intolerance was a blissful ignorance of legitimate variation found throughout the Spanish-speaking world. Combinations which do occur were labeled as nonexistent, while moribund or archaic forms were presented as though they were in daily use everywhere.

Spanish-English contact and "Spanglish"

When referring to racial and ethnic minorities in the United States, a number of words and expressions once used frequently and insensitively have fallen out of favor and are now shunned in favor of more accurate designations. Words once openly spoken in reference to African Americans, Jews, Italians, Asians, Native Americans, Latinos, and those with mental and physical disabilities, and found in radio and television programs, popular literature, films and public discourse in general are now socially and politically unacceptable. One particular subset of these terms refers to individuals or groups that result from racial or ethnic mixture, generally included in ersatz cover terms such as *half-breed*. Of the racial/ethnic terms that have survived the enhanced focus on civil rights and social conscience, only one refers simultaneously to language use and—by inference rather than by direct indication—to specific ethnic groups: *spanglish*. An obvious blend of *English* and *Spanish* this word has become the less transparent *espanglish* in the Spanish-speaking world. Although *spanglish* has at times been used to refer to a wide variety of phenomena , in the vast majority of instances *spanglish* targets the language usage of Latinos born in or residing in the United States. There are substantive differences in the usage of this term within the United States and in Spanish-speaking countries. Outside of the United States, the situation of the Spanish language in the U. S. is often entangled with anti-imperialistic political postures that assume as axiomatic that any language and culture arriving in the United States will be overwhelmed by Anglo-American values, and will be denatured, weakened, contaminated, and ultimately assimilated by the mainstream juggernaut. Defenders of language mixing and borrowing have largely come from literary circles and from the political left, and have been frustrated in attempts to bring their views to the attention of mainstream educators, journalists, and community leaders. In the usual circumstances, *spanglish* is used

derogatorily, to marginalize U. S. Latino speakers and to create the impression—not supported by objective research—that varieties of Spanish used in or transplanted to the United States become so hopelessly entangled with English as to constitute a "third language" substantially different from Spanish and English. This "third language" in turn is seen as gradually displacing Spanish in the United States, thereby placing U. S. Latino speakers at a disadvantage vis-à-vis their compatriots in other countries. One common thread that runs through most accounts of *spanglish* is that most Latinos in the United States and perhaps in Puerto Rico and border areas of Mexico speak this "language" rather than "real" Spanish. In a few instances *spanglish* is a strictly neutral term, and as will be seen, some U. S. Latino political and social activists have even adopted *spanglish* as a positive affirmation of ethnolinguistic identity. Since upwards of 50 million speakers are at stake, the matter is definitely of more than passing interest.

Within the United States the designation *spanglish* is most commonly used by non-Latinos (or by Latinos who are openly critical of non-standard language usage), in reference to the speech patterns of resident Latino communities. The most frequent targets are the nation's two oldest Hispanophone communities, those of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin. In the southwestern United States, *Tex-Mex* is often used (by non-Latinos) as a synonym of *spanglish*, as is *pocho* among Mexican-Americans. *Spanglish* is occasionally used to refer to Cuban-Americans and increasingly to resident Dominicans; rarely if ever does one hear *spanglish* used in conjunction with expatriates from Spain or Southern Cone nations perceived as "white," thus suggesting an element of racism coupled with the xenophobia that deplores any sort of linguistic and cultural hybridity. Despite the lack of empirical evidence, the view that *spanglish* constitutes a specific type of language is widespread; one can find dictionaries, grammar

sketches, greeting cards, t-shirts, bumper stickers, and an enormous number of editorial comments and references in popular culture, all suggesting that *spanglish* has a life of its own.

Despite the unlikelihood that *spanglish* has a unique parentage, the *Oxford English Dictionary* places the first known written attestation of this word—in Spanish rather than in English—in a setting that represents the quintessence of conflicting linguistic attitudes: Puerto Rico. The ambiguous status of Puerto Rico—at once a Spanish-speaking Latin American nation and a colony of the world's most powerful English-speaking society—has provoked a level of concern about the purity of the Spanish language and an ambivalence towards the English language unmatched in the Spanish-speaking world. The number of popularizing works that purport to describe and decry the "contamination" of Puerto Rican Spanish by English is enormous; serious linguistic studies are much fewer, but a pair of prominent monographs have kept the debate alive. The term *spanglish* (*espanglish* in Spanish) appears to have been coined by the Puerto Rican journalist Salvador Tio, in a newspaper column first published in 1952. Tio—who certainly considers himself the inventor of this word (an opinion largely shared by others in Latin America)—was concerned about what he felt to be the deterioration of Spanish in Puerto Rico under the onslaught of English words, and waged a campaign of polemical and satirical articles over more than half a century. Many of Tio's examples are legitimate borrowings from English—some in unassimilated form—that are found in modern Puerto Rican speech. Most refer to consumer products marketed in the United States or to aspects of popular youth culture, but Tio felt that Puerto Rican Spanish could suffer a far worse fate than simply absorbing foreign borrowings—which, after all, had been occurring in Spanish for more than a thousand years. Tio's early article also contained humorous "Spanglish" words of his own invention, which were not used at the time and have not been used since, thereby creating some

confusion between legitimate examples of language contact and sarcastic parodies. Although Tio had lived in New York City, and therefore had experienced first-hand true bilingual contact phenomena, he accepted uncritically others' parodies of Spanish-English interaction, such as the following, from McKinstry (1930:336), quoted in Mencken (1962:650-1): *"¡Hola amigo! ¿Cómo le how do you dea?" "Voy very welldiando, gracias"* Despite his affirmation of concern about the status of Spanish in Puerto Rico—and by extension in other areas where English threatens to overwhelm it—Tio (1954:64) offers his own version of *spanglish,* a travesty of bilingual behavior that set the stage for later debates on *spanglish*. Although Tio offers this wry "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em" pseudo-solution to language and culture clash, his bitter refutation of English comes through clearly. Tio's many remarks about *spanglish*—scattered across several articles and four decades—present an ambiguous picture. On the one hand Tio shared with many other Puerto Rican intellectuals of the time the fear that United States cultural imperialism and the crushing weight of English would eventually displace a language that had landed with Columbus and had survived unaltered until only a few decades previously. After all, Tio could remember the English-only schools that arrived with the American occupation of Puerto Rico, and his first comments on *spanglish* were written just after Puerto Rico had finally wrested from the United States government the right to elect its own governor and congress. By the middle of the 20th century world-wide Spanish already contained numerous well-integrated Anglicisms, and Puerto Ricans used even more, including those that had entered via the American school system, consumer advertising, American businesses located in Puerto Rico, and by the increasing tide of Puerto Ricans who emigrated to the mainland to work and returned with new English expressions. Tio, like McKinstry and scores of nameless commentators before and since, deliberately invented pseudo-bilingual monstrosities into order to denigrate legitimate

bilingual speech communities individually and collectively. For McKinstry the prime motivation was racist supremacy: Mexicans were regarded as inferior to Anglo-Americans, hence incapable of adequately acquiring English but all too capable of losing their grip on their own native language once confronted—even at a distance and separated by a national border—with the English language juggernaut. Tio may well have harbored racist sentiments against Anglo-Americans—and his scorn for the Afro-American language Papiamentu provides a possible bit of evidence—but his harshest broadsides are directed at his fellow citizens for their failure to embrace monolinguism, for Tio a primordial virtue. Tio foreshadows a viewpoint that would later be taken up in the continental United States by expatriate intellectuals like the distinguished literary critic Roberto González Echeverría, namely that even educated Latinos willingly allow their language to be overrun by English in the mistaken view that this increases their upward social mobility. The latter wrote in a 1997 *New York Times* op-ed piece that: "The sad reality is that Spanglish is primarily the language of poor Hispanics, many barely literate in either language. They incorporate English words and constructions into their daily speech because they lack the vocabulary and education to adapt to the changing culture around them. Educated Hispanics who do likewise have a different motivation: some are embarrassed by their background and feel empowered by using English words and directly translated English idioms. Doing so, they think, is to claim membership in the mainstream. Politically, however, Spanglish is a capitulation; it indicates marginalization, not enfranchisement." This condemnation of *spanglish* as a manifestation of defeat and submissiveness by Hispanic communities in the United States recalls past North American Spanish Academy president Odón Betanzos Palacios' lament, when he speaks of [the problem of some Hispanics in the United States, who have not had the opportunity to learn either of the languages (Spanish or English)].

In another commentary on *spanglish*, the Spaniard Joaquim Ibarz (2002:3) offers the following observation, which clearly confuses regional and social dialects, youth slang, and language contact phenomena: [… the language resulting from the mixture of Spanish and English, known as "spanglish," is spoken by more than 25 million people on both sides of the U. S.-Mexican border, an area in which some 40 million Latinos live. Most use some variety of this dialect, which varies according to the country of origins, like Cubonics in Miami, Nuyorican for Puerto Ricans in Manhattan and Pachuco caló of San Antonio]

For the Cuban linguists Valdés Bernal and Gregori Tornada (2001:5), *spanglish* is in essence a phenomenon peculiar to Puerto Ricans living in New York, but is also now found among young Cuban-Americans in Miami: [spanglish, as might be expected, has made an appearance in Miami among the new generation of Cuban-Americans—yacas—who "mess around" speaking this dialect "part Anglicized Spanish, part Hispanized English, and part syntactic combinations used unconsciously by children and adults]. Most of the cited examples are based on loan translations, but in some cases the results of language erosion among increasingly English-dominant bilinguals is taken as an indicator of *spanglish* (for example the use of the familiar pronoun *tú* in conjunction with deferential address forms such as *señor alcalde* `honorable mayor').

Spanglish as used in most of the unfavorable comments just surveyed and even in some more neutral accounts does not have a totally consistent definition, but generally refers to a combination of lexical borrowings (both assimilated and non-assimilated to Spanish morphological and phonological patterns) and calques or loan-translations. Occasionally, oblique reference to the speech of English-dominant or semifluent bilinguals gets added to the mix, indicative of phenomena that strictly speaking are not the result of language contact but

rather language erosion. Even most of the neutral observations by linguists focus on lexical borrowings and calques. In contrast to the bombastic and satirical account of Salvador Tio, Rose Nash (1970:223-5) speaks of "Spanglish" in Puerto Rico as follows :

> In the metropolitan areas of Puerto Rico, where Newyorricans play an influential role in the economic life of the island, there has arisen a hybrid variety of language, often given the slightly derogatory label of Spanglish, which coexists with less mixed forms of standard English and standard Spanish and has at least one of the characteristics of an autonomous language: a substantial number of native speakers. The emerging language retains the phonological, morphological, and syntactic structure of Puerto Rican Spanish. … Spanglish as defined here is neither language containing grammatical errors due to interference nor intentionally mixed language.

Most of Nash's examples represent the sort of lexical borrowing found in all bilingual contact situations. In a recent survey of attitudes and inquiries about Spanish in the United States, Fairclough (2003:187) defines *spanglish* as simply [the mixture of English and Spanish]; Stavans (2003:6) similarly defines *spanglish* innocuously as "The verbal encounter between Anglo and Hispano civilizations." His anecdotal accounts of learning *spanglish* upon arriving in New York City from Mexico reveal an often less than affectionate reaction, and also the implicit definition of *spanglish* as based on syntactic calques: "But to keep up with these publications [Spanish-language newspapers in New York City in the 1980's] was also to invite your tongue for a bumpy ride. The grammar and syntax used in them was never fully "normal,' e.g., it replicated, often unconsciously, English-language patterns."

Given that *spanglish* loosely defined as calques and lexical borrowings typifies virtually every language contact environment world wide (past and present), it is not surprising that fact

and fantasy become blurred as to the sorts of borrowings and calques that actually occur. It is true, for example, that all Spanish-speaking communities in the United States, including some archaic isolates, render the English verbal particle *back* by *pa(ra) atrás: te llamo patrás* `I'll call you back,' *ven patrás* `come back,' *no me hables patrás* `don't talk back to me,' etc. It is equally true that false or partial cognates are often fair game in bilingual environments: thus Spanish *aplicar* `to dedicate' now means `to apply for a job, a scholarship, etc.,' while *mayor,* an adjective meaning `larger,' occasionally slips in as meaning `(city) mayor.' But even the most uneducated bilingual speakers implicitly know where to draw the line; the same cannot be said of detractors of Spanish in the United States, who are responsible for urban legends that are now widely believed to be actually occurring instances of "Spanglish." More than half a century ago the Nobel Prize winning Spanish author Camilo José Cela claimed that he had encountered stores in the northeastern United States that offered home delivery of groceries via the grotesque combination *deliveramos groserías,* literally (and taking into account spelling differences) `we think about dirty words.' This same expression has subsequently been attributed to stores in Miami, Texas, California, and elsewhere, as a brief Internet search will reveal, in all cases without a single eye witness to the alleged impropriety. The proliferation of Internet web sites devoted to commentary on the Spanish language has spawned numerous variants of this obvious urban legend, including a supposed grocery store employee—a truck driver—who told the visiting Cela "me paso el tiempo deliberando groserías," which in anybody's Spanish can only mean "I spend my time thinking about dirty words." Cela, the author of the infamous *Diccionario secreto*, the world's most scholarly treatise on Spanish obscene words, is said to have been duly impressed with this response. The chances that even the most precarious bilingual speaker has spontaneously produced such an expression seriously (and not, e.g. as a

deliberate parody) are virtually nil, and yet this example is brandished even today as "proof" of the deplorable condition of U. S. Spanish. The continued belief in the existence of such linguistic gargoyles is reminiscent of the often-quoted notion that the Inuit (Eskimo) languages have numerous words for different types and textures of snow, since their society depends so vitally on a snowbound environment. Anthropologist Laura Martin (1986) and linguist Geoffrey Pullum (1991) have revealed this fallacy (in fact Inuit languages have no more words for snow than other languages in contact with snow), the result of careless repetition of a plausible but unverified assertion. It is also plausible that a bilingual speaker whose languages leak into each other uncontrollably would blurt out *deliveramos groserías* in some unhappy moment, but the fact is that no such combination exists in bilingual communities, and precisely because no such unconstrained leakage occurs in normal bilingualism. Due to the continued outpouring of what Jane Hill calls "junk Spanish" in American popular culture and the elevation of some apocryphal specimens to worldwide cult status, including Ilan Stavans' well-intentioned but grotesque "translation" of the first chapter of the *Quijote* into his own version of "Spanglish," humorous pseudo-Spanish constitutes one of the greatest impediments to the serious study of Spanish in the United States. Observers from outside the United States who do not have the opportunity to observe true Spanish-English bilingualism first hand are particularly gullible in this regard; harboring anti-American sentiments further facilitates the willing suspension of disbelief required in the propagation of outrageous linguistic myths.

So what is U. S. Spanish really like?

If *spanglish* is taken to refer to borrowings and loan translations, then Spanish in the United States is identical to every other variety of Spanish past and present, since Spanish has borrowed and calqued freely from every language it has ever come into bilingual contact with,

including Basque, Visigothic, Arawak, Nahuatl, Quechua, Aymara, Italian, Portuguese, and French. To criticize U. S. Spanish for doing what all languages in contact do is to repeat the age-old fallacy that incorporating new items into a language is a detrimental activity and one that can be kept in check through deliberate social engineering. The fact that Spanish within the United States is so frequently criticized is directly linked to anti-American sentiment; similar criticisms are voiced in Spain about the Spanish of Gibraltar, a fluently spoken native language of most Gibraltarians, and which bears many contact-induced similarities with U. S. varieties of Spanish. In this case the centuries-long dispute over control of Gibraltar underlies what is effectively an expression of anti-British sentiment, and has little to do with the linguistic reality of Gibraltar. The real question in the United States is whether there are any objectively verifiable changes to the basic structure of the Spanish language as transplanted to this country, and if so, whether there is any way in which they can be construed as a form of language deterioration. Such a question is not directed at cases of language erosion due to the trans-generational shift to English, a progression that affects all immigrant groups, albeit with a reduced velocity in the larger Spanish-speaking communities. Rather, we need to question whether Spanish as spoken fluently and sometimes quasi-monolingually in the United States is undergoing any systematic structural changes. Set against the backdrop of smokescreens, red herrings, scapegoats, straw men and other metaphorical chimeras, serious empirical research on Spanish in sustained and disadvantageous contact with English in the United States does occasionally reveal the grammatical limitation of Spanish morphosyntactic resources in favor of those that coincide with English, although true cases of grammatical convergence are rare except among transitional or semifluent bilinguals (Lipski 1986b, 1993, 1996a, 1996b). There is some differentiation with respect to monolingual Spanish speakers with respect to verb tense usage, particularly the

historically variable preterite-imperfect distinction (e.g. Floyd 1982; Pousada and Poplack 1982; Chaston 1991), although this distinction is never obliterated, as in English. Similarly, the Spanish indicative-subjunctive distinction never disappears, except among non-fluent heritage language speakers, but some constructions that show variable subjunctive usage among monolingual speakers may gravitate towards the indicative among English-dominant bilinguals (e.g. De la Puente-Schubeck 1991, Kirschner 1992; Ocampo 1990). Silva-Corvalán (1994) and others have documented a reduction in Spanish word-order possibilities in bilingual communities, essentially restricted to combinations that match the canonical SVO order of English. The same research shows than when the use of Spanish is effectively diminished or discontinued when children begin school (in English), less commonly used verb tenses, such as compound tenses and irrealis forms not used frequently in speech directed to children, may not fully emerge in the child's Spanish grammar, unless reinforced by later training in that language. Bilingual Spanish speakers in daily contact with English may prefer the analytical passive voice construction—congruent with English—to the pseudo-passive constructions with *se* that are peculiar to Spanish. In Spanish overt subject pronouns are normally redundant and used primarily for emphatic or focus constructions, while English requires overt subject pronouns in nearly all finite verb constructions. Research on subject pronoun usage among bilinguals reveals a broad range of variation, with a clear tendency to use more overt pronouns in Spanish as a direct correlate of English dominance (e.g. Otheguy and Zentella 2007; Flores-Ferrán 2004; Lipski 1996a). These differences with respect to monolingual usage are not systematic and do not characterize any particular speech community, but rather constitute a series of observations dispersed across the many millions of Spanish speakers in the United States.

It should be reiterated that even the aforementioned differences are found predominantly among individuals who speak Spanish under duress, in conditions of poverty and discrimination, deprived of opportunities for formal study in Spanish, and frequently working and living in environments where Spanish is actively repressed. In the case of immigrants from marginalized rural areas of Latin America, they may be speakers of highly non-canonical local dialects whose characteristics are little known and which may be confused with the results of contact with English or with language erosion. Even in these extreme cases, no non-Spanish structures emerge among fluent speakers; the "worst" that can be detected is the reduced use of options within Spanish that do not coincide with similar constructions in English. Arguably, this does not constitute linguistic impoverishment, since the expanded use of, e.g., the true passive voice, progressive constructions with stative verbs, and other patterns widely regarded as having been enhanced through contact with English, in effect counterbalance the diminished use of alternative constructions in other varieties of Spanish. Much of the criticism directed at the public use of Spanish in the United States, e.g. by Stavans, Tio, and González Echeverría, is due to the fact that the first generation of U. S.-born professional journalists and announcers in the Spanish-language media did not have the benefit of formal education in Spanish or in the professional use of Spanish, and were therefore at a great disadvantage when compared with their foreign-born and professionally trained counterparts. The public use of "home brew" Spanish no longer characterizes mainstream Spanish-language media in the United States, and can only be found in some local talk shows and community newsletters, but old stereotypes die hard.

What about code-switching?

One of the most noteworthy aspects of Spanish-English bilingualism in the United States is the frequent code-switching, including in the midst of a single sentence. Fluent bilingual speakers often switch between languages within the confines of a single conversation. Language switching is not unexpected when conversational participants change; it is logically understandable when topics change, e.g. between home- and work-related domains. It is when speakers freely switch back and forth between languages—often within a single sentence—with no obvious external shifts of focus or participants that non-bilinguals experience the greatest "linguistic shock." Linguistic research, beginning in the early 1970's, has definitively demonstrated that such intra-sentential code-switching is not the result of confusion and the inability to speak either language fluently, but rather an intertwining of languages governed by morphosyntactic and pragmatic constraints. Once confined to the most colloquial discourse of largely uneducated Latino bilinguals, and still highly criticized by out-group observers, in the United States and abroad, code-switching has now become an established feature of Latino creativity and activism. Since the late 1960's, the use of code-switching in U. S. Latino literature has become increasingly common, first in poetry and eventually in narrative texts as well. Such writers as Alurista, Tato Laviera, Roberto Fernández, and Rolando Hinojosa have fine-tuned the language of U. S. Latino communities to create a striking "third language" in their innovative literary texts. Even in their most creative flights of fancy, these writers almost always adhere to the syntactic and pragmatic rules that govern spontaneously-produced bilingual speech. The most general restriction on mixing languages within the same sentence is that no grammatical rule in either language be violated, and in particular that the point of transition be "smooth" in the sense that the material from the second language is in some way as likely a combination as a continuation in the first language. Latino activists and large segments of the young Latino

populations have also adopted code-switching as an essential component of self-identity, and have often applied the term *spanglish* exclusively to code-switched discourse. Just as *Chicano* now has vastly different connotations than this word once had in Mexico and the southwestern United States a few decades ago, so has *spanglish* been deliberately claimed as linguistic and cultural patrimony by Latinos seeking to turn lemons into *limonada*. Younger Puerto Ricans in New York and other cities of the Northeastern United States are beginning to adopt the word "Spanglish" with pride, to refer explicitly to code-switching: Zentella (1997:82) notes that "… more NYPR's are referring to "Spanglish" as a positive way of identifying their switching." She concludes (112-13) that "Contrary to the attitude of those who label Puerto Rican code switching "Spanglish" in the belief that a chaotic mixture is being invented, English-Spanish switching is a creative style of bilingual communication that accomplishes important cultural and conversational work." Zentella's proposed grammar of "Spanglish" is in reality a compilation of grammatical and pragmatic constraints on code-switching. Ed Morales (2002:3) takes a politically-grounded stance, linking *spanglish* with the notion that:

> Latinos are a mixed-race people… there is a need for a way to say something more about this idea than the word "Latino" expresses. So for the moment, let's consider a new term for the discussion of what this aspect of Latino means—let us consider Spanglish. Why Spanglish? There is no better metaphor for what a mixed-race culture means than a hybrid language, an informal code; the same sort of linguistic construction that defines different classes in a society can also come to define something outside it, a social construction with different rules. Spanglish is what we speak, but it is also who we Latinos are, and how we act, and how we perceive the world. It's also a way to avoid the sectarian nature of other labels that describe our condition, terms like Nuyorican,

Chicano, Cuban American, Dominicanyork. It is an immediate declaration that translation is definition, that movement is status quo.

The promotion of code-switching among Latinos is a conscious decision to move away from monolingual Spanish (since an interlocutor not fluent in English would be at a loss to understand the entirety of a conversation), and the affirmation of bilingualism in its most intertwined form as the essence of U. S. Latino identity and speech.

The emergence of new hybrid varieties of U. S. Spanish

The adoption of code-switching as one emblem of U. S. Latino identity is a powerful indicator that the Latino population can no longer be regarded as "foreign," and that pride in language is displacing self-effacing and apologetic postures that result from the re-colonization of Spanish within the United States. Code-switched discourse is, strictly speaking, not a variety of Spanish but rather a manifestation of "Spanish-plus," and whereas one may speculate on whether intrinsically bilingual speech will emerge as the principal exponent of Latino speech, this does not address the question of the nature of Spanish itself as a language growing natively and hybridizing in the United States. That such hybridization is occurring is beyond question, both in terms of continued lexical borrowing and calquing, but also of contact among various Spanish dialects, and the resulting innovations.

Although there has not emerged a single pan-U. S. variety of Spanish—and such will probably never occur—the individual Spanish-speaking speech communities are no longer linguistic satellites of their respective countries of origin. This is the most important single factor defining the present and future of the Spanish language in the United states, namely the emergence of self-sustaining dialects that embrace innovations not found elsewhere. This is not surprising; the history of the Spanish language in Latin America provides a blueprint for the

emergence of autonomous dialect zones, a pattern that was followed relentlessly over more than 400 years, and whose fundamental principles are once more operative among the millions of Spanish speakers in the United States. In both instances two fundamental factors are implicated: (1) expanding speech communities that cross the threshold separating small groups dependent linguistically and economically on the countries of origin and larger self-sufficient urban zones; and (2) liberation from sociopolitical ties to the ancestral homeland. The operation of these factors is clearly discernible in tracing the major linguistic changes that have affected both Peninsular and Latin American Spanish from the early 16th century to the beginning of the 20th century (Lipski 2002b, 2007).

Until at least the middle of the 18th century, the principal cities of Spanish America were small and relatively isolated, and contained speech patterns which could be easily influenced by rather small numbers of incoming settlers and immigrants. By comparing linguistic innovations occurring in Spain since the early 16th century with emerging traits of Latin American Spanish, it is possible to identify with some accuracy the period in which Latin American dialects ceased to reflect major innovations occurring in Spain; essentially between 1650 and 1700 most innovations in Spain no longer passed unconditionally to Latin America. Involved in this reckoning are early changes such as the devoicing of the sibilants /z/ and /d^z/ and the merger of /b/ and /v/, together with later changes such as the backing of /ʃ/ to /x/, and the innovative pronouns *usted/ustedes*. The emergence of the interdental phoneme /θ/ in the early 17th century affected only Castile, and never took root in Latin America, although some researchers have suggested brief interludes of survival in a few colonies. Later changes affecting Spain did not survive in Spanish America, although they were certainly present in the speech of arriving immigrants; this includes loss of the subject pronoun *vos,* the uvularization of the posterior

fricative /x/, use of the present perfect to express perfective actions not including the present moment, and several innovations in the use of object clitics.

The cutoff of Peninsular innovations affected all of Spanish America, occurring a bit earlier in isolated rural areas and somewhat later in cities. The cutoff came during a time when colonial cities experienced their first growth spurts; a comparison of the time line of changes in Spain and Latin America with the demographic patterns of Spanish American urban zones—ports and capital cities—reveals that once cities reached a critical mass of several tens of thousands, these speech communities effectively resisted full incorporation of language changes occurring in Spain and arriving with new settlers. By 1700, for example, Caracas had more than 20,000 inhabitants, Lima had 52,000, Santiago de Chile 25,000, Mexico City some 70,000, Havana around 30,000, and Potosí, Bolivia, site of the world's richest silver mine, 150,000, twice the population of Seville. All these cities had populations of no more than one thousand inhabitants a century before, meaning that the arrival of several ships per year, each carrying hundreds of settlers, saturated the local populations with speech patterns arriving from Spain, and ensured that Spanish American dialects were linguistically dependent on arrivals from overseas. Over the next century, the urban growth of more than 1000% and the attainment of overall population figures that dwarfed the number of settlers arriving at any given time created the conditions for linguistic self-sustainability, to which can be added growing sentiments of regional identity. It is precisely after these growth spurts that the term *criollo* or `creole' emerges as a marker of identity, referring to free white Spanish citizens born in the colonies and closely tied to the social and cultural patterns of their birthplace as opposed to a metropolis which many had never visited. The Anglo-American equivalents of *criollos,* for example, staged the Boston Tea Party.

During the century-plus interlude between the effective cutoff of Peninsular innovations and the dawn of post-colonial independence in the 1820's, less is known about changes affecting Latin American Spanish dialects, but such information as can be gleaned suggests that with the exception of contact-induced phenomena among marginalized indigenous and African groups, few innovations emerged to define "new" Spanish American dialects. Nearly all of the features felt today to be quintessentially Latin American innovations emerged as distinctive dialectal features beginning around the time of independence and continuing through the end of the 19th century and into the 20th. This includes the groove fricative pronunciation of /y/ as [⇒] and later devoicing to [⬀] in Buenos Aires and Montevideo, the strongly assibilated word-final /r/ pronounced as [⇦⇨] in Mexico City, the highly fronted posterior fricative, now nearly a palatal [⇩] in Chile, the consolidation of non-inverted questions of the type *¿qué tú quieres?* `what do you want' in the Caribbean zone, the preference for the diminutive suffix *–ico* after stem-final /t/ (*momentico, chiquitico*) in Colombia, Costa Rica, and parts of Venezuela and the Dominican Republic; "pseudo-cleft" constructions such as *tenemos es que apurarnos* `we have to hurry' and `*lo conocí fue en la fiesta*' `I met him at the party,' found in Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, Ecuador, and the Dominican Republic, among many others. The inference to be drawn is that the additional boost to national and regional self-esteem coming with independence and the often vigorous self-assertion of newly constructed identities created an environment in which linguistic innovations could flourish and take root. The same two factors—attainment of a critical demographic mass, and social independence from countries of origin—increasingly characterize U. S. Latino communities.

Within the United States, Spanish-speaking communities have grown both in terms of absolute numbers and of linguistic self-sufficiency. U. S.-born Spanish speakers in large urban

areas such as Los Angeles, Houston, New York City, Miami, Chicago, and Detroit are in general not absorbing all linguistic changes occurring in their countries of ancestral origin, are asserting linguistic self-sufficiency, and are developing innovative linguistic structures that are not dependent on the dialects of origin. Some examples:

(1) The obvious front-runner in the creation of innovative U. S. Spanish varieties is the incorporation of a core of calques, in addition to the many Anglicisms. Foremost among the calques, and highly characteristic of U. S. Spanish in the aggregate, is the much-criticized *para atrás* constructions, found among all U. S. Spanish speakers, including those of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Dominican, Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, Guatemalan, and Colombian origin, as well as isolated groups, such as the descendents of Canary Islanders in Louisiana known as *isleños,* speakers of traditional non-immigrant New Mexican Spanish, and descendents of Mexican military encampments found along the border between Texas and Louisiana (Lipski 1985, 1987; Otheguy 1993). This combination is clearly a part of several U. S. Spanish dialects, and also occur in the Spanish of Gibraltar (Lipski 1986c); in both instances the combinations have not "passed over" to the countries of origin, although in the case of Gibraltar that country lies only a few hundred yards away, as it often does along the U. S.-Mexican border.

(2) Already in the 1980's scholars such as Beatriz Varela (summarized in Varela 1992) pointed out differences between the speech of Cuban-Americans and innovative patterns in Cuba. Although older Cuban-Americans traditionally considered themselves to be part of a "greater Cuba" and lived for the day of an eventual return, younger Cuban-Americans born in the United States are pursuing their own linguistic destiny in ways that do not parallel contemporaneous developments in Cuba.

(3) Central Americans arriving in the United States usually drop the use of *vos* and the accompanying verb forms when speaking Spanish to individuals from other countries (Lipski 1986a, 2000a; Baumel-Schreffler 1989, 1994, 1995); at first this was done to avoid identification as non-Mexicans and subsequent harassment by immigration officials, and now it is more of a concession to the majority of U. S. Spanish speakers. Young U. S.-born Salvadorans have developed an innovative marker of transplanted Salvadoran identity. many add the tag *vos* to questions and affirmations, much as is done in Central America (Lipski 2000b), as an explicit affirmation of their Salvadoran identity. They may also use *vos* in conjunction with verb forms corresponding to *tú*. This occurs more frequently when speaking with other Salvadoran-Americans, and less frequently when using Spanish with members of other ethnic groups, as shown by the work of Susana Rivera-Mills (a, b):

George tiene mi dinero, *vos* `George has my money'

Vos,)por qué no te compras unos zápatos nuevos? `Why don't you buy some new shoes?'

Vos vienes a la fiesta conmigo `You're coming to the party with me'

)Puedes ver la televisión *vos*? `Can you see the television?'

Vos no te olvides de la fiesta `Don't forget the party'

Sí/no *vos* `Yes/no'

Vos mira, eso es cierto. `Look, that's right'

)Vienes mañana, *vos*? `Are you coming tomorrow?'

(4) Research by José Esteban Hernández (2002)on Salvadoran-Mexican interaction in Houston has shown Salvadoran speech modifying the traditional Central American use of *andar* as a transitive verb meaning `to carry on one's person,' as in *hoy no ando pisto* `today I'm not

carrying any cash.' Similarly, the *vos* verb forms are restricted to reported speech (involving other Salvadorans) and when directly addressing Mexicans.

(5) Younger Nicaraguans living in Miami are gravitating toward some Cuban speech patterns, particularly the use of non-inverted questions such as *cómo tú te llamas*`what's your name?', although resisting many typically Cuban lexical items.

(6) In dialect contact zones such as Chicago and New York City, some interpenetration of dialect traits is occurring, in addition to the ever-present lexical leveling. In Chicago, where Puerto Rican and Mexican varieties of Spanish are frequently in contact, Ghosh Johnson (2005) has shown that Mexican pronunciation of syllable-final /s/ is being weakened, presumably through contact with Puerto Rican Spanish (also Potowski 2004, 2007; Potowski and Matts 2007; Ramos-Pellicia 2004).

Hybrid vigor in U. S. Spanish

Within Spanish-speaking societies, linguistic hybridity has typically been seen as undesirable, a debilitating feature that undermines the "purity" of the language. Objectively, nothing could be further from the truth. Spanish, in its serendipitous trek along the route from Vulgar Latin, bumping up against Phoenician, Greek, Iberian, Basque, and other lesser-known peninsula-mates, did not even begin to coalesce as a self-conscious language until the planning efforts of the 13th century king Alfonso X, himself a native speaker of a regional variety that did not go on to become "Spanish." Eight centuries of contact with Arabic were followed immediately by the entry into Spanish of numerous Amerindian words; 300 years later, English—first from Great Britain and later from the United States—became a serious source of new lexical material, and a major bone of contention. By this time, the Spanish-speaking world was graced with numerous language academies, which acted as official gatekeepers in accepting

only a tiny fraction of the torrent of neologisms and innovations that the world's Spanish speakers actually used, while maintaining a nostalgic reincarnation of the Spanish maxim that *todo tiempo pasado fue mejor*, which could be paraphrased in plain English as "things ain't what they used to be." Even a cursory glance of the hundreds of widely used Spanish words and constructions that are NOT found in the Spanish Royal Academy's official dictionary and grammar books suffices to show what the Spanish language would be like if the language-meddlers had their way. It would not only be a hopelessly paralyzed anachronism, trapped in time and unable to respond to the present, much less the future, but it would also be devoid of a substantial portion of its creative potential. Ebenezer Scrooge recoiled in horror before the Ghost of Christmas Yet to Come, and those who embrace Spanish as a living language are equally repelled by the "Spanish Yet to Come" that emerges from the fantasy world of prescriptivism. Hybridity is the natural order of the world, and hybrid vigor is an established biological principle, to wit the enhanced survival rates of mongrel cats and dogs as opposed to inbred pedigreed "pure" animals. When applied to social constructions such as language, hybrid vigor is more than a metaphor, it is a fundamental reality supported by as much empirical evidence as in the life sciences. Through the ages, attempts to curtail hybridity and force-fit Spanish into externally-imposed molds have failed, but in their ultimately futile struggles these efforts have caused much needless suffering. One need think only of Franco's attempts to eradicate Catalan, Basque, and even his native Galician from Spain, and of Fidel Castro's prohibition of Anglicisms in Cuba (except in the domain of his favorite sport, baseball), while making the respectful terms *señor* and *señora* instead of *compañero/compañera* suspect as indications of counterrevolutionary sentiments. In a less sinister vein, one can mention Andrés Bello's rantings against the use of *vos,* especially in Chile, but also the thousands of anonymous

classrooms in Spain and Latin America where innocent children are stripped of their linguistic birthright and are humiliated and badgered into using “pure” language. If Paul Simon had been a sociolinguist, he might have sung “when I think back on all the crap I learned in grammar class, it’s a wonder I can speak at all.” Spanish, like all other languages, has survived the many attempts on its continued existence, and even its near-death experiences have injected more vigor and elasticity. The emergence of Spanish as a national language of the United States, and no longer a hot-house specimen that wilts upon contact with the outside world, has produced the usual “immune response” of linguistic purists, aided in their efforts by the many jaundiced viewpoints enumerated previously. However just as other varieties of Spanish withstood the pressures of colonial and neo-colonial society to become vehicles of national expression, so have the many Spanishes of the United States reached the point—in terms of numbers and of the demonstrated capability for innovation instead of imitation—where they no longer require the advice and consent of other Spanishes in other countries, nor of self-anointed prophets of linguistic doom here at home. Will linguistic self-awareness develop alongside linguistic self-sufficiency? If it does not, Spanish in the United States will continue to survive under erasure, always looking elsewhere for authorization, unaware or unconvinced of its own legitimacy and creativity, to be jettisoned in search of upward mobility. We as linguists and educators are not futuroligists or motivational therapists, but we occupy strategic positions from which to interact with the constituents involved, and to place the debate on an empirical footing. As Spanish continues to evolve in the United States, our research paradigms will be incorporated into public discourse as well as within the closed circles of academia. I urge caution and compassion as we walk the tightrope, balancing scientific inquiry and social justice.

References

Baker, Paulline. 1953. *Español para los hispanos*. Dallas: B. Upshaw. Subsequent printings by National Textbook Company, Skokie, IL.

Barker, George. 1950. Pachuco: an American-Spanish argot and its social function in Tucson, Arizona. *University of Arizona Social Sciences Bulletin* 18.1-38.

Baumel-Schreffler, Sandra. 1989. Una perspectiva del voseo: una comparación de dos naciones voseantes, Guatemala y El Salvador. M. A. thesis, University of Houston.

______. 1994. Second-person singular pronoun options in the speech of Salvadorans in Houston, Texas. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 13.101-119 [pub. 1998].

______. 1995. The *voseo*: second person singular pronouns in Guatemalan speech. *Language Quarterly* 33(1-2).33-44.

Bergen, John (ed.). 1990. *Spanish in the United States: sociolinguistic issues*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Betanzos Palacios, Odón. 1997. El "espanglish" y sus accidentes. Article published in the newpaper *Diario* of New York.

______. 2001. El español en Estados Unidos: problemas y logros. Presented at the II Congreso de la Lengua Española, Valladolid, Spain.

Blansitt, E. and R. Teschner (eds.). 1980. *Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Braddy, Haldeen. 1953. Narcotic argot along the Mexican border. *American Speech* 30.84-90.

______. 1956. Smugglers argot in the Southwest. *American Speech* 21.96-101.

______. 1965. The Pachucos and their argot. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 24.255-271.

Canfield, D. Lincoln. 1951. Tampa Spanish: three characters in search of a pronunciation. *Modern Language Journal* 35.42-44.

Chang-Rodríguez, Eugenio. 1976. Palabras del director del *Boletín*. *Boletín de la Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Española* 1.5-6.

Chaston, John. 1991. Imperfect progressive usage patterns in the speech of Mexican American bilinguals from Texas. *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-speaking world*, ed. Carol Klee, Luis Ramos-García, 299-311. Tempe: Bilingual Review Press.

Claudel, Calvin. 1945. Spanish folktales from Delacroix, Louisiana. *Journal of American Folklore* 58.209-24.

De la Puente-Schubeck, Elsa. 1991. La pérdida del modo subjuntivo en el español chicano de Nuevo México. Ph. D. dissertation, University of New Mexico.

Espinosa, Aurelio. 1917. Speech mixture in New Mexico: the influence of the English language on New Mexican Spanish. *The Pacific Ocean in history*, ed. H. Morse Stephens, Herbert Bolton, 408-428. New York: Macmillan.

Fairclough, Marta. 2003. El (denominado) *Spanglish* en los Estados Unidos. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 1(2).185-204.

Fishman, Joshua, Robert Cooper, and Roxana Ma (eds.). 1975. *Bilingualism in the barrio*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2nd ed.

Flores-Ferrán, Nydia. 2004. Spanish subject personal pronoun use in New York City Puerto Ricans: can we rest the case of English contact? *Language Variation and Change* 16.49-73.

Floyd, Mary Beth. 1982. Aspectual distinction in past reference: preterite and imperfect in southwest Spanish. *Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest* 5.36-41.

Friedman, Lillian. 1950. Minorcan dialect words in St. Augustine, Florida. *American Dialect Society* 14.81.

Ghosh Johnson, Subhadra Elka. 2005. Mexiqueño?: issues of identity and ideology in a case study of dialect contact. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

González, R. J. 1967. Pachuco: the birth of a creole. *Arizona Quarterly* 23.343-356.

González-Echeverría, Roberto. 1997. Is `Spanglish' a language? *New York Times*, March 28, 1997, p. A29.

Gray, Edward. 1912. The Spanish language in New Mexico: a national resource. *University of New Mexico Bulletin Sociological Series* 1(2).37-52.

Griffith, Beatrice. 1947. The pachuco patois. *Common Ground* 7.77-84.

Hayes, Francis. 1949. Anglo-Spanish speech in Tampa, Florida. *Hispania* 32.48-52.

Hernández, José Esteban. 2002. Accommodation in a dialect contact situation. *Filología y Lingüística* 28(2).93-100.

Ibarz, Joaquim. 2002. In un placete de La Mancha. *El Espectador* (Bogotá), 3 de julio de 2002.

Kirschner, Carl. 1992. The Spanish subjunctive and the Spanish-English bilingual: a semantically-motivated functional shift. *Hispanic Linguistics* 5.89-108.

Kreidler, Charles. 1958. A study of the influence of English on the Spanish of Puerto Ricans in Jersey City, New Jersey. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Lipski, John. 1985. The construction *pa*(*ra*) *atrás* in bilingual Spanish-English communities. *Revista/Review Interamericana* 15.91-102.

______. 1986a. Central American Spanish in the United States: El Salvador. *Aztlán* 17.91-124.

______. 1986b. El español vestigial de los Estados Unidos: características e implicaciones teóricas. *Estudios Filológicos* 21.7-22.

_____. 1986c. Sobre el bilingüismo anglo-hispánico en Gibraltar. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 87.414-427

_____. 1987. The construction *pa*(*ra*) *atrás* among Spanish-English bilinguals: parallel structures and universal patterns. *Ibero Americana* 28/29.87-96.

______. 1993. Creoloid phenomena in the Spanish of transitional bilinguals. In Roca and Lipski (eds.), 155-182.

______. 1996a. Patterns of pronominal evolution in Cuban-American bilinguals. In Roca and Jensen (eds.), 159-186.

______. 1996b. Los dialectos vestigiales del español en los Estados Unidos: estado de la cuestión. *Signo y Seña* 6.459-489.

_____. 2000a. The linguistic situation of Central Americans. *Language diversity: problem or resource?* (2nd ed.), ed.Sandra McKay, Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, 189-215. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

______. 2000b. El español que se habla en El Salvador y su importancia para la dialectología hispanoamericana. *Científica* (Universidad Don Bosco, San Salvador) 1:2.65-88

______. 2001. Back to zero or ahead to 2001?: issues and challenges in U. S. Spanish research. *Research on Spanish in the United States: linguistic issues and challenges*, ed. Ana Roca, 1-41, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

______. 2002a. Rethinking the place of Spanish. *PMLA (Publications of the Modern Language Association)* 117.1247-1251.

_____. 2002b. The role of the city in the formation of Spanish American dialect zones. *Arachne* 2.1 (2002). http://arachne.rutgers.edu/vol2_1lipski.htm

______. 2004. La lengua española en los Estados Unidos: avanza a la vez que retrocede. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 33.231-260.

______. 2005. Code-switching or Borrowing? No sé *so* no puedo decir, *you know*. *Selected Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics* ed. Lotfi Sayahi, Maurice Westmoreland, 1-15. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

_____. 2007. Castile and the hydra: the diversification of Spanish in Latin America. Presented at the Conference on Iberian Imperialism and language evolution in Latin America, University of Chicago, April 13, 2007.

_____. Forthcoming. *Varieties of Spanish in the United States.* Washington: Georgetown University Press.

MacCurdy, Raymond. 1947. Un romance tradicional recogido en Luisiana: *las señas del marido*. *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 13.164-6.

______. 1948. Spanish riddles from St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 12.129-35.

______. 1949. Spanish folklore from St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 13.180-91.

______. 1950. *The Spanish Dialect of St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

______. 1952. Spanish folklore from St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana. *Southern Folklore Quarterly* 16.227-50.

Marcoux, Fred. 1961. Handicaps of bi-lingual Mexican children. M. A. thesis, University of Southern California.

Martin, Laura. 1986. Eskimo words for snow: a case study in the genesis and decay of an anthropological example. *American Anthropologist* 88.418-422.

Marx, Meyer. 1953. *The problem of bi-lingualism among Spanish speaking groups in the United States: a review of the literature*. Project Report, University of Southern California, August 1953.

May, Darlene. 1966. Notas sobre el tex-mex. *Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* 70.17-19.

McKinstry, H. E. 1930. The American language in Mexico. *American Mercury* 19(75), March 1930, 336-338.

Mencken, H. L. 1962. *The American language*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 4th edition.

Morales, Ed. 2002. *Living in Spanglish: the search for Latino identity in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Morrill, D. B. 1918. The Spanish language problem. *New Mexico Journal of Education* 14 (May), 6-7.

Nash, Rose. 1970. Spanglish: language contact in Puerto Rico. *American Speech* 45.223-233.

Ocampo, Francisco. 1990. El subjuntivo en tres generaciones de hablantes bilingües. In Bergen (ed.), 39-48.

Ortiz, Carmelita. 1947. English influences on the Spanish of Tampa. M. A. thesis, University of Florida.

______. 1949. English influence on the Spanish of Tampa. *Hispania* 32.300-304.

Otheguy, Ricardo. 1993. A reconsideration of the notion of loan translation in the analysis of U. S. Spanish. In Roca and Lipski (eds.), 21-45.

Otheguy, Ricardo and Zentella, Ana Celia. 2007. Apuntes preliminarios sobre nivelación y contacto en el uso pronominal del español en Nueva York. *Spanish in contact:*

Educational, linguistic, and social perspectives, ed. Kim Potowski and Richard Cameron, 273-293. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pérez, G. 2003. Puertorriquenas rencorosas y mejicanas sufridas: Gendered ethnic identity formation in Chicago's Latino communities. *The Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 8(2).96-125.

Potowski, Kim. 2004. Spanish language shift in Chicago. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 23(1).87-116.

_____. 2007. "I was raised talking like my mom": The influence of mothers in the development of MexiRicans' phonological and lexical features. *Linguistic identity and bilingualism in different Hispanic contexts*, ed. Jason Rothman, Mercedes Niño-Murcia. Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins.

Potowski, Kim & Matts, J. 2007. MexiRicans: Inter-ethnic language and identity. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*.

Pousada, Alicia and Shana Poplack. 1982. No case for convergence: the Puerto Rican Spanish verb system in a langauge-contact situation. *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*, ed. J. Fishman, G. Keller, pp. 207-40. New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College Press.

Ramos-Pellicia, M. 2004. Language contact and dialect contact: Cross-generational phonological variation in a Puerto Rican community in the Midwest of the United States. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Pullum, Geoffrey. 1991. *The great Eskimo vocabulary hoax and other irreverent essays on the study of language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rael, Juan. 1934. *Cosa nada* en el español nuevomejicano. *Modern Language Notes* 49.31-32.

______. 1939. Associative interference in New Mexican Spanish. *Hispanic Review* 7 (1939), 324-336.

______. 1940. Associative interference in Spanish. *Hispanic Review* 8.346-349.

Ramírez, Manuel. 1939. Some semantic and linguistic notes on the Spanish spoken in Tampa, Florida. *Revista Inter-Americana* 1.25-33.

Ranson, Helen. 1954. Viles pochismos. *Hispania* 37.285-287.

Rivera-Mills, Susana. 2000. *New perspectives on current sociolinguistic knowledge with regard to language use, proficiency, and attitudes among Hispanics in the U.S.: the case of a rural Northern California community.* Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press.

______. Forthcoming a. Un análisis comparativo del voseo salvadoreño.

______. Forthcoming b. The Use of the Voseo as an Identity Marker among Second and Third Generation Salvadorans in the U.S.

Roca, Ana and John Jensen (eds.). 1996. *Spanish in contact: issues in bilingualism.* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Roca, Ana and John Lipski (eds.). 1993. *Spanish in the United States: linguistic contact and diversity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1991a. Cross-generational bilingualism: theoretical implications of language attrition. *Crosscurrents in second language acquisition*, ed. Thom Huebner, Charles Ferguson, 325-345. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

______. 1991b. Spanish language attrition in a contact situation with English. *First language attrition: structural and theoretical perspectives*, ed. H. W. Seliger, R. Vago, 151-171. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

______. 1993. On the permeability of grammars: evidence from Spanish and English contact. *Linguistic perspectives on the Romance languages*, ed. William Ashby, Marianne Mithun, Giorgio Perissinotto, Eduardo Raposo, 19-43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

______. 1994. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stavans, Ilan. 2000. *Spanglish para millones*. Madrid: Colección Apuntes de Casa de América.

______. 2002. Translation of the *Quijote* into "spanglish." *La Vanguardia* (Barcelona) July 3, 2002.5-6.

______. 2003. *Spanglish: the making of a new American language*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Tio, Salvador. 1954. Teoría del espanglish. *A fuego lento, cien columnas de humor y una cornisa*, 60-65. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico.

______. 1992. *Lengua mayor: ensayos sobre el español de aquí y de allá*. Madrid: Editorial Plaza Mayor.

Valdés Bernal, Sergio y Nuria Gregori Torada. 2001. Identidad, uso y actitudes lingüísticas de la comunidad cubana en Miami. Unidad y diversidad, programa informativo sobre la lengua castellana 4 de abril de 2001.

Varela, Beatriz. 1992. *El español cubano-americano*. New York: Senda Nueva de Ediciones.

Webb, John. 1976. A lexical study of "calo" and non-standard Spanish in the Southwest. Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

______. 1980. Pidgins (and creoles?) on the U. S.-Mexican Border. In Blansitt and Teschner (eds.), 326-331.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.