

Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics

Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics provide comprehensive overviews of the key topics in applied linguistics. All entries for the handbooks are specially commissioned and written by leading scholars in the field. Clear, accessible, and carefully edited, *Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics* are the ideal resource for both advanced undergraduates and postgraduate students.

The Routledge Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics

Edited by Manel Lacorte

The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics

Edited by Martha Bigelow and Johanna Ennser-Kananen

The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics

Edited by Malcolm Coulthard and Alison Johnson

The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics

Edited by Anne O'Keeffe and Mike McCarthy

The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes

Edited by Andy Kirkpatrick

The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics

Edited by James Simpson

The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis

Edited by James Paul Gee and Michael Handford

The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition

Edited by Susan Gass and Alison Mackey

The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication

Edited by Jane Jackson

The Routledge Handbook of Language Testing

Edited by Glenn Fulcher and Fred Davidson

The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism

Edited by Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blackledge and Angela Creese

The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies

Edited by Carmen Millán-Varela and Francesca Bartrina

The Routledge Handbook of Language and Health Communication

Edited by Heidi E. Hamilton and Wen-ying Sylvia Chou

The Routledge Handbook of Language and Professional Communication

Edited by Stephen Bremner and Vijay Bhatia

The Routledge Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics

Edited by Manel Lacorte
University of Maryland, College Park

- Sancho, M. (2013). 'La integración sociolingüística de la inmigración hispana en España: Lengua, percepción e identidad social'. *Lengua y migración/Language and Migration*, 5 (2): 91–110.
- Sanz, G. (2010). 'Actitudes lingüísticas. Rumanos en Alcalá'. *Lengua y migración/Language and Migration*, 2–2: 97–112.
- Shohamy, E., Ben-Rafael, E. and Barni, M. (2010). *Linguistic Landscape in the City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Showstack, R. E. (2012). 'Symbolic power in the heritage language classroom. How Spanish heritage speakers sustain and resist hegemonic discourses on language and cultural diversity'. *Spanish in Context* 9 (1): 1–26.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (ed.) (1995). *Spanish in Four Continents. Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Stavans, I. (2003). *Spanglish. The Making of a New American Language*, New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Thompson, R. W. (1992). 'Spanish as a pluricentric language'. In M. Clyne (ed.) *Pluricentric languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations* (pp. 45–70). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tonkin, H. (2003). 'The search for a global linguistic strategy'. In J. Maurais and M.A. Morris (eds.) *Languages in a Globalising World* (pp. 319–333). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uranga, B. and Marañón, M. (eds.) (2008). *El futuro de las lenguas. Diversidad frente a uniformidad*. Madrid: Catarata.
- Valero, C. (ed.) (2005). *Traducción como mediación entre lenguas y culturas*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Valero, C. (2009). 'Inmigración y servicios de traducción en España'. *Lengua y migración/Language and Migration* 1 (2): 57–72.
- Velázquez, I. (2009). 'Intergenerational Spanish transmission in El Paso, Texas: Parental perceptions of cost/benefit'. *Spanish in Context* 6 (1): 69–84.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2007). 'Trayectorias bilingües: los desafíos en la construcción de identidades entre inmigrantes hispanas'. *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana* 5 (2): 163–176.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). 'Super-diversity and its implications'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (6): 1024–1054.
- Villa, D. J. and Rivera-Mills, S. V. (eds.) (2009). Spanish maintenance and loss in the U.S. Southwest [Special issue]. *Spanish in Context* 6 (1).
- Zentella, A. C. (2002). 'Spanish in New York'. In O. García and J. A. Fishman (eds.), *The Multilingual Apple. Languages in New York City* (2nd ed.) (pp. 167–201). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zimmermann, K. and Morgenthaler, L. (2007). 'Introducción: ¿Lingüística y migración o lingüística de la migración?'. *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana* 5 (2): 7–19.

Spanish and Hispanic Bilingualism

Ofelia García and Ricardo Otheguy (CUNY Graduate Center)

Introduction

This chapter focuses on Spanish as a *way of speaking* deployed in multilingual social contexts by multilingual speakers (including bilingual contexts and bilingual speakers). Bilingual ways of speaking have always been common in both Spain and Latin America, placing Spanish speakers at all points in history in multilingualism with Catalan, English, Euskara, Galician, Nahuatl, Quechua, Yoruba, and many other European, African, and Indigenous American languages. As Spanish ways of speaking continue to spread at the present time, a concomitant expansion in the number of bilinguals seems assured. These spreads and expansions create the urgent need to develop a theoretically coherent understanding of *Hispanic bilingualism*.

In this chapter we develop what we shall call a *speaker-centered* view of Hispanic bilingualism, a *disaggregated* view of linguistic competence, and a *translanguaging* view of bilingual practices, all sheltered under what is generally known as a *heteroglossic ideology*. In the interest of a coherent theoretical grasp of bilingual Hispanic settings and bilingual Hispanic speakers, we propose that it is *not* profitable to view Spanish as a discrete language system that exists as a separately compartmentalized grammar, mentally represented as distinct and apart from the other languages of the Hispanic bilingual. Such a stance is unprofitable because it insists on external categories generated by the national, political, educational, and ideological systems prevalent in the societies where Hispanic bilinguals live, and because, in so doing, it ignores the bilingual speaker's own perspective. The posture that we set aside has been usefully criticized as springing from a *monoglossic ideology* that looks at the bilingual through the conceptual biases of the monolingual. This is to be contrasted with the *heteroglossic ideology* embraced in our approach, under which the effort is made to achieve something akin to the anthropologist's *insider view*, looking at bilingualism through the bilingual's own eyes (Bailey 2007; Del Valle 2000; García 2009).

In our speaker-centered, disaggregated, heteroglossic approach, Spanish is the name of one aspect of the complex linguistic repertoire of multilingual Hispanic speakers. This position is rooted in linguistic and sociolinguistic theories that recognize that the seemingly obvious carving out of inherently distinct countable languages is not at all given or natural, representing instead the contingent adoption of a cultural and political categorization that is far from self-evident (Blommaert, 2010; Duchêne and Heller 2007; Franceschini 2011; Heller 2007; Kemp 2009; Makoni and Pennycook 2007). The adoption of these enumerated language categories tends to distort the very nature of bilingualism, certainly for the speakers, and ultimately even for the societies where the bilinguals live.

To help articulate these ideas, the chapter will introduce the concept of *translanguaging* as the ability of bilinguals to use their entire linguistic repertoire to make meaning. In the context of a speaker-centered heteroglossic approach that sees bilinguals as translanguagers, Spanish and the other languages of Hispanic bilinguals are seen not as single systems, but as sets of disaggregated linguistic features deployed for translanguaging meaning-making. In the bilingual, the disaggregated features that the layman and the linguist call Spanish share the communicative stage with the also disaggregated features called Catalan, English, Quechua, etc. The view of a *disaggregated linguistic competence*, that is, of a competence consisting of features that exist independently (and that seem to allow bilinguals to 'mix and match' as desired) is probably compatible with many linguistic theories. We have seen it best articulated in such sociolinguistic works as Jørgensen and colleagues (2011), and in the theorizing of linguists such as Diver (1995: 45) and Reid (2006). The chapter is built around the following five questions:

1. What is Spanish bilingualism?: (a) The speaker-centered approach, (b) The translanguaging alternative.
2. What is NOT Spanish bilingualism?: (a) Additive: Spanish plus, (b) Language contact, (c) Incomplete acquisition.
3. Who are Spanish speakers?: (a) The myth of the native speaker, (b) Complex bilingual identities, (c) Power and linguistic hierarchies.
4. How do Spanish-speaking bilingual communities 'language'?: (a) Extending Diglossia, (b) Reconceptualizing language maintenance and shift and conceptualizing language sustainability.
5. How is Spanish taught in bilingual contexts and what do we need to consider?: (a) Bilingual Education, (b) Spanish language education.

Before reviewing these five questions, we provide a historical perspective on Spanish bilingualism. This survey, which will be informed by our speaker-centered, heteroglossic theory, shows that multilingualism has been and remains a central characteristic of the Hispanic world. At the same time, our account makes evident the considerable effort exerted by many historical actors to conceive of the Spanishes of multilingual speakers in Spain and Latin America as if they constituted a single autonomous language system used prototypically and valued most highly, and sometimes exclusively, in its monolingual manifestation. We also detail the no less considerable effort exerted by these actors to present Spain and Latin America as being, in their essence, Spanish-only areas, casting their patently obvious multilingualism as incidental and their other linguistic traditions as little worth acknowledging, appreciating, or bringing forth.

Historical Perspectives

The Spanishes that we know today have evolved from the multiple ways of speaking of people in the Iberian Peninsula and its colonial dependencies, especially in the Americas. In all these contexts, and throughout the centuries, bilingualism has been the norm (Escobar 2010; Marcos-Marín 2006; Moreno-Fernández 2007; Niño-Murcia *et al.* 2008; Wright 1994). Although studies of bilingualism in Roman Hispania are rare (for an exception, see Adams 2003), bilingualism must have characterized many, perhaps most, of the speakers who came into contact with each other during the expansion of the Roman Empire into the Peninsula. After the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, it was the contact between the Vulgar Latins of the Romans and the

other languages of Iberia that led to the different Hispano-Romance forms of speech. In the northwest, the Celtic languages, coupled with Vulgar Latins and, later, the languages of the Germanic invaders served to shape the ways of speaking that eventually came to be known as Galician. In the southeast, the contact of southern Gauls with speakers of other local Romance forms resulted eventually in what became known as Catalan. In the Kingdom of Castile, the different local Romances were spoken alongside the languages of the Moors (718–1492), in a period of considerable bilingualism, contact, and leveling (Tuten 2003). Among them, it is worth stressing the presence of Mozarabic, a continuum of Arabic-influenced local Romances. Not even the more isolated northern Basque region was untouched by bilingualism. In this area, much larger in earlier times than today, Basque-Romance bilingualism was widespread, a fact seen by López García (1985) as crucial to our understanding of the genesis of contemporary Spanishes.

The kaleidoscopic multilingualism of the Peninsula before the Renaissance would eventually clash with the conception of the monolingual State, implemented through a single standardized speech form, to be known as Castilian or Spanish. In the 13th century, Alfonso X the Wise (1221–1284) compiled Castile's legal tradition in his *Siete Partidas* (1265), and codified the orthography of Castilian, modeled on the speech of the upper class of Toledo. With the marriage in 1469 of Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, the crowns of Aragon/Catalonia and Castile/Leon/Galicia were united. The political ascendancy of the Catholic Monarchs, and the stronger presence of the Castilian part of the merger, provided the language of Castile with greater power and authority. In 1492, as the Moorish Kingdom of Granada surrendered to Castilian power, Antonio de Nebrija published his *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*, the first grammar of any Romance language. Nebrija dedicates his grammar to Queen Isabella by saying: *Siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio*. A single Spanish language was needed to rule territories where bilingualism was being discouraged, in the service of the idea of a newly imagined monolingual nation-state.

The extension of Castilian ways of speaking into the Americas opened a new chapter in the persistent historical pattern of Spanish bilingualism. For the evangelization of speakers of Indigenous languages, missionaries were to rely at first on Castilian speech forms (Briceño Perozo 1987). On June 7, 1550, Charles V issued an edict that Spanish be used in *catequización* in the Viceroyalty of New Spain. But understanding the difficulties involved, by 1570 King Phillip II had authorized evangelization through designated Indigenous languages, which became known as *lenguas generales* (García *et al.* 2010; Hamel 1994). Many Franciscan and Jesuit missionaries became bilingual and wrote dictionaries and grammars that would facilitate the learning of these forms of speech by others. For their part, many of the Indigenous people too became bilingual, as they absorbed both the Spanishes of the *conquistadores* and the *lenguas generales* of their religion.

Although Spanish national borders had been clearly delineated by the 17th century (by 1640 with Portugal and by 1659 with France), Castilian ways of speaking did not monopolize speech spaces in Spain any more than they did in the American possessions (Wright 2004), and the break between the multilingualism found on the ground and the monoglossic ideology endorsed by the institutions intensified. In 1713, the Real Academia Española (RAE) was founded on instructions of Philip V, the first Bourbon ruler of Spain, to guarantee a Spanish norm and to *velar por que los cambios que experimente . . . no quiebren la esencial unidad que mantiene en todo el ámbito hispánico*.¹ That is, the Academy's principal task was to ensure the unity of Spanish throughout a highly multilingual Spanish-speaking world; thus its now abandoned motto, *limpia, fija y da esplendor*. In subsequent years, Royal decrees defending Spanish offer a demonstration, if any were needed, of the multilingual nature of the realm whose bilingual populations

made these decrees necessary. In 1714, Castilian was declared the language of the State, and in 1768, King Charles III decreed that there should be one language (and one currency) throughout the realms of the Spanish Crown (Siguán 1993). As part of this policy of forward sailing Spanish monolingualism against the headwinds of multilingual practices, the Jesuits, known for their enthusiastic embrace of ways of speaking from many traditions, were expelled from the Latin American possessions (Mar-Molinero 2000).

After four centuries of colonial hegemony, Spain lost much of its overseas Empire during the Napoleonic upheavals of the early 1800s. The weakened status of the Spanish State led to aggressive moves on the part of the new nation of the United States (US) to acquire formerly French and Spanish territories (Louisiana from France in 1803; Florida from Spain in 1819). And, more significantly, it led to the rise of independence movements in what would become the new Latin American republics. These developments created more bilingual Hispanic speakers, continuing the historical trend.

Soon afterwards, the proposed US annexation of Texas in 1845 led to the Mexican American War, which ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848). Mexico ceded to the US the 500,000 square miles of territory that today encompasses California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, most of Arizona and Colorado, and parts of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Wyoming. In addition, the outcome of the war gave the US undisputed control over Texas (Rives 1918). Throughout these vast areas, Spanish-English bilingualism became widespread.

Meantime, developments in the newly independent Latin American republics were producing increasing levels of bilingualism. Populations that were formerly monolingual in the Indigenous languages gradually added Spanish ways of speaking to their repertoires. And in some areas, the dramatic rise in the volume of importation of African slaves, and the numbers among them who eventually acquired Spanishes, opened a new front in the, by then, centuries-long pattern of Spanish bilingualism.

As Indigenous Americans and African slaves expanded Spanish bilingualism, the process was mostly ignored by the political and intellectual elites. Almost from the beginning of the creation of the independent Latin American republics, the role of the Spanish language was for the ruling groups a matter of great concern. In the newly formed nations, Spanish was to serve in the needed crystallization of a national identity, while in the process minoritizing the many other, and often more widely spoken, languages (Del Valle and Stheeman 2002). An important player in these developments was Andrés Bello, born in Caracas in 1781 before independence. In 1847 Bello published his *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos*. In the prologue, Bello argues that the Spanish language should conserve what he calls *su pureza* so as to ensure the Hispanic world a common language. Bello argues that Latin American countries have as much right as regions of Spain to have their own differences, but adds that this is so just *cuando las patrocina la costumbre uniforme y auténtica de la gente educada*. In this intellectual and political climate, a diglossic relationship was established between the Spanish of the white, European-descended elite and the languages of the Indigenous groups or of African slaves. Only the Spanishes of the white elite were accepted for use in government and education and in the interactions of those having or aspiring to power and influence, with the languages and the bilingualism of others relegated to informal and powerless domains.

In 1870, the Real Academia Española authorized the establishment of what became known as *Academias Correspondientes* in the Americas, a move motivated in part, and quite explicitly, by the need to hold back the forces of multilingualism. The agreement talked about *repúblicas americanas españolas, hoy independientes, pero siempre hermanas nuestras por el idioma* because *una misma lengua hablamos* (cited in Lázaro Carreter 1994). The Academy warned that unless there was a strong defense of the Castilian language, *llegará la lengua en*

aquella tan patria como la nuestra a bastardearse. The *Academias Correspondientes* were finally able to *oponer un dique, más poderoso tal vez que las bayonetas mismas, al espíritu invasor de la raza anglo-sajona en el mundo por Colón descubierto*. As a result, 19 *Academias Correspondientes* were established after 1871 in Latin America. In subsequent decades, as massive immigration saw Spanishes re-entering Florida and the territories north of the Rio Grande, joining in some cases long-settled Hispanic populations, the Corresponding Academies movement expanded into the US. In 1973 the *Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua* (ANLE) was established in New York, with, until recently and with few exceptions, little awareness of the bilingualism of most North American practitioners of Spanish ways of speaking (Dumitrescu and Piña-Rosales 2013).

Thus, despite efforts to discourage bilingualism and guard against its effects, the history of the expansion of Castile in Iberia and of Spain in the Americas has inevitably led at almost every historical period, and with few exceptions, to ever larger numbers of bilinguals recruited into the Hispanic speech world (Klee and Lynch 2009; Olbert and Muysken 2005; Roca and Jensen 1996). In Spain itself, since the mid-19th century and into the 20th century, Catalonia's *Renaixença*, Galicia's *Rexurdimento*, and Basque nationalism have gained ground, bringing bilingualism to the forefront (Mar-Molinero 2000; Siguán 1993; Turell 2001). And in Latin America, few countries can be characterized as lacking substantial amounts of bilingualism.

With the end of the Franco dictatorship in Spain in 1975 came the end of Spain's highly authoritarian moves on behalf of Spanish. While the new constitution passed in 1978 declared Castilian to be the official language of the State, it also pronounced that the other languages of Spain were official in their autonomous communities. The Laws of Linguistic Normalization instructed the communities to promote and protect their *lenguas propias*. Multilingualism has officially entered the Peninsula, and the *lenguas propias* have since grown in stature through the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century (Balfour and Quiroga 2007; Siguán 2007).

The same can be said about bilingualism in Latin America. Since the democratization movement of the 1990s, 15 countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela—have passed laws recognizing their multilingualism (Escobar 2013; see Godenzzi and Sichra, this volume). Thus, Spanish multilingualism continues to characterize both the Iberian and Latin American sociolinguistic scenes every bit as much now as it did in the past.

In the 21st century, as globalization and its new technologies have spurred the great population movements of our times, the diasporic peoples using Spanish ways of speaking show, more than ever, the effects of dynamic and changing sociopolitical arrangements. To be sure, and as we have seen, movements of peoples and transgressions of borders, and their linguistic consequences, were common in the Hispanic world from the 16th century to the 20th century. But during these centuries, these movements and transgressions, and the resulting linguistic diversity of Spain and the Americas, were contained within political borders, even if these borders were the far-flung ones of the Crown of Castile. This meant that, in the past, the language diversity of Spain, Latin America, and the US could be hidden from public view, as discourse about language was controlled by a single national power with a monoglossic ideology that kept watch over diverse and heterogeneous practices. The spread of Spanish in the US has certainly contributed to this complex sociolinguistic situation (Fuller 2013; Potowski and Carreira 2010; Roca and Lipski 1993; Salaberry 2009). Today, language practices do not correspond to official national borders, nor do they respond to a single center of power or express a unitary identity. It is this heteroglossia that characterizes the use of what is called Spanish in the 21st century.

Core Issues and Topics

The core issues surrounding Spanish and bilingualism in the 21st century have to do with the tension between its many bilingual speakers and the continued construction of an imagined Spanish-speaking monolingual world by those with power to implant such constructions (which, of late, are presented with a welcome tolerance for difference, even if this tolerance seems at times motivated by no more than the desire to bolster the economic power of the Spanish-speaking corporate sphere) (see Del Valle 2008; Mar-Molinero 2008). We propose a different theorization of bilingualism and especially of Hispanic bilingualism, and of Spanish speakers, Spanish-speaking communities, and Spanish language education. We start developing the theoretical basis for our work by questioning the concept of 'Spanish' itself.

What Is Spanish Bilingualism? A Speaker-Centered Approach and the Translanguaging Alternative

In the perspective adopted in this chapter, the mental grammars of multilingual Hispanics consist of large and complex arrays of disaggregated structural features (phonetic, phonological, morphosyntactic, and semantic) that do not belong to or reside inside of the speaker's two or more languages by virtue of inherently differentiated linguistic membership. Instead, these grammars are externally labeled by contingent sociocultural conventions. These conventions in some cultural settings assign some of these complex feature arrays to Spanish and others to Catalan; in other settings the conventions assign some features to Spanish and others to Quechua; in still others they assign some to Spanish and others to English, and so forth.

This amounts to saying that, under the heteroglossic theorizing that we propose here, the structural features making up linguistic repertoires bear no inherent linguistic affiliation but only external cultural labeling. The naming of a particular lexical or morphosyntactic feature as Spanish or Catalan or English or Quechua, or whatever, is not part of the speaker's *internal linguistic-structural competence*. Rather, the allocation by the bilingual of this feature to that language and of that other feature to that other language is part of the *external social-sorting competence* of those (which may include the speaker) who know how to assign this feature to this named-language category and that feature to that other named-language category. A bilingual who says *Tengo frío* and *I'm cold* (and does not say *Soy frío* or *I have cold*) can be reasonably argued to be displaying structural linguistic knowledge (although this too is oversimplified). However, when the same bilingual (or others around her) reports that *Tengo frío* is Spanish and *I'm cold* is English, that is, when the bilingual assigns words and phrases to one or the other named-language category, what is being displayed is knowledge of sociocultural conventions that in no sense should be seen as structural or linguistic.

The position that we are outlining is generally compatible with the *language-mode* perspective favored by Grosjean (2004), though it differs from it in one important respect. With Grosjean, we see bilinguals selecting features from their linguistic repertoire depending on contextual, topical, and interactional factors. But we do not follow Grosjean when he defines a language mode as 'a state of activation of the bilingual's languages and language-processing mechanisms' (Grosjean 2004: 40). In our conception of things, there are no two languages that are cognitively activated or deactivated as the social and contextual situation demands, but rather, as we have proposed, a single array of disaggregated features that is always activated. Our position finds support in recent neurolinguistic evidence. To be sure, neurolinguistic research still clings to the two-language conception of the bilingual. But reports are that when one language is in use, the other remains activated and can be easily accessed (Thierry and Wu

2007; Wu and Thierry 2010). Similarly, research on cognition and multilingual functioning supports the view that the 'two languages' of bilingual speakers interact collaboratively in listening or speaking (De Groot 2011). Unlike Grosjean, then, we see the monolingual-bilingual mode continuum as entirely socioculturally based, having little to do with internal linguistic-structural competences that become activated or deactivated depending on external stimuli. In the way that we propose to make sense of bilingual settings and bilingual speakers, then, the 'bi-' of *bilingual* and *bilingualism* is the product of social convention, not of psychological or cognitive dualism.

As with all sociocultural conventions, the sorting and assigning conventions of features to named languages are changeable, local, and contingent (Heller 2007). A feature said, for example, to be part of English (or Catalan or Quechua) in one setting and for one group of speakers may be said, in another setting and for another group, to be part of Spanish. Our position is not that bilingual speakers are never aware whether they are speaking one language or the other. In many settings, many are, and everyone is in agreement; in other settings, many are not, and there are differences of opinion, and there are discussions as to what is what. Our point is the simple one that in every case we are dealing with matters related to sociocultural, not linguistic, awareness.

This approach, skeptical of the discreteness of named languages and viewing linguistic resources as disaggregated in the sense that features are separable and not integrated into single linguistic systems, is probably compatible with many linguistic theories. It is perhaps best articulated by William Diver:

[There is no 'language' existing out there] in the sense of some ideal construct, which is the job of the learners to learn and analysts to analyze. The learner, rather, seems to create what may be fairly called individualized techniques of communication, more or less on the model of what can be observed in the behavior of others. This has as a consequence a lack of anything even approaching absolute uniformity from individual to individual.

(Diver 1995: 45)

For an example, consider a Latino New Yorker who says, *Ellos quieren que yo les pago el doble por parquear el carro porque ellos dicen que ellos están full por el problema del parade*. Many will analyze this utterance as containing (a) an English-based choice of indicative form in *pago*; (b) redundant, unnecessary, and English-motivated subject personal pronouns *ellos* and *yo*; and (c) a string of borrowed (and more or less adapted) English words *parquear*, *full*, and *parade*. This monoglossic-inspired analysis would recognize as more legitimately 'Spanish' the utterance *Quieren que les pague el doble por estacionar el coche porque dicen que están llenos por el problema del desfile*, with subjunctive *pague*, omitted subject pronouns, and words *estacionar*, *desfile*, and *llenos* (with plural morphology agreeing with the plural inflection of *están*).

But in our speaker-centered, disaggregated, heteroglossic approach, neither utterance is more or less Spanish than the other, and none of the features belongs inherently to one or the other language. Whether these different lexical and morphosyntactic items are English or Spanish is, in our view, not related to the speaker's linguistic competence. That is, their description as belonging to one or the other language is not due to affiliations inherent in the items. Instead, the registering of these features in lists belonging to Spanish or English (or to 'real' Spanish versus 'Anglicized' Spanish) is part of the external sociocultural competence of some (though, significantly, not all) society members, a group that in some cases (though significantly not in all cases) may include the speaker.

Let us make the same point in a different way. The registration and labeling of the mood choice (*pago* vs. *pague*), or of present versus absent pronouns (*ellos dicen que ellos están* vs. *dicen que están*), or of one set of words or another (*parquear, full, parade* vs. *estacionar, llenos, desfile*) as part of English or Spanish responds to sociocultural conventions of assignment and categorization, not to anything having to do with linguistic competence per se. Moods, pronouns, words, and all other structural characteristics of linguistic competences are separable, disaggregated features, even among monolinguals. In bilinguals, this disaggregation provides the conditions under which takes place the translanguaging selection of different features for different communicative goals. The features do not 'belong together' in language boxes, but reside in a common pool from which different choices are made. In our example, the choice of mood form may be accompanied, as above, with the use of many overt pronouns, or it may not, so that we may get both *que yo pague* (pronoun present, subjunctive mood) or *que pago* (pronoun absent, indicative mood). And either combination may occur with *full* or either one with *llenos*. Taking the bilingual's perspective, there is little point in labeling *que yo pago* as less Spanish than *que yo pague* and the latter as less Spanish than *que pague*, which would be for some analysts the true Spanish exemplar. Such labeling, from the speaker-internal view being advocated here, constitutes cultural pigeonholing rather than linguistic description.

The speaker-centered, disaggregated posture enables us to see that bilinguals do not just use Spanish at one point in time and then English/Quechua/Galician, etc., at another point; they do not mix elements from this one with elements of that one. Rather, bilinguals make use, at all times, of their entire linguistic repertoire. Or, as we prefer to say it, they *translanguage*. Translanguaging does not refer to using two separate languages, nor to a synthesis of different language practices or to a hybrid mixture of languages (García 2009). Instead, translanguaging refers to language practices by bilinguals that appear to be indifferent to the social ascription of some features to one language box and of others to another language box. Usually these features respond to different histories, ideologies, contexts, and fixed identities that are constrained by nation-states, so that, in monolingual interactions, the features deceptively appear to have hardwired separate affiliations (*llenos* is Spanish, *full* is English; *quieren que pague* is authentic Spanish, *quieren que yo pago* is not). But within multilingual interactions, these socially separate features are experienced as one new whole. In the words of one of the authors of the present work, translanguaging thus posits that:

[B]ilinguals have *one linguistic repertoire* from which they select features *strategically* to communicate effectively. That is, translanguaging takes as its starting point the *language practices of bilingual people as the norm*, and not the language of monolinguals, as described by traditional usage books and grammars.

(García 2012)

In so doing, translanguaging releases histories and understandings that have been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states (see Mignolo 2000). The concept of translanguaging is related to the concept of *multicompetence* posited by Cook (2008). Bilingual speakers' lives, minds, and actions are necessarily different from those of monolingual speakers, and their complex interactions are always in the foreground (Franceschini 2011). Multilingual individuals do not have 'languages', rather, they have an interconnected whole, an ecosystem of mutual interdependence of possibly heteronamed linguistic features forming a single web, where translanguaging is the speech product generated by the web.

Translanguaging opens up a space that allows multilingual individuals to integrate social spaces (and thus 'language codes') that have been formerly practiced separately in different

places. For Li Wei, translanguaging is going both *between* different linguistic structures, systems and modalities, and going *beyond* them.

[Translanguaging] creates a social space for the multilingual user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance.

(2011: 1223)

Li Wei explains that a translanguaging space has its own transformative power because it is permanently ongoing and combines and generates new identities, values, and practices. Translanguaging, for Li Wei, embraces both *creativity* (the following or flouting of norms of language use), as well as *criticality* (using evidence to question, problematize, or express views). Multilingualism is a rich source of creativity and criticality, as it entails tension, conflict, competition, difference, and change in a number of spheres, ranging from ideologies, policies, and practices to historical and current contexts.

What Is Not Spanish Bilingualism? Additive Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Incomplete Acquisition

Because bilingualism has been most often studied (including in some of our own work) from an external monoglossic perspective (the perspective of 'the language', whose least problematic exemplar is found in monolinguals), the assumption has been made that bilinguals have two separate language systems. This conception is what lies behind the terms *additive* and *subtractive* bilingualism, coined by Lambert (1974) in his discussion of different approaches to bilingual education; a second language is either added or replaces a first language.

But under the proposal being advanced here, bilingualism can never be additive or subtractive because bilinguals do not have two separate language systems, one added to or subtracted from the other. In our proposal, which is consistent with Grosjean's (1982) apt remark that bilinguals are not two monolinguals in one, bilingualism is said to be *dynamic* (García 2009). The term dynamic conceptualizes bilingualism in a way that goes beyond not only Lambert's idea of additiveness but also beyond Cummins's (1979) well-known notion of interdependence between the two languages. Instead of focusing on the addition, subtraction, or interdependence of two distinct named systems (which, as we have seen, get their separate existence from external, sociocultural naming conventions), dynamic bilingualism focuses on the language *practices* of bilinguals. These practices are complex and interrelated; they do not emerge in two separately linear ways, nor do they function independently.

Two metaphors have been useful to get across the dynamic view of bilingualism that stems from the speaker-centered heteroglossic approach. The practices of the bilingual are not like the balanced wheels of two bicycles, as in the concept of additive bilingualism, nor like the single wheel of a monocycle, as in subtractive bilingualism (García 2009). Instead, dynamic bilingualism is like an all-terrain vehicle, with individuals using their entire linguistic repertoire to adapt to the ridges and craters of communication in uneven interactive terrains (see García and Kleifgen 2010). In another image, García (2009) points to the banyan tree, which starts life when seeds germinate in the cracks and crevices of a host tree and send down roots toward the ground. The tree also grows horizontal roots that then fuse with the descending ones and girdle the trunk, often becoming a 'columnar tree' when the host tree dies. Dynamic bilingualism emerges in the same way, in the cracks and crevices of communication with others

who language differently, gradually becoming in and of itself the only way of languaging. For multilinguals in an increasingly multilingual world, dynamic bilingualism is then both the foundation of languaging and the goal for communication (see also Clyne 2003).

Psycholinguists have also recently proposed that the co-adaptation of linguistic resources in multilingual interactions is related to psychologically and sociologically determined communicative needs, which themselves have a transformative effect on language resources. Dynamic Systems Theory holds that there is interaction between internal cognitive ecosystems and external social ecosystems, and that therefore languaging is always being co-constructed between humans and their environments. A dynamic bilingual approach sets aside the social construct of the autonomous language, in our case Spanish, and replaces it with the notion of translanguaging, acknowledging the emergence of a single bilingual complex repertoire. The process of becoming bilingual, then, is not just the 'taking in' of autonomous and separate linguistic forms by learners, but 'the constant adaptation of their linguistic resources in the service of meaning-making in response to the affordances that emerge in the communicative situation, which is, in turn, affected by learners' adaptability' (Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008: 135). It is true that those who are learning what is taught or conceived of as Spanish as an 'additional language' distinguish these new features as different from those of their 'first language'. But it is also true that it is only when these language users integrate these new features and appropriate them as their own within a single linguistic repertoire that bilingualism can be said to truly emerge.

The speaker-centered heteroglossic approach to bilingualism is of a piece with the dynamic translanguaging conception of multilingual practices. Neither appears to keep together at ease with such familiar notions as *contact-induced change* (*borrowing, calquing, structural change*) and *codeswitching*, notions that have long been used productively in the study of bilingualism by many scholars, including in some of our own research (cf. Otheguy and García 1988; Otheguy *et al.* 1989; Otheguy *et al.* 2007; Otheguy and Zentella 2012). In this line of work, which started with path-breaking studies by Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1953, 1956), and which has continued in widely recognized works by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Winford (2003), the basic conceptual tool has been, with some exceptions, the externally named single language that imports material (loanwords, calques, structures, etc.) from another also externally named single language.

In this literature, the two languages of bilingual communities are frequently compared to the same languages as they are, or once were, spoken in their respective monolingual communities. In this approach, the socially subordinate language of the bilingual community, the one receiving the imported material, is frequently compared to that same language as spoken in settings where it is, or once was, the language of socially dominant monolinguals. The Turkish of bilinguals in Amsterdam is compared to that of monolinguals in Turkey; the Russian of bilinguals in Brooklyn is compared to that of monolinguals in Russia; the Spanish of bilinguals in Los Angeles or New York is compared to that of monolinguals in Mexico or the Caribbean, etc. The most commonly recognized and the most widely studied forms of language contact in this research in general, and certainly so in the Hispanic world, are the lexical phenomena known as *borrowing* and *calquing*. Borrowing consists of importing words into the recipient language (as in the *parquear* and *parade* of our examples above) and calquing consists of assigning meanings from the donor language to recipient language words (as when US Latinos are said to use Spanish *registrarse* in the sense of English *register*).

These and other types of language contact, as processes that change the separately conceived languages, are studied alongside the distinct process of *codeswitching*, where speakers are said to juxtapose or to 'within the same speech exchange passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems' (Gumperz 1982). As productive as these conceptions

of bilingualism have been, and as much as we have used them ourselves in seeking answers to our own research questions, they labor under serious limitations. These limitations, which we have outlined above, stem from the uncritical adoption of the external perspective that trades on the sociocultural separateness of languages and on the monoglossic ideology that privileges the monolingual speaker and the monolingual setting as the natural and unmarked condition of languaging.

The speaker-centered heteroglossic view of the bilingual's language and the dynamic translanguaging view of the bilingual's practices not only show a poor fit with notions of contact and switching, but are antithetical to another widely used concept of bilingual studies, namely that of *incomplete acquisition* of a minority language in an immigrant bilingual setting (Benmamoun *et al.* 2013a, 2013b). The notion has been widely applied, in our case, to the incompleteness of the Spanishes of second-generation Latinos born in the US and other immigrant settings (Montrul 2008, 2013b). Now the general proposal of incomplete acquisition is of little coherence under the sponsorship of any theory, because no clearly articulated notion of *completeness* has ever been put forth against which to establish incompleteness. In addition, the proposal flies in the face of long-settled understandings regarding the manner in which children construct always-new grammars that never perfectly replicate those of the previous generation. And it clashes as well with widely accepted tenets regarding the independence of the cognitive-systemic concept of grammaticality from the educationally dictated notion of correctness, as articulated in, for example, the papers in Williams (1970), especially Labov (1970), and, for Spanish, in Otheguy and Zentella (2012: Chapter 10). But dubious as it is under any theory, the proposal of incomplete acquisition is particularly weak when one stresses, as we have been doing here, the sociocultural basis of the separateness of languages and the ideologically arbitrary roots of the monolingual setting and the monolingual speaker as ideal linguistic archetypes.

In the Hispanic context, the proposal that the Spanish of second-generation Latinos in the US is best understood when regarded as a form of incompletely acquired Spanish is based on comparisons between the speech of the US-born bilingual with that of the Latin American-born monolingual. In the example given above, the use of indicative verb forms in *Quieren que yo pague* is a prototypical case of incomplete acquisition, because 'in Spanish' one would have to say *Quieren que pague*, with a subjunctive form. The monoglossic bias here is transparent, as the speech of bilinguals is seen as lacking something (a complete knowledge of the verbal tense-mood system) simply on the grounds that it is different from that of the idealized monolingual. Equally clear is the external conventional bias, as the postulation of a reified and discrete 'Spanish' is crucial for there to be something that is incompletely acquired.

Who Are Spanish Speakers? The Myth of the Native Speaker, Bilingual Identities, and Power and Linguistic Hierarchies

The reality of being a Spanish speaker in the globalized world of today bears little connection with the still-influential Romantic ideas of German scholars like Johan Gotfried Herder (1744–1803), who defined ethnic identity as natural and immovable, and connected to the language a people spoke. For as attractive as Herder's ideas may appear, and as Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) suggest, languages may be not only markers of identity, solidarity, and empowerment, but also sites for the exercise of discrimination. Attitudes, values, and beliefs about languages are always ideological, and far from serving only or primarily to facilitate identity, are often tightly linked to social systems, implementing the domination and subordination of groups (Irvine and Gal 2000; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994).

Perhaps no other language marker has been more implicated in these deleterious enterprises than the concept of the 'native speaker' (Bonfiglio 2010; Leung *et al.* 1997). Through the myth of the idealized native speaker, much linguistic discrimination has taken place. For 'Spanish' this has meant that Indigenous Americans, for example, have been often excluded from full social participation. And the bilingual practices of Catalans, Basques, and Galicians, fluent and natural speakers of Spanish in most cases, were rendered illegal during Francisco Franco's dictatorship, restricting social privilege to the Castilian-speaking center, where monolingual native speakers of Spanish were found.

The notion of the native speaker is, also, an essential part of the theoretical tool kit that attempts to make coherent the notion of incomplete acquisition. Second-generation Spanish speakers in the US, it is claimed, are not native speakers of Spanish (they are *heritage* speakers of Spanish). Somewhat eccentrically, in this literature it is required to have received formal education in a language in order to be a native speaker of it (Benmamoun *et al.* 2010). But even leaving that aside, it is clear that incompleteness relies crucially on the comparison between the complete grammar of a 'true' native speaker and the incomplete one that does not measure up. The latter is said to be that of the heritage bilingual (a non-native), while the former is that of the prototypical monolingual native. In contrast to external, monoglossic positions reliant on ideal nativity, a speaker-centered heteroglossic posture acknowledges alternative and complex linguistic identity options, and not simply monolingual obligations that respond to one or another socioculturally defined autonomous language.

How Do Spanish-Speaking Bilingual Communities 'Language'? Extending Diglossia and Reconceptualizing Language Maintenance and Shift

The speaker-centered heteroglossic approach to Spanish bilingualism and the translanguaging approach to Hispanic bilingual practices that we are proposing go beyond traditional diglossic formulations. We first review the classical definitions of diglossia given to us by Psycharis, Ferguson and Fishman, as well as the recent Catalan formulation of diglossia by Ninyoles and others.

In the late 19th century, the French philologist Psycharis used the term *diglossie* to distinguish the classical standard of Greek, *Katharevusa* from the popular modern Greek *Dimotiki*. This is the way in which Ferguson (1959) used *diglossia* in his famous article to refer to societal arrangements in which one variety of a language is used for prestigious or *High* functions, whereas the other variety is used for informal or *Low* functions. Fishman extended Ferguson's definition to encompass not only language varieties, but also different languages. Fishman and colleagues warn that 'socially patterned bilingualism can exist as a stabilized phenomenon only if there is functional differentiation between two languages' (1971: 560), either by territory (what Fishman calls the territorial principle) or by functions (what he calls the personality principle). In Fishman's view, language maintenance could only be the product of a harmonious and consensual compartmentalization of languages. Paraguay is one of the examples given by Fishman to demonstrate 'bilingualism with diglossia'. Guaraní, Fishman says, fulfills an ethnic identity function in Paraguayan homes, with Spanish having a more public function. It is precisely the functional compartmentalization of Guaraní and Spanish that Fishman regards as responsible for the maintenance of Guaraní over generations. This is in contrast to other Indigenous situations in the Americas where, lacking diglossia, language shift has predominated.

Catalan sociolinguists, however, have deplored the linguistic hierarchy that is produced through the compartmentalization of languages by function, with the dominant language always occupying the position of power. These analysts highlight the conflictive nature of

diglossia, and propose, for Catalonia, that to reverse language shift, a counter-diglossic ideology favoring normalization of Catalan nationalism and normativization of Catalan needs to be espoused. In their view, to place Catalan on equal footing with Spanish requires that Catalan be restored to a normal level by dictating standards of use (Ninyoles 1972; Vallverdú 1981).

Our speaker-centered and heteroglossic translanguaging approach to Hispanic bilingualism goes beyond both of the harmonious and conflictive models of diglossia explained above. Rather, the position adopted here is closer to what García (2009) has called *transglossia*. The super-diverse patterns of multilingualism and the emergence of new multimodal forms of communication in the 21st century (Blommaert 2010) mean that bilingual speakers can perpetuate their language practices not by isolation—since they are not using two autonomous languages but one dynamic linguistic repertoire—but through the functional interrelationship of the disaggregated features in their repertoire. This transglossic model does not simply support language maintenance, since language is neither autonomous nor pure; rather, it proposes the *sustainability* of languaging (García 2011), a concept that aspires to more than the traditional one of language maintenance.

Simple language-maintenance efforts, as espoused by some in the language rights movement, often result in an intensification of 'linguistic shame' among bilingual communities, resulting in much language shift (for bilingual Latino youth in the US, see Zentella 1997, 2011). The recent study of language practices and ideologies among Indigenous youth in the US by Wyman and colleagues (2013) shows that these young people value and conceive of their cultural and language practices not as one or the other: local or global, Indigenous or English, traditional or modern. Instead, what sustains these practices is the fact that they draw from different communities and different semiotic systems, and this is so despite their complexity, variation, and dynamism. In the US, bilingual Hispanic youth are often embarrassed by what they consider to be their 'limited native language ability' or their 'Spanglish', an attitude that can only be constructed (and deconstructed) within the bilingual community itself, by educators and sociolinguists valuing their dynamic practices.

Sustainability thus refers to the capacity to endure, but always *in interaction* with the social context in which linguistic resources are deployed, and not just in an abstract monolingual context. That is, the concept of sustainability is embedded in the social, economic, and environmental conditions by which systems remain diverse and productive over time (García 2011). Thus, language sustainability is for us a much more apt concept for the future of Hispanic bilingualism than the traditional one of Spanish language maintenance, which often fails to grapple with the sociopolitical and economic conditions of bilingual speakers.

How Is Spanish Taught in Bilingual Contexts and What Do We Need to Consider? Bilingual Education and Spanish Language Education

Spanish language education and bilingual education that includes Spanish usually aim to develop monolingual standard Spanish language practices. Whether Spanish language or bilingual education programs are for what are called mother-tongue speakers or heritage-language speakers, Spanish is treated as an autonomous language whose archetypical manifestation is found in monolinguals (for Indigenous Latin America see e.g., Hamel 2008; Hornberger 2000; López and Sickra 2008; for Basque see Cenoz 2009). The curriculum followed in these educational efforts is inspired by a monoglossic ideology, attempting to keep Spanish separate from all other language practices in a diglossic arrangement. And yet, all these educational programs today actually incorporate multilingual children with diverse languaging practices. Whether in Galicia or the Basque Country, in Mexico or the US, in Castile or Catalonia, it is super-diversity, especially in language practices, that characterizes classrooms (Vertovec 2007).

In the US, when bilingual education programs are available, the languages are strictly compartmentalized in what are called 'dual language' (and not bilingual) programs. It is the contradiction between that rigid language arrangement and the more fluid language practices, that is, the translanguaging actually observed in these classrooms, that may account for the failure to truly educate bilingual speakers of Spanish (see García 2009, 2011, 2013). Not only do these educational practices reify two languages as autonomous systems, but they also normalize a diglossia that keeps one language dominant and that relegates the other to a position of inferiority, of minority status, of being simply part of 'the heritage'. And yet, schools for Hispanics could build on the languaging of all emergent bilingual students and encourage translanguaging as an important resource to imagine, learn, read, write, and do research.

Returning to our example above, schools for Hispanics could handle the features under discussion in such utterances as *Ellos quieren que yo les pago el doble por parquear el carro porque ellos dicen que ellos están full por el problema del parade* in ways that improve on the fair-minded but simplistic stance of 'accepting' and 'acknowledging' them. In such an approach, these features are positively recognized as part of the student's home language, but a part that, regrettably, must be kept at bay in the school all the same, since they are not part of the standard. Educators operating under a speaker-centered view of Hispanic bilingualism, a disaggregated view of linguistic competence, and a translanguaging view of bilingual practices, inspired by a heteroglossic ideology, would do much more. They would make room for these features in the daily life of the school, endow them with parity, utilize them actively as everyday useful tools in the school, and celebrate them as structurally valid items. To say all this is not to deny that there may be moments when it may be worth acknowledging what the students already know, namely that, in some circles, and in some contexts, *Quieren que pague* may be more valued than *Ellos quieren que yo pago*. Rather, to say it is to insist that educators who understand the position being advocated here would see the greater social valuation of one of these two utterances in some circles (but only in some circles!) in a different light. They would see it as a little detail, a minor coda, an Ann Landers manners footnote to a much richer textual discourse that would be imbued with an awareness of what bilingualism really is when seen through the eyes of the bilingual.

Looking Into the Future

The five critiques made above of monoglossic ideologies and of the constructs they sustain have led to new proposals. They urge to see Hispanic bilingualism under a heteroglossic ideology that brings forth the bilingual's perspective and centers our understanding of bilingualism on translanguaging practices rooted in disaggregated competences. These proposals foment new conceptions of, and, it is hoped, new ways of researching questions in the field of Hispanic bilingualism.

A Speaker-Centered Approach and Translanguaging

The speaker-centered posture that we have described will facilitate the problematization of the concept of Spanish and, along with it, the concepts of Catalan, English, Euskara, Quechua, Yoruba, etc. Because it does not set much store by these traditional constructs, the heteroglossic, speaker-centered theorizing that we propose encourages a change in the conversation about the complex languaging of bilingual Hispanic people, calling attention to the ways in which bilinguals deploy the linguistic features that social conventions assign, in some cases, to Spanish and in others to other languages.

It is thus that in the context of bilingualism we need not, strictly speaking, ask questions about Spanish, but rather about Hispanic translanguaging practices. In other words, Spanish bilingualism will not be most usefully examined from the perspective of the social construct of 'Spanish'. It follows from this that traditional concepts that we have all used to study Spanish bilingualism, such as additive bilingualism, language contact, and incomplete acquisition, will be problematized, and the phenomena that they have been seen to cover will be inserted into a new phase in the understanding of Hispanic bilingualism.

Additive Bilingualism, Language Contact, Incomplete Acquisition

Our speaker-centered perspective, endorsing a disaggregated view of competence and informed by the severe questioning of monoglossic ideologies, inspires an alternative view of the traditional notions of additiveness and contact and of the relatively newer notion of incompleteness. Under the proposal here, the languaging of the bilingual Hispanic, when examined from his or her own perspective under a heteroglossic dynamic lens, does not have to be seen as involving any kind of contact (not borrowing, not calquing, not changing structures) or of switching between languages. Rather, the speaker can now be seen as selecting features from one dynamically constructed repertoire, the product of multilingual interactions with different externally labeled social and linguistic features. This translanguaging will be distinguished from the notion of codeswitching in being not simply a shift between two languages, but rather the speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another language, but which make up the speaker's complete language repertoire.

Similarly, the future understanding of second-generation bilinguals is envisioned here under a very different light than presently utilized by scholars working with the concept of incomplete acquisition. From any theoretical perspective, second-generation speakers in immigrant settings, among them second-generation Hispanics in the US, are drawing on linguistic resources that are different but every bit as complete (if one insists on invoking the incoherent notion of completeness) as the resources drawn upon by Hispanics in Latin America or by first-generation immigrants. This is even more clearly the case when adopting the speaker-centered heteroglossic approach of disaggregated competence being urged in the present work. In a heteroglossic theory, there is no room for a monolingual 'Spanish' that would be more or less completely acquired by bilinguals. And in a speaker-centered theory, there is no space for deviance or error as a characterization of the natural speech ways of entire populations of fluent speakers, such as US-born Hispanics. In the example we have been using, the bilingual's indicative *pago* does not manifest the failure by an incomplete acquirer to realize that, in this particular structural environment, the correct Spanish choice is subjunctive *pague*; it represents a translanguaging practice, legitimate in itself, free of the pernicious comparison with a socio-culturally defined, ideal monolingual Spanish.

Who Are Spanish Speakers? The Myth of the Native Speaker

Our questioning of speaker-external approaches that find solace in the notion of the native speaker takes us into a different research territory, one where Hispanic bilingualism is studied under a different set of questions. In translanguaging on the basis of unlabeled, disaggregated features, individuals will be seen as constructing one complex linguistic repertoire, but also a coherent yet dynamic and flexible identity. Translanguaging enables multilingual speakers to construct a new language-identity *habitus* (Bourdieu 1991), acting against the 'symbolic

domination' that has kept them believing that monolingual practices, whether in 'Spanish' or other named languages, represent the only valid behavior.

Diglossia, Language Maintenance, Language Shift

A speaker-centered, heteroglossic, disaggregated, and translanguaging approach to Hispanic bilingualism will not aim for functional compartmentalization and language maintenance, nor for isolation and normalization to reverse language shift. Instead it will focus on supporting the community's translanguaging to renew and sustain bilingual language practices that adapt to the different community contexts, with different degrees of bilingualism and monolingualism. That is, bilingual speakers will be encouraged to monitor the complex and dynamic interaction between their internal cognitive and linguistic ecosystem and the external social environment in which they operate. Thus, translanguaging will enable the bilingual Hispanic community, whether in the Peninsula, in the Americas, in other geographic contexts, or in virtual space, to language in order to meet the needs of the present while not compromising those of future generations.

Bilingual Education and Spanish Language Education

In a future vouched for by a speaker-centered understanding, children will be encouraged to use multiple languaging to learn and to perform, breaking the link between separate ethnolinguistic identities that are perpetuated when the languages are separated. In this future, teachers will not be afraid to build up and use the children's entire linguistic repertoire to educate and extend their language practices to encompass academic ones, without creating the asymmetry of power between languages and identities.² Translanguaging holds much promise, both as an act of communication in a global world and as a pedagogical practice for the bilingual Hispanic world.

In the future that follows from the perspectives sketched here, it will be realized that to separate Spanish language practices from other language practices in bilingual communities and among bilingual Hispanic speakers is indeed to relegate bilingualism to an inferior role. Sustainability of the complex language practices of bilinguals in functional interrelationship with the social and academic context in which they are performed is what schools must aim for in the 21st century.

Conclusion

This chapter has proposed a theoretically coherent understanding of Hispanic bilingualism based on a disaggregated view of linguistic competence and a translanguaging view of bilingual practices. The social construct that we refer to as Spanish needs to be described and interpreted as an element of the social and cultural practices of not only monolingual speakers but also bilingual speakers. The sustainability of 'Spanish' as part of global ways of speaking in the 21st century depends precisely on its ability to remain flexible enough to adapt to the fluid languaging of the increasingly multilingual Hispanic population that speaks in part by means of it.

Related Topics

bilingualism
heteroglossia
multilingualism

Spanish language education
Spanish language planning
translanguaging

Further Reading

- Del Valle, J. (ed.) (2013). *A Political History of Spanish. The Making of a Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (This edited volume consists of contributions from different spatial and historical perspectives that position Spanish as a discursively constructed artifact.)
- García, O. and Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Implications for Language, Bilingualism, and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. (A comprehensive review of the development of translanguaging theory.)
- Huffman, A. (2011). 'Introduction: The enduring legacy of William Diver'. In A. Huffman and J. Davis (eds.), *Language, Communication and Human Behavior. The Linguistic Essays of William Diver* (pp. 1–20). Leiden/Boston: Brill. (An introduction to Columbia Linguistics on which the disaggregated feature view is based.)
- Montrul, S. (2013a). *El bilingüismo en el mundo hispanohablante*. Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell. (A comprehensive, albeit traditional, treatment of bilingualism in the Spanish-speaking world.)
- Otheguy, R. and Zentella, A. C. (2012). *Spanish in New York: Language Contact, Dialect Leveling, and Structural Continuity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (A variationist study of Spanish in New York that ends in Chapter 10 with a revisionist approach to the concept of incomplete acquisition.)

Notes

1. Retrieved from: http://noticias.juridicas.com/base_datos/Admin/rd1109-1993.html#a1
2. For an effort to implement these practices in New York, see the CUNY-NYSIEB project (www.cuny-nysieb.org). Principal Investigators: Ricardo Otheguy, Ofelia García, and Kate Menken. Project director: María Teresa Sánchez.

References

- Adams, J. N. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, B. (2007). 'Heteroglossia and boundaries'. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 257–276). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Balfour, S. and Quiroga, A. (2007). *España reinventada*. Barcelona: Península.
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S. and Polinsky, M. (2010). 'White paper: Prolegomena to heritage linguistics'. Retrieved from: http://scholar.harvard.edu/mpolinsky/files/hl_white_paper_june_12.pdf
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S. and Polinsky, M. (2013a). 'Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics'. *Theoretical Linguistics* 39 (1): 129–181.
- Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S. and Polinsky, M. (2013b). 'Defining an "ideal" heritage speaker: Theoretical and methodological challenges'. *Theoretical Linguistics* 39 (1): 259–294.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010). *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speakers*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Briceño Perozo, M. (1987). *La espada de Cervantes*. Madrid: Academia Nacional de la Historia.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards Multilingual Education. Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Cummins, J. (1979). 'Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters'. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19: 121–129.

- De Groot, A. (2011). *Language and Cognition in Bilinguals and Multilinguals. An Introduction*. New York and Hove: Psychology Press.
- Del Valle, J. (2000). 'Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: Misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia'. *Language and Communication* 20 (2): 105–132.
- Del Valle, J. (2008). 'The Pan-Hispanic community and the conceptual structure of linguistic nationalism'. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 2 (1–2): 5–26.
- Del Valle, J. and Stheeman, L.G. (eds.) (2002). *The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000: Language Ideologies and Hispanic Intellectuals*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Diver, W. (1995). 'Theory'. In A. Huffman and J. Davis (eds.), *Language: Communication and Human Behavior. The Linguistic Essays of William Diver* (pp. 445–522). Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (eds.) (2007). *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum.
- Dumitrescu, D. and Piña-Rosales, G. (eds.) (2013). *El español en los Estados Unidos: E Pluribus Unum? Enfoques multidisciplinares*. New York, NY: Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Española.
- Escobar, A. M. (2010). 'Variación lingüística en español'. In J.L. Hualde, A. Olarrea, A.M. Escobar and C. Travis (eds.), *Introducción a la lingüística hispánica* (2nd ed.) (pp. 391–445). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Escobar, A. M. (2013). 'Bilingualism in Latin America'. In T.K. Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 642–661). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1959). 'Diglossia'. *Word* 15: 325–340.
- Fishman, J.A., Cooper, R.L., Ma, R. (1971). *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Franceschini, R. (2011). 'Multilingualism and multicompetence: A conceptual view'. *Modern Language Journal* 95 (3): 344–355.
- Fuller, J. (2013). *Spanish Speakers in the USA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- García, O. (2011). 'From language garden to sustainable languaging: Bilingual education in a global world'. *Perspective. A publication of the National Association for Bilingual Education*. Sept/Oct 2011: 5–10.
- García, O. (2012). 'Theorizing translanguaging for educators'. In C. Celic and K. Seltzer, *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. Retrieved from: www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/03/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf
- García, O. (2013). 'From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st century'. In C. Abello-Contesse, P.M. Chandler, M.D. López-Jimenez and R.C. Beltrán (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st Century. Building on Experience* (pp. 155–175). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. and Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating Emergent Bilinguals. Policies, Programs and Practices for English Language Learners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., López, D. and Makar, C. (2010). 'Language and identity in Latin America'. In J.A. Fishman and O. García (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity* (pp. 353–373). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2004). 'Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues'. In T.K. Bhatia and W.C. Ritchie (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 32–64). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamel, R.E. (1994). 'Linguistic rights for Amerindian peoples in Latin America'. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and R. Phillipson (eds.), *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination* (pp. 289–303). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hamel, R.E. (2008). 'Bilingual education for indigenous communities in Mexico'. In J. Cummins and N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education 5: Bilingual Education* (pp. 311–322). New York, NY: Springer.
- Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Language in America. A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Heller, M. (2007). *Bilingualism. A Social Approach*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2000). 'Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility'. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 31 (2): 173–201.
- Irvine, J. and Gal, S. (2000). 'Language ideology and linguistic differentiation'. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics and Identities* (pp. 34–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M.S., Madsen, L.M. and Møller, J.S. (2011). 'Polylinguaging in superdiversity'. *Diversities* 13 (2): 23–37.
- Kemp, C. (2009). 'Defining multilingualism'. In L. Aronin and B. Hufeisen (eds.), *The Exploration of Multilingualism* (pp. 11–26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klee, C.A. and Lynch, A. (2009). *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Labov, W. (1970). 'The logic of nonstandard English'. In F. Williams (ed.), *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme* (pp. 153–189). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lambert, W. (1974). 'Culture and language as factors in learning and education'. In F. Aboud and R. Meade (eds.), *Cultural Factors in Learning and Education* (pp. 91–122). Bellingham, WA: 5th Western Washington Symposium on Learning.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lázaro Carreter, F. (1994). 'La Real Academia y la unidad del idioma'. In *Actas del Congreso de la Lengua Española, Sevilla 1992*. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes. Retrieved from: http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/congresos/sevilla/apertura/Aper_Laz_Car.htm
- Leung, C., Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (1997). 'The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities'. *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (3): 543–560.
- López, L.E. and Sichra, I. (2008). 'Intercultural bilingual education among indigenous peoples in Latin America'. In J. Cummins and N. Hornberger (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education 5: Bilingual Education* (pp. 295–309). New York, NY: Springer.
- López García, A. (1985). *El rumor de los desarraigados. Conflicto de lenguas en la península ibérica*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2000). *The Politics of Language in the Spanish-Speaking World: From Colonization to Globalization*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mar-Molinero, C. (2008). 'Subverting Cervantes: Language authority in global Spanish'. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 2 (1–2): 27–47.
- Marcos-Marín, F. (2006). *Los retos del español*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2000). *Local Histories/Global Designs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Montrul, S. (2008). 'Incomplete acquisition in Spanish heritage speakers: Chronological age or interface vulnerabilities?' In H. Chan et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Annual Boston University on Language Development* (pp. 299–310). Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Press.
- Montrul, S. (2013b). 'Bilingualism and the heritage language speaker'. In T. Bhatia and W. Ritchie (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism* (pp. 168–189). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Moreno-Fernández, F. (2007). 'Perfil histórico-geográfico de la lengua española'. In M. Lacorte (ed.), *Lingüística aplicada del español* (pp. 253–278). Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Ninyoles, R. (1972). *Idioma y poder social*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Niño-Murcia, M., Goddenzi, J.C. and Rothman, J. (2008). 'Spanish as a world language: The interplay of globalized localization and localized globalization'. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 2 (1–2): 48–66.
- Olbert, H. and Muysken, P. (eds.) (2005). *Encuentros y conflictos. Bilingüismo y contacto de lenguas en el mundo andino*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert.

- Otheguy, R. and García, O. (1988). 'Diffusion of lexical innovations in the Spanish of Cuban Americans'. In J. Ornstein-Galicia, G. Green and D. Bixler-Márquez (eds.), *Research Issues and Problems in US Spanish: Latin American and Southwestern Varieties* (pp. 203–243). Brownsville, TX: Pan American University.
- Otheguy, R., García, O. and Fernández, M. (1989). 'Transferring, switching, and modeling in West New York Spanish: An intergenerational study'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 79: 41–52.
- Otheguy, R. and Zentella, A. C. (2012). *Spanish in New York: Language Contact, Dialectal Leveling and Structural Continuity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Otheguy, R., Zentella, A. C. and Livert, D. (2007). 'Language and dialect contact in Spanish in New York: Toward the formation of a speech community'. *Language* 83: 770–802.
- Pavlenko, A. and Blackledge, A. (eds.) (2004). *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Potowski, K. and Carreira, M. (2010). 'Spanish in the USA'. In K. Potowski (ed.), *Language Diversity in the USA* (pp. 66–80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, W. (2006). 'Columbia School and Saussure's langue'. In J. Davis, R. Gorup and N. Stern (eds.), *Advances in Functional Linguistics: Columbia School Beyond its Origins* (pp. 17–39). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Rives, G. L. (1918). *The United States and Mexico, 1821–1848: A History of the Relations between the Two Countries from the Independence of Mexico to the Close of the War with the United States, Volume 2*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Roca, A. and Jensen, J. (eds.) (1996). *Spanish in Contact. Issues in Bilingualism*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Roca, A. and Lipski, J. M. (eds.) (1993). *Spanish in the United States. Linguistic Contact and Diversity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Salaberry, M. R. (ed.) (2009). *Language Allegiances and Bilingualism in the US*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Siguán, M. (1993). *Multilingual Spain*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Siguán, M. (2007). 'El español en contacto con otras lenguas de España'. In M. Lacorte (ed.), *Lingüística aplicada del español* (pp. 281–308). Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Thierry, G. and Wu Y. J. (2007). 'Brain potentials reveal unconscious translation during foreign-language comprehension'. *PNAS* 104 (30): 12530–12535.
- Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Turell, T. (2001). *Multilingualism in Spain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tuten, D. (2003). *Koineization in Medieval Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vallverdú, F. (1981). *El conflicto lingüístico en Cataluña: Historia y presente*. Barcelona: Ediciones Peninsula.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). 'Super-diversity and its implications'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6): 1024–1054.
- Wei, L. (2011). 'Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (5): 1222–1235.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*. New York, NY: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Williams, F. (ed.) (1970). *Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme*. Chicago, IL: Markham Publishing Co.
- Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Woolard, K. A. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). 'Language ideology'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82.
- Wright, R. (1994). *Early Ibero-Romance*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalization*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wu Y. J. and Thierry G. (2010). 'Investigating bilingual processing: The neglected role of language processing contexts'. *Frontiers in Psychology* 1: 178.
- Wyman, L. T., McCarty, T. L. and Nicholas, S. E. (eds.) (2013). *Indigenous Youth and Multilingualism: Language Identity, Ideology, and Practice in Dynamic Cultural Worlds*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zentella, A. C. (2011). '“Dime con quién hablas y te dire quién eres”: Linguistic (in)security and Latino unity'. In J. Flores and R. Rosaldo (eds.), *A Companion to Latina/o Studies* (pp. 25–39). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Contributors

Moisés Almela graduated in German studies from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid and in English studies from the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia. He obtained a PhD from the Universidad de Murcia, where he works as a tenured lecturer. His research and publications focus on corpus linguistics, collocation, and lexical semantics. He is co-founder of the Spanish Association for Corpus Linguistics (AELINCO).

Marta Antón (BA, University of Oviedo; MA and PhD, University of Massachusetts at Amherst) is professor of Spanish and chair of the Department of World Languages and Cultures at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis. She is also associate director of the Spanish Resource Center and research fellow at the Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication. She has conducted research on sociocultural approaches to classroom interaction and dynamic assessment, health discourse, and Spanish sociolinguistics. Recent publications include a book on methods of assessment (Arco/Libros 2013) and chapters and articles in *Foreign Language Annals*, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *Language Teaching*, among others.

Elisabeth Arévalo-Guerrero (BA in English with minors in Spanish, Universidad de Málaga, Spain; MA in Intercultural Communication, Certificate in Instructional System Design; and PhD in Language, Literacy, and Culture, University of Maryland, Baltimore County [UMBC]) teaches effective communication, research methods, and professional English at Les Roches Marbella, International School of Hotel Management, Spain. She was previously visiting professor in the Department of Modern Languages, Linguistics, and Intercultural Communication at UMBC and lecturer in UMD, College Park. Her research and publications focus on intercultural communication and training and intercultural competence.

Elvira N. de Arnoux is professor of interdisciplinary linguistics and sociology of language in the School of Philosophy and Literature at the Universidad de Buenos Aires. She directed the Institute of Linguistics between 1991 and 2009. She is now the director of the MA in discourse analysis and the post-graduate program in reading and writing processes. She also coordinates the Argentinian office of the UNESCO Chair for reading and writing. Her research covers glotopolitics, discourse analysis, and pedagogy of writing. She is the coordinator of the series *Enciclopedia Semiológica* and *Historia de las Políticas e Ideas sobre el Lenguaje en América Latina* at Editorial Eudeba.

Susan Berk-Seligson (PhD in linguistics, University of Arizona) is professor of Spanish linguistics in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Vanderbilt University. Author of *The*