Spanish and Hispanic Bilingualism
Oelila García and Ricardo Otheuy (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, Basque, Galician, Navarre, Quechua, Yoruba, and many other European, African, and Indigenous American languages. As Spanish ways of speaking continue to spread at the present time, a conscientious 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 multilingual 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 this 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 (Byatt 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 curving 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, 2016; Dubeche and Heller 2007; Francozoni 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 multilingualism as the ability of bilinguals to use their entire linguistic repertory to make meaning. In the context of a speaker-centered hermeneutic approach that sees bilingualism as translanguaging, Spanish and the other languages of Hispanic bilinguals are seen not as single units, but as sets of disaggregated linguistic features deployed for translanguaging meaning-making. In the bilingual, the disaggregated features that the hymnman and the lingua franca share the communicative stage with the also disaggregated features called Castilian, 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 Driver (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 identity: power and hierarchy.
5. How is Spanish taught in bilingual contexts and what do we need to consider?: (b) Bilingual Education, (c) 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, hermeneutic theories, 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 Spanish 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 manifestations. 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 these protean obvious multilingualism as incidental and their other linguistic traditions as little worth acknowledging, appreciating, or bringing forth.

Historical Perspectives

The Spanish 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, throughout the centuries, bilingualism has been the norm (Escobar 2010; Marcus-Marin 2006; Moreno-Fernández 2007; Núñez-Marinu et al. 2008, Wright 1998). 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 Latin 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 (Toeten 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 Garcia (1985) as crucial to our understanding of the genesis of contemporary Spanish.

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 (1256), and codified the orthography of Castilian, modeled on the speech of the upper class of Toledo. With the marriage in 1469 of Isabel of Castille and Ferdinand of Aragon, the crowns of Aragon/ Catalonia and Castile/Léon/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 Cominútica de la Lengua Castillana, the first grammar of any Romance language. Nebrija dedicates his grammar to Queen Isabella by saying: Siempre la lengua fue compuesta del imperio. A single Spanish language was needed to rule territories where bilingualism was being discouraged, in the service of the idea of a new 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 Perros 1987). On June 7, 1550, Charles V issued an edict that Spanish was to be used in autochthony 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 Franciscans 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 Spaniards of the conquistadors 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 multilingualities found on the ground and the monolingual ideology enunciated by the institutions intensified. In 1713, the Real Academia Española (RAE) was founded on instructions of Phillip V, the first Bourbon ruler of Spain, to guarantee a Spanish norm and to saber por qué los cambios que experimente... no quieren la corriente usual que monte en todo el idioma hispánico? 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, impias, pisa, 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, Castilla declared the language of the State, and in 1778, King Charles III decreed that there should be one language (and one currency) throughout the Kingdom of the Spanish Crown (Sigüenza 1972). As part of the Spanish Policy of Transplanting the Spanish Moors into America 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-Moliner 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 nations 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 a foothold on the Gulf of Mexico (Rives 1919). 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 Spaniﬁsh, 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 marginalizing the many other, and often more widely spoken, languages (Del Valle and Sibbern 2002). An important player in these developments was Andrés Bello, born in Caracas in 1781 before independence.

In 1847 Bello published his Cosmética de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los criollos. In the prologue, Bello argues that the Spanish language should conserve what he calls la gramática 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 grammatical sense that this is so just because la gramática la castellana uniform y auténtica de la lengua española. 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 Spanish 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 to forward, and quite explicitly, by the need to hold back the forces of multilingualism. The agreement talked about republicas americanas españolas, lejos independientes, pero siempre hermanas nuestras por el idioma because una misma lengua hablamos (listed in Lazano Carretero 1994). The Academies warned that unless there was a strong defense of the Castilian language, lenguas en aquella son tan patrias como los muros a bastonarte. The Academias Correspondientes were finally able to open un dique, más poderoso tal vez que las hayeas mismas, al espíritu innovador de la raza and to go on… (in the world by Colón descubierto). As a result, 19 Academias Correspondientes were established after 1871 in Latin America. In subsequent decades, as massive immigration saw Spaniards 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 Americana de la Lengua (AANL) 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 Pita-Rosales 2013).

Thus, despite efforts to discourage bilingualism and guard against its effects, the history of the expansion of Castilian in Iberia and of Spanish 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 (Rives and Lynch 2009; Obiols and Muysken 2005; Roa and Jensen 1996). In Spain itself, since the mid-19th century and into the 20th century, Catalán, Galician and Basque nationalism have gained ground, bringing bilingualism to the forefront (Mar-Moliner 2000; Sigüenza 1995; Turell 2001). And in Latin America, few communities 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 promulgated 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 (Málfray and Quirós 2007; Sigüenza 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 Godenzi and Schiøth, 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 in 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 outposts 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 (Faller 2013; Potowski and Carretera 2010; Roa and Lipki 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 uses of what is called Spanish in the 21st century.
Oliveira García and Ricardo Ortuño

Core Issues and Topics

The core issues surrounding Spanish and bilingualism in the 21st century have to do with the tension between many bilingual speakers and the continued construction of an anglicized Spanish-speaking monolingual world by those with power to implant such constructions (which, of late, are promoted 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-Moliner 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 Translinguistic Alternative

In the perspective adopted in this chapter, the mental grammar of multilingual Hispanics consist of large and complex arrays of disaggregated structural features (phonetic, phonological, morphophonemic, and semantic) for each language, 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 Catañan, in other settings the conventions assign some features to Spanish and others to Quechua, in still others they assign none to Spanish and others to English, and so forth.

This amounts to saying, under the heterolinguistic 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 morphophonic feature as Spanish or English or Quechua, or whatever, is not part of the speaker's internal linguistic structuration—rather, the allocation of the bilinguals' feature to that language and of that feature to that language is part of the external sociolinguistic conventions—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 fiebre and I'm cold (and does not say Soy fiebre 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 fiebre 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 Grojsman (2004), though it differs from it in one important respect. With Grojsman, we see bilinguals selecting features from their linguistic repertoires depending on contextual, topological, and interactional factors. But we do not follow Grojsman when he defines a language mode as 'a state of activation of the bilingual's languages and language-processing mechanisms' (Grojsman 2004: 40).

In our conception of things, there are no two languages that are cognitively activated or disactivated 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 Grojsman, 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 'two' of bilingual and bilinguism is the product of social convention, not of psychological or cognitive dualism.

As with all sociocultural conventions, the setting and assigning conventions of features to named languages are changeable, local, and contingent (Keller 2007). A feature said, for example, to be part of English (or Catañan 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 analysis 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 approximating absolute uniformity from individual to individual. (Diver 1995: 45)

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

But in our speaker-centered, disaggregated, heterolinguistic 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 descriptions as belonging to one or the other language is now 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. paga), or of present versus absent pronouns (él el please estás vs. él voce estás) or of one set of words or another (purposes full, done vs. estar, lying, doing) in a 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 paga (pronoun present, subjunctive mood) or que pago (pronoun absent, indicative mood). And either combination may occur with full or either one with flows. Taking the bilingual’s perspective, there is little point in labeling que yo paga as less Spanish than que yo paga and the latter as less Spanish than que pago, which would be for some analysts the true Spanish exemplar. Such labeling, from the speaker’s 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 (Garcia 2009). Instead, translanguaging refers to language practices by bilinguals that appear to be indifferent to the social adscription 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 (Arias is Spanish, full is English; quienes que paga is authentic Spanish, quienes que 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:

[Bilinguals 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 a norm, and not the language of monolinguals, as described by traditional usage books and grammars.]

(Garcia 2012)

In so doing, translanguaging releases histories and understandings that have been built within fixed language identities constrained by nation-states (see Migone 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 (Francéschini 2011). Multilingual individuals do not have ‘languages’, rather, they have no interconnected whole, an ecosystem of mutual interdependence of possibly heteronized linguistic features forming a single web, where translanguaging is the speech practice generated by the web.

Translanguaging opens up a space that allows multilingual individuals to integrate social spaces and that ‘language code’ 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 floating of norms of language use), as well as criticality (using evidence to question, problematize, or express viruses). 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 monolingual 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 replaced in a first language.

But under the proposed 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 (Garcia 2009). The term dynamic conceptualizes bilingualism in a way that goes beyond not only Lambert’s idea of additive/subtractive 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 minded 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 (Garcia 2006). 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 Mollóen 2010). In another image, Garcia (2009) points to the huanac car, which turns life when needs 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 “colanuus tree” when the host tree dies. Dynamic bilingualism emerges in the same way, in the crevices and crevices of communication with others
who language differently, gradually becoming in and of itself the only way of language. For multilinguals in an increasingly multilingual world, dynamic bilingualism is then both the foundation of languagings 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 sociolinguistically determined communicative needs, which themselves have a transformative effect on language resources. Dynamic System Theory holds that there is interaction between internal cognitive ecosystems and external social ecosystems, and that therefore language is always being co-constructed between humans and their environments. A dynamic linguistic approach sets aside the social construct of the autonomous language, in our case Spanish, and replaces it with the notion of languaging, 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” (Lecas-Freeman and Cameron 2008: 135). It is true that those who are learning what is taught or conceived of as a ‘‘language’’ distinguish these new features as different from those of their ‘‘first language’’. But it is also true that in the process of developing of when 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 translanguage conception of multilingual practices. Neither appear to keep together at case with such familiar notions as contact-induced change (borrowing, calquing, semantic change) and code-switching, 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 Garcia 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 Winfred (2003), the basic conceptual tool has been, with some exceptions, the externally named single language that imports material (lexeurods, 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 is seen as 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 parapar and parada 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 repartir in the sense of English ‘give away’).

These and other types of language contact, as processes that change the separately conceived languages, are studied alongside the distinct process of code-switching, 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 uncrirical adoption of the external perspective that trades in the sociocultural separatism of languages and the monologic 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 translanguage 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 (Hernamom et al. 2013a, 2013b). The notion has been widely applied, in our case, to the incompleteness of the Spanish of second-generation Latinos born in the US and other immigrant settings (Moñes 2008, 2010). Now the general proposal of incomplete acquisition is of little coherence under the sponsorship of any theory, because too clearly articulated notions 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 Williamts (1970, especially Lakov (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 separatness 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 Quienes que me pago is a prototypical case of incomplete acquisition, because ‘in Spanish’ one would have to say Quién me paga, with a subjunctive form. The monologic 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 idea of German scholars like Johann Gottfried 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 Pfeilholz 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 (Irvin and Gil 2000; Woolard and Scharfstein 1994).
Perhaps no other language issues has been more implicated in these deleterious enterprises than the concept of the ‘native speaker’ (Boziofigo 2010; Leung et al. 1997). Throughout the myth of the idealized native speaker, much linguistic discrimination has taken place. ‘Spanish’, that 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 native 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 is it 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 (Henmamou 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 individual (a non-native), while the former is that of the prototypically monolingual native. In contrast to external, monolingual positions, which focus on ideal native, 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 diglos- dicentric formulations. We first review the classical definitions of diglossia given to us by Psychiarras, Ferguson and Fishman, as well as the recent Catalan formulation of diglossia by Ninyoles and other.

In the late 19th century, the French philologist Psychiarras used the term diglossia to distin- guish the classical standard of Greek, Katharevousa from the popular modern Greek Demotic. 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 diglossias can exist as a stable phenomenon, for example, 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 harmoni- zation and communal compartmentalization of languages. Paraguayan is one of the examples given by Fishman to demonstrate ‘bilingualism with diglossia’. Guarani, Fishman says, fulfills an ethni- nic identity function in Paraguayan horses, with Spanish having a more public function. It is precisely the functional compartmentalization of Guarani and Spanish that Fishman regards as responsible for the maintenance of Guarani over generations. This is in contrast to other Indige- nous 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 reverse language shift, a counter-diglossic ideology favoring normalization of Catalan nativism and normalization of Catalan needs to be explored. 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; Valdés 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 Garcia (2009) has called biauglossia. The super-dense patterns of multilingualism and the emergence of new multimodal forms of communication in the 21st century (Blimmer and Fernández 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 interrelationships of the diglossic features in their repertoire. This translanguaging model does not simply support language maintenance, since language is neither autonomous nor pure; rather, it proposes the sustainability of language (Garcia 2013), a concept that aspires to more than the traditional one of language maintenance.

Simple language-maintenance efforts, as expounded by some in the language rights move- ment, 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 semantic systems, and this is so despite their com- plexity, 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 (Spanish), 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 envi- ronmental conditions by which systems remain diverse and productive over time (Garcia 2011). Thus, language sustainability is for us a much more apt concept for the future of His-panic 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 bilin- gual 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., Hame 2008; Hornberger 2008; López and Síkora 2008; for Basque see Cenoz 2005). The curriculum followed in these edu- cational efforts is informed by a monoglossic ideology, attempting to keep Spanish separate from other language practices in a diglossic arrangement. And yet, all these educational programs today actually incorporate multilingual children with diverse language practices. Whether in the Basque Country, in Mexico or the US, in Catalonia or Catalonia, it is super-diversity, especially in language practices, that characterizes classrooms (Vertovec 2007).
In the US, where 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, in 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 rely on two languages as autonomous systems, but they also normalize a diglossic 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 translanguaging 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 Elles quieren que yo les pague el débito porque ellas dicen que ellas están hambrientas. Translanguaging in these contexts is thus not simply the acceptance of ‘diglossic’ and ‘acknowledging’ them. In such an approach, these features are positively recognized as part of the student’s home language, and a part that, respectively, is kept at bay in the school. In this way, they are not part of the standard. Educators operating under a speaker-centered view of Hispanic bilingualism, a diglossic view of language competence, and a translanguaging view of bilingual practices, inspired by a heterogeneous 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 Elles quieren que yo pague. Rather, 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 code, an Ann Landers manner of 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 monolingual 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 diglossic competences. These proposals commit 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 Catalán, English, Eskoka, Quichua, Yoruba, etc. Because it does not set much more by these traditional constructs, the heteroglossic, speaker-centered theorizing that we propose encourages a change in the conversation about the complex language of bilingual Hispanic people, calling attention to the ways in which bilinguals display 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 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 monolingual ideologies, inspires an alternative view of the traditional notions of addressee and contact and of the relatively newer notion of incompleteness. Under the proposal here, the language 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 code switching 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 different light than presently seen 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 deviation 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 indicator page does not manifest the failure by an incomplete acquirer to realize that, in this particular structural environment, the correct Spanish choice is subjunctive, it represents a translanguaging practice, legitimate in itself, free of the pernicious comparison with a socioculturally 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, 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 in situ (Boalderi 1991).
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, disengaged, 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 interactions 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 languages 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. 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 negate 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.
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