

STRUCTURAL LINGUISTICS AND BILINGUAL INTERFERENCE: PROBLEMS AND PROPOSALS

John M. Lipski

A situation of languages in contact,¹ particularly one characterized by a large amount of bilingual interaction, inevitably leads to the influence of one language upon the other. Such an influence generally occurs in both directions, but, when one of two languages represents a majority and/or prestige language, it is most frequent for this language to exert a more profound influence on the minority language. In such cases, it is usual to speak of linguistic interference, borrowing, and the numerous *-isms* (e.g. Anglicisms, Latinisms, etc.) characterizing studies of bilingual transfer.

Interference between languages, while encompassing every conceivable form of linguistic structure, may be divided into three general categories, via the *substratum*, *superstratum* or *adstratum* models of linguistic interference. The first involves lexical interference, that is, borrowing of entire words or phrases. The second case is phonological interference, involving the transfer of sounds or sound patterns from one language to another. Finally, we come to syntactic interference, involving the formation of words and phrases, the transference of patterns of word formation from one language to another, and the shift in meaning of partial or false cognate forms. While all three categories of linguistic interference have been studied, there has by no means been an equal amount of scholarly activity devoted to each. Lexical interference, being perhaps most common, and certainly most easily catalogued, forms the basis for the majority of studies of bilingual interference, studies which run the gamut from mere lists of foreign borrowings to more sophisticated studies seeking to determine the causes for the borrowing of particular words, in terms of the semantic and lexical structures of the languages. Phonological interference, involving transference of sounds and phonemic oppositions, has received due attention, and explanations based on the phonological influence of substrata have traditionally formed part of the stock in trade of historical linguistics. In synchronic analyses, phonological interference is responsible for "foreign accents," which in many instances work their way, after several generations, into the pronunciation of the majority language.² Finally, in the realm of syntactic interference, there has been comparatively little investigation, particularly within the framework of modern linguistics. The transference of syntactic patterns has often been felt to be somewhat of a linguistic curiosity, difficult to determine and even more difficult to describe. In 1881, William Dwight Whitney³ defined a scale of the difficulty with which various linguistic structures are borrowed, with nouns at the end of greatest ease, and sounds at the opposite end. Turning his attention to the borrowing of grammatical patterns, Whitney then noted: "the exemption of 'grammar' from mixture is no isolated fact; the grammatical apparatus merely resists intrusion most successfully, in virtue of its being the least material and the most formal part of language. In a scale of constantly increasing difficulty it occupies the extreme place." More recently, however,⁴ it has been admitted that "native speakers. . . seldom make syntactic errors. . . non-native speakers do make syntactic mistakes frequently and stubbornly as they make semantic and morphological mistakes, because they tend to transfer to the foreign lan-

guage their native syntactical system as well as their morphological habits and semantic values." Linguists have nonetheless tended to avoid questions of grammatical interference, particularly among bilinguals, and have directed their attention instead toward the methodologically less troublesome areas of interference in the lexicon and phonological components, leaving the study of syntactic interference in the hands of often linguistically naive scholars.

The above remarks, while describing the study of bilingual encounters in general, are particularly relevant to the interaction between Spanish and English in the United States and its environs. Given the majority status of English as compared to Spanish, especially in the United States, and given the generally extensive lexical borrowing from English encountered throughout the world's languages, it is reasonable to expect that close contact between Spanish and English would lead to a profound influence of the latter on the former. Studies on the influence of English on Spanish abound,⁵ yet the majority cluster around the area of lexical borrowing, with a diminished number treating phenomena of phonological interference. Within the realm of syntactic interference, the most common methodology has been to present as "evidence" a Spanish expression which may or may not be a commonly accepted pattern, together with a similar phrase in English, followed by the claim that the Spanish expression is a calque or loan-translation of the English expression in question. In many cases such claims may be intuitively quite satisfying, especially when gleaned from areas where one is led to expect large quantities of linguistic interference of English on Spanish, but the fact remains that to date, there is no comprehensive linguistic methodology for determining true cases of syntactic interference comparable, for example, to the work which has been done in assessing phonological interference.⁶

To the generality of the preceding comments may be added some specific observations regarding situations of Spanish-English interaction. In particular, the present note will focus on certain claims regarding the influence of English on the Spanish of Puerto Rico, in an attempt to assess the effectiveness of the results hitherto reported. While no comprehensive linguistic methodology will result, due to the embryonic state of research into bilingual interaction, it will be suggested that a greater application of linguistic theory to the study of language contact will yield a clearer picture of the type and extent of interference to be anticipated.

The fact that Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States, thus having English as one of its official languages, leads to inevitable claims of English influence on Puerto Rican Spanish, claims further strengthened by a constant source of linguistic flux attributable to Puerto Ricans in the United States, allegedly removed from extensive contact with the living Spanish language and consequently exposed to a higher degree of unmitigated English influence. Touching on a topic of political and social relevance, claims of English influence in Puerto Rico cannot be divorced from the polemical tirades and impressionistic observations which accompany discussions of foreign interference and independence, and as a result the study of Puerto Rican Spanish has suffered in empirical acceptability, if not in volume.

Studies of Puerto Rican Spanish generally cluster around two poles, those claiming large amounts of linguistic interference from English, and those asserting that, apart from lexical borrowing, Puerto Rican Spanish remains relatively free of foreign influence; relatively few studies strike the middle ground, and thus the reader is left with a feeling of confusion and frustration when attempting to draw his own conclusions. In particular, the studies of Navarro Tomás,⁷ Gili y Gaya,⁸ and especially that of De Granda⁹ have claimed for Puerto Rican Spanish a relatively high degree of English influence, in the syntactic structures as well as in the lexicon. Taking the opposing viewpoint we may cite the studies of Lloréns¹⁰ and Pérez Sala.¹¹ The work

of the latter author is especially significant in that he has devoted an entire monograph to the study of structural syntactic interference of English on Puerto Rican Spanish; more significantly still, Pérez decries the lack of methodological rigor characterizing earlier studies and calls for a rigid structural linguistic methodology to deal with cases of syntactic interference. In reality, however, it turns out that, after a discussion of structural linguistics in general, Pérez Sala's application of linguistics to the study of syntactic interference is not radically different from that to be found in earlier studies, although undertaken from a much more rational viewpoint. After adopting a set of general categories, such as *noun phrase*, *verb phrase*, etc., the author compiles a list of Spanish expressions suspected of being "Anglicized," together with the English expressions from which they reputedly came. In order to verify the degree of similarity between the expressions in question, Pérez notes (p. 48, fn. 10) that "basta una ojeada a las tres formas para constatar, con cierta seguridad, que la frase [española] es un calco de la frase [inglesa]." Thus, right from the outset there is no indication of precisely what it means for two phrases in two languages to be sufficiently similar for one to have influenced the other. To assert the similarity after the fact is a totally circular procedure, providing no escape from the impressionism to be found in nearly all works dealing with syntactic interference.

Since Pérez Sala believes that the majority of his examples may be dismissed as false Anglicisms, he proceeds via a process of elimination to provide other explanations for the expressions in question. The general method is to search for another attestation, either in other Spanish dialects, or in earlier periods of the Spanish language. With respect to the first possibility, given the pervasive influence of English in the modern world, a fact amply recognized by Pérez himself, finding an attestation of an expression elsewhere in the Hispanic world is no guarantee that this area has not also been influenced by English. Arguments based on historical parallels are generally much more substantial, for given the highly diversified history of the Spanish language, together with the numerous attested archaic forms, in Puerto Rico and elsewhere, it is not surprising to find that Old Spanish shared many structural patterns with modern English, patterns which may have survived intact in certain regions without having been directly influenced by modern English. However, once these resources have been exhausted, all remaining examples must automatically be relegated to the status of Anglicisms, and thus the appeal to "structural linguistics" seems to have been in vain, since at no point has a true linguistic model been applied.

It is thus seen to be of the utmost importance whether in fact an algorithm can be established which will sort out true cases of foreign interference from spontaneous evolutions within the language, in the absence of additional attestations. In general, it may be affirmed that such a determination is impossible, since, as with any scientific hypothesis, claims of foreign influence can never be totally *proved*; on the other hand, by amassing sufficient counterevidence, the possibility of foreign influence may, in many cases, be reduced to negligible proportions. It is here that a more substantive appeal to structural linguistics may aid in the determination of linguistic interference, for by viewing languages as structured entities instead of bodies of isolated forms, a total view may be obtained.

A natural language is a system in equilibrium, a sort of micro-ecological system, in which both static and dynamic aspects play a role in maintaining the balance. Therefore, despite the polemic accompanying the theory of transformational-generative grammar,¹² there is no incompatibility between linguistic theories stressing static aspects of language and those placing emphasis on the dynamic aspects, as long as there is articulation between the two components. In particular, both the static and dynamic aspects may be relevant to the study of syntactic in-

terference, inasmuch as the process of borrowing is itself *dynamic*, although its results are usually assessed in terms of static after-effects.

In addition to providing a precise description of what constitutes sufficient similarity between two expressions to warrant formation of a calque, a more detailed application of linguistics may also serve in the role of devil's advocate in the determination of linguistic interference, in determining the relation between the underlying system of language and the spoken chain. Ferdinand de Saussure¹³ defined the terms *syntagm* and *paradigm* to characterize these notions. Most generally, they relate the set of possible choices available at any given time with the choice that is actually made. The paradigm is the *system*, the set of all possible alternatives for a given element, whether it be sound, word, sentence, or even something more diffuse like narrative unit. The paradigm is highly structured by a number of correlations interrelating the members along various axes. The syntagm, on the other hand, is the *concrete realization* of this underlying system, in which one choice is made for each element in question. As an example, one may consider the total conjugation of a verb as a paradigmatic set, while the occurrence of a particular verbal form in a given sentence belongs to the level of the syntagm. Roman Jakobson¹⁴ has described this relationship by characterizing the paradigm as a relation of *similarity*, where the elements are related by virtue of sharing common traits which would make them appropriate in a given slot; the syntagm generates a relation of *contiguity*, where the elements are related by virtue of their juxtaposition in the spoken chain.

In the majority of cases, the paradigm or system and the syntagm or concrete realization are opposed to one another, as distinct axes. When these axes overlap, however, striking and unusual results may ensue. Roland Barthes¹⁵ notes, in a description of the syntagm/paradigm dichotomy: "the mode of articulation of the two axes [i.e. syntagmatic and paradigmatic] is sometimes 'perverted,' when, for instance a paradigm is extended into a syntagm. There is then a defiance of the usual distribution *syntagm/system*, and it is probably around this transgression that a great number of creative phenomena are situated. . ."

The interaction of the syntagm and the paradigm has been a particularly fruitful area of investigation in linguistics, particularly in the study of sound change. In general, it is assumed that the paradigm or system exerts pressures of conformity on the syntagm, or spoken chain,¹⁶ although in the field of sound change, the opposite claim has occasionally been made.¹⁷ In the realm of syntactic interference, however, the possible role of the syntagm in shaping the underlying structure of the language has received little attention, outside of a few scattered references in specific studies. For example, speaking of the occasional use of *le vi* instead of the more common *lo vi* in Colombia, Restrepo¹⁸ notes that "an occasional *le vi* was usually an affectation of the peninsular Spanish, or the influence of the written word. However, let us bear in mind the possibility of an expression such as *no le vi la cara. . .*" The latter observation clearly indicates the possibility for the spoken chain to influence a more fundamental paradigmatic pattern. Similarly, speaking of the frequently occurring *está siendo*, which many have claimed is the result of English influence, Ramos¹⁹ notes "aunque dicho sintagma sea atribuible al inglés (*is being + participio o adjetivo*), podría ser explicado estructuralmente dentro del sistema sintáctico español."²⁰ In a more comprehensive study, Vallejo²¹ attempts to demonstrate that Spanish expressions of the form *por fuerte que sea*, evolved from earlier configurations such as *maguer muy fuerte sea* > *por maguer fuerza tenga* > *por fuerza que tenga* > *por fuerte que sea*, rejecting the Academy's hypothesized evolution from *porque sea fuerte*.

The possibility for the spoken chain to profoundly influence the underlying system or paradigm has, nonetheless, never been systematically explored, especially in regard to cases in-

volving putative bilingual interference. It is here, nonetheless, that structural linguistics can potentially add to the arsenal of facts needed to substantiate or refute claims of foreign influence, by providing yet another alternative to simple cases of calques or borrowings. In addition to arguments involving attestations from earlier historical periods or far-flung dialects, a questionable expression which is structurally similar to one in another language may also be described as the result of a spontaneous internal evolution, stemming from the successive transformation of structures already present in the language, under the influence of dominant syntagmatic patterns. While the determination of such routes of transformation will be, in most cases, purely hypothetical, the amassing of sufficient data, and hopefully precedent evolutions in other areas of the language, may place the overall role of foreign influence in a somewhat narrower perspective. Some concrete cases should serve to demonstrate the potential inherent in such a methodological procedure.

Pérez Sala, and others,²² note the expression *el pasado presidente* "the past president" instead of what is claimed to be the "correct" Spanish, *el ex presidente*. The former expression is claimed to result from the English version, a claim not unlikely given the occurrence of errors like *pasado año*, *pasada semana*, etc., frequently encountered among English-speaking students in Spanish classes. To stop here, however, would fail to take into consideration the equally acceptable *el antiguo presidente*, also with preposed adjective, as in English. The adjective *antiguo* belongs to a restricted group of Spanish adjectives which change in meaning, or at least in scope, according to whether they are anteposed or preposed;²³ others include *viejo*, *pobre*, *cierto*, *nuevo*, etc. Compare, for example, *un amigo viejo* "a friend who is old" with *un viejo amigo* "a friend of long standing." While it is quite likely that the English syntactic pattern was instrumental in attracting the adjective *pasado* into the sphere of the variable adjectives like *antiguo*, the presence of *el antiguo presidente*, given the close semantic relationship between *pasado* and *antiguo*, must not be overlooked as having at least contributed to the shift in question.

Another expression branded as an Anglicism is *¿cómo te gustó la película?* instead of simply *¿te gustó la película?*; the former expression presumably comes from English "how did you like the picture?" However, it must be noted that Spanish *gustar* is not syntactically equivalent to English *like*, but rather to *please*;²⁴ thus, a phrase such as *¿cómo te gustó la película?* would be literally rendered into English as "how did the picture please you?" On the other hand, the English expression asks for a value judgment, given the presence of the interrogative adverb *how*; typical answers would be *a lot*, *not at all*, etc. The "correct" Spanish *¿te gustó la película?* merely asks for a *yes-no* response, thus providing a totally different type of interrogative structure.²⁵ Gili y Gaya (*op. cit.*, pp. 137-8) notes, with reference to the expression *¿cómo te gustó la película?* that:

el forastero a quien se dirigen tales preguntas se da cuenta de que en la intención de los hablantes no se proponen decir ¿De qué manera le gusta P.R.?, ¿De qué manera le gusta mi casa?, y que la respuesta esperada es *sí* o *no*, o las expresiones ponderativas *mucho* o *poco*, del mismo carácter afirmativo o negativo. *Cómo* pierde en esas frases su sentido modal. Un hablante hispánico que no se percatara de la intención de su interlocutor, al oír ¿cómo le gusta la playa de Luquillo? contestaría: *A la luz de la luna*, o *Con poco oleaje*.

While agreeing with Gili y Gaya that *cómo* has lost much of its adverbial force in the expressions in question, we would disagree that *sí* and *no* would be totally acceptable answers to the question, although *mucho*, *poco*, etc., do fit the situation, as in English. However, again as in English, the semantic erosion of *cómo* does not occur only in this expression, but also with other verbs requiring value judgments. In his encyclopedic Spanish grammar, Ramsey²⁶ noted

that "after *cómo*, *encontrar* 'to find' or *parecer* 'to seem' are preferable to *gustar* in asking an opinion," a statement even implicitly admitting the acceptability of the type-form *¿cómo te gusta?*, although giving preference to other expressions. Given the possibility of variants like *¿cómo/qué te parece?*, as well as *¿cómo te encuentras?*, all of whose meanings are almost identical to that expressed in *¿cómo te gusta?*, it is not unlikely that this latter expression has been influenced by structures already present in Spanish. Gili y Gaya, in fact (p. 138, fn. 5) hints at another possible alternative to English influence, noting "Cabría en lo posible que este uso del *cómo* interrogativo fuese una propagación analógica del *cómo* exclamativo en las frases: *¡Cómo me gusta esta calle!* *¡Cómo me parece bien esa idea!* y otras parecidas. En este caso, la frase en cuestión vendría de antiguo y no sería anglicada en su origen, si bien el contacto con la expresión inglesa puede haber contribuido a consolidarla y propagarla." The last remark is particularly pertinent, for, in discussing possible cases of foreign interference, it is necessary to differentiate between simple cases of borrowing, and internal evolutions aided by the overwhelming presence of structurally similar expressions in the predominant language.

Also considered to have come from English are expressions like *él sabe cómo hablar inglés* "he knows how to speak English," instead of simply *él sabe hablar inglés*, since *saber* + infinitive means "to know how to." This sort of error is frequently heard among English-speaking students of Spanish, and thus claims of English influence are quite plausible. However, it must also be noted that Spanish, in addition to allowing *saber* to be followed by the adverbs *cuándo*, *dónde*, etc., also permits contrast between *saber* + infinitive and *saber cómo* + infinitive, for example in the pair:

(1) *El no sabe traducir*. "He doesn't know how to translate."

(2) *El no sabe cómo traducir este párrafo*. "He doesn't know how to translate this paragraph."

In sentence (1), general ability is referred to, while in (2), inability on a specific occasion necessitates the use of the adverb *cómo*: he doesn't know how to go about translating a particular paragraph. A literary citation²⁷ also aids in exemplifying this distinction: "—¡Valérie! ¡Déjame! ¡No sé! ¡No sé hacerlo!—gritó con violencia, tratando de incorporarse—¡No sé cómo hacerlo!" The meanings of *saber* + infinitive "to be able to" [in theory], and *saber cómo* + infinitive "to be able to" [on a specific occasion], are sufficiently close that a certain amount of semantic transference could be anticipated, even in the absence of foreign influence. This situation is parallel to that exhibited by the preterite and imperfect tenses of *poder* + infinitive. Compare:

(3) *Podía abrir la ventana*. "I was able (in theory) to open the window."

(4) *Pude abrir la ventana*. "I was able to open the window (and opened it)."

As the meanings of the preterite and imperfect may merge under certain conditions, so might the difference between *saber* + inf. and *saber cómo* + inf. become blurred in the minds of many speakers.

Another example is provided by the expression *hay que darle pensamiento a eso* "it's necessary to give that some thought," instead of preferred *hay que estudiar eso*. Also cited is *darle seguimiento a* "to follow up," instead of *tramitar*. In the first case, the structure of the Spanish expression is sufficiently close to that of its English counterpart to make one suspect a calque; in the second example, however, there is no ready syntactic parallel, other than the use of the verb pair *seguir/follow*. In any case, expressions of the form *darle* + noun + *a* are sufficiently common in Spanish in other cases where no English influence is to be suspected. Most common is *darle vueltas a* "to ponder." Encountered in a Nicaraguan novel²⁸ is *darle pegamento a* "to stick," while the expression *dar nacimiento a* "to give birth to," is found in a novel by a Cuban

author not generally given to unintentional use of Anglicisms.²⁹ Thus it appears quite possible that the Spanish expressions in question are the result of neologisms, following an already established pattern, rather than being ascribable to the influence of English.

As a final example, let us consider the pleonastic usage of the indefinite articles *uno* and *una* in expressions like *la consecuencia es una muy importante* "the consequence is an important one," instead of *la consecuencia es muy importante*, *el plan parece uno demasiado costoso* "the plan seems a very expensive one," instead of *el plan parece demasiado costoso*, etc. Here the insertion of the unnecessary article in the Spanish expression parallels English usage, thus adding plausibility to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronominalized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns *one* or *ones* must be inserted in place of the deleted noun: *I have the blue pens* > *I have the blue ones*; *That is an important consequence* > *that is an important one*, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater differentiation provided by gender and number concord in adjectives, pronominalization may be accomplished merely through deletion of the noun: *tengo las plumas azules* > *tengo las azules*; *me gusta aquel libro* > *me gusta aquél*, and so forth. Errors of the form *este uno* for "this one" are frequent in beginning Spanish classes, until students have mastered the process of pronominalization in Spanish.

It is possible, however, to construct acceptable and indeed necessary combinations of indefinite article + adjective in Spanish, paralleling those found in the unacceptable expressions cited above. The requirement is that the article + adjective combination in the predicate must not be co-referential with any noun phrase in the subject, but rather must stand in contrast with it. Compare the following pronominalizations, where unacceptable derivations are marked with an asterisk: *Los problemas son difíciles* > **son unos difíciles* > *son difíciles*; *El espectáculo es muy costoso* > **es uno muy costoso* > *es muy costoso* > *buscamos uno menos costoso*; *El espectáculo no tuvo lugar en un edificio viejo sino en uno nuevo*, etc. In these examples it may be seen that the combination of *uno* + adjective is called for whenever a new, previously unspecified adjective being referred to, while *uno* is not permitted in the same frame if the pronominalized adjective is co-referential with an NP in the subject. The crucial question then is whether it would be possible for this requirement of non-coreferentiality to spontaneously disappear, thus permitting transfer of patterns of the type *uno* + adjective to cases involving co-referential noun phrases. At this point, only a speculative answer may be offered, since no data are available which bear directly on the emergence of the questionable Spanish phrases. Clearly, considering only the predicate phrases in both types of expressions could lead to a transfer of the type suggested above, particularly since we do not ordinarily process or produce sentences on a word-by-word basis, but rather in larger, stereotyped chunks which are often retained or modified as integral units.³⁰ Moreover, there is at least one other case in Spanish where requirements of co-referentiality are being lost, and this concerns the growing use of the disjunctive pronouns *él*, *ella*, etc., to the exclusion of the reflexive pronouns *sí*, *consigo*, etc. This process, which Henríquez Ureña³¹ dates back to the end of the 19th century, has not reached full generality in Spanish, but certain authors, for example Julio Cortázar, use the pronouns *él*, *ellos*, etc. consistently in such cases; for example *lo trajo con él*, *leía para él*, instead of *lo trajo consigo*, *leía para sí*. A similar process has taken place in modern French. Thus, the possibility of transfer of patterns involving the combination of indefinite article + adjective to cases involving co-referentiality through spontaneous internal evolution would not be totally unparalleled. More likely, as with most of the previously cited examples, the English expression provided either the initial impetus or reinforcement for a structurally permissible change in Spanish.

In addition to searching for earlier attestations, studying the possibility of internal deformations of already existing patterns cannot definitively disprove claims of foreign linguistic interference. However, a cogent and well-argued linguistic presentation can place claims of structural interference in a different perspective, by giving due consideration to language as a structured entity, capable of complex evolutionary patterns, rather than as a passive mechanism which swallows words and expressions whole merely upon contact with another language. Clearly the rudimentary examples presented in this note make no claims to represent a comprehensive linguistic theory of internal evolution; they were included merely to demonstrate the sort of results that may be anticipated by applying structural models of language to problems of bilingual interaction. Only by giving sufficient consideration to all aspects of the bilingual encounter, linguistic as well as social, can a truly accurate portrayal be realistically approached. The current state of research into bilingualism shows a healthy cooperation of varying disciplines, and it is in the spirit of such interdisciplinary cooperation that the preceding remarks have been offered.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Footnotes

- ¹The literature on linguistic aspects of bilingualism is enormous. For a panoramic view, in which the "contact" aspect is emphasized, see Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968 [1st ed. 1953]).
- ²For some specific examples of this process, see William Labov, *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966).
- ³William Dwight Whitney, "On Mixture in Language," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12 (1881) 5-26.
- ⁴Eric H. Kadler, *Linguistics and Teaching Foreign Languages* (New York: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc. 1970, pp. 86-7).
- ⁵See for example Richard Teschner, "A Critical Annotated Bibliography of Anglicisms in Spanish," *Hispania* 51 (1974) 631-78.
- ⁶For instances, as exemplified by André Martinet, *Economie des changements phonétiques* (Bern: Francke, 1955); F. Jungemann, *La teoría del sustrato y los dialectos hispano-romances y gascones* (Madrid: Gredos, 1956); A.G. Haudricourt and A.G. Juillard, *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français* (2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton, 1970).
- ⁷Tomás Navarro Tomás, *El español en Puerto Rico* (3rd ed. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria, 1974).
- ⁸Samuel Gili y Gaya, *Nuestra lengua materna* (San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña, 1965).
- ⁹Germán de Granda, *Transculturación e interferencia lingüística en el Puerto Rico contemporáneo (1898-1968)* (Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, 1971).
- ¹⁰Washington Lloréns, *El habla popular de Puerto Rico* (Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, 1971).
- ¹¹Paulino Pérez Sale, *Interferencia Lingüística del inglés en el español hablado en Puerto Rico* (Hato Rey: Inter American University Press, 1973).
- ¹²Cf. Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structure* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957); Paul Postal, *Constituent Structure* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964); *Aspects of Phonological Theory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).
- ¹³Ferdinand de Saussure, *A Course in General Linguistics* (trans. W. Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959).
- ¹⁴See R. Jakobson and M. Halle, *Fundamentals of Language* (The Hague: Mouton, 1956), pp. 48-81; R. Jakobson, *Studies on Child Language and Aphasia* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), pp. 49-94.
- ¹⁵Roland Barthes, *Elements of Semiology* (trans. A. Lavers and C. Smith. Boston, Beacon Press, p. 86).

- ¹⁶See the references in fn. 6; also, E. Dorfman, "Correlation and Core-relation in Diachronic Romance Phonology," *Word* 24 (1968) 81-98.
- ¹⁷For one recent study, see K.I. McCalla, "System Attraction and the Syntagm: Modern English Assibilation," *La Linguistique* 9 (1973) 95-104.
- ¹⁸R.J. Restrepo, "More on 'lo' and 'le,'" *Hispania* 52 (1969) 433-4 [p. 433].
- ¹⁹M.A. Ramos, "El fenómeno de 'estar siendo,'" *Hispania* 55 (1972) 128-31, [p. 129].
- ²⁰For further discussion of this same expression, see Gili y Gaya, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
- ²¹J. Vallejo, "Notas sobre la expresión concesiva," *Revista de Filología Española* 9 (1922) 40-51.
- ²²For example Gili y Gaya, *op. cit.*; Rose Nash, "Spanglish: Language Contact in Puerto Rico," *American Speech* 45 (1970) 223-33.
- ²³The term "bivalent" has been suggested by William E. Bull, "Spanish Adjective Position and the Theory of Valence Classes," *Hispania* 37 (1954) 32-38.
- ²⁴For further discussion of the evolution of *gustar*, see John Lipski, "A Syntactic-semantic Shift in Spanish," *Folia Linguistica* 7 (1974).
- ²⁵For a discussion of Spanish interrogative patterns, see R.P. Stockwell, J.D. Bowen and J.W. Martin, *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 220-30; Roger L. Hadlich, *A Transformational Grammar of Spanish* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 115-19.
- ²⁶M. Ramsey, *A Textbook of Modern Spanish* (revised by R. Spaulding. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1956 [1st ed. 1894], p. 507).
- ²⁷Enrique Lafourcade, *El príncipe y las ovejas* (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Zig Zag, 1961).
- ²⁸Lizandro Chávez Alfaro, *Trágame tierra* (Mexico: Editorial Diógenes, 1969).
- ²⁹Severo Sarduy, *Gestos* (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1963).
- ³⁰This is a commonly known fact in psycholinguistics. For a novel discussion, in terms of "centos," see Fred Householder, *Linguistic Speculations* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971), Chap. 15.
- ³¹P. Henríquez Ureña, "Ello," *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 1 (1939) 209-29 [p. 209]; also, Mercedes Roldán, "Relexivation in Spanish," in Rose Nash, ed., *Readings in Spanish-English Contrastive Linguistics* (Hato Rey: Inter American Univ. Press, 1973), pp. 197-219 [pp. 202-5].