between goals for English as a Second Language (ESL), which emphasize assimilation only, and goals for bilingual education; consequently, the two program names should not be used arbitrarily or interchangeably. High on the list of goals of bilingual education is the desire for interrelationships between the bilingual community and the school, with major emphasis on the development of the bilingual child's positive self-concept and prevention of his academic retardation. Conversely, the bilingual program directors were not concerned with such goals as elitism, language for its own sake, or other goals which tend toward exclusivity.
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STRUCTURAL LINGUISTICS AND BILINGUAL INTERFERENCE: PROBLEMS AND PROPOSALS

John M. Lipski

A situation of languages in contact, 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 U-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 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. 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 Whitney 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 exception of grammar from mixture is no isolated fact; the grammatical apparatus merely results in 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, 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-
Linguists, however, tend to avoid questions of grammatical interference, particularly among bilinguals, and have directed their attention instead toward the methodologically troublesome areas of interference in the lexicon and phonological components. Thus the terrain of syntactic interference in the hands of often linguistically native 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. It is obvious, given the major 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, yet the majority cluster around the area of lexical borrowing, with a diminished number treating phenomena of phonological and morphological 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 an exact or near 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.

Furthermore, the generality of the preceding comments may be added some specific observations regarding situations of Spanish-English interaction. In particular, the fact that the Puerto Rican community in the United States has always been characterized by a high degree of contact with English, and an even higher degree of contact with English in the Puerto Rican community, and consequently exposed to a higher degree of unmitigated English influence. Taking 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 for 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, Gill y Gaya, and especially that of De Granda, 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 opposite viewpoint we may cite the studies of Liorens” and Pérez Sala. Such a polemic accompanying the theory of transformational-generative grammar, there is no incompatibility between linguistic theories stressing static aspects of language and those placing emphasis on syntactic structures, as long as there is articulation between the two components. In particular, while the static and dynamic aspects may be relevant to the study of syntactic-
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voicing 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 syntactic 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, 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, pasado 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 preposed or preposed; others include viejo, pobre, claro, 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 determined in attracting the adjective pasado into the sphere of the variable adjectives like another case in which the presence of el antiguo presidente, given the close semantic relationship between pasado, 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 similar expression asked for a value judgment, given the presence of the interrogative adverb la película? This is a 21 b) you, not as at, etc. The “correct” Spanish ¿te gustó la película? merely typical answers would be a lot, not at all, etc. This is a different type of interrogative structure. 21 This is a different type of interrogative structure.

8. Gilly and Gaya (op. cit., pp. 137-38) notes, with reference to the expression ¿cómo te gustó la película? that:

el forastero a quien se dirige tales preguntas se da cuenta de que en la intención de los hablantes no se espera que el hablante conteste literalmente la pregunta, sino que se espera que sea contestada de manera más forzada, por lo tanto más o menos negativa.

Similarly, speaking of the occupational use of le vi instead of the more common lo vi in Colombia, Restrepo notes that “an occasional le vi was usually an affectation of the ” The other observation clearly indicates the possibility for the spoken chain to influence a more fundamental paradigmatic pattern. The similarity of the frequently occurring este siendo, which many have claimed is the result of English influence, Ramos notes "aunque dicho sintagma sea atributivo al inglés (e.g. being + participio o adjetivo), podría ser explicable estructuralmente dentro del sistema sintáctico español." 29 In a more comprehensive study, Vallejo attempts to demonstrate that Spanish expressions of the form por fuerte que sea, evolved from earlier configurations such as muy fuerte say por magnífica moviera tenga > por fuerza que tenga > por fuerza que sean, reflecting the Academy’s hypothesized evolution from porque fuerza sea.

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
that "after cómo, encontrar 'to find' or parecer 'to seem' are preferable to gustar in asking 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 ¿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) hint at another possible alternative to English influence, noting "Cabría en lo posible que este uso de 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 tendría de antemano y no sería anglicizada 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 + infinitivo 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 adding to allowing saber to be followed by the adverbs cuando, donde, 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 citation also aids in exemplifying this distinction: "—Valéried! Dijiste ¡No sé! ¡No sé hacerlo! —gritó con violencia, tratando de incorporarse— ¡No sé cómo hacerlo!" The meanings of saber + infinitivo "to be able to" [in theory], and saber cómo + infinitivo "to be able to" [on a specific occasion], are sufficiently close that a certain amount of semantic interference 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 + infinitive and saber cómo + infinitive. But influence from English 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 dar un seguimiento a "to follow up," instead of continuar. 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; 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 novel is darle seguimiento 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. 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, the pronouns uno or una must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference. In English, when the combination of noun and adjective is pronounized by deletion of the noun, the pronouns one or ones must be inserted in place of the deleted noun. I have the blue pen > I have the blue ones; That is an important consequence > that is an important one, etc. In Spanish, due in part to the greater diffidence plus adding plausibly to claims of structural interference.
In addition to searching for earlier attestations, studying the possibility of internal deformations of already existing patterns cannot definitively disprove claims of foreign language 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 true 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.