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Abstract
Situations of sustained language contact between Spanish and English have existed in the United States since the early nineteenth century. Initial contact between these two languages in what is now the U.S. Southwest was the result of territorial expansion by English-speaking settlers. Later contact situations in New York and Florida were caused by economic and political circumstances facing Spanish-speaking caribeños. As a result of this contact, English has exerted some degree of influence on the bilingual Spanish spoken in the United States. The structural results of contact range from subtle changes in articulation to broad changes in the lexicon, all of which have been studied to greater and lesser extents by linguists over the past century. This introduction provides a point of reference for these studies. The accumulation of structural influences from English, regardless of geographical location, is leading to a transformation in the linguistic structure of U.S. Spanish, thereby making it distinct from other varieties of this language.
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1 Spanish in the United States

1.1 Spanish in the American Southwest
Spanish has been spoken in what is now the Southwest of the United States since the initial expeditions of Spanish colonists traveling north from the intendancies of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, which is now Mexico, dating back to the mid-sixteenth century. Naturally, settlement of these far-flung provinces, which covered the entire American Southwest, from present day California to Texas, was slow and riddled with setbacks and challenges. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Spanish missionaries helped to bring an increased use of the Spanish language to the indigenous peoples of these areas, where there was hardly an Anglo presence. This changed dramatically in the early 1800s as Anglos began settling these areas in greater numbers. The California Gold Rush (1848–55) opened the floodgates for the Anglo expansion of what is now the American Southwest. The availability of arable or semi-arable land also served as a powerful stimulus for Anglo settlement in these areas. As a result of these settlement activities and the near extermination of the native population, the cultural and linguistic landscape of the American Southwest would be changed forever.

Due to the historical circumstances just described, the original dialects of Spanish spoken in the United States were those of the Spanish colonizers, who naturally changed and adapted both culturally and linguistically over time (Bills and Vigil, 1999). The longest-standing dialects found in the American Southwest are those of New Mexico and southern Colorado. The archaic nature of these dialects, frequently attributed to their geographic isolation (Bills and Vigil, 2008), confirms this status. Throughout northern New Mexico, Spanish has been spoken for centuries. Subsequent settlements of the southern part of the state, most notably in Las Cruces, which occurred much later in the mid-1800s, have been more heavily influenced by Mexican varieties of Spanish. The same is true for the vast majority of dialects spoken in the western United States. Due to the history of this region and its close proximity to Mexico, the vast majority of Spanish speakers in the western United States speak some form of Mexican Spanish. That said, the varieties of Spanish spoken in major cities have become much more diverse over time, as immigrant populations from other parts of Latin America have expanded greatly.

1.2 Caribbean settlement of the eastern seaboard
While the cultural fabric of the American Southwest has been shaped largely by Mexican-Americans, Spanish-speaking Caribbean immigrants have transformed the cultural and linguistic landscape of New York, New Jersey, and Florida. Puerto Rican immigrants have resided in New York City since the early 1900s. More
recently, there has also been extensive immigration from the Dominican Republic to many parts of New York and New Jersey. Cubans began migrating to Florida in consistent numbers at the turn of the nineteenth century and have since become synonymous with the culture of southern Florida, especially Miami. Immigration to the United States from Latin America continues today, with greater numbers of Latinos settling all over the country, often in areas that previously had little or no Latino presence. This is essentially having the effect of greater numbers of Americans claiming Spanish as a home language in areas that have not had a sizable Latino population historically, such as Washington, Minnesota, and North Carolina (Saenz, 2004). Obviously, the current issue cannot address all of these varieties. Instead, we will focus on the three dialects that have the longest-standing history in the United States, and therefore the longest period of sustained contact with English. These three bilingual dialects are northern New Mexican Spanish, New York City Puerto Rican Spanish, and Miami Cuban Spanish.¹

1.3 Differences in contact situations
It should be mentioned at the outset of this issue that these three dialects represent different historical realities with respect to language contact. Northern New Mexican Spanish has resulted from a situation of historical language contact and continues to evolve due to its proximity with Mexico. Despite its archaic character, it represents a situation of sustained cultural, historical, and geographical contact between the United States and Mexico. There is much evidence, in fact, that contact with Mexico is having the somewhat unintended effect of bolstering the preservation of Spanish in New Mexico through the greater use of this language among a more recent immigration population from Latin America. This is not to say that this factor alone will ensure its preservation (Bills, 2005), especially given the fairly consistent lack of intergenerational transmission of this language, but it surely creates more opportunities for the use of this language. The situations in New York City and Miami differ from that of New Mexico in that language contact in these cities has resulted strictly through immigration, most of which has been relatively recent (from the 1940s on). They are akin to the contact situation in New Mexico, though, in that the cultural and geographic connection with Puerto Rico and (to a much lesser extent) Cuba still exists for many Puerto Rican and Cuban Americans.

1.4 Areas of English influence
Despite the differences that exist between these three bilingual dialects with respect to their histories, geographies, and cultural and linguistic provenances, the linguistic outcomes of language contact between Spanish and English have been strikingly similar. Influences from English on the structure of U.S. Spanish have
been attested at all levels of linguistic organization. The most obvious and instantly recognizable influence has been in the lexicon, with English loan items being incorporated into the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals since the initiation of contact. Code-switching is also very common in bilingual speech and, as such, has become emblematic of the bilingual speaker. Changes in morphosyntactic patterns, however subtle, have also resulted from the contact between English and Spanish (Lipski, 1993). Less easily identifiable are influences from English on the phonologies of Spanish speakers, which have received very little attention. This may be due to the subtle nature of phonological influence from English, the erroneous attribution of any English-like sound in bilingual varieties of Spanish as an influence from this language, or both. This does not mean, however, that linguists should abandon analyses of this type. It should be noted here that the use of Spanish in the United States has also led to influences from this language on bilingual varieties of English, which will not be addressed here, but which are of great importance since they provide understanding into the multiple ways in which both languages affect one another structurally in situations of language contact. Of course, the levels of permeation of these influences depend largely on a bilingual’s use of both languages, exposure to them, onset age of acquisition, and a host of other socio-pragmatic factors. These differences have precipitated the need to distinguish between balanced and transitional bilinguals (Lipski, 1993).

1.5 The issue of Spanglish

Due to the structural changes that have resulted from contact between English and Spanish, which are not unlike linguistic phenomena in many other situations of language contact, many non-linguists refer to bilingual varieties of U.S. Spanish as *Spanglish*. This term, which has somewhat derogatory connotations since it invokes the semi-speaker, semi-language misconception, has come to be synonymous with bilingual varieties of U.S. Spanish. This has come about through a multitude of different uses of the term *Spanglish* to cover influences from English that run the spectrum from articulation to changes in the grammar (Lipski, 2008:53). Given the various uses of the term *Spanglish*, its meaning has become hard to define with precision. There does seem to be a tacit understanding among many Spanish-English bilinguals, however, that Spanglish refers to a form of Spanish that has resulted from contact with English and is highly associated with the characteristics of this variety, most notably code-switching, spontaneous (or ‘nonce’) borrowing, calquing, and changes in morphosyntax.
Non-linguists, and regrettably even some linguists, often claim that Spanglish is a language distinct from either Spanish or English; however, no serious study to date has shown any evidence of grammatical hybridization among fluent bilinguals of these two languages. In fact, many studies have shown just the opposite. Extensive research (e.g. Gingrás, 1974; Lipski, 1978, 1985; Myers-Scotton, 1995; Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1980, 1981; Reyes, 1976; Sankoff and Poplack, 1981; Sridhar and Sridhar, 1980; Timm, 1975, 1993; Woolford, 1983) has shown that, when mixing languages in bilingual discourse, bilingual speakers maintain the structural integrity of phrases for each language. In this sense, code-switching represents a complex communicative activity in which the participants, in order to switch faithfully from one language to another, must possess a deep understanding of the morphosyntactic structure of both languages. Since the term Spanglish is so fraught with complications, largely due to its use in a non-technical way, with all of the misunderstandings that come with an uninformed perspective, it will not be used in the current issue. Instead, we will refer to the varieties in question as bilingual dialects.

2 Linguistic outcomes of language contact

Cases of language contact do not merely involve choices in the use of two languages either separately or within the same stretch of discourse, as if to imply that bilinguals make neat separations in the use of both languages according to a given linguistic situation. Rather, both languages exert more nuanced forms of influence on one another. Consider Willis’s findings concerning the fronting of non-anterior vowels in the Spanish of the U.S. Southwest, including the fronting of /a/ to the vowel space typical of English [æ] (Willis, 2005). These nuanced influences are not easily detected among non-linguists, especially where articulation is concerned. The same could be said of morphosyntactic influences, especially in languages that do not diverge wildly in these areas, such as Spanish and English. For example, Lipski (1996) found that transitional bilinguals tend to use redundant pronominal subjects when there is no change of referent, which would be extremely uncharacteristic of monolingual varieties of Spanish. Levels of influence, of course, depend on the individual. Changes in structure due to influence from English vary widely due to social factors such as age, gender, social class, language use, language preference, and sociocultural identity. A bilingual’s variable use of two languages inevitably results in a wide variety of linguistic processes. According to Silva-Corvalán (2001:272), ‘in language contact situations, bilinguals develop diverse strategies with the purpose of lessening the cognitive load that remembering and using two or more different linguistic
systems implies’ (translation mine). These strategies include simplification, overgeneralization, transfer, and language mixing. Even though bilinguals use these strategies frequently in discourse, they show an incredible ability to remember and process linguistic forms from both languages, especially when they use both languages frequently in daily interactions.

2.1 Simplification
Simplification refers to a reduction in the number of forms in a bilingual’s linguistic repertory with a concomitant extension in the use of these forms to a greater number of linguistic contexts at the expense of other possible forms. It should be noted, however, that simplification is also common in monolingual speech and has characterized the historical development of languages in general. A well-documented case of simplification in the speech of Chicano bilinguals (and even Spanish monolinguals from all parts of the Spanish-speaking world) is a preference for the indicative over the subjunctive in linguistic contexts prescriptively requiring the subjunctive (Bergen, 1978; García and Terrell, 1977; Silva-Corvalán, 1994; Studerus, 1995). Though each of these studies gives different explanations for the preferential use of indicative mood forms, none would deny that this phenomenon is a clear example of the simplification of mood distinctions within the Spanish verbal system. Of particular interest to theories of bilingualism is the observation that the influence of English (which does not distinguish mood morphologically) may be accelerating this decline in the use of the subjunctive by Chicano speakers (Silva-Corvalán, 1994). Mark Waltermire examines this phenomenon among bilingual speakers of Albuquerque, New Mexico in the current issue.

2.2 Overgeneralization
Related to the process of simplification is overgeneralization. Like simplification, overgeneralization involves an extension in the use of a linguistic form and a generalization concerning appropriate contexts in which this form may be used. The only difference between the two, however, is that while ‘simplification refers explicitly to contraction or reduction – that is, to the less frequent use of a more or less alternative form – overgeneralization does not’ (Silva-Corvalan, 2001:273, translation mine). In other words, overgeneralization extends the use of a form to more linguistic contexts but does not affect the distribution of other forms. A case of overgeneralization among Spanish-English bilinguals would be the use of overt subject pronouns in primarily Spanish discourse where their use is not required (i.e. in non-contrastive contexts). Naomi Shin and Cecilia Montes-Alcalá examine these potential influences from English in the Spanish of Puerto Rican Americans in the current issue.
2.3 Transfer
Transfer is a process affecting the linguistic system of bilinguals that can be seen as a highly entrenched interference phenomenon. Weinreich (1968:1) defines interference as a ‘deviation from the norms of either language which occurs in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact’. The difference between interference and transfer is one of stability. Interference phenomena are unstable, meaning that influence from one language only occasionally affects a bilingual’s use of certain linguistic forms in another language. Transfer, on the other hand, ‘corresponds to transferred elements from one language to another that are maintained in a more or less stable form in the recipient language’ (Silva-Corvalán, 2001:269, translation mine). Linguistic transfer (and interference) can occur at all levels of language – phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, and pragmatic. For the current issue, we will focus on phonological transfer.

Weinreich (1968) distinguishes between four different types of phonological transfer – underdifferentiation, overdifferentiation, reinterpretation, and substitution. Underdifferentiation of phonemes occurs ‘when two sounds of the secondary system whose counterparts are not distinguished in the primary system are confused’ (Weinreich, 1968:18). For example, if a speaker’s primary system is Spanish (which does not differentiate between tense and lax vowels) and his secondary system is English (which does), there is a possibility that the two sounds will be underdifferentiated as a result. A word like ‘knit’ [nIt], therefore, will potentially be realized as [nit] since only one high front vowel exists in the speaker’s primary system. The counterpart of underdifferentiation is overdifferentiation. During the process of overdifferentiation, there is an ‘imposition of phonemic distinctions from the primary system on the sounds of the secondary system, where they are not required’ (Weinreich, 1968:18). Silva-Corvalán (2001:281–282) gives the example of /b/ and /v/ for an English-dominant speaker conversing in Spanish. Since these sounds ‘have a distinctive function in English (boat [bout], vote [vout]) but not in Spanish (vote [vóte/bóte])’, there will possibly be an overdifferentiation of these phonemes when this speaker produces initial orthographic b and v in Spanish (Silva-Corvalán, 2001:282, translation mine). Reinterpretation, a seemingly less common type of phonological transfer, ‘occurs when the bilingual distinguishes phonemes of the secondary system by features which in that system are merely concomitant or redundant, but which are relevant in his primary system’ (Weinreich, 1968:18). Weinreich (1968:19) gives an example from Schwyzertütsch–Romansh, noting that for these bilinguals, ‘[fil:i] “many”, phonemically /fili/, can be interpreted as */filli/. The length of [l:], which in Schwyzertütsch is a concomitant of its position after a short vowel, is seen as distinctive, while the properly distinctive brevity of the [i] is disregarded, since
Romansh does not treat vowel length as relevant’. The last major type of phonological transfer is substitution, which ‘applies to phonemes that are identically defined in two languages but whose normal pronunciation differs’ (Weinreich, 1968:19). This concept should be extended to include the substitution of similar phonemes in systems whose phonemic inventories differ. This type of transfer is common since bilinguals frequently replace second language articulations with phonological realizations associated with a primary language due to interference. For example, many English-dominant speakers fail to pronounce Spanish /b/, /d/, and /ɡ/ as fricatives in intervocalic position due to direct phonological interference from English (in which they are realized as stops) (Barrutia and Schwegler, 1994:114). In the current issue, Scott Alvord and Brandon Rogers explore the possibility of substitution of Spanish vowels by typically English vowels in the Spanish of Miami.

2.4 Language mixing

In situations of societal bilingualism, in which two languages are frequently used in all social domains, languages are often mixed. Language mixing is a natural result of knowing and using two different linguistic codes. According to Haugen (1978:21), ‘the key to bilingual performance is code convergence: under conditions of language contact the experiences of bilinguals are rarely so distinct that it is possible for them to keep the codes wholly apart’. As a result of not being able to separate codes in discourse, both languages are frequently mixed in bilingual speech. That said, there are plenty of bilinguals who are capable of separating two languages, but choose not to. For example, in the Spanish of the U.S. Southwest, bilinguals who grew up speaking and/or learning both languages from an early age are often capable of using either one language or another when this is required socially, but mix both languages in informal discourse with other balanced bilinguals. In this sense, language mixing should not be viewed as a strictly cognitive process, but rather as a marker of social and cultural identity.

Two major types of language mixing have been distinguished in the literature – code-switching and borrowing. Poplack (1980) makes the important claim that these language mixing types differ from one another based on their levels of integration into the base/matrix language. Poplack (1993:255) defines code-switching as ‘the juxtaposition of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of the language of its provenance’. In general, code-switches remain unadapted to base language patterns at all levels, though some code-switches may be uttered according to base language phonological patterns. The phonological criterion is not diagnostic of language mixing type since multi-word fragments that do not conform to recipient language morphological and syntactic
patterns, regardless of how they are realized phonologically, must be considered code-switches (i.e. a switch from one linguistic system to another). Since code-switching does not involve a deviation from the norms of either language, some linguists have referred to it as a process of ‘code preservation’ (e.g. Haugen, 1953). Though code-switching and borrowing in Spanish-English bilingual discourse have been analyzed extensively in the past, in the current issue John Lipski and Nydia Flores analyze phenomena that have not received much attention in the literature. John Lipski discusses the involuntary use of English elements in the Spanish of low-fluency bilinguals, which resemble patterns of congruent lexicalization previously associated only with fluent bilinguals, and argues for an expansion of code-switching typologies to include these types of switches. Nydia Flores examines the use of bilingual discourse markers in oral narratives of personal experience in the bilingual Spanish of New York City, comparing the functional categories, language specificity, marker doubling and tripling, and information structure of discourse markers for English-dominant speakers and Spanish-dominant speakers.

Unlike code-switches, loanwords are adapted to base language patterns. According to Poplack (1993:256), loanwords are characterized by their adaptation to the ‘morphological and syntactic (and usually, phonological) patterns of the recipient language’. Level of adaptation is an extremely important distinguishing factor that indicates the implementation of different processes during code mixing. Following Sankoff, Poplack, and Vanniarajan (1990:72), ‘code-switching within the confines of a single sentence requires access to the syntactic apparatus of both languages because each of the monolingual fragments making up a code-switched sentence is internally grammatical by the rules of its language. Borrowing on the other hand operates independently of the grammar of the donor language.’

3 The history of Spanish-English contact dialects

Now that some of the most relevant phenomena related to language contact have been discussed, as well as their relationship to the studies presented in this issue, we will turn to the histories of Spanish-English contact for the three varieties of bilingual Spanish explored here. Concise overviews of the contact situations for each of the Spanish-English bilingual dialects to be explored in the current issue will be presented first, followed by a brief mention of some of the most relevant studies related to the potential influences of English on the linguistic structure of these dialects. Due to space limitations, the results of these studies will not be discussed. The mention of these studies is intended to guide the reader to related studies for comparison and orientation for future research.
3.1 Initial contact: New Mexico

The area of the United States with the longest sustained use of Spanish and with the greatest number of Spanish speakers is the Southwest. Millions of Spanish speakers live in the American Southwest, primarily in California and Texas, where Spanish has been spoken for centuries. These states, along with other southwestern states, were once part of the Viceroyalty of New Spain following the Spanish conquest of the Aztecs in 1521 and later part of Mexico after achieving independence from Spain three hundred years later. Like other states along the U.S.–Mexico border, New Mexico has a high proportion of Spanish speakers compared to the general population. According to 2010 census reports, 28.5% of the population speaks Spanish, which is the same proportion for California, the state with the greatest number of Spanish speakers. Of these states, New Mexico has the greatest proportion of citizens who claim Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (at 46.3%). This is no doubt due to the historical importance of Santa Fe, New Mexico as the final major destination along the Camino Real, which stretched from this historical capital to Mexico City.

Santa Fe was established as the capital of the province of Santa Fé de Nuevo México in 1610. The permanent settlement of other areas of New Spain occurred much later. As such, New Mexican Spanish is the oldest continuously spoken variety of this language in the United States. In this sense, New Mexican Spanish is very distinct from the varieties of Spanish spoken by Nuyoricans in New York and Cuban Americans in Miami. New Mexican Spanish, especially the variety spoken in the northern part of the state, has not resulted from massive immigration from Latin America, though there has been substantial immigration to this state, primarily from northern Mexico. The issue of Mexican immigration will not be addressed in the current issue since the variety to be examined here is spoken in Albuquerque, which is considered a variety of “traditional” New Mexican Spanish. According to Bills and Vigil (2008:5), speakers of this dialect ‘represent early settlement prior to the twentieth century and today reside primarily in the upper Río Grande drainage area of central and northern New Mexico’. This is not to say that there has been no recent Mexican immigration to these parts of the state. Many immigrants from Mexico as well as other parts of Latin America have settled in Albuquerque; and while this change is reshaping the dialect spoken in this city, the Spanish of Albuquerque still exhibits many of the same traits as those found in the Spanish of more northern locales.

The potential results of contact with English in the Spanish of New Mexico have been studied quite extensively. Studies focusing on lexical influences include the pioneering studies of Hills (1906) and Espinosa (1911), which served as a foundation for future studies (Bills and Vigil, 2008; Bowen, 1952; Clegg, 2010;
Clegg and Waltermire, 2009; Cobos, 1983; Fernández, 1990; Lance, 1975; Ornstein, 1975; Valdés, 1976). Though Bills and Vigil (1999:54) claim that English influence 'has been limited almost exclusively to the lexical inventory', several studies have shown that this is simply not the case. With respect to English influence on morphosyntax, there have been several important studies showing influence from this language on the Spanish of New Mexico (e.g. de la Puente Schubeck, 1991; Gutiérrez, 1995; and Torres-Cacoullos and Travis, 2010). Studies on the influence of English on the phonology of New Mexican Spanish include Piñeros (2005), Rael (1937), Torres-Cacoullos and Ferreira (2000), and Willis (2005).

### 3.2 Puerto Rican Spanish in New York

Migration to the continental United States from Puerto Rico has not involved the legal entanglements experienced by immigrants from other parts of Latin America since Puerto Rico is an unincorporated territory of the United States. This special relationship has resulted in an ebb and flow of migration patterns from Puerto Rico to the United States, particularly to the northeastern states, as well as return migration. Migratory patterns have largely been the result of economic concerns. Due to the official granting of U.S. citizenship to all Puerto Ricans, which was enacted in 1917 as part of the Jones Shafroth Act, as well as massive recruitments of contract laborers by United States companies, migration from Puerto Rico to the United States has been consistent over the past century, though it certainly has not been confined to New York City.

Despite migration to other areas of the United States, the greatest concentration of Puerto Ricans living in the United States, however, has historically been in New York City. As early as the 1910s, Puerto Ricans migrated to New York City to work in cigar factories and textile plants. Employment in other sectors grew dramatically during subsequent decades, which resulted in massive migration from Puerto Rico to New York. It is estimated that approximately 36.6% of Puerto Ricans living in the United States resided in New York City in 1910 with this proportion growing to 82.9% by 1950 (Whalen, 2005:3). The Puerto Rican population in New York City more than quadrupled during the following two decades, from 187,420 in 1950 to 817,712 in 1970 (Whalen, 2005:3). The number of Puerto Ricans living in New York City remained virtually the same during the 1970s and 1980s, with a population of approximately 860,000 according to census reports for 1980 and 1990. Since this time, the Puerto Rican population in New York City has actually declined (789,172 by 2000; 723,621 by 2010) according to official census data. The city of New York has indeed diversified with respect to its Latino population (N=2,336,076), with Puerto Ricans currently representing about 31%. This is partly due to the fact that Puerto Ricans have simply migrated
and immigrated to different parts of the United States while other Latino groups have continued to immigrate to New York City. While 82.9% of all Puerto Rican immigrants to the United States lived in New York City by 1950, only 68.6% of Puerto Ricans living in the United States resided in New York City by 1960 with this percentage dropping to 58.5% by 1970 (Whalen, 2005:3). This trend has continued over the years. According to official 2010 Census reports, out of the 4,623,716 Puerto Ricans currently living in the United States, just 723,621 live in New York City (a mere 15%). Despite this population shift, Puerto Ricans have left an indelible mark on the culture of New York City and, given their historical ties to the city, are the Latino group most highly identified with the city.

Of the multitude of studies that have focused on Spanish-English bilingual varieties spoken in New York City, the following have examined potential influences from English. With respect to influences on the lexicon, there have been numerous important studies (Poplack, 1980, 1981; Torres, 1989a, 1997, 1998, 2002; Zentella, 1981, 1990, 1997). There have also been many studies dedicated to the influence of English Morphosyntax on this variety (Dvořáč, 1983; Flores-Ferrán, 2004; Lapidus and Otheguy, 2005; Otheguy and Zentella, 2012; Poplack, Pousada, and Sankoff, 1982; Torres, 1989b). Almost no research has been conducted with respect to potential influences from English in the realm of phonology, with the exception of Toribio, Bullock, Botero, and Davis (2005).

### 3.3 Cuban Spanish in Florida

The first group of Cubans to settle in Florida were nationalist revolutionaries, most notably José Martí, who set up operations in Key West starting in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Lipski, 2008:99). Though Key West was the first established settlement region for Cubans in Florida, Tampa quickly began to flourish, partly due to a boom in cigar production and business that resulted from greater resources in this area (Pérez, 1986). The first cigar factories in Tampa opened in 1886. After a brief decline (from 1891 to 1895), Cuban immigration to Tampa increased dramatically over the next two decades due to political and economic strife on the island. During this time, according to Pérez (1986:127–128), ‘the cigar making industry of Tampa was at its height, attracting a considerable number of cigar workers from the island’. By the early part of the twentieth century, Tampa had become a lucrative center of cigar manufacturing and locus of Cuban settlement in the United States.

Despite these primarily economic motivations for Cuban immigration to the United States, political motivations continued to be the driving force behind immigration patterns throughout the twentieth century. The political motivations resulted primarily from the shift in power from Fulgencio Batista’s dictatorial regime to the communist regime imposed by Fidel Castro. During the first several
years of the Castro regime, the Cuban population living in southern Florida was expanded greatly by some 200,000 Cuban-born exiles, many of whom settled in Miami-Dade County. According to the Cuban refugee center in Miami, over 400,000 Cubans immigrated to Florida and the United States in the 1960s (Lipski, 2008:105). These massive numbers were aided immensely by Castro’s granting of permission for Cubans with U.S relatives to leave the island freely in 1965.

Another massive wave of migration occurred as a result of the Mariel Boat Lift. In 1980, due to the granting of political asylum to six Cubans at the Peruvian embassy, Castro opened the port of Mariel in northwestern Cuba to American boats for any Cuban who wished to leave the country. Some 125,000 Cubans immigrated to southern Florida during this time. Yet another wave of Cuban exiles fled to southern Florida in 1994 due to harsh living conditions, including food rationing, that resulted from strained trade relations between Cuba and Russia. About 33,000 exiles fled the country at this time. The immigration of Cubans to the United States has been aided immensely by the almost categorical refugee status and special privileges, including less stringent requirements for permanent residency status, which have been afforded to Cuban immigrants. According to 2010 U.S. Census Bureau data, approximately 1.2 million residents of Florida (about one third of all Latino residents) claim Cuban ethnicity. Even more revealing, however, especially to the current issue, is that in Miami-Dade County, which has a 65% Latino population (1.62 million residents), Cubans comprise over half of that population (876,000 residents). As such, approximately one in every three residents living in Miami-Dade County identifies as Cuban or Cuban-American.

There has been surprisingly little research conducted on the potential influence of English on the structure of Miami Cuban Spanish, especially when compared to research in these areas for New Mexican and New York City Spanish. That said, all three structural areas receiving examination in the current issue have been researched for this variety. Otéguy and García (1988) and Varela (1974, 1992) have examined the lexicon. Lipski (1996), López-Morales (2003), Lynch (1999), Porcel (2002), and Varela (1992) have researched morphosyntactic influences. With respect to phonology, there have also been several studies (e.g. Alvord, 2006, 2010; Lynch and Kraemer, 2003; Varela, 1974, 1992).

4 Objectives of this issue

This issue will focus on the structural results of contact between Spanish and English in the United States. More specifically, it will explore the various ways in which English affects the linguistic structure of U.S. Spanish as it is spoken in New Mexico, New York, and Miami.
This issue is unique in that structural influences from English are explored for three historically and culturally distinct dialects of U.S. Spanish. By examining the structural effects from English on these varieties, a more holistic perspective can be gained on the influence of English in general, which is not relegated to a select few varieties. As a natural result of contact, the use of English by bilinguals, regardless of geographical location, is leading to a transformation in the linguistic structure of U.S. Spanish, thereby making it distinct from other varieties of this language. The research to be presented in this issue will represent multiple theoretical and methodological approaches. While these approaches may vary, they complement one another within a generally usage-based and variationist framework.

Various structural results of contact with English in the dialects just described will be explored in detail. By exploring contact-induced structures and structural patterns in these varieties, a more unified perspective on U.S. Spanish will be achieved. Though the dialects to be explored are historically and culturally distinct in almost every way, the impact of English on their linguistic structure is similar. The implications of these similarities are important to the study of language contact and dialectology. The degree to which English influences the structure of Spanish, of course, depends on the speaker. That is, speakers who use English frequently and prefer this language demonstrate higher rates of use of typically English linguistic features. The use of these features will likely accelerate in the near future given the increasingly low rates of Spanish use reported among younger generations of speakers. Additionally, the breadth of contact-induced structures, spanning from general lexical and grammatical phenomena to very subtle phonological changes, will be presented in an attempt to show that contact leads to linguistic restructuring at all levels. Oftentimes, the influence of English on U.S. Spanish is seen as being limited to lexical items. Though it may be true that restructuring begins in the lexicon, other structural changes have also begun to take hold in bilingual communities throughout the United States.

5 Organization of this issue

With the aforementioned objectives in mind, the most effective way to organize this issue is to proceed from more general areas of inquiry to more specific areas of inquiry. That is, research related to lexical influence from English will be presented first, followed by research on morphosyntactic influence and phonological influence. With respect to the geographic varieties of Spanish under investigation, research will be presented beginning with a general population of speakers and proceeding to the more specific dialects of New York, New Mexico, and Miami.
5.1 Lexical influence from English
The first article of this special issue is ‘Spanish-English code-switching among low-fluency bilinguals: towards an expanded typology’ by John M. Lipski, who explores code-switching patterns among heritage and vestigial speakers of Spanish. He finds that fluent bilinguals demonstrate patterns of alternation while low-fluency bilinguals often demonstrate patterns of congruent lexicalization involving the involuntary and/or unconscious insertion of English elements. Using data from other language pairs that show similar results among low-fluency bilinguals, he proposes that the code-switching typology proposed in Muysken (2000) be expanded to include the type of syntactically radical congruent lexicalization produced during ‘fluid but low-fluency’ bilingual language mixing. Nydia Flores-Ferrán, in her article ‘Sopues entonces: an examination of bilingual discourse markers in Spanish oral narratives of personal experience of New York City-born Puerto Ricans’, compares the functional categories, language specificity, marker doubling and tripling, and information structure of discourse markers for English-dominant speakers and Spanish-dominant speakers. She finds that English-dominant speakers show higher frequencies of use of English discourse markers than Spanish-dominant speakers, who seldom use markers from this language. The English-dominant individuals use Spanish discourse markers for all functions, but prefer to use English markers for clarification and in new information contexts. These results indicate that English-dominant bilinguals have two systems of discourse markers at their disposal, which they utilize in innovative ways.

5.2 Morphosyntactic influence from English
The analysis of English morphosyntax on the Spanish of the United States begins with ‘El uso contextual del pronombre sujeto como factor predictivo de la influencia del inglés en el español de Nueva York’ by Naomi Lapidus Shin and Cecilia Montes-Alcalá. The authors investigate the use of subject pronouns in New York Spanish according to patterns of use of subject pronouns in English. They find that for imperative constructions, the use of overt subject pronouns is highly infrequent, due to their near obligatory omission in this context in English, whereas the use of overt subject pronouns parallels rates of use in English in coordinate clauses with the same referent. In this sense, English serves to inhibit the use of pronouns in contexts where both languages tend to omit them. Next, Mark Waltermire examines the variable use of subjunctive and indicative mood forms in ‘The social conditioning of mood variation in the Spanish of Albuquerque, New Mexico’. According to prescriptive grammars of Spanish, inflectional markers of the subjunctive mood are required for subordinate clause verbs introduced by the complementizer que ‘that’ when the matrix clause corresponds
to one of several semantic notions (e.g. volition, uncertainty, personal commentary, etc.). Actual speech data, however, reveal that speakers variably use indicative and subjunctive mood forms in these contexts. Waltermire focuses on the conditioning role of social factors (age, sex, language preference, and education) on the use of mood in the Spanish of Albuquerque and finds that indicative forms are preferred by English-dominant speakers who have had little formal education in Spanish.

5.3 Phonological influence from English

Potential phonological influences from English in the Spanish of the United States are explored in the final contribution. In ‘Miami-Cuban Spanish vowels in contact’, Scott M. Alvord and Brandon M. A. Rogers examine potential vowel changes that exist as a result of bilingualism with English in the Spanish of Miami. They investigate transfer phenomena in the vowel system of three generations of Miami-Cuban bilinguals, but find no evidence of English vowels replacing Spanish vowels. Instead, they find the existence of vowel centralization of unstressed vowels among these speakers and explore the stability of the Miami-Cuban Spanish vowel system as compared to Spanish in general.

Notes

1 Though the isleño dialect of Spanish spoken in St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana dates back to the late 1700s and, as such, is also one of the longest-standing dialects of Spanish spoken in the United States, it will not be studied here.

2 Only studies related to the influence of English on the structure of U.S. Spanish will be mentioned. There has been extensive research documenting other language-contact phenomena that characterize Spanish–English bilingual varieties that are either unrelated to linguistic structural outcomes or very loosely related to them (such as language maintenance, shift, demographics, language use in different domains, social functions of language mixing, etc.). Since the potential structural results of contact with English is the focus of this issue, only studies that have addressed these results directly, and for the varieties in question, will be included.
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