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The language practices of Latinos in the US continue to attract attention from politicians, educators, journalists, linguists and the general Hispanic and non-Hispanic public. While monolingual speakers of English in the US expect Hispanics to shift to English like other minority language speakers have done in the past, monolingual speakers of Spanish expect them to speak “pure” Spanish. Even Spanish-English bilingual speakers criticize Latinos for mixing Spanish and English or speaking Spanglish. This term has been rejected by some linguists who claim that it is technically flawed and only applies to casual oral registers. In this paper I consider the linguistic nature, sociolinguistic functions and attitudes towards Spanglish, I show that Latinos are using this hybrid, heteroglossic variety beyond casual oral registers, and I suggest a broader perspective which not only considers the linguistic features of Spanglish but also the political, social and cultural issues involved.
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Spanglish: la voz híbrida de los latinos en los Estados Unidos

Los hábitos lingüísticos de los latinos en los EEUU siguen atrayendo la atención de políticos, profesores, periodistas, lingüistas y del público en general. Mientras que los hablantes monolingües de inglés esperan que los hispanos adopten el inglés como han hecho otros inmigrantes, los hablantes monolingües de español esperan que conserven y usen un español “puro.” Incluso los hablantes bilingües critican a los que hablan los dos idiomas por mezclarlos o hablar Spanglish. Este término ha sido rechazado por algunos lingüistas que argumentan que no es técnicamente válido y que solamente ocurre en registros de habla informal. Este trabajo considera la naturaleza lingüística, las funciones sociolinguísticas y las actitudes sobre el Spanglish, muestra que los latinos están usando esta
variedad híbrida y heteroglósica más allá de los registros de habla informal y sugiere una perspectiva más amplia que tenga en cuenta no solamente las características lingüísticas del Spanglish sino también su contexto político, social y cultural.

Palabras clave: Spanglish; cambio de Código; latinos; español de EEUU; mezcla de códigos; lengua mixta
Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate. (Anzaldúa [1987] 1999, 81)

1. Introduction
In 2014, there were almost 55.4 million Hispanics in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center 2016). As this population continues to grow, different people including politicians, educators, journalists, linguists and the general Hispanic and non-Hispanic public are paying close attention to their language choices. Should they shift to English and give up Spanish? Should they maintain Spanish? Should they embrace their hybrid linguistic and cultural heritage? As shown by movements like English-only, the use of Spanish in the United States is under attack and some monolingual speakers of English in the US are urging Hispanics to shift to English like other minority language speakers have done in the past. Further, when politicians address Latinos in Spanish their linguistic choice is often criticized. This happened to Gabriel Gómez when he announced his candidacy for the senate seat vacated by John Kerry with an opening in Spanish, to Marco Rubio for delivering a taped Spanish version of his response to the State of the Union address, to Jeb Bush for using Spanish in his campaign and, more recently, to Tim Kaine, to give just a few examples.

This attitude reminds us of Samuel Huntington, who in his book Who are we? The Challenges to America’s National Identity warns Americans of the danger of this new reconquista and of the cultural threat posed to American identity by Latino immigration, which he states “could divide the United States into two peoples, two cultures and two languages” (2004, 256). Despite this fear, the fact is that actually, as pointed out by James Crawford (1993, 2000), language shift from Spanish to English has been happening in the Latino community, in the same way as in other minority language communities in the United States, and English is in fact the main language of most Hispanics in the US. That said, Hispanics have not given up on Spanish just yet.

Interestingly, monolingual speakers of English in the US are not the only ones criticizing Hispanics’ use of Spanish. Monolingual speakers of Spanish from other Spanish-speaking countries like Argentina, Colombia, Mexico and Spain often criticize Latinos for not speaking so-called “pure” Spanish, but speaking Spanglish, a mixing of Spanish and English. This mixing has been controversial among educators and both the general Hispanic and non-Hispanic public. Even Spanish-English bilingual speakers often praise the ability to keep both languages separate and criticize those who do not. Since it can refer to distinct contact phenomena, Spanglish is usually avoided by linguists. However, some have entered into a debate about the appropriateness of the term and the phenomenon itself. Thus, in an article entitled “On so-called Spanglish,”

In this paper the terms Hispanic and Latino will be used interchangeably despite their different connotations.
Ricardo Otheguy and Nancy Stern (2011) propose to discard the term *Spanglish* and use instead simply Spanish or Spanish in the United States. According to these authors, *Spanglish*, which in their view most often describes the casual oral registers of the speech of Hispanics in the United States, is an unfortunate and misleading term. From their perspective, “Spanish in the USA is not of a hybrid character, that is, not centrally characterized by structural mixing with English” (85). They conclude that “the term [Spanglish] is not only technically flawed, but it also contributes to closing the doors of personal and economic progress to speakers who would be better served by thinking of themselves as speakers of Spanish” (98). Although they do mention that it is used with pride by some Latinos, they do not consider some of the social, cultural and political factors which I think are important in this debate. This article brings together insights from linguistics, sociolinguistics and border studies, considers the linguistic nature and sociolinguistic functions of *Spanglish* and attitudes towards this phenomenon, and suggests a broader perspective should be taken which not only considers the linguistic features of *Spanglish* but also the political, social and cultural issues involved. As linguist Ana Celia Zentella has aptly pointed out when describing her anthropolitical linguistics approach, “whether we choose to discuss it or not, there is no language without politics” (Zentella 1997, 14).

This article is organized as follows. In section two I consider the linguistic nature of *Spanglish* and the distinct language contact phenomena it involves. Section three focuses on its sociolinguistic local and global functions and attitudes towards the name and the phenomenon itself. In section four I show that *Spanglish* cannot be viewed as just a casual oral register, and in section five I bring together some views from sociolinguists and border studies to suggest the need to consider not only purely linguistic aspects of this phenomenon but also the important cultural, social and political issues involved.

2. The Linguistic Nature of *Spanglish*

Similar to other blends, the term *Spanglish*, coined by Puerto Rican writer Salvador Tió in the late 1940s, has been informally used to refer to the mixing of Spanish and English, frequent in communication among Spanish-English bilingual speakers. The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* defines *Spanglish* as “Spanish marked by numerous borrowings from English; broadly: any of various combinations of Spanish and English” ([2003] 2017, s.v.). Although the Real Academia Española (RAE) recently agreed to eliminate the word *deformándolos* [“deforming them”], in the text below we find the original entry for *Espanglish* in its dictionary:

---

2 For other articles on *Spanglish* see Álvarez (1998), Dumitrescu (2010; 2013), Fairclough (2003), Lipski (2007) and Montes-Alcalá (2009), among others.

3 Similar blends are Arablish, Chinglish, Czenglish, Denglish, Dunglish, Finglish, Heblish, Hinglish, Konglish, Polglish, Runglish, Serblish, Swenglish, Yinglish, etc. In Gibraltar the mixture of Spanish and English is referred to as Llanito and in the United States other names such as Tex-Mex, Pocho, Nuyorican, Cubonics, Pachuco or Caló have also been used.
SPANGLISH: THE HYBRID VOICE OF LATINOS IN THE US

(From English Spanglish, blend of Span-ish and En-glish)
Variety used by some Hispanic speakers in the United States, which mixes and deforms lexical and grammatical elements of Spanish and English.)

As mentioned in the introduction, what is informally referred to as Spanglish can be a combination of distinct contact phenomena. These phenomena include the use of borrowings, calques, semantic extensions, nonce borrowings, code-switching and code-mixing. The use of English borrowings is a hallmark of the Spanish spoken by Latinos, as the entry for Spanglish in the Merriam-Webster dictionary above makes clear. These are words or phrases borrowed from English which are phonologically, and sometimes orthographically and morphologically, adapted to Spanish. In (1) we have an example where to type has been borrowed into Spanish as taipear:

(1) Tengo que taipearlo primero y luego te lo llevo. (Sánchez 1983, 126)
[“I have to type it first and then I will bring it to you”]

Other borrowings from English include words like troca [“camión”] (< English “truck”), yarda [“patio”] (< English “yard”) or suiche [“interruptor”] (< English “switch”) (Sánchez 1983, 124). As we know, the Spanish language in general, not only US Spanish, is constantly borrowing words from English and so the incorporation of borrowings would certainly not warrant a special name like Spanglish to refer to Spanish spoken in the US. Non-US Spanish abounds with English loanwords such as living, basketball, sweater, jersey, mail, tattoo, bracket, look and hundreds of others.

In addition to borrowings, another common contact phenomenon is the use of calques or loan translations. This is common with compounds or phrases where each word is translated into the borrowing language. Here we have some examples from US Spanish: llamar pa’trás (< English “to call back”), está p’arriba de ti (< English “it’s up to you”), correr para gobernador (< English “to run for governor”) (Montes-Alcalá 2009, 106). This phenomenon also happens in non-US Spanish. For example, the following calques are common in Spain and other Spanish-speaking countries: correo electrónico (< English “electronic mail”), cursos en línea (< English “online courses”), etc.

Another well-known contact phenomenon, usually referred to as semantic extension, involves adding a new meaning to an existing word, converting a false cognate into a true cognate. Thus, in US Spanish words like carpeta and librería have acquired an additional meaning from their English equivalents: carpeta (< English “folder” + “carpet”), librería (< English “bookstore” + “library”). Not surprisingly, this is also common in non-US Spanish varieties. For example, the verb ignorar has acquired the meaning of its English cognate “to ignore” and can be used both meaning “lack of knowledge,” as in example (2) or “disregard” as in example (3).
(2) *Ignoro lo que te va a decir* ["I don’t know what s/he is going to say”].
(3) *Puedes ignorar lo que te diga* ["You can ignore what s/he might tell you”].

Thus, we have seen that loanwords, calques and semantic extensions are common in any variety of Spanish. Further, some of these words or phrases are also used by monolingual speakers of Spanish who might be unaware of their English origin. In contrast, the remaining contact phenomena present in Spanglish which are to be discussed here require some degree of bilingualism. First, we can distinguish nonce borrowings (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller 1988). These are words which have not become an established part of the language and are spontaneously borrowed by bilingual speakers with or without phonetic adaptation. This is exemplified in (4), where the word *tenure* has been momentarily borrowed into Spanish.⁴

(4) *Juan todavía no tiene tenure* [“Juan doesn’t have tenure yet”].

Second, one of the most noticeable features of Spanglish, also present in the definitions considered above, is the combination or mixture of the two languages. This combination is usually referred to as code-switching, and it can occur across sentences—intersentential code-switching—as in (5), or within sentences—intrasentential code-switching—as in (6).⁵

(5) His cousin Pedro Pablo sucked his teeth with exaggerated disdain. *Esto aquí es un maldito infierno.* (Díaz 2007, 275)
(6) These are not *gente de calidad*. (Díaz 2007, 273)

The term code-switching is especially apt for cases like (5) and (6), which involve a switch from one language to another at major syntactic or prosodic boundaries.⁶ The term code-mixing, on the other hand, seems more appropriate for those cases where rather than switching from one language to another at a sentence or a phrase level, bilingual speakers mix two or more languages inside a phrase, as in (7):

(7) *Estos giant porteño mosquitos are trying to bite my hyper-sensitive cuerpo here en el comedor* where I write. (Chávez-Silverman 2004, 65)

Different authors have used different terms for these phenomena, however. Peter Auer (1999), for example, distinguishes between code-switching and language mixing

---

⁴ Other linguists might consider cases like (4) to be instances of single-word switches, particularly if the original language pronunciation is retained.
⁵ To highlight the difference between the two languages in the examples containing elements from both, italics are used.
⁶ Researches sometimes also use “tag switching” to refer to those switches which involve tags, as in “It is raining a lot these days, *verdad*?” (Toribio 2001, 205)
and uses the term “fused lect” to refer to cases where both languages seem to be fusing. When this fusion has become a stable variety linguists have used the term “mixed language.” A well-known mixed language is Media Lengua, a mix of Spanish and Quechua which has been studied by Pieter Muysken (1997). In examples (8), (9) and (10) we find sentences in Spanish, in Quechua and in Media Lengua:

(8) Vengo para pedir un favor
    *Come [1 p. sg.] to ask [infinitive] a favor*
 violation

(9) Shuk fabur-da maña-nga-bu shamu-xu-ni
    *one favor [ACC] ask [NOM-BEN] come [1 p. sg.]*
 Quechua

(10) Unu fabur-ta pidi-nga-bu bini-xu-ni
    *one favor [ACC] ask [NOM-BEN] come [1 p. sg.]*
 Media Lengua

(Muysken 1997, 365)

It should also be noted that Spanglish should be distinguished from Junk or Mock Spanish. These are phrases, used by Anglos, which make fun of Spanish expressions, such as *grassy ass* for “gracias,” or use some Spanish words or morphemes with English nouns, typically the Spanish determiner *el* (“the”) and the suffix *-o*, as shown in “the drinko for Cinco,” “el cheapo” or “no problemo” (Hill 2008, 138; quoted in Toribio 2011, 534). As pointed out by Jane H. Hill “Mock Spanish borrows Spanish-language words and suffixes, assimilates their pronunciation to English (often in a hyperanglicized or boldly mispronounced form), changes their meaning, usually to make them humorous or pejorative, and uses them to signal that the moment of English-language speech or text thus embellished is colloquial and informal” (2008, 134; quoted in Toribio 2011, 534).

Finally, Pieter Muysken (2000) has proposed the following typology of code-switching: insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization. These distinctions form a continuum rather than a clear-cut division. Insertions involve the introduction of a word or a phrase, as in (11), where the phrase *in a state of shock* is inserted into a Spanish sentence:

(11) Yo anduve *in a state of shock* por dos días. (Pfaff 1979, 296)

Alternation is switching to a different language, as in (12), where the speaker starts in Spanish and then switches to English:

(12) *Andale pues* and do come again. (Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez 1971, 118)

Congruent lexicalization can take place when the languages share equivalent structures, which can be filled in by lexical elements from either language, as in (13).7

(13) Bueno, in other words, *el flight que sale de Chicago* around three o’clock. (Pfaff 1976, 250)

---

7 This kind of structure is what comedian Santiago must have in mind when he says: “Yo ♥ Spanglish. Twice the vocabulary, half the grammar” (Santiago 2008, 33).
Hence, although there are different perspectives on how to analyze code-switching and code-mixing and numerous debates about the best way to describe the grammar or grammars involved, all linguistic analyses of these phenomena have concluded that the mixture is not random, but in fact is rule-governed and systematic. That is, as Toribio (2001) has pointed out, bilinguals distinguish between permissible and unacceptable code-switches and would agree that the example in (14) is possible while that in (15) is not.

(14) *Toda mi familia* speaks English well.
(15) *Five of my cousins have completado estudios universitarios.* (Toribio 2001, 206)

The first attempts at explaining the grammaticality of code-switched sentences appealed to specific constraints for code-switching such as Shana Poplack’s Free Morpheme and Equivalence Constraints (1980). However, more current approaches suggest that rather than trying to come up with specific constraints for data involving code-switching, our linguistic theories should be able to account for both non-code-switched and code-switched data without any additional principles or constraints—see MacSwan (2014) for more details.

In sum, we have seen that, as opposed to a meaningless hodge-podge of English and Spanish, Spanglish is in fact the result of bilinguals’ use of borrowings, calques, semantic extensions, nonce borrowings, and the skillful mixture of two grammars in cases of code-switching and code-mixing.

3. Functions and Attitudes towards Spanglish
All the linguistic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and/or discourse analyses of the use of two languages in the same conversation or sentence have shown that in contrast to popular perceptions of the general public who view this practice as a sign of language degeneration, the combination of two or more languages in the same sentence or paragraph can have very specific local and global functions. Since the time of the pioneering work of John J. Gumperz (1982) and others, it has been recognized that specific instances of code-switching can be used to quote, emphasize, add another level of meaning, clarify or evoke richer images, add humor, irony or word/language play, mark closeness, emphasize bonds or, on the contrary, mark distance. Gumperz (1982, 75-84) distinguished between the following six conversational functions: (a) quotations, the code-switched passage can

---


9 According to the Equivalence Constraint code switches are allowed as long as the word order requirements of both languages are met. Thus, as expressed by the asterisks preceding them, all options in the examples below are ungrammatical, since the different order of object pronouns in English and Spanish makes this structure non-equivalent, e.g., *told le, *le told, *him dije, *dije him* (Poplack 1981, 176). The Free Morpheme Constraint says that a code switch may not occur at the boundary of a bound morpheme. This predicts that the switch in this example is disallowed: *“eat-iendo”* (Poplack 1980, 586). For a review of other constraints proposed in the literature, see MacSwan (2000).
be identified as a direct quotation or as reported speech; (b) addressee specification, the switch directs the message to one of several possible addressees; (c) interjections, the switch is an interjection or sentence filler; (d) reiteration, the switch repeats or clarifies adding emphasis to the message; (e) message qualification, the switch adds a qualification to the message; and (f) personalization vs. objectivization, the switch may add objectivity and symbolize varying degrees of speaker involvement. Further, similar socio-pragmatic functions have been found to also be present in written code-switching—see Callahan (2004) and Montes-Alcalá (2001), among others.

In addition to specific local functions of individual switches, Carla Jonnson’s analysis of plays by Cherríe Moraga shows that switching and mixing can be used globally to construct a hybrid/third space identity and challenge and transform power relations (2005). According to Ana Celia Zentella codeswitching for bilinguals is “a way of saying that they belong to both worlds, and should not be forced to give up one for the other” (1997, 114). Using a musical metaphor, sociolinguist Guadalupe Valdés says: “By alternating between their languages, bilinguals are able to use their total speech repertoire, which includes many levels, and styles and modes of speaking in two languages. It is helpful to imagine that when bilinguals code-switch, they are in fact using a twelve-string guitar, rather than limiting themselves to two six-string instruments” (1988, 126).

Next to this poetic characterization of the nature of Spanglish, however, very negative attitudes can also be found. For example, Spanglish has been characterized by Nobel Prize writer Octavio Paz as “neither good nor bad, but just abominable” (Stavans 2000, 555). In this vein, Carlos Varo states “[e]l “Spanglish” es [...] una enfermedad crónica, como puede serlo el sentimiento de dependencia y la frustración que busca un escape por la droga, el alcohol o la violencia física o sexual” (1971, 109; quoted in Acosta-Belén 1975, 15). Interestingly, this attitude is not restricted to the 1970s, an anonymous comment on a YouTube video entitled “Yo hablo spanglish” reads: “Odio la gente que habla en spanglish, parecen retrasados mentales”.12

With regard to the name itself, the most recent criticism of the term Spanglish by linguists is that of Otheguy and Stern (2011), who propose discarding the term Spanglish and using instead just Spanish or Spanish in the United States. As mentioned in the introduction, Otheguy and Stern claim that the term Spanglish is “unfortunate” and misleading:13

10 Jonnson (2005) borrows the terms “hybridity” and “third space” from Homi Bhabha, who explains: “But for me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original moments from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom” (1990, 211). These issues are discussed in section five.
11 For a much criticized defense of Spanglish see Stavans (2004).
12 “Entrevista a Tommy Roque. Yo hablo spanglish” [Accessed online on October 26, 2017].
13 It is interesting to note that in the same way that the term Spanglish has been criticized, defenders of the term have also criticized the term code-switching. Comedian Bill Santiago has this to say: “please don’t say ‘code-switching.’ Ese término flojo makes me cringe. ¿Cómo que code ni qué code? First of all, cuando escucho la palabra ‘code,’ I think of top-secret military messages, not Spanglish. Suena medio silly, like lingo from a bad submarine movie” (2008, 17).
The term is unfortunate for at least four reasons. First, it conceals the fact that the features that characterize popular forms of Spanish in the USA are, for the most part, parallel to those of popular forms of the language in Latin America and Spain; second, the term incorrectly suggests that popular Spanish in the USA is of an unusually hybrid character; third, it inaccurately implies that Spanish in the USA is centrally characterized by structural mixing with English; and fourth, it needlessly separates Spanish-speakers in the USA from those living elsewhere. (2011, 85-86)

As we saw in section two, Spanglish seems to refer to a combination of distinct language contact phenomena and it is only natural for linguists to reject such a nontechnical term. In fact, although Otheguy and Stern may be the linguists who are most outspoken about this, they are not alone. John M. Lipski has also rejected this term, using the following comparison: “As a term, Spanglish is as out of place in promoting Latino language and culture as are the words crazy, lunatic, crackpot or nut case in mental health, or bum, slob, misfit, and loser in social work” (2008, 72). As Ana Celia Zentella has recently pointed out, however, “inappropriate analogies aside, no mental health or social work advocates have adopted any of Lipski’s insulting labels with pride the way many speakers embrace Spanglish” (2016, 28).

Nevertheless, the arguments used by Otheguy and Stern might not be strong enough to reject the term completely. First, linguists use terms all the time which might be considered to be flawed. Just think of the ubiquitous distinction between language and dialect. Further, even quite technical terms such as code-switching are not without flaws either—see Gardner-Chloros (2009). Second, “Spanish in the US” would not be a good replacement since it is certainly much broader and includes varieties similar to those found in Spain and Latin America in addition to Spanglish. Third, Otheguy and Stern do not see the mixture of English and Spanish as an important part of Spanish in the US. They appear to assume that Latino bilinguals should behave like two monolinguals in one, which Francois Grosjean (2001) has pointed out is never the case. Although this applies to all types of bilinguals, it is surely more pertinent for Latinos in the US, who in many cases belong to border cultures which are intrinsically hybrid and multilingual. In the words of border studies scholar and activist Gloria Anzaldúa:

For a people who are neither Spanish nor live in a country in which Spanish is the first language; for a people who live in a country in which English is the reigning tongue but who are not Anglo; for a people who cannot entirely identify with either standard (formal, Castilian) Spanish nor standard English, what resource is left to them but to create their own language? A language which they can connect their identity to, one capable of communicating the realities and values true to themselves—a language with terms that are neither español ni inglés, but both. ([1987] 1999, 77; emphasis in the original)

She explicitly complains, in Spanglish, about those Spanish-speaking folks who expect Hispanics to use “pure” Spanish: “even our own people, other Spanish speakers nos quieren
poner candados en la boca. They would hold us back with their bags of reglas de academia” (76). From this perspective, it might not be fair to expect Latinos to behave like Anglo Americans when they speak English and Latin Americans when they speak Spanish. Fourth, and most importantly, as we will see in more detail in section five, many Latinos think that Spanglish is the best term to represent what they speak and who they are.

4. Spanglish Beyond Casual Oral Registers
The use of Spanglish by Latinos in casual oral registers is well-known. In example (16) we have an instance from Shana Poplack’s classic study “Sometimes I’ll Start a Sentence in Spanish y termino en español” (1980):

(16) He was sitting down en la cama, mirándonos peleando, y, really, I don’t remember si él nos separó or whatever, you know. (589)

Furthermore, in addition to face-to-face conversations, Spanglish appears in literary works, films, TV series and commercials, radio programs, newspapers, magazines, advertisements, song lyrics, comedy acts, websites, e-mails, blogs, Facebook, chats and text messages. That is, all kinds of oral and written interaction and all types of artistic expression.

Although not mentioned by Otheguy and Stern (2011), the mixing of English and Spanish in literary texts is quite common especially in poetry and plays, but also in short stories and novels.14 Below I offer some examples by genre.15

Poems

(17) No such thing as too much mush
  My life, mi vida, es mush
  You, mi vida, eres too mush
  Mientras más mucho mejor
  Mad for mush
  Made for mush
  Dame más
  Dame mash
  Dame mush

Gustavo Pérez-Firmat, “Mad for Mush” (1995, 13)

(18) Thick clouds pulled over the cielo like a charcoal rebozo
  Loud claps pounded as if manos slapped masa together

14 Lipski (1985) and Torres (2007) have both analyzed the different strategies used by Latino writers to include Spanish in their English texts. See also Callahan (2004), Cintrón (1997), Mendieta-Lombardo and Cintrón (1995), Montes-Alcalá (2000; 2001) and Timm (2000).

15 For a recent analysis of the socio-pragmatic functions of code-switching in Nuyorican and Cuban American literature, see Montes-Alcalá (2016).
thundering their message, “I’m coming [...] I’m coming”
and the withering grass like a viejito perked up to see el barullo.
Verónica Reyes from “Desert Rain: blessing the land” (2013, 11)

Plays

(19) Si quieres empezar otra pelea, I’m not in the mood. Anyway, vine a otra cosa.
Dolores Prida, Beautiful Señoritas & Other Plays (1991, 164; quoted in Montes-Alcalá 2016, 207)

(20) But the woman knows. Tú no entiendes. Wait until you have your own son.

Novels/Memoirs

(21) If I respected languages like you do, I wouldn’t write at all. El muro de Berlín fue derribado. Why can’t I do the same. Desde la torre de Babel, las lenguas han sido siempre una forma de divorciarnos del resto de la humanidad. Poetry must find ways of breaking distance.
Giannina Braschi, Yo-Yo Boing! (1998, 142)

(22) The next year the drought continued y el ganado got hoof and mouth. Se cayeron en las pastas y el brushland, panzas blancas ballooning to the skies. El siguiente año still no rain.
Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands-La Frontera ([1987] 1999, 30)

Rather than fading, this trend is becoming even more visible as shown by the work of Pulitzer-prize winning author Junot Díaz, who in The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao (2007) includes hundreds of Spanish words without translation or italics, as shown in example (23).¹⁶

(23) That was when I realized she hadn’t been crying at all. She’d been faking! Her smile was like a lion’s. Ya te tengo, she said, jumping triumphantly to her feet. Te tengo. And that is how I ended up in Santo Domingo [...] It was like the fight between the egg and the rock, my abuela said. No winning. (70)

Even more radically, authors like Susana Chávez-Silverman mix the two languages to such an extent that their works cannot be said to have a main language. Thus, in Killer Crónicas (2004), as shown in examples (24) and (25), Chávez-Silverman takes Spanglish to a different level.¹⁷

(24) So, comencé a drive around en círculos on the dry lake bed, at first, then I began to back up over my tracks, siguiendo las directions del professional-driver boyfriend. (76)

¹⁶ See Casielles-Suárez (2013) and Dumitrescu (2014) for an analysis of this work.
¹⁷ For a detailed analysis of Díaz’s and Chávez-Silverman’s work see Derrick (2015).
(25) So, qué es lo que esto nos dice about borders, identidades, transnational studies, about the end of nationalisms, sobre el supposedly-shrinking global mundo? (10)

As Toribio has pointed out, the mixing of English and Spanish is not restricted to literary works and has also expanded into popular culture (2011, 533). It can be seen in songs—examples (26) and (27)—advertisements (28) and blogs (29).

(26) Claro que yes i wanna be contigo
    English or Spanish a mí me da lo mismo
    Y si tú quieres i’ll teach you a little y si no quieres también.

(27) when it comes to Spanglish yo soy el creador
    the creator the inventor el inventor
    the teacher that’s right el maestro
    te enseño with this rhyme with this rap te muestro
    que no soy un juego and far from a joke […]
    soy el brother de dos lenguas the brother with two tongues.
    Mellow Man Ace “Brother with Two Tongues” (1992)

(28) ¿Tienes Lupus? You may not know.
    From Latina magazine, February/May 1999 (quoted in Mahootian 2005, 336)

(29) En el mundo hispanohablante we have a very similar debate sobre la influencia del inglés on other languages. Internet blogger (quoted in Montes-Alcalá 2007, 169)

Sometimes, Spanglish or Espanglish is explicitly mentioned in these texts. In example (30) we have an excerpt from a mixed text by contemporary artist Molina, which repeatedly refers to it.

(30) Mi hijo speak no Espanglish
    'cause Daddy's Spanish is not fluent
    Sí, entiendo mucho pero
    the words do not always come out the same way they come in
    ¿Me entiendes? […]
    Mi hijo speak no Espanglish

19 The absence of the third-person singular present tense marker -s in the verb speak is a well-known feature of Chicano English. For more information on Chicano English see Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia (1985) and Santa Ana (1993), among others.
cuz daddy hasn’t spent much time teaching him Spanish

cuz abuelo never taught daddy Rarámuri or Nahuatl
because his mother did not speak it to him,
because things were changing then [...] 

Molina Speaks, “Mi hijo speak no Espanglish” (2012)

As this poem clearly shows, Spanglish cannot be dismissed as a casual oral register. Well-known scholars like Gloria Anzaldúa have also referred to Spanglish. Here’s her lament, quoted at the beginning of this paper:

(31) Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate. ([1987] 1999, 81)

Thus, as the examples above confirm, Spanglish cannot be said to be restricted to casual oral registers. In fact, its use is expanding so much that many Latinos are reappropriating the name and using it with pride. As pointed out by Mariana Achugar (2008), they are, in this way, engaging in counter-hegemonic language practices. That is, they are challenging the dominant class definition of what is a legitimate and illegitimate language and defending their hybrid, heteroglossic and borderless language. 20

5. SPANGISH: AN INAPPROPRIATE NAME OR A WAY OF LIFE?

We have seen that Spanglish is not restricted to casual oral registers and is being accepted by many Latinos as a reflection of their hybrid culture and identity. However, it is still being rejected by some linguists, who claim it is harmful to Latinos. The final question I would like to consider here is: should we be telling Latinos what they should call the mixed variety they use and how they should think of themselves, based on purely linguistic research, or should we listen and take into account their cultural, social and political motivations?

As Carla Jonnson (2005) points out, the term Chicano had pejorative connotations until the 1960s, at which point young Mexican Americans started using the term as, in David G. Gutiérrez’s words, “an act of defiance and self-assertion and as an attempt to redefine themselves by criteria of their own choosing” (1995, 184). In the same spirit, Irene Isabel Blea points out that “since usually it is the people with the most powerful positions in society who do the labelling for others, the Chicanos/-as are empowering themselves by

20 In Language and Symbolic Power, Pierre Bourdieu coined the term “legitimate language” to refer to languages that are dominant and therefore selected as legitimate by society, meaning that other languages are then regarded as marginal. He says: “All linguistic practices are measured against the legitimate practices, i.e., the practices of those who are dominant” (1991, 53).
choosing to label themselves” (1995, 5-6). As Jonnson notes, “you are what others call you. However, if you label yourself you are what you want to be” (2005, 41). From this perspective, some Latinos’ desire to choose Spanglish as the label of their mixed discourse is a way to defy the dominant class language practices, the distinction between a legitimate and an illegitimate language, and a way to defend their hybrid and borderless language.

Although not directly referred to in Otheguy and Stern (2011), some well-known linguists have long defended Spanglish and pointed out the necessity of considering the socio-cultural context in which it happens. Gleen A. Martínez (2006), for example, has pointed out that the mixing of English and Spanish is a vital part of communication in some Latino communities. He in fact proposes a critical linguistic approach, which takes into account not only the linguistic and social manifestations of language contact, but the political ramifications as well. He says: “Like the linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches, critical linguistic perspectives on bilingualism try to explain both the formal manifestations of languages in contact and the functional distribution of these languages. Critical approaches to bilingualism differ, however, in that they focus on the uses of the two languages as a reflection of the ideological systems of dominance and subordination that underpin social hierarchies” (1).

Ana Celia Zentella (1997), in the same spirit, has proposed the term “anthropopolitical linguistics” and has pointed out that the objective of this perspective is “to understand and facilitate a stigmatized group’s attempts to construct a positive self within an economic and political context that relegates its members to static and disparaged ethnic, racial and class identities, and that identifies them with static and disparaged linguistic codes” (13).

The perspective of non-linguists should also be taken into account. Maybe the most powerful defense of Spanglish comes from Anzaldúa’s book Borderlands-La Frontera. She says: “The US-Mexican border es una herida abierta where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. And before a scab forms it hemorrhages again, the lifeblood of two worlds merging to form a third country—a border culture” ([1987] 1999, 25).

An important part of this borderland for Anzaldúa and many other Latino writers is the linguistic border between English and Spanish. In a chapter entitled “How to Tame a Wild Tongue” and under the heading “Linguistic Terrorism,” she uses both languages and writes:

Deslenguadas. Somos los del español deficiente. We are your linguistic nightmare, your linguistic aberration, your linguistic mestizaje, the subject of your burla. Because we speak with tongues of fire, we are culturally crucified. Racially, culturally and linguistically somos huérfanos—we speak an orphan tongue. (80)

It is worth pointing out that the linguistic “mestizaje” she is referring to involves several languages and several varieties of those languages and it is not restricted to standard versions of English and Spanish. In the preface she asserts:
The switching of “codes” in this book from English to Castilian Spanish to the North Mexican dialect to Tex-Mex to a sprinkling of Nahuatl to a mixture of all of these reflects my language, a new language—the language of the Borderlands. There, at the juncture of cultures, languages cross-pollinate and are revitalized; they die and are born. Presently this infant language, this bastard language, Chicano Spanish, is not approved by any society. (Anzaldúa [1987] 1999, 20)21

Anzaldúa wrote this in 1987, when the first edition of *Borderlands-La Frontera* was published, and it looks like thirty years later many Hispanics and non-Hispanics are starting to approve of this new, “bastard language,” which seems to be acquiring some sort of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991). As Jonnson (2005) has pointed out with particular regard to the plays of Cherríe Moraga, theories such as poststructuralism, postcolonialism and linguistic anthropology can be used to point out some global functions in her use of two languages. More specifically, she identifies two of these functions as the construction of a hybrid identity and the challenging of power relations.

The importance of this hybrid or non-monoglossic discourse is well-known inside and outside the field of linguistics. See, for instance, Mikhail Bakhtin’s concepts of hybridization and heteroglossia (1981), Homi K. Bhabha’s hybridity (1994) or Walter D. Mignolo’s bilanguaging (2000), among others.22 Bhabha, for instance, states:

> [T]he importance of hybridity is that it bears the traces of those feelings and practices which inform it, just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings or discourses [...] The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (1990, 211)

Jonnson suggests that both the Chicano culture in general and Chicano discourse and code-switching in particular are examples of hybridity and third space and that Chicano discourse in theater can be seen as Bhabha’s new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. She points out that “as a result, power relations can be resisted, negotiated and eventually transformed” (2005, 46).23 Finally, Alfred Arteaga uses Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia to refer to Chicanos in the borderlands, saying that:

---

21 In fact, in chapter five she lists all the languages she is using: “Chicano Spanish sprang out of the Chicanos’ need to identify ourselves as a distinct people. We needed a language with which we could communicate with ourselves, a secret language. For some of us, language is a homeland, closer than the Southwest—for many Chicanos today live in the Midwest and the East. And because we are a complex, heterogeneous people, we speak many languages” (Anzaldúa [1987] 1999, 77). Some of the languages she mentions are: Standard English, working class and slang English, Standard Spanish, Standard Mexican Spanish, North Mexican Standard dialect, Chicano Spanish, Tex-Mex and Pachuco.

22 See also Saldívar’s concept of the *transfrontera* contact zone (1997) and García’s concept of translanguaging (2009).

23 Bhabha defines hybridity as: “the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom” (1990, 211).
The mere presence of Chicano discourse resists Anglo American suppression of heteroglossia. [...] And inasmuch as Chicano discourse is specifically multilingual and multivoiced, it further undermines the tendency towards single language and single-voiced monologue, that is, it undermines Anglo American monologism. It undercuts claims of prevalence, centrality and superiority and confirms the condition of heteroglossia. It draws the monologue into dialogue. In short, it dialogizes the authoritative discourse. (1994, 14)

With particular regard to Chicano poetry Arteaga says: “Chicano poetry has opted for hybridization, a linguistic mestizaje, incorporating the languages and discourses at play in America. It tends to reject the monologue of either autocolonial, assimilationist, English-only verse or the monologue of nationalist Spanish-only verse. Instead, it opts for a multiple tongue, multivoice literature of the border” (1994, 27).

Thus, it looks like although Spanglish may not be the technical term that linguists would choose to refer to the combination of phenomena examined in section two, if we take into account the non-linguistic factors surrounding this label, the cultural, social and political aspects that have been pointed out in other types of research mentioned above, Spanglish seems to perfectly capture this hybrid character of the discourse of Latinos and their in-between-ness. In Ed Morales’ words: “Spanglish is what we speak, but it is also who we Latinos are, and how we act and how we perceive the world” (2002, 3). From this perspective, Spanglish far from being a misleading term is a way of life, a necessity, and a reflection of Latinos’ cultural and linguistic identity. I would therefore like to end this paper by suggesting that although purely linguistic analyses of Spanish/English code-switching and code-mixing are needed and are perfectly legitimate, rather than being tempted to tell Latinos which label they should use for their linguistic variety and how they should think of themselves, we should cross some disciplinary borders and take into account not only the linguistic features of Latinos’ language but also their social, cultural and political circumstances. Similar to what happened with the term Chicano, Latinos are reappropriating the term Spanglish with pride; they are defying the linguistic borders imposed on them and opting to use a term which embodies their hybrid, fluid language which, perhaps most importantly, has been chosen by them. Can linguists accept this term? I think we can.
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