Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 7 (2), 2004, 165–173 © 2004 Cambridge University Press DOI: 10.1017/S1366728904001476

Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: Evidence from code-switching*

ALMEIDA JACQUELINE TORIBIO
The Pennsylvania State University

The present article examines one property of bilingual speech – convergence – and strives towards explanatory depth by attending to the insights of the antecedent research in formal linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics. In particular, the paper adopts as a point of departure (and further substantiates) the argument that convergence will be evidenced in the syntax–pragmatic interface (Hulk and Müller, 2000) and the assertion that convergence is a 'bilingual optimization strategy' (Muysken, 2002), in advancing the claim that convergence (cum congruent lexicalization) in bilingual speech may be amplified or attenuated in tandem with the language mode (bilingual versus monolingual) of the bilingual (Grosjean, 1998). Specifically, it will be demonstrated through an analysis of two individual bilinguals' productions in both monolingual and bilingual modes that the convergence that is already manifested to some degree in these individuals' Spanish is enhanced in Spanish-English code-switching when their languages are simultaneously activated and deployed.

Bilingual speakers, bilingual speech

In their everyday lives, most Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States find themselves situated along a continuum that induces different language modes within a bilingual range (cf., Grosjean, 1998; Valdés, 2000). At one end of the continuum, bilinguals interact in monolingual mode, activating one language and suppressing the other.[1] A ready example is afforded by Zentella's (1997) ethnolinguistic study of the Puerto Rican enclave of East Harlem, where children could be observed to speak English with educators and peers, while switching to Spanish in deference to elders and in addressing infants. At the bilingual endpoint, speakers activate both languages, alternating between them, often within the same segment of discourse; this code-switching behavior, exemplified in (1), is common among proficient bilinguals, and may indeed be the norm in many bilingual communities.[2]

(1) a. I've been interested in this as a sociologist *pero también* as a person who has lived in an area of dynamic transition *en los últimos año*s . . .
'I've been interested in this as a sociologist but also as a person who has lived in an area of dynamic transition in the last years . . . '

b. I mean, it doesn't matter. I can always tell 'em not to leave that many, *porque, es mucho, voy [a] estar pagando como diez al mes, de pura agua*.
'I mean, it doesn't matter. I can always tell 'em not to leave that many, because it's a lot, I'm going to be paying about ten a month, in just water.'
(Sánchez, 1983)

For bilinguals, then, two language systems constitute their linguistic competence in a singular sense, and their linguistic performance reflects the contribution of the component languages independently or in tandem, as permitted by the observables of the speech situation, e.g., pragmatic norms, specific setting, and participants.

Contact Spanish: Monolingual and bilingual mode

To be sure, even in monolingual mode, when one language is privileged, traces of the inactive contact language are reflected in permanent or ephemeral incursions which may be observed at all levels of linguistic analysis (cf., Grosjean, 1998). In the contact between Spanish and English, as in most contact situations, the influence is most noted in the lexicon (cf., Clyne, 2003; Winford, 2003) – witness the now-common *estín* and *bréiks* in (2), forms

* I wish to thank Eduardo Faingold, Luis López, and Jeff MacSwan for insightful comments on the manuscript, and Barbara Bullock for stimulating discussions on the research. I would also like to thank Jürgen Meisel for his patience.

[1] The two languages are, however, constantly available (cf., Kecskes and Papp, 2000).

[2] Viewed from a communicative perspective, code-switching may be characterized as serving a number of socially- and discursively-indexical functions in bilingual conversation (cf., Gumperz, 1976). Viewed from a linguistic optic, code-switching is known to be rule-governed and systematic (though there is little consensus on the universal and language-specific principles that best characterize it).

Address for correspondence
Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese, The Pennsylvania State University, 211 Burrowes Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA
E-mail: *ajt5@psu.edu*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that have been permanently incorporated into the contact variety of Spanish spoken in New York.

(2) a. Hoy no están dando *estín*.
"They're not providing heat today."
(*estín* < English *steam*)
(Otheguy, 1995)

b. Se quejaba de estar sentada en frente de una máquina de coser todo el día, o que los *bréiks* eran muy cortos . . .
"She complained of sitting in front of a sewing machine all day, or that the breaks were too short . . ."
(*bréiks* < English *breaks*)
(Esmeralda Santiago, 1994, *When I was Puerto Rican*)

These lexical innovations do not similarly affect all domains: certain content words are more canonical candidates for acquisition than others. It is unusual for speakers to borrow core terms such as *tree*, for which there is sufficient semantic congruence for such general concepts across languages (cf., Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Backus, 2000). On the contrary, as formalized in Backus' (2000) Specificity Hypothesis, the incorporation of items is facilitated for words that have a highly specific referential meaning, and whose inter-linguistic equivalents, where they exist, conjure up quite different connotations (cf. also Myers-Scotton and Jake, 1995).

Borrowing (and related phenomena such as semantic extension or modeling) may be conceived as a site of language change – a new sign emerges or a new or nuanced meaning is ascribed to an existing sign, motivated by the need to articulate unfamiliar objects, notions, and cultural practices (cf., Otheguy, 1995). But these lexical innovations do not reflect systemic change, i.e., they do not give rise to novel categories or structures. Much less certain is whether other types of lexical incursions – particularly calques or loan translations/shifts – have consequences for the morpho-syntactic module of the receiving language system. In considering examples of calquing in contact Spanish, e.g., forms such as *llamar para atrás* "to call back" in (3a), Otheguy presents arguments that counter their characterization as 'syntactic Anglicism' (cf., Lipski, 1985). More specifically, he notes that *llamar para atrás* (V+PP) is not structurally parallel to the English model *call back* (V+Adv) and that intransitive verbs followed by adverbial prepositional phrases are frequent in monolingual Spanish, as in (3b).

(3) a. Le dije a Carlos que cuando tuviera tiempo me *llamara para atrás*.
"I told Carlos that when he had some time he should call me back."
(cf., Spanish *devolver la llamada*)

b. No me quero meter por esa calle, por que más adelante te encuentras que están en obras y tienes que *volver para atrás*.
"I don't want to go down that street because further up you find that there is construction and you have to turn around."
(Otheguy, 1995)

Such forms, Otheguy maintains, are no more than "curious instances of the use and exploitation of an intact linguistic structure" in the recipient language that express a communicative innovation (Otheguy, 1995, p. 215); this communicative convergence, he contends, is not accompanied by grammatical convergence.

This question of systemic change rooted in inter-lingual contact may be better addressed by a consideration of non-target sentence-level forms in the influenced variety. Consider by way of example the data in (4)–(6), culled from three studies that examine contact Spanish with an eye towards characterizing the formal features that motivate well-formed derivations and their felicitous interpretations. In (4), from Zapata, Toribio and Sánchez (2003), speakers of contact Spanish evidence a marked absence of the distinction between Clitic Left Dislocation and Topicalization constructions and a concomitant preference for preverbal licensing of subjects; a DP/NP direct object prompt in initial position is principally understood as the subject of a passive construction.[3] Similarly, Silva-Corvalán's (1994/2000) bilingual subjects regularly produced pre-nominal adjectives and inalienable possession expressed with possessive pronouns, (5), both of which find parallels in the English-language system. Finally, in Montrul (2002), early bilinguals demonstrated target-deviant (and variable) knowledge of the differences between imperfect and perfective meanings in tasks that required them to assess as logical or illogical sentences with predicates of accomplishment, achievement, and state, (6). Some bilinguals, Montrul concludes, may never converge on the monolingual Spanish target system.

(4) a. Prompt: Quién hace el pastel? El pastel_____.
"Who makes the cake? The cake . . ."
Response: El pastel es hecho por Ceciia.
"The cake is made by Cecilia."
(cf., Clitic Left Dislocation: *El pastel* ***lo*** *hace Cecilia* "Ceclia makes the cake")

b. Prompt: Quién compra verduras? Verduras_____.
"Who buys salad greens? Salad greens . . ."
Response: Verduras son compradas por Miguel.
"Salad greens are bought by Miguel."
(cf., Topic: *Verduras compra Miguel* "Miguel buys the salad greens")
(Zapata et al., 2003)

[3] In Spanish, generic DPs may be fronted into a Topic position, but specific DPs must appear in a Clitic Left Dislocation construction (cf., Rizzi, 1997).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(5) a. la más importante persona
"the most important person"
(cf., Spanish: *la persona más importante*)
b. . . . y me dieron en la cara y quebraron mi *jaw*
". . . and they hit me in the face and broke my jaw"
(cf., Spanish: . . . *me dieron en la cara y me quebraron la mandíbula*)
(Silva-Corvalán, 1994/2000)

(6) a. La clase era [IMP] a las 10 pero empezó a las 10:30.
La clase fue [PRET] a las 10 pero empezó a las 10:30.
"The class was at 10 but started at 10:30."
b. Los González vendían [IMP] la casa pero nadie la compró.
Los González vendieron [PRET] la casa pero nadie la compró.
"The Gonzalez were selling/sold the house but nobody bought it."
c. Pedro corría [IMP] la maratón de Barcelona pero no participó.
Pedro corrió [PRET] la maratón de Barcelona pero no participó.
"Pedro used to run/ran the Barcelona marathon but he did not participate."
(Montrul, 2002)

Still, in each case outlined, the contact situation renders anticipated structures that are not only congruent with those of English, but, significantly, are themselves extant in Spanish. That is, the effects of contact with English are manifest not in the integration of new syntactic structures into the Spanish system, but in the preferential use of some structures over other options, and in the loss of semantic and discourse-pragmatic constraints governing the use of specific variants (Silva-Corvalán, 1994/2000). For example, although the structures in (4)–(5) are target-deviant with respect to the monolingual Spanish norm, they do not represent innovations in the syntax of Spanish – passivization via A-movement is attested in all monolingual varieties, though with much less frequency and acceptability than with the impersonal subject pronoun *se* (cf., *Se habla español* "Spanish is spoken"), and adjectives may appear pre-nominally, though with semantic consequences (cf., *el gran hombre* "the great man" vs. *el hombre grande* "the tall man").

In summary, the Spanish that is spoken by Spanish-English bilinguals (in monolingual mode) will differ from that spoken by their Spanish monolingual counterparts, but the non-target forms can arguably be attributed to the dual effects of lexico-semantic calquing and the over-extension of native-language syntactic options into new contexts (Bullock and Toribio, 2004). Similar observations are formalized by Hulk and Müller (2000) as originating at the pragmatics–discourse interface of the syntax, the point in language production where the context influences choices of syntactic structure (cf., Paradis and Navarro, 2003). Speaking specifically to sentence-level pragmatic/discursive alternations, it is maintained here that in their linguistic performance, bilinguals select the most parsimonious grammar that serves both languages.

When bilinguals' languages are simultaneously deployed, as in code-switching, their interaction may be more pronounced and parsimony more urgent. Muysken (2002) advances and explores the usefulness of the notion of "bilingual optimization strategies" in his investigation of bilingual code-mixing (a broad term than comprises contact phenomena from lexical borrowing to code-switching):

(i) structural coherence may be optimized for the language that is activated, in which case one may observe the INSERTION of lexical items or entire constituents from the language that has been temporarily deactivated;

(ii) universal combinatory principles may be optimized through the activation and ALTERNATION between structures from both languages;

(iii) inter-lingual correspondences may be optimized with CONGRUENT LEXICALIZATION of material from different lexical inventories into a largely (but not completely) shared grammatical structure.[4]

Within this three-way typology, mixing of Spanish and English, as exemplified in (7), may be described as comprising insertions and alternations; however, as Muysken also recognizes, the fluid intermingling of languages suggests a shared structure, i.e., optimization via congruent lexicalization: words from Spanish and English are inserted into a shared structure.

(7) *El sol no había salido cuando* I rode my bike to campus and it was freezing. *Todos los estudiantes* freaking out *y mucha tensión en el ambiente*.
"The sun was not out yet when / I rode my bike to campus and it was freezing. / All the students / freaking out / and so much tension in the air."
(Montes-Alcalá, 2001)

[4] The interpretation of the three patterns, Muysken suggest, can also be sociolinguistic, in terms of bilingual strategies: alternation is frequent in stable bilingual communities with a tradition of language separation and is structurally little intrusive; insertion is frequent in colonial settings and recent migrant communities, where there is considerable asymmetry in the speakers' proficiency in the two languages; congruent lexicalization may be associated with second-generation migrant groups, dialect/standard and post-creole continua, and bilingual speakers of closely related languages with roughly equal prestige and no tradition of overt language separation. Consult Muysken (2000) for a thorough-going treatment of these contact phenomena.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Having considered the inter-lingual congruence that is achieved in the languages of the bilingual in monolingual language mode, we turn to examine the congruence that obtains when the bilingual is in bilingual code-switching language mode. The following investigation, then, is guided by the question: Does the simultaneous presence of languages in code-switching further induces the searching for parallels between them, and hence increases the striving towards convergence via congruent lexicalization?

Bilingual code-switching and linguistic convergence

In considering the 'permeability' of Spanish to the effects of the English grammatical system across monolingual and bilingual modes, attention must be focused on attributes of the Spanish grammar that may be susceptible to modification. One syntactic feature of Spanish lends itself to such inquiry – the appearance or suppression of subject pronouns. Recall that inter-lingual incursions are expected when there exists the possibility of surface-level structural congruence between the two languages (though what motivates these structures and how they are interpreted may be quite distinct – e.g., both English and Spanish manifest overt pronouns but their appearance in the latter is pragmatically conditioned). In broad terms, the null subject of Spanish corresponds to the pronoun of English, and the overt subject in Spanish corresponds to the phonologically-emphatic subject of English (cf., Chomsky's (1981) pragmatic metric Avoid Pronoun; cf. also Larson and Luján, 1992).[5]

(8) a. Sonia cree que (*ella) va a ganar las elecciones.
"Sonia believes that *(she) will win the elections."
b. Sonia cree que ella va a ganar las elecciones (y no Javier).
"Sonia believes that SHE will win the elections (not Javier)."

Since the positioning and expression of subject arguments is governed by factors such as focus, switch reference, and disambiguation, properties that reside in the interpretive interface of the grammar, this syntactic property of contact Spanish cannot be studied independently of discourse context. And, following Grosjean (1998), bilingual speech cannot be examined without consideration of the language mode in which the speaker is situated.

In examining this property, therefore, we draw on the extended discourse of two Mexican-American Spanish-English bilingual speakers across two conditions. In one condition, the participants were situated within a Spanish language set, i.e., a Spanish monolingual mode was induced; they deactivated their English language system and adopted the language of the task, which obliged them to tell a story fully in Spanish based on a series of colored pictures depicting "Little Red Riding Hood" (*La Caperucita Roja*). Sample excerpts from the two renditions appear in (9). In the second condition, a bilingual mode was induced, requiring the participants to activate both Spanish and English simultaneously in rendering the ending to a mixed-language fairy tale "El Principe Pordiosero/The Beggar Prince", which they had previously read aloud; excerpts of oral code-switched narratives appear in (10). (As acknowledged, it is difficult for bilinguals to suppress one of their language systems completely; however, what is of interest here is the difference between (partial) suppression and dual activation of language systems.)

(9) a. *Speaker A: Spanish-language narrative "La Caperucita Roja/Little Red Riding Hood"*
Esta es la historia de Caperucita Roja. Un día, la niña, Caperucita, Caperucita Roja, iba caminando por el bosque. Iba a ir a la, a su casa. Y iba feliz, contenta, cantando unas canciones, apreciando la belleza del de los árboles, y en eso oyó una canción de un pajarito cantando. Ella paró a escucharlo. Al parar, no sabía ella que a detrás de ella iba un lobo persiguiéndola. Luego, después de que escuchó las canciones del pajarito, se fue a su casa. Al llegar a la casa, su mamá le pidió que fuera a hacer unos mandados. Le dio un paquete, y le dijo "Lleva esto a la abuelita." . . .
"This is the story of Little Red Riding Hood. One day, the girl, Riding Hood, Little Red Riding Hood, was walking through the forest. She was going to go to her house. She was happy, content, singing some songs, appreciating the beauty of the trees, and just then heard a song of a bird singing. She stopped to listen to it. On stopping, she didn't know that behind her there was a wolf following her. Then, after she listened to the bird's songs, she went home. On arriving at the house, her mother asked her to go run an errand. She gave her a package, and told her, 'Take this to your grandmother.' . . ."
b. *Speaker B: Spanish-language narrative "La Caperucita Roja/Little Red Riding Hood"*
Había una vez una niña llamada Caperucita Roja. Un día, su mamá le dijo, "Caperucita, tu abuelita está muy mala. Llévale esta sopa, por favor." "Sí, mamá, con mucho gusto." "Caperucita," le dijo la mamá, "no hables con nadie. Vete directamente a la casa de tu abuelita." Caperucita Roja empezó a recoger flores y al ir a la casa de su abuelita, se encontró a un señor. Un señor vestido con un traje muy elegante. Y le dijo, "Hola, Caperucita, adónde vas?" "Voy a la casa de mi abuelita que está mala y

[5] In English, with little exception (e.g., imperatives, diary null subjects), overt subject arguments are obligatory, and pragmatic information is encoded through intonation and pronominalization.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

le llevo esta sopa que le hizo mamá." "O, y dónde vive tu abuelita?" "Mi abuelita vive por el bosque pero mamá me dijo que no hable con nadie, así es que ya me voy." . . .
"There once was a girl named Little Red Riding Hood. One day, her mother told her, 'Little Red, your grandmother is very ill. Take this soup to her, please.' 'Yes, mother, with pleasure.' 'Little Red,' said the mother, 'Don't speak with anyone. Go directly to your grandmother's house.' Little Red Riding Hood started to pick flowers and on going towards the grandmother's house she met a man. A man dressed with an elegant suit. And he said to her, 'Hello, Little Red, where are you going?' 'I'm going to the house of my grandmother, who is very ill and I'm taking her this soup that my mother made.' 'Oh, and where does your grandmother live?' 'My grandmother lives in the woods but mother told me not to talk with anyone, so I will go.'"

(10) a. *Speaker A: Spanish-English code-switching narrative "El Príncipe Pordiosero/The Beggar Prince"*
. . . la princesa accepted the decision that the husband had made *y se fueron al bosque* where they would both live in the little house *y esperaba algo, algo bonito, humilde, aunque ella nunca había tenido algo así*. She had always lived in the palace *y nunca había salido* out to the forest before. She was . . . she wanted to experiment, *quería ver qué había allá fuera del, del palacio. Quería saber qué tipo de animales habían*, what type of trees, flowers, *pajaritos*. She wanted to see *la belleza que tenía, que había afuera del palacio. Pero al llegar a la casita*, she noted, she noticed how small and how, how, . . . how humble it was. There was no soft beautiful bed that she was accustomed to. *No había ninguna estufa en donde se puede cocinar algo muy bueno aunque* she didn't know how to cook anyways, she had always been fed . . .
" . . . the princess / accepted the decision that the husband had made / and they went to the forest / where they would both live in the little house / and she expected something, something pretty, humble, although she had never had anything like that. She had always lived in the palace / and had never gone / out of the forest before. She was . . . she wanted to experiment, / she wanted to see what was outside of, of the palace. She wanted to know what type of animals there were, / what type of trees, flowers, / birds. / She wanted to see / the beauty that it had, that there was outside the palace. But on arriving at the house, / she noted, she noticed how small and how, how, . . . how humble it was. There was no soft beautiful bed that she was accustomed to. / There was no stove where she could cook something good although / she didn't know how to cook anyways, she had always been fed . . ."

b. *Spanish-English code-switching narrative (transcription), Speaker B*
Como el esposo de la princesa le dijo que tenían que, they could, *se tenían que ir de la* palace. *A ella no le gustó mucho la noticia*. They had to return to his meager work *y a una casa que era muy humilde*. *Ella no estaba* accustomed to that kind of work. *Así es que ella sintió que esto no, que ella no iba a poder resistirlo. Tenía que* wash clothes *a mano*, she had to cook. *Era una vida totalmente diferente a la que ella estaba* accustomed to. She couldn't make it anymore, one day, *y le dijo a su esposo*, "Honey, I can't take this anymore. *Tengo que regresar a la* palace. *No sé qué voy a hacer si sigo viviendo en estas circunstancias*." . . .
"Since the princess' husband told her that they had to, / they could, / they had to go from the / palace. She didn't like the news much. / They had to return to his meager work / and a house that was very humble. She was not / accustomed to that kind of work. / so she felt that that was not, that she could not withstand it. She had / to wash clothes/ by hand, / she had to cook. / It was a totally different life from what she was / accustomed to. She couldn't make it anymore, one day, / and she told her husband, / 'Honey, I can't take this anymore. / I have to return to the / palace. / I don't know what I'm going to do if I continue living in these circumstances.' . . . "

Since the syntactic property at issue is conditioned by discourse- and semantic-pragmatic considerations, our analysis must go beyond the syntactic and semantic confines of isolated sentences to analyze linguistic forms in relation to the narrative or other discourse functions that they perform within a given text. The extended discourse of fairytale narratives proves especially opportune for their examination.

At first observation, the Spanish of both monolingual and bilingual texts appears structurally well-formed. However, in considering the expression of subjects, there emerges a difference in the syntactic options selected. The overt pronouns in the monolingual excerpts in (11) and (12) are, in general, well-formed, as judged by six independent raters and marked by [√] (or indicated by [?] by two or fewer judges); most expressed subjects serve the function of contrast, switch reference, or disambiguation. However, there are some pronominal uses to which no

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

such function can be attributed, especially when the English language is activated, as indicated by [*]; noteworthy in this respect are the pronouns in the bilingual Spanish samples in (13d) and (14a) – their usage is not grammatically incorrect, but discourse-pragmatically non-target-like. On the other hand, those that appear in the bilingual excerpts in (13) and (14) are assessed by the same judges as being discursively marked, as indicated by [*].

(11) *Overt personal subject pronouns in monolingual mode (Speaker A)*

a. . . . y iba feliz, contenta, cantando unas canciones, apreciando la belleza del de los árboles, y en eso oyó una canción de un pajarito cantando. **Ella**$_{[?]}$ paró a escucharlo. Al parar, no sabía **ella**$_{[?]}$ que a detrás de ella iba un lobo persiguiéndola.
". . . and she was happy, content, singing some songs, taking in the beauty of the trees, and right then she heard a song of a bird singing. She stopped to listen to him. On stopping she didn't know that behind her there was a wolf following her."

b. . . . cuando iba, cuando **ella**$_{[\surd]}$ iba cantando y caminando de pronto detrás de un árbol, salió el lobo, el mismo lobo que la iba persiguiendo. **Él**$_{[\surd]}$ le dio unas flores y le dijo qué bonita se miraba. También le preguntó que pa' dónde iba, verdad, y **ella**$_{[\surd]}$ le respondió, y le dijo, "Voy a la casa de mi abuelita a darle un . . . un en . . . a entregarle algo que mamá me mandó. No sé qué es." Entonces, **él**$_{[\surd]}$ le dijo, "Okay, pues, nos vemos. Y ten buen día." En eso, **él**$_{[\surd]}$ se fue y **ella**$_{[\surd]}$ siguió por el bosque, feliz, cantando con sus flores que le dio el lobo. Mientras **ella**$_{[\surd]}$ iba por el bosque, el lobo se apuró y llegó a la casa de la abuelita.
". . . when she was, when she was singing and walking quickly behind a tree there appeared a wolf, the same wolf that was following her. He gave her some flowers and told her how pretty she looked. He also asked here where she was going, right, and she responded, and she said, 'I'm going to my grandma's house to give her . . . give her . . . a package something that mother sent me. I don't know what it is.' Then he said, 'Okay, then, I'll see you. And have a good day.' Right then, he went and she continued through the woods, the wolf hurried and arrived at the grandma's house."

c. . . . y en eso le apunta Caperucita a, a las orejas, las orejas del, del lobo y le pregunta, "Oiga, abuelita, por qué tiene unas orejas tan grandotas?" Y **él** le contesta, "O, pa' poder escucharte mejor cuando me andes hablando." Entonces **ella**$_{[\surd]}$, la Caperucita Roja, le pregunta al lobo, "Oiga abuelita, Por qué tiene unos dientes tan grandes, una boca tan grande?" Y en eso, el lobo le responde, "O, pues para poder comerte mejor." Y en eso al mismo tiempo que **ella**$_{[\surd]}$ le estaba haciendo todas esas preguntas, . . .
". . . right then Little Red points to, to his ears, the ears of the wolf and asks, 'Listen, grandma, why do you have such big ears?' And he answers her, 'Oh, to hear you better when you are talking to me.' And then she, the Little Red Riding Hood asked the wolf, 'Listen grandma, why do you have such big teeth, such a big mouth?' And right then, the wolf responded, 'Oh, well to better eat you.' And at that same time that she was asking all of these questions . . ."

d. . . . el lobo estaba persiguiendo a Caperucita sobre todo, entre la casa, verdad, por todas las partes, andaba detrás de ella y **él**$_{[\surd]}$ se iba y le corría a la cocina y alrededor de la mesa y debajo de la mesa . . .
". . . the wolf was chasing Little Red over all, in the house, right, all over, he was behind her and he ran off and ran to the kitchen and around the table and under the table . . ."

(12) *Overt personal subject pronouns in monolingual mode (Speaker B)*
Estaba muy asustada y el lobo la seguía persiguiendo. **Ella**$_{[\surd]}$ no sabía qué hacer. Mientras tanto, mientras el lobo corría atrás de ella, el Señor Pinpón, con su escopeta, lo vio y le dijo, "Para, o te mato."
"She was very frightened and the wolf continued to follow her. She didn't know what to do. In the meantime, while the wolf ran after, Mr. Pinpón, with his rifle, saw him and said to him, 'Stop or I'll kill you.'"

(13) *Overt personal subject pronouns in bilingual mode (Speaker A)*

a. . . . *la princesa* accepted the decision that the husband had made *y se fueron al bosque* where they would both live in the little house *y esperaba algo, algo bonito, humilde, aunque* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *nunca había tenido algo así*.
". . . the princess accepted the decision that the husband had made and they went to the forest where they would both live in the little house and she expected something pretty, humble, although she never had anything like that."

b. . . . since she had agreed to go and live with him. ***Ella*** *dijo que "Voy a ver a ver cuánto puedo quedarme aquí*. Let's see if I could get used to it." Well she did, *se quedó* almost you know, ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *dijo, "Me voy a quedar aquí un mes y a ver a ver qué tal*."
". . . since she had agreed to go and live with him. She said that I'm going to see how long I can stay

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

here. Let's see if I could get used to it. Well she did, she stayed almost you know, she said, 'I'm going to say here a month and see how it is.'"

c. . . . *ya, la belleza del bosque, pues no se le hacía tan tan bonita, tan primorosa pero, todavía dijo* ***ella***$_{[\surd]}$, "I'll give some time, myself two more weeks, I'm half way done." Well, during the third week, ***ella***$_{[\surd]}$, *el esposo la empezó a mandarle, empezó a decir,* ***él***$_{[*]}$ *esperaba que, que pues*, . . .
". . . then the beauty of the forest well did not seem so pretty, so primrose but, still she said, 'I'll give some time, myself two more weeks, I'm half way done.' Well, during the third week, she, the husband started to command her, started to say, he expected that, well . . ."

d. *y llegando el, la cuarta semana, pues ya entonces* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *empezó a sentir el, qué tan duro es trabajar*, how, how easy she had it, how all the things that, that, that she took for granted, you know, she, uh, she started to reflect upon, *así que* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *decidió en la, durante la cuarta semana de que ella se iba a regresar al palacio,* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *no podia vivir como una pesona humilde*.
"and having arrived, the fourth week, well then she started to feel the how hard it was to work, how, how easy she had it, how all the things that, that, that she took for granted, you know, she, uh, she started to reflect upon, so she decided in the during the fourth week that she was going to return to the palace, she couldn't live like humble person."

e. . . . *el grillo la iba a llevar al palacio. Pero en eso, entonces, en eso* ***ella***$_{[\surd]}$, *verdad, le di, le di, le le pidió y le dijo*, you know, *le dio las gracias, le dijo*, you know, *"Por favor llévame* to my palace."
". . . the cricket was taking her to the palace. But right then, right then she, right, said to him, asked him and said to him, you know, she thanked him, she said to him, you know, 'Please take me to, to my palace.'"

f. . . . *entonces el grillo le dijo*, "Okay, *pues aquí debajo de este árbol descansa, verdad*, um, *no te preocupes, verdad, pronto llegaremos a tu palacio*." *Entonces* ***ella***$_{[\surd]}$ *se durmió*, . . . she didn't know what was going to happen *en eso que* ***ella*** *despierta* and umm, right in front of her, she sees her husband.
". . . then the cricket said to her, 'Okay, well rest here under this tree, right, um, don't worry, right, we'll soon arrive, to, to, to your palace.' Then she fell asleep . . . she didn't know what was going to happen when she awoke and umm, right in front of her, she sees her husband."

g. . . . *entonces,* ***él***$_{[\surd]}$*, you know,* ***él***$_{[\surd]}$ *le preguntó a ella, verdad*, "Oh *m'hija* you know, *estabas perdida y qué bueno que te encontré, verdad? Qué bueno que lleg, que te regresastes." Entonces* ***ella***$_{[\surd]}$ *le dijo* . . .
". . . then, he, you know, he asks her, right, 'Oh m'hija you know, you were lost and how good that I found you, right? How good that you returned.' Then she said to him . . ."

(14) *Overt personal subject pronouns in bilingual mode (Speaker B)*

a. They had to return to his meager work *y a una casa que era muy humilde.* ***Ella*** *no estaba* accustomed to that kind of work. *Así es que* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *sintió que esto no, que* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *no iba a poder resistirlo. Tenía que* wash clothes *a mano*, she had to cook. *Era una vida totalmente diferente a la que* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *estaba* accustomed to.
"They had to return to his meager work / and a house that was very humble. She was not / accustomed to that kind of work. / so she felt that that was not, that she could not withstand it. She had / to wash clothes / by hand, / she had to cook. / It was a totally different life from what she was / accustomed to."

b. She couldn't make it anymore, one day, *y le dijo a su esposo*, "Honey, I can't take this anymore. *Tengo que regresar a la palace. No sé qué voy a hacer si sigo viviendo en estas circunstancias." El esposo le dijo, "Pero si* ***tú***$_{[*]}$ *te casas conmigo tienes que seguir a tu esposo y* ***yo***$_{[\surd]}$ *quiero estar en esta* house. *Así es que nos tenemos que quedar." "Si* ***tú***$_{[*]}$*," ella*$_{[*]}$ *le contestó, "Si* ***tú***$_{[*]}$ *no me complaces, te tendré que dejar y no quiero, porque te quiero mucho." "No sé," dijo* ***él***$_{[?]}$*, "Déjame pensar un poco."*
"She couldn't make it anymore, one day, / and she told her husband, 'Honey, I can't take this anymore. / I have to return to the / palace. / I don't know what I'm going to do if I continue living in these circumstances. The husband told her, 'but if you married me you have to follow your husband and I want to be in this house. So we have to stay.' 'If you,' she answered him, 'If you don't please me, I'll have to leave you and I don't want to, because I love you very much.' 'I don't know,' said he, 'Let me think a bit.'"

c. ***Ella***$_{[*]}$ *estaba muy* sad because *se quería ir a su casa y seguir la vida que* ***ella***$_{[*]}$ *tenía antes*.
"She was very / sad because / she wanted to go home and continue the life she had before."

d. *Al siguiente día, desesperada, no sabía qué le iba a contestar a su* husband. *Empezó a llorar. Su esposo había decidido que la iba a tener aquí y que no iba nadie a regresar, pero, como la vio* crying *decidió, cambió de opinión. Y le dijo, "Está*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> *bien. Como* ***tú***$_{[*]}$ *quieres regresar a la* palace *y no te puedo tener aquí . . . esto es muy* sad. *Entonces*, we will go to the palace, *y viviremos una vida feliz para que* ***tú***$_{[*]}$ *estés feliz a mi lado."*
> "On the following day, desperate, she didn't know what she was going to answer her husband. / She began to cry. Her husband had decided that he was going to have her here and that no one would return, but, since he saw her / crying / he decided, changed his mind. And he said to her, 'It's fine. Since you want to return to the / palace / and I can't have you here . . . this is very / sad. / Then, / we will go to the palace, / and we will live a happy life so that you will be happy by my side.'"

To summarize, the core linguistic system represented in these exemplars of contact Spanish approximates that of the full variety spoken by monolinguals (e.g, the strong features that motivate verb raising and that license null subjects), but those areas where the syntax interfaces with other extra-grammatical areas are vulnerable to respecification and convergence (cf., Montrul, 2004 – this volume). Significantly, this outcome is favored when both language systems are simultaneously activated. Thus, it proves instructive to couch the discussion of contact forms within the competence/performance dichotomy of linguistic theorizing (MacSwan, p.c.): though bilinguals' competence remains unchanged, the mode in which they find themselves will affect their performance.

Concluding comments and avenues for future research

In conclusion, the hypothesis posed is valid and has been empirically confirmed in this case study: The simultaneous presence of languages in code-switching further favors the searching for parallels between them, and hence promulgates the striving towards convergence. As the present study represents two individual cases, the conclusions drawn from the findings cannot be but somewhat guarded. Nevertheless, the argument seems straightforward and allows for the formulation of principled predictions that may be profitably understood as a point of departure for future work.

It is clear that researchers must examine the role of context in studying bilingual speech behavior. Linguistic convergence may be promoted not only by considerations of economy, but also because the bilingual may have been exposed to and developed a contact variety of the language (cf., Silva-Corvalán, 1994/2000); thus at least some interlingual influence may be attributable to converged input (Clyne, 2003). In a pertinent study, Paradis and Navarro (2003) examine whether the convergence manifest in a child exposed to Spanish and English is reflective of the input available in the linguistic environment. A more comprehensive study would also control for language mode. For if convergence is a reflex of a speaker's attempt at reducing the complexity (and cognitive cost) of processing two simultaneously active language systems, then it is predicted to be more pronounced in children exposed to two languages in the home, who are called on regularly to produce and process information in two languages (e.g., within the one-parent/one-language paradigm), as compared with children whose language input is contextually differentiated. Similarly, if this hypothesis is correct, we can outline consequences and make predictions for general perspectives on contact-induced language change as related to bilingual USAGE in diverse settings. For example, congruent lexicalization is predicted to be more favored in communities in which code-switching is practiced and valued (e.g., as a marker of in-group membership). A related matter for investigation is the transmission of a linguistic system with variable forms yet one biased in the direction of convergence (Bullock and Toribio, 2004), which could lead to an incomplete replication of the original syntactic system and indirectly to syntactic change (cf. Meisel, 2001). Finally, the present study has much to offer by way of informing our understanding of language maintenance in the context of language contact. The findings support the observation that languages in contact can sustain incursions and nevertheless remain robust and stable. For example, the speech samples of the bilingual code-switching discussed here may exemplify a 'composite' language system (most keenly evidenced in the intersection between discourse/pragmatics and syntax, especially when both systems are activated), but this composite system need not signal a 'turnover' from one system to another (cf., Myers Scotton's 1998 "matrix language turnover" hypothesis). In other words, increased rates of overt (and preverbal) subjects are not attributable to changes in competence, but rather are a reflex of bilingual usage, most significantly of code-switching.

References

Backus, A. (2000). The role of semantic specificity in insertional codeswitching: Evidence from Dutch-Turkish. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II*, pp. 125–154. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bullock, B. & Toribio, A. J. (2004). Intra-system variability and change in nominal and verbal morphology. Ms., Pennsylvania State University. [Forthcoming in D. Arteaga & R. Gess (eds.), *Historical Romance linguistics: Retrospectives and perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.]

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11, 131–149.

Gumperz, J. (1976). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *Working Papers of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory*, 46. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Hulk, A. & Müller, N. (2000). Bilingual first language acquisition at the inteface between syntax and pragmatics. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3, 227–244.

Kecskes, I. & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Larson, R. & Luján, M. (1992). Focused pronouns. Ms., State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Lipski, J. (1985). *Linguistic aspects of Spanish-English language switching*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, Center for Latin American Studies.

Meisel, J. (2001). From bilingual acquisition to theories of diachronic change. *Working Papers in Multilingualism*, 30 (Series B). University of Hamburg: Collaborative Research Center on Multilingualism.

Montes-Alcalá, C. (2001). Written codeswitching: Powerful bilingual images. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Code-switching worldwide II*, pp. 193–219. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Montrul, S. (2002). Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5, 39–68.

Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: A case of morphosyntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7 (2), Special Issue: *Bilingualism and Linguistic Convergence*, 125–142.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. (2002). Modelling bilingual speech: Otra vez. Ms., Radboud University Nijmegen.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A way to dusty death: The Matrix Language turnover hypothesis. In L. Grenoble & L. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, pp. 289–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J. (1995). Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model: Evidence from intrasentential code switching. *Linguistics*, 33, 981–1024.

Otheguy, R. (1995). When contact speakers talk, linguistic theory listens. In E. Contini-Mrava & B. Sussman Goldberg (eds.), *Advances in linguistic sign theory*, pp. 213–242. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Paradis, J. & Navarro, S. (2003). Subject realization and crosslinguistic interference in the bilingual acquisition of Spanish and English: What is the role of the input? *Journal of Child Language*, 30 (2), 371–393.

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegemn (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, pp. 281–237. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Sánchez, R. (1983). *Chicano discourse: Socio-historic perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Santiago, E. (1994). *When I was Puerto Rican*. New York: Vintage.

Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994/2000). *Language contact and change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Thomason, S. G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Toribio, A. J. (2001). Accessing Spanish-English code-switching competence. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 193–231.

Valdés, G. (2000). Bilingualism and language use among Mexican Americans. In S. L. McKay & S.-L. C. Wong (eds.), *New immigrants in the United States*, pp. 99–136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Zapata, G., Toribio, A. J. & Sánchez, L. (2003). Attrition of Interpretable Features in Heritage Speakers of Spanish. Paper presented at the 33rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Linguistics, April 2003, Indiana University.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Received January 22, 2004
Revision received February 20, 2004
Accepted February 27, 2004

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001476 Published online by Cambridge University Press