

One Construction, Two Source Languages: *Hacer* with an English Infinitive in Bilingual Discourse

Damián Vergara Wilson
University of New Mexico

1. Introduction

In the editor's introduction to the International Journal of Bilingualism's Special Issue on New perspectives on transfer among bilinguals and L2 users, Treffers-Daller and Sakel (2012) call for a renewal in studies of bilingualism, noting that there has been a predisposition toward studying bilingualism from a monolingual perspective. In this call for renewal, they state that while studying transfer should be a priority "[i]n some cases, contact between the languages in the bilingual can lead to the emergence of unique, hybrid features that exist in neither of the two source languages" (4). This study examines an emergent hybrid feature used frequently by Spanish/English bilinguals in the Southwestern US, the bilingual compound verb *hacer* + V. While previous studies have examined this construction (Fuller Medina, 2005; Jenkins, 2003; Pfaff, 1982; Reyes, 1982; Toribio et al., 2012), the present study is the first to examine it from a usage-based approach in order to demonstrate that it is a case of linguistic evolution emerging from bilingual discourse practices. Examples (1 and 2) provide instances of *hacer* + V:

- (1) Ivette: ...somebody used to feed them
...(0.7) from the beginning los hacian feed.
(06.La Crinolina, 1617-8)¹
- (2) Miguel: ...(H) pero si el Ricky venía,
pero el Ricky le decía smoking,
ese hacía smoke.
(04.PiedrasandGallinas, 2537-9)

In applying a usage-based analysis to spoken data from New Mexico, the present study demonstrates how *hacer* + V is a hybrid construction that is not accounted for solely through lexical deficiency. Instead, *hacer* + V is productive, readily expanded to new types, and is the conventional way expressing certain verbal situations. This study provides evidence that the verb *hacer* in this construction has undergone grammaticalization and that the input for this linguistic change comes from bilingual discourse practices. This reinforces the notion that bilinguals operate on a continuum in regards to discourse mode.

* I would like to thank the audience at WSS6 for excellent feedback. I would also like to thank Naomi Lapidus Shin and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on the submitted version. I am grateful to Rena Torres Cacoullos and Catherine E. Travis for sharing their corpus (NMSEB) with me. Any errors or shortcomings are my own.

¹ Codes refer to recording number-name and line number in the New Mexico Spanish / English bilingual corpus (NMSEB) (Torres Cacoullos and Travis, in preparation). Examples are reproduced verbatim from speaker utterances. In order to highlight the proposal that speakers make use of a bilingual discourse mode, Spanish segments will not be italicized. Translations into English will not be provided as the publication is bilingual in accepting submissions in English or Spanish.

1.1. Bilingual Compound Verbs (BCVs)

According to Edwards and Gardner-Chloros (2007) BCVs are found in many contact situations. They typically “consist of a light or “operator” verb, frequently translatable as ‘do’ or ‘make’, which appears in conjunction with a lexical element (the “adjunct”) which contributes the core semantic content of the construction” (74). In the case of *hacer* + V, the “operator” is the Spanish verb *hacer* (‘to do/make’) and the “adjunct” is a bare English infinitive (e.g. Ex. 1. ‘feed’; Ex. 2. ‘smoke’). While the formation of compound verbs in monolingual speech is puzzling especially in cases where there are single-word synonyms (Wray, 2002), they occur in many languages (Edwards & Gardner-Chloros, 2007). As a contact phenomenon, Myers-Scotton (2002) found that BCVs have emerged in many contact situations and propose that this type of adjunction is universal. Edwards and Gardner-Chloros (2007: 74) cite various studies of BCVs and list over fifteen different contact situations in which they occur. In Palenquero, a Spanish-based creole spoken in Colombia, Smith (this volume) finds a phenomenon similar to *hacer*+ V in which *asé*, based etymologically on Spanish *hacer*, is used to mark aspect with bare infinitives that contribute the semantic content. Whether these occur monolingually, in contact situations, or in creoles, the verb is considered to have almost no semantic value, only a grammatical one through contributing tense, aspect, and mood (TAM) to the construction (Edwards & Gardner-Chloros, 2007; Smith, this volume).

This investigation will contribute to the understanding of BCVs by looking at *hacer* + V in spontaneously occurring speech in order to demonstrate: a.) *hacer* + V is a hybrid construction whose elements do not pattern after either ‘donor’ language (henceforth L_d), b.) Previous proposals that it has arisen due to lexical gap do not account for its usage and it is most likely the most acceptable way of describing many verbal situation, c.) Usage of this construction has been affected by processes of language change typically studied in monolingual settings such as conventionalization, productivity, and grammaticalization, and, d.) Usage of *hacer* + V not a typical case of convergence, borrowing, or code-switching (henceforth CS).

1.2. Hacer + V

The BCV *hacer* +V is a multi-word construction in which the verb *hacer* contributes TAM while the open slot, represented by ‘V’ takes a wide variety of bare English infinitives that contribute the lexical information. The rest of this section will review previous studies of *hacer* + V discussing findings and geographical distribution (§1.2.1), and will show how the construction has no direct L_d equivalents (§1.2.2).

1.2.1. Previous studies and geographical distribution of *hacer* + V

The most relevant research to the present study comes from Jenkins (2003), who looked at *hacer* + V in the speech of bilingual New Mexicans in sociolinguistic interviews from the New Mexico Colorado Spanish Survey, or NMCOS (Bills & Vigil 1999). One of his goals was to find motivations for using *hacer* + V. He proposed that it was used after repair phenomena, in English language domains, in new verbs, and with low frequency lexical items. Jenkins (2003: 198) hypothesized that the construction is used largely due to a lexical deficit especially for low frequency words: “These items may or may not be present in the Spanish lexical inventory of the speaker, but given their relatively low frequency in quotidian speech the Spanish counterparts of these verbs are simply unavailable to the speakers at the time of the utterance.” At the same time, he acknowledged that it was not a typical case of CS and that it had a lack of equivalency in either language. He also proposed that it has met rejection from Eastern US Spanish-speaking groups and points out that it is a surprising that it is not found in other contact situations given the widespread usage of other “Spanish/English bilingual constructions” (197) such as *llamar patrás*.

This construction has been documented in Belize. Fuller Medina (2005) examined *hacer* + V in data collected in Belize and found that 18 out of 21 Spanish/English bilinguals produced the construction in sociolinguistic interviews. She collected a total of 35 tokens with 22 different infinitive types and found that 91 % of these tokens were from dynamic verbs and 9% were from stative ones. Regarding frequency, 96% of the tokens had low frequency Spanish equivalents. Similar to Jenkins (2003), Fuller Medina suggested that speakers use *hacer* + V in cases where a low-frequency verbs are unavailable to the speaker. Hagerty (1996), in his documentation of bilingual behavior in Belize also found that his informants used *hacer* + V. Although he stated that it was most likely due to lexical gap, he also noticed that “these expressions come in to being just as readily when there is no lexical gap to be filled” (136).

Reyes (1982) found examples of *hacer* + V in his study of various types of language mixing in Chicano speech from Oakland, California. He proposed that this was a syntactic frame devised by the speech community in order to borrow English verbs. In explaining its usage, he claimed that certain frequent English infinitives never appear in *hacer* + V (e.g. **hacer* eat/sit down/walk). Furthermore, he suggested that Spanish equivalents of the infinitives he found in *hacer* + V “belong to a more formal style typical of Chicano speech” (162). Pfaff (1982) also found this construction in data from central California (Fresno, Selma, Porterville) but concludes that “[t]he use of *hacer* + English stem is rare, and may be geographically or socially restricted” (276).

Toribio et al. (2012) examined cases of *hacer* + V in data from Texas. In the SPinTX Corpus, a corpus under development with 32 video-recorded interviews tagged for part of speech and for the presence of English words, they found the construction in interviews with two participants from El Paso, TX. Although it was infrequent, the participants who used it had the “highest rates of English insertion into Spanish” (23). They also found a positive correlation between the occurrence of *hacer* + V and the amount of English used by both the interviewer and the interviewee. Toribio et al. (2012) also conducted survey data and found that *hacer* + V was met with widespread rejection from participants in the Southwest. In a similar vein, Pfaff’s (1982) participants in Texas recognized the construction but claimed that they would not use it themselves.

1.2.2. *Hacer* + V: a compound verb with no L_d equivalents

Through an examination of spoken data (described below in Section 2), the present research supports proposals that there is no equivalent usage of *hacer* in monolingual Spanish (Fuller Medina 2005; Jenkins 2003). Structurally, but not semantically, the closest construction found in Spanish is the causative construction (Ex. 3).

- (3) *Te voy a hacer llorar*, ‘I am going to make you cry’

As seen in this example, *hacer* used with a Spanish infinitive retains its lexical value through denoting a sense of causation—the agent of causation will induce crying in the experiencer. Reyes (1982) believed that this causative usage was a syntactic frame that provided an analogical basis for *hacer* + V because of its similar structure (verb + infinitive). However, Jenkins (2003) notes that the periphrastic causative construction differs semantically from *hacer* + V in significant ways, both in losing the causative sense (i.e to induce) and in the finding that it generally incorporates a dative object pronoun whereas *hacer* + V “does not necessarily, and in some cases cannot, use any such clitic” (201). Consider the example of *hacer* + V in (4) below.

- (4) Ivette: venían los huevos anyway.
 (H) .. los hacía suck,
 y los echabas en el carton.
 (06.La Crinolina, 1589-93)

Example (4) shows *hacer* + V used with an accusative clitic (los) yet the construction describes the action of a packing machine sucking the eggs and putting them into a carton, and does not have any causative sense. The verb does not contribute semantic information and functions as an auxiliary that

contributes TAM to the action indicated by the bare English infinitive, a proposal shared by Jenkins (2003) and Reyes (1982). Therefore, *hacer* + V is different on semantic and morphosyntactic dimensions from the Spanish causative despite sharing the verb + infinitive structure.

Jenkins (2003) explored the possibility that there was some analogical influence from English verb + infinitive constructions and states that *do* is used as an auxiliary in three declarative contexts: a.) with a bare infinitive as an emphatic affirmation, or as an anaphoric ‘dummy verb’ in response to questions b.) with bare infinitives in sentential negation, and, c.) with a nominalized gerund. Edwards and Gardner-Chloros (2007) also point out that ‘do’ can be combined with nouns and adjectives in innovative ways (e.g. ‘to do a Thatcher’). However, there is no *do*-construction that is a plausible source for *hacer* + V and claims that it may have influenced its emergence are tenuous.

English bare infinitives also appear with ‘make’ verbs in a causative construction that is similar to the Spanish causative with *hacer*, as in (5). There is one ‘make’ construction used to verbalize nouns (6) that is similar to a Spanish/English BCV using *hacer* with an English noun (7) or monolingually (e.g. “*Vamos a hacer el intento*”) whose exploration is beyond the scope of this paper, yet warrants acknowledgement.

- (5) “Make him stop / talk / walk.”
- (6) “The new officer made the arrest.”
- (7) Molly: ... (0.7) no le he hecho el try nunca no.
(09.La Salvia, 628)

The construction *hacer* + V is a hybrid form that has no direct equivalents to monolingual English or Spanish although the structure of the causative may have served as a syntactic model (Reyes, 1982). At the same time, the emergence of *hacer* + V may have come about simply through extension of this light verb regardless of structural similarity to the causative. After all, there are other BCVs in the present data in which *hacer* is an auxiliary with English nouns and adjectives as adjuncts. It would be illuminating to examine potential semantic or analogical influence from other BCVs on *hacer* + V. A possible source for *hacer* + V is the Spanish *hacer* + NP (e.g. *hacer el intento* ‘to try’) which could be readily expanded to an English NP (e.g. *hacer el try* ‘to try’). As dropping the subject pronoun has little impact semantically (e.g. *hacer try* ‘to try’), it is a plausible step in an evolutionary process.

1.2.3. Overview

The rest of this paper examines data from spoken corpora (see §2) in order to show that, contrary to previous hypotheses, usage of *hacer* + V is not primarily motivated by a lexical gap. Instead it is a conventionalized construction used in bilingual discourse whose usage isn’t due to a lexical gap. Instead, it shows evidence of grammaticalization (see §3). The finding that these evolutionary processes are producing hybridized forms has consequences for future studies of bilingualism, language contact, and language change (see §4).

2. Data, Participants, and Methods

The data on which this study is based were extracted from the New Mexico Spanish / English Bilingual (NMSEB) corpus (Torres Cacoullas & Travis, in preparation) housed at the Evaluating Convergence via Code Switching project office at the Pennsylvania State University. Both the participants in this project and the interviewers are speakers of Northern New Mexico ‘Traditional’ Spanish. This speech community has been in contact with English for over 150 years and has seen both abandonment of Spanish due to societal pressures, and maintenance due to immigration of Spanish speakers principally from Mexico (cf. Bills & Vigil, 2008). The data consist of both Sociolinguistic interviews and recorded conversations with the aim of examining linguistic convergence. Consequently, the interviews that have been transcribed are ones in which participants demonstrated bilingual behavior such as CS.

Data were extracted using SCP (Reed, 2011) in order to select the interviews that contained examples of *hacer* + V. All instances of the verb *hacer* were extracted from the interviews containing *hacer* + V (shown in Table 1., below) and were examined in order to determine whether they were instances of *hacer* + V or not. In order to qualify, the verb token could be any morphological realization of the verb *hacer* used as an auxiliary with an English bare infinitive as the adjunct. Cases in which the adjunct was nominalized by an article or determiner (e.g. *hacer el try*) were excluded.

3. Findings

Table 1 gives an overview of the data extracted. Of the ten interviews available at the time of research, five contained instances of *hacer* + V. Out of a total of 414 occurrences of the verb *hacer*, 62 (15%) were instances of *hacer* + V in the data examined. Some speakers seemed to have a predilection for using this construction frequently (20% of all instances of *hacer* in 06/I), whereas some used it less frequently (4% in 11/M).

Table 1. Overview of *hacer* + V

Interview/Participant	N <i>hacer</i>	N <i>hacer</i> + V	% <i>hacer</i> +V
04/ M	76	11	15%
06 / I	191	39	20%
08 and 8.1 / I	14	2	14%
09 / F and M	60	7	12%
11 / M	73	3	4%
Total:	414	62	15%

Table 2 provides figures relevant to the standardized frequency of *hacer* + V. There was a total of 52,621 words in the data from participants who used *hacer* + V. In terms of standardized frequency, the verb *hacer* occurred at a rate of 78.5 per ten thousand words (10k), while the construction *hacer* + V occurred at a rate of 12 times per 10k words. In order to gain a relative basis of comparison, frequency calculations were made using the oral data from the 1900s in Davies' *Corpus del Español* (2002). The verb *hacer* occurred at a rate of 18 times per 10k, which was higher than any other mode in this century (academic, news and fictional writing) or in any other century. This is not nearly as frequent as in the NMSEB data and is probably attributable to differences in context and topic. Yet, taken as a whole, these figures demonstrate that both *hacer* and *hacer* + V occur at a relatively high rate in the NMSEB.

Table 2. Overview of standardized frequency

# words analyzed	52,621
<i>hacer</i> / 10k words	78.5
<i>hacer</i> + V / 10k words	12
<i>hacer</i> in Davies (2002) corpus / 10k words	18 (1,825 / million)

Therefore, a substantial portion of the instances of the frequently occurring verb *hacer* are accounted for by *hacer* + V and there does not appear to be any other Spanish auxiliary used with English infinitives competing with it in usage (there was one case of an English bare infinitive used with *tener* 'to have' as an auxiliary). As a construction, *hacer* + V shows other signs of conventionalization aside from frequency. It is schematic in that the V slot can be filled by a variety of English infinitives and productive in that it is readily expanded to new types. In addition, it may be gaining ground with younger speakers as time goes on in the contact situation—Jenkins (2003) found that older speakers in his data did not use it. The evidence so far depicts a situation in which this construction is poised to gain in frequency: it is flexible, acceptable, and established.

Table 3 gives all of the bare English infinitival types found in the open adjunct slot of the construction *hacer* + V. This table also gives the number of times it appeared in the data and indicates whether its Spanish synonym was high or low frequency. There were a total of 42 types distributed across 62 tokens. The type 'walk' was mentioned by Reyes (1982) as a type that would never occur in

Chicano speech due to its high frequency in both languages. Because this is the only type mentioned as high frequency by Reyes that also appeared in these data, it was chosen as an arbitrary cutoff for identifying high and low frequency Spanish equivalents through the oral portion of Davies' corpus (2002). As *caminar* 'to walk' in all of its morphological realizations occurred at a rate of 22 times per million words in the oral portion of Davies' corpus, all types that occurred at or above this rate were considered high frequency. While Fuller Medina (2005) found that only 5% of the tokens in her data had high-frequency equivalents in Spanish, it appears that many more so are high-frequency in these data—8 out of 42 types (19%) and 10 out of 62 tokens (16%) had high frequency Spanish equivalents occurring at the same or higher rate as *caminar*. This is evidence that these types do occur with frequently occurring verbs in these data and, perhaps, reflects a community norm instead of being produced due to an insufficient lexicon. Because of their high frequency, it is possible that many of these speakers alternate between the Spanish equivalent as well as the type found in *hacer + V*, as in the case of Ivette explored below (§3.1).

Table 3: Types found in *hacer + V* in NMSEB (Torres Cacoullas and Travis in prep)

apply	1	L	fly	1	L	retire	2	L
audit	2	L	freeze	1	L	ride	1	L
cater	4	L	hire	2	L	ruin	2	L
clock out	1	L	impress	1	L	sew	1	L
collect	1	L	line up	1	L	shower	1	L
cook	1	L	mix	1	L	skate	1	L
cremate	1	L	pack	2	L	slide	2	L
dance	1	H	pay attention	1	L	smoke	2	L
decide	1	H	plaster	2	L	suck	2	L
draw	3	L	pole vault	1	L	switch	1	H
exercise	2	L	practice	1	L	teach	1	H
explain	1	H	register	1	L	travel	1	H
express	3	H	remodel	2	L	walk	1	H
feed	1	L	rent	2	L	work out	1	L

L < 22/million; H ≥ 22/million
 Total types: 42, Total Tokens: 62

There is evidence that certain combinations of *hacer + V* are the conventionalized way of expressing certain actions as in the case of *hacer retire*. Jenkins (2003) found this combination in his data from bilingual New Mexicans (NMCROSS, Bills & Vigil 1999). Two different speakers in the data for the present study also used it. Therefore the fact that it is used by different speakers evinces that *hacer retire* may be the most conventional way of expressing this verbal situation among bilingual New Mexicans. Taken one step further, it is possible that this combination is a linguistic prefab (cf. Erman & Warren 2000).

3.1. *Hacer + V* types and Spanish synonyms

Previous research has suggested that speakers employ the construction *hacer + V* to fill a lexical gap (Fuller Medina, 2005; Hagerty 1996; Jenkins, 2003; Reyes, 1982). However, by examining data from the most prolific user of *hacer + V* in these data (Ivette, 06.La Crinolina) this section presents evidence that this is not always the case among New Mexican bilinguals. In Table 4 we see that Ivette produced six types in *hacer + V* for which she also produced the Spanish synonym in the same interview. Out of the 29 types she produced, these six account for 21%. In some instances, the synonym was used more frequently than the type found in *hacer + V*. While she only produced *hacer sew* one time, she used its synonym *coser* 23 times. Three of these synonym types (*enseñar*, *caminar*, and *cambiar*) were identified as high frequency, as shown in Table 3, above. While there are many potential motivations for using *hacer + V*, for this speaker it cannot be accounted for strictly by lexical gap as the Spanish synonym seems to be readily available for usage in discourse.

Table 4. *Hacer* + V types and Spanish synonyms: the case of Ivette (06.La Crinolina)

<i>Hacer</i> + V Type	Spanish Synonym
<i>hacer sew</i> (N = 1)	<i>coser</i> (N = 23)
<i>hacer cook</i> (N = 1)	<i>cocinar</i> (N = 1)
<i>hacer teach</i> (N = 1)	<i>enseñar</i> (N = 10)
<i>hacer walk</i> (N = 1)	<i>caminar</i> (N = 1)
<i>hacer switch</i> (N = 1)	<i>cambiar</i> (N = 18)
<i>hacer pay attention</i> (N = 1)	<i>poner atención</i> (N = 1)

While no other speakers used as high a proportion of synonyms, there were other relevant findings. Miguel (04.PiedrasandGallinas) produced the combination *hacer hire* and also produced a nonstandard synonym using the verb *agarrar* ‘to get’, as in (8).

- (8) .. yeah he was teaching,
 ándale.
 ... lo hicieron hire pa' eso,
 he applied y --
 .. lo agarraron para eso.
 (04.PiedrasandGallinas, Miguel, 1772-76)

While this is merely one example, it points to the need to analyze bilinguals as participants in complex speech communities where many factors come in to play. When deciding whether or not they use Spanish synonyms for English verb types, we must consider community norms in order to account for their linguistic abilities instead of measuring bilinguals against an idealized monolingual norm. Part of their community norms may include alternating between *hacer* + V and its Spanish synonym.

3.2. Grammaticalization and emergent phenomena

In examining the emergence of *hacer* + V, it is important to consider the processes of language change that may be at work on this construction. This section argues that the verb *hacer* used in this construction has undergone grammaticalization. Bybee (2010, p. 106) defines grammaticalization as “the process by which a lexical item or sequence of items becomes a grammatical morpheme, changing its distribution and function in the process”, and emphasizes that it is a gradient process in which lexical items become more grammatical. In the case of constructions Noël (2007, p. 179) points out that “multi-word lexical material can also be at the centre of specific grammaticalizations”. The finding that particular constructions form the central context of grammaticalization for specific items is echoed by other researchers in both language change theory and construction grammar (cf. Bybee, 2003; Bybee, 2010; Hopper & Traugott, 1993; Traugott, 2003).

If we examine the usage of *hacer* in the periphrastic causative construction, (e.g. *Nos hicieron llorar*), we see that it carries the lexical meaning ‘to induce’ and also expresses TAM. Yet in *hacer* + V (e.g. *Es cuando hice rent*), the verb is much more generalized in that it carries no lexical meaning and only expresses TAM. This is common in other BCVs (Edwards & Gardner-Chloros, 2007). The loss in lexical content of *hacer* in *hacer* + V is indicative of semantic ‘bleaching’, a hallmark of grammaticalization (Bybee, 2010).

The argument structure changes in a way that evinces the increased generality of the verb in *hacer* + V resulting from its bleaching, and highlights its status as an auxiliary. The causative construction is often a transitive or ditransitive construction that includes an agent, an experiencer, and an action predicated by the infinitive. Shibatani (2002) states that causatives contain an agent that causes another participant to perform an action or change states. On the other hand, the argument structure of *hacer* + V is determined by the English infinitive and may be stative or transitive. In other words, because the verb is an auxiliary in a productive BCV, it is possible for *hacer* + V to play a role in broader constructions such as intransitive (9), transitive (10), and reflexive (11) ones.

- (9) ... (1.2) so él todavía hace cater,
o no más cuando la Kathleen necesita ayuda?
(09.La Salvia, Fabiola, 832-3)
- (10) Los estaba haciendo teach a nosotros y a los=fourth graders estaban
como haciendo sus homework o,
(06.La Crinolina, Ivette, 424-3)
- (11) .. (H) pa; que se levante y,
y se aliste,
y se haga shower
(11.El Trabajo, Mónica, 901-3)

One of the hallmarks of grammaticalization is that the grammaticalizing element, usually through its participation in a specific construction, becomes independent from more etymological uses of this element (Bybee, 2010). This is evident in the data presented; the verb in *hacer* + V is clearly independent from its nearest structural (*hacer* + infinitive) neighbor, the causative. This follows an observed grammaticalization path in which auxiliaries arise out of main verbs that take a complement (Bybee, 2010; Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994).

A final outcome of grammaticalization that warrants mention is productivity. The construction *hacer* + V can take a variety of English infinitives (42 types in these data) that have at least three general types of argument structure (transitive, intransitive, reflexive). In other words, this construction is highly schematic, a characteristic that both Trousdale (2010) and Bybee (2010) cite as a characteristic of grammaticalization. Not only is this schematicity reflected in the type frequency, but also in the token frequency of *hacer* + V, as it accounts for 15% of all instances of the verb *hacer* in these data.

The proposal that *hacer* + V has grammaticalized is not without some controversy. Himmelmann (2004, p. 39) observes in a footnote that there is a tendency to label all types of grammatical change as grammaticalization “including simple reanalyses, analogical leveling and contact-induced change”. He goes on to warn that by becoming a synonym for grammatical change, “the concept of *grammaticalization* loses all theoretical significance”. Similarly, Lehmann (2004, p. 155) argues that by considering all “creation of grammar” to be grammaticalization the term becomes “less apt to generate falsifiable empirical generalizations”. While cautions against a wide definition of grammaticalization are duly noted, this paper takes the stance that the contact-induced phenomenon studied here is a clear case of grammaticalization (cf. Heine & Kuteva, 2003, 2005). Despite Himmelmann’s (2004) objections to including contact phenomena under the umbrella of grammaticalization, he does not elaborate or defend this point. This may be part of a monolingual bias that is sometimes present in linguistic analysis. This paper takes the position that researchers should be looking to language contact and bilingualism as a source of emergent phenomena. It is likely that many language changes studied have arisen in contact situations despite the omission of this detail on the part of the investigators. Silva-Corvalán (1994) has noted that contact situations may speed up internally and externally motivated language change. The Spanish language itself evinces many contact situations through inherited vocabulary from Arabic, Hebrew, Visigoth, and English (Penny, 2002) and some of its lexicalized phrases (e.g. *Si Dios quiere*) may have roots in Arabic idioms (Alatorre, 2002). Therefore, by omitting contact phenomena from the possibilities of grammaticalization, researchers may be omitting a potentially rich explanation for changes that are dismissed as contact induced or even changes that may be considered as monolingual developments.

4. Discussion

This section discusses some of the potential implications these findings have for theories of bilingualism and language contact. First, we examine possibly applicable terminology, such as convergence, CS, and borrowing (§4.1). The following section (§4.2) explores the possibility that bilingual discourse practices can nurture the emergence of new constructions.

4.1. Convergence, CS, or borrowing?

Part of the purpose of this study is to examine bilingual data from a bilingual perspective. To that end, this section briefly explores previously defined bilingual phenomena and examines whether the respective terminology is adequate in describing *hacer* + V. In other words, is *hacer* + V a case of convergence, CS, or borrowing?

Is *hacer* + V a case of convergence? In examining a case of possible convergence in the expression of first-person pronouns Torres Cacoullos and Travis (2011: 242) define convergence as “structural similarity due to language contact”. The emergence of *hacer* + V is not a case of convergence in the traditional sense in which the linguistic structure of the L_d impresses itself upon the L_r . Instead, it is a hybrid form in which elements from each ‘donor language’ are used in ways that are different from each source language. In other words, *hacer* + V is neither a form in Spanish patterned after one in English nor vice versa. If it is convergence, it is convergence in a hybrid sense because there is a departure from both of the donor languages.

Is *hacer* + V a case of CS? In a widely used definition of the Juxtapositional Model, Poplack (1993, p. 225) defines CS as “the *juxtaposition* of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of the language of its provenance”. Because *hacer* + V is not consistent with ‘rules’ of either language of provenance, it is not a case of CS. Jenkins (2003, p. 196) agrees with this and states that it could not be a case of CS because the ‘switch’ happens “*within* the verb structure”. The study of BCVs has raised issues with widely held notions of bilingual behavior. Edwards and Gardner-Chloros (2007, p. 85), in discussing BCVs, CS, and convergence, observe that “notions of congruence predicated on the assumption that speakers are comparing the two languages for convenient convergence points at which to effect a switch are insufficient to capture the facts”.

Is *hacer* + V a case of borrowing? Poplack and Meechan (1998, p. 130) provide a commonly cited definition of borrowing: “If the constraints on variability of the L_d -origin forms are parallel to those constraining their L_r counterparts, the former can only be borrowings”. By constraints on variability, they refer to constraints on syntactic modification such as the usage of articles or other morphosyntactic ways of encoding grammatical relationships between elements. Once again the fact that the elements in *hacer* + V follow neither ‘donor’ nor ‘recipient’ language patterns in terms of morphosyntax puts it outside of this traditionally held definition. Furthermore, the fact that *hacer* shows evidence of grammaticalization indicates that it does not follow the constraints on variability of other uses of *hacer*.

What is *hacer* + V? The fact that, upon examination, *hacer* + V does not fit into these categories challenges “the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems” (Gardner-Chloros, 1995, p. 70). The following section discusses a third, bilingual discourse mode and looks at *hacer* + V in this light.

4.2. Bilingual phenomena and the bilingual discourse mode

Previous researchers have highlighted problems with the proposal that bilinguals maintain two discrete linguistic systems (Edwards & Gardner-Chloros, 2007; Gafaranga, 2007; Gardner-Chloros, 1995, 2009; Gardner-Chloros & Edwards, 2004). One proposal that recognizes bilingual complexity and differential linguistic behavior is that bilinguals function in a ‘bilingual mode’ (Grosjean, 1997; 2012). Grosjean (2012) defines language mode as “state of activation of the bilingual’s languages and language processing mechanisms at a given point in time” (12). This section reviews previous studies that find differentiated behavior by bilinguals in a possible ‘bilingual mode’.

Grosjean (1997) elicited ‘bilingual mode’ by having French / English bilinguals recount a narration delivered in French with English borrowings of an essentially American scene (e.g. Thanksgiving). In recounting these scenes to a French speaker assimilated into American culture, Grosjean found a higher number of borrowings in ‘bilingual mode’ than in recounting a culturally French scene to a less assimilated French speaker (‘monolingual mode’). Toribio (2004) elicited ‘bilingual mode’ by having participants read a fairy tale in English and then having part of it read aloud to them in Spanish with English CS. As participants completed the story, she found a higher rate

of expressed subjects in ‘bilingual mode’. Torres Cacoullós and Travis (2011) examined possible convergence of in the rates of expressed Spanish I_{ps} due to CS in sociolinguistic interviews and operationally defined ‘bilingual mode’ as “the use of English by the same speaker in the preceding three clauses or 10 Intonation Units (whichever represents the larger segment of discourse)” (p. 255). They found that cross-linguistic priming from English *I* raised rate of expressed Spanish *yo* in ‘bilingual mode’. In other words, they did not attempt to elicit this ‘bilingual mode’ but found it was an epiphenomenon of the relatively greater presence of contact phenomena. The common thread is that these researchers were able to identify or elicit discursive practices in which bilingual speakers demonstrated linguistic behavior that was differentiated from monolingual norms.

The present study raises questions about the notion that bilinguals frequently make use of a third ‘bilingual mode’. One of the points of this study is to highlight the fact that *hacer* + V is a hybrid form that does not have direct equivalents in either possible L_d and to explore the ramifications of this. An examination of this construction in a spoken corpus provides evidence that *hacer* + V has emerged through processes typical of diachronic language change—namely that it has undergone grammaticalization. Furthermore, its usage is not always a result of a lexical deficiency, it may be the conventional way of expressing certain actions (e.g. *hacer retire*), and it is highly productive. Jenkins (2003) suggests that it may be gaining in frequency based on his finding that older speakers used it less. The question arises, then, as to what the input for these processes may be. For language to evolve, it must evolve out of language usage. As Edwards and Gardner-Chloros (2007, p. 88) conclude in their cross-linguistic examination of BCVs, “[r]ather than operating within the limits allegedly imposed by the participating grammars, there is evidence that speakers abstract over grammatical features at various levels”. It appears that the discourse practices of these New Mexican bilinguals have resulted in hybrid innovations such as *hacer* + V. It is plausible that these discourse practices are indicative of a “state of activation of the bilingual’s languages and language processing mechanisms” (Grosjean 2012, p. 12), or a ‘bilingual discourse mode’ and that these practices propel the emergence of new forms. Therefore, instead of simply being a case of convergence, hybrid or otherwise, this is emergence.

5. Limitations and future studies

One of the limitations on this study and others that have examined *hacer* + V quantitatively (e.g. Fuller Medina, 2005; Jenkins, 2003; Toribio et al., 2012) is that it is difficult to capture large numbers of tokens in spoken corpora. Future studies will examine newly transcribed portions of the NMSEB (Torres Cacoullós & Travis, in preparation) and will re-examine interviews from the NMCOS (Bills and Vigil, 1999) in order to collect more tokens of *hacer* + V. Additionally, it will be insightful to explore the possibility that *hacer* + NP may have influenced the emergence of *hacer* + V. Examining notions of cognitive load and repair phenomena will inform the argument that usage of *hacer* + V is not due to lexical gap. It will also be insightful to collect data regarding acceptability of *hacer* + V in this community to see if it met with the same overall rejection that Toribio et al. (2012) found in their survey data.

6. Conclusion

This study has shown that the BCV *hacer* + V is a hybrid construction that is productive in the New Mexican bilingual speech community. Despite differences from ‘donor’ languages, this construction fits seamlessly into bilingual discourse and its productive usage makes it appear less plausible that bilinguals maintain two discrete linguistic systems. Instead, it appears that bilingual discourse practices can give rise to new grammar. New constructions, such as *hacer* + V may become the conventionalized way of describing certain situations in a speech community and are used by some speakers in alternation with their Spanish synonym. These data do not support asymmetrical insertion models (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002) and call for a re-examination of juxtapositional models (Poplack 1993), as both of these models operate on the assumption that bilinguals draw from two discrete grammars.

References

- Alatorre, Antonio. (2002). *Los 1001 Años De La Lengua Española* (3. ed.). México, D.F: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bills, Garland and Neddy Vigil. (2008). *The Spanish language of New Mexico and southern Colorado : a linguistic atlas*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Bills, Garland and Neddy Vigil. (1999). Ashes to ashes: The historical basis for dialect variation in New Mexican Spanish. *Romance Philology*, 53, 43–67.
- Bybee, Joan. (2003). Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: the role of frequency. In B. Joseph and R. Janda (Eds.), *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bybee, Joan. (2010). *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davies, Mark. (2002, present). Corpus del Español (100 Million Words, 1200's to 1900's). Retrieved from www.corpusdelespanol.org
- Edwards, Malcom, and Penelope Gardner-Chloros. (2007). Compound Verbs in Codeswitching: Bilinguals Making Do? *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11(1), 73–91.
- Ermann, Britt, and Beatrice Warren. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text*, 20(1), 29–62.
- Fuller Medina, Nicté. (2005). Spanish-English Contact in Belize: the case of “HACER + V.” *Proceedings of the 2005 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.
- Gafaranga, Joseph. (2007). *Talk in two languages*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. (1995). Code-switching in community, regional, and national repertoires: the myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In Leslie Milroy and Pieter Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two languages: a cross-disciplinary perspective to code-switching* (pp. 69–78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. and M. Edwards. (2004). Assumptions Behind Grammatical Approaches To Code-Switching: When The Blueprint Is A Red Herring. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102(1). 103–129.
- Grosjean, François. (1997). Processing mixed languages: Issues, findings, and models. In Annette M. B. de Groot and Judith F. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 225–54). Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grosjean, François. (2012). An Attempt to Isolate, and Then Differentiate, Transfer and Interference. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16(1), 11–21.
- Hagerty, Timothy W. (1996). The Influence of English on the Spanish Language of Belize. *Belize: Selected proceedings from the second interdisciplinary conference* (pp. 131–42). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. (2003). On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language*, 27(3), 529–572.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. (2005). *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2004). Lexicalization and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal? In Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelman, and Björn Wiemer (Eds.), *What makes grammaticalization?: a look from its fringes and its components*, Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs (pp. 21–42). Berlin ; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, Devin L. (2003). Bilingual Verb Constructions in Southwestern Spanish. *Bilingual Review* 27(3). 195–204.
- Lehmann, Christian. (2004). Theory and method in grammaticalization. In Gabriele Diewald (Ed.), *Grammatikalisierung* (pp. 152–187). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. (1993). *Duelling languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noël, Dirk. (2007). Diachronic construction grammar and grammaticalization theory. *Functions of Language*, 14(2), 177–202.
- Penny, Ralph J. (2002). *A History of the Spanish Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfaff, Carol. (1982). Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English. In Jon Amastae and Lucía Elias-Olivares (Eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects* (pp. 264–98). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Poplack, Shana. (1993). Variation theory and language contact: Concepts, methods and data. In Dennis R. Preston (Ed.), *American dialect research* (pp. 251–86). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Poplack, Shana, and Marjory Meechan. (1998). Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(2), 127–38.
- Reed, Alan. (2011). *Simple Concordance Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.textworld.com/scp/>
- Reyes, Rogelio. (1982). Language Mixing in Chicano Spanish. In Jon Amastae and Lucía Elías-Olivares (Eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects* (pp. 154–65). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (2002). Introduction: Some basic issues in the grammar of causation. In Masayoshi Shibatani (Ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, Typological studies in language (pp. 1–22). Amsterdam ; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. (1994). *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Hiram. (this volume). Habitual aspect in Palenquero: ASÉ or zero marking? *Proceedings from the 6th International Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics, April 12-14*. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Toribio, Almeida. J. (2004). Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: Evidence from code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(2), 165–173.
- Toribio, Almeida. J., Barbara E. Bullock, and Christian Greaser. (2012). The bilingual compound verb [*hacer* + *VE*] in Texas Spanish: The value of corpus data. *Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Presented at the Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, Gainseville, FL.
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena, and Catherine E. Travis. (2011). Testing convergence via code-switching: Priming and the structure of variable subject expression. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(3), 241–267.
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena, and Catherine E. Travis. (in preparation). *New Mexico Spanish / English Bilingual (NMSEB) corpus*. National Science Foundation 1019112/1019122. Retrieved from <http://nmcode-switching.la.psu.edu/>
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. (2003). Constructions in grammaticalization. In Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* (pp. 624–647). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine, and Jeanette Sakel. (2012). Why Transfer Is a Key Aspect of Language Use and Processing in Bilinguals and L2-Users. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 16(1), 3–10.
- Trousdale, Graeme. (2010). Issues in constructional approaches to grammaticalization in English. In Ekaterini Stathi, Elke Gehweiler, and Ekkehard König (Eds.), *Grammaticalization: Current views and issues* (pp. 51–71). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wray, Allison. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics

edited by Ana M. Carvalho
and Sara Beaudrie

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-456-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Wilson, Damián Vergara. 2013. One Construction, Two Source Languages: *Hacer* with an English Infinitive in Bilingual Discourse. In *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, ed. Ana M. Carvalho and Sara Beaudrie, 123-134. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2862.