Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999. 28:375–95
Copyright © 1999 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY OF US LATINOS

Norma Mendoza-Denton
Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721; e-mail: nmd@u.arizona.edu

Key Words: bilingualism, Spanish, language contact, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans

■ **Abstract** Issues in the linguistic study of US Latinos are reviewed, with an emphasis on recent work in sociolinguistics. Predominant models of language contact are evaluated, as are factors contributing to variation. Among these factors are (*a*) the state of changes in progress; (*b*) the complexity of historical, socioeconomic, and demographic conditions of US Latinos; (*c*) the community's degree of contact with other ethnic/linguistic groups; (*d*) language attitudes toward the matrix and embedded languages; (*e*) the local evaluation and patterns of use of particular variants; and (*f*) the possibility of autochthonous innovation within the dialect. Questions of US Latino participation in changes beyond those in their immediate communities are addressed. The need to connect linguistic variation with other aspects of semiotic meaning is emphasized.

CONTENTS

Introduction 376
Spanish and English—Models of Language Contact 377
Factors in Variation 377
Issues in Bilingualism: Diglossia, Loyalty, and Shift 380
Participation in Changes Beyond the Immediate Speech Community 383
Instantiating Variation in Discourse 385
Conclusion 388

0084-6570/99/1015-0375$12.00

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

INTRODUCTION

In the past 20 years, the linguistic study of US Latinos has undergone explosive growth, paralleling the growth of the US Latino population. In 1980, the US Census Bureau estimated that "persons of Hispanic origin (of any race)" constituted 6.4% of the total US population. Today, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, that figure has swelled to an estimated 11.4% of the total US population, and it is projected to reach 24.5% by the year 2050. Currently in Los Angeles, two Spanish music radio stations top the charts, while local and national legislation seeking to curtail the use of Spanish at the federal level, in education, and even in store-front signs (Ledge 1999) gains increasing strength. The demographic, linguistic, and cultural importance—as well as the social challenges—of the growing Latino population is reflected in the myriad developments in the study of all aspects of language and culture among US Latinos.

This review concentrates on the two largest demographic segments of this population: Chicanos (persons of Mexican ancestry) and mainland US Puerto Ricans. Other reviews in this series and elsewhere have addressed in depth related issues pertaining to these populations, reviewing the substantial literature on Chicano studies (Rosaldo 1985), borderlands studies (Alvarez 1995), work on bilingualism and codeswitching (Fishman et al 1971, Myers-Scotton 1993, Silva-Corvalán 1995, Urciuoli 1995), language planning and policy (Roca 1991, Castro 1992, Paulston 1996), language attitudes (López Morales 1990, Roca 1997, Zentella 1997b), Latino immigration and circular migration (Espenshade 1995, Suárez-Orozco 1998, Zentella 1990), immigration and education (Zhou 1997, Trueba 1998, Vélez Ibañez & Greenberg 1992, Gonzales 1995, Valdés 1998), bilingual education (Fishman & Keller 1982; Moll & Díaz 1985; Valdés 1996; García & Fishman 1991; García & Otheguy 1985, 1997; Crawford 1999; Roca 1997), and cultural citizenship (Rosaldo 1994).

In this article, I divide the broad sociolinguistics/linguistic anthropology continuum into two primary areas: One deals with microstructural linguistic issues pertaining to the linguistic varieties spoken by US Latinos, including some of the particulars of these varieties; the other is concerned with studies of these particulars in use, i.e. studies in the realm of discourse, folklore, language ideology, and the media.

The linguistic varieties I survey include Chicano English (ChE), Chicano Spanish (ChS), mainland Puerto Rican English (MPRE), and mainland Puerto Rican Spanish (MPRS). Varieties used by other US Latinos, such as Cuban-Americans, Dominican-Americans, Salvadoran-Americans, Ecuadorian-Americans, the Latino Deaf, Isleños, Ladinos, and others, are exemplified in the text, but a more complete treatment of varieties other than those covered here can be found in the extensive literature (Lipski 1996, Lambert 1996, Resnick 1988, Lipski 1986, Coles 1992, Lantolf 1982, García & Otheguy 1988, Harris 1982, Otheguy 1973, Otheguy et al 1989, Lozano 1983, Delgado 1984, Gerner de García 1993, Amastae & Elías-Olivares 1982).

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

SPANISH AND ENGLISH—MODELS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT

In his description of the state of Chicano sociolinguistics, Peñalosa (1980) points out that most of the literature had up to that time focused on ChS. Twenty years later, the situation has changed markedly, with several recent studies of the phonetics and phonology of ChE (Santa Ana 1991, Mendoza-Denton 1997, Fought 1997). Researchers have noted that contact varieties of English, such as ChE or MPRE, were formerly situated mostly within frameworks that viewed them as the result of the imperfect acquisition of English as a second language (Fishman et al 1971, Baugh 1984, Torres 1991), at the phonological level amounting to a sort of phonemic filtering system wherein proponents argued that one language would be spoken with the phonemes of another (García 1974). This, which I call the interference model of language contact, regards even native, monolingual speakers of ChE or MPRE as speakers who have (mal)acquired a linguistic system that is neither English nor Spanish, but an interlanguage. Although an interference/interlanguage model can be useful in the study of second-language acquisition, it is essentially a deficit model, unsuitable when applied to a native speaker of any linguistic variety.

The interference model is predominant in the popular imagination, however, and is operationalized to have a tangible effect at every level in the lives of US Latinos, from anti-Spanish language attitudes (Urciuoli 1996, Torres 1997) and workplace discrimination (Ruiz 1984, Spicher 1992, Macías 1997), to legal representation (Berk-Seligson 1990, Jongh & Roca 1991). Researchers point out that native English speakers of the ChE and PRE varieties taking the speech test required for teacher certification in California and New York have been penalized because of their "foreign" accents (Peñalosa 1980, Zentella 1987), whereas fluent ChE- and PRE-speaking students continue to be classified as Limited English Proficient (Mendoza-Denton 1997, Valdés & Figueroa 1994).

Recently, linguists have turned their attention from interference models to ethnic contact-dialect models (Penfield & Ornstein-Galicia 1985, Wald 1984), which assume that contact dialects are structurally stable systems that have been developed and learned by succeeding generations of speakers. The continuous nature of transmission sets stable contact varieties apart from phenomena such as pidgins and creoles, which are defined by social or generational breaks in transmission (Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Wald 1993), and second-language acquisition, characterized by instability of output early in the acquisition process (Bayley & Preston 1996).

FACTORS IN VARIATION

The genesis of ChE, MPRE, ChS, and MPRS stems from the geographical proximity, historical continuity, and social contiguity of English and Spanish in

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

the United States, giving rise to contact phenomena such as bilingualism, an extensive loanword and cognate system (Galván & Teschner 1985), and phonological, lexical and grammatical innovations (Wolfram 1974, Torres 1997, Labov 1996, García 1984, Jaramillo 1995, Santa Ana 1991, Amastae & Satcher 1993, Bayley 1994, Galindo 1999). A point to note here is that despite the generative emphasis of some of the work (Guitart 1981), detailed comparisons of the structural inventories of both contact languages have failed to yield simple universals or predictive formulae of the form "if X and Y language come into prolonged contact, speakers of an XY contact variety will exhibit Z feature." Although the possibilities for transference and borrowing are restricted typologically by the source languages, the determinants of magnitude of influence and direction of change are primarily sociolinguistic and not structural (see Thomason & Kaufman 1988; for various degrees of disagreement with this view in the realm of morphosyntax, see Silva-Corvalán 1994, and Reyes 1981). It is important to consider each contact situation as a complex configuration of several sociolinguistic factors.

1. The state of changes in progress within each contact variety, both at the time of contact and diachronically. To understand obsolescence and language death in New York Judeo-Spanish, for example, it is crucial to distinguish foreign influences present before the 1950s from those incorporated more recently (Harris 1982).
2. Historical, socioeconomic, and demographic conditions. Peñalosa (1985) advocates a world-systems perspective that would allow us to model similarities in socioeconomic factors and thus account for similarities in social contexts of mainland Puerto Rican and Chicano language varieties, and to contrast their experience with that of other groups, such as Cubans in Miami (Castro 1992), who experience markedly different conditions. Urciuoli (1996) argues against the simple classification of Puerto Ricans as the inhabitants of "bilingual speech communities." US government policies toward Puerto Rico have historically had two simultaneous and disparate aims: one "racializing," controlling through forced sterilization and labor migration an island population perceived as disordered; and the other "ethnicizing," fostering the establishment of a US model of middle-class orderliness—often reproduced through the symbolic capital of "good English." Urciuoli argues that this historical context has produced two different kinds of bilingualism for Puerto Ricans, both of them resulting in the production of Marked Americans who either "succeed as good ethnics or fail as the members of a raced underclass." (1996:38)
3. Degree of contact with other ethnic/linguistic groups. Galindo (1987) notes extensive contact with African-American and Mexican immigrant varieties in the speech of Mexican-American teens in Texas, whereas Gonzales (1999) and Briggs (1988) report differences in patterns of gendered outgroup contact within the same New Mexico community.

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

4. Language attitudes toward the matrix and embedded languages[1]. Exemplary of the complex problems in this area is the puzzle of academic achievement, often closely tied to language attitudes of both students and teachers. Bloom (1991) found that bilingual teaching candidates and bilingual teachers rated pupils more favorably when they employed standard Spanish than when they employed nonstandard (Chicano) Spanish, and that these ratings went hand in hand with attitudes toward skin color, with light-skinned pupils receiving higher mean scores than dark-skinned pupils from both bilingual teaching candidates and bilingual teachers (see Murguia & Telles 1996). Ramírez (1981) found that negative attitudes on the part of teachers toward Latino students' Spanish/English codeswitching varieties were correlated with lower student gains in reading.

5. The local evaluation and patterns of use of particular variants. Poplack (1979) notes that lateralization of /r/ is stereotyped and stigmatized in Philadelphia PRS, despite the fact that in her sample the standard flap variant was much more common than [l], which accounted for only 10% of the data. It could be said that in her sample lateralization loomed larger in perception than in production, being raised above the level of consciousness despite its infrequent use. Although raw frequency of the variable is important, perceptual and social saliency of a particular variant can be boosted by its use in socially meaningful carrier words and constructions, as well as by evaluative factors like stigmatization (Mendoza-Denton 1997). It is important to note also that evaluation is often severely fragmented along ethnic lines: Giles (1979) notes that although in the matrix American population, small increments in ChE features were associated with gradually less favorable impressions of the speaker, Mexican Americans themselves were among the few who would favorably perceive the use of ChE phonological markers.

6. The possibility of autochthonous innovation within the variety in question. One example of this is a widely reported (Santa Ana 1991, Galindo 1987, García 1984) phonological change within Los Angeles ChE—the lowering of /ɛ/ to [æ] before /l/ (as in the word elevator), which cannot possibly have arisen as a result of Spanish contact. Under the assumption of Spanish substratal influence—"phonemic filtering" above—the prediction would be the tensing and raising of /ɛ/ to [e], since Spanish does not have the phoneme /ɛ/. Instead, ChE exhibits realizations in the opposite direction, of lowering and laxing to [æ]. Researchers conclude that the lowering of /ɛ/ is either an independent innovation within ChE, possible evidence of influence from surrounding English dialects, or both.

[1]The terms matrix and embedded are extensions of usage found in the literature on codeswitching (Myers-Scotton 1993), and not a translation from Spanish *lengua matriz* (mother tongue).

An example that illustrates the complex interplay of these factors as well as the unpredictability of the output of contact of the "same" languages is one of different possibilities for the realization of a single lexical set. The pronominal lexical set *something*/*anything*/*nothing* has been found to differ between ChE and MPRE and, furthermore, to be unpredictable from the patterns of their respective source dialects. Whereas in New York PRE the only attested phonetic forms are [nʌt] and [nʌʔ], in California ChE they are [no iŋ] and variably [noθiŋ], leading researchers to posit disparate structural constraints to account for the phonetic realization of /I/ (Wolfram 1974, Mendoza-Denton 1997). However, researchers note extensive interethnic dialect contact in their respective sites, of MPRE with African-American English in the case of the New York speakers, and of ChE with Euro-American English and African-American English among the California population. It is precisely in these local configurations of variable phonologies and changes in progress, prestigeful variants, social networks, and histories of contact that we find epiphenomenal explanations for seemingly disparate processes.

ISSUES IN BILINGUALISM: DIGLOSSIA, LOYALTY, AND SHIFT

A major component of the US Latino linguistic experience is bilingualism. Bilingualism (individual use of two linguistic varieties) and diglossia (society-wide use of two linguistic varieties) have been the subjects of heated debate among sociolinguists, psychologists, sociologists, and educators (for a review of codeswitching, see Urciuoli 1995). Ferguson's classical conception of diglossia defines two complementary languages: a "high" language H, used for education, literature, writing, and formal oral communication, and a "low" language L, used for informal oral purposes (Ferguson 1959). His early definition was expanded and modified by Fishman et al, who proposed a four-quadrant schematization of the relationship between bilingualism and diglossia and applied it to a greater New York area Puerto Rican community (Fishman et al 1971).

I represent the Fishmanian quadrants by using a plus-or-minus feature notation, where the presence of bilingualism is marked as [+bil] and that of diglossia as [+digl]. The first quadrant, [+bil, +digl], identifies the bilingual Spanish-speaking population of New York in the 1970s, when Spanish, relegated to intimate social functions, was the L variety in relation to English. Location in this quadrant requires the compartmentalization of linguistic roles, and Fishman et al (1971) concluded that among the MPR high-school-age boys interviewed in his sample, there existed domain diglossia, where language was functionally distinguished, with Spanish used for friendship and English used for education and employment. Today, researchers would argue that codeswitching plays an extremely complex and important role in the greater New York PR community (Torres 1991, Zentella 1997a, Urciuoli 1996), and that strict domain diglossia may no longer obtain because of society-wide patterns of using both languages

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

and because of changes in the availability and use of Spanish-language media. In terms of the +/- bilingualism/diglossia model, some US Latino populations now inhabit the [+bil, -digl] quadrant, where widespread bilingualism and codeswitching exist without such extreme functional differentiation. Though this may be seen as a positive outcome, with wider social services, media, and employment available in both languages (Bixler-Marquez 1985), Fishman et al identified it with unstable linguistic situations leading to shift and loss, since the minority language no longer inhabits any "protected" domain that might be impervious to outside influence.

Some researchers claim that US Latino populations challenge the immigrant language loss paradigm (Pedraza 1985) and exhibit the greatest language loyalty among "new" immigrant groups (Estrada 1997), and that in some groups they show outstanding cross-generational language retention, with fluent ChS and MPRS speakers in the third and even fourth generations (García et al 1988, Briggs 1988, Pedraza 1985). Others, however, report that language shift among Latinos is slowed by perhaps half a generation but that it otherwise progresses as with other immigrant groups (Veltman 1983). In one of numerous collaborations on a comprehensive correlational study of 1980 census data, Bills et al (1995) found that for Mexican-Americans, language loyalty most closely correlated with the size of the Spanish-speaking population, itself a function of the number of persons directly immigrated from Mexico. Density of Spanish-speakers was a diagnostic of the potential of cross-generational transmission, and proximity to the USA/Mexico border fostered positive language attitudes and played a part in the maintenance of a sociocultural context favoring language acquisition [however, in a separate study in San Diego, proximity to the Mexican border was also related to negative language attitudes and ethnic stereotyping of Latinos among Euro-American university student learners of Spanish (Nocon 1995)]. Judging from the literature, one can predict that a continuation of high immigration and in-migration rates from Spanish-speaking areas will result in the continued ethnolinguistic vitality of Spanish in the United States, especially along the borderlands.

As Latino populations move toward acquiring varieties of English, they also experience some degree of Spanish language shifting, a shift that some would argue results in attrition of the home language across the generations (Silva-Corvalán 1994), and eventual loss of the language, with this shift most pronounced among populations in the North and in groups with the highest socioeducational indicators (Hudson et al 1995).

Silva-Corvalán (1991, 1994) hypothesizes that "intensive and prolonged contact with a superordinate language, and consequent reduction in the domains of [subordinate language] use, would have consequences on the Spanish...of bilinguals such that it would evidence...simplification, transfer, and consequent convergence with English" (1991:152). She investigates aspects of the rapidly changing verbal system of three generations of bilinguals from Los Angeles: the leveling of the opposition between the copulas *ser* and *estar*, the tendency to develop verbal periphrasis [*hacer* (to do/make) + nominal] to facilitate the pro-

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

duction of conjugated forms (1994), and the overall simplification of tense-mood-aspect (TMA) paradigms across generations. It is thus possible to show the simplification and leveling of TMA morphological distinctions in the absolute-relative tenses as a delicate implicational hierarchy across the generations. With these data, Silva-Corvalán supports her hypothesis of a five-stage bilingual continuum, with speakers of the first generations more fluent in normative, standardized Spanish and speakers of the succeeding ones progressively less fluent in these registers of Spanish and more fluent in varieties of English (but see Zentella 1997a for a critique of this approach). It should be noted, however, (*a*) that some of the TMA changes in progress shown in Table 1 represent extensions and continuations of changes already in progress in Mexican Spanish, as noted by Silva-Corvalán (1994); (*b*) that although there is some comparison of regional/generational equivalents of Mexican Spanish, systematic studies may shed more light on the issue of possible parallel shifts in varieties of rural Mexican Spanish. Santa Ana & Parodi (1998), for instance, have found the *ser-estar* move to merger quite advanced among speakers in the Mexican state of Michoacán, and Santa Ana (1995) points out the need to consider the absence of a single precontact dialect when using Standard Spanish as a baseline in studies of variation; (*c*) that shift and leveling of the tense system does not result in communicative deficits because speakers also produce innovations in other areas of the grammar to restructure functional and communicative load; and (*d*) that subordinate languages do not undiscerningly calque structures from superordinate languages. Linguistic innovations that may appear to be modeled on the superordinate language nevertheless do not create structural instability for the recipient language (Silva Corvalán 1994:6–7).

Some other general questions arise with respect to the linguistic systems of bilinguals. Do Latino bilinguals actually process each language they speak differently from monolinguals in those languages? And aside from codeswitching, are the varieties spoken by bilinguals distinguishable from those spoken by monolinguals in the same speech communities?

Godinez & Maddieson (1985) set out to investigate the claim that "all vowels of [Chicano] English are shorter than the corresponding General American vowels" (Lynn 1945:173). In addition, they compare vowel qualities in Chicano English and General Californian English to determine whether there might be any differences. Their acoustic phonetic study, based on speech samples from native Chicano English speakers (one group of bilinguals and one group of monolinguals) and native General Californian English speakers, showed no differences in either phonological categories or vowel duration between the groups studied. Only with respect to vowel quality were statistically significant differences found, with the monolingual and bilingual Chicano English speakers patterning more like one another than like speakers of General Californian English. Thus, we might say that although differences are undetectable at the phonological level, at the level of suprasegmental implementation there is a continuum between Spanish/English bilinguals, monolingual ChE speakers, and General Californian English speakers (but note that similarities between bilinguals and ChE speakers

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

TABLE 1 Change in the TMA system across five stages in the bilingual continuum[a]

Absolute-relative tenses	Mexico-born bilinguals		US-born bilinguals		
	I	II	III	IV	V
Conditional periphrastic (future in the past)	+	+	+	+	+
Present subjunctive (future in the past/present)	+	+	+	+	-
Imperfect subjunctive (future in the past)	+	+	+	-	-
Pluperfect subjunctive (future perfect in the past)	+	+	+	-	-
Pluperfect indicative (past of past)	+	+	-	-	-
Conditional perfect (future perfect in the past)	+	-	-	-	-
Future perfect (future of future)	-	-	-	-	-

[a]From Silva-Corvalán (1991:162)

could be due to sharing the contact variety of English and not to the influence of Spanish). Experimental results reported in the domain of psycholinguistics suggest that voice onset time (VOT) and speaking rate vary within individual bilinguals depending on whether they are in "Spanish mode" or "English mode." Magloire & Green (1999) went to considerable lengths to test ChE/ChS bilingual speakers in separate modes and found that when in English and Spanish modes, bilingual speakers could not be differentiated from native monolingual speakers.

PARTICIPATION IN CHANGES BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE SPEECH COMMUNITY

Another question that arises in an ethnic-contact dialect is to what extent are speakers participating in linguistic changes of the matrix speech community? This is a complex question since it involves charting the dialects not only of the contact-variety speakers but of other speakers in surrounding speech communities. The answer to this question, furthermore, has tended to vary according to the variable studied. For instance, final -t/-d deletion patterns among Los Angeles ChE speakers are found to distinguish them from surrounding Angelenos (Santa Ana 1991). Other studies of the California dialect area suggest that ChE speakers are participating in matrix California changes such as the fronting of the nuclei of /ow/ and /uw/ and the lowering of /ae/ (Fought 1997). In other cases, such as the tensing and raising of /I/, it appears that ChE speakers may in fact be leading the

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Euro-American matrix population (Mendoza-Denton 1997), as dialect descriptions of the Northern California area in the 1950s (DeCamp 1971) do not document this change.

The related question of convergence or divergence with other varieties of Spanish has been vigorously pursued within studies of MPRS morphophonology, with attempts to both explain and link patterns of word-final aspiration and deletion of /-s/ in MPRS to variation in other Spanish dialects, particularly the Caribbean and Southern Cone lowland varieties that also exhibit consonantal weakening. Terrell (1981) surveys available data and places MPRS and Miami Cuban Spanish in the continuum of sound change for Latin-American Spanish dialects (Table 2). The history and development of /-s/ were reconstructed on the basis of mostly synchronic data collected from a wide variety of different studies (see Terrell 1981, 1983). Terrell notes that general final syllable weakening aspiration and /-s/ deletion form part of a Western Romance language historical process that has been carried through to near completion in languages like French (where contexts favoring liaison {__DET +´V} closely parallel those blocking -s deletion in Caribbean Spanish).

Table 2 allows us to tentatively predict future divergence between the island and mainland varieties of PRS and Cuban Spanish. The US mainland varieties appear to have carried the syllable-weakening change in progress (s→h→ø) further and to more contexts than their island counterparts (though Terrell notes stylistic and social stratification), but not as far as the change to completion and consequent restructuring evident in the Dominican Republic. This change may in the future continue accelerating away from high-SES (socioeconomic status) sibilant speakers in Puerto Rico, with whom there is little sustained contact (currently most in-migrants from Puerto Rico come from a working-class background, accounting for overall higher rates of aspiration and deletion in MPRS). Other factors could have the effect of slowing divergence between island and mainland varieties of PRS. Shifting demographics within Latino groups (i.e. greater presence of Chicanos in areas that were predominantly Puerto Rican, as in some areas in the Midwest) will result in increased contact between speakers of MPRS and speakers from more conservative dialects that do not exhibit aspiration/deletion. As radical speakers come into contact with conservative ones (Guitart 1996), and trends in the increase of Standard Spanish education restructure attitudes with regard to the desirability/prestige of this socially marked variable, we may observe a boost in frequency of sibilant realizations of /–s/(AC Zentella, personal communication). Local dynamics of contact between groups of Latinos who speak different dialects may lead eventually to greater regional diversification in dialects of MPRS.

Another subject of controversy with respect to /-s/ is its relationship to high rates of pronoun usage in PRS (in contrast to many other varieties of Spanish, which exhibit pro-drop). Based on interviews with Boston-area PRS-speaking women, Hochberg (1986) postulates that a high rate of final /-s/ deletion in the verbal paradigms of PRS rendered verbal forms ambiguous (second person singular *está*(s) vs third person singular *está*), and promoted functional compensation

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Table 2 Deletion of sibilant -s in all phonetic contexts[a]

Location	SES or register, as defined by researcher	Percentage of deletion
Buenos Aires, Argentina	Educated	14%
La Habana, Cuba	Educated	26%
San Juan, Puerto Rico	Educated, formal	30%
	Working class	73%
Caracas, Venezuela	Educated	35%
Panama	All	50%
Miami Cuban Spanish	Fast casual speech	59%
New York MPRS	Working class	63%
Santo Domingo	Working class	91–98%

[a]Top to bottom, conservative to innovative. Synthesized from Terrell (1981:119, 1983:140). SES, socioeconomic status; MPRS, mainland Puerto Rican Spanish.

in the form of high rates of overt subject pronoun expression (second person singular *tú está*(s) vs third person singular *ella está*). Such pronominal expression was believed to occur only in greater-Caribbean varieties where /-s/ deletion might affect recoverability of the pronominal referent. Cameron (1993) disagrees, citing comparative statistically weighted evidence from Madrid Spanish (which has invariant /-s/ retention) and suggesting that the effects that seemed due to ambiguous person marking could instead be attributed to discourse-level patterns of switch reference, where shifting referents alone would promote overt subject pronoun expression. The controversy on -s deletion and overt subjects across varieties of Spanish continues (García & Tallon 1995, Baumel-Schreffler 1995, Lipski 1995, Widdison 1997) and has earned a place for PRS as one of the classic arenas of debate in sociolinguistic variation theory.

INSTANTIATING VARIATION IN DISCOURSE

New directions in the literature on variation in Latino linguistic resources include recent twin emphases on the instantiation of variation in discourse patterning, and on making meaningful connections between the speech patterns observed and the communities studied. This development comes partly as a result of critiques (Torres 1991, Sánchez 1983) of variationist work that castigate "meaningless quantitative studies...indicating the number of times a particular variant appeared in the speech of one group or another" (Sánchez 1983:92) and exhort researchers to describe language varieties taking into account the social context of the communities.

It is a new wave of anthropolitical linguistic studies, argues Zentella (1994), that is needed to amend the methods and objectives of the field and to bridge the

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

gap between micro-oriented variationist sociolinguistics and the more macro-oriented political economy and linguistic anthropology. Zentella argues that when researchers choose to focus on evidence of language shift and loss (Silva-Corvalán 1994), speaker innovations are ignored or disparaged. The Puerto Rican girl-to-women speakers in her 18-year longitudinal study (Zentella 1987, 1994, 1997a) were born and raised in one of New York City's *bloques* and actively constructed through their codeswitching and innovations a bilingual New York Puerto Rican identity, or more accurately multiple and shifting identities, reflecting in their linguistic patterns both ethnic pride and contact with African-American English while "touching base" with both languages through codeswitching. These speakers exhibited different verbal systems in informal, naturally occurring conversation, where they used the innovative forms, than in more formal elicitation interviews, where they used more normative forms (Zentella 1994). This evidence points to a considerable degree of speaker agency in the performative implementation of linguistic competence (see also Briggs 1988), and it highlights the need for researchers to use a multiplicity of data collection techniques to better approximate the complexity of a speech community.

Further connecting linguistic form with identity and context are studies of specific speech routines/practices, such as joking (Paredes 1968, Limón 1988, Galindo 1999), teasing (Zentella 1997a), *consejos* (advice) (Gonzales Velásquez 1995), *relajo* (suspension of seriousness) (Farr 1994), prayer (Baquedano-López 1998), community labeling (Limón 1981), individual naming (Rymes 1996), language in situated play routines such as hopscotch (Goodwin 1994), and linguistic play for poetic purposes (Morgan & Janda 1989, Peña 1996).

Ethnographies of language and gender among US Latinas/os have for some time now theorized the role of Latina women as cultural brokers in language accommodation (Valdés et al 1982, Zentella 1987) and language maintenance (Gonzales Velásquez 1995), and have closely examined the structure of families and their relationship to educational institutions in studies of language socialization (Vasquez et al 1994, Gonzales 1995, Valdés 1996, Baquedano-López 1998, Ramos-Pellicia 1998). Research that is not exclusively focused on kin groups or schools betrays some internal tension and antagonism toward popular gendered stereotypes of Latinas and Latinos. Latino scholars continually challenge the legacy of literary, anthropological, and historical stereotypes (Paz 1961, Lewis 1961, deLeón 1983) of Mexican and Chicano working-class men and question persistent popular notions of Latina women and girls as passive, quiet, and subordinate to men (Anzaldúa 1987). Both of these challenges have led to an emerging focus on subversive and parodic speech acts, including taboo language (but see Cummings 1991). Galindo (1987, 1999), for instance, looks at the speech of young Texas pachucas in all-women groups and their use of taboo words as creative resources conveying intimacy, camaraderie, and bonding between the women. Limón (1994) also examines subversive speech, focusing on homoerotic sublimation, inversion, taboo language, and the carnivalesque in the speech of Texas working-class men. Mendoza-Denton (1996) argues for symbolic coherence in the performance of counterhegemonic gendered identities among young Califor-

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

nia Latina high-school girls and addresses the relationship between language and other social symbolic resources in the construction of particular styles, such as makeup, clothing, and music.

Speech routines such as joking, teasing, rhyming, and praying are the building blocks for larger elements and allow theorization of artistic performance genres such as *corridos* (Paredes 1993, Arteaga 1985, Herrera-Sobek 1990), *conjuntos* (Peña 1985), *carpas* (Haney 1998), ballads and poems (Limón 1992), and devices such as metaphorical codeswitching in musical genres (see Aparicio 1997 on Puerto Rican salsa music lyrics).

Briggs' (1988) linguistic ethnography among Mexicanos in Córdova, New Mexico, links the form of traditional genres of expression with meaning-making and articulates the shifting figure/ground relationship between text and context as manifested in various performative and artistic forms in the community. Looking at the highly contrastive roles of the textual and contextual spheres in performance, he argues that as the textual sphere increases in importance, the contextual sphere recedes: historical discourse, proverbs, scriptural allusions, jokes, legends, hymns/prayers (Briggs 1988:184). It is precisely this shifting dynamicity of interpretation that constitutes speech genres in Córdova. Briggs points out that linguistic features of performance do not merely reflect the situational factors in which they are embedded, they interpret the social interaction for both the artist and the listener, always within the historical trajectory of preceding interpretations, embedding epistemic stance and political interpretation into narrative performance.

In the context of mass production, how are US Latinos and their language portrayed in the larger media? Hill (1993) takes up this question in her study of what she terms mock Spanish, essentially a subregister of English that employs a collection of strategies (semantic derogation, euphemism, affixation of Spanish grammatical elements, and hyperanglicization) to transform neutral Spanish meanings into jocular or pejorative ones within an English context. Hill gives as an example the common expression "No problemo," analyzed as the suffixation of Spanish morphological material to the English phrase "no problem." The productivity and frequency of this usage is attested to by her collection of several examples in media images, ranging from magazine cartoons, advertisements, newspaper columns, and major motion pictures (to view examples, see Hill 1995). Hill contends that the jocularization of such usages, although unthreatening to and largely unnoticed by non-Latino speakers, nevertheless serves as an important arena and device in the reproduction of covert racism.

In a critical discourse analytic study of *Los Angeles Times* coverage on the topic of immigration over the course of 15 months in 1993 and 1994, during the California political campaign to address undocumented immigrant use of public services, Proposition 187, Santa Ana (1999) finds that metaphoric representations of immigrants in the media reflect and constitute the racist world-view that frames public opinion. The dominant immigrant metaphor used in the *Times* was immigrant as animal. Santa Ana argues that in news coverage, immigrants are portrayed as less than human; he gives evidence of human/animal lexical distinctions used in the public discourse to depict immigrants (e.g. give birth vs drop).

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

CONCLUSION

One of the most important trends in current sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology of US Latinos is work in the area of the politics of representation, which is especially important given the colonial history of anthropology and its interventions. Many researchers currently working with US Latinos are native to and residents of the communities where they work (Zentella, Torres, Limón, among others); this has resulted in great time depth and the incorporation of the unique insights of native ethnographers into current research. Other methodological developments have also taken place: Briggs (1986), for instance, published a highly influential interrogation of interview methodology, the foundation of much socolinguistic research. Urciuoli (1996) quotes extensively from members of the New York–area Puerto Rican community among whom she worked, laying out their experiences in their own words, as well as their theories of language and power. The voices of Latinos in these and other works variously interrogate racism, crossing/passing, and issues of borders, bringing into focus a sociolinguistics not so much defined by homogeneous speech communities, but one constituted through contact across boundaries, borders, and isoglosses. A linguistics of contact (Pratt 1987) allows us to glimpse not only along and across the borders of groups that traditionally have been imagined as "different" from each other (sometimes to their surprise) but also to investigate borders that are not national or linguistic, but material and embodied. It is in the close analysis of contact that we will find the articulation of different levels of semiotic systems, where subtle linguistic cues work in tandem with material culture to index history and ideology. The relationship between micro- and macro-levels of analysis is still one that will undergo tremendous growth, with connections to be made not only between micro- and macro-levels of language (such as the discourse implementation of phonetic variation), but also between micro-aspects of social meaning-making and macro-aspects of the sociopolitical setting [for instance, the relationship between Chicana girls' makeup and the larger discourses of ethnicity, language, and gender in California (Mendoza-Denton 1996)]. One area in great need of exploration is that of the relationship between embodiment, materiality, space and place, historical process, and linguistic practice. Some of this interdisciplinary work is already well under way (Cintrón 1997, Urciuoli 1996, Goodwin 1994, Modan 1997); sociolinguitics and linguistic anthropology may yet turn to the rich and extensive literature on the folklore of US Latinos for further insights into these connections.

Investigating the links between materiality, the body, history, contact, space, and language will result in the denaturalization of some of our implicit assumptions. I anxiously anticipate work in progress on contact issues among different groups of Latinos in New York by Otheguy and Zentella, and work on the re-examination of the link between race/ethnicity, class, and class mobility that has been naturalized in anthropology as well as in public discourse. Current scholarship focuses almost exclusively on the "problems" of working-class and/or immigrant Latinos, and on education, widely perceived as the solution to those

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

problems and as a vehicle of class mobility. The narrow legitimation of these kinds of research funnels the ways in which Latinos can be talked and written about, not only by academics but in the larger media. There is little research on middle-class Latinos despite overwhelming evidence of the emergence of a Latino middle class (US Census Bureau 1998). Although some attention has been paid to multi-ethnic school contexts (Gibson 1988), ethnographies of multi-ethnic and class-diversified workplaces, neighborhoods (Modan 1997), and non-institutional settings are sorely needed.

I anticipate future work on a variety of diasporic Latino experiences that do not take place only in and from the perspective of the United States. Latino emigration is a worldwide phenomenon, and yet we know comparatively little about and do not incorporate into our analyses the differential experiences of Latinos in Canada, Europe, Africa, or Asia. How does the global mass-marketing and commodification of images of Latinos (Hill 1995) impact the perception and reception of Latinos worldwide? Although we have a wealth of studies on many levels of production, few are on the contexts of reception. How are Latino speakers perceived? How do Latino speakers experience stereotypes and prejudice? And what are the lasting consequences of that experience?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to the many colleagues who provided me with references, encouragement, reviews of and comments on this article. Many improvements resulted from their contributions, and any remaining flaws are of course my own. Thanks especially to Robert Bayley, Charles Briggs, Peter Haney, David Samuels, Otto Santa Ana, Bambi Schieffelin, Carmen Silva-Corvalán, Jessica Weinberg, and Ana Celia Zentella.

Visit the *Annual Reviews home page* at www.AnnualReviews.org.

LITERATURE CITED

Alvarez RR. 1995. The Mexican-US border: the making of an anthropology of borderlands. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:447–70

Amastae J, Elías-Olivares L. 1982. *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Amastae J, Satcher D. 1993. Linguistic assimilation in two variables. *Lang. Var. Chang.* 5:77–90

Anzaldúa G. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: the New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books

Aparicio FR. 1997. On sub-versive signifiers: tropicalizing language in the United States. In *Tropicalizations: Transcultural Representations of Latinidad*, ed. FR Aparicio, S Chávez-Silverman. Hanover: Dartmouth College. pp. 194–212

Arteaga A. 1985. Chicano-Mexican corrido. *J. Ethn. Stud.* 13:75–105

Baquedano-Lopez P. 1998. *Language socialization of Mexican children in a Los Angeles catholic parish*. PhD thesis. Univ. Calif., Los Angeles. 259 pp.

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Baugh J. 1984. Chicano English: the anguish of definition. See Ornstein-Galicia & Metcalf 1984, pp. 3–13

Bauman R, Abrahams R, eds. 1981. *"And Other Neighborly Names": Social Processes and Cultural Image in Texas Folklore*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Baumel-Schreffler S. 1995. *Mexican-Spanish in Houston, Texas: a study of language contact and its effects on overt subject pronouns (Mexican-Americans)*. PhD thesis. Univ. Fla., Gainesville. 420 pp.

Bayley R. 1994. Consonant cluster reduction in Tejano English. *Lang. Var. Chang.* 6: 303–26

Bayley R, Preston D. 1996. *Second Language Acquisition and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Berk-Seligson S. 1990. T*he Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Bills GD, Hernandez Chavez E, Hudson A. 1995. The geography of language shift: distance from the Mexican border and Spanish language claiming in the Southwestern U.S. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 114:9–27

Bixler-Marquez DJ. 1985. Mass media and the retention of Spanish by Chicanos. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 53:21–29

Bloom GM. 1991. T*he effects of speech style and skin color on bilingual teaching candidates' and bilingual teachers' attitudes towards Mexican-American pupils*. PhD thesis. Stanford Univ., Stanford, CA. 191 pp.

Briggs CL. 1986. *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Briggs CL. 1988. *Competence in Performance: The Creativity of Tradition in Mexicano Verbal Art*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press

Bucholtz M, Liang AC, Sutton L, Hines C, eds. 1994. *Cultural Performances: Proc. Women Lang. Conf.*, 3rd. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women & Lang. Group

Cameron R. 1993. Ambiguous agreement, functional compensation, and nonspecific tú in the Spanish of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and Madrid, Spain. *Lang. Var. Chang.* 5: 305–34

Castro MJ. 1992. The politics of language in Miami. In *Miami Now! Immigration, Ethnicity, and Social Change*, ed. G Gernier, A Stepick III, pp. 218–30. Gainesville: Univ. Press Fla.

Coles FA. 1992. *Social and linguistic correlates to language death: research from the Isleño dialect of Spanish*. PhD thesis. Univ. Tex., Austin. 425 pp.

Colombi CM, Alarcon FX, eds. 1997. *La Ensenanza del Español a Hispanohablantes: Praxis y Teoría*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin (In Spanish)

Crawford J. 1999. *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Los Angeles: Biling. Educ. Serv.

Cummings L. 1991. Carne con limón: reflections on the construction of social harmlessness. *Am. Ethnol.* 18:370–72

DeCamp D. 1971. The pronunciation of English in San Francisco. In *A Various Language: Perspectives on American Dialects*, ed. J Williamson, V Burke, pp. 549–69. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston

deLeón A. 1983. *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes Toward Mexicans in South Texas, 1821–1900*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Delgado G, ed. 1984. *The Hispanic Deaf: Issues and Challenges for Bilingual Special Education*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet Coll. Press

Durán R, ed. 1981. *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Elías-Olivares L, ed. 1983. *Spanish in the U.S. Setting: Beyond the Southwest*. Rosslyn, VA: Natl. Clearinghouse Biling. Educ.

Espenshade T. 1995. Unauthorized immigration to the United States. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 21:195–216

Estrada L. 1997. Demographics and the new immigration. In *Immigration and Education: Issues and Research. Spencer Found.*

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Conf. Rep., ed. R Barr, C Lacey, pp. 30–34. Chicago: Spencer Found.

Farr M. 1994. Echando relajo: verbal art and gender among Mexicanas in Chicago. See Bucholtz et al 1994, pp. 168–86

Ferguson CA. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–40

Fishman JA, Cooper RL, Newman RM. 1971. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press

Fishman JA, Keller GD. 1982. *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Fought CR. 1997. *The English and Spanish of young adult Chicanos*. PhD thesis. Univ. Penn., Philadelphia. 265 pp.

Galindo DL. 1987. *Linguistic influence and variation of the English of Chicano adolescents in Austin, Texas*. PhD thesis. Univ. Tex., Austin. 237 pp.

Galindo DL. 1999. Caló and taboo language use among Chicanas. See Galindo & Gonzales 1999. In press

Galindo DL, Gonzales MD, eds. 1999. *Speaking Chicana: Voice, Power and Identity*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Galván RA, Teschner RV. 1985. *El Diccionario del Español Chicano: the Dictionary of Chicano Spanish*. Lincolnwood, IL: Natl. Textbook Co.

García M. 1984. Parameters of the East Los Angeles speech community. See Ornstein-Galicia & Metcalf 1984, pp. 85–98

García M, Tallon M. 1995. Postnuclear /-s/ in San Antonio Spanish: nohotros no aspiramos. *Georgetown J. Lang. Linguist.* 3: 139–62

García O, Evangelista I, Martínez M, Disla C, Bonifacio P. 1988. Spanish language use and attitudes: a study of two New York City communities. *Lang. Soc.* 17:475–511

García O, Fishman JA. 1991. *Bilingual Education*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

García O, Otheguy R. 1985. The masters of survival send their children to school: bilingual education in the ethnic schools of Miami. *Biling. Rev.* 12:3–19

García O, Otheguy R. 1988. The language situation of Cuban Americans. In *Language Diversity: Problem or Resource? A Social and Educational Perspective on Language Minorities in the United States*, ed. SL McKay, SC Wong, pp. 166–92. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House

García O, Otheguy R. 1997. No sólo de estándar vive el aula: lo que nos enseñó la educación bilingüe sobre el español de Nueva York. See Colombi & Alarcon 1997, pp. 156–74

García RL. 1974. Toward a grammar of Chicano English. *English J.* 63:34–38

Gerner de García BA. 1993. *Language use in Spanish-speaking families with deaf children*. PhD thesis. Boston Univ., Boston, MA. 309 pp.

Gibson MA. 1988. *Accommodation Without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Giles H. 1979. Ethnicity markers in speech. In *Social Markers in Speech*, ed. K Scherer, H Giles. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Godinez M, Maddieson I. 1985. Vowel differences between Chicano and General Californian English? *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 53: 43–58

Gonzales MD. 1999. Crossing social and cultural borders: the road to language hybridity. See Galindo & Gonzales 1999. In press

Gonzales N. 1995. *Child language socialization in Tucson: United States Mexican households*. PhD thesis. Univ. Ariz., Tucson. 424 pp.

Gonzales Velásquez MD. 1995. Sometimes Spanish, sometimes English: language use among rural New Mexican Chicanas. In *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, ed. K Hall, M Bucholtz, pp. 421–46. New York: Routledge

Goodwin MH. 1994. '¡Ay, Chillona!': stance-taking in girls' hopscotch. See Bucholtz et al 1994, pp. 232–41

Guitart JM. 1981. The pronunciation of Puerto Rican Spanish in the mainland: theoretical and pedagogical consideration. In *Teach-*

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

ing Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims, and Methods, ed. G Valdés, AG Lozano, R García-Moya, pp. 46–58. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Guitart JM. 1996. Spanish in contact with itself and the phonological characterization of conservative and radical styles. In *Spanish in Contact: Issues in Bilingualism,* ed. A Roca, J Jensen, pp. 151–57. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla

Haney P. 1998. *'En un clavo están colgadas.' History, parody, and identity formation in the Mexican American carpa*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 97th, Philadelphia

Harris T. 1982. Foreign interference and code-switching in the contemporary Judeo-Spanish of New York. See Elías-Olivares 1982, pp. 53–68

Herrera-Sobek M. 1990. *The Mexican Corrido: A Feminist Analysis*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press

Hill JH. 1993. Hasta la vista, baby: Anglo Spanish in the American Southwest. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13:145–76

Hill JH. 1995. *Mock Spanish: A Site for the Indexical Reproduction of Racism in American English. Univ. Chicago Lang. Cult. Symp. 2*. http://www.cs.uchicago.edu/l-c/archives/subs/hill-jane

Hochberg J. 1986. Functional compensation for /-s/ deletion in Puerto Rican Spanish. *Language* 62:609–21

Hudson A, Hernández-Chavez E, Bills G. 1995. The many faces of language maintenance. See Silva-Corvalán 1995

Jaramillo J. 1995. Social variation in personal address etiquette. *Hisp. Linguist.* 6–7: 191–224

Jongh ED, Roca A. 1991. Interpreting Spanish codes in Southern Florida: the Preparation of court interpreters. See Klee & Ramos-García 1991, pp. 349–58

Klee C, Ramos-García LA, eds. 1991. *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World: Iberia, Latin America, United States*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual/Bilingue

Labov W. 1996. Some notes on the role of misperception in language learning. See Bayley & Preston 1996, pp. 245–52

Lambert WE. 1996. Language in the lives of ethnic minorities: Cuban American families in Miami. *Appl. Linguist.* 14:477–500

Lantolf JP. 1982. Toward a comparative dialectology of U.S. Spanish. See Elías-Olivares 1982, pp. 3–20

Ledge J. 1999. Spanish signs. Atlanta GA, *WABE Radio Broadcast,* March 15

Lewis O. 1961. *The Children of Sanchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family*. New York: Random House

Limón J. 1981. The folk performance of "Chicano" and the cultural limits of political ideology. See Bauman & Abrahams 1981, pp. 197–225

Limón J. 1988. Agringado joking in Texas Mexican society. *Perspect. Mex. Am. Stud.* 1:109–27

Limón JE. 1992. *Mexican Ballads, Chicano Poems: History and Influence in Mexican-American Social Poetry*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Limón JE. 1994. *Dancing With the Devil: Society and Cultural Poetics in Mexican-American South Texas*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press

Lipski J. 1995. Blocking of Spanish /s/-aspiration: the vocalic nature of consonantal disharmony. *Hisp. Linguist.* 6–7:287–327

Lipski JM. 1986. Central American Spanish in the United States: some remarks on the Salvadoran community. Aztlan. *J. Chicano Stud.* 17(2):91–123

Lipski JM. 1996. Patterns of pronominal evolution in Cuban-American bilinguals. In *Spanish in Contact: Issues in Bilingualism*, ed. A Roca, JB Jensen, pp. 159–86. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla

López Morales H. 1990. Bilingüismo y actitudes lingüísticas en Puerto Rico: breve reseña bibliográfica. In *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Issues*, ed. JJ Bergen, pp. 86–93. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press (In Spanish)

Lozano AG. 1983. Oversights in the history of United States Spanish. In *Spanish and Por-*

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

tuguese in Social Context, ed. JJ Bergen, GD Bills, pp. 12–21. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press

Lynn K. 1945. Bilingualism in the Southwest. *Q. J. Speech* 31:175–80

Macías RF. 1997. Bilingual workers and language use rules in the workplace: a case study. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 127:53–70

Magloire J, Green K. 1999. A cross-language comparison of speaking rate effects on the production of Voice Onset Time in English and Spanish. *Phonetica*. In press

Mendoza-Denton N. 1996. "Muy macha": gender and ideology in gang girls' discourse about makeup. *Ethnos* 61(1–2): 47–63

Mendoza-Denton N. 1997. *Chicana/Mexicana identity and linguistic variation: an ethnographic and sociolinguistic study of gang affiliation in an urban high school*. PhD thesis. Stanford Univ., Stanford, CA. 152 pp.

Modan G. 1997. *Housing rights, discourse of family, and the re/inscription of place.* Pap. presented at Annu. Conf. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., Washington, DC, Nov. 1997

Moll LC, Díaz S. 1985. Ethnographic pedagogy: promoting effective bilingual instruction. In *Advances in Bilingual Education Research*, ed. EE Garcia, RV Padilla, pp. 127–49. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press

Morgan TA, Janda RD. 1989. Musically-conditioned stress shift in Spanish revisited: empirical verification and nonlinear analysis. In *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. C Kirschner, J DeCesaris, pp. 273–88. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Murguia E, Telles E. 1996. Phenotype and schooling among Mexican Americans. *Sociol. Ed.* 69: 276–89

Myers-Scotton C. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching.* New York : Oxford Univ. Press

Nocon HD. 1995. Is the word "Mexican" taboo? The impact of the border on Spanish students' integrative attitude and motivation. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 114:47–66

Ornstein-Galicia J, Metcalf A, eds. 1984. *Form and Function in Chicano English*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Otheguy R. 1973. The Spanish Caribbean: a creole perspective. In *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, ed. C-JN Bailey, RW Shuy, pp. 323–39. Washington, DC: Geogetown Univ. Press

Otheguy R, Fernandez M, Garcia O. 1989. Transferring, switching, and modeling in West New York Spanish: an intergenerational study. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 79:41–52

Paredes A. 1968. Folk medicine and the intercultural jest. In *Spanish-Speaking People in the United States*, ed. J Helm, pp. 63–77. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press

Paredes A, Bauman R, eds. 1993. *Folklore and Culture on the Texas-Mexican Border*. Austin: Cent. Mex. Am. Stud., Univ. Tex.

Paulston CB. 1996. Language policies and language rights. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 26: 73–75

Paz O. 1961. *The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico*. New York: Grove

Pedraza P. 1985. Language maintenance among Puerto Ricans. In *Spanish Language Use and Public Life in the United States*, ed. L Elías-Olivares, A Leone, R Cisneros, JR Gutiérrez, pp. 59–72. Berlin: de Gruyter

Peña MH. 1985. *The Texas-Mexican Conjunto: History of a Working-Class Music.* Austin: Univ. Tex. Press

Peña M. 1996. From Ranchero to Jaiton: ethnicity and class in Texas-Mexican music (two styles in the form of a pair). In *Between Two Words: Mexican Immigrants in the United States*, ed. DG Gutierrez, pp. 149–74. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resourc.

Peñalosa F. 1980. *Chicano Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Peñalosa F. 1985. A world-system perspective for Chicano sociolinguistics. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 53:7–19

Penfield J, Ornstein-Galicia J. 1985. *Chicano English: An Ethnic Contact Dialect*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Poplack S. 1979. *Function and process in a variable phonology*. PhD thesis. Univ. Penn., Philadelphia. 282 pp.

Pratt ML. 1987. Linguistic utopias. In *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature,* ed. N Fabb, D Attridge, A Durant, C McCabe, pp. 48–66. Manchester, UK: Manchester Univ. Press

Ramírez A. 1981. Language attitudes and the speech of Spanish-English bilingual pupils. See Durán 1981, pp. 217–35

Ramos-Pellicia M. 1998. *Repetition in support groups for breastfeeding mothers*. Presented at Perceiving Performing Gender: Symp. Geschlechterforsch. Christian-Albrechts-Univ., Kiel, Ger.

Resnick MC. 1988. Beyond the ethnic community: Spanish-language roles and maintenance in Miami. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 69: 89–104

Reyes R. 1981. Independent convergence in Chicano English and New York City Puerto Rican bilingualism. See Durán 1981, pp. 39–48

Roca A. 1991. Language maintenance and language shift in the Cuban American community of Miami: the 1990s and beyond. In *Language Planning: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. DF Marshall, pp. 245–57. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Roca A. 1997. La realidad en el aula: logros y expectativas en la enseñanza del espanol para estudiantes bilingües. See Colombi & Alarcon 1997, pp. 55–64

Rosaldo R.1994. Cultural citizenship and educational democracy. *Cult. Anthropol.* 9(3): 402–11

Rosaldo R. 1985. Chicano studies, 1970–1984. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 14:405–27

Ruiz R. 1984. Orientations in language planning. *Natl. Assoc. Biling. Educ. J.* 8:15–34

Rymes B. 1996. Naming as social practice: the case of Little Creeper from Diamond Street. *Lang. Soc.* 25(2):237–60

Sanchez R. 1983. *Chicano Discourse: Socio-Historic Perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Santa Ana O. 1991. *Phonetic simplification processes in the English of the barrio*. PhD thesis. Univ. Penn., Philadelphia. 262 pp.

Santa Ana O. 1995. Review of language contact and language change, by Carmen Silva-Corvalán. *J. Linguist. Anthropol.* 5(2):108–10

Santa Ana O. 1999. Like an animal I was treated: anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse Soc*. In press

Santa Ana O, Parodi C. 1998. A speech community model: configurations and variable types in the Mexican Spanish setting. *Lang. Sociol.* 27(1):23–51

Silva-Corvalán C. 1991. Spanish language attrition in a contact situation with English. In *First Language Attrition*, ed. H Seliger, R Vago, pp. 156–70. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Silva-Corvalán C. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Silva-Corvalán C. 1995. *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press

Spicher LL. 1992. *Language attitude towards speakers with a Mexican accent: ramifications in the business community of San Diego, California*. PhD thesis. Univ. Tex., Austin. 116 pp.

Suárez-Orozco M, ed. 1998. *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Terrell T. 1981. Diachronic reconstruction by dialect comparison of variable constraints: s-aspiration and deletion in Spanish. In *Variation Omnibus*, ed. D Sankoff, H Cedegren, pp. 115–24. Edmonton, Can.: Linguist. Res.

Terrell T. 1983. Sound change: the explanatory value of the heterogeneity of variable rule application. See Elías-Olivares 1982, pp. 133–48

Thomason SG, Kaufman T. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

Torres L. 1991. The study of U.S. Spanish varieties. See Klee & Ramos-García 1991, pp. 255–70

Torres L. 1997. *Puerto Rican Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study of a New York Suburb*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Trueba HT. 1998. The education of Mexican immigrant children. In *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. M Suárez-Orozco, pp. 125–40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

US Census Bureau. 1998. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1998. Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2050.* Washington, DC: US Census Bur.

Urciuoli B. 1995. Language and borders. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:525–46

Urciuoli B. 1996. *Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class*. Boulder, CO: Westview

Valdés G. 1996. *Con Respeto: Bridging the Distances Between Culturally Diverse Families and Schools: An Ethnographic Portrait*. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Valdés G, Figueroa RA. 1994. *Bilingualism and Testing: A Special Case of Bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Valdés G, García H, Storment D. 1982. Sex-related speech accommodation among Mexican-American bilinguals: a pilot study of language choice in customer-server interactions. In *Bilingualism and Language Contact: Spanish, English, and Native American Languages*, ed. F Barkin, E Brandt, J Ornstein-Galicia, pp. 187–200. New York: Teachers Coll. Press

Valdés GV. 1998. The world outside and inside schools: language and immigrant children. *Educ. Res.* 26(6):4–18

Vasquez OA, Pease-Alvarez L, Shannon SM. 1994. *Pushing Boundaries: Language and Culture in a Mexicano Community.* New York: Cambridge Univ. Press

Vélez Ibañez C, Greenberg J. 1992. Schooling processes among U.S. Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans: a comparative, distributive, and case study approach. In *Hispanics in the United States*, ed. T Weaver, pp. 270–80. Houston, TX: Arte Público

Veltman G. 1983. *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin: de Gruyter

Wald B. 1984. The status of Chicano English as a dialect of American English. See Ornstein-Galicia & Metcalf 1984, pp. 14–31

Wald B. 1993. On the evolution of would and other modals in the English spoken in East Los Angeles. *Modality in Language Acquisition,* ed. N Dittmar, A Reich. pp. 59–96. Berlin: de Gruyter

Widdison K. 1997. Phonetic explanations for sibilant patterns in Spanish. *Lingua* 102(4): 253–64

Wolfram W. 1974. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City*. Arlington, VA: Cent. Appl. Linguist.

Zentella AC. 1987. Language and female identity in the Puerto Rican community. In *Women and Language in Transition*, ed. J Penfield, pp. 167–80. Albany: State Univ. NY Press

Zentella AC. 1990. Returned migration, language, and identity: Puerto Rican bilinguals in dos worlds/two mundos. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 84:81–100

Zentella AC. 1994. *Towards an anthropolitical perspective on the Spanish competence of US Latinos*. Presented at Annu. Conf. New Ways of Analyzing Variation, 23rd, Stanford Univ., Stanford, CA

Zentella AC. 1997a. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell

Zentella AC. 1997b. The Hispanophobia of the Official English Movement in the U.S. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 127:71–86

Zhou M. 1997. Growing up American: the challenge confronting immigrant children and children of immigrants. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 23:63–95

Annual Review of Anthropology
Volume 28 (1999)

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

What is Anthropological Enlightenment? Some Lessons of the Twentieth Century, *Marshall Sahlins* i

ARCHAEOLOGY

Islamic Settlement in North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula, *James L. Boone and Nancy L. Benco* 51

The Political Economy of Archaeology in the United States, *Thomas C. Patterson* 155

BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The Chemical Ecology of Human Ingestive Behaviors, *Timothy Johns* 27

Evolutionary Perspective on Human Growth, *Barry Bogin* 109

Whither Primatology? The Place of Primates in Contemporary Anthropology, *P. S. Rodman* 311

Life History Traits in Humans: Theory and Empirical Studies, *Kim Hill and Hillard Kaplan* 397

The Human Adaptation for Culture, *Michael Tomasello* 509

Evolutionary Psychology, *Doug Jones* 553

LINGUISTICS AND COMMUNICATIVE PRACTICES

Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives, *R. Wodak and M. Reisigl* 175

The Case for Sound Symbolism, *Janis B. Nuckolls* 225

Moving Bodies, Acting Selves, *B. Farnell* 341

Sociolinguistics and Linguistic Anthropology of US Latinos, *Norma Mendoza-Denton* 375

Introducing Optimality Theory, *D. B. Archangeli* 531

REGIONAL STUDIES

The State of Culture Theory in the Anthropology of Southeast Asia, *Mary Margaret Steedly* 431

Africa, Empire, and Anthropology: A Philological Exploration of Anthropology's Heart of Darkness, *Andrew Apter* 577

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.

SOCIOCULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Nutrition and Politics in Prehistory, *Marie Elaine Danforth* 1
War: Back to the Future, *Anna Simons* 73
Mirrors and Windows: Sociocultural Studies of Human-Animal Relationships, *Molly H. Mullin* 201
Environments and Environmentalisms in Anthropological Research: Facing a New Millennium, *Paul E. Little* 253
Bad Endings: American Apocalypsis, *Kathleen Stewart and Susan Harding* 285
Emergent Forms of Life: Anthropologies of Late or Postmodernities, *Michael M. J. Fischer* 455
New Ecology and the Social Sciences: What Prospects for a Fruitful Engagement?, *I. Scoones* 479

THEME I: MILLENNIUM

War: Back to the Future, *Anna Simons* 73
Environments and Environmentalisms in Anthropological Research: Facing a New Millennium, *Paul E. Little* 253
Bad Endings: American Apocalypsis, *Kathleen Stewart and Susan Harding* 285

THEME II: EMPIRE AND ITS AFTERMATH

Nutrition and Politics in Prehistory, *Marie Elaine Danforth* 1
Africa, Empire, and Anthropology: A Philological Exploration of Anthropology's Heart of Darkness, *Andrew Apter* 577

INDEXES

Author Index 599
Subject Index 619
Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 20–28 643
Cumulative Index of Chapter Titles, Volumes 20–28 645

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1999.28:375-395. Downloaded from www.annualreviews.org
Access provided by University of California - Los Angeles UCLA on 05/22/19. For personal use only.