HISPANIC STUDIES
review

Assessing the Effect of English Contact on Spanish Futurity in 19-century Texas

Russell Simonsen
Miami University

Abstract
Since the 13th century, the Spanish periphrastic future (PF; *voy a cantar*) has been steadily replacing the morphological future (MF; *cantaré*) (Aaron, 2006). Attempting to account for the especially fast rate of change from the MF to PF in US Spanish, researchers have suggested that contact with English is one of the causes (e.g., Balestra, 2002). Nevertheless, this hypothesis has not been assessed in a balanced way with data from both Spanish and English. The present study documents the use of the Spanish PF and the analogous English construction *going to + infinitive* in Northern Mexico/Texas during the years 1822–1836, the first period of intense contact between these languages in the region. A crosslinguistic comparison of these future constructions was completed in order to determine their degree of susceptibility to contact-induced change through linguistic convergence. Serving as a case study, the future expression of the advanced bilingual Stephen F. Austin was also examined. The results do not suggest that the Spanish PF accelerated specifically due to contact with English during this period. I discuss this conclusion in the context of recent work on Spanish futurity in the US and outline important considerations for future research on this topic.

Introduction

The expression of futurity in Spanish has received a great deal of attention from Hispanic linguists, from both a synchronic (e.g., Orozco, 2007) and diachronic perspective (e.g., Aaron 2007). A process of grammaticalization began in Late-Latin which evolved into a morphological future (MF; e.g., *cantaré*), and then later, a periphrastic future (PF) construction (e.g., *voy a cantar*). Both the MF and PF have continued evolving, yet they maintain traces of their different origins (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994). Researchers (e.g., Gutiérrez, 1995) have shown that the PF has largely replaced the MF for future expression in US Spanish, even more so than in many other Spanish-speaking countries. Balestra (2002) hypothesizes that English had a significant role in the increase of the Spanish PF in California after the arrival of large numbers of Anglo-American settlers during the second half of the 19th century, and Orozco (2007) suggests that the rise of the Spanish PF among New York Colombians is due in part to contact with the analogous *going to + infinitive* construction in English. These claims of contact-induced change have been made without analyzing data in English, however, which makes it difficult to understand how these "go" future constructions might influence each other in a contact situation.

Based on a more stringent model for identifying contact-induced language change (Torres Cacoullos & Travis, 2015), I analyzed the future expression of Spanish monolinguals, English monolinguals, and a highly functional English-Spanish bilingual. The analysis was based on letters from the first 14 years of extensive English-Spanish contact in Texas/Northern Mexico,

1822–1836. Following Orozco (2007), I considered the following to be the most likely conflict site between future forms in Spanish and English: the Spanish PF (*ir a + infinitive*) and the English *going to + infinitive*. It is possible that a contact situation caused these two "go" structures to become more similar, a process known as linguistic convergence (Torres Cacoullos & Travis, 2015). To assess this possibility, all tokens of these two comparable structures were obtained from corpora. The frequency and linguistic context (e.g., subject animacy, verb class, clause type) of these future expressions were documented in each language. Additionally, an analysis of the future expression of the bilingual Stephen F. Austin was completed in both languages to provide a glimpse into how language contact might have affected the competing systems of futurity in the mind of an individual. If his future expression differed from monolinguals in either language, this could potentially provide insight into a change in progress.

Although future expression in 19th-century Texas is the focus of the present study, the results will also be discussed in the context of modern studies of Spanish futurity, with particular attention paid to research on Spanish in the US. I will link both historical and modern Spanish and explain why it is unlikely that contact with the English language is uniquely responsible for the significant increase in the Spanish PF in the US over the past two centuries.

2. The Evolution of the Morphological and Periphrastic Future Constructions in Spanish

Before discussing Spanish futurity in the 19th–21st centuries, it is important to understand how the Spanish PF and MF developed and competed in the history of the language. Classical Latin had MF forms (CANTĀBŌ 'I will sing'), but these were eventually replaced in spoken Latin by a wide array of expressions that indicated future time (Penny, 2002). The expression that was ultimately most successful was *infinitive* + the auxiliary HABĒRE: CANTĀRE HABEŌ 'I have to sing.' After substantial phonological reduction and grammaticalization, a new morphological form resulted; CANTĀRE HABEŌ became *cantaré* 'I will sing' (Penny, 2002). This is the origin of the Spanish MF, which can be traced back to Late Common Romance in the 4th or 5th centuries (Fleischman, 1982).

The Spanish PF was a much later development. PF constructions in Spanish, French, and Portuguese were first documented in the 13th and 14th centuries—almost a thousand years after the MF was being formed (Fleischman, 1982). The Spanish PF emerged as the result of a semantic extension that occurred in the expression *ir (a) + infinitive*. Company Company (2003) explains that prior to the 13th century, *ir (a)+ infinitive* only indicated that an agent was physically on a path toward a goal:

(1) Luego se levantaron los ifantes de Carrión, **ban besar** las manos al que en ora buena nació. (1140; Poema de Mio Cid)
'Then the royal children of Carrión stood up, and they go to kiss the hands of the one who was just born.'

In (1), it is clear from the context that *ban besar* 'they go to kiss' refers to agents physically moving to accomplish a goal rather than referring to a future action. Eventually, there was a shift in meaning from an agent on a path toward a goal to one of general futurity. Kanwit (2014) ex-

plains that this change is natural in that it only requires "generalizing the contexts of use, since movement in space already implies movement in time" (p. 41). The fact that the infinitive in *ir a + infinitive* can now be a stative or psychological verb—verbs that do not require movement (e.g., *Voy a pensarlo*.)—reveals that the verb *ir* has been semantically bleached of its element of movement in the context of the PF in modern Spanish.

3. Studies of Spanish and English Futurity

3.1 General Uses and Distribution of the Spanish MF and PF

While there is dialectal variation in the use of the MF and PF, some general tendencies have developed throughout the Spanish-speaking world. Based on its overall extension, the PF has largely become the default future construction in modern Spanish, in both Spain and Latin America. This has been shown by Montes Giraldo (1962) in Colombia, by Gómez Manzano (1988) in both Spain and Mexico, by Silva-Corvalán and Terrell (1989) in the Caribbean, and by Gutiérrez (1995) in the Southwest US. However, the mode of communication, social class, and education have also been found to condition future expression. For example, Méndez-Vallejo (2008) studied the oral and written future forms of upper-class, educated residents of Bogotá, Colombia. She discovered that the PF is used 79.2% of the time in oral data, but only 18.8% of the time in writing; the MF is dominant in written Spanish (82.2%). The results from Gutiérrez (1995) also suggest that education is a major factor in the distribution of future forms, given that the popular variety of Spanish spoken in Morelia, Mexico has a higher rate of the PF and lower rate of the MF (73% PF; 8.5% MF) when compared with the highly-educated Spanish of speakers in Mexico City (51% PF; 23% MF). Another important observation is that the MF's default function is no longer one of expressing temporal futurity, but rather one of epistemic modality (Orozco 2007; e.g., *Tendrá 40 años* 'He must be about 40 years old').

The linguistic constraints on future expression have also been investigated in Peninsular Spanish from a diachronic perspective by Aaron (2006, 2007). Since these studies document the evolution of Spanish futurity in a region that has not had significant direct contact with English, they will serve as a useful point of comparison when analyzing Spanish in the US. Aaron (2006) reveals that in the 13th century, when the PF just began to form, it was used in less than 1% of future contexts when compared to the MF. By the 19th century, the PF was used in 12% of variable contexts, and by the 20th century, the rates for this construction were 27% and 66% for written and spoken Spanish, respectively. Although the PF gradually became more frequent than the MF over the centuries, not all linguistic contexts allowed for the expansion of the PF to the same degree. For example, from the 13th to the 20th century, the use of the PF was consistently favored with motion and dynamic verbs, and in the absence of a temporal adverbial (Aaron 2006). Aaron points out that the lasting correlation between the PF and motion/dynamic verbs is consistent with the original lexical meaning of the *ir a + infinitive* expression: "an agent on a path toward a goal" (p. 271). This explains why the PF is disfavored with stative (e.g., *estar, ser*), perceptual (e.g., *ver, oír*), and psychological verbs (e.g. creer); these verbs do not have semantic content that is related to the motion or energy of *ir* (Aaron, 2006). Finally, Aaron (2007) finds that as the MF's default meaning changed from futurity to epistemic modality over the centuries, speakers increasingly relied on temporal adverbials (e.g., mañana) in conjunction with the MF in order to signal that they were referring to future time and not an epistemic assessment.

3.2 Futurity in US Spanish

Most relevant to the present study is the research that has focused on the linguistic factors that condition the expression of Spanish futurity in the US. In an analysis of modern New Mexican Spanish, Villa (1997) shows that the PF tends to appear in main clauses, while the MF appears most often in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, the PF is used in 94% of contexts related to intention, and 95% of contexts related to prediction. The MF, on the other hand, is more prevalent (64%) in contexts of low certainty, a use related to epistemic modality (Villa, 1997, p. 80). Finally, in the majority of the uses of the PF (79%), the subject of the verb is an animate agent. Villa (1997) traces this finding back to the original semantic content of *ir*, since prior to the 13th century, the grammatical subjects of *ir* were always animate agents moving on a path toward a goal (See also Aaron, 2006; Company Company, 2003).

Balestra (2006) examines Spanish future expression in 19th-century (1800-1831) California with a special focus on gender. She finds that for males, the distribution of future constructions in terms of frequency is as follows: 86.3% MF; 3.2% PF; 8.4% haber de +infinitive; 2.1% present indicative. Females, on the other hand, use the PF in 34.6% of future contexts, leading Balestra to conclude that women were largely responsible for the increase in use of the PF in California. The author supports this hypothesis by pointing out that women were expected to stay at home and educate their children in 19th-century California. As a result, mothers' frequent use of the PF could have resulted in the frequent use of the PF among their children.[1] Although this does not explain exactly *why* women started to use the PF more than men, it at least suggests that a wide array of social factors may be relevant to this shift.

Two additional studies on futurity in 19th-century California—Acevedo (2000) and Moyna and Decker (2005)—confirm one of Balestra's (2006) main findings: the MF is the dominant future construction during the entire century. In fact, in Moyna and Decker's (2005) corpus of San Diego documents, the PF is not found until 1873. The authors comment that this might be due to the fact that the earlier documents in the corpus were formal, and since the PF was still an innovative/minority construction for future expression, it would have been less likely for it to appear in written Spanish. Additionally, they note that when the PF started to appear in 1873, it was used only in contexts of planning, certainty, and for expressing future time, while the MF could be used in any context, including the expression of futurity, hypothesis, and imperative force. This demonstrates that at least in written language, the MF was without a doubt the most extended future expression during the 19th century in the Southwest US.

Balestra (2006) speculates that in addition to being influenced by social factors, the Spanish MF>PF shift that occurred in 19th-century California was also accelerated due to contact with English. She explains, "...el contacto con la lengua inglesa **debe de haber influido** en la aceleración [de la forma perifrástica] que ya se estaba produciendo en el español de California cuando se trataba de una comunidad monolingüe..." (p. 44; bold my own). Although the arrival of large numbers of Anglo-Americans to California during the second half of the 19th century did coincide with a notable increase in the PF, Balestra does not explicitly discuss the reasons that English contact would have been responsible for this change. Similarly, in a study of modern US Spanish, Orozco (2007) concludes that English language contact has affected the Spanish future expression of New York Colombians: "Arriving younger and staying longer

1 cf. Otheguy (2016) for an alternate explanation of how children's language interacts with their parents'.

[in New York] are both consistent with a disfavoring effect on the MF, and a longer stay is consistent with a higher rate of use of the form most analogous to the English future, namely the PF" (p. 110). The most analogous English future construction to the Spanish PF that the author was referring to is *going to+ infinitive*.[2] Apart from pointing out the structural similarity between future forms in Spanish and English, the author does not use crosslinguistic data to probe for processes of contact-induced change, such as linguistic convergence.

3.3 The Development of English Futurity

Because scholars have proposed that contact with English future forms has contributed to the increased extension of the Spanish PF, it is necessary to understand the nature and evolution of English futurity. As in Spanish, English future expression is variable, with the structures *will + infinitive* and *going to + infinitive* being the most common (Torres Cacoullos & Walker, 2009). The English *going to* future developed in a parallel fashion to the Spanish PF. Before referring to future time, it only referred to movement toward a goal (Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2000). Nevertheless, while the Spanish PF was documented as early as the 13th century (Fleischman, 1982), the English *going to + infinitive* first appeared with a sense of futurity at the end of the 15th century, in 1482 (Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2000). This construction has been increasing in frequency in North American English since then, but it is still not as extended as the Spanish PF.

The use of the English *going to + infinitive* is conditioned by register and mode of communication, like the Spanish PF. Tagliamonte (2016) analyzed the future expression of university students in different styles of written communication. While there were no instances of the English *going to + infinitive* in the students' written essays, it did form part of their future expression in less formal writing, such as instant messages (27.6%) and email (19.4%). In oral communication, *going to +infinitive* is more abundant, making up anywhere between 34% (Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2000) and 47.2% (Szmrecsanyi, 2003) of future references in North American English. This range is lower than the average use of the PF in spoken Spanish, cross-dialectally (e.g., 66% in 20th century Spain, (Aaron, 2006); 79.2% in Bogotá, Colombia (Méndez-Vallejo, 2008)).

4. The Present Study

The present study assesses the hypothesis that the arrival of English to the Southwest US in the 19th century accelerated the use of the Spanish PF (Balestra, 2006). Future expression data from both Spanish and English during the first period of intense contact in Texas/Northern Mexico, 1822–1836, will be analyzed. One way to assess whether language change has occurred due to contact is to search for signs of linguistic convergence, a process by which structures in two languages become more similar (Torres Cacoullos & Travis, 2015). Testing for linguistic convergence requires identifying "conflict sites" between languages, which are structures that function differently even though they might serve a similar communicative function (Poplack & Meechan, 1998). In the present study, recall that the identified conflict site between Spanish

2 This was confirmed through personal communication with the author, and the reason for considering the Spanish PF and the English going to + infinitive analogous is due to the very similar evolution of these structures.

and English are the respective "go" future constructions (Orozco, 2007): the Spanish PF (*ir a + infinitive*) and the English *going to + infinitive*. A stringent assessment of linguistic convergence involves examining how the structures are used by monolinguals in each language and by bilinguals (Torres Cacoullos & Travis, 2015, p. 378). To this end, I will examine the use of the Spanish PF by monolingual Spanish speakers, the use of *going to + infinitive* by monolingual English speakers, and the use of both constructions by an advanced bilingual, Stephen F. Austin.

There are several potential findings that could support the hypothesis that English contact led to an increase in the extension of the Spanish PF. For example, if Stephen F. Austin is shown to have used the English and Spanish future constructions in a similar way, but differently than monolinguals in each language, this could indicate that the two constructions were susceptible to linguistic convergence as they competed in his linguistic repertoire at a conflict site. It is conceivable that the gradual increase of the Spanish PF has been the result of such changes in the idiolects of bilinguals that eventually led to a more significant change at the societal level, especially considering the large number of Spanish-English bilinguals that have lived in the Southwest US over nearly 200 years. Frequency might also play an important role. It is possible that the English expression *going to + infinitive* was significantly more common than the analogous Spanish PF between 1822–1836, which could have accelerated the use of the latter once in contact. Even a similar rate of usage of the constructions could have set the stage for contact-induced language change. Because the two "go" future expressions were developing in a similar fashion (Fleischman, 1982; Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2000), contact between the two languages could have accelerated this change that started internally in each language (Gutiérrez, 1995).

4.1. Corpus Background and Study Design

The years 1822–1836 constitute the period during which the first mass immigration of Anglo-Americans to Texas occurred. This was a result of Stephen F. Austin, a native of Virginia, obtaining a grant from Mexico in 1823 to settle 300 families (mostly English-speaking) in Northern Mexico, which later became the state of Texas. Between 1825–1828 Austin was given permission to settle 900 additional families, and in a partnership with his secretary Samuel M. Williams, another 800 families in western Texas (TSHA Online *Handbook*). The fact that this period marks the beginning of a situation of intense contact is of great relevance to the study of language change. Villa (1997) notes, "…para proponer un mecanismo de cambio, hay que estudiar la manera en que se usa una forma en el momento cuando aparece empleo innovador de ella" (p. 88). Spanish and English futurity as used in the present century may obscure the catalysts (i.e., "empleos innovadores") of a linguistic change that began long ago. Therefore, focusing on the first period of contact is of special interest.

Much of the documented language in this study has been obtained from the *The Austin Papers* (Barker, 1924), a corpus of transcribed letters in English and Spanish from Northern Mexico/Texas ranging from the late 1700s to 1836. Only the years 1822–1836 are included in this analysis, however, since this is the period that is characterized by robust language contact in the region. The formality of the letters varies greatly: some are informal letters between family members, some are business transactions, and others are official government correspondence. This study also includes a search of the University of North Texas's online archives, *The*

Portal to Texas History, which contains hundreds of additional letters in English and Spanish during the same period.

Given that Stephen F. Austin will serve as a case study bilingual, it is important to briefly describe his background. He was an Anglo-American, native English speaker who became a highly functional English-Spanish bilingual, writing extensively in both languages while establishing his colonies in Texas (Cantrell, 1999). Austin's Spanish use, although marked by some gender and grammatical mood inconsistencies, is very advanced, which is a result of his regular communication in Spanish with monolinguals and the fact that he "dedicated himself to the task [of learning Spanish] in a single-minded, almost fanatical, fashion" (Cantrell, 1999, p. 115).

4.2 Corpus Analysis

Using the corpus *The Austin Papers* (Barker, 1924), Spanish PF tokens were obtained from 50 letters written by Spanish monolinguals and 50 letters written by Stephen F. Austin. A search was also conducted through the University of North Texas's online corpus, *The Portal to Texas History*, which added hundreds of letters to the analysis. Since one of the goals was to compare future expression between Spanish monolinguals and Austin for the purpose of assessing linguistic convergence, each use of the PF was classified according to several of the linguistic factors that proved to be relevant to future expression in previous studies: subject animacy (animate or inanimate), verb class of the infinitive (dynamic, movement, or stative), clause type (main or subordinate), and presence of temporal adverbials (yes or no). The three-part verb class categorization is a modified version of the one from Aaron (2007). Dynamic verbs encompass several classes of non-stative verbs, such as *comer* and *decir*. Examples of movement verbs are *salir* and *entrar*. The stative category includes verbs such as *estar* and *ser*, perceptual verbs (e.g., *ver*), and psychological verbs (e.g., *creer*).

Next, in order to understand the connection between the Spanish PF and the English *going to + infinitive* between 1822–1836, all tokens of *going to + infinitive* were obtained from 50 letters written by English monolinguals and 50 letters written by Austin. *The Austin Papers* was also used for this part of the investigation. A search for *going to + infinitive* was subsequently performed through *The Portal of Texas History*, which added hundreds of additional letters to the search. The other main future construction in English, which consists of a modal verb and an infinitive—"will/shall + infinitive"—will not be considered because of its very different semantic evolution. Even though this construction is periphrastic as well, it is more similar to the Spanish MF in that its core meaning has always been rooted in modality, not movement (Tagliamonte, 2006). In other words, the historical development and grammatical structure of the Spanish PF and the English *going to+ infinitive* are nearly identical, so they would be the most likely candidates for convergence in a contact situation.

5. Results

5.1 Analysis of Spanish PF of Monolinguals and Bilingual Stephen F. Austin

A search for the Spanish PF between 1822–1836 returned 54 uses: 26 from monolinguals and 25 from Austin.[3] The factors that conditioned monolinguals' and Austin's use of the PF are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Uses of the Spanish PF by monolinguals and Stephen F. Austin according to linguistic context (26 tokens from monolinguals; 25 from Austin).

	Subject Animacy	Verb Class	Clause Type	Presence of Temporal Adverbial
Monolinguals	20 animate (76.0%)	24 dynamic (92.3%)	10 main (38.5%)	4 yes (15%)
		1 movement (3.8%)		
	6 inanimate (23.1%)	1 stative (3.8%)	16 subordinate (61.5%)	22 no (85%)
Stephen F. Austin	21 animate (84%)	18 dynamic (72%)	14 main (56%)	7 yes (28%)
		4 movement (16%)		
	4 inanimate (16%)	3 stative (12%)	11 subordinate (44%)	18 no (72%)

Understanding the general distribution of PF uses by Spanish monolinguals and Austin is the first step in assessing the likelihood of contact-induced change due to linguistic convergence. A Chi-square goodness of fit test was conducted within each group in order to determine whether the distributions of outcomes for each variable were due to chance alone, or alternatively, influenced by linguistic factors. The threshold for significance was set at $p < .05$. The analysis revealed that the distribution of results for three of the variables was not random in either group. Specifically, the PF was used more often with animate subjects (monolinguals: $X2 = 7.54$, $p = .01$; Austin: $X2 = 11.56$, $p = .001$), dynamic verbs (monolinguals: $X2 = 40.74$, $p < .001$; Austin: $X2 = 16.9$, $p < .001$), and without a temporal adverbial (monolinguals: $X2 = 12.46$, $p < .001$; Austin: $X2 = 4.84$, $p = .028$). On the other hand, a correlation between the PF and clause type was not found in either group (monolinguals: $X2 = 1.385$, $p = .239$; Austin: $X2 = .36$, $p = .549$). Finally, a Chi-square test of independence was conducted in order to compare results across groups. The analysis revealed that monolinguals' use of the PF patterned similarly to Austin's. To elaborate, there were no significant differences between the two groups' use of the PF based

3 Someone was considered a monolingual Spanish speaker if he was born in Mexico/Texas before 1822 (since English speakers had not arrived in large numbers before then) and did not write any letters in English.

on subject animacy (X2 = .405, p = .525), verb class (X2 = 3.649, p = .162), clause type (X2 = 1.574, p = .21), or presence of a temporal adverbial (X2 = 1.199, p = .274).

As Villa (1997:101) notes, the fact that the PF favors animate subjects may be attributed to the early semantic function of *ir*, which was to express movement of a living being and not movement in general. This semantic content is also linked to verb class; the PF is favored with dynamic verbs and disfavored with stative and perceptual verbs. Because stative (e.g., *ser*; *estar*) and perceptual verbs (e.g., *ver*; *sentirse*) do not require movement in order for an action to be fulfilled, it follows that their connection with the PF would be weak until this structure is semantically bleached of its original relationship with movement. The disfavoring of the PF with stative verbs is the same result that Aaron (2006, 2007) found in her diachronic studies of peninsular Spanish.

The results regarding the presence of temporal adverbials suggest that the communicative function of the Spanish PF was not ambiguous during the period in question. As Aaron (2007) explains, temporal adverbials become more common when an expression has competing functions and speakers wish to clarify that they are intending to convey futurity. Therefore, the fact that both monolingual Spanish speakers and Austin seldomly used temporal adverbials with the PF suggests that it was understood as a clear reference to future time in 19th-century Texas. In other words, when Austin wrote "He recibido noticia…que los Tahuacanos…**van a atacarnos** aquí" (1926), it was clear that he was anticipating an attack from a Native American group in the future without any implication of whether they were literally on their way to attack (i.e., on their path toward a goal). While the Spanish PF was not the default construction of futurity in written form during this period, its function was probably commonly understood as a result of its wider use in oral discourse.

The lack of evidence of a correlation between the PF and clause type in the present study is not in line with previous work. Villa (1997) reports that the PF tends to appear in main clauses in New Mexican Spanish, while Gudmestad and Geeslin (2011) document the PF more in subordinate clauses among both native and non-native Spanish speakers. Aaron (2006) only finds clause type to be a significant factor in future expression selection during the 19th century in Spain. Because of the inconsistent results from the studies mentioned and the lack of a correlation in the present study, it is clear that clause type, of all the variables discussed, has the weakest link to the Spanish PF.

5.2 Analysis of English Futurity

Of the 260 tokens of English future-time reference in the 50 selected letters from English monolinguals in *The Austin Papers*, not a single periphrastic *going to+ infinitive* structure was found. Futurity was most commonly expressed with the modals *will* and *shall*. However, the search for "going to" in *The Portal to Texas History* between the years 1822 and 1836 did yield eight uses of this structure with a sense of futurity (e.g., "…Sophia Hawkins is going to marry soon"; *The Portal to Texas History*, 1832). All other uses of *going to* indicated movement only (e.g., "She is going to Texas"). This clearly demonstrates that the most obvious English candidate for possible linguistic convergence with the Spanish PF—*going to + infinitive*—was not common in American English among monolinguals during this period, at least in written form.

The subsequent analysis of Stephen F. Austin's English revealed that the expression *going to + infinitive* was exceedingly rare in his writing. He used it precisely once between 1822–1836; the

context is shown in (2).

(2) "I wish to know definitely what you intend to do for I must make some final arrangement before long…At all events let me know what you are **going to do** and when you will be here" (Stephen F. Austin, 9/22/1830)

Austin's single use of this English construction contrasts starkly with his 25 uses of the Spanish PF. To ensure that no uses of *going to + infinitive* by Austin were overlooked, I conducted a search for this construction in an additional database, the *Digital Austin Papers*, which contains hundreds of English letters written by this author. The search confirmed that he produced *going to + infinitive* with a sense of futurity only once between 1822–1836.

It is interesting to note that the search for *going to + infinitive* in Austin's writing returned one additional result from a letter written in 1829, which was later discarded. It read, "I am **going to put** my ideas in some form and I shall send them to you" (*Portal to History of Texas*). After a more thorough investigation, however, it became clear that Austin did not actually write this English version of the letter—it was a translation of one of his letters originally written in Spanish (translated by W.W. Robinson). At this point I located the original letter in *The Austin Papers*, and found that Austin had written "***Voy a poner** mis ideas en alguna forma y la mandaré a [usted]*". It was W.W. Robinson, then, who likely completed a word-by-word translation of Austin's *voy a poner*, resulting in "I am **going to put** my ideas…". This is probably not how Austin would have translated this phrase into English, however. He almost certainly would have expressed this as "I will/shall put my ideas…", given that *going to + infinitive* was almost completely absent in his writing.

6. Discussion

The results from this study indicate that between 1822–1836, the infrequent English structure *going to + infinitive* is unlikely to have played a significant role in the extension of the Spanish PF in Texas/Northern Mexico. Between both monolingual English speakers and Austin, there were only 9 uses of *going to + infinitive* in their letters, but between monolingual Spanish speakers and Austin, there were 54 instances of the Spanish PF. The case of Stephen F. Austin is particularly interesting because it reveals how the Spanish PF and the English *going to + infinitive* competed in the mind of a bilingual. The findings suggest that selectively using the PF in written Spanish was something that Austin acquired in his second language, rather than one that he transferred from his first language based on his use of *going to + infinitive*. He apparently used the Spanish PF stylistically (perhaps to express a nuance that the MF could not), but he did not use the analogous English expression in a similar fashion. Over a period of 14 years, Austin only found it necessary to use *going to + infinitive* once in written form, but he used the Spanish PF 25 times intermittingly, with the first instance in 1823, and the last in 1835.

Another goal of this study was to consider potential linguistic convergence between English and Spanish futurity by comparing the analogous "go" structures in the two languages according to the linguistic factors that conditioned their use. If there were crosslinguistic discrepancies in how these structures were used, this would have constituted a conflict site and could have led to linguistic convergence. However, it was not possible to conduct a full cross-

linguistic analysis of convergence due to the scarcity of the English *going to + infinitive*. With only 9 tokens gathered from several different people, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the conditions that favored its use. As a result, there is no discernible sign of linguistic convergence between the two "go" future constructions in Spanish and English during the years 1822–1836.

Additionally, it is possible to speculate that English contact did not significantly affect the use of the Spanish PF because the English-dominant bilingual Stephen F. Austin was able to use the Spanish PF similarly to Spanish monolinguals. Both used the PF primarily with animate subjects, dynamic verbs, and without a temporal adverbial; neither were sensitive to clause type. The same general linguistic distribution between the two groups indicates that Austin's dominance in English did not interfere with his ability to use the Spanish PF like Spanish monolinguals.

Through a consideration of the historical evolution of futurity in Spanish and the results obtained in this study, English contact does not appear to have been a major factor in the acceleration of the shift from MF>PF in the Southwest US when the two languages came into contact in the 19th century (c.f., Balestra, 2002). Diachronic studies on Spanish have shown that the MF>PF shift had already been underway for several centuries by this point. In the absence of significant contact with English, the use of the PF also increased from a relative frequency of 4% to 27% between the 17th and 20th centuries in Spain (Aaron, 2006). It is therefore relevant to consider one of Poplack, Zentz, and Dion's (2012) tests for linguistic change in a candidate feature as a result of contact: the feature should not be found in pre-contact varieties, since if this is the case, the change could be completely internal. Because the shift from MF>PF was already in progress internally in Spanish in areas that did not have previous significant contact with English (e.g., Spain; Mexico before 1822), a claim that English contact changed the quantitative or qualitative use of the Spanish PF would have to be supported by a nuanced analysis that also accounted for internal change in Spanish.

While it is clear that English did not initiate the shift from MF>PF in Spanish in the US, we still have to explain why the PF is more prevalent in the Spanish of bilinguals in the US than in many monolingual varieties. Gutiérrez (1995), for example, concludes that language contact with English was a factor in the acceleration of the PF given that the Southwest Spanish-English bilinguals in his study use the PF 37% more than the monolingual Spanish speakers in Mexico City (89% vs 51%). Also, through an analysis of sociolinguistic interviews, Orozco (2007) finds that Colombians living in New York use the PF 16.6% more than Spanish monolinguals in Colombia. Although he points out that there may be several social factors relevant to the expression of futurity, such as age, sex, length of time in the US, education, and social class, he also states that "a longer stay [in New York] is consistent with a higher rate of use of the form most analogous to the English future, namely the PF" (110). However, what Orozco (2007) does not consider is that the most analogous form to the Spanish PF—*going to + infinitive*—is no more common than the less analogous future construction in English, *will+ infinitive*.

Based on a corpus analysis of American spoken English, Szmrecsanyi (2003) reports that the *going to+infinitive* is used in 47.2% of future contexts, which is slightly less than the frequency of *will + infinitive*[4]—52.8% (p. 303). Tagliamonte (2006) finds that the two forms are used with

4 Szmrecsanyi (2003) included three marginal uses of *shall + infinitive* (0.6% of future forms) in the same category as *will + infinitive*.

roughly equal frequency in Toronto English (~40-45% each), "competing quite vigorously" (313). To illustrate why these rates of the English *going to + infinitive* are problematic for claims of contact-induced change in US Spanish, consider the context in Orozco (2007). The monolingual Spanish speakers from Colombia in his study use the Spanish PF at a rate of 45.9%, but the New York Colombians use it at a rate of 62.5%. It is unlikely that this 16.6% spike in the New York Colombians' use of the Spanish PF is attributable to English contact if we assume that the analogous structure *going to + infinitive* makes up only 47.2% of future expression in American English (Szmrecsanyi, 2003). In theory, it is true that if English and Spanish are both independently experiencing an increase in their periphrastic "go" futures, a contact situation could accelerate this process (Gutierrez, 1995). Nevertheless, if this is the case, there should also be a spike in the use of the English *going to + infinitive* among the New York Colombians. Without an analysis of the English spoken in this bilingual community, the claim that the dramatic acceleration of the Spanish PF in this region is partly caused by English contact is only speculative (Orozco, 2007).

It is important to point out that Orozco (2007) does not claim that English contact is the only cause of the extension of the PF. Since the bilingual Colombians from his study were residing in New York, he also suggests that their high rates of PF could have been influenced by contact with other Spanish dialects that have particularly high PF rates, such as Caribbean Spanish. Recall that in Caribbean Spanish, the PF is used in 71% to 95% of future contexts (Silva Corvalán & Terrell, 1989). The influence of Caribbean Spanish is particularly important to consider in the Northeast, since in 2012, there were 4.9 million Puerto Ricans in the mainland US, and 52% of them were living in the Northeast (Cohn, Patten, & Lopez, 2014). Due to these demographics, it is certainly plausible that dialect leveling has played a role in the extension of the PF in the US (Orozco, 2007), but this question will require further research.

There is evidence from a different language contact context that suggests that the acceleration of the Spanish PF is not always a result of a crosslinguistic conflict between future constructions. Escobar (1997) explains that in the Andean Spanish of Peru, "future time is expressed almost exclusively by means of the periphrastic expression *ir a + infinitive*" (p. 73); the MF is used only 2% of the time to refer to future time (Escobar, 1997). The increased rates of the PF in this region have been a consequence of the MF losing its connection to future expression and gaining a stronger association to the expression of modality and evidentiality. Evidentiality is a subsystem of modality, and it is used to provide information about the source of information (i.e., whether or not the speaker personally experienced something) (Escobar, 1997). As the MF took on these new functions in Andean Spanish, the PF filled its void as the standard expression of future time. Put differently, rather than changing due to convergence with a structure in Quechua, the PF became more prevalent in order to replace the MF's waning function of future expression.

With a lack of clear evidence supporting the idea that English contact has significantly contributed to the wider use of the Spanish PF in the US, it is important to consider other factors that can play a role in morphosyntactic change. For example, it has been shown that morphosyntactic simplification in Spanish is a natural occurrence once speakers have been displaced from an area where Spanish is the dominant, majority language. This process was revealed in successive generations of US Spanish speakers in Silva-Corvalán (1994). A similar displacement of Spanish speakers occurred when Texas became an independent Republic in 1836. Martínez (2005) explains that the Anglo-dominant Republicans made "lo mexicano" the

enemy, and Spanish-speakers were often denied their rights due to linguistic intolerance. Despite this reality, bilingual education was still very common—and for the most part tolerated—until the end of the 19th century, due to the large populations of people of Mexican, German, and Czech heritage in Texas (Blanton, 2004). In fact, even in the 1880s, there is evidence of Spanish being the overwhelmingly dominant language in many areas, as revealed in a quote from a Texan judge during this period: "The entire population of the county are Mexican and [it] is very hard for teachers to teach the English language and make rapid progress..." (Blanton, 2004, p. 28).

Toward the end of the 19th century, an English-only movement gained momentum in Texas (Blanton, 2004). In 1893 and 1905, laws were passed that required that only English be taught in schools, but these laws ultimately failed to eliminate bilingual education because of a lack of enforcement (Blanton, 2004). However, in 1918, an English-only law was passed that was "totalitarian in its scope and finality" (Blanton, 2004, p. 76). At this point, it became a criminal offense to teach in a language other than English, and this law officially remained in place until the late 1960s (Blanton, 2004). The linguistic politics of Texas between 1836 and the present day are important to consider when examining language change in the state. The lack of access to formal Spanish instruction would have provided the ideal situation for language simplification, such as the loss of the subjunctive mood (Silva-Corvalán, 1994) or a marginalization of the MF.

The uneven access to Spanish education in the US is particularly relevant to future expression because the MF is most commonly used in written/formal Spanish, not in spoken Spanish (Méndez-Vallejo, 2008). This means that people who do not learn to read and write in Spanish will naturally use the MF less, and consequently, the PF more. What is more, the MF is acquired late by both native and non-native Spanish speakers (Kernan & Blount, 1966; Solon & Kanwit, 2014), so superficial exposure to the MF will likely lead to more reliance on the PF. While the English-only policies of the 20th century are no longer in place in states like Texas, the majority of US bilinguals/heritage speakers are schooled primarily in English, which does not allow them to develop an academic register in the same way as their monolingual counterparts in countries where Spanish is the dominant language. In the absence of formal instruction, many Spanish speakers in the US may rely more on unconscious influences when selecting future expressions, such as Silva-Corvalán's *principle of distance*: "When speakers select a form from two or more that are in competition, they tend to choose the form with the closest temporal, spatial, or psychological meaning" (Gutiérrez, 1995, p. 222). With regard to future expression, the PF is the form with the closer temporal, spatial, and psychological meaning (Villa, 1997). Incidentally, this principle may be contributing to the extension of the Spanish PF in all dialects, but the effect is exaggerated in contexts where formal instruction in Spanish is not available.

7. Conclusion

In this paper I have offered an overview of periphrastic "go" future constructions in Texas/Northern Mexico during the first period of contact between English and Spanish. While the Spanish PF already had a foothold in written correspondence between 1822–1836, the English *going to + infinitive* was exceedingly rare. For this reason, it is unlikely that English contact significantly fueled the extension of the Spanish PF in the US during this century, which counters

Balestra's (2006) hypothesis. Additionally, the fact that the English-dominant bilingual Stephen F. Austin did not use the English "go" structure systematically but still learned to use the Spanish PF in a native-like way suggests that these future constructions did not represent a conflict site for him. In other words, his expression of futurity did not show signs of linguistic convergence.

Without supporting evidence based on stringent tests of contact-induced change (see Torres Cacoullos & Travis, 2015), it will be difficult to prove that English has played a role in the acceleration of the Spanish PF in the US for four fundamental reasons:

1) The Spanish MF>PF shift began as a language-internal change (Fleischman 1982).
2) The development of the Spanish PF has historically outpaced—and continues to outpace—the development of the English *going to + infinitive* (Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2000).
3) There are exceptionally high rates of the Spanish PF found in areas of the Spanish-speaking world without significant English-Spanish contact (Escobar 1997; Silva-Coravalán & Terrell 1989), and in general, the PF predominates among future constructions in the Spanish-speaking world (see Orozco, 2007).
4) The MF is acquired late, by both native and non-native Spanish speakers (Kernan & Blount 1966; Solon & Kanwit, 2014), and it is most commonly used in written/formal Spanish (Méndez-Vallejo, 2008). The MF will naturally be less common among speakers who were not educated extensively in Spanish, like the majority of heritage/bilingual speakers in the US

It seems that the MF>PF shift is mostly the result of the natural loss of and lack of exposure to the MF. Until a more specific connection between the Spanish PF and the English language is established in a way that can simultaneously address the four points above, the process of dialect leveling (Orozco, 2007), the language-internal loss of the MF, and the limited access to formal education in Spanish might be considered the most pertinent factors in the MF>PF shift in the US.

Works Cited

Aaron, J. E. (2006). Me voy a tener que ir yendo: A Corpus-Based study of the grammaticization of the ir a+ INF construction in Spanish. In *Selected Proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Somerville: Cascadilla.

Aaron, J. E. (2007). El futuro epistémico y la variación: gramaticalización y expresión de la futuridad desde 1600. *Moenia* 13: 253–274.

Acevedo, R. (2000). Perspectiva histórica del paradigma verbal en el español de Califonia. *Research in Spanish in the US*, ed. by Ana Roca, 110–20. Somerville: Cascadilla.

Balestra, A. (2002). Del futuro morfológico al perifrástico: Un cambio morfosintáctico en el español de California, 1800–1930. Houston: University of Houston, dissertation.

Balestra, A. (2006). El tiempo futuro en el español de California (1800–1930): Incidencia del género en un cambio lingüístico en marcha. *Spanish in Context* 3.1: 25–47.

Barker, E. C. (ed.) (1924). *The Austin papers*. US Government Printing Office.

Blanton, C. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas*, 1836-1981 (Fronteras series; no. 2). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Bybee, J., Perkins, R. D., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cantrell, G. (1999). *Stephen F. Austin, empresario of Texas*. New Haven: Yale University Press: William P. Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Southern Methodist University.

Cohn, D., Patten, E., & Lopez, M.H. (2014). Puerto Rican Population Declines on Island, Grows on U.S. Mainland. *Pew Research Center's Hispanic Trends Project*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/08/2014-08-11_Puerto-Rico-Final.pdf

Company Company, C. (2003). La gramaticalización en la historia del español. *Medievalia* 35.

Digital Austin Papers. (n.d.). Accessed January 2, 2019, from http://digitalaustinpapers.org/.

Escobar, A. M. (1997). From time to modality in Spanish in contact with Quechua. *Hispanic Linguistics* 9: 64–99.

Fleischman, S. (1982). The future in thought and language. Diachronic evidence from Romance. *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics London* 36.

Gómez Manzano, P. (1988). La expresión del futuro absoluto en el español hablado en Madrid y en México. *Anuario de Letras* 26.

Gudmestad, A., & Geeslin, K. L. (2011). Assessing the use of multiple forms in variable contexts: The relationship between linguistic factors and future-time reference in Spanish. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 4.1: 3–34.

Gutiérrez, M. J. (1995). On the future of the future tense in the Spanish of the Southwest. *Spanish in four continents: Studies in language contact and bilingualism*, ed. by Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 214–26. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Kanwit, M. (2014). *The acquisition of future expression* in L2 Spanish. Dissertation. Indiana University.

Kernan, K., & Blount, B. (1966). The acquisition of Spanish grammar by Mexican children. *Anthropological Linguistics* 8.9: 1–14.

Martínez, G. A. (2005). Políticas de subordinación lingüística en Tejas durante la época revolucionaria. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 29.3: 231–46.

Méndez-Vallejo, D.C. (2008). Periphrastic and morphological future forms in Bogotá Spanish: A preliminary sociolinguistic study of upper-class speakers. *IULC Working Papers*

Online 8.3: 1-22.
Montes Giraldo, J. J. (1962). Sobre la categoría de futuro en el español de Colombia. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* 17.3: 528–555.
Moyna, I. M., & Decker, W. (2005). A historical perspective on Spanish in the California borderlands. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 24.1-2: 145–68.
Orozco, R. (2007). Social constraints on the expression of futurity in Spanish-speaking urban communities. *In Selected Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*. 103–12.
Otheguy, R. (2016). The linguistic competence of second-generation bilinguals: A critique of "incomplete acquisition." *Romance Linguistics 2013*, ed. by Christina Tortora; Marcel den Dikken; Ignacio L. Montoya; & Teresa O'Neill, 301–320. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
Penny, R. (2002). *A history of the Spanish language*. Cambridge University Press.
Poplack, S., & Meechan, M. (1998). Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. International Journal of Bilingualism, *2*(2), 127–138.
Poplack, S, Zentz, L., & Dion, N. (2012). Phrase-final prepositions in Quebec French: An empirical study of contact, code-switching and resistance to convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 15.2: 203–25.
Poplack, S., & Tagliamonte, S. (2000). The grammaticization of going to in (African American) English. *Language Variation and Change*, 11.3: 315-342.
Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). The gradual loss of mood distinctions in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language Variation and Change* 6.3: 255–72.
Silva-Corvalán, C, & Terrell, T. (1989). Notas sobre la expresión de futuridad en el español del Caribe. *Hispanic Linguistics* 2.2: 191–208.
Solon, M, & Kanwit, M. (2014). The emergence of future verbal morphology in Spanish as a foreign language. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 7.1: 115–148.
Szmrecsanyi, B. (2003). Be going to versus will/shall: Does syntax matter? *Journal of English Linguistics* 31.4: 295–323.
Tagliamonte, S. (2006). 'So cool, right?': Canadian English entering the 21st century." *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics/La revue canadienne de linguistique* 51.2 : 309–31.
Tagliamonte, S. 2016. So sick or so cool? The language of youth on the internet. *Language in Society* 45.1: 1–32.
The Handbook of Texas Online. (n.d.). Accessed December 21, 2015, from https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online
The Portal to Texas History. (n.d.). Accessed December 21, 2015, from http://texashistory.unt.edu/
Torres Cacoullos, R., & Travis, C. E. (2015). Gauging convergence on the ground: Code-switching in the community. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 19.4: 365-386.
Torres Cacoullos, R., & Walker, J. (2009). The Present of the English Future: Grammatical Variation and Collocations in Discourse. *Language*, 85(2), 321-354.
Villa, D. (1997). El desarrollo de futuridad en el español. México, DF: Grupo Editorial Eón.