

Hispanic Acculturation

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University Of Alicante

Summary

Acculturation was the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humankind, and it integrated the history of languages, societies, and cultures. The hypothesis of the anthropological history of humankind as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to the linguistic, social, and cultural facts and to the very continuity of history. Our main working hypothesis was that within Hispanic acculturation there was linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Punic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Catalan-Aragonese, medieval Castilian, medieval Valencian, Castilian, and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups and their adaptation to a new sociocultural context. This hypothesis has been confirmed, and the aforementioned peoples and cultures were the first agents of the change from medieval Latin to Romance languages within their respective speech communities. In this sense, Hispanic acculturation offers the most significant contribution of European languages and cultures to the anthropological history of humanity over the past twenty-five centuries, even though it has gone largely unnoticed despite its undeniable importance. Linguistic change did not occur without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and language shift were integral to acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion. There was never a final generation of medieval Latin, nor a first generation of Romance languages. Therefore, there was never an origin or death of languages, but rather acculturation and linguistic and cultural continuity. The fact that Basque, Catalan, Galician, and Guarani are currently co-official languages with Spanish raises the need for a new anthropological history that seeks to appreciate the meaning of the events and takes as its starting point and reference system the positions adopted by the various cultures.

Keywords: *Acculturation, Hispanic acculturation, linguistic and cultural transfers, social and cultural mixing, languages in contact, language shift.*

Date of Submission: 02-12-2025

Date of Acceptance: 12-12-2025

I. Introduction

The introduction of anthropology into medieval history was one of the most significant historiographical developments of the last third of the 20th century. Indeed (since 1970), there has been an enrichment of perspectives and a deepening of the understanding of the configuration of society, and especially of its behaviors in relation to the territory it occupied. The interest of geographers and economists in regional phenomena and analysis was strengthened in the field of medieval studies by the emergence of a series of notable French theses based on this type of framework (G. Fourquin, R. Fossier, P. Toubert, P. Bonnassie, and G. Bois).

The central idea of ecosystem and the key concept of acculturation were used by some Spanish historians to show a new perspective on the implications that the social organization of space had during the Middle Ages in the Crown of Castile, and to offer a new interpretation of the behavior of Hispanic-Christian society. J. A. García de Cortázar (1985) proposed starting from the conception of society and space as elements of a system, whose evolution occurred through the complexity of its social organization, and established the close connection between the formulas of economic reproduction and the structures of domination and social cohesion, as well as the system of values (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1973).

The introduction of anthropology (and medieval history) into the history of language was later, and could be placed at the end of the last century. F. Gimeno, (1988a, 1988b, 1990: 138-44, 1995) pointed out that sociolinguistics was born from an anthropological commitment that ultimately viewed linguistics as a chapter of social and cultural anthropology (and of the psychology of knowledge). General sociolinguistics as an extension and revision of institutional disciplines (linguistics, sociology and anthropology) integrated a *sociology of language* and a *strict sociolinguistics*, as well as the *ethnography of communication* (see C. F. Hockett, 1958/1962; C. A. Ferguson, 1959; B. Malmberg, 1966; R. Jakobson, 1970; J. A. Fishman, 1964/1968, 1971; D. Hymes, 1971, 1974; B. J. Imhoff, 1999; H. López Morales, 2006; F. Gimeno, 2019: 182-96).

Studies on linguistic and cultural contact in Europe lacked broad coordination, even though the forerunners were European (W. Leopold, E. Haugen, and U. Weinreich). U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologists, linguistic contact was simply one aspect of cultural contact, and language transfer was a facet of social diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increased anthropological interest in contact issues, particularly in the United States after World War I, studies on linguistic and cultural contact remained largely uncoordinated, and the relationship between these two fields of study had not been properly defined.

The most interesting problem in language transfer was the interaction of social and cultural factors that promoted or hindered such transfer. Anthropologists investigating acculturation were compelled to include linguistic evidence as indicators of the overall acculturation process, while linguists needed the help of anthropology to describe and analyze those factors that governed language transfer and were truly within the realm of culture.

II. Acculturation

Acculturation was the empirical foundation of the anthropological history of humanity, and it integrated the history of languages, societies, and cultures. The hypothesis of the anthropological history of humanity as a succession of acculturations was more appropriate to the linguistic, social, and cultural facts and to the very continuity of history. There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and of language shift were part of acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion. It was, therefore, not merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. The fundamental principle of the history of linguistic change and language shift was the acculturation of social groups, with social and cultural mixing (see F. Gimeno, 2024d, 2025g).

Acculturation refers to all cultural phenomena resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation was widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to describe the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together, without distinguishing whether it should be applied to the results or the processes of cultural change.

Acculturation, therefore, encompassed those events resulting from direct and continuous contact between social groups with different cultures, with the corresponding changes and reinterpretations in the original culture of one or both groups. The terms “acceptance,” “adaptation,” and “reaction” referred to the assimilation of cultural elements and their reinterpretation within new groups, as well as the rejection of those elements. Gradually, the term *transculturation* has become less common than the more frequent acculturation. While the latter was used to refer to the change of one or both poles of contact, transculturation has generally been used in relation to a single society or group (see F. Gimeno, 2024a, 2024b).

R. Menéndez Pidal (1923: 414) wrote that the languages of Spain had three periods of development:

- 1) From the earliest times until the end of the Second Punic War in 206 BC.
- 2) From the arrival of the Romans in Spain in 206 BC until the fall of the Visigoths in 711 AD.
- 3) From the Arab invasion in 711 AD to the present day.

Regarding its main purpose, the *History of Humankind: Cultural and Scientific Development* (I, 7-9), sponsored by UNESCO (1963), alluded in its "Preface" to the need to overcome traditional approaches to the study of history that attributed decisive importance to political, economic, and military factors. A history was needed that sought to appreciate the meaning of events, taking as its starting point and frame of reference the positions adopted by diverse cultures. The perspective opened by each culture on the universal in human beings was a projection of that culture's humanity within its own particular circumstances.

The fundamental principle in the history of languages in contact and linguistic change was the acculturation of generational and social groups. An anthropological history of the Hispanic Romance languages presupposed the contact of different social groups and languages, with the linguistic and cultural transfers that entailed the social and cultural mixing of pre-Roman peoples within the various Romance-speaking communities.

E. Coseriu (1955: 157) alluded to the fact that, by discarding linguistic geography, the generality and physical nature of the “phonetic law” had to introduce a new norm: the continuity of areas. The risks of falling into the objectivism of linguistic forms and areas considered as independent of speakers, and of attending only to multiplicity and heterogeneity, implied questioning the unity and homogeneity of language (see A. Alonso, 1941; R. Menéndez Pidal, 1950; A. Martinet, 1955: 275-80; E. Coseriu, 1958; B. Malmberg, 1963; Y. Malkiel, 1976; F. Gimeno, 1984, 1985, 1995: 40-2).

During the second half of the last century, significant contributions to historical linguistics were made, which went largely unrecognized by historians of language. These contributions have yielded major breakthroughs and technical applications to address issues lacking any social context and previously inexplicable phenomena. The only viable solution was the intrinsic relationship between language, society, and culture.

Within the anthropological history of Hispanic Romance languages, our working hypothesis has been that there was a linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Phoenician - Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Catalan-Aragonese, medieval Castilian, medieval Valencian, Castilian and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups, and the adaptation to a new sociocultural context.

This hypothesis has been confirmed (see F. Gimeno, 2025a, 2025b, 2025c, 2025d, 2025e, 2025f). The aforementioned peoples and cultures were the first agents of the Latin-medieval change to Romance languages in their respective speech communities. In this sense, Hispanic acculturation offers the most significant contribution of European languages and cultures, for more than twenty-five centuries, to the anthropological history of humanity, even though it has gone largely unnoticed, despite its undeniable importance. The fact that Basque, Catalan, Galician, and Guarani are currently co-official languages with Spanish necessitates a new anthropological history that seeks to appreciate the significance of these events and takes as its starting point and frame of reference the positions adopted by the various cultures. (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 1969, 1973, 2012, 2016, F. Gimeno and C. García Turza, 2010; F. Gimeno 2016a, 2016b, 2019).

In his considerations on structuralism and history, R. Menéndez Pidal (1959: 106-9) sought to adopt the new methodological proposals, but within his own convictions and without revising his basic foundations. He thus assimilated the concept of “structure” and the idea that evolution depended on a millennia-old tradition that exerted pressure on the structural forces at work at any given time. In most cases, he concluded, when faced with a linguistic change, the possibilities for historical explanation should first be examined, and his initial hypothesis was that a prior historical tradition preceded structural development and therefore conditioned it.

Previously, R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950: 532-8) commented that the beginning of language evolution had been sought in each generational change, but generations (according to him) did not change every twenty or thirty years, but rather were born and imperceptibly renewed every day. Undoubtedly, this was an unfounded geological assumption, within a section where the author argued that the constitution of a phonological change was never the exclusive work of three or four generations into which the coexisting population was arbitrarily divided, but rather the product of a latent, multi-secular state that persisted through many generations of social groups, and was based on the fact that many consecutive generations shared the same innovative idea and constituted a new tradition, in conflict with an older one (see W. von Wartburg, 1950; M. Torreblanca, in press; F. Gimeno, 2019, 2025h).

The term “substrate” denoted the latent influence of the conquered native languages on the conquering languages, and was accepted (in one way or another) by various linguists, even from the beginning of the 19th century (see I. Jordan, 1932: 20-1). Regarding the assumption of linguistic strata, BE Vidos (1956: 203) suggested that, fundamentally, substrate, superstratum, and adstratum were nothing more than metaphorical expressions to indicate the linguistic influences of the conquered, conquering, and coexisting peoples, respectively.

However, the historian P. Wolff (1971), when he summarized that in Gaul the action of the superstratum confirmed and reinforced the action of the substrates, did not realize that the duality of the victorious/vanquished people offered the same result (linguistic transfers), and that this meant that the conflict did not matter, since it was unrelated to linguistic change.

The influence of the linguistic substrate was explained by the enormous duration of phonological changes, the long coexistence of forms that competed against one another, and the latent state of a deeply rooted tendency, though completely ignored by observers. Linguistic geography asserted that each word had its own history, and that the sum of the histories of each word would give us the history of the formation of the phonological rule.

R. Menéndez Pidal's (1911:26-70) assumption that Castilian epic poetry in its primitive period lived for several centuries in constant variation and a supposed latent state, in which there were no written texts, but rather limited oral texts on each occasion, was an incomprehensible contradiction, since in the long process of Scythian normalization of Castilian Romance (and in the specific one of epic poetry), within the ancient stage, the materialization of the *Poem of Mio Cid* was inadmissible (sociologically and culturally), through the oral transmission of the various minstrels who intervened in the creation and dissemination of the Poem. The author was a multilingual monk from Burgos (Per Abatt) with a deep knowledge of the corresponding Poetics, and it was written in the Benedictine abbey of Saints Peter and Paul of Cardeña, documentarily related to Rodríguez

Díaz de Vivar, at the beginning of the 13th century (see R. Menéndez Pidal (ed.) 1908-1911; K. Baldinger, 1958, 1988; M. Seco (ed.) 2003; M. Torreblanca, 2021; J. F. Domene, 2021; F. Gimeno, 2021, 2024b).

Within the sociocultural framework of language contact, U. Weinreich (1953: 4) reiterated (based on the words of E. Haugen) that theories constructed about the influence of languages remained suspended in mid-air, since what had been said about substrates and superstrata had to continue to be considered stratospheric unless empirically observed in the behavior of different social groups. The assumption of strata confusedly simplified the facts of linguistic and cultural transfer in social situations of language contact and represented a very superficial and pre-scientific first manifestation of a grammatical theory of linguistic change, based on the contributions of social multilingualism and acculturation.

We sociolinguists have thus overcome the obsolete assumption of linguistic strata, veritable catch-alls and mere imitations of the bilingual chapter, and accepted the proposal of historical sociolinguistics on the general configuration of linguistic change, based on the social situations of language contact.

In contrast to traditional and meager labels of substrate, superstratum and adstratum, we had to look for hypotheses based on empirical studies on linguistic behavior and the dimensions of social multilingualism, and specify which facts of linguistic transfer (interference, code-switching, calque or borrowing) and of cultural transfer (social and cultural mixing) appeared to be involved in which dynamic (linguistic substitution and acculturation), within the convergent strategies of linguistic and cultural change.

On the other hand, centuries-old traditions and stable discursive traditions of written texts were foreign to the anthropological history of the communicative competences of successive generations of different social groups, within the Basque-Iberian acculturation of some Romance-speaking communities, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition.

Variation and change were distinct dimensions of linguistic evolution, and ongoing variation should never be confused with linguistic change. While all change implied ongoing variation, not all variation implied change. Indeed, linguistic change based on the discontinuous interaction of parents and children simplified the issue to generational variation, but the parents' grammar was the first component of the child's first grammar, ensuring acculturation and the continuity of familial transmission.

The historical varieties of Medieval Latin could be arranged along a temporal continuum, like a chain in which each pair of adjacent varieties from successive generations of social groups (within the different speech communities) were mutually intelligible, although the opposite ends of that chain were not. There was never a final generation of Medieval Latin, nor a first generation of Romance languages. Therefore, there was no origin or death of languages, but rather acculturation and linguistic and cultural continuity. (See P. Bec, 1970; L. Rubio, 1971; Y. Malkiel, 1985: 30-40; J. Portolés, 1986: 45-83; M. T. Echenique, 2004; H. Lüdtke, 1968, 2005: 565-8; F. Gimeno, 1995: 21-7).

Regarding the realism and contribution of variational grammar, H. Weydt and B. Schlieben-Lange (1981) expressed some skepticism, arguing that variationists were replacing the concept of a 'functional language' system with the conception of language as a continuum. According to these authors, a functionalist sociolinguistics was meaningless. However, the aim was simply to situate discrete varieties on a continuum determined by their partial similarities, in order to construct a diasystem at a higher level than that of discrete and homogeneous systems, and to move towards the analysis of language use. This would allow for the complementation and revision of ultimate generative approaches through the heterogenization of homogeneity. Variability and regularity were not mutually exclusive and constituted the key to a correct understanding and general and historical explanation of the process of linguistic change. Furthermore, a "structured heterogeneity" of language was proposed, and mother tongue mastery implied control of such heterogeneous structures.

J. P. Rona (1976) examined the relationship between sociolinguistic stratification and dialectal variation, without which the dialectal situation and evolution could not be satisfactorily explained. His working hypothesis was clear regarding the Uruguayan-Brazilian border, between Montevideo (Uruguay) and Porto Alegre (Brazil), in which geographical varieties could be arranged along a dialectal continuum, like a chain of contiguous varieties in which each pair of adjacent varieties were mutually intelligible, but those at opposite ends of the chain were not (see E. Haugen, 1953/1969, 1973; U. Weinreich, W. Labov and M. I. Herzog, 1968: 187-8; J. Herman, 1975/1997).

The association between structure and homogeneity was a false assumption, since linguistic structure included the ordered differentiation of social groups and registers through rules governing variation within the speech community. F. Gimeno (1987, 1990, 46-9, 79-87) distinguished between the term's *idiomatic community*, *linguistic community*, and *speech community*. The idiomatic community defined a set of social groups belonging to a historically established language. The linguistic community implied a shared language. The speech community specified social groups (not necessarily speaking the same language) characterized by a shared

knowledge of communicative constraints and norms of social behavior, and was configured by certain evaluative behaviors and by the uniformity of abstract models of variation (see H. López Morales, 1989: 180-207).

III. Basque-Iberian Acculturation

Among the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, Iberian was the best documented, allowing for a phonological system to be developed for the textual material of inscriptions. This culture was the product of the arrival of new social groups (probably of North African origin) during the Neolithic period along the entire Mediterranean coast, from southern France to the southern Iberian Peninsula. In the first millennium BCE, it was impacted by a Phoenician-Punic-Greek acculturation, resulting from the introduction of new technologies on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as well as from repeated contact with individuals from that region who possessed a more advanced culture.

From an archaeological perspective, some clearly distinguishing elements of Iberian culture include: complex settlements, developed urban planning, the existence of large-scale religious and funerary sculpture, the use of the potter's wheel, early knowledge of writing, and the use of coinage in the final centuries of its independent existence. Iberian culture arose as a consequence of the impact exerted on the indigenous populations by small groups from the East, traditionally identified as Phoenicians and Greeks, although these names encompassed people of very diverse origins who arrived on the coasts of the Iberian Peninsula from the second millennium BC onward. Its degree of influence was very different on the different coasts of the peninsula, and if we add to this the fact that the cultural development of the various Hispanic peoples was also different, it should not surprise us that neither the degree nor the process of Iberianization was homogeneous throughout the Iberian area (see M. Gómez Moreno, 1943; A. Tovar, 1962; F. González Ollé, 1970, 2016; M. Echenique, 1983, 2004, 2006, 2013b; S. Segura and J. M. Etxebarria, 1996; F. Villar, 2014).

Although we can identify the Iberians as indigenous people inhabiting the Mediterranean coasts and acknowledging that much of southeastern France was quickly Iberianized, Iberian culture also spread inland, assimilating peoples who initially could not be considered Iberian, such as those of the Ebro Valley or the Meseta Central. Iberian culture, therefore, did not represent an ethnic unity, but rather a cultural one. Thus, it was not surprising that peoples originally not Iberian (such as those in the interior of the peninsula) became culturally Iberianized over the centuries, even though regional and local differences within Iberian culture remained. The Iberian world was composed of a mosaic of peoples (Turdetani, Bastetani, Contestani, Oretani, Edetani, Ilercavones, Lacetani, Ilergetes, Vascones, etc.).

Iberian had five vowel phonemes /a e i o u/, for which there was no evidence of a possible distinction in quantity. Although it was not easy to demonstrate, some of the features of the Romance languages were ultimately related to pre-Roman languages, and the five-vowel system of Castilian was the same as that of Basque and Iberian. While in the past it could not be proven that there was a genetic relationship between Iberian and Basque, Basque-Iberianism has now been confirmed, since there was undeniable similarity in the vowel phonological system, among other features. The Phoenician merchants were fully competent in various forms of writing and knew their own alphabet and the Cypriot and Neo-Luwian syllabaries, both with their series of vowel syllabograms, and the former with the vowel signs <a, e, i, o, u>, the same ones found in Greek and in some Paleo-Hispanic scripts.

Between the 5th and 3rd centuries BC, the period of greatest flourishing of this culture, known as the "First Iberian Period," took place. During this time, cities were built and inhabited, sculpture flourished, trade increased, wealth accumulated, and a high level of development was achieved. An emblematic example of Iberian sculpture and art was the "Dama de Elche," whose face possessed the features and majestic perfection of the severe-style Greek goddesses, dating from the first half of the 5th century BC. All this great art was destroyed during the first half of the 3rd century BC, a destruction attributed to the pressure exerted by the Carthaginian generals of the Barca dynasty.

Regarding the Iberian script, L. Abad (1987) offered a brief overview of the unusual nature of this alphabet, which had already attracted the attention of scholars in the 16th century and was one of the clearest pieces of evidence of the Iberians' high level of development. Thus, Strabo noted that the Turdetani were the most cultured of the Iberians, possessing written laws and a grammar that was many years old.

Our specific working hypothesis assumed that this vowel system was a clear Semitic influence of Iberian on the vowel systems of Basque and Castilian. Regarding Basque-Iberian acculturation in the Hispanic Romance languages, and especially in Riojan, the most significant transfer was undoubtedly the substitution of colloquial Latin vowels with the calque of phonological variants of the five-vowel system within the Basque-Romance bilingualism of the different Basque-speaking social groups in their speech community, who were unfamiliar with the quantitative oppositions.

In the reconstruction of Basque, a system of five oral vowels with three degrees of openness was observed, without any trace of quantitative opposition. The Riojan vowel system (as well as that of Aragonese and Asturian, which presented a system identical to that of Basque) therefore originated in the Basque-Romance bilingualism of the different social groups within the Basque-speaking community, and not in the vowel system of Hispanic Latin in the Pyrenean region and surrounding areas of Spain. Furthermore, these Riojan-speaking groups consolidated the Romance diphthongization of the two open stressed vowels of colloquial Latin (*e* and *o*), although this diphthongization existed in other Romance languages, but in none of them the diphthongs completely replace the two open vowels.

Furthermore, regarding Basque-Iberian acculturation in the Romance languages, M. Echenique (2004) offered several considerations on Basque-Romance contact, since Basque, as a pre-Roman language, was the only Paleo-Hispanic language to survive the acculturation of the Iberian Peninsula. Initially, it coexisted with Latin, and later with the Romance languages, in whose contact the influence of the Romance languages on Basque was undoubtedly more significant than vice versa, without implying the displacement of the Basque language, within a context of broad diglossia. Likewise, regarding the oral formation process of the Riojan vowel system, this author explained that it stemmed from Basque-Latin bilingualism and the formation of Proto-Romance variants. Indeed, this process was inseparable from the close proximity and contact with the reality of the Basque language, since at the beginning of the 10th century the entire western part of the province of Logroño was spoken in Basque and Riojan (see J. A. Correa, 2004; F. Gimeno, 1998).

IV. Roman And Christian Acculturation

The transformation of the Iberian Peninsula into a Roman province (*Hispania*), following the military occupation of its territory by Rome and the dominion exercised by Rome over its inhabitants, brought about a profound transformation, both in its political and social organization and in its ways of life, as well as in its legal system, due to the dual process of Roman acculturation and legal administration to which they were subjected.

Both processes occurred in parallel and independently, as they were facilitated by the need to provide the occupied territory with a military and administrative organization that would allow the coexistence of the different peninsular peoples with the new occupiers from Italy. However, the extension of *Roman citizenship* to the inhabitants of the new province depended on the discretionary decisions of the Roman authorities and the provincial magistrates.

Throughout the Roman Empire, the following elements played a decisive role in Romanization: the Roman administration, military garrisons (and, in connection with them, the granting of citizenship to discharged soldiers from the provinces), Roman culture in urban centers and schools (especially in Spain and Gaul), trade, and rural colonization. The acceptance of Latin by the inhabitants of the provinces was a process that developed without any coercion and simply represented the linguistic impact of the empire's political, commercial, and cultural penetration. Nor was there any conscious desire among the inhabitants of the provinces to preserve their native language, except in the aforementioned conservative strongholds. However, language shift and Roman acculturation implied a linguistic awareness and attitude (see C. Tagliavini, 1949/1969: 363-4; H. Lausberg, 1956-1962: I, 51-94; A. M. Barrero, 1993: 231).

The transformation of the Iberian Peninsula into a Roman province (*Hispania*), following the military occupation of its territory by Rome and the dominion exercised by Rome over its inhabitants, brought about a profound transformation, both in its political and social organization and in its ways of life, as well as in its legal system, due to the dual process of Roman acculturation and legal administration to which they were subjected. Both processes occurred in parallel and independently, as they were facilitated by the need to provide the occupied territory with a military and administrative organization that would allow the coexistence of the different peninsular peoples with the new occupiers from Italy.

Based on this action and the personal nature of Roman law, the full legal Romanization of Hispania was not officially achieved until the year 212, when Emperor Caracalla granted Roman citizenship to all inhabitants of the empire, although as far as the Iberian Peninsula was concerned, it seemed that this measure only served to ratify a factual situation, since at that time practically all Hispanics had to be governed by Roman law.

At the beginning of the second century, J. A. García de Cortázar (2012: 13-56) alluded to the creation of a clergy composed of the bishop, priests, and deacons, who gradually accumulated privileges and functions. From the mid-third century, and especially after 313, a growing number of Christian faithful sought monasticism as a way to fulfill their desire for perfection. Initially, a monk was someone who withdrew from the world to advance in the spiritual life. The earliest known manifestations of Christian monasticism date from the late third century in the eastern Mediterranean, and throughout its history, it has presented three forms: anchoritism, the *laura*, and the cenobitic community.

In the history of Christian acculturation, the momentous legacy of Jerome (347-420), disciple of the Greek grammarian Donatus and author of the *Vulgate*, stands out. His work involved revising the ancient Greek translation

of the *Vetus Latina*, based on the translation of the Hebrew text of the Bible. From then on, Latin would continue as the written record of the Church. On the threshold of the Middle Ages, his figure as a philologist and historian, alongside Ambrose and Augustine, came to encapsulate what history would become for the next thousand years: a history of monasteries and codices, texts and scribes, who translated, revised, and constructed a universe in which written standardization maintained a leading role (see J. A. García de Cortázar, 2016; F. Gimeno, 2019: 166-77).

The connection between Hispanic cultural transmission and the Carolingian Renaissance was highlighted by J. García Turza (2000), who asserted that the Visigothic period in Spain was a time of recollection of ancient cultural traditions, as preserved by Visigothic bishops and Irish and Italian monks between the 5th and 8th centuries. In Western Europe (especially around the Mediterranean), what remained of that culture was placed at the service of the Church. Christianity, with its Scriptures and Hebrew tradition, its faith and liturgy, could not do without such a rich expression as that which it had received from antiquity, and the debate between the two positions (acceptance or rejection of a pagan culture) was resolved with the acceptance of the Greco-Roman tradition. Visigothic Spain was one of the last and most valuable manifestations of ancient culture. Isidore of Seville laid the foundations of medieval culture, and was the bridge that united Antiquity with the Middle Ages (see J. García Turza, 1990, 2013).

The lexical glosses of the *Em. 60* codex off the Royal Academia off Historia and those of the *Silense* codex *Add. 30853* from the British Library (although Emilian in origin) were the first examples of Hispanic Romance languages. *Glosas Emilianenses* (in 950) and *Glosas Silenses* (in second half off 10th century) significantly demonstrated the process of written standardization and the first Hispanic evidence of an early linguistic awareness of the new Riojan Romance, alongside Visigothic Latin. The Romance glosses responded to revisions and adaptations of the written texts to the temporal, geographical, and social context of an implicit planning of the Riojan Romance language on the linguistic border of the Basque-speaking community, less linked to the Latin-Roman tradition, due to historical, sociological, cultural, and legal determinants (see M. Alvar, 1969, 1989, 1996; M. C. Díaz, 1978, 1996; C. Hernández *et al.* (eds.) (1993); C. García Turza, 2003, 2004, 2011, 2013, 2023; C. García Turza and J. García Turza, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2004; F. González Ollé, 2004; F. García Andreva, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; J. A. García de Cortázar, 2016; M. Banniard, 2023; M. Pérez, 2023; F. Gimeno, 2004, 2013, 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2019: 307-51, 2024a, 2024b, 2024c).

Charlemagne's concern for achieving efficient administration and the profitable use of economic resources was reflected in the cultural sphere in what became known as the "Carolingian Renaissance." The cultural reform promoted by the French king was an aspect of his program of religious reconstruction and reorganization, and it encompassed a Latin, biblical, and humanistic culture that had been transmitted within the minority circles of the ecclesiastical aristocracy.

To this end, he turned to the most intellectually accomplished clergymen in Europe, including authors such as Boethius, Cassiodorus, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, and Bede the Venerable. Their works had found refuge in the *scriptoria* of the finest schools (monastic or cathedral) that upheld the Roman tradition (Jarrow and York in England, Luxel and Saint Denis in France, Bobbio and Monte Cassino in Italy).

The solution came with the creation of the Christian cultural *corpus*, the intellectual foundation of Europe, at least until the 12th century. Isidore of Seville (c. 570-630), bishop of the city and a beneficiary of the cultural tradition of the Sevillian episcopal and monastic school, composed a monumental encyclopedia (*Etymologiae*) in which he summarized the knowledge of Antiquity in twenty books and placed it at the service of Christian science. He also laid the foundations of peninsular historiography and forged a unified destiny for Hispania under the Visigothic monarchy. The widespread dissemination of his work made it a standard handbook found in all monastic libraries of the Middle Ages.

The profound impact of Roman acculturation was well known, as it shaped the Italic group (within the Indo-European family) and formed the basis of the Romance languages, although it was not the model of Classical Latin and the written register, but rather the oral register, which manifested itself in both vocabulary and surface structure (morphological and phonological). The term *Romance language* was the literal translation of the Latin term *lingua romana*, which appeared in the second paragraph of canon 17 of the Council of Tours (813), where priests were advised to preach in the oral register (the vernacular Romance language) so that they could be understood by the faithful (see M. Banniard, 1992: 405-6; F. Gimeno, 2019: 66-70).

The linguistic awareness of Romance languages arose from the Gallo-Romance-Franzic contact in the Frankish kingdom, beginning in the first half of the 8th century. This was fostered by the bilingual Gallo-Romance-Franzic consciousness of a multicultural Romance-Germanic community, less bound to Roman acculturation. In general, linguistic awareness was less clear and decisive in the Romance context than in the Germanic one, due to the lesser differentiation between Medieval Latin and the Romance languages. The Romance world emerged from the Gallo-Romance-Franzic contact in northern Gaul.

V. Medieval Castilian Acculturation

The rupture caused by military action and the subsequent settlement of the Muslim community constituted a milestone that marked the beginning of a new period in the history of Castile. The Middle Ages extended, depending on the political events and the institutional framework that characterized it, until the end of the 15th century. However, as far as the legal field was concerned, if this period coincided with the coexistence in Spain of two different political organizations and two different legal systems, its term "ad quem" was not significant for the development of Castilian law, since the entry of the Hispanic kingdoms into modernity as a consequence of the reception in them of the common European law occurred earlier and gradually throughout the 13th century, so that although this entailed important changes, it did not cause a radical break with the previous legal system, whose survival (at least in law) was guaranteed by the legal texts themselves for more than a millennium (see A. Vårvaro, 1968, 1991; M. Torreblanca, 1976; J. A. García de Cortázar, 2004).

By the end of the 11th century, the revival of urban life was already a reality, particularly along the Camino de Santiago in the Castilian-Leonese kingdom. This revival brought about a new spatial organization, while the town council already had a long-standing tradition. The fusion of these two elements resulted in the communities of towns and their surrounding lands, which shaped the new territories, and their presence south and north of the central mountains was dominant.

The relationship established between the towns and their (sometimes) very extensive districts could be considered a manorial relationship, but the collective nature of these lordships, the property and freedom requirements imposed on their inhabitants, and their degree of participation in decisions that affected them, established a significant difference between them and those headed by a cathedral, a monastery, or a nobleman. The charters of the towns themselves established these differences, and neighborhood, profession, function and religion made it possible to distinguish different social groups very early on (see A. M. Barrero and M. L. Alonso, 1989).

The first noteworthy aspect of the formation of law in the early medieval Christian kingdoms was the different value assigned to various modes of normative production compared to the previous legal system. In this atmosphere of political weakness, and in the absence of an authority capable of enforcing it, the law lost its role as the fundamental source it had held among the Visigoths. Initially, *customs*, and particularly important *judicial decisions*, replaced it with the regulation of most institutions.

By its very nature, this customary and judicial law did not extend beyond the local or regional sphere of application. However, this did not prevent the same customs from coming into force in different places due to the common origins of their inhabitants, a consequence of the repopulation process. Nor did it prevent certain judgments or "deeds," whether due to the prestige and authority of those who issued them or the fairness and appropriateness of their solutions, from establishing a judicial practice known and applied by other courts.

Subsequently, this initial legal basis was expanded by a new body of law, generally of a privileged nature, born from the need to encourage and promote settlement in the reconquered territories in order to ensure their defense. Beyond the common denominator of its purpose, the variety of documents that embodied this law, in terms of their nature and content, was extraordinary. The generic category of charters of "settlement," "privilege," or "franchises" encompassed everything from private or contractual texts to public documents granted by the corresponding political authority, which established rules for organizing community life.

All of these were aimed at creating new population centers or stimulating the development of existing ones in a specific way, and their scope was strictly local. In those cases, they served as a starting point for the subsequent development of community law, through the combination of the various sources mentioned and the statutory capacity that local authorities acquired. These were intended to complete, update and even replace the system that had been in place until then, whether it was based on old Visigothic texts, or on customary and judicial origin.

Based on studies of numerous legal codes from different periods and regions, it appears that this process of local drafting may have begun in the first third of the 12th century, in those areas where repopulation and the founding of new towns had been most intense. Consistent with the nascent development of municipal life, the texts produced during this century shared certain formal and substantive characteristics, such as the regulation of only specific aspects of community life, their formal adaptation to the chancery norms of the time, the widespread use of Latin (and occasionally Romance languages), and the use of a deficient legal technique typical of practitioners familiar with local or regional law, but lacking in legal scholarship.

The political evolution of the kingdoms and the rise of municipal life within them, already noticeable in the first decades of the following century, together with the development of legal science as a consequence of the gradual reception in the Iberian Peninsula of the common European law, determined the formation of new local drafts that were increasingly broader and more technically perfect in the formulation of their rules and in their organization.

In the 13th century, with Ferdinand III undertaking the Reconquista of Andalusia, the parallels between the situation in Toledo and some of the recovered cities, along with other political factors, likely led this king to approach the repopulation of the Guadalquivir Valley by granting municipal charters (along with other privileges) based on the *Liber* (which was already circulating in its updated version translated into the vernacular, the *Fuero Juzgo*), sometimes as such (as in Córdoba and Carmona), and other times, as in Seville, as the charter of the city of Toledo.

The charters of Toledo were granted to various towns, some closer than others, initially based on the personal status of their inhabitants. However, from the mid-12th century onward, due to the widespread use of the *Liber* and the consolidation of Toledo's charters and privileges, references to personal status in grants to other places became exceptional. This drafting process must have already reached a certain intensity in the first half of the 13th century, since the texts of this nature that have come down to us, which could be dated to the second half of the century and the first decades of the next, revealed the use as models of several other earlier drafts, now unknown.

The creation of a new system of legal sources to replace the kingdom's traditional one was the work of Alfonso X, whose extensive legacy included three particularly important texts attributed to him (commonly known as the *Fuero Real*, *Espéculo*, and *Partidas*), as well as a legal treatise of a didactic nature, the *Setenario*. Their prologues all emphasized Alfonso X's firm conviction regarding both the need for reform and his authority to implement it through the application of a legal code (each of these texts) drafted with the advice of the Court and legal experts.

The conditions of the kingdom demanded action with urgency, but also with extreme prudence, and this was reflected in the documentation of the time, which shows how the king already had a legal body of some extent that, anticipating possible resistance to its acceptance by the kingdom, he granted as municipal charters to several towns in León, Castile and Extremadura between 1255 and 1265, considering that they did not have a charter by which they should be judged, and also as a general privilege to the hidalgos of this last region in 1264 (see A. M. Barrero, 1993: 259-68).

Several scholars have asserted that the application of the *Espéculo* never became effective, since an event such as the imperial succession, external to the kingdom but not to its sovereign (aspiring to such a coveted title), interfered with the course of his legislative work. With the establishment of the "*Fecho del Imperio*" in 1256, when the *Espéculo*, according to some, had only recently been approved at Court, or according to others, was still in progress (it should not be forgotten that it has been preserved incomplete), the king decided to undertake, in support of his hereditary rights to the Empire, the creation of a universal code of laws, unprecedented (as it would prove to be) in the Europe of his time, which would compile all the legal knowledge of the era: the *Siete Partidas*.

This encyclopedic, rather than practical, conception of the work was consistent with the eminently scientific nature of its content, and justified its initial lack of promulgation, although other opinions attributed this not to any prior intention on the part of the king, but rather to the kingdom's resistance to its acceptance. Other hypotheses, to varying degrees, linked the formation of the *Siete Partidas* to King Alfonso's imperial aspirations to the Holy Roman Empire.

If during the 9th century the predominant written language in the Iberian Peninsula was Classical Arabic, in the 12th century it was Medieval Latin, and in the 13th century Castilian Romance gradually gained ground, until it became established as the language in which official documents of the Chancery, notaries, courts, Cortes, etc. were written. Within a definitive commitment by Alfonso X to the explicit standardization of Castilian, I. Fernández-Ordóñez (2004) raised the fundamental role of the royal initiative of Alfonso VIII, Fernando III, Alfonso X and Sancho IV.

Until Castile and León united under King Ferdinand III in 1230, the Leonese chancery (dependent on the Archbishop of Santiago de Compostela) had issued its documents only in Medieval Latin, while the Castilian chancery (linked to the archiepiscopal court of Toledo) had sporadically drafted documents in Castilian Romance. After the union of the kingdoms, Juan de Soria extended his functions to the Kingdom of León and maintained the use of Castilian as the preferred Romance language of the chancery, although Leonese Romance began to be used in private and local charters until the end of the 13th century.

In the period between 1231 and 1240, the percentage of Castilian texts from the Castilian-Leonese chancery doubled, and from 1241 until the end of his reign (1252), Romance documents outnumbered Latin ones. When Alfonso X ascended the Castilian-Leonese throne, the chancery of Ferdinand III had issued around 60% of its documents in Castilian over the previous decade. From then on, the chancery of Alfonso X maintained this linguistic pattern, and the use of Castilian Romance was widespread, unconstrained by document type or legal register, although documents destined for other kingdoms were written in Medieval Latin. With the decisive selection of Castilian Romance and exclusion of medieval Latin, the Castilian chancery was ahead of the other kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula, as well as the English and French (see F. González Ollé, 1978; L. Rubio, 1981; M. de Epalza *et al.* 1983; M. Pérez, 1985; A. Palacios, 1991; M. C. Díaz, 1995; F. Gimeno, 2019: 255-71).

VI. Catalan-Aragonese Acculturation

Regarding the field of law in Catalonia, according to AM Barrero (1993: 248-51), the first compilation chronologically, in terms of its technical perfection and its significance for the development of Catalan law, was the *Usatges de Barcelona*. It arose both to address the shortcomings of *Liber* and to update its norms in accordance with the social and economic evolution experienced by the Catalan counties as a result of their intense process of feudalization.

A text of enormous complexity in the form it has been preserved due to successive revisions over time, its first draft appears to have been written in the second half of the 12th century, within the context of the Curia of Barcelona, where an anonymous jurist undertook to collect the rulings issued by its judges, which generated a body of legal practice, along with some general constitutions. From the beginning it enjoyed full authority and prestige and its scope of application, initially limited to the territories dependent on the Count of Barcelona, was gradually extended to other Catalan counties and cities and other kingdoms of the Crown of Aragón.

In the kingdoms of Aragón, València and Majorca, and in the principality of Catalonia, the transition from their early medieval law to that which characterized the late Middle Ages and Modern period occurred without difficulty. In some, this was because, as newly conquered kingdoms, there were no significant obstacles to establishing a particular legal system. In others, various factors allowed for the development of a new order (not by replacing the old one as in Castile), but through the gradual evolution of their traditional law. This evolution resulted from its adaptation to the trends of the new era, aimed at achieving the legal unification of the kingdoms and the incorporation, to a greater or lesser extent, *de jure or de facto*, of common European law into their respective systems (see J. M. Nadal and M. Prats, 1982; B. Montoya, 2013; B. Montoya, M. R. Hernández and F. Gimeno, 1995).

In Aragón, A. M. Barrero (1993: 255-9) explained that manifestations of local law could be found in its different phases of development. The earliest surviving texts, brief in nature, appeared at the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th centuries, when the advance southward began, granted by Kings Sancho Ramírez and Pedro I. Aimed at encouraging settlement, they had the characteristics of privileged charters, and were of particular interest because they revealed the two different systems with which the Aragonese kings initially approached repopulation: one, used in Jaca, based on equality of charters; the other, that of Barbastro, which involved the (more or less general) application of a privileged class law: that of the *infanzones* (minor nobles).

The first charter of Jaca (1077), as well as the subsequent royal privileges it received, fostered the city's development. Consequently, it was soon considered particularly suitable for the establishment of urban centers with intense commercial activity, and therefore attractive to people from outside the region. Various 14th-century accounts concur in presenting Jaca as the center that generated its own legal system, which achieved widespread diffusion beyond its immediate territory and even extended far beyond the borders of the kingdom.

Indeed, there was more evidence of the spread of the Jaca charter in Navarre than in Aragón, where circumstances were different, and therefore it was only granted to some nearby places. This expansion of the Jaca charter was due, judging by the preserved documents, to royal initiative, and appeared to be closely linked (especially in Navarre) to the repopulation process generated around the Jacobean route (Sangüesa, Pamplona, Estella, Logroño and Nájera) (see M. Molho (ed.) (1964), (reed .) (2003), vol. I.; A. M. Barrero, (2003), II: 111-60; F. Gimeno, 1995: 103-15, 153-5).

Jaume I's decision to put an end to the legal uncertainty of the Aragonese kingdom caused by the existence of the various versions that had been formed by private initiative since the middle of the 12th century, and were presented as compilations of the law of the kingdom, culminated with the promulgation in general, in the Cortes of Huesca of 1247, of an official version of the *Fueros of Aragón*.

In the newly established kingdoms of Majorca and València, the advanced state of the era and the way in which their conquest and repopulation were carried out prevented the development of a distinct local legal system. In the Balearic Islands, repopulated by Catalans from the Empordà region who had aided in their conquest, the system established in Lleida and Tortosa was applied to the city and island of Majorca through the granting of charters of settlement by the king himself. And in Ibiza and Formentera, the system established in Lleida and Tortosa was applied by their lord (the Archbishop of Tarragona), without specifying the application of any other law, except for the *Usatges* in cases of libel and injury.

Later, the Mallorcan regime extended to Ciutadella, Mahón, and the island of Menorca. Meanwhile, with the conquest of València undertaken by the Aragonese and Catalans, the occupation and settlement of each place was also carried out through the granting of the original charters of the settlers in the corresponding town charters. The incorporation of Jaume I into the enterprise after the conquest of Mallorca brought this policy to an end. Repopulation began with the recapture of the city of València and the approval of a new legal code (the *Furs*) as the general law of the kingdom, which incorporated extensively Justinian law.

Jaume I's decision to participate actively and personally in the reconquest of the Moorish kingdom of the Levant completely transformed the undertaking. With València occupied by capitulation on September 28, 1238, and the definitive borders south of the Júcar River established within eight years, the king retained the territory under the direct control of the Crown, without ceding it to those who had participated in its conquest. He also took charge of the repopulation, thus overcoming any obstacles that might have prevented him from achieving his stated objectives, as in Mallorca, of providing the new kingdom with an independent political constitution and its own legal system.

This policy, coupled with the near-total absence of a Christian legal tradition at the time of the conquest in these lands, which had been heavily Islamized since ancient times, allowed the Conqueror to act with complete freedom in establishing his legal system. But here, unlike in the islands, he did not limit himself to this; rather, he provided the kingdom with a comprehensive legal framework by promulgating in 1240, with the advice and in the presence of several bishops, nobles, and leading citizens of the cities, a code that presented a "compilation of customs" to govern the city and kingdom of València. The illustrious Vidal de Canellas may have been involved in its drafting.

In the war fought for the succession to the Spanish throne, the cost of supporting the Austrian Archduke Charles was high for the subjects of the Crown of Aragón, and especially for the Valencians. Once the military actions were decided in his favor, Philip V proceeded to promulgate a series of decrees that effectively ended the political organization of each kingdom, and consequently, the development and application of their public law.

The suppression, by virtue of these decrees, of the local institutions, and therefore of the Cortes (parliaments), had the immediate consequence of reducing the sources of law to royal legislation. This meant the end, in all the kingdoms, of the normative development of their respective legal systems, given the centralizing interests of the Crown. The initial stance of extreme radicalism was evident in the Decree of 1707, which abolished and repealed the legal systems of València and Aragón. This measure, apart from the subsequent recognition of the personal rights of the nobles who had been loyal to him, had repercussions in València, which was from then on fully integrated into the Castilian system.

While Aragón (in 1711), through the Nueva Planta decrees for the organization of the Audiencia, saw the application of its civil law recognized, both in the first instance and on appeal to the Council of Castile. Subsequent decrees of 1715 and 1716 for the Audiencias of Majorca and Catalonia, respectively, extended this recognition in those territories to the criminal, procedural, and commercial spheres. The absence of any reference to the application of supplementary laws gave rise to theoretical discussions that did not, in practice, affect the prevalence of Castilian law.

VII. Medieval Valencian Acculturation

From prehistoric times, the successive social groups that populated the ancient Kingdom of València (Iberians, Ibero-Romans, Romans, Visigoths, and Muslims) formed the human basis of the language community, which had been passed down from generation to generation since pre-Roman times, and were the heirs of the community's native inhabitants. The crucial importance of the break in continuity caused by the limited medieval repopulation brought by the army of King Jaume I, and the subsequent settlers following the expulsion of the Moors in the 17th century, provided the key to understanding the centuries of the formation of the Kingdom of València.

Although we can identify the Iberians as indigenous people inhabiting the Mediterranean coasts, and bearing in mind that much of southeastern France was soon Iberianized, Iberian culture also spread inland and assimilated peoples who initially could not be considered Iberian, such as those of the Ebro Valley or the Meseta Central. Iberian culture, therefore, did not represent an ethnic unity, but rather a cultural one. Thus, it was not surprising that peoples who were originally not Iberian (such as those in the interior of the peninsula) became culturally Iberianized over the centuries, although there were regional and local differences characteristic of Iberian culture. The Iberian world was composed of a mosaic of peoples (Turdetani, Bastetani, Contestani, Oretani, Edetani, Ilercavones, Lacetani, Ilorgetes, Vascones, etc.).

Between the 5th and 3rd centuries BC, the period of greatest flourishing of this culture, known as the "First Iberian Period," materialized. During this time, cities were built and inhabited, sculpture flourished, trade increased, wealth accumulated, and a high level of development was achieved. An emblematic example of Iberian sculpture and art was the "Dama de Elche," whose face possessed the features and majestic perfection of the severe-style Greek goddesses, dating from the first half of the 5th century BC.

All this great art was destroyed during the first half of the 3rd century BC, a destruction attributed to the pressure exerted by the Carthaginian generals of the Barca dynasty. The distinctive character of Iberian script was one of the clearest indications of the Iberians' advanced level of development. Thus, Strabo pointed out that the Turdetani were the most cultured of the Iberians, and had written laws and a "grammar" that was many years old.

The Iberians' contact with a civilization different from their own began a long process of acculturation that led (well into the Christian era) to a complete Romanization, at least of the ruling classes. The initial contacts were undoubtedly military in nature, and the area became a battleground and a passage for armies: in the 2nd century BC, the battles of Sucron and Urbicua, and in 138 BC the transfer of Roman veterans from the war against Viriathus, who established a city on a river island in the Turia River. This city would later become *Colonia Valentia*, although its colonial status from the date of its founding is uncertain. Another transfer of veterans, after their discharge, involved two legions and the Iberian city of Alcludia de Elche, which from then on would be called *Colonia Iulia Illici Augusta*, in the second half of the 1st century BC.

Based on various events that occurred between 711 and 1238, M. Sanchis Guarner (1956, 1972) proposed the near-total disappearance of the Mozarabic communities of València. First, the Almoravid invasion (1086) brought about a veritable Africanization of the country, a wave of fanaticism and intolerance, in which the Mozarabs were the primary victims. The fall of València to this new power was provisional between 1092 and 1094, and definitive in 1102, which triggered a significant emigration of Mozarabs to Castile.

Secondly, the attack by Alfonso the Battler, King of Aragón, carried out in 1125 with the help of the Mozarabs, resulted, at the time of his retreat, in a mass exodus of Mozarabs who went to repopulate the newly conquered Aragonese lands. With this second, massive emigration of Mozarabs (some 10,000 families), the Christian population of València must have been greatly reduced, and the city became more Islamic than ever, although the Valencian Mozarabs would have preserved their Romance language, to a greater or lesser degree, until their integration into the kingdoms of Jaume I.

The only widespread language among the Moriscos (Arabs who were baptized after the conquest) between 1238 and 1609 was Arabic, and from this it has obviously been inferred that Arabic must also have been the language they spoke before 1238. P. Guichard (1976) studied the impact of the Arab invasion on the native (majority) population, and considered that the anthropological structure of the country was so modified that it could be suspected that Islamic acculturation must also have been very strong, although slow.

The linguistic situation of the kingdom of València and Mallorca during the first half of the 13th century, when it was still impossible for Catalan to have had a significant impact on the country, and a glance at the *Llibre dels feits* of King Jaume I was enough to show that the Arabs of Majorca and the Kingdom of València spoke Arabic, and that language was a constant obstacle to communication between the Catalan conquerors and the conquered native population. It seemed clear, then, that in the first quarter of the 13th century, the Muslims needed an interpreter (*trujaman*) to communicate with the conquerors, and that the latter had a clear awareness of what the *algaravia* spoken by the Muslims was.

The Muslims who lived in the Kingdom of València between 1238 and 1609, unlike those who lived in Aragón or Castile, spoke exclusively Arabic. It was difficult to believe that before the conquest in 1238, when Arabic was the dominant language, the Muslims of València could have spoken a Romance language (Mozarabic), and that after 1238, when Catalan was dominant, they would have had to abandon their native tongue to adopt Arabic. It was therefore difficult to argue for the continuity of Mozarabic in the current language of the Kingdom of València. The changes that took place in the Arab Kingdom of València during the 11th century, with the beginning of economic activity and urban life, suggested that secondary urban centers likely played an important role in a process of Islamic acculturation.

C. Barceló (1995) proposed that (after the Arab conquest of the Iberian Peninsula) a significant portion of the Christian population converted to Islam and, at the same time, learned Arabic. In the 13th century, the entire population of the former Kingdom of València was monolingual in Arabic, although very little Arabic documentation from that period survives. Documentation from the 14th and 15th centuries was more extensive, and even more so from the 16th and 17th centuries (over 100 documents). There is no Romance syntax or morphology, nor many words of Latin etymology that could be found in glossaries or in documentation predating the conquest, not only of València but of the entire Iberian Peninsula. When the Church began, from 1525 onwards, to realize that it was necessary to speak Arabic to achieve conversion, priests, preachers and other Christians in charge of catechizing who spoke Arabic arrived in the villages (see R. Pérez *et al.*, 1980; F. Corriente, 2004).

The issue of the expulsion of the Moriscos (raised in the 16th century and decided at the beginning of the 17th) had been brewing for some time, and it could be said that it began with the very repopulation of the kingdom that had allowed the Muslim (Mudéjar) presence, due to economic interests (creation of territorial lordships) and demographic deficiencies (lack of Christian settlers), in a socio-religious climate of mutual tolerance, confirmed even legally in the series of settlement charters granted under Muslim law in one of the most Islamized areas of the country: the *mountains d'Espadà*. Religious tolerance gave way to intransigence not only towards the Muslim population. And when Rome in 1525 recognized the sacramental validity of those acts, the Mudéjars, suddenly converted into Moriscos (New Christians), raised with the *d'Espadà uprising* of 1526 the

need for a true conversion and evangelization (1525-1570), postponed from that moment on by Turkish and barbarian pressure in the Mediterranean.

Thus, the reasons of state were combined with Christian acculturation to demand greater effectiveness in preaching, already in the time of Philip II, with aspects of repression (1570-1609) against a population that still lived in mountainous or dryland areas (outside the irrigated districts of Gandía), and was growing at a much more rapid pace than the Old Christians, as well as threatening in the near future to overwhelm the dominant population. For this reason, the great Valencian nobility, of which the favorite Lerma (titled Marquis of Denia) may have been the spokesperson at the court of Philip III, agreed to the expulsion (1609), not without complaints that brought them, as compensation, the immediate requisition of the expelled Moriscos' property, including estates, and later the cancellation of most of the financial obligations contracted with the rentier bourgeoisie.

Indeed, the consequences of the expulsion seemed to support this interpretation. Aside from the generally catastrophic effects that resulted: demographic voids due to the exodus of over 170,000 people, agricultural crises that impacted the three main crops (sugar cane, rice, and wheat), the trillion-dollar inflation, and the failure of the *Taula de Canvi* in 1613. It was true that the expulsion ultimately benefited the landed nobility extraordinarily. This was evident in the land consolidation that resulted from the authorization to requisition the Moriscos' property, the imposition of harsh settlement charters on the new settlers, which reinforced the prevailing feudalism in the countryside, and the 50 percent reduction in the monetary investments that the rentier bourgeoisie had directed toward agriculture.

VIII. Castilian Acculturation

The Castilian language was not imposed on Spanish America, and there was no language shift of indigenous languages, but rather a Castilian acculturation. Guaraní, as a current co-official language with Spanish in Paraguay, represents the best example of Castilian acculturation. The incidental nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Crown of Castile, according to A. M. Barrero (1993: 271-4), by virtue of the donation by Pope Alexander VI to the Catholic Monarchs and their successors in the kingdoms of León and Castile of the lands discovered and yet to be discovered, determined that their legal configuration and organization were not carried out through the creation of a new legal system, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and rules of this to a different reality was what gave rise to the formation of a law of its own to the Indies (the *Indian law*), for the regulation of the multiple situations not contemplated by the former.

A cumulative count for the entire 16th century revealed that during the first century in the Americas, almost half of the identified inhabitants (around 27,000 individuals) came from five provinces, in descending order: Seville, Badajoz, Toledo, Cáceres, and Valladolid. While the first two cities, which could be considered speakers of southern varieties, totaled slightly more than 18,000 individuals, the remaining three cities, which could be considered speakers of non-southern varieties, totaled just over 9,000 individuals. However, the regional and social components of the first strata of Castilian acculturation were undoubtedly reinforced or weakened depending on the nature of subsequent migratory overlaps. In this way, the linguistic character of the regions was shaped, laying the foundations for continued evolution, and signifying that the Castilian language transplanted to America underwent a process of *patrimonial restructuring*.

Historians had accepted without question that the 16th century was significant as a period in which the relationship between the European and American environments was consolidated. This process of *creolization*, achieved in all spheres and with the purpose of acculturation, began in the Antilles, whose geographical location served as a base for the annexation of the continent. M. Vaquero (1996) alluded to the fact that the Antillean islands were unique destinations in the early years of acculturation, which would eventually develop into a mobile and transient society rather than permanent settlements.

Given the majority presence of Andalusians during the first stage of acculturation, in which Andalusian women also represented 67% of the transplanted female population, it should come as no surprise that the first linguistic leveling occurred in the southern Iberian Peninsula. Furthermore, considering the importance of trade during this initial period, there was no doubt that *majority status* and *prestige* acted as conditioning factors in the leveling of the Antillean language, since 49% of Andalusians were merchants and traders. These data allow us to accept that Andalusian identity acted as a leveling force, resulting in the first creolization of Castilian Spanish in the Americas (see R. Lapesa, 1942/1981, 1963; D. Catalán, 1958; R. Menéndez Pidal, 1962; F. Abad, 1991).

The Antillean standard was transmitted to the Americas, where it coexisted with speech patterns originating from central and northern Spain, brought by subsequent waves of migration. In this second phase, therefore, and without disregarding the indigenous presence, the creolized people of the Antilles shared the space with those arriving directly from the Iberian Peninsula. This situation allowed for the coexistence of the first

standard (the product of the initial Andalusian standardization) with the second, northern Peninsular standard, which arrived with the direct migrations. The subsequent development of Latin American linguistic varieties confirmed that the coexistence of standards involved a continuous transfer of speakers from one to another, in a process that could have been extremely slow, and whose final outcome depended, in each territory, on many other specific factors. However, it should not be overlooked that *seseo*, brought to the Americas with the Antillean-Andalusian standard, eventually became the only general phonological feature of American Spanish.

Creole hypothesis was proposed for the Caribbean. This hypothesis posited that the Castilian Spanish of this region originated from a simplified and creolized system, developed from the 16th century onward through contact between various African ethnic groups and Peninsular Castilian, or through contact between Castilian and a proto language of Portuguese origin used in the Caribbean by Africans. This hypothesis assumed a sociolinguistic situation in the colonial Hispanic Antilles similar to that which existed in the French or Anglo-Saxon Caribbean (conducive to the development of creole languages), but it lacked convincing documentary support.

Modern Caribbean Spanish (after five centuries of adaptations, adoptions, and influences) exhibited dialectal characteristics that allowed it to be described as an insular Caribbean variety, with an Andalusian-Canarian base, spoken in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico. Although the historical trajectory of these three territories has differed since the 20th century, and despite Puerto Rico's special political situation, Spanish is the mother tongue in all three countries, conditioned by the specific sociocultural factors of each, and without having given rise to any creole language, unlike the French-based *creoles* (Haiti, Martinique) or the Anglo-Saxon creoles (English-speaking Virgin Islands).

In the Hispanization of America (Castilian and Indigenous languages since 1492), A. Rosenblat (1963) wrote that the Hispanization process (begun on October 12, 1492) had not ended after four hundred and seventy years, but understanding the path traveled was important. The Indian or Castilian interpreter represented a first stage, that of approximation. Undoubtedly, the stable forms of coexistence were more important, and of these, three above all: work, miscegenation, and catechization. However, the latter concerned the Admiral from the very beginning, since it appeared as a fundamental condition of Spain's rights in the papal bulls of Alexander VI (1493), with the Treaty of Tordesillas (June 7, 1494) signed between the representatives of John II of Portugal and those of the Catholic Monarchs, and as the supreme objective in the Instructions of the Catholic Monarchs.

From his first letters (November 2 and 12, 1492), Christopher Columbus spoke of Christianization. On November 27, he announced that he would have members of his household learn the language of the indigenous people and that he would endeavor to convert all the new settlements to Christianity. The Royal Instructions from this early period included the teaching of Castilian Spanish as part of the catechization process. On Columbus's second voyage, the monarchs sent Friar Boyl, a man they trusted implicitly, for whom they had obtained a papal bull granting extraordinary powers. He was accompanied by other religious figures, tasked with transmitting the tenets of the Catholic faith to the indigenous people in their native language, "striving to instruct them in it as best as possible." The Royal Instruction of 1503 stipulated that the Indians should be grouped into towns ("to be instructed as free persons, and not as servants") and that in each of them there should be a church and a chaplain, and that the chaplain should instruct the children and teach them to read and write, to make the sign of the cross and to confess, and the prayers were usually taught in Latin.

Castilian Spanish was the general instrument of catechization, and it is recorded that Friar Alonso del Espinar, upon returning to Hispaniola (Haiti) in 1512, carried 2,000 primers provided by the House of Trade of the Indies. The teaching of Castilian Spanish at that time implied the teaching of Latin: a Royal Decree of 1513 stipulated that the sons of the caciques of Hispaniola receive instruction in *grammar* (that is, Latin language and literature) from the Bachelor Hernán Xuárez, and for this purpose, twenty copies of Nebrija's *Arte* were given to him. Through various means, a familiar relationship developed between Castilians and Indians, "with their languages mingling," as Peter Martyr said.

The Castilianization of the Antilles islands was rapid, perhaps too rapid, and so profound that a mixed language did not emerge on any of the islands colonized by the Castilians. It is well known that the Antillean Indian population quickly died out under the new social conditions, decimated by epidemics and diseases against which they had no immunity, or absorbed by the dissolving effect of miscegenation. In truth, contrary to what was believed, small indigenous communities (entirely Castilianized) still existed until the end of the last century in Cuba and Santo Domingo, and it is not difficult today to recognize the indigenous heritage in a large part of the Antillean population. And even in their Castilian Spanish, in which hundreds of words survived, many of which (*maíz, batata, ají, maní, cacique, canoa, piragua, hamaca, carey, tiburón, tabaco*) enriched the Castilian language. In any case, the Castilianization ultimately meant the disappearance of the Antillean Indian.

The conquest would, in effect, entail Hispanization through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the State, and it had to be a slow process. The colonial regime was superimposed on indigenous society, which generally continued to maintain its old structures (Royal Decrees, from 1512 onward, upheld the privileges of the

"natural lords"). But the conquest ultimately had only one religious justification, which always appeared, in all the Instructions, as the supreme goal: to eradicate idolatry and convert the Indians to Christianity. And this task could not be conceived as a slow undertaking, unfolding over generations, but rather as an immediate and radical one. Conquest and Christianization would be one and the same enterprise.

However, there was no Hispanic American conquest, but rather annexation by virtue of the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494), which in effect implied Castilian acculturation through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the Crown of Castile. Acculturation was an essential characteristic of human history, and the primary principle of the history of languages in contact and of linguistic change was the acculturation of social groups.

Hispanic American was a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, apart from the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Perú, Ecuador, and as far south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spoken indigenous language in Hispanic American, with some six million speakers, who were also highly differentiated dialectally, and of whom four million also spoke Spanish. The current, and quite commendable, trend of educating indigenous people in their own languages and teaching them to read in their native tongues (a trend that began in Mexico and spread to the Peruvian jungle) meant that indigenous people learned to read Spanish very early on, paradoxically facilitating their acculturation into Spanish.

The case of Paraguay is unique in Hispanic American, since the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any indigenous people (except for about 40,000 living in the forests). This astonishing fact was attributed to the work of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the indigenous people by preaching to them in Guaraní: by 1750, they had 30 settlements with some 150,000 indigenous inhabitants. It was a closed world (some even spoke of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even engaging in bloody battles, with the authorities in Asunción. The missions operated in this way for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully managed by a small number of religious figures.

Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in school and university education and in public life. And it is undoubtedly the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Hispanic American countries. The world today is moving towards universality, and for the 18 states that have Spanish as an official language and another 3 states as a co-official language, universality consists of being an active part of a language community with 496 million speakers (see F. Gimeno, 2023a).

The Crown of Castile did not maintain the same language planning in Hispanic American throughout the entire period, but rather implemented various policies, and three main stages can be distinguished. A. Herranz (1996) identified two periods: 1) Colonial (1502-1820), and 2) Independent (1821-1995). Regarding the first period, he differentiated the following linguistic policies:

- a) Establishment of a Castilian monolingual policy (1502-1569), designed by the Catholic Monarchs and continued by King Charles V. It was based on the idea that "all natives of America should learn Castilian by obligation."
- b) The establishment of a multilingual policy (1570-1769) marked a significant change, requiring priests and friars to learn indigenous languages to indoctrinate and evangelize the indigenous population in their native tongues. The indigenous people were free to learn Castilian.
- c) Establishment of a Castilian monolingual policy (1770-1820), initiated by King Charles III, which represented a return to the Castilian monolingual policy of the first stage.

The first stage was characterized by the rapid assimilation of the great Aztec and Quechua cultures and was surprising for the swift decision of the Catholic Monarchs to implement a minimum of Royal Decrees and other documents outlining the main principles of a language planning based on the mandatory learning of Castilian for all native inhabitants of the Indies. For this Castilianization effort, the queen relied on the invaluable participation of the Latin scholar E.A. de Nebrija, author of the *Gramática castellana* (1492), the first grammar of the Romance languages spoken in Europe, and of the explicit standardization of its orthography in his work *Reglas de ortografía castellana* (1516). In the "Prologue" to the former, he clearly explained his reasons for writing it. The primary reason was to give Castilian stability, uniformity, and simplicity. The second was of a pedagogical nature, and the third explained that grammar could be used for understanding the Castilian legal system. Consistent with this language planning, which had brought Castile so much success on the Iberian Peninsula and in the newly conquered Canary Islands, they transferred it to America with minor variations (see M. T. Echenique, 2013a).

IX. Anglo-Saxon Acculturation

The Hispanic presence in the territories that today constitute the United States dates back to the 16th century. But what truly mattered, according to H. López Morales (2008: 31), were the settlements: the colony of San Miguel

de Guadalupe, founded in 1526 by Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, in the Carolinas; the Franciscan missions established in present-day Georgia, in 1565; the founding of St. Augustine in Florida that same year by Menéndez de Avilés; the Jesuit missions of Axacán in Virginia in 1561 and that of Chesapeake nine years later. The founding of the town of San Juan by Oñate, in 1598, refounded and moved a few years later with the name of Santa Fe, in New Mexico, the mission of El Paso, in 1682, and another located east of the same Texas in 1690 (see H. López Morales, 1983, 1987, 1998, 2013; J. L. Rivarola, 2004; J. A. Samper and C. E. Hernández, 2008).

Subsequently, H. López Morales (2012: 40-58) added that the current reality of “Hispanics” in the United States was the result of a series of historical processes. If we discount early settlements and a few isolated instances, true immigration began in the early 20th century, with Mexico leading the way, followed by Puerto Ricans and later Cubans. In recent decades, Dominicans, Central Americans, and others from various parts of South America have arrived. Spaniards have been and continue to be a significant minority. However, this was not merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. “Spanglish” is a clear example of Anglo-Saxon acculturation. It was not, therefore, a matter of the Hispanic immigrants' language shift of Spanish.

E. Lago (2008: 25-6) pointed out that the strength of Spanish is a direct consequence of the fact that it was the language of expression in some twenty American countries. The United States was experiencing a growing process of Hispanization, and the expansion of the language was an essential part of this phenomenon. The Hispanic community in the United States is a conglomerate resulting from the fusion of those who have been established in the country for a long time (some for more than a century and a half) with the immigrants who continue to arrive from the most diverse regions of the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. The different national cultures tend to relate to one another spontaneously, creating a hybrid entity of a pan-Hispanic nature, clearly differentiated from that of the countries of origin.

This was a phenomenon still in progress, and it will take time to fully crystallize, but many signs of this new entity are already evident. Similar to what happens with culture, I posit that an indigenous variety of Spanish is being forged in the United States, resulting from the amalgamation of its different regional varieties. The need to find a form of Spanish with which all Hispanics feel comfortable is becoming perceptible in the media.

The beginning of bilingual education in the United States occurred without any intervention from the Federal Government. In 1974, the Federal Government provided a definition of what bilingual education meant to them. It was instruction conducted in English, with the study of both English and the native language of children who did not speak English well. At that time, only 'transitional bilingual education' was supported, with no support for programs that used Spanish in instruction for other purposes.

The federal government's message was clear: Spanish for the transition to English, not for its preservation. In the last five years, as Spanish has gained global and local status in the United States, the word "bilingual" has been silenced and has disappeared. Instead, there has been a notable surge of interest in English acquisition for immigrants and those who do not speak it. The transition program has aimed at Anglo-Saxon acculturation for Hispanic students and monolingual Spanish speakers. The United States is increasingly a multilingual and multicultural country.

The real problems of language policy in the United States emerged in the last quarter of the 20th century with the "English Only" movement, and were closely linked to an anti-immigrant attitude, which constituted one of the most serious political problems of the 20th and 21st centuries. Until 1965, the United States had not established a limit on the number of Hispanic immigrants who could settle in the country. The figure was then set at 120,000 per year. However, at the beginning of the 21st century, Spanish speakers became the country's largest minority, surpassing the Black minority.

Furthermore, it was claimed that approximately 12,000,000 uncounted individuals resided illegally. This was not merely a demographic fact, but rather involved two issues (one cultural and the other economic) to which a political dimension had to be added. Regarding legal texts, there is no declaration or prescription on this matter in the federal Constitution. In reality, the United States has never had a predetermined language policy, but rather ad hoc policies. However, the situation of constitutional legislation in the federated states is as follows: thirty proclaim English as their official language, and twenty do not. Hawaii is the only officially bilingual state.

Hispanics are by far the largest minority group in the United States. According to estimates by the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. population of Hispanic origin exceeded 62.5 million in July 2022. This figure represents an increase of more than 12 million since 2010 and more than 53 million since 1970. In the last five decades, the Hispanic population has increased sevenfold and its relative weight has quadrupled. Currently, 18.9% of Americans identify ethnically as Hispanic, placing this community well above the Asian (6.1%) and African American (13.6%) populations (see C. Silva-Corvalán, 1988/2001, 1994, 2000; A. Morales, 1992, 1999; R. Otheguy, 2008).

The geographic mobility observed in this community is also gradually altering its traditional pattern of concentration, which placed Hispanics of Mexican and Central American origin primarily in the states closest to Mexico, while those of Caribbean origin were concentrated only in Florida, New York, or, in general, in the eastern states. Currently, it is easy to find Hispanics of diverse origins throughout the country. Although Mexico remains the primary country of origin (59.5% of the total), followed by Puerto Rico (9.3%), El Salvador (4%), Cuba (3.8%), and the Dominican Republic (3.8%).

In terms of Spanish usage, the states with the highest percentage of Spanish speakers are Florida (92%) and New York (84%), closely followed by Illinois and Texas, and not far behind by California, Arizona, and New Mexico (69%). The fact that Florida and New York top the list suggests that more recent immigrant populations are better at maintaining their native language. However, the most important factor is the use of Spanish in public settings. And in this regard, Miami-Dade County (in Florida) leads the nation, due to its official bilingual and bicultural status (English and Spanish).

In the mass media, not forgetting the advertising aspect, Spanish is very well represented. For example, in Miami there are 30 radio stations, all with programming entirely in Spanish, several television channels that broadcast entirely in Spanish, two daily newspapers with large circulations, and more than five weekly publications. New York and, to a lesser extent, Los Angeles follow this pattern. Regarding the press, it should be noted that *Diario Las Américas* and, more recently, *El Nuevo Herald*, newspapers serving Miami's Hispanic community, offer their readers articles on language-related topics.

Since the 1990s, our specific working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, "New Information and Communication Technologies" and American English were closely related. Immigration has been yet another chapter in economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, which has exceeded all expectations and limitations. The United States is the country with the most immigrants. Between 1987 and 1990, the impact of economic globalization was analyzed in six Spanish newspapers (three from the Spanish of the United States and three from Spain), in order to investigate the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation (see E. Lorenzo, 1966, 1996, 1999; C. Pratt, 1980; O. García *et al.* (1985), 2008; F. Rodríguez, 1999, 2023; L. Valozic, 2015; A. Cece and F. Gimeno, 2020; F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003; F. Gimeno, 2008, 2023a, 2023b).

The overall results of the total occurrences of lexical imports (categorical and variable), based on each of the newspapers in the Spanish press of the United States and Spain, showed that lexical import followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 2nd) Barcelona; 3rd) Los Angeles; 4th) Madrid (*El País*); 5th) New York; and 6th) Madrid (*ABC*), in which there was no statistically significant relationship in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain.

However, there was a greater number of lexical imports in *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, than in *La Opinión* of Los Angeles, although lexical importation was widespread. On the one hand, there was no clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical imports in the Hispanic press of the United States compared to the press of Spain. On the other hand, our working hypothesis regarding the greater impact of economic globalization on *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, was confirmed, stemming from the social and cultural diffusion of lexical importation, as well as from Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

The overall results for the total occurrence of lexical calques (categorical and variable), according to each of the Spanish-language newspapers in the United States and Spain, revealed that lexical substitution followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1) Los Angeles; 2) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 3) New York; 4) *La Vanguardia*; 5) *ABC*; and 6) *El País*. In summary, we observed a clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical calques in the Hispanic press of the United States, compared to the press of Spain, where a statistically significant relationship was found. Furthermore, our working hypothesis about the Hispanic press of *La Opinión* de Los Angeles was confirmed, which was marked by the greatest number of lexical substitutions, and showed the greatest social and cultural diffusion, as well as Anglo-Saxon acculturation, through translations copied from the English of the United States.

In contrast to the hypothesis of two standard varieties of Spanish in the phonological component (Atlantic Spanish and Castilian Spanish, with the variables characterizing seseo and voseo), we had to differentiate three standard varieties of Spanish in the semantic component (Spanish of the United States of America, Spanish of the Americas, and Spanish of Spain), with the variables characterizing statistically significant lexical borrowing in the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. Furthermore, we considered the non-significant frequency of lexical importation in the same process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

X. Conclusions

1. Our main working hypothesis was that within Hispanic acculturation there was linguistic and cultural continuity, based on successive and diverse historical acculturations (Indo-European, Basque-Iberian, Phoenician-Punic—Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Byzantine, Islamic, Catalan-Aragonese, medieval Castilian, medieval Valencian, Castilian, and Anglo-Saxon), with the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural mixing of these groups and their adaptation to a new sociocultural context. This hypothesis has been confirmed, and the peoples and cultures were the first agents of the Latin-medieval change to Romance languages in their respective speech communities. In this sense, Hispanic acculturation offers the most significant contribution of European languages and cultures, for more than twenty-five centuries, to the anthropological history of humanity, even though it has gone largely unnoticed despite its undeniable importance.

There was no linguistic change without languages in contact, and both the history of linguistic change and language shift were part of acculturation, stemming from social and cultural diffusion. There was never a final generation of medieval Latin, nor a first generation of Romance languages. Therefore, there was never an origin or death of languages, but rather acculturation and linguistic and cultural continuity. Basque, Catalan, Galician, and Guarani, as current co-official languages with Spanish, raise the need for a new anthropological history that seeks to appreciate the significance of these events and takes as its starting point and frame of reference the positions adopted by the various cultures.

2. Acculturation refers to all cultural phenomena resulting from the acquisition, modification, or reinterpretation of a culture, particularly the reception and assimilation of cultural elements from one social group by another, with adaptation to a new sociocultural context. The term acculturation was widely accepted among American anthropologists in the late 19th century to describe the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together, without distinguishing whether it should be applied to the results or the processes of cultural change. Acculturation thus encompassed those phenomena resulting from direct and continuous contact between social groups with different cultures, with the corresponding changes and reinterpretations in the original culture of one or both groups. The terms "acceptance," "adaptation," and "reaction" referred to the assimilation of cultural elements and their reinterpretation within new groups, as well as the rejection of those elements.

3. Among the languages of pre-Roman Hispania, Iberian was the best documented, allowing for a phonological system to be developed from the textual material of inscriptions. This culture was the product of the arrival of new social groups (probably of North African origin) during the Neolithic period along the entire Mediterranean coast, from southern France to the southern Iberian Peninsula. In the first millennium BC, it was impacted by a Phoenician-Punic-Greek acculturation, resulting from the introduction of new technologies on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, as well as from repeated contact with individuals from that region who possessed a more advanced culture.

Iberian had five vowel phonemes /a e i o u/, for which there was no evidence of a possible distinction of quantity. Although it was not easy to demonstrate, some of the features of the Romance languages were ultimately related to pre-Roman languages, and the five-vowel system of Castilian was the same as that of Basque and Iberian. Phoenician merchants were fully proficient in several forms of writing, and they knew their own alphabet and the Cypriot and Neo-Luwian syllabaries, both with their series of vowel syllabograms, and in particular the former with the vowel signs <a, e, i, o, u>, the same ones found in Greek and in some Paleo-Hispanic scripts.

4. Throughout the Roman Empire, the following elements played a decisive role in Romanization: the Roman administration, military garrisons (and, in connection with them, the granting of citizenship to discharged soldiers from the provinces), Roman culture in urban centers and schools (especially in Spain and Gaul), trade, and rural colonization. The acceptance of Latin by the inhabitants of the provinces was a process that developed without any coercion and simply represented the linguistic impact of the empire's political, commercial, and cultural penetration. Nor was there any conscious desire among the inhabitants of the provinces to preserve their native languages, except in the aforementioned conservative strongholds.

At the beginning of the second century, the clergy was established, consisting of the bishop, priests, and deacons, who gradually accumulated privileges and responsibilities. From the mid-third century, and especially after 313, a growing number of Christian faithful sought monasticism as a way to fulfill their desire for perfection. Initially, a monk was someone who withdrew from the world to pursue a spiritual life. The earliest known examples of Christian monasticism date from the late third century and originate in the eastern Mediterranean.

5. The profound impact of Roman acculturation was well known, as it shaped the Italic group (within the Indo-European family) and formed the basis of the Romance languages. While the model was not Classical Latin and the written register, but rather the oral register, this influence manifested itself in both vocabulary and surface structure

(morphological and phonological). The term *Romance language* is the literal translation of the Latin term *lingua romana*, which appeared in the second paragraph of Canon 17 of the Council of Tours (813). This canon recommended that priests preach in the oral register (the vernacular Romance language) so that they could be understood by the faithful.

The linguistic awareness of Romance languages arose from the Gallo-Romance-Franzic contact in the Frankish kingdom, beginning in the first half of the 8th century. This was fostered by the bilingual Gallo-Romance-Franzic consciousness of a multicultural Romance-Germanic community, less bound to Roman acculturation. In general, linguistic awareness was less clear and decisive in the Romance context than in the Germanic one, due to the lesser differentiation between Medieval Latin and the Romance languages. The Romance world emerged from the Gallo-Romance-Franzic contact in northern Gaul.

6. The connection between Hispanic cultural transmission and the Carolingian Renaissance was highlighted by J. García Turza (2000), who asserted that the Visigothic period in Spain was a time of recollection of ancient cultural traditions, as preserved by Visigothic bishops and Irish and Italian monks between the 5th and 8th centuries. In Western Europe (especially around the Mediterranean), what remained of that culture was placed at the service of the Church. Christianity, with its Scriptures and Hebrew tradition, its faith and liturgy, could not do without such a rich expression as that which it had received from antiquity, and the debate between the two positions was resolved with the acceptance of the Greco-Roman tradition. Visigothic Spain was one of the last and most valuable manifestations of ancient culture. Isidore of Seville laid the foundations of medieval culture and served as the bridge between Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

The lexical glosses of the *Em. 60* codex of the Royal Academy of History and those of the *Silense* codex *Addendum 30853* from the British Library (though Emilian in origin) were the first examples of Hispanic Romance languages. *Glosas Emilianenses* (950) and *Glosas Silenses* (second half of the 10th century) significantly demonstrated the process of written standardization and provided the first Hispanic evidence of an early linguistic awareness of the new Riojan Romance language, alongside Visigothic Latin. The Romance glosses represented revisions and adaptations of written texts to the temporal, geographical, and social context of an implicit planning of Riojan Romance on the linguistic frontier of the Basque-speaking community, which was less tied to the Latin-Roman tradition due to historical, sociological, cultural, and legal factors.

7. Based on studies of numerous documents from different dates and regions, it appears that this process of local drafting may have begun in the first third of the 12th century, in those areas where repopulation and the founding of new towns had been most intense. Consistent with the nascent development of municipal life, the texts produced during this century shared certain formal and content characteristics, such as the regulation of only specific aspects of community life, their formal adaptation to the chancery norms of the time, the widespread use of Latin (and occasionally Romance languages), and the use of a deficient legal technique typical of practitioners familiar with local or regional law, but lacking in legal scholarship. The political evolution of the kingdoms and the rise of municipal life within them, already noticeable in the first decades of the following century, together with the development of legal science as a consequence of the gradual reception in the Iberian Peninsula of the common European law, determined the formation of new local drafts that were increasingly broader and more technically perfect in the formulation of their rules and in their organization.

8. The creation of a new system of legal sources to replace the kingdom's traditional one was the work of Alfonso X, whose extensive legacy included three particularly important texts attributed to him (commonly known as the *Fuero Real*, *Espéculo*, and *Partidas*), as well as a legal treatise of a didactic nature, the *Setenario*. Their prologues all emphasized Alfonso X's firm conviction regarding both the need for reform and his authority to implement it through the application of a legal code (each of them) drafted with the advice of the Court and legal experts. The conditions of the kingdom demanded action with urgency, but also with extreme prudence, and this was reflected in the documentation of the time, which shows how the king already had a legal body of some extent that, in anticipation of possible resistance to its acceptance by the kingdom, he granted as municipal charters to several towns in León, Castile and Extremadura between 1255 and 1265, considering that they did not have a charter by which they should be judged, and also as a general privilege to the gentry of this latter region in 1264.

9. If during the 9th century the predominant written language in the Iberian Peninsula was Classical Arabic, in the 12th century it was Medieval Latin, and in the 13th century Castilian Romance gradually gained ground, until it became established as the language in which official documents of the Chancery, notaries, courts, Cortes, etc. were written. Within a definitive commitment by Alfonso X to the explicit standardization of Castilian, I. Fernández-Ordóñez (2004) raised the fundamental role of the royal initiative of Alfonso VIII, Fernando III, Alfonso X and Sancho IV. Until Castile and León united under King Ferdinand III in 1230, the Leonese chancery (dependent on the Archbishop of Santiago de Compostela) had issued its documents only in Medieval Latin, while the Castilian chancery

(linked to the archiepiscopal court of Toledo) had sporadically drafted documents in Castilian Romance. After the union of the kingdoms, Juan de Soria extended his functions to the Kingdom of León and maintained the use of Castilian as the preferred Romance language of the chancery, although Leonese Romance began to be used in private and local charters until the end of the 13th century.

10. In the period between 1231 and 1240, the percentage of Castilian texts from the Castilian-Leonese chancery doubled, and from 1241 until the end of his reign (1252), Romance-language diplomas outnumbered Latin ones. When Alfonso X ascended the Castilian-Leonese throne, the chancery of Ferdinand III had issued around 60% of its documents in Castilian during the previous decade. From then on, the chancery of Alfonso X maintained this linguistic approach, and the use of Castilian Romance was widespread, unconstrained by document type or legal register, although documents destined for other kingdoms were written in Medieval Latin. With the decisive selection of Castilian Romance and the exclusion of Medieval Latin, the Castilian chancery took the lead over the other kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula, as well as England and France.

11. Regarding the field of law in Catalonia, the first compilation chronologically, both in terms of its technical perfection and its significance for the development of Catalan law, was the *Usatges* de Barcelona. It was created both to address the shortcomings of the *Liber* and to update its norms in accordance with the social and economic evolution experienced by the Catalan counties as a result of their intense process of feudalization. A text of enormous complexity in its preserved form, having undergone successive revisions over time, its first draft appears to have been written in the second half of the 12th century, within the Curia of Barcelona. There, an anonymous jurist compiled the rulings issued by its judges, which generated a body of legal practice, along with some general constitutions. From the outset, it enjoyed full authority and prestige, and its scope of application, initially limited to the territory's dependent on the Count of Barcelona, gradually expanded to other Catalan counties and cities, as well as those of other kingdoms of the Crown of Aragón.

12. In the kingdoms of Aragón, València, and Majorca, and in the principality of Catalonia, the transition from their early medieval law to that which characterized the late Middle Ages and the Modern Era occurred without difficulty. In some, this was because, as newly conquered kingdoms, there were no significant obstacles to establishing a particular legal system. In others, various factors allowed for the development of a new order (not by replacing the old one, as in Castile), but through the gradual evolution of their traditional law. This evolution resulted from its adaptation to the trends of the new era, aimed at achieving the legal unification of the kingdoms and incorporating, to a greater or lesser extent, *de jure* or *de facto*, the common European law into their respective systems.

13. In Aragón, the first preserved legal texts, of a brief type, appeared dated to the end of the 11th century and the first years of the 12th century when the advance towards the south began, granted by the kings Sancho Ramírez and Pedro I. Aimed at promoting the settlement of the population, they responded to the characteristics of privileged charters, and also offered special interest because they revealed the two different systems with which the Aragonese kings initially approached the repopulation: one, the one used in Jaca, based on the equality of charter; Another, that of Barbastro, involved the (more or less general) application of a privileged class right: that of the *infanzones*. The first charter of Jaca (1077), as well as the successive royal privileges it received, favored the development of the city, so it was soon considered especially appropriate for the establishment of urban centers with intense commercial activity, and therefore attractive to people from outside the land.

14. Jaume I's decision to participate actively and personally in the reconquest of the Moorish kingdom of the Levant completely transformed the undertaking. With València occupied by capitulation on September 28, 1238, and the definitive borders south of the Júcar River established within eight years, the king retained the territory under the direct control of the Crown, without ceding it to those who had participated in its conquest. He personally oversaw its repopulation, thus overcoming any obstacles that might have prevented him from achieving his stated objectives, as in Mallorca, of providing the new kingdom with an independent political constitution and its own legal system. This policy, coupled with the almost complete absence of a Christian legal tradition in these lands, which had been heavily Islamized since ancient times, allowed the Conqueror complete freedom in establishing his legal system. But here he did not limit himself, as in the islands, but endowed the kingdom with a complete order by promulgating in 1240, with the council and in the presence of several bishops, nobles and leading men of the cities, a code that presented a "compilation of customs" that was to govern in the city and kingdom of València, in whose elaboration the illustrious Vidal de Canellas may have intervened.

15. Based on various events that occurred between 711 and 1238, M. Sanchis Guarner (1956) proposed the near-total disappearance of the Mozarabic communities of València. First, the Almoravid invasion (1086) brought about a veritable Africanization of the country, a wave of fanaticism and intolerance, in which the Mozarabs were the primary

victims. The fall of València to this new power was temporary between 1092 and 1094, and definitive in 1102, which triggered a significant emigration of Mozarabs to Castile. Secondly, the attack by Alfonso the Battler, King of Aragón, carried out in 1125 with the help of the Mozarabs, resulted, at the time of his retreat, in a mass exodus of Mozarabs who went to repopulate the newly conquered Aragonese lands. With this second, massive emigration of Mozarabs (some 10,000 families), the Christian population of València must have been greatly reduced, and the city became more Islamic than ever, although the Valencian Mozarabs would have preserved their Romance language, to a greater or lesser degree, until their integration into the kingdoms of Jaume I.

16. The Muslims who lived in the Kingdom of València between 1238 and 1609, unlike those who lived in Aragón or Castile, spoke exclusively Arabic. It was difficult to believe that before the conquest in 1238, when Arabic was the dominant language, the Muslims of València could have spoken a Romance language (Mozarabic), and that after 1238, when Catalan was dominant, they would have had to abandon their native tongue to adopt Arabic. It was therefore difficult to argue for the continuity of Mozarabic in the current language of the Kingdom of València. The changes that took place in the Arab Kingdom of València during the 11th century, with the beginning of economic activity and urban life, suggested that secondary urban centers likely played an important role in a process of Islamic acculturation.

17. Following the Arab conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, C. Barceló (1995) suggested that a significant portion of the Christian population converted to Islam and, at the same time, learned Arabic. In the 13th century, the entire population of the former Kingdom of València was monolingual in Arabic, although very little Arabic documentation from that period survives. Documentation from the 14th and 15th centuries was more extensive, and even more so from the 16th and 17th centuries (over 100 documents). There is no Romance syntax or morphology, nor many words of Latin etymology that could be found in glossaries or pre-conquest documentation, not only of València but of the entire Iberian Peninsula. When the Church began, around 1525, to realize that Arabic was necessary to achieve conversion, priests, preachers, and other Christians tasked with catechizing, who spoke Arabic, arrived in the villages.

18. The Castilian language was not imposed on Spanish America, and there was no language shift of indigenous languages, but rather Castilian acculturation. Guaraní, as a current co-official language with Spanish in Paraguay, represents the best example of Castilian acculturation. The incidental nature of the incorporation of the Indies into the Crown of Castile, according to A.M. Barrero (1993), by virtue of the donation from Pope Alexander VI to the Catholic Monarchs and their successors in the kingdoms of León and Castile of the lands discovered and yet to be discovered, determined that their legal configuration and organization were not carried out through the creation of a new legal system, but rather through the transplantation of the Castilian legal system. The need to adapt the principles and norms of this system to a different reality gave rise to the formation of a specific law for the Indies (*Indian law*), for the regulation of the many situations not covered by the former.

19. The Antillean standard was transmitted to the Americas, where it coexisted with speech patterns from central and northern Spain, brought by subsequent waves of migration. In this second phase, therefore, and without forgetting the indigenous presence, the creolized people of the Antilles shared the space with those arriving directly from the Iberian Peninsula. This situation allowed for the coexistence of the first standard (the product of the initial Andalusian standardization) with the second, northern Peninsular standard, which arrived with the direct migrations. The subsequent development of Latin American linguistic varieties confirmed that the coexistence of standards involved a continuous transfer of speakers from one to another, in a process that could have been extremely slow, and whose final outcome depended, in each territory, on many other specific factors. However, it should not be overlooked that *seseo*, brought to the Americas with the Antillean-Andalusian standard, eventually became the only general phonological feature of American Spanish.

20. In his work on the Hispanization of America (Castilian and Indigenous languages since 1492), A. Rosenblat (1963) wrote that the Hispanization process (October 12, 1492) had not ended after four hundred and seventy years, but understanding the path traveled was important. The Indian or Castilian interpreter represented a first stage, that of approximation. Undoubtedly, the more stable forms of coexistence were more important, and of these, three above all: labor, miscegenation, and catechization. However, the latter concerned the Admiral from the very beginning, since it appeared as a fundamental condition of Spain's rights in the papal bulls of Alexander VI (1493), with the Treaty of Tordesillas (June 7, 1494) signed between the representatives of John II of Portugal and those of the Catholic Monarchs, and as the supreme objective in the Instructions of the Catholic Monarchs.

21. The conquest would in fact imply Hispanization, through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the State, and it had to be a slow process. The colonial regime was superimposed on indigenous society, which generally continued to maintain its old structures. But the conquest ultimately had only one religious justification,

which always appeared, in all the Instructions, as the supreme goal: to eradicate idolatry, to convert the Indians to Christianity. And this task could not be conceived as a slow undertaking, unfolding over generations, but rather as an immediate and radical one. Conquest and Christianization would be one and the same undertaking. However, there was no Hispanic-American conquest, but rather annexation by virtue of the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494), which in fact implied Castilian acculturation, through the political, economic, and legal institutions of the Crown of Castile. Acculturation was an essential characteristic of the anthropological history of humanity . , and the primary principle of the history of languages in contact and of linguistic change was the acculturation of social groups.

22. Hispanic American was a mosaic of languages and dialects, and its extreme fragmentation was fundamentally detrimental, with the exception of the spread of Quechua (in Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and as far south as Colombia) and Guaraní. Quechua was the most widely spoken indigenous language in Latin America, with some six million speakers, who were also highly differentiated dialectally, and of whom four million also spoke Spanish. The current, and quite commendable, trend of educating indigenous people in their own languages and teaching them to read in their native tongues (a trend that began in Mexico and spread to the Peruvian jungle) meant that indigenous people learned to read Spanish very quickly, paradoxically facilitating their assimilation into Spanish.

23. The case of Paraguay is unique in Hispanic American, since the entire country speaks Guaraní. There are no longer any indigenous people (except for some 40,000 living in the jungle). This astonishing fact was attributed to the work of the old Jesuit missions. The Jesuits won over the indigenous people by preaching to them in Guaraní: by 1750, they had 30 towns with some 150,000 indigenous inhabitants. It was a closed world (some even spoke of the Jesuit Kingdom of Paraguay), which was often in conflict, even engaging in bloody battles, with the authorities in Asunción. The missions operated in this way for about 150 years, until 1767, peacefully governed by a small number of religious figures. Guaraní is the second official language, but Spanish prevails in schools and universities and in public life. And it is undoubtedly the link that unites Paraguay with the community of Latin American countries.

24. The Hispanic presence in the territories that now constitute the United States dates back to the 16th century. However, the current reality of “Hispanics,” according to H. López Morales (2012), is the result of a series of historical processes. If we discount early settlements and some isolated instances, true immigration began in the early 20th century, with Mexico leading the way, followed by Puerto Ricans and later Cubans. In recent decades, Dominicans, Central Americans, and others from different parts of South America have arrived. Spaniards have been and continue to be a significant minority. However, this was not merely a linguistic issue, but also a social and cultural one. “Spanglish” is a clear example of Anglo-Saxon acculturation. It was not, therefore, a matter of the language shift of the Spanish spoken by Hispanic immigrants.

E. Lago (2009) pointed out that the strength of Spanish is a direct consequence of the fact that it was the language of expression in some twenty American countries. The United States was experiencing a growing process of Hispanization, and the expansion of the language was an essential part of this phenomenon. The Hispanic community in the United States is a conglomerate resulting from the fusion of those who have been established in the country for a long time (some for more than a century and a half) with the immigrants who continue to arrive from the most diverse regions of the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. The different national cultures tend to interact with each other spontaneously, creating a hybrid entity of a pan-Hispanic nature, clearly distinct from that of the countries of origin.

25. The real problems of language policy in the United States emerged in the last quarter of the 20th century with the so-called “English Only ” movement, and were closely linked to an anti-immigrant attitude, which constituted one of the most serious political problems of the 20th and 21st centuries. Until 1965, the United States had not established a limit on the number of Hispanic immigrants who could settle in the country. The figure was then set at 120,000 per year. Furthermore, at the beginning of the 21st century, Spanish speakers became the country's largest minority, surpassing the Black minority.

Furthermore, it was claimed that approximately 12,000,000 uncounted individuals resided illegally. This was not merely a demographic fact, but rather involved two issues (one cultural and the other economic) to which a political dimension had to be added. Regarding legal texts, there is no declaration or prescription on this matter in the federal Constitution. In reality, the United States has never had a predetermined language policy, but rather ad hoc policies. However, the situation of constitutional legislation in the federated states is as follows: thirty proclaim English as their official language, and twenty do not. Hawaii is the only officially bilingual state.

26. Hispanics are by far the largest minority group in the United States. According to estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. population of Hispanic origin exceeded 62.5 million in July 2022. This figure represents an increase of more than 12 million since 2010 and more than 53 million since 1970. In the last five decades, the Hispanic population has grown sevenfold and its relative weight has quadrupled. Currently, 18.9% of Americans identify ethnically as Hispanic, placing this community well above the Asian (6.1%) and African American (13.6%) populations .

The geographic mobility observed in this community is also gradually altering its traditional pattern of concentration, which placed Hispanics of Mexican and Central American origin primarily in the states closest to Mexico, while those of Caribbean origin were concentrated only in Florida, New York, or, in general, in the eastern states. Currently, it is easy to find Hispanics of diverse origins throughout the country. Although Mexico remains the primary country of origin (59.5% of the total), followed by Puerto Rico (9.3%), El Salvador (4%), Cuba (3.8%), and the Dominican Republic (3.8%).

27. In terms of Spanish usage, the states with the highest percentage of Spanish speakers are Florida (92%) and New York (84%), closely followed by Illinois and Texas, and not far behind by California, Arizona, and New Mexico (69%). The fact that Florida and New York top the list suggests that more recent immigrant populations are better at maintaining their native language. However, the most important factor is the use of Spanish in public settings. And in this regard, Miami-Dade County (in Florida) leads the nation, due to its official bilingual and bicultural status (English and Spanish).

Since the 1990s, our specific working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, "New Information and Communication Technologies" and American English were closely related. Immigration has been yet another chapter in economic globalization and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, which has exceeded all expectations and limitations. The United States is the country with the most immigrants. Between 1987 and 1990, the impact of economic globalization was analyzed in six Spanish newspapers (three from the United States and three from Spain) in order to investigate the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

28. The overall results of the total occurrences of lexical imports (categorical and variable), according to each of the newspapers of the Spanish press in the United States and Spain, showed that lexical import followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1st) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 2nd) Barcelona; 3rd) Los Angeles; 4th) Madrid (*El País*); 5th) New York; and 6th) Madrid (*ABC*), in which there was no statistically significant relationship in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain.

However, there was a greater number of lexical imports in *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, than in *La Opinión* of Los Angeles, although lexical importation was widespread. On the one hand, there was no clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical imports in the Hispanic press of the United States compared to the press of Spain. On the other hand, our working hypothesis regarding the greater impact of economic globalization on *El Nuevo Día* of San Juan, Puerto Rico, was confirmed, stemming from the social and cultural diffusion of lexical importation, as well as from Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

29. The overall results for the total occurrence of lexical calques (categorical and variable), according to each of the Spanish-language newspapers in the United States and Spain, revealed that lexical substitution followed the following hierarchy in the newspapers of: 1) Los Angeles; 2) San Juan, Puerto Rico; 3) New York; 4) *La Vanguardia*; 5) *ABC*, and 6) *El País*. In summary, we observed a clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical calques in the Hispanic press of the United States, compared to the press of Spain, where a statistically significant relationship was found. Furthermore, our working hypothesis about the Hispanic press of *La Opinión* de Los Angeles was confirmed, which was marked by the greatest number of lexical calques, and showed the greatest social and cultural diffusion, as well as Anglo-Saxon acculturation, through translations copied from the English of the United States.

In contrast to the hypothesis of two standard varieties of Spanish in the phonological component (Atlantic Spanish and Castilian Spanish, with the variables characterizing seseo and voseo), we had to differentiate three standard varieties of Spanish in the semantic component (Spanish of the United States of America, Spanish of the Americas, and Spanish of Spain), with the variables characterizing statistically significant lexical borrowing in the process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. Furthermore, we considered the non-significant frequency of lexical importation in the same process of social and cultural diffusion of lexical transfers and Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

References

- [1]. Abad, F. (1991), "Historiografía Del Concepto De "Español Atlántico", In Actas Del Del III Congreso Internacional Del Español De América, Valladolid, Junta De Castilla Y León, I, 155-63.
- [2]. Abad, L. (1987), "La Cultura Ibérica", In Suárez, L. Et Al. (Dirs.) (1985-1995), 1/2, 171- 253.

- [3]. Alonso, A. (1941), "Substratum Y Superstratum", In Alonso, A. (1967), 259-71.
- (1967), Estudios Lingüísticos. Temas Españoles, 3rd Ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- [4]. Alvar, M. (1969), El Dialecto Riojano, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1976.
- (1989), "De Las Glosas Emilianenses A Gonzalo De Berceo", RFE, 69, 5-38.
- (1996), "Riojano", In Alvar, M. (Dir.) (1996), 81-96.
- (Dir.) (1996), Manual De Dialectología Hispánica. El Español De España, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [5]. Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.), (1971), Antropología Social Y Lenguaje, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1976.
- [6]. Artola, M. (Dir.) (1973-1976), Historia De España Alfaguara, 7 Vols., Madrid, Alianza.
- (Dir.) (1988-1993), Enciclopedia De Historia De España, 7 Vols., Madrid, Alianza
- [7]. Baldinger, K. (1958), La Formación De Los Dominios Lingüísticos En La Península Ibérica,
- [8]. 2nd Ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- [9]. — (1988), "Miseria Y Esplendor De La Filología", In Actas Del I Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española, Madrid, Arco/Libros, I, 19-44.
- [10]. Banniard, M. (1992), Viva Voce: Communication Écrite Et Communication Orale Du Ive Au Ixe Siècle En Occident Latin, Paris, Institut Des Études Agustiniennes.
- [11]. — (2023), "La Génesis De Las Lenguas Románicas En El Siglo XXI: La Sociolingüística En Diacronía Larga (V-IX Ss)", In García Turza, C. (Dir.) (2023), 87-130.
- [12]. Barceló, C. (1995), "La Llengua Dels Sarraïns Valencians", In Colomina, J.(Ed.) (1995), 13- 23.
- [13]. Barrero, A. M. (1993), "Las Fuentes Del Derecho Histórico Español", In Artola, M. (Dir.) (1988-1993), VII, 229-335.
- (2003), "La Difusión Del Fuero De Jaca En El Camino De Santiago", In Molho, M. (2003), II, 111-60.
- [14]. — And Alonso, M. L. (1989), Textos De Derecho Local Español En La Edad Media. Catálogo De Fueros Y Costums Municipales, Madrid, CSIC.
- [15]. Bec, P. (1970), Manuel Pratique De Philologie Romane (Italien, Espagnol, Portugais, Occitan, Catalan, Gascon), I, Paris, Editions A. Y J. Picard.
- [16]. Cano, R. (Coord.) (2004), Historia De La Lengua Española, 2nd Ed., Barcelona, Ariel, 2013.
- [17]. Catalán, D. (1958), "Génesis Del Español Atlántico", Revista De Historia Canaria, XXIV, 233-42.
- [18]. — (Ed.) (1962), Estructuralismo E Historia: Miscelánea Homenaje A A. Martinet, III, La Laguna, Universidad De La Laguna.
- [19]. Cece, A. And Gimeno, F. (2020), "El Impacto De La Globalización Económica Y Del Anglicismo Léxico En Los Diarios Económicos De Italia Y España", In Gimeno, F. (Coord.) (2020), 129-52.
- [20]. Colomina, J. (Ed.) (1995), Llengües En Contacte Als Regnes De València I De Múrcia (Segles XIII-XV), 2nd Ed., Alacant, Universitat d'Alacant.
- [21]. Corominas, J. And Pascual, J. A. (1980-1991), Diccionario Crítico Etimológico Castellano E Hispánico, 6 Vols., Madrid, Gredos.
- [22]. Correa, J.A. (2004), "Elementos No Indoeuropeos E Indoeuropeos En La Historia Lingüística Hispánica", In Cano, R. (Coord.) (2004), 35-57.
- [23]. Coseriu, E. (1955), "La Geografía Lingüística", In Coseriu, E. (1977), 103-58.
- (1958), Sincronía, Diacronía E Historia. El Problema Del Cambio Lingüístico, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- (1977), El Hombre Y Su Lenguaje. Estudios De Teoría Y Metodología Lingüística, Madrid, Gredos.
- [24]. Criado De Val, M. (Ed.) (2001), Los Orígenes Del Español Y Los Grandes Textos Medievales Mio Cid, Buen Amor Y Celestina, Madrid, CSIC.
- [25]. Díaz Y Díaz, M. C. (1978), Las Primeras Glosas Hispánicas, Barcelona, Universidad Autónoma.
- [26]. — (1995), "Problemas Y Perspectivas Del Latín Medieval Hispano", Actas Del I Congreso Nacional De Latín Medieval, León, Universidad De León, 17-26.
- [27]. — (1996), "Las Glosas Protohispánicas", Actas Del III Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española, I, 653-66.
- [28]. Dil, A. S. (Ed.) (1972), Language In Sociocultural Change. Essays By J. A. Fishman, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- [29]. Domene, J. F. (2021), "El Feudalismo Y La Reconquista", In Gimeno, F. (Coord.) (2021), 109-140.
- [30]. Echenique, M. T. (1983), Historia Lingüística Vasco-Románica, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Paraninfo, 1987.
- (2004), "La Lengua Vasca En La Historia Lingüística Hispánica", In Cano, R. (Coord.) (2004), 59-80.
- [31]. — (2006), "La Emergencia Del Romance Castellano En El Conjunto Hispánico Y Románico. Apunte Crítico", Revista De Historia De La Lengua Española, I, 145- 52.
- [32]. — (2013a), "La Obra De Nebrija Como Fuente Para El Estudio De La Pronunciación Castellana", In Echenique, M. T. And Satorre, F. J. (Eds.) (2013), 165-215.
- (2013b), "Dialectos Románicos Y Dialectos Vascos En Contacto En La Protohistoria Hispánica", Aemilianense, 3, 23-45.
- [33]. — And Satorre, F. J. (Eds.) (2013), Historia De La Pronunciación De La Lengua Castellana, Valencia, Tirant Humanidades.
- [34]. Epalza, M. De Et Al. (1983), Moros Y Moriscos En El Levante Peninsular (Sharq Al- Andalus). Introducción Bibliográfica, Alicante, Diputación Provincial.
- [35]. Estal, J. M. Del (Coord.) (1985), Studia Historica In Honorem V. Martínez Morellá, Alicante, Diputación De Alicante,
- [36]. Ferguson, C. A. (1959), "Diglossia", Word, 15, 325-40.
- [37]. Fernández-Ordoñez, I. (2004), "Alfonso X El Sabio En La Historia Del Español", In Cano, R. (Coord.) (2004), 381-422.
- [38]. Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), "Language Maintenance And Language Shift As A Field Of Inquiry: Revisited", In Dil, A. S. (Ed.) (1972), 76-134.
- [39]. — (1971), "The Sociology Of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach To Language In Society", In Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- (Ed) (1971), Advances In The Sociology Of Language, 2 Vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- [40]. García, O. (2008), "El Uso Del Español En La Enseñanza. La Educación Bilingüe", In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 417-22.
- Et Al. (1985), "Written Spanish In The United States: An Analysis Of The Spanish Of The Ethnic Press", IJSL, 56, 85-98.
- [41]. García Andreva, F. (2009), "Del Manuscrito Al Cartulario. Notas Sobre La Fidelidad Textual Del Becerro Galicano De San Millán De La Cogolla", In Julià, C. Et Al. (Coords.) (2009), 277-88.
- [42]. — (2010a), "Estudio Léxico Del Becerro Galicano Emilianense", Aemilianense, II, 37- 126.

- (2010b), *El Becerro Galicano De San Millán De La Cogolla*. Edición Y Estudio, San Millán De La Cogolla, Cilengua.
- [43]. García De Cortázar, J. A. (1969), *El Dominio Del Monasterio De San Millán De La Cogolla* (Siglos X Al XIII). Introducción A La Historia Rural De Castilla Altomedieval, Salamanca, Universidad De Salamanca.
- [44]. —(1973), *La Época Medieval*, In Artola, M. (Dir.) (1973-1976), II, 2ª Ed., Madrid, 1974.
- [45]. —(1985), “Introducción: Espacio, Sociedad Y Organización Medievales En Nuestra Tradición Historiográfica”, In García De Cortázar, J. A. Et Al. (1985), 11-42.
- [46]. —(2004) “Resistencia Frente Al Islam: Reconquista Y Repoblación En Los Reinos Cristianos (Años 711-1212)” In Cano, R. (Coord.) (2004), 239-56.
- [47]. —(2012), *Historia Religiosa Del Occidente Medieval (Años 313-1464)*, Madrid, Ediciones Akal.
- [48]. —(2016), “La Difusión Social De La Nueva Cosmovisión Cristiana En Los Siglos I Al IV”, *Aemilianense IV* (Homenaje Al Prof. C. García Turza), 235-67.
- [49]. — Et Al. (1985), *Organización Social Del Espacio En La España Medieval. La Corona De Castilla En Los Siglos VIII A XV*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [50]. García Turza, C. (2003), “La Glosa 89 Del Em 60, ‘El Primer Vagido Del Español’”, *Estudis Romànics*, 25, 299-310.
- [51]. — (2004), “El Códice Emilianense 31 De La RAH. Presentación De Algunas De Las Voces De Interés Para El Estudio Lingüístico Del Latín Medieval Y Del Iberorromance Primitivo”, *Aemilianense*, I, 95-170.
- [52]. —(2011), *Los Primitivos Romances Hispánicos. Nuevas Aportaciones Desde Los Glosarios Visigóticos*, San Millán De La Cogolla, Cilengua.
- [53]. — (2013), “La Influencia De La Biblia Y Sus Traducciones En La Historia De La Lengua Española”, *Aemilianense*, IV, 2016, 35-84.
- [54]. — (2023), “Hacia Un Proyecto Genuinamente Filológico”, In García Turza, C. (Dir.) (2023), 17-86.
- [55]. —And García Turza, J. (1997), *Fuentes Españolas Altomedievales. El Códice Em. 46 De La Real Academia De La Historia, Primer Diccionario Enciclopédico De La Península Ibérica*, Ed. And Est., Logroño, RAH And Fundación Caja Rioja.
- [56]. —And García Turza, J. (2000), “El Glosario Latín Del Códice Em. 24 De La RAH”, In *Investigación Humanística Y Científica En La Rioja. Homenaje A J. L. Fernández Sevilla Y M. Balmaseda*, Logroño, IER, 107-35.
- [57]. —And García Turza, J. (2001), “La Datación Y La Procedencia De La Glosas Emilianenses Y Silenses: Anotaciones Críticas A Los Nuevos Planteamientos”, In Criado De Val, M. (Ed.) (2001), 33-47.
- And García Turza, J. (2002), “El Códice Em. 46 De La RAH”, In García Turza, C. (Coord.) (2002), 77-115.
- [58]. —And García Turza, J. (2004), *Fuentes Españolas Altomedievales. El Códice Em. 31 De La RAH*, Ed. Y Est., Logroño, FCR.
- [59]. —(Coord.) (2002), *Los Manuscritos Visigóticos: Estudio Paleográfico Y Codicológico. I. Códices Riojanos Datados*, Logroño, Fundación San Millán De La Cogolla.
- [60]. —(Dir.) (2023), *Las Glosas Emilianenses Y Silenses. Los Textos Latinos*, Madrid, San Millán De La Cogolla, Fundación San Millán De La Cogolla.
- [61]. García Turza, J. (1990), *El Monasterio De Valbanera En La Edad Media (Siglos XI-XV)*, Madrid, Unión Editorial.
- [62]. — (2000), “La Transmisión Cultural Hispana Y El Renacimiento Carolingio”, En Iglesia, J. I. (Coord.) (2000), 17-38.
- [63]. —(2013), *El Monasterio De San Millán De La Cogolla, Una Historia De Santos, Copistas, Canteros Y Monjes*, León, Everest.
- [64]. Gimeno, F. (1984), “El Sustrato Lingüístico Y El Seseo Valenciano De La Comunidad De Habla Alicantina”, In Micel.Lània Sanchis Guarner, II, Barcelona, Abadía De Montserrat, 1992, 161-84.
- [65]. —(1985), “Caracterización Sociolingüística Del Libro De Los Primitivos Privilegios De Alicante De Alfonso X El Sabio”, In Estal, J. M. Del (Coord.) (1985), 117-42.
- [66]. —(1987), “A Propósito De Comunidad De Habla: ‘The Social Dimension Of Dialectology’ De J. P. Rona”, *Actas Del I Congreso Internacional Sobre El Español De América* (San Juan De Puerto Rico, 1982), Madrid, Boletín De La Academia Puertorriqueña De La Lengua, 689-98.
- [67]. — (1988a), “Sociolingüística Histórica”, *Actas Del Xviii Congrès International De Linguistique Et De Philologie Romanes*, V, Tübingen, M. Niemeyer, 111-20.
- [68]. — (1988b), “Aproximación Sociolingüística A Los Orígenes Del Español”, *Actas Del I Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española*, II, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 1183-92.
- [69]. —(1990), *Dialectología Y Sociolingüística Españolas*, 2nd Ed., Alicante, Universidad De Alicante, 1993.
- (1995), *Sociolingüística Histórica (Siglos X-XII)*, Madrid, Visor Libros
- (1998), “La Sustitución Lingüística De Las Lenguas Prerromanas Por El Latín”, *Actas Del IV Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española*, II, Logroño, Universidad De La Rioja, 475-83.
- (2004), “Situaciones Sociolingüísticas Disparas En El Proceso De Formación De Las Lenguas Romances”, *Aemilianense*, I, 171-223.
- [70]. —(2008), “La Respuesta De La Lengua Española Ante La Globalización Económica Y El Anglicismo Léxico”, *Actas Del VI Congreso Internacional De ‘El Español De América’*, Valladolid, Diputación De Valladolid, 251-68.
- [71]. —(2013), “Fundamentos Antropológicos Y Sociológicos De Los Protorromances Hispanos”, *Aemilianense*, III, 47-131.
- [72]. —(2016a), “Historia Social De Los Protorromances Hispanos”, In Terrado, J. Y Sabaté, F. (Eds.) (2016), 15-42.
- [73]. —(2016b), “Variación Y Cambio Del Latín Al Romance: El Calco Sintáctico Del Orden Semítico De Palabras”, *Aemilianense*, IV (Homenaje Al Prof. C. García Turza), 291-365.
- (2017), “Sociolingüística Histórica: Fundamentos De Los Protorromances Hispanos”, In Mesa, J. F. (Ed.) (2017), 509-20.
- [74]. — (2019), *Historia Antropológica De Los Romances Hispanos*, San Millán De La Cogolla, Centro Internacional De La Lengua Española.
- (2021), “La Normalización Escrita De La Épica Castellana” In Gimeno, F. (Coord.) (2021), 13-107.
- (2023a), “Present And Near Future Of Spanish”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 11, 2, 11-24.
- [75]. —(2023b), “The Spanish Of The United States Of America”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 12, 1, 13-29.
- [76]. —(2024a), “Formation Processes Of Hispanic Romances”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 2, 10, 39-56.
- (2024b), “Sociological And Legal Keys To The Formation Of Hispanic Romances”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 3, 7, 60-79.
- [77]. —(2024c), “Anthropology History Of First Hispanic Romance Text”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 5, 7, 11-29.
- (2024d), “Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 29, 11, 3, 17-32.
- (2025a), “Basque-Iberian Aculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 2, 2, 31-45.
- (2025b), “Castilian Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 3, 5, 46-60.
- (2025c), “Anglo-Saxon Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 4, 6, 41-57.
- (2025d), “Catalan-Aragones Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 5, 6, 4-37.
- (2025e), “Medieval Castilian Acculturation”, *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 7, 1, 38-51.

- (2025f), "Medieval Valencian Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 9, 3, 64-80.
- [78]. —(2025g), "Historical Sociolinguistics And Acculturation", *IOSR-JHSS*, 30, 10, 4, 34-44.
- [79]. —(2025h), *Historia Antropológica De La Frontera Valenciano-Castellana Meridional*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [80]. —And García Turza, C. (2010), "La Función Social De Los Protorroances Hispanos", *Aemilianense*, II, 127-202.
- [81]. —And Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El Desplazamiento Lingüístico Del Español Por El Inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [82]. —(Coord.) (2020), *Lengua, Sociedad Y Cultura. Estudios Dedicados A Alberto Carcedo González*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicane.
- [83]. —(Coord.) (2021), *El Poema De Mio Cid. Nuevas Revisiones Críticas*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [84]. Gómez Moreno, M. (1943), "La Escritura Ibérica", *Boletín De La Real Academia De La Historia*, 112, 231-78.
- [85]. González Ollé, F (1970), "El Romance Navarro", *RFE*, LIII, 45-93.
- [86]. — (1978), "El Establecimiento Del Castellano Como Lengua Oficial", *BRAE*, 58, 229-80.
- [87]. — (2004), "Observaciones Filológicas Al Códice Emilianense 46 (Glosario Turza), Con Algunas De Sus Aportaciones A La Historia Lingüística Española", In Lüdtkke, J. And Schmitt, C. (Eds.) (2004), 13-37.
- [88]. —(2016), "Vascones Y Vascuence: Historia (Para Romanistas) De Una Relación", *Revista Iberoamericana De Lingüística*, 11, 35-197.
- [89]. Guichard, P. (1976), *Al-Andalus. Estructura Antropológica De Una Sociedad Islámica En Occidente*, Barcelona, Barral Ediciones.
- [90]. Haugen, E. (1953/1969), *The Norwegian Language In America. A Study In Bilingual Behavior*, 2nd Ed., 2 Vols., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969.
- [91]. — (1973), "Bilingualism, Language Contact, And Immigrant Languages In The United States: A Research Report 1956-1970", In Sebeok, T. A. (Ed.) (1973), 505-91.
- [92]. Herman, J. (1975/1997), *El Latín Vulgar*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [93]. Hernández, C. Et Al. (Eds.) (1993), *Las Glosas Emilianenses Y Silenses*, Ed. Crítica Y Facsímil, Burgos, Ayuntamiento De Burgos.
- [94]. Herranz, A. (1996), *Estado, Sociedad Y Lenguaje. La Política Lingüística En Honduras*, Tegucigalpa, Guaymuras.
- [95]. Hockett, C. F. (1958/1962), *A Course In Modern Linguistics*, New York. Trad. Española Curso De Lingüística Moderna, 4th Ed., Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1971.
- [96]. Hymes, D. (1971), "La Sociolingüística Y La Etnografía Del Habla", In Ardener, E. Et Al. (Eds.) (1971), 115-51.
- [97]. — (1974), *Foundations In Sociolinguistics. An Ethnography Approach*, London, Tavistock.
- [98]. Iglesia, J. I. (Coord.) (2000), *La Enseñanza En La Edad Media*, Logroño, IER.
- [99]. Imhoff, B. J. (1999), "Review Of F. Gimeno Menéndez, *Sociolingüística Histórica (Siglos X -XII)*", *Southwest Journal Of Linguistics*, 18, 1: 132-4.
- [100]. Instituto Cervantes (1999), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (1999)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [101]. — (2000), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (2000)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [102]. — (2023), *El Español En El Mundo. Anuario (2023)*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [103]. Jordan, I. (1932), *Lingüística Románica. Evolución, Corrientes, Métodos* (Reed. Parcial And Notas De M. Alvar), Madrid, Alcalá, 1967.
- [104]. Jakobson, R. (1970), "Relaciones Entre La Ciencia Del Lenguaje Y Las Otras Ciencias", In Jakobson, R. (1976), 11-82.
- [105]. — (1976), *Nuevos Ensayos De Lingüística General*, México, Siglo XXI.
- [106]. Julià, C. Et Al. (Coords.) (2009), *Tendencias Actuales En La Investigación Diacrónica De La Lengua*, Barcelona.
- [107]. Lago, E. (2008), "Estados Unidos Hispanos", In López Morales, H. (Coord.) (2008), 23-6.
- [108]. Lapesa, R. (1942/1981), *Historia De La Lengua Española*, 9th Ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- [109]. — (1963), "El Andaluz Y El Español De América", In *Presente Y Futuro De La Lengua Española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 173-82.
- [110]. Lausberg, H. (1956/1962), *Lingüística Románica*, Reimp., 2 Vols., Madrid, Gredos, 1970/1973.
- [111]. Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.) (1968), *Directions For Historical Linguistics: A Symposium*, Austin, University Of Texas Press.
- [112]. López Morales, H. (1983), *Estratificación Social Del Español De Puerto Rico*, UNAM.
- [113]. — (1987), "Anglicismos Léxicos En El Habla Culta De San Juan De Puerto Rico", *LEA*, IX, 285-303.
- [114]. — (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3rd Ed., Madrid, Gredos, 2004.
- [115]. — (1998), *La Aventura Del Español En América*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- [116]. — (2006), "Sociolingüística Histórica", *Actas Del VI Congreso Internacional De Historia De La Lengua Española*, III, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 2385-402.
- [117]. (2012), *La Lengua Española En El Mundo Actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- [118]. — (2013), "Los Estudios Sociolingüísticos En Río Piedras", In Montoya, B. And Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), 409-18.
- [119]. (Coord.) (2008), *Enciclopedia Del Español En Los Estados Unidos*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [120]. Lorenzo, E. (1966), *El Español De Hoy, Lengua En Ebullición*, 3rd Ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1980.
- [121]. — (1996), *Anglicismos Hispánicos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [122]. — (1999), *El Español En La Encrucijada*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- [123]. Lüdtkke, H. (1968), *Historia Del Léxico Románico*, Madrid, Gredos, 1974.
- [124]. — (2005), *Der Ursprung Der Romanischen Sprachen. Eine Geschichte Der Sprachlichen Kommunikation*, Kiel, Westensee-Verl.
- [125]. —And Schmitt, C. (Eds.) (2004), *Historia Del Léxico Español. Enfoques Y Aplicaciones. Homenaje A B. Müller*, Madrid, Iberoamericana.
- [126]. Malkiel, Y. (1976), "From Romance Philology Through Dialect Geography To Sociolinguistics", *International Journal Of The Sociology Of Language*, 9, 59-84.
- [127]. — (1985), "La Última Fase (1939-1969) De La Labor Lingüística De R. Menéndez Pidal", *AL*, 23, 5-68.
- [128]. Malmberg, B. (1963), "Encore Une Fois Le Substrat", *Studia Lingüística*, 17, 40-6.
- [129]. — (1966), *La Lengua Y El Hombre. Introducción A Los Problemas Generales De La Lingüística*, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Istmo, 1972.
- [130]. Martinet, A. (1955), *Economía De Los Cambios Fonéticos. Tratado De Fonología Diacrónica*, Madrid, Gredos, 1974.
- [131]. Menéndez Pidal, R. (1911), *Poema De Mio Cid*, 11th Ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1966.
- [132]. — (1923), "Filología (Idiomas Y Dialectos Españoles)", In *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, XXI, 413-50.
- [133]. — (1926/1950), *Orígenes Del Español. Estado Lingüístico De Las Península Ibérica Hasta El Siglo XI*, 8th Ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1976.

- (1950), “Modo De Obrar El Sustrato Lingüístico”, RFE, 34, 1-8.
- [124]. —(1959), “Introducción”, In *Enciclopedia Lingüística Hispánica*, I, Madrid, CSIC, XXV-CXXXIX.
- (1962), “Sevilla Frente A Madrid”, In *Catalán*, D. (Ed.) (1962), III, 99-165.
- [125]. —(Ed.) (1908.1911), *Cantar De Mio Cid*. Texto, Gramática Y Vocabulario, 3 Vols., 5th Ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1944.
- [126]. Mesa, J. F. (Ed.) (2017), *Latinidad Medieval Hispánica*, Firenze, Edizioni Del Galluzzo.
- [127]. Molho, M. (Ed.) (1964), *El Fuero De Jaca*, Ed. Crítica, Zaragoza, Instituto De Estudios Pirenaicos.
- (Reed.) (2003), *El Fuero De Jaca*, Ed. Facsímil, 2 Vols., Zaragoza, Justicia De Aragón.
- [128]. Montoya, B. (2013), “Història Social De La Llengua: Dels Orígens Als Primers Intents De Normativització Del Català”, *Aemilianense*, III, 163-97.
- [129]. —, Hernández, M. R. And Gimeno, F. (1995), “Historical Sociolinguistics: A Current Trend Of Research”, *Catalan Review*, IX, 2, 219-35.
- [130]. —And Mas, A. (Eds.) (2013), *Studia Linguistica In Honorem F. Gimeno*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [131]. Morales, A. (1992), “El Español De Los Estados Unidos: Aspectos Lingüísticos Y Sociolingüísticos”, *Lingüística*, 4, 125-70.
- [132]. —(1999), “Tendencias De La Lengua Española En Estados Unidos”, In *Instituto Cervantes* (1999), 241-72.
- [133]. Nadal, J. M. And Prats, M. (1982), *Història De La Llengua Catalana. I/ Dels Inicis Fins Al Segle XV*, Barcelona, Edicions 62.
- [134]. Otheguy, R. (2008), “El Llamado Espanglish”, In *López Morales, H. (Coord.)* (2008), 222-43.
- [135]. Palacios, A. (1991), *Alfonso X El Sabio*. Fuero Real, Edición, Estudio Y Glosario, Barcelona, Promociones Y Publicación Universitarias.
- [136]. Pérez, M. (1985), *El Latín De La Cancillería Castellana (1158-1214)*, León, Universidades De Salamanca Y León.
- [137]. —(2023), “Estudio Lingüístico De Los Textos Latinos De Base De Las Glosas Emilianenses Y Silenses”, In *García Turza, C. (Dir.)* (2023), 275-349.
- [138]. Pérez, R. Et Al. (1980), *País Valencià. Geografia I Història*, València, Arts Gràfiques.
- [139]. Portolés, J. (1986), *Medio Siglo De Filología Española (1896-1952)*. Positivismismo E Idealismo, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [140]. Pratt, C. (1980), *El Anglicismo En El Español Peninsular Contemporáneo*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [141]. Rivarola, J. L. (2004), “La Difusión Del Español En El Nuevo Mundo”, In *Cano, R. (Coord.)* (2004), 799-823.
- [142]. Rodríguez, F. (1999), “Anglicisms In Contemporary Spanish. An Overview”, *Atlantis*, 21, 103-39.
- [143]. —(2023), *Estudios Sobre El Anglicismo En El Español Actual. Perspectivas Lingüísticas*, Berlin, Peter Lang.
- (Dir.) And Lillo, A. (1997), *Nuevo Diccionario De Anglicismos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [144]. Rona, J. P. (1976), “The Social Dimension Of Dialectology”, *International Journal Of The Sociology Of Language*, 9, 7-22.
- [145]. Rosenblat, A. (1963), “La Hispanización De América. El Castellano Y Las Lenguas Indígenas Desde 1492”, In *Presente Y Futuro De La Lengua Española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 189-216.
- [146]. Rubio, L. (1971), *Textos Comentados Del Francés Antiguo*, Murcia, Universidad De Murcia.
- [147]. —(1981), *Del Latín Al Castellano En Las Escrituras Reales*, Murcia, Universidad De Murcia.
- [148]. Samper, J. A. Y Hernández, C. E. (2008), “La Luisiana”, In *López Morales, H. (Coord.)* (2008), 75-9.
- [149]. Sanchis Guarner, M. (1956), “Els Parlars Romànics Anteriors A La Reconquesta De València I Mallorca”, In *Estudios Dedicados A R. Menéndez Pidal*, VI, Madrid, 1956, 151- 86.
- (1972), *La Llengua Dels Valencians*, València.
- [150]. Sebeok, T. A. (Ed.) (1973), *Current Trends In Linguistics. Linguistics In North America*, The Hague-Paris, Mouton.
- [151]. Seco, M. (Ed.) (2003), *Léxico Hispánico Primitivo (Siglos VIII Al XII)*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- [152]. Segura, S. Y Etxebarria, J. M. (1996), *Del Latín Al Euskara*, Bilbao, Universidad De Deusto. Silva-Corvalán, C. (1988/2001), *Sociolingüística Y Pragmática Del Español*, 2nd Ed., Washington, D. C., Georgetown University Press.
- [153]. —(1994), *Language Contact And Change. Spanish In Los Angeles*, Nueva York, Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- [154]. —(2000), “La Situación Del Español En Estados Unidos”, In *Instituto Cervantes* (2000), 65-116.
- [155]. Suárez, L. Et Al. (Dirs.) (1985-1995), *Historia General De España Y América*, 2nd Ed., 19 Vols., Madrid, RIALP.
- [156]. Tagliavini, C. (1949/1969), *Orígenes De Las Lenguas Neolatinas. Introducción A La Filología Románica*, 5th Ed., México, Fondo De Cultura Económica, 1973.
- [157]. Terrado, J. And Sabaté, F. (Eds.) (2016), *El Naixement De La Consciència Lingüística A l’Edat Mitjana*, Lleida, Pagès Editors.
- [158]. Torreblanca, M. (1976), *Estudio Del Habla De Villena Y Su Comarca*, Alicante, Diputación Provincial.
- [159]. — (2010), “Orígenes Del Sistema Grafo-Fonológico Del Castellano Medieval”, *Aemilianense*, II, 291-333.
- [160]. —(2021), “Estudio Lingüístico Y Edición Crítica”, In *Gimeno, F. (Coord.)* (2021), 141-289.
- (En Prensa), *Orígenes Del Castellano*, Logroño, Cilengua.
- [161]. Tovar, A. (1962), “Fonología Del Ibérico”, In *Catalán, D. (Ed.)* (1962), III, 171-81.
- [162]. UNESCO (Patr.) (1963), “Prefacio”, In “*Prehistoria Y Los Comienzos De La Civilización*”, In *Historia De La Humanidad. Desarrollo Cultural Y Científico*, Barcelona, Planeta, 1977, 7-10.
- [163]. Valozic, L. (2015), *El Anglicismo Léxico En La Publicidad*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [164]. Vaquero, M. (1996), “Antillas”, In *Alvar, M. (Dir.)* (1996), 51-67.
- [165]. Várvaro, A. (1968), *Historia, Problemas Y Métodos De La Lingüística Románica*, Barcelona, Sirmio, 1988.
- (1991), “Latin And Romance: Fragmentation Or Restructuring?”, In *Wright, R. (Ed.)* (1991), 44-51.
- [166]. Vidos, B. E. (1956), *Manual De Lingüística Románica*, 2nd Ed., Madrid, Aguilar, 1977.
- [167]. Villar, F. (2014), *Indoeuropeos, Iberos, Vascos Y Sus Parientes. Estratigrafía Y Cronología De Las Poblaciones Prehistóricas*, Salamanca, Universidad De Salamanca.
- [168]. Wartburg, W. Von (1950), *La Fragmentación Lingüística De La Romania*, 2nd Gredos.
- [169]. Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages In Contact. Findings And Problems*, 7th Ed., 1970. Trad. Cat. *Llengües En Contacte*, Alzira, Bromera, 1996.
- [170]. —, Labov, W. And Herzog, M. I. (1968), “Empirical Foundation For A Theory Of Language Change”, In *Lehmann, W. P. And Malkiel, Y. (Eds.)* (1968), 95-195.
- [171]. Weydt, H. And Schlieben-Lange, B. (1981), “Wie Realistisch Sind Variations Grammatiken?”, In *Logos Semantikos (Studia Linguistica In Honorem E. Coseriu, 1921-198)*, Madrid, Gredos, V, 117-45.
- [172]. Wolff, P. (1971), *Origen De Las Lenguas Occidentales, 100-1500 D. C.*, Madrid, Guadarrama.
- [173]. Wright, R. (Ed.) (1991), *Latin And The Romance Languages In The Early Middle Ages*, London, Routledge.