

Present And Near Future Of Spanish

Francisco Gimeno-Menéndez
University of Alicante

ABSTRACT

The languages were enriched by the process of lexical transfer, and responded to the social and cultural needs of the social groups of the different speech communities. Our current working hypothesis has proposed a new project of historical sociolinguistics, based on the coordinates of social and cultural diffusion, as well as the successive and diverse historical acculturations of Spanish (Indo-European, Iberian, Fenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Islamic and Anglo-Saxon), which have enriched the different Spanish-speaking communities, and have produced profound changes in the sociological, political, economic and cultural structure of the Iberian Peninsula. These transformations were historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of linguistic change, in their respective speech communities, and increased the development of linguistic convergence within social and cultural multilingualism. In the second half of the 13th century, the king of Castile and León Alfonso X began a first normalization of romances. The planning of the Castilian romance was promoted by the development of writing by private notaries, from the first half of the 9th century. While Latin was the language of the universities, E. A. de Nebrija produced the Gramática de la lengua castellana (1492), the first of the Romance languages spoken in Europe, and explicitly fixed its spelling in his work Reglas de Ortografía en la lengua castellana (1516).

KEYWORDS: *Social multilingualism, Multiculturalism, Acculturation, Lexical transfer, Linguistic and cultural diversity, Linguistic planning.*

Date of Submission: 23-10-2023

Date of Acceptance: 03-11-2023

I. INTRODUCTION

Currently, two fundamental strata of the hierarchical stratification of languages must be differentiated, upper and lower. In the first, the displacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, Malay and Spanish) will produce greater pluralism. In the second, the significant language shift of several thousand minority languages will cause the immense breakdown of social and cultural diversity, and a prediction that not 50% of minority languages will survive the 21st century is the most plausible.

Economic globalization had to be channeled through absolute respect for the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples, and thus constitute two current currents of environmental pressure. It was necessary, therefore, to stop cultural globalization and Anglo-Saxon influence, by advocating respect for the cultural and linguistic diversity of peoples, as proposed by the UN, and was sanctioned by the plenary session of the 33rd General Convention of UNESCO (2005).

One of the characteristics that these varieties must possess will be their superficial simplicity (phonological, morphological and lexical), in order to materialize the necessary social and cultural identification of their speakers with their mother tongue and facilitate the teaching of the majority varieties as second languages. The spelling of the Spanish language should not only be a function of the history of the language, but also of the present and near future of an efficient and simple supranational language. A first version of this article was written at the request of the General Secretariat of the Permanent Commission of the Association of Academies of the Spanish Language, and was published in the *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de "El Español de América"* (see F. Gimeno, 2008; on new contributions to the origin, present and near future of languages, see F. Gimeno, 2023a, 2023b).

Since the nineties of the last century, our working hypothesis has been that economic globalization, "New information and communication technologies" (including social media) and the lingua franca (American English) were closely related. Between 1987 and 1990, F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno (2003) analyzed the impact of economic globalization in six Spanish newspapers (three Spanish from the United States and three from Spain), through the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer. Furthermore, in 2005 and 2006, F. Gimeno and L. Valozic (2012) studied the influence of economic globalization on newspaper advertising in four countries (Spain, Italy, France and Serbia), also through the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer. Subsequently, A. Cece and F.

Gimeno (2020) analyzed the impact of economic globalization on the economic newspapers of Italy and Spain, also through the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer.

In all cases, lexical transfer occurred between related Indo-European languages (thus, e.g., English, French, Spanish, Italian and Serbian), and the process of lexical transfer had to materialize through lexical imports above the lexical substitutions or lexical calques, especially in the economic and advertising sociolect. In the case of non-related languages (such as, for example, English and Chinese), the process of lexical transfer, especially in the economic sociolect, had to be materialized through lexical substitutions or lexical calques over and above lexical imports. Furthermore, based on current reports on the present and near future of languages, no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the last century. Nowadays, the sociolinguistic situation is less regulated, and the monopoly of English is being moderated by other supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, Russian and Malay).

According to data from Eurydice Network (2008), T. Tinsley (2011) cited that Spanish was the fourth foreign language in Europe, studied by 7.6% of students in the first stage of secondary education and by 15.4% of students in the second stage of secondary school. It was especially strong in France, where almost two-thirds of students studied it, and in Sweden and Denmark, with 40% and 28% of students respectively. In the United Kingdom, it had recently overtaken German as the second foreign language after French, but what was most striking was its rapid rise against a backdrop of general decline in the study of foreign languages in secondary schools.

Behind the statistics, there were factors that were influencing this change. So e.g., a complex mix of social attitudes, academic interests, limitations in resources, facts not yet fully assimilated and perceptions (sometimes erroneous) of the students, and above all, the undeniable cultural attraction that both Spain and Latin America exerted. The appeal of Hispanic American culture not only came from these countries, but also from the United States.

Another factor of a communicative nature, which was not mentioned in the official documents, but which was of undoubted interest (both for the students and the official centers) was the ease of learning second languages. For speakers of the major European languages, Spanish was easier than other languages that used different alphabets or came from different language families. A survey carried out in the United Kingdom placed Spanish as the easiest language to learn in a list of ten, based on factors such as pronunciation, syntax, spelling, vocabulary and reading (French was in sixth place, tied with Welsh and Arabic). In this sense, Spanish as a language of international communication had managed to position itself in many cases as a second foreign language in Europe, behind English, but displacing French, German and Italian from that place (see J. L. García Delgado, J. A. Alonso and J. C. Jiménez, 2012: 16).

The relationships between the oral and written register were very important, since they were social and situational varieties of languages, depending on the domain of family use versus the domain of educational use. The grammars of the vernacular and the standard were disparate, based on historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants, and were resolved with the ordering criterion of a principle that referred to M. F. Quintiliano in the 1st century AD, according to which each phoneme a grapheme had to be used, and vice versa. That is, the relationship between the pronunciation of the oral register and the spelling of the written register had to be resolved with the resource that we had to write as we pronounced and pronounce as we wrote. The greater the difference between the oral and written register, the greater the difficulty in teaching the majority varieties as second languages. In this sense, E. Lorenzo (1966: 98) collected this dichotomy as an orthographic anachronism of the old Anglo-Saxon language.

In the case of the historical phonology of Castilian, the importance of Iberian and Basque vocalism should be highlighted, since the most important transfer was undoubtedly the replacement of the Latin-colloquial vocalism of seven vowels by the copy of the phonological variants of the five-vowel system. The *Fuero de Avilés* (1155) was the model for written normalization of the Castilian epic, by the author-monk of the *Poema de Mio Cid* (1207). While Latin was the language of the universities, E. A. de Nebrija produced the *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492), the first of the Romance languages spoken in Europe, and explicitly fixed its spelling in his work *Reglas de Ortografía en la lengua castellana* (1516) (see R. Lapesa, 1948; M. T. Echenique, 2013: 167-75; F. Gimeno, 2019: 101-7, 262-71; F. Gimeno, coord., 2021).

Our article is limited to the following sections: a) social multilingualism; b) economic globalization and linguistic and cultural diversity; c) Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer in economic newspapers and advertising, and d) linguistic planning of Spanish.

II. SOCIAL MULTILINGUALISM

The social and cultural situation of languages has changed, since there is a linguistic conflict with the language shift of many minority languages in this century, without social mobility. Furthermore, it must be taken into account that the world economy is suffering a slowdown phase that could have serious consequences, due to the terrible turmoil in the political scene and the deep social crisis. The tremendous social, cultural and legal decomposition

of several Anglo-Saxon countries (United States of America and the United Kingdom) and other large nations (Russia and China) poses a new social situation of multilingualism and multiculturalism, less linked to Anglo-Saxon acculturation and the loss of the social and cultural influence of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer. The near future opens up new possibilities for replacing this monopoly of English with the oligopoly of several supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Arabic, Malay, Russian and Spanish).

The future of a language has been said to depend on the number of its speakers, and this has often determined the importance of a language. However, this criterion gives rise to disagreements, due to the difficulties involved in the strict definition of 'native speaker' of a language, and the lack of reliable data. Likewise, some basic indicators of the international position of a language function at the same time as factors that influence said position. Some of these indices are related (in addition to the significance of demographic strength) with the broad fields of international relations, thus, e.g., with economic, technological, political and scientific development.

U. Weinreich (1953: 37-40) commented that for some anthropologists, language contact was nothing more than an aspect of cultural contact, and linguistic transfer was a facet of social, cultural diffusion and acculturation. However, despite the increase in anthropological interest in problems of contact, particularly in the United States of America after the First World War, studies on language contact and cultural contact were not widely coordinated, nor were there properly defined state the relationship between both fields of study

Acculturation called all cultural phenomena that came from the acquisition, conservation or modification of a culture, in particular the reception and assimilation of cultural elements of 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 refer to the changes that occurred when social groups with different cultural traditions came together, and it did not differentiate whether it should be applied to the results or the processes. Acculturation therefore included those events resulting from direct and continuous contact between social groups that had different cultures, with the corresponding changes in the original culture of one or both groups.

An efficient methodological premise of social multilingualism was the analysis of linguistic conservation and substitution, which basically dealt with the relationship between the degree of stability (or substitution) in the models of linguistic use and the psychological, sociological and cultural processes, which they were developed in multilingual communities for inter- or intra-community communication. These processes were variables associated with the habitual use of the language, and the selection of these variables had to be made not only by impressions of what seemed to be the most relevant processes in a given multilingual situation, but also by more general theories about personal change, social and cultural (see J. A. Fishman, 1964/1968).

The languages were enriched by the process of lexical transfer, and responded to the social and cultural needs of the social groups of the different speech communities. Science, economy, politics, technology and supranational relationship had to be integrated, therefore, within the knowledge and habits of the people, so that the linguistic and cultural diversity of all peoples could be preserved.

Faced with the opinion of some linguists who consider that the authentic answer to linguistic and communication problems in the first decades of the 21st century is in an auxiliary international language (English), we must argue that respond to social and cultural needs of the social groups, within the principle of respect and protection of the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples. The history of humanity has materialized through oral communication, although today the great qualitative and quantitative leap that the development of writing has represented should not be questioned, since it has overcome all the great limitations of oral discourse.

The media (and especially the press) appear among the basic drivers of a globalization of culture and an Anglophilia, which ranges from large multimedia groups to fast food restaurants, and also has the standardizing utilitarianism of computing and the Internet. The global market has created economic and technological interdependence, which has enhanced the use of an international language within a global society. In that sense, a consequence of this subordination is that the growing diffusion of English is in the hands of its non-native speakers.

English has experienced a continuous progression since the beginning of the 20th century. The influence of English has been described as a historical contribution, since it exceeds in number of loanwords and lexical transfers, as well as in sociocultural repercussions, all the contacts between the Romance languages as a whole. One of the main characteristics of globalization was the fact that it favored a supranational horizon, where the lingua franca of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century has been American English.

The sociocultural history of language contact was reflected within the languages of the European Union in the massive presence of borrowings from other languages. The intimate medieval coexistence of Catalan romance with Arabic, together with the influence of Islamic culture, led to the introduction of numerous Arabisms. The first Gallicisms and Occitanisms of French influence in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries were followed by the influence of the Italian Renaissance between the 15th and 17th centuries.

Under the name Castilian and then Spanish as the national language, A. Alonso (1943: 14-58) reflected on the Renaissance manifestation of national consciousness in Europe (Spain, France, England, Germany and, with less

coherence, Italy), where a supraregional and historical-cultural significance had to be intentionally considered in the language, although the name “Spanish” was already used sometimes in the Middle Ages. In the 16th century, the Castilian-Spanish alternation was dominant in the first fifty years, and the designation of “Spanish” appeared and spread from 1495 onwards in a multitude of book titles in which Spanish was named Castilian. The name “Spanish” in the 16th century assumed a richer and more precise meaning, which was a new Renaissance consciousness of nationality that was superimposed on that of “Castilian” (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 267-70).

While the French influence on social life in the 18th and 19th centuries motivated the rise of Gallicism, at the beginning of the 20th century German was the scientific language. Subsequently, in the 20th century, Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer has grown in intensity, first in the Latin American countries most closely affected by the political and economic expansion of the United States of America (Antilles, Mexico and Central America), and then throughout the European Union. The common concern for the future of the Spanish language brought up the words of S. Gili Gaya (1963) about the language of science and technology. According to this author, we were wrong to place ourselves extremely in the mental attitude of those who felt threatened and were preparing to defend themselves. Catalan had a phonetic and syntactic structure that was sufficiently firm to resist foreign lexical invasion without becoming denatured. English, with a much more complicated phonological system (especially vocalism) and a simplified syntactic structure, incorporated 50% of Latin, French and other words from other sources into its vocabulary, without essential losses in its nature. No matter how great the common basis that Latin and Greek gave us to form neologisms, there always remained an important wealth of foreign technicalities.

The scientific and technical vocabulary responded to three main characteristics: a) the scientific nomenclature tended to be international; b) it lived confined to the world of specialists, but influenced the colloquial register, and c) its forms and meanings varied according to changes in scientific concepts. The perfect and lasting solution that he proposed to foreign technicalities consisted of adapting foreign words in the best possible way. When there is a notable discrepancy between the spelling and the foreign pronunciation, it was resolved in favor of one or the other, depending on whether the word in question had entered through the written or oral register. Thus, for example, *trust* and *club* were pronounced as they were written, and not *trost* and *clob*, as corresponded to the English pronunciation. There were a few examples of ancient anglicisms whose written register had been adjusted to the original pronunciation, such as *esplín* (spleen) and *bistec* (beefsteak), and more recently *béisbol* (baseball) and *fútbol* (football).

The attribution of economic power to different countries and their languages is becoming more and more useless. Within a global economy, nation states lose economic sovereignty. But what has been favoring economic globalization has been the continuous rise of English as a world language, which is based on a trend that dates back to the industrial revolution and particularly to the beginning of the 20th century. To the extent that a globalized world challenges increased interdependence among all languages, globalization encourages social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. Furthermore, the more a language spreads in a supranational sphere, the more it escapes the control of its native speakers. Both the English and Spanish languages long ago ceased to belong to any specific human group, and are open in the present and near future to the transfer of all those who decide to use them. That's why they are changing so much as they spread across the planet.

D. Crystal (2011: 62) has suggested that when we talk about “global English,” we often refer to the common characteristics that identify the variety called Standard English. However, more and more attention is being paid to the regional features that differentiate different areas of the English-speaking world. So, for example, today we speak normally of the various “English” varieties (British, American, Australian, South African, Indian...), and studies are accumulating on the distinctive way in which these varieties handle pronunciation, spelling, syntax, vocabulary and speech structure. Much of the differences reside in the lexicological area, since it is the linguistic section most closely related to cultural identity, and numerous dictionaries have already been developed that reflect the distinctive lexicons of the different regions.

On the other hand, the Hispanic community in the United States of America is the fastest growing population group in the last decade, and has highlighted the lack of a television channel dedicated to them, offering content in English. After 50 years on the air, Univision partnered with ABC to launch the first medium aimed at young Hispanics aged 18 to 30, who mainly consumed information in English. Thus was born the new television channel in English *Fusión* (October 28, 2013) for young Hispanics. The growth of the Hispanic community in recent years (more by birth than by immigration) and the fact that they dominated both English and Spanish forced the media to choose between two strategies: a) expansion of the spectrum of news that their journalists covered, in order to include those topics that most interested the country's minorities (in this case, immigration, education, health, the economy and information about Latin America), or b) creation of a medium that recognized the existence of these new bilingual viewers. *Picas Fusión* was the bet for this last strategy.

Completely different is the situation of linguistic conflict maintained by the vernacular Spanish of Hispanic immigrants to the United States (mainly Mexicans from the southwest and Puerto Ricans from New York), where there is a clear and irreversible component of language shift, without social mobility. The substitution of Spanish for English among Hispanic minority communities in the United States, which amounted to 22% (that is, 5 million young

speakers, according to the 1990 census), requires an action of linguistic recovery and cultural, which favors a position of respect and promotion of the use of the mother tongue in education (see A. Morales, 1999: 241-72; H. López Morales and C. Domínguez, 2008: 83-103).

III. Economic Globalization and Linguistic And Cultural Diversity

Economic globalization was not a new phenomenon in the history of humanity, since the approach of some individuals to others had always been known, through their economy, culture and customs. However, the most recent globalization had different characteristics from the previous ones, because it was based on a technological revolution (digital code and the Internet era), and it affected finance (more than any other sector). True globalization had an economic component, another cultural one and another social one, but the one that dominated and unbalanced was the economic one (see A. Sasot, 2004). The globalizing stage we are experiencing has three initial characteristics: 1) absolute freedom of the movement of money across borders; 2) relative freedom of the movement of goods and services between nations, and 3) a freedom (very restricted at the beginning) of the movements of people and workers, through the contemporary migration phenomenon, but which has surpassed all provisions and restrictions (150 million immigrants, according to some, 220 million, according to others, since 1990). Immigration was, therefore, part of globalization.

After the celebration of the *VI Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española* in Panama City (October 20-23, 2013), dedicated to several topics (the electronic or paper book between the Atlantic and the Pacific, the publishing industry, teaching and literary creation), we should not lose sight of the necessary reflection on the present and near future of Spanish. Spanish is a language spoken in various countries around the world, comprising 18 states that have it as their only official language (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Spain, Guatemala, México, Nicaragua, Panamá, Paraguay, Perú, Dominican Republic, Uruguay and Venezuela, although in some cases, such as México, this fact is not confirmed in the text of their constitutions), plus 3 other states (Paraguay, Puerto Rico and Equatorial Guinea) in which is a co-official language.

Furthermore, we must add the centers of immigrants in other countries, where Spanish lacks official recognition. Thus, e.g., the United States (today the second Hispanic country in the world by the number of speakers), and with lower numbers, France, the ABC islands (Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao), Canada, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, Belize, Sweden, Belgium, Israel, Andorra, Turkey, Virgin Islands, Luxembourg and Morocco. Furthermore, the Philippines, Gibraltar and Guam should be mentioned, where Spanish has been used since ancient times and has a certain degree of conservation (see H. López Morales, 2011).

Among the reasons that explained the current extension of Spanish, according to H. López Morales (2012: 63), were:

- a) the number of native speakers and students of Spanish as a foreign language;
- b) the relative linguistic homogeneity it enjoyed;
- c) the undoubted prominence that it held in hundreds of universities, libraries, archives, dozens of international newspapers, powerful radio and television networks, and
- d) the regular traffic that was beginning to become congested on the IT roads.

Spanish as a foreign language was studied in one hundred countries around the world. The teaching of Spanish in the United States, according to H. López Morales (2012: 55), was on the rise. In public secondary education, the distribution of foreign language enrollments was as follows: Spanish (68.7%), French (18.3%), German (4.8%), Italian (1.2%), Japanese (0.8%), Russian (0.2%) and other languages (3.3%). In American universities, enrollments for the study of Spanish had skyrocketed throughout the country and at all levels, and it was the most studied language by an overwhelming majority: 850,000 enrollments in Spanish classes, in contrast to 210,000 for French, the 198,000 of German, 92,000 who had selected sign language, 74,000 who learned Japanese and 61,000 who studied Chinese.

The economic power of the Spanish resides in its numbers. *El español en el mundo. Anuario del Instituto Cervantes (2022)* states that some 496 million inhabitants have Spanish as their mother tongue (6.3% of the world population), which adds to the almost 100 million who have it as a second language, and occupy one of the most important and widespread linguistic areas in the world, just over 12 million square kilometers, in which European territory is a small part that only houses 10% of the world's Spanish-speaking population. In Europe, Spanish benefits both from being a "local" language necessary for trading with adjacent or nearby countries (unlike Chinese), and from its role as a global language necessary for multinational businesses. It is the fourth most spoken language in the world, after Hindi/Urdu, Chinese and English.

If the speakers as a whole are considered, they refer to just over 7% of the world's population, but this group has a purchasing capacity of around 10% of the GDP. Specifically, it would be 9.77%, about 13 trillion dollars in 2022, and the per capita income of Spanish speakers would amount to 22,481 dollars, 131%, higher than the world average. Some 395 million speakers have access to the Internet, and some 273 are Facebook users. It is the third most used language on the Internet, after Chinese and English, and the second on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn and X, as well as on the best-known digital platforms (YouTube, Netflix or Wikipedia).

Furthermore, it is important to remember the number of States in which the languages are official, co-official or majority. Thus, for example, Chinese is official in five countries or administrations. English, on the contrary, appears in 50 countries in the world, while Spanish is in more than 20 (see J. A. Alonso, J. C. Jiménez and J. L. García Delgado, 2022).

F. Gimeno (2008) proposed that economic globalization should be channeled through absolute respect for the linguistic and cultural diversity of people, and thus constitute two current currents of environmental pressure. It was necessary to advocate absolute respect for the cultural and linguistic diversity of peoples, as proposed by the UN, and was sanctioned by the plenary session of the 33rd General Convention of UNESCO. Linguistic planning had to be called for, and a supranational policy of cultural protection and promotion was possible, with the conservation of the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples (see J. Maurais and M. A. Morris, 2003; J. Maurais, 2003; W. F. Mackey, 2003).

Although theoretically they may seem incompatible terms, globalization and cultural and linguistic diversity are reconcilable in practice, which fit perfectly into the principle of diversity in globality. Thus it has been stated that more than a process that leads to uniformity, globalization seems to tend towards the creation of new mixed forms of culture, language and political organization.

A good forecast about the near future of languages has been the report by D. Graddol (1997: 59), although it shows a pessimistic forecast of extinction of minority languages (80%). Based on both economic and demographic evolution and potential language shift, this author offered the following hierarchical stratification for the year 2050:

- a) the major languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, English, Spanish and Arabic);
- b) the supranational languages of the largest trading blocs (Arabic, Malay, Chinese, English, Russian and Spanish);
- c) the national languages, around 90 languages that will serve more than 220 nation-states, and
- d) the regional languages, the rest of some 1000 languages of the world with varying degrees of official recognition.

In the 21st century no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the last century. On the one hand, the current replacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several languages in the upper stratum will produce greater pluralism, but the significant loss of several thousand languages in the lower stratum will cause the immense loss of current diversity. It is possible that another prediction that 50% of minority languages will not survive the 21st century is more plausible, although it is still a harsh and unacceptable reality. On the other hand, Spanish is one of the languages that will grow the fastest. The closest rivals to English (German, French and Japanese) will increase more slowly (see H. López Morales, 2006, 2010; F. A. Marcos-Marín, 1979, 2006; F. Moreno and J. Otero, 2007).

The advance of the process of economic globalization and the incessant deployment of the knowledge society revalue the languages of international communication in our time, while imposing challenges on all of them by virtue of social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. In the case of Spanish, a language marked from its very origin by an integrative and open vocation, today we are witnessing a new phase of its long process of internationalization (see J. L. García Delgado, J. A. Alonso and J. C. Jiménez, 2012: 11).

Advertising activity and its trends are strongly influenced by the largest advertising agencies, which are located in Western Europe and the United States, as are news agencies. Due to this, many advertising campaigns from multinational companies reach different countries made in English, and are translated or used directly in English.

This influence can be clearly observed in different strategies for using slogans in English, especially in the case of multinational companies. The first strategy observed consists of maintaining the slogan in English, regardless of whether English is the mother tongue or official language of the country. On other occasions, the English slogan is translated into the native language. A third option is for the global slogan to be accompanied by one in the official language. In this case, the local slogan takes center stage, and the global slogan accompanies it along with the logo.

Furthermore, trends towards communication strategies more adapted to specific social and cultural contexts were already observed in newspapers and advertising. In a globalized market where there was fierce competition, companies were looking for strategies to get closer and better to a local audience, since an international strategy with messages in English was not always enough. In the last third of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, the use of English in advertising messages has represented a positive symbolic value, but it has spread so much that now, to differentiate themselves from others, companies are looking for new ways of communication more adapted to their target audience in a specific country, geographic area or continent.

In the processes of developing these campaigns better adapted to real and specific contexts (apart from market research), social, cultural and linguistic consulting companies occupy a very important position. In this sense, the use of New information and communication technologies serve (in addition to supporting advertising campaigns) as means of research into consumer habits, tastes and opinions.

IV. Anglo-Saxon Lexical Transfer in Economics and Advertising Journals

One of the most characteristic features of the Spanish lexicon of the 20th century, and especially of the last decades, was the enormous flow of voices from English. F. Rodríguez (dir.) and A. Lillo (1997: 9) in their "Introduction" to the *Nuevo diccionario de anglicismos* alluded to the fact that this penetration was the consequence of a clear influence exerted by the Anglo-Saxon countries. Initially, until the first half of the 20th century, the main Anglo-Saxon contribution came from England, and was notable in areas such as navigation, sports, fashion and industrial technique. Starting in 1950, the importation of Anglicisms increased greatly due to the hegemony that the United States of America held in the most diverse disciplines, such as political-military, economic, scientific or cultural.

Subsequently, F. Rodríguez (2013) in a critical review and lexicographic treatment of "false Anglicisms" proposed that the influence of the English lexicon in modern languages was not only reflected in the flood of terms borrowed, copied or adapted to the language itself, but it extended to any expression that, although it did not coincide in use, contained some element that could be recognized as English by its form, at different linguistic levels, or that assumed a different meaning, while maintaining the same form. These deviations or innovations traditionally had a format or some morphological feature of English origin, but they were not technically Anglicisms, to the extent that their use was not recorded in any of the varieties of the English language. Lexicographically, he proposed a fairly comprehensive definition of lexical Anglicism as any individual or systematic linguistic feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired or stimulated by models of English, used in communication within a language other than English.

However, studies of social multilingualism focused on certain coordinates (linguistic, sociological or formal) of language contact, which were influenced by the contributions of U. Weinreich (1953), E. Haugen (1953/1969), C. A. Ferguson (1959) and W. Labov (1969). We owe the process of lexical transfer and the more systematic classification of loan development terminology to E. Haugen (1950), although later (1953/1969) he revised said formal typology, with greater attention to understanding the process of linguistic integration of the loan, and started from the distinction of two large sections; 1) lexical import, which presented partial or total lexical introduction, and 2) lexical calque, which exhibited lexical substitution without import (see F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno, 2003: 101-200).

Indeed, most researchers who have dealt with the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer have not clearly separated the initial act of lexical transfer and the final acceptance of the loan already integrated, as a result of the lack of delimitation between the sociolinguistic process of the lexical transfer and the lexicographic discussion on the ultimate or immediate origin of the loan. The two manifestations that have best defined the process of lexical transfer have been lexical import (or *code-switching*) and lexical substitution or lexical calque.

Furthermore, the open differentiation between the Anglo-Saxon lexical importation (for example, *clown*), which has been lexicographically called "crude Anglicism" or "patent Anglicism", and the integrated loan (for example, *cederrón*), although both came from English. It is well known that integrated loanwords (linguistically and socially) were part of the recipient language. That is, as Spanish social groups socially adopted Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers and adapted them linguistically, the terms ceased to be Anglo-Saxon and were integrated into the Spanish lexicon (see W. Labov, 1972, 1982; J. A. Fishman, 1971; H. López Morales, 1983, 1989; S. Poplack, 1988; S. Poplack and D. Sankoff, 1988; C. Silva-Corvalán 1988/2001, 1994).

F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno (2003: 227-87) analyzed the impact of globalization in six Spanish newspapers (three Spanish from the United States and three from Spain), through Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer, in order to examine the process of lexical and cultural diffusion and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. The research sample consisted of 30 journalistic copies (between 1987 and 1990), and was made up of:

- 1) daily national press with a large circulation and greater representation by size and circulation: *El País* (Madrid), *ABC* (Madrid) and *La Vanguardia* (Barcelona), and
- 2) daily Hispanic press from the United States of America with a large circulation and greater representation by size and circulation: *El Diario / La Prensa* (New York), *La Opinión* (Los Angeles, California) and *El Nuevo Día* (San Juan de Puerto Rico).

The general results of the relative frequencies on the types of lexical imports and lexical calques showed that: a) lexical imports represented 80% of the anglicisms, while lexical calques were limited to 20%, and b) categorical sectors or obligatory sectors (lexical imports and lexical calques) were slightly less than double that of the variable sectors, that is, 65% compared to 35%. In summary, the predominance of lexical importation and that of categorical sectors showed the general influence of social and cultural diffusion and Anglo-Saxon acculturation in Spanish newspapers in the United States and Spain.

The general results of the total occurrences of lexical imports and lexical calques, based on the Spanish press in the United States and Spain, showed that: a) lexical imports were more common than lexical calques (17,580 occurrences compared to 11,401), and both (lexical imports and lexical calques) were higher in the Hispanic press of the United States than in the press of Spain (23,156 occurrences compared to 5,825), and b) the percentage of imports over lexical substitutions It was lower in the Hispanic press in the United States (55% compared to 45%) than in the

press in Spain (81% compared to 18%). In summary, the Hispanic press in the United States was marked by the large number of lexical substitutions, and showed the greatest social and cultural diffusion, as well as the greatest acculturation of the messages of American society and culture, through translations copied from the United States English.

The general results of the total occurrences of lexical imports (categorical and variables), depending on each of the newspapers of the Spanish press in the United States and Spain, showed that lexical import followed the hierarchy next in the newspapers of: 1°) San Juan de Puerto Rico; 2°) Barcelona; 3°) Los Angeles; 4°) Madrid (*El País*); 5°) New York, and 6°) Madrid (*ABC*). It should be noted that the lexical imports of: a) the press of San Juan de Puerto Rico almost quadrupled that of the Hispanic press of Los Angeles, since in both cases it was the standard Spanish of the press; b) the newspaper *La Vanguardia* surpassed the Hispanic press in Los Angeles, due to the greater presence of variable lexical imports, and c) the newspaper *El País* surpassed the Hispanic press in New York. In summary, lexical import was general, and there was no clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical imports in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain, in which there was no statistically significant relationship.

The general results of the total occurrences of lexical calques (categorical and variables), depending on each of the newspapers of the Spanish press in the United States of America and Spain, showed that lexical substitution followed the hierarchy next in the newspapers of: 1st) Los Angeles; 2°) San Juan de Puerto Rico; 3°) New York; 4°) Barcelona; 5°) Madrid (*ABC*), and 6°) Madrid (*El País*). In summary, we were witnessing a clear dichotomy between the presence of lexical calques in the Hispanic press of the United States, with respect to the press of Spain, in which there was a statistically significant relationship.

In this sense, faced with two standard varieties of Spanish in the phonological component (Atlantic Spanish and Castilian Spanish, with the characterizing variables of seseo and voseo), we had to differentiate three standard varieties of Spanish in the semantic component (Spanish from the United States from America, Spanish from America and Spanish from Spain), with the variables characterizing the lexical calque statistically significant and the non-significant greater or lesser frequency of the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical import, respectively (see E. Lorenzo, 1966: 97).

F. Gimeno and L. Valozic (2012) analyzed the impact of globalization in twelve newspapers from four European countries (Spain, France, Italy and Serbia), through the Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer in advertising, in order to examine the process of social and cultural diffusion and Anglo-Saxon acculturation. The research sample consisted of five copies from each country, with a total of 60 newspaper copies (between 2005 and 2006), and was made up of daily press with the largest audience, general information and national distribution from the following countries and diaries:

- 1) Spain: *El País*, *El Mundo* and *ABC*;
- 2) France: *Le Parisien*, *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*;
- 3) Italy: *Corriere della Sera*, *La Repubblica* and *La Stampa*, and
- 4) Serbia: *Blic*, *Ve černje novosti* and *Politika*.

The analysis of the global data of the corpus indicated that in terms of total occurrences, lexical imports far exceeded lexical calques. The percentage of the former was very high, and corresponded to 97.04% of the total, in contrast to 2.96% of the latter. The total number of occurrences of lexical imports was unevenly distributed between categorical and variable imports. While the former comprised 96.5% of the total, the latter were at the opposite extreme with a very small percentage, specifically 0.54%. Variable lexical imports had only been found in Serbian newspapers, and corresponded to a total of 13 occurrences. Its inclusion had not changed any results of the statistical tests carried out, which is why it was concluded that its presence was not significant. In these same terms of the total occurrences, lexical calques comprised 2.83% of categorical lexical calques and 0.13% of variable lexical calques.

In the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer, the overwhelming superiority of lexical imports over lexical calques in the sample indicated that lexical import prevailed over lexical substitution. Furthermore, the import of a term had no competition, since the variable lexical imports had very low frequencies. Lexical import was also due to commercial strategies linked to the symbolic meaning of prestige that English had. Another cause of this tendency towards preferential use of categorical lexical imports from English was the influence of market strategies that were developed in international domains.

The calculation of the total occurrences of categorical lexical imports revealed the predominance of Italian newspapers, which accounted for 43.33% of the total Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers. Spanish newspapers were in second place with a high percentage of lexical imports, which corresponded to 37.62%. In both cases, there was a very big difference with the Serbian newspapers, where the total occurrences of lexical imports reached 11.63%. Finally, there were the French newspapers that contained only 4.46% of lexical imports.

The percentages of the total occurrences of lexical calques placed the Italian newspapers in first place (1.13%), followed by the Spanish and Serbian newspapers (0.83% each), and finally the French newspapers (0.17%). The newspapers with the highest density of advertisements with Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers were the

Italian ones, since these accounted for 46.94% of the total advertisements in those newspapers. In Spanish newspapers, advertisements with Anglo-Saxon lexical transfers represented a much smaller percentage, 29.24%. Next were the French newspapers with 20.89% and the Serbian newspapers with 20.37% of the total, with a relatively small difference between them.

The study of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer in the advertising sociolect thus clearly stated that commercial market strategies were influenced by economic globalization. Furthermore, said sociolect intervened in the process of social and cultural diffusion and Anglo-Saxon acculturation, within the four countries in the sample. In the complex economic terrain, global market strategies coexisted with others focused on combining with the characteristics of a specific local context (see L. Valozic, 2008, 2015, 2020; F. García Andrevia, 2020; F. Rodríguez, 2023).

On the other hand, the “Real Academia Española” (RAE) included in its last edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (23rd, 2014: XLVI) the “crude foreignisms”, which the *DRAE* had included in its penultimate edition (22nd, 2001) in cursive, since its graphic representation and pronunciation were foreign to the conventions of the Spanish language, especially in a universally recognized normative dictionary. As we have said, they were processes of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer with lexical imports, and the loanwords were linguistically adapted and socially adopted. Thus, for example, the following Anglo-Saxon lexical imports appeared in italics (and with the origin of “English phrase”): *best seller*, *big bang*, *blazer*, *blues*, *bourbon*, *brandy*, *bulldozer*, *caddie*, *clown*, *curry*, *cyclo-cross*, *delicatessen*, *disc-jockey*, *dumping*, *ferry*, *gentleman*, *gin*, *ginger-ale*, *gin-tonic*, *hall*, *hockey*, *hooligan*... (see F. J. Sánchez-Martín (2011)

In fact, in the “Warnings for the use of this dictionary”, the *DRAE* (2001, XXX-XXXI) stated that the foreign words widely used in our language were incorporated in two ways: a) in bold round letters, if their writing or pronunciation minimally adjusted to the uses of Spanish (as was the case of **club**, **réflex** or **airbag**), and b) in italics, when its graphic representation or pronunciation were foreign to the conventions of our language (as was the case of *rock*, *hall* or *blues*). E. Lorenzo (1996: 152) lexicographically cited **CD-ROM** as a loan. In addition, the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* (RAE and ADALE, 2005 sv **cedé** y **cederrón**) included **cedé** and **cederrón** in bold. In the previous edition of the *DRAE* (21st, 1992), there was no warning about foreign words, and Anglicisms appeared in bold round type (as was the case of **clown**, **puzzle**, among others).

Regarding “The plural of voices of non-Castilian origin (II). Loans from other languages”, in the *Nueva gramática de la lengua española* (RAE and ADALE, 2009, 144-5), a description was offered of the linguistic tension that occurred between the morphological patterns of the Spanish grammar and those that corresponded to the languages to which the plurals that Spanish speakers already knew belonged to. The growing internationalization of the lexicon and the linguistic contact that had occurred in many countries (between speakers of Spanish and those of other languages) explained to some extent that the processes of morphological adaptation had to be gradual, and be subject to considerable variation. Lexical imports formed the plural according to the rules of the language to which it corresponded, and when these words were used in a Spanish text it was recommended that they be marked with some typographical highlight, usually italics.

V. Spanish Language Planning

The formulation of working hypotheses in the history of the language was the exception rather than the rule, and the most basic was the one proposed by R. Menéndez Pidal (1926/1950) on the origins of Spanish: in the absence of more Romance terms ancient of 1170, the investigation had to begin with the documents of the 9th and 10th centuries. This assumption was clearly insufficient in our days, since it was not an older current of romances, but rather a process of written normalization of the romances Hispanics, which responded to an implicit planning (like most normalizations) regarding the reforms of Visigothic Latin, based on the first written texts (hybrids and romances), from the second half of the 8th century. This process of written normalization had to be differentiated from the previous process of oral formation of the romances, and included periods of unstable social situations, within the proto-romance stage (promoted by the Carolingian and Gregorian reforms), with restrictions to the use of the text written romance, compared to other periods of stable situations of written normalization (within the proto-romance and ancient stages), favorable to the use and development of the romance text (see F. Gimeno and C. García Turza, 2010).

Although in the two stages and five periods we observed samples and hybrid texts, where there was a transition of the varieties involved, we found in the stages and periods of stable situations a greater number of documents than in the periods of unstable situations (or linguistic conflict), within the proto-romance stage. There was, therefore, a statistically significant relationship between the number of legal documents preserved, depending on the stages and periods of written normalization of Hispanic romances, with disparate and discontinuous social situations (unstable and stable). The written normalization of Hispanic romances (Castilian, Catalan, Navarrese, Aragonese, Asturian, Leonese, Galician and Portuguese) took place within the ancient and medieval period, from the end of the 11th century to the end of the 15th century.

The social and cultural history of the Spanish language responded, therefore, implicitly to a process of linguistic planning from the Romance vernacular to the standard. The general principle of full understanding forced the replacement of linguistic norms that were artificial and complex, in the face of the necessary identification of the social groups of the different speech communities with their various standard varieties. The RAE and ADALE must ensure and materialize the adaptation of the language to social use, within the work of regularization and simplification of its linguistic components (phonological, semantic, syntactic and lexical), which already Alfonso X and E. A. de Nebrija started.

The specific objective of this section is the technical approach of a near future proposal for linguistic planning of Spanish, based on a phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and lexical update, in a context of economic globalization and social multilingualism, within the principles empirical studies of linguistic change, where there must be a necessary social identification of its mother tongue speakers with the majority standard varieties, as well as facilitating the growing dissemination and teaching of Spanish as a second language to non-native speakers.

The term *linguistic planning* was disclosed by E. Haugen (1987, 626-7) in 1958, and he defined it as the activity of writing a normative orthography, syntax and dictionary, in order to guide writers and speakers in a heterogeneous language community. Likewise, this term could be used retrospectively and applied backwards in the history of the most cultured nations. Said author confessed that the term was first used by U. Weinreich, as the title of a seminar given at Columbia University in 1957.

Furthermore, E. Haugen (1983, 269-70) proposed a first model of the phases of linguistic planning, in which he integrated the sociological and linguistic dimensions, on the one hand, and the norm and function, on the other. This was an explicit (conscious and more or less programmed) application of written standardization of the vernacular, in order to offer a speech community a new standardized variety. So this model described the following four phases of language planning:

- a) *selection of the standard*;
- b) *standard codification*;
- c) *implementation of the function*, and
- d) *elaboration of the function*.

On the one hand, stages a) and b) were related to the norm, and c) and d) were concerned with the function. On the other hand, stages a) and c) were mainly sociological and “external” to the language, and b) and d) were especially linguistic and “internal” to the language. These phases showed a certain logical succession, but they were not necessarily temporally successive, but could also be simultaneous or cyclical.

Subsequently, E. Haugen (1987, 627-34) enriched and revised this model with several contributions, in which he required a distinction between form (as *political linguistics*) and function (as *language cultivation*). Each of these, in turn, resulted from the actions of a society (which he called *status planning*), and dealt with the language itself (which he called *corpus planning*). These four aspects formed a double-entry matrix (*selection, codification, implementation and elaboration*), within which we considered all the major activities of language planners (see F. Gimeno, 2019: 47-51).

Although linguistic planning was defined as the explicit activity of normalizing a spelling, syntax, and dictionary, the implicit reconstruction of written normalization of Hispanic romances allowed us to understand and explain the appearance of the first Romance lexical samples and the first Romanesque texts in the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, in accordance with the influence of the history of Roman law and the prescriptions of Tours, together with the conservation of the peculiarity of the Hispano-Visigothic tradition.

From the second half of the 8th century, the first Romance texts of the manuscript documentation and the first Romance samples of the glosses could not be seen only as superficial innovations of the scribes but were inscribed within an implicit process of linguistic planning. Visigothic Spain was one of the last and most valuable manifestations of ancient culture. Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) laid the foundations of medieval culture, and was the bridge that united Antiquity with the Middle Ages, although we had to keep in mind the transcendental legacy of Jerome (c. 347-420) to the transmission cultural and textual of the ancient history of monasteries, codices and copyists, in which written standardization permanently maintained a leading role (see J. A. García de Cortázar *et al.* (1985); F. González Ollé, 1978, 1996, 2002; C. García Turza and J. García Turza, 1997; R. Penny, 2000: 297-305; F. Gimeno, 2019: 179-271, 353-419).

The social and cultural history of the Spanish language responded to an implicit process of linguistic planning of Castilian Romance towards the standard, through the *selection* of a specific variety and the *implementation* of the function, which coincided with the *elaboration* of legal registers. This process began precisely with the appearance of glosses and glossaries, as well as with the first documents of the Romance languages, from the first half of the 9th century. The explicit development of the written normalization of Castilian romance in the mid-13th century, during the reign of Alfonso X, continued the phases of selection, implementation and elaboration, and rejected a conception of the history of the language based on successive reforms since the 13th century.

The selection of the geographical variety of Toledo as the basis of the standard was due to the political and religious importance of the city (seat of the Castilian church and most common seat of the court), as well as its cultural

prestige. Because of the overwhelming use of this variety in the literary, legal and scientific production of Alfonso's writing, it became the model for all types of writing (including that of chancery documents) throughout the kingdom. This scientific and literary enterprise of Alfonso X was the one that promoted the functional development of Castilian, and radically expanded its scientific (astronomy, astrology, mineralogy, jurisprudence, historiography, etc.) and literary (narrative prose, lyric poetry, translations of the Bible, etc.) domains, with the displacement of literary Latin, which had already been carried out previously by the royal chancellery (Alfonso VIII and Ferdinand III), within a general movement throughout Romania of secularization of culture and legally accredited historical practice. The importance of Alfonso X and Toledo was indisputable and extraordinary in the subsequent explicit development of the planning of Castilian.

In recent years, the RAE and the twenty-one Academies of America and the Philippines (which together make up the Association of Academies of the Spanish Language) have been developing an academic commitment ("pan-Hispanic linguistic policy") that involved collaboration of all of them in the works they supported, and they had to express the unity of Spanish in its rich variety: the *dictionary*, *grammar* and *spelling*. A secular tradition (officially recognized) entrusted the Academies with the responsibility of setting the standard that regulated the correct use of the language. The Academies carried out this work from the awareness that the character of the Spanish norm was polycentric, since the different uses of the linguistic regions were considered fully legitimate, with the condition that they were generalized among the educated speakers of their area, and would not represent a breakdown of the system as a whole. In a task of permanent exchange, the twenty-one Academies of the Spanish Language articulated a consensus that established the common standard for all Spanish speakers in matters of lexicon, grammar or spelling, in order to harmonize the unity of the language with the fruitful diversity in which was carried out.

The linguistic planning of Spanish in the near future must recognize the evolutionary successes of the past in the simplification of Spanish grammar (vocalic phonological system, graphematic-phonological *alfonsí* system, open syllabic system, simplification of the Latin nominal declension, analogical system in verbal morphology...), and must demand the principles of maximum coherence, adequacy, economy, clarity and simplicity, with regard to trying to simplify the spelling rules as much as possible, and eliminate inconsistencies, arbitrary rules and as many exceptions as possible.

J. Martínez de Sousa (1991: 71-2) based the need for Spanish spelling reform on the following considerations, among others:

- a) introduction of coherence into a system that is unnecessarily difficult because of its irregularity;
- b) simplification of inoperative orthographic rules, due to their abundance and casuistry, in accordance with Quintilian's principle: to each phoneme, a grapheme and vice versa;
- c) elimination, as far as possible, of exceptions in the use of graphemes and other orthographic elements;
- d) continuation of the reform effort initiated by Alfonso X, followed by EA de Nebrija and completed by the Academy of the first century (1713-1815);
- e) ease of learning Spanish as a second language for foreigners, and
- f) ease of computer processing of the language.

The mismatches (due to the lack of phoneme-grapheme correspondence in our orthographic system) can be summarized in the following sections: a) phonemes that are represented with more than one grapheme; b) graphemes that represent more than one phoneme; c) graphemes that do not represent any phoneme; d) graphemes that represent a set of phonemes, and e) a set of graphemes that represent a single phoneme.

However, there are no fewer reasons that advise against undertaking reforms in the orthographic system, when a language has a stable orthography, known and accepted by the majority of its literate speakers. The resistance to accepting spelling changes is manifested mainly in the educational and social media sectors, and is explained by the difficulty of achieving sufficient consensus to undertake general reforms with guarantees of success. The fundamental criteria that have worked constantly in establishing the spelling standards of Spanish are pronunciation, etymology and consolidated traditional usage. Of course, pronunciation has been the one that has had the greatest weight and continuity in Spanish orthographic theory, and explains the important role it has played in the final configuration of the orthographic system.

The spelling of the Spanish language is essentially normative and conventional and should not only be a function of the history of the language, but also of the present and near future of an efficient and simple supranational language. Of course, spelling is one of the pending subjects of the Spanish language (see J. Martínez de Sousa, 1996a, 1996b).

VI. Conclusions

Our current working hypothesis has proposed an interdisciplinary project of historical sociolinguistics, based on the coordinates of social and cultural diffusion, as well as the successive and diverse historical acculturations of Spanish (Indo-European, Iberian, Fenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic, Islamic and Anglo-Saxon), which have enriched the different Spanish-speaking communities, and have produced profound changes in the sociological, political, economic and cultural structure of the Iberian Peninsula. These transformations were

historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of linguistic change, in their respective speech communities, and increased the development of linguistic convergence within social and cultural multilingualism.

Faced with the opinion of some linguists who consider that the authentic answer to linguistic and communication problems in the 21st century lies in an auxiliary international language, we must argue that languages respond to the social and cultural needs of social groups, within the principle of respect and protection of the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples. The history of humanity has materialized through oral communication, although today the great qualitative and quantitative leap that the development of writing has represented should not be questioned, since it has overcome all the great limitations of oral discourse.

Despite the lack of agreements to carry out activities to promote and teach Spanish as a foreign language jointly among Latin American countries, Spanish as a foreign language was studied in one hundred countries around the world. The teaching of Spanish in the United States was on the rise. In public secondary education, the distribution of foreign language enrollments was as follows: Spanish (68.7%), French (18.3%), German (4.8%), Italian (1.2%), Japanese (0.8%), Russian (0.2%) and other languages (3.3%). In American universities, enrollments for the study of Spanish had skyrocketed throughout the country and at all levels, and it was the most studied language by an overwhelming majority: 850,000 enrollments in Spanish classes, in contrast to 210,000 for French, the 198,000 of German, 92,000 who had selected sign language, 74,000 who learned Japanese and 61,000 who studied Chinese.

Furthermore, in the case of Spanish, is a language marked from its very origin by an integrative and open vocation, today we are witnessing a new phase of its long process of internationalization. Spanish as a language of international communication had managed to position itself in many cases as a second foreign language in Europe, behind English, but displacing French, German and Italian from that place, behind English.

For our part, we have delimited the sociolinguistic process of lexical transfer and the lexicographic discussion on the ultimate or immediate origin of the loan. Furthermore, the integration of the loan could not be reduced to the linguistic dimension, with complete ignorance of the necessary social adoption, just as confusion between morphological description and normative prescription had to be avoided. While borrowing appeared in the speech of monolingual speakers, the use of lexical transfer in lexical import and lexical calque always implied some degree of bilingual competence.

Since the nineties of the last century, we have analyzed the impact of economic globalization in the economic and advertising newspapers, through the process of Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer. In all cases there was contact between related Indo-European languages (e.g., English, French, Spanish, Italian and Serbian). The percentages of lexical imports in the economic and advertising sociolect have largely prevailed over the percentages of lexical calques. Therefore, the working hypothesis is confirmed, both of social and cultural diffusion, and of Anglo-Saxon acculturation.

Based on current reports on the present and near future of languages (since this second decade of the 21st century), no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost achieved at the end of the last century. Nowadays, the sociolinguistic situation is less regulated, and the monopoly of English is being moderated by other supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, Russian and Malay). On the other hand, the influence of the Anglo-Saxon lexical transfer process on the lexical import of Spanish (from America and Spain) raises the need for a linguistic policy defined by the linguistic and social adaptation and integration of Anglo-Saxon lexical imports.

The linguistic planning of Spanish in the near future must recognize the evolutionary successes of the past in the simplification of Spanish grammar (vocalic phonological system, *alfonsí* graphematic/phonological system, open syllabic system, simplification of the Latin nominal declension, analogical system in verbal morphology...), and must demand the principles of maximum coherence, adequacy, economy, clarity and simplicity, with regard to trying to simplify the spelling rules as much as possible, and eliminate inconsistencies, arbitrary rules and as many exceptions as possible. The two graphemes *s/z* must be simplified into optional graphematic variants of Spanish, in order to integrate the social identification of all Spanish speakers into a supraregional written norm. The spelling of the Spanish language should not only be a function of the history of the language, but also of the present and near future of an efficient and simple supranational language.

References

- [1]. Alonso, A. (1943), *Castellano, español, idioma nacional. Historia espiritual de tres nombres*, 3th. Ed., Buenos Aires, Losada, 1958.
- [2]. Alonso, J. A., Jiménez, J. C. And García Delgado, J. L. (2022), *Los futuros del español. Horizonte de una lengua internacional*, Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- [3]. Ammon, U. et al. (eds.) (1987-1988), *Sociolinguistics. An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 2 Vols., Berlin, W. de Gruyter.
- [4]. 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.
- [5]. Covarrubias, J. And Fishman, J. A. (eds.) (1983), *Progress in language planning. International perspectives*, Berlin, Mouton.
- [6]. Crystal, D. (2011), "Las consecuencias del inglés global", in Instituto Cervantes and British Council (eds.) (2011), 59-65.
- [7]. Dil, A. S. (Ed.) (1972), *Language in sociocultural change. Essays by J. A. Fishman*, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.

- [8]. Echenique, M. T. (2013), "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.
- [9]. Echenique, M. T. and Satorre, F. J. (eds.) (2013), *Historia de la pronunciación de la lengua castellana*, Valencia, Tirant Humanidades.
- [10]. Eurydice Network (2008), *Cifras clave para la enseñanza de lenguas en los centros escolares de Europa*, Bruselas, EACEA.
- [11]. Ferguson, C. A. (1959), "Diglossia", *Word*, 15, 325-40.
- [12]. Fishman, J. A. (1964/1968), "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited", in Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972), 76-134.
- [13]. Fishman, J. A. (1971), "The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society", in Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), I, 217-404.
- [14]. Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the sociology of language*, 2 vols., The Hague, Mouton.
- [15]. García Andruva, F. (2020), "Consideraciones sobre la presencia de préstamos y calcos ingleses en la historia del Diccionario de la lengua española (1780-2014)", in Gimeno F. (coord.) (2020), 153-84.
- [16]. García de Cortázar, J. A. et al. (1985), *Organización social del espacio en la España medieval. La Corona de Castilla en los siglos VIII A XV*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [17]. García Delgado, J. L., Alonso, J. A. and Jiménez, J. C. (2012), *Valor económico del español: una empresa multinacional*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [18]. García Turza, C. and García Turza, J. (1997), *Fuentes españolas altomedievales. El código Em. 46 de la RAH, primer diccionario enciclopédico de la península ibérica*, Logroño, RAH and Caja Rioja.
- [19]. Gili Gaya, S. (1963), "El lenguaje de la ciencia y de la técnica", in *Presente y futuro de la lengua española*, Madrid, OFINES, II, 269-76.
- [20]. Gimeno, F. (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, 251-268.
- [21]. Gimeno, F. (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- [22]. Gimeno, F. (2023a), "The sociocultural origin of the oral register of languages", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- [23]. Gimeno, F. (2023b), "Present and near future of languages", *IOSR-JHSS*, 28, 8, 5, 44-53.
- [24]. Gimeno, F. (Coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a A. Carcedo*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- [25]. Gimeno, F. (Coord.) (2021), *El Poema de Mio Cid. Nuevas revisiones críticas*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [26]. Gimeno, F. and García Turza, C. (2010), "La función social de los protorromances hispanos", *Aemilianense*, II, 127-202.
- [27]. Gimeno, F. and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [28]. Gimeno, F. and Valozic, L. (2012), "El impacto de la globalización económica y del anglicismo léxico en los diarios y la publicidad", *I Jornadas Vocento*, Logroño. <http://www.futuroen español.es>.
- [29]. Goebel, H. et al. (eds.) (1996/1997), *Contact linguistics. An international handbook of contemporary research*, 2 vols., Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- [30]. González Ollé, F. (1978), "El establecimiento del castellano como lengua oficial", *BRAE*, 58, 229-80.
- [31]. González Ollé, F. (1996), *El habla toledana, modelo principal de la lengua española*, Toledo, Diputación Provincial.
- [32]. González Ollé, F. (2002), "El habla cortesana, modelo principal de la lengua española", *BRAE*, 82, 153-231.
- [33]. Graddol, D. (1997), *The future of English?*, London, The British Council.
- [34]. Haugen, E. (1950), "The analysis of linguistic borrowing", *Language*, 26, 210-31.
- [35]. Haugen, E. (1953/1969), *The norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969.
- [36]. Haugen, E. (1983), "The Implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice", in Cobarrubias, J. and Fishman, J. A. (eds.) (1983), 269-89.
- [37]. Haugen, E. (1987), "Language planning", in Ammon, U. et al. (eds.) (1987), I, 626-37.
- [38]. Instituto Cervantes (1999), *El español en el mundo. Anuario* (1999), Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [39]. Instituto Cervantes (2022), *El español en el mundo. Anuario* (2022), Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [40]. Instituto Cervantes And British Council (Eds.) (2011), *Palabra Por Palabra*, Madrid, Santillana.
- [41]. Kelly, L. G. (ed.) (1969), *Description and measurement of bilingualism: An international seminar*, Toronto, Toronto University Press.
- [42]. Labov, W. (1969), "Commentaries/Commentaires", In Kelly, L. G. (ed.) (1969), 250-5.
- [43]. Labov, W. (1972), *Modelos sociolingüísticos*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [44]. Labov, W. (1982), "Building on empirical foundations", In Lehmann, W. P and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1982), 17-92.
- [45]. Lapesa, R. (1948), "Asturiano y provenzal en el Fuero de Avilés", in Lapesa, R. (1984), 53-122.
- [46]. Lapesa, R. (1984), *Estudios de historia lingüística española*, Madrid, Paraninfo.
- [47]. Lehmann, W. P and Malkiel, Y. (eds.) (1982), *Directions for historical linguistics: A symposium*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- [48]. López Morales, H. (1983), *Estratificación social del español de San Juan de Puerto Rico*, México, UNAM.
- [49]. López Morales, H. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, Madrid, Gredos, 3th ed., 2004.
- [50]. López Morales, H. (2006), *La globalización del léxico hispánico*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- [51]. López Morales, H. (2010), *La andadura del español por el mundo*, Madrid, Taurus.
- [52]. López Morales, H. (2011), "Unidad y diversidad del español", in Instituto Cervantes and British Council (eds.) (2011), 47-51.
- [53]. López Morales, H. (2012), *La lengua española en el mundo actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- [54]. López Morales, H. (coord.) (2008), *Enciclopedia del español en los Estados Unidos*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes.
- [55]. López Morales, H. and Domínguez, C. (2008), "Introducción a la demografía hispánica en los Estados Unidos", in López Morales, H. (coord.) (2008), 83-103.
- [56]. Lorenzo, E. (1966), *El español de hoy, lengua en ebullición*, 3th ed., Madrid, Gredos, 1980.
- [57]. Lorenzo, E. (1996), *Anglicismos hispánicos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [58]. Mackey, W. F. (2003), "Forecasting the fate of languages", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 64-81.
- [59]. Marcos-Marín, F. A. (1979), *Reforma y modernización del español. Ensayo de sociolingüística histórica*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [60]. Marcos-Marín, F. A. (2006), *Los retos del español*, Madrid, Vervuet /Iberoamericana.
- [61]. Martínez de Sousa, J. (1991), *Reforma de la ortografía española: estudio y pautas*, Madrid, Visor.
- [62]. Martínez de Sousa, J. (1996a), *Diccionario de ortografía de la lengua española*, Madrid, Paraninfo.
- [63]. Martínez de Sousa, J. (1996b), *Diccionario de usos y dudas del español actual*, Barcelona, Bibliograf.
- [64]. Maurais, J. (2003), "Towards a new linguistic world order?", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 13-36.
- [65]. Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), *Language in a globalising world*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- [66]. Menéndez Pidal, R. (1926/1950), *Orígenes del español. Estado lingüístico de la Península Ibérica hasta el siglo XI*, 8th ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe, 1976.
- [67]. Morales, A. (1999), "Tendencias de la lengua española en Estados Unidos", in Instituto Cervantes (1999), 241-72.
- [68]. Moreno, F. and Otero, J. (2007), *Atlas de la lengua española en el mundo*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [69]. Nebrija, E. A. (1492), *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, ed. A. Quilis, Madrid, R. Areces, 1989.
- [70]. Nebrija, E. A. (1516), *Reglas de Ortographía en la lengua castellana*, ed. A. Quilis, Bogotá, Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1977.
- [71]. Penny, R. (2000), *Variación y cambio en español*, Madrid, Gredos, 2004.
- [72]. Poplack, S. (1988), "Conséquences linguistiques du contact de langues: un modèle d'analyse variationniste", *Langage et Société*, 43, 23-48.
- [73]. Poplack, S. and Sankoff, D. (1988), "Code-switching", in Goebel, H. et al., (eds.) (1996/1997), II, 1174-80.
- [74]. Real Academia Española (1992), *Diccionario de la lengua española*, 21th ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe.
- [75]. Real Academia Española (2001), *Diccionario de la lengua española*, 22th ed., Madrid, Espasa-Calpe.
- [76]. Real Academia Española (2014), *Diccionario de la lengua española*, 23th ed., Madrid, Espasa Libros.
- [77]. Real Academia Española and Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2005), *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*, Madrid, Santillana.
- [78]. Real Academia Española and Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009), *Nueva gramática de la Lengua Española. Morfología y Sintaxis I*, Madrid, Espasa Libros.
- [79]. Real Academia Española and Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2012), *Ortografía básica de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Espasa Libros.
- [80]. Rodríguez, F. (2013), "Pseudoanglicismos en español actual. Revisión crítica y tratamiento lexicográfico", *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 43/1: 123-69.
- [81]. Rodríguez, F. (2023), *Estudios sobre el anglicismo en el español actual. Perspectivas lingüísticas*, Berlin, Peter Lang.
- [82]. Rodríguez, F. (dir.) and Lillo, A. (1997), *Nuevo diccionario de anglicismos*, Madrid, Gredos.
- [83]. Sánchez-Martín, F. J. (2011), "El trabajo de la Real Academia Española en el avance de la 23ª edición del Diccionario de la Lengua Española: las voces inglesas", *Lexis*, XXXV (1), 143-61.
- [84]. Sasot, A. (2004), "El proceso de globalización", in *Historia Universal. Fin de siglo. Las claves del siglo XXI*, Madrid, Salvat, 165-216.
- [85]. Silva-Corvalán, C. (1988/2001), *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*, 2nd ed., Washington, D. C., Georgetown University Press.
- [86]. Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994), *Language contact and change. Spanish in Los Angeles*, Nueva York, Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- [87]. Tinsley, T. (2011), "¿Por qué el español?", in Instituto Cervantes and British Council (eds.) (2011), 107-12.
- [88]. Valozic, L. (2008), "Análisis del anglicismo léxico en el sociolecto publicitario", *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de "El Español de América"*, Valladolid, Diputación de Valladolid, 723-35.
- [89]. Valozic, L. (2015), *El anglicismo léxico en la publicidad*, Alicante, Universidad De Alicante.
- [90]. Valozic, L. (2020), "El cambio de código en clase de ELE", in Gimeno F. (coord.) (2020), 335-52.
- [91]. Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 6th ed., The Hague, Mouton, 1968.