

## Present And Near Future Of Languages

Francisco Gimeno-Menendez  
*University of Alicante*

---

### ABSTRACT

Languages are a social and cultural product of oral training, and excellent instruments of expression and communication for the cognitive development of social groups, within the different speech communities. The acquisition of the language by a child before the age of seven was subjected to the conjugated action of biology and culture, as well as its innate character was the necessary basis for social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. Based on current reports on the near future of languages, our current working hypothesis has proposed a new project of historical sociolinguistics, that no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost reached at the end of the last century, from this second decade of the 21st century, based on anthropological, sociological, cultural and legal determinants. On the one hand, the current displacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, Malay and Spanish) at the top will produce greater pluralism. On the other, the significant replacement of several thousand minority languages in the lower stratum will cause the immense bankruptcy of current diversity and showed a forecast of the order of 50% of minority languages, which will not survive the 21st century. The economic globalization had to be channeled through absolute respect for the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples, thus constituting two current trends of environmental pressure. It was necessary, therefore, to stop cultural globalization and Anglo-Saxon influence, starting from 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 UNESCO General Convention (2005).

**KEYWORDS:** Economic globalization, Linguistic and cultural diversity, Social multilingualism, Multiculturalism, Supranational, national and regional languages.

---

Date of Submission: 06-08-2023

Date of Acceptance: 16-08-2023

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

Globalization is not a new phenomenon in the history of humanity, since the approach of social groups from different speech communities to others has always been known, through their travels, emigrations, economies, cultures, and customs. However, the most recent globalization had different characteristics from the previous ones, because it was based on a technological revolution (the digital code and the Internet age), and it affected (more than any other sector) finance. It was a financial globalization. Capital was not only winning the mobility race, it was driving the globalization of everything else. 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 *Proceedings of the VI International Congress of "The Spanish of America"* (see F. Gimeno, 2008a).

Globalization was not synonymous with the internationalization of everything, but with the movement of capital. The free movement of capital around the world was the central feature of this globalization. These movements were not new, although their breadth and freedom were. Financial globalization was only one part of economic globalization, and this was a partial view of the increasing standardization of actual life. True globalization had an economic component, a cultural one, and a social one, but the one that dominated and unbalanced was the economic one. Although it has been commented that there has been a deglobalization, this has not existed. The economic interdependence between the regions of the world is a fact, and trust between nations is essential to achieve a better and more democratic world.

The social and cultural situation of languages in the past was a wide and stable diglossia, with social mobility, and linguistic displacement in some domain of scientific use (economics, technology, medicine...) and international relations for English. However, new possibilities have been opened up for the replacement of that monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several supranational languages (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, Malay and Spanish). Previously, our working hypothesis was that economic globalization, new information and communication technologies, and the lingua franca (American English) were closely related.

Based on current reports on the near future of languages, our current working hypothesis has proposed a new project of historical sociolinguistics, within the coordinates of social and cultural diffusion and acculturation, on which

no language will occupy the hegemonic position that almost reached English at the end of the last century, from this second decade of the 21st century, based on anthropological, sociological, cultural and legal determinants. Social and cultural situation of languages has changed, since there has been a linguistic conflict with language shift, without social mobility. In addition, it must be taken into account that the world economy is undergoing a phase of slowdown that could have serious consequences, due to the terrible turmoil on 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 great nations (Russia and China) poses a new social and cultural situation of multilingualism and multiculturalism, less linked to Anglo-Saxon acculturation and the loss of the social and cultural impact of lexical Anglicism. Language of science and natural language are different terms. Latin was a scientific language until the 18th century, and it was a language without a speech community.

Economic globalization as a current term presents several aspects that we must unveil, in order to recognize its specific dynamics (often hidden and ignored) and channel them. Opposite to the English calque itself (globalization, already usual in all scientific circles), the Spanish speaker has used the terms of internationalization, universalization, liberalization, deterritorialization, leveling, modernization, generalization, standardization, homogenization, etc.

The present and near future of languages must respond to the immediate challenge posed by two fundamental characteristics of the early 21st century: economic globalization and lexical Anglicism. In fact, for most of the last century, the main models in linguistics (structuralism and generativism) have systematically ignored the degree of displacement (or stability) of languages and did not include the chapter of social multilingualism in their respective paradigms, although said omissions responded to theoretical priorities, already assumed (see F. Gimeno, 2023).

The social history of languages considers the evolution of the growing contacts between them, since the greater density and mobility of their populations have led them to interact, with the progressive impact on the social functions of languages, where the language itself and the number of speakers does not recede, but these functions related to the domains of use, through emigration, validity of historical mechanisms of language shift, decrease in the birth rate, economic globalization, unequal socialization of the younger generations in the language indigenous, etc. And in turn, another language can expand by assuming the social functions of the subordinate language.

## **II. SOCIAL MULTILINGUALISM**

The patterns of distribution of the social function of languages are continually changing due to a combination of demographic, cultural and economic factors. Furthermore, any increase in communication (or in the potential for communication) can increase the speed of language contact. As the extent and distribution of speakers widens, an increase in speed translates into an increase in value which, in turn, increases the use of languages.

The speed of contact is related to the ecology of a language, in order to produce profound and far-reaching effects in the context of its society and culture (see W. F. Mackey, 1994). This (like information and entertainment) becomes a commodity that can be bought and sold. The very volume, speed, and economy of rapid and large-scale production and distribution of cultural products limit the number of languages that operate globally, with direct and indirect diffusion of their concepts, culture, worldview, meanings, and other elements. Social communication media are an indisputable part of the economic fabric, and have become globalized.

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 divergences, due to the difficulties involved in the strict definition of 'native speaker' of a language, and the lack of reliable data. So e.g., W. F. Mackey (2003: 64-5) has suggested that in countries with a question of languages in their national census their population can be classified according to different non-comparable variables (thus, for example, ethnic origin, identity, mother tongue, familiar language, habitual language or first language used). The most habitual language of millions of speakers throughout the world is not their first spoken language, but the one in which they were educated, usually a regional, national or colonial language. And in that case the demographic statistics of the past of the world's languages is limited more to the number of readers than to the number of speakers.

Likewise, some basic indicators of the international position of a language function at the same time as factors influencing that position. Some of these indices are related (in addition to the importance of demographic force) with the broad fields of international relations, thus, e.g., with economic, technological, political and scientific development (see U. Ammon, 2003). Furthermore, other more subtle factors, such as historical traditions and group feeling or social identity, should also be included (see H. Giles *et al.*, 1977).

The attribution of economic power to different countries and their language becomes increasingly useless. Within a world economy, nation states lose economic sovereignty. But what has been fueling economic globalization is the continued rise of English as a world language, which is based on a trend that dates back to the industrial revolution and particularly to the 20th century. By the middle of that century, English was the language

of half the world's newspapers and magazines, three-quarters of its mail, and three-fifths of its radio stations. Since the trend has continued, through the export of motion pictures, hit songs, video cassettes, computer *software programs* and more recently the spread of the internet (see W. F. Mackey, 2003; D. Cristal, 2004).

In this sense, the Anglo-Saxon cultural industry, the most powerful in the world, has continually issued messages, although for some skeptics of globalization it could be seen that national and local cultures maintained their respective institutions that dominated public life, and reinterpreted in the light of autochthonous cultural traditions part of foreign products or ways of life. However, for the supporters of taking a position against globalization, the interconnection channels between cultures have never been so strong, nor have they had such solid international permeability infrastructures: information and communication technologies have swept all the borders.

All cultures and particular languages responded to the evolution of specific peoples, and multilingualism and multiculturalism implied the processes of social and cultural diffusion, as well as acculturation. The intrinsic relationships between languages, societies and cultures have been the essential coordinates for current research on linguistic variation and change between different social groups, within various speech communities. The language policy of the European Union was a clear and unequivocal commitment to the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples. Information and communication technologies should ensure respect for and protection of such diversity.

Of all the social factors that have affected the Romance languages in their long history, the influence of contemporary English has been the most surprising in many ways. The increase of this influx during the past decades has been so important that it surpassed in number of loans and lexical anglicisms, as well as in terms of sociocultural repercussions, all contacts between Romance languages as a whole. Without a doubt, it could already be described as a historical contribution.

The socio-cultural history of language contact was reflected within the languages of the European Union in the massive presence of loanwords from other languages. The intimate medieval coexistence of the Catalan Romance with the Arabic, together with the influence of Islamic culture, led to the introduction of numerous Arabisms. The first French-influenced Gallicisms and Occitanisms 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 of Castilian and then Spanish into the national language, A. Alonso (1943: 14-58) reflected on the Renaissance manifestation of national consciences in Europe (Spain, France, England, Germany and, with less coherence, Italy), where a supra-regional and historical-cultural significance had to be considered intentionally in the language, although the name "Spanish" was already used a few times in the Middle Ages. In the 16th century, the Castilian-Spanish alternation was dominant in the first fifty years, and the designation "Spanish" appeared and spread from 1495 on in a multitude of book titles in which Spanish was named for Castilian. The name "Spanish" in the 16th century assumed a richer and more precise meaning, which was a new Renaissance awareness 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 led to the rise of Gallicism, at the beginning of the 20th century German was the scientific language. Subsequently, in the 20th century, Anglicism 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 later in the entire European Union. The common concern for the future of the Spanish language brought up the words of S. Gili Gaya (1963) on the language of science and technology. According to this author, we were wrong to situate ourselves extremely in the mental attitude of the one who felt threatened and was preparing to defend himself. Catalan had a sufficiently firm phonetic and syntactic texture to resist foreign lexical invasion without becoming distorted. English, with a much more complicated phonological system (especially vocalism) and a simplified syntactic structure, incorporated 50% of Latin, French and other words into its vocabulary, without essentially diminishing their nature. No matter how great the common base that Latin and Greek gave us to form neologisms, there was always 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) 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 in the face of foreign technicalities consisted sensibly in adapting foreign words in the best 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. So e.g. *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 older Anglicisms whose written register had been adjusted to the parent pronunciation, such as *esplín* (spleen) and *bistec* (beefsteak), and more recently *béisbol* (baseball) and *fútbol* (football).

### **III. ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION AND LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

In the debate on the globalization process, within the keys of the 21st century, A. Sasot (2004) stated that there was no agreement on its concept, chronology, scale, impact, political meaning or on the way to control the process. Thus, for example, those who defended the term *globalization* as valid used it with five different meanings, depending on the linguistic environments in which it appeared: a) internationalization; b) liberalization; c) universalization; d) westernization, and d) deterritorialization.

Regardless of whether or not we accept the validity of the concept of globalization, it was indisputable that its very existence and the set of processes and problems with which it was related affected any citizen at the beginning of the 21st century. Therefore, the following premises on how to deal with its continuous invasion of our everyday space could be useful:

- 1) We were living through a period of transformations, the implications and direction of which were not being specified by analysts, who constantly mixed the discourse on reality and the discourse that that reality wanted to generate;
- 2) regardless of the position we adopted in the theoretical debate, we had to accept that human beings were physical entities that lived in specific geographies;
- 3) there are no human-based social processes that could not be reworked, restructured, and redirected by the actions of humans themselves;
- 4) The weight of the social changes was felt in a very different way on the different segments of the population of a social formation and among the various social formations;
- 5) social changes were complex processes, the determining factors of which had not been revealed by any investigator;
- 6) the only aspect of our social system that did not seem to be contested was the capitalist mode of production, and
- 7) our reality was marked by the rise of neoliberalism. Other ways of negotiating reality were not only feasible, but also seemed necessary: modeling, building, and managing a better world was possible.

Globalization had been defined by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as the growing economic interdependence of all the countries of the world, caused by the increase in the volume and variety of cross-border transactions of goods and services, as well as international flows of capital, at the same time as the accelerated and widespread diffusion of technology. Although it seemed like a technical concept of economists, globalization affected us all, and it was certainly not a strictly economic phenomenon, but a broader one. It was described as a state of planetary development without barriers, where everything was close and accessible, and therefore solidarities and interdependencies increased.

The globalization stage we were living in had three initial characteristics: 1) absolute freedom of movement of money across borders; 2) relative freedom of movement of goods and services between nations, and 3) very restricted freedom of movement of people and workers, through the contemporary migratory phenomenon. Immigration was one more chapter of globalization. It was a stage in the history of humanity and a process that gave a new dimension to the phenomena already present. It meant that we were all more interdependent, closer, looking more alike and acting increasingly alike, and living in the same world with the lingua franca of the 21st century: American English. In any case, the two most determining factors in this set of phenomena were technological development, on the one hand, and those ideologies that pushed for international opening, especially in the economic field, on the other. Most of the debates on the effects of internationalization revolved around two major themes: a) the increase/reduction of inequality, and b) cultural uniformity/diversity.

The fundamental characteristics of social change in the decades at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st consisted of two paradoxically opposed processes: 1) leveling and globalization of production and consumption, greater homogenization and convergence towards a general and global society, and 2) greater aspiration for national, regional and local autonomy. In the first case, the integration of societies in the scientific and technological field could imply the replacement of linguistic and cultural differentiation with the selection of a universal language and culture. In the second, the tendencies of self-affirmation in the political, religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic fields drifted towards the preservation of pluralism, which affected both the diversity of cultures, languages, beliefs and practices, as well as the distribution of power in the society and the conservation of the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples.

On the other hand, we were witnessing a universal trend towards specialization or structural differentiation of functions and positions, with the growing increase in the world population. A. de Francisco (1997: 47-108) analyzed social change as a conceptual universe, and distinguished two levels of social change: the nuclear and the peripheral of the dominant institutions of social life. The tradition of social dynamics assumed social change as a directional process. A good part of social and ethnographic evolutionism understood cultural evolution linearly as a process that had to gradually overcome certain phases of development. All in all, the triple distinction of evolutionism (unilinear, universal and multilinear) was useful, since it allowed us to speak of a weak

unilinear evolutionism to describe the universal process of evolution of humanity, which was compatible with the verification of the existence of divergent sequences (multilinear) of particular evolution.

The modernization process could be considered universal, but not all modernizing processes were the same, nor were their final configurations identical on the sociocultural level. At the same time, the existence of "de-modernizing" countertendencies was confirmed, not only in the contemporary world, but also in the secular process of Western modernization itself (as an inseparable part of said process), even though the general and dominant trend it was rationalization, differentiation, and secularization. There seemed to be a growing consensus on the fact that the development of humanity (without understanding it teleologically) was a macroprocess globally marked by the growth of available information, especially that information relevant to the technological manipulation of the material world, and this apart from or below other surely more visible trends: population growth, urban growth, growing division of labor, growing state power, growing bureaucratization, etc. Recently, the global panorama is increasingly fragmented. The latest IMF global perspectives confirm that globalization is giving way to a slowdown in international exchanges, especially those that take place between geopolitical blocks.

J. Maurais and M. A. Morris (2003) highlighted the importance of supranational (or supraregional) economic integration for the future of languages, and suggested how comparisons could help provide further understanding. Comparative supranational integration had been recognized as an increasingly important dimension of a globalizing world, but comparisons about its related linguistic dimension were largely neglected. The European Union, North America and South America offered a solid base for obtaining relationships between globalization, supra-regionalism and languages, but they also contrasted in the major features of linguistic dynamics. The European Union and Mercosur included a language policy within a supranational integration, while the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA) between Canada, the United States of America and Mexico did not.

In addition, the complex comparisons between the proposals for different supranational integration of the European Union and Mercosur became the main vehicles for the promotion of the largest languages, with more success in the case of the supranational grouping of the former than in that of Mercosur the grouping of the second. One more difference was that the European Union had taken some active steps to promote minority languages, while Mercosur had taken none. NAFTA, for its part, had no jurisdiction over other linguistic issues than the declaration of three official languages (English, Spanish and French), although some fact could suggest that it would become a bilingual area (English and Spanish), as a result of the extension of NAFTA to a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). However, the status of French in Quebec at the end of the last century was higher than the prediction made half a century earlier (see J. A. Fishman, 1991).

The challenges posed by the continued spread of English affected all three supranational economic integration groupings, but the implications seemed to differ. In the European Union, the spread of English could have contributed to the relaxation of the traditional hegemony of majority languages, such as French and Spanish, within their national territories, since it thus allowed greater freedom for minority languages, such as Corsican, Basque and Catalan. The continued spread of English in North America did not yet seem to have endangered French in Quebec or Spanish in Mexico or Puerto Rico, but it seemed to have threatened minority languages in the United States of America even more. In South America, Mercosur's efforts to promote Spanish or Portuguese had not materialized or stopped the spread of English, but neither of these Iberian languages was yet under threat.

J. Maurais and M. A. Morris (2003) concluded that a globalized world posed a challenge of increasing interdependence between languages, as no language system was protected or secured, and a more tightly integrated world generally favored the spread of English. Language shift was not new, but the global scope of competition between languages was modern. However, this was especially difficult, since while language policy had historically been oriented within nations, current relations were global in scope. A global language strategy was needed that would balance the continued spread of English with the preservation of linguistic diversity.

However, it should be noted that the spread of English had not contributed to the relaxation of the traditional hegemony of the majority languages, since our field experience did not support the hypothesis that it allowed greater freedom for minority languages (in particular, on the Valencian Community, see F. Gimeno and J. R. Gómez, 2007; F. Gimeno, 2008b). Linguistic displacement manifested itself in social situations of wide diglossia and linguistic conflict, but both situations should not be confused, since they were completely dissimilar. Neither could there be any hypothesis that the strengthening of minority languages (Catalan, Basque and Galician) was a factor that contributed to the weakening of Spanish. Linguistic normalization policies have tried to correct the situation of the linguistic minorities of the Spanish State, but it was a matter of social and cultural diffusion, as well as Castilian acculturation.

Regarding linguistic mortality, H. López Morales (1989: 252-6) affirmed that within the framework of languages in contact there was the extreme phenomenon of linguistic decay and death, where one of the varieties weakened descriptively until it disappeared, and the context communicative bilingual became monolingual. There had been no theory of linguistic decline and mortality, although the idea that the interference of one language with another was always an obvious sign of decline had to be discarded, since there were situations in which such

transfers were enriching, and endowed the receiving language of communication media that they did not previously possess.

Linguistic mortality should not be explained only in terms of acculturation of the dominated language, translated into structural transferences of the dominant one. On many occasions the new structures had not offered parallels with the source variety. There were descriptively inherent principles of linguistic change in dying languages, which acted independently of the dominant language structures. Said deaths were descriptively the direct consequence of two factors: 1) general principles of linguistic mortality, if any, in the absence of a theory of decline, as he had stated, and 2) intervention of linguistic and social variables. On the one hand, the difference between morphosyntactic and lexical phenomena of both languages; and on the other, the functional exchanges and the new direction of the attitudes of the speakers.

On the life and death of languages, M. C. Junyent (1992; 22-3) argued that the extension of anthropomorphic terms to the development of languages, according to which languages are descriptively "born", "live" and "die" are understood, but dangerously if it made us think that it was the languages that followed the process, and not the social groups of the speech communities. In general, when we spoke of the "death" of languages, we were referring to language shift, that is, the process of total abandonment of one's own language by a speech community.

Another question to be resolved was in which cases of substitution we could speak descriptively of the "death" of a language, when it was a total substitution of one language for another in a community, or outside only of the social groups of a variety of a language with more social groups. The important thing was to describe what were the mechanisms that led to substitution, in order to be able to counteract them in time, if we could think of it. However, we had to descriptively avoid the terms dead and living languages, since they were misleading and confusing, and instead had been more proper names for extinct and non-extinct languages.

It is possible that the concept of social multilingualism in a current context of economic globalization and social and cultural diffusion is more comprehensive and explanatory, as well as the bilingual communicative competence (active and passive) of social groups is the best hypothesis of an explanatory model of social and cultural communication, within the bilingual speech community. In this sense, language contact at linguistic borders represented the best research laboratory, for the simple reason of interpreting languages with references to their place in the social and cultural context of the social groups involved, within the speech community (see U. Weinreich, 1953: 5-6).

However, languages, as excellent instruments of expression and communication of the cognitive development of the various social groups, within the social and cultural history of languages, could not be identified as biological entities, and they never had a vital period with a beginning and end, since they were not born or died. The contact of languages and cultures implied the linguistic and cultural transfers that implied the social and cultural miscegenation of the peoples of the different speech communities, with cultural assimilation and reinterpretation of foreign models, as well as the displacement of their languages, except in the case of Basque. Our working hypothesis analyzed the linguistic variations and changes, depending on the social and cultural diffusion, as well as the successive and diverse acculturations (Indo-European, Iberian, Phenopunic-Greek, Roman, Christian, Germanic, Visigothic and Islamic) (see F. Gimeno, 2019).

The very linguistic and cultural continuity of the anthropological history of the Hispanic romances, based on the successive and diverse acculturations, enriched the different Spanish speech communities (together with other linguistic and social factors), and produced profound changes in the sociological structure, political, economic and cultural of the Iberian Peninsula. These transformations were the historical, sociological, cultural and legal determinants of the Latino change to Romance, in their respective speech communities, and increased the development of linguistic variation, within social multilingualism.

#### **IV. NEAR FUTURE OF LANGUAGES**

J. Maurais (2003) wondered if we were heading towards a new linguistic order in the 21st century, and offered some of the forecasts offered by various authors. Some predicted that we will witness a decrease in diversity. Thus, for example, the languages spoken in the world were evaluated to be around 6,600, and it was estimated that 90% of all languages will disappear or be close to extinction during this century. Others predicted the fragmentation of the great languages and the loss of intercomprehension between the different geographical varieties of the countries. He even mentioned the past position of A. Meillet about the homogenization of all European languages, with the tendency towards linguistic convergence through semantic calques and lexical calques. In addition, some had predicted that in the distant future, Chinese would be the lingua franca of the world. The seemingly irresistible rise of English in the world put other languages on the defensive as a result of their efforts to hold their place in a rapidly changing world. Globalization, accompanied by the spread of English, already placed countries that had English as a majority language in an even more special position.

Proposals that the world's linguistic problems could be easily solved either by the spread of English, by the technological resources of the automatic translation machine, or by the compulsory teaching of two foreign languages,

had nothing to do with reality. It was a fallacy. Neither utopian universal multilingualism nor the monolingualism of the hegemonic world could satisfy our needs for communication and cultural identities. Faced with the expensive multilingualism promoted by the European Union, where all the speeches in the monthly sessions of Parliament had to be translated into the 20 official languages (thus, for example, in 1997 translation and interpreting activity in Europe was evaluated at 3, 75 billion euros), J. Maurais was of the opinion that the true answer to linguistic and communication problems at the dawn of the 21st century was in an auxiliary international language (English).

An investigation into the near future of languages was the report by D. Graddol (1997: 59), at the request of the British Council. Based on both economic and demographic evolution and potential linguistic displacement, said author offered the following hierarchical stratification for the year 2050:

- 1) the major languages of more than 300 million first language speakers (Hindi/Urdu, Chinese, English, Spanish and Arabic).
- 2) the supranational languages of the largest trading blocs (Arabic, Malay, Chinese, English, Russian and Spanish);
- 3) the national languages, around 90 languages that will be attended by more than 220 nation-states, and
- 4) Regional languages, the rest of about 1000 world languages, with varying degrees of official recognition.

In the 21st century, no language will occupy the hegemonic position that English almost reached at the end of the 20th century. On the one hand, the current displacement of the monopoly of English by the oligopoly of several languages in the upper stratum will produce greater pluralism. On the other, the significant language shift of several thousand minority languages in the lower stratum will cause the immense bankruptcy of the current diversity and showed a forecast of the order of 80%. Another forecast that 50% of minority languages will not survive the 21st century may be more acceptable (see W. F. Mackey, 2003: 77).

In a report on the Spanish language in today's world, H. López Morales (2012: 55-7) stated that the teaching of Spanish in public secondary education in the United States of America was a language on the rise. The percentage distribution of foreign language enrollments were 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 addition, the language preferences of young university students in the United States of America were in the same direction. Enrollments to study Spanish had skyrocketed throughout the country and at all levels, since it was by far the most studied language in American universities: 850,000 enrollments in Spanish classes, in contrast to 210,000 for French, 180,000 for German, 92,000 who had selected sign language, 74,000 learning Japanese and 61,000 studying Chinese.

He also alluded to Hispanic immigrants in the United States of America, and to their acculturation, which did not stop at superficial issues, but at matters of greater depth, such as the vision of the world, culture in general and, in particular, language. Once the initial ethnic-cultural pride had disappeared, it tended to be incorporated into growing processes of de-ethnicization and to reach total acculturation, with increasing abandonment of positive attitudes towards the mother tongue, progressive weakening of linguistic loyalty, restriction of the domains of use of Spanish and gradual impoverishment, leading to a language shift by English.

C. Truchot (2003) pointed out that the reality of the European Union was very far from the advocated multilingualism, since intra-institutional communication favoured the use of two dominant supranational languages or lingua francas (English and French), and in expert meetings normally used only one (English since 1996, more in the written register than in the oral). German was generally chosen as a third language, but its use was limited, despite Germany's high demographic, political and economic weight within the European Union. The lingua francas played a more important role, enjoyed greater prestige and their international position was consolidated. However, the big winner in each field was English, as a result of the globalization process that led to the use of English in the fields of fundamental importance that were under the competence of the European Union.

Economic and political factors were, then, behind the present action to promote the use of English in numerous fields in the European Union. Its role in the European institutions gave it in fact an institutional legitimacy that interacted with the other factors, which would be strengthened if it became the only lingua franca of its institutions. However, it was evident that the European Union had to contribute to a great extent to maintain a linguistic balance in Europe, through the consolidation and extension of its official linguistic regime. In any case, it was not an economic question, but a political one.

In accordance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights (approved in Nice, 2000), the European Union contributed to the preservation and promotion of common values, while respecting the diversity of cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe. For its part, the European Parliament (the European entity that is most sensitive to linguistic diversity and the only public body that has adopted the principle of comprehensive multilingualism) recommended that the governments of the member states provide minority languages with an adequate legal status that would cover the except for the fields of education, culture, justice and public administration, the media, toponymy and other sectors of public and cultural life (see A. Argemí, 2002).

In Madrid (June 11-12, 2005), the Ministers of Culture of 45 countries signed an agreement on cultural diversity as a factor of pluralism, democracy, identity of societies and individuals, social cohesion and dialogue. Said

declaration, presented shortly after (October 20) at the 33rd General Convention of UNESCO, held in Paris, was confirmed with the votes in favor of 148 states. Two governments did so against (United States of America and Israel), and four abstained. It entered into force, with the ratification of 30 countries, and only had the force of law in those territories whose governments ratified it. The plenary sanctioned the right of peoples to cultural diversity, and demanded the protection and promotion of cultural diversity, in order to curb economic globalization and current liberalization.

In addition, it took into account the principle of equality of all cultures (since they were part of the common heritage of humanity), the nature of cultural goods and services (which should have a differentiated treatment from all merchandise, and released them of the rules of the World Trade Organization), the establishment and development of policies that promote and protect cultural diversity, and the role of culture as a factor of employment and economic growth.

F. Gimeno (2008a) stated that it was necessary to stop cultural globalization and Anglo-Saxon influence, starting from advocating absolute respect for the cultural and linguistic diversity of peoples, as proposed by the UN. The linguistic planning of linguistic and cultural diversity had to be claimed and demanded. It was possible that a supranational policy of cultural protection and promotion would balance the spread of English with the preservation of the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples. Although theoretically they might seem incompatible terms, globalization and linguistic and cultural diversity were reconcilable in practice, and they fit perfectly into the principle of diversity in globality, as well as constitute two current trends of environmental pressure. Thus it had been affirmed that more than a process that led to uniformity, globalization seemed to tend towards the creation of new mixed forms of culture, language and political organization.

## **V. LEXICAL ANGLICISM**

Most of the researchers who dealt with lexical Anglicism did not clearly separate the initial act of the linguistic process of language contact and the final acceptance of the already integrated loan, as a consequence of the lack of delimitation between the sociolinguistic process of lexical transfer and the lexicographical discussion about the ultimate or immediate origin of the loan. Moreover, to this day, this last analysis is the one that has been most generally considered, and any recognition of the concrete dynamics of linguistic and social integration of code-switching and lexical calques has been largely ignored. In this way it is explained that up to now all loans of English origin have been generally admitted under the denomination of lexical anglicism .

Analysis of the development of lexical transfer was to begin with a study of the behavior of bilingual speakers. While borrowing could occur in the speech of monolingual speakers, code-switching and calque always implied some degree of bilingual communicative competence. Our research was based on the sociolinguistic contributions of social multilingualism and the open differentiation between lexical Anglicism and integrated borrowing. Similarly, the process of linguistic and social integration of the loans required the differentiation between non-integrated loans and integrated loans. The two manifestations that best defined the process of language contact were code-switching and calque. Therefore, within lexical Anglicism, the delimitation between code-switching versus calque should be considered, since the former always implied an attempt to import all or part of the foreign lexeme.

The analysis of lexical Anglicism in the Spanish of America and Spain has occupied the attention of scholars and linguists for many years now. The influence of English was earlier and greater in Hispanic America than in Spain, since the ties of the countries of Spanish America with the Anglo-Saxon nations gave them greater contact with the English language. Starting in the 1940s, studies dedicated to compiling the common Anglicisms in American Spanish began to appear, particularly in Puerto Rico and Panama, and expressed concern about differentiating between superfluous foreign words and neologisms that should be adopted to language enrichment.

Between 1987 and 1990, F. Gimeno and M. V. Gimeno (2003) analyzed the impact of globalization on six Spanish newspapers (three from the United States of America and three from Spain), through lexical Anglicism. In addition, in 2005 and 2006, F. Gimeno and L. Valozic (2012) studied the influence of globalization on newspaper advertising in four countries (Spain, Italy, France and Serbia), also through lexical Anglicism. (see L. Valozic, 2015). Finally, A. Cece and F. Gimeno (2020) analyzed the impact of economic globalization and lexical Anglicism in the economic newspapers of Italy and Spain. In all cases there was contact between related Indo-European languages (to each other, e. g, English, French, Spanish, Italian and Serbian), and the percentages of code-switching changes in the total of lexical Anglicisms prevailed overwhelmingly over those percentages of lexical calques, especially in the economic and advertising sociolect.

The linguistic displacement of Spanish by English at the end of the 20th century has materialized in the following three degrees or phases of the Anglo-Saxon acculturation process:

- a) the language shift of Spanish, within the third generation of immigrants, in the cases of the Spanish speech communities of Los Angeles and New York. “Spanglish” did not respond to a new language or amalgamation of Spanish and English, but to a terminal stage of linguistic atrophy, as a result of the acculturative process ;



- b) the linguistic displacement of Spanish within some social functions (government, social communication media and educational system) linked to the domain of public use (before the bilingual policy of official protection of English), in the specific case of the Puerto Rican speech community, and
- c) the preference for the categorical or obligatory importation of the Anglo-American lexeme, although the use of the variable code-switching (along with the Spanish lexical variant) should also be mentioned, in the cases of the speech communities of the Hispano-American countries and of the Spanish State.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

Our proposal regarding the immediate challenge of the present and the near future of languages was limited to the following sections:

1. All languages were enriched by social and linguistic contact and reflected the social and cultural needs of social groups in idiomatic communities. The present and near future of languages had to respond to the challenge posed by two fundamental characteristics of the early 21st century: economic globalization and lexical Anglicism. Of all the social factors that affected the Romance languages in their long history, the influence of contemporary English has been the most surprising in many ways.

2. The influence of lexical Anglicism in languages raised the need for a linguistic policy defined by the integration and adaptation of code-switching, which would avoid clear strategies of wide diglossia and linguistic displacement without social mobility. Society had to be committed to the conservation of languages, and also to the strengthening of relations with other languages. The media have an extraordinary influence on the present and the near future of languages.

3. Economic globalization should be channeled through absolute respect for the linguistic and cultural diversity of peoples, and thus constitute two current trends of environmental pressure. It was necessary, therefore, to stop cultural globalization and Anglo-Saxon influence, starting from 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 UNESCO General Convention (2005).

4. Linguistic planning for linguistic and cultural diversity must be called for and demanded. It is possible, therefore, that a supranational policy of protection and promotion of all languages and cultures can ensure the conservation of the cultural and linguistic diversity of humanity.

5. Our working hypothesis of historical sociolinguistics about the present and the near future of languages, based on anthropological, sociological, cultural and legal determinants, is confirmed that no language will occupy the hegemonic position of English, from this second decade of the 21st century, within a new social and cultural situation of multilingualism and multiculturalism.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- [1]. Alonso, A. (1943), *Castellano, español, idioma nacional. Historia espiritual de tres nombres*, 3th ed., Buenos Aires, Losada, 1958.
- [2]. Ammon, U. (2003), "The International Standing of The German Language", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 231-49.
- [3]. Argemí, A. (2002), "Les llengües d'Europa i la globalització (en ocasió de l'Any Europeu de les Llengües)", in Martí, J. and Mestres, J. M. (eds.) (2002), 65-85.
- [4]. Bastardas, A. and Boix, E. (dirs.) (1994), *¿Un estado, una lengua? La organización política de la diversidad lingüística*, Barcelona: Octaedro.
- [5]. 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.
- [6]. Crystal, D. (2004), *La revolución del lenguaje*, Madrid, 2005.
- [7]. Doppelbauer, M. and Cichon, P. (eds.) (2008), *La España multilingüe. Lenguas y políticas lingüísticas de España*, Viena, Praesens.
- [8]. Fishman, J. A. (1991), *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*, Cleveland, Multilingual Matters.
- [9]. Francisco, A. de (1997), *Sociología y cambio social*, Barcelona, Ariel.
- [10]. Giles, H. et al., (1977), "Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations", in Giles, H. (ed.) (1977), 307-48.
- [11]. Giles, H. (ed.) (1977), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*, New York, Academia Press.
- [12]. 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.
- [13]. Gimeno, F. (2008a), "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, Universidad de Valladolid, 251-68.
- [14]. Gimeno, F. (2008b), "La situación sociolingüística de la Comunidad Valenciana", in Doppelbauer, M. and Cichon, P. (eds.) (2008), 213-22.
- [15]. Gimeno, F. (2019), *Historia antropológica de los romances hispanos*, San Millán de la Cogolla, Cilengua.
- [16]. Gimeno, F. (2023), "The sociocultural origin of the oral register of Languages", *IOSR-JJSS*, 28, 5, 4, 42-54.
- [17]. Gimeno, F. (coord.) (2020), *Lengua, sociedad y cultura. Estudios dedicados a A. Carcedo*, Alicante, Universidad de Alicante.
- [18]. Gimeno, F. and Gimeno, M. V. (2003), *El desplazamiento lingüístico del español por el inglés*, Madrid, Cátedra.
- [19]. Gimeno, F. and Gómez, J. R. (2007), "Spanish and Catalan in the Community of Valencia", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 184, 95-107.
- [20]. 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.
- [21]. Graddol, D. (1997), *The future of English?*, London, The British Council.
- [22]. Junyent, M. C. (1992), *Vida i mort de les llengües*, 6th ed., Barcelona, Empúries, 2008.

- [23]. López Morales, H. (1989), *Sociolingüística*, 3th ed., Madrid, Gredos.
- [24]. López Morales, H. (2012), *La lengua española en el mundo actual*, Valencia, Aduana Vieja.
- [25]. Mackey, W. F. (1994), "La ecología de las sociedades plurilingües", in Bastardas, A. and Boix, E. (eds.) (1994), 25-54.
- [26]. Mackey, W. F. (2003), "Forecasting the fate of Languages", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 64-81.
- [27]. Martí, J. and Mestres, J. M. (eds.) (2002), *Les llengües i les cultures en el procés de globalització de la societat de la informació (Actes del Curs del Cuimpb, 2001)*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- [28]. Maurais, J. (2003), "Towards a new linguistic world order?", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 13-36.
- [29]. Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (2003), "Introduction", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 1-10.
- [30]. Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), *Language in a globalising world*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [31]. Sasot, A. (2004), "El proceso de globalización", in *Historia Universal. Fin de siglo. Las Claves del siglo XXI*, Madrid, Salvat, 165-216.
- [32]. Truchot, C. (2003), "Languages and supranationality in Europe: The linguistic influence of the European Union", in Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (eds.) (2003), 99-110.
- [33]. Valozic, L. (2015), *El anglicismo léxico en la publicidad*, Alacant, Universitat d'Alacant.
- [34]. Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*, 6th ed., The Hague, Mouton, 1968.